**CARIBBEAN EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL**  
**ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS**  
**MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT**  
**CARIBBEAN STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Centre:</th>
<th>Centre Code:</th>
<th>Name of Teacher:</th>
<th>Year of Examination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADMINISTRATION DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Projects requested:</th>
<th>Number of Projects received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Marks for each research project were recorded clearly and correctly.  
  - Yes [ ] No [ ]
- A completed Moderation Form (FRM/EDPD/192) was submitted with the research project.  
  - Yes [ ] No [ ]

**APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics chosen were relevant to the content of the unit.</th>
<th>Submissions were appropriate for the level of the candidates.</th>
<th>Submissions showed sufficient evidence of candidates’ individual work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES**

- Research projects adhered to stipulated length.  
  - Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Penalty was imposed by teacher if length was exceeded.  
  - Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Research projects were submitted using the stipulated format.  
  - Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Research projects did not include the following section(s):  
  - __________________________________________________________

**QUALITY OF CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSIONS**

- The overall quality of research projects was  
  - Excellent [ ] Satisfactory [ ] Unsatisfactory [ ]
- The aspect of the Candidates’ submission which was most commendable was:  
  - __________________________________________________________
- Candidates could have improved their submissions by:  
  - __________________________________________________________

**QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING**

- The teacher’s marking of the research project was:  
  - Acceptable [ ] Severe [ ] Lenient [ ] Inconsistent [ ]
- The teacher followed the guidelines for marking.  
  - Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Marks were clearly shown for each of the criteria set out in the marking guidelines.  
  - Yes [ ] No [ ]

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

- Candidates observed the word limit.  
  - Always [ ] Often [ ] Rarely [ ]
- Candidates followed the guidelines as laid out in the syllabus.  
  - Always [ ] Often [ ] Rarely [ ]
- The research topics were clearly stated and well focused.  
  - Always [ ] Often [ ] Rarely [ ]
- Candidates were awarded marks for tasks not done.  
  - Always [ ] Often [ ] Rarely [ ]
- Candidates’ understanding of appropriate research methods was.  
  - Comprehensive [ ] Satisfactory [ ] Poor [ ]
- Candidates’ presentation and analysis of data were.  
  - Comprehensive [ ] Satisfactory [ ] Poor [ ]

**OTHER COMMENTS**

- __________________________________________________________
- __________________________________________________________
- __________________________________________________________
- __________________________________________________________
- __________________________________________________________
- __________________________________________________________
- __________________________________________________________
- __________________________________________________________

Moderator’s Initials: ____________________  
Chief/Assistant Chief Examiner’s Initials ____________________
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