



CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION®

MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

LAW - UNIT 1

Name of Centre: \_\_\_\_\_

Centre Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

Year of Examination: \_\_\_\_\_

ADMINISTRATION DETAILS

Number of projects requested: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of projects received: \_\_\_\_\_

Marks for each research project were recorded clearly and correctly. Yes  No

A completed Moderation Form (FRM/EDPD/352) was submitted with the research project. Yes  No

APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIVITIES

Topics chosen were relevant to the content of the Unit. Yes  No

Submissions were appropriate for the level of the candidates. Yes  No

Submissions showed sufficient evidence of candidates' individual work. Yes  No

COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES

Projects adhered to stipulated length. Yes  No

Penalty was imposed by teacher if length was exceeded. Yes  No

Projects adhered to the stipulated format. Yes  No

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' submissions which was most commendable was:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Candidates could have improved their submissions by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

QUALITY OF TEACHER'S MARKING

The teacher's marking of the research projects was:

Acceptable  Severe  Lenient  Inconsistent

The teacher followed the criteria 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' understanding of appropriate research methods was  Comprehensive  Satisfactory  Poor

Candidates' understanding of the concepts and principles of the law was  Comprehensive  Satisfactory  Poor

Candidates' application of legal principles to cases was  Good  Satisfactory  Weak

Candidates' analysis and interpretation of the law were  Comprehensive  Satisfactory  Poor

Quality of the language was  Good  Satisfactory  Poor

Plagiarism was evident  Often  Sometimes  Never

Appropriate teacher guidance was evident  Always  Sometimes  Never

Moderator's Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner's Initials \_\_\_\_\_

Chief/Assistant Chief Examiner's Initials \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_