CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION®
MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

LAW - UNIT 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERATOR'S INITIALS: ____________________</th>
<th>EXAMINER'S INITIALS: ____________________</th>
<th>CHIEF/ASSISTANT CHIEF EXAMINER’S INITIALS: ____________________</th>
<th>DATE: ______________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ADMINISTRATION DETAILS**

Number of projects requested: __________

Number of projects received: __________

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

A completed Modération 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 ☐
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