**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/353) 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: ____________
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