CARIBBEAN EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL
CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION®
MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON THE SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT
MANAGEMENT OF BUSINESS UNIT 1

NAME OF CENTRE: ___________________________________
CENTRE CODE: _______________________________________
NAME OF TEACHER: ___________________________________
YEAR OF EXAMINATION: _______________________________

---

### A. ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects requested:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects received:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling guidelines were adhered to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks were accurately recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills/competencies were clearly indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component marks were clearly indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates details were accurately recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### B. APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topics chosen were appropriate for the CAPE level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics chosen were relevant to Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission could have been improved by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### C. COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects adhered to prescribed length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects adhered to stipulated format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### D. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK ON CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSION

**CANDIDATES:**
- Demonstrated adequate knowledge of the objectives being assessed
- Selected and organized pertinent material
- Showed relationship among components of the business environment
- Interpreted data correctly
- Showed relationship between findings and recommendations
- Presented report using relevant charts, tables, graphs

**Yes** | **No**
---|---
- | -
- | -
- | -
- | -
- | -
- | -

---

### E. QUALITY OF CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSION

The overall quality of candidates’ submission was:
- Excellent
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Candidates’ performance could have been improved by:

---

### F. QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING

The teacher’s assessment of the sample of projects was:
- Acceptable
- Severe
- Lenient
- Inconsistent

---

### G. PRELIMINARY DECISION

Moderation was NOT possible because:
- No projects were received
- Insufficient number of projects were received
- Projects were not appropriately marked

---

### H. OTHER COMMENTS

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

---

Revised September 2013