CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION
MANAGEMENT OF BUSINESS UNIT 2

NAME OF CENTRE: ________________________________  CENTRE CODE: ________________________________
NAME OF TEACHER: ________________________________  YEAR OF EXAMINATION: ____________________

A. ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects requested: ___</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects received: ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling guidelines were adhered to</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks were accurately recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills/competencies were clearly indicated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component marks were clearly indicated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates details were accurately recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics chosen were appropriate for the CAPE level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topics chosen were relevant to Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submissions could have been improved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES

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

D. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK ON CANDIDATES' SUBMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Demonstrated adequate knowledge of the objectives being assessed | Yes | No |
| 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 |     |    |

E. QUALITY OF CANDIDATE'S SUBMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The overall quality of candidates’ submission was</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates’ performance could have been improved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher’s assessment of the sample of projects was</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. PRELIMINARY DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderation was NOT possible because:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No projects were received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. OTHER COMMENTS

| ____________________________________________ |
|________________________________________________|
|________________________________________________|
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