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CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION®

MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

SOCIOLOGY - UNIT 1

Name of Centre: _____________________________
Name of Teacher: _____________________________
Centre Code: ________________________________
Year of Examination: _________________________

ADMINISTRATION DETAILS

Number of Projects requested: __________
Number of Projects received: __________
Marks for each research project were recorded clearly and correctly.  
A completed Moderation Form FRM/EDPD/403 was submitted with the research project.

APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIVITIES

Topics chosen were relevant to the content of the unit.  
Submissions were appropriate for the level of the candidates.  
Submissions showed sufficient evidence of candidates’ individual work.

COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES

Research projects adhered to stipulated length.  Yes ☐ No ☐
Penalty was imposed by teacher if length was exceeded.  Yes ☐ No ☐
Research projects were submitted using the stipulated format.  Yes ☐ No ☐
Research projects did not include the following section(s):

QUALITY OF CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSIONS

The overall quality of research projects was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The aspect of the Candidates’ submission which was most commendable was:

Candidates could have improved their submissions by:

QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING

The teacher’s marking of the research project was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Lenient</th>
<th>Inconsistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 were awarded marks for tasks not done.  
Always ☐ Often ☐ Rarely ☐
Candidates’ understanding of appropriate research methods was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Candidates’ presentation and analysis of data were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OTHER COMMENTS
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__________________________________________________
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Moderator’s Initials: ________________
Chief/Assistant Chief Examiner’s Initials __________________