### PRINCIPLES OF ACCOUNTS

**A. ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS**

- Number of assignments requested
- Number of assignments received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. APPROPRIATENESS OF TASKS**

- Topic(s) chosen was/were relevant to the syllabus
- Topic(s) chosen was/were appropriate for the CSEC level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES**

1. Assignment details submitted
2. Assignments adhered to specified length
3. Assignments adhered to required format
4. Mark Schemes conformed to syllabus guidelines
5. Assignments marked as specified in syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK ON CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSIONS**

Candidates have:
1. Demonstrated adequate knowledge of the content and objectives assessed
2. Demonstrated competence in the skills assessed
3. Demonstrated adequate knowledge of content and objectives being assessed
4. Selected and organized relevant material for project selected
5. Shown the relationship among components of the business environment
6. Interpreted data correctly
7. Shown the relationship between findings and recommendations
8. Presented report using relevant charts, tables, graphs

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

Candidates’ performance could have been improved by:

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

**E. QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING**

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