



SOCIAL STUDIES

Name of Centre: \_\_\_\_\_ Territory: \_\_\_\_\_ Centre Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_ Year of Examination: \_\_\_\_\_

**A. ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS**

Number of assignments requested

Number of assignments received

Sampling guidelines adhered to  Yes  No

Candidates' names and registration numbers accurately recorded  Always  Rarely  Frequently

Marks on candidates' assignments consistent with marks on moderation form  Always  Rarely  Frequently

Profile/component marks are clearly indicated for criteria  Always  Rarely  Frequently

Marks clearly indicated for components/criteria  Always  Rarely  Frequently

**B. APPROPRIATENESS OF TASKS**

Topic(s) chosen was/were relevant to the syllabus  Always  Frequently  Rarely

Topic(s) chosen was/were appropriate for the CSEC level  Always  Frequently  Rarely

Comments  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**C. COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES**

	NA	Always	Frequently	Rarely
1. Assignment details submitted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Assignments adhered to specified length	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Assignments adhered to required format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Mark Schemes conformed to syllabus guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Assignments marked as specified in syllabus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Candidates have:

	Always	Frequently	Rarely
1. Demonstrated adequate knowledge of the content and objectives assessed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Demonstrated competence in the skills assessed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Submitted neat and legible research papers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Included all the essential features of good presentation in the research papers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Demonstrated understanding of the issues related to the topics chosen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Stated conclusions that were coherent and relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Showed sufficient evidence of their own work in the research paper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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