



MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

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