



**CARIBBEAN EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL
CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION®**

FRM/EDPD/602

MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

FINANCIAL SERVICES STUDIES - UNIT 2

Name of Centre: _____

Centre Code: _____

Name of Teacher: _____

Year of Examination: _____

ADMINISTRATION DETAILS	QUALITY OF CANDIDATES' SUBMISSIONS	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
Number of projects requested: _____ Number of projects received: _____ Marks for each research project were recorded clearly and correctly. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> A completed Moderation Form FRM/EDPD/600 was submitted with the research project. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	The overall quality of research projects was Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> The aspect of the candidates' submissions which was most commendable was: _____ _____ _____ Candidates could have improved their submissions by: _____ _____ _____	Candidates observed the word limit. <input type="checkbox"/> Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely Candidates followed the guidelines as laid out in the syllabus. <input type="checkbox"/> Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely The research topics were clearly stated and well focused. <input type="checkbox"/> Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely Candidates were awarded marks for tasks not done. <input type="checkbox"/> Always <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Never Candidates' understanding of appropriate research methods was <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Poor Candidates' presentation and analysis of data were <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIVITIES Topics chosen were relevant to the content of the unit. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Submissions were appropriate for the level of the candidates. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Submissions showed sufficient evidence of candidates' individual work. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALITY OF TEACHER'S MARKING The teacher's marking of the research projects was: Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Severe <input type="checkbox"/> Lenient <input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher followed the criteria for marking. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Marks were clearly shown for each of the criteria set out in the marking guidelines. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER COMMENTS _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES Projects adhered to stipulated length. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Penalty was imposed by teacher if length was exceeded. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Projects were adhered to the stipulated format. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Projects did <u>not</u> include the following section(s): _____		

Moderator's Initials: _____

Examiner' Initials _____

Chief/Assistant Chief Examiner's Initials _____