**CARIBBEAN EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL**

**CARIBBEAN ADVANCED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION®**

**MODERATION FEEDBACK REPORT ON SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES STUDIES - UNIT 2**

**ADMINISTRATION DETAILS**

- Name of Centre: __________________________
- Centre Code: __________________________
- Name of Teacher: __________________________
- Year of Examination: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects requested: _________</th>
<th>Number of projects received: _________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks for each research project were recorded clearly and correctly.</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A completed Moderation Form FRM/EDPD/600 was submitted with the research project.</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIVITIES**

- Topics chosen were relevant to the content of the unit. | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
- Submissions were appropriate for the level of the candidates. | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
- Submissions showed sufficient evidence of candidates’ individual work. | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

**COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES**

- Projects adhered to stipulated length. | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
- Penalty was imposed by teacher if length was exceeded. | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
- Projects were adhered to the stipulated format. | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
- Projects did not include the following section(s): __________________________

**QUALITY OF CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSIONS**

The overall quality of research projects was

- Excellent ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

The aspect of the candidates’ submissions which was most commendable was:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Candidates could have improved their submissions by:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

**QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING**

The teacher’s marking of the research projects was:

- Acceptable ☐ Severe ☐ Lenient ☐ Inconsistent ☐

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 □ Sometimes □ Never
- Candidates’ understanding of appropriate research methods was □ Comprehensive □ Satisfactory □ Poor
- Candidates’ presentation and analysis of data were □ Comprehensive □ Satisfactory □ Poor

**OTHER COMMENTS**

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Moderator’s Initials: ________________ Examiner’ Initials ________________ Chief/Assistant Chief Examiner’s Initials ________________