PRINCIPAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

BOTSWANA EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL

BSSE HORTICULTURE

2025

PAPER 1: WRITTEN PAPER

General Comments

The 2025 cohort showed slightly weaker performance than 2024, especially in math-based and problem-solving questions. While most work was neat and logically presented, some left blanks and missed rubric requirements. Fewer errors in spelling and cancellations suggest improved care in presentation.

Comments on Individual Items

1 (a) (i) Most candidates attempted the question, but many gave incorrect examples like diary or labour records instead of proper financial records. Correct responses include balance sheet, income statement, and debtors/creditors accounts. Centres are advised to have a clearer focus on farm accounting terms.

(ii) Most candidates misunderstood the question, focusing on general record-keeping benefits instead of ICT advantages. Few mentioned efficiency, accuracy, or remote access. Clearer emphasis on digital benefits like reduced errors and data security is needed.

(iii) Most candidates identified budgeting and loans as key points but gave incomplete explanations. Stronger responses linked record keeping costing control, profit tracking, and informed decision-making. Teaching should focus on connecting records to financial outcomes.

(b) (i) Most candidates correctly defined tropism as growth movement in response to directional stimuli. A few missed key terms like growth or used “unidirectional” incorrectly. Overall, understanding was solid but precision matters.

(ii) Candidates performed well, accurately describing geotropism as roots growing downward for stability and nutrient uptake, shoots upward for light. Responses showed clear understanding of both movement and purpose. Well done!

(iii) Most candidates described hydrotropism correctly but failed to link it to farming in dry areas. They missed key points like targeting water to roots, choosing deep-rooted crops, or using mulch. Practical application needs more focus.

(c) (i) Most candidates clearly explained that water softens the seed coat and activates enzymes, while oxygen supports respiration for energy production. A few oversimplified oxygen’s role as “providing air.” Overall, understanding was strong.

(ii) Performance was fair, but many missed linking actions to benefits e.g., loosening soil improves aeration and root growth. Some gave reasons without factors or used vague terms like “cultivating.” Emphasizing clear cause-and-effect pairs will improve responses.

(iii) Most candidates identified 25 °C as optimal but struggled to justify it with biological reasoning. Many incorrectly claimed enzyme denaturation at 30 °C. Stronger responses linked 25 °C to peak enzyme activity, metabolism, and growth. Data interpretation needs deeper explanation.

2 (a) (i) Most candidates correctly named soil sampling tools like auger, trowel, or soil probe. A few confused tools with lab materials (e.g., pH strips). Overall, understanding was solid but practical vs. analytical tools should be clarified.

(ii) Candidates performed well, clearly explaining that multi-depth sampling helps assess nutrient distribution, pH, and root zone conditions. Responses showed good understanding of soil variability and its impact on crop choice. Well-reasoned.

(iii) Most candidates correctly suggested adding lime but lacked proper justification. Stronger answers linked liming to improved nutrient availability, reduced toxicity, and better microbial activity. Emphasizing the "why" behind practices will boost scores.

(b) (i) Most candidates gave general terms like cultivation or ploughing, missing the specific activity, harrowing, or discing as a secondary cultivation step. While some were on track, precision in terminology needs reinforcement.

(ii) Most candidates identified factors like soil or crop type but failed to explain how they affect harrowing depth. Some gave irrelevant answers like seed size. Clearer focus on linking each factor to its practical effect is needed.

(iii) Many candidates mentioned benefits like aeration or moisture but missed the how, such as breaking clods for better seed contact or burying weeds. Some used vague terms like “cultivating” instead of specific actions. Clearer links between practice and outcome are needed.

(c) (i) Candidates performed well, identifying key factors like mature plant size, soil fertility, and equipment use. Most showed good understanding of how spacing affects growth and management. Clear and relevant responses overall.

(ii) Most candidates mentioned watering but missed hardening off, the key practice. Few who named it failed to explain the gradual exposure to light, wind, and reduced watering. Teaching should focus on the process, not just the term.

(iii) Most candidates struggled with the calculation, failing to convert spacing to area or apply seed rate correctly. Few reached the final answer of 50 kg. Step-by-step practice on unit conversion and scaling is essential.

3 (a) (i) Most candidates correctly identified irrigation as the general term. A few incorrectly gave specific methods like drip or sprinkler. Emphasis on distinguishing broad terms from specific techniques is helpful.

(ii) Most candidates mentioned reduced evaporation but missed key points like weed suppression or improved soil structure. Responses were partial. Teaching should link mulching to both immediate and long-term water conservation.

(iii) Most candidates recognized drip irrigation’s efficiency but some misattributed issues to furrow irrigation. Stronger responses highlighted targeted watering, reduced waste, and disease control. Focus on comparative analysis will improve answers.

(b) **(i)** Most candidates correctly stated calibration ensures accurate pesticide or mixture measurement. A few mistakenly mentioned fertilizer. Clear understanding overall, reinforcing purpose prevents misuse.

(ii) Most candidates correctly identified key spraying precautions like constant speed, height, and calm conditions. A few mentioned PPE or wind direction. These are valid but not technique focused. Overall, strong grasp of safe application practices.

(iii) Many candidates struggled by combining steps, leading to errors. The correct approach requires calculating used volume (15 L), then spray rate (0.15 L/m²), and finally total for 500 m² (75 L). Clear, step-by-step calculation is key.

(c) **(i)** Most candidates accurately listed maturity indicators like colour, firmness, aroma, and sugar content. Responses were comprehensive, showing good understanding of harvest readiness. Well done!

(ii) Candidates clearly explained key advantages: selective harvesting, less tree damage, gentle handling, and cost efficiency. The responses were well-articulated, showing strong understanding of tool benefits over machinery.

(iii) Most candidates listed factors but missed linking them to environmental impacts. Full marks required pairing, e.g., machinery causing soil compaction (reduces aeration) or agrochemicals polluting water (harming aquatic life). Clear cause-effect links are essential.

4 **(a)** **(i)** Most candidates recognized the tool but used general terms like rake instead of the specific spring tine rake. Precision in naming agricultural tools is needed to secure full marks.

(ii) Candidates performed well, clearly stating benefits like better aeration, improved water infiltration, and pest reduction. Responses showed good understanding of lawn care and tool functionality. Well done.

(iii) Many candidates mentioned pollution or harm to non-target species but missed linking cause and effect. Full credit required pairing, like herbicides harming beneficial organisms or causing resistance. Clearer focus on impact *and* consequence is needed.

(b) **(i)** Most candidates correctly identified plant life span categories as annual, biennial, perennial, showing good understanding. A few confused common names with classification. Focus on terminology clarity remains key.

(ii) Most candidates identified key traits like colour, longevity, and fragrance. Some responses were incomplete or vague. Emphasizing specific, relevant characteristics will improve precision.

(iii) Many candidates recognized climbing plants' benefits but missed justifying how they control erosion or improve aesthetics. For the lawn material, sprigs was rarely named, and spacing factors like grass type or soil were often omitted. Clearer links and terminology are needed.

(c) **(i)** Most candidates struggled to identify sprigs or stolons as the planting material. Many also missed key spacing factors like grass type or soil condition. Clearer teaching on propagation methods and establishment practices is needed.

(ii) Most candidates correctly noted that sprigs form ground cover and roots bind soil, reducing erosion. Some missed explaining how this works over time. Strengthening cause-effect reasoning will improve responses.

(iii) Most candidates calculated the 2 kg nitrogen needed but failed to determine the total fertilizer amount using the 2: 3: 2 (22) ratio. Only a few completed the calculation to find ~31.7 kg. Step-by-step guidance on NPK math is essential.

5 **(a)** **(i)** Most candidates correctly named pruning tools, with secateur being the most common, though often misspelled. A few gave overly general terms like knife or saw. Spelling and precision matter.

(ii) Most candidates correctly described hand pulling, herbicides, or tool use for pavement weeds. Strong responses included removing roots to prevent regrowth. A few missed details, losing full marks. Clear, complete explanations are key.

(iii) Most candidates suggested painting or sanding but often missed explaining why, like preventing splinters or rot. Stronger answers linked each task to safety and longevity. Clear reasoning is crucial for full marks.

(b) **(i)** Most candidates correctly identified economic benefits like increased property value or job creation. Responses were clear and relevant, showing good understanding of landscaping's economic role.

(ii) Candidates performed well, clearly describing benefits like noise reduction, erosion control, and improved safety. Responses showed strong understanding of environmental and functional roles of roadside trees.

(iii) Most candidates suggested planting vegetation, but few mentioned terracing, drainage, or retaining structures. Some gave incorrect methods like ploughing across slopes. Emphasizing engineered and natural solutions together will improve responses.

(c) **(i)** Candidates clearly identified key limitations like terrain challenges, obstacles, and weather effects. Responses showed good awareness of practical measurement issues in outdoor settings.

(ii) Most candidates stated that accurate measurements are important but failed to explain how such as ensuring proper spacing, grading, or cost estimation. Clearer links between precision and practical outcomes are needed.

(iii) Many candidates calculated areas but failed to convert units (m^2 to cm^2), leading to wrong totals. Only a few arrived at 48 stones. Emphasizing unit consistency is crucial for accurate results.

PAPER 2: PRACTICAL EXAMINATION

General Comments

The overall performance of candidates in this component was disappointing and below standard compared to previous years. While most centres correctly displayed the required specimens as per instructions, a notable number failed to follow guidelines. Some repeated specimens or used incorrect alternatives, leading to avoidable mark loss. Candidates struggled with basic observation, inference, and data interpretation, core skills under AO 2 and AO 3. Responses were often vague, incomplete, or off topic. Many failed to link observations to biological or horticultural principles, and logical reasoning was weak.

Presentation quality varied. Some scripts were neat and well-structured, but many showed poor diagram quality, missing labels, incorrect proportions, or lack of clarity. Mathematical ability was a concern with errors in calculations, wrong formulas, or missing units. Spelling mistakes were frequent. Some ignored the rubrics. Despite this, a few centres produced strong work, with clear drawings, accurate data analysis, and sound reasoning, showing what is possible with proper preparation. With focused improvement in scientific observation and inference, and rubric compliance, performance can rebound in 2026.

Comments on Individual Questions

1 (a) Most candidates correctly identified Specimen D as Mexican poppy / devil's thorn. Most demonstrated good recognition of morphology: narrow leaves for A and C, and broad leaves for B and D. However, the following weaknesses were noted:

- Specimen A: Commonly misidentified as star grass (correct: buffel/foxtail grass)
- Specimen B: Often not attempted or incorrectly named
- Specimen C: Mistaken for pigweed or couch grass (correct: herringbone/nut-sedge)
- Vein type confusion: Many wrote narrow/broad instead of parallel or branched. This shows lack of understanding between leaf shape and venation pattern
- Some gave life cycle (annual/perennial) under morphology

Centres are advised to teach correct common names with visual aids and emphasise scientific distinction of plant features, noting that morphology is not same life cycle and shape cannot be equated to veins.

(b) Most candidates correctly identified: Herbicide 1 as Targa Super (for grassy weeds like A) and Herbicide 2 as Amine Weed Killer (for broadleaf weeds like B). This shows good understanding of selective herbicide use based on weed type. Nonetheless, timing of application was poorly answered: Many said after planting or after germination which was too vague. The correct answer, post-emergent must be clearly stated. Some confused timing with pre-emergent or blanket spraying.

Centres must strengthen precision in terminology and timing, emphasising that post-emergent is the required term, not descriptive phrases. Pre-emergent = before weeds emerge and post-emergent = after weeds are visible.

(c) **(i)** Most candidates correctly classified all specimens according to their method of dispersal but lost marks as they were unable to correctly outline a feature observed that enable their dispersal. Instead, they described the mechanism of dispersal. The item needed the cohorts to state only the observable feature enabling a seed to be dispersed through the named method not what they knew theoretically. Most candidates correctly classified dispersal methods: Animal, Q: Self-explosive, R: Wind, and S: Water.

However, feature identification was weak. Candidates described how dispersal happens, not what physical feature enables it. Common errors were:

- sticks to animals instead of hooks/spines,
- explodes instead of open pods,
- carried by wind instead of fluffy/parachute structure
- floats on water instead of light/fibrous

Clarifying confusion between mechanism and observable feature will improve performance.

(ii) Most candidates failed to name a real weed with the same dispersal method as Specimen Q (self-explosive). Many gave incorrect examples (e.g., couch grass, pigweed) or left blank. The expected examples include squirting cucumber, touch-me-not (Impatiens), or hura tree (sandbox tree). These have exploding pods that eject seeds. Advice to Centres is to teach local examples of explosive-dispersed weeds, using videos or live demonstrations of pod bursts.

2 **(a)** Most candidates correctly listed inventory items with accurate quantities. This shows clear understanding of enterprise setup for cabbage production. However, some omitted item capacities (e.g., water tank without size). Others wrote costs in the quantity column, showing confusion between number and price. Lack of units (e.g., 5 instead of 5 kg or 5 litres) was also common. Centres must emphasise accuracy in data presentation and column alignment. Quantity does not equate to cost.

(b) **(i)** This item was poorly done as most candidates. Most candidates omitted or miswrote the title. Assets and liabilities confused, many swapped or misclassified items. This misplacement resulted wrong totals. Equity was calculated incorrectly or left blank. Centres must focus on clarity, correct titles, and accurate categorisation (What is owned, assets vs. owed, liabilities). Assets = Liabilities + Equity, No liabilities before ordering, then equity = assets.

(ii) Most candidates correctly judged the cabbage enterprise as viable, showing clear decision aligned with the data. However, no reason was given for viability hence missing explanation. Many wrote Yes, viable but did not link to profit potential, low debt, or asset coverage. There was lack of supporting evidence from the balance sheet. Centres must note that a correct answer needs justification to earn full marks.

PAPER 3: PROVIDER BASED ASSESSMENT

General Comments

In 2025, four centres were moderated for Animal Production Paper 3 (1255/03), up from just one centre in previous years, leading to candidature rising from an average of 40 to 144. Due to the larger volume, a sample of scripts was marked, unlike in past years when all scripts were moderated. All centres successfully conducted and assessed the practical components: Farm Diary (15%), Field Observation (25%), Field Practical Training – FPT (35%), and Practical Tasks (25%).

Centres submitted complete summary mark sheets with candidate names and individual scores for each component: Farm Diary, Field Observation, FPT, and Practical Tasks with total and weighted marks. All component marks were recorded to one decimal place, with rounding applied only to totals. This ensured clear, precise differentiation in the final scores.

Most centres used quotation files and slide binders to organize Practical Tasks, Farm Diary, FPT, and Field Observation scripts. The scripts were arranged by candidate number in ascending order and securely boxed in BEC-provided packaging. Quotation files are recommended since they are easier to navigate and keep work better protected.

Individual Scored Tasks Reports

2.1 : FARM DIARY

2.1.1 General comments

All centres submitted typed diaries, which shows full compliance. Most covered a single enterprise (crop, horticultural tree, or landscape). Entries showed chronological tracking. However, some ignored required format: missing dates, comments, or observations. Description and comment columns were sometimes merged or omitted. Some observations lacked depth, mostly routine notes. Centres must train candidates to write meaningful comments, not just watered plants. Emphasise observation over listing. A good diary tells a story of growth, not just a checklist. Follow standard template:

Date Activity Description Comment/Observation

2.1.2 Cover page

Candidates wrote vague enterprise titles, missing specific crop/enterprise focus as required: e.g., Vegetable enterprise instead of Onion production. Centres must enforce precision, ensuring that candidates state exact enterprise.

2.1.3 Enterprise details

This section was poorly attempted with most candidates stating unrealistic harvesting ages e.g., Tomatoes: 14 months instead of approximately 3 months. Some giving duration instead of age, confusing growth period with initial/harvest age. Cover page merged with Enterprise Details, violating required structure. Centres must note that the correct practice is to record initial age (e.g., seedling age at planting), state harvesting age accurately (e.g., 8–12 weeks for lettuce), and separate Cover page and Enterprise Details page.

2.1.4 Sequence of activities

This section was poorly attempted by most candidates. The dates were out of order which breaks chronological flow. Activities not sequenced, mismatched with actual farming stages. Activities must follow logical farming timeline: e.g., Land preparation → Planting → Weeding → Harvesting. Dates must be in ascending order. A clear sequence shows real engagement.

2.1.5 Activities/operations

A common error was observations recorded under Activities, instead of in Comments/Observations column, mixing description with reflection. The correct approach is to record what was done, explain tools used and giving reasons for operations in the Activities column. Centres must clarify that: Activities = actions taken (3kg of chicken manure was applied per 1m2) while Observations = what was seen (e.g., plants appeared greener after application).

2.1.6 Tools used

Tools were listed in a separate column, not integrated into Description. Hands were frequently listed as a tool which is not acceptable. Real farming uses real tools (e.g., hoe, spade, rake). Advice to Centres is that tools must be named and described in action, e.g., used a hoe to break soil clods. Not just, Tools: hands, hoe.

2.1.7 Importance

The common errors noted were:

- Too few reasons given for activities
- Importance written under Comments, not in dedicated section
- Generic responses: e.g., to help plants grow which lacks depth.

The expectation is to have one clear reason per activity e.g., Mulching conserves moisture or suppress weed. Centres must train candidates to link importance directly to activity and avoid duplication.

2.1.8 Relevance of comments

Most comments were relevant and thoughtful, showing good attempts at reflection and observation. However, some repeated description or importance. e.g., Weeded to remove competition, not a comment, but a repeat of action/reason. Comments should show what was observed (e.g., Fewer weeds after mulching), challenges (e.g., soil was too dry to work easily) or insights (e.g., seedlings emerged faster in shaded bed). Centres must train the candidates to keep comments observational, not repetitive.

2.1.9 Precautions

This section was poorly done. Vague statements were given, e.g., Wear protective clothing with no detail. This miss specifics like which clothing? And why? Tools were cleaned but not how (e.g., washed, dried, greased). Stored safely but not how (e.g., locked storeroom, out of reach). Centres must emphasise specificity and purpose, e.g., Protective gear: e.g., Wore gloves to prevent thorn injuries, cleaned hoe with water and oiled blade to prevent rust, or Stored tools in locked shed to prevent misuse.

2.1.10 Project termination

The section was poorly attempted with most candidates missing closure actions, e.g., Many just said land returned to Agriculture Department. Showing the following weaknesses:

- Residue and product disposal not stated.
- Only one (or no) viability reason, need two with evidence (e.g., profit, yield, low cost).
- Termination not included in activity log. This should be final entry. A strong project ends with purpose.

Centres are advised to treat termination as a key task and log it in the table. Link viability to real data, not opinion.

2.1.11 Neatness

This part was poorly done. Pen was used for corrections creating messy, unprofessional appearance. Printer ink smudges/stains resulting in poor print quality. This affects overall presentation and readability. Centres are advised to reprint pages if correction is needed after revising. For neatness, every page should look polished.

2.2 FIELD OBSERVATION REPORT (FOR)

2.2.1 General comments

There were repeated titles across candidates, indicating lack of originality. One centre used old BGCSE project subtitles which is not aligned with OBE/BSSE requirements. This shows poor understanding of current syllabus structure. The expectation is for candidates to have unique, descriptive titles reflecting actual field work. Centres should avoid copying templates from outdated syllabi.

2.2.2 Title of observation

This section was poorly done. Titles were too vague, missing focus (comparison or variable). A good title shows what changed and what was measured. Candidates are expected to write clear, comparative titles. For example:

Effect of Organic vs. Inorganic Fertilizer on Lettuce Growth

Weed Density in Mulched vs. Unmulched Beds

2.2.3 List of equipment/materials

Candidates are expected to write accurate, per-enterprise lists, matching what was used. Unmatching lists indicate guesswork, raising authenticity concerns.

2.2.4 Objectives/ aims of observation

The section was poorly done. The key Issues noted in many objectives include:

- Single treatment only, no comparison (need two for valid observation)
- Vague objectives: e.g., many stated observing growth which is not measurable
- Mismatch with title: e.g., title mentions Weeks 4–6 but objective omits time

A strong objective is focused, measurable, and linked aligned with title and treatments.

2.2.5 Statement of factor to be observed

This section was poorly attempted with may reports showing the following Issues:

- No clear problem stated: e.g., poor growth, weed infestation
- Cause not explained: e.g., “Low yield due to poor soil”
- Solutions for one treatment only, not comparative
- Benefit to farmer/user missing

Clarity here drives the whole investigation; Centres are expected to state the problem; the likely cause; comparative solutions; and the benefit (Why does this matter to the farmer?).

2.2.6 Factor to compare and contrast in observation

This section was poorly attempted with most reports showing the following key Issues:

- Factor copied from objective, not clearly re-stated for comparison
- Only one treatment described no contrast (e.g., with compost vs. without)
- Manipulation method unclear: How was the factor changed?

Centres are expected to clearly name comparative factor: e.g., Type of fertilizer stating both treatments (Organic vs. inorganic) and explain how it is manipulated (Applied 2kg/bed of each type at planting). Clarity in comparison guarantees valid and meaningful results.

2.2.7 Number of units per observation/manipulation

Most candidates correctly stated the number of plots used in the study but did not explain how many or why replication. The expectation is to state the number of plots per treatment and justify e.g., 3 plots per treatment for reliability. This makes results stronger.

2.2.8 Layout /Sketch plan of observation

Most candidates drew complete sketches but with unclear, poor, or handwritten labels. Titles were weak, neither bolded/underlined nor descriptive, often missing crop name or treatments. Plot dimensions were not fully labelled. Candidates should present clear, neat sketch with all parts visible, title correctly formatted and descriptive e.g., Layout: Tomato Growth – Organic vs. Inorganic Fertilizer Trial. A good sketch tells the story immediately.

2.2.9 Procedure/Approach

Most candidates described only one treatment, missing side-by-side steps for comparison. Unnumbered steps make it hard to follow sequence. Some entries lacked detail, e.g., applied fertilizer with no reference to type, amount, or method. Centres should note every step of the procedure matter for it to be reproducible. Emphasise use of numbered steps for both treatments. Include essential details e.g., for fertilisers, applied 2kg of organic compost to Plot A; 2kg NPK 25:5:10 to Plot B.

2.2.10 Information collected

This was missing entirely in some reports. Many confused statistical parameters (e.g., mean) with actual measured data (e.g., height, leaf count). Some candidates did not place raw data tables in appendices. Candidates are expected to clearly state what was measured e.g., plant height (cm), number of leaves

and include raw data table in appendices not in main body. Use consistent units and labels, e.g., Table 1: Weekly Plant Height Measurements.

2.2.11 Analysis of findings

This section was poorly attempted with many reports showing the following issues:

- Incorrect title focused on one treatment, not reflecting comparison
- Stated measured parameter (e.g., height) instead of statistical analysis (e.g., mean, range)
- No visual presentation, data described but not in tables/graphs
- Incomplete labelling: Y-axis only, missing row headings in tables
- Overview of findings missing (no summary of key trends)

Strong analysis tells the story behind the numbers. Centres must emphasise interpreting data, not just listing it. Correct formatting of titles and inclusion of table/graph in body, raw data and calculations in appendices could improve performance.

2.2.12 Conclusion

The conclusion was poorly attempted by most candidates with many reports showing the following issues:

- Objective not restated indicating disconnect from start
- Trends ignored: no comparison of treatments or why differences occurred
- Missing lesson learnt what was gained from the study
- No mention of unexpected results (e.g., pests, weather effects)
- Conclusions vague or copied from analysis

Candidates are expected to restate objective and confirm if met, summarise key differences between treatments giving reasons (linking findings to real farming practice) and include lessons learnt e.g., Mulching reduces water use. A strong conclusion shows understanding, not just results.

2.2.13 Recommendations

This section showed the following key issues:

- Action based on findings either vague or missing in many reports
- Procedural improvements ignored e.g., more replications or better spacing
- Some recommended changing treatments while focus should be on method refinement
- Misalignment with objectives due to single treatment focus

Candidates must suggest actionable advice e.g., Use compost for better yield, procedural tweaks like increasing replication to 4 for accuracy. Ensure that suggestions match findings and original objective. Good recommendations turn results into progress.

2.2.14 Precautions

Most candidates focused only on safety (e.g., cuts), missed health (e.g., chemical exposure) and environment (e.g., runoff, waste). Reasoning for identified threats was not given. Mitigations were either weak or missing, many failed to suggest how to reduce future risks. Centres are advised to teach SHE framework: Safety + Health + Environment. Strong precautions show responsibility in action and planning.

2.2.15 Alignment of observation to existing literature

In many cases there was no link to existing studies, findings presented in isolation. Many cited irrelevant sources, not related to crop, treatment, or context. Incorrect referencing was common, APA/Harvard format not followed. Ghost references were listed but not used in text.

Candidates are expected to compare findings to published work. Centres must teach How does your work fit into what is already known? and provide referencing guides. Credible work connects to knowledge.

2.3 FIELD PRACTICAL TRAINING (FPT) REPORT

2.3.1 Cover page

Most candidates did well on the cover page, but a few missed key details like the actual farm name and FPT dates. Mixing up the university name with the farm location is a common oversight. A quick checklist could help next time to ensure all required elements are included.

2.3.2 Title page

Few candidates missed signing the title page and left out the submission date. These small but important details help ensure accountability and completeness. It might help to remind candidates to treat the title page like a formal document. A quick review before submission could catch these omissions.

2.3.3 Content page

The content page had some consistency and formatting issues. Missing page numbers, misalignment, and inconsistent leader dots affect professionalism. Skipping subheadings or forgetting to indent them can make the structure unclear. Reminding candidates to double-check that their content page matches the actual report could prevent mismatched numbering.

2.3.4 Declaration of Originality

The declaration section had some important gaps. Missing declarations altogether or misstating the purpose (like focusing on FPT participation instead of originality of the report) undermines the integrity of the submission. And using the university name instead of the actual farm, like BUAN instead of the specific farm blurs accountability. It is probably worth emphasizing that this declaration is about ownership and honesty in reporting. A clear, standardized statement might help candidates get it right.

2.3.5 Acknowledgements

Candidates mostly remembered to name who helped them but missed detailing a range of service types. Acknowledging only one or two kinds of support (like supervision or feeding) is not enough; they need at least four distinct types, think guidance, technical help, accommodation, tools, training, etc. Adding variety

shows deeper engagement and gives proper credit. Maybe a quick reminder in the guidelines could help: List who helped and what they did.

2.3.6 Introduction

While the introductions were generally solid, the expectations and benefits part seem to have been framed more like a summary of what was gained, rather than what was hoped for at the start. The introduction should reflect forward-looking goals: what skills they aimed to build, what experiences they expected, and how the FPT would support their growth. Keeping that distinct from the later reflection helps show development over time.

2.3.7 Description of farm routine schedule

The farm routine schedule section had several gaps despite some strong points. Missing employee counts, vague job descriptions, and lack of timing in daily schedules weaken clarity. Also, listing record types is not enough. Candidates needed to explain how records were kept and why they matter. Same with technology: naming it is not enough the advantage had to be clear. And on marketing preparation: it is about describing two key activities in detail (what, how, tools used), not just listing steps. Profitability statements were rare, a missed chance to show business insight.

2.3.8 Description of activities carried out

Candidates demonstrated solid effort in listing activities but missing key details like duration and accurate worker counts. Including learners as part of the workforce inflates the numbers and blurs the real labour dynamics. Emphasizing who did what, how long it took, and how many actual staff were involved would make the report more accurate and professional.

2.3.9 Findings/observations

It was common to see a disconnect between stated expectations and actual findings. Candidates should align their reflections with the original goals, and clearly note which expectations were or were not met. Also, unexpected discoveries are valuable but only if candidates explain why it matters. A quick note on usefulness turns a random observation into meaningful insight.

2.3.10 Conclusion

The conclusion captured the value and lessons well but missed the chance to reflect on how the institution could improve the learning experience. That is a key part: suggesting ways the program itself could be enhanced, like better preparation, support, or structure. Constructive feedback here helps shape future training. Simple suggestions go a long way.

2.3.11 Recommendations

Most candidates gave one solid recommendation, but missed the second, especially around practices that should be discouraged. It is not just about improving what is there, but also identifying what is not working or could be harmful. Encouraging two clear, actionable suggestions one to improve, one to stop would make this section more balanced and critical.

2.3.12 Rating by TOI (Training Officer in Industry)

There were instances of missing TOI ratings or incomplete forms (like no final score or truncation). This can undermine the report's validity. Using the wrong appraisal form, like Ministry of Education instead of BEC, also creates administrative issues. It is good most candidates were well-rated, but completeness

and correct documentation matter just as much. A quick checklist for TOIs might help ensure all fields are properly filled and forms are standardized.

2.3.13 Overall report quality

Creativity could be improved with more visuals like photos, not just tables and organograms. Including images would make reports more engaging and concrete. ICT skills were strong, and clarity was mostly good, but missing subheadings which hurt the flow. And while binding was generally neat, combining everything into one file is not ideal, separate components help with organization and assessment.

2.3.14 Appendices

Some reports were missing request letters or using incorrect forms (MoE instead of BEC) which affects authenticity. And farm record samples need to be complete, clear, and meet the minimum (3), otherwise they do not reflect real engagement. Also, using stock images from the internet undermines credibility. Photos should be original, labelled, and specific to each candidate's experience. Reusing the same pictures across reports is not fair and compromises assessment. Encouraging unique, well-labelled visuals per category will make each report more genuine and personal.

2.4 Practical Tasks:

There was full compliance with number of practical tasks per module. A wide variety of hands-on activities were assessed across all modules. Some centres submitted strong evidence via hard drives. However, computation errors were observed in Practical Tasks Assessment Forms and Module Summary Marksheets. Weighted averages were miscalculated, incorrect formulas used. There is lack of verification before submission. Centres are advised to double-check all calculations (use templates with built-in formulas). Train teachers on correct weighting and mark conversion. Label digital evidence clearly (e.g., Practical Task: Module 3). Accuracy in marking and computation ensures fairness and moderation readiness.