

# PRINCIPAL EXAMINER'S REPORT



BOTSWANA  
EXAMINATIONS  
COUNCIL

## JCE HOME ECONOMICS 2025

## PAPER 1: SHORT ANSWER AND STRUCTURED

### General Comments

The 2025 cohort performed better in handling information and problem-solving questions and were weaker in recall questions. For example, majority of candidates did not attempt Question 1(b) well, which required a definition of menu. Candidates generally found scenario-based questions 12 and 16 (a, b, c) manageable, providing accurate responses however, most candidates struggled with Question 17(d).

Simple recall questions in 2025 posed a challenge to most candidates. Most of the candidates could not accurately define basic terms e.g. menu, production, give examples of basic cutting equipment, fasteners, banking services.

There were several candidates who wrote information unrelated to Home Economics in their answer spaces e.g. use of vulgar language, statements that they were not taught the concepts the question(s) are referring to. Candidates should be cautioned against using vulgar language in their responses.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A

- 1 The question required candidates to recall definitions of certain terms, and part (a) was not well done, while part (b) was well done.
  - (a) The candidates were required to define the term production, and most candidates performed below average. The most common correct response was: The act of making or manufacturing goods and services, while most common incorrect response was: Producing a product, instead of the act of making, creating or manufacturing goods/services.
  - (b) The question was well answered. Most candidates managed to score a full mark on defining Menu, the most correct answer given was: A list of dishes that make up a meal. The most common incorrect response was, "List of food in a card".
- 2 This question was not well done. Most candidates failed to score the full marks allocated (2 marks). Majority of them scored 1 mark with the common correct response being "Cotton" and the common incorrect responses were synthetic fibres such as Nylon, Acetate, Silk and Wool, instead of cotton, polycotton, ramie, sisal, jute/mokgwapha, hemp and linen.
- 3 (a) The question required candidates to state one indigenous food item at P. The performance was above average, the most common correct responses were Sorghum, Maize & Millet, the incorrect responses were: Morogo wa dinawa, Rice, Thepe and Logala. Other correct answers

also included maize, maize meal, mosutlhwane, kabu, ntlatlwane etc. Indigenous dishes were also accepted where the main ingredient was a cereal/cereal product.

**(b)** This question required candidates to explain any one dietary guideline relating to Q in the food plate diagram: candidates generally identified the dietary guideline but failed to provide a proper explanation, whilst some just wrote it in a statement form, instead of Eat less fat / oils / fatty foods to prevent obesity / high blood pressure / CHDs. Or eat less sugar / sugary foods to prevent diabetes / dental carries.

**4** The performance of most candidates was average with the most common correct response being Scissors. The question generally required the cohort to give two needlework tools used for cutting. However, candidates were challenged in giving the correct spelling e.g. candidates gave different versions of the word scissors, for example Sizzar, Sisoors & Cizza. In some cases, candidates were able to give one correct tool.

**5** The cohorts' understanding of collage was below average, with many focusing on materials rather than the technique itself. Candidates seemed to lack a clear comprehension of the collage concept, failing to describe its essence as a visual representation made from gluing/pasting different materials to create a picture/made by assembling different materials, images, or objects onto a single surface.

**6 (a)** Most candidates performed above average, as candidates were able to state the correct class of the cooking method being dry method.

**(b)** Majority of candidates performed well. A variety of correct moist methods that included steaming, boiling/simmering, stewing, casseroles, poaching, braising etc. were given.

**7** The question required the cohort to give two classes of methods of purchasing goods. The performance was below average, with the most common incorrect responses being Lay bye, Hire purchase & Credit card. The common correct response was "Cash", the required correct answers were cash and credit as the two classifications of purchasing methods.

**8** Candidates generally did well in identifying fasteners, showcasing a range of options. However, some included buttons, which on their own are not normally classified as fasteners. The question aimed to assess their knowledge of specific fastening elements, such as zippers, Velcro, press studs, hook and loop/eye/bar etc.

**9** The question required candidates to explain one reason for using a raising agent when preparing flour mixtures. The performance was below average as candidates identified reasons for using

raising agents but struggled to provide thorough explanations. The responses were: their reaction adds a distinctive flavour and taste to flour mixture product; their reaction adds a distinctive aroma to flour mixture product; they introduce air / carbon dioxide which expands when heated to make the flour mixture raise; they produce air pockets / spaces in the baked bread/dough to make the dough light and fluffy / improves to the texture of the dough.

- 10** Candidates performed reasonably well on this question, presenting various valid reasons for maintaining environmental cleanliness. Responses included practical benefits like preventing spread of diseases, preventing accidents, to make the environment look attractive, to avoid breeding of pests, to prevent bad smells, to create space, to reduce the spread of germs and bacteria, etc.
- 11** The performance was above average as candidates gave common correct answers such as give the sick balanced meals and follow doctors' instructions when giving medications to the sick. The answers included: to encourage the sick to exercise, wear surgical / clinical / rubber gloves when handling body fluids, maintain high standard of personal hygiene, give the sick nutritious meals, bath the sick, ensure that they are comfortable, provide appropriate clothing, dispose of waste appropriately, give medication according to doctor's prescription, show emotional support.
- 12** The question requested candidates to explain one skill necessary to start a food business, it was fairly done; most candidates identified the skill but could not explain it. Most candidates were able to identify the skills necessary to start a food service business but could not relevantly explain the skill, such as: Food preparation skills:
- It is necessary to have good food preparation skills when running a food service business so that they provide the clients with well-cooked meals with good colour texture and taste creatively/attractively
  - The business needs people who can present and serve the meals well.
  - The food should be prepared in safe and hygienic environment to prevent food contamination and poisoning.
- 13** This question requested the cohort to outline two ways by which poisoning by substances at home can be avoided. Majority of candidates performed above average with varied correct responses e.g. "Label containers with poisonous substances", keep poisonous substances out of reach of children. Some of the required answers were: Buy medicines / chemicals with child resistant caps / lids; Store in a locked cupboard; Store poisonous substances in clearly labelled containers; Separate poisonous substances from food; Label non-edible substances.

- 14** An average performance obtained on the question, that asked candidates to give any two services offered by the bank. The candidates scored at least half the mark allocated to the question. The required answers were - Money withdrawals, money deposit, currency exchange, overdrafts, loans, mobile banking, credit transfers, standing order/debit cards, online banking/EFT etc.
- 15** An outstanding performance was obtained on the question, that required candidates to state one example of a Home Economics related career. Varied careers given to the question, which were mostly correct. The required answers were Chef, Home Economics teacher, Fashion Designer, Dietician, Nutritionist, Cook, potter, Florist, Interior Designer.

### Section B

- 16** In this scenario-based question, candidates were assessed on their understanding of safety and hygiene principles to a given situation.
- (a) The cohort was expected to list any two safety guidelines in the kitchen that Tlhopho should have observed. The cohort struggled with identifying kitchen safety measures in the scenario. Many confused safety guidelines with hygiene practices or provided unrelated answers. Correct responses focused on handling the jar with care, putting knives with sharp edge facing down, putting the mop away in a safe place etc.
- (b) Candidates excelled in part (b), successfully recognising Tlhopho's hygienic actions. Wearing protective attire (apron and headgear) and handwashing were frequently cited as correct examples. Many students even provided additional hygiene practices, showing a strong grasp of cleanliness measures in food preparation.
- (c) An average performance was obtained on the question; majority of candidates managed to state the hygienic practice and could not explain the importance of hygienic practice hence scored at least half of the marks allocated.
- (d) The performance was below average. Candidates could not relate their responses to the scenario given. In some instances, correct hygiene rules were stated but candidates could not further discuss the hygiene rule given, but it was only amongst a handful of candidates.
- 17** It required candidates to use information from diagrams R and S, which showed garment construction processes.
- (a) The candidates were required to name garment construction processes R and S. An average performance was noted on this question. There were instances where incorrect responses such "SEAM", instead of specifying the type of SEAM were given. Unsatisfactory performance

obtained with “SLIT” as incorrect response to the question. Some managed to identify the process correctly as an “inverted pleat.

- (b) For this question, candidates' performance improved slightly, as many were able to identify the seam finish in diagram R, even if they struggled with naming the seam itself. This indicates that while some students may not fully grasp seam types, they are more familiar with seam finishes, which is a positive aspect of their garment construction knowledge. Overall, the cohort demonstrated an average understanding of seam finishes.
- (c) Majority of the candidates managed to come up with other varied ways of finishing an open SEAM and scored all marks allocated, common correct responses given included “blanket stitching”, “overcasting”
- (d) This question presented difficulties for most candidates, resulting in below-average performance. They could not describe the garment construction shown in the diagram, for example the responses given were description of slits, darts which were not correct. This suggests that students found it hard to accurately interpret and describe the garment construction process depicted in the diagram, highlighting a need for better visual comprehension skills. Majority of the candidates who accurately identified the pleat were able to give relevant description of how to construct the pleat.
- (e) Candidates generally understood the significance of notching curves but struggled to explain the process itself. Many only received one mark, as they either didn't define notching or confused it with pattern-making notches. This below average performance reveals a gap in understanding the purpose and technique of curve notching, which is crucial for accurate garment construction.

## PAPER 2: PRACTICAL TEST

### A. General Preparation for the Examination

Overall, most Centres demonstrated good preparation for the examination, with clean, organised labs and appropriate equipment. Candidates were well-arranged in manageable groups, and safety measures were in place. However, some Centres had cleanliness issues and disorganised planning sheets. Candidates were punctual, properly dressed, and easily identifiable, contributing to a smooth examination process.

Most candidates excelled in selecting dishes for both parts, showing good culinary judgment. However, they struggled with creating accurate shopping lists, often miscalculating ingredient quantities. Additionally, many candidates lacked a logical workflow, skipping essential steps like collecting ingredients or improperly handling cooked dishes. This suggests a need for better meal planning and time management skills.

The question preference varied significantly among candidates. Question 3 was the clear favourite, with nearly all candidates opting for it. Questions 1 and 2 were less popular, while the remaining questions (4-10) attracted only a small number of candidates.

Candidates generally performed well, displaying organisation, engagement, and understanding of tasks. They adhered to proper procedures, maintained hygiene, and accurately measured ingredients. Most completed tasks on time, cleaned up, and used tools correctly. While some flour mixture dishes did not turn out as expected, overall, the food was edible, well-presented, and served appropriately. The menu cards and garnishes/decorations added a skilled touch to their work.

#### Arrangement of Planning Sheets into Sessions and Sealing

Most Centres followed the guidelines for planning sheets, but a few used unsealed manila files. Session sizes varied, with 8 candidates being the norm, though some Centres had fewer, especially for SPED learners. Centres with extra days sometimes spread candidates thinly, resulting in smaller sessions. It's crucial to maintain at least 8 candidates per session to ensure timely completion and allow examiners sufficient travel time between Centres.

#### Lab Arrangement; Readiness of Stoves and Gas Cylinders

While many Centres had functional stoves, some faced challenges with gas stoves, including limited availability, leaks, and fires. These issues posed safety risks and disrupted the examination. Electric stoves were more reliable in some cases, but power outages still caused difficulties. Ensuring all Centres have safe, reliable cooking equipment is essential for a smooth and hazard-free practical examination.

#### Labelling of Work Areas and General Lab Setup

Most laboratories were well-prepared for the examination. Work areas, serving areas and stoves were neatly labelled, with some centres going further to label each area with candidate numbers and question

numbers to enhance organisation. Some Centres even went further to provide fly chasers, food umbrellas and flowers to enhance the ambience of the laboratories.

### **Cleanliness of the Lab**

Overall, the laboratories and their surroundings including courtyards were clean and orderly. In general, surfaces and equipment were found to be clean and presentable. On the other hand, there were some laboratories which were very dirty from the floors to the walls. Even the equipment was not clean. This inconsistency highlights the need for consistent cleaning protocols and maintenance across all Centres to ensure a hygienic environment for the practical examination.

### **Provision of Safety Gadgets and Utensils/Tools**

Fire safety measures were largely in place, with accessible extinguishers at most Centres. First aid kits were also common, but some contained outdated items like expired antiseptics and ointments. Upon discovery, the expired supplies were removed and replaced, ensuring that all Centres had updated first aid materials for the examination.

### **Candidates' Readiness and Attendance**

Candidates were generally punctual and prepared, but scheduling clashes with the Art examination caused issues at some Centres. These conflicts led to last-minute changes in examination sessions, which inconvenienced examiners and disrupted the examination process. To prevent such problems in the future, Centres should proactively identify and resolve timetable overlaps between subjects to ensure a smoother experience for all.

### **Cleanliness of Candidates**

Candidates presented themselves well, adhering to dress code standards with clean uniforms and polished footwear. No one had nail polish, and overall, personal grooming was satisfactory. This adherence to appearance guidelines reflects positively on the students' discipline and professionalism during the examination.

### **Protective Clothing and Labelling**

All candidates wore clean aprons and mop caps as required. Most were appropriately labelled with their candidate numbers displayed clearly on both the front and back. The consistent labelling across Centres facilitated efficient management of the examination process.

### **Sessions (Division into Groups)**

Candidates were divided into sessions consisting mostly of eight (8) or seven (7) candidates per group. Only a few exceptions were noted where there were six (6) or ten (10) candidates in a single session.



## PERFORMANCE

### HE 1: Choice of Work

Most candidates managed to meet test requirements, and some did exceptionally well-made correct dish choices for both part A and B. There were some Centres where most candidates had a lot of omissions, only to write the dishes under ingredient section especially questions which had roman figures in questions 1, 3, 8 and 10. Some would write ingredients under choice. Most recipes were correct as well except for a few instances where candidates omitted main ingredients thereby rendering the whole recipe wrong. Candidates scores varied widely, some managed to score the whole mark but most scored between 3½ and 5½. The score was between 0/6 and 6/6.

### HE 2: Shopping List

Center performance differed, with some exceeding expectations and others falling short, mainly due to errors in ingredient omissions. Most candidates scored between 1½ - 2½ marks out of 3, showing room for improvement. Most made a mistake under quantities where they failed to order correct quantities of ingredients. Quantity errors were a common mistake, as many candidates struggled to accurately measure and list the necessary amounts of ingredients. This oversight could lead to imbalances in recipes and affect the final dishes' quality. Enhancing measurement skills and attention to detail would help candidates improve in this area. Candidates generally did well in identifying main ingredients and organising them under appropriate categories. This demonstrates their understanding of recipe components and structure, which is crucial for effective meal preparation. Proper categorisation also helps in managing ingredients and ensuring that nothing is overlooked during cooking.

### HE 3: Order of Work

Candidates encountered challenges in sequencing tasks, often skipping essential steps like collecting ingredients while others served without removing dishes from heat. Special points were sometimes misaligned or omitted, and there were a few dovetailing attempts which were frequently misplaced. Most methods were detailed and not brief. Some were incomplete, for example flour mixtures methods did not indicate the actual baking. Instead, they incorrectly stated baking in the special point section. Wash-ups were relevantly indicated by most candidates, including the final wash-up. There were a few instances where candidates indicated the final wash-up without the expected two wash-ups in between dishes. And very few had no wash-ups at all. Time management was generally satisfactory, though some struggled to allocate tasks within the 2-hour timeframe. There were few instances where time was not staggered, and candidates failed to account for 2 hours as expected. Scores reflected these inconsistencies, spanning 0 to 9 out of eleven.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 Very few candidates answered this question. For part (a), most common dishes were part (i) samp cheese, part (ii) beef stew, part (iii) stewed rape and fried spinach whereas for part (b), common dishes were pumpkin and butternut dishes. Some incorrect dishes that did not answer the question were potato dishes (is not Vit. A rich) and liver pilaf which was not a vegetable dish.
- 2 Only a few candidates tackled this question, and many opted for non-indigenous dishes like boiled rice and macaroni cheese. Others overlooked dietary restrictions for invalids, selecting fried foods such as fried chicken and fish which were not suitable. Correct choices included traditional dishes such as beef seswaa and morogo wa dinawa. Beverage selections were also largely inappropriate, choosing juices and punches that were not indigenous drinks. This shows a lack of cultural awareness and understanding of dietary needs in meal preparation. Part (b) of the question was well attempted by a majority of the candidates.
- 3 Majority of candidates across Centres answered this question with some Centres having more than two-thirds of candidates selecting it. Most common chosen dishes were deep fried chicken, samp/macaroni cheese, cheese scones, fried potato chips and potato salad, which do not necessarily showcase a variety of culinary skills or creativity. It is worth encouraging candidates to explore a broader range of recipes in future assessments.
- 4 The question attracted little interest; with most Centres having no candidates having attempted it. Those who did often selected baked dishes like scones, gingerbread, and cupcakes, while others incorrectly chose fried or non-baked items or meals, e.g., fried rice, bean curry, fish cakes and fried liver.
- 5 Few candidates responded to this question, but those who did provided appropriate dishes like macaroni cheese, green salad, and cooked vegetables. However, some made the mistake of including meat dishes unsuitable for the lacto-vegetarian. For Part (b), stewed apple was a common correct choice, a few candidates incorrectly opted for raw fruit salads.
- 6 This question drew minimal responses, with cupcakes, gingerbread, cheese scones, macaroni cheese and sandwiches being common answers. Many candidates overlooked the question requirement to demonstrate varied preparation methods, limiting their dishes to rubbed-in or creamed preparations thus not fully answering the question. For Part (b), salads such as coleslaw and green salad dominated choice.



- 7 A few candidates answered the question. Most candidates met the test requirements for both part (a) and (b), most common answers were grilled beef, macaroni cheese or fried chicken. There were some who did not show understanding of what a main dish is and incorrectly chose meals. For part (b) most chose beetroot salad, stir fried mixed vegetables, potato salad and potato chips.
- 8 Only a tiny fraction of candidates attempted this question. Their choices for Part (a) included scones, baking powder bread, and savoury items like beef burgers and scotch eggs, while Part (b) most candidates incorrectly chose fresh fruit salad.
- 9 Few candidates who answered this question were able to give dishes that are indigenous such as beef stew, seswaa for protein dish, maize meal/sorghum porridge for carbohydrate dish and stewed morogo wa dinawa for part (a). For part (b) most met requirements, chosen dishes were coleslaw and green salad. But there were some who chose incorrect dishes like a cooked beetroot salad.
- 10 Most candidates met test requirements for both part (a) and (b), most common dishes were beef seswaa, beef stew, potato salad, banana custard, milky porridge; for part (b) common fruit dish was stewed apple.

## C PRACTICAL

### Approach

Most candidates were focused, organised, and clear about their tasks, showing a good level of preparedness. However, some struggled with nervousness, frequently checking recipe cards, and a small number appeared uncertain, spending time watching others instead of working on their own tasks. Overall, the majority demonstrated readiness, but a few could benefit from confidence-building and task clarification.

### Procedures

Majority of the candidates followed correct procedures. For example, water boiled before adding boiled foods. Rice was rinsed; boiled foods drained at the end of cooking. Salads were chilled and fried foods drained as well. Some candidates did not rinse fruits and vegetables before use, and some did not preheat ovens before baking or roasting. Most fried dishes were coated. Yeast breads were left to rise before cooking. There were instances where candidates preparing macaroni cheese, boiled all the ingredients for the sauce all at once which was incorrect. Some did not preheat grill before grilling food.

### Hygiene

Candidates generally upheld hygiene standards, washing hands, cleaning utensils, and covering food. However, some overworked dough, and a few neglected to refresh water after washing, compromising cleanliness. There were a few instances where candidates did not change water after wash-ups, ending

up using dirty water to wash utensils. These lapses, though minor, emphasize the importance of consistent adherence to sanitation practices to ensure food safety and quality.

### **Tidiness**

Candidates mostly maintained a tidy workspace, lining bins and promptly cleaning spills. However, there were few instances where food and matchsticks were left on the floor, and not all bins were emptied post-exam. While the majority demonstrated good housekeeping habits, diligence in all aspects of cleanliness is essential for a professional kitchen environment.

### **Economic Use of Resources and Fuel**

Ingredient measurement was largely accurate, though some candidates collected excessive materials. Stoves and ovens were switched off after use. There were a few cases of burnt food such as gingerbread and macaroni cheese which resulted in wasted fuel. Improving cooking precision and monitoring food as it cooks can help minimize errors and conserve energy.

### **Completion of Tasks/Timing**

Most candidates across all Centres successfully completed tasks, cooking dishes, cleaning tools, cleaning stoves and emptying bins. Yet, a minority neglected final cleanups or did not finish all dishes, particularly flour-based ones. Ensuring thorough completion of all tasks and maintaining cleanliness throughout the process are key to a well-executed practical exam.

### **Use of Tools**

Most candidates used correct tools for intended purposes, e.g., vegetable knives for cutting fruits and vegetables, butcher knives for meats, and peelers for peeling. Colanders for draining, casserole dishes for casseroles, etc. There were a few instances where candidates used butcher knives to chop vegetables and vegetable knives to cut meats.

## **D QUALITY OF RESULTS**

### **Appearance**

Candidates' dishes generally met expectations in appearance, with salads being bright and appetising. However, some flour mixture items looked unappealing, possibly due to undercooking or burning. Achieving the right texture and presentation in baked goods requires precise cooking times and temperatures, areas where some candidates could improve.

### **Texture/Consistency/Edibility**

Textural expectations were fulfilled, with dishes like stews, salads, and rice exhibiting desired consistencies. However, macaroni cheese often turned out dry, and some candidates skipped making cheese sauce. Hardness was an issue in baked items like gingerbread and scones, while undercooked



or burnt flour dishes rendered them inedible in one center. Perfecting textures requires mastering various cooking techniques and ingredient ratios.

### **Use of Clean, Correct Serving Equipment**

Most candidates across all centres used clean, correct serving dishes for different dishes. There were a few instances in some centres where candidates presented dishes on cooking equipment especially flour mixture products because of time constraints.

### **Presentation**

Most savoury dishes were garnished, and sweet dishes were decorated. Menu cards were presented as well in some centres. There were very few instances where dishes were not garnished nor decorated. Served dishes were covered with nets in a well-set serving area across all centres.

## PAPER 3: COURSEWORK

### General Comments

This report presents the findings of the validation exercise for Home Economics coursework paper 3. The validation team was primarily looking at the candidates' folios together with the group mark sheets provided by the different Centres. The focus of the team was to determine whether the Centres followed the JCE assessment syllabus in marking the coursework paper. The expected components of the folio included justification, brief description of the project, sketches, samples, brief notes on the techniques done, presentation, evaluation and costing.

The validation process adhered to the syllabus standards, with most Centres showing minimal deviation, a notable improvement from 2024. The virtual workshop's positive impact is evident, as it helped Centres align more accurately with assessment guidelines. Only a few Centres required remarking due to significant deviations, highlighting the importance of consistent syllabus implementation.

The reduction in Centres requiring remarking from 49 in 2024 to fewer (12) in 2025, indicates a positive trend. This improvement suggests that Centres are better aligning their assessments with BEC standards.

### Comments on the Projects

#### 1 Observations from Exercise

##### Administration by Centres

- Some Centres had the candidates' marks recorded in pencil. This exposes candidates' marks to alterations which could give wrong reflection of student's marks.
- Standardisation is crucial for fair and consistent marking. The absence of this process in some Centres may lead to inconsistencies and potential biases in grading. To ensure reliability and credibility of the assessment outcomes, it's essential for every center to adopt and strictly follow standardisation practices.
- Despite improvements in other areas, the issue of missing candidate numbers on portfolios persisted from 2024 to 2025. This oversight hinders efficient verification and tracking. Centres should prioritise proper labelling to ensure smoother processes and maintain candidate anonymity during assessments. In 2024, there were Centres that did not submit anything, neither portfolios nor group mark sheet, in the 2025 cycle most Centres submitted but the packages were not bound together.
- There's a positive change in submission rates compared to 2024, as all Centres now provided both portfolios and projects. This increased participation suggests better awareness and cooperation among Centres, which is encouraging for the overall assessment process. Continued engagement will help maintain this progress.

### Challenges

- The disorganisation of documents, such as sending them separately or failing to label packages, caused administrative challenges during validation. Clear communication and proper packaging are vital to streamline the process. Centres should ensure all necessary documents are securely bundled with portfolios and clearly marked to avoid confusion and delays.
- BEC's requirements for submission were clear, yet some Centres did not fully comply. Submitting all documents, portfolios, attendance records, and mark sheets is essential for validation and verification. Centres must adhere to these guidelines to facilitate a smooth assessment process and maintain the integrity of the coursework evaluation
- Brief notes for techniques/skills, candidates were expected to present their methods briefly and to the point; however, most had challenges in doing so. Writing lengthy and overly elaborate methods which in the end demonstrated a lack of clarity and focus. These methods generally were not precise and could not be easily followed to produce a similar artifact(s). Hence candidates with such methods could not access all the marks under brief notes.
- Costing- most candidates did not use a correct costing formula. Teachers are encouraged to refer to the assessment criteria where the correct costing formula is clearly stated. An incorrect formula negatively affects costing, resulting in the affected candidates not accessing the marks. There were some candidates who used the correct formula but made calculation errors, which also led to a loss of marks for in the product price and the profit calculation.
- Major materials- candidates were expected to list all the materials used in producing the product, however some candidates omitted major material. Omission of the major material(s) by the candidates affected marks for costing, as the price of the product is dependent on costing of all materials used in its creation.
- There were a lot of inconsistencies in the application of the marking criteria by Centre examiners (i.e. teachers). Some examiners within a Centre would award marks for a component/part of the project that was not included by a candidate e.g. awarding full marks for sketches whereas the candidate did not have sketches in their folio. This led to discrepancies between teachers marks and those of the validators, resulting in marks that were invalid. Such Centres were requested to remark their candidates' projects.
- Evaluation, the assessment criteria require candidates to evaluate the product, and the techniques used. However, some candidates instead evaluated their overall experience of making the product, mentioning issues such as shortages of materials or time constraints rather than focusing on evaluation of the quality of the product and the techniques applied.

- Sketches, most candidates either produced unlabeled sketches or did not include sketches altogether. This is another area that leads to discrepancies between teachers and validators, as marks are sometimes given despite the required labelling or sketches being absent.

### **Findings of Validation Proceedings**

- Inadequate packaging by most Centres led to inefficiencies, as locating works became time-consuming. 33 Centres provided folios without documents, and this delayed the validation process whilst 11 Centres had said they sent the documents to BEC which were at times found package in other syllabuses' coursework projects/submissions.
- The lack of organisation based on candidate numbers made it difficult to manage and process the works efficiently. Sorting submissions by candidate numbers would significantly enhance the logistics of validation, allowing for quicker identification and assessment of individual portfolios. Centres should prioritise this simple yet effective organisational step.
- While there was overall progress in mark allocation, differences persisted in specific areas like brief notes, evaluation, and costing. Focusing on these aspects can help Centres refine their marking practices, ensuring consistency and fairness in student assessments
- Mark inflation appears to be less prevalent this year, which is a reassuring sign. While minor discrepancies between teacher and validator scores exist, they are minimal and mostly attributed to calculation errors. Overall, the marks seem to reliably represent students' performance, fostering confidence in the assessment process.