

## GENERAL COMMENTS

The quality of coursework for NSSC 2021 was well done for some centres but errors are still picked up at some centres. It implies that the overall quality of coursework did not show that tremendous effort was applied. Regional Offices should make sure that Examiner's Reports are studied and recommendations drafted for implementation purposes are sent/disseminated from the Regional Offices to schools.

Regional Office should give Continuous Professional Development(CPD) programmes for teachers teaching Metalwork and welding. If possible networking with DNEA, NIED and other regions with Senior Education Officers as well as relevant stakeholders should be initiated to have teachers capacitated and assisted on a regular basis. The common mistakes made by centres during the academic 2021 design folder are basically the same. These makes one realise how candidates are penalised for poor quality work submitted because of centres who have not been putting in much needed efforts from the beginning of the Senior Secondary phase. The Design folder started in Grade 10 and should be completed at the beginning of the second term of Grade 11, but yet folders submitted showing little time spent on them. One can conclude that Centre Reports are not studied and recommendations are not implemented by many centres. Due to the defiant negligence by some centres, the assistance of the Regional Directors is needed to make sure that Senior Education Officers and Circuit Inspectors study and analyse these reports and monitor the recommendations are implemented at schools that present Metalwork and Welding as a subject.

**Once again, Regional Offices, Principals and HOD's are pleaded to take a responsibility of ensuring that folders and projects are monitored throughout Grades 10 to 11. Towards the end of the second term of the Grade 11 year, folders should be internally moderated before the marks are dispatched to DNEA for external moderation. Regional Offices must make sure that NSSC schools are provided with the necessary materials and tools for candidates to build quality models. DNEA observed that some centres' projects were compromised by the lack of adequate resources.**

**It is not acceptable for candidates that are not submitting folders or courseworks and given a zero with just an explanation why a learner did not submit while on the other hand no evidence or proof shared in attempted efforts done by teacher/HOD/ Principal school board /Regional Office (SEO). Since the folder is supposed to be completed over a two years time and not to be done in a one-week period, as this is the case at some Centres.**

Candidates who are not submitting photographic evidence has become a common practice, yet marks are awarded for the quality of products by the centres. There were few cases where candidates made poor problem selections and outcomes and showed little evidence of imaginative interpretation and creativity. The sample of work presented for moderation was suitable in most cases and centres generally applied the assessment criteria appropriately, although, in some cases, this was not at the correct level.

All folders **must** include clear photographic evidence that includes the production stages (**selection of materials, marking, measuring, cutting, joining and finishing and testing of the artefacts**), in addition to an overall view of the final product, showing detail to support the awarding of marks.

There are some centres that awarded to candidates marks for a product and no folders submitted which is unacceptable at all. The folder must be completed first and the teacher must go through the folders and help the candidate where adjustments must be done before the candidates can commence with manufacturing their products.

## COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT HEADINGS

### Generation and exploration of ideas

- Since the specifications are already given in the scenario, it was supposed to be very easy for the candidates to generate ideas of their own.

Some of the candidates presented three sketches of ideas with no notes but no measurements, no enhancement or rendering and no finer details. This means that the specifications were not taken into consideration.

- **It is very important that the above mentioned points are taken seriously, because the candidate could score maximum marks.**

This is the part where most candidates lost valuable marks. This is where candidates can show evidence of genuine design creativity and not copies from books. Some candidates included a wide range of different ideas enhanced by clearly annotated sketches. Too often candidates presented a few formal drawings that showed too little design capabilities and tended to follow a single concept. These ideas can be presented most successfully through sketches and candidates should be encouraged to include everything that comes to mind. Annotations should include comments as to how an idea might link to the specification.

### **Development of proposed solution**

In this section of the folder the candidates should take the chosen idea and make further detailed decisions on form, materials and construction methods to be used in the final product. In some cases candidates still found it difficult to apply, and in these cases the final ideas were simply a repetition of one of the ideas recorded in the previous section.

In most cases the final drawings of the Design Solution were generally well-presented and gave sufficient information with regards to the manufacturing of the product. However, working drawings remain a challenge and a need for improvement is required for most of the centres.

### **Planning for production**

In this section candidates did fairly well, which is applaudable. However, the **working drawing** presented by candidates, does not give enough detail of the final product.

Most of the candidate shows a clear and detailed effective order of sequences of operation, time schedule for production, tools and materials. The candidate has done exceptionally well and credit must be given to them without any hesitation. This is a sign of acknowledging the commitments and accomplishment.

**A working drawing is the blueprint on which the final product is based on. This means that enough information should be available on the drawing to realise the product.**

### **Product realization**

Candidates should be congratulated on the wide range of materials used for their products. Photographic evidence showed that some candidates were able to work on their own and able to work at an acceptable standard of construction and finish to the extent that the end product could be used. Sadly, some centres could not provide sufficient photographic evidence to substantiate the credibility of the folders. Some photographic evidence is just a mere posing activity and no real action is seen.

### **Testing and Evaluation**

Most candidates included photographic evidence to show the testing of the product, which is commendable. They are, however, encouraged to link the outcome of the original specifications and make objective judgements on the success of their products.

The section should also include suggestions for further modifications or possible future improvements. Therefore centres are urged to ensure that the specifications are fully evaluated and tested in this section, which will guarantee maximum marks for the candidates.

### **Conclusion**

The centres that have done tremendously well should be applauded and credit should be given to the centre, the teacher, the candidates, the SEO as well as the regional office at large. It is clear that the 11 centres offering NSSC Metalwork and Welding for 2021 as a subject need to get a unified training in the near future. The training is required to better standardize the general understanding on the different sub-topics for the design folders.