### C. COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES

1. Assignment details submitted
2. Assignments adhered to specified length
3. Assignments adhered to required format
4. Mark Schemes conformed to syllabus guidelines
5. Assignments marked as specified in syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK ON CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSIONS

Candidates have:
1. Demonstrated adequate knowledge of the content and objectives assessed
2. Demonstrated competence in the skills assessed
3. Listed projects adequately
4. Indicated accurate interpretations of drawings given for project including sketches, orthographic drawings and procedures
5. Submitted list of materials, layout and construction and joints appropriate for design
6. Presented adequate assembly and finish of projects
7. Written assignments adequately in terms of:
   - Introduction
   - Content
   - Presentation
   - Summary

The overall quality of candidates’ submissions was

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Candidates’ performance could have been improved by:

________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________

### E. QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING

The teacher’s marking of the sample was:

- Acceptable
- Severe
- Lenient
- Inconsistent

6 March 2017