

Chief Examiner Report

**T Level Technical Qualification
in Healthcare Science
QN: 603/7083/X**

**Summer 2025 – employer set project
(ESP) Assisting with Healthcare
Science**

Introduction

Summer 2025 – employer set project (ESP) Assisting with Healthcare Science

Assessment dates: **06 May 2025 to 16 May 2025**

Paper number: **P002793**

This report contains information in relation to the externally assessed component provided by the chief examiner, with an emphasis on the standard of student work within this assessment.

The report is written for providers, with the aim of highlighting how students have performed generally, as well as any areas where further development or guidance may be required to support preparation for future opportunities.

Key points:

- grade boundaries
- standard of student work
- evidence creation
- responses to the external assessment tasks
- administering the external assessment

It is important to note that students should not sit this external assessment until they have received the relevant teaching of the qualification in relation to this component.

Grade boundaries

Raw mark grade boundaries for the series are:

	Overall
Max	96
A	73 +
B	62
C	51
D	41
E	31

Grade boundaries are the lowest mark with which a grade is achieved.

For further detail on how raw marks are converted to uniform mark scale (UMS), and the aggregation of the core component, please refer to the Qualification Specification.

Administering the external assessment

The external assessment is invigilated and must be conducted in line with our [Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment](#) document. Students may require additional pre-release material to complete the tasks. These must be provided to students in line with our regulations.

Students must be given the resources to carry out the tasks and these are highlighted within the [Qualification Specific Instructions for Delivery](#) (QSID) document.

Standard of student work

This was the seventh session of the ESP for this T Level. Although the cohort size was small, there was a spread of marks from 24 to 63. This is a wider spread of marks than previous sessions, and students were able to achieve up to a B grade.

Although the scenario was different, the five tasks and their Mark Scheme were unchanged from previous sessions. This suggests that this ESP was of equal difficulty to those in previous sessions.

Students are still making simple mistakes or omissions, which result in them not being able to gain some marks. This is expanded on later in this report, where there is a task-by-task breakdown of performance. Almost all students submitted all five tasks.

For this session, two new proformas were included for task 3 and task 5. Most students used these and they are discussed in more detail later.

Evidence creation

During this session, there were very few instances of missing evidence.

As most of the evidence was typed, there were no issues in reading the submitted work. Some of the task 3 proformas were handwritten, which limited the amount some students wrote. Additionally, some of these proformas were more challenging to read than others.

Again, there was some difficulty with a few submissions for task 4 (b). Care must be taken to make sure that the student can be heard clearly. There was some difficulty with sound quality in the video evidence provided. MP4 is the preferred format and most providers submitted their evidence in this format. When submitting in MP3 format, providers should ensure that they upload copies of the slides from the presentation. Providers submitting older formats, for example, WAV files, should make sure the files play correctly.

There are further task-specific comments in the next section.

Responses to the external assessment tasks

Task 1: research / literature review

This task carried 20 marks as well as 4 marks for the use of English. All students were given the same case study and web links to use.

As with the previous session, there was a wide range of submissions with some students submitting as little as two pages and others submitting many more.

Those students who scored higher for this task demonstrated good use of the resources available. They were able to demonstrate that they could link the online resources to the specific case, not just comment on what they had read but think about how it related to the case. They were also aware that some online sources were of higher quality than others, for example a peer-reviewed study.

Compared to previous sessions, more students structured their literature reviews. The reviews were well defined with introductions, conclusions, and ideas grouped together. Some students spent time creating tables of data; however, many were simply replicating what had already been given to them in the task brief. This was not a good use of their time, especially when many did not then comment on what the table told them.

Students who scored lower marks often had poor structure to their report, did not draw conclusions specific to the case, made limited use of the links provided, or typed a lot of background information that did not score them marks. For example, repeating sections from the case study documentation wasted their time.

What was also noticeable is the number of students who were not able to reference properly. This also included not producing a proper reference list of the sources they had used, at the end of the literature review. This is an area providers can work on.

Task 2: improvement report

This task carried 20 marks. An additional four marks for the use of English, two marks for mathematical skills, and three marks for digital skills were also available.

Almost all students used the proforma. However, some students struggled to provide enough information on the proforma. For example, some students just wrote one sentence for some of the bullet points. When students expanded on the suggested points and contextualised them to the given case study, they scored higher marks, particularly around skills associated with assessment objective (AO) 3. An example of this would be 'staff training' where some students added detail about what would be covered, why it is needed, how it will be delivered, how to ensure compliance and understanding, as well as a timeframe for production and delivery.

The sections later in the proforma were generally answered very briefly and only with generic answers rather than referring to the case.

Some students did achieve band 4 responses, which was encouraging to see. These responses usually had more detail around what the required improvements to the standard operating procedure (SOP) needed to be and explained the importance of each change.

For the additional marks, all students gained some of the English marks. However, few students gained marks for mathematics and digital skills, despite them showing these skills in task 1. Although a proforma can seem restrictive, it is still possible to demonstrate maths and digital skills, which we saw with some students.

Providers are, once again, reminded regarding the signature boxes at the end of task 2. Some providers submitted evidence with many of these boxes blank, despite the reminder on the proforma, 'The tutor must sign this piece of work for the purpose of validation'.

Task 3 (b): peer discussion

This session NCFE introduced a new proforma for this task. However, there was not much improvement in the marks.

Many of the responses to this task were lacking in detail and therefore we did not see many students reach band 3. What was missing was a lack of the justification for making a change (or not) and we saw very little evidence of reflection on the feedback given. Most just accepted the peer feedback. This top band also requires critical reflection. Those who handwrote their task 3 tended to give shorter answers than those who typed them. Some providers used a previous submission type for the written report, which allowed students to give more detail, and many of these achieved a higher mark.

Task 4 (b): presentation

This task carried 16 marks, with 2 marks available for digital skills.

Listening to the students talking about their work was enjoyable, and it was pleasing to see some overcoming their nerves, becoming more confident as they started talking.

The quality of the recordings was much improved this time, with only a couple that required some effort to hear. Some providers uploaded MP3 files and some MP4; either is acceptable.

Thank you to the tutors who also uploaded their notes on the questions asked of the students. These comments were helpful to read.

Matching the improvement in performance seen in other tasks, we saw more students reaching bands 3 and 4 for this task. They had put more thought into structuring their presentations, demonstrating their excellent knowledge and understanding of the project, and referring to the literature to back up their suggestions for improvement. Some students gained more marks due to the detail they gave. For example, students talking about training covered a broad range of topics such as what should staff be trained on, methods of training, how often training needs to be conducted, by whom, and how to check staff understanding after training.

Task 4 (b) also had two marks available for digital skills. These marks were straightforward to award when evidence was provided (for example, presentation slides) and most students were able to achieve both marks. This evidence can be submitted as a PowerPoint or even as a PDF, if providers would find that easier.

Task 5: reflection

This task carried up to 16 marks. There were no additional marks provided for English, mathematics and digital skills.

As with previous sessions, many students struggled to score high marks for this task.

For this session, a new proforma was introduced aid students in preparing for this task. For many students, this proforma was the only evidence submitted for task 5, with no written reflective statement. The Provider Guide states the form is optional 'to help them structure their reflections'.

Providers should therefore continue to have students prepare a written reflection for Task 5, with the proforma being used to help prepare students and make them think about evidence/examples to demonstrate what they have learnt, would do differently, their strengths and weaknesses, and future development.

Very few students referred to a reflective cycle. Although the Gibbs reflective cycle was the main one used, students did not always follow the full cycle. Many students provided very descriptive accounts, writing what they did task-by-task rather than following a reflective cycle format. Where the written reflection was structured to follow a reflective cycle, students achieved higher marks.

Document information

Copyright in this document belongs to, and is used under licence from, the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education, © 2025.

'T-LEVELS' is a registered trade mark of the Department for Education.

'T Level' is a registered trade mark of the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education.

'Institute for Apprenticeships & Technical Education' and logo are registered trade marks of the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education.

The T Level Technical Qualification is a qualification approved and managed by the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education.

NCFE is authorised by the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education to develop and deliver this Technical Qualification.

'T-Level' is a registered trade mark of NCFE.