



Chief examiner's report

**T Level Technical Qualification in
Healthcare Science (Level 3)
(603/7083/X)**

**Summer 2022 – Employer set project
(Assisting with Healthcare Science)**

Chief examiner's report

Summer 2022 – Employer set project (Assisting with Healthcare Science)

Assessment dates: **09 – 20 May 2022**

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 which 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 shown below, but are based on the limited data available for this first assessment period:

	Overall
Max	96
A*	84
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 marks (UMS), and the aggregation of the core component, please refer to the qualification specification.

Standard of student work

The spread of marks achieved within this assessment was wide, with students receiving results from across the range of available grades. Most of the tasks making up the employer set project (ESP) had a spread of

marks, but most students noticeably struggled to score higher marks for the last task (reflective statement). This was mainly due to the lack of genuine insight and reflection, and failure to use a reflective cycle to help formulate their statement. Many submissions read as a simple description of each task, with no or limited reflection.

Students who scored well in task 1 tended to also score well for task 2. But task 4(b) did not follow this trend, as some students who were weaker on tasks 1 or 2 were able to score in a higher band for the presentation and discussion, showing their varying strengths in the skills being assessed.

There were some very interesting points raised by students in task 2, which showed their understanding of the context and how change can be implemented in an organisation as complex as the NHS.

For task 3(b) students would be better to focus on reflection on the feedback and justification for the changes they make. Giving a rationale for changes would help them score higher marks, as some submissions gave very little narrative for the changes highlighted in the document.

This theme of explanation and justification applies across all tasks. As some of the tasks have a time constraint, where a student is being overly descriptive or repetitive, or too lengthy but superficial with their response, they are wasting time that could be better spent giving a narrower but deeper, more justified or explained response.

Evidence creation

The evidence provided was in a consistent format across providers, with most of the student evidence being word or pdf documents. The pro-forma for task 2 helped to guide students in writing their answers, although not all students chose to use this. The pro-forma is designed to support students in giving an accurate and efficient response, and it would be prudent for providers to recommend students use this where available.

When uploading evidence, we would urge providers to follow a consistent setup of the folders and file naming conventions for the ESP as this would make it clearer to markers what evidence is present and what is missing, as well as allowing providers more chance to clearly ensure all required evidence is uploaded correctly

The evidence provided for task 4 was interesting to review and mark. Some students had a video recording, whilst others provided an mp3 recording instead. This difference did not have an impact on the marking for this task, but it was rewarding to see some nervous students overcome their fears and articulate their answers to the tutors' questions in a way that was clear and well presented.

Providers need to make sure that they submit additional evidence, such as presentation slides, so that the students can be awarded the marks for digital skills as these cannot be awarded when only a voice recording is available.

Responses to the external assessment tasks

Task 1: Research/literature review

There was a wide spread of marks seen for this task. All students had the same case therefore it was interesting to see how different students tackled this task. Those who effectively investigated the problem

scored highly, whereas those who relied on repeating quotes from the sources did not score as highly, as their response was descriptive, lacking effective research, and often lacking in detail and conclusion.

Task 1: English

There were up to 4 marks available for this, and students received marks across the range, with most in the middle of the range. To achieve a higher score, students needed to evidence evaluation or synthesis of information gleaned from the sources, summarising effectively.

Task 2: Quality improvement report

The pro-forma helped to focus the students in structuring their submission and almost all students followed this.

To achieve a mark in the higher bands, students needed to focus on a range of elements to quality improvement and effectively present conclusions. It was evident that those who were very descriptive and repeated information from task 1 did not score as highly. There also needed to be a consideration for how these changes would be implemented. Again, where this was explored and justified, higher marks were awarded. Those who scored lower did not answer how changes would be implemented.

Task 2: English, mathematics and digital skills

Students struggled to achieve high marks for this element, which was mainly related to students' use of English, as few students referenced any mathematics in their task. Those that did scored higher.

The pro-forma should not be a barrier to accessing marks for digital skills, and many students did manage to include images or tables into their report, accessing the available marks.

Task 3(b): Quality improvement report v2

There was a good spread of marks for this task with some students scoring highly. However, in many instances it was not always clear what changes the student had made. Where changes were made, some students did not give a rationale for the changes or additions. Those who scored higher marks did so because they demonstrated that they had reflected on feedback and acknowledged weakness in the original report, hence made a justified change.

Students need to make sure that they refer to, and reflect on, the feedback they have been given. For clarity, ideally, this needs to be captured in a separate report or evidence document and not simply written on an updated copy of the task 2 report.

Students who scored higher marks for this task did so because they demonstrated that they were able to reflect on the feedback given to them, acknowledging where they could improve weaknesses and justifying each change or addition they made to the task 2 report.

Students who did not score high marks for this task did not reflect on the feedback given to them and did not justify why changes were made. Making a change just because someone told you to do it does not demonstrate a reflection on feedback.

Task 4(b): Discussion with tutor

This task was interesting to mark, as examiners were able to see and hear students.

The length of presentations varied widely, with some lasting less than 2 minutes, whilst others managed over 6 minutes. Those who gave longer presentations were better able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the project outcomes, as well as providing justification for the changes they made following the peer feedback session. Whilst there is no time limit on the presentation, it follows that a shorter presentation gives a student less opportunity to present a range of knowledge and understanding, therefore potentially limiting the marks they can achieve.

The 4 questions asked by the tutor were from a pre-prepared list in the provider guide. This helped to give some level of consistency across the providers.

Where students scored low marks, this was because the answers were too short, too simplistic, or did not answer the question that was asked. Many students repeated elements of the question without fully answering or gave a response that did not address the question asked. Students must learn to listen and engage fully with the question and give a considered response.

Those who scored higher marks demonstrated an understanding of the quality improvement and were able to justify the changes they made to their report. Students should understand that making a change simply because it was suggested you make the change does not demonstrate a good justification.

Task 4(b): Digital skills

Where only an mp3 recording was available by the provider, with no supporting evidence, it was difficult to apply marks for digital skills. When additional evidence was provided, such as slides, it was easier to award marks.

Task 5: Reflective account

Many students failed to achieve high marks for this task which resulted in a limited spread of marks, with most students at the lower end of what is available. This was due to many students only providing a descriptive account of what they did for each of the ESP tasks, with little or no reflection and often of less than one side of A4 in length.

To score high marks for this task, students needed to use a reflective cycle, such as Gibbs or Kolb, and I would urge providers to look at their teaching of reflection to better prepare students for this area. Students need to genuinely think about their strengths and weaknesses of how they have performed across all elements of the assessment, as well as reflecting on what they might do in the future, rather than a superficial list of completed tasks. Many marks were lost due to a brief and shallow reflection.

Administering the external assessment

The external assessment is supervised and must be conducted in line with our [Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment](#). 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 Document](#) (QSID).