

# Chief Examiner's Report

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

**Autumn 2023 - employer set project  
(Assisting with Healthcare Science)**

## Chief Examiner's Report

### Autumn 2023: employer set project

#### Assessment dates: November 2023

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 shown below.

	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 see refer to the Qualification Specification.

## Standard of student work

This was the fourth session of the employer set project (ESP) for this T Level, and this time we have seen a wider spread of marks than for previous sessions. This is reflected across all five tasks that make up the ESP. Whilst this has meant that some students scored very low marks, we have also seen a larger proportion of students achieve a final mark of over 50. This distribution now more closely fits that which is seen with the two core papers.

Although the scenario was different, the five tasks and their Mark Scheme were unchanged from previous sessions, so the ESP was of equal difficulty to previous sessions.

It is still the case that there are simple mistakes or omissions happening, which result in students not being able to gain some marks, and this is expanded on later in this report, where there is a task-by-task breakdown of performance.

## Evidence creation

During this session, there were very few instances of missing evidence. The new remote marking system has made it easier to spot any gaps and refer back to the providers for evidence, without delaying the marking.

As most of the evidence was typed, there were no issues in reading the submitted work.

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 were instances where the microphone was next to the tutor, which meant that the sound of the tutor shuffling paper drowned out the student who was some distance away from the microphone. MP4 is the preferred format and was followed by most of the providers. We do accept MP3 as well, but providers should ensure that they upload copies of the slides from the presentation.

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 achieved at least 2 of the 4 marks for their use of English.

All students were given the same case study and web links to use.

We saw a wide range of submissions, from some students submitting at less than 2 pages to others managing to submit as much as 7 pages.

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

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, and often typed a lot of background information that did not score them marks for example repeating sections from the case study documentation that wasted their time.

It was also evident that there were some students who struggled with referencing, or who did not reference at all for this task.

### Task 2: Quality improvement report

This task also showed a range of marks across the bands (20 marks plus 9 marks for English, maths and digital)

It was encouraging to see that all of the providers made use of the pro-forma available to them. However, some students struggled to provide enough information on the pro-forma. For example, just writing 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 the AO3 skills. An example of this would be 'staff training' where some students added detail about what would be covered, why, how it will be delivered, how to ensure compliance and understanding, as well as a timeframe for production and delivery.

In addition, there were up to 4 marks for English, 2 marks for maths and 3 for digital skills available.

Whilst all students gained some of the English marks, very few gained marks for maths or digital skills. Although numerical data was provided and more made available via links, many students did not use it for this task.

I would also like to remind providers of the boxes at the end of task 2. We saw many tasks submitted with features such as names and signatures all blank, despite the reminder on the pro-forma.

### Task 3: Quality improvement report v2

Page 14 of the project brief stated:

'Use this feedback to write a summary of how you will update your quality improvement report ...'

This was in the previous report, but we still saw some ESPs where there was no written statement to mark, with just a reworded pro-forma submitted as evidence. This made it difficult to tell what changes had been made, but more importantly, this was not what was asked for. Resubmitting an amended task 2 pro-forma limited the number of marks available as the requirement was for a discussion of the feedback they received and any changes they would make to their task 2 report. This is why some students scored such a low mark for this task.

We did however see some very good written summaries. These were ones where they reflected on the feedback from their peers and gave justification for either making the change (or not making a change). We do not want the students to just agree with all suggestions, we want to see evidence that they have thought about it and evaluated it. There is evidence that providers need to address reflection skills with students.

#### **Task 4 (b): Presentation**

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.

Providers need to make sure that recordings are of good quality, so that we can hear the students, but also that they submit full recordings. There was a provider who split the task into more than one recording. I would advise against this in case a file is misplaced or missed altogether.

There was considerable variation in the length of some presentations, but there was one cause for concern. One provider stopped their students' presentations after 5 minutes. This is not what is stated in the provider guidelines and means that some students did not finish their presentations. The provider guidelines state a maximum of 15 minutes. This could have cost their students marks.

Task 4 (b) also had 2 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. There was one provider who had many students using the same template of headings. Care should be taken to avoid this as it should be the student's own work.

#### **Task 5: Reflection**

This task carried up to 16 marks (no marks for additional English, maths or digital).

In previous reports, it has been stated that students have struggled to score high marks for this task. For this session, we have seen a noticeable improvement in this task. Many more students mentioned a reflective model (usually Gibbs) and those who then structured their answer using these headings scored much higher than we have seen previously. It was noted however that some students stated Gibbs reflective cycle, but then did not follow it; instead giving the very descriptive statements of each task that we have seen in previous sessions. So, some improvements, but still more work to be done to help students achieve the higher bands. They need a better understanding of reflective writing as well as giving more consideration for future development.

#### **Administering the external assessment**

The external assessment is invigilated 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).