



T Level Technical Qualification in Healthcare Science

Employer set project (ESP)

Assisting with Healthcare Science

Mark scheme

T Level Technical Qualification in Healthcare Science Employer set project (ESP)

Assisting with Healthcare Science

Mark scheme

Contents

Marking guidelines	3
Task 1: research/literature review	6
Task 2: quality improvement report	10
Task 3(b): quality improvement report v2*	15
Task 4(b): presenting and discussing your quality improvement report*	17
Task 5: reflective account	20
Document information	23

Marking guidelines

Levels of performance marking grids have been designed to award a student's response holistically, drawing on the evidence the student produces in the tasks, and should follow a best-fit approach.

Marking will be carried out by NCFE examiners and will take place once all tasks are complete, and the marker has access to all the student's evidence for each of the tasks.

Table 1 shows which of the tasks (pieces of evidence) that will be used as the basis of judgement for each of the assessment objectives (AOs). Markers should review each of these pieces of evidence, using the indicative content to support an understanding of what they are expecting to make their judgement on, before placing the student in one of the bands.

The grids are broken down into bands, with each band having an associated descriptor indicating the performance at that band. You should determine the band before determining the mark.

When determining a band, you should use a best-fit approach. A judgement should be made on the overall quality of the student's evidence, and should reward students positively, rather than focussing on small omissions. If the response covers aspects at different bands, you should use a best-fit approach at this stage and use the available marks within the band to credit the response appropriately.

When determining a mark within the band, your decision should be based on the quality of the response in relation to the descriptors. You must also consider the relative weightings of the AOs, so as not to over/under credit a response. Standardisation materials, marked by the chief examiner, will help you with determining a mark. You will be able to use exemplar student responses to compare to live responses, to decide if it is the same, better, or worse. As a rule of thumb, allocation to the highest mark within a 3 mark band should be evidence that may meet the criteria convincingly. For 2 marks out of a total of 3, evidence may meet the criteria adequately and for the lowest mark, the evidence may just be meeting the criteria. This is guidance and any approach will be confirmed in standardisation.

You are reminded that the indicative content provided under the marking grid is there as a guide, not an exhaustive list. It is not a requirement that students cover all of the indicative content to be higher band marks. This is also guidance, and any amendments will be confirmed in standardisation.

Table 1: marks by task

	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	AO5	TOTAL
Task 1						
Research/literature review		15	5			20
English, mathematics and digital				4		4
Task 2						
Quality improvement report	6	14				20
English, mathematics and digital				9		9
Task 3						
3(b) Quality improvement report v2* *task 3(a) is not marked		2	2		5	9
Task 4						
4(b) Discussion with tutor* *task 4(a) is not marked		11			5	16
English, mathematics and digital				2		2
Task 5						
Reflection		6	4		6	16
Total marks:	6	48	11	15	16	96
Percentage (%)	6.25	50.00	11.46	15.63	16.66	100

Marking bands

Mark bands	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	AO4 (English/mathematics/digital)
Task 1	1–4 marks	5–8 marks	9–12 marks	13–16 marks	17–20 marks	4
Task 2	1–4 marks	5–8 marks	9–12 marks	13–16 marks	17–20 marks	9
Task 3(b)	1–3 marks	4–6 marks	7–9 marks			
Task 4(b)	1–4 marks	5–8 marks	9–12 marks	13–16 marks		2
Task 5	1–4 marks	5–8 marks	9–12 marks	13–16 marks		

Task 1: research/literature review

Using **only** the literature sources listed in the brief, you are required to carry out research to inform the working group about considerations for blood tube procurement, maintaining an inventory and sharing or pooling resources with other local NHS services and lessons learned from previous/similar events.

The information gathered will help identify failings in current procedure which may have caused the incident to occur.

The findings from your research should be presented in a written literature review, summarising the main points in individual sections.

The research requirements include:

- collation of appropriate and relevant information about current national guidelines and best practice in relation to the issues in the incident. You may include reference to other commonly used consumables in your answer
- application of information gathered to determine what went wrong in the incident described
- data analysis and presentation of data in tables or graphs to illustrate key findings, for example, the usage frequency of blood tubes for different purposes or at different times of the year in the NHS
- drawing conclusions and summarising key themes arising from the literature and data analysis
- clear presentation of information in a written report summary.

(20 marks)
plus 4 marks for English
(Total marks: 24)

Band	Mark	Descriptor
5	17–20	<p>The written review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• demonstrates that the student has effectively investigated the problem using relevant literature and has applied a wide range of acquired knowledge of quality management requirements to structure a highly detailed and accurate written review (AO2, CS1.1, CS1.2, CS4.1)• shows evidence that the student has made excellent use of most available resources to access a very wide range of information to address the problem being investigated, including excellent use of data to illustrate key points (AO3)• shows evidence that the student has grouped most findings and data into key themes to draw highly relevant conclusions to address the problem being investigated, with effective referencing throughout (AO3, AO2, CS5.1, CS1.3).

Band	Mark	Descriptor
4	13–16	<p>The written review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates that the student has investigated the problem to a good level, using relevant literature, and has applied acquired knowledge of quality management requirements to structure a detailed and accurate written review (AO2, CS1.1, CS1.2, CS4.1) • shows evidence that the student has made use of a good number of available resources to access a range of information to address the problem being investigated, including good use of data to illustrate key points (AO3) • shows evidence that the student has grouped findings and data into key themes to draw clear conclusions to address the problem being investigated, with effective referencing included most of the time (AO3, AO2, CS5.1, CS1.3).
3	9–12	<p>The written review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates that the student has partially investigated the problem to an acceptable level, using relevant literature, and has applied some knowledge of quality management requirements to structure a written review which is reasonably detailed and sometimes accurate, but contains some minor errors (AO2, CS1.1, CS1.2, CS4.1) • shows evidence that the student has made use of some available resources to access an adequate range of information to address the problem being investigated, including some attempt to use data to illustrate key points (AO3) • shows evidence that the student has drawn satisfactory conclusions based on research findings; the report content is structured reasonably effectively, with some reference to literature at times (AO3, AO2, CS5.1, CS1.3).
2	5–8	<p>The written document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates that the student has attempted a basic investigation of the problem using some available literature and has applied basic knowledge of quality management requirements to structure a partially detailed written review, which contains some errors (AO2, CS1.1, CS1.2, CS4.1) • shows evidence that the student has made basic use of few available resources to access a range of information to address the problem being investigated – there is partial use of supporting data but with some errors (AO3) • shows evidence that the student has attempted to draw conclusions based on research findings, but these are not always relevant or supported by the literature, and evidence of basic understanding of data (AO3, AO2, CS5.1, CS1.3).

Band	Mark	Descriptor
1	1–4	<p>The written document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrates that the student has investigated the problem to a limited level with basic use of available literature and has applied limited knowledge of quality management requirements to structure a written review which includes basic detail and contains errors (AO2, CS1.1, CS1.2, CS4.1) shows evidence that the student has made limited use of available resources to access relevant information; the review addresses the problem being investigated to a limited extent and contains simplistic information, with basic use of supporting data (AO3) shows limited evidence that the student has drawn relevant conclusions based on research findings and includes limited reference to literature and a basic understanding of data (AO3, AO2, CS5.1, CS1.3).
	0	No credible evidence.

Indicative content

The student should conduct a methodical review of current guidelines and practices which is structured to highlight common themes. These should include, but are not limited to, appropriate and relevant information about:

- procurement strategies that are commonly employed to obtain commonly used hospital consumable items such as (but not limited to) blood tubes.
- the common usage of blood tubes
- the causes and consequences of the 2021 UK national blood tube shortage
- demonstrate an understanding of:
 - inventory management, audit and quality control procedures
 - supply and demand issues which might affect inventory stock and quality
 - risk assessments (COSHH) linked to storage of hazardous and non-hazardous stock (for example, needles, flammables, consideration of shelf-life) and the benefits of periodic auditing of procedures
 - staff training/education and assessment of competency.
- use case study examples to illustrate value of these procedures in sustaining service provision in the face of changing demand
- present/display data from the research
- analyse data to a basic level from which conclusions can be drawn
- approaches for reporting collated information to the working group.

Task 1 AO4: English

English
(1–4 marks)

4 marks:

Quality improvement report demonstrates excellent use of English throughout and conveys meaning clearly, concisely, and coherently. The report is well informed by consistent application of information gleaned through research which has been collated and summarised very effectively.

3 marks:

Quality improvement report demonstrates good use of English in most parts of the report and conveys meaning clearly and coherently. There is evidence of applying information gleaned through research which is summarised well and used effectively to support recommendations made in the report.

2 marks:

Quality improvement report demonstrates inconsistent use of English throughout. The work lacks conciseness, although overall, it conveys meaning coherently. Information has been summarised to an acceptable but basic level. There is an attempt to draw conclusions and make inferences based on findings to support recommendations made in the report.

1 mark:

Quality improvement report demonstrates simplistic use of English throughout. There may be some errors in comprehension of research findings used to inform the report. There is limited evidence of ability to summarise information required to support recommendations made in the report.

Task 2: quality improvement report

You have been asked to create a quality improvement report for the working group. This report should outline actions that are needed to monitor the supply, safe storage and quality of blood tubes. Your aim is to build principles of good scientific and clinical practice into workplace practices.

Use the information given in the brief, formal letter of complaint and Table 1 to complete your quality improvement report. The information you provide should be supported with relevant facts and figures from your literature review, your analysis of the information in Table 1 as well as your existing knowledge. You must explain how your quality improvement plan will be implemented and supported by the healthcare team. When writing your report, ensure that you:

- reference the information gathered as part of your research in task 1 and the content of the incident report.
- provide your answer using the pro-forma which has been provided

(20 marks)

plus 4 marks for English, 2 marks for mathematics and 3 marks for digital

(Total marks: 29)

Band	Mark	Descriptor
5	17–20	The quality improvement report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidences an excellent level of preparation and planning, which has resulted in a sound understanding of most steps that could be taken to avoid a reoccurrence of the incident (AO1) • is detailed and covers a wide range of elements of a quality improvement report, and effectively presents conclusions to meet required quality improvements, with excellent reference to supporting information throughout (AO2, CS4.2, CS5.2, CS2.1) • describes all, or almost all, of the required improvements to a high level of detail and convincingly addresses how these will be implemented (AO2, CS5.2, CS2.1).
4	13–16	The quality improvement report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidences a very good level of preparation and planning, which has equipped the student with a good understanding of a range of steps that could be taken to avoid a reoccurrence of the incident (AO1) • is highly detailed and covers most elements of a quality improvement report, and describes several conclusions made to meet required quality improvements, with reference to supporting information most of the time (AO2, CS4.2, CS5.2, CS2.1) • describes most of the required improvements well and gives very good consideration to how these will be implemented, but may be missing some minor details (AO2, CS5.2, CS2.1).

Band	Mark	Descriptor
3	9–12	<p>The quality improvement report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidences a good level of preparation and planning, which has partially enabled the student to understand some of the steps that could be taken to avoid a reoccurrence of the incident (AO1) is adequately detailed overall and describes a number of conclusions made but not always effectively – there is some reference to supporting information (AO2, CS4.2, CS5.2, CS2.1) describes a reasonable number of the required improvements to a satisfactory level and gives some consideration to how these will be implemented, but some key improvements are missing (AO2, CS5.2, CS2.1).
2	5–8	<p>The quality improvement report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidences a reasonable level of preparation and planning, which has resulted in a basic understanding of some of the steps that could be taken to avoid a reoccurrence of the incident (AO1) most elements of the report have been completed with basic detail in parts, however, there is limited description throughout and limited use of available supporting information (AO2, CS4.2, CS5.2, CS2.1) describes a limited number of the required improvements to a basic level, with limited consideration of how these will be implemented – several key improvements are missing (AO2, CS5.2, CS2.1).
1	1-4	<p>The quality improvement report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrates limited evidence of effective preparation and planning, and a limited understanding of preventative steps (AO1) includes limited detail which may not be relevant to the task, with limited description of conclusions drawn and takes little/no account of available supporting information (AO2, CS4.2, CS5.2, CS2.1) limited attempt to describe required improvements to meet the requirements of the task, and explain how these will be implemented (AO2, CS5.2, CS2.1).
	0	No credible evidence.

Indicative content

The student could consider:

- the introduction of risk assessments that weigh fluctuation in demand, supply chain issues and storage considerations for blood tubes
- the use of electronic stock taking procedures
- the development of SOPs for all healthcare staff to ensure the integrity of stock supply and quality

- a strategy for communicating recommendations to the working group and the wider healthcare team
- staff training and an audit of procedures.
- explain the framework and time-frame for addressing complaints received from patients and the role of the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman
- explain the role of the Institute of Biomedical Sciences in ensuring professional working standards and protocols are maintained
- perform calculations such as percentages or ratios using the data in Table 1 to illustrate the change in blood tube usage as supply and demand changes through the year.
- show these data as line graphs, pie charts or histograms to illustrate the pattern of blood tube use through the year.
- recognise the type and range of events which might cause rapid fluctuations in blood tube demand
- describe the central issues linked to stock maintenance and quality monitoring. These might include:
 - electronic recording and review of stock inventory
 - principles of inventory maintenance
 - working with the healthcare team and supplier to anticipate demand
 - monitoring usage over time to establish usage patterns which may be used to inform healthcare planning and procurement.
- describe approaches that might be used to monitor and communicate surges in blood tube demand to facilitate shared use of resources among local NHS providers.

AO4: English, mathematics and digital skills	
English (1–4 marks)	<p>4 marks: Quality improvement report demonstrates excellent use of English throughout and conveys meaning clearly, concisely, and coherently. The report is well informed by consistent application of information gleaned through research that has been collated and summarised very effectively.</p> <p>3 marks: Quality improvement report demonstrates good use of English in most parts of the report and conveys meaning clearly and coherently. There is evidence of applying information gleaned through research that is summarised well and used effectively to support recommendations made in the report.</p> <p>2 marks: Quality improvement report demonstrates inconsistent use of English throughout. The work lacks conciseness, although overall, it conveys meaning coherently. Information has been summarised to an acceptable but basic level. There is an attempt to draw conclusions and make inferences based on findings to support recommendations made in the report.</p> <p>1 mark: Quality improvement report demonstrates simplistic use of English throughout. There may be some errors in comprehension of research findings used to inform the report. There is limited evidence of ability to summarise information required to support recommendations made in the report.</p>
Maths (1–2 marks)	<p>2 marks: Quality improvement report demonstrates excellent use of mathematics with few and minor errors when interpreting data. The student takes all available opportunities to use relevant data to support and inform recommended actions. Numerical information is communicated very clearly and with a high level of accuracy.</p> <p>1 mark: Quality improvement report demonstrates adequate use of mathematics but there are some basic errors when interpreting data. The student uses data to support and inform some recommended actions, but not consistently. Numerical information is communicated with reasonable clarity and accuracy, but at times may require clarity.</p>

AO4: English, mathematics and digital skills

Digital skills (1–3 marks)

3 marks:

Quality improvement report produced demonstrates consistently effective and creative use of digital technology and media to present information and assessment evidence clearly and concisely, so it is both easily understood and persuasive. The student uses digital skills very effectively to analyse and present data accurately in a range of appropriate digital formats.

2 marks:

Quality improvement report produced demonstrates an overall effective use of digital technology and media, presenting the information and assessment evidence clearly and accurately. The student demonstrates good use of digital skills when analysing and presenting data, and the ability to use some appropriate digital formats with occasional minor errors.

1 mark:

Quality improvement report produced demonstrates use of digital technology and media, sometimes presenting the information and assessment evidence clearly but at times the information lacks clarity or is inaccurate or misleading. The student demonstrates simplistic use of digital skills when analysing and presenting data, using a narrow range of digital formats and with frequent errors.

Task 3(b): quality improvement report v2*

**Tasks 3(a)(i) and 3(a)(ii) (reflect on and evaluate the reports of other students, providing feedback through peer group discussion) are not marked. Marking must be solely based on the student's updated report and the student's justifications for changes made and not made following the peer discussion.*

3(b) Use your feedback from your peer discussion form and reflect on the feedback that you have received. Use this feedback to write a summary of how you will update your quality improvement report, referencing the feedback received during the peer discussion. Your tutor will provide you with a copy of your submitted report from task 2.

You must justify the feedback that you decided to act on, as well as the feedback that you decided not to use.

(9 marks)
 (Total marks: 9)

Band	Mark	Descriptor
3	7–9	The student demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are willing and open to constructively consider and effectively evaluate all feedback in relation to the report (AO3, CS2.1, CS2.2) a deep level of critical reflection of their work in relation to the feedback they have received, to evaluate good and bad elements, and conclude on what can be improved, acknowledging their own limitations where appropriate (AO2, CS2.1, CS2.2, CS3.2, CS6.2, CS6.3) they can make rational and well understood amendments to their report and are able to clearly communicate the justification for the changes they wish to use and any they do not wish to use (AO5, CS3.2).
2	4–6	The student demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are prepared to effectively evaluate most of the feedback in relation to the report (AO3, CS2.1, CS2.2) some effective critical reflection of their work in relation to the feedback they have received and uses this to identify some good and bad elements and areas for improvement (AO2, CS2.1, CS2.2, CS3.2, CS6.2, CS6.3) the ability to make some improvements to their report that they are able to justify, including giving some rationale for any suggestions from peers that they decide not to use (AO5, CS3.2).

Band	Mark	Descriptor
1	1–3	The student demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a limited evaluation of the received feedback, and basic understanding of the thinking behind the suggestions made (AO3, CS2.1, CS2.2) • a limited ability to reflect on the suggestions made and to take on board feedback to identify good and bad elements or areas for improvement (AO2, CS2.1, CS2.2, CS3.2, CS6.2, CS6.3) • a limited ability to make use of constructive feedback to inform changes to their report, resulting in few or poor amendments to the report (AO5, CS3.2).
	0	No credible evidence.

Indicative content

The evidence could demonstrate:

- an effective review and reflection of the feedback received from peers in relation to the quality improvement report
- the ability to rationalise which changes they will implement and justify their amendments
- the ability to rationalise which feedback they have not acted upon
- the ability to identify additional areas they feel require amendments based on their review of their own work

Task 4(b): presenting and discussing your quality improvement report*

*Task 4(a) (preparing to present your quality improvement report) is not marked. Marking must be solely based on the student's performance in task 4(b).

4(b) You must present and discuss with, your tutor, the overview of your report prepared in task 4(a).

As part of task 4(b) you will also be assessed on your communication skills. Your tutor will record the audio from this discussion.

(16 marks)
plus 2 marks for digital skills
(Total marks: 18)

Band	Mark	Descriptor
4	13–16	<p>The student is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• clearly demonstrate their excellent knowledge and understanding of the project outcome drawn from national guidelines and areas of good practice, via verbal presentation and in-depth discussion with tutor (AO5, AO2, CS1.3, CS2.2, CS5.2)• effectively demonstrate thorough understanding of the justification for all changes made following peer feedback and why they are required to ensure quality of care (AO2, CS1.3)• confidently provide theoretically sound responses to questions from the tutor which demonstrate excellent understanding of quality management requirements (AO2, CS2.2).
3	9–12	<p>The student is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• demonstrate their comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the project outcome drawn from national guidelines and areas of good practice, via verbal presentation and good discussion with tutor (AO5, AO2, CS1.3, CS2.2, CS5.2)• effectively demonstrate understanding of the justification for most changes made following peer feedback and why they are required to ensure quality of care (AO2, CS1.3)• mostly provide theoretically sound responses to questions from the tutor but not extensive in detail which demonstrates good understanding of quality management requirements (AO2, CS2.2).

Band	Mark	Descriptor
2	5–8	<p>The student is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate a reasonable level of knowledge and understanding of the project outcome drawn from national guidelines and areas of good practice, via verbal presentation and some discussion with tutor (AO5, AO2, CS1.3, CS2.2, CS5.2) • demonstrate reasonable understanding of the justification for some changes made following peer feedback and partial understanding of why they are required to ensure quality of care (AO2, CS1.3) • make a limited attempt to answer questions from the tutor and provide some correct answers but with limited detail, which demonstrates a reasonable understanding of quality management requirements (AO2, CS2.2).
1	1–4	<p>The student is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate a limited level of knowledge and understanding of the project outcome drawn from national guidelines and areas of good practice, via verbal presentation and limited discussion with tutor (AO5, AO2, CS1.3, CS2.2, CS5.2) • demonstrate limited understanding of the justification for some changes made following peer feedback and limited understanding of why they are required to ensure quality of care (AO2, CS1.3) • make a limited attempt to answer questions from tutor, however answers may sometimes be incorrect, and is only able to demonstrate limited understanding of quality management requirements (AO2, CS2.2).
	0	No credible evidence

Indicative content

The evidence should demonstrate:

- the student has the ability to communicate a summary of their quality improvement report which is logically structured and clearly communicated
- that information from the research and the incident complaint and table, explaining the content of the quality improvement report that the student explains the content of the quality improvement report
- that the student should be able to discuss and justify amendments made to the report following task 3.

AO4: digital skills

Digital skills
(1–2 marks)

2 marks:

Summary and presentation of the report produced in task 2 demonstrate mostly effective use of digital technology, sometimes presenting the information clearly so it can be accessed by the intended audience in the context of the healthcare setting. Data and information have been processed and conveyed well and accessed in a safe manner.

1 mark:

Summary and presentation demonstrate use of digital technology that is sometimes effective but causes the intended audience in the context of the healthcare setting to have some difficulty in accessing the information presented. Data and information have been processed and analysed in an acceptable manner. It is clear to the audience that the use of digital skills is a weakness and could be strengthened to enhance accessibility and presentation.

Task 5: reflective account

You must now complete a written reflective account of your experience completing the project. You should reflect on all elements (tasks) involved and you will need to communicate how you have achieved the expected outcomes.

In your reflective account, you will need to provide evidence of your evaluation of your performance when completing the tasks. Explain how your reflections will enhance your professional development and self-awareness.

You should also reflect on how this event would impact others, for example, the patient, in a real clinical scenario, including how your recommendations will bring about improvements to quality of care to patients.

Your tutor will give you copies of your evidence produced in tasks 1, 2, 3(a), 3(b), 4(a) and 4(b)(notes and presentation materials).

(16 marks)

(Total marks: 16)

Band	Mark	Descriptor
4	13–16	<p>The reflective account includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an excellent level of deep reflection on each element of the project, which includes consistent evidence of critical evaluation and conceptualisation of the tasks being reflected on (AO2, CS6.1, CS6.2)• use of an effective model for reflective writing throughout to produce a consistently well-structured account with appropriate language, tense, and depth of analysis (AO3, AO2, CS6.1)• detailed personal review of performance, which includes an account of the individual's own identified strengths and weaknesses, which have clearly been informed by reflection (AO2, CS6.3)• key actions clearly identified for future personal development, and an excellent explanation of how these will enhance the individual's own practice (AO2, CS6.3)• detailed consideration of the impact the event would have on others, demonstrating excellent and well thought through suggestions for improvements to the quality of care (AO5).

Band	Mark	Descriptor
3	9-12	<p>The reflective account includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a good level of deep reflection on most elements of the project with some evidence of evaluation and conceptualisation of the tasks being reflected on (AO2, CS6.1, CS6.2) • good overall structure with partial use of a model for reflective writing, including appropriate language, tense, and depth of analysis (AO3, AO2, CS6.1) • a detailed account of personal performance outlining some of the individual's own identified strengths and weaknesses, which have been informed by reflection (AO2, C6.3) • good identification of a range of key actions for future personal development, with some understanding of how these will enhance the individual's own practice (AO2) • good consideration of the impact the event would have on others, demonstrating good suggestions for improvements to the quality of care (AO5).
2	5-8	<p>The reflective account includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • satisfactory level of reflection on some elements of the project but more descriptive in style than reflective (AO2, CS6.1, CS6.2) • reasonably effective structure with attempts to use a model for reflective writing, with reasonably appropriate language, tense, and some evidence of analysis (AO3, AO2, CS6.1) • satisfactory review of own performance outlining some strengths and weakness (AO2, C6.3) • identification of some actions for future personal development but these are not always sufficiently detailed, with partial awareness of impact on own practice (AO2) • consideration of the impact the event would have on others, demonstrating some degree of thought has been given to suggestions for improvements to the quality of care (AO5).
1	1-4	<p>The reflective account includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a limited level of reflection or reflection only on some elements of the project, which is heavily descriptive rather than reflective, with little or no evidence of analysis (AO2, CS6.1, CS6.2) • limited use of a model for reflective writing and limited use of appropriate language and tense (AO3, AO2, CS6.1) • minimal review of own performance with a strength or weakness identified (AO2, C6.3) • some acknowledgements of future personal development needs, with minimal awareness of impact on own practice (AO2) • limited consideration of the impact the event would have on others, with limited thought given to suggestions for improvements to the quality of care (AO5).
	0	No credible evidence.

Indicative content

The student should:

- follow a published method of reflection, for example, Gibbs or Kolb, and not be overly descriptive in content
- include an account of the effectiveness of their own communication skills and quality of their own contribution within peer discussion and tutor discussion
- reflect on the extent to which feedback informed changes to their report and how giving and receiving feedback made them feel
- review how effective they have been in completing all the tasks, commenting on the quality of their report in addressing the problem
- identify any areas of weakness and describe desired improvements to their own knowledge, planning skills, and collaborative working for future practice.

Document information

All the material in this document is © NCFE.

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

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

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

Owner: Head of Assessment Design