Chief examiner's report

**T Level Technical Qualification
in Health (Level 3)
(603/7066/X)**

Summer 2022 – Employer set project

NCFE
CACHE

Chief examiner's report

Summer 2022 – Employer set project (Health)

Assessment date: **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:

	Overall
Max	100
A*	89
A	78
B	67
C	56
D	46
E	36

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

It is clear that providers have put a lot of work into this first wave of the employer set project (ESP) and that in general, students have responded well throughout the process.

It is pleasing that so many students, having been given the opportunity to produce work via a variety of assessment methods, have been able to display their personal communication skills well.

A range of achievement has been seen and, in many cases, students have been able to perform significantly better across some tasks than others, for example, where students may not have been as confident in the audio/visual tasks, they have, in some cases, produced stronger work within the written tasks.

Providers should be mindful of the many technical issues which can occur due to the nature of the tasks 2(a) and 3(b) and ensure that audio/visual recordings are checked for sound and quality issues.

A significant challenge noted by examiners was task 4. Student's reflective skills were often the weakest of their tasks and were frequently repetitive and a regurgitation of their previous tasks, failing to provide any meaningful new reflection.

Evidence creation

Generally, most providers were able to follow guidance for production of evidence. However, there were examples of students not using pro-formas, creating additional work for themselves by creating new formats, and problems arose with some recordings being uploaded incorrectly, some with no sound or being uploaded in formats which failed to open, requiring follow-up by NCFE.

Providers should always ensure that all tasks and files are clearly labelled with both the task number and student name, and those responsible for uploading student work are efficient when receiving and responding to requests from NCFE where issues are highlighted to avoid disadvantage to students.

Responses to the external assessment tasks

Task 1: Report

When completing this task, some students displayed strong research skills using reputable sites. Students achieving higher marks were able to demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge well when sourcing useful information that supported their chosen case study. Some students were able to include numerical details including graphs and statistics, presenting data clearly, with the accurate analysis of this further improving their grade and allowing them to move to higher mark bands. However, whilst this information should be used as justification for support and followed up with logical reasoning, in many cases it was not.

Reference to the holistic needs of the chosen client was a positive inclusion with concise notes made about how each of the PIES would be addressed throughout further tasks within the project. However, in some cases, this was very general and not specific enough to the client and case, limiting the student to the mid-range of marks.

Not enough students included relevant links to evidence-based practice, theory and policy, and those who did not always relate it appropriately to their chosen individual.

References to communication barriers was lacking within this task and for the students who did, the support suggestions were rarely justified.

Many students forget to address the task itself consistently throughout their responses. Many examples included purely information driven research, with the omission of how to support their chosen client. This had

a significant impact on achievement within bands. The focus here should be proposed support or else students are limited to a partial response.

Task 1: English, mathematics and digital skills

Too many students failed to structure their report appropriately and had significant avoidable spelling and grammar errors throughout. Many students had poor referencing skills.

Task 2(a): Role play

Pleasingly, there was some positive practice demonstrated by students in this task. It provided an excellent opportunity for students to demonstrate not only their knowledge but also their softer skills.

The provider has a key role to play in this task which should be a high priority for preparation and engagement. There were many examples of a poor set up within the role play, in terms of the chosen space for this task with lots of distracting background noise, or camera angles which did not allow for the examiner to see the full facial expressions or body language of the student.

Some of the stronger responses seen included:

- clear introductions of their role and what they aimed to achieve
- students creating a dialogue rather than a series of questions and answers – a genuine conversation whilst collection information in a natural conversational flow
- using prior knowledge from the case study
- checking the person understood the roles within the multi-disciplinary team, and introducing roles if not
- responding to answers with further probes and appropriate comments
- showing good verbal and non-verbal skills, such as nodding, eye contact, and reflecting comments back
- empathetic responses
- ending the interview properly by summarising the main issues discussed and the next steps needed

In some cases, basic skills were often forgotten, including greetings and introductions and, in some cases, the feel of a supportive meeting was missing.

Whilst it is helpful to the students for the service user to appear authentic, the person playing this role needs to consider whether they are disadvantaging the student with their approach and responses, such as refusing to answer or providing limited responses.

It is important that students remember that to gather enough information to create an appropriate care plan, their questions must be thoroughly considered, and time spent on the responses to these questions. There were some examples of this task that were very basic and brief, as short as only 2 to 3 minutes, with superficial questions posed to the client that could have been answered from the case study information alone. Whilst no minimum time frame is suggested, a meeting this short would not allow a realistic and client centred plan to be created, and so is limiting for the marks available for a student.

Students should be mindful of their role within this task and ensure they understand what their responsibilities and limitations are within this role. In this instance they are not counsellors or GPs able to prescribe medication and so should respond appropriately.

Task 2(b): Healthcare plan

Positive examples of good healthcare plans (HCPs) demonstrated a solid understanding of client need and the effective use of information gathered from task 2(a).

Good practice from students included identification of a specific health or support need and then completion of each column in relation to that need. In many cases, students lacked a basic understanding of how to create and structure a HCP. Many students lost marks for neglecting to include a timeframe for plans and reviews. There were very few examples of the inclusion of safeguarding measures and identification of risk which should have been a key element for all service users regardless of choice of case study. Very few students referred to their own role within the HCP.

Task 2(b): English, mathematics and digital skills

As with the first task, there was often little attention to detail with spelling, punctuation and grammar, and proof reading, leading to an avoidable loss of marks for some students.

Task 3(b): Presentation

Many students simply repeated their HCP information for this task which limited their achievement of the criteria. Provider problems again included very noisy environments and lack of guidance to the student regarding where they needed to be facing for presentation skills to be fully assessed.

Students would benefit from remembering that their audience is a senior colleague; many students wrote and presented their work as though it was to someone who did not work within the sector. This has a significant impact in the quality of the work that they produced and how prepared they were for the questions asked by their tutors at the end.

Task 3(b): English, mathematics and digital skills

Very few students displayed any numeracy skills via the use of graphs and statistics. Generally, students had very basic digital skills and there was little use of anything other than PowerPoint. Some students had neglected to proofread their slides, creating confusion when reading aloud.

Task 4: Reflection

For this task there was a significant lack of formal written English displayed and an understanding of reflective writing. There was often little justification for judgements on students' own performance and a lack of appropriate evaluation.

Students who performed well were able to accurately highlight areas for improvement with a solid idea of how this could be done differently based on both experience and feedback provided by peers and tutors. Some students were also able to reflect on the research process and identify how their whole project could have been more successful with more effective research where appropriate.

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).