



HM Government

T-LEVELS

Chief Examiner Report

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

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

Introduction

Autumn 2025 – employer set project (ESP) Assisting in Healthcare Science

Assessment dates: **03 November 2025 to 14 November 2025**

Paper number: **P003003**

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*	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 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

Although the cohort size was small, we saw a spread of marks from 28 to 62. We were able to award grades up to the B grade, with those students who were retaking the assessment showing an improvement in performance.

Although the scenario was different, the five tasks and their mark schemes were unchanged from previous sessions, so the marking team (also unchanged) for this ESP consider it to be of equal challenge to previous sessions.

Most students submitted all five tasks, and supporting evidence, for example, screenshots of browser history. It was however the case that there were some simple mistakes or omissions, which result in students 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.

Evidence creation

During this session, there were very few instances of missing evidence and where queries were raised, providers replied promptly, without delaying the marking.

As most of the evidence was typed, there were no issues in reading the submitted work. Providers also managed to make the pro-formas accessible, as most of these were typed this time; a notable improvement from the previous session.

As with the previous session, 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 it was encouraging to see most of the students presenting their work. Fortunately, providers uploaded the slides from the presentations, as it was not always possible to read the screen in the recordings. The presentation slides can be uploaded in various formats, but PDF is preferred. However, the system does accept PowerPoint.

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

Responses to the external assessment tasks

Task 1: research/literature review

This task carried up to 20 marks, as well as up to four marks for the use of English.

There was a wide variety of answers, with some being quite short and others extending over many pages, including diagrams and reference lists.

Whilst some students achieve high marks for this task, there remain areas where students are not accessing all of the available marks.

- Many students did not follow referencing, with a lack of proper in-text referencing and a poorly constructed reference list at the end.

- Some only used two or three sources, whilst others used eight or more. This is reflected in the wording of the mark scheme around the use of literature.
- Many wasted time repeating the assessment brief, which is not necessary. Similarly, graphs and tables were added by some, but we saw that not every student commented on what the table told them. It was added as a way to break up the text and not referred to or explained.

In some cases, the structure was poor. Grouping into themes gave better structure and demonstrated their ability to access and comprehend the list of sources.

To gain more marks, students need to explain why the situation has happened, rather than a lot of background information. Summarising a source is acceptable, but needs to be related back to the scenario to show relevance and understanding. Providers should ensure that students are taught referencing skills. Also, students should provide an explanation for the use of diagrams, tables or graphs.

Task 1: AO4 – English

There were up to four marks available for English. We saw a high proportion of students obtaining three marks for this task, and a few scoring four marks.

Task 2: AO4 – English, mathematics, and digital skills

This task carried up to 20 marks, as well as four marks for the use of English, two marks for the use of mathematics and three marks for the use of digital skills.

The pro-forma for this task should be familiar to providers by now and we saw students completing all parts of the pro-forma. Those that achieved higher marks demonstrated the ability to relate information to the case and give details into the causes and considerations for improvement. For example, when discussing staff training, high performing students were able to discuss what training topics needed to be covered, and why. They also considered how training could be delivered, including timescales and how to ensure that the learning achieved its aims.

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

I will again remind providers regards the signature boxes at the end of task 2. We saw some providers submitting evidence with many of these boxes blank, despite the reminder on the pro-forma stating, 'The tutor **must** sign this piece of work for the purpose of validation'.

Task 2: AO4 – English, mathematics, and digital skills

Up to four marks were available for the use of English, with most students receiving three to four marks for this task.

Up to two marks were available for mathematics. However, we saw many students failing to achieve any marks for mathematics in this task. Despite some students including mathematics in task 1, very few carried this through into task 2. The table of data provided gives the potential to do some simple data analysis for marks.

Up to three marks were available for the use of digital skills. We saw a spread of marks from one to three marks for this. Some students demonstrated digital skills, such as including diagrams, or creating tables. Those who scored only one mark did not demonstrate any digital skills beyond typing into the pro-forma.

Task 3 (b): using peer feedback to update your Quality Improvement Report

This task carried up to nine marks.

This session was only the second time the pro-forma has been used, with most providers using it. We saw the pro-forma completed to a higher standard than the previous session and included more items of feedback being considered.

What separated those in band 3 from band 1 is the amount of detail in the last column, especially if they reflected on why to make the change (or not). Where there was reflection, the mark was much higher; rather than those who simply accepted the feedback.

Task 4 (b): presenting and discussing your Quality Improvement Report

This task carried up to 16 marks, as well as two marks for the use of digital skills.

The quality of recordings has continued to improve, although it was sometimes difficult to see the slides, or hear the student due to the microphone being closer to the tutor.

Whilst we have seen improvements in the quality of slides and information presented, the greatest difference in student performance was seen when it came to the Q&A part. Those who scored lower marks gave more basic answers and were brief with their responses. This could be due to nerves, but marks can only be awarded for what is recorded. Some students gave detailed answers, linking back to the case study, tasks 1 and 2 and considered what else they might need.

I would like to thank the tutors who also uploaded their notes on the questions asked of the students. These comments were good to read. All tutors used the questions given in the provider guide.

Task 4 AO4: digital skills

Up to two marks were available for the use of digital skills, with most students receiving both marks for this task, with slides being uploaded as evidence.

Task 5: reflective account

This task carried up to 16 marks. This task continues to challenge many students, which is reflected in the weaker performance seen. This was similar to previous sessions.

In the previous session, a new pro-forma was included to help preparation for this task. Unfortunately, we saw this as the only submitted evidence from some students. The top of the pro-forma states 'this pro-forma does not need to be submitted as a piece of evidence – it is provided to support your preparation'. Therefore, we are still expecting the submission of a reflective account.

Where only the pro-forma was present, these students did not score high marks, as they could not demonstrate adequate reflective skills, or the use of a reflective framework.

Where students followed a reflective framework (usually Gibbs) they scored higher marks. We still saw some submissions that were overly descriptive, for example, 'In task 1 I did ...' and therefore did not demonstrate much reflection. However, there were some submissions where the reflective cycle was followed and they were able to reflect on their strengths, weaknesses and ideas for future development.

Document information

Copyright in this document belongs to, and is used under licence from, the Department for Education, © 2026.

‘T-LEVELS’ and ‘T Level’ are registered trade marks of the Department for Education.

NCFE is authorised by the Department for Education to develop and deliver this T Level Technical Qualification.

‘CACHE’ is a registered trade mark of NCFE.