



Chief examiner's report

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

**Summer 2023 – Employer set project
(Assisting with Healthcare Science)**

Chief examiner's report

Summer 2023 – Employer set project (Assisting with Healthcare Science)

Assessment dates: **June 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. These were unchanged from the previous session:

	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.

Standard of student work

This was the third session of the employer set project (ESP) for this T Level, and it is encouraging that, compared to the previous session, we are seeing some students performing slightly better. This is reflected across all five tasks that make up the ESP. When looking at the cohort as a whole, we can see that there was only a limited spread of marks, with very few students achieving the high bands. This can only be achieved if the student performs well across all five tasks.

The five tasks and their mark scheme were unchanged from the previous session, 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. An example of this is for task 4(b), where providers should ensure that there is evidence of the student's presentation so that they can be awarded the marks for digital skills.

This is expanded upon later where there is a task-by-task breakdown.

Evidence creation

During this session, there were fewer instances of missing evidence. The new RM system made it easier to spot any gaps and refer back to the provider for evidence.

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). Some providers uploaded MP4, which meant a good video recording, whilst others did sound only as an MP3. 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 them shuffling paper drowned out the student who was some distance away from the microphone. MP3 and MP4 are the preferred formats and any providers wishing to submit a different file type should check with NCFE first (for example, we had some submissions in the WAV format, which did not play).

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.

We saw examples of evidence across the five marking bands.

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. Those that 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. 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 did not draw conclusions specific to the case and often provided 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 no referencing 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, mathematics and digital skills).

It was encouraging to see that 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, and 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 mathematics and 3 for digital skills.

Whilst all students gained some of the English marks, very few gained marks for mathematics and almost no students received the digital skills marks. Statistical information was available from the links provided, as well as the bar chart in the case study, but very few students referenced these and therefore lost out on marks.

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...'

Unfortunately for some students, the only evidence for this task was a resubmission of the task 2 pro-forma with a few changes made. 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.

The written summary requires students to consider the feedback from their peers, reflect on it, and then justify if they made the change or not. For this reason, some students scored very low for this task. However, there were some very detailed written reports submitted, with scores as high as 7 (out of a possible 9). This was due to features such as justifying why they accepted or declined comments, rather than just accepting a change because someone told them to. Students need to think of the rationale for changes.

Task 4(b): Discussion with tutor

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.

There was considerable variation in the length of some presentations, with the shortest being only 2 minutes long, and the longest over 10 minutes. This was reflected in some of the scoring, where the longer presentations were able to provide more detail and demonstrate students' knowledge and understanding of the case study, national guidelines, good practice and their conclusions.

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 only submitted the tutor Q&A for evidence, which meant that the students could not access the full marks available.

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). Unfortunately for some students, the only

evidence was the voice recording; therefore, there was no evidence available to award marks for digital skills.

Task 5: Reflective account

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

Students have again struggled to score high marks for this task, which is the same as the last session.

One improvement this time was that some students referred to a reflective cycle – usually Gibbs’.

Unfortunately, despite this reference, some did not follow it, or missed some of the stages.

Those that scored lower marks submitted reflections that were too descriptive of what the tasks were and what they did.

Those students who scored higher marks were those who demonstrated more reflection and also referred to their future professional development and self-awareness.

As this task is worth up to 16 marks, providers should spend some time on reflective skills with students.

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 for Delivery](#) (QSID).