



HM Government

T-LEVELS

Chief Examiner Report

**T Level Technical Qualification
in Digital Business Services
QN: 603/6902/4**

**Autumn 2025 – employer set project
(ESP) Data Technician**

Introduction

Autumn 2025 – employer set project (ESP) Data Technician

Assessment dates: 03 November 2025 to 14 November 2025

Paper number: P003016

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	80
A*	71
A	62
B	53
C	45
D	37
E	29

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

This is the eighth series that students have been able to undertake the employer set project (ESP) for this qualification. The ESP is a core skill assessment that students undertake in the first year of their T Level qualification, alongside the core exams. The majority of students who undertook the ESP this series will be second-year students who are having a second or subsequent attempt at the assessment.

The ESP consists of a pre-release task given to students approximately a month prior to the assessment which is then used when providing evidence for five tasks. These tasks are set over a 2-week timetable assessment period.

In the first week of assessment, students are to undertake Tasks 1, 2 (a) and 2 (b), with Tasks 3 and 4 being completed in the second week.

The scenario for this assessment was about Apex DigiSports (ADS) who build and sell professional gaming PCs. The business currently has one premises and an e-commerce website; ADS are looking to expand their premises so that they can introduce a budget-friendly range of gaming PCs and components. In addition to the Project Brief, students were also provided with a range of ADS's internal data and external secondary statistics.

This series has a more limited number of entries which impacts on the quantity of evidence which is seen. However, as with previous series, performance across the grade range was seen within the assessment this series. The quality of student work continues to vary, and performance is comparable with previous autumn series. This series tends to see entries from students who are hoping to improve on their performance in previous series, and the evidence seen suggests that these improvements are being made.

There were a small number of excellent-quality responses to the tasks, demonstrating that some students have a developed knowledge of digital business and have soft skills of a level which support them to deliver evidence of the quality expected of a digital data technician in the workplace. These students demonstrated that they had a very good understanding of the requirements of the project that ADS were asking them to engage with. This was evident in the contextualised answers provided throughout their ESP evidence in relation to gaming PC's and from any recommendations they were making that were relevant and within the constraints of the project.

When students performed to a good or reasonable standard, they demonstrated that they had a developing range of underpinning knowledge of the digital business sector. These students were able to demonstrate a range of soft skills within their evidence which were, for the most, part of a good standard and this supported the students to provide reasonable / good-quality evidence. These students were able to provide some good answers within their evidence, but this was often not as developed or contextualised as students who were achieving higher mark bands.

The difference between good-performing students and reasonably-performing students tends to be how contextualised the evidence they were producing is, and how this linked to the aims of ADS Project Brief. Students who performed well were able to consider what types of data might be useful when considering the expansion of the business and in particular how they can market the new products and services. Reasonably-performing students were able to provide some contextualised answers, but they tended to be more generic in nature rather than being specific to the needs of ADS.

When students provided limited-quality evidence this was due to a range of factors. These students were able to demonstrate a reasonable understanding of the digital business sector but there were some

misconceptions or omissions in their work. These students were able to demonstrate a range of soft skills throughout their ESP, however, these were often not fully developed.

Consistent with previous series, Task 3, the presentation, continues to be of a good standard with a wide range of digital skills being demonstrated. Students continue to use a range of tools and techniques within their presentations such as slide transitions, use of charts and graphs, using images and speaker's notes which result in a more professional-quality slide deck being presented.

One area more challenging in this series was the project management tool. In this series, students were for the first time provided with financial data for the project and were asked to create a budget. Students were also provided with information about a range of marketing activities and asked to allocate some of the budget to different activities in line with the aims of ADS's Project Brief. Students were also provided with key factors and issues which may affect the project. In this series, the performance in this task does not seem to have been as confident as seen in previous series due to this new tool being used for the first time. Performance varied, with some students producing a high-quality budget, some students combining the budget with a Gantt chart and some students just restated the figures from the Project Brief, which suggested that some students may not have fully understood the tool properly.

Contextualisation continues to be comparable to previous series, but it remains a key area for development for students in their ESP. The purpose of the ESP is to simulate a task that students could be expected to undertake by their employer. Students should be ensuring that every element of the work they are completing for each task is directly linked to the Project Brief, the aims of the business and linked to the specific project the business is asking them to advise on. Students should be encouraged to include context in every part of their evidence. Contextualising their evidence in this way would support students to improve their performance in their ESP.

Task 2 (b) continues to be the most challenging task of the ESP once again in this series. Most students attempted an entity relationship diagram (ERD) and there has been a marked improvement in students presenting evidence that is starting to look like an ERD, even if the ERD was missing key information or would not function. Students are still struggling to complete the task, and this had an impact on how well they could then explain their actions in the email. This is a consistent issue which has been evident in all series of the ESP and students continue to find Task 2 (b) the most challenging of the ESP.

The other tasks in the ESP have performed in line with previous series from the limited evidence that was available for this series.

As with previous series, students continue to largely treat each task of the ESP as being independent. The ESP is designed to enable students to use the knowledge and data they have collected or generated in each task to support their decision-making for subsequent tasks. Students should be encouraged to refer to previous evidence within subsequent tasks, either implicitly by reusing / restating information or explicitly by referring to the task by name. Task 3 continues to be the task where students are referring to prior tasks most consistently, but it would be beneficial to students if they are treating the ESP as one large task, where they refer to previous evidence, rather than treating each task in isolation.

On the whole, performance this series has shown some improvement from the previous series and that students are becoming more confident in their knowledge and skills in digital business, however, there are still areas for further development.

Evidence creation

Providers and students should be aware that there continues to be no set format in which students are required to produce their evidence beyond the allowed file formats. If examples of tools such as project management tools or ERDs are provided in mark schemes or GSEMs, for example, it should be noted that this is just one example of how evidence could be presented. This is not a definitive example of how

students are expected to present their evidence; it is provided as an example of how students could present their evidence and the level of detail that they may include. Students should be encouraged to produce their evidence using any appropriate software and any suitable format as long as it meets the evidence requirements provided in the Provider Guide, student guide and project tasks. It should be noted that students need to ensure that the evidence that they provide should be easy to access. In this series, some students opted to export their evidence for their Task 1 budget plan and their Task 2 (b) data to PDF in a format that made it difficult for examiners to read. Students should be encouraged to check all their evidence once they have exported it to a PDF format to ensure that it is still easy to read. Students should try to strike a balance between presenting all elements of a task on one page and the evidence being readable. In the event that presenting the task on one page would make the evidence difficult to read, then students should consider utilising more pages but keep this to the minimum required.

There was a range of evidence provided by students within this assessment. This series saw an increase in the number of requests for missing evidence. Whilst many of the samples were well presented, there was a significant number of missing tasks. Many providers had included the Notice to Examiners form to indicate missing evidence; however, when contacted evidence was available for the student. Providers should ensure that they check thoroughly for all student evidence and only include the Notice to Examiners form for tasks where there is no evidence available.

This series there continued to be some instances where task briefs, blank templates or the spreadsheets provided to providers were uploaded. Some students had included these documents in addition to their evidence and for others it was instead of their evidence. It is advisable that providers check that the documents they upload are the student's final evidence rather than the templates. It is not required that task briefs, blank templates or the original tasks are uploaded as part of the student's evidence. When a request does need to be made, it is appreciated greatly by the examining team when providers respond promptly to requests so they can continue marking the students work.

Providers should continue to remind students to retain the original file formats of their work. Sometimes the quality of their evidence can be affected when they convert it to a PDF format, such as not saving speaker's notes. Having the original file format available means that the examiner can then check the student's evidence to give credit for all the evidence produced. There were more instances this series of original files not being available and this can affect the student's overall performance. Students should save all the evidence that they produce as this will ensure that all student evidence is seen and marked by an examiner and that students are not disadvantaged due to issues with conversion of the files. Uploading original file format and PDF versions of all evidence is an acceptable approach for students and providers to take should they wish.

For Task 1: students presented their budget using a range of software such as Word and spreadsheet software and then presented this in PDF format. Students were provided with a template for their email, and this has been submitted as a Word document or a PDF. Some students opted to not utilise the template and crafted their email in a Word document which is an acceptable approach as long as all the key information is still included.

For Task 2 (a): students submitted as a Word document or a PDF.

For Task 2 (b) Action 1, students have presented their cleansed data in spreadsheet software or in a Word document. Students have presented their ERDs in a range of formats such as in a spreadsheet, a document and PDF.

For Action 2: students used a range of tools to display their data such as charts, pivot tables, graphs, dashboards and lists in a spreadsheet.

For Action 3: students have presented their email in the form of a document and PDF. Some students also included relevant screenshots of their evidence from Actions 1 and 2 in their emails to support their statements. Some students opted to not utilise the template and crafted their email in a Word document which is an acceptable approach as long as all the key information is still included.

For Task 3: students created their presentations in presentation software or exported their presentation to a PDF.

For Task 4: students were provided with a template for their reflection on their project which most used, and this has been submitted as a Word document or PDF. Some students opted to not utilise the template and crafted their reflection in a Word document which is an acceptable approach as long as all the key information is included.

Some providers also ensured that all relevant documentation, such as internet search history and student declarations, were included within student evidence folders. There was a decrease this year in the inclusion of the internet search history so for future series students should be reminded to include this in their evidence for upload because it is needed as part of the marking process.

Responses to the external assessment tasks

Task 1: project management tool

This series, students were asked for the first time to create a budget for their project management tool. Students were provided with the project budget and a list of project expenses. They were also provided with an overall marketing budget and the costings of a range of different marketing activities and were asked to plan a marketing budget for the project. Students were also provided with a summary of the timescales for each activity, a table of factors and issues and were asked to consider the impact on the stakeholders of the project as a result of their approach the project.

Students largely presented their budget as series of separate tables and as an inclusion in their email.

Most students were able to create a budget, and they were able to correctly include some elements which would be expected in a budget. Some students were able to produce a well-structured budget. When students performed well in this task, they had produced a budget which included all the key expenditure of the project, with a detailed budget of their planned spending for the marketing budget. They were also able to consider an appropriate contingency for the budget and included this within their overall budget. When students had not performed as well, their budget lacked some of the key elements that would be expected. Some students did not include all of the project expenditure, and they did not include a breakdown of their planned marketing budget. These students also tended to opt for more of a tabular presentation of their budget with separate tables for each element of the project, rather than one overall project budget. To improve performance, students should ensure that they are confident that they know the different project management tools that could be assessed for this task. Students should ensure that they refer back to the Project Brief throughout the task to ensure that they are fully understanding the specific requirements of the Project Brief and are not producing a generic project management tool. In particular, when asked to create a budget, students should make sure they are presenting their evidence in a budget format, rather than generic tables, and that they are completing all elements of the task.

Task 1: email to line manager

In this series, students were asked to create an email to their line manager to justify their approach to the budget and to discuss the factors and issues that could arise from the project. In common with previous series, many students are still not considering all elements of the task, instead tending to focus on the areas where they feel more confident, Ysuch as explaining the impact of the factors and issues of

the project, and not always considering the risks and how this would impact the project and stakeholders.

Students that performed well on this task were able to discuss their planned approach to the budget, in particular their planned spending on marketing. They were able to consider which of the provided marketing activities would be most likely to reach their target market of eSports enthusiasts and were able to justify their planned spending and timescales for this. These students were also able to consider the wider risks that Apex DigiSports may face as a result of the planned project and how they could mitigate these.

Students that performed less well tended to focus more on describing the figures that they had been provided for the project, rather than why they had planned the marketing activities they had. These students tended to include the marketing budget as a whole figure rather than breaking the budget down into the individual spend on each type of marketing activity they planned to utilise. They also tended not to consider allowing contingency within the project in case of additional costs or delays. Some of these students did consider wider risks but they tended to be more identification of risks than consideration of the impact they would have or how they could be resolved. They also tended to be more generic in nature. To improve performance, students should ensure that they know how to write an email in the professional setting and that they are including all relevant information that they are asked to consider in the task.

Some students tend to cover most of the task requirements and miss out one or two key elements, like risks or how it would help the project be successful. If students ensure they fully understand the requirements of the task and link to the Project Brief throughout, this should help them produce evidence that meets the requirements more fully. Students should ensure that they are confident what a budget is, how it works, what its purpose is and how to create a realistic budget for a project such as the one being undertaken by Apex DigiSports.

Task 1: English skills

The English skills seen this series were similar to those seen in previous series. The emails presented by students continue to be more consistent with the structure and formality that would be expected from an email.

There are still a very small number of students who are not utilising paragraphs, grammar and spellchecking in their work, although this has continued to decrease again this series. Students should be encouraged to make use of all relevant digital tools in their chosen software packages to support them with this.

Students are continuing to develop their understanding of how to address an email and this continues to improve each series. Student should be encouraged to address their email to a specific person and if a name is not provided in the Project Brief they are free to utilise any name for their line manager that they feel would be appropriate as this would allow them to produce a more professional formatted email than simply starting their email 'Dear Line Manager'. There were a small number of students this series who did not present their evidence as an email. Students should be reminded that this task is an email and should be presented as such.

Task 2 (a): sources of data

This series students were once again asked to create a document which considered the sources of data that would be needed to support the planning of Apex DigiSports expansion project.

Students that performed well in this task were able to consider a good range of internal and external sources of data which were relevant to the project. These students were able to consider which sources of data would be most appropriate and what the data could tell Apex DigiSports about their business and

the eSports market and how they could utilise this when planning the expansion to allow them to offer the budget range.

Students that performed less well were able to provide a range of sources of data, both internal and external, that could be used, however, some of these may not provide useful data for Apex DigiSports.

Students tended to consider a range of sources of data rather than being selective of the most appropriate data for the type of business and the planned project. This meant these students provided less depth in their report than students who had been more selective of the sources of data. There continues to be a number of students providing a commentary on how they will process data rather than saying which data they need. It is good to see that students know how they plan to process the data, however, they must make sure that they are identifying which data they will be processing and what they intend to use the data for, what the data will be able to tell them about the Apex DigiSports plan to offer a budget-friendly range of gaming PCs and how they can then utilise it to make informed decisions.

Students should be aware that this task does not require them to address all potential sources of data, instead they should select the sources of data which would be most relevant. This means that each series students may be considering different sources of data.

To improve performance, students should refer to the Project Brief and previous tasks to identify what specific types of data will be needed. Students should identify the most important sources of data for the project or the type of business that is involved in the project and start with these and ensure that they are explaining why this data would be essential to the project's overall success. Students should then continue to consider the sources of data they will need in order of importance to the project aims and brief.

Task 2 (b) Action 1: ERD and data cleanse

This series students were once again asked to use the provided datasets to cleanse some customer data and to then create an entity relationship diagram (ERD). As with previous series this task continues to prove challenging for most students.

Students that performed well were able to cleanse the data which included removing incomplete records and normalising the data. They were able to use the tools available in their chosen spreadsheet software to complete this for all the records in the datasets. Students were then able to use this data to create an ERD.

Students that performed less well were able to use the datasets to begin to cleanse the data. Most students were able to normalise the data within the dataset. Some students opted to identify all the errors in the dataset but did not then proceed to cleanse the data.

For the ERD, some students were able to present a recognisable ERD, however, this was not always complete, and they were not able to identify the primary or foreign keys. This series did see an improvement in students being able to correctly lay out their ERD, however, it continues to be a challenge for students to present an ERD that functions.

To improve performance further students still need to ensure that they are confident in the creation and use of the tools they will need for this action. This can be the tools for the data cleanse or when producing the ERD. The more confident students are in using these tools and preparing these diagrams the more their performance should improve. Students should be encouraged to utilise the tools within their chosen spreadsheet package when cleansing the data. Many are opting to manually cleanse the data rather than use the tools within the software to aid them to complete this activity.

Task 2 (b): action 2 data analysis

This series students were again given a number of datasets that they were then asked to use to create a new dataset to provide data for the new project. This series students were informed in the task that they could create charts / graphs, in addition to using a range of other tools such as pivot tables, using any tools they feel will allow them to best present the data and trends in their new dataset.

Students that performed well in this task were able to review the datasets that were provided, with many choosing to also include the dataset from Action 1, and to select relevant data to create their new dataset. Students are not asked to utilise the data that is provided in Action 1; however, these students are able to select relevant data from all the data that is provided when creating their new dataset which enables them to demonstrate an excellent understanding of how to process data to achieve a meaningful output. These students were able to use a range of tools such as conditional formatting, tables, queries, charts and graphs to present the data. They presented their information in a number of different tables or charts / graphs and had combined relevant data together to create data that could be used in planning and delivering the project. These students were able to select the relevant data from the gaming market data and Apex DigiSports market research data to utilise in their new dataset.

Students that performed less well in this task were able to review the datasets provided with, however, they tended to be less selective with the data or to use fewer tools when presenting their data. Students were able to demonstrate use of tools, but this was more limited and tended to be limited to tables or sorting data. The ways in which the data was presented tended to be less organised and students tended not to select data that was relevant to Apex DigiSports. These students also tended to create a range of different charts and tables, but many did not work, such as slicers, or they focused on data that was not relevant to the project.

To improve performance further students should be confident in how to select data based on the Project Brief and aims they are given. Not all the data that is provided in the datasets will be relevant to the project and students need to develop the confidence to select the data that is most relevant to the project. In developing the skills to select relevant data and to then present this in a range of formats this will enable students to be able to explain what the data is showing and its relevance to the project more effectively in subsequent tasks. Providers should encourage students to use any tools available to them in their spreadsheet software even if the task is not explicit in requesting them. Students presenting accurate charts / graphs / dashboards will have their evidence rewarded equally to those who use other tools to produce accurate new datasets such as queries, conditional formatting or tables. This task enables students to create their new datasets in a format which they feel will best present the data, both in this task and for use in task 3.

Students should also be checking that any tools they utilise work. Some students created pivot tables and slicers in their dashboards, however, when the examiner tried to use the dashboard, they did not function so students should check any tools they utilise work in the way they planned. It is not a requirement that student utilise these types of tools so it may be beneficial for students to utilise the tools that they are most confident in utilising to present their new dataset.

Task 2 (b): action 3 email to line manager

This series, students were once again asked to send their line manager an email summarising the data cleansing and data analysis from Actions 1 and 2.

Students that performed well in this task drafted an email which provided an explanation of the steps they had taken in cleansing and analysing the data and why these steps were appropriate to the project. These students were able to discuss why they took the decisions they did in terms of cleansing or analysing the data specific to the plans for the expansion and new budget range. These students

1 were able to make recommendations on pricing and which components or services that Apex DigiSports
2 may want to include or exclude from their new budget range based on the datasets.

3
4 Students that performed less well in this task were able to describe some of the steps taken in Actions 1
5 and 2. These students were able to describe how they had cleansed the data and why they chose the
6 data for Action 2. They also were able to provide some limited explanations of why the data selected
7 was relevant to the business. These students tended to focus on the actions they have taken rather than
8 how the data can be used to inform the project. These students did not tend to comment on the data and
9 where they did it was simple identification rather than linked to how it would help to inform the decisions
10 being made by Apex DigiSports.

11
12 Some students continue to find this action challenging due to their performance in Actions 1 and 2.
13 Where students have only limited evidence in the previous actions or where they found Actions 1 and 2
14 challenging, this then meant that the feedback to the line manager was limited to an overview of the
15 elements they attempted. This tended to be a description of the steps they have taken as they were not
16 sure what the data was showing. Students who did not understand how to create an ERD from the
17 cleansed dataset couldn't then explain what steps they took or why they took them which then affected
18 what evidence they were able to include in their email.

19
20 To improve performance further students should ensure that they are confident in the skills they need to
21 undertake Actions 1 and 2, as this will then provide students with the evidence they need to complete
22 this action more effectively. Students should also make sure that they are providing a number of
23 recommendations to the business based on what they learnt when processing the data. This could be
24 related to areas such as which age group of customers to target, what items to sell, what to charge and
25 so on. Students may wish to include screenshots from their Action 1 and / or Action 2 evidence within
26 their email as this may support them in explaining the steps they have taken or what their data shows.

27 28 **Task 3: presentation of research findings**

29
30 This series, students were once again asked to produce a presentation which summarised their findings
31 in relation to Apex DigiSports plan to expand their premises so that they can launch a budget-friendly
32 gaming PC range. Students were asked to consider data analytics, impact on stakeholders, and any
33 solutions to any issues or risks raised.

34
35 Students that performed well created a professionally presented presentation which was appropriate for
36 the directors of Apex DigiSports and was linked to the Project Brief. These students were able to explain
37 what the data they analysed in Task 2 (b) meant for the project. They also considered how the project
38 could impact on Apex DigiSports' stakeholders and solutions to any issues that the project faced. These
39 students were able to explain what the charts / dashboards they had created showed and what decisions
40 Apex DigiSports may want to make when planning their budget-friendly range of gaming PCs.

41
42 Students that performed less well produced professional-looking presentations that were appropriate for
43 the directors. These students tended to produce presentations that explained the different requirements
44 of the task rather than explaining how Apex DigiSports would need to address the requirements for the
45 expansion to be a success. These students tended to include data and charts but then did not explain
46 how these were relevant to the project or what Apex DigiSports should do as a result of the
47 findings. These students may have considered the stakeholders of Apex DigiSports, but this was more in
48 terms of who the stakeholders of the project were than how Apex DigiSports might address or mitigate
49 the stakeholder concerns. Some students did not include the stakeholders. Students also considered the
50 issues the project may face, but these were often issues any project may face rather than being specific
51 to the launch of the new product range. Solutions which were offered by these students tended to be
52 generic in nature and not always relevant to the specific issues being faced by the business and this
53 means that many of these recommendations were not relevant to the project aims.

As with previous series and other larger tasks such as the Task 1 report, some students continue to not fully address all elements of the presentation. Students are addressing the majority of the tasks, and each series does still see a slight improvement in the coverage, however, there are still some areas that are consistently missing or approached in less detail than other areas of the presentation. Students need to ensure that they are reading the task fully, identifying all the evidence they need to include and that they are ensuring it is all addressed in order to demonstrate good or excellent performance.

To improve performance further, students should ensure that they are addressing all the requirements of the task and that they are contextualising their presentation. Students need to be developing their evidence beyond just explaining what data analysis is or who the stakeholders are. They need to be explaining how they used data analytics to create their charts and what this means for the project. Students should also ensure that they are linking back to the project aims on each slide. The evidence should be focused on what the data shows and how that will inform decision-making rather than simply describing what the various concepts are.

Task 3: digital skills

The digital skills seen this series continue to be of a similar standard to those seen in recent series. Students are utilising a range of the tools available to them in their chosen presentation software to produce professional-quality presentations. Students across all performance levels are using these tools. Popular digital tools utilised included inserting charts / graphs, using backgrounds, using speaker's notes, and using a theme throughout their presentation.

Most students are demonstrating reasonable to good digital skills in their presentations. Students continue to demonstrate a range of different skills such as inserting pictures, annotating their slides, using themes to give a house style to their presentation and transitions between slides.

Some students are demonstrating excellent use of digital skills. These students are producing professional-quality presentations which would be of the quality that they could be used for the intended purpose of presenting information to the directors.

Students should be encouraged to demonstrate their mastery of their presentation software in any way they feel would best engage the directors of the business. This could be through making slides more interactive or engaging with more movement or could be through their use of the image formatting tools to present their visual data in a more unique way.

Task 3: English skills

The English skills seen this series remain at a similar level as previous series. Most students are utilising the speaker's notes or producing an accompanying script which is resulting in better-quality evidence on the slides. Students are using more appropriate sentence structure and length for the type of written communication being utilised.

There are still some students who are not fully utilising the editor tools available to them in their chosen presentation software, however, on the whole spelling and grammatical errors have reduced this series in students' presentations.

Task 4: evaluation

This series, students were once again asked to reflect on their ESP project. Students are provided with a template that they can use to complete this activity, and most students have opted to present their evidence for the task on this template.

Students that performed well showed good or excellent reflective skills. They continue to be able to summarise the actions they undertook during the tasks, why these actions were needed and the impact on the project. These students refer to the project aims and self-reflect on how well their recommendations will allow Apex DigiSports to achieve these and they then consider how they could

1 have completed these actions in a more effective way. Students continue to self-evaluate why their
2 actions were effective or not and could then offer better alternative approaches they could have
3 considered. These students also understand their own professional development needs, and they
4 identify relevant continuing professional development CPD to support their future development needs.
5 Students that performed less well demonstrated reasonable to good reflective skills. These students are
6 able to summarise their actions within each task of the ESP, however, these tended to be more
7 superficial or generic in nature and tend not to be linked to the project aims.

8
9 These students tended to provide more of a summary of the actions they took but did not then consider
10 how their performance in each task or how their skills impacted on the overall performance in the project.
11 These students also tended to provide a more positive review of their own skills and performance, and
12 this then impacted on the recommended CPD as they felt they did not necessarily need further training.

13
14 This series a small number of students opted to provide a summary of the project performance rather
15 than a review of their performance in each task. Students need to ensure that for this task they are
16 reviewing how well they have performed in each task, what this meant for the project as a whole and
17 what impact gaps in their own knowledge and skills has had on the project. Students are at the start of
18 their career so it is not expected that they can perform all the skills needed at a professional-level.
19 Students who perform well in this task are able to identify their areas for development and really
20 consider how they will develop these skills and how that would make the next project they are involved in
21 more successful.

22
23 To improve performance further, students should ensure that they are considering their specific
24 performance in relation to the project aims and brief. Students need to be considering how effective their
25 work is in helping the project to be a success rather than a generic summary of their skills in the different
26 tasks.

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.

'NCFE' is a registered trade mark of NCFE.