



# Chief examiner's report

**T Level Technical Qualification in  
Education and Early Years (Level 3)  
(603/5829/4)**

**Summer 2023 – Employer set project  
(Early Years Educator and Assisting  
Teaching)**

## Chief examiner's report

### Summer 2023 – Employer set project (Early Years Educator and Assisting Teaching)

Assessment dates: **02/05/2023 – 22/05/2023**

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:

	Overall
Max	90
A*	77
A	68
B	59
C	50
D	42
E	34

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 refer to the qualification specification.

## Standard of student work

Overall, the standard of the employer set project (ESP) was much higher in this series with a consistent approach observed.

The purpose of the ESP is to ensure that students can apply core knowledge and skills to develop a substantial piece of work in response to a set brief in the context of an employer. There was generally a good understanding from providers regarding what is expected for the assessment, based upon student evidence presented for marking.

There were some excellent responses from students that demonstrated that they had a clear understanding of the expectations from the project brief and were able to apply their knowledge appropriately to the various tasks included within this assessment.

Students should be made aware during their learning of how the assessment objectives are implemented in marking the project, so they will understand the level of performance that will achieve high marks. Students awarded with higher marks could apply their knowledge and understanding to the assessment criteria and write coherently with depth and detail in response to the brief. Some students lacked precision in their responses or produced responses that lacked depth in terms of demonstrating the core skills, and this limited marks awarded.

## Evidence creation

The provided proformas were used and therefore supported the structure and creation of evidence effectively.

Some evidence was not always labelled or uploaded correctly. Providers are informed to label each task clearly within the Regulations for the Conduct of the External Assessment document. Failure to follow this requirement may have implications for the awarding of students' grades. If examiners are not easily able to identify which evidence relates to which task, this may limit the marks awarded for that task; a judgement can only be based on the evidence that has been submitted.

Providers must ensure all submissions, including recordings, are thoroughly checked prior to submitting these to NCFE, that a final check is carried out to ensure everything is accounted for, and that they are swift to respond to NCFE should further information be required. Providers are encouraged to use the checklist to ensure they have checked all evidence has been submitted.

## Responses to the external assessment tasks

### Task 1: Early support plan

Task 1(a) and 1(b): There was evidence of some excellent, highly detailed intervention and support plans.

Students generally took full account of all the information available to them and demonstrated a sound understanding of theoretical and philosophical approaches to inform their early support plans, considering the impact they have on practice. The most effective plans clearly addressed the child/young person's holistic development and support needs, rather than being less targeted and more generic in approach.

To achieve higher marks, the student should ensure that planning 'fully addresses all development/support needs', therefore the student should have used most of the information given in the brief to create their plan. In some plans, only one area of development was considered, and whilst this was the main area of development to plan for, there was other relevant information regarding the child's holistic needs to consider.

Students gained marks by providing creative, accurate and concise information on the activity plan that met the task requirements, using the information from the early support plan and making consistent links to the project brief. Many students created activity plans with a proficient level of detail. Again, there was excellent

reference to relevant educational theories, concepts and pedagogies underpinning the activity plans, along with practice-relevant terms and relevant examples.

Some students submitted generic support plans and activity plans that did not focus on the child in the given brief. This meant that general support and activity strategies were presented with no reference to the child's individual needs, which limited marks awarded.

### **Task 1: English, mathematics and digital skills**

Mathematic skills were demonstrated through the skills of processing the data in the project brief. Most students were able to make sense of and interpret the information provided, although some did struggle in this area.

Digital skills were used to present information clearly using word processed plans, with further evidence including the design of learning materials and examples of how to record and track children/young people's attainment. Most students presented their evidence in a clear, easy to follow format, and many were effective and creative in their written tasks, showing confident application of writing skills with some excellent use of technical terminology to support this.

Students are advised to proofread their work for accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation before submission, as avoidable errors were noted which, at times, did impact on ability to achieve all available marks.

### **Task 2(b): Activity plan v2**

For this task, students should revise and redraft their work following peer feedback. Reflection and evaluation should then be used to inform the updated activity plan and the amended plan should then be submitted. Students should clearly reference each piece of feedback received in their summary of changes, showing justifications in their responses.

Most plans were amended, clearly using the peer feedback to enhance and develop the plan. Examples of adapted plans highlighted where students had used the peer feedback and demonstrated justification of the amendments, and included the feedback they chose not to use. Good examples included the use of a bold font or where the amendments were underlined. Other students included their amendments at the end of their plan as a summary of changes, clearly stating that this was their peer feedback and the changes they had made/decided not to make.

Students need to use skills of reflection *and* evaluation. They must justify the feedback they acted on as well as the feedback they decided not to use. Some students simply copied the peer feedback into the activity plan without saying why they had included it, or how it improved the plan.

### **Task 3(b): Discussion with tutor**

This task requires a discussion with the tutor. Some providers only submitted the questions and not a discussion, which limited marks. Excellent examples were observed where the tutor scaffolded the discussion using the key points given in the brief, and therefore clearly demonstrating an understanding of the tutor guidance. Providers are reminded that the purpose of this task is for a discussion to take place, and not simply for the student to present information. Some students simply read word-for-word from their PowerPoint or notes, which does not constitute a well-prepared discussion.

Common issues concerning tutor questioning was identified (for example, some students did not understand the questions correctly). Some students did not present their discussion – the tutor only asked the questions; therefore, marks could not be awarded in the higher bands to ensure fairness to all students. Some tutors may have given students access to the questions before the discussion; this is **not** permitted as stated in the tutor guidance, and where this is suspected, malpractice procedures may be followed. Students are not permitted to take in any materials outside of the allocated assessment time, as stated in the tutor guidance (for example, pre-prepared cue cards for the tutor discussion).

There were some issues with sound quality; providers should ensure there are no distractions whilst the discussions take place.

Some tutors may have inadvertently been viewed as attempting to lead students and thus give them an opportunity to share new/further evidence. The examiners did not mark any additional evidence in such cases. In cases where tutors are clearly 'leading', this may lead to malpractice procedures being followed.

Some discussions went over the allocated time and some used less time; to complete this task effectively, providers are advised to use the allocated time for this task.

Providers are not required to record the peer discussions – only the tutor/student discussion is required to be uploaded as evidence.

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

Digital skills could be assessed through the preparation for the tutor discussion in the form of word processed notes or by PowerPoint. Some of the PowerPoints were excellent and of a high quality, demonstrating a high level of preparation.

### **Task 4: Reflection**

There was evidence of highly reflective accounts, where students demonstrated higher level thinking skills including clear, well-reasoned reflection with comprehensive evaluation and justified actions. Some students perhaps did not always understand what constitutes a reflective account – they may have struggled with understanding the command verbs. Whilst it might support some students to use a theoretical reflective cycle for this task, this is not a requirement.

Students gained higher marks particularly when they were identifying improvements to their own knowledge, planning skills and future practice. Some evaluations were descriptive statements, and some did not include any reference to improvements. Both evaluation and analysis must be provided within the account.

Some students lost marks because the four areas for reflection were not covered, particularly the requirement to make links to future practice. Some evaluations were basic or very descriptive statements, and some did not include any reference to improvements, which limited marks awarded for this task. Some students simply repeated what they had produced for each task but did not give enough explanation or reflection, which resulted in some vague reflective accounts.

## 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).