

T Level Technical Qualification in Digital Support Services (603/6901/2)

Summer 2022 – Employer set project (Digital Support)



# Chief examiner's report

# May 2022 - Employer set project (Digital Support)

### Assessment dates: 09 - 20 May

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	76
<b>A</b> *	67
Α	58
В	49
С	41
D	33
Е	25

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

The range of tasks differentiated students effectively, giving a good spread of grades. Some excellent responses were given by stronger students.

Tasks 1 and 3 targeted application (AO2) and proved to be more challenging to students as they required higher order skills to apply the knowledge gained during the year. There were clear distinctions between students who understood the concepts and those who did not.

Most students were able to communicate clearly in their interview, but many struggled to deviate from their script, which resulted in missed opportunities to ask follow up questions.

It was clear from the email task that many students needed more practice in communicating to both technical and non-technical audiences and the application of analytical thinking.

Applying a logical approach to problem solving was also an area of weakness for many students, this was evident in tasks 1 and 3.

Reviewing how well the outcomes meet the brief (AO5) proved difficult for weaker students, who lacked the approach/structure to capitalise on marks.

Assessment marks for English and mathematics skills (AO4) were needlessly lost across the ability range and care should be taken in future to ensure students get into the habit of proofreading their work.

## **Evidence creation**

It was pleasing to see that most of the evidence submitted by providers was well presented, making it easier to review. The audio files and documents were in a common format (usually mp3 and pdf respectively), ensuring compatibility.

On occasion, some evidence was inadvertently not submitted by providers, causing delays in assessment. Care must be taken in future to ensure that this does not happen.

## **Responses to the external assessment tasks**

## Task 1: Troubleshooting document

Most students identified a display/resolution setting issue, with many scoring 3 or 4 marks. Good responses identified possible driver issues and included the steps needed to resolve the problem. This task was intended to test students' understanding of troubleshooting using a logical process involving relevant steps to identify the computer faults. Some students did not grasp the need to fully resolve the fault and stopped after making a single recommendation.

#### Task 1: Test plan document

Most students showed good understanding of how to structure a test plan but struggled to describe the logical sequence of relevant tests required to resolve the computer fault.

Most students scored 1 to 8 marks. Some students confused the task and described testing for computer 1. Only a few students achieved higher band marks, giving a very detailed test plan containing a logical sequence of relevant tests.

### Task 2: Interview

This task was completed well by students. Most students were able to apply reasonable communication techniques to ascertain the required information through a series of constructed questions. Some students achieved a band one mark due to them sticking too rigidly to their pre-planned questions and missing opportunities to ask follow-up questions or demonstrate active listening.

On occasion it was difficult for students to demonstrate their communication skills due to providers volunteering too much information without any or very little prompting from students. The opposite was also evident in which students would ask relevant questions and receive little information in return.

### Task 2: Emails

Many students were able to communicate differently to both audiences, but this tended to be superficial in nature. The expected technical terminology was minimal or non-existent. To achieve higher band grades students must also demonstrate excellent application of analytical thinking and problem solving regarding the scenario problems. This was lacking in most of the evidence and is an area for improvement across the cohort.

### Task 3: Project proposal

This task is an opportunity for students to demonstrate their understanding of the scenario issues and to offer a resolution. This covers the current problems, possible solutions, judgements on hardware/software/services and associated cyber security. This task is worth up to 24 marks and is therefore a substantial piece of evidence; this is also reflected in the 4 hours allocated to its completion. Some students did not grasp the magnitude of what was required to achieve higher marks and submitted 1 to 2 pages of evidence. This did not cover the required scope given in the task.

Often students would duplicate resources, for example, purchase multiple expensive servers as well as recommending a full cloud solution. Although hybrid networks are a valid approach, more care is needed when describing the purpose of each component.

Good responses addressed cyber security issues and possible solutions and referenced the scenario requirements throughout their evidence.

#### Task 3: Mathematics skills

This task required students to demonstrate numeracy skills within their proposal. Some students scored one mark, only missing out on full marks due to the inaccuracy of their calculations, with often a simple mistake.

Some students simply listed price, sometimes in dollars, and evidenced no calculations, and so achieving no marks.

Good responses included a table containing hardware, software and service costs, identification of quantities if relevant, one off or monthly cost, subtotals, and an overall total. Often a simple application of addition/subtraction/multiplication/division operations would suffice to gain full marks.

# Task 4: Testing method - audience testing (sample satisfaction survey)

Most students achieved some marks in this task. Some students mistook the purpose of the survey and addressed all their questions to the company and their network upgrade without any consideration to the end user.

Good responses included relevant questions, and a range of question types, covering both qualitative and quantitated data.

### Task 4: Post-project review

This task was tackled well with most students demonstrating a reasonable understanding of the key issues given in the scenario, their solution, health and safety and security factors.

Most students also evaluated their own performance throughout the project and gave explanations of actions taken and proposed solutions.

### Task 2, 3 and 4: English skills

Many students lost marks in this category unnecessarily due to having spelling, punctuation and grammar errors present in their tasks 2, 3 and 4. It is vital that students get into the habit of proofreading their work.

## Administering the external assessment

The external assessment is supervised and must be conducted in line with our <u>Regulations for the Conduct</u> of <u>External Assessment</u>. 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 <u>Qualification</u> <u>Specific Instructions Document</u> (QSID).