Chief examiner's report

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

November 2022 – Employer Set Project (Assisting with Healthcare Science)

Chief examiner's report

November 2022 – Employer set project (Assisting with Healthcare Science)

Assessment dates: 07 – 18 November 2022

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 marks (UMS), and the aggregation of the core component, please see refer to the qualification specification.

Standard of student work

This is only the second time there has been an ESP for this T Level, and it is encouraging that, compared to the previous session, we have seen a better spread of marks, with more students managing to achieve the higher bands in tasks, reflected across all five tasks that make up the ESP.

It is still the case that many students struggled with reflection (task 5) and are not using a reflective cycle. Even when a cycle is mentioned, it was not always followed, with some stages being missed.

Where the mark scheme awards marks for use of English, maths and digital, there was not always evidence to support this. Task 4b is a good example and providers should ensure that there is evidence of the student's presentation submitted to support this.

Evidence creation

During this session evidence submission by Providers was improved. There were fewer instances of missing evidence and there were no access issues (for example corrupted files or document formatting issues). The marking team give thanks to providers for ensuring a more complete set of evidence for each student, and the swift resolution of identified issues. Where gaps were identified, they were responded to swiftly and did not impact on the marking timeline. Most students made use of the pro-formas, which is an improvement from the previous session.

There are task specific comments, which are addressed 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 their use of English, with marks awarded demonstrating a spread across all 5 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 a 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 about COVID-19, or the use of COVID-19 test centres – the case study was not set in a COVID-19 test centre, it was for taking readings for those with respiratory diseases.

Task 2: quality improvement report

This task, worth 20 marks, again saw a spread across the range.

It was encouraging to see that providers made use of the pro-formas available to them, however, some students struggled to provide enough information. When students expanded on the suggest points and contextualised them to the given case study, they scored higher marks.

In addition, there were up to 4 marks for English, 2 marks for maths and 3 for digital skills.

Whilst all students gained some of the English marks, very few gained marks for maths and almost no students received the full digital skills marks. Statistical information was available from the links provided, but very few students referenced these, which would have helped them gain additional 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 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.

For this reason, some students scored as low as 1 mark for this task. However, there were some more 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 carefully consider the rationale for changes they accept.

Task 4b: presentation

Listening to the students talking about their work was enjoyable, and it was pleasing to see some overcoming their nerves.

This task has a wide spread of marks, although none higher than 12 from the possible 16.

There was considerable variation in the length of some presentations, with the shortest being only 2 minutes long, and the longest being 10 minutes. This was reflected in some of the scoring, where the longer

presentations were able to provide more detail. Students are not marked on the length of their presentation, however some shorter presentations were very brief, and lacking in sufficient detail to receive higher marks.

One comment to providers is that they should use the sets of possible questions provided to them. Some providers decided to come up with their own questions (see pages 12 to 15 of the provider guide for more details). Providers are strongly advised to follow the pre-set questions, as making up questions carries a high risk of disadvantaging students, as they may not be able to draw out answers of the depth required.

Task 4b also had two 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 and there was no other evidence available within the task to award marks for digital skills.

Task 5: reflection

This task carried up to 16 marks, however the marks awarded were in the lower half, with no student exceeding 7 marks.

Students have again struggled to score high marks for this task, just as they did in the previous series.

One improvement this series was that more students referred to a reflective cycle, usually Gibbs. Unfortunately, despite this reference, some did not follow it, or missed stages within it.

Those that scored lower marks often contained reflections that were too descriptive, simply a narrative of what the tasks were and what they did.

Those students who scored higher marks were those who demonstrated a deeper level of reflection, and also referred to their future professional development and self-awareness of their own practice.

Administering the external assessment

The external assessment is invigilated and must be conducted in line with our regulation 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).

Document information