

# **T Level Technical Qualification in Onsite Construction**

## **8711-30 Core Report (Summer 2024)**

Version and date	Change detail	Section	Question
V1-0 August 2024			

# Contents

<b>Foreword</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>8711-031 Paper 1</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>8711-032 Paper 2</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>8711 Sub-Component: Exam</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment.....	11
Support materials .....	12
Grade boundaries .....	13
<b>8711-033 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project</b> .....	<b>14</b>
Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment.....	18
Support materials .....	22
Grade boundaries.....	23
<b>8711-30 Onsite Construction Core</b> .....	<b>24</b>
UMS grade boundaries.....	24

# Foreword

## Summer 2024 Results

The technical qualification is made up of two components (the Core and the Occupational Specialism), both of which need to be successfully achieved to attain the T Level Technical Qualification in Onsite Construction. This takes into account the best result for a specific component from the summer and autumn series. This document covers the Core component only.

We discussed the approach to standard setting/maintaining with Ofqual and the other awarding organisations before awarding this year. We have agreed to take account of the newness of qualifications in how we award this year to recognise that students and teachers are less familiar with the assessments ([grading-arrangements-for-vtqsand-technical-qualifications-within-t-levels-in-the-academic-year-2023-to-2024](#)), whilst also recognising the standards required for these qualifications.

## Introduction

This document has been prepared to be used as a feedback tool for Providers in order to support and enhance teaching and preparation for assessment. It is advised that this document is referred to when planning delivery and when preparing candidates for the T Level Technical Qualification (TQ) in Onsite Construction **Core** assessments.

This report provides general commentary on candidate performance in both the examination papers and Employer-Set Project (ESP). It highlights common themes in relation to the technical aspects explored within the assessment, giving areas of strength and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat assessments in the summer 2024 assessment series.

The grade boundaries (and notional boundaries where appropriate) that were used to determine candidates' final summer 2024 results are also provided.

More information regarding T Levels TQ grading, awarding, UMS and rules for retakes can be found in the T Levels Technical Qualifications Grading Guide available on the [City & Guilds T Levels Resources and Support Hub](#).

# 8711-031 Paper 1

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Onsite Construction core content:

- Health and safety in construction
- Construction design principles
- Construction and the built environment industry
- Construction sustainability principles
- Building technology principles
- Tools, equipment, and materials

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Onsite Construction core element.

The exam has been split into **two** sections. Below details the type of questions and marks available for each section.

**Section A** is made up of **60** marks and includes **14** short answer and medium answer questions.

**Section B** is made up of **30** marks and includes **3** extended response questions.

The exam is designed to provide sufficient sampling across the content and consists of a mixture of short answer questions (SAQs), some of which are structured, and extended response questions (ERQs). The exam assesses across assessment objectives (AOs) 1a/b, 2 and 3 to allow for the appropriate assessment and differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:

- **AO1a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1b** Demonstrate understanding
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and understanding to different situations and context
- **AO3** Analyse and evaluate information and issues

Most candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge of the core content on the AO1a and AO1b questions, when asked to name, state or identify information, but fewer were able to achieve marks on questions that asked to demonstrate understanding, application, analysis, or evaluation (AO2 and AO3).

Areas of strength include:

- recalling first aid requirements on site (Q1). The majority of responses appropriately answered this question. A few responses incorrectly related their answer to an induction instead of first aid.
- recalling the term that applies to listed buildings (Q4). This question was generally answered correctly, with candidates providing the correct term 'listed'. The grades that listed buildings are classified as were also accepted as an answer.
- describing topics to be covered in a site induction (Q6). A broad spectrum of answers was offered in the responses seen.

- discussing construction methods used to minimise waste (Q7). Responses mainly focussed on recycling and reusing materials. A few responses also talked about the correct way to handle and store materials to minimise waste. Other answers that would have been accepted but were not given included the use of smart design to ensure building to standardised sizes.
- correctly calculating costs for a project (Q10). Different methods to calculate the cost of concrete and labour were applied to give the final answers. The maths competency skills seen this series showed improvement when compared to previous series.
- understanding of how to mitigate the risks when working onsite (Q12). There were many positive responses that correctly explained suitable PPE for the carpentry and plastering tasks. It was noted that some responses tended to focus more on the correct PPE for the plasterer but didn't cover the needs of the carpenter in as much detail.

Areas for development include:

- recalling that CDE stands for 'Common Data Environment' (Q2). There were few correct responses with many mistaking the 'C' to stand for construction.
- recalling the fact that putting out fires with water can cause electrocution (Q5). There were some mixed responses with some correctly stating that red coded fire extinguishers are filled with water, but few went on to explain why it should not be used on an electrical fire, namely: water is a conductor of electricity and risk of electrocution.
- identifying the general application of specific Approved Documents (Q8). There were a few correct responses, with the majority only providing one correct Approved Document, instead of the two required.
- understanding what BREEAM is used for (Q9). Many responses thought it was a method of planning construction works, much the same as a Gantt chart would, instead of explaining that it is an environmental framework to assess and support sustainability and environmental matters on a project.
- understanding how various factors can affect profitability of a project (Q14). There were mixed responses to this question, mostly identifying the possibility of asbestos and the cost of demolition. Some responses showed they did not fully read the scenario, leading to answers about the unused commercial building remaining rather than it being demolished and replaced with houses.

### **Responses to extended response questions (ERQs)**

Most candidates attempted the ERQs, but the responses showed that they found these questions challenging. Some candidates provided superficial responses, whilst others produced a lot of text but did not demonstrate clear understanding of the scenario, a pattern seen from previous series. Most responses showed limited reasoned analysis and struggled to display evaluation skills and justification for the choices and/or rationale provided. The

majority of candidates scored in the lower mark bands with only a few accessing the higher mark bands.

The first ERQ (Q15) concerned a development where the reduction of flooding and environmental solutions were required in relation to the design of a roof and rainwater management. This question required a discussion around the potential difficulties and solutions of roof and drainage design. Most responses showed some limited analysis of the potential difficulties for the development but didn't provide much breadth and depth in the responses and tended to focus on the roof and little on the drainage. The higher marked responses provided a more balanced response when analysing the potential difficulties, but many still didn't identify solutions. Higher marks could have been obtained through further in-depth analysis, focusing on potential flooding and solutions in addition to the roof.

The second ERQ (Q16) concerned a building site in a city centre and the emergency situations that could be encountered, along with the correct procedures. Candidates tended to concentrate more on the unsafe situations and did not go on to confirm the emergency procedures that needed to be followed for each. Many responses provided everyday site situations rather than emergencies or only provided a limited range of emergencies. Higher marks could have been obtained by understanding what the question was asking from the candidate, and then providing thorough analysis and application of knowledge around the scenario.

The third ERQ (Q17) set a scenario where a construction company was considering which construction method would be suitable for a development where speed and cost were important. Candidates gave a variety of construction methods, with some comparing different on-site and off-site methods. The question asked for solutions for the roof and the walls, however many candidates did not mention the roof at all, or briefly in passing. Higher marks could have been achieved by providing construction methods for both the walls and roof.



## 8711-032 Paper 2

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Onsite Construction core content:

- Construction science principles
- Construction measurement principles
- Construction information and data principles
- Relationship management in construction
- Digital technology in construction
- Construction commercial/business principles

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Onsite Construction core element.

The exam has been split into **two** sections. Below details the type of questions and marks available for each section.

**Section A** is made up of **60** marks and includes **17** short answer and medium answer questions.

**Section B** is made up of **30** marks and includes **3** extended response questions.

The exam is designed to provide sufficient sampling across the content and consists of a mixture of short answer questions (SAQs), some of which are structured, and extended response questions (ERQs). The exam assesses across assessment objectives (AOs) 1a/b, 2 and 3 to allow for the appropriate assessment and differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:

- **AO1a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1b** Demonstrate understanding
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and understanding to different situations and context
- **AO3** Analyse and evaluate information and issues

This paper covers a range of question types including knowledge recall, understanding, applying knowledge and understanding and extended analytical response questions across the full range of the units being assessed within this paper.

The majority of candidates answered the simple recall of knowledge and basic understanding questions to a high level providing simple lists and brief explanations to questions on construction science principles, measurement principles and relationship management.

The AO2 questions by their nature are designed to be more challenging and require the candidates to analyse the question and provide a detailed response or solve a mathematical task based around a scenario.

Areas of strength include:

- saying what is a non-ferrous metal (Q1). There was a good response to this question, including citing examples of non-ferrous metals.
- identifying the protected characteristics in the Equality Act (Q3). This question was answered well by the cohort with a number providing three correct answers.

- tests on concrete (Q5a). Part a was answered fairly well, with responses giving the correct answer of 'slump test'. Part b on which test is to be carried out on concrete after curing presented more of a challenge. Some responses provided 'compression test' and were awarded a mark whereas others incorrectly answered 'silt test'.
- the positive outcomes of a 'win-win' negotiation approach (Q7). This question was generally well answered by the cohort, with the higher performing candidates providing the full three positive outcomes asked for in the question.
- benefits of good customer service (Q10). Responses showed an understanding of this topic area with a range of benefits provided.
- organisational procedures to help reduce the risk of cyberattacks (Q15). Generally, responses showed understanding on the measures that needed to be in place to help prevent future attacks.
- employment rights and responsibilities (Q16). Responses showed a general understanding of this topic. Only a few responses showed they fully understood the scenario and the importance of security and confidentiality when working in a nuclear power station.
- mathematical competency question on ratios and labour costs (Q17). Most responses correctly calculated basic quantities from a given ratio (part a) and the three-stage costing question (part b). A small number of responses incorrectly took off the VAT instead of adding it on.

Areas for development include:

- knowing the basic principles of (CSR) Corporate Social Responsibility (Q4). There was a mixed response to this question, with many providing basic business principles as opposed to CSR.
- naming the type of electrical transformer needed on site to operate power tools (Q6). There was a mix of responses, with some providing the correct answer of a step-down transformer. Some responses only referred to the colour of the transformer or gave an answer on what a transformer does rather than identifying the transformer required.
- explaining how smart technology can be used in an office building (Q8). Some responses linked to air conditioning and room temperature, but few provided an explanation of how it is a smart technology and how it contributes to a comfortable working environment.
- composition and uses of different mortar mixes (Q11). Responses focused only on sand and cement mixes, with incomplete or uncommon ratios. Some confused concrete composition with that of mortar and very few responses discussed the use of lime mortar.

- understanding the effects of ground conditions when designing a foundation (Q12). Some responses addressed the impact of the tree on a foundation already in the ground, rather than the impact it would have on the design of a suitable foundation. A few higher scoring responses understood how the tree would affect the ground conditions and provided suitable solution for the foundation design.

There was a mixed response to the question around personal qualities required by employees to help avoid conflict (Q14). Lower scoring candidates incorrectly explained conflict resolution techniques rather than the personal qualities that employers could implement in their employees. This emphasises the need for candidates to read and fully understand the question being asked before providing a response. This was a common theme with the lower marked candidates especially on the AO2 and ERQ questions.

### **Responses to extended response questions (ERQs)**

The extended response questions are designed to provide candidates with the opportunity to showcase their breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding across the full syllabus, with each question asking for a discussion or solution to an issue that relates to a scenario. The lower achieving candidates tended to provide a basic response that focused on a single aspect of the scenario and provided very limited rationales to support their comments, recommendations and solutions. Higher achieving candidates provided a response that covered a wider range of options with detailed analytical rationales that supported the commentary provided.

The first ERQ (Q18) set the scene of an old house with several faults: the windows bowing downwards in the middle and the upper floor having excess movement. The question asked for possible causes of the faults. Some responses demonstrated a reasonable level of understanding on why the lintels had failed for the windows. Responses for the flooring however focused on the heating having a negative effect on the structure and missed the part of the scenario mentioning that the central heating system had been recently installed, meaning the installation of the pipes may not have followed notching conventions.

The second ERQ (Q19) set a scenario where a block of flats is being designed that is located close to a busy road and factory. The question asked candidates to talk about possible design solutions to ensure the flats were quiet for occupants. Most responses talked about insulation and double/triple glazing. Higher scoring responses discussed noise deflection, the shape and position of the building and creating sound barriers between the source of the noise and the flats.

The third ERQ (Q20) asked for a discussion on the business objectives and values a building operative should consider when setting up a business converting loft spaces into useable rooms. There was a mixed response to this question. Some limited answers only discussed cash flow and customer service while the higher scoring responses covered a range of different objectives and values. Some responses didn't align to the question and went off topic to talk about how to complete the loft conversion work.

## 8711 Sub-Component: Exam

### **Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment**

Providers can help emphasise the importance of candidates thoroughly reading and re-reading the question to determine the content and level of response required. This includes considering the command verb and the number of marks available for each question. Candidates would benefit from understanding what different command verbs are asking of them. For example, the type of response required by an 'Explain' question requires a higher level of response than a 'Describe' question.

Where a question requires a specific number of responses, for example "state three reasons..." only the first three responses will be marked, and any following responses will be disregarded. Crossed out responses will not be counted as these first responses, unless they are not replaced. Providers can remind candidates about this when undertaking formative assessment and prior to the exam.

Extended Response Question (ERQ) performance could be further enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and analysis (including secondary implications where appropriate) on different scenarios and relating it back to the context. To achieve marks in the higher bands, candidates need to include more detailed conclusions and justifications in their responses.

Candidates should be encouraged to develop their skillset to construct detailed and in-depth responses for extended response type questions. Providers can help candidates focus on question responses by devising their own targeted exam revision for both short/medium answer questions and extended response questions, as well as offering support and guidance on various answer/response techniques. Providers should be aware of using the sample and past series questions on the City & Guilds webpages, to help and guide both staff and candidates (see Support materials section).

Providers should encourage candidates to take great care when writing their responses to ensure their handwriting is legible. Writing in block capital letters may be a possible solution if a candidate's handwriting is not legible or alternatively utilising a scribe.

In conclusion, candidates must be reminded of the need to ensure they fully read all questions before responding. In particular, the ERQ scenario-based questions and questions assessing both understanding and the application of knowledge and understanding. An additional focus for candidates should be applied to making sense of what is being asked of them in the question.

## Support materials

### Sample and Past Papers:

It is recommended that Providers utilise and deliver the **sample examinations** as well as **past papers** as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

Sample and past papers: [T level Technical Qualification in Onsite Construction \(8711\)](#)

### Exam Guides:

It is also recommended that Providers utilise the **exam guides** which provides general tips for candidates taking these assessments, examples of different types of questions that will appear, example candidate responses with examiner commentary and examiner hints and tips.

8711-30 Exam Guide: [8711-30 Onsite T Level exam guide](#)

### Events and Webinars:

City & Guilds run free webinars and events throughout the year on preparing for and delivering the T Level exams. The below link provides details on upcoming in person events, live webinars, on-demand webinars and preparation for the core exams.

Link: [Events and webinars - T Levels | City & Guilds \(cityandguilds.com\)](#)

## Grade boundaries

The table below shows the grade mark ranges for the Exam, along with the notional boundaries for Paper 1 and Paper 2 – **for the summer 2024 series.**

Grade	Mark range	Notional boundaries	
		Paper 1 (8711-031)	Paper 2 (8711-032)
A*	155 - 180	77 - 90	77 - 90
A	135 - 154	68 - 76	67 - 76
B	115 - 134	57 - 67	57 - 66
C	95 - 114	47 - 56	47 - 56
D	75 - 94	37 - 46	37 - 46
E	55 - 74	27 - 36	28 - 36
Unclassified (U)	0 - 54	0 - 26	0 - 27

## 8711-033 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project

The Employer-Set Project (ESP) assessment is a project comprising a number of tasks, based on a scenario comparable to a real-life project in the industry. The assessment is designed to allow candidates to show how they can perform on a project using the Core knowledge and skills. This approach to assessment emphasises to candidates the importance and applicability of the full range of their learning to industry practice.

The ESP covers the following elements of the Onsite Construction core content:

- Health and safety in construction
- Construction design principles
- Construction sustainability principles

The Employer-Set Project allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Onsite Construction Core element. The ESP assesses across assessment objectives that will allow for the appropriate differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:

- **AO1** Planning skills and strategies
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and skills to the context of the project
- **AO3** Analyse contexts to make informed decisions
- **AO4** Use maths, English and digital skills
- **AO5** Carry out tasks and evaluate for fitness for purpose

The project is based around a brief which provides information on an Onsite Construction project and specific relevant details and resources. Candidates have to draw on their Core knowledge and skills and independently select the correct processes and approaches to take to provide a solution and the evidence specified in the project brief. All tasks are completed under supervised/controlled conditions.

## Employer-Set Project tasks overview

Task	Task type	Assessment Objectives covered	Max mark	Task weighting
1.1	Research	AO1: Knowledge, AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO3: Select, AO4c: Digital	9	9%
1.2	Report	AO1: Knowledge	6	26%
		AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills	12	
		AO3: Select	2	
		AO4a: Maths, AO4b: English, AO4c: Digital	6	
1.3	Plan	AO1: Knowledge, AO3: Select, AO4a: Maths	8	24%
		AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills	16	
1.4	Presentation	AO1: Knowledge, AO3: Select, AO4b: English	6	18%
		AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills	12	
2.1	Collaborative Problem Solving	AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills, AO3: Select, AO5a: Realise project outcome	15	15%
2.2	Evaluation	AO4b: English, AO5b: Review outcome against brief	8	8%



## **Candidate performance by task**

### **Task 1.1 – Research**

Often lacked supporting information for the costing requirement, with many candidates failing to provide sources or calculations. Referencing was inconsistent, and some papers reused drawings without proper citation. Over-reliance on AI applications for research was common, and many candidates missed the opportunity to include relevant drawings or sketches. While understanding of foundation type was clear, task approaches varied significantly, with many candidates copying and pasting AI-generated content. Health and Safety controls related to excavation were mainly overlooked, resulting in few top-band marks. References were often unreliable hyperlinks, or they did not work, appropriate referencing was rarely followed. Research relating to calculations showed considerable variance.

### **Task 1.2 – Report**

Some candidates structured their reports well with numbered headings and subheadings. Reports often lacked analysis, comparison, and evaluation, and did not sufficiently meet health and safety in regard to excavation and the foundation works. Appropriate selection of sources from Task 1.1 was typically poor, with a lot of copy/pasting from the research. Many candidates showed confusion in price calculations and comparisons against the foundation linear metre budget. Although responses generally followed the brief, a significant number failed to answer the questions well, displaying a lack of structure and process understanding. Candidates often correctly focused on foundation types in relation to Approved Document A, with mixed results on sewer and tree solutions. Some well-structured reports included clear diagrams and illustrations supporting the findings.

### **Task 1.3 – Project plan**

Gantt charts were generally correct in the sequencing of project tasks but often misunderstood the brief regarding time requirements. Health and Safety coverage was typically light. A small minority of candidates used Microsoft Project, but the majority used Microsoft Excel, both a good resource to record the timelines and order of works. Most candidates scored in the lower middle band due to unrealistic project plan dates and timings. While many candidates produced basic programmes of work and understood the process and techniques, there was wide variation in responses. Better responses linked written statements of site activities to the programme of works though many did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the brief, focusing on tasks beyond the construction of the foundation. Descriptions of tasks varied in terminology, and very few candidates referenced a critical

path. Supporting statements generally explained foundation construction but lacked detail in Health and Safety aspects.

#### **Task 1.4 – Presentation**

The presentations were generally of a good standard, with most candidates delivering confidently and clearly in a suitable environment. However, the lack of key evidence in the initial research task was reflected in some presentations. Most candidates scored in the middle band, with variations in the level of detail and content quality. Few responses fully addressed the brief requirements, such as foundation choice, regulations, budget, and conclusions. Many presentations were overly reliant on Task 1 and Task 2 findings and lacked evaluation. While some candidates excelled in the delivery of the presentation without much use of prompts and keeping eye contact with the audience, others read from screens or notes. Despite this, the majority of presentations were structured logically, though some lacked explanations of costs and how they calculated the amount of concrete.

#### **Task 2.1 – Collaborative problem-solving**

Overall, candidates completed the task as required, accurately following the brief. Group discussions varied in participation, with some candidates dominating and others contributing minimally. Occasionally, candidates asked probing questions and shared positive contributions. Discussions ranged from 5 to 30 minutes and involved 2 to 4 students (although groups **must** only have 2-3 candidates). Video recordings showed varied participation, with some working from scripts and others from set points. While collaborative efforts were evident, some lacked direction. All candidates completed the email draft, though its structure and content varied.

#### **Task 2.2 – Evaluation**

Candidate evaluations often resembled diary accounts, listing completed tasks rather than addressing the brief. Few evaluations related to project requirements such as how sewers and trees affect construction, and costings relating to the project, or reflected on lessons learnt. Detailed self-evaluation was rare, with candidates typically listing what went well without discussing improvements or skills gained. While some evaluations aligned with performance and demonstrated a good understanding of the brief, most lacked a logical, self-reflective approach. Many candidates described their activities without evaluating what was successful, what was not, and how they could improve to meet the brief's requirements.

## Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment

It is recommended that providers utilise and deliver the sample ESP as well as the past ESPs (see Support materials section) as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

- All references/sources/links and images used in the Employer-Set Project **must** be included within Task 1.1 evidence, so that it is clear that they were obtained during the research task. If any of these things are newly introduced from Task 1.2 onwards (when internet use is not permitted), this could cause delays, due to potential malpractice investigations. Furthermore, Providers should note that Task 1.1 is the only place where candidates can obtain marks for their referencing.
- The evidence checklist has a list containing each task, with details of each piece of corresponding evidence that makes up the task. Sometimes Providers may choose to upload evidence for the whole task as one document, or they may upload each piece of evidence separately. No matter how evidence is uploaded, each individual piece of evidence on the checklist must be accounted for with Y/N (and an issue code, where necessary). If evidence for a task is incorporated into one document, it must be clear which work constitutes each piece of evidence. For example, in Task 1.3 Project Plan, the two pieces of evidence ('programme of works' and 'supporting statement') must be clearly labelled.
- The 'what must be presented for marking' section of each task outlines the minimum expectations of evidence that must be submitted for marking. As above, Providers must detail where evidence has not been submitted.
- The only evidence considered for the marking of an individual task is what is listed within the 'what must be produced for marking' section within the assessment materials. Evidence for any other task, regardless of the knowledge or skills it may demonstrate, will not be considered when marking that task.
- Providers are advised that individual tasks are marked in isolation and that each task has been weighted in relation to the assessment objectives covered. This information is detailed in the qualification Specification. As all tasks are marked separately, where evidence produced by a candidate is contained in another task, that evidence will not be considered.
- Comments on the observation records for Tasks 1.4 and 2.1 must be based on the candidate's performance using the terminology, verbs and vocabulary from the sample marking grids. Notes must be detailed, accurate and differentiating, and they should identify areas of strength and weakness to distinguish different levels of performance quality. These records should also be submitted as separate documents for each task, rather than scanned into one document.
- Providers should ensure files and documents are named according to the naming conventions in the Provider guidance, to ensure consistency and ease of access. This also includes the use of assessment component headers.

- Providers are strongly encouraged to use evidence headers for each task, to allow for ease of identification of candidate evidence and efficiency in marking. All information within the task headers should be completed. Candidate evidence should be included within the header document and not as a separate file.
- Providers are advised to ensure the tutor and candidate both sign and date declarations prior to uploading evidence.
- Providers should request that candidates include a word count for all written reports and tasks where applicable.
- Providers should note that the number of candidates in the Task 1.2 collaborative discussion **must** be either 2 or 3.

### **Task 1.1 – Research**

Providers are advised to ensure candidates take time to read the Project Brief document as well as the requirements for this task.

Providers are also advised to work with candidates to improve their skills in relation to research and correct referencing. Sources must be UK-based where they relate to region-specific topics such as legislation, grants and costings.

As this task forms the foundation of later tasks, it is important that all required elements are researched, and all references/sources/links and images for use in later tasks are included. No further research can take place in later tasks, as use of the internet is not permitted. Task 1.1 is not a report, it is a record of research notes for later use.

It is recommended that candidates have an understanding of how to research costs relating to construction projects from reliable UK based sources for use in calculations. There should be a clear format for presenting findings rather than put in text, improving consistency in referencing practices, and use of research practices beyond AI applications. Providers should encourage comprehensive coverage of Health and Safety controls related to excavation and related works. They should also ensure candidates demonstrate clear understanding and application of assessment criteria in future series.

### **Task 1.2 – Report**

Providers are reminded of the published guidance which states that internet access is not allowed in Task 1.2 or beyond. Where evidence is found of internet usage following Task 1.1 this will result in a malpractice investigation and potentially impact on results.

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their report writing skills, providing justifications where required.

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their digital skills including the layout of reports to contain tables, calculations and images.

Providers should encourage candidates to improve analysis, comparison, and evaluation skills, particularly in relation to essential elements of the scenario task such as Health and Safety aspects.

Providers should give guidance on improving referencing quality, moving away from unreliable hyperlinks. Providers should also encourage clear structure and process understanding for producing well-structured reports with clear diagrams and illustrations to strengthen their findings.

It is recommended that candidates have an understanding of how to use costing information in calculations relating to construction projects.

### **Task 1.3 – Project plan**

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop the skills required, to plan a project including the production of Gantt charts/programmes of works.

Candidates need to know how a Gantt chart works in terms of sequencing, durations and logic. This requires scheduling trades and activities into a coherent programme relative to time/dates relative to the brief.

Supporting statements should justify the considerations that have been taken into account when constructing the project plan.

Candidates should be encouraged to utilise Microsoft Project and Excel effectively for presenting a project timeline. This should include adverse solutions and how these would be implemented if required, standardising the use of consistent industry terminology and encouraging a critical path, with this being referenced in the supporting statement.

### **Task 1.4 – Presentation**

Providers should ensure that candidates can be clearly heard during their presentations. Some coaching on presenting to an audience without reading directly from notes may help candidates to achieve higher marks. Providers are reminded that presentations should not include any research materials from the internet, unless they were already included in Task 1.1, as internet access is not permitted during this task.

Providers are advised to consider the layout of the room and where the tutor/marker and the candidate are positioned. Providers are also advised to ensure assessment areas are suitable, with no distractions or noise that could be off-putting for candidates and/or affect the recording sound quality.

Providers should ensure candidates focus on content quality and detail in presentations, particularly in addressing the research findings which have been used to write the report. Providers are encouraged to provide practical exercises to enhance presentation skills, reducing reliance on screens or notes, to ensure consistent improvement in presentation quality and adherence to assessment criteria.

Providers must ensure that all aspects of candidates' presentations can be marked to the marking grids, including assessment of body language. Presentations must be given

standing up, with no obstructions in front of candidates. Presentations must not be conducted remotely, over MS Teams, Zoom or similar.

### **Task 2.1 – Collaborative problem-solving**

Providers are advised to support learners in how to put emails together including key requirements and layout.

Providers should introduce candidates or give them ID sheets when working on the collaborative task to enable easy identification of candidates for markers.

Providers should be aware that group discussions **must** be held between either 2 or 3 candidates. Having 4 or more candidates is against Provider guidance for this task and could lead to an unbalanced discussion and may disadvantage candidates.

As per Task 1.4, Providers are advised to carefully select and set up assessment areas that are suitable and free from distractions/noise.

Providers should encourage participation in group discussions, encouraging all candidates to actively contribute and engage with probing questions and promoting effective communication and teamwork. Practical exercises will enhance candidates' ability to maintain direction and improve collaborative efforts. The email draft's structure and content should align consistently with the task requirements, promoting clarity and relevance.

### **Task 2.2 – Evaluation**

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their self-evaluation skills, including evaluating their performance against the requirements of each task, to identify not only successes, but also how they could improve. This also includes making reference to the project brief.

Guidance should promote a logical, structured approach in evaluations, ensuring responses demonstrate a clear understanding of the assessment brief.

## Support materials

### Sample and Past ESP Assessments:

It is recommended that Providers utilise and deliver the **sample ESP** as well as **past ESPs** as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

Sample and past ESPs: [T level Technical Qualification in Onsite Construction qualifications and training courses | City & Guilds \(cityandguilds.com\)](#)

### Exemplar ESP Assessments:

It is also recommended that Providers utilise the **exemplar ESP Assessments** to help understand the standard that was required in the Summer 2023 assessment series to achieve an A and E grade.

8711-033 ESP A grade exemplar: [8711-033 - A grade exemplar - Summer 2023 \(cityandguilds.com\)](#)

8711-033 ESP E grade exemplar: [8711-033 - E grade exemplar - Summer 2023 \(cityandguilds.com\)](#)

### TQ Employer-Set Project Assessment Process Guide:

The guide gives support to Providers in preparing for and delivering T Level Employer-Set Projects.

Link: [TQ Employer-Set Project Assessment process guide \(cityandguilds.com\)](#)

### Events and Webinars:

City & Guilds run free webinars and events throughout the year on preparing for and delivering the T Level Employer Set Projects. The below link provides details on upcoming in person events, live webinars, on-demand webinars and preparation for the ESP assessment.

Link: [Events and webinars - T Levels | City & Guilds \(cityandguilds.com\)](#)

# Grade boundaries

The table below shows the grade mark ranges for the Employer-Set Project – **for the summer 2024 series.**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
A*	<b>77 - 100</b>
A	<b>68 - 76</b>
B	<b>59 - 67</b>
C	<b>50 - 58</b>
D	<b>41 - 49</b>
E	<b>32 - 40</b>
Unclassified (U)	<b>0 - 31</b>



## 8711-30 Onsite Construction Core

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Onsite Construction core is made up of the below sub-components (and weightings).

- Exam (70%)
- Employer-Set Project (30%)

### UMS grade boundaries

The table below shows the UMS values available for grades in the sub-components. It also shows the UMS values required to achieve each grade for the overall Core. This table will not vary across the series, the values are fixed for this TQ.

Grade boundary	Exam sub-component	ESP sub-component	Overall Core
A*	252 - 280	108 - 120	360 - 400
A	224 - 251	96 - 107	320 - 359
B	196 - 223	84 - 95	280 - 319
C	168 - 195	72 - 83	240 - 279
D	140 - 167	60 - 71	200 - 239
E	112 - 139	48 - 59	160 - 199
Unclassified (U)	0 - 111	0 - 47	0 - 159

## Get in touch

The City & Guilds Quality team are here to answer any queries you may have regarding your T Level Technical Qualification delivery.

Should you require assistance, please contact us using the details below:

Monday - Friday | 08:30 - 17:00 GMT

T: 0300 303 53 52

E: [technicals.quality@cityandguilds.com](mailto:technicals.quality@cityandguilds.com)

W: <http://www.cityandguilds.com/tlevels>

Web chat available [here](#).

The T Level is a qualification approved and managed by the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education.

Copyright in this document belongs to, and is used under licence from, the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education, © 2024. 'T-LEVELS' is a registered trademark of the Department for Education. 'T Level' is a registered trademark of the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education. 'Institute for Apprenticeships & Technical Education' and logo are registered trademarks of the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education.

We make every effort to ensure that the information contained in this publication is true and correct at the time of going to press. However, City & Guilds' products and services are subject to continuous development and improvement, and the right is reserved to change products and services from time to time. City & Guilds cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of information in this publication.

City & Guilds is a trademark of the City & Guilds of London Institute, a charity established to promote education and training registered in England & Wales (312832) and Scotland (SC039576). City and Guilds Group Giltspur House, 5–6 Giltspur Street London EC1A 9DE