HM Government

T LEVELS

T Level Technical Qualification in Engineering, Manufacturing, Process and Control (8730-13)

Core Report

(Autumn 2025)

Version 1.0

City & Guilds | eal

Version and date	Change detail	Section
1.0	Published core report	

Contents

Foreword	**4**
Introduction	**5**
8730-031 Paper 1	**6**
8730-032 Paper 2	**8**
8730 Sub-Component: Exam	**11**
Grade boundaries	**13**
8730-035 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project	**14**
Grade boundaries	**22**
8730-033 Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing & Control	**23**
UMS grade boundaries	**23**

Foreword

Autumn 2025 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 Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing and Control. 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.

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 Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing and Control 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 strengths and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat assessments in the Autumn 2025 assessment series.

The grade boundaries (and notional boundaries where appropriate) that were used to determine candidates' final Autumn 2025 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.

8730-031 Paper 1

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Engineering & Manufacturing core content:

- Essential mathematics for engineering and manufacturing
- Essential science for engineering and manufacturing
- Materials and their properties
- Mechanical principles
- Electrical and electronic principles
- Mechatronics

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Engineering and Manufacturing core element.

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

Section A is made up of **67** marks and includes **17** short answer questions.
Section B is made up of **33** 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) to allow for the appropriate assessment and differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:

- **AO1 a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1 b** Demonstrate understanding
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and understanding to different situations and context
- **AO3** Analyse and evaluate information and issues

The paper is common to the three pathways of Engineering & Manufacturing; Design & Development (D&D), Maintenance, Installation and Repair (MIR) and Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing and Control (EMPC).

The examination paper is designed so that it gradually increases in challenge. Questions were ramped in terms of difficulty throughout section A starting with AO1a through to AO2, this allowed for the level of demand to be increased steadily throughout the paper. The extended response questions (ERQ) in section B were scenario based and ramped with AO2 and AO3 questions.

Areas of strength include:

- Q5 was one of the strongest performing items. This question required area and volume calculations, which most candidates completed accurately using fundamental mathematical skills.
- Q7a showed positive performance overall, with the majority of candidates able to achieve full marks. This also focused on essential mathematics.
- Q7c also performed very well. This question focused on probability, an area that again focused on using fundamental mathematical skills.
- Q12a and Q12c, assessing mechanical principles, saw notably strong performance. Mechanical principles was a comparatively strong topic for the majority of the cohort.

- Q16 also saw some achievement. This question focused on materials, and although the cohort was able to answer this well and achieve some marks, there was not many candidates who could achieve full marks.

Areas of weakness include:

- Q2c, which required candidates to state the purpose of a cylinder within the given context, was poorly answered. Responses frequently repeated the question or referred to unrelated storage functions, suggesting issues with technical terminology.
- Q7b, requiring candidates to calculate standard deviation, was answered incorrectly by the majority. Although the formula was provided, many candidates struggled with the iterative process and frequently stopped after calculating the mean.
- Q9, contextualised around definite integrals, was another weak area. This continues a trend from previous series where candidates demonstrate limited understanding of integral calculus and its basic applications.
- Q14b, requiring candidates to use differentiation to optimise dimensions, was poorly attempted. This reflects historic performance patterns, with many candidates demonstrating only limited understanding of calculus despite its relevance within Level 3 study.

As with previous series, candidates' understanding of core mathematical and scientific principles was noticeably below the expected Level 3 standard, and this had a significant impact on performance across multiple items. Written responses often lacked sufficient detail, technical precision, or contextual relevance to access higher marks.

Responses to extended questions (ERQs)

Performance across the ERQs showed a similar distribution to previous series, with the majority of candidates achieving within bands 1 and 2, although the full mark range was accessed. These questions had the highest discrimination value across the cohort.

Higher achieving candidates typically provided clear, contextually grounded explanations supported by technical reasoning. Lower achieving candidates tended to produce generic responses that lacked evaluation, justification, or explicit links back to the scenario. Many candidates struggled to demonstrate analytical or evaluative skills consistently, which limited opportunities to access the upper mark bands.

Most candidates attempted all ERQs, and stronger candidates provided more detailed and developed responses than those in the lower bands. As in previous series, it remains important that candidates are supported in applying their knowledge to the specific scenario and in demonstrating how their reasoning relates to the context.

8730-032 Paper 2

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Engineering and Manufacturing core content:

- Working in the Engineering and Manufacturing sectors
- Engineering and manufacturing past, present, and future
- Engineering representations
- Engineering and manufacturing control systems
- Quality management
- Health and Safety principles and coverage
- Business, commercial, and financial awareness
- Professional responsibilities, attitudes, and behaviours
- Stock and asset management
- Continuous improvement
- Project and programme management

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Engineering and Manufacturing core element.

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

Section A is made up of **67** marks and includes **12** short answer and medium answer questions.

Section B is made up of **33** 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:

- **AO1 a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1 b** Demonstrate understanding
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and understanding to different situations and context
- **AO3** Analyse and evaluate information and issues

The paper is common to the three pathways of Engineering and Manufacturing; Design & Development (D&D), Maintenance, Installation and Repair (MIR) and Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing and Control (EMPC).

Questions were ramped in terms of difficulty throughout section A starting with AO1a through to AO2, this allowed for the level of demand to be increased steadily throughout the paper. The extended response questions ERQ questions in section B were scenario based and ramped with AO2 and AO3 questions.

Areas of strength include:

- Q4: Candidates were able to clearly explain the main duties of organisations in relation to diversity. A full spread of marks was achieved.
- Q7a: Candidates demonstrated a understanding of the advantages of Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA).
- Q10b: Most candidates were able to explain the importance of effective stock and inventory management. This question produced a spread of marks.
- Q10ci: Candidates were generally able to give an advantage for a company using a product arrangement (layout) for their machines and processes.
- Q12: There was a good understanding of common injuries associated with tools and equipment, along with control measures to reduce risk. Many candidates produced well-structured responses that achieved mark band 2.

Areas of weakness include:

- Q3c, Q3d, Q3e: Recall of drawing features, standard abbreviations, and GD&T symbols proved inconsistent. While some candidates demonstrated accurate knowledge and achieved full marks, others showed limited understanding.
- Q5a & Q5b: Understanding of limits and fits was mixed. Some candidates successfully calculated the upper and lower values from the table provided, but few were able to accurately explain the type of fit required.
- Q7b: Explaining a disadvantage of FMEA was challenging for weaker candidates, who often gave generic statements lacking technical relevance.
- Q8: Although many candidates could provide a suitable advantage of an open loop control system, the majority struggled to convey a disadvantage.
- Q10ai–iii: Candidates frequently showed limited understanding of key financial concepts and were unable to clearly explain the implications for a company.
- Q10d: Hybrid technologies in manufacturing were often misinterpreted, with many candidates failing to explain their use or benefits accurately.
- Q11: The benefits of implementing the 6S approach were misunderstood by many candidates, with a significant number confusing it with Six Sigma.
- Q14: Discussion of environmental legislation issues relating specifically to waste generated by an agricultural machinery company was weak. Many candidates conflated agricultural waste with general waste or broader environmental issues, indicating a lack of contextual clarity.

As in previous series, AO2 responses often showed basic knowledge without sufficient expansion or contextualisation to access higher marks. Many candidates did not develop their explanations in enough depth to demonstrate secure application of knowledge to the given scenarios.

Response to extended question (ERQs)

The ERQs generated a range of responses, with the mark bands accessed across the cohort.

Question 13 assessed candidates' understanding of the key responsibilities of a company project manager involved in developing a new solar energy system. Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the role, including links to engineering and manufacturing processes, regulatory requirements, and customer needs.

Question 14 asked candidates to discuss environmental legislation related to waste produced by an agricultural machinery company. This proved challenging for most candidates. Many confused agricultural waste with general waste or broader environmental impacts, leading to vague or inaccurate responses. A small proportion of candidates left the question unanswered or provided minimal relevant content, indicating limited familiarity with sector-specific environmental legislation.

Question 15 required candidates to discuss the stages involved in the design, manufacture, and maintenance of an autonomous delivery drone for urban environments. Overall performance on this question was good. Most candidates demonstrated an ability to integrate knowledge across different stages of the product lifecycle, resulting in marks within the middle bands. However, responses commonly lacked deeper analysis or evaluation. Few candidates justified design choices in detail or fully considered real-world constraints such as regulation, safety requirements, or maintenance challenges.

8730 Sub-Component: Exam

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

It is recommended that providers utilise and deliver the sample examinations as well as past papers (Summer 2023/2024/2025 & Autumn 2023/2024/2025) as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

In preparing candidates for both short-answer and extended questions, providers should focus on developing candidates' ability to:

- recall basic knowledge accurately;
- demonstrate clear understanding of processes, principles, and terminology;
- apply their knowledge within appropriate engineering contexts; and
- analyse and evaluate information where required.

Performance in ERQs could be further enhanced by encouraging candidates to produce in-depth explanations, context-specific analysis, and well-reasoned conclusions or justifications. Higher band responses typically show clear links to the scenario, structured arguments, and an ability to consider implications or secondary effects. Developing these skills through regular practice, model answers, and structured feedback will support candidates in accessing higher mark thresholds.

To further strengthen performance, centres are encouraged to support candidates in developing the skills required to construct responses that demonstrate understanding, application of knowledge, analysis, and evaluation. These higher order skills remain essential for securing marks in the upper bands of the ERQs.

Mathematical skills continue to present a significant challenge for many candidates, mirroring trends seen in previous series. Although some improvement was evident, a substantial proportion of candidates continued to struggle with basic numerical techniques, interpreting data accurately, and selecting and applying appropriate units and formulae. Difficulties were particularly evident when candidates were required to work with data presented in real world or business-related contexts. Targeted practice that relates mathematical concepts directly to practical engineering scenarios would help candidates to develop greater confidence and accuracy.

Candidates would benefit from further support in recognising the demands of different command verbs. Questions requiring an *Explain* response demand more detail and depth than those requiring *State* or *Describe*. Misinterpretation of command words remains a barrier to accessing marks, particularly when explanation, justification, or contextual linkage is required. Centres should therefore remind candidates of the importance of reading each question carefully and ensuring they fully understand what is being asked before responding.

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 Engineering and Manufacturing (Core) qualifications and training courses | City & Guilds (cityandguilds.com)**

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.

Link: **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 Autumn 2025 series.**

Grade	Mark range	Notional boundaries	
		Paper 1 (8730-031)	Paper 2 (8730-032)
A*	159-200	78-100	80-100
A	140-158	69-77	71-79
B	121-139	59-68	61-70
C	102-120	49-58	52-60
D	83-101	40-48	43-51
E	65-82	31-39	34-42
Unclassified (U)	0-64	0-30	0-33

8730-035 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project

The Employer Set Project (ESP) assessment is a project comprised of 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 project is made up of a number of tasks which all relate to the same employer-set project brief and tender specification.

- Research
- Report
- Design
- Present

The project draws on the content from the core knowledge that sits across all specialisms in Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing and Control.

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** Plan approach to meet the brief
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and skills to contexts
- **AO3** Select techniques and resources to meet brief
- **AO4** Use maths, English and digital skills
- **AO5** Release project outcome and evaluate

The project is based around a brief which provides information on an Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing and Control 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	Research	AO1, AO2a, AO3 (Planning, core knowledge, selecting techniques and resource)	9	16.6%
		AO2b (Core Skills)	6	
2	Report	AO1, AO3 (Planned approach, selecting techniques)	6	20%
		AO2a (Core knowledge)	6	
		AO2b (Core Skills)	6	
3	Design	AO1, AO3 (Planned approach, selecting techniques)	6	26.7%
		AO2a (Core knowledge)	6	
		AO2b (Core Skills)	6	
		AO5a, AO5b (Realise outcome, review outcome)	6	
4	Present	AO1, AO3 (Planned approach, selecting techniques)	6	26.7%
		AO2a (Core knowledge)	6	
		AO2b (Core Skills)	6	
		AO5a, AO5b (Realise outcome, review outcome)	6	
Maths, English and digital skills		AO4a (Maths)	3	10%
		AO4b (English)	3	
		AO4c (Digital Skills)	3	

Task 1 – Research:

For the research tasks most of the candidates completed their research following the guidance within the brief. However, within most of the scripts marked, this was not always methodical. Not all candidates were able to provide clear evidence of methodical and thorough approach to research and information gathering and research was disorganised.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers should support candidates by giving guidance on how to structure their research, including using an index/contents page and appropriate headings and sub-headings. They should consider using a range of information sources (not only web-based) and ensure that all sources used—including AI-generated materials—are properly referenced. Information sources may include data charts, textbooks, British Standards publications, and material specifications.

They should also encourage candidates to work systematically through the project brief to ensure all required items are (a) covered and (b) presented in a logical manner, with clear references showing where information has been researched. Candidates who achieved higher marks typically produced well-structured reports, which helped them fully meet the brief. Providers should also encourage candidates to use images effectively. Many candidates included images from the internet—for example, of sensors, eggs, or gripper technologies—without explaining the relevance or context of these images.

Task 2 – Design:

All candidates had applied a range of core skills with narrative on design choices. However, there was evidence that these were inconsistent and there was an increase in the use of AI within this series. Research has been compiled (extracted) using web-based sources only and embedded within a word document without any credible structure, judgement or analysis to be awarded high marks. It was identified that many would have benefitted from the use of images, DATA tables to present sensor options. Some candidates didn't always fully investigate and analysed this task with most research being stated rather than justified for the information attached in some instances and missed opportunity to thoroughly plan and develop responses. Those who did use a range of source were able to analyse and interpret their findings.

There were sometimes gaps present in terms of the requirements of the brief and elements not covered. 73% of the candidates achieved Band 3 (4-6 marks), Candidates who scored lower marks were due to planning; some elements in the task were covered briefly or not at all. Those who achieved higher marks did so as they demonstrated consistency in the planning of their report to meet project brief. Some Candidates could not answer some of the key elements asked in the task e.g. health and safety considerations. Some of the candidates were able to use appropriate approach to write a report was planned, organised and complete. Evidence provided was not consistently meeting all the points required in the coverage of the brief to get into the higher band. There was minimal demonstration of individual judgment and reasoning due to the high reliance from Task 1.

A large proportion of the candidates were able to show applied knowledge from across the core content and use appropriate technical terminology. Most of the candidates applied core knowledge with the right terminology. Knowledge from across the core is applied. They also

displayed some connection between different elements, with some gaps. Some of the candidates could not answer the viability of the proposed solution and whether their chosen solution could realistically work within the context of the brief.

Candidates were able to demonstrate appropriate and effective communication and evidence of planning as demonstrated by the structure of the reports presented the majority of the candidate had use the right terminology in analysing and interpreting the best approach to the proposed design of the sensor system and making good judgment and sound reasoning as well. Some candidates typically missed the opportunity to analyse and expand on their research and interpret how these decisions will impact their solutions; however, communication style was appropriate.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers should support candidates by giving guidance on how reports are structured (e.g. use of an index) and work through project brief to ensure all items are covered in a logical way. They would also require prompting to include information on materials (a range) with clear explanation justifying reasons for choice / selection.

Provider should also ensure reporting processes follow industry practices on report writing (use headings / sub headings / paragraphs, page numbers).

Task 3 – Plan:

Candidates generally applied a range of core skills in relation to different aspects of the brief, but these were sometimes lacking in consistency. Marks were broadly between (3-4) in Band 2 with 15% of candidate achieved Band 3. It is felt by the team leaders that Candidate performance was poor/average as many learners did not demonstrate core skills in their design solution to the issues presented in the client brief. There was also limited use of draft (iterations) of the design to show how the design idea has developed during the completion of the tasks was limited. There was a lack overall of CAD drawings for mounts. A majority only provided annotated drawings of the assembly line, as they had used supplier provided mounts, thus only showing where they were being mounted on the assembly line as a whole. There was a limited number of orthographic drawings. An opportunity for additional marks was not taken in the following areas: title blocks, measurements and other industry drawing conventions etc. The reflective notes lacked sufficient depth and detail. They did not fully demonstrate critical thinking or meaningful evaluation. Overall the reflective notes could be improved to gain higher marks.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers should ensure basic engineering drawing practices are taught and embedded. This includes dimensioning, completion of a border, notes, part list and BOM. Where 3D solid modelling techniques are used, these must be supported by annotated drawings including dimensions, borders, tolerances, finishes plus a GA with a BOM. Providers should encourage candidates to embed within their design the range of options considered (e.g. design iterations).
Providers should work to help candidates embed calculations in a robust and coherent way within written report (a range of calculations).

Task 4 – Present:

Many of the candidates created and delivered a structured and logical presentation and the selection of appropriate techniques for delivery. Candidates who scored higher marks produced presentations that included all the required task elements and delivered the presentation with clarity and confidence. Some presentations were short (between 5-10 minutes) and it was unclear to the marker if handouts or additional materials were used to support the delivery of the presentation.

In general, the candidates followed a logical approach to their presentation layouts and some utilised presentation slides to a high level. Notably, candidate confidence was high regarding presenting, and many had a good mix referring to the presentation whilst maintaining eye contact. There was generally clear evidence of a structured presentation articulating all the issues raised in the client brief. A few candidates had copied work from their tasks, resulting in 'cut and paste' style presentation: small text, picture quality/clarity and lack of drawing detail. Supporting video evidence and recordings were clear and candidates showing appropriate body language during the presentation task, while few candidates just read from their presentation slides or pieces of note paper.

Most candidates were able to coherently present how their design fulfilled the requirements of the brief. However, some presentations did not always include challenges with the project or justify how their chosen solution addressed some of these requirements; oral questioning was used by their tutor to strengthen areas requiring further development. Technical knowledge was shown by some candidates through their understanding of engineering principles; material selected, gripper, manufacturing aspects, however, many candidates struggled to show an understanding of engineering principles which has influenced the solution with limited reasoning applied.

Presentation materials were generally well-constructed and delivered showing good communication skills in terms of the target audience (technical background). 91% of candidates achieved (3) marks or more. There was notable use of technical language of how the sensors work and most candidates were able to explain how sensors detect empty slots in the egg carton. The candidates were confident in replying to questions from the tutors. As mentioned above, some candidates showed a lack of technical understanding of engineering principles impacting their reflective account on chosen solutions (e.g. what worked well and why?).

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers should encourage candidates to make use of the available time provided.
Providers should provide guidance on the structure of presentation materials, in particular, use of visuals aids/diagrams and size of text. There were many instances of candidates 'cutting and pasting' their written reports into the presentation which could be summarised with bullet points.

Maths, English & digital skills:

Maths
Most candidates were able to show a range of mathematical concepts and calculations effectively, showing both their workings and solutions. However, this was not consistent. Calculations related to the gripping force required to grip the eggs and placed them safely on the system with the right orientation and weight as well as the lifting force

required to pick up medium eggs were inconsistent although it was clearly specified in the brief. A few candidates were awarded lower marks due to insufficient evidence of calculations. In some cases, candidates had extracted screenshots of mathematical calculations by using screenshots taken form the internet – consequently, these candidates did not apply any calculation methodology within their project, so marks could not be awarded.

English

Almost all candidates completed their written research, written reports and presentations using IT and used a communication style that was understandable. Candidates achieved between (1-3) marks; 11% achieving top marks only. Some of the candidates were able to use appropriate and accurate English and conveying technical information with the right terms and taking part in discussion throughout the tasks from 1-4, with some good level of articulation and delivery of information in summarising ideas and responding to questions at the end of the task 4.

Digital

Most candidates used appropriate communication styles for the tasks completed. There were a notable number of candidate reports with spelling mistakes and basic grammatical issues (e.g. paragraphs, sentences). Technical information was generally communicated fluently, in terms of both written and oral communication. However, this was not always appropriate across all tasks. Nearly all candidates failed to enhance their work fully using digital skills (e.g. hyperlinks, pagination) or made to 'supercharge' their reports missing on top marks. References were not simplified and hyperlinks not accessible.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

To strengthen performance across all three skill areas:

- Providers should work with candidates to teach the skills on how to enhance written documents (e.g. use spell-check, hyperlinks
- Providers should ensure, where CAD has been applied, drawings are completed following industry standards.
- Providers should encourage candidates to use spell check software to enhance the quality of written reports and presentations.

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

There was an issue with some file conventions for evidence making it difficult for markers to identify evidence. Providers are advised to ensure that candidate documents are uploaded correctly and contain the relevant content and labelled with the correct filename to ensure consistency and ease of access. For example: *Task_1_Research_[Registration numbers #]_[surname]_[first letter of first name]*

In some instances, providers uploaded evidence for the incorrect candidate. Providers should be aware that this could lead to a delay in results being issued. Providers are asked to check the evidence hasn't corrupted prior to upload and that any videos play and have sufficient sound. This should then be declared on the evidence checklist.

Providers are advised to ensure where separate documents or tasks are requested these and uploaded as separate files.

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 should complete and submit the 'Evidence checklist' and must detail on this where evidence has not been submitted. This is designed to be a checklist of the minimum evidence that is expected for a candidate. The checklist must align to what has been uploaded to the system.

Providers are reminded that each task is marked in isolation and that each task has been weighted in relation to the assessment objectives covered. This information is detailed in the specification and sample assessments. All tasks are marked separately, so where evidence that originated in another task within the Employer Set Project is produced by a candidate, no marks will be retrospectively awarded for that evidence in previous tasks, despite the knowledge or skills that it may demonstrate. 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 each marking grid.

Providers are advised to ensure the tutor and candidate both sign and date Declarations of Authenticity once the assessment has been completed. This confirms that the assessment has been conducted in line with the stipulated conditions and guidance. Each candidate only requires one declaration each, declarations are not required for each task.

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 Engineering and Manufacturing (Core) qualifications and training courses | City & Guilds (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 Autumn 2025 series.**

Grade	Mark range
A*	72-90
A	64-71
B	56-63
C	48-55
D	40-47
E	32-39
Unclassified (U)	0-31

8730-033 Engineering, Manufacturing, Processing & Control

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Engineering and Manufacturing 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

T-LEVELS

Get in touch

City & Guilds Technicals Quality Team

We 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:

T: 0300 303 53 52 (Monday - Friday | 08:30 - 17:00 GMT)

E: technicals.quality@cityandguilds.com

W: cityandguilds.com/tlevels

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.

City & Guilds Limited is authorised by the Department for Education to develop and deliver this T Level Technical Qualification.

City & Guilds is a registered trade mark of City & Guilds Limited (Reg No 16513878). City & Guilds, Giltspur House, 5–6 Giltspur Street, London, EC1A 9DE.

City & Guilds | eal