T-LEVELS | IfATE Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education

T Level Technical Qualification in Maintenance, Installation and Repair for Engineering and Manufacturing

8730-12 Core Report (Summer 2025)

Version 1.2

City & Guilds | eal

Version and date	Change Detail	Section
V1-0 - August 2025	Published core report	
V1-1 - August 2025	Grade boundaries table	8730 Sub-Component: Exam
V1-2 – August 2025	Grade boundaries table - year	8730-033 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project

Contents

Foreword **3**

Introduction **4**

8730-031 Paper 1 ..... **5**

8730-032 Paper 2 ..... **8**

8730 Sub-Component: Exam **11**

Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment 11

Support materials 12

Grade boundaries 13

8730-033 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project **14**

Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment 19

Support materials 20

Grade boundaries 21

UMS grade boundaries 22

Foreword

Summer 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 Maintenance Installation and Repair for Engineering and Manufacturing. 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 Maintenance Installation and Repair for Engineering and Manufacturing **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 summer 2025 assessment series.

The grade boundaries (and notional boundaries where appropriate) that were used to determine candidates' final summer 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 **18** 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:

- SI units and symbols (Q4). This was an AO1a question and candidates were able to recall the current SI units and symbols that were asked. Candidates performed well overall in this question.
- Estimation (Q6). Candidates responded well to this question with most candidates achieving full marks. This was an AO1b question and candidates needed to apply their fundamental mathematical knowledge as the question relied on basic percentage and multiplication.

- Measurement Equipment (Q10). Generally candidates were able to perform well on this question. They were able to provide the correct equipment that should be used when given a measurement that needed to be carried out. This was an AO1b question as the candidate had to show understanding of the measurement that was requested and the equipment that should be used.
- Hooke's Law (Q14). Question 14 contained two parts (a and b) and candidates performed well on both of these parts. This was an AO2 question. The candidate had to use a Graph and a Table to answer these questions, which meant the candidate had to apply knowledge and understanding within the given context of the question. The candidates were able to clearly explain the relationship between force and extension.
- Calculation of energy and type of energy (Q16ai & Q16aii). The candidate had to calculate the energy within a given context. They were given the necessary figures in order to work this out, but they needed to know how to do this. The second part of this was knowing what type of energy this was. Both of these questions were AO2 questions, as there was knowledge and understanding shown in a given context.

Overall, an improvement in candidates' performance was seen in candidates' responses to Section A when compared to previous series.

Areas of weakness include:

- Differentiation and integration (Q7). Many candidates struggled with this question with the majority of candidates not scoring any marks. A small percentage achieved 1 mark out of 2, but a larger percentage achieved full marks. A common error seen was the direct substitution of the value of t into the distance formula. Only a limited numbers of candidates correctly identified that the distance function needed to be differentiated to find velocity, suggesting limited understanding of how calculus is applied in motion-related problems.
- Units of measurements used in engineering (Q8). The majority of candidates were not able to convert μA into amps.
- There were two different mathematical approaches to respond to Q12 depending on the interpretation of the question and both were fully credited, though many still struggled with the mathematical demands of the question.
- Materials testing methods (Q13). A full range of marks were shown on this question, however a large amount of candidates scored 0. Many candidates focused on describing the mechanical strength of materials rather than outlining the process used to test for hardness. The better answers were able to include specific test types like Brinell or Vickers and clearly outlined the steps as asked in the question.
- Principles of motion and mechanics in engineering and manufacturing (16b). Although candidates generally performed well in part of A of this question they struggled with part B. Candidates needed to calculate speed and were required to use the transposition technique, however the struggled to make v the subject of the equation. Although the majority of candidates did get 0 marks. If candidates did score marks they generally got full marks (3). Very few candidates scored 1 or 2 marks.

Similar to previous series it was observed that candidates understanding of mathematics and scientific principles was not at the level expected at Level 3. With some written responses candidates' answers often lacked the detail to demonstrate they had the required knowledge to warrant marks. Responses were usually generic and lacking in depth.

Responses to extended response questions (ERQs)

The majority of candidates attempted the ERQ's within Section B, with the high achieving candidates responding with more depth and detail in their responses, in comparison to the low achieving candidates. It's important to emphasise the need to relate back to the context of the question to exemplify answers and demonstrate application of knowledge and understanding. Although most candidates evaluation skills could be improved with particular focus on justifying their choices and rationales, the overall performance of the ERQs did increase slightly to compared to previous series.

Question 19 required candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of thermodynamics. A full spread of marks was seen, with the majority of candidates responses in mark band 1 (1,2 or 3 marks out of 9). While many candidates recognised that airflow plays a role in generating lift, explanations were often vague or incomplete—for example, stating that 'the wing goes up because air moves faster' without clarifying the link to pressure differences. Some attempted to reference Bernoulli's principle, but their application lacked accuracy or relevance to the context. More competent answers correctly explained that faster airflow over the curved upper surface results in lower pressure above the wing, while higher pressure beneath it creates lift. The best responses went further, detailing how the shape of the wing influences airflow and contributes to this pressure imbalance.

Question 20 assessed candidates' knowledge and understanding of sintering. Once again, a full range of marks were seen, 0 to 12 marks, and similar to question 19 most candidates were in mark band 1. This topic proved challenging for many candidates, with a significant number of general discussions on materials, quality, or broader manufacturing principles. Responses often focused on the general production of engine parts rather than the specific process of sintering. There were several candidates who mistakenly described sintering as powder coating. A lack of understanding of the sintering process was common, though a small number of responses demonstrated clear and accurate knowledge.

Many candidates listed advantages such as less waste or stronger parts without explaining how these benefits are achieved or why they are relevant to engine components. In contrast, more thorough responses addressed key concepts such as densification, porosity, and material selection, linking them to improvements in strength, durability, and precision. The strongest answers provided detailed evaluations of how sintering parameters, such as temperature, pressure, and atmospheric control affect final part performance, while also considering the economic and environmental implications for large-scale manufacturing.

Question 21 assessed candidate's knowledge and understanding of a suitable plastic to use within a context of a water tank. Performance on this question was generally better with most candidates being in mark band 2 (4,5 or 6 marks out of 12), and again the full range of marks were seen. Candidates demonstrated varying levels of understanding in material selection for this question. Some responses named generic plastics without considering the performance requirements of a water tank exposed to steam and elevated temperatures, while others suggested metals or inappropriate materials. A common issue was the failure to specify a suitable type of plastic, with some suggestions unsuited to the application.

Stronger responses identified the need for materials with good thermal resistance, rigidity, and corrosion resistance, often recommending appropriate thermosetting plastics. These answers also highlighted the advantages of plastics in terms of weight, cost-effectiveness, and ease of manufacture. High-quality responses went further, addressing important factors such as dimensional stability, design flexibility, and suitability for moulding or forming processes. The most comprehensive answers demonstrated evaluative thinking, offering well-reasoned justifications and showing awareness of real-world considerations, including regulatory compliance, environmental impact, and material availability.

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) 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:

- Monitoring (Q2). Candidates typically answered correctly with most candidates being able to provide two suitable responses. This was an AO1a question, so candidates were required to recall knowledge of an abbreviation used in engineering drawings. Questions 4b and 4c asked for different abbreviations but did not perform as well.
- Engineering representations (Q4a). Most candidates achieved the mark for this question. This was an AO1a question, so candidates were required to recall
- Health and safety, employee and employer obligations (Q5). There was strong performance on this question, which was an AO1b question, so candidates were required to show understanding. Candidates mainly achieved full marks, 4 out of 4, and in some instances where candidates did not score any marks candidates provided employer responsibilities where as the question asked for employee responsibilities.
- Project and programme management, control (Q6). Candidates generally performed well on this question and were able to identify two reasons that were asked for, where full marks were not achieved the candidate often did not explain that reason. As an AO1b question, the candidate needed to demonstrate understanding.
- Fully automated (Q7). This question has a part a and part b, both questions were answered well. The questions related to advantages and limitations, with advantages performing slightly better than limitations, but responses on both were very strong.
- Health and Safety legislation (Q9a). The majority of candidates were able to achieve at least 2 marks for identifying 2 items and the higher achieving candidates were able to provide a linked response achieving full marks. This was an AO2 question, so candidates had to demonstrate knowledge and understanding in relation to the context of the question.
- Health and Safety, considerations (Q9b). There were three marks available on this question and the majority of candidates were able to achieve 2 or 3 marks.
- Just in time (Q10a). Candidates had to provide and advantage and disadvantage of a company adopting a just in time inventory management system within the given context. As this related back to a context this was also an AO2 question, and candidates were able to show their knowledge and understanding with most candidates scoring 2-4 marks.

Areas of weakness include:

- Project planning and control (Q1). This was an AO1a question and candidates were asked to recall knowledge. Most candidates were unable to achieve a mark as they could not provide a project planning method and often were providing a design process. There were some candidates that achieved full marks (2), as they were able to provide 2 methods.
- Engineering and manufacturing control systems, active (Q8a). This question was an AO1b question, so candidates were required to show their understanding of actuators, however some candidates were not able to do this and received 0 marks. There was still a sizeable number of candidates that received 1 or 2 marks, out of a possible 2.
- Budgets (Q9d). This was an AO2 question, so candidates needed to demonstrate understanding and knowledge within the given context. Some candidates did seem to struggle with this question, with many providing reasons that explained why the project may have gone over budget rather than implications as required.

- Augmented reality (Q11). A large number of candidates described aspects of virtual reality rather than augmented reality that was asked for. Although, the full range of marks were achieved, (0 – 6 marks) many candidates received 0 as they were discussing virtual reality.

Response to extended question (ERQs)

Question 13 assessed candidates' knowledge and understanding of specific legal practices in the operation of an engineering organisation. The majority of candidates demonstrated excellent understanding of contracts and warranties securing at least, but very few candidates were able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of tendering limiting responses. Therefore, most candidates were within marking band 2 (4, 5 or 6 marks out of 9). A full range of marks were seen, so the stronger responses were able to fully contextualise the practices and their influences.

Question 14 required candidates to evaluate Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) within a manufacturing and assembling context. A full range of marks were shown with this question (0-12 marks). Some candidates did not score any marks on this question, however most candidates either fell into mark band 1 (1, 2 or 3 marks) or mark band 2 (4, 5 or 6 marks). Most candidates were able to provide reasons for using SOPs showing a good understanding in the context provided, though for the weaker candidates it was not always clear in the response that SOP is a set of instructions, rather than a general discussion of safety and quality compliance. Those who did receive a lower mark often did not refer to the context.

Question 15 asked candidates to discuss how the design brief affects the design and manufacture of a certain product within a certain context. A full range of marks were seen with this question (0-12 marks). Most candidates were within mark band 2 (4, 5 or 6 marks). Although candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of a design brief many were unable to link their understanding to manufacturing, which limited the number of candidates that were able to access mark band 3. Many candidates also struggled to link their answers back to the context, which also limited the number of marks they received.

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 & Autumn 2023/2024) as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

Providers are advised to ensure that the full range of specification handbook content is covered to the required depth shown in the 'what learners need to learn' section of the content, and that sufficient time is given to each of these topic areas.

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 'State' or 'Describe' question. Candidates should be reminded of the need to ensure they fully read and understand all questions before responding.

Providers should support candidates on developing their skills in writing responses to questions that ask for basic knowledge recall, demonstration of understanding, as well as those that are set within, and require reference to, appropriate engineering contexts.

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 the application of knowledge and understanding (AO2) must be related back to the context of the 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 the higher bands candidates needed to include more detailed conclusions and justifications in their responses.

Mathematical skills remain an area of weakness for many candidates, as has been evident across multiple series. While some showed improvement, many continue to struggle with applying basic numerical techniques, interpreting data accurately, and using appropriate units or formulae.

Some of the papers had very unclear handwriting, making it difficult for the marker to read the response. Providers should encourage candidates to ensure their handwriting is legible. Writing in block capital letters is a possible solution if a candidate's handwriting is not legible.

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 summer 2025 series.**

Grade	Mark range	Notional boundaries	
		Paper 1 (8730-031)	Paper 2 (8730-032)
A*	168-200	83-100	84-100
A	148-167	73-82	75-83
B	128-147	63-72	65-74
C	108-127	53-62	55-64
D	88-107	43-52	45-54
E	68-87	33-42	35-44
Unclassified (U)	0-67	0-32	0-34

8730-033 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
- Plan
- Present

The project draws on the content from the core knowledge that sits across all specialisms in Maintenance, Installation and Repair for Engineering and Manufacturing.

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 a Maintenance, Installation and Repair 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	26.7%
		AO2a (Core knowledge)	6	
		AO2b (Core Skills)	6	
		AO5a, AO5b (Realise outcome, review outcome)	6	
3	Plan	AO1, AO3 (Planned approach, selecting techniques)	6	20%
		AO2a (Core knowledge)	6	
		AO2b (Core Skills)	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

Candidates were required to conduct research into different types of belt conveyor systems and condition-based monitoring requirements in line with the specifications provided by the client.

In general, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the research process and planned this out well, whilst addressing most of the research requirements required. They were able to offer appropriate conveyor system options. Referencing was often missing, with irrelevant information often included. In terms of performance, the percentage of candidates achieving the marks was dispersed across the mark range, with over half the cohort achieving within band 2 descriptor (marks 4, 5 or 6). While stronger candidates showed clear comparisons between types of conveyors, lower band submissions often lacked depth.

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

Providers are encouraged to reinforce good academic research habits, particularly in citing and referencing sources consistently. Additionally, helping candidates understand the format and purpose of research in technical contexts (eg choosing systems for industrial use) will further strengthen performance.

Task 2: Report

Candidates were required to draft a report outlining the installation of the new belt conveyor system and condition-based monitoring plan. This had to include an annotated drawing for the selected belt conveyor system.

Most candidates produced well-structured reports covering the majority of requirements stipulated on the task brief. Similar to task 1 most candidates were in mark descriptor 2 (marks 3 or 4) for task 2. Candidates could have improved the quality of their drawings, which often lacked key details. To achieve higher marks candidates could have included more evaluations on their choices. Candidates that performed strongly included a full evaluation of their choices.

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

Detailed instructions and training on how to create and format engineering drawings, including both hand-drawn and CAD techniques, should be provided.

Task 3: Plan

Candidates were required to create a planning chart for the removal and installation of the belt conveyor system. The task was broken down into 2 parts, part A was a planning chart and part B was a supporting statement to justify the decisions made in part A.

Many candidates were unable able to apply planning tools such as Gantt Charts or Critical Path Analysis (CPA). For those candidates who did provide a recognised Gantt chart, a mixture of excel documents and MS projects were seen. In general planning charts lacked detail, but higher performing candidates were able to provide well-organised plans. In addition to this, supporting statements were often brief and lacking in detail, particularly in justifying the job roles and responsibilities, selection of tools, equipment and costs. This is

reflected in the mark distribution for this task, with the majority of candidates achieving the low end of mark band 2 (3 out of 6 marks).

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

Providers are encouraged to dedicate time to developing learners' familiarity with project planning methods. This could include practice opportunities for candidates to develop their planning skills, incorporating the creation of detailed and varied planning charts, are necessary. Additional resources and training on the importance and methods of effective planning would also be beneficial.

Task 4: Present

Candidates were required to produce and deliver a presentation, addressing the brief requirements. The presentation was to be delivered to the Chief Executive Director from the company in the brief who will have a non-technical background.

Task 4 was generally an area of strength for candidates with most candidates scoring in the top of band 2 descriptor (4 marks out of 6 marks). Many candidates presented confidently and demonstrated clear understanding of their projects. However, a recurring issue was the failure to tailor presentations to a non-technical audience. Some presentations were stronger than the written components, showing candidates' ability to verbally communicate complex ideas effectively. It is noted that assessing some candidate's videos was difficult due to the inability to gauge their' confidence levels, due to how the presentation was delivered/recorded.

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

Providers should encourage practice presentations with peer and instructor feedback to build confidence and improve performance. With emphasis on audience awareness, technical or non-technical, which would help to refine the delivery.

Presentations should also take place without external distractions such as noise during video recordings as this can affect candidate performance in some instances.

Maths, English & digital skills:

Overall, candidates performed well in English and Digital Skills, with many demonstrating clear written communication and competent use of software for research, report writing, and presentation. Most learners used spellcheck and formatting tools effectively, contributing to professional-looking submissions. To score higher marks in English skills more candidates could have used more technical engineering terminology. A few candidates even incorporated digital elements such as diagrams, flowcharts, and slides with embedded media, which enhanced the clarity and impact of their work. More widespread use of these additional digital elements would have seen more candidates score higher in digital aspects. In Maths, while some candidates showcased accurate calculations, this remained the least confident area across the cohort. While some candidates lacked any attempts at showing how long a package would take to travel across the entire belt some did attempt this, but it was incorrect, which is why Maths did not score as highly as English and Digital skills.

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

Providers should integrate more opportunities for candidates to apply math skills in practical contexts within their tasks. Enhancing vocabulary and technical language instruction specific to engineering would be beneficial, which could be done by encouraging its regular use in both spoken and written formats. Comprehensive training on digital tools and software relevant to planning and presentation tasks should be provided to ensure all candidates can competently use them. Including activities that require the use of digital tools for research, planning, and presentation can help build confidence and proficiency. Candidates should be encouraged to explore more advanced features of the tools they already use, such as animation, CAD, and data visualisation.

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

Providers should integrate more opportunities for candidates to apply math skills in practical contexts within their tasks. Enhancing vocabulary and technical language instruction specific to engineering would be beneficial. Comprehensive training on digital tools and software relevant to planning and presentation tasks should be provided to ensure all candidates can competently use them. Including activities that require the use of digital tools for research, planning, and presentation can help build confidence and proficiency.

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. This checklist must align back with the evidence uploaded. If there are any discrepancies with this, this may delay the marking of the candidates work and City and Guilds will be back in contact with the provider to clarify this.

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 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 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.

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. Providers only have to upload the declaration as evidence of compliance to the assessment conditions, there is no need to upload further evidence such as records of the candidates search history. If City and Guilds have concerns relating to the conduct of the assessment and require further evidence, we will contact Providers for this.

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)

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 2024 assessment series to achieve an A and E grade.

8730-033 ESP A grade exemplar: https://www.cityandguilds.com/-/media/productdocuments/engineering/mechanical/8730/assessment-materials/employer-set-project-exemplars/maintenance-installation-and-repair-for-engineering-manufacturing/8730-033-esp-a-grade-exemplar-summer-2024-v1-0-pdf.pdf

8730-033 ESP E grade exemplar: https://www.cityandguilds.com/-/media/productdocuments/engineering/mechanical/8730/assessment-materials/employer-set-project-exemplars/maintenance-installation-and-repair-for-engineering-manufacturing/8730-033-esp-e-grade-exemplar-summer-2024-v1-0-pdf.pdf

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 2025 series.**

Grade	Mark range
A*	70-90
A	62-69
B	54-61
C	46-53
D	38-45
E	31-37
Unclassified (U)	0-30

8730-12 Maintenance, Installation and Repair for Engineering and Manufacturing Core

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Engineering & 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

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**

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, © 2025. '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.

Every effort has been made to ensure that the information contained in this publication is true and correct at time of publication. 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 City & Guilds Limited, a company registered in England and Wales (company number 16513878). City and Guilds Group, Giltspur House, 5–6 Giltspur Street, London EC1A 9DE