HM Government

T-LEVELS

T Level Technical Qualification in Maintenance, Installation and Repair for Engineering and Manufacturing (8730-12)

Core Report

(Summer 2026)

Version 1.0

City & Guilds

Version and date	Change detail	Section
V1.0 – August 2026	Published core report.	

Contents

Foreword 4

Introduction 5

8730-031 Paper 1 6

8730-032 Paper 2 9

8730 Sub-Component: Exam 12

Grade boundaries 14

8730-033 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project 15

8730 Sub-Component: ESP 21

Grade boundaries 23

8730-033 Maintenance, Installation and Repair for Engineering and Manufacturing 24

UMS grade boundaries 24

Foreword

Summer 2026 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 strength and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat assessments in the Summer 2026 assessment series.

The grade boundaries (and notional boundaries where appropriate) that were used to determine candidates' final Summer 2026 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 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:

- **AO1a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1b** 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:

- Engineering calculations and mathematical techniques (Q7). Candidates generally performed well on this question, demonstrating a secure understanding of the mathematical principles required. Most were able to apply the correct methods and arrive at accurate solutions.
- Ratios (Q10). This question was answered particularly well, with candidates demonstrating strong knowledge and understanding of the mathematical principles required.
- Gas laws and engineering science (Q11). Candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of Boyle's Law and Charles's Law and were generally able to apply these principles appropriately to the given scenario.
- Quadratic equations (Q12). Performance on this question was strong. Most candidates demonstrated confidence in solving quadratic equations and were able to apply established mathematical methods correctly.
- Trigonometry (Q13a and Q13b). Candidates generally demonstrated good understanding of trigonometric principles and were able to apply their mathematical knowledge effectively when solving problems involving triangles. Performance was particularly strong in Question 13a.
- Materials (Q4). Most candidates responded well to this question and responses often showed correct application of knowledge.
- Heat transfer (Q16b). Many candidates successfully applied the correct calculation method and arrived at an appropriate solution. Where marks were not fully achieved, this was often due to not following the instructions in the question.

Areas of weakness include:

- Logarithms (Q9). Candidates found this question challenging. Although some demonstrated an awareness of the correct mathematical approach, many were unable to develop their method sufficiently to reach a correct solution. This suggested a weaker understanding of logarithmic techniques than would be expected at this level.
- Linkages and fastening methods (Q5). This was one of the weaker areas of performance. Many candidates struggled to demonstrate secure knowledge and understanding of linkages and methods used to fasten components together.
- Combined circuits (Q14). Candidates often found this question challenging. Common difficulties included selecting the correct formula, applying prefixes and units correctly, and converting values accurately. These issues frequently prevented candidates from progressing through the calculation successfully.
- Mechanical principles (Q15). Many candidates struggled to apply fundamental mechanical principles appropriately. Common misconceptions included confusion between conservation of momentum and kinetic energy, as well as difficulty identifying and applying the different stages of the calculation process. Candidates also found it challenging to interpret the significance of energy losses within the system.

- Material properties (Q8). Responses indicated that many candidates found it difficult to apply their knowledge of material properties to the requirements of the question. Whilst some candidates identified relevant properties, explanations often lacked sufficient development or failed to explain how those properties influenced engineering performance.
- Application of mathematical and scientific principles. As in previous series, candidate performance suggested that understanding of some mathematical and scientific principles remains an area for development. This was particularly evident in questions requiring the application of logarithms, electrical and electronic principles, and mechanical principles within unfamiliar contexts.

Response to extended response questions (ERQs)

Performance on the extended response questions was generally stronger than in previous series, with most candidates demonstrating an appropriate level of knowledge and understanding. The strongest responses showed clear application of engineering principles and were able to develop points with depth and supporting rationale.

The extended response questions produced a broad range of responses and were effective in differentiating between candidates of varying ability. Whilst many candidates were able to identify relevant engineering concepts and provide appropriate explanations, a common weakness was limited evaluation and justification. Candidates often described solutions or approaches without fully explaining why they were appropriate or considering alternative options.

Higher-scoring responses demonstrated stronger evaluative skills, providing reasoned judgements that were supported by technical knowledge and evidence from the scenario. These candidates were also more likely to apply their knowledge directly to the context provided rather than relying on generic engineering examples.

As with previous series, candidates would benefit from focusing on the application of knowledge within the context of the question. Stronger responses consistently linked technical knowledge to the scenario presented, using contextualised examples to support explanations, evaluations and conclusions.

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 **13** 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:

- **AO1a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1b** 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:

- Capacity management (Q7). Candidates generally performed well on this question and demonstrated good understanding of the benefits of capacity management. Most were able to identify operational advantages such as improving efficiency, matching resources to demand and supporting productivity. The majority of candidates secured at least two marks on this AO1b question by demonstrating appropriate understanding.
- Project planning and control, Gantt charts (Q8a). Performance was strong on this question, with most candidates demonstrating good knowledge of the purpose and visual utility of Gantt charts. Candidates were generally able to identify how Gantt charts are used to plan, schedule and monitor project activities effectively, with many achieving full marks.
- Project planning and control, Critical Path Analysis (Q8b). Candidates showed a sound understanding of Critical Path Analysis, with most achieving at least half of the available marks. Stronger responses demonstrated greater technical accuracy and understanding of critical activities, dependencies and project duration, although these responses were less common.
- Total Productive Maintenance (Q9b). Most candidates demonstrated a reasonable understanding of both the benefits and limitations of TPM. Responses were generally balanced and appropriate, with the majority of candidates achieving between two and four marks.
- Document management and version control (Q10a). Candidates typically demonstrated good knowledge of document management and version control systems. Most secured three or four marks by identifying how these systems support document control, traceability and collaboration. A common weakness within otherwise strong responses was an overemphasis on reducing human error rather than the wider benefits of document control.
- Environmental management systems, ISO 14001 (Q11c). This question was generally answered well. Candidates showed a sound understanding of the environmental and organisational benefits of ISO 14001, with most achieving between four and six marks. As an AO2 question, candidates were able to apply their knowledge effectively within the context provided.
- Anthropometric data and design considerations (Q12). Most candidates achieved marks within the middle band by identifying factors such as comfort, size, weight and material properties. Stronger responses demonstrated a more developed understanding of anthropometric data and applied this effectively to design considerations.
- Sources of finance (Q13). Candidates generally demonstrated a sound understanding of different types of finance and were able to describe them appropriately. Higher-scoring responses included more detailed discussion of loans and alternative finance sources, such as crowdfunding and investment, with clearer links to business needs.

Areas of weakness include:

- Engineering professional bodies (Q2b). Candidates often demonstrated a narrow understanding of the role of engineering professional bodies. Responses were frequently limited to setting standards, with few candidates recognising their wider roles in professional development, accreditation, registration and support for Chartered Engineers.
- Latches (Q4). A common misconception was evident in candidates' understanding of latches. Many described a latch simply as a device that changes state, rather than

explaining its ability to retain an output state until reset or changed by an external signal.

- Engineering drawing abbreviations (Q5). Few candidates correctly identified the abbreviation for a chamfer. Many responses appeared to be guesses, with incorrect abbreviations such as "CHf" and "Chamf" commonly seen. As an AO1a question, candidates were required to recall specific knowledge.
- Engineering and manufacturing control systems (Q11a). This was one of the weaker questions on the paper. Candidates were expected to demonstrate understanding of hydraulic, pneumatic and electrical control systems, but many instead focused on physical movement or mechanical components. The use of inappropriate terminology and failure to address the requirements of the question limited performance significantly.

Response to extended response questions (ERQs)

Question 14 assessed candidates' knowledge and understanding of developments in materials and their applications within the healthcare sector. Most candidates achieved marks within Mark Band 2, demonstrating a reasonable awareness of materials used in healthcare applications. Responses often included relevant examples but tended to focus on common applications such as prosthetics and stents, with limited evaluation and technical depth. Some candidates confused materials with chemicals, which restricted achievement. Higher-scoring responses accurately identified specific materials, such as advanced polymers, composites and shape-memory alloys including Nitinol, and clearly explained how developments in these materials have improved healthcare applications.

Question 15 required candidates to evaluate the use of the hierarchy of control within a manufacturing context. Performance on this question was weaker overall. A common misconception was to interpret the hierarchy of control as an organisational management structure rather than a risk-control framework. Whilst a small number of candidates produced detailed and well-structured responses, most struggled to apply the hierarchy effectively to the scenario provided. In particular, few candidates considered elimination strategies, such as specifying pre-finished components or using additive manufacturing processes, which restricted access to the higher mark bands.

Question 16 asked candidates to discuss how the requirements of a design brief influence both design and manufacture. The majority of candidates achieved marks within Mark Band 2. Most recognised key requirements within the design brief but often focused primarily on product design, with limited consideration of manufacturing implications. Discussion of material selection, production methods, quality assurance and testing was frequently underdeveloped, preventing progression into the highest mark band. Stronger responses demonstrated a clear understanding of how design brief requirements, including temperature control, energy efficiency and durability, influenced both design decisions and manufacturing processes, providing a more holistic and integrated response.

8730 Sub-Component: Exam

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

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.

Providers should continue to support candidates in developing their ability to construct responses that demonstrate understanding, application of knowledge, analysis and evaluation. These skills are particularly important in extended response questions, where candidates are expected to provide structured responses that develop points fully, apply knowledge to the context provided, and justify conclusions with appropriate reasoning.

Mathematical knowledge and its application remains an area for development for some candidates. Providers should ensure that candidates have regular opportunities to practise applying mathematical techniques, selecting and using appropriate formulae, interpreting data and working with correct units. Greater emphasis should also be placed on the application of mathematical principles within engineering contexts, including electrical, electronic and mechanical scenarios, to help candidates develop confidence in applying their knowledge to assessment-based problems.

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

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 2026 series.**

Grade	Mark range	Notional boundaries	
		Paper 1 (8730-031)	Paper 2 (8730-032)
A*	167-200	83-100	83-100
A	145-166	72-82	73-82
B	123-144	61-71	62-72
C	102-122	51-60	51-61
D	81-101	41-50	40-50
E	60-80	31-40	29-39
Unclassified (U)	0-59	0-30	0-28

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** Realise 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 undertake research to support the design and development of a condition-based monitoring (CBM) solution and demonstrate their understanding of the requirements outlined in the brief. Overall, candidate performance improved compared with the previous series, with most candidates producing well-planned research supported by appropriate sources.

Most candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of condition-based monitoring requirements and were able to research relevant health and safety regulations and procedures effectively. Research was generally organised and relevant to the task requirements. However, some candidates would have benefited from more detailed referencing, particularly where artificial intelligence tools had been used. In a number of cases, sources were not referenced fully, making it difficult to identify the origin of information used within responses.

Candidates who achieved the higher mark bands provided well-structured research evidence supported by a range of sources and clear referencing. These candidates demonstrated stronger justification and evaluation throughout their work, moving beyond descriptive statements to explain the relevance and value of information gathered. Candidates achieving the lower mark bands often relied on more descriptive research approaches with limited evaluation or explanation.

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

Providers are advised to continue developing candidates' research skills, including the accurate referencing of all sources used. Where artificial intelligence tools are used to support research, candidates should be encouraged to reference these appropriately and identify the sources used to verify the information obtained.

Candidates would benefit from developing stronger evaluative skills, moving beyond simple description to provide greater depth, justification and analysis within their research activities.

Task 2 – Report

Candidates were required to produce a technical report addressing the requirements of the brief and communicate information using appropriate engineering representations. Performance on this task was varied, with candidates generally performing more strongly within the written report than the drawing component.

Most reports were logically structured and demonstrated a reasonable breadth of core engineering knowledge. Candidates were generally able to communicate relevant information and address the key requirements of the task. However, explanations, justifications and evaluations often lacked sufficient depth, which limited progression into the higher mark bands.

The engineering representation element of the task proved more challenging. Many candidates produced sketches or two-dimensional drawings of the pump and motor assembly rather than the schematic representation required by the brief. Whilst some candidates demonstrated awareness of drawing conventions through the use of title blocks and drawing frames, many responses did not meet the required standards for technical drawing.

Candidates who achieved the higher mark bands demonstrated a stronger understanding of engineering representation and standards, producing more accurate drawings supported by

detailed technical explanations and effective evaluation. Candidates who achieved the lower mark bands often provided limited technical detail and weaker justification of decisions made.

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

Providers are advised to ensure candidates are familiar with the full range of engineering representations identified within the specification, including the production and interpretation of engineering schematics and the application of relevant drawing standards.

Candidates would benefit from opportunities to review and evaluate engineering drawings through self-assessment and peer-assessment activities. The use of exemplar materials could support candidates in recognising the characteristics of effective and ineffective engineering representations.

Providers should also continue to support candidates in developing the depth of their written responses, with a particular focus on justification, evaluation and technical explanation.

Task 3 – Plan

Candidates were required to produce a project plan detailing the activities, resources and considerations necessary to complete the project successfully. Performance was similar to the previous series, with a small improvement observed overall.

Most candidates produced clear project plans, commonly using formats such as Gantt charts to communicate activities and timescales. Plans were generally organised logically and demonstrated an understanding of the key stages required to complete the project. However, project plans often lacked sufficient detail, with milestones omitted or planning activities presented at a broad level. Critical Path Analysis (CPA) was frequently absent or only partially completed.

Supporting documentation generally demonstrated appropriate planning and organisation, although explanations often lacked sufficient detail. Tool selection, equipment requirements and resource planning were areas that were not always fully developed.

Candidates who achieved the higher mark bands produced more detailed and comprehensive planning documentation, including accurate sequencing of activities, realistic timescales and stronger justification of decisions. Lower-performing responses tended to provide more superficial planning with limited supporting explanation.

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

Providers are advised to ensure candidates develop their understanding of Critical Path Analysis (CPA) as part of their project planning skills. Case studies and practical examples may assist candidates in understanding how CPA is applied in engineering projects.

Candidates would also benefit from greater experience of justifying project decisions, including the selection of tools, equipment, resources and methods. The use of real-world engineering projects may support candidates in developing a deeper understanding of planning processes and project management techniques.

Task 4 – Presentation

Candidates were required to produce and deliver a presentation based on their project

outcomes and findings. Overall, performance on this task improved compared with the previous series, with most candidates demonstrating strong communication skills.

Presentations were generally well structured, with clear introductions, development of key points and appropriate conclusions. Most candidates demonstrated good levels of technical knowledge and were able to communicate effectively using relevant engineering terminology. Responses to questioning were typically confident and demonstrated secure understanding of the project undertaken.

Some candidates would have benefited from greater consideration of audience needs, improved planning and more detailed explanations within their presentations. In some cases, evaluation and reflection lacked depth and only emerged through responses to questioning. A small number of candidates relied heavily on presentation slides or were affected by environmental distractions during delivery.

Candidates achieving the higher mark bands delivered confident and engaging presentations that demonstrated clear technical understanding and strong reflection on project outcomes. Effective use of supporting materials, such as notes and cue cards, often contributed positively to the overall delivery.

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

Providers are advised to continue providing opportunities for candidates to develop presentation skills through a range of classroom and project-based activities. Presenting to different audiences can help candidates build confidence and develop strategies for effective communication.

Candidates would benefit from further guidance on the effective use of presentation software, including slide design, appropriate use of images and animations, and the balance between visual information and spoken delivery. Emphasis should also be placed on audience engagement and the communication of technical information in a clear and professional manner.

Maths, English and digital Skills

Evidence across all four tasks was considered when assessing maths, English and digital Skills. Overall, English and digital skills were generally demonstrated more effectively than mathematical skills.

In mathematics, some candidates successfully applied calculations and budgeting activities within their project work. However, the range of mathematical techniques demonstrated was often limited, and opportunities to apply more advanced skills were not always utilised. The absence of Critical Path Analysis (CPA) within many project plans also restricted demonstration of mathematical application.

English skills were largely consistent with previous series. Most candidates communicated information clearly, particularly during presentations, and many used appropriate technical terminology. However, some written responses contained informal language, spelling errors and inconsistencies in grammar and punctuation, which reduced the professionalism of responses.

Digital skills were generally demonstrated appropriately throughout the assessment. Most candidates used software tools effectively to support planning, reporting and presentations. Some candidates demonstrated more advanced digital skills through the use of CAD software, planning software, presentation features and document automation tools. These

candidates were often able to use digital technologies effectively to enhance communication and presentation of information.

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

Providers are encouraged to develop maths, English and Ddgital Skills through integrated delivery across the qualification. Opportunities to apply mathematical skills within project-based activities should be embedded throughout teaching and learning to encourage practical application of knowledge.

Providers should continue to reinforce technical vocabulary and professional communication standards within both written and verbal activities. Digital skills should be developed in ways that support project delivery, including the effective use of planning software, CAD, document management tools and presentation software to communicate information effectively.

8730 Sub-Component: ESP

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 assessor 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 2025 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-2025-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-2025-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

Grade boundaries

The table below shows the grade mark ranges for the Employer-Set Project – **for the Summer 2026 series.**

Grade	Mark range
A*	73-90
A	65-72
B	57-64
C	49-56
D	41-48
E	34-40
Unclassified (U)	0-33

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

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Maintenance, Installation and Repair for 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

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.