



**T Level Technical Qualification in
Agriculture, Land Management
and Production:
Crop, Woodland and Horticulture**

8717-31 Core Report (Summer 2024)



Version 1.0

Contents

Foreword	2
Introduction	3
8717-030 Core: Paper 1	4
8717-031 Core: Paper 2	8
8717 Sub-Component: Exam	12
Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment.....	12
Support materials	13
Grade boundaries.....	14
8717-035 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project	15
8717 Sub-Component: ESP	21
Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment.....	21
Support materials	23
Grade boundaries.....	24
8717-31 Crop, Woodland and Horticulture Core	25
UMS grade boundaries.....	25

Foreword

Summer 2024 Results

The Technical Qualification is made up of two components (the Core and the Occupational Specialism), both of which need to be successfully achieved to attain the T Level Technical Qualification in Agriculture, Land Management and Production: Crop, Woodland and Horticulture. This takes into account the best result for a specific component from a summer or autumn series. This document covers the Core component only.

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

Introduction

This document has been prepared to be used as a feedback tool for providers in order to support and enhance teaching and preparation for assessment. It is advised that this document is referred to when planning delivery and when preparing candidates for the T Level Technical Qualification (TQ) in Agriculture, Land Management and Production: Crop, Woodland and Horticulture **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 2024 assessment series.

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

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

8717-030 Core: Paper 1

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Agriculture, Environmental and Animal Care, Common Core, content:

- Health and safety
- Sustainability
- Working in the Agriculture, Environmental and Animal Care sector
- Ethics
- Business
- Equality
- Communication
- Relationship management
- Finance
- Information and data

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Agriculture, Environmental and Animal Care 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 **44** marks and includes **15** short answer and medium answer questions.

Section B is made up of **36** marks and includes **3** extended response questions.

The exam paper 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 contexts
- **AO3a** Analyse information and issues
- **AO3b** Evaluate information and issues

Questions were ramped in terms of difficulty throughout Section A starting with AO1a through to AO2, allowing for the level of demand to be increased steadily throughout the paper, with the bridging question utilised to facilitate the step towards the extended response questions. The extended response questions (ERQs) in Section B were scenario based AO2 and AO3 questions.

This was the first series for this examination. Overall, performance varied across the cohort. Whilst candidates gained a full range of marks on all questions in Section A, the range of marks in Section B was more limited.

Most candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the core content in AO1a and AO1b questions. The cohort typically performed well on the more familiar topic areas where they could relate their thinking to 'real life' situations. However, some candidates struggled with recalling technical terminology and would often provide generic responses which demonstrated a lack of understanding in key areas. Providers are encouraged to support candidates in developing their understanding of technical terminology across the core content.

Candidates showed good understanding in the AO2 questions. It was common to see the lower scoring candidates perform better on AO2 questions compared to AO1a and AO1b questions, as candidates were required to consider the scenario, rather than just recall information out of context. Responses were often correct but basic, however they were lacking the development with reasoning or justification needed to gain the higher marks. Some candidates provided repeated responses so were not always able to achieve full marks.

Areas of strength include:

- Information and data – ways to respond to a data security breach (Q1 AO1a) and the purpose of the General Data Protection Regulation (Q8 AO1b). Both questions were answered well with candidates typically providing a wide range of responses.
- Effective communication – formats of formal communication (Q2 AO1a) and the benefits of social media (Q9 AO1b). Candidates were able to provide responses that reflected on personal experiences.
- Equality and diverse backgrounds – methods to promote diversity and inclusion (Q5 AO1b). This was answered well with a good range of examples provided.
- Measures that businesses use to determine success – the consequences of not meeting quality standards (Q10 AO1b). This question was answered well. Loss of custom and reputation were among the main answers.
- Key requirements of health and safety legislation and consequences of poor health and safety practice – management of own health and safety (Q12 AO2), consequences of poor health and safety in the workplace (Q13 AO2). These questions were answered well overall. Candidates were able to provide a range of responses demonstrating good levels of understanding within this topic area.
- Purpose of customer care – impact of poor customer care (Q15 AO2). Most candidates performed well and were able to show a range of breadth and depth from across the indicative content.
- Purpose of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) opportunities – the benefits of CPD opportunities to the business (Q16 AO2, AO3a, AO3b). The cohort answered

this part of the ERQ well and were able to demonstrate a very good understanding of CPD.

Areas of weakness include:

- Health and safety – steps required to manage risk (Q3, AO1a). Candidates were often unable to fully recall the specific steps in this question.
- Characteristics protected by equality legislation – UK legislation that safeguards protected characteristics (Q4, AO1a). Candidates were often able to identify the Equality Act but incorrectly provided other examples such as HASAWA or COSHH.
- Roles of different stakeholders – impact of trade union (Q6, AO1b). Candidates often referred to trade between countries, rather than being able to apply knowledge of trade unions to the context of the question.
- Business organisations – limited company (Q7, AO1b). Candidates were often unable to recall the key characteristics of this type of company leading to incorrect evaluations provided within their response.
- Sustainability – understanding of sustainable development goals (SDGs), 25-Year Environmental Plan, three pillars of sustainability (Q17, AO2, AO3a, AO3b). There was often a lack of reference to the SDGs within the responses, demonstrating a lack of understanding of technical terminology in this area.
- Principles of enterprise skills – risk management methods and controls, risk register, strategic planning and development (Q18, AO2, AO3a, AO3b). A large number of candidates were unable to demonstrate their knowledge of these principles, and those that could, only provided superficial responses.

Responses to extended questions (ERQs)

The three ERQs gave candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of Continuous Professional Development (CPD), sustainability goals, risk management and finance. These questions generally produced a narrow range of marks with most responses sitting at the top of Band 1 or bottom of Band 2. No candidates gave a response that gained marks from Band 4.

Some candidates were able to show understanding in key areas, but for the most part, candidates' understanding of these topics was inconsistent. Varying degrees of breadth and depth were evident across favoured topic areas and most candidates were able to demonstrate awareness of different parts of the indicative content. Responses often lacked sufficient coherent reasoning and justification to gain access to the full range of higher marks. In most cases, candidates would provide responses that were not comprehensive or did not demonstrate thorough evaluative skills. Candidates also typically focussed on one of the two parts of each ERQ, often only providing responses relating to either the analysis or to the justification element of the stem. This meant that candidates could not progress into the

higher bands. Given that each ERQ is equally weighted between AO2, AO3a and AO3b, candidates must consistently demonstrate both evaluative skills and justifications in relation to the specific context.

The higher performing candidates tended to achieve marks in Band 2 and occasionally Band 3. Responses from higher scoring candidates demonstrated that they had considered the full scenario and both parts of the question. The structure of these responses was also clear and easy to follow.

Overall, technical language and terminology was reasonable across the cohort. There was some evidence of very strong application of technical terminology, but this was infrequent.

Q16 focused on Continuous Professional Development (CPD) and how this impacts staff retention and declining profits of a company. Candidates were required to analyse how the company would benefit from additional CPD opportunities and provide justified actions to improve employee performance. It was evident that candidates could provide some good understanding of CPD, but their responses were often not fully analysed. As most responses focussed on the benefits of CPD, those relating to justified actions were minimal or, in some cases, missing altogether.

Q17 covered the topic of sustainability and required candidates to explore issues of failing to adhere to sustainable development agreements. It was common for candidates to apply the context of the scenario in their answer to a descriptive level, rather than providing an analysis, as required by the command verb in the question. Candidates were also required to justify actions that the business could take to ensure that its sustainable development goals were met. Candidates typically struggled here and showed a lack of core knowledge and understanding in this topic, resulting in many candidates achieving marks in Band 1 only for this question.

Q18 required candidates to demonstrate their understanding of finance and risk management methods and controls. Most candidates were able to provide some good levels of understanding when applying the scenario and responded with relevant impacts to the company of failing to pay invoices. Although candidates showed strength in this topic area, they were not able fully analyse these impacts and responses were often superficial explanations of the impact. Candidates were also required to consider risk management methods and controls. This was an area of weakness for many candidates and responses were often very limited. Candidates tended to focus on the impacts to the business rather than consider responses such as forecasting, strategically planning cash flow management, key performance indicators or diversification.

ERQ performance could be enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and analysis on different scenarios and supported justifications.

8717-031 Core: Paper 2

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Crop, Woodland and Horticulture core content:

- Health and safety
- Sustainability
- Biosecurity
- Supply chain
- Plant growth and development

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Crop, Woodland & Horticulture 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 **44** marks and includes **13** short answer and medium answer questions.

Section B is made up of **36** marks and includes **3** extended response questions.

The exam paper 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 contexts
- **AO3a** Analyse information and issues
- **AO3b** Evaluate information and issues

This was the first year of this examination being sat. All three components (Crop Production, Woodland and Horticulture) of the pathway were given equal consideration throughout the paper.

Questions were ramped in terms of difficulty throughout section A starting with AO1a through to AO2, allowing for the level of demand to be increased steadily throughout the paper, with the bridging questions utilised to facilitate the step towards the extended response questions. The extended response questions in section B were scenario based AO2 and AO3 questions.

Overall, the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the core content, but many candidates did struggle with multiple areas of the core assessment within this paper and there was a recurrent issue with the correct interpretation of command words. In general, there was an overarching lack of analysis and evaluation, notably in some of the later answers on the paper which required more complete responses to gain full marks.

Areas of strength include:

- Responses to questions related to hazards, risks and control measures associated with working in the industry.
- Recalling the protections given to plants listed as protected species (Q1 AO1a). Most candidates gained marks here, but a small number of candidates lost marks for naming plants instead of the protections as asked.
- Identifying risks from being exposed to working in severe weather conditions (Q2 AO1a). This question was well answered with candidates often answering hypothermia and hyperthermia.
- Explaining the function of roots (Q8b AO1b). Most candidates gained marks here, but some lost marks by failing to fully explain a single function and instead gave two different functions.
- Applying health and safety knowledge and understanding to a scenario about manually moving containerised trees (Q10 AO2). Most candidates responded well to this question and showed some good knowledge and understanding of health and safety, but many gave only basic explanations and failed to expand further to access the full marks available.

Areas of weakness include:

- A lack of clarity regarding biosecurity principles (Q3 AO1a) from some candidates who lost marks by giving vague answers.
- Questions on the understanding of basic botany and plant science were generally not responded to well and there were some poor answers for these questions.
 - A range of confused answers was given when differentiating between sexual and asexual reproduction (Q5a AO1b) and aerobic and anaerobic respiration (Q8a AO1a) and many candidates lost marks by only giving one difference instead of two.
 - Most candidates did not demonstrate understanding of ephemeral life cycles (Q5b AO1b), with some candidates not attempting this question and others giving an incorrect answer.

- Applying knowledge and understanding of methods of sourcing materials to explain disadvantages of direct purchase (Q11 AO2). Some good answers were given, but many candidates gave responses that focused just on sustainability or repeated points such as profit throughout. Where two points were given, they were often basic explanations and failed to expand further to access the full marks available.
- Understanding how the principles of stock management that need to be applied when moving to a smaller facility (Q13 AO2). A lack of understanding of the basic principles of stock management was apparent from many candidates and they often lost marks by focusing on giving examples rather than explaining the principles.

A common area of weakness across the cohort was the lack of depth in responses to questions designed to assess understanding. For instance, many candidates struggled with questions using the command verb "Explain," often providing only basic points without further expansion. In these cases, candidates tended to state two or more simple ideas but failed to develop them sufficiently to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the subject matter.

Responses to extended questions (ERQs)

The three extended response questions (ERQs) in Section B in this paper were based on topical and relevant scenarios of importance to all three components of the pathway and were open enough questions to enable students to write extended responses to gain marks. These questions generally produced a broad range of marks, but with most responses sitting in Band 2 and many others in Band 1. No candidates gave a response that gained marks from Band 4.

Generally, responses did not include sufficiently coherent reasoning or justification to gain access to the full range of higher marks. To achieve the higher bands candidates needed to demonstrate more comprehensive and thorough evaluative skills and justification in relation to the specific context. Candidates should ensure they read the extended response questions carefully and ensure they answer all elements of the question. Many candidates focussed on one particular element of a question, rather than looking at the question as a whole.

The technical vocabulary of the candidates appeared limited when they were making specific points in their ERQs, and in general many were unable to provide point – evidence – explain sentences to support and justify their points and gain higher marks.

Question 14 focused on the effects of increasing numbers of very hot days on the physical and physiological processes in plants and how these higher temperatures may impact the

growth of plants. There were some good attempts made, but many candidates failed to discuss physiological processes in their responses. Some candidates focused on the environmental factors of climate change on plants, which wasn't directly asked in the question, and missed some key answers. Many candidates did not respond to the 'evaluate' command verb and evaluation was often missing in their answers.

Question 15 explored applying the principles of biosecurity to a scenario where an estate is opening a visitor attraction. This question was slightly better answered with many candidates making a reasonable attempt and demonstrating a good depth of knowledge. However, justifications were often lacking.

In Question 16, candidates were asked to analyse how waste can be disposed of safely and evaluate how sustainability can be increased by applying waste management principles. There were some good responses that described key principles of waste management, but many candidates failed to develop the evaluation of how the sustainability of the business could be increased by applying these principles. Some candidates did not attempt this question.

Overall, ERQ performance could be enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and analysis on different scenarios and supported justifications.

8717 Sub-Component: Exam

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

- Candidates should be encouraged, when reading through a question, to look at the marks available and take this into account when providing their answer.
- Candidates would benefit from reading the question fully to understand the point of view of what is being asked. For example, if the question is 'State the impact on the employees', the answers provided should not include the impact on the organisation.
- Many candidates repeated the question in the first part of their response. This takes time for candidates to write but does not gain any additional marks so providers should encourage candidates to focus on the response to the question.
- Candidates would benefit from understanding what different command verbs are asking of them. For example, the type of response required by an 'Explain' question requires a higher level of response than a 'Describe' question. For an 'Explain' question, candidates are required to provide a statement and basic explanation for the first mark and a further developed explanation of their initial point for the second mark.
- Candidates should be reminded of the need to ensure they fully read and understand all questions before responding.
- Candidates should be encouraged to expand answers to ensure the correct number of responses are given where the question includes a quantifier. They should take care to ensure that they do not repeat their response using different wording.
- In the extended response questions, candidates should be encouraged to note the key areas of the scenario and how these relate to the question before writing. Well completed extended response questions were those where candidates gave an organised response, following the structure given by the stem.
- ERQ performance could be further enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and analysis. To achieve the higher bands candidates needed to include more detailed conclusions and justifications in their responses.
- 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.
- It is recommended that providers utilise and deliver the sample examinations and going forward past papers as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

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 Agriculture, Environmental and Animal Care qualifications and training courses | City & Guilds \(cityandguilds.com\)](https://www.cityandguilds.com/qualifications/t-levels/qualifications-and-training-courses)

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 \(cityandguilds.com\)](https://www.cityandguilds.com/events-and-webinars/t-levels)

Grade boundaries

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

Grade	Mark range	Notional boundaries	
		Paper 1 (8717-030)	Paper 2 (8717-031)
A*	128-160	63-80	64-80
A	111-127	55-62	56-63
B	94-110	46-54	47-55
C	77-93	38-45	38-46
D	60-76	30-37	30-37
E	44-59	22-29	22-29
Unclassified (U)	0-43	0-21	0-21

8717-035 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:

- Research
- Report
- Plan
- Peer Review
- Evaluate and present.

The project draws on the content from the core knowledge that sits across all specialisms in Crop, Woodland and Horticulture.

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

This was the first series for the Employer-Set Project. The project is based around a brief which provides information on a Crop, Woodland and Horticulture 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.

Many candidates related well to the scenario, and many were aware of the context across all areas of the Crop, Woodland and Horticulture pathway. However, some based their work on their own specific pathway to the exclusion of the others, which restricted their responses in places. The better candidates showed insight and awareness and offered their own valuable ideas on the topic across the pathways.

Employer-Set Project tasks overview

Task	Task type	Assessment Objectives covered	Max marks	Task weighting
1	Research	AO1: Plan approach to meeting the brief AO3: Select relevant techniques and resources to meet the brief	6	13%
		AO2b: Apply core skills	6	
2	Report	AO1: Plan approach to meeting the brief AO3: Select relevant techniques and resources to meet the brief	9	33%
		AO2a: Apply core knowledge	9	
		AO2b: Apply core skills	9	
		AO4a: Maths	3	
3	Plan	AO1: Plan approach to meeting the brief AO3: Select relevant techniques and resources to meet the brief	9	27%
		AO2a: Apply core knowledge	6	
		AO2b: Apply core skills	6	
		AO4b: English	3	
4	Peer review	N/A (not marked)	N/A	0%
5	Evaluate and present	AO2a: Apply core knowledge AO2b: Apply core skills	9	27%
		AO5a: Realise project outcome AO5b: Review outcome against brief	12	
		AO4c: Digital	3	

Task 1 Research:

Candidates were asked to conduct research to investigate and improve an estate's biosecurity procedures in line with the key biosecurity principles and plant health legislation.

A varying level of response was observed across the cohort and the correlation between candidate input at this task and quality of work in the later tasks was evident as where research had been carried out in a minimal manner this reflected on the rest of the work.

- A number of candidate's Research Action Plans did not make full use of the template provided and, in many instances, were repetitive and lacking details. Many action plans featured repeated information, such as timings, which clearly had not been given due consideration. However, some excellent structured responses were observed.
- Research notes were often more structured but lacked balance and depth. Many candidates however failed to research the area in depth and produced ideas that lacked substantiation.
- Some research notes featured images that the candidates later used in their presentations, but most research notes were typed notes only.
- The references were often limited, but most provided some valuable source information for the report. Some candidates included these sources in the research notes, while others provided a separate list of references.
- There was an over-reliance on generic websites rather than in depth research. Many candidates relied heavily on the internet as their main research source without using a variety of websites or considering the reliability of the information from those websites which did not show comprehensive research techniques.
- This was an opportunity to bring together all the elements but, in many cases, this was not considered, and many candidates did not research all three areas (Crop, Woodland & Horticulture) or all of the key areas of plant health legislation, regulations, codes of practice, industry guidance, health and safety and biosecurity threats and procedures.

Actions providers can take to support delivery of the assessment for future series:

Providers are advised to work with candidates to improve their skills in relation to research beyond generic internet searches. Further guidance is needed on how to provide research and use reliable sources, verifying the information they have found, rather than accepting the first source as fact, and reference these sources. Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their writing skills including providing justifications where required. Providers are advised to emphasise that the templates provided to generate valuable information for this task.

Task 2 Report:

Candidates were asked to create a report which included: their recommended methods of biosecurity, chosen equipment and materials, locations of biosecurity points, and the cost of upgrading and maintaining the biosecurity procedures, as well as an explanation of how the solution improves biosecurity procedures and justifications.

- A wide range of response was noted. Some candidates submitted excellent well-structured and informative reports but in most cases the structure of the report could be improved, with a lack of analysis and consideration of the wider context provided.
- The structure of the reports varied, but in some cases were informed, well-written and in a few cases background information was used to reinforce their ideas. Some candidates clearly focussed on their area of specialism rather than considering the other parts of the pathway.
- The budgeting exercise offered a range of responses, some based on highly practical ideas and others that were impractical or miscalculated. There was a range of methods of presentation for the costings and financial data. Some candidates presented the data here well, showing the calculations clearly within the report. However, some candidates included the costings within the main text of the report which was sometimes unclear and hard to interpret to understand what decisions had been made and where any mistakes in costings had been made.
- There were some very good maths skills shown by many candidates.

Actions providers can take to support delivery of the assessment for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have had opportunities to develop their report writing skills, including the importance of providing rationales with justifications. Providers should also ensure that candidates are clear on what their reports must include as a minimum, the task outlined the minimum expectation of what needs to be included. Providers are also advised to give more specific instruction to candidates regarding the presentation of the financial data and costings to make their calculations and decisions clear.

Task 3 Plan:

Candidates were asked to create a plan for the implementation of their proposed biosecurity strategy, taking into account a number of considerations as detailed in the task, and provide a supporting statement to justify their plan.

- Candidate interpretation of the Implementation Plan and supporting statement varied. In some cases, candidates combined the two or repeated content from the plan in the supporting statement and did not provide two clear and separate responses.

- In some cases a clear, detailed and logical Implementation Plan was produced which fully took into account the context of the brief and provided specific details of staffing, resources, training and legislative requirements. In most cases, the candidates did not present the work as a specified plan, but more a series of statements which sometimes lacked clarity and cohesion.
- The supporting statements were a missed opportunity in a number of cases and often did not add any additional value to the Implementation Plan, with some supporting statements being very brief and lacking in detail and justification. However, some were well-presented and well thought-out with supported justifications.
- English skills were assessed in Task 3 and variable responses were found from the candidates. At the higher end, the evidence presented had excellent structure and highly appropriate language and terminology. Most candidates showed good structure and moderate use of language and terminology.

Actions providers can take to support delivery of the assessment for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop the skills required to plan a project and the importance of supporting these plans with written explanations. Providers are advised to ensure candidates answer all parts of the task clearly. Providers are encouraged to emphasise the importance of structuring written work to candidates.

Task 4 Peer Review:

Candidates were asked to explain their recommended biosecurity strategy to their tutor and two of their peers to gain feedback. This task was not marked but candidates would be asked to reflect on and evaluate the feedback they received in Task 5.

Though not marked, this provided valuable information and insight. Peer review comments were often perceptive, pointing out areas of weakness and strength, which could then be used by some candidates to influence their evaluation in Task 5 in a positive manner.

Actions providers can take to support delivery of the assessment for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure that these tasks are completed and documented in full as they can provide valuable evaluative and reflective information. Providers are advised to ensure that candidates develop their reviewing and feedback skills prior to the assessment. This will allow them to provide their peers with relevant and specific feedback. Providers should ensure candidates are able to give specific and constructive feedback to their peers.

Task 5 Evaluate and present:

Candidates were asked to prepare and deliver a presentation reflecting on their strategy and how well it has met the project brief. They were also asked to answer questions from their tutor about their project.

This was designed to give the candidates the opportunity to synthesise their reflection, evaluation and digital presentation skills.

- The presentations were a missed opportunity for some candidates. In many cases the presentations were simply taken verbatim from their report and not developed further to demonstrate the evaluation and reflection that this task required.
- The presentation skills shown varied. At the top end they were confident and informed, but many were delivered in perfunctory manner. Some candidates were seen to sit at a computer and read from the screen which demonstrated very limited presentation skills. There were some very confident presentations where the candidates used their slides only as the basis of their talk and were able to expand and contextualise their work.
- A small number of candidates used the annotated site map and other images provided either in the brief or in their research within their presentations. These images were valuable presentation aids and worked well where they were included. However, most candidates did not utilise these resources.
- The recording quality of the presentations was inconsistent, including within the same centre, with some very poor sound quality.
- The answers to questions often gave some useful information where the candidate had been prepared, but others clearly were unsure of the questions and how to respond.
- There was limited use in digital skills within this task, and candidates missed opportunities to utilise the functionality of the software to aid in the delivery of their presentation.

Actions providers can take to support delivery of the assessment for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their presentation skills, including the production of presentations, and presenting information to the appropriate audience. It is important that candidates are made aware of distraction behaviours (pacing, fidgeting, no eye contact) and body language, including standing up to deliver the presentation (where possible). Within this task, a lack of evaluation was noted, and candidates are encouraged to reflect on how fully they have met the requirements of the brief, what challenges were faced throughout the project and how they had overcome them, and any improvements. It should not be seen as a weakness to critically evaluate self-performance, instead it should be made clear to candidates that this evaluation will allow them access to higher marks.

8717 Sub-Component: ESP

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

It is recommended that providers utilise and deliver the sample ESP as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

- All references/sources/links and images used in the Employer-Set Project must be included within Task 1 evidence, so that it is clear that they were obtained during this research task. If any of these things are newly introduced from Task 2 onwards (when internet use is not permitted), this could cause delays, due to potential malpractice investigations.
- Providers are advised to encourage candidates to focus equally on all elements of the task and of the project brief, including all areas of Crop, Woodland and Horticulture.
- The evidence checklist has a list containing each task, with details of each piece of corresponding evidence that makes up the task. Sometimes providers may choose to upload evidence for the whole task as one document, or they may upload each piece of evidence separately. No matter how evidence is uploaded, each individual piece of evidence on the checklist must be accounted for with Y/N (and an issue code, where necessary). If evidence for a task is incorporated into one document, it must be clear which work constitutes each piece of evidence. For example, in Task 3 – Plan, the two pieces of evidence ('implementation plan' and 'supporting statement') must be clearly labelled.
- The 'what must be presented for marking' section of each task outlines the minimum expectations of evidence that must be submitted for marking. As above, providers must detail where evidence has not been submitted.
- The only evidence considered for the marking of an individual task is what is listed within the 'what must be produced for marking' section within the assessment materials. Evidence for any other task, regardless of the knowledge or skills it may demonstrate, will not be considered when marking that task.
- Providers are advised that individual tasks are marked in isolation and that each task has been weighted in relation to the assessment objectives covered. This information is detailed in the qualification Specification. As all tasks are marked separately, where evidence produced by a candidate is contained in another task, that evidence will not be considered.
- Providers should ensure files and documents are named according to the naming conventions in the Provider Guidance, to ensure consistency and ease of access. This also includes the use of assessment component headers.
- Providers are strongly encouraged to use evidence headers for each task, to allow for ease of identification of candidate evidence and efficiency in marking. All information

within the task headers should be completed. Candidate evidence should be included within the header document and not as a separate file.

- Providers are advised to ensure the tutor and candidate both sign and date declarations prior to uploading evidence.
- Providers should request that candidates include a word count for all written reports and tasks where applicable.
- Providers should ensure that candidates are filmed clearly for Task 5 and that the video and audio quality is sufficient to support marking. Video conferencing (eg MS Teams / Zoom) may be used to record the presentation (video and audio), but videos must show the full length of the learner standing next to the presentation on a screen (or similar). Providers must ensure that this evidence can be easily matched to the correct candidate and task, is clearly shot, well-lit and shows the areas of particular interest in sufficient detail and clarity for assessment.

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 Agriculture, Environmental and Animal Care qualifications and training courses | City & Guilds \(cityandguilds.com\)](https://www.cityandguilds.com/qualifications/t-levels/qualifications-and-training-courses)

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 \(cityandguilds.com\)](https://www.cityandguilds.com/qualifications/t-levels/assessment-process-guide)

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 \(cityandguilds.com\)](https://www.cityandguilds.com/qualifications/t-levels/events-and-webinars)

Grade boundaries

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

Grade	Mark range
A*	73-90
A	64-72
B	55-63
C	47-54
D	39-46
E	31-38
Unclassified (U)	0-30

8717-31 Crop, Woodland and Horticulture Core

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Agriculture, Land Management and Production: Crop, Woodland and Horticulture core is made up of the below sub-components (and weightings).

- Exam (60%)
- Employer-Set Project (40%)

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*	216-240	144-160	360-400
A	192-215	128-143	320-359
B	168-191	112-127	280-319
C	144-167	96-111	240-279
D	120-143	80-95	200-239
E	96-119	64-79	160-199
Unclassified (U)	0-95	0-63	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: technical.quality@cityandguilds.com

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

Web chat available [here](#).

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

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

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

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