

**T Level Technical Qualification in  
Agriculture, Land Management and  
Production: Land-based  
Engineering**

**8717-32 Core Report (Summer 2024)**

# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Foreword .....</b>  | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>Introduction.....</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>8717-030 Paper 1 .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>8717-032 Paper 2 .....</b>  | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>8717 Sub-Component: Exam .....</b>  | <b>11</b> |
| Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving<br>performance in assessment..... | 11        |
| Support materials.....   | 12        |
| Grade boundaries .....   | 13        |
| <b>8717-036 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project .....</b>  | <b>14</b> |
| <b>8717 Sub-Component: ESP .....</b>   | <b>20</b> |
| Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving<br>performance in assessment..... | 20        |
| Support materials.....   | 22        |
| Grade boundaries .....   | 23        |
| <b>8717-032 Land-based Engineering Core.....</b>   | <b>24</b> |
| UMS grade boundaries .....   | 24        |

# Foreword

## Summer 2024 Results

The Technical Qualification is made up of two components (the core and the Occupational Specialism), both of which need to be successfully achieved to attain the T Level Technical Qualification in Agriculture Land Management and Production: Land-based Engineering. 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 Land-based Engineering **Core** assessments.

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

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

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

# 8717-030 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.



## 8717-032 Paper 2

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Land-based Engineering core content:

- Health and safety
- Sustainability
- Biosecurity
- Supply chain
- Types of land-based equipment and machinery
- Operating principles of integrated and stand-alone systems and components
- Land-based equipment and machinery maintenance
- Repair land-based equipment and machinery

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Land-based Engineering 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 **14** short answer and medium answer questions.

**Section B** is made up of **36** 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
- **AO3a** Analyse information and issues
- **AO3b** Evaluate information and issues

This was the first year of this examination being sat. 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.

The paper contained a range of questions of various levels of difficulty and was closely aligned with the sample paper. Most candidates attempted all questions with very few omissions, which was positive to see.

Overall, candidates within the cohort were able to demonstrate knowledge of the core subject content, often achieving marks for recalling knowledge when asked to name or state information (AO1a). Candidates did find accessing marks more of a challenge when they were required to demonstrate understanding, application, analysis and justification (AO1b, AO2, AO3a and AO3b). Candidates often achieved marks by demonstrating knowledge but struggled to show any further depth of understanding of the subject area. Candidates did attempt to answer questions which used technical terminology; however, responses tended to be out of context, with answers demonstrating a lack of understanding of these terms. This inconsistency impacted candidates' ability to access marks in technical questions.

Areas of strength include:

- Recall of information around health and safety, risk control and organisational responsibilities (Q1-4, AO1a). These types of questions allowed candidates across all bands to access marks.
- The importance of a work site induction (Q7, AO1b). Although candidates accessed marks here, there was a lack of expansion on the initial point which prevented full marks from being awarded to some.
- Use of the Ohm's law formula in calculating current flow in an electrical circuit (Q10b, AO2). Candidates were able to apply the formula, showing good application of mathematical skills.
- Factors influencing the stock level of spare parts in a dealership (Q12, AO2). Most candidates were able to identify and explain the impact of these factors; however, they did not relate this back to dealer standards, which was required for further expansion.
- The use of a dynamometer in diagnosis and repair (Q13, AO2). Candidates explained one (diagnosis or repair) better than the other, which was reflected in marks achieved.

Areas of weakness include:

- The responsibilities of employers when managing health and safety in the workplace (Q5, AO1b). The majority of candidates stated that supplying PPE fell under the legislation, but this is not the case and therefore scoring was low.
- The operating principle of a relay (Q8, AO1b). There was a lack of depth of understanding in this question. Although some candidates did achieve full marks, most achieved partial or no marks.
- Knowledge of the formula used to calculate the current flowing in the circuit (Q10a, AO1b). Despite being able to apply the formula in question 10b, many candidates did not state the correct formula.
- The correct procedure for diagnosing a fault on trailer brakes activated by a cable (Q14, AO2). Responses lacked a depth of detail, and logical processes of testing were rarely followed. The use of terminology was evidence of some depth of knowledge, but this was not supported with applied understanding when this was put into the testing context. Many candidates moved on to describing the repair process

rather than focusing on the testing process as the question required. Providers are encouraged to focus on the reasoning for tests when preparing candidates for this type of question.

Candidates seemed to perform better in AO1a and AO1b questions, as this type of question asked candidates to 'identify', 'name' or 'state' responses rather than 'explain'. Candidates found adding an extended response to 'explain' questions a challenge and this resulted in low scoring across the paper when answering AO2 questions.

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

Overall, the responses to the three extended response questions (ERQs) in Section B were weak. Most responses fell within Band 1, and there were no answers in Bands 3 or 4. Candidates were able to discuss testing strategies and apply a logical approach to the process but failed to justify why these tests were being used and only a few gave an analysis of component operating principles.

Responses did not contain the level of breadth and depth of understanding in any of the three areas that were tested (AO2, AO3a and AO3b). Responses tended to be rather brief in comparison with the question text and did not reach the level of demand expected from the command verbs within the question text ('analyse' and 'justify'). For example, in question 17, when candidates were asked to analyse and justify actions and controls for the procedure of recovery, recycling, and recharging an air conditioning system, many candidates described the basic operation of an air conditioning system rather than how their actions would reduce the risk of refrigerant being released into the atmosphere.

Performance in the ERQs could be enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and an analysis of different scenarios, such as the logical diagnosis of different systems.

## 8717 Sub-Component: Exam

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

- Providers should support candidates in developing their skills in writing responses to questions that ask for demonstrating understanding, application of knowledge, analysis and evaluation.
- Providers are advised to continue supporting their candidates' development with their responses to the 'explain' types of questions, helping to instil a solid core subject knowledge, enabling candidates to express their subject knowledge and understanding. Providers must focus on developing candidates' question response structure with a focus on not only a basic explanation but the extended explanation to access greater marks across these types of questions. In this development, providers need to focus on the depth and detail required, to fully answer questions. This development and tuition in this area will be a key element, enabling candidates to provide detailed and in-depth responses to the various question types within the paper.
- 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.
- ERQ performance could be further enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations, analysis (including secondary implications where appropriate) and justification for any processes or (eg in Paper 2) diagnostic tests that are selected in line with the different scenarios and relating it back to the context. To score in the higher bands candidates need 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 or alternatively utilising a scribe. Candidates should be reminded of the need to ensure they fully read and understand all questions before responding.
- These areas should be further developed, with providers devising their own targeted exam revision for both short answer questions and ERQ questions, as well as offering support and guidance on various answer/response techniques. Providers should be aware of using the sample and past series questions on the City & Guilds webpages to help and guide both Provider delivery staff and candidates.

## 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<br>(8717-030) | Paper 2<br>(8717-032) |
| A*               | 129 – 160  | 64 – 80               | 64 – 80               |
| A                | 111 – 128  | 55 – 63               | 56 – 63               |
| B                | 93 – 110   | 46 – 54               | 47 – 55               |
| C                | 76 – 92    | 38 – 45               | 38 – 46               |
| D                | 59 – 75    | 30 – 37               | 29 – 37               |
| E                | 42 – 58    | 22 – 29               | 20 – 28               |
| Unclassified (U) | 0 – 41     | 0 – 21                | 0 – 19                |

## 8717-036 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project

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

The 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 Employer-Set Project allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Land-based Engineering Core element.

The ESP assesses across assessment objectives that will allow for the appropriate differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:

- **AO1** 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 Land-based Engineering 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.

Overall, there was a range of performances, with some low and high-scoring candidates. However, the majority achieved 50% of possible marks and below. Plans were generally logical, well-written and made good use of technical terminology; research and presentations were more variable.

## Employer-Set Project tasks overview

| Task | Task type            | Assessment Objectives covered  | Max marks | Task weighting |
|------|----------------------|--|-----------|----------------|
| 1    | Research             | AO1: Plan approach to meeting the brief<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>AO2b: Apply core skills  | 9         | 27%            |
|      |                      | AO5a: Realise project outcome<br>AO5b: Review outcome against brief  | 12        |                |
|      |                      | AO4c: Digital  | 3         |                |



## **Task 1: Research**

### **Action plan**

Evidence of planning was often limited. While some good planning was evident, many candidates did not fully utilise the form or present in the correct format. Candidates often did not consider the assignment brief in full at this stage.

The action plans often highlighted that candidates did not note the most appropriate source of information or what information they were planning to research, and in many cases only stated the search engine they planned to use.

### **Research notes**

Most candidates within the cohort were able to demonstrate the ability to research the service requirements of a range of machines. This was not always carried out accurately, and some candidates researched petrol-powered utility vehicles when the brief had clearly stated a diesel utility vehicle. Other machines were generally researched more accurately.

Many candidates researched the parts required to carry out the services, although few accurately researched the costs of the parts required. Higher performing candidates went on to include the manufacturer's part numbers for the required parts.

Sources of information relating to the cost and supply of parts presented a challenge to many candidates, and it was apparent they were not looking in the correct places for the information. Candidates often gathered their research from obscure or foreign sources.

Research of the national sprayer testing scheme was limited, with candidates often showing little or no evidence of this throughout the project. In addition, lower-performing candidates had often not researched relevant legislation or specialist tool requirements.

Candidates researched the time required to carry out the service. Higher performing candidates went on to associate a labour cost to the service.

Research was generally presented in an essay format by the candidates, with a small explanation of each area researched. It should be noted that candidates are allowed to present their research in any relevant format; however, the higher performing candidates' research was often presented in note form, allowing them time to carry out further, more in-depth research.

### **Task 1: Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series**

Candidates need to be able to develop more specific action plans for their research. This will help them ensure they cover all the requirements of the brief. Missing an element of research in Task 1 will often have implications in the following tasks.

Providers should be encouraged to develop candidates' note-taking skills. Many of the candidates made notes in an essay format instead of recording key facts.

Providers should try to ensure candidates are aware of relevant places to source information about machines and parts, to aid candidates in making their research more accurate and efficient. Candidates should be aware of major brands in the UK to ensure their research is appropriate.

## **Task 2: Report**

All candidates produced a written report outlining their research. Reports were generally written to a good standard. They did, however, highlight the importance of the research element of the assignment, as candidates with incomplete research often produced limited responses in this task.

Many of the lower performing candidates failed to refer to the cost implications of carrying out the services, which heavily impacted their marks in AO4a. Candidates often made reference to the time required to carry out the services, although this was often not linked to the cost.

Candidates gave some justification for the service actions they would be carrying out, although only the higher performing candidates correctly linked the machine's age and hours to their service requirements. Many candidates failed to recognise that the machine's service requirements would differ based on its age and hours, and so they suggested the same service activities for both the first and second years of the plan.

Candidates' mathematical skills were assessed in this task. The higher performing candidates costed the service activities, considering factors such as parts and labour costs, whereas the lower performing candidates did not include calculation of costs or links to the financial implications of the service activities.

## **Task 2: Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series**

Candidates often struggled to report the financial considerations of their research in a logical format. Providers should allow candidates to review similar industry documentation, giving candidates an understanding of how to present information in a professional manner.

## **Task 3: Plan**

The higher performing candidates produced supporting statements that contained good levels of justification and reasoning as to why their plan would be suitable. Most statements were limited, however, and contained limited justification and reasoning with limited links to the task brief. Candidates often did not consider the seasonal usage of the machines, recommending annual services to take place in peak season or multiple services be carried out to a machine that would not have been used since its previous service.

Lower performing candidates often demonstrated a limited understanding of the machine service requirements in their plans. It was not uncommon for candidates to confuse operator checks with service requirements. Multiple candidates recommended sending an engineer out daily to carry out pre-use checks, which would normally be carried out by the operator.

Candidates often did not link their plans to the age or hours of the machine and instead suggested a generic service to be carried out on an annual basis. Lower performing candidates showed a little understanding of machine warranties, often suggesting that as the machine was under warranty it would be serviced free of charge. Misconceptions were also evident when describing what would be covered by a machine warranty.

### **Task 3: Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series**

Providers should ensure candidates are practiced in writing plans in a range of formats. Candidates should be able to select a clear and relevant format for the task.

Candidates need to develop their ability to justify their proposals. This will help to ensure a strong supporting statement.

### **Task 4: Peer Review**

Peer feedback was not always an accurate reflection of the work that was presented. The feedback often suggested that candidates had completed the tasks to a high standard, which then limited the candidate's ability to evaluate and discuss in the final task.

### **Task 4: Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series**

Candidates should develop their reviewing and feedback skills prior to the assessment. Providers should ensure candidates are able to give accurate, specific and constructive feedback to their peers to ensure it is a true reflection of the work submitted.

### **Task 5: Presentation**

Candidates often demonstrated an awareness of the elements they had missed, with numerous candidates mentioning missing or inaccurate costings.

In general, candidates often showed a limited ability to reflect in their presentation on the plan they had produced. Often the peer feedback had not been specific enough and this therefore did not give the candidates an accurate evaluation of the plan they had produced.

Presentations were often filmed from a low angle with a limited view of their slides. This filming angle resulted in the candidates looking down into the camera as opposed to looking up and talking to the room.

AO4c assesses the candidates' digital skills. The candidates that performed best in this AO produced slides that contained animation, colour and relevant pictures. The lower performing candidates' slides contained black and white slides with no colour or animation. The marks achieved in AO4c were often not consistent with those seen in other AOs.

### **Task 5: Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series**

Providers should develop candidates' evaluative skills and ability to reflect critically on their plans.

Providers should ensure candidates are filmed clearly, with a full view of the learner and their presentation slides.

Candidates should be given the opportunity to practise their presentation and digital skills prior to the start of the assessment window.

## 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.
- 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/employer-set-project-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*               | 75 – 90    |
| A                | 66 – 74    |
| B                | 57 – 65    |
| C                | 48 – 56    |
| D                | 39 – 47    |
| E                | 30 – 38    |
| Unclassified (U) | 0 – 29     |



## 8717-032 Land-based Engineering Core

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Agriculture, Land Management and Production: Land-based Engineering 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: [technicals.quality@cityandguilds.com](mailto:technicals.quality@cityandguilds.com)

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

Web chat available [here](#).

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

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

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

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