

T Level Technical Qualification in Agriculture, Land Management and Production: Livestock

8717-33 Core Report (Summer 2024)

Contents

Foreword	2
Introduction	3
8717-030 Paper 1	4
8717-033 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
8717-037 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project	15
8717 Sub-Component: ESP	22
Best practice and guidance to providers on potential areas for improving performance in assessment.....	22
Support materials	24
Grade boundaries.....	25
8717-033 Livestock Core	26
UMS grade boundaries.....	26

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: Livestock. 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/maintenance 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: Livestock **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.

8717-033 Paper 2

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Livestock core content:

- Health and safety
- Sustainability
- Biosecurity
- Supply chain
- Anatomy and physiology
- Diseases, disorders and health plans
- Nutrition
- Medicine
- Technology and equipment
- Data and information

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 **14** 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. The paper featured a balanced mix of topics and question types, allowing both practical and academic candidates to effectively apply their knowledge and understanding.

This was the first series for this exam and the cohort achieved a range of marks. Candidates generally performed well in AO1a and AO1b questions, particularly where they could apply their current practical experience to help demonstrate knowledge and understanding. However, some candidates only gave partial responses as they only gave one example when multiple examples were required. Other candidates provided a list of responses that exceeded the required number; candidates should be aware that only their first responses (up to the number specified in the question) are accepted. Providers should advise candidates to only give the required number of responses.

For AO2 questions, whilst most candidates were able to apply their understanding to the context of the scenarios, the number of marks achieved varied across the cohort. This was largely because responses were often given as statements with some evidence of basic explanations. Candidates that achieved the higher marks were able to demonstrate greater depth of understanding by providing full, developed explanations.

Areas of strength include:

- Hazards, risks and control measures associated with working in the livestock industry (Q1, AO1a). This question was well answered with candidates providing a wide range of risks.
- Procedures and plans for emergency situations in the livestock sector (Q2, AO1a). Candidates were able to draw on their knowledge of a practical situation. Many responses included ensuring the safety of staff and animals and contacting the emergency services.
- Principles of stock management in the livestock production industries – technologies (Q4, AO1a). Candidates were able to provide a diverse range of technologies used within the sector, including tagging and robotics.
- Waste management principles in the livestock sector – consequences of incorrectly managing slurry (Q6, AO1b). This question was well answered by candidates, with many explaining the environmental impact of slurry entering a water course.

Areas of weakness include:

- Anatomy and physiology systems of livestock – respiratory system (Q5a/b, AO1b). Many candidates were unable to recognise the structures listed as being parts of the respiratory system. Some responses would indicate that candidates considered them to be part of the digestive system. When candidates were able to link each structure to the respiratory system, most were unsuccessful in describing how features support their function.
- Principles of safe manual handling (Q8, AO1b). Some responses incorrectly described examples of the manual handling of livestock and how this could be undertaken safely. Other candidates missed possible marks as they only gave statements and did not provide extended explanations.

- How technology and equipment are used effectively in supporting the management of livestock at different stages of production – factors that affect the suitability of eggs for hatching (Q11, AO2). Most candidates were unaware of the conditions required for successful hatching of eggs so were unable to explain the factors that may have contributed to the low hatching rates. Responses often related to the fertility of the flock, rather than the eggs and the incubation requirements.
- Veterinary medicine and health supplements and their uses in supporting livestock during all stages of production – implications of treatment (Q13, AO2). In this scenario, a dairy cow with mastitis is treated with intra-mammary infusion of antibiotics used for drying off cows. Candidates incorrectly considered that this treatment would cause the cow to cease milk production so it would no longer need to be milked.
- Waste management principles in the livestock sector – fallen stock (Q14, AO2). Candidates often gave methods to prevent future fallen stock rather than explaining how to manage the current situation, as required in the question.

Responses to extended questions (ERQs)

Generally, the ERQs were those which candidates found the most difficult across the paper. Most candidates were able to meet the Band 1 or Band 2 criteria but were unable to demonstrate greater depth of understanding. Responses from lower performing candidates lacked structure and evidence of planning and often included multiple repetitions of the same point. Higher performing candidates were able to analyse the scenarios in detail and provide developed explanations which were linked to justified actions. Being able to link these elements enabled candidates to progress to the higher bands.

In question 15, candidates were required to analyse the potential impact of the scenario on the market's other meat suppliers and justify actions that the suppliers can take to minimise the impact.

- Most candidates were able to provide analysis for a limited range of impacts. Whilst many correctly stated that the other suppliers would be negatively impacted with a reduction in customers and therefore profits, these points often lacked further development. Candidates were unable to link their initial responses to justify the actions required to minimise the impacts.
- Most candidates did not consider how the ethical procedures of livestock production could impact on the supply chain and the choices a customer makes. This meant they missed the opportunity to discuss the importance of high welfare standards as a marketing tool to attract customers (ie for many customers it is the reason why they shop at farmers' markets as opposed to high street supermarkets). The importance of accreditation and assurance schemes was often not considered.

Question 16 required candidates to analyse how the introduction of imported pigs can influence biosecurity and justify actions to maintain high level biosecurity.

- Most candidates were able to provide analysis and justifications, however responses were generally limited and lacked structured links. Candidates correctly talked about the imported pigs bringing disease onto the farm and considered quarantine/isolation of new stock from existing stock. However, candidates often missed the opportunity to consider the influence of poor biosecurity on the spread of disease from the existing livestock to the imported livestock.
- Candidates were able to describe a limited range of biosecurity measures, but these were often repetitive. Some responses focussed solely on PPE but did not consider changing or disposing of PPE before coming into contact with the existing livestock. Other responses covered foot dips and wheel washers but did not consider reducing footfall or vehicle movements on the farm.

Question 17 required candidates to analyse the business impact of the scenario and to justify the steps the farmer could take to meet the nutritional requirements from mating to lambing.

- Many candidates focussed on one part of this ERQ, often only providing responses to either the analysis or to the justification element of the stem. This meant that candidates could not progress into the higher bands. Candidates must answer both parts of the stem in order to consistently demonstrate use of analysis and justifications in relation to the specific context.
- Some candidates considered that the ewes may not have the required nutrition for the production of young and milk for lactation. However, scanning of pregnant ewes and feeding accordingly was generally not considered. There was also limited consideration of pregnancy toxæmia, associated with poor nutrition and multiple births.

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

- When reading through a question, candidates should be encouraged to look at the marks available and take this into account when providing their response.
- Many candidates repeated information from the question in the first part of their response. This would have taken time for the candidate to write, yet does not gain any additional marks, so providers should encourage candidates to focus on responding to the question directly.
- Candidates would benefit from reading the question fully to understand the point of view from which the question is being asked. For example, if the question is 'state the impact on the farmer', the answer should relate directly to the farmer and not the organisation.
- For questions that ask for multiple answers, candidates should be aware that only the specified number of answers will be marked. For example, if the question asks for three points, only the first three answers will be marked.
- Candidates would benefit from greater understanding of different command verbs and what they require. For example, questions beginning with 'state' require a list of answers, and those starting with 'explain' require a higher-level response than 'describe'. To achieve full marks in 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 fully read and understand the questions before answering to ensure they provide the correct number of responses and avoid repetition.
- Performance in ERQs could be significantly improved by planning the answer to ensure all areas of the scenario are addressed. It is important that candidates show analysis, actions and justification to move to the higher bands.
- Providers are encouraged to use the sample assessment material in order to prepare the candidates for the exam. Providers are also encouraged to devise their own targeted exam revision for both short answer questions and ERQs and offer support and guidance on various answer techniques.

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 (8717-033)
A*	128 – 160	63 – 80	64 – 80
A	111 – 127	55 – 62	56 – 63
B	94 – 1110	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

8717-037 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project

The Employer-Set Project (ESP) assessment is a project consisting 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 five tasks which all relate to the same Employer-Set Project brief:

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

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

- **AO1** Plan approach to meet the brief
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and skills to contexts
- **AO3** Select techniques and resources to meet brief
- **AO4** Use maths, English and digital skills
- **AO5** Release project outcome and evaluate.

The ESP requires candidates draw on their core knowledge and skills. They must also independently select the correct processes and approaches to provide a solution, and the evidence specified in the project brief. All tasks are completed under supervised/controlled conditions.

This was the first series for the Employer-Set Project. The project was based upon the introduction of new livestock enterprises to a farm that was previously arable.

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:

The responses to this task varied across the cohort. There was a direct correlation between the level of detail/depth of research and candidate performance in later tasks. It was common for the lower scoring candidates to produce limited amounts of research which resulted in a lack of core knowledge and understanding for the later tasks.

- Use of the Research Action Plan template was very limited amongst many candidates. These plans were often repetitive and typically provided lists of different species and generic common themes. This meant that candidates' action planning lacked detail to demonstrate understanding of what research was required. Very few were able to use the task breakdown to ensure they would go on to research the appropriate subject matter. Some candidates referred to 'Google' in the planned resources/sources of information column, demonstrating a lack of knowledge of relevant sources of information such as ADHB or DEFRA. Whilst there was some evidence of excellent structure in this part of Task 1, most candidates were unable to calculate their research time accurately and included timings that exceeded the allocated time given for the individual task.
- Candidates' research notes typically provided more structure but often lacked depth. Candidates tended to focus their research on one of the livestock species and provide superficial information about the other two species.
- Research notes were often typed up and written as if this was a report. This meant that the very same wording was commonly repeated in the Task 2 Report.
- A small number of candidates took the opportunity to add images from the internet to their research notes so that they could be included in their Task 5 presentation.
- References were often limited but candidates were able to source some good pieces of information in their research notes. Where references were included, they were often embedded into the research notes themselves with only some producing a separate list of references.

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

Providers are advised to work with candidates to improve their research skills so that they go beyond generic internet searches. Further guidance is needed on using reliable sources and verifying the information they have found, rather than accepting the first source as fact. Following on from this, candidates should be taught to develop their referencing skills. Providers should also ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their writing skills to include justifications where required. Candidates should be advised about the importance of using the Research Action Plan template effectively.

Providers should consider developing candidates' note-taking skills. Some candidates wrote a report instead of making notes. Although higher performing candidates were able to produce good quality research notes, some of the lower performing candidates did not produce clear or useful notes, which then affected their performance in future tasks.

Internet access is allowed for Task 1, but not for other tasks. If a candidate wishes to find images for use in their Task 5 presentation, these images should be included in their research notes.

Task 2 Report:

Candidates were required to produce a report which included an outline of their research findings, justifications into the two recommended livestock enterprises, and a number of considerations for the next three years.

- Candidates provided a wide range of responses to this task. There was some evidence of excellent structure and highly informative reports, but in most cases the structure was inconsistent, with a lack of analysis and consideration to the relevant context of Brimham Farm.
- It was common for candidates to focus their report on the livestock species familiar to them, rather than provide the depth required for all three livestock species. This had a negative impact on the structure of the report, with the minority of candidates being able to produce informed and well-written reports.
- The costing element of this task was generally overlooked, and most candidates included superficial reference to costings throughout the report. Calculations were often omitted making it hard to interpret or understand the decisions that had been made and where miscalculations had been made. Where costings were included, some candidates were able to present this data well in a structured format, but this was typically only for the first year rather than for the three-year project.
- The mathematical skills shown overall were variable, but attempts were made in most cases.

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

Candidates should be given the opportunity to develop their report writing skills and guidance should be given on how to structure their report. The task outlined the minimum expectation of what needs to be included, and candidates should ensure that they are able to meet all of these requirements.

Providers are also advised to support candidates with the presentation of costs and financial data as a whole. This will ensure that both their calculations and any decisions made based on these calculations are clear.

Task 3 Plan:

Candidates were required to produce an implementation plan for Brimham Farm that detailed the introduction of two chosen livestock enterprises for the next three years. Candidates were required to take into account a number of considerations, as detailed in the task, and provide a supporting statement to justify their plan.

- There was a wide variation in how the candidates interpreted the implementation plan and supporting statement. Some candidates were able to clearly structure their plan for each enterprise for the next three years, however in most cases, candidates repeated information from the Task 2 Report and made no clear attempt to implement the plan. It was also common for candidates to focus solely on one year, rather than the full three years as detailed in the task.
- Some candidates were able to provide a clear and justified supporting statement. However, in most cases, the supporting statement lacked detail and justifications and did not add any additional value to the implementation plan.
- English skills were assessed in this task and most candidates were able to demonstrate good evidence of these skills.

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

Providers should ensure that candidates develop the skills required to plan a project and to support these plans with written justifications. Candidates should focus on meeting all of the different requirements of the task; for example, if they were required to produce an implementation plan for the two chosen enterprises, candidates should ensure that they produce a separate plan for each of the enterprises.

Providers are advised to encourage candidates to use the full word count (typically 1000 words) for their supporting statement. This will enable candidates to demonstrate their full understanding and provide a high level of justification in order to achieve the higher bands.

Providers should also encourage candidates to answer both parts of the task (implementation plan and supporting statement) and to structure their work so that both parts are clearly titled.

In order to achieve the higher marks for English skills, providers should encourage candidates to write in full sentences.

Task 4 Peer Review:

Candidates were asked to explain their two chosen livestock enterprises to the farm manager and two of their peers to gain feedback. This task was not marked but candidates were asked to reflect on and evaluate the feedback they received in Task 5.

Although this task was not marked, it did provide valuable insight and information into the explanations and justifications. The feedback provided by their peers was not always consistent and Peer Review Forms sometimes lacked detail. However, in most cases, the peers were able to provide key strengths and weaknesses, which then could be used by candidates in Task 5.

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

Providers are advised to ensure that this task is completed and documented in full as it can provide valuable informative, evaluative and reflective information regarding the candidates. It is advised that providers work with the peer reviewers to ensure they know what is expected from them. This will ensure that peer reviewers provide the evaluative feedback required to aid candidates in Task 5. Providing support with reviewing and feedback skills prior to the assessment would strongly benefit all candidates.

Task 5 Evaluate and present:

Candidates were asked to prepare and deliver a presentation that reflected on their two chosen livestock enterprises and how these met the requirements of the project. They were also required to answer questions from their tutor about their project.

This task was designed to give candidates the opportunity to reflect, evaluate and demonstrate their digital presentation skills.

- When giving their presentation, some candidates read from their Task 2 Report or Task 3 Implementation Plan. As a result, these candidates were not able to develop the evaluation and reflection skills that this task required.
- Overall, candidates demonstrated great confidence and enthusiasm during their presentations. The format of the presentation varied across the cohort. Some candidates were able to present to the room, using their slides as the basis of their talk, and others were able to expand on their slides to contextualise their rationales. However, most candidates were unable to demonstrate these presentation skills as they sat at a computer and read directly from the screen.
- The recording of the presentation was inconsistent both in terms of sound quality and visibility. It was common for the recordings to only show the ceiling or part of the candidate.
- Answers to the tutor's questions often provided good further reflection but candidates either did not know how to respond or provided very superficial responses.
- There was very limited evidence of digital skills within this task. Candidates typically missed the opportunity to utilise the functionality of software to aid the delivery of their presentation. Candidates would often provide large paragraphs of text on their slides which made it difficult for the audience to read and follow.

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

Providers are advised to develop candidates' presentation skills. This should include the production of presentation slides as well as how to present information to the appropriate audience. Candidates should also be guided on how to deliver presentations with positive body language and should be encouraged to stand (where possible).

Providers must ensure that the video recordings show the candidate in full view, delivering their presentation to the audience so that presentation skills can be adequately assessed. Providers should follow the City & Guilds' guidance documents provided to ensure recordings are of a high quality.

Providers are advised to develop candidates' evaluative skills so that they understand that critical self-evaluation is not a weakness. Candidates are required to develop their strengths and weaknesses to evaluate their project as a whole.

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 details all the evidence required for each task. 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 made clear on this checklist which work constitutes each piece of evidence. For example, in the Task 3 Plan, the two pieces of evidence (implementation plan and supporting statement) must be clearly labelled.
- Each task contains a section entitled 'what must be presented for marking'. This section outlines the minimum expectations of evidence that must be submitted for marking. As above, providers must detail on the evidence checklist 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 that both the tutor and candidate 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*	74 – 90
A	65 – 73
B	56 – 64
C	47 – 55
D	38 – 46
E	30 – 37
Unclassified (U)	0 – 29

8717-033 Livestock Core

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Agriculture, Land Management and Production: Livestock 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