

Quality Assurance Guide for Centres

Technical Qualifications and the
Extended Project Qualification (EPQ)

Document revision history

Please note – this document replaces two separate Marking and Moderation Guides for Technical Qualifications and the Extended Project Qualification (EPQ).

Version 1.0, Publication, November 2022

Version 2.0, Publication, November 2023

Version 3.0, Publication, August 2024

Version 3.1, Publication, October 2024

Contents

Introduction	4
Section A: Administration	7
1. Support and guidance	8
2. Submissions overview	12
Section B: Marking, moderation and quality assurance	13
3. Evidence collection	14
4. Synoptic visits	19
5. Other centre activities	22
6. Marking	24
7. Standardisation	27
8. Quality assurance	29
Section C: Requirements for uploading evidence	34
9. Requirements for uploading evidence	35
Section D: Results and post-results	39
10. Awarding	40
11. Results and post-results services	41
Section E: Quality Assurance criteria and sanctions	43
12. Quality Assurance criteria	44
Appendix 1	48
Appendix 2	50
Appendix 3	54

Introduction



Introduction

What is this document?

This document is a quality assurance guide for centres delivering City & Guilds Technical Qualifications and the Extended Project Qualification (EPQ). It provides administrative information, guidance, and best practice.

Please note – this document replaces two separate Marking and Moderation Guides for Technical Qualifications and the Extended Project Qualification (EPQ)

The document covers the following sections:

- **Section A**

Administration

This section of the document provides information for centres on the administrative requirements for Technical Qualifications and EPQ, including key deadlines, systems, forms and other supporting information.

- **Section B**

Marking, moderation and quality assurance

This section provides guidance on marking Technical Qualifications & EPQ for tutors/markers and information about the moderation and quality assurance process.

- **Section C**

Requirements for uploading evidence

This section provides guidance and best practice to support the upload of evidence to the Moderation Portal.

- **Section D**

Results and post-results

This section provides information on awarding, release of results and post-result services available to centres.

- **Section E**

Quality Assurance criteria and sanctions

This section provides information on the quality assurance criteria centres must adhere to and are measured against for Technical Qualifications and EPQ. It also provides information on the possible sanctions City & Guilds may issue to address poor practice or non-compliance.

How Technical Qualifications work

There are several assessment components, which must be successfully completed to achieve City & Guilds Technical Qualifications. Qualification Handbooks, available on the relevant qualification page of our website, detail the specific assessment components for each Technical Qualification, although they will be comprised of some or all of the following:

Mandatory assessments	<p>This includes the Theory Exam and the Synoptic Assignment, both of which contribute to the overall qualification grade.</p> <p>Some qualifications have additional mandatory units (which are centre-assessed components) that do not contribute to the overall grade but must be completed to achieve the qualification.</p>
Optional assessments	<p>Some qualifications have a requirement for a minimum number of optional units (which are centre-assessed components) to be completed. These do not contribute to the overall grade but must be completed to achieve the qualification.</p> <p>Centres can select which of these units they wish their candidates to undertake, provided they meet the minimum requirements set out in the rules of combination.</p>
Employer involvement	<p>Key Stage 5 Technical Qualifications have an Employer Involvement requirement.</p> <p>This does not contribute to the overall grade but must be completed to achieve the qualification.</p>

How the Level 3 Extended Project Qualifications works


The Level 3 Extended Project is a free-standing qualification that can be taken alongside other Level 3 studies.

It allows learners to create an extended piece of work that complements their studies in City & Guilds Technical qualifications, A Levels, NVQs and apprenticeships. Alternatively, the Extended Project qualification may explore an area of personal interest or activity outside the main programme of study.

The qualification is comprised of one assessment (Extended Project) which is externally moderated by City & Guilds.

Section A: Administration

This section of the document provides information for centres on the administrative requirements for Technical Qualifications and EPQ, including key deadlines, systems, forms and other supporting information



I. Support and guidance

This section deals with the support and guidance resources available for centres delivering City & Guilds Technical Qualifications and EPQ.

I.1. Technical Qualifications checklist

The Technicals Checklist for Delivery is available on the Technicals Resource Hub under the 'Teaching and Learning Resources' menu. It provides information specific to key dates, deadlines and activity periods for each academic year.

The key dates for the EPQ are published on the qualification page here.

I.2. Booking assessments

Centres who intend registered candidates to undertake assessments within an academic year must ensure that they book them onto the relevant assessments in that same year.

Candidates must be booked for assessments using Walled Garden, our secure online administration system.

Any candidates who undertake assessments without being booked, risk delay or even disqualification of results.

All bookings must be completed by the date specified in the Technicals Checklist for Delivery. Bookings made after the deadline will be subject to additional fees which are set out in the City & Guilds and ILM UK Centre Charges List published on the Centre Document Library under the 'Applications for Centres' menu.

I.3 Centre forms

These are the specific Technical Qualification forms that centres must use during the marking and quality assurance process.

Form	Description	Location	Ratio
Practical Observation (PO) forms	Used by tutors/markers to record candidate evidence of performance during practical observations.	Relevant qualification page of the website, under 'Documents' tab.	One per candidate, per synoptic assessment. (Unless otherwise specified)
Candidate Record Form (CRF)	Used by tutors/markers to capture the justification for marks awarded against each Assessment Objective (AO).	Relevant qualification page of the website, under 'Documents' tab.	One per candidate, per synoptic assessment.
Declaration of Authenticity	Form signed by the candidate and the centre to demonstrate that the work is the candidate's own. It also holds information on the amount of support provided during assessment. These forms are generic.	Technical Qualifications Resource Hub, under Teaching and Learning Resources.	One per candidate, per synoptic assessment.
Centre Standardisation Declaration Form	This confirms that centres have undertaken internal standardisation for the marking of the synoptic assessment, where there is more than one marker for the assessment. These forms are generic.	Technical Qualifications Resource Hub, under Teaching and Learning Resources.	One per cohort, per synoptic assessment.
Personal Interest Form	Used to provide information relevant to moderation e.g. indication when a marker has a personal interest in a candidate (for example a parent or other relation), if required. These forms are generic.	Technical Qualifications Resource Hub, under Teaching and Learning Resources.	One per cohort, per synoptic assessment.
Centre Assessed Component forms	These can vary across the different assessment types, but may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Assignment result and justification form · Declaration of authenticity · Candidate feedback form · Multiple choice answer sheet · Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) forms 	Relevant qualification page of the website, under 'Documents' tab.	One per candidate, per assessment.

I.4 Moderation Portal

The Moderation Portal is the online administration platform used by centres and City & Guilds to facilitate the moderation and quality assurance of the synoptic assignments and other centre-assessed components.

All centres delivering Technical Qualifications and EPQ are provided with access, via secure login, to the Moderation Portal. City & Guilds Moderators also have access to the platform to view centre marks/grades and candidate sample evidence.

The Moderation Portal Centre User Guide, available on the Technical Qualifications Resource Hub, contains detailed information on how to use the platform.

Centres are also encouraged to utilise the support available each year to assist them in using the portal.

I.5 Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

Access arrangements allow candidates with special educational needs, disabilities or temporary injuries to access assessments, through the use of readers, scribes and Braille question papers, for example.

Access arrangements must be requested and agreed before an assessment takes place.

Further information is available on the Centre Document Library under the 'Access Arrangements' menu.

I.6 Special consideration

Where a candidate's performance is materially affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control, they may be eligible for special consideration.

Please ensure you review the information available on the Centre Document Library under the 'Access Arrangements' menu first. The form to submit a request for special consideration is also available on this page.

I.7 Assessment materials

Assessment materials for all Technical Qualifications are available on the relevant qualification page of the website.

This includes:

- Synoptic assignments
- Other centre-assessed components

As well as assignment briefs, task details and information on the types of evidence that candidates must produce, they include instructions on the timings and conditions of assessment, and the marking grids.

It is very important that tutors/markers familiarise themselves with the contents of all relevant assessment materials prior to assessments taking place.

Please note – these are live formal summative assessments and must not be used as practice materials.

Centres will also find previous years' assessment material on the qualification page which they can use as mock formative assessments for their candidates, but they must make sure they use the assignment for the current year for the live assessment.

I.8 Other Technical Qualifications documents

There are a number of other guidance documents to support the administration and assessment of Technical Qualifications, available on the Technical Qualifications Resource Hub.

Technical Qualifications – Guide to Teaching, Learning and Assessment

This guide breaks down the differences between credit-based qualifications and Technical Qualifications. It also provides useful information on supporting excellent teaching, learning and assessment.

Employer Involvement Centre Guidance

This guide explains what is required from centres in terms of Employer Involvement including what 'meaningful' employer involvement is, plus how to plan and track relevant activities.

Moderation Portal Centre Guide

This guide supports centres using the Moderation Portal, our online platform used in the assessment of Technical Qualifications. The Moderation Portal allows centres to upload marks, grades and evidence for Synoptic Assignments and other centre assessed components of the Technical Qualifications.

Guide to Booking Assessments

This document provides guidance on the booking process for all assessment components of Technical Qualifications.

I.9 Additional support materials

Additional materials to support the administration, delivery and assessment of Technical Qualifications are also available on the Technicals Resource Hub.

I.10 Support teams

Our centre support team is available to support with general queries relating to registrations and bookings.

T: 0192 4930 800

E: centresupport@cityandguilds.com

Our dedicated quality team are on hand to support all queries relating to quality assurance of Technical Qualifications.

T: 0300 303 53 52

E: technicals.quality@cityandguilds.com

2. Submissions overview

This table shows the submission requirements for all centre-assessed components of Technical Qualifications.

Submission dates can be found in the Technicals Checklist for delivery.

Moderation sample sizes are detailed in Section 8.2 of this document.

Type of Assessment	Requirements	Assessment method	Forms	Systems
Synoptic assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate marks • Representative sample of candidate evidence (for each synoptic assignment) 	<p>Internally marked</p> <p>Externally moderated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declaration of authenticity (each candidate) • Practical Observation (PO) form (each candidate) • Candidate Record Form (each candidate) • Centre Standardisation Declaration (one per cohort, per synoptic assessment) • Personal Interest Form (one per cohort, per synoptic assessment – if required) 	Moderation Portal
Other centre-assessed components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate grades or outcomes (for all required units and components) • Representative sample of candidate evidence for the required components (these will be specified by City & Guilds each year, see Section 8.3) 	<p>Internally marked</p> <p>Externally verified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant forms from the Optional Assignments pack / other assignments pack (e.g. Recording forms, checklists, results sheets, IQA forms etc.) 	Moderation Portal
Employer Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indication whether candidate has met requirement • Record of all employer involvement activities undertaken by candidates 	<p>Internally marked</p> <p>Externally reviewed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employer Involvement Planner & Tracker 	Moderation Portal

Section B: Marking, moderation and quality assurance

This section provides guidance on marking Technical Qualifications and EPQ for tutors/ markers and information about the moderation and quality assurance process.



3. Evidence collection

The collection of high-quality evidence that clearly demonstrates candidate abilities and supports the allocation of marks, is an essential part of the assessment process.

Markers must be able to clearly link available candidate evidence to the marks they have awarded and demonstrate this in their recorded evidence.

3.1 Candidate evidence

Candidates must produce valid evidence for accurate marking to take place. This means the evidence must contain information demonstrating their ability in the areas of performance that matter for the assessment. The evidence must be independently produced without feedback from the tutor.

Candidate evidence must be captured in a suitable format for remote moderation / external quality assurance. Centres should also consider the practicalities of uploading this evidence to the Moderation Portal (see Section C for more details).

Candidate evidence must be retained and stored securely by the centre during the assessment window. Once the centre marking has been completed, the marks and a sample of candidate evidence (across the range of marks) are then submitted through the Moderation Portal. The Moderator may also request additional candidate samples, or any missing evidence as part of the moderation and/or external quality assurance processes. In these instances, centres must provide this information within 3 working days. Any delay in Moderators receiving the appropriate sample will have an impact on the process and could result in candidate results being issued after the published result date.

Please note - additional candidate evidence may be requested to support with the Awarding process (where grade boundaries are determined for each assessment), or if a review of moderation / appeal is submitted, and so all candidate evidence must be retained until candidate results have been issued.

3.2 Types of candidate evidence

The type of evidence will vary depending on the type of performance being judged, and it is important that it captures the aspects of performance that are valuable indicators of quality.

For some types of performance, the actions and interactions of the candidates are important to observe (e.g. interactions with children in a childcare setting), whereas in others it is the quality of the final product (e.g. a meal in a hospitality setting).

The following table illustrates the types of evidence that could be produced for each Assessment Objective (AO). Please note that this is a guide only. Required forms of evidence are specified in the Assessment Packs for each qualification and are described as 'What you must produce for marking' and/or 'Additional evidence of your performance that must be captured for marking'.

Additional information can be found in 'Task instructions for centres' and 'Centre Guidance' in the Assessment Materials.

Assessment Objectives	Performance	Evidence
<p>AO1</p> <p>Recall of knowledge relating to the qualification LOs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of technical terms • Selection of tools, materials, equipment, processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotations, labels, • Candidates selecting tools, equipment etc themselves.
<p>AO2</p> <p>Understanding of concepts theories and processes relating to the LOs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanations • Justifications • Application in new situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creative development log • Oral presentation of work • Professional discussion; reflective log
<p>AO3</p> <p>Application of practical/technical skills</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance of skill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A performance that can be observed and tutor notes, photographs, video to support. • End Product – artifact/product that can be submitted in digital format.
<p>AO4</p> <p>Bringing it all together – coherence of the whole subject</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptation of methods based on synthesis of learning to meet context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient detail in an assignment that shows the candidate has drawn their response from across the Learning Outcomes of the mandatory content of the qualification (This may not always be evident in every task).
<p>AO5</p> <p>Attention to detail/perfecting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of product or artefact • Quality of interactions • Use of evaluation techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written description of techniques used. • Visual evidence of product or artefact • Context that demands professional and considered interactions. • Candidate review & evaluation of their work

3.3 Observation evidence

Where the tutor is required to carry out observation of performance, detailed and discriminating notes should be recorded on subject-specific Practical Observation (PO) forms.

The number of candidates a tutor will be able to observe at one time will vary depending on:

- the complexity of evidence collection for the task,
- local conditions e.g. layout of the assessment environment,
- amount of additional support available (e.g. to capture image/ video evidence), staggered starts etc.,
- whether there are any peak times where there is a lot of evidence to collect that will need additional support or any times that are quieter.

Centres must consider whether the number of candidates per tutor is appropriate for ensuring that they are able to be observed clearly and fully and will not be disadvantaged in any way.

It is advisable to trial the planned arrangements where possible during formative assessment, reviewing the quality of evidence captured and manageability. It is expected that for straightforward observations, (and unless otherwise specified) no more than eight candidates will be observed by a single tutor at one time, and the number will usually be fewer than this maximum. The key factor to consider is the logistics of collecting sufficient evidence for every candidate.

As far as possible, candidates should not be distracted, or their performance affected by the process of observation and evidence collection. If the assessment specifies a need for oral questioning as part of the observation evidence collection, the tutor should use methods that ensure this does not interfere with that candidate's or nearby candidate performance.

3.3.1 Observation notes

Observation notes on the PO form make up a critical part of the candidate's evidence and must evaluate how well the activity has been carried out, rather than stating the steps and actions the candidate has taken. The notes must be very descriptive and focus on the quality of the performance in such a way that comparisons between performances can be made. They must provide sufficient, appropriate evidence that can be used by the marker (and Moderator) to mark the performance using the marking grid i.e. if two candidates have different marks based on their performance, the difference in quality must be evident from the descriptions presented in the PO form.

Identifying what differentiates candidate performance can clarify the qualities that are important to record. Each candidate is likely to carry out the same steps, so a checklist of this information will not help differentiate between them. However, qualitative comments on how well they perform/complete the task (what it was that made it better/worse), and quantitative records of accuracy and tolerances will.

The tutor must refer to the marking grid to ensure appropriate aspects of performance are recorded. These notes will be used for marking and moderation/quality assurance purposes and so must be detailed, accurate and differentiating.

3.3.2 Supporting evidence

Tutors should ensure that any required additional supporting evidence (including photographs) can be easily matched to the correct candidate and task, are clear, well-lit and show the areas of particular interest in sufficient detail and clarity for assessment (i.e. taken at appropriate points in production, showing accuracy of measurements where appropriate).

For some specified assignments the ephemeral evidence is hard to capture through photographs and tutor notes alone. For these qualifications, a synoptic visit will be specified to support high quality evidence collection.

Video evidence is not normally requested for Technical Qualifications.

3.4 Planning evidence collection

In preparation for observations of practical work it is important that the collection of evidence is well planned so that the evidence collected is of a high standard and supports the awarding of marks.

Tutors should consider:

- identifying which specific aspects need to be observed and evidenced
- planning approaches to capturing evidence accurately
- ensuring that the appropriate resources for capturing evidence are available (relevant forms, photographic images, additional support needed for taking images etc.)
- planning for staggered start times where ephemeral evidence for all candidates will need to be viewed / recorded at the same time
- planning any critical points at which evidence must be captured e.g. where the practical task involves working on internal machine parts, which will then be covered over, making provision to capture relevant evidence before the coverings are added.

Planning should also consider local circumstances, and it is good practice to become experienced in collecting relevant evidence using the PO form during formative assessments throughout the learning period. This evidence can additionally be used as feedback for candidates. Approaches that work can then be used during the assignments.

3.5 Authenticating Evidence

Tutors must authenticate all candidate evidence. To ensure authenticity, tutors must ensure that candidate work is completed under the specified supervised conditions and is securely stored between sessions. Further details which relate specifically to the assignment can be found in the relevant Assessment Pack. A Declaration of Authenticity must be signed by each candidate and the tutor(s), after the work is completed.

Failure to submit a completed form will result in the work not being moderated and final results not being produced.

Some candidate evidence may support authenticity more than demonstrate the actual level of performance. All candidates' notes should be retained until results are published to confirm authenticity. If a centre wishes to appeal, the notes could be of use in this instance.

There may therefore be evidence that the tutor will review in order to be able to sign the declaration of authenticity and which should be retained until results and appeals are complete. However, this does not need to be submitted for moderation.

3.6 Minimum evidence requirements

The following sections in the Assessment Materials for each Synoptic Assignment list the minimum requirements of evidence to be submitted for marking and the moderation sample:

- What you must produce for marking
- Additional evidence of your performance that must be captured for marking

Where the minimum requirements have not been submitted for the sample by the final deadline, or the quality of evidence is insufficient to make a judgement, moderators will contact the centre to request the additional evidence. In the instance that a centre does not provide this, the moderation / quality assurance process and any subsequent adjustment (where applicable) will be based on the evidence that has been submitted.

Please note – in some instances, moderation may not be possible. E.g. if the evidence does not provide sufficient coverage of the content (specified in the assessment) for the award of the qualification, meaning that final results will not be produced for affected candidates. Where this is the case, centres will be informed of this situation prior to the release of results.

4. Synoptic visits

For some Technical Qualifications ephemeral evidence plays a significant part in the assessment and evaluation of candidate performance. Therefore, the quality of the evidence collected by tutors during the practical assessment is vital.

For these qualifications, remote moderation may be supported with a visit to the centre by the moderator. A full list of the Technical Qualifications that require synoptic visits can be found in Appendix 3.

The objective of the synoptic visit is to:

- Observe and ensure that evidence gathered by the tutor during the practical sections of the synoptic assessment is sufficient, valid and reliable enough to support any subsequent marking or moderation of the synoptic assessments
- Allow the independent collection of evidence by the moderator, providing a benchmark against which to compare the tutor-produced evidence, especially where photographic evidence cannot provide valid or complete backing to support tutor evidence.

Please note - visiting moderators are not permitted to give feedback on the accuracy of centre marking, or to comment on whether candidates are likely to pass or fail.

4.1. Principles of synoptic visits

Technical Qualifications requiring synoptic visits will be allocated these according to the below principles. All centres will be notified of which principle their visits have been allocated under. This may result in some centres having multiple visits across various qualifications, where some centres may have just the one visit to cover a number of qualifications.

4.1.1. Single-level visits

These are qualifications where the ephemeral evidence forms a significant part of the output for the synoptic practical assessment and a significant amount of the learners' practical performance can be observed during the synoptic visit. See Appendix 3 for a list of qualifications applicable.

4.1.2. Multi-level visits

Where the same team of moderators are assigned to both levels of the qualification, and if it is practical to do so at the centre, a moderator may observe multiple levels of a qualification during the same visit.

If it is not possible for the centre to conduct practical assessments across both levels on the same day in one visit, then two visits (one at each level) may need to take place, but this will be agreed in principle by the Moderator and agreed with the Quality team at City & Guilds. See Appendix 3 for a list of qualifications applicable.

4.1.3. Cross-site visits

Where delivery of the qualification occurs across more than one site (commonly referred to as suffix centres) the number of visits may be reduced by the Principal Moderator or Moderator after discussing with the centre. This will be where delivery involves the same staff across different locations. Following synoptic visits, centres are expected to then carry out standardisation across all pathways and all sites based on the feedback provided.

4.2. Arranging synoptic visits

The process for arranging synoptic visits is as follows:

- Visiting moderators are allocated to each centre. In general, the ratio will be one per qualification with a synoptic assignment, but this will depend on the qualification structure and industry area.
- The moderator will need to observe any practical task, which generates significant ephemeral evidence.
- The centre must provide the proposed scheduling for this part of the assessment along with details of all markers and Internal Quality Assurers (IQAs).
- The moderator then confirms with the centre which assessment session they will attend and details of the sample of candidates they would like to observe.
- Moderators should ideally observe a sample to include the range of markers (where more than one is involved) and candidate performance. Centres should consider this when planning their practical assessments.

The visit will take place as early as possible in the synoptic assignment assessment window, to ensure that any guidance and feedback on evidence gathering and recording can be applied to the whole cohort.

4.3. Synoptic visit sample

It is recommended that moderators observe a minimum sample of six candidates per assessment task. Where there are less than six candidates in a cohort, all candidates should be observed. However, this will depend on the specific requirements of the qualification and/or industry sector.

The sample should include candidates across the range of performance. Centres can use predicted performance to evidence this. Where there is more than one marker involved, the sample should include candidates marked by each marker. If there are practical difficulties in achieving this, centres should discuss this with the moderator beforehand.

4.4 During the synoptic visit

During the visit, the moderator will work alongside, but independently of, the centre markers.

Moderators will observe the sample of candidates identified and take notes on performance in such a way as to support their subsequent remote moderation.

It is highly recommended that as many tutors/markers as possible attend this visit, in order to benefit from receiving moderator feedback on the evidence they gather and how their observation notes are produced.

Once the candidate sample has been observed, the moderator will review the evidence they have gathered, alongside the evidence gathered by the marker(s) for these candidates. This includes marker notes and any appropriate supporting evidence e.g. photographic evidence.

The moderator will then provide verbal feedback to the IQA (or lead marker) on the following areas:

- whether the evidence produced by the assessor(s) was appropriate for the task, focused on the right areas and aligned with the correct AOs
- whether the evidence collected by the candidate was sufficient, valid and of the appropriate quality to support marking and moderation
- whether the evidence collected provided clear descriptions of the performance which validated / justified any subjective language / conclusions (e.g. what about the performance made it 'good' or 'excellent')
- whether markers/tutors are collecting evidence on candidate performance across the full range of AOs
- whether additional evidence could be provided to ensure that the moderator gets a clearer view of candidate performance
- advice and guidance on the format of the tutor/marker notes and the nature of any supporting evidence (e.g. whether photographs validly represent the candidates' work, how to label/identify this evidence)
- a comparison of the evidence gathered by different tutors/markers highlighting examples of good and poor practice (where relevant)
- any follow up actions that the centre should take.

The Lead Marker/IQA is responsible for making sure that any feedback provided by the moderator during the visit is then used to ensure the production of high-quality evidence by all tutors/markers, which will support the subsequent marking and moderation. Where other practical sessions have already taken place (i.e. with a large cohort, or long practical assessment), this may require the centre to review the evidence from earlier observations to ensure it meets the required standard.

4.5. After the synoptic visit

Once the visit has taken place, the Technical Lead and/or Quality Nominee will be provided with a copy of the completed visit report (which will capture the verbal feedback the moderator has already provided). Centres must take this feedback into account before continuing their assessment and marking activity. This may mean reviewing the evidence collected for candidates who completed the practical assessment task prior to the visit, if necessary.

During remote moderation, the moderator will refer to both the observation evidence that is uploaded by the centre, and the evidence they have themselves collected on the visit, to inform their final judgments.

5. Other centre activities

During the academic year, City & Guilds will carry out a range of other quality assurance centre activities which may include:

Quality Assurance Activity	Overview
Advisory / Standardisation Activity	City & Guilds will provide risk-based advisory/standardisation activities where required. These will be agreed and arranged by the Quality team and carried out by either a Moderator, Technical Advisor, Quality Manager or Quality Executive.
Exam Audit	Exam audits are carried out by exam auditors and are designed to ensure centres are administering the externally set and marked examinations (paper and e-volve) in line with JCQ ICE requirements.
Short notice visits (including observation of practical assessment for centre-assessed components)	Short notice visits cover practical assessments within the centre-assessed components. They will not be scheduled for internally marked theory exams or non-practical assessments. They are arranged at short notice. The Moderator will consider marking since the last review (i.e. where there are any actions or feedback for improvement) and observe live assessments and marking for one or more centre-assessed components as appropriate.
Planned visits (including observation of practical assessment for centre-assessed components)	Planned visits cover practical assessments within the centre-assessed components. They will not be scheduled for internally marked theory exams or non-practical assessments. They are arranged with advance notice. The Moderator will consider marking since the last review (i.e. where there are any actions or feedback for improvement) and observe live assessments and marking for one or more centre-assessed components as appropriate.

5.1. Arranging activities

Advisory/Standardisation activities and planned visits for centre-assessed components are arranged with advanced notice being provided to the centre. This is to ensure that the centre is able to maximise the value of the activity, through agreeing a mutually convenient date.

Some quality assurance activities will be unannounced, such as an exam audit or a short notice visit for centre-assessed components, therefore will not be arranged with the centre. The centre must comply with these activities and permit entry to the City & Guilds representative.

Activities will vary each year, depending upon the number of qualifications a centre offers and historic performance data. For example, a centre delivering qualifications in Hair & Beauty, Agriculture and Construction will only likely receive a short-notice activity in one of these areas per year.

Centres will be requested to provide details of the delivery/assessment plan for any centre-assessed components containing practical assessments at the start of the academic year, including dates where the practical assessments are to take place.

Specific to the short notice visits the Moderator will then select a date to carry out the activity and provide the centre with no more than 5 working days' notice. The centre must comply with the Moderator's request.

During both planned & short-notice visits, the Moderator may plan to observe a live assessment taking place for a centre-assessed component, as well as the marking process (where applicable).

5.2. After the activity

After any centre activity, the Technical Lead and/or Quality Nominee will receive a report from the Quality team setting out:

- The purpose of the activity
- Summary of what took place, including any observation of assessment and/or marking.
- Details of any actions and/or improvements required.

Centres will need to ensure that any actions and/or improvements that are set out as part of the report are addressed in-year, particularly where they impact the accuracy or consistency of the assessment marking process. The completion of these actions will be followed up at any subsequent activity.

5.3. Cancellation Policy

City & Guilds exercises its right to charge the full or partial fee for quality assurance activities at the value stated within the Centre Charges List 1.2 Qualification approval and monitoring. As specified within Section E, 11.2 Non-compliance, where a centre is sanctioned with an Advisory/Support activity, these are chargeable to the centre at £450.00. Please note, some Advisory/Support activities may be provided to a centre as a routine support activity and these are not chargeable to the centre.


Where a centre has additional chargeable quality assurance activity implemented as a sanction, if the centre cancels or rearranges the activity with less than 5 days' notice, or the moderator arrives to the centre on the scheduled day and are unable to complete the activity for any reason, the centre will incur the full cost of the activity.

Inclusive quality assurance activities, (e.g., synoptic visits, short notice visits and planned visits) are not chargeable to the centre, however, if the centre cancel or rearrange the activity with less than 5 days' notice, or the moderator arrives to the centre on the scheduled day and are unable to complete the activity for any reason, the centre will incur the full price of the cost of the moderator.

6. Marking

This section focuses on helping to ensure that centre markers understand the marking process and the use of the marking grids.

The diagram below identifies the key stages in the process.



6.1. Marking synoptic assignments

Marking should be carried out for each Assessment Objective (AO) and the marks totaled to give the candidate's final mark for the assignment. Evidence from all tasks should be considered holistically when recording the mark given for each AO.

Markers must ensure that they are familiar with the detailed descriptions of the generic AOs, as detailed in Appendix 2 as well as the relevant subject-specific marking grid. This will clarify the skills and level of performance to look for with each AO, including:

- the relevant aspects of quality of performance to focus on
- how this relates to the qualification, using the 'Examples of types of knowledge expected' section of the marking grid.

Markers must scrutinise the evidence for each AO and make a holistic judgement as to whether the evidence suggests that the level of performance displayed sits within marking band indicator 1 (poor to limited), band 2 (fair to good) or band 3 (strong to excellent).

The generic description of the performance should be used to sense check this, along with the contextualised band information. The contextualised information does not relate to the specific assignment, but examples from across the qualification content, and should be interpreted with consideration given to the evidence each assignment allows the candidate to generate.

Centre markers must refer to the relevant Qualification Handbook as well as the marking grid, when making assessment decisions.

At this point, markers should consider whether the candidate is positioned comfortably within the chosen mark band, or towards the top or bottom of the band. The marks available should now start to be considered as a full scale rather than as bands. The greater the number of available marks in the mark band, the more likely there will be a greater quantity of evidence available to differentiate the performances of the candidates.

It is easier to make comparative judgements (i.e. which of two performances is better) than absolute judgements (which mark is this performance worth), therefore markers may find it useful to consider comparing and ranking the evidence from candidates who have been identified as being in the same range on the scale to help decide on a final score for the AO.

This is a suggested method of how to allocate a score for an individual candidate. This method will allow centres to accurately score candidates based on their assessment performance, and place this ranking on the scale of marks available. Moderation checks the centre's application of the marking grid against the national standard.

6.2. Candidate Record Forms (CRF)

Justifications for the awarding of marks for each candidate must be recorded on a Candidate Record Form (CRF). The CRF must sufficiently justify the holistic final marks for the candidate, based upon all the evidence provided, including any Practical Observation (PO) forms. CRFs must clearly explain why the marks are being awarded and how the evidence available supports and justifies this. If evidence is contradictory, or if the justification is not clear, this may lead to adjustments being made to final marks.

6.3. Provision for reworking evidence

If, during the completion of the synoptic assignment, a candidate is unhappy with the quality of a specific piece of work, they may choose to restart and rework the evidence during their normal allocated time, before it is handed in for final marking by the tutor. This may demonstrate insight and evidence of knowledge or attention to detail, which should be captured in tutor evidence and reflected when the work is being marked.

The impact of reworking evidence will vary depending on the nature of the task and evidence being produced. A rework at the design stage may have minimal impact on time available to complete the assignment. However, reworking at the production stage or redoing a service is likely to have a much bigger impact.

For example:

Restarting the production of an artefact from scratch increases the quantity of materials used which will impact cost-effectiveness.

Asking to redo a service would have an impact on the customer, as well as resources.

Tutors should record the candidate's actions in the Practical Observation (PO) form. Any impacts should be taken into consideration when marking and recorded in the Candidate Record Form. The same applies to any acceptable support given to the candidate. Tutor support may focus on supporting the candidate in accessing and keeping on track with the assignment but must not provide specific feedback on quality of

work. The relevant assessment pack will contain details of the level of support allowed.

In these instances, the tutor must indicate what, if any, additional support has been given on the Declaration of Authenticity.

6.4. Malpractice

Where a centre suspects malpractice by staff and/or candidates, centres must report the matter to City & Guilds for further investigation. Information relating to the procedures for identifying and reporting malpractice by staff and/or candidates can be found in the [Centre Document Library](#) section of the City & Guilds website, under the Assessment Malpractice section

For support, advice and guidance in relation to malpractice, please contact:
investigationandcompliance@cityandguilds.com.

Please note – Any candidates where malpractice is suspected should be marked as normal and the mark/grade submitted to Moderation Portal. Candidates suspected of malpractice should not be marked as ‘zero’ or entered as ‘WNS’ (Work Not Submitted) on Moderation Portal.

7. Standardisation

Internal standardisation is vital in ensuring that centre marking is consistent, reliable, and accurate. Where centre marking is not standardised, there is an increased risk that the moderation process will result in adjustments being made to marks awarded for synoptic assignments. Similarly, for centre-assessed components, assessments may need to be remarked by the centre and resubmitted. It is the lead marker/IQA's role to ensure standardisation takes place, to ensure a consistent standard has been agreed and to ensure the required standard is adhered to during marking.

7.1. Pre-standardisation

It is recommended that all tutors are included in early discussions around the use of the marking grid, to ensure staff thoroughly understand the basis of marking for the qualification. This can assist staff in preparing candidates for summative assessment by;

- practicing bringing candidates' skills and knowledge together to complete a task
- helping candidates to learn how to explain and justify their choices in terms of subject knowledge

For the synoptic assignment, tutors must study Appendix 2 of this document, along with the marking grid, to ensure they are clear about the different AOs and how they may show up in candidate evidence for their relevant subject area. If more than one tutor is carrying out marking at the centre, this process should be carried out as part of a group activity to ensure all markers are clear and in agreement.

It may be useful at this stage to discuss how to support and manage candidates through the assessment, without providing feedback on quality.

Tutors should also discuss what makes evidence valid, and the practicalities of evidence collection (especially photographic evidence and records of ephemeral evidence).

Consideration should be given to the following:

- How evidence will be captured
- How to identify which photograph belongs to which candidate, including how to annotate to show the task number and any details such as 'before' 'during' or 'after' (e.g. a card showing candidate name and the date could be provided and kept in shot for each photograph. Photos must be annotated to show the Task number and details such as 'before' 'during' or 'after')
- Any file naming conventions that will be used to ensure easy identification of evidence to be uploaded for the moderation sample.
- How to ensure that candidates capture relevant evidence photographically and whether there needs to be someone with a specific role of capturing photographic evidence in addition to the marker
- How to ensure that notes about the candidate's performance are descriptive in a way that supports qualitative judgements by the markers, but also by moderators. For example, tick lists or pre-populated templates are not appropriate.

Centre markers should come together earlier in the year to trial the practicalities of capturing relevant and appropriate evidence, as described in Section 3, and using the marking grid from the assessment pack.

Candidate evidence from a formative task could be used for pre-standardisation activities such as this.

7.2. Standardisation

The internal standardisation process is as follows:

- Standardisation is required for each assessment and must include all markers.
- Standardisation must always take place using the complete candidate evidence (as it would be presented for moderation) from the current assignment.
- Individually, markers should mark in draft, a common sample of candidates' evidence using the Candidate Record Forms (CRF) to record justification for marks, following the guidance in Section 7.
- The common sample should be chosen to give coverage of the range of performance expected, and to give examples of work that may be at the borderline between marking bands on the marking grid.
- Where there are discrepancies in marks awarded, markers should examine these collectively and come to a consensus in the interpretation of the marking grid. If there is any disagreement, the Lead Marker/IQA will have the final say. There should not be an 'agreement to disagree', a final mark must be agreed.
- Further common pieces of evidence should be marked to confirm the agreed standard.
- Markers are encouraged to keep notes during standardisation and develop shared reference material to support them in maintaining the agreed standard throughout marking.

7.3. Post-marking review

Following the completion of marking, but prior to submitting the work for moderation, it is best practice for centres to review a sample of candidates' evidence where the same and/or similar marks have been awarded but have been marked by different markers. Such practice will help to confirm whether markers are consistent in their application of the marking grid.

It is important that any issues identified by centres are dealt with prior to submission for moderation and external quality assurance. Following moderation of the synoptic assignment, where marking is determined to be inconsistent or inaccurate, marks will be adjusted. Following verification of centre-assessed components, where marking is determined to be inconsistent or inaccurate, centres will be actioned to re-mark and re-grade the assessments, before re-submitting.

8. Quality assurance

All Technical Qualification components are subject to external quality assurance by City & Guilds.

- Synoptic assignments are quality assured through moderation
- Other centre-assessed components (mandatory and optional) and the employer involvement component are subject to external verification and review respectively.

8.1. Submission of marks, outcomes and evidence

Centres must submit the following via the Moderation Portal by the deadlines specified in the Technical Qualifications: Checklist for delivery:

Component	Submissions
Synoptic Assignments	All candidates' marks and a representative sample of candidates' evidence
Centre-Assessed Components	All candidates' grades, plus a representative sample of candidates' evidence for the centre-assessed components which have been selected for sampling.
Employer Involvement* (KS5 Only)	All candidates' grades. It is recommended that an Employer Involvement Planner and Tracker document is uploaded as supporting evidence per cohort.

*see the Employer Involvement centre guidance for further information

If any of these components are missing, moderation and external quality assurance will not be able to take place.

Following the initial submission by the centre, the Moderator and/or City & Guilds may request additional candidate samples, and/or any missing evidence (including forms) at any time for quality assurance purposes. Centres must upload any additional requested evidence within 3 working days. Failure to do so will result in delays to the moderation/quality assurance process and release of timely results.

8.2. Moderation

Moderation is the external quality assurance process for the centre marking of the synoptic assignment.

Once centre marking is complete, City & Guilds Moderators re-mark a representative sample of candidate evidence for each synoptic assignment, to determine how closely the centre's marking aligns with the national standard. This dictates whether centre marks are accepted and if not, by how much the marks should be adjusted to bring them into alignment with the set standard. An adjustment can be positive or negative (i.e. marks can go up or down). If an adjustment cannot be reliably made, the whole cohort will be remarked by City & Guilds (centres will be charged where this occurs).

Qualified Moderators are employed by City & Guilds to undertake this work. Quality assurance is maintained in the following ways:

- A Principal Moderator is assigned to all subject areas. They are responsible for ensuring there is a consistent and common standard of marking within their moderating team
- Moderators attend generic and subject-specific training, including on the use of the marking grid
- Moderators complete a standardisation activity for each synoptic assignment they are marking, to ensure that they are marking accurately and consistently in line with the standard set by the Principal Moderator
- Moderators are regularly sampled throughout the marking period, by the Principal Moderator and/or Lead Moderators, to ensure that they are consistently aligned to the set standard.

8.2.1. Moderation sample

The moderation sample for each synoptic assignment must include the highest marked and lowest marked candidate work, and a representative range in between. This means that the sample of evidence provided by centres must be spread across the range of marks being submitted - evidence must not only be provided for the highest-marked candidates or the lower-marked candidates but should provide the Moderator with a selection across the whole range of performance.

Please note – where a synoptic assignment is shared across multiple qualifications, the total candidates should be pooled and considered as one cohort when selecting the sample. We recommend where this is the case removing the qualification filter in the Moderation Portal and selecting only the assessment to show all candidates with a booking for the assessment.

The sample size is determined by the number of candidates completing a synoptic assignment. The table below sets out the minimum sample size requiring upload:

No of candidates	Sample size
20 or fewer	All candidates
21-100	20
101-200	30
More than 200	35

Please note – the minimum sample sizes were increased in 2022.

If the sample uploaded does not meet requirements, Moderators will request additional or replacement candidates to be included.

Where Moderators request additional samples of candidate evidence, centres must provide this work within 3 working days in order to facilitate the moderation process and release of timely results.

Other factors that should be considered when selecting candidates for the representative sample are:

- Inclusion of work marked by all markers for a synoptic assignment (if there is more than one)
- Marker to candidate ratio (i.e. If one marker marked the majority of the work, this should be reflected in the make-up of the sample)
- Inclusion of any candidates observed during the synoptic visit (where relevant)
- Any candidates identified on the Personal Interest Form (if used) must be included in addition to the sample size set out in the above table.

8.2.2. Moderation outcomes

Moderation of centre marking, for each synoptic assignment, will have one of the two outcomes:

Centre marks are accepted	Centre marks will be accepted where centre marking is found to be within tolerance* of the moderator marks.
Centre marks are adjusted	<p>Centre marks will be adjusted where centre marking is found to be either lenient or harsh. In these instances, City & Guilds will make an adjustment to all candidate results to bring them in line with the agreed national standard for the qualification.</p> <p>A full remark will be undertaken where an appropriate adjustment cannot be made to centre marking. This is normally where internal standardisation of marking has either not taken place or was not effective in a centre. In these instances, centres will be required to upload evidence for all candidates in the cohort to the Moderation Portal.</p>

* The moderation process allows for a tolerance of mark difference between the moderator and centre marks. Tolerance is set on the understanding that the marks awarded to a candidate by a centre may reasonably vary from those that would have been awarded by City & Guilds. This is on the basis that it may not be reasonable to expect exact agreement, so a degree of variation may be allowed, within a certain tolerance.

Where centre marks are within tolerance of moderator marks, centre marking is accepted. Where centre marks are out of tolerance of moderator marks, City & Guilds will make necessary adjustments to align them with the agreed standard.

8.3. Quality assurance of other centre-assessed components

For other centre-assessed components (including optional and mandatory units), City & Guilds quality assure centre assessment decisions. Although these components do not contribute to the overall qualification grade, they are required to achieve the qualification and as such are subject to external quality assurance activity.

Unlike the moderation process of the synoptic assignment, during the external verification process of centre-assessed components, centres are permitted to revise their marking and resubmit grades following moderator feedback, where required.

All centre-assessed components, whether optional or mandatory units, may be subject to external quality assurance.

The quality assurance process is as follows:

- The Quality team will confirm with the centre which centre-assessed components require a sample of evidence to be uploaded. The number of assessments requested varies according to the volume of assessments there are within the qualification. Where multiple centre-assessed components are in use, centres should broadly expect to be required to upload 2-3 assessments per qualification.
- Moderators will review the sample of candidate evidence for the centre-assessed components.
- Where centre assessment decisions are felt to be inaccurate, or if any relevant evidence is missing, moderators provide feedback to centres along with improvement actions.
- Centres must use this feedback to inform a re-mark of the assessment, applying the same process to other centre-assessed components if appropriate. Centres may also choose for candidates to re-sit/redo the assessment tasks if they have failed. Centres must upload any missing or additional evidence as requested.
- Moderators may also request that the centre submits a sample for further centre assessed components, to verify that the centre has adopted the feedback provided.
- Once approved, Moderators will confirm this to the Quality team, providing a report detailing any feedback and actions agreed with the centre.
- The Quality team will review the report, confirm the outcomes in the Moderation Portal and finalise the report to be sent to the centre.
- Centres must ensure all actions in the report are addressed, and any feedback is adopted for future centre assessments.

Please note – if a qualification does not feature any additional centre-assessed components (i.e. only an exam and synoptic are available) centres will not be required to make a submission.

83.1. Submission process for other centre-assessed components

As with the synoptic assignments, centres must upload results and candidate samples for other centre-assessed components to the Moderation Portal.

Please note – each academic year, centres will be notified which centre-assessed components require a sample of evidence to be uploaded.

Sample sizes and requirements are the same as for the synoptic assignment. Centres must also upload all relevant forms relating to additional centre-assessed components, as specified in the relevant assessment packs.

Where Moderators require further evidence to sample, they will request this directly from the centre. Although the submission deadline for centre-assessed components is in early June, City & Guilds recommends that centres submit the candidate evidence sample for the requested units as early as possible, once the Moderation Portal is available. This can enable earlier sampling by the Moderator and therefore, earlier provision of feedback to the centre which may require responses and/or actions.

8.4. Employer Involvement submission

For Key Stage 5 Technical Qualifications, centres are required to submit outcomes (grades) to Moderation Portal to confirm that the Employer Involvement component has been completed. City & Guilds recommend that an Employer Involvement Planner and Tracker document is uploaded to the Moderation Portal as supporting evidence for each cohort.

The submission deadline for Employer Involvement is the same as for centre-assessed components in early June.

Centres are required to submit:

- Outcomes (grades) for all candidates


Centres may choose to submit:

- A completed Employer Involvement Planner and Tracker (template is available on the Technical Qualifications Resource Hub under the 'Teaching and learning resources' menu).
- Additional evidence to supplement the planner and tracker, however this is not mandatory.

Detailed information on the process and requirements can be found in the Employer Involvement Centre Guidance.

Section C: Requirements for uploading evidence

This section provides guidance and best practice to support the upload of evidence to the Moderation Portal



9. Requirements for uploading evidence

Centres must pay close attention to the task requirements within the assessment packs and ensure that the candidate evidence submitted demonstrates that the requirements have been fully met, shows candidate ability, and supports the awarding of marks.

Candidate Record Forms (CRFs) and Practical Observation Forms (POs) must be completed by tutors and uploaded to support the submission of candidate evidence. The CRFs and POs must be clearly written and contain sufficient detail regarding candidates' performance that aligns with the candidate evidence submitted.

9.1. Content of evidence

Candidate evidence should show the processes used by the candidate to perform a task. It should be a tool to help visualise the actions performed by the candidate while completing the task, not just the final result.

Only files related to the specific unit/assessment should be uploaded against an assessment record. E.g: synoptic evidence uploaded against the synoptic unit and any employer involvement documents uploaded against the employer involvement unit.

The Moderation Portal has the functionality to allow evidence to be uploaded at cohort level or individual candidate level. Cohort-level evidence must be uploaded to the 'Documents' tab once a qualification and assessment has been selected. Candidate-specific evidence can be uploaded directly to the relevant candidate's record.

The table below details which types of evidence count as 'cohort evidence' and which count as 'candidate evidence':

Candidate-specific evidence	Cohort-level evidence
Candidate Record form (CRF)	Employer Involvement Planner
Declaration of Authenticity	Employer Involvement evidence
Candidate assessment evidence	Centre standardisation declaration
Practical Observation form (PO)	Personal Interest form
Centre assessed components – candidate assessment evidence	

Centres must ensure that the correct type of evidence is uploaded to the correct record.

9.2. Labelling of evidence

Clear labelling supports the moderation and quality assurance process, as it indicates what evidence contains and how it relates to the task.

Evidence should have a file name that clearly indicates the content of the document (task/type of unit/ name of student). We strongly recommend the following file name convention style:

- XYZ9753_Firstname_Lastname_0172-030_Task_1_Report
- XYZ9753_Firstname_Lastname_0172-030_Task_2_Practical_evidence
- XYZ9753_Firstname_Lastname_0172-030_Photos
- XYZ9753_Firstname_Lastname_0172-030_Task_4_Slide deck

Centres must include the candidate's name and enrolment number in the full name as above. This helps the Moderator to reconcile the evidence.

Labelling should be consistent throughout the cohort, with each candidate's evidence using the same file-naming conventions.

9.3. Number and type of documents

Centres are reminded that the relevant Assessment Pack contains guidance on what candidates must present for marking. This is the candidate evidence that must be uploaded to the Moderation Portal.

Centres should consider the format of evidence produced for a task in order to facilitate it being scanned/ uploaded. For example, if candidates produce a large single page of work (i.e. a Mood Board) centres should consider how to best capture it in photographs or scans to ensure legibility.

The number of documents should be kept to a minimum and where possible evidence for full tasks should be kept together in a single compressed (zipped) file.

Where evidence consists of several images, centres must combine these into one file. Programmes such as Adobe Acrobat allow PDFs to be combined into a single file. Please remove any blank pages from documents.

Photographs of evidence must be clear and display the evidence in its entirety. If a task requires fine detail to be evidenced, then photos must accurately capture this.

Centres should consider the lighting, and framing for photographs to ensure that it clearly shows the candidate's evidence. If photographs are unclear, or out of focus, this will inhibit the moderator's ability to assess whether the task requirements have been met.

Each photo should have clear annotations to describe the activity being evidenced e.g. Task 2 Results of hair colour. Any photographs which do not indicate what the evidence is showing should be discarded.

Scanned images and documents must be checked for clarity, please pay particular attention to handwritten documents. Where possible candidates should be discouraged from producing handwritten pieces, however if they do then they must use black ink.

Drawings should be carried out in a very dark pencil or black pen.

9.4. File size and formats

The files uploaded cannot exceed 150Mb (per file).

It is suggested that lower resolution formats are used for pictures, provided they remain clear.

Assessment packs for Technical Qualifications or the EPQ do not normally request audio or video evidence. However, where they do, centres should ensure that short clips are used that capture the relevant part of candidate performance that supports the awarding of marks (i.e. no more than a few minutes).

Lengthy video and audio recordings can add complexity to the moderation and quality assurance process and use up large amounts of data, this is why the file size is capped at 150Mb. A transcript or reflection account may be more appropriate, usually the Practical Observation (PO) form.

File formats must be compatible with Windows (and Mac) and should be commonly recognised types (e.g. Word documents, PDFs, JPEGs).

Please ensure that all evidence is uploaded using a file type as listed in our acceptable file formats:

File extension	Document type	Description
doc	application/msword	Microsoft Word document
xls	application/vnd.ms-excel	Microsoft Excel worksheet
pps/ppt	application/vnd.ms-powerpoint	Microsoft Powerpoint document
pdf	application/pdf	Adobe PDF document
htm	text/html	Web document
html	text/html	Web document
zip	application/x-zip-compressed	Archive file
gif	image/gif	Image file
png	image/png	Image file
jpeg	image/jpeg	Image file
bmp	image/bmp	Image file
docx	application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document	Microsoft Word document
pptx	application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.presentationml.presentation	Microsoft Powerpoint document
xlsx	application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.spreadsheetml.sheet	Microsoft Excel document
mp3	audio.mpeg	Audio file

Section D: Results and post- results

This section provides information on awarding, release of results and post-result services available to centres.



10. Awarding

For the Synoptic assignment and the Extended Project (as part of the EPQ), following marking and moderation, an awarding process is carried out by City & Guilds, where the grade boundaries are agreed. This happens for each assessment series, every academic year.

To do this, City & Guilds hold awarding meetings with a panel of subject experts, including the Principal Moderator for the qualification.

At this event, each awarder scrutinises several pieces of work from across a range of marks to identify the raw mark they feel is the boundary for the grade. The awarders have reference to grade descriptors and previously archived boundary benchmark materials. Their findings are discussed, the final boundary is determined through consensus and with reference to all the available information.

Grade boundaries for all assignments are published once the awarding process is completed.

Grade boundaries will likely differ from year to year, and centres are advised not to rely on the previous year's grade boundaries for an assessment to predict candidate performance or achievement.

There is no awarding process for the centre assessed components, as the grade boundaries are published within the relevant assessment packs. Broadly, these do not change from year to year.

10.1. Additional candidate evidence for awarding

In some instances, City & Guilds may request centres to upload additional candidate evidence samples in order to help facilitate the awarding process.

Where this is needed, centres will be contacted with a list of specific candidates whose evidence is required. This must be uploaded to the Moderation Portal within 3 working days.

11. Results and post-results services

Final results, including summer exams, synoptic assignments and qualification grades (where applicable) are released in August.

Where there have been issues within a centre relating to assessment bookings and evidence submissions, this may delay external quality assurance processes and in such instances City & Guilds cannot guarantee the release of timely results.

City & Guilds publish the grade boundaries for each assessment window onto our website. These can be found under the 'Post-results service' menu of the Technical Qualifications Resource Hub.

11.1. Final Moderation Feedback

All centres will receive a Final Feedback Report for each synoptic assignment, these reports will be sent to the Technical Lead and/or Quality Nominee. Final Feedback Reports detail the outcome from the moderation process, provides feedback on the accuracy of centre marking and the quality of centre administration. Constructive feedback will be provided to support future delivery, along with recommendations for future series. This report is provided to support the release of results.

11.2. Centre-Assessed Component Feedback

The Technical Lead and/or Quality Nominee will also receive a report providing feedback on the sampled centre-assessed components for each Technical Qualification. This will detail the outcome of external quality assurance for the centre-assessed components, provide feedback on the accuracy of centre marking/grading and the quality of centre administration. Constructive feedback will be provided to support future delivery, as well as summarising the outcome of the external quality assurance and whether any adjustments were required to be made by the centre during the verification process.

11.3. Review of Moderation for synoptic assignments

If a centre wishes to challenge the outcome of synoptic moderation, a Review of Moderation can be requested. Synoptic assignment reviews can only be requested for the full cohort of candidates, as the outcome of synoptic moderation is applied at a cohort level (not to individual learners).

A Review of Moderation involves the original sample of candidates being re-moderated by a different Moderator (usually a Principal or Lead Moderator). Following re-moderation, the marking of the centre and the original moderator will be compared to the marks awarded during the Review of Moderation. Please be aware that a Review of Moderation may result in a cohort's marks decreasing, remaining the same or increasing.

A Review of Moderation for a synoptic assignment cannot be requested in the following circumstances:

- if the original centre marks were not adjusted (i.e. centre marks accepted)
- for an individual candidate

Reviews of Moderation for synoptic assignments are available following the release of results in August. Further information on the process, including fees and timescales, can be found under the 'Appeals' menu of the Centre Document Library.

11.4. Missing bookings and submissions

Following the release of candidate results in August (post-results), where a centre has failed to make a booking for an assessment component via Walled Garden and has therefore not been able to submit a result for the component to the Moderation Portal, centres will need to submit this as a 'Missing Booking and Submission' request.

The relevant form must be completed on the Technical Qualifications Resource Hub which can be found under the 'Enquiries, missing submissions and amendments' menu. Once the bookings have been processed, they will appear on the Moderation Portal where centres can submit their mark/grade, alongside any evidence the Quality team request to support this late submission.

City & Guilds is not accountable for late results due to centres failing to make the necessary bookings and/ or submissions on time.

11.5. Error correction and amendments

To request corrections to centre submission errors (e.g. where the wrong mark/grade has been submitted, or there has been an administrative error) centres will need to complete the relevant form on the Technical Qualifications Resource Hub available under the 'Enquiries, missing submissions and amendments' menu.

One request form is required per candidate.

Centres will be requested to upload candidate evidence (where not already available) to the Moderation Portal.

All errors will be reviewed by the Quality team and/or a Moderator.

A photograph of three people in a factory or industrial setting. They are wearing high-visibility yellow safety vests over dark clothing. The woman on the left has blonde hair and is looking towards the right. The woman in the middle has curly brown hair and is also looking towards the right. The man on the right has short brown hair and is looking towards the right. They appear to be engaged in a conversation or inspection. The background shows industrial equipment and structural elements of a large building.

Section E: Quality Assurance criteria and sanctions

This section provides information on the quality assurance criteria centre must adhere to and are measured against for Technical Qualifications and EPQ. It also provides information on the possible sanctions City & Guilds may issue to address poor practice or non-compliance.

12. Quality Assurance criteria

Centres delivering Technical Qualifications and EPQ must ensure all reasonable steps are taken to ensure compliance with the requirements for delivery, assessment, and quality assurance.

For the avoidance of doubt, these criteria and conditions will be set out across various documents, constituting the following;

- [Centre Contract General Terms](#);
- [Quality Assurance Standards: Centre Handbook](#);
- [Quality Assurance Standards: Centre Assessment](#);
- The relevant Qualification Handbook
- The relevant Qualification Assessment Packs (setting out the conditions for assessment)

12.1. Monitoring criteria

In addition to the documents listed above, the following quality assurance criteria also apply.

Criteria	Section 1: Management systems
1.01	Candidates will be registered on or before of the published registration deadline.
1.02	Candidates will be booked onto all required assessment components of the Technical Qualification on or before the appropriate published booking deadline.
1.03	Candidates will be registered and booked onto the qualification and components at the correct centre (in the case of centres which maintain satellite/suffix sites or sub-centres).
1.04	Centres will make sufficient arrangements each academic year to ensure candidates are booked onto all necessary units to meet the Rules of Combination for a Technical Qualification, including the Employer Involvement unit.
1.05	A single named contact will be identified to take full and overarching responsibility for all communication regarding Technical Qualifications.
1.06	Centres will provide the contact details of key staff for Technical Qualifications where relevant (e.g., exams contacts and key subject-specific curriculum staff).
1.07	Centres will notify City & Guilds of all changes pertaining to the delivery and/or assessment of the Technical Qualification (e.g., staff or physical resource changes).
1.08	Centres will maintain effective systems to support and store data regarding assessment of qualifications (e.g., candidate assessments, standardisation records, internal verification records).

Criteria	Section 2: Resources
2.01	Centres will ensure sufficient time and resource is allocated to ensure effective delivery of the Technical Qualification according to the Guided Learning Hours (GLH).
2.02	Centres will ensure there are sufficient staff to support the delivery and/or assessment of the Technical Qualification.
2.03	Tutors/markers/lead markers have the skills and occupational competency to perform their role according to the requirements of Technical Qualifications.
2.04	Centres will maintain suitable physical resources for the requirements of qualification delivery and assessment.

Criteria	Section 3: Assessment
3.01	Internal markers and quality assurance staff must be adequately trained and standardised to ensure reliable and consistent marking.
3.02	Centres will ensure all assessors/markers/lead markers/IQAs perform their roles with accountability and responsibility.
3.03	Centres will ensure that assessment arrangements comply with the requirements set out in the qualification and assessment documentation and all assessment processes and practices can be demonstrated effectively.
3.04	Centres will ensure compliance with the recording requirements for the assessment(s) (such as the provision of all necessary Practical Observation (PO) recording forms, Candidate Record Forms CRF) etc.).
3.05	Centres will ensure the authenticity of all candidate evidence through the provision of Candidate Declaration(s) of Authenticity.
3.06	Centres will be able to demonstrate standardisation of assessment decisions across a cohort and provide evidence of this, supported by a Centre Declaration of Standardisation form.

Criteria	Section 4: Quality Assurance
4.01	Centres must be approved for the qualification they are delivering. Applications for approval must be submitted ahead of the registration window opening to ensure sufficient time for the approval process to be carried out and registrations to be made prior to the published deadline.
4.02	Centres will complete all required actions as set out in any approval report in line with the scheduled completion dates.
4.03	Centres will comply with the requirements of any quality assurance activity for Technical Qualifications, including the preparation for the activity and any post-activity actions or requests from Moderators.
4.04	Technical Leads for Technical Qualifications will share Moderator feedback following the quality assurance activity with all staff involved in the delivery/assessment process.
4.05	Centres will submit marks/grades/outcomes and required evidence ahead of the published deadlines for synoptic assignments, centre assessed components (as requested by City & Guilds) and employer involvement.
4.06	Centres will ensure the sample requirements for synoptic assignment and centre assessed component submissions are fully understood and adhered to.

Criteria	Section 4: Quality Assurance
4.07	Centres will communicate efficiently with their Moderator and/or with the Quality team with any requests for additional evidence or missing evidence for components of Technical Qualifications.
4.08	Centres will immediately notify City & Guilds of any necessary amendments to candidate marks or grades published on Walled Garden.
4.09	Centres will ensure there is an effective internal quality assurance (IQA) process to actively monitor the marking of synoptic assignments and centre assessed components.
4.10	Centres will ensure there is an effective standardisation plan to ensure accurate, consistent, and standardised marking across all markers.
4.11	Where centres deliver Technical Qualification across multiple sites, centres will ensure there is sufficient quality monitoring and/or consistency of practice across these sites.

Criteria	Section 4: Quality Assurance
5.01	Centres will declare any conflicts of interest (COIs) in the delivery or assessment of Technical Qualifications. The Personal Interest Form must be submitted for any candidates where a conflict of interest is identified, and the sample of evidence required for submission must be extended accordingly.
5.02	Centres will be familiar with the evidence requirements for synoptic assignment as detailed within the assessment pack and comply with the submission of all required evidence within their sample for moderation.
5.03	Centres will ensure that where any marks/grades/outcomes have been submitted to the Moderation Portal, there is evidence to support these. City & Guilds reserve the right to request this evidence at any stage for quality assurance purposes.
5.05	Centres will comply with all requirements regarding the recording of assessment and/or internal verification decisions.
5.06	Centres will ensure all assessment records are maintained for a minimum period of three years post issue of results.

Criteria	Section 6: Continuous Improvement
6.01	Centres will ensure staff attend training and standardisation events, webinars or support activities provided by City & Guilds or Associates.
6.02	Centres will support Continuous Professional Development (CPD) of staff involved in the delivery of the Technical Qualification.
6.03	Centres will ensure sufficient training, support or development opportunities are made available for delivery staff, markers, assessors or IQA(s).

12.2. Non-compliance

Non-compliance with any of the criteria set out above and/or any specific conditions as set out in the documents listed in Section 12 may result in sanctions being applied to a centre. City & Guilds will always act in the interest of protecting public-confidence in the validity of our assessments and qualifications. All centres will be supported in the first instance to address issues relating to non-compliance.

City & Guilds may choose to manage, mitigate and/or remove risk via an Enforced Action Plan by City & Guilds

Enforced Action Plan Component	Examples of use
<i>Actions/Improvements</i>	<p>Action and/or improvements plans will be set and agreed by the Quality Delivery team in conjunction with a City & Guilds associate.</p> <p>The plan will include a date by which the set action/improvement must be addressed. This will be followed up in a subsequent activity.</p> <p>Where they are not addressed, City & Guilds may take further action.</p>
<i>Training</i>	<p>Mandatory training for centre staff may be enforceable which must be agreed by the Quality team and evidenced by the centre.</p> <p>This may include mandatory attendance at City & Guilds events/webinars.</p>
<i>Advisory/Support activity</i>	<p>Advisory/support activities may be imposed to address relevant non-compliance or to address issues such as inadequate assessment practices. These are chargeable to the centre.</p>
<i>Standardisation activity</i>	<p>We may also impose additional standardisation requirements, which could include either;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Moderator carrying out a standardisation and training session at the centre, or • Centre attendance at a City & Guilds standardisation event. <p>These are to address poor standardisation and marking inconsistencies. These are chargeable to the centre.</p>
<i>Additional chargeable exam audit</i>	<p>Additional exam audit scheduled due to concerns and/or issues identified at previous activity.</p>

Where non-compliance poses a

Criteria	Section 4: Quality Assurance
Action/ Improvement plans	Action and/or improvements plans will be set and agreed by the Quality Delivery team in conjunction with a City & Guilds associate. The plan will include a date by which the set action/improvement must be addressed. This will be followed up in a subsequent activity. Where they are not addressed, City & Guilds may take further action.
Training	<p>Mandatory training for centre staff may be enforceable which must be agreed by the Quality team and evidenced by the centre.</p> <p>This may include mandatory attendance at City & Guilds events/webinars.</p>
Advisory/ support activity	<p>Advisory/support activities may be imposed to address relevant non-compliance or to address issues such as inadequate assessment practices.</p> <p>These are chargeable to the centre.</p>
Standardisation activity	<p>We may also impose additional standardisation requirements, which could include either;</p> <p>A Moderator carrying out a standardisation and training session at the centre, or Centre attendance at a City & Guilds standardisation event.</p> <p>These are to address poor standardisation and marking inconsistencies. These sare chargeable to the centre.</p>
Extended evidence provisions	<p>Extended requirements for provision of candidate evidence for additional moderation sampling activity may be required. Examples may be where marks are determined to be significantly out of tolerance and adjustments cannot be made, thus resulting in a full cohort remark. This scenario will be charged back to the centre to recoup the costs associated to the additional activity.</p>
Assessment arrangements advanced approval	<p>Internal assessment arrangements may need to be approved by the City & Guilds Quality team in advance, prior to embarking on the next academic year delivery and assessment.</p>
Qualification approval	<p>Temporary suspension or permanent withdrawal of qualification approval may be imposed in serious cases of non-compliance, or where City & Guilds does not have confidence in the integrity of centre deliver in such that it risks the validity of results.</p> <p>Alternatively, rather than suspending/withdrawing approval, City & Guilds may allow a centre to be re- approved for a qualification (where appropriate).</p>
Centre approval	<p>Temporary suspension or permeant withdrawal of centre approval may be applied in very serious cases of non-compliance.</p>

Appendix 1

Evidence capture methods

In addition to this section, centres should refer to the Requirements for uploading evidence document, which gives advice and best practice for uploading evidence on the Moderation Portal.

All evidence should be clearly labelled, in order to support the moderation process.

Evidence capture method	Examples of use	Notes on good practice
Word processed files	<p>Self-development plans, tutor observation notes, reports, results and evaluations, project plan, handbooks and guides, forms, business plans, tools lists, specifications, calculations, designs, asset register, risk assessments, professional discussion records, checklists, job cards, invoices, witness testimony, URLs.</p> <p>Longer pieces of written work demonstrating understanding of workplace formatting conventions e.g. reports, case notes.</p>	<p>If using speech to text software (e.g. for note taking or capturing candidate's thoughts before editing into evidence) retain original recordings as proof of authenticity.</p> <p>Use header / footer to page number and give candidate name. (This can then make it easier to refer to items showing specific AOs during marking and help the moderator to see where marks have been awarded).</p> <p>Use of title page / contents page / bibliography (where appropriate) all facilitate the marking and moderation process.</p>
Handwritten, scanned material	<p>Tutor observation notes, self-development plans, calculations, witness testimony etc. as above CAD (computer-aided design) drawings.</p> <p>Screen shots for database and web design skills Notebook/ diary of reflections or development of an idea.</p> <p>Essay – demonstrating the ability to structure thoughts and arguments without editing.</p>	<p>Use black ink for clarity when scanning and uploading to the moderation platform.</p> <p>If original is double sided, make sure that both sides are scanned.</p> <p>Upload any screen shots as one file per task.</p>
Sketches – scanned	<p>Draft plans, early ideas for designs, annotating with thoughts/ reasoning/ justifications makes understanding and reasoning visible.</p>	<p>If there are a number of images, consider combining them as PDFs using a programme such as Acrobat.</p>
Spreadsheets	<p>Data collection and analysis, graphs and charts, project plans.</p>	<p>Make sure these are not password protected or restricted.</p>
PowerPoint	<p>Plans, self-reflection.</p>	<p>Candidates should utilise the notes area (below the slides) as this can aid in providing further detail which does not fit on slides.</p>

Evidence capture method	Examples of use	Notes on good practice
Audio files	Note taking e.g. reflective thoughts, tutor's observations, professional discussion records.	<p>Avoid these being unnecessarily lengthy as this adds complexity to marking and moderation – capture the key aspects.</p> <p>Avoid / minimise background noise. Label files appropriately.</p> <p>Add notes or transcripts to aid clarity.</p>
Photographic images	Images of artefacts and products, completed work, records of tolerance measurements.	<p>Make sure lighting and background is adequate, photographs show areas of particular interest for assessment.</p> <p>Ensure that digital photographs are of an appropriate resolution (suggested no lower than 200 dpi).</p> <p>Ensure that the files are commonly used, easily readable types (e.g. jpegs, PDFs).</p> <p>If there are a number of images, consider combining them as PDFs using a programme such as Acrobat.</p> <p>Capture date and time.</p> <p>Add details such as 'before' 'after' or 'during' and the Task that each photo relates to.</p>

Appendix 2

Understanding the marking grid for synoptic assignments

Please note – centres should refer to the specific marking grid in the relevant synoptic assessment pack

How the marking grid supports consistent, valid marking

The marking grid is arranged by generic assessment objectives rather than by assignment task or unit learning outcome for two reasons.

First, there may be some flexibility for the centre to interpret the externally set assignment to better reflect local employment needs. Where this occurs, the evidence being marked will not be identical for all candidates for the qualification. To ensure standardisation of marking and to ensure the same characteristics are being considered for each candidate across variations in evidence it is necessary for the same marking grid to be used.

Secondly, where tasks or learning outcomes are separately assessed, and the marking guidance is separately produced for each, there is a risk that the candidate is repeatedly but unintentionally being attributed marks for the same characteristic. For example, breadth of knowledge may be favoured over depth of understanding (or vice versa), or the complex decision-making during practice, that requires application of knowledge and understanding, is missed if the marking focus is on practical skills.

The aim of this grid is to ensure a more balanced and consistent assessment across all of the required characteristics for all candidates. This also supports synoptic assessment, where the aim of drawing together knowledge and skills from across the qualification makes mapping to specific learning outcomes difficult as candidates may themselves interpret the brief differently and use their knowledge and skills in different ways.

How the grid is laid out

The marking grid is divided into several rows, each representing the assessment objective which is to be assigned marks.

Each row is divided into columns:

- The first column shows the weighting of the relevant AO
- The second row provides contextualised examples of the justifications the tutor may make about a piece of evidence when judging which band, the evidence falls. Where a band has been assigned a larger number of marks, for example more than five, a descriptor may be provided for the top and bottom of the band.
- Columns three to five describe the marking bands and are further subdivided into two rows:
- The first row gives the number of marks available for the band as well as generic descriptions of performance in each band.
- The second row provides contextualised examples of the sorts of thoughts and justifications the tutor may make about a piece of evidence when judging into which band the evidence falls. Where a band has been assigned a larger number of marks, for example more than five, a descriptor may be provided for the top and bottom of the band. It is noted at the top of the grid that, for any AO, it is possible to assign zero marks, even though the first band will always start at one.

Generic Assessment Objectives

For different qualifications, the balance of marks assigned to each assessment objective (AO) will vary depending on how important they are for that qualification.

Please note: Not all AOs are equal. Some may focus on higher level skills and so a candidate who shows high levels of recall (AO1) might not necessarily also show high levels of ability to bring it all together (AO4). The bands therefore do not relate to the standard expected for the grades pass, merit, distinction, but aim to support the standard allocation of marks at AO level.

Moderation will adjust centre marks where they do not align with the national standard, to ensure all candidates are represented on a single scale before a panel of independent awarders set boundaries for pass merit and distinction.

Clarification on the differences between assessment objectives is given below by describing precisely the characteristics that marking of that AO should focus on:

AO1	<p>Recalls knowledge from across the breadth of the qualification.</p> <p>Security of factual knowledge base that is available to the candidate when presented with a problem. The candidate's ability to recall the specific knowledge that is important in relation to the context of what is being assessed.</p>	<p>Focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant breadth and depth • accuracy/ correctness of content.
AO2	<p>Demonstrates understanding of concepts, theories and processes from across the breadth of the qualification.</p> <p>Security of understanding of the theories, concepts and processes that underpin the qualification.</p> <p>Ability of the candidate to correctly apply or explain understanding in the specific context.</p> <p>Ability of the candidate to make plausible adjustments to thinking that demonstrates understanding rather than recall or mimicry.</p> <p>This is about quality of understanding of individual concepts rather than recall of facts or ability to draw information together.</p>	<p>Focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • security of understanding • accuracy, confidence in application • willingness to question/formulate new ideas in response to the brief.
AO3	<p>Ability of the candidates to carry out the practical and technical skills required by the qualification. For some areas this is typically ease of hand eye coordination when using tools but could also relate to confidence in other skills for other areas, for example interpersonal skills.</p>	<p>Focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of skill, dexterity, familiarity, fluidity • ability to draw on practical experience to adjust practice to avoid or deal with complexity or problems.

AO4

Applies knowledge, understanding and skills from across the breadth of the qualification in an integrated and holistic way to achieve specified purposes.

Recognition of the subject as a whole, interconnected body of knowledge and skills.

The ability to use and integrate knowledge from across the qualification rather than compartmentalising learning within topic or unit. This

is about the use of theory to assist.

implementation of skills, the combination of theory and concepts to address the context or to solve problems.

Focus on:

- Integration, interplay of theories, concepts, skills having an impact on implementation.

AO5

Demonstrates perseverance in achieving high standards and attention to detail while showing an understanding of wider impact of their actions.

Use of feedback for example sensory (looking, listening, feeling, tasting, smelling), measurements, tests or other feedback mechanisms to check quality in order to improve the outcome.

This should include ensuring their actions support quality in the wider picture (for example meeting time commitments, ensuring their actions will enhance rather than have a detrimental impact on the work of others).

This might typically be seen as care and attention, focus, engagement, with the aim to improve quality.

In some areas might occur as much or more in the preparation as finishing. This is in part attitudinal relating to the persistence required to achieve high standards i.e. 'I think it's nearly there' rather than 'it's good enough' or 'that'll do'.

Focus on:

- Evidence of repeated checking (for example to get right first time or to revise)
 - Precision, care, quality.
-

An overview of the marking grid

For any AO, 0 marks may be awarded where there is no evidence of worthy achievement.

%	Assessment Objective	Band 1 descriptor Poor to limited	Band 2 descriptor Fair to
15	<p>AO1 Recall of knowledge relating to the qualification LOs</p> <p>Does the candidate seem to have the full breadth and depth of taught knowledge across the qualification to hand?</p> <p>How accurate is their knowledge? Are there any gaps or misunderstandings evident?</p> <p>How confident and secure does their knowledge seem?</p>	<p>(1-4 marks)</p> <p>Recall shows some weaknesses in breadth and/or accuracy.</p> <p>Hesitant, gaps, inaccuracy</p>	<p>(5-8 marks)</p> <p>Recall is generally accurate and of reasonable breadth. Inaccuracy and misunderstandings are infrequent and usually minor.</p> <p>Sound, minimal gaps</p>
Examples of types of knowledge expected:			
25	<p>AO2 Understanding of concepts theories and processes relating to the LOs</p> <p>Does the candidate make connections and show causal links and explain why?</p> <p>How well theories and concepts are applied to new situations/ the assignment?</p> <p>How well chosen are exemplars – how well do they illustrate the concept?</p>	<p>(1-6 marks)</p> <p>Some evidence of being able to give explanations of concepts and theories. Explanations appear to be recalled, simplistic or incomplete.</p> <p>Misunderstanding, illogical connections, guessing,</p>	<p>(7-12 marks)</p> <p>Explanations are logical. Showing good comprehension and generally free of misunderstanding but may lack depth. Connections are incompletely explained.</p> <p>Logical, slightly disjointed, plausible</p>
Examples of types of knowledge expected:			
Questions to use as prompts to focus marking		Minimum and maximum marks available to allocate in the band	

Appendix 3

Synoptic visits for Technical Qualifications

Single-level visit qualifications

Qual No.	Qualification title
0171-28	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Land-Based Engineering
0171-38	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Land Based Engineering (1080)
6002-21	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Hairdressing
6002-22	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Cutting and Styling Services
6002-23	Level 2 Technical Certificate for Hair Colouring Services 6002-
31	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Hairdressing (540) 6002-
20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Barbering
6002-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Barbering
6010-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Make-up Artistry
6010-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Media Make-up Artistry (540)
6010-31	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Theatrical, Special Effects and Media Makeup Artistry (540)

Multi-level visit qualifications

Qual No.	Qualification title
0172-21	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Animal Care
0172-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Certificate in Animal Management 0172-31
	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Animal Management (540)
0172-32	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Animal Management (720) 0172-
33	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Animal Management (1080)
0172-26	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Equine Care
0172-35	Level 3 Advanced Technical Certificate in Equine Management 0172-
36	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Equine Management (540)
0172-37	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Equine Management (720)

Qual No.	Qualification title
0172-38	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Equine Management (1080)
0174-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Horticulture
0174-36	Level 3 Advanced Diploma in Horticulture (540)
0174-37	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Horticulture (1080)
0174-21	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Forestry & Arboriculture (360)
0174-38	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Forestry and Arboriculture (1080)
0175-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Floristry
0175-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Floristry (540)
6003-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Beauty Therapy
6003-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Beauty and Spa Therapy (540)
6003-22	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Nail Treatments
6003-32	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Nail Technology (450)
6100-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate Professional Cookery
6100-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Professional Cookery (450)
7905-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Bricklaying
7905-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Bricklaying (450)
7906-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Site Carpentry
7906-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Site Carpentry (450)
7906-21	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Architectural Joinery
7906-31	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Architectural Joinery (450)
7907-20	Level 3 Technical Certificate in Painting and Decorating
7907-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Painting and Decorating (450)
7908-20	Level 3 Technical Certificate in Plastering

Qual No.	Qualification title
7908-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Plastering (450)
8202-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Electrical Installation
8202-30	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Electrical Installation (450)
8202-25	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Plumbing
8202-35	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Plumbing (450)
0171-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Agriculture
0171-31	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Agriculture (540)
0171-33	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Agriculture (1080)
0173-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Land and Wildlife
0173-35	Level 3 Advanced Technical Diploma in Land and Wildlife Management (540)
0173-37	Level 3 Advanced Technical Extended Diploma in Land and Wildlife Management (1080)
7178-20	Level 2 Technical Certificate in Food Preparation and Service

About City & Guilds

Since 1878 we have worked with people, organisations and economies to help them identify and develop the skills they need to thrive.

We understand the life changing link between skills development, social mobility, prosperity and success. Everything we do is focused on developing and delivering high-quality training, qualifications, assessments and credentials that lead to jobs and meet the changing needs of industry.

We work with governments, organisations and industry stakeholders to help shape future skills needs across industries. We are known for setting industry-wide standards for technical, behavioural and commercial skills to improve performance and productivity. We train teams, assure learning, assess cohorts and certify with digital credentials. Our solutions help to build skilled and compliant workforces.

Contact us

**Giltspur House
5-6 Giltspur Street
London EC1A 9DE**

general.enquiries@cityandguilds.com

01924 930 801

www.cityandguilds.com

Every effort has been made to ensure that the information contained in this publication is true and correct at 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.

©2022 The City & Guilds of London Institute. All rights reserved. City & Guilds is a trademark of the City & Guilds of London Institute, a charity registered in England & Wales (312832) and Scotland (SC039576).