T Level Technical Qualification in Building Services Engineering for Construction

8710-30 Core Report (Autumn 2022)

Version 1.0

Contents

Foreword

Autumn 2022 Results

The technical qualification is made up of two components, both of which need to be successfully achieved to attain the T Level Technical Qualification in Building Services Engineering for Construction. This takes into account the best result for a specific component from the summer and autumn series. This document covers the Core component only.

In summer 2022 T level awarding organisations, including City & Guilds, and Ofqual discussed the approach to standard setting before setting the grade boundaries. We agreed to award the Core more generously in the summer, to recognise the unfamiliarity of providers with the new assessments. This reflects the approach to first awarding in other new or reformed qualifications. The approach to awarding was also designed to help mitigate the impact of Covid-19 related disruption to learning in the 2021-2022 academic year. Learners taking other qualifications were also seeing some acknowledgement of this in the way the grade boundaries were determined in the summer ([What's behind this summer's VTQ results? - The Ofqual blog](#)).

For the autumn 2022 assessment series, Ofqual recommended that T Level awarding organisations align the standard with the summer assessment series, taking into account that these are new qualifications and the continued disruption from the pandemic.

Introduction

This document has been prepared to be used as a feedback tool for providers in order to support and enhance teaching and preparation for assessment. It is advised that this document is referred to when planning delivery and when preparing candidates for the T Level Technical Qualification (TQ) in Building Services Engineering for Construction **Core** assessments.

This report provides general commentary on candidate performance in both the examination papers and Employer-Set Project (ESP). It highlights common themes in relation to the technical aspects explored within the assessment, giving areas of strengths and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat assessments in the autumn 2022 assessment series.

The grade boundaries (and notional boundaries where appropriate) that were used to determine candidate's final autumn 2022 results are also provided. **For autumn 2022, as per Ofqual guidance, the approach to grading recognises that these are new qualifications, and the ongoing impact of the pandemic.**

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

8710-031 Paper 1

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Building Services Engineering core content:

- Health and safety in construction
- Construction design principles
- Construction and the built environment industry
- Construction sustainability principles
- Building technology principles
- Tools, equipment and materials

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Building Services Engineering core element.

The exam has been split into **two** sections. Below details the types of questions and marks available for each section.

Section A is made up of **77** marks and includes **20** short answer and medium answer questions.

Section B is made up of **33** marks and includes **3** extended response questions.

The exam is designed to provide sufficient sampling across the content and consists of a mixture of short answer questions (SAQs), some of which are structured, and extended response questions (ERQs). The exam assesses across assessment objectives (AOs) 1a/b, 2 and 3 to allow for the appropriate assessment and differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:

- **AO1 a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1 b** Demonstrate understanding
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and understanding to different situations and context
- **AO3** Analyse and evaluate information and issues

Nationally, 127 candidates undertook this exam series. The majority of candidates were resitting this paper following their first attempt in summer 2022.

Generally, candidates tended to respond better to the short-answer, recall of knowledge type questions, when compared with the understanding and evaluative long-answer type questions. This was very evident across the exam cohort. Most candidates only achieved partial marks for the majority of questions due to not fully responding or failing to contextualise their responses. It was observed that responses often did not respond as expected to the command verbs used in questions, for example where questions began with explain, describe or discuss. Providers should place an emphasis on how candidates should respond to the command verbs used in questions. This exam technique must be addressed during the course delivery and exam preparation/revision. See best practice section of this document.

The majority of responses to some questions indicate that technical terminology is not fully understood, in terms of the meaning of words/language. This misunderstanding and limited interpretation of technical terminology very much hindered candidates from achieving some

available marks for both short answer and extended response questions (ERQ). In turn, this prevented responses from accessing the higher range marks and bands for some questions.

The exam cohort as a whole performed reasonably well across some questions, however it is evident that there were significant gaps in candidate knowledge and understanding across the core content topics in general.

Topic areas that were responded to reasonably well were as follows:

- Health and Safety
- Construction design principles
- Tools, equipment and materials

Candidates responded reasonably well to these topic areas, with higher scoring responses showing a little more depth and detail in some questions.

Most candidates responded well to the only maths type question in the paper (Q16), which assessed interpretation of a diagram and calculation of estimated costs for lighting.

Topic areas that were not well responded to by most candidates were as follows:

- Construction and the built environment industry
- Construction sustainability principles
- Building technology principles

Generally, candidates found these topic areas very challenging when making a response. Some of the questions in these topic areas were not attempted at all by some candidates. The responses achieving higher marks for these questions showed some depth and detail.

Overall, responses to the extended response questions in Section B were weak, with very limited responses given in relation to the context of the question. Candidates did not appear to fully understand the question requirements. Mostly, responses fell into band 1, due to the lack of depth and detail given.

Generally, responses did not include sufficiently coherent content to gain access to the full range of higher marks. Responses to ERQ questions must include reasoning or justification, as indicated by the command verb and context provided. Simply stating fact is little more than recall of knowledge. Candidates should ensure they read the extended response questions carefully and ensure they answer all elements of the question. Many candidates focussed on a particular element of the question, rather than looking at the question as a whole.

For example, the third ERQ (Q23) asked candidates to evaluate the different categories of sustainable design most suitable for a new housing project. Most candidates mentioned the different types of renewable energy methods and just focused on those rather than exploring other forms of sustainability such as recycling materials amongst others. This restrict responses from accessing the higher mark bands.

ERQ performance could be enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and analysis on different scenarios, such as systems, processes and sequences. See best practice section of this document.

Discounted question

Q7 – This question was worth 1 mark and asked candidates to describe what safety feature must activate in a domestic dwelling containing a PV system should the public supply fail. As safety is not explicitly mentioned in relation to a PV system within the Core specification, this question was deemed to have the potential to disadvantage candidates.

For this question we undertook additional statistical analysis to predict each candidate's likely performance on the discounted questions based upon their overall score across the assessment. Where there was a difference between the predicted and examiner assigned mark, the higher of the two was awarded.

8710-032 Paper 2

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Building Services Engineering core content:

- Construction science principles
- Construction measurement principles
- Construction information and data principles
- Relationship management in construction
- Digital technology in construction
- Construction commercial/business principles
- Building Services Engineering (BSE) systems
- Maintenance principles

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the BSE core element.

The exam has been split into **two** sections. Below details the types of questions and marks available for each section.

Section A is made up of **77** marks and includes **20** short answer and medium answer questions.

Section B is made up of **33** marks and includes **3** extended response questions.

The exam is designed to provide sufficient sampling across the content and consists of a mixture of short answer questions (SAQs), some of which are structured, and some are extended response questions (ERQs). The exam assesses across assessment objectives (AOs) 1a/b, 2 and 3 that will allow for the appropriate differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:

- **AO1 a** Demonstrate knowledge
- **AO1 b** Demonstrate understanding
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and understanding to different situations and context
- **AO3** Analyse and evaluate information and issues

Nationally, 126 candidates undertook this exam series. The majority of candidates were resitting this paper following their first attempt in summer 2022.

Generally, candidates tended to respond better to the short-answer, recall of knowledge type questions, when compared with the understanding and evaluative structured and extended response type questions. Most candidates only achieved partial marks for the majority of questions due to not fully responding or failing to contextualise their responses. This would include not showing working out, of both formula and calculations, as well as not providing the units of measurement for values and figures calculated.

It was observed that responses often did not respond as expected to the command verbs used in questions, for example where questions began with explain, describe or discuss. Providers should place an emphasis on how candidates should respond to the command verbs used in questions. This exam technique must be addressed during the course delivery and exam preparation/revision. See best practice section of this document.

The majority of responses to some questions indicate that technical terminology is not fully understood, in terms of the meaning of words/language. This misunderstanding and limited interpretation of technical terminology very much hindered candidates from achieving some available marks for both short answer and ERQ questions. In turn, this prevented responses from accessing the higher range marks and bands for some questions.

The exam cohort as a whole found this paper very challenging across many of the questions. It is evident that there were significant gaps in candidate knowledge and understanding across the core content topics in general.

Topic areas that were responded to reasonably well by high achieving candidates were as follows:

- Construction science principles
- Construction measurement principles
- Relationship management in construction

Candidates responded reasonably well to these topic areas, with higher scoring responses showing a little more depth and detail in some questions. However, some candidates appeared to find the science and measurement principle questions very challenging.

Topic areas that were not very well responded to by most candidates, across the exam cohort as a whole, are as follows:

- Construction science principles
- Construction measurement principles
- Relationship management in construction
- Construction information and date principles
- Construction sustainability principles
- Digital technology in construction
- Construction commercial/business principles
- Building Services Engineering (BSE) systems
- Maintenance principles

Generally, candidates found these topic areas very challenging when making a response. Some of the questions in these topic areas were not attempted at all by some candidates. The responses achieving higher marks for these questions showed some depth and detail.

The majority of responses to the science and measurement principle questions in the paper were weak. In many instances the questions were not attempted. It was evident that candidates had limited knowledge and understanding in these core topics. Centres need to address these topic areas in more depth, with purposeful revision questions for candidates to practise and improve their abilities.

Overall, responses to the ERQs in Section B were weak, with very limited responses given in relation to the context of the question. Candidates did not seem to fully understand the question requirements. Mostly, responses fell into band 1, due to the lack of depth and detail given.

Generally, responses did not include sufficiently coherent content to gain access to the full range of higher marks. Responses to ERQ questions must include reasoning or justification, as indicated by the command verb and context provided. Simply stating fact is little more

than recall of knowledge. Candidates should ensure they read the extended response questions carefully and ensure they answer all elements of the question. Many candidates focussed on a particular element of the question, rather than looking at the question as a whole.

For example, the third ERQ (Q23) asked candidates to evaluate the most suitable way to resolve site disputes and bullying issues using management and communication skills. The question response needed to address both the site disputes and the bullying issue. However, many candidates didn't address both issues and therefore were unable to access higher marks.

Candidates needed to expand on the following:

- Delays and disruptions appear to be due to poor prior management and planning
- Use of techniques to resolve situation using negotiation techniques
- Use of communication methods between conflict parties
- Investigation into allegations of bullying

Responses did not show the required knowledge and understanding to address some of points listed above.

ERQ performance could be further enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and analysis on different scenarios, such as systems, processes and sequences etc.

Discounted questions

Q8 – This question was worth 5 marks and asked candidates to determine the approximate mass of a vessel when full of water. As water density was not provided in the question, this question was deemed to have the potential to disadvantage candidates.

Q11 – This question was worth 4 marks and asked candidates to explain the role of the Clerk of Works on a construction project. As Clerk of Works is not explicitly mentioned within the Core specification, this question was deemed to have the potential to disadvantage candidates.

For both questions we undertook additional statistical analysis to predict each candidate's likely performance on the discounted questions based upon their overall score across the assessment. Where there was a difference between the predicted and examiner assigned mark, the higher of the two was awarded.

8710 Sub-Component: Exam

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

It is recommended that Providers utilise and deliver the sample examinations as well as past papers (Summer 2022 and Autumn 2022) as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

Providers should also be advised that there are resources available to help guide and support both provider staff and candidates. This includes a course textbook which is designed to assist in delivery of the BSE core content and exam preparation and revision.

There were some points that were noted across candidates' performance in both exam papers.

- Some of the papers had very unclear handwriting, making it difficult for the marker to read the response. Providers should encourage candidates to ensure their handwriting is legible. Writing in block capital letters is a possible solution if a candidate's handwriting is not legible.
- Providers should support candidates on developing their skills in writing responses to questions the ask for demonstrating of understanding, application of knowledge, analysis and evaluation.
- Candidates would benefit from understanding what different command verbs are asking of them. For example, the type of response required by an 'Explain' question requires a higher level of response than a 'Describe' question. Candidates should be reminded of the need to ensure they fully read and understand all questions before responding. In particular, the ERQ scenario-based questions in Section B and questions assessing both understanding and application of knowledge and understanding.
- An additional focus for candidates should be applied to making sense of what is being asked of them in the question. For example, they need to identify if the question is asking about a component's individual function or the component's function within a system.
- Providers should be aware, of using the sample and past series questions on the City & Guilds webpages, to help and guide both provider staff and candidates.

Providers are advised to continue supporting their candidates' development with their responses to these types of questions, helping to instil a solid core subject knowledge, enabling candidates to express their subject knowledge and understanding. Providers must focus on developing candidates' question responses and how candidates should respond to command verbs. In this development, providers need to focus on the depth and detailed required, to fully answer questions. This development and tuition in this area will be a key element, enabling candidates to provide detailed and in-depth responses to the various question types within the paper.

These areas should be further developed, with providers devising their own targeted exam revision for both short answer questions and ERQ questions, as well as offering support and guidance on various answer/response techniques. Providers should be aware, of using the

sample and past series questions on the City & Guilds webpages, to help and guide both provider delivery staff and candidates.

In conclusion, candidates must be reminded of the need to ensure they fully read all questions before responding. In particular the ERQ scenario-based questions and questions assessing both understanding and the application of knowledge and understanding.
An additional focus for candidates should be applied to making sense of what is being asked of them in the question.

Providers should also be advised that there is now a new course textbook available, to help guide and support both centre staff and candidates. This resource will be a valuable assistant for the delivery of the BSE core content, as well as support for exam preparation and revision.

https://www.hoddereducation.co.uk/subjects/construction/series-pages/t-levels-bse-and-construction

Building Services Engineering for Construction T Level: Core
ISBN 9781398332874

Grade boundaries

The table below shows the grade mark ranges for the Exam, along with the notional boundaries for Paper 1 and Paper 2 – **for the autumn 2022 series.**

Grade	Mark range	Notional boundaries	
		Paper 1 (8710-031)	Paper 2 (8710-032)
A*	135 - 220	69 - 110	65 - 110
A	120 - 134	62 - 68	58 - 64
B	105 - 119	54 - 61	50 - 57
C	90 - 104	46 - 53	43 - 49
D	75 - 89	39 - 45	36 - 42
E	61 - 74	32 - 38	29 - 35
Unclassified (U)	0 - 60	0 - 31	0 - 28

8710-033 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project

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

The ESP covers the following elements of the Buildings Services Engineering core content:
- Health and safety
- Construction design principles
- Sustainability principles
- Building services engineering (BSE) systems

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

The ESP assesses across assessment objectives that will allow for the appropriate differentiation of candidates to support the reliable setting of boundaries. The assessment objectives represent the following:
- **AO1** Planning skills and strategies
- **AO2** Apply knowledge and skills to the context of the project
- **AO3** Analyse contexts to make informed decisions
- **AO4** Use maths, English and digital skills
- **AO5** Carry out tasks and evaluate for fitness for purpose

This was the second series for the ESP component.

The project is based around a brief which provides information on a BSE project and specific relevant details and resources. Candidates are required to draw on their Core knowledge and skills and independently select the correct processes and approaches to take to provide the evidence specified in the project brief. All tasks are completed under supervised/controlled conditions.

Employer-Set Project tasks overview

Task	Task type	Assessment Objectives covered	Max mark	Task weighting
1.1	Research	AO1: Knowledge, AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO3: Select, AO4c: Digital	9	9%
1.2	Report	AO1: Knowledge	6	26%
		AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills	12	
		AO3: Select	2	
		AO4a: Maths, AO4b: English, AO4c: Digital	6	
1.3	Plan	AO1: Knowledge, AO3: Select, AO4a: Maths	8	24%
		AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills	16	
1.4	Presentation	AO1: Knowledge, AO3: Select, AO4b: English	6	18%
		AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills	12	
2.1	Collaborative Problem Solving	AO2a: Apply knowledge, AO2b: Apply skills, AO3: Select, AO5a: Realise project outcome	15	15%
2.2	Evaluation	AO4b: English, AO5b: Review outcome against brief	8	8%

Task-specific feedback

Task 1.1 Research:

Research one renewable technology including how the chosen renewable technology can be sited.

- Overall, the research was undertaken successfully by the majority of candidates, although some misunderstood the project brief and responses were therefore unable to reach higher mark bands.
- Not all elements of the project brief were considered by the candidates whilst conducting their research, including missed opportunities for gathering information.
- Some candidates did not research everything specified in the list, despite the task instructions saying they needed to. This limited access to higher mark bands.
- Candidates' research was not always referenced as required by the task and, in some instances, not referenced at all.
- Candidates did not always organise their research in an effective manner.
- Most candidates did not provide any explanation as to requirements of the task and where their research was relevant.
- As per the previous series, a number of candidates used copy and paste to lift information directly from websites without attempting to organise or structure it. This was evident on a number of completed tasks and included various fonts/sizes and text styles.

Task 1.2 Report:

Produce a report detailing options available for siting the technology and associated external equipment, the effects on performance of the technology based on each location, the effects of each location on aesthetics and neighbouring properties, final recommendation on the preferred location with justifications.

- A number of candidates did not meet the requirements of the task, with elements of the task not addressed in the report.
- Many responses indicated that information obtained in Task 1.1 was copy/pasted into Task 1.2, without amending the structure or tailoring content to meet the requirements of the report.
- Some candidates provided very detailed research which, on the surface, seemed like a report, but the report itself did not feature much of the content of that research. This limited the marks that could be awarded for this task.
- Many candidates provided no reasoning/justification for decisions made.
- As with Task 1.1 not all elements of the project brief were considered, for example the location of welfare facilities and the justifications for this.
- The evidence offered from the majority of candidates was very brief.

Task 1.3 Project plan:

Plan the key stages of the installation of the renewable technology in the new build eco house.

- Not all candidates produced any type of programme of work plan, as required by the task.
- Some candidates produced a written statement, but it did not support or justify their programme of work plan.
- There were missed opportunities linking to the considerations included in the task brief including specialist equipment, contractors and waste management.
- The majority of candidates did not meet the requirements to an acceptable standard, with responses not accessing higher mark bands due to a lack of demonstration of plan effectiveness and understanding.
- There was an issue with some file conventions for evidence making it difficult for markers to identify evidence.

Task 1.4 Presentation:

Present your findings from Task 1.2 and Task 1.3 to the Local Authority Planning Committee.

- A number of candidates omitted information and details due to not fully reading the requirements of the brief and previous tasks. This had an impact on marks that could be awarded.
- Some PowerPoint presentations included more text than needed on each slide.
- Some candidate's presentation skills were very weak with not all information being relayed effectively and the audience outlined in the task not considered.
- Not all candidates identified themselves at the beginning of the task, as per the guidance instructions.
- There was an issue with some file conventions for evidence making it difficult for markers to identify evidence.

Task 2.1 Collaborative problem-solving:

In small groups discuss options for an alternative contractor following one of the company's trusted contractors going out of business.

- Most candidates completed this task to a reasonable standard including producing the supporting email.
- Not all candidates identified themselves at the beginning of the task, as per the guidance instructions.

Task 2.2 Evaluation:

Complete an evaluation with reference to all tasks completed detailing how the work met the brief requirements, what elements were successful and what skills and knowledge have been developed.

- The evaluation was attempted reasonably well by most candidates.
- Not all candidates linked their evaluation to the task and project brief.
- Candidates did not provide explanations as to how they met the requirements of the brief.
- Most candidates gave a task-by-task explanation of their work rather than an holistic evaluation of how well they met the brief.

Best practice and guidance

It is recommended that Providers utilise and deliver the sample employer-set projects as well as past assessments (Summer 2022 and Autumn 2022) as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

There was an issue with some file conventions for evidence making it difficult for markers to identify evidence. Providers should ensure files and documents are named better to ensure consistency and ease of access. This also includes the use of assessment component headers.

The examples below show the correct format for file names:

Task_1.4_presentation_[Registration numbers #]_[surname]_[first letter of first name]

Task_1.4_observation record_[Registration numbers #]_[surname]_[first letter of first name]

In some instances, providers uploaded evidence for the incorrect candidate. Providers should be aware that if evidence is uploaded for an incorrect candidate this could lead to a delay in results being issued.

Providers are strongly encouraged to use evidence headers for each task, to allow for ease of identification of candidate evidence and efficiency in marking. All information within the task headers should be completed. Candidate evidence should be included within the header document and not as a separate file.

Observation records should be submitted as separate documents for each task and not scanned into one document.

The 'what must be presented for marking' section of each task outlines the minimum expectations of evidence that must be submitted for marking. Providers must detail where evidence has not been submitted.

Providers are advised that all tasks are marked in isolation and that each task has been weighted in relation to the assessment objectives covered. This information is detailed in the qualification Specification. All tasks are marked separately, so where evidence that

originated in another task within the Employer Set Project is produced by a candidate, no marks will be awarded for that evidence, despite the knowledge or skills that it may demonstrate. The only evidence considered for the marking of an individual task is what is listed within the 'what must be produced for marking' section within the assessment materials.

Providers are advised to ensure the tutor and candidate both sign and date declarations prior to uploading evidence.

Providers should request that candidates include a word count for all written reports and tasks where applicable.

Task 1.1 - Providers are advised to ensure candidates are briefed in relation to task requirements and to ensure they meet the requirements of each task. Providers are also advised to work with candidates to improve their skills in relation to research and correct referencing they would also benefit from working with candidates on the layout requirements for the research to ensure all elements are covered.

Task 1.2 - Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their report writing skills including providing justifications where required.

Task 1.3 - Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop the skills required, to plan a project including the production of Gantt charts and programme of works.

Task 1.4 - Providers are advised to consider the layout of the room and where the tutor/marker and the candidate are positioned. Providers are advised to ensure observation records are consistent. Some providers used verbs and vocabulary from the marking grid, which was helpful to markers, but most providers only made short comments. These must be based on the candidate's performance using the terminology from the sample marking grids. Notes must be detailed, accurate and differentiating. They should identify areas of strength and weakness to distinguish different levels of performance quality. Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their presentation skills including the production of presentations and presenting information to an audience.

Task 2.1 - Providers are advised to ensure observation records are consistent. Some providers used verbs and vocabulary from the marking grid, which was helpful to markers, but most providers only made short comments. These records must use positive language throughout. Providers are advised that this task must be completed with a maximum of three candidates at a time. Providers are reminded that tutors should not lead on this task.

Markers also noted that the video evidence uploaded by some providers did not play or had poor sound. Providers are advised to check the quality of video evidence prior to submitting it and to use microphones. Providers should introduce candidates or give them ID sheet when working on the collaborative task to enable easy identification of candidates. Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the basic digital skills and the ability to construct an email.

Task 2.2 - Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their self-evaluation skills, including evaluation of their performance against the requirements of each task, and how they could improve.

Grade boundaries

The table below shows the grade mark ranges for the Employer-Set Project – **for the autumn 2022 series.**

Grade	Mark range
A*	74 - 100
A	65 - 73
B	56 - 64
C	47 - 55
D	38 - 46
E	30 - 37
Unclassified (U)	0 - 29

8710-30 Building Services Engineering for Construction Core

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Building Services Engineering for Construction core is made up of the below sub-components (and weightings).

- Exam (70%)
- Employer-Set Project (30%)

UMS grade boundaries

The table below shows the UMS values available for grades in the sub-components. It also shows the UMS values required to achieve each grade for the overall Core. This table will not vary across the series, the values are fixed for this TQ.

Grade boundary	Exam sub-component	ESP sub-component	Overall Core
A*	252 - 280	108 - 120	360 - 400
A	224 - 251	96 - 107	320 - 359
B	196 - 223	84 - 95	280 - 319
C	168 - 195	72 - 83	240 - 279
D	140 - 167	60 - 71	200 - 239
E	112 - 139	48 - 59	160 - 199
Unclassified (U)	0 - 111	0 - 47	0 - 159

Get in touch

The City & Guilds Quality team are here to answer any queries you may have regarding your T Level Technical Qualification delivery.

Should you require assistance, please contact us using the details below:

Monday - Friday | 08:30 - 17:00 GMT

T: 0300 303 53 52

E: **technicals.quality@cityandguilds.com**

W: **http://www.cityandguilds.com/tlevels**

Web chat available **here**.