

T Level Technical Qualification in Management & Administration

8715-30 Core Report (Summer 2023)

Version 1.0

Contents

Foreword	2
Introduction	3
8715-031 Paper 1	4
8715-032 Paper 2	7
8715 Sub-Component: Exam	10
Grade boundaries	11
8715-033 Sub-Component: Employer-Set Project	12
Grade boundaries	17
8715-30 Management & Administration Core	18
UMS grade boundaries	18

Foreword

Summer 2023 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 Management & Administration.

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

Introduction

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

This report provides general commentary on candidate performance in both the examination papers and Employer-Set Project (ESP). It highlights common themes in relation to the technical aspects explored within the assessment, giving areas of strengths and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat assessments in the summer 2023 assessment series.

The grade boundaries (and notional boundaries where appropriate) that were used to determine candidate's final summer 2023 results are also provided. **For summer 2023, 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](#).

8715-031 Paper 1

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Management & Administration core content:

- Business context
- People
- Business behaviours

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Management & Administration 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 **55** marks and includes **17** short answer and medium answer questions.

Section B is made up of **45** marks and includes **4** 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

This was the first year for the exam component. Overall, there was a range of performance throughout the cohort and full range of marks were gained on all questions.

Candidates generally did well in questions that required them demonstrate knowledge and understanding AO1a and AO1b. In AO2 questions, candidates generally did well on those which related to more 'current situations' where they could relate their thinking to 'real life', although in such questions candidates should also consider what is realistic. Candidates who scored higher marks for AO2 questions read both the scenario and the question and related their answer to these.

Topic areas that were answered well by most candidates were:

- Legislation which governs the employee life cycle – employee dismissal (Q3) AO1a. This question was well answered with candidates often answering theft, misconduct or assault.
- The importance of self-management approaches – why employees attend training (Q5) AO1a. Most candidates were able to provide two reasons.
- Legislative and regulatory frameworks – methods to comply with health and safety legislation (Q7). Candidates were able to identify one method and expand on why the

method suggested complied. While a range of responses were seen across the cohort, most candidates' responses were linked to PPE.

- The value and benefits of equal, diverse and inclusive workforce (Q10) AO1b. Most candidates were able to explain two benefits of having a diverse and inclusive workforce, making connections between having broader skills and experience, efficiency and creativity amongst other benefits.
- The importance and impact of employee well-being and resilience – benefits of a well-being champion (Q12) AO1b. Most candidates were able to give expanded reasons on the benefits to the organisation. Those that lost marks either responded to the question relating to an employee rather than the organisation or provided two benefits that were not sufficiently different from each other.
- The importance of policies and compliance with codes of conduct – impacts of not challenging the non-compliant behaviour (Q15) AO2. For the most part, candidates had good understanding of the potential impacts on the organisation. Higher scoring candidates provided well thought out responses, that showed good reasoning skills and referred to the internal and external impact of the situation.

Topic areas that were not answered well by candidates:

- Legal entity types that organisations can form – Characteristics of Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) (Q6) AO1a. While some candidates did score full marks on this question, some were only able to give a partial answer with one characteristic. Some candidates confused a Limited Liability Partnership with a Partnership.
- Importance of good communication and adapting communication to professional standards- Importance of employees following set house style for written comms (Q8) AO1b. Some candidates gave incorrect or irrelevant responses due to a lack of understanding of house style. A common misconception was that 'house style' was used to prevent fraud. Other candidates lost marks because they gave reasons relating to employees rather than the organisation. Candidates that understood house style and linked their reasons to the organisation were able to achieve full marks.
- Different approaches to the way people are managed - the reasons to use a directive leadership style with a team of new staff on a fast-moving project (Q17) AO2. Many candidates limited their opportunity to gain marks by only talking about a range of different leadership styles in general, not focusing on directive leadership or the context of the scenario as the question required.

Responses to extended questions (ERQs)

Across the paper as a whole, it was the extended response questions that candidates struggled with the most. Within this section candidates often did not answer in adequate, accurate detail to gain marks in the higher bands. In many cases, candidates wrote a lot but did not show sufficient understanding of the question or scenario. Higher performing candidates tended to achieve marks in bands 2 or 3 and occasionally band 4. These higher-scoring answers flowed in a way that showed the candidate had thought about the full scenario and question and made sure all aspects of the question were covered. They also summarised their answers. Poorly developed and poorly structured responses limited the marks available for several candidates.

In question 18, candidates were asked to consider recruitment channels for a technology company moving overseas. This was the best answered extended response question. Higher achieving candidates in this question considered the types of recruitment channels that were most appropriate for recruiting in line with the specific scenario provided. Candidates that

scored lower marks tended to miss important factors in the scenario, some gave three detailed recruitment channels, these were not always suitable for the scenario.

In question 19, candidates were asked to discuss what a team manager would need to consider, to improve the use of external communication for a team selling theatre tickets. Some candidates made a reasonable attempt at this question, discussing a range of considerations, that linked back to the scenario. However, many did not take into consideration the full question; either not considering the inconsistency in communication when suggesting a new marketing strategy or not considering the long-term success of the business. Lower scoring candidates did not have a secure grasp on the factors the team manager would need to consider, with some focusing on social media rather than the manager improving the problems with inconsistencies across external communication.

In question 20, candidates were asked to evaluate approaches to implementing an emerging technologies model in a bank organisation that had identified efficiencies for staff working remotely. The majority of candidates responded to this question in some way, however sometimes answers lacked depth and did not relate to the particular scenario. Candidates tended to focus on the team and the specifics of getting them on board and whether staff would work well at home rather than other considerations. Many candidates focused on one area, for example staff training or security, rather than considering a range of factors. There was little consideration given to cost or the practicalities of implementation.

In question 21, candidates were asked to evaluate how self-management approaches could support managers and staff in an organisation for managers and staff. Some candidates did not attempt to answer this question. Many responses mentioned self-management without providing actual approaches whereas some focused upon ways to improve the relationship between managers and staff without explaining how. Many candidates focused on leadership styles and took the opportunity to show this knowledge which did not answer the question.

8715-032 Paper 2

This exam paper covers the following elements of the Management & Administration core content:

- Quality and Compliance
- Finance
- Policies and procedures
- Project and change management

This exam paper allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Management & Administration 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 **55** marks and includes **17** short answer and medium answer questions.

Section B is made up of **45** marks and includes **4** 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

This was the first year for the exam component. Overall, the majority of candidates within the cohort were able to demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the core content, however candidates did struggle with a number of questions across the paper, in particular questions around change management and project management. Generally, candidates seemed to perform better on questions which were broader in scope than those questions that focused on specific areas of the specification. Often lower scoring candidates achieved marks by demonstrating knowledge but struggled to show any further depth of understanding of the subject. There were some candidates that did not attempt several questions in the exam.

Topic areas that were answered well by most candidates were.

- Common change management theories and models (Q2) AO1a. Most candidates were able to identify Mckinsey 7s model, those that lost marks captured Kotter or Lewins theory.
- How organisations develop policies and procedures and why - Reasons for developing policies, developing procedures (Q4) AO1a. Most candidates were able state two

reasons, with most common responses being legal or regularity and employee expectations.

- The role of regulatory bodies and inspections - Consequences of regulatory breaches (Q5) AO1a. Good responses from most candidates, most often citing fines, suspension, imprisonment, and closure. Some candidates went beyond what was expected of the question and started to explain the consequences.
- Sources of finance for different types of organisations - Risks of bank loans (Q7) AO1b. Most candidates were able to identify one risk, those that lost marks did not expand their response further to describe the risk.
- The role of regulatory bodies and inspections - non-compliance (Q13) AO2. Most candidates were able to identify multiple risks and impacts of not complying to a warning from the HSE. Higher performing candidates developed their responses further to include lack of trust and poor staff retention as resultant impact on the company.

Candidates responded well to these topic areas, with the high achieving candidates displaying a range of comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the topics in their responses, developing their response where required.

Topic areas that were not answered well by most candidates were.

- Common terms used in financial reporting (Q1) AO1a – Candidates struggled to recall the meaning of financial liability; many candidates didn't connect liability as debts that exist.
- Project management tools and approaches (Q3) AO1a – Most candidates could not state a reason for using PERT; many responses were around project evaluation generally, not specific to PERT so did not gain marks. Most awardable marks were for reasons based on the timeline or for scheduling tasks with a project.
- Project management tools and approaches (Q8) AO1b – Most candidates struggled to explain the use of a Pareto chart and many candidates did not attempt to answer this question. A few candidates referenced the 80:20 rule.
- Common change management theories and models (Q11) AO1b – Candidates struggled to explain how ADKAR change management model can support individuals through change. Most candidates were able to identify a link to supporting individuals but struggled to expand their responses any further. Some candidates understood ADKAR but described the model without explaining how it supports the change process. Some candidates did not attempt to answer this question.
- Common terms used in financial reporting (Q14) AO1b/AO2 – Most candidates could calculate gross profit but struggled to calculate profit margins.
- Reasons why organisations need to make continuous improvement (Q17) AO2 – Responses varied across the cohort; most candidates were able to gain some marks explaining how innovation supports adapting products, but few were able to expand their responses to gain higher marks. Some candidates misinterpreted the question focusing on the move to remote working rather than how innovation could support a company to adapt its products.

Responses to extended response questions (ERQs)

Candidates struggled with the extended response questions and often did not answer in adequate detail to gain marks in the higher bands. Many candidates did not attempt all extended response questions.

In question 18, candidates were asked to discuss the way a performance monitoring process can measure the success of sales staff activities. Most candidates were able to show a

limited understanding of ways performance monitoring activities can be used to measure the activity, with many referencing the need to make sure measures are smart and using dashboards. Candidates often missed discussion of benchmarking, performance review and accuracy of data.

In question 19, candidates were asked to evaluate how the use of quality improvement processes would be effective at addressing a healthcare organisation's issues with negative feedback. Some candidates were able to identify the basic elements of quality improvement processes, but most candidates provided more generic responses in relation to seeing the issue and rectifying it, which limited their ability to gain higher marks. Higher achieving candidates were able to contextualise their response to the organisation and had a better comprehension of quality improvement methodologies.

In question 20, candidates were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of using a scrum approach to support project management of internal and external projects for a software development company. Many candidates did not attempt to answer the question. A small number of higher performing candidates were able to show a comprehensive understanding of SCRUM, but most that did answer the question showed a lack of knowledge and understanding of SCRUM principles. Where some knowledge of SCRUM was demonstrated, candidates struggled to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of using a SCRUM approach.

In question 21, candidates were asked to evaluate two different financial options for a toy manufacturing company that wants to centralise its manufacturing. Most candidates were able to suggest two financial options but struggled to capture clear advantages/disadvantages of each option. Higher performing candidates showed a broader understanding of the finance options suggested and made some attempt to evaluate each option. Some candidates did not take into consideration the scenario, which meant the sources of finance were not always appropriate.

8715 Sub-Component: Exam

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

- Candidates should be encouraged, when reading through a question, to look at the marks available and take this into account when providing their answer.
- Many candidates repeated the question in the first part of their response. This takes time for candidates to write but does not gain any additional marks so providers should encourage candidates to focus on the response to the question.
- Candidates would benefit from understanding what different command verbs are asking of them. For example, the type of response required by an 'Explain' question requires a higher level of response than a 'Describe' question. Candidates should be reminded of the need to ensure they fully read and understand all questions before responding.
- In the extended response questions, candidates should be encouraged to note the key areas of the scenario and how these relate to the question before writing. Well completed extended response questions were those where candidates gave an organised response, following the structure given by the stem.
- ERQ performance could be further enhanced by preparing candidates to consider in-depth explanations and analysis. To achieve the higher bands candidates needed to include more detailed conclusions and justifications in their responses.
- Some of the papers had very unclear handwriting, making it difficult for the marker to read the response. Providers should encourage candidates to ensure their handwriting is legible. Writing in block capital letters is a possible solution if a candidate's handwriting is not legible.
- It is recommended that providers utilise and deliver the sample examinations and going forward past papers as formative assessment to support candidates in preparation for summative assessment.

Grade boundaries

The table below shows the grade mark ranges for the Exam, along with the notional boundaries for Paper 1 and Paper 2 – **for the summer 2023 series.**

Grade	Mark range	Notional boundaries	
		Paper 1 (8715-031)	Paper 2 (8715-032)
A*	165-200	82-100	82-100
A	143-164	72-81	71-81
B	121-142	61-71	60-70
C	99-120	50-60	49-59
D	78-98	40-49	38-48
E	57-77	30-39	27-37
Unclassified (U)	0-56	0-29	0-26

8715-033 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 work-based problem in industry. The assessment is designed to allow candidates to show how they can tackle problems 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 Management & Administration core content:

- Business context and commercial awareness
- Project management
- Communication
- Collaborative problem solving
- Applying a logical approach to problem solving
- Undertaking research
- Reflective practice

The Employer-Set Project allowed for candidates to demonstrate a broad range of subject knowledge within the Management & Administration 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 first series for the Employer-Set Project. The project is based around a brief which provides information on a business project and specific relevant details and resources. Candidates have to draw on their core knowledge and skills and independently select the correct processes and approaches to take to provide a solution and the evidence specified in the project brief. All tasks are completed under supervised/controlled conditions.

In general, candidates responded well to the ESP producing a consistent performance across all the constituent tasks. Higher performing candidates developed their project across the range of tasks, taking their initial findings and following it through in a logical format. This demonstrated an in depth understanding of the brief. Providers should be encouraged by the quality of the ESP produced by candidates in this series.

Task 1.1 Investigate the project brief – undertake research and environmental, organisational and cost benefit analyses to identify an appropriate solution for the organisation.

- Overall, the research was undertaken successfully by the majority of candidates. Higher performing candidates structured the research well, completed clear referencing and used their research to present clear findings.

- For some candidates the brief was not always fully considered so links between research and the task were weak.
- A number of candidates used copy and paste to lift information directly from websites giving no explanation or rationale to why it had been selected, this limited their opportunity to gain marks in higher bands as they did not demonstrate the application of their own knowledge to the research. Referencing also varied across the cohort, many candidates not having a good knowledge of how this should be carried out.
- Some candidates did not produce a research summary table, which limited their opportunities to gain marks as it meant that a logical approach not always demonstrated.
- PESTLE and SWOT analyses were in general well attempted; higher scoring candidates showed clear links to the brief, candidates with lower marks tended to include generic information.
- Some candidates demonstrated a misunderstanding of the purpose of SWOT and PESTLE and used it to assess other organisations or the solution.
- The Cost Benefit Analysis produced varied results. Most candidates attempted this, producing 2 options to consider, however a chosen solution was not always presented. There were some good examples of in-depth cost benefit analysis demonstrated by higher performing candidates.
- Where candidates produced basic examples of the cost benefit analysis with minimal demonstration of calculations this impacted the marks that could be given for numeracy.
- Some candidates did not attempt any calculations in their cost benefit analysis.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers are encouraged to ensure candidates are producing a research summary table and to work with candidates to improve their skills in relation to research and correct referencing.

Providers are also advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their understanding of SWOT, PESTLE and Cost Benefit Analysis techniques.

Task 1.2 Project Initiation Document - develop a project initiation plan for the implementation of the chosen solution.

- Most candidates were able to produce a project initiation document demonstrating their solution using the provided template.
- Higher performing candidates presented tangible information within the document for example task timings, budget breakdowns and risk mitigations.
- Project briefs and rationales linking back to the brief were generally well attempted.
- Many candidates found this task challenging leaving one or more areas blank, restricting marks.
- A lack of knowledge was evident particularly in areas such as project evaluation and quality management. Methodology could often be identified but not applied.
- The information presented was often brief or lacking in detail.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure candidates develop their understanding of project tools and techniques and how to apply these effectively.

Providers should ensure that candidates attempt all aspects of the PID template.

Task 1.3 Project Planning – develop a plan on a page to demonstrate how the solution will be implemented.

- There was a variety of different responses to the task from across the cohort with the structure and format varying widely.
- Higher Performing candidates produced plans that contained specific actions they were going to take forward including Gantt charts clearly demonstrating task timings and deliverables, detailed communication plans and clear KPIs.
- Many candidates did not provide a justification document, where it was present, strong justifications were generally presented which moved candidates into higher bands.
- Some candidates copied and pasted information from task 1.2 into their plan which didn't develop the task and limited their opportunity to gain marks in higher bands.
- Lower performing candidates tended to produce narrative pieces which did not contain tangible information demonstrating planning skills – these often-identified techniques such as communication and risk management but didn't specify what actions the candidate would take when implementing their solution.
- Often the information presented did not detail specific actions that would be taken which are required for a project plan and there was a lack of understanding of resource planning and evaluation methods.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop and the skills required to plan a project for example making use of tools such as Gantt charts, risk management plans and communication plans.

Some providers gave candidates a template and this did limit candidates' ability to gain higher banded marks. Providers should share a range of project planning templates with candidates during delivery to give options to use as part of the assessment.

Task 1.4 Presentation of the plan and how it will be monitored including budget restrictions and identified impacts.

- The majority of candidates responded well to the task producing and presenting their solution through a structured presentation.
- Higher performing candidates followed all areas of the brief in their slides and were able to communicate confidently to the audience using minimal notes.
- Higher performing candidates utilised the majority time permitted for their presentation enabling them to convey their information in detail and enter higher bands.
- A good level of digital skills was demonstrated across the cohort of learners.
- Some candidates read from detailed notes or from the presentation itself which restricted communication and engagement with the audience.
- A number of candidates omitted information and details by not fully reading the requirements of the brief and previous tasks. This had an impact on marks awarded.
- Some presentations included too much text, and some included too little – both scenarios impacted on the candidate's ability to communicate the required information.

- Some presentations were very short (<10 mins) which limited candidates' ability to convey the information required in detail.
- In general, the questioning session was less well performed with candidates often giving short answers, lacking detail and not checking for sufficiency and understanding of their answers.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure candidates have the opportunity to develop their presentation skills including the production of presentations and presenting information to an audience.

Some presentations were filmed in PowerPoint or using video conferencing software. This restricted the ability for candidates to show full presentation communication skills such as body language – it is advised that presentations be recorded to show the candidate presenting in person.

Interactive screens also caused a problem visually as often the presentation could not be seen – providers are encouraged to practice recording presentations to ensure that candidates can fully demonstrate their presentation skills.

Markers also noted that the video evidence uploaded by some providers did not play, had poor sound or poor visual quality. Providers are advised to check the quality of video evidence prior to submitting it and to ensure that microphones are used, and candidates are positioned appropriately.

Background noise was also a problem during this task with tutors typing whilst recording and doors opening and closing. It is advised that to support the candidate the centre should take steps to eliminate as much noise as possible.

Task 2.1 Collaborative problem-solving - providing and justifying solutions to a problem the organisation is facing.

- Most candidates completed this task to a reasonable standard. They were able to come up with a number of ideas and solutions linking to the task brief and produce the supporting email and brief.
- Higher performing candidates were well prepared, engaged in discussions, shared ideas, made arguments for their solutions and questioned others. Some took lead roles and helped to involve others in the discussion.
- Some candidates did not discuss the advantages and disadvantages of their solutions which restricted marks.
- Higher performing candidates were generally in groups of 3 or more, sitting in a round table format and were unscripted.
- Lower performing candidates included those who had potentially written scripts of what they intended to say, sometimes were just in a group of 2 and those that were lined up in front of the camera.
- Some candidates failed to fully engage in the collaborative task - this was due to a lack of preparation or in some cases having a script.
- Not all candidates identified themselves at the beginning of the task, which made identification difficult on occasions.
- The brief and email were mostly well attempted and gave the candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their planning and knowledge skills regardless of how

they had performed in the actual discussion. Higher scoring candidates tended to have more content and better structure.

- Some lower scoring candidates did not complete one or more parts of the task.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

Providers are advised to ensure all learners identify themselves at the beginning of the task to support efficient identification.

It is recommended that where possible candidates should complete this task in groups of 3 and in a round table format.

Providers are advised to develop candidates' discussion skills and discourage scripting.

Providers are reminded that tutors should not lead on this task or ask probing questions and are encouraged to read in full the provider guidance for this task.

It was also noted that the video evidence uploaded by some providers did not play, had poor sound or poor visual quality. Providers are advised to check the quality of video evidence prior to submitting it and to ensure that microphones are used, and candidates are positioned appropriately.

Background noise was also sometimes a problem during this task with tutors typing whilst recording and doors opening and closing. It is advised that to support the candidate the centre should take steps to eliminate as much noise as possible.

Task 2.2 Evaluation - reflection regarding how well the task was achieved and analysis of own performance.

- The evaluation was attempted by most candidates with varying degrees of success.
- Some candidates concentrated more on how well the project outcomes had been met, others reflected more on their performance in each task. Higher scoring candidates considered both, producing a balanced critique of their work.
- Some learners identified where they had struggled within the previous tasks and gave an honest reflection of how they could improve in the future – this enabled them to gain higher marks in this task.
- Some lower scoring candidates didn't include all areas required by the task, which limited their opportunity to gain marks.
- Some lower scoring candidates misunderstood the task completely and rewrote a summary of the project instead.

Actions providers can take to support assessment preparation for future series:

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

Candidates should be encouraged to address each of the bulleted areas of the task to ensure that they cover all aspects of the brief in their evaluation.

Grade boundaries

The table below shows the grade mark ranges for the Employer-Set Project – **for the summer 2023 series.**

Grade	Mark range
A*	84-100
A	73-83
B	62-72
C	52-61
D	42-51
E	32-41
Unclassified (U)	0-31

8715-30 Management & Administration Core

The T Levels Technical Qualification (TQ) in Management & Administration core is made up of the below sub-components (and weightings).

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

UMS grade boundaries

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

Grade boundary	Exam sub-component	ESP sub-component	Overall Core
A*	216	144	360
A	192	128	320
B	168	112	280
C	144	96	240
D	120	80	200
E	96	64	160
Unclassified (U)	0	0	0

Get in touch

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

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

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

T: 0300 303 53 52

E: technical.quality@cityandguilds.com

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

Web chat available [here](#).

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

Copyright in this document belongs to, and is used under licence from, the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education, © 2023. 'T-LEVELS' is a registered trademark of the Department for Education. 'T Level' is a registered trademark of the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education. 'Institute for Apprenticeships & Technical Education' and logo are registered trademarks of the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education.

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

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