



NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Computing Science
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	June 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H227 74	National 4	Added Value Unit

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All selected centres used SQA's Added Value Unit assessment support packs for National 4. There was a relatively even spread across the four SQA assessment tasks (Games review, Language tutors, Music fans, and Ticket agency).

The majority of centres' assessment approaches were accepted. There was one example where a centre appears to have adapted the SQA assessment task. Centres are reminded that if they make any alterations to an SQA assessment task, or create new assessment tasks, the task must be included with the centre's verification materials.

Assessment judgements

While the majority of centres' assessment judgements were sound, there were a number of recurring judgement issues, namely:

Assessment standard 1.1

Across all four of the assessment tasks, centres are reminded to consult the judging evidence table for clarification as to what the software solution for part A and part B must do. In particular the requirement for the candidate to 'outline the key parts involved to meet requirements'.

Assessment standard 1.2

In the Games review task (Part A) a number of centres judged a wireframe design of the user interface to have met the requirements.

This assessment standard focusses on the design of the program, rather than the physical appearance of the solution. A successful design must show a selection of the programming constructs detailed in the judging evidence table (page 8).

It is challenging for candidates at National 4 level to successfully design the whole program, therefore a design for just one part of the program (for example the ball movement, or the control keys) is sufficient to meet this assessment standard.

Centres are also reminded that a reasonable level of support is permitted at this stage of the assessment in order to ensure that a candidate has a suitable design for implementation.

Assessment standard 1.4

Across all four of the assessment tasks, a number of centres judged the standard to have been met when candidates had not covered all three aspects of evaluation required here. For both the information system and the program, centres must ensure that candidates include:

- ◆ how the requirements are met — candidates must describe how the solution satisfies the requirements outlined in the Analysis stage.
- ◆ difficulties encountered — it is acceptable for candidates to simply state that they had no difficulties.
- ◆ suggested improvements — candidates must describe a suitable improvement to their solution. It is not acceptable to simply state that their solution cannot be improved. Improvements do not have to be implemented, so the candidate can describe any improvement, even if it is out with their current level of ability to implement.

Section 3: general comments

Centres are reminded that in order to meet the standard required for an overall pass, a candidate must pass at least three of the four assessment standards.

There remains some evidence that centres are not applying this threshold when making an overall judgement on whether the candidate passes or fails the unit. This requirement is set out in the Added Value Unit specification.

All centres provided evidence of their internal verification process, and the standard of internal verification continues to improve overall. There were numerous examples of very robust verification taking place, with discussions about assessment judgements being documented. Not only is this good practice in centres, it also greatly helps the external verification process.