



NQ verification 2023–24 round 1

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Science
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	August 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H267 74	National 4	Science: Fragile Earth
H268 73	National 3	Science: Human Health
H268 74	National 4	Science: Human Health

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Almost all centres verified used the most up-to-date and appropriate unit assessment support (UAS) packs.

Some centres did not include outcome 1 evidence but indicated that the evidence they submitted was complete. In these cases, the evidence is interim, as only outcome 2 could be verified. Candidates cannot achieve a pass in a unit until they pass both outcome 1 and outcome 2.

Assessment judgements

In general, most centres' judgements were appropriate. Most centres used a test with a 50% cut-off score to assess outcome 2, which is good practice.

There are two options for assessing outcome 2:

- ◆ Option 1
Centres can assess candidates using a single test with marks and a cut-off score. A suitable unit assessment covers all the key areas and assesses each of the problem-solving skills. If a candidate achieves 50% or more of the total marks available in a single unit assessment, they pass outcome 2 for that unit.
- ◆ Option 2
Centres can assess assessment standards 2.1 and 2.2 separately using the existing UAS packs. Using this approach, candidates must achieve 50% of the available marks for assessment standard 2.1 in each unit and 50% of the total marks available for assessment standard 2.2 across the units.

Centres should ensure that assessors annotate candidate evidence to show where the candidate has achieved a particular mark. It is good practice for the internal verifier to also annotate candidate evidence. This practice is helpful for candidates and verifiers.

Annotating marking instructions clarifies where centres are accepting alternative answers. This is useful for subsequent years and further discussions during internal verification activities.

Centres should use the published examples to clarify their knowledge of national standards for assessment, and they can incorporate these examples into their internal verification approach. It is also good practice to use the [Internal Verification Toolkit](#) on SQA's website.

Section 3: general comments

The most effective internal verification processes include discussions about assessment judgements and annotations on the candidates' evidence or an attached form.

Centres should use the checklist provided to ensure that they include all appropriate SQA documentation in their external verification pack. It is especially important that centres complete the candidate evidence flyleaf correctly and attach it to the candidate evidence.

[Common questions about National 3 and National 4 Science](#), which contain information about unit assessment, are available on the Science subject page on SQA's website.



NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Science
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	August 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H26A 74	National 4	Science Assignment

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres assessed the National 4 added value unit using the UAS pack, Science Assignment (National 4) Added Value Unit (published December 2017). This assessment allocates a total of 14 marks across the five assessment standards. Candidates must achieve 7 marks or more to pass.

Most centres submitted candidates' written reports or presentations as evidence. Some centres also included candidate logs alongside these reports or presentations, which is good practice. If centres refer to a candidate log when making an assessment judgement, they should submit this log as candidate evidence so that verifiers can confirm the candidate has achieved the assessment standard.

A few centres submitted an outcome 1 report as evidence for the added value unit, which cannot be accepted. The assessment standards for outcome 1 in the National 4 units and outcome 1 in the added value unit are different. Outcome 1 in the National 4 units requires candidates to produce a scientific report about an experiment or practical investigation. The added value unit is an assignment that candidates complete over a period of time. They must complete the communication stage of the assignment under supervised conditions, producing a report that communicates the findings of the research stage of the assignment.

Posters were an effective means of engaging candidates. Some centres submitted good examples of candidates' posters for verification.

Assessment judgements

Centres should ensure that assessors clearly annotate candidate evidence to show where the candidate has achieved a particular assessment standard. It is good practice for the internal verifier to also annotate candidate evidence. This practice is helpful for candidates and verifiers.

Centres should record reasons for judgements clearly for verification purposes. There were some inconsistencies within centres, but, in general, centres performed in line with the national standards.

Centres should use the published examples to clarify their knowledge of national standards for assessment, and they can incorporate these examples into their internal verification approach. It is also good practice to use the [Internal Verification Toolkit](#) on SQA's website.

Assessment standard 1.1 requires candidates to clearly state what they are investigating and why the issue is relevant to the environment/society. Candidates completed this assessment standard well, however, they struggled with the relevance to society aspect. Candidates must refer to this relevance to enforce their findings.

Assessment standard 1.2 requires candidates to select at least two relevant sources and record at least two sources in a way that a third party can retrieve them. Assessors should ensure that information is relevant to the issue before awarding a mark for a source.

Although candidates do not have to use a formal referencing system, assessors should only award a mark for being able to retrieve information or data when candidates include the full URL. If candidates use a textbook, they do not have to include an ISBN or edition number at this level. If one of the sources is an experiment, then candidates should record the title and aim. This must be separate to the overall title and aim for the investigations. There is no requirement for one of the sources to be an experiment. Candidates can provide two other relevant sources.

Assessment standard 1.3 requires candidates to present information or data from one of their sources in a different way, such as in an appropriate table or graph form or as a summary. Candidates generally completed this assessment standard well. Candidates must include the correct headings, labels, and units. In addition, almost all (90%) of the candidate's processing must be correct to achieve all 3 marks for this assessment standard.

Assessment standard 1.4 requires candidates to explain or describe underlying science that relates to the issue. Candidates should also explain or describe at least one impact on the environment and/or society using some underlying science. Their reports should relate back to the topical issue from their initial aim. They should clearly state and explain the science involved.

Assessment standard 1.5 requires candidates to communicate their findings clearly and concisely, using an appropriate structure. Including a summary paragraph or conclusion at the end of the report is an effective way for candidates to ensure that they summarise the

ideas, issues, findings or conclusions in response to the topical issue and its impact on the environment/society.

Section 3: general comments

Most centres verified in round 2 had a good understanding of national standards. Most centres provided candidate evidence that had been internally verified.

The most effective internal verification processes record assessment judgements and include annotations on the candidates' evidence or an attached form.

Centres should use the checklist provided to ensure that they include all appropriate SQA documentation in their external verification pack. It is especially important that centres complete the candidate evidence flyleaf correctly and attach it to the candidate evidence.