



# NQ verification 2022–23 round 1

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Chemistry
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	April 2023

### National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H21G 73	National 3	Chemical Changes and Structure
H21G 74	National 4	Chemical Changes and Structure
H21J 74	National 4	Nature's Chemistry

### Section 2: comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

We removed the requirement to complete outcome 1 for unit assessments at National 3 and National 4 for session 2022–23. We also removed the requirement to complete the National 4 added value unit for session 2022–23. For more information, refer to the [National Course modification summary: Chemistry](#).

Centres selected for verification of National 3 and National 4 Chemistry units submitted evidence for outcome 2 only.

#### National 3 units

All centres verified used the SQA unit assessment support (UAS) packs and there were no issues with the approach to assessment. All centres used a test with a 50% cut-off score to assess outcome 2.

### **National 4 units**

All centres verified used the SQA UAS packs. There were few issues with the approach to assessment.

All centres used the unit-by-unit approach to assess candidates. Most centres used a test with a 50% cut-off score to assess outcome 2.

A number of centres provided candidates with a template to record their responses. This is acceptable; however, centres must ensure that this does not reduce the level of demand. For questions that require candidates to provide the correct units, centres must not supply a template for responses with the units included, as this reduces the level of demand.

Centres must ensure they use the most up-to-date UAS packs from SQA's secure website. They must also stay up-to-date with the requirements of course assessment, including any modifications in place. This information is on the [National 4 Chemistry subject page](#).

If a centre accepts responses that are not in the marking guidance, they should annotate the marking guidance to reflect the additional correct responses. Some centres annotated the marking guidance, which was helpful during verification. However, in a few cases, the additional responses annotated on the marking guidance were incorrect. Centres must ensure that all responses they add to the marking guidance are appropriate.

### **Assessment judgements**

#### **National 3 units**

All centres verified made reliable assessment judgements and applied the marking guidance consistently.

#### **National 4 units**

Most centres verified made reliable assessment judgements and applied the marking guidance consistently.

For outcome 2, some assessors awarded marks for responses that included incorrect units, incorrect chemical symbols, and incorrect specific chemical terms. If a response does not require a unit, but a candidate states an incorrect unit, assessors should not award a mark. If a candidate states a chemical symbol, they must use the correct format, for example Li, not LI for lithium. Candidates must state chemical terms correctly. When writing chemical formulae, including general formulae for families of organic compounds, candidates must use subscript numbers when appropriate for their response to be correct.

### **Section 3: general comments**

Almost all centres verified had a good understanding of national standards. All centres provided candidate evidence that was internally verified by cross-marking.

It was often clear which judgements were made by the assessors and which were made by the internal verifiers by centres assigning different colours of pen. Internal verification activity

like this is helpful to external verifiers. Many centres included comments and notes on professional dialogue between assessors and internal verifiers, which was very helpful.

In some centres, the process of internal verification was not entirely effective. In some cases, both the assessor and the internal verifier awarded marks incorrectly. On a few occasions, there was a discrepancy between the assessor and the internal verifier, and it was not clear what the final assessment judgement was. Where assessment judgements differ, it is helpful to clearly mark the final judgement on candidate evidence or on a log sheet.