



# NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 1

## Qualification Verification Summary Report

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

**Verification group name:** Computing Science  
**Verification event/visiting information:** Event  
**Date published:** 2022

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H21X 73	National 3	Building Digital Solutions
H222 73	National 3	Information Solutions
H223 74	National 4	Software Design and Development
H226 74	National 4	Information System Design and Development

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

All centres that were verified used SQA unit assessment support packs for National 3 units and almost all used them for National 4. Some centres devised their own assessments for National 4 with mixed results.

One centre created a written assessment for National 4 Software Design and Development. It included questions where candidates had to write 1 to 2 lines of code and was used as evidence towards the achievement of some outcome 2 assessment standards. This is not appropriate as outcome 2 requires candidates to develop programs within a software development environment.

Another centre-devised assessment for outcome 2 provided too much scaffolding in the form of a detailed algorithm. Care should be taken to ensure that candidates are supplied with the main steps only.

When centre-devised pre-prepared files are supplied to candidates as part of an Information System Design and Development assessment, it is essential that hard copy evidence is submitted for the verification process to be effective.

## Assessment judgements

All centres that were verified judged the evidence according to the appropriate assessment standard at National 3 and almost all at National 4 level.

Most centres verified for National 4 submitted evidence for Information System Design and Development. Confusion persists in some centres with assessment standard 2.1 describing the features and functionality of the information system. For clarity, features are what the information system 'has' while functions are what the system 'does'.

Some candidates from those centres that submitted evidence for Software Design and Development continued to lack depth in their internal commentary. It is not sufficient to state the constructs and variable types being used. Instead, candidates should identify and explain the purpose of the constructs and variable types required for the program to work.

03

## Section 3: General comments

There is evidence that centres are not applying the thresholds in relation to the number of assessment standards that candidates must pass to achieve each unit. These thresholds, which were introduced to reduce re-assessment requirements, have been in place for several years. Threshold information for each unit can be found in the unit specifications available from the [Computing Science subject page](#).

The good practice of annotating candidate evidence to indicate where the assessment standard has been achieved was apparent in almost all centres that were verified. All centres provided evidence of their internal verification process, with some centres indicating what judgement call is carried forward when there is a discrepancy between the assessor and internal verifier judgements. This is very helpful and is encouraged.

Further guidance on internal verification can be found in [Internal Verification: A guide for centres](#).