



# Qualification Verification Summary Report

## NQ Verification 2019–20

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Computing Science
Verification event/visiting information	Round 1 Event
Date published:	July 2020

#### National 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

Almost all centres verified used SQA unit assessment support packs, adopted a unit-by-unit approach to assessment. Two centres, delivering National 4 Software Design and Development, adapted an assessment from SQA Unit Assessment Support Package 3, creating a set of multiple-choice questions for outcome 1. Care should be taken to ensure that candidates are given the opportunity to explain code as stated in assessment standard 1.1. Multiple-choice questions alone are not appropriate in this case.

Some centres did not apply 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, can be found in the unit specifications available from the [Computing Science subject page](#).

The prior verification service is available free of charge and full details can be found on our [National Qualifications – prior verification page](#).

## 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.

Almost all centres verified for National 4 submitted evidence for Information Systems Design and Development. Apart from some confusion over features and functionality for assessment standard 2.1, judgements were reliable and accepted.

Candidates from those centres who used SQA Unit Assessment Support Package 1 continued to lack depth in their internal commentary. Rather than explaining and identifying the purpose, candidates simply stated what constructs and variable types were being used. This is not sufficient evidence for achievement of outcome 1.

When oral evidence was used to add further detail to candidate responses, almost all centres included a note of the discussion that took place, providing the crucial information needed to justify assessment judgements. It is important to note that this does not count as a re-assessment and when re-assessment is necessary, a different assessment instrument should be used.

03

## Section 3: General comments

Almost all centres have adopted the good practice of annotating the candidate evidence to indicate where the assessment standard has been achieved. There is increasing evidence of internal verification annotations too, with some centres indicating where a judgement call is carried forward when there is a discrepancy between the assessor and verifier judgements.

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