Course report 2026

Higher Physics, SCQF level 6

We've written this report for teachers and lecturers. We recommend you read this with the published course assessment documents and marking instructions.

Note: we've made changes to the course assessment from session 2026–27. Check your subject page for more information.

The report:

- provides a summary of how each course component performed
- highlights areas of the question paper and coursework where candidates performed well and areas where they did not perform well
- has advice you might find useful when preparing candidates for assessment

We collect and prepare the statistics in course reports before we complete the appeals process.

Copyright © Qualifications Scotland 2026

Statistical and grade boundary information

Course entries

Number of resulted entries in 2025: 8,561

Number of resulted entries in 2026: 8,663

Distribution of course awards (including minimum mark to achieve each grade)

Course award	Number of candidates	Percentage	Cumulative percentage	Minimum mark required
A	2,496	28.8	28.8	102
B	2,119	24.5	53.3	86
C	1,826	21.1	74.4	71
D	1,385	16.0	90.3	55
No award	837	9.7	100	Not applicable

We've not applied rounding to these statistics.

In this report:

- 'Most' means greater than or equal to 70%.
- 'Many' means 50% to 69%.
- 'Some' means 25% to 49%.
- 'Few' or 'a few' means less than 25%.

You can find statistical reports on our website.

General commentary on grade boundaries

Our main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels, and to maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, we aim to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade A boundary)

It's very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject, at every level. Therefore, we hold a grade boundary meeting for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Senior Qualifications Scotland staff normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors use their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. We can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- We can adjust the grade boundaries downwards if there's evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- We can adjust the grade boundaries upwards if there's evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- If levels of difficulty are comparable to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries.

Every year, we evaluate the performance of our assessments in a fair way, while ensuring standards are maintained so that our qualifications remain credible. To do

this, we measure evidence of candidates' knowledge and skills against the national standard.

For full details of the approach, please refer to the Awarding and Grading for National Courses Policy.

How the course assessment performed

Question papers

Feedback from teachers, lecturers and candidates indicated that the papers were fair and accessible.

Question paper 1 performed as expected. Question paper 2 performed as expected.

We made adjustments to the C-grade boundary for questions 7(b) and 13(a), as they were considered not to have functioned wholly as intended.

We made an adjustment to the A-grade boundary for question 13(a), as it was considered not to have functioned wholly as intended.

Some candidates were unable to answer questions that related to practical work, including questions related to particular experiments detailed in the Higher Physics Course Specification, which is available on the Higher Physics subject page. While it was evident that some candidates had experience of a range of practical work, others showed little or no evidence of experience of practical work, and had therefore not developed the necessary knowledge and skills. Questions testing recall of facts and definitions continue to be done poorly.

A number of markers commented on the poor quality of handwriting of a large number of candidates, which made it difficult to determine what had been written.

A number of candidates supplied more responses to particular questions than required. This can prevent candidates accessing the maximum marks available for a question, as markers apply general marking principle 21 on surplus answers to these responses (see 'Physics: general marking principles', available on the Higher Physics subject page).

Assignment

The assignment performed as expected, with the marks awarded aligning closely with performance in 2024 and 2025. We did not make any adjustments to grade boundaries for this part of the assessment.

How candidates performed

Areas where candidates performed well

Question paper 1

Question 1 Most candidates calculated the distance the car travelled correctly, using the data provided.

Question 2 Most candidates explained why an object travels at its terminal velocity.

Question 3 Most candidates determined the component of weight of the cyclist down the slope.

Question 4 Most candidates determined the total kinetic energy before and after the collision.

Question 5 Many candidates determined the change in speed of the car.

Question 6 Most candidates determined the magnitude of the average force from the data provided.

Question 8 Most candidates calculated the length of the spacecraft as measured by a stationary observer correctly.

Question 9 Most candidates described the observed changes in frequency correctly.

Question 10 Most candidates identified the source of evidence for dark energy.

Question 12 Most candidates compared the mass of the two particles in terms of orders of magnitude.

Question 13 Most candidates identified the force-mediating particle associated with the electromagnetic force.

Question 14 Many candidates identified that the reaction was an example of nuclear fusion.

Question 16 Many candidates determined the work function of the metal.

Question 17 Many candidates identified the correct change in amplitude of sound as the microphone is moved across the interference pattern.

Question 18 Many candidates explained why one of the spectral lines was brighter than the others.

Question 19 Most candidates identified the critical angle and determined the refractive index of the material.

Question 20 Most candidates determined the frequency and rms voltage of the electrical supply.

Question 21 Most candidates determined the power dissipated in the 4.0 Ω resistor.

Question 22 Most candidates determined the total resistance of the network.

Question 23 Many candidates defined the ampere in terms of other electrical units.

Question 24 Most candidates calculated the maximum charge stored by the capacitor correctly.

Question 25 Most candidates calculated the tension correctly.

Question paper 2

Question 1(a)(i)(A) Most candidates calculated the horizontal component of the initial velocity of the shot correctly.

Question 1(a)(i)(B) Most candidates calculated the vertical component of the initial velocity of the shot correctly.

Question 1(a)(ii) Many candidates determined the maximum height of the shot above the ground.

Question 1(a)(iv) Most candidates calculated the horizontal distance travelled by the shot correctly.

Question 1(b)	Many candidates stated that the horizontal distance travelled by the shot increased and justified why this was the case.
Question 2(b)(i)	Most candidates calculated the mean value of the data correctly.
Question 2(b)(ii)	Many candidates calculated the approximate random uncertainty correctly. Some candidates did not achieve full marks because they either omitted the unit or gave an incorrect unit.
Question 3(a)(i)	Most candidates showed the correct value for the redshift.
Question 3(a(ii)	Most candidates determined the approximate distance correctly.
Question 3(c)	Many candidates stated the name of the Hubble-Lemaître law.
Question 4(a)(i)	Most candidates calculated the weight of the boat correctly.
Question 4(b)	Most candidates determined the maximum power output of the electric motor.
Questions 5 and 11	The open-ended questions performed very much as they have done in previous exams. Answers for both questions ranged from very good to very poor. These questions are intended to be demanding.
Question 6(a)(i)	Most candidates identified the element as uranium.
Question 6(a)(ii)	Many candidates determined the mass of the particle. A number of candidates rounded their values inappropriately before their final answer, which resulted in a final answer that wasn’t acceptable.
Question 6(b)	Many candidates calculated the magnitude of the charge on the particle correctly. However, a number of candidates used

	the relationship to calculate the charge on a capacitor, which resulted in an incorrect final answer.
Question 6(c)	Many candidates determined the direction of the force on the particle as it enters the field.
Question 7(a)(ii)	Most candidates calculated the energy of the photon correctly.
Question 8(a)(i)	Many candidates explained, in terms of waves, how a maximum is formed.
Question 8(a)(iii)	Most candidates calculated the wavelength of the red light correctly.
Question 10(a)(ii)	Most candidates calculated the absolute refractive index of the glass correctly.
Question 10(a)(iii)	Many candidates calculated the frequency of the light correctly. However, a number of candidates were not aware that the frequency of light remains unchanged when it passes from air into glass.
Question 12(b)(i)	Many candidates determined the EMF from the graph.
Question 12(d)	Many candidates drew an appropriate line on the graph showing the trend for the different power supply.
Question 14(a)(i)	Many candidates drew a graph of the data.
Question 14(b)	Many candidates used their value determined in question 14(a)(iii) to then determine the rebound height of the ball.

Assignment

An aim that describes clearly the purpose of the investigation

Most candidates stated an aim that clearly described the purpose of their investigation. For the few candidates who did not gain this mark, the most common reason was that their aim lacked specificity.

An account of the physics relevant to the aim of the investigation

Many candidates demonstrated at least a reasonable understanding of the physics relevant to their investigation. A few candidates did assignments on topics that were either at National 5 level or lower, or experiments that were more suited to an Advanced Higher project. In the case of the former, candidates often struggled to include any physics at Higher level. In the case of the latter, it was often evident that the candidates did not understand the physics behind the experiments. Centres must ensure that experiments are at an appropriate level for Higher.

Sufficient raw data from the candidate's experiment

Most candidates included sufficient raw data from their experiment. Where candidates did two experiments, at least one met the criteria for this mark to be awarded.

Data relevant to the experiment obtained from an internet/literature source or data relevant to the aim of the investigation obtained from a second experiment

Most candidates included either data relevant to their experiment from an internet or literature source, or data relevant to their aim from a second experiment. For the few candidates who did not achieve this mark, it was usually because the data they included from an internet or literature source was not relevant to their experiment. For example, a number of candidates included a data book value for a constant rather than including data that could be compared to their own experimental data. A number of candidates included internet graphs that did not include data. Where a candidate's aim was to determine a value or a constant, these graphs were not awarded the mark for this section.

Axes of the graph have suitable scales

Most candidates produced graphs that had suitable scales.

Axes of the graph have suitable labels and units

Most candidates produced graphs that had suitable labels and units.

Scale reading uncertainties and random uncertainties

Most candidates gave either appropriate scale reading uncertainties or random uncertainties. However, only some candidates gave both. It was quite common for the quoted scale reading uncertainties not to match the level of precision used for the measurements — for example, measurements quoted to 0.1 of a division but scale reading uncertainty quoted as 0.5 of a division. Some candidates included a scale reading uncertainty for one of their measured quantities, but not all of them.

A clear and concise report with an informative title

Most candidates produced clear and concise reports and included an informative title.

Areas where candidates did not perform well

Question paper 1

Question 7 Only some candidates identified which of the three statements were correct. Some candidates indicated that the statement that the vertical velocity of the ISS was increasing was correct. Some candidates indicated that the statement that the gravitational field strength was zero at a height of 420 km above the surface of the Earth was correct.

Question 11 Only some candidates identified which of the three statements were correct. Some candidates chose responses that would have meant the electric field around the point charge was uniform, despite the question including a diagram showing a radial field around the point charge.

Question 15 Only some candidates determined the irradiance at the new distance.

Question paper 2

Question 1(a)(iii)	Some candidates calculated the time taken for the shot to reach the ground correctly.
Question 2 (a)	Few candidates described how to use the apparatus and then process the data to determine the acceleration of the vehicle down the slope, despite this experiment being one of the six mandatory practicals stated in the course specification. Some candidates described using other apparatus, even though the question stated that they should use the apparatus shown.
Question 2(b)(iii)	Some candidates explained that taking more readings would decrease the random uncertainty. A number of candidates answered this question in terms of accuracy, when the question required them to answer in terms of precision.
Question 2(c)	Some candidates stated and justified that starting the vehicle at a different point on the slope would have no effect on the acceleration.
Question 3(b)	Some candidates identified the correct line and justified their selection by calculation.
Question 4(a)(ii)	Some candidates determined the correct tension in each rope. A number of candidates did not divide by four, so they arrived at an incorrect value of tension. This was despite the number four being in bold in the stem of the question.
Question 4(c)	Some candidates stated that the tension in the cable increased and justified their answer correctly.
Question 7(a)(i)	Only some candidates stated the definition of work function.
Question 7(a)(iii)	Only some candidates determined the maximum kinetic energy of the electron.

Question 7(b)	Only some candidates stated that the tinsel now falls more quickly. However, few candidates justified why.
Question 7(c)(i)	Only some candidates stated that a doped semiconductor is one to which an impurity has been added.
Question 7(c)(ii)	Only some candidates explained the operation of an LED in terms of band theory.
Question 8(a)(ii)	Few candidates explained why the central maximum is white. Few candidates stated that the path difference is zero for all wavelengths.
Question 8(b)(i)	Few candidates suggested that the appropriate way to process data from the experiment is to draw a graph of wavelength against the sine of the angle and then calculate the gradient of the line of best fit. A number of candidates suggested finding the value for each set of data and then calculating the average of these values. This is an example of invalid averaging, and not an appropriate approach.
Question 8(b)(ii)	Only some candidates determined the number of lines per millimetre for the grating.
Question 9(a)	Some candidates gave two features of the Bohr model of the hydrogen atom. A number of candidates stated that the nucleus contained proton**s**; this is untrue for a hydrogen nucleus. A number of candidates gave more than two features of the Bohr model. Where candidates supplied any responses that were not features of the Bohr model, general marking principle 21 was applied.
Question 9(b)(i)	Few candidates stated the minimum energy required to ionise the atom.
Question 10(a)(i)	Few candidates stated the definition of absolute refractive index.

Question 10(b)	Few candidates identified the correct point on the screen and justified their selection.
Question 12(a)	Only some candidates stated the definition of electromotive force (EMF).
Question 12(b)(ii)	Only some candidates determined the internal resistance from the graph.
Question 13(a)(i)	Few candidates determined the potential difference across the capacitor. Many candidates attempted to calculate the value using a constant current, despite obtaining a value from a graph that shows the current was decreasing with time.
Question 13(c)	Although many candidates stated that the time to charge is greater, few candidates justified their answer.
Question 14(a)(ii)	Some candidates calculated the gradient of their line. A number of candidates used data points that did not lie on the line they had drawn.
Question 14(a)(iii)	Some candidates used their gradient to calculate the coefficient of restitution.

Assignment

A brief summary of an approach used to collect experimental data

Only some candidates provided a summary of the approach they used to collect the experimental data. A number of candidates did not summarise the approach and instead included a full experimental method. Other candidates did not include details of the measuring instruments they used.

Data, including any mean and/or derived values, presented in correctly produced tables

Although this should be a straightforward mark to achieve, some candidates did not present their data correctly. Common issues included mistakes in calculating mean and/or derived values, columns with missing or inappropriate headings (for example, ‘mean’ rather than ‘mean voltage’), and columns with missing units. A few candidates quoted their measurements to inconsistent levels of precision; for example, some values were quoted with no decimal places, while others were quoted with one or two decimal places. All values should be quoted to the same precision (as displayed on the measuring instrument), for example, 2.00 and 3.45, not 2 and 3.45.

A citation and reference for a source of internet/literature data or information

Some candidates did not cite and reference their secondary source of data when conducting one experiment, or a source for their underlying physics when conducting two related experiments. At this level, candidates do not need to use a formal citation and referencing system, but a notable proportion of candidates who gained the mark used a Vancouver-style system. Common errors included using a full URL as the citation, omitting the date of access when referencing websites, and omitting page numbers when referencing a book.

Accurately plotted data points and, where appropriate, a line of best fit

Only some candidates plotted points with sufficient accuracy or drew the appropriate line of best fit. Common issues included lines of best fit that were forced through the origin, lines of best fit drawn simply from the first point to the last point (which is seldom likely to be the line of best fit), and choosing awkward scales that made it difficult to plot points accurately. A few candidates chose to use graphing software, which is acceptable, but produced graphs that were too small to check accuracy of plotting. A few candidates omitted minor gridlines or used large default Excel data points, which meant markers could not check the accuracy of plotting. A few candidates drew straight lines of best fit when the data points showed a clear curve.

Analysis of experimental data

Some candidates analysed their experimental data appropriately. Those that carried out meaningful calculations were much more likely to gain the mark than those that tried to analyse their data descriptively — often, their descriptions were not at the

correct level for Higher Physics. However, some candidates carried out calculations that had no real meaning, or calculated a value but then did not explain its significance.

A few candidates carried out invalid averaging. For example, they calculated a value for g for each data point and then averaged the values they had calculated. Candidates should be aware that the correct way to analyse such data is to determine the gradient of the line on their graph (assuming it is a straight line) and use the gradient to determine the quantity being investigated. At Higher level, mathematical analysis is better than written descriptions. Candidates must show their calculations or include a sample calculation.

A valid conclusion that relates to the aim and is supported by all the data in the report

Some candidates stated a valid conclusion supported by all the data in their report. A common issue was basing the conclusion on only one set of data in the report. This was typically their experimental data, and they ignored their secondary data, although there were a few instances where the candidate based their conclusion on the secondary data and ignored their experimental data. This issue tended to be less frequent when the candidate had taken the two-experiment option. Other issues included claiming direct proportionality when the line of best fit did not pass through the origin. However, for candidates who analysed their results by calculating appropriate uncertainties, this conclusion may have been appropriate within the range of those uncertainties. A better approach is to advise candidates to use the term ‘linear relationship’, which can be applied to any straight line of best fit, whether it passes through the origin or not. A few candidates claimed incorrectly that curves confirmed direct proportionality or that they confirmed the relationship or law being investigated.

Evaluation of the investigation

Few candidates gave more than one evaluative statement with appropriate justification. Evaluation is a higher-order skill and is expected to be demanding. Common issues included missing or incorrect justifications for suggestions. In some cases, the suggestions made would have made no difference to the measurements

or results. For example, some candidates suggested repeating measurements more often, even when measurements showed little or no variation. Some candidates continued to confuse the terms accuracy, precision, and reliability. There is no requirement for candidates to use these terms in their report, but if they do, they must use them correctly. Candidates also made evaluative comments that were irrelevant to their experiment or their data.

For example, candidates who carried out an investigation into the internal resistance of a cell using a method measuring the terminal potential difference of the cell and the current claimed that they should have taken the resistance of the wires into account. This is not valid for this experimental method, although it may be valid for a method that alters the measured resistance and measures the current.

Preparing candidates for assessment

Higher Physics is a practical course that requires candidates to develop their knowledge, understanding and skills related to practical work.

You **must** give candidates opportunities to take an active part in a wide range of practical work throughout the course, including opportunities to evaluate and analyse, so they can develop the necessary knowledge and skills. While demonstration of experiments, videos and computer simulations may be useful additional tools, they cannot replace active experimental work and do not develop the knowledge and skills associated with practical work.

Regular opportunities to practise experimental skills during classwork should help candidates answer questions that assess aspects of experimental technique and analysis of experimental data. They should also help candidates to improve their performance in the assignment.

In the assignment, you must ensure that a range of topics is available for candidates to choose from and you must minimise the number of candidates in a class investigating the same topic. For example, in a class of 20, where candidates may work in groups of up to four, you must provide a minimum of five different topics, with each group investigating a different topic. While some centres offered up to seven or eight different topics and ensured each group in a class investigated a different topic, others offered only two or three and did not minimise the number of candidates in a class investigating the same topic. For clarity, a topic is something such as internal resistance or refractive index. Having groups in the same class investigate the refractive index of different materials still means that the groups are investigating the same topic.

Candidates should be aware that evaluative statements must be relevant to both their practical work and their data.

Question paper

Encourage candidates to make their handwriting as clear as possible. Many markers commented that candidates' handwriting was difficult to read.

You should encourage candidates to learn the definitions required for Higher Physics.

Encourage candidates to read the questions carefully and answer the question being asked. There is some evidence that candidates give answers to questions that are in past papers rather than the question in front of them.

Candidates should know that sketching a graph or completing a diagram requires both accuracy and precision. They should use a ruler when drawing straight lines. Candidates should also use a ruler when drawing a line of best fit on a graph.

Strongly advise candidates not to copy answers from their calculator containing a large number of significant figures or to use ellipses as the penultimate stage in their response before stating their final answer, as this can often introduce transcription or rounding errors into their calculations. Strongly encourage candidates to show only the selected relationship, the substitution and then the answer, including units, to the appropriate number of significant figures.

Discourage candidates from rounding at the intermediate stage of a calculation, as this can result in their response not being one of the acceptable values.

Teachers and lecturers should ensure that candidates are aware that they should follow sign conventions through to the end of calculations and that it is not acceptable to drop negative signs part-way through a calculation. Teachers and lecturers should ensure that candidates understand the vector nature of velocities.

In the examination, encourage candidates to refer to the data sheet and the relationships sheet rather than trying to remember data and relationships. A concerning trend is that, despite the relationships sheet showing the correct use of subscripts or superscripts, some candidates change subscripts to superscripts (powers) in relationships, making the relationship incorrect. For example:

$$\frac{V^1}{V^2} = \frac{R^1}{R^2}$$

Markers cannot give credit for this.

Candidates should be able to describe electric fields around both point charges and between charged parallel plates.

Candidates should know the features of the Bohr model of the hydrogen atom.

Candidate should know that the path difference at a central white maximum is zero for all wavelengths of light.

Candidates should know that the refractive index of a material increases as the frequency of the light passing through it increases.

Candidates should know that a doped semiconductor is one that has had an impurity added to it.

Candidates should know how to calculate the potential difference across a capacitor as it charges in an RC circuit.

Candidates should know that the best way of processing data is to draw a graph.

Candidates should know that increasing the number of repeats in an experiment may reduce the random uncertainty in a value and therefore improve the precision of the value.

Give candidates opportunities to practise interpreting graphs that may be unfamiliar.

You should give candidates opportunities to practise drawing graphs where the data does not give a perfect fit, so they become skilled at drawing an appropriate line of best fit. Advise candidates not to draw a line from the first data point to the last unless this agrees with the rest of the data. Advise candidates not to force the line of best fit through the origin.

Advise candidates not to calculate the gradient of a line by using data points in the table of results unless their line passes through those data points.

Encourage candidates to take care of powers of ten when calculating the gradient of a line of best fit.

Centres should ensure that candidates know to provide only the number of responses required by a question. Candidates should also know that markers will apply general marking principle 21 if they provide excess answers.

When carrying out practical work, give candidates opportunities to discuss practical improvements to their experiments.

Centres should refer to the 'Physics: general marking principles' on the Higher Physics subject page for general guidance on marking question papers and assessments. Centres must use these instructions when marking prelim examinations and centre-devised assessments for all Qualifications Scotland Physics courses.

Assignment

Teachers and lecturers must ensure that they offer a sufficient range of topics and that the topics are at an appropriate level for Higher. Whole classes or cohorts, or a significant proportion of a class, must not investigate the same topic. Offering Higher candidates topics at National 4, National 5 or Advanced Higher level can disadvantage them when marks are awarded. The experiments can be standard ones from the Higher course and do not have to be unfamiliar or from outwith the course.

Teachers and lecturers must give candidates the 'Instructions for candidates' from the Higher Physics Assignment Assessment Task, which is available under the 'Coursework' heading on the Higher Physics subject page. Centres must not alter or add content to these instructions.

Centres should ensure that if candidates are only conducting one experiment, they have an opportunity to find data from internet or literature sources that is relevant to their experiment. If candidates are seeking to use their data to determine a numerical value, for example the refractive index of Perspex, their second source should also include data that allows them to determine that value.

Centres **must** give candidates opportunities to take part in a wide range of practical work before choosing a topic for investigation.

Teachers and lecturers should ensure that candidates can cite and reference their sources correctly. While a formal citing and referencing system is not required, strongly encourage candidates to use a system such as the Vancouver refencing system.

Teachers and lecturers should ensure that candidates have frequent opportunities to produce graphs from experimental data and analyse the data from the graphs. Where candidates use graphing software, teachers and lecturers should ensure that they know how to use it correctly.

Teachers and lecturers should make candidates aware that they need to conclude all of their data —both practical and literature. Where a candidate's experimental data does not agree with their literature data, the conclusion should reflect this.

Teachers and lecturers should advise candidates to use the term 'linear relationship' when their graph results in a straight line of best fit. This avoids problems around whether lines show direct proportionality.

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates understand that a best-fit curve on a graph cannot be used to confirm a relationship or law. To do this, candidates would need to plot more appropriate quantities that produce a straight line of best fit.

Teachers and lecturers should ensure that candidates are given opportunities to develop the necessary skills to evaluate their data and experimental procedures.

In preparation for the report stage of the assignment, teachers and lecturers must check the materials candidates have gathered to ensure that they do not include prohibited items. For example, candidates can take in a table of their raw data, but it must not include blank columns to fill in, partially completed columns with headings and units, or pre-calculated mean and derived values, such as the sine of the angles in a Snell's Law experiment. Extracts from internet or literature sources must not include sample calculations. Teachers and lecturers must refer to the Higher Physics Assignment Assessment Task to ensure that the conditions of assessment are understood and applied.

Centres are also advised to consult the 'Guidance on conditions of assessment' for coursework, which is available under the 'Coursework' heading on the

Higher Physics subject page, for clarification and examples of acceptable conduct during coursework assessments.

Changes to the course assessment from session 2026–27

- Replaced question paper 1 and question paper 2 with a single question paper.
- The new question paper is worth 130 marks in total and lasts 2 hours and 30 minutes.
- The assignment still has 20 marks, and is scaled to 33 marks, instead of 30.

We've amended the question paper details in the course specification. Candidates must have the opportunity to carry out a wide range of experimental work. You may wish to update prelims to match the updated format and duration of the question paper.