



NQ verification 2022–23 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

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

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
J239 75	SCQF level 5	Chemical Changes and Structure
J23B 75	SCQF level 5	Nature's Chemistry
J23D 75	SCQF level 5	Chemistry in Society
J1YK 76	SCQF level 6	Chemical Changes and Structure
J23C 76	SCQF level 6	Nature's Chemistry
J23E 76	SCQF level 6	Chemistry in Society

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

We removed the requirement to complete outcome 1 for unit assessments at SCQF levels 5 and 6 for session 2022–23. For more information, refer to the [National Course modification summary: Chemistry](#).

SCQF level 5 units

All centres verified used the SQA unit assessment support (UAS) packs, which meant there were few issues with the approach to assessment.

A number of centres did not use the most up-to-date versions of the SQA UAS packs. Centres must ensure they use the most up-to-date UAS packs from SQA's secure website.

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.

SCQF level 6 units

All centres verified used the SQA UAS packs, which meant there were few issues with the approach to assessment.

Almost all centres used the unit-by-unit approach to assess candidates. A very small number of centres used the portfolio approach.

A number of centres did not use the most up-to-date versions of the SQA UAS packs. A small number of centres used the original UAS packs, which increased the level of demand because candidates had to demonstrate more knowledge than the current UAS packs require.

Centres must ensure they use the most up-to-date UAS packs from SQA's secure website.

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.

Assessment judgements

SCQF level 5 units

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

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.

SCQF level 6 units

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

For outcome 2, some assessors awarded marks for responses that included incorrect units, incorrect specific chemical terms, and incorrect bond connectivity. If a response does not require a unit, but a candidate states an incorrect unit, assessors should not award a mark. Candidates must state chemical terms correctly. When writing chemical formulae, including general formulae for families of organic compounds, candidates must use subscript numbers, where appropriate, for their response to be correct. Candidates must draw structural formulae with correct and accurate bond connectivity.

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.

Some centres submitted evidence for multiple units. Centres only need to submit evidence for one unit for verification.

Most centres clearly showed the assessor's judgements and the internal verifier's judgements by using different colours of pen. Internal verification activity like this is helpful to external verifiers. Many centres also 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. On a few occasions, there was a discrepancy between the assessor and internal verifier, and it was not clear what the final assessment judgement was. In some cases, both the assessor and internal verifier awarded marks incorrectly. Where assessment judgements differ, it is helpful to clearly mark the final judgement on candidate evidence or on a log sheet.