NQ Computing Science Qualification

Verification Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Computing Science
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	1
Date published:	June 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H21X 73	National 3	Building Digital Solutions
H226 74	National 4	Information System Design and Development
H223 74	National 4	Software Design and Development

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres used SQA published unit assessment support packs, and assessment approaches were all valid.

Assessment judgements

The majority of assessment judgements were in line with national standards.

Section 3: general comments

At National 3 level, centres in the sample were reminded that the application of thresholds was very important when making their overall judgement on whether the candidate passed or failed the unit. Centres are reminded to refer to the judging evidence table in the unit assessment support packs for Assessment standard 2.1 in the Software Design and Development unit. Candidates are required to implement two of the three listed constructs for this assessment standard; however, this does not have to be in a single program.

At National 4 level, all centre assessment judgements were in line with national standards. This demonstrated a good understanding of the standards required, as set out in the unit assessment packs.

NQ Computing Science Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Computing Science
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	2
Date published:	June 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H227 74	SCQF level 4	Computing Science Assignment

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All selected centres used SQA's National 4 added value unit assessment support packs. There was a relatively even spread across the four SQA assessment tasks (Games review, Language tutors, Music fans, and Ticket agency). As a result, all centres' assessment approaches were accepted.

Although there were no instances this year, centres are reminded that if they make any alterations to an SQA assessment task or create a new assessment task, these must appropriately assess candidates and the task must be included with the centre's verification materials.

Assessment judgements

While many centre's assessment judgements were sound, there were a number of recurring judgement issues, namely:

Assessment standard 1.2

In the Games review task, assessment of this standard focuses on the design of the program rather than the physical appearance of the solution. A successful design should show a selection of the programming constructs detailed in the judging evidence table (page 8 of the unit assessment support pack).

It may be overly challenging for candidates at National 4 level to successfully design the whole program; therefore, it is sufficient to design just one part of the program (for example, the ball movement, or the control keys) to meet this standard.

Assessment standard 1.2

In the Music fans and Language tutors assessment tasks, several centres judged the standard to have been met when candidates had design evidence consisting of a screenshot of design information (for example MS Access design view) after the

database had been created. The design of the database should be created before the implementation stage; therefore, a screenshot of this type is not sufficient to meet this assessment standard.

Assessment standard 1.4

Across all four of the assessment tasks, a small number of centres judged the standard to have been met when candidates had not covered all three aspects of evaluation required here. For both the information system and the program, centres must ensure that candidates include:

- how their solution meets the requirements. It is not sufficient to simply say that it does meet the requirements. Candidates should describe how their solution matches with the requirements outlined in the analysis stage of the assessment.
- the difficulties they encountered. It is acceptable for candidates to simply state that they had no difficulties.
- suggested improvements. Candidates must describe a suitable improvement to their solution. It is not acceptable to simply state that their solution cannot be improved. Improvements do not have to be implemented, so the candidate can describe an improvement that would be outwith their current level of ability, if desired.

Section 3: general comments

Centres are reminded that in order to meet the standard required for an overall pass, a candidate must pass at least three of the four assessment standards.

There is still some evidence that centres are not applying this threshold when making an overall judgement on whether the candidate passes or fails the unit. Threshold information can be found in the added value unit specification, available from the Computing Science subject page.

For centres chosen for future verification, please ensure that materials for the unit selected for verification are submitted. If centres are unsure as to whether they will be

able to provide sufficient assessed evidence for verification, they should contact the NQ verification team.

All centres provided some evidence of their internal verification process, with most centres' processes continuing to improve. However, there were a small number of instances where the internal verification processes did not function as well as it could have. As internal verification is an essential component of the assessment process, the internal verifiers themselves should be familiar with the assessment standards. Further advice and guidance on internal verification can be found in SQA's Internal Verification Toolkit, available on SQA's website.