

NQ Computing Science Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	Computing Science
Verification activity	Event
Round	1
Date published	August 2026

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H21X 73	National 3	Building Digital Solutions
H223 74	National 4	Software Design and Development
H226 74	National 4	Information System Design and Development
J27C 76	SCQF level 6	Software Design and Development

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Most centres used our unit assessment support packs, and assessment approaches were all valid.

Assessment judgements

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

General comments

Centres that use their own assessment tasks, including those that have been verified through our [Prior verification service](#), must include marking instructions in future verification submissions. This allows verifiers to see how assessment judgements were made.

The Information System Design and Development (National 4) unit assessment pack 3 includes an assessment titled 'Guess What'. While candidates may use presentation or web authoring software to complete it, there are no restrictions as to how it must be completed. Candidates can complete this task using code (such as HTML).

In a number of verification submissions, while the correct overall assessment judgement was made using the published thresholds, candidates did not appear to have attempted all assessment standards. All candidates should have the opportunity to be assessed against all assessment standards.

All centres provided some evidence of their internal verification process, and centres' processes continue to improve. However, in a small number of centres, the internal verification process did not function as well as it could have. As internal verification is an essential component of the assessment process, internal verifiers must be familiar with the assessment standards.

You can find guidance about internal verification in our [NQ internal verification toolkit](#).

NQ Computing Science Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	Computing Science
Verification activity	Event
Round	2
Date published	August 2026

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H227 74	National 4	Computing Science Assignment — added value unit

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

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

Although this did not occur this year, if centres make any changes to a Qualification Scotland 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

The vast majority of centres' assessment judgements were in line with national standards. However, there were some recurring assessment judgement issues:

Assessment standard 1.2

In the 'Music fans' and 'Language tutors' assessment tasks, several centres judged the standard to have been met based on evidence consisting of a screenshot of design information after the database had been created (for example, MS Access Design View). This cannot be accepted as evidence of database design. The design of the database should be created before it is implemented.

Assessment standard 1.4

Across all four assessment tasks, a small number of centres judged that the standard was met when candidates had not covered all three required aspects of evaluation.

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 meets the requirements. Candidates must describe how their solution aligns 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. If the candidate says they had difficulties but that 'the teacher helped them' (or words to that effect) then this does not meet the standard required. The candidate must describe the difficulty and how they resolved it.
- 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 is beyond their current level of ability.

General comments

For centres chosen for future verification, please ensure that materials for the unit selected for verification are submitted. If centres are unsure whether they will be able to provide sufficient assessed evidence for verification, they should contact the NQ verification team.

Some centres included multiple submissions per candidate, including evidence marked as 'interim' and as 'complete'. Centres are reminded to submit only one submission per candidate, and that submission must reflect the candidates' current position. Previous versions of candidate work are not required.

While all centres provided some evidence of their internal verification processes, there were a small number of cases where the internal verification processes did not function as well as they could have. As internal verification is an essential component of the assessment process, the internal verifiers must be familiar with the assessment standards. You can find guidance about internal verification in our [NQ internal verification toolkit](#).