

NQ Media Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	Media
Verification activity	Event
Round	1
Date published	July 2026

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H235 73	National 3	Analysing Media Content
H238 73	National 3	Creating Media Content
H235 74	National 4	Analysing Media Content
J297 75	SCQF level 5	Analysing Media Content
J297 76	SCQF level 6	Analysing Media Content

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

We recommend that centres use the unit assessment support (UAS) packs available on our secure site, and many centres used these effectively. Some centres chose to assess candidates using centre-devised assessments. While this is possible, we recommend centres make use of our free [prior verification](#) service, to ensure that assessment approaches used by centres are valid. This gives centres confidence that their assessment is fit for purpose and meets national standards.

If using centre-devised assessments, centres must ensure that candidates have opportunities to achieve all the assessment standards. If centres use new or adapted instruments of assessment, they must provide a modified version of the judging evidence table that exemplifies possible responses to the centre-devised assessment.

Some centres chose to deliver Media units as part of a Scottish Studies award. While we encourage this, centres must ensure candidates demonstrate sufficient understanding of the Media qualification. Some candidates (mostly in SCQF level 6 Analysing Media Content), did not analyse specific media key aspects in their responses and instead answered questions in a more general way. In these cases, the evidence was not sufficient to meet the assessment standards.

Assessment judgements

Most centres made valid and reliable assessment judgements with reference to the unit specifications and judging evidence tables in the UAS packs. However, in some cases, assessment judgements were inconsistent or lenient with regards to what was being accepted for analysis of media content and contexts. In SCQF level 5 and 6 Analysing Media Content units, there were instances where analysis of media key aspects was unclear, or in some cases inaccurate, but was accepted by the centre as sufficient to meet the assessment standards.

We recommend centres refer to our Understanding Standards materials, which exemplify the appropriate level of detail required. Centres can find these materials in the Understanding Standards section of our secure website.

Some centres provided minimal or no indication of assessment judgements on the candidate evidence, which makes both internal and external verification more challenging.

General comments

Many centres had good quality assurance procedures in place, with evidence of internal verification through cross-marking with colour-coded comments. Assessors clearly recorded their assessment decisions on candidate materials and candidate assessment records, along with confirmation or amendments by the internal verifier.

Gathering additional supporting evidence from candidates through discussion is valid; however, assessors must provide sufficiently detailed records to help both internal and external verification processes.

Group projects can be a natural way for candidates to generate evidence for the Creating Media Content units; however, assessors must give candidates sufficient opportunities to produce separate evidence that allows each group member to achieve the assessment standards without duplication. This can be achieved in a number of ways, for example by allocating each group member responsibility for an individual production role, or for producing a separate section of the media text.

NQ Media Verification Summary 2025-26

Verification information

Subject	Media
Verification activity	Event
Round	2
Date published	July 2026

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H239 74	National 4	Media Assignment (added value unit)

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Many centres chose to assess candidates using modified versions of our unit assessment support (UAS) pack, often with appropriate levels of scaffolding and support. This approach was generally effective and enabled most candidates to generate evidence for the assessment standards.

Some centres chose to use centre-devised or adapted assessments. While this is possible, we recommend centres make use of our free [prior verification](#) service, to ensure that assessment approaches used by centres are valid.

If using centre-devised assessments, centres must ensure that candidates have opportunities to achieve all the assessment standards. If centres adapt assessment instruments, they must provide a modified version of the judging evidence table that exemplifies possible responses to the assessment.

Some centres did not submit the unit requested for verification (National 4 Media Assignment), and others did not provide sufficient evidence for verification activity to proceed. Centres must ensure that they submit all requested candidate evidence and that sufficient evidence is available to support assessment judgements.

Assessment judgements

Most centres made valid and reliable assessment judgements with reference to the unit specification and judging evidence tables in the UAS pack.

Many centres submitted National 5 assignment evidence for candidates who had changed to National 4 level. While this is valid, centres must ensure that candidate evidence is assessed against the National 4 added value unit assessment standards and that they provide any additional evidence required.

In the added value unit, centres must ensure that candidates provide sufficient evidence for assessment standard 1.3. This requires candidates to identify two valid institutional factors and provide a simple statement explaining how they would deal with them. Candidate responses should make specific reference to plans they have made for their production. It also requires candidates to describe the equipment and resources required for the production. This information is not always fully addressed through completion of the National 5 assignment and centres must ensure that sufficient evidence is available to demonstrate achievement of this assessment standard.

We recommend centres refer to our Understanding Standards materials, which exemplify the appropriate level of detail required for National 4 assignment added value unit evidence. Centres can find these materials in the Understanding Standards section of our secure website.

General comments

Many candidates demonstrated confident understanding of media terminology and the key aspects of media. Many candidates demonstrated good awareness of their own production skills when evaluating their work.

If centres gather additional candidate evidence through discussion, they must ensure that sufficiently detailed records are maintained in order to support assessment judgements.

Many centres had effective quality assurance procedures in place, with evidence of internal verification and clear annotation of candidate evidence. Many centres clearly recorded assessment decisions, supporting both internal and external verification processes.

We remind centres to carefully review the verification selection instructions before submitting evidence. This ensures centres submit the correct units and that sufficient candidate evidence is available to support assessment judgements.