

# NQ Modern Studies Verification Summary 2025–26

## Verification information

|                              |                |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Subject</b>               | Modern Studies |
| <b>Verification activity</b> | Event          |
| <b>Round</b>                 | 1              |
| <b>Date published</b>        | July 2026      |

## National Units verified

| Unit code | Unit level   | Unit title                                                   |
|-----------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| H23C 73   | National 3   | Modern Studies: Democracy in Scotland and the United Kingdom |
| H23F 73   | National 3   | Modern Studies: Social Issues in the United Kingdom          |
| H23G 73   | National 3   | Modern Studies: International Issues                         |
| H23C 74   | National 4   | Modern Studies: Democracy in Scotland and the United Kingdom |
| H23F 74   | National 4   | Modern Studies: Social Issues in the United Kingdom          |
| H23G 74   | National 4   | Modern Studies: International Issues                         |
| J2A3 75   | SCQF level 5 | Modern Studies: Democracy in Scotland and the United Kingdom |

| Unit code | Unit level   | Unit title                                                   |
|-----------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| J2A5 75   | SCQF level 5 | Modern Studies: Social Issues in the United Kingdom          |
| J2A7 75   | SCQF level 5 | Modern Studies: International Issues                         |
| J2A4 76   | SCQF level 6 | Modern Studies: Democracy in Scotland and the United Kingdom |
| J2A6 76   | SCQF level 6 | Modern Studies: Social Issues in the United Kingdom          |
| J2A8 76   | SCQF level 6 | Modern Studies: International Issues                         |

## Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

Most centres used either our unit assessment support packs or assessments that we had prior verified.

Centres that produce their own assessment materials can submit these to us to be prior verified. This ensures that assessment materials are appropriate and fully in line with the national standard for the level being assessed. Centres must include the prior verification code if submitting materials that we have prior verified.

When using materials with out-of-date or historic statistics, we encourage centres to update or amend these statistics to modernise the information for candidates.

### Assessment judgements

Most assessment judgements were valid, reliable and accepted.

Centres often supported assessment judgements with detailed and specific comments from assessors, which were further consolidated with robust professional dialogue between assessor and verifier about candidate attainment. Centres consistently indicated judgements on candidate scripts, often by annotating judgements using different coloured pens, demonstrating ongoing professional dialogue.

Centres should ensure that they do not inflate assessment standards by allocating marks to assessments or by using SCQF level 5 prompts, such as 'in detail', for National 4 assessments.

We remind centres that the threshold approach for re-assessing candidates remains valid and they should apply these where relevant. While some centres were fully aware of and effectively applied these thresholds, some centres were not, and this had an impact on the accuracy and reliability of centre judgements.

## **General comments**

Almost all centres showed evidence of good assessment practice, with a clear understanding of the assessment standards and how to apply these when measuring candidate attainment.

Centres demonstrated evidence of their internal verification procedures and provided detailed and specific overviews of the steps they take to ensure consistency of judgement across all centre colleagues and candidates. Centres often provided in-depth candidate learning and progress logs, and records showing robust moderation and verification standards that they applied consistently with a high level of transparency and agreement between centre assessor and verifier. This displays a clear understanding of the importance of internal verification processes and the steps undertaken to ensure accuracy of centre judgement across all candidates.

Centres showed further evidence of good practice through very effective script annotation and ongoing professional dialogue.

# NQ Modern Studies Verification Summary 2025–26

## Verification information

|                              |                |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Subject</b>               | Modern Studies |
| <b>Verification activity</b> | Event          |
| <b>Round</b>                 | 2              |
| <b>Date published</b>        | July 2026      |

## National Units verified

| <b>Unit code</b> | <b>Unit level</b> | <b>Unit title</b>         |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| H23R 74          | National 4        | Modern Studies Assignment |

## Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

All centres used our unit assessment support pack to assess candidate progress and attainment.

Candidates presented evidence in a variety of ways, for example A3-sized posters, PowerPoints, candidate or centre workbooks, and written candidate evidence sheets.

## **Assessment judgements**

Most centres made assessment judgements in line with national standards.

Centres demonstrated strong evidence of effective and detailed professional dialogue taking place between assessors and verifiers in estimating and determining candidate attainment. Most centres logged and recorded dialogue and discussion on centre documentation and candidate assessment records. Centres had a clear understanding of what candidates had to do to achieve each assessment standard. However, some centres allocated marks to specific assessment tasks. We remind centres that each assessment standard is assessed on a pass or fail basis and marks should not appear anywhere on assessment tasks.

## **General comments**

Overall, centres submitted material that was of a good standard and quality, with evidence that they applied the national standard consistently across candidates and centres.

Most centres had effective and robust approaches to internal verification with many including their own faculty or centre policies in their submission, which were evident on candidate scripts through assessor and verifier comments and agreements.

Centres demonstrated effective cross-marking, robust record keeping and recording of verification decisions, ongoing professional dialogue, and verbal remediation for candidates who may have failed to achieve a specific assessment standard.