

# NQ Psychology Verification Summary 2025–26

## Verification information

<b>Subject</b>	Psychology
<b>Verification activity</b>	Event
<b>Round</b>	1
<b>Date published</b>	April 2026

## National Units verified

<b>Unit code</b>	<b>Unit level</b>	<b>Unit title</b>
J2D1 75	SCQF level 5	Psychology: Individual Behaviour
J2CY 75	SCQF level 5	Psychology: Research
J2D3 75	SCQF level 5	Psychology: Social Behaviour
J2D2 76	SCQF level 6	Psychology: Individual Behaviour
J2D0 76	SCQF level 6	Psychology: Research
J2D4 76	SCQF level 6	Psychology: Social Behaviour

# Comments on assessment

## Assessment approaches

Some centres used our unit assessment support packs, with most using package 1 — the unit-by-unit approach to assessment. As these unit assessment support packs have been through our quality assurance process, they are valid approaches to assessment.

Some centres took a combined approach to assessment, using either prior-verified assessments or our package 3 unit assessment support packs. As these have also been through our quality assurance process, both are valid approaches to assessment. The combined approach was most common in centres presenting the National Progression Award in Psychology at SCQF levels 5 and 6. A few centres modified the approach to assessment in such a way that candidates were unable to meet the assessment standards.

A few centres over-assessed candidates, requiring evaluation of multiple approaches and/or theories for the Psychology: Individual Behaviour unit, particularly for SCQF level 6. Centres must be aware that unit assessments are set to a minimum standard and while centres may see it as beneficial for candidates to demonstrate they have the skills to fulfil additional demands, achievement of the unit should not be dependent on them.

Centres adapted our unit assessment support packs in different ways, for example, using different tasks for the assessment standards, such as posters and scenarios.

A few centres included a mark allocation in their approach to assessment. While this approach may assist in preparing candidates for external assessment, it does not effectively determine whether they have met the required assessment standards for unit assessment. Candidates are required to meet the minimum standard in relation to each of the assessment standards in order to achieve outcomes and be awarded a unit pass. Basing decisions on the overall number of marks gained can result in centres making inaccurate assessment judgements.

Centres must ensure they are using the current version of our unit assessment support packs, which are published on our secure site.

If centres wish to devise their own assessments or significantly adapt a unit assessment support pack, we provide a free prior-verification service. We recommend that centres make use of this service to ensure the validity of the assessment approach. Information on this service is available on our [website](#).

## **Assessment judgements**

In some centres assessor judgements were consistent and in line with national standards, were clearly based on the assessment standards, and appropriately identified candidate evidence as pass or fail. Some assessors demonstrated a clear understanding of assessment standards and accurately and consistently applied this when making judgements against candidate evidence.

Some assessors provided useful notes on candidate assessment records to explain how they reached their assessment judgements and some centres annotated candidate scripts to indicate where candidates achieved assessment standards. We recommend that assessors mark on candidate scripts where candidates achieve an assessment standard, as this aids both internal and external verification.

We advise centres to pay particular attention to assessment standards that require candidates to support their explanations with research evidence. This is relevant for assessment standard 1.3 in the units J2D3 75 Psychology: Social Behaviour, J2D2 76 Psychology: Individual Behaviour, and J2D4 76 Psychology: Social Behaviour. In each of these units some candidates explained applications or examples of everyday behaviour but had not supported these explanations with research evidence. Centres should be aware that to achieve this assessment standard candidates are required to use research evidence to support their explanations. This information is available in the second column of the judging evidence table for the relevant unit assessment support pack.

Some candidates could have met the requirements of the assessment standards if assessors had referred to the judging evidence table and the unit specification when making assessment judgements. A few centres over-assessed candidates as they

had not considered the thresholds that were added to the unit specifications in 2019 when making assessment judgements. It is important that centres are aware of minimum standards for achievement and assessment standard thresholds detailed in the unit specifications.

## **General comments**

### **Internal verification**

In some centres, internal verification procedures were thorough and supportive. Evidence showed that assessors and internal verifiers engaged in professional dialogue and collaborative processes, which supported the external verification process. Assessors and internal verifiers annotated scripts in different colours or used different colours of sticky notes, which gave clear indications of the different assessment judgements each made.

Internal verification should ensure national standards are maintained and be a supportive process for assessors. You can find guidance about internal verification in our [NQ internal verification toolkit](#).

### **Good practice**

Some assessors provided detailed feedback to candidates in relation to achievement and gave clear indications of required remediation. Some centres identified where candidates met assessment standards on candidate scripts and used the candidate assessment record effectively, enabling candidates to monitor their progress. This practice was helpful during the verification event.

Centres submitted evidence in a range of formats, including posters, responses to prompts and/or scenarios and worksheets, showing some variety in the way centres adapted the approach to assessment to support achievement for the specific requirements of their candidates.