NQ Religious, Moral, and Philosophical Studies Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	1
Date published:	August 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H263 73	National 3	World Religion
H264 73	National 3	Morality and Belief
H263 74	National 4	World Religion
H264 74	National 4	Morality and Belief
H265 74	National 4	Religious and Philosophical Questions
H266 74	National 4	Religious, Moral, and Philosophical Studies Assignment
J2D5 75	SCQF level 5	World Religion
J2D7 75	SCQF level 5	Morality and Belief
J2D8 76	SCQF level 6	Morality and Belief

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

During verification, the following observations were made:

- Most centres that were verified at the event were deemed to be either 'accepted' or 'accepted*'. This shows that the majority of centres were consistent in their application of assessment approaches and in their assessment judgements. Centres are commended for this consistency in application of standards.
- Most centres gave candidates supportive and clear instructions for the actual assessment task, and this made it clear to candidates what was expected from them in the assessment activity.
- The majority of centres adjusted the judging evidence table (JET) to suit their centre-specific issue or area. This included good, clear examples of sample responses, and these JETs clearly matched up with the relevant assessment task.
- A few centres used a booklet approach to support candidates as they worked through the assessment standards. This approach supported candidates in collecting evidence that clearly met the relevant assessment standards.

Action points

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

- Some centres effectively used the sample questions that are included in the unit assessment support pack materials as the basis of their assessment materials. Centres are encouraged to use this approach.
- A few centres used assessment approaches that placed demands on candidates that went beyond the requirements of the assessment standards. Centres should ensure that the language of their instruments of assessment supports candidates in clearly understanding what is expected of them to achieve the relevant standard, and does not disadvantage candidates by asking for more than the standards require.

- Centres are reminded that the assessment standards are judged against minimum competency, which differs from external SQA assessments.
- Centres can use alternative methods of collecting evidence for meeting assessment standards, for example, naturally occurring evidence.

Assessment judgements

During verification, the following observations were made:

- Most centres continue to make appropriate and valid assessment judgements of candidates' evidence for each of the specific assessment standards, in line with national standards.
- Most centres clearly showed on candidate scripts exactly where each assessment standard had been met. This is good practice, as it can facilitate consistent judgements between colleagues and assists the verification process.
- Many centres submitted candidate assessment records that were extremely detailed with regard to why judgements were being made. This was a great help to the verification team, and is also very supportive to candidates.
- The verification team were encouraged to see that some centres had used 'discussion with candidates' to elicit further information from candidates to qualify any achievement of an assessment standard. This approach is encouraged.

Action points

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

- Centres should clearly show where candidates meet assessment standards. A few centres still did not clearly show on candidate materials exactly where candidates met assessment standards, which made it difficult for verifiers to agree with centre judgements.
- Assessment standards can be met throughout candidate evidence, and candidates should be given credit for achieving assessment standards no matter where they achieve it in any materials submitted for verification.

- A few centres submitted more candidate evidence than was needed. This can slow down the verification process, as the verification team reviews all submitted evidence. Centres should carefully consider how much evidence to submit for verification, and should only submit evidence for one level per candidate. Centres choose the unit to be verified and only need to send evidence from one unit, not every unit that candidates sit.

Section 3: general comments

Most centres' internal verification procedure was clear, well laid out, and put into practice. This meant that reviewing assessment judgements was a straightforward process, and centres are commended for this consistency of approach.

Centres are reminded that assessment standards must not be changed. The latest assessment standards must be used, or candidates will be disadvantaged. Centres can find details of how to access SQA's secure site for this information from their SQA coordinator.

Centres are reminded that RMPS has a holistic approach to assessment standards. This means that if a candidate broadly meets the requirements of the assessment standards, then there is no need for re-assessment.

The few centres that were not accepted at the verification event had never been verified previously. The verification team encourages any centre that has never been verified to take advantage of SQA's prior verification service when they are creating new approaches to assessment. This supportive (and free) process enables centres to ensure that their instruments of assessment are in line with national standards before being used or entered as part of the verification process.

If selected for verification, centres should ensure that they submit copies of the following information so the verification process can run smoothly:

- the assessment task

- the judging evidence table, adjusted to suit their own needs
- specific quality assurance processes for internal verification documentation
- candidates' evidence of meeting the assessment standards, including clearly marked assessor decisions
- evidence (and comments, where applicable) of the work done by the internal verifier

Centres seeking guidance on internal verification should refer to SQA's [NQ internal verification toolkit](#).

NQ Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	2
Date published:	August 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H266 74	National 4	Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Assignment

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

As in the previous year, the majority of centres that were verified at the event were judged to be either 'accepted' or 'accepted*'. This showed that most centres are

consistent in their application of assessment approaches and in their assessment judgements. Centres are to be commended for this consistency in application of standards.

Most centres seemed to have worked well with their candidates to ensure that the issue or topic for study for the added value unit was relevant within the context of RMPS. Centres also ensured that the issue or topic was phrased in the form of a question, which supported their candidates throughout the research part of the added value unit.

For their final presentation, the majority of candidates submitted written essays. This is the most straightforward approach for candidates, though centres are reminded that other approaches, such as posters or videos, are also acceptable methods of presentation.

Many centres produced a booklet to support their candidates in the collection of evidence to achieve the assessment standards. Also, most centres gave candidates clear guidance on how to achieve the assessment standards for this unit.

Action Points

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

- A few centres used wording in their support booklets that over-complicated what was expected from candidates, and therefore could have disadvantaged them. Centres' instructions to candidates should support candidates' understanding of the specific assessment standards and what they are required to produce to meet those standards. Sending in proposed support booklets to SQA for prior verification is one way of ensuring that all materials used for the research part of the added value unit are suitable for use.
- Centres are reminded that research evidence can be submitted as part of the candidates' added value unit, as well as for the final presentation. This evidence often helps support the verification process, as candidates can achieve assessment standards in the research process that are not as clearly shown in their final presentation.

Assessment judgements

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

The majority of centres demonstrated very clearly where each assessment standard had been met in the candidates' work. This clear marking of final submissions meant that the verification process was straightforward, as it was easy to see the basis of the assessment judgements.

Some centres still seem to misunderstand assessment standard 1.6. Candidates meet this assessment standard by the actual presentation of their findings — it is not connected to any requirement to have a conclusion.

Some centres overestimated the evidence required to meet the assessment standards and seemed to expect more evidence than what was required to achieve an assessment standard. Centres must ensure that they are familiar with the requirements of each assessment standard.

Many centres provided clear and helpful feedback to candidates when they had not met the assessment standards, and this supported the candidates in the re-submission of their work. Clearly recorded, written dialogue showed the process that had taken place.

Many centres' internal verification procedure was clear and well-laid out. This meant that reviewing assessment judgements was a straightforward process, and centres are commended for this approach.

Action Points

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

- Assessment standard 1.6 in the added value unit relates to the candidate presenting their findings, and does not require a conclusion or a candidate's personal opinion.
- Centres are reminded that the assessment standards cannot be changed, and the latest assessment standards must be used, or candidates will be disadvantaged.

The most recent unit assessment support pack on the SQA secure site contains the most up-to-date set of standards, as well as information on the application of these standards.

- It is the centres' responsibility to ensure that assessment standards are applied correctly, and that candidates are not disadvantaged by centres applying standards that are not in line with national standards. This is especially important with regard to assessment standards 1.2 and 1.6. Bibliographies are unnecessary and sources can be noted in the actual presentation or in the research materials.

- Assessment standards for the added value unit can be met in both the research stage as well as the presentation of findings stage. If the candidate broadly meets the needs of the assessment standard, then there is no need for re-assessment.

Section 3: general comments

Centres are reminded that the purpose of verification is to review a centre's assessment and determine whether the approach to assessment and the assessment judgements are sound. The verifiers' role is not to re-assess candidates work, but to consider if the centre's assessment approach is valid and if assessment judgements have been made reliably; this process cannot be carried out if the candidate work is not clearly annotated, showing where each assessment standard has been met.

Centres are encouraged to review the unit assessment support pack, Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Assignment, August 2016 (version 2.0), as this contains useful information for centres. Also, pages 13 to 16 contain instructions for candidates which will greatly support them in achieving the assessment standards for this unit.

The internal verification procedures of each centre are there to ensure that the proper evidence is submitted to SQA for verification, as well as to ensure that assessment judgements are clear and evidenced. It is also good practice to use the NQ internal verification toolkit on SQA's website.

Centres are encouraged to read the qualification verification summary reports for both rounds of verification on the RMPS subject page of SQA's website.