

NQ Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies
Verification activity	Event
Round	1
Date published	September 2026

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H263 73	National 3	World Religion
H263 74	National 4	World Religion
H264 74	National 4	Morality and Belief
H265 74	National 4	Religious and Philosophical Questions
J2D7 75	SCQF level 5	Morality and Belief
J2D9 75	SCQF level 5	Religious and Philosophical Questions
J2D8 76	SCQF level 6	Morality and Belief
J2DA 76	SCQF level 6	Religious and Philosophical Questions
J2BC 77	SCQF level 7	Medical Ethics

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Most centres used appropriate assessments based on our unit assessment support packs across all units. These assessments enabled candidates to understand what they had to do to independently achieve the assessment standards.

Most centres successfully based their assessment approaches on the unit-by-unit approach, and the evidence was based on written responses to prompts taken from the judging evidence table or appendix 1. This demonstrated that most centres used our materials effectively, specifically the judging evidence tables, and we encourage this approach.

However, a few centres produced centre-devised assessments that did not follow the assessment conditions in the unit specifications or unit assessment support packs. Therefore, candidates were unable to achieve the required outcomes because either the approaches to assessment were ambiguous and did not give enough support or there was too much scaffolding such as example answers or in using a cloze-style task. These were inappropriate for unit assessments as they did not allow candidates to work independently through the assessment task. Assessment prompts should be appropriate to the level being assessed.

We remind centres that sending in proposed assessment tasks for prior verification is one way of ensuring that they are suitable for use.

Centres can use alternative methods of collecting evidence of meeting assessment standards, for example, naturally occurring evidence. If centres submit naturally occurring evidence it is useful for the verification process to include explanations of how the tasks, questions or prompts and answers relate to the assessment standards.

Assessment judgements

We observed the following examples of good practice:

- Most centres made assessment judgements in line with national standards.
- Most centres submitted clearly-annotated candidate evidence that showed where each assessment standard was or was not met through, for example, highlighting, underlining, bracketing or numbering. We encourage these annotations, which made the verification process straightforward.
- Many centres submitted detailed candidate assessment records that showed why judgements were made, which helps with verification and supports candidates.
- Some centres provided full written records of internal verification discussions that had taken place. This detailed evidence was a support to verifiers and is an example of good practice.

General comments

The first step of any internal verification process should be to ensure that the centre is using the most up-to-date unit assessment support pack to produce their assessments and to assess candidates' work. Centres must also ensure that the assessment used is in line with the published unit specification so that candidates are not disadvantaged by ambiguity of prompts or too much scaffolding, which results in the assessment being 'not accepted'. This has an impact on candidates and the verification process as it becomes difficult to accept centres' judgements for specific outcomes.

Centres can submit interim and complete evidence for candidates, and they should complete the verification sample form, clearly showing whether a candidate has passed or failed the units or assessment standards.

Centres can choose the unit that is to be verified and only need to send evidence for one unit, not every unit that candidates sit.

We recommend that centres use our [prior verification service](#) when creating new approaches to assessment and refer to the [Evidence for verification events](#)

document on our website for alternative ways to assess and submit candidate evidence.

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

- the assessment task
- the judging evidence table adjusted to suit their own situation
- 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

We've published [verification submission guidance for units](#) under the 'What evidence do you need to provide for verification?' heading on our website.

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

NQ Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies
Verification activity	Event
Round	2
Date published	September 2026

National Units verified

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

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

We made the following observations during verification:

- All centres were either ‘accepted’ or ‘accepted*’ in this round of verification for their application of assessment approaches. We commend centres for their consistency in applying national standards.
- Most centres used the unit-by-unit approach, and most evidence submitted was based on written responses to an end of unit activity. We remind centres that

they can also use alternative methods of evidence gathering such as naturally occurring evidence.

- Most centres successfully used our published unit assessment support pack and adapted this for their own context.
- A few centres produced assessments that used a centre-devised assessment booklet for the added value unit and the Morality and Belief unit, which can avoid over-assessment if it's clearly indicated on the centre-devised assessment booklet where candidates met the outcomes for each unit.

Action points

Centres should consider the following comments as a guide for future practice:

- When developing their own assessments for candidates, centres should refer to the instructions for candidates (appendix 1) in the unit assessment support pack for the National 4 Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Assignment. By referring to the style and language in these instructions for candidates, centres can avoid any issues with complexity of language and tasks for candidates. Centres should ensure they do not disadvantage candidates by asking for more than the assessment standards require.
- Centres should give candidates a copy of the outcomes and assessment standards for the assignment as part of the assessment so that they are clear about what they are expected to do to achieve each assessment standard and outcome.
- Centres should ensure they use the most up-to-date version of the added value unit published on our secure website, which they can access through their Qualifications Scotland co-ordinator.
- Centres should refer to the 'Assessment conditions' section of the added value unit which states: 'The final stage of this assessment is the presentation of findings. This stage has been designed to be capable of completion within a notional period of four hours.' However, we remind centres that this is not a timed assessment.

Assessment judgements

Almost all centres made assessment judgements in line with national standards.

Many centres submitted candidate assessment records that clearly detailed why assessors made judgements, which helped the verification team and supported candidates.

Most centres clearly indicated on candidate scripts exactly where candidates met each assessment standard, which helped the verification process run smoothly.

Some centres gave helpful feedback to candidates on how to achieve a particular assessment standard. A few centres used this to support candidates as they prepared for re-assessment. We encourage centres to use this approach to ensure candidates can meet all assessment standards and outcomes for the unit.

Some centres used discussions with candidates to gain further information to ensure candidates met the assessment standard, and recorded these discussions in detail on the evidence, allowing the verification team to accept their judgements.

Action points

Centres should consider the following comments as a guide for future practice:

- A few centres did not clearly show on candidate responses exactly where candidates achieved each assessment standard and this made the verification process difficult. Centres must ensure that all outcomes are shown on all candidates' work to enable the verification process to be carried out without uncertainty. This is also helpful to the internal assessors and internal verifiers so that they can track clearly and easily that candidates have achieved all assessment standards, which ensures consistency across candidates. Assessors can achieve this by making annotations on candidate evidence that can be transferred to the candidate assessment record or by using a variety of coloured highlighters for separate outcomes.
- The role of verifiers is not to re-assess candidate work, but to consider if the centre has made assessment judgements reliably. This process cannot be

carried out if the candidate work is not clearly annotated, showing exactly where candidates met each assessment standard.

- When centres devise their own assessment approaches, they should include some possible responses as this helps the verification process. Examples of these responses can be found in the unit assessment support packs on our secure site. We remind centres about the 'prior verification' option we offer when creating their own assessment approaches.

General comments

Many centres submitted evidence that demonstrated cross-marking within and across centres. This is good practice as it clearly indicates a robust internal verification approach. Documented professional dialogue between the assessor and internal verifier promotes consistency of standards.

We remind centres about the following information included in the unit assessment support pack for the assignment: 'In the case of assessment by observation or oral questioning, evidence should include assessors' comments and other relevant supporting evidence that shows clearly the basis on which assessment judgements have been made. All evidence should be identified with the candidate's name and date of production, and in such a way that it can be referenced against more than one assessment standard as required.' This helps candidates and assessors to avoid over-assessment and allows the verification process to run smoothly.

We encourage centres to use our free [prior verification service](#) if they have devised their own end of unit assessments or significantly changed our assessments to suit their needs. The service ensures that the proposed assessment is fit-for-purpose and meets national standards.