



NQ Science Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Science
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	1
Date published:	June 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H267 73	National 3	Science: Fragile Earth
H268 73	National 3	Science: Human Health
H269 73	National 3	Applications of Science
H268 74	National 4	Science: Human Health
H269 74	National 4	Applications of Science

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres verified used the most up-to-date and appropriate unit assessment support (UAS) packs.

Centres must use the most up-to-date UAS packs and should note that we updated the UAS pack 'H268 74 Science: Human Health (National 4) Outcome 2: Assessment activity 2 — test' in September 2023, and it contains updated marking guidance.

Assessment judgements

In general, most centres' judgements were appropriate. Almost all centres used a test with a 50% cut-off score to assess outcome 2, which is good practice.

Centres should ensure that assessors annotate candidate evidence to show where the candidate has achieved a particular mark. It is good practice for the internal verifier to also annotate candidate evidence. This practice is helpful for candidates and verifiers.

Annotating marking instructions clarifies where centres are accepting alternative answers. This is useful for subsequent years and further discussions during internal verification activities.

Centres should use the published examples to clarify their knowledge of national standards for assessment, and they can incorporate these examples into their internal verification approach. It is also good practice to use the [NQ internal verification toolkit](#) on SQA's website.

Section 3: general comments

The most effective internal verification processes include discussions about assessment judgements and annotations on the candidates' evidence or an attached form.

Centres should use the checklist provided to ensure that they include all appropriate SQA documentation in their external verification pack. It is especially important that centres complete the candidate evidence flyleaf correctly and attach it to the candidate evidence.

Centres submitting complete evidence for a unit must submit evidence for outcome 1 and outcome 2.

Common questions about National 3 and National 4 Science, which contain information about unit assessment, are available on the [Science subject page](#) on SQA's website.



NQ Science Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Science
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	2
Date published:	June 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H26A 74	National 4	Science Assignment

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres assessed the National 4 added value unit using the unit assessment support pack, Science Assignment (National 4) Added Value Unit (published December 2017). This assessment allocates a total of 14 marks across the five assessment standards. Candidates must achieve 7 marks or more to pass.

Most centres submitted candidates' written reports or presentations as evidence. Some centres also included candidate logs alongside these reports or presentations, which is good practice. Some centres submitted posters, which can be an effective way to engage candidates.

A few centres submitted an outcome 1 report as evidence for the added value unit, which cannot be accepted. The assessment standards for outcome 1 in the National 4 units and outcome 1 in the added value unit are different. Outcome 1 in the National 4 units requires candidates to produce a scientific report about an experiment or practical investigation. The added value unit is an assignment that candidates complete over a period of time. They must complete the communication stage of the assignment under supervised conditions, producing a report that communicates the findings of the research stage of the assignment.

Assessment judgements

Centres should ensure that assessors clearly annotate candidate evidence to show where the candidate has achieved a particular assessment standard. It is good practice for the internal verifier to also annotate candidate evidence. This practice is helpful for candidates and verifiers.

Centres should record reasons for judgements clearly for verification purposes. There were some inconsistencies within centres, but, in general, centres performed in line with the national standards.

Assessment standard 1.1 requires candidates to clearly state what they are investigating and why the issue is relevant to the environment and/or society.

Candidates completed this assessment standard well, however, some struggled with the relevance to society aspect. Candidates must refer to this relevance to enforce their findings. Some candidates were able to meet this assessment standard with evidence they included elsewhere in their presentations or posters.

Assessment standard 1.2 requires candidates to select at least two relevant sources and record at least two sources in a way that a third party can retrieve them. Assessors should ensure that information is relevant to the issue before awarding a mark for a source. Although candidates do not have to use a formal referencing system, assessors should only award a mark for being able to retrieve information or data when candidates include the full URL. If candidates use a textbook, they do not have to include an ISBN or edition number at this level. If one of the sources is an experiment, then candidates should record the title and aim. This must be separate to the overall title and aim for the investigation. There is no requirement for one of the sources to be an experiment. Candidates can provide two other relevant sources.

Assessment standard 1.3 requires candidates to present information or data from one of their sources in a different way, such as in an appropriate table or graph form or as a summary. Candidates generally completed this assessment standard well.

Assessment standard 1.4 requires candidates to explain or describe underlying science that relates to the issue. Candidates should also explain or describe at least one impact on the environment and/or society using some underlying science. Their reports should relate back to the topical issue from their initial aim. They should clearly state and explain the science involved.

Assessment standard 1.5 requires candidates to communicate their findings clearly and concisely, using an appropriate structure. Including a summary paragraph or conclusion at the end of the report is an effective way for candidates to ensure that they summarise the ideas, issues, findings or conclusions in response to the issue and its impact on the environment and/or society.

Section 3: general comments

Most centres verified had a good understanding of national standards. Almost all centres provided candidate evidence that was internally verified.

The most effective internal verification processes record assessment judgements and include annotations on the candidates' evidence or an attached form.

Centres should use the checklist provided to ensure that they include all appropriate SQA documentation in their external verification pack.

It is good practice to use the [NQ internal verification toolkit](#) on SQA's website.