

# NQ Science Verification Summary 2025–26

## Verification information

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

## National Units verified

| <b>Unit code</b> | <b>Unit level</b> | <b>Unit title</b>       |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| H267 73          | National 3        | Science: Fragile Earth  |
| H268 73          | National 3        | Science: Human Health   |
| H269 73          | National 3        | Applications of Science |
| H267 74          | National 4        | Science: Fragile Earth  |
| H268 74          | National 4        | Science: Human Health   |
| H269 74          | National 4        | Applications of Science |

# Comments on assessment

## Assessment approaches

Almost 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.

Some centres indicated that the candidate evidence they submitted was complete, but they did not provide an outcome 1 report for their candidates. Complete evidence must include evidence for both outcome 1 **and** outcome 2 and candidates cannot pass a unit until they pass **both** outcomes. If a candidate has not completed an outcome 1 report, centres should mark the evidence as interim.

Evidence of outcome 1 is transferable between units at the same level and, therefore, candidates only need to complete one outcome 1.

A small number of centres modified the UAS packs. These modifications were not always valid and changed both the level of demand and the balance of question styles in the assessment. If centres modify UAS packs, or use centre-devised materials, they should submit them for prior verification before they use them with candidates. This ensures that they are of the correct level of demand and have appropriate coverage of all the key areas in a unit. Our [National Qualifications prior verification web page](#) has more information.

## 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 our website.

## **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 documents 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](#) of our website.

# NQ Science Verification Summary 2025–26

## Verification information

|                              |           |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Subject</b>               | Science   |
| <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>Component/Unit title</b> |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| H26A 74          | National 4        | Science Assignment          |

## 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 5 assessment standards. Candidates must achieve 7 or more marks 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. If centres refer to a candidate log when making an assessment judgement, they should submit this log as candidate evidence so that

verifiers can confirm the candidate has achieved the assessment standard. 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 make sure 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 in centres, but, in general, centres performed in line with the national standards. It is good practice to include comments and notes of discussions between the assessor and internal verifier that led to the final mark.

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 met 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 its 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 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.

## **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. It is good practice for centres to include comments and notes on professional dialogue between assessors and internal verifiers.

Centres should use the checklist provided to make sure they include all appropriate documents in their external verification pack.

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