



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification event/visiting information	Event and visit
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H20E 74 National 4 Added value unit

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Centres, with one exception, used the unit assessment support pack appropriately to set out the task for candidates.

Assessment judgements

A number of centres had overinflated the national minimum standards. Centres are reminded to refer to the minimum assessment standards given in column 3 of the judging evidence table for guidance.

Some centres misinterpreted assessment standard 1.6. Centres either overinflated the standard and expected a judgement to be made, or credited the final product candidates had produced as meeting AS 1.6. The minimum standard for candidates at National 4 is to sum up their ideas, issues or findings.

A number of centres had provided candidates with misleading advice on the requirements to meet AS 1.4 and AS 1.5. Centres should provide clear guidance to candidates on how to address the cause or impact of a theme/event, as shown in Column 3 of the judging evidence table.

Centres should ensure that all of the candidates' work is credited, even after the point at which the minimum standard has been achieved.

Good practice was recognised by annotation at the point of achievement. For example: *Tanks were armoured to protect soldiers inside. 1.4*

This allows the verifier to see where and how the assessor has reached the assessment judgements, and allows the verification process to be take place.

Points given by candidates can meet more than one assessment standard. For example: *The war also changed life at home. Women had to take over jobs which men had previously done. 1.4 + 1.5* (This is a point of description of a key feature, but also an impact of the theme or event, so can be credited as meeting both assessment standards.)

03

Section 3: General comments

The overall standard of candidate work and centre submissions was higher than previously, indicating increasing familiarity and confidence in understanding standards.

Centres are reminded to include their internal verification policy or evidence that this process has taken place, for example either through the use of different coloured annotations or through DM minutes. It is good practice to show evidence of internal verification on candidate work as well as the internal verifier signing assessment record.

Centres should ensure that appropriate support is given to candidates to allow them to successfully meet the requirements of AS 1.1. Whilst it is appropriate for a candidate to choose a theme, for example the Atlantic Slave Trade, it was not obvious whether the candidate was considering the causes or impact of this in the AVU. To meet the requirements of AS 1.1 this should be made clear somewhere in the AVU. This will also assist candidates in achieving AS 1.4 and 1.5.

Centres are reminded that sampling refers to the whole cohort at each level, and not sampling the candidates who are to be used for external verification.

There were good examples of candidates' self-assessment which involved keeping their own records with a record sheet provided that showed the actions they had taken to meet each of the assessment standards. This provided good evidence of personalisation and choice, especially for AS 1.1.

Centres are submitting excellent pupil work which has demonstrated a rich variety of methods of completion, emphasising the benefits of personalisation and choice.