



Internal Assessment Report: History

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject.

National Courses

Titles/levels of Courses verified

History Intermediate 1
History Intermediate 2
History Higher

General comments

Centres had a very clear understanding of the National Standard.

95% of centres assessed candidates to the National Standard, although a few were just within (severe/generous) the tolerance limits.

90% of centres used holistic marking, which is recommended, rather than marking by PC which makes accurate assessments for History cumbersome.

Centres all used NABs. Two centres, however, used older versions of the NABs which were, fortunately, still valid. Centres which use old NABs which are no longer valid will not be accepted.

It is strongly recommended that, for the Higher essays, centres use the marking grid which is available on the SQA website. They should then record a separate mark for each of argument, structure and knowledge, before totalling them for the overall mark out of 20. The pass mark for these essays is 10/20 and candidates should not be penalised for having one area of weakness.

For the short eight-mark essay for Intermediate 2, centres should reserve three marks for introduction (context/factors) and conclusion, and award a maximum of five marks for clearly explained and relevant points.

Most centres displayed a secure grasp of the MI for Source Evaluation for Intermediate 2 by awarding a maximum of only one mark each for origin, authorship/bias, possible purpose, content and content omission. Similarly with the developed comparison, centres correctly awarded two marks for an extended comparison including a piece of relevant information from each source and an explanation of the comparison.

Centres should not make substitutes for candidates who had failed the Course or have changed levels. Failed scripts allow verifiers to assess the accuracy of the pass/fail interface – past experience shows that centres are more often too severe than too lenient.

Some centres are still allowing revisiting, which is only acceptable for non-revised Courses. It is possible that centres have revisited to help their candidates improve their responses, but the 'improved scores' should not be used to adjust the original mark.

Centres do change the levels of weak candidates to a more appropriate level, and candidates who fail to progress (eg from Intermediate 1 to Intermediate 2) are generally withdrawn.

Advice on good practice

A growing number of centres are now using specific Marker Codes (rather than universal ticks) to indicate where credit has been given. Most use the code system used for External Assessment. This makes it clear to the candidate where and for what credit has been awarded and, consequently, should help them to improve their responses in the future.

More centres are now incorporating cross-marking into their assessment process and that has made assessment within a centre more consistent and accurate.

Centres are now giving candidates more written feedback, usually to explain why something is wrong but sometimes giving very positive feedback.

Written feedback makes it clear to candidates what they have done well and where they have failed to gain credit, and so helps the candidates to improve.

Areas for further development

Marker codes show candidates where they are achieving credit, which builds up their comprehension of the Outcomes as well as their competence and confidence at achieving them.

Cross-marking brings more consistency across a centre and improves the confidence involved in assessment.