



National Qualifications 2011 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 National Courses verified

History (Intermediate 1)

History (Intermediate 2)

History (Higher)

General comments

Centres had a very clear understanding of the national standard.

Course Arrangements documents, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All centres used current NABs. Older versions of the NABs which do not match the current assessment criteria will not be accepted.

Almost all the centres verified for Higher History used the marking grid for essays. Candidates were awarded separate marks for argument, structure and knowledge which were clearly based on the marking grid and which were added to give an overall mark out of 20.

For the Short Intermediate 2 Essay, centres were allocating three marks to the Introduction/Conclusion but there were some cases where candidates were being credited for points which, while related to the question, did not answer it. Marks should only be awarded for points which are relevant and clearly explained.

Candidates answering Source Evaluation questions for Intermediate need only comment on one piece of content from the source to get the maximum of one mark. There is a maximum of one mark for origin, authorship/bias, possible purpose and content omission.

Evidence Requirements

A few centres withdrew candidates who had failed the level for which they had been entered, or submitted evidence of success at a lower level.

Scripts which fail to achieve the pass mark should be submitted to show that the centre is accurate in its assessment of Pass and Fail scripts — especially at the borderline.

Administration of assessments

The vast majority of centres assessed candidates to the national standard. A few centres were just within either side (severe/lenient) of the tolerance limits but they were consistent in their assessment.

Areas of good practice/areas for improvement

The quantity and quality of feedback centres give to candidates has been increasing over the years. This feedback is not only helpful to candidates because it shows them exactly where they have achieved credit or where/why they have failed to do so, it is also very helpful to the Verifiers.

Most centres used marking codes for feedback rather than using basic ticks. This does help candidates understand why they have achieved credit. It was, however, noted that a variety of codes were used — even within centres (eg in one centre 'K', 'R' and 'M' were all used to

indicate the successful use of recalled knowledge). SQA does have a marking code for History and it would be helpful to candidates and Verifiers if this code was used consistently.

There is increasing evidence that centres are using cross-marking to ensure that their assessments are accurate and consistent. There were a very few cases where cross-marking was not implemented, consequently assessments were erratic and the centres were Not Accepted.

Specific areas for improvement

The use of SQA's marker codes will show candidates where they have been successful in gaining credit, which will reinforce their comprehension of Outcomes as well as their confidence and competence in achieving them.

Cross-marking will bring more consistency within a centre and will increase candidates' confidence in their achievement.