



National Qualifications 2015 Internal Assessment Report History

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

National Qualifications (NQ) Units

Titles/levels of NQ Units verified:

History: Higher, Intermediate 2, Intermediate 1

General comments

It is clear that the vast majority of centres have a very clear understanding of the national standards.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All centres used NABs. Consequently, there were no issues with either the instruments of assessment or the marking schemes.

Evidence Requirements

Centres produced all the relevant evidence (NABs with marking schemes, candidate scripts, etc). 90% produced evidence for the candidates selected, and the remaining centres had substitutes for candidates who had been withdrawn.

Administration of assessments

All of the centres assessed their candidates using NABs and by applying the holistic marking scheme.

It was noted that a small number of centres were just within the tolerance limits, particularly in rewarding analysis at Higher. Some were too generous while others were too severe.

This was less of an issue for centres where cross-marking was used as part of their procedures.

A small number of candidates had evidence submitted where there were no marks or comments on the paper. Presumably a comments sheet had been used and it ought to have been included as part of the assessment evidence.

Areas of good practice

It was noted that more and more centres are using marking codes (rather than just ticks) for where credit had been awarded. Usually the codes matched those used for external assessments. This makes it clear to candidates (and to verifiers) where and for what credit had been awarded. It also made it clear to verifiers where centres were verging towards the lenient and they were able to comment on that in their report.

A number of centres also used written comments beside these to reinforce the message to the candidate that credit had been awarded. These centres also indicated and explained to candidates where credit had not been awarded. These comments were very helpful to verifiers and helped us prepare our reports.

There was also more clear evidence of cross-marking and where that occurred, there was very little divergence from the national standard.

Specific areas for improvement

An increasing number of centres are using marker codes and also using cross-marking. These developments are very welcome because these centres usually are very accurate in applying the national standard. These should also make it easier for candidates to understand what is required and to achieve credit.

Centres where several people assessed candidates' work and where cross-marking was not used were much more liable to produce erratic results and to be Not Accepted.

A number of centres were giving candidates very little written feedback to explain where credit had or had not been given. Possibly this feedback was given verbally but more written feedback should be considered.