NQ Verification 2015–16
Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	History
Levels	N4 – Advanced Higher
Date published:	October 2016

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.

NQ Verification 2015–16
Key Messages Round 1

01 ## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	**March 2016**

National Courses/Units verified:

H20C 75, H20C 76	Historical Study: British
H205 75, H205 76	Historical Study: Scottish
H20D 75, H20D 76	Historical Study: European and World
H7WD 77	Historical Study
H7WE 77	Researching Historical Issues

02 ## Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Centres had made very good use of current Unit assessment support packs (UASPs) to create their own assessments.

In column 4 of the judging evidence table, it is preferable the 'possible response' is presented in the form of a candidate answer rather than being a list of acceptable points of evidence.

Centres are reminded that some UASPs were updated last year and that the most up-to-date version should be used.

Assessment judgements

Nominees found it very helpful to have a summary of individual candidates' attainments at the end of the script or on a separate form (centre-devised or the SQA grid) so the overall picture can be seen at a glance.

Nominees find it very helpful when the Assessment Standard (2.1 or 2.2 etc) is noted at the point of achievement.

It is helpful if candidates' oral additions are scripted/summarised by teachers then signed and dated by both. Many centres had made careful records, including specific dates and specific details of the discussions held, showing the evolution of the internal verification process.

It is considered good practice if centres continue annotating the script beyond the point of achievement of an Assessment Standard so that it can be assured that other Assessment Standards have/have not been met within the response.

03 ▶ Section 3: General comments

Overall the quality of submissions was of an even higher standard for this year's Round 1, reflecting the increasing experience and growing confidence of most centres.

Centres should note the new guidelines about sample size at particular levels. Centres are reminded that candidate evidence at a particular level (eg N4 or N5) must be submitted from the same Unit.

Centres should ensure that assessment tasks are included to support assessment of candidates' performances.

Centres should continue to submit 'naturally occurring' evidence to support candidates where appropriate.

Internal verification

Centres are reminded that they must have an effective internal quality assurance system which ensures that all candidates are assessed accurately, fairly and consistently to national standards. In addition, all internal assessments must be internally verified.

It was helpful to nominees if internal verification had been done in two separate colours and brief notes written at the point at which an Assessment Standard had been credited, particularly if there was any debate.

Also, nominees found it very helpful to have notes of discussions which identified specific issues or candidates where areas of debate existed. Overview notes of this sort were more helpful than general minutes in which the process was discussed.

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.