



# Qualification Verification Summary Report

## NQ Verification 2019–20

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification event/visiting information	Event/visiting
Date published:	August 2020

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H20C 73	National 3	British
H20D 73	National 3	European and World
H205 73	National 3	Scottish
H20C 74	National 4	British
H20D 74	National 4	European and World
H205 74	National 4	Scottish
H20E 74	National 4	Added Value Unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Most centres had adhered to the structure, questions stems and judging the evidence tables set out in the unit assessment support packs when devising their assessments.

Centres are reminded that unit assessment support packs are subject to revision — the current version of unit assessment support pack should always be used.

Centres are reminded that candidates should continue to be given the opportunity of personalisation and choice when responding to assessments. Where this was done, some excellent examples of good practice were in evidence.

Centres are advised to adhere to the wording of question stems to avoid altering or inflating demands on candidates.

For round 1, centres are reminded that candidate evidence should be based on unit assessment(s) only and that evidence from added value units should not be submitted.

### **Assessment judgements**

There was increased evidence of annotation at the point of achievement. This is highly recommended as good practice.

Centres are reminded that at National 4 a candidate is deemed to have achieved the full outcome when three out of four assessment standards have been met. Candidates should, nevertheless, be given the opportunity to achieve the remaining assessment standard.

Centres are encouraged to make full use of oral re-assessment in this regard, and in general terms.

Centres are reminded that they should be guided by column 3 of the judging the evidence tables regarding the minimum requirements of each assessment standard, to avoid inflating demands on candidates.

Assessors should continue to mark all candidate evidence — even after the point at which assessment standards have been achieved.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Once again, the overall quality of submissions was of a high standard.

Centres are reminded that, when submitting evidence for a group of candidates at the same level, the evidence for all candidates should be chosen from the same unit of study.

Centres are reminded to adhere to the guidelines regarding the number of candidates required when making a submission that includes multiple levels. There was a small group of centres that exceeded the maximum required.

Those centres that had appended success criteria, either to individual question stems or within general candidate instructions, assisted their candidates in understanding the demands and meet the criteria.

It would be helpful to the process of verification during events if the role of the internal verifier was clearly set out, as well as the work of the verifier being indicated on individual candidate evidence.

Centres are strongly advised to make use of the detailed checklist documents that SQA has made available to support submissions.