



Qualification Verification Summary Report

NQ Verification 2018–19

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2019

Round 1

National Courses/Units verified:

H205 73	National 3	Scottish
H205 74	National 4	Scottish
H20C 74	National 4	British
H20D 74	National 4	European and World
H7WD 77	Advanced Higher	Historical Study
H7WE 77	Advanced Higher	Researching Historical Issues

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The vast majority of centres had followed the guidelines set out in the unit assessment support packs, suitably adapting assessments to local needs.

Centres are reminded that the current version of unit assessment support packs should always be used.

Some centres had provided excellent examples of personalisation and choice, particularly for National 4, giving candidates opportunities to present their findings in a variety of formats.

Assessment judgements

The vast majority of centres had followed the guidelines set out in the unit assessment support packs, suitably adapting judging the evidence tables to local needs.

There was further encouraging use of annotation at the point of achievement. Centres should indicate clearly and correctly by the use of annotation where candidates are being credited with achieving standards. (Some centres simply included 'assessment standard achieved' at the end of candidate evidence.)

Centres should assess to the end of candidate evidence and not stop as soon as any or all individual assessment standards have been achieved.

There was an increased use of annotations on candidates' work to indicate where assessors and verifiers had co-ordinated their roles.

Centres are reminded to adhere closely to the assessment standards set out in the unit assessment support pack and avoid inflating standards, particularly at National 3 and National 4.

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.

Centres are encouraged to use a variety of approaches to address Researching Historical Issues at Advanced Higher. Some centres had provided excellent local examples adapted to their candidates' needs and interests.

03

Section 3: General comments

Centres are reminded that candidate evidence at all levels should be based on the same unit, that is Scottish, British or European and World. (A number of centres had submitted mixed evidence or evidence based on multiple units.)

Many candidates would benefit from increased use of success criteria attached to relevant assessment prompts.

Use of oral re-assessment is suitable for all levels, National 3 to Advanced Higher, and is recommended.

Centres should include individual candidate record forms to clarify all outcomes and assessment standards that have been achieved.

Centres are reminded that SQA has made available detailed checklist documents at all levels to support submissions.

Round 2

National Courses/Units verified:

H20E 74	National 4	History Assignment — added value unit
H20C 75	SCQF level 5	British
H20D 75	SCQF level 5	European and World
H205 75	SCQF level 5	Scottish
H20C 76	SCQF level 6	British
H20D 76	SCQF level 6	European and World
H205 76	SCQF level 6	Scottish

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

The comments below refer to the added value unit.

Assessment approaches

All centres adhered to the guidance provided by the unit assessment support pack (H20E 74 September 2015 (version 1.1)).

There was a noticeable increase in the use of personalisation and choice to allow candidates to present their findings, particularly the use of ICT.

For assessment standard 1.1, it would be helpful to have a brief indication of the discussion that took place with the candidate in choosing the theme or event. There is no requirement for the theme or event to have a question format for a title.

Centres should take care not to inflate standards required for candidates to achieve all aspects of the outcome. For example, the use of specialist vocabulary or a summative statement at any point in the added value unit meets the requirements of assessment standard 1.6. A conclusion is not a requirement of this assessment standard.

Centres are reminded that more than one assessment standard can be credited in a section of candidate evidence, often not as intended by the candidate but recognised by the assessor.

Assessment judgements

Centres are reminded that it is considered best practice to annotate at the point of achievement within the body of candidate evidence, providing clear indication of the correct assessment standard.

Centres should ensure when capturing candidate evidence in booklet form that candidate guidance is accurately aligned with assessment standards. For example, clearly showing candidates where to present evidence for three key features with two supporting points.

It is considered best practice to use different colours for annotations by assessor(s) and the internal verifier. This provides clear indication by the centre regarding the process of verification internally.

Centres are reminded that oral re-assessment remains a very effective method in supporting candidates to complete individual assessment standards.

The comments below refer to the verification of freestanding units.

Assessment approaches

Centres are reminded that candidate evidence at SCQF level 5 and SCQF level 6 should be based on the same unit, that is Scottish, British or European and World. (A number of centres had submitted mixed evidence or evidence based on multiple units.)

Assessment judgements

Centres are reminded that although candidates at SCQF level 5 and SCQF level 6 are to be credited with overall achievement if they fail to meet the requirements of only one assessment standard, they should nevertheless be given the opportunity of re-assessment. This could be completed orally.

Very detailed judging the evidence tables were provided by the majority of centres. It is considered good practice to use only the current version of the unit assessment support pack when devising an evidence table.

03

Section 3: General comments

There was a significant increase in personalisation and choice with regard to candidate choice of theme or event and the method by which the candidates presented their findings.

Many centres provided detailed candidate evidence records which were very helpful in reviewing the progress of the added value unit within the centre from both the assessor and the candidate point of view.

Although not a requirement of a verification submission, it has become good practice to include an internal verification policy document. This is a practice to be encouraged.

Whilst candidate evidence can be gathered from work based on past examination papers the centre still requires to provide a suitable judging the evidence table to support this approach/judgement.