

HIGHER HISTORY REVIEW FINDS MARKING STANDARD DID NOT CHANGE – INDEPENDENT, EXTERNAL SCRUTINY CONFIRMS CONCLUSION

A review of Higher History has concluded that the marking standard in 2024 did not change and that the marking and grading processes worked as intended. Learners were not disadvantaged and can be confident that the attainment rate for Higher History accurately reflected their performance.

Independent, external scrutiny of the review by an expert in standard-setting and exams has endorsed the findings and confirmed the evidence supports the report's conclusions.

The review of Higher History was commissioned by Scotland's Chief Examiner after a number of concerns were raised about the marking standard, in the media, on social media and directly with SQA.

It was carried out by SQA's Head of Standards with support and oversight from the Director of Policy, Analysis and Standards, neither of whom had any prior involvement in the marking or grading of Higher History.

The 51-page, evidence-led review report concludes that:

“All stages of SQA's normal processes were followed rigorously and robustly, and in accordance with SQA's established processes and procedures. The Higher History exam team acted with integrity throughout this process.

“The standard set in the Higher History assessments...was not higher than that set in previous years that this examination has run.

“Feedback from markers, who are all teachers, provided in their reports to SQA was overwhelmingly focused on the poor standard of responses provided by learners in this year's examinations.”

Martyn Ware, SQA Director of Policy, Analysis and Standards, said:

“Our review of Higher History has been rigorous and robust with a wide range of evidence gathered and analysed. While the concerns raised by teachers and others were focused on the standard of marking, in practice this is just one stage in the process of standard-setting so the review looked at the full range of processes and procedures relating to marking and grading.

“All of these processes and procedures were followed rigorously and the standard set in Higher History was not higher than in previous years.”

Richard Harry, Executive Director of Qualifications and Assessment at WJEC, Wales' largest awarding body, provided independent, external scrutiny of the review. He said:

“On behalf of WJEC, I have undertaken a review of the report produced by SQA regarding their History Higher qualification this summer. I have engaged with those producing the report on the extent to which the evidence and analysis set out in the report supports its conclusions and recommendations. To this end, I have engaged with the review team on several occasions prior to the publication of the report, and I thank the team for their candour and openness to challenge through this process.

“Any assessment process relies on the judgements of key individuals at each stage, to ensure valid and fair outcomes. In line with the feedback received regarding this summer's results, the

focus of the review was on the marking standard and related processes. I am content that the report's conclusions are supported sufficiently.

"The report sets out a number of areas for continuous improvement to bolster the marking process, which are supported by the review's findings. The links between assessment demands, marking standards and performance are an essential consideration of awarding, and the recommendations regarding how to ensure a strong chain between these will also help to ensure appropriate grades for learners in future."

Shirley Rogers, Chair of the SQA Board, said:

"On the basis of the extensive evidence gathered and analysed, the review has concluded that the marking standard did not change, that the marking and grading processes performed as intended, and that the grading decisions made were the right ones. Learners were assessed and graded fairly.

"I hope the outcome of this review, published today to allow full transparency, will draw a line under the issue and reassure learners, parents, carers, teachers and lecturers – as well as the wider public - that they can have full confidence in SQA's assessment and awarding processes"

Fiona Robertson, Scotland's Chief Examiner, said:

"Given the concerns that were raised about Higher History in the weeks after Results Day, it was important to provide reassurance to learners and teachers and to provide confidence in the results and the processes that underpinned them. That's why I commissioned SQA's Head of Standards to undertake a comprehensive, evidence-led review and we asked another awarding body, WJEC, to mark SQA's homework and provide independent assurance that any conclusions reached were evidence-based and valid.

"I acknowledge that the review has taken longer than anticipated but, in the interest of learners, it was important to ensure the review was robust and rigorous. We also had to ensure the external reviewer had sufficient time to analyse, assess and audit the evidence and conclusions. I am very grateful to Richard Harry for the time he has given to provide external scrutiny of the review.

"There are always lessons for us to learn and this report highlights some areas for wider reflection, which I welcome. In particular, we need to improve how we deal with feedback we receive from markers so that they know that their concerns are being listened to and, where necessary, dealt with. We are committed to giving all learners and educators a stronger voice as we transition into Qualifications Scotland."

NOTES TO EDITORS

The Higher History Review 2024 was commissioned by the Chief Examiner on 11 September.

The review was carried out by the SQA Head of Standards with support and oversight from the Director of Policy, Analysis and Standards.

The review considered a wide range of evidence, including the course specification, question papers and learners' answers, marking instructions, marker reports and feedback, and interviews with both SQA staff and senior appointees, who are all practicing teachers and lecturers, including the Principal Assessor for Higher History.

Independent, external scrutiny of the report was carried out by Richard Harry, Executive Director of Qualifications and Assessment at WJEC.

A summary version of the review report can be found at XXXX

A full version of the review report can be found at XXXX

Key points in the review report include:

- This year's Higher History assessments were set and marked by an experienced and established exam team; the team took no action to change the marking standard
- In response to marker feedback, marking instructions in 2024 included more points of detail to ensure better consistency of marking; this is normal practice, supported by academic research
- Learners were not required to provide more detailed responses to obtain marks than in previous years; specifically, there is evidence of learners being awarded a mark without naming specific individuals
- While some markers provided feedback on the marking standard, the overwhelming feedback was about the poor standard of performance; 81% of markers (56 out of 69) provided feedback saying that learner performance on the Scottish history paper was lower or much lower than in 2023
- Variation in marking is not uncommon (particularly in humanities subjects such as history which by their nature are more subjective than subjects such as sciences and maths); however, checks and balances identify and control any variations and these were followed fully in 2024 and ensured all marking was on standard
- Analysis of appeals outcomes for Higher History in 2024 shows evidence of greater reliability in marking than in previous years.

The report offers some wider reflections and areas for continuous improvement, including:

- Further work to strengthen understanding of the full awarding process, including the checks and balances which provide quality assurance and address any variations in marking
- Reviewing how marker feedback is gathered, considered and used, and how the feedback loop is closed to ensure markers understand how any concerns have been addressed through checks and balances.