From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 17:01
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

I think we leave things as they are just now, however we will need to think about how to respond next week after the article is published. I don't imagine that it will bring forward much from the profession given the information I have from the people I have spoken to today.

We may want to consider strengthening our position in our response. We can pick up next week though.

Iain and Denise are both off, however the QO and PA are both in the loop and been really helpful, as has Jen Morrison.

Thanks to you both for your help.

Have a good weekend.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 14:12
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: FW: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi Donna

Despite the below, we're still minded to not respond with any more details – other than to say that we're not commenting further.

This does however mean that the piece will likely include the fact that there were changes to marking standards.

What do you think?

Thanks

[redacted]

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 13:25
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Dear Donna

I spoke with [redacted] who has reviewed the content of the emails. This is her (edited) response:

The specific example of a change in marking standards:

I [redacted] spoke with Iain yesterday and he confirmed that negative examples of Scottish emigrants **would** be credited given that they were accurate. This reflects my own experience as a marker.

Regarding the comment that marks weren't awarded that previously were, I do remember a comment at the markers meeting that certain textbooks could be out of date and that only accurate history would be awarded - implying that it was the responsibility of the profession to stay abreast of changes. There was a US event for non-markers last session, and this was referenced at the markers meeting, so I imagine it was also raised there.

As a School Partnership Team, we are currently planning an event via Understanding Standards around decolonisation and are working in partnership with [redacted] and [redacted] from Stirling University, SATH, Scottish Government and Education Scotland to ensure that the event is as valuable as possible for History teachers. The event will take place in early 2027 and Iain Morrison will provide an input from a Qualifications Scotland perspective. I (Jillian) am planning to arrange a meeting with [redacted] on her return to discuss the plans.

Warm regards

[redacted]

[redacted]
School Partnership Team (Schools Unit)

t: [redacted] **m:** [redacted]
e: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot
w: www.qualifications.gov.scot
Qualifications Scotland
Lowden, 24 Wester Shawfair, Dalkeith, Midlothian, EH22 1FD

The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, Glasgow, G2 8DQ

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 12:02
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Fw: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted] - I'm not aware of any issues around HH so it would be good to know what featured in SATH if you can.

[redacted] would you mind linking in with the PA if you are in the same building?

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:59
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Dear Donna

I have forwarded the information on to [redacted] for comment, we will come back to you asap.

[redacted] made me aware of the issue earlier in the week (which featured on STATH) and we let Iain know. He has responded directly to [redacted] to get more information. [redacted] said that there were mixed views on the messenger site.

I have had various conversations about History with [redacted] previously. She mentioned the impact of the scrutiny on the wellbeing of the PA. Just wondering if they need to be made aware?

Warm regards

[redacted]

[redacted]
School Partnership Team (Schools Unit)

t: [redacted] **m:** [redacted]
e: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot
w: www.qualifications.gov.scot
Qualifications Scotland
Lowden, 24 Wester Shawfair, Dalkeith, Midlothian, EH22 1FD
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, Glasgow, G2 8DQ

Qualifications Scotland
Teisteanasan Alba

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:28
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Fw: Media enquiry - Higher History

[redacted]

You will see below that we have some queries about H History marking this year. At the moment both [redacted] and Iain are both off.

As one of your QEMs is a history specialist could you ask them to take a look into the issues set out below to give some initial thoughts on the disparities around marking that have been raised?

Happy to talk through if helpful.

Many thanks,
Donna

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer |

Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:22
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

HI folks – the line was sent back to The Herald earlier – we've now had some follow-up questions...

Just to be clear, the PA referred to in this comment has been mentioned to me specifically as part of the ongoing problems with History and the article will note that.

I also take it that this is Qualifications Scotland rejecting the accusations of the teachers, including current markers? Does QS believe that they are wrong?

I also note that you haven't addressed the specific example of a change in marking standards that I provided. Given that you have not disputed this, I take it that this change has indeed happened as the teachers have stated.

Let me know if you want us to address these, or if we are not offering any further comments / replies at this time.

cheers

[redacted]

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 09:18
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks, Donna and Iain – we'll get this away and keep you updated on any further developments/coverage.

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 08:37
To: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted] - happy with this reponse.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:36
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi [redacted]

Thanks for putting this together. I am happy with the level of response at this stage, so OK from my end.

Thanks again.

Iain

Iain Morrison
Head of Humanities, Care & Services | Ceannard nan Daonnachdan, Cùram & Sheirbheisean
Qualifications Development | Leasachadh Teisteanasan

m: [redacted] | **e:** iain.morrison@qualifications.gov.scot | **w:** http://www.qualifications.gov.scot
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, GLASGOW, G2 8DQ

Qualifications Scotland
Teisteanasan Alba

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:30

To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

I've gone back to the journalist to say that we'll get back with a response tomorrow. Grateful for your comment and approval of the updated line, in the morning:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2026 16:38
To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks everyone – updated line:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

[redacted]

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 15:00
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

And maybe add that we regularly engage with SATH and will be meeting them again on XXX [not sure if in diary] which will enable us to hear first hand from the history teacher community.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:55
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted]

Can we bring in something on Understanding Standards and the number of teachers that took part in that.

Also be interested to know what SATH's view is on these claims?

I'm not sure what time the query came in but 5pm seems like a ridiculously short deadline for such a complex enquiry and set of accusations.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:16
To: [redacted]qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted] <R[redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Looping Georgina in here as Iain is on A/L.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:14
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

We've had the following detailed enquiry in about Higher History, which covers a number of points, including mention of a colleague and the team in general.

Deadline is 5pm today – while we may want to address the specific points – here is a suggested high-level response as a starter:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal

Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published for each subject in the Course Reports from next month.

We are committed to continuing to engage with History teachers and providing them with support and understanding standards materials.

-ends-

Enquiry

Following on from the extensive controversy in 2024, I have been approached by several History teachers raising major concerns about the management of exam marking once again this year.

I have been told that during marking this year for paper 2, that "Points that have previously been awarded marks, and have been awarded on mark schemes in the past and are on BBC Bitesize etc have inexplicably not been given, and the first we found out was at the markers meeting, after the children had sat the exam.

A number of examples have been provided to me, including: "question 2 asked about the relationship between the Scottish King John Balliol and English Edward I. One of the standard points we would expect pupils to make was that Balliol took an Englishman, Master Thomas of Hunsingore, to be his Chancellor. Standard, straightforward point; you'll see it on the MI from the 2022 paper when this issue came up last. It's credited on specimen papers. Not awarded this year."

I have been provided with links to previous Marking Instructions and Understanding Standards exemplars that clearly do give a mark for this, and also a screenshot from this year's marking briefing showing it should not be given. I'm told that this image was taken because so many teachers present were unsure they had heard correctly and thought this was a clear break from the past.

And another was: "A further example from Higher Assignment: markers were told that evaluation couldn't be credited twice in one paragraph. This is news to me, a seriously experienced teacher and marker, and every teacher I have spoken to since. Nowhere is this recorded in the marking instructions or in any guidance ever published. There have been understanding standards materials in the past where evaluation has been credited twice in one paragraph. "

To be clear, these are not the only examples or comments I have received, and I think I should also point out that, once again, [redacted] has been specifically mentioned, along with other members of the History team.

And these comments were, I thought, particularly damning:

"How are we to prepare candidates when we don't know the standard? The only children who can be adequately prepared are those being taught by the small team of people sitting in the core team making decisions. It is almost criminally unfair. This has been flagged before, denied, and even when it was proved that the goalposts were being changed, nothing happened. Nobody cares. Why would anything change when the SQA team that has always done this and shown such disregard, bordering on contempt, for history teachers and students is now the QS team doing the same? The people haven't changed, so why would the problems. Frustrated

doesn't even cover it. I don't fill in the markers reports because I know complaints will at best be ignored, and at worst be held against me."

This is basically the exact same issue that arose two years ago, and which your CEO subsequently admitted to me should have been revisited.

I should also point out that those speaking to me have insisted that they stay anonymous because they do not trust Qualifications Scotland not to attempt to punish them for raising these concerns.

Another teacher I have spoken to says that one possible issue in other areas of marking is that schools have worked hard to decolonise their curriculum as part of national efforts, and in some cases this could have led to pupils being penalised:

"We really engaged with the materials for this last year and tried to include in our teaching more of the negative impacts of Scottish settlers. I think we have been penalised for this because we, again, have examples of random and inconsistent decision making about what is mark worthy and what is not. Probably also because we are including new stuff that markers won't recognise. Our Scottish paper marks were worse than ever this year at 90% of the national average. Last year, we were 112.2% of the national average and the disastrous year before we were 98% Same staff, with vast experience. I wonder if the trend in other schools is the same. The net effect will be to make us stick to the old stuff - this great white man went and built a railway etc."

So if you could also address those accusations that would be good.

The SQA (eventually) initiated an investigation into Higher History marking in 2024, but this was widely dismissed as a whitewash and the exam board admitted that a fully independent review (rather than having SQA staff investigate other SQA staff) was not considered.

Will Qualifications Scotland consider a properly independent investigation this time, and does it accept that there are major concerns about the conduct of the History team, which has the same people on board as in 2024?

This year the mean mark for paper 1 went up compared to last year, but the mean mark for paper 2 went down. The SD for paper 2 is also quite a bit higher than for Paper 1.

All of that would seem to support the arguments I'm hearing from History teachers.

I've also spoken to another one since I emailed you and they say that there is widespread amongst history teachers over marking once again, particularly given the disparity between papers. This individual also backed the allegations about marking of evaluation in the assignment.

And just to be clear, coverage of this is almost certainly going to include the fact that the History team at QS is led by the same people who were in charge the last time there was a major controversy over marking. I know that caused issues internally (and eventually externally) last time so I figure it's only fair to make that explicitly clear.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 12:03
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]
[redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Fw: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted]- I'm not aware of any issues around HH so it would be good to know what featured in SATH if you can.

[redacted] would you mind linking in with the PA if you are in the same building?

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:59
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Dear Donna

I have forwarded the information on to [redacted] for comment, we will come back to you asap.

[redacted] made me aware of the issue earlier in the week (which featured on STATH) and we let Iain know. He has responded directly to [redacted] to get more information. [redacted] said that there were mixed views on the messenger site.

I have had various conversations about History with [redacted] previously. She mentioned the impact of the scrutiny on the wellbeing of the PA. Just wondering if they need to be made aware?

Warm regards

[redacted]

[redacted]

School Partnership Team (Schools Unit)

t: [redacted] **m:** [redacted]
e: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot
w: www.qualifications.gov.scot
Qualifications Scotland
Lowden, 24 Wester Shawfair, Dalkeith, Midlothian, EH22 1FD
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, Glasgow, G2 8DQ

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:28
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Fw: Media enquiry - Higher History

[redacted]

You will see below that we have some queries about H History marking this year. At the moment both [redacted] and Iain are both off.

As one of your QEMs is a history specialist could you ask them to take a look into the issues set out below to give some initial thoughts on the disparities around marking that have been raised?

Happy to talk through if helpful.

Many thanks,
Donna

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:22
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart

<donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

HI folks – the line was sent back to The Herald earlier – we've now had some follow-up questions...

Just to be clear, the PA referred to in this comment has been mentioned to me specifically as part of the ongoing problems with History and the article will note that.

I also take it that this is Qualifications Scotland rejecting the accusations of the teachers, including current markers? Does QS believe that they are wrong?

I also note that you haven't addressed the specific example of a change in marking standards that I provided. Given that you have not disputed this, I take it that this change has indeed happened as the teachers have stated.

Let me know if you want us to address these, or if we are not offering any further comments / replies at this time.

cheers

[redacted]

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 09:18
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks, Donna and Iain – we'll get this away and keep you updated on any further developments/coverage.

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 08:37
To: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted] - happy with this reponse.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:36
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Rosie[redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi [redacted]

Thanks for putting this together. I am happy with the level of response at this stage, so OK from my end.

Thanks again.

Iain

Iain Morrison
Head of Humanities, Care & Services | Ceannard nan Daonnachdan, Cùram & Sheirbheisean
Qualifications Development | Leasachadh Teisteanasan

m: [redacted] | **e:** iain.morrison@qualifications.gov.scot | **w:** http://www.qualifications.gov.scot
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, GLASGOW, G2 8DQ

Qualifications Scotland
Teisteanasan Alba

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:30
To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

I've gone back to the journalist to say that we'll get back with a response tomorrow. Grateful for your comment and approval of the updated line, in the morning:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2026 16:38
To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks everyone – updated line:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

[redacted]

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 15:00
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

And maybe add that we regularly engage with SATH and will be meeting them again on XXX [not sure if in diary] which will enable us to hear first hand from the history teacher community.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:55
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted]

Can we bring in something on Understanding Standards and the number of teachers that took part in that.

Also be interested to know what SATH's view is on these claims?

I'm not sure what time the query came in but 5pm seems like a ridiculously short deadline for such a complex enquiry and set of accusations.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland

qualifications.gov.scot

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:16
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Looping Georgina in here as Iain is on A/L.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:14
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

We've had the following detailed enquiry in about Higher History, which covers a number of points, including mention of a colleague and the team in general.

Deadline is 5pm today – while we may want to address the specific points – here is a suggested high-level response as a starter:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published for each subject in the Course Reports from next month.

We are committed to continuing to engage with History teachers and providing them with support and understanding standards materials.

-ends-

Enquiry

Following on from the extensive controversy in 2024, I have been approached by several History teachers raising major concerns about the management of exam marking once again this year.

I have been told that during marking this year for paper 2, that "Points that have previously been awarded marks, and have been awarded on mark schemes in the past and are on BBC Bitesize etc have inexplicably not been given, and the first we found out was at the markers meeting, after the children had sat the exam.

A number of examples have been provided to me, including: "question 2 asked about the relationship between the Scottish King John Balliol and English Edward I. One of the standard points we would expect pupils to make was that Balliol took an Englishman, Master Thomas of Hunsingore, to be his Chancellor. Standard, straightforward point; you'll see it on the MI from the 2022 paper when this issue came up last. It's credited on specimen papers. Not awarded this year."

I have been provided with links to previous Marking Instructions and Understanding Standards exemplars that clearly do give a mark for this, and also a screenshot from this year's marking briefing showing it should not be given. I'm told that this image was taken because so many teachers present were unsure they had heard correctly and thought this was a clear break from the past.

And another was: "A further example from Higher Assignment: markers were told that evaluation couldn't be credited twice in one paragraph. This is news to me, a seriously experienced teacher and marker, and every teacher I have spoken to since. Nowhere is this recorded in the marking instructions or in any guidance ever published. There have been understanding standards materials in the past where evaluation has been credited twice in one paragraph. "

To be clear, these are not the only examples or comments I have received, and I think I should also point out that, once again, [redacted] has been specifically mentioned, along with other members of the History team.

And these comments were, I thought, particularly damning:

"How are we to prepare candidates when we don't know the standard? The only children who can be adequately prepared are those being taught by the small team of people sitting in the core team making decisions. It is almost criminally unfair. This has been flagged before, denied, and even when it was proved that the goalposts were being changed, nothing happened. Nobody cares. Why would anything change when the SQA team that has always done this and shown such disregard, bordering on contempt, for history teachers and students is now the QS team doing the same? The people haven't changed, so why would the problems. Frustrated doesn't even cover it. I don't fill in the markers reports because I know complaints will at best be ignored, and at worst be held against me."

This is basically the exact same issue that arose two years ago, and which your CEO subsequently admitted to me should have been revisited.

I should also point out that those speaking to me have insisted that they stay anonymous because they do not trust Qualifications Scotland not to attempt to punish them for raising these concerns.

Another teacher I have spoken to says that one possible issue in other areas of marking is that schools have worked hard to decolonise their curriculum as part of national efforts, and in some cases this could have led to pupils being penalised:

"We really engaged with the materials for this last year and tried to include in our teaching more of the negative impacts of Scottish settlers. I think we have been penalised for this because we, again, have examples of random and inconsistent decision making about what is mark worthy and what is not. Probably also because we are including new stuff that markers won't recognise. Our Scottish paper marks were worse than ever this year at 90% of the national average. Last year, we were 112.2% of the national average and the disastrous year before we were 98% Same staff, with vast experience. I wonder if the trend in other schools is the same. The net effect will be to make us stick to the old stuff - this great white man went and built a railway etc."

So if you could also address those accusations that would be good.

The SQA (eventually) initiated an investigation into Higher History marking in 2024, but this was widely dismissed as a whitewash and the exam board admitted that a fully independent review (rather than having SQA staff investigate other SQA staff) was not considered.

Will Qualifications Scotland consider a properly independent investigation this time, and does it accept that there are major concerns about the conduct of the History team, which has the same people on board as in 2024?

This year the mean mark for paper 1 went up compared to last year, but the mean mark for paper 2 went down. The SD for paper 2 is also quite a bit higher than for Paper 1.

All of that would seem to support the arguments I'm hearing from History teachers.

I've also spoken to another one since I emailed you and they say that there is widespread amongst history teachers over marking once again, particularly given the disparity between papers. This individual also backed the allegations about marking of evaluation in the assignment.

And just to be clear, coverage of this is almost certainly going to include the fact that the History team at QS is led by the same people who were in charge the last time there was a major controversy over marking. I know that caused issues internally (and eventually externally) last time so I figure it's only fair to make that explicitly clear.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:35
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]

[redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted]- could we check if we have any enquiries come in at all about H History marking. I haven't been made aware of any issues.

It might be something we could use if we choose to respond.

Thanks,
Donna

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 11:22
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

HI folks – the line was sent back to The Herald earlier – we've now had some follow-up questions...

Just to be clear, the PA referred to in this comment has been mentioned to me specifically as part of the ongoing problems with History and the article will note that.

I also take it that this is Qualifications Scotland rejecting the accusations of the teachers, including current markers? Does QS believe that they are wrong?

I also note that you haven't addressed the specific example of a change in marking standards that I provided. Given that you have not disputed this, I take it that this change has indeed happened as the teachers have stated.

Let me know if you want us to address these, or if we are not offering any further comments / replies at this time.

cheers

Russell

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 09:18
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks, Donna and Iain – we'll get this away and keep you updated on any further developments/coverage.

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 08:37
To: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted] - happy with this reponse.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:36
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi [redacted]

Thanks for putting this together. I am happy with the level of response at this stage, so OK from my end.

Thanks again.

Iain

Iain Morrison
Head of Humanities, Care & Services | Ceannard nan Daonnachdan, Cùram & Sheirbheisean
Qualifications Development | Leasachadh Teisteanasan

m: [redacted] | **e:** iain.morrison@qualifications.gov.scot | **w:** http://www.qualifications.gov.scot
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, GLASGOW, G2 8DQ

Qualifications Scotland
Teisteanasan Alba

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:30
To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

I've gone back to the journalist to say that we'll get back with a response tomorrow. Grateful for your comment and approval of the updated line, in the morning:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2026 16:38

To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks everyone – updated line:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

[redacted]

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 15:00
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

And maybe add that we regularly engage with SATH and will be meeting them again on XXX [not sure if in diary] which will enable us to hear first hand from the history teacher community.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:55

To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted]

Can we bring in something on Understanding Standards and the number of teachers that took part in that.

Also be interested to know what SATH's view is on these claims?

I'm not sure what time the query came in but 5pm seems like a ridiculously short deadline for such a complex enquiry and set of accusations.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:16
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Looping Georgina in here as Iain is on A/L.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:14
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]

[redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

We've had the following detailed enquiry in about Higher History, which covers a number of points, including mention of a colleague and the team in general.

Deadline is 5pm today – while we may want to address the specific points – here is a suggested high-level response as a starter:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published for each subject in the Course Reports from next month.

We are committed to continuing to engage with History teachers and providing them with support and understanding standards materials.

-ends-

Enquiry

Following on from the extensive controversy in 2024, I have been approached by several History teachers raising major concerns about the management of exam marking once again this year.

I have been told that during marking this year for paper 2, that "Points that have previously been awarded marks, and have been awarded on mark schemes in the past and are on BBC Bitesize etc have inexplicably not been given, and the first we found out was at the markers meeting, after the children had sat the exam.

A number of examples have been provided to me, including: "question 2 asked about the relationship between the Scottish King John Balliol and English Edward I. One of the standard points we would expect pupils to make was that Balliol took an Englishman, Master Thomas of Hunsingore, to be his Chancellor. Standard, straightforward point; you'll see it on the MI from the 2022 paper when this issue came up last. It's credited on specimen papers. Not awarded this year."

I have been provided with links to previous Marking Instructions and Understanding Standards exemplars that clearly do give a mark for this, and also a screenshot from this year's marking briefing showing it should not be given. I'm told that this image was taken because so many teachers present were unsure they had heard correctly and thought this was a clear break from the past.

And another was: "A further example from Higher Assignment: markers were told that evaluation couldn't be credited twice in one paragraph. This is news to me, a seriously experienced teacher and marker, and every teacher I have spoken to since. Nowhere is this recorded in the marking instructions or in any guidance ever published. There have been understanding standards materials in the past where evaluation has been credited twice in one paragraph. "

To be clear, these are not the only examples or comments I have received, and I think I should also point out that, once again, [redacted] *has been specifically mentioned, along with other members of the History team.*

And these comments were, I thought, particularly damning:

"How are we to prepare candidates when we don't know the standard? The only children who can be adequately prepared are those being taught by the small team of people sitting in the core team making decisions. It is almost criminally unfair. This has been flagged before, denied, and even when it was proved that the goalposts were being changed, nothing happened. Nobody cares. Why would anything change when the SQA team that has always done this and shown such disregard, bordering on contempt, for history teachers and students is now the QS team doing the same? The people haven't changed, so why would the problems. Frustrated doesn't even cover it. I don't fill in the markers reports because I know complaints will at best be ignored, and at worst be held against me."

This is basically the exact same issue that arose two years ago, and which your CEO subsequently admitted to me should have been revisited.

I should also point out that those speaking to me have insisted that they stay anonymous because they do not trust Qualifications Scotland not to attempt to punish them for raising these concerns.

Another teacher I have spoken to says that one possible issue in other areas of marking is that schools have worked hard to decolonise their curriculum as part of national efforts, and in some cases this could have led to pupils being penalised:

"We really engaged with the materials for this last year and tried to include in our teaching more of the negative impacts of Scottish settlers. I think we have been penalised for this because we, again, have examples of random and inconsistent decision making about what is mark worthy and what is not. Probably also because we are including new stuff that markers won't recognise. Our Scottish paper marks were worse than ever this year at 90% of the national average. Last year, we were 112.2% of the national average and the disastrous year before we were 98% Same staff, with vast experience. I wonder if the trend in other schools is the same. The net effect will be to make us stick to the old stuff - this great white man went and built a railway etc."

So if you could also address those accusations that would be good.

The SQA (eventually) initiated an investigation into Higher History marking in 2024, but this was widely dismissed as a whitewash and the exam board admitted that a fully independent review (rather than having SQA staff investigate other SQA staff) was not considered.

Will Qualifications Scotland consider a properly independent investigation this time, and does it accept that there are major concerns about the conduct of the History team, which has the same people on board as in 2024?

This year the mean mark for paper 1 went up compared to last year, but the mean mark for paper 2 went down. The SD for paper 2 is also quite a bit higher than for Paper 1.

All of that would seem to support the arguments I'm hearing from History teachers.

I've also spoken to another one since I emailed you and they say that there is widespread amongst history teachers over marking once again, particularly given the disparity between papers. This individual also backed the allegations about marking of evaluation in the assignment.

And just to be clear, coverage of this is almost certainly going to include the fact that the History team at QS is led by the same people who were in charge the last time there was a major controversy over marking. I know that caused issues internally (and eventually externally) last time so I figure it's only fair to make that explicitly clear.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 21 August 2026 08:37
To: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted] - happy with this reponse.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:36
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi [redacted]

Thanks for putting this together. I am happy with the level of response at this stage, so OK from my end.

Thanks again.

Iain

Iain Morrison
Head of Humanities, Care & Services | Ceannard nan Daonnachdan, Cùram & Sheirbheisean
Qualifications Development | Leasachadh Teisteanasan

m: [redacted] | **e:** iain.morrison@qualifications.gov.scot | **w:** http://www.qualifications.gov.scot
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, GLASGOW, G2 8DQ

Qualifications Scotland
Teisteanasan Alba

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 17:30
To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Nick Page <nick.page@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

I've gone back to the journalist to say that we'll get back with a response tomorrow. Grateful for your comment and approval of the updated line, in the morning:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2026 16:38
To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks everyone – updated line:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published in the Course Report from next month.

We have continued to provide History teachers with support and Understanding Standards materials. Since 2024, over 2,900 educators have downloaded the Higher History resources, webinars and accompanying documents, covering the question papers and assignment.

We are committed to continuing to engage with the History teacher community and hearing first hand from them.

-ends-

[redacted]

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 15:00
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

And maybe add that we regularly engage with SATH and will be meeting them again on XXX [not sure if in diary] which will enable us to hear first hand from the history teacher community.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:55
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted]

Can we bring in something on Understanding Standards and the number of teachers that took part in that.

Also be interested to know what SATH's view is on these claims?

I'm not sure what time the query came in but 5pm seems like a ridiculously short deadline for such a complex enquiry and set of accusations.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer
Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:16
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Looping Georgina in here as Iain is on A/L.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:14
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

We've had the following detailed enquiry in about Higher History, which covers a number of points, including mention of a colleague and the team in general.

Deadline is 5pm today – while we may want to address the specific points – here is a suggested high-level response as a starter:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published for each subject in the Course Reports from next month.

We are committed to continuing to engage with History teachers and providing them with support and understanding standards materials.

-ends-

Enquiry

Following on from the extensive controversy in 2024, I have been approached by several History teachers raising major concerns about the management of exam marking once again this year.

I have been told that during marking this year for paper 2, that "Points that have previously been awarded marks, and have been awarded on mark schemes in the past and are on BBC Bitesize etc have inexplicably not been given, and the first we found out was at the markers meeting, after the children had sat the exam.

A number of examples have been provided to me, including: "question 2 asked about the relationship between the Scottish King John Balliol and English Edward I. One of the standard points we would expect pupils to make was that Balliol took an Englishman, Master Thomas of Hunsingore, to be his Chancellor. Standard, straightforward point; you'll see it on the MI from the 2022 paper when this issue came up last. It's credited on specimen papers. Not awarded this year."

I have been provided with links to previous Marking Instructions and Understanding Standards exemplars that clearly do give a mark for this, and also a screenshot from this year's marking briefing showing it should not be given. I'm told that this image was taken because so many teachers present were unsure they had heard correctly and thought this was a clear break from the past.

And another was: "A further example from Higher Assignment: markers were told that evaluation couldn't be credited twice in one paragraph. This is news to me, a seriously experienced teacher and marker, and every teacher I have spoken to since. Nowhere is this recorded in the marking instructions or in any guidance ever published. There have been understanding standards materials in the past where evaluation has been credited twice in one paragraph. "

To be clear, these are not the only examples or comments I have received, and I think I should also point out that, once again, [redacted] has been specifically mentioned, along with other members of the History team.

And these comments were, I thought, particularly damning:

"How are we to prepare candidates when we don't know the standard? The only children who can be adequately prepared are those being taught by the small team of people sitting in the core team making decisions. It is almost criminally unfair. This has been flagged before, denied, and even when it was proved that the goalposts were being changed, nothing happened. Nobody cares. Why would anything change when the SQA team that has always done this and shown such disregard, bordering on contempt, for history teachers and students is now the QS team doing the same? The people haven't changed, so why would the problems. Frustrated doesn't even cover it. I don't fill in the markers reports because I know complaints will at best be ignored, and at worst be held against me."

This is basically the exact same issue that arose two years ago, and which your CEO subsequently admitted to me should have been revisited.

I should also point out that those speaking to me have insisted that they stay anonymous because they do not trust Qualifications Scotland not to attempt to punish them for raising these concerns.

Another teacher I have spoken to says that one possible issue in other areas of marking is that schools have worked hard to decolonise their curriculum as part of national efforts, and in some cases this could have led to pupils being penalised:

"We really engaged with the materials for this last year and tried to include in our teaching more of the negative impacts of Scottish settlers. I think we have been penalised for this because we, again, have examples of random and inconsistent decision making about what is mark worthy and what is not. Probably also because we are including new stuff that markers won't recognise. Our Scottish paper marks were worse than ever this year at 90% of the national average. Last year, we were 112.2% of the national average and the disastrous year before we were 98% Same staff, with vast experience. I wonder if the trend in other schools is the same. The net effect will be to make us stick to the old stuff - this great white man went and built a railway etc."

So if you could also address those accusations that would be good.

The SQA (eventually) initiated an investigation into Higher History marking in 2024, but this was widely dismissed as a whitewash and the exam board admitted that a fully independent review (rather than having SQA staff investigate other SQA staff) was not considered.

Will Qualifications Scotland consider a properly independent investigation this time, and does it accept that there are major concerns about the conduct of the History team, which has the same people on board as in 2024?

This year the mean mark for paper 1 went up compared to last year, but the mean mark for paper 2 went down. The SD for paper 2 is also quite a bit higher than for Paper 1.

All of that would seem to support the arguments I'm hearing from History teachers.

I've also spoken to another one since I emailed you and they say that there is widespread amongst history teachers over marking once again, particularly given the disparity between papers. This individual also backed the allegations about marking of evaluation in the assignment.

And just to be clear, coverage of this is almost certainly going to include the fact that the History team at QS is led by the same people who were in charge the last time there was a major controversy over marking. I know that caused issues internally (and eventually externally) last time so I figure it's only fair to make that explicitly clear.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 15:03
To: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks Iain.

Let's hold fire on mentioning SATH for now.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 15:00
To: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]

[redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Media enquiry - Higher History

Afternoon all.

I have had word that there is a lot of negativity in the SATH chat, which might be related to this. I will attempt to get more details.

Agree with John that 5pm is a very quick turnaround for something so detailed.

Iain

Iain Morrison
Head of Humanities, Care & Services | Ceannard nan Daonnachdan, Cùram & Sheirbheisean
Qualifications Development | Leasachadh Teisteanasan

m: [redacted] | **e:** iain.morrison@qualifications.gov.scot | **w:** http://www.qualifications.gov.scot
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, GLASGOW, G2 8DQ

Qualifications Scotland
Teisteanasan Alba

From: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:55
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Thanks [redacted]

Can we bring in something on Understanding Standards and the number of teachers that took part in that.

Also be interested to know what SATH's view is on these claims?

I'm not sure what time the query came in but 5pm seems like a ridiculously short deadline for such a complex enquiry and set of accusations.

John

John Booth
Chief Strategy Officer

Qualifications Scotland
qualifications.gov.scot

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 14:16
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Looping Georgina in here as Iain is on A/L.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:14
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

We've had the following detailed enquiry in about Higher History, which covers a number of points, including mention of a colleague and the team in general.

Deadline is 5pm today – while we may want to address the specific points – here is a suggested high-level response as a starter:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published for each subject in the Course Reports from next month.

We are committed to continuing to engage with History teachers and providing them with support and understanding standards materials.

-ends-

Enquiry

Following on from the extensive controversy in 2024, I have been approached by several History teachers raising major concerns about the management of exam marking once again this year.

I have been told that during marking this year for paper 2, that "Points that have previously been awarded marks, and have been awarded on mark schemes in the past and are on BBC Bitesize etc have inexplicably not been given, and the first we found out was at the markers meeting, after the children had sat the exam.

A number of examples have been provided to me, including: "question 2 asked about the relationship between the Scottish King John Balliol and English Edward I. One of the standard points we would expect pupils to make was that Balliol took an Englishman, Master Thomas of Hunsingore, to be his Chancellor. Standard, straightforward point; you'll see it on the MI from the 2022 paper when this issue came up last. It's credited on specimen papers. Not awarded this year."

I have been provided with links to previous Marking Instructions and Understanding Standards exemplars that clearly do give a mark for this, and also a screenshot from this year's marking briefing showing it should not be given. I'm told that this image was taken because so many teachers present were unsure they had heard correctly and thought this was a clear break from the past.

And another was: "A further example from Higher Assignment: markers were told that evaluation couldn't be credited twice in one paragraph. This is news to me, a seriously experienced teacher and marker, and every teacher I have spoken to since. Nowhere is this recorded in the marking instructions or in any guidance ever published. There have been understanding standards materials in the past where evaluation has been credited twice in one paragraph. "

To be clear, these are not the only examples or comments I have received, and I think I should also point out that, once again, [redacted] *has been specifically mentioned, along with other members of the History team.*

And these comments were, I thought, particularly damning:

"How are we to prepare candidates when we don't know the standard? The only children who can be adequately prepared are those being taught by the small team of people sitting in the core team making decisions. It is almost criminally unfair. This has been flagged before, denied, and even when it was proved that the goalposts were being changed, nothing happened. Nobody cares. Why would anything change when the SQA team that has always done this and shown such disregard, bordering on contempt, for history teachers and students is now the QS team doing the same? The people haven't changed, so why would the problems. Frustrated doesn't even cover it. I don't fill in the markers reports because I know complaints will at best be ignored, and at worst be held against me."

This is basically the exact same issue that arose two years ago, and which your CEO subsequently admitted to me should have been revisited.

I should also point out that those speaking to me have insisted that they stay anonymous because they do not trust Qualifications Scotland not to attempt to punish them for raising these concerns.

Another teacher I have spoken to says that one possible issue in other areas of marking is that schools have worked hard to decolonise their curriculum as part of national efforts, and in some cases this could have led to pupils being penalised:

"We really engaged with the materials for this last year and tried to include in our teaching more of the negative impacts of Scottish settlers. I think we have been penalised for this because we, again, have examples of random and inconsistent decision making about what is mark worthy and what is not. Probably also because we are including new stuff that markers won't recognise. Our Scottish paper marks were worse than ever this year at 90% of the national average. Last year, we were 112.2% of the national average and the disastrous year before we were 98% Same staff, with vast experience. I wonder if the trend in other schools is the same. The net effect will be to make us stick to the old stuff - this great white man went and built a railway etc."

So if you could also address those accusations that would be good.

The SQA (eventually) initiated an investigation into Higher History marking in 2024, but this was widely dismissed as a whitewash and the exam board admitted that a fully independent review (rather than having SQA staff investigate other SQA staff) was not considered.

Will Qualifications Scotland consider a properly independent investigation this time, and does it accept that there are major concerns about the conduct of the History team, which has the same people on board as in 2024?

This year the mean mark for paper 1 went up compared to last year, but the mean mark for paper 2 went down. The SD for paper 2 is also quite a bit higher than for Paper 1.

All of that would seem to support the arguments I'm hearing from History teachers.

I've also spoken to another one since I emailed you and they say that there is widespread amongst history teachers over marking once again, particularly given the disparity between papers. This individual also backed the allegations about marking of evaluation in the assignment.

And just to be clear, coverage of this is almost certainly going to include the fact that the History team at QS is led by the same people who were in charge the last time there was a major controversy over marking. I know that caused issues internally (and eventually externally) last time so I figure it's only fair to make that explicitly clear.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]

From: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:17
To: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>; Georgina Holmes <georgina.holmes@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Media enquiry - Higher History

Looping Georgina in here as Iain is on A/L.

Donna Stewart | Chief Qualifications and Examinations Officer | Qualifications Scotland | Teisteanasan Alba
donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot

From: [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Sent: 20 August 2026 14:14
To: Donna Stewart <donna.stewart@qualifications.gov.scot>; Iain Morrison <Iain.Morrison@qualifications.gov.scot>
Cc: John Booth <john.booth@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>; [redacted]@qualifications.gov.scot>
Subject: Media enquiry - Higher History

Hi folks

We've had the following detailed enquiry in about Higher History, which covers a number of points, including mention of a colleague and the team in general.

Deadline is 5pm today – while we may want to address the specific points – here is a suggested high-level response as a starter:

Higher History in 2026 performed as intended, with a slight improvement on A-C attainment. Through the awarding process we use the rich variety of feedback, observations and insights from the teachers and lecturers who mark the assessments. Reflections from the Principal Assessor and advice for teachers and lecturers to help them prepare their learners for the coming year, will be published for each subject in the Course Reports from next month.

We are committed to continuing to engage with History teachers and providing them with support and understanding standards materials.

-ends-

Enquiry

Following on from the extensive controversy in 2024, I have been approached by several History teachers raising major concerns about the management of exam marking once again this year.

I have been told that during marking this year for paper 2, that "Points that have previously been awarded marks, and have been awarded on mark schemes in the past and are on BBC Bitesize etc have inexplicably not been given, and the first we found out was at the markers meeting, after the children had sat the exam.

A number of examples have been provided to me, including: "question 2 asked about the relationship between the Scottish King John Balliol and English Edward I. One of the standard points we would expect pupils to make was that Balliol took an Englishman, Master Thomas of Hunsingore, to be his Chancellor. Standard, straightforward point; you'll see it on the MI from the 2022 paper when this issue came up last. It's credited on specimen papers. Not awarded this year."

I have been provided with links to previous Marking Instructions and Understanding Standards exemplars that clearly do give a mark for this, and also a screenshot from this year's marking briefing showing it should not be given. I'm told that this image was taken because so many teachers present were unsure they had heard correctly and thought this was a clear break from the past.

And another was: "A further example from Higher Assignment: markers were told that evaluation couldn't be credited twice in one paragraph. This is news to me, a seriously experienced teacher and marker, and every teacher I have spoken to since. Nowhere is this recorded in the marking instructions or in any guidance ever published. There have been understanding standards materials in the past where evaluation has been credited twice in one paragraph. "

To be clear, these are not the only examples or comments I have received, and I think I should also point out that, once again, [redacted] *has been specifically mentioned, along with other members of the History team.*

And these comments were, I thought, particularly damning:

"How are we to prepare candidates when we don't know the standard? The only children who can be adequately prepared are those being taught by the small team of people sitting in the core team making decisions. It is almost criminally unfair. This has been flagged before, denied, and even when it was proved that the goalposts were being changed, nothing happened. Nobody cares. Why would anything change when the SQA team that has always done this and shown such disregard, bordering on contempt, for history teachers and students is now the QS team doing the same? The people haven't changed, so why would the problems. Frustrated doesn't even cover it. I don't fill in the markers reports because I know complaints will at best be ignored, and at worst be held against me."

This is basically the exact same issue that arose two years ago, and which your CEO subsequently admitted to me should have been revisited.

I should also point out that those speaking to me have insisted that they stay anonymous because they do not trust Qualifications Scotland not to attempt to punish them for raising these concerns.

Another teacher I have spoken to says that one possible issue in other areas of marking is that schools have worked hard to decolonise their curriculum as part of national efforts, and in some cases this could have led to pupils being penalised:

"We really engaged with the materials for this last year and tried to include in our teaching more of the negative impacts of Scottish settlers. I think we have been penalised for this because we, again, have examples of random and inconsistent decision making about what is mark worthy and what is not. Probably also because we are including new stuff that markers won't recognise. Our Scottish paper marks were worse than ever this year at 90% of the national average. Last year, we were 112.2% of the national average and the disastrous year before we were 98% Same staff, with vast experience. I wonder if the trend in other schools is the same. The net effect will be to make us stick to the old stuff - this great white man went and built a railway etc."

So if you could also address those accusations that would be good.

The SQA (eventually) initiated an investigation into Higher History marking in 2024, but this was widely dismissed as a whitewash and the exam board admitted that a fully independent review (rather than having SQA staff investigate other SQA staff) was not considered.

Will Qualifications Scotland consider a properly independent investigation this time, and does it accept that there are major concerns about the conduct of the History team, which has the same people on board as in 2024?

This year the mean mark for paper 1 went up compared to last year, but the mean mark for paper 2 went down. The SD for paper 2 is also quite a bit higher than for Paper 1.

All of that would seem to support the arguments I'm hearing from History teachers.

I've also spoken to another one since I emailed you and they say that there is widespread amongst history teachers over marking once again, particularly given the disparity between papers. This individual also backed the allegations about marking of evaluation in the assignment.

And just to be clear, coverage of this is almost certainly going to include the fact that the History team at QS is led by the same people who were in charge the last time there was a major controversy over marking. I know that caused issues internally (and eventually externally) last time so I figure it's only fair to make that explicitly clear.

-ends-

Thanks

[redacted]