



NQ verification 2023–24 round 1

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	July 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H20D 73	National 3	Historical Study: European and World
H205 73	National 3	Historical Study: Scottish
H20C 73	National 3	Historical Study: British
H20D 74	National 4	Historical Study: European and World
H205 74	National 4	Historical Study: Scottish
H20C 74	National 4	Historical Study: British

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Most centres successfully followed the guidelines to assessment at both National 3 and National 4 levels, as set out in the SQA unit assessment support packs. Many had adapted assessments to suit the needs of their centre, using well-constructed assessments that helped candidates demonstrate their knowledge and understanding across different assessment standards in a range of approaches, for example booklets, posters and PowerPoints. Centres are reminded to clearly state the nature of the assessment used, whether centre-devised or adapted from an SQA-generated unit assessment support pack or include the prior verification certificate. In devising assessments, centres effectively used question stems suitable for the level being assessed, appropriate assessment structures, and judging evidence tables. Centres used candidate-style responses to exemplify to markers what candidates may write, and how they may write it. Many assessments included supportive strategies for candidates, for example underlining key terms in instructions and clearly identifying success criteria. Most centres accurately used the thresholds for a unit

pass at National 4 level as stated in the course specification, although this was not always the case.

Some assessments inflated the standard by asking candidates to make more points than required to meet each assessment standard. For the National 4 Scottish unit, some centres asked candidates to identify author **and** timing of a source when **either** author **or** timing is required. Several assessments inflated demands for National 3 and/or National 4 candidates by using SCQF level 5 approaches and/or sources. Centres are advised to use the wording of question stems in the unit assessment support packs to avoid altering or inflating demands on candidates.

It is good practice for centres to indicate the number of points a candidate is required to make to achieve each assessment standard on task prompts. Most centres effectively labelled task prompts with the assessment standard or outcome although there was some mislabelling with several centres using outcome when it should have been assessment standard (for example, assessment standard 2.1 and not outcome 2.1).

Many centres included the checklist for verification with their submissions and made good use of the candidate assessment record, which is helpful for recording discussions regarding assessment judgements made for each candidate.

Centres are reminded that the current version of unit assessment support packs on SQA's secure site should always be used as these are subject to revision. These can be accessed through SQA co-ordinators at each centre.

Assessment judgements

Centres are commended for some excellent, well-defined internal verification, which showed clear processes adopted in making assessment judgements. There was evidence of professional dialogue and a record of professional discussions as to why judgements had been made, particularly when a candidate had revisited an assessment standard. There was good evidence of feedback on candidate assessment records, which helps assessors and candidates and aids the internal verification process. Some centres included examples of candidate feedback boxes allowing candidates to reflect on their performance and share their views. There was good evidence of partial re-assessment rather than candidates being required to complete a whole task again. There was more evidence of assessors using coloured annotations, identifying the assessment standards at the point of achievement, and of centres highlighting exactly where a candidate had used their own words in achieving assessment standard 1.1 at National 4 level.

Centres are encouraged to demonstrate clear evidence of cross-marking throughout a candidate response rather than only annotating the top of the paper. Assessors should continue to mark all candidate evidence, even after the point at which the candidate achieved the assessment standard.

Centres are reminded that at National 4 level the candidate is deemed to have achieved the full outcome if three out of four assessment standards have been met in the British and European and World units, and if four out of five assessment standards have been met in the Scottish unit. This is specified on page 4 of each [unit specification](#). National 3 candidates must achieve all assessment standards for a unit pass.

Centres are encouraged to make full use of oral re-assessment and should record clearly if a candidate has met assessment standards through this process.

Section 3: general comments

The overall quality of submissions was of a high standard with centres clearly responding to advice given previously.

There was good use of pre-delivery meetings taking place in centres, which agreed the sample for internal verification. There was good evidence of discussions between markers in centres, shown by the recording of professional dialogue on candidate assessment records and internal verification policies being embedded in practice.

Centres had successfully adapted unit assessment support packs to identify where candidates could meet assessment standards to aid candidates and assessors. There was also effective evidence of candidates being able to revisit assessment standards and to be re-assessed. Centres have increasingly used oral re-assessment and have recorded good evidence of when assessment standards were to be revisited.

Several centres did not submit the assessment with candidate evidence for verification or did not submit the judging evidence table, or a judging evidence table that matched the assessment, to allow verification to be completed.

Overall, centres are commended for their ongoing support and encouragement of their candidates, exemplified by thorough, constructive, and supportive feedback on candidate responses.



NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	July 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
J1YM 75	SCQF level 5	Historical Study: British
J1YP 75	SCQF level 5	Historical Study: European and World
J1YD 75	SCQF level 5	Historical Study: Scottish
J226 76	SCQF level 6	Historical Study: British
J228 76	SCQF level 6	Historical Study: European and World
J225 76	SCQF level 6	Historical Study: Scottish
J29M 77	SCQF level 7	Historical Study

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Most centres had successfully followed the guidelines to assessment at each level as set out in the unit assessment support packs. Many had suitably adapted assessments to meet the needs of their candidates. Some centres had effectively outlined success criteria alongside question prompts, had clearly structured assessments, and included candidate style responses in the judging evidence tables. There was some evidence of personalisation and choice, particularly at SCQF level 5.

Centres are advised to use the wording of question stems in the unit assessment support packs to avoid altering or inflating demands on candidates. In SCQF level 6 assessments, some centres were trying to use the 'Two Source' question that asks 'How much do sources A and B agree ...'. This question requires candidates to interpret the view of each source and use recalled knowledge to assess what the sources reveal about differing interpretations of a given event or development, but as the unit assessment criteria is different from the

Higher exam, this question is not appropriate. Several assessments inflated demands for SCQF level 6 candidates by using Higher essay titles and, for SCQF level 5 candidates, by using lengthy sources. It is good practice to add success criteria and assessment standards to assessment tasks to aid candidates, which may include revisiting prior verified assessments where necessary. Some centres submitted timed essays as part of a portfolio approach, however, timed, closed book assessments inflate the standard and centres are therefore reminded to consult the appropriate unit assessment support pack for guidance.

Many centres made effective use of the checklist for verification with their submissions and made use of the candidate assessment record, which is useful for recording discussions regarding assessment judgements made for each candidate.

Centres are reminded that the current version of unit assessment support packs on SQA's secure website should always be used as these are subject to revision.

Assessment judgements

Centres should be commended on some excellent, well-defined internal verification, which showed clear processes adopted in making assessment judgements.

Most centres made effective use of candidate assessment records to exemplify evidence and attainment, demonstrating effective cross-marking. Particularly useful was where assessors had highlighted sections of candidate responses that specifically met each assessment standard. It was encouraging to see wide use of annotation at the point of achievement, often colour coded to distinguish between the assessor and the internal verifier. Centres are reminded to continue annotating the entire candidate response, beyond the point where outcomes are achieved.

Some centres submitted excellent evidence of oral re-assessment by providing a transcript of the discussion held with the candidate to support assessor judgements.

More centres had suitably adapted the judging evidence tables to show possible candidate responses to exemplify possible knowledge. Centres must submit the assessment task as even when it seems obvious what the candidate has been asked to do, it would be helpful to the verification process to see what the task was, and any success criteria given to the candidate.

Section 3: general comments

The overall quality of submissions was of a high standard with centres clearly responding to advice given previously. The overall standard of candidate work was to be admired.

It was evident that centres had effective internal verification processes and centre staff worked cooperatively to ensure consistency, although not all centres submitted their verification policies with their verification sample. It is helpful to verifiers to see the process centres have adopted.

There was good evidence of discussions between markers within centres, shown by candidate assessment records.