



NQ History Qualification Verification

Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	1
Date published:	July 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H20D 73	National 3	Historical Study: European and World
H20C 73	National 3	Historical Study: British
H205 73	National 3	Historical Study: Scottish
H20D 74	National 4	Historical Study: European and World
H20C 74	National 4	Historical Study: British
H205 74	National 4	Historical Study: Scottish
J1YP 75	SCQF level 5	Historical Study: European and World
J1YM 75	SCQF level 5	Historical Study: British
J1YD 75	SCQF level 5	Historical Study: Scottish
J228 76	SCQF level 6	Historical Study: European and World
J226 76	SCQF level 6	Historical Study: British

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
J225 76	SCQF level 6	Historical Study: Scottish

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres used SQA unit assessment support packs, either directly or with minor modifications that mainly altered topics.

A significant number of centres used prior verified assessments. However, it is important to note that these might be based on older versions of unit assessment support packs. While the approach is valid, it is vital to ensure any prior verified assessments align with the latest judging evidence tables published in SQA unit assessment support packs. Centres should pay particular attention to column 3, which was updated in 2019 with minor language changes, and column 4, which now includes prose example responses meeting the assessment standard. Centres should update their judging evidence tables to reflect current assessment standards.

Across all levels, centres mainly used the unit by unit approach and rarely used combined or portfolio approaches, which were often not suitably implemented.

Assessment judgements

In general, centres demonstrated a clear understanding of the assessment standards. However, some centres over-inflated the assessment standards at National 4 level by seeking responses at National 5 level, especially for assessment standards 2.1 and 2.2. While some centres tended to over-expect from candidates, most centres demonstrated sound judgement.

Some centres were inconsistent in applying assessment standard thresholds, where candidates can achieve an outcome by gaining either three out of four or four out of five

assessment standards. Centres need to address this to ensure fairness and consistency in assessment.

Centres made good use of candidate assessment records and provided detailed comments to justify decisions.

Many centres did not use the most recent judging evidence table, often not including the prose example response that meets the assessment standard in column 4.

Almost all centres submitted evidence of effective internal verification; however, there were some issues with internal verification practices. While many centres had signed internal verification policies and forms, there was sometimes no evidence of procedures taking place. Centres demonstrated good practice, including thorough cross-marking, marking at the point of achievement (not solely adjacent to the response), and using distinct coloured pens to differentiate assessor and internal verifier.

Section 3: general comments

Overall, centres demonstrated a generally good understanding of assessment approaches and judgement. Many centres made positive progress, with clear evidence that feedback from previous reports had been effectively implemented. Several centres that had previously not met the required standards were now successful, demonstrating a commitment to improvement.

However, despite this overall progress, some areas still require attention. Centres should ensure they use up-to-date judging evidence tables that align with current unit assessment support packs, which is crucial for consistent assessment. Centres should explore the potential of combined or portfolio approaches where appropriate, as these can offer richer opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their skills and knowledge.

Many centres have incorporated past paper questions and prelim evidence into adapted unit assessment support packs. While this practice is acceptable as long as the materials assess the required assessment standards at the appropriate level and do not introduce content exceeding those standards, a key concern remains the substitution of

the judging evidence table with marking instructions. The judging evidence table is the essential tool for ensuring national standards are met, as it outlines the specific criteria for a pass. Using marking schemes instead of the judging evidence table can inadvertently lead to candidates being assessed against higher standards than those nationally agreed, creating inconsistencies in assessment outcomes.

Furthermore, a recurring issue, although less common than in previous years, is the inconsistent application of the threshold for a unit pass at National 4 level and SCQF levels 5 and 6.



NQ History Qualification Verification

Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	2
Date published:	July 2025

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H20E 74	National 4	History Assignment

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Overall, many centres effectively used the unit assessment support pack and guidance, demonstrating strong support for candidates who produced high-quality work that centres accurately recognised. While this positive trend is evident, specific approaches

to assessment reveal areas of both good practice and opportunities for further improvement.

- National 5 materials: many centres used evidence generated by National 5 activities. The majority of centres appropriately applied advice for judging evidence at National 4 level and used effective supporting documents. However, this has led to an increase in National 5-type question stems and inflated expectations regarding introductions, balanced or supported conclusions, and direct referencing
- personalisation and choice: most centres supported a range of personalisation and choice. However, some centres restricted candidate choice by advising from a list of topics or questions and/or formats. In some cases, centres predetermined the topic or theme and/or format through the phrasing used in the assessment task
- assessment materials: there is widespread evidence of centres using centre-devised planning booklets. Best practice involves using evidence from both the planning or research phase and the final presentation for assessment. However, some centres did not demonstrate this holistic approach by not annotating planning materials and the final piece

Assessment judgements

Overall, centres demonstrated areas of good practice and strengths in applying National 4 standards for the History Assignment. For example, a majority of centres effectively provided candidates with the opportunity to revisit assessment standards that they had not yet achieved, demonstrating a clear commitment to supporting candidate progress. Furthermore, a higher number of centres used candidate assessment records to clearly indicate where in the candidate's evidence each assessment standard was met, contributing to clearer evidencing of achievement. However, despite these positives, common themes as to where clarity and consistency could be improved were evident.

- misapplication of National 5 expectations: a recurring problem across multiple assessment standards (1.2, 1.3 and 1.6) is the over-inflated expectation of National 4 candidates to meet National 5 level requirements. This includes demanding direct

referencing, introductions or conclusions, or balanced conclusions with supporting reasons, which are not mandatory for National 4

- inconsistent or incorrect annotation and understanding: across assessment standards (1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6), centres are inconsistently annotating candidate evidence (for example, incorrect placement of annotation for assessment standard 1.3 and lack of detailed annotation for assessment standard 1.4). This often indicates a misunderstanding of the specific requirements of each assessment standard, leading to centres awarding passes incorrectly (1.4 and 1.5) or a conflation of different assessment standards (1.5)
- lack of clarity on minimum requirements: for assessment standards such as 1.6, some centres are unsure of the minimum required standard, leading to unnecessary demands (for example, for a formal conclusion), and are overlooking other valid ways for candidates to demonstrate achievement (for example, through specialist vocabulary or summing up ideas)

Section 3: general comments

- opportunity to revisit assessment standards: the majority of centres effectively provided candidates with the opportunity to revisit assessment standards that they had not yet achieved, demonstrating a commitment to supporting candidate progress
- clearer evidencing of achievement: a higher number of centres used candidate assessment records to clearly indicate where in the candidate's evidence each assessment standard was met
- internal verification: many centres used documentation directly from or adapted from the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit, leading to best practice in professional dialogue and assessment approach. Many also used appropriate paperwork for detailed professional dialogue, resulting in consistency of standards. However, a minority of centres submitted verification packs with no evidence of internal verification procedures
- submitting materials: a significant concern is that many centres did not provide an assessment task or a judging evidence table. This omission severely impacts the ability to verify the assessment approach or the assessment judgements made by centres