



NQ verification 2022–23 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	History
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	June 2023

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H20C 74	National 4	Historical Study: British
H20D 74	National 4	Historical Study: European and World
H205 74	National 4	Historical Study: Scottish
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. Centres had effectively used suitable question stems, assessment structure and judging the evidence tables in devising assessments. There was some evidence of personalisation and choice, particularly at National 4 level.

Centres are advised to use the wording of question stems in the unit assessment support packs to avoid altering or inflating demands on candidates. Several assessments inflated demands for SCQF level 6 candidates by using Higher essay titles and, for SCQF level 5

candidates, using lengthy sources. It is good practice to add success criteria and assessment standards to assessments to aid candidates, which may include revisiting prior verified assessments where necessary. At SCQF level 6, some centres assessed candidates on the 'How much do sources A and B reveal...' stem using a source comparison question, which is not the same skill. Centres are therefore reminded to refer to the appropriate unit assessment support pack for guidance, as required.

Centres had 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 submitting evidence digitally should ensure that if candidate evidence is double sided, that all pages are scanned for submission and the candidate flyleaf is also uploaded.

Centres are reminded that the current version of unit assessment support packs available 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. Assessment trackers used by centres demonstrating candidate progression showed good practice.

Centres made effective use of the candidate assessment records to exemplify evidence and results, 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 very wide use of annotation at the point of achievement, often colour coded.

Where a candidate has been orally re-assessed to meet assessment standards, this has been clearly recorded by centres. Some centres recorded the detail of candidate oral responses on candidate scripts, which exemplifies good practice.

More centres had suitably adapted the judging the evidence tables to show possible candidate prose to exemplify possible knowledge.

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.

Centres should be commended on holding purposeful pre-delivery meetings, which agreed a sample for internal verification. There was good evidence of discussions between markers within centres, shown by candidate assessment records and internal verification policies being embedded in practice. There was evidence of post-assessment reviews by centres, which specified actions to be taken based on both candidate and marker reflections of the process, for example, identifying when to reword questions in assessments to improve clarity.