

NQ History Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	History
Verification activity	Event
Round	1
Date published	September 2026

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
J1YM 75	SCQF level 5	Historical Study: British

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
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
J29N 77	SCQF level 7	Researching Historical Issues

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

For National 3 and 4 levels, most centres used our unit assessment support packs or made minor changes to them to cover different topics. Some centres demonstrated good practice by adapting packs into ‘write-on’ booklets while still offering candidates flexibility in how they presented their work. While most centre-devised assessments at SCQF levels 5 and 6 were appropriate, many were too demanding. In these cases, centres often inflated the national standard, therefore requiring more from candidates than they needed to achieve assessment standards.

Across all levels, many centres used prior verified assessments, many of which had been shared across centres over time. While these are valid, centres should ensure they align with the judging evidence tables published in our unit assessment support packs. Centres should refer to column 3, which was updated in 2019 with minor language changes, and column 4, which includes example responses that meet the assessment standard. Centres should update their judging evidence tables to reflect current assessment standards.

Most centres used the unit-by-unit approach, across all levels. Centres rarely used combined or portfolio approaches.

Some centre-devised assessments used question prompts or provided sources, which would not allow candidates to meet the assessment standards. For example, some question prompts were worded to elicit a description, even though the assessment standard specifically required an explanation.

Assessment judgements

Most centres demonstrated a consistent and clear understanding of the assessment standards across all levels. However, some centres over-inflated assessment standards at SCQF levels 5 and 6, with assessors seeking responses that would achieve full marks in National 5 or Higher courses rather than using the information in columns 3 and 4 of the judging evidence table.

Some centres did not submit judging evidence tables with their assessment materials. Submitting only the assessment (the tasks or questions) provides an incomplete view of the assessment process. Without the accompanying judging evidence table, there is no formal record of the criteria used to reach assessment judgements. Centres must provide the specific evidence requirements, and we encourage centres to use column 4 to provide an example of an accepted response to allow assessors to maintain consistency and ensure judgements align with national standards.

General comments

The overall quality of submissions was of a high standard, with centres showing the following good practice:

- Centres provided evidence of effective discussions taking place between assessors within centres, shown by using candidate assessment records and giving detailed comments to justify their decisions.
- Centres demonstrated evidence of internal verification policies embedded in practice.

- Centres provided strong evidence of candidates being appropriately supported and re-assessed across all levels.
- Centres often used oral re-assessment and recorded good evidence of when assessment standards were to be re-assessed.
- Centres demonstrated consistency in using assessment standard thresholds.

NQ History Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	History
Verification activity	Event
Round	2
Date published	September 2026

National Units verified

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

Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Most centres used effective, centre-devised approaches or successfully adapted our unit assessment support pack to guide candidates. A positive aspect of these approaches was that many centres provided opportunities for personalisation and choice. Candidates were well supported in selecting specific topics or historical questions in which they had a personal interest.

Some centres overinflated the required standard at National 4 level by using National 5 assignment-style questions, which can be a disadvantage to National 4 candidates. In some centres, the chosen topic or question lacked the scope and/or depth to allow

candidates to successfully meet assessment standard 1.4. Some centres were inconsistent in their approach to assessment standard 1.3, with some requesting complex research tables when using paragraphs or headings is sufficient to meet the requirements.

Assessment judgements

We observed the following regarding assessment judgements:

- Most assessment judgements were accurate, with many centres demonstrating good practice in applying National 4 standards for the History assignment. For example, many centres provided candidates with supportive feedback and frequently used candidate assessment records to clearly indicate where in the evidence each candidate achieved each assessment standard.
- Assessors did not always place their annotations at the point of achievement on candidate evidence. This can make it challenging to work out exactly how judgements were made, particularly for assessment standards 1.4 and 1.5. If candidates need to provide multiple descriptions or explanations, assessors should annotate the evidence to show exactly what contributes to that specific assessment standard.
- We observed some inconsistency with assessment standard 1.6, with several centres only awarding this for a conclusion, occasionally overlooking that candidates can also meet this assessment standard by using specialist language appropriately.
- Some centres misunderstood the requirements for assessment standards 1.4 and 1.5. For example, for assessment standard 1.4, there must be three factors or themes and two points of knowledge or descriptions for each theme. Similarly, for assessment standard 1.5, there must be at least two descriptions of the cause or impact of the chosen theme.

General comments

Overall, the quality of submissions was of a high standard. Many centres demonstrated effective internal verification processes, with good evidence of professional discussions between markers clearly noted on candidate assessment

records. As digital resources become more accessible, we encourage centres to monitor this carefully and ensure they guide candidates to present their evidence in their own words, rather than lifting text directly from AI tools or online sources.