



**National Qualifications 2022
Qualification Verification Summary Report
Mental Health and Wellbeing
Awards**

Verification group number: 707

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject.

National Qualifications Awards

Mental Health and Wellbeing Awards

Titles/levels of NQ Awards verified:

Mental Health and Wellbeing Award SCQF Level 4

Mental Health and Wellbeing Award SCQF Level 5

General comments

There was no external verification for the Mental Health and Wellbeing Awards in 2019–20 and 2020–21 due to the pandemic. This year, evidence was submitted by schools, colleges and training providers across both SCQF level 4 and level 5. It was evident that, in general, centres have an understanding of the national standards. However, some centres do need to be aware of the evidence requirements for different levels and of ensuring that candidates are given the opportunity to meet these minimum evidence requirements.

Course arrangements, unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

It was clear from the evidence submitted that all centres adhered to the unit specifications. Some centres used the assessment support packs (ASPs) as part of the assessment process. All centres used an appropriate instrument of assessment. It is recommended that if centres use an adapted assessment instrument, they submit it for prior verification.

Evidence requirements

Most centres had exemplified the minimum evidence requirements or had used the assessment support materials produced by SQA. Two centres had slightly adapted the assessment material provided by SQA and this had led to candidates not being able to meet the minimum evidence requirements. An example of this related to a level 5 Understanding Mental Health Issues assessment, where candidates were asked to provide three pieces of legislation in relation to mental health. The minimum evidence requirements at level 5 ask for one policy and two pieces of legislation. This can be prevented by centres submitting any adapted assessment materials to SQA for prior verification.

Administration of assessments

It was apparent that some centres had used the ASP as an exam under controlled conditions. This award lends itself to being holistically assessed, by generating evidence throughout, to meet the minimum evidence requirements. Some candidates' work met the evidence requirements, but they had also completed the assessment within the assessment support pack which was not necessary.

The assessment provided in the ASP can be used as a tool to ensure that candidates have met the minimum evidence requirements.

Other centres provided candidate evidence which had been assessed throughout and clearly met the evidence requirements. This included PowerPoints, personal stories, videos, written work, and posters — giving candidates a choice in how they wished to produce their evidence.

Some centres provided evidence of internal verification and standardisation. It is good practice to internal verify assessments and evidence to ensure that national standards are met. Regular standardisation meetings are important, especially if a large teaching team is involved in the delivery of the awards.

Feedback to candidates was evident in some areas, but not across all centres. All centres should aim to provide feedback to candidates whenever possible as a form of good practice.

Areas of good practice

There were many areas of good practice within the evidence supplied by centres:

- ◆ One centre specifically focused on their local community allowing the candidates to research local issues relating to mental health.
- ◆ Overall, the evidence generated was to a very high standard and in a variety of formats including: videos, personal stories, PowerPoints, posters, and written work.
- ◆ Some centres provided evidence of robust internal verification and detailed and thorough feedback to candidates throughout.

Specific areas for improvement

There are areas to be considered when delivering the award:

- ◆ Centres should aim to provide appropriate candidate feedback whenever possible.
- ◆ Centres should have evidence of internal verification processes carried out and assessor feedback.
- ◆ Centres should assess candidates to the appropriate level, be aware of over-assessing, and provide appropriate marking guides.
- ◆ Centres should aim to generate naturally occurring evidence to meet the minimum evidence requirements for the award.
- ◆ It is recommended that centre-devised assessments are submitted for prior verification.
- ◆ If centres are using different IT platforms, the accessibility of these platforms should be considered if the centre is selected for external verification.