



National Qualifications Awards

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2023–24

Mental Health and Wellbeing

Verification group number: 707

Award Courses

GP2T 44 Mental Health and Wellbeing Award at SCQF level 4

GP2V 45 Mental Health and Wellbeing Award at SCQF level 5

GV2V 46 Mental Health and Wellbeing Award at SCQF level 6

General comments

This is the fifth year that centres have been delivering the awards at SCQF levels 4 and 5, and the number of centres delivering the awards is increasing each year.

This year the Mental Health and Wellbeing Award at SCQF level 6 was introduced with some centres delivering the award for the first time. This year's evidence was provided for verification from a variety of schools, colleges, and private training organisations, across levels 4, 5 and 6. It was evident that, in general, centres were clear of the national standard and the minimum evidence requirements. Some centres do need to be aware of the national standard and the evidence requirements for different levels, and to make sure that candidates have the opportunity to meet the minimum evidence requirements, specific to the level being delivered.

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

It was clear that all centres were adhering to the unit specifications, as this was evident in the work produced. Some centres used the assessment support packs 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 that they submit it for prior verification. This will give the centres confidence in knowing that the assessment will ensure that candidates will be meeting the minimum evidence requirements.

Evidence requirements

The vast majority of centres were aware of the evidence requirements for these awards, as most centres had adhered to the minimum evidence requirements or had used the assessment support materials produced by SQA. It was clear throughout that centres were giving ownership of the awards to the candidates, as evidence was collated and provided in a variety of formats.

Administration of assessments

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

had failed. This has improved significantly over the past few years as this is becoming less prevalent and candidates are being given the opportunity to revisit outcomes that have not met the minimum evidence requirements.

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

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

Feedback to candidates was evident in some areas, but not across all centres.

Learning and teaching

It was very clear that the centres were using a variety of resources to support the delivery of the award, allowing candidates to gather and produce evidence over time and in different ways. It was evident that the candidates were able to discuss mental health openly.

Overall assessment

Overall, the evidence supplied for external verification was of an excellent standard, allowing candidates to gather evidence in a variety of ways. The increased use of internal verification was clearly evident and very supportive of assessors in relation to feedback, clarifying any areas within candidates' work that needed to be amended.

Verification

Most centres had provided evidence of internal verification and standardisation. It is good practice to internally verify assessments, to make sure that they allow the candidates to meet the minimum evidence requirements. Regular standardisation meetings are important especially if a large teaching team is involved in the delivery of the awards.

Most centres provided robust internal verification processes and feedback to the assessors.

It is also important that centres send in any adapted assessments for prior verification.

Further support on verification is available on [SQA's website](#).

Areas of good practice reported in 2023–24

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

- Evidence was supplied in various formats, including videos, personal stories, PowerPoints, posters, brain moulds, and written work. Increasingly, candidates are being given the opportunity to reflect on their own mental health.
- Most centres provided robust internal verification processes and feedback to the assessors.
- Most centres had provided detailed and thorough feedback to candidates throughout their work, providing clear assessment judgements.
- Some centres had provided forms completed by the candidates to confirm authenticity that it was the candidate's own work.
- Candidates were given the opportunity to revisit outcomes that had not met the minimum evidence requirement.

Specific areas for improvement reported in 2023–24

Overall, the evidence generated was to a very high standard, using different formats.

There are areas that centres should consider when delivering the award:

- Provide appropriate candidate feedback.
- Have evidence of internal verification and assessor feedback.
- Assess candidates to the appropriate level, be aware of over-assessing, and provide appropriate marking guides.
- Use naturally occurring evidence to generate the minimum evidence requirements for the award.
- Submit centre-devised assessments for prior verification.