

Northern Ireland

Social

Care

Council

Professional in Practice

Individual Assessment Route (IAR)

Method for Submission: Accreditation of Prior Certificated Learning (APCL) Handbook

Produced by:

NISCC
7th Floor, Millennium House
25 Great Victoria Street
Belfast
BT2 7AQ

Tel: 028 95 362600
Web: www.niscc.info
Email: info@niscc.hscni.net

July 2021 (updated February 2022)

Contents

Accreditation for Prior Certificated Learning (APCL)	4
Eligibility Criteria.....	4
Word Count.....	4
Making an APCL Claim (Accreditation of Prior Certificated Learning).....	4
Content of the Submission	6
Marking Grid.....	7

Accreditation for Prior Certificated Learning (APCL)

Eligibility Criteria

- Candidates must be enrolled with the Professional in Practice Framework.
- Candidates must be registered with the NISCC (on Part 1 of the Social Care Register).
- The Certificated Learning being used as part of the claim must have been assessed as competent at Postgraduate Level 7 or equivalent.

Candidates should discuss with their agency Professional in Practice representative their particular work focus and which requirements are best met by the APCL method.

Word Count

The emphasis of this method of submission is on accreditation for prior certificated learning therefore the following word limits apply to the written statements linking learning to the Requirements claimed:

A commentary statement must be submitted for each Requirement claimed. There is a maximum of **300 words** per Requirement for Consolidation, Specialist and Leadership & Strategic Awards. There can be flexibility as to how the word count is allocated across the Requirements depending on the evidence submitted, eg. If the evidence is more substantial or self-explanatory for a particular Requirement, the commentary for that Requirement could potentially be less than 300 words and the remainder allocated to the commentary for another Requirement.

Making an APCL Claim (Accreditation of Prior Certificated Learning)

APCL claims can be made for learning that has been previously assessed and certificated by an academic or other equivalent institution. The certificated programme must have been at postgraduate level, e.g. PG Cert; PG Dip; Master's Degree, Doctorate or Higher Level Professional Award.

A claim may be made for any of the Professional in Practice Requirements within any of the Awards.

APCL may be used for achievement of a full Award. Academic credits **may not** be claimed via an APCL submission.

To make an APCL claim, candidates must submit the following documentation:

- A completed Claim Form (sections 1 & 3), countersigned by the line manager

- A copy of the certificate issued by the awarding body or verification that the certificate was issued.
- A sample of the original work submitted for assessment and a copy of the course/programme handbook.
- A mapping matrix identifying where, within the body of work, the Professional in Practice Requirements are evidenced
- A short commentary (of no more than 300 words per Requirement) which identifies where, how and why the Professional in Practice Requirements are demonstrated in terms of learning achieved and application to practice.

Where the certificated programme was undertaken more than 5 years ago, an additional commentary must be included addressing how the learning has been updated and remains current in its application. This commentary should be no more than 500 words. This should be supported by a line manager verification of **currency** report.

Please note that it is not just the experience of the activities alone, but more importantly, the achievement of learning or the outcome of that learning for practice that is being assessed.

The following points apply to all APCL submissions:

- The focus of the submission must be on links to the Professional in Practice Requirement(s).
- The Requirement(s) being claimed must be evident in the following places:
 - (1) The original coursework/piece of work.
 - (2) The commentary of the APCL submission.
- It should be noted that markers who are marking an APCL submission will not mark the original evidence again, but will maintain their focus on how that work meets the Professional in Practice Requirements being claimed.
- Candidates do not need to submit all of the evidence used to meet the specification of the original programme as part of an APCL submission. They should only include the sections which are relevant to the Requirements claimed unless the candidate believes additional context is necessary. In this case, all references/links to the Requirements should be clearly signposted.
- Coursework can only be used for one submission.

Content of the Submission

Each submission must use the Individual Assessment Route Booklet format which is available on the Learning Zone. This booklet contains the: Front Sheet, Candidate Checklist, Statement of Consent, Statement of Confidentiality, your written submission and the Line Manager Verification Report.

Where part of your submission is in a PDF format (for example: evidence in an APL submission or Assessor Report for a Direct Observation), these can be uploaded to the NISCC Portal as a separate document / documents.

Each APCL submission should contain the following:

	Number of words	Included in word count
IAR Booklet Forms: Front Sheet, Candidate Checklist, Statement of Consent, Statement of Confidentiality, Line Manager Verification Report.		No
Claim form for APL (Sections 1&3)		No
Mapping Matrix		No
<p>Commentary: linking statement demonstrating how evidence provided meets the requirements claimed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The commentary should make clear links between the candidate's learning and the content of the PiP Requirement. ➤ Supplementary references should be included where relevant to support the claim made. ➤ Candidates should avoid directly copying material from the evidence but should instead direct the assessor to where they have shown competence in the Requirement claimed. 	A maximum of 300 words per requirement across all awards. There is flexibility in how word count is used across requirements.	Yes
Contemporising piece where evidence is over 5 years old.	A maximum of 500 words	No
Evidence of accredited learning activity		No
<p>References</p> <p>The references should be up to date and relevant and adhere to the recommended Harvard format.</p>		No

Marking Grid

% Range	Content* (must include professional ethics) 30	Application of theory and research 20	Knowledge and understanding 20	Evidence of reading 15	Referencing (Harvard) 5	Presentation, grammar and spelling 10
70 – 100	Critical insightful evaluation and synthesis of complex issues and materials. A high level of originality and reflection. Demonstrates the ability to pursue research at Doctoral level. Originality. (21 – 30)	Extensive evidence of advanced applications and/or empirical data, where applicable, informed extensively by current research and practice in the area. Innovative and original use of knowledge. (14 – 20)	Exceptional knowledge and conceptual understanding of complex and/or specialised principles and concepts and the development and advancement of ideas and practice. High level critical judgement and confident grasp of complex issues. (14 – 20)	Extensive evidence of integrating current supplementary sources. (12 – 15)	Outstanding referencing with current sources. (5)	Outstanding, well-directed presentation, logically and coherently structured, using correct grammar, spelling and referencing. (8 – 10)
60 – 69	Critical evaluation and synthesis of complex issues and materials which includes some originality and a reflective approach. Well argued. (18 –20)	Clear evidence of relevant applications and/or empirical data, where applicable, informed by current research and practice in the area. Critical judgement and a grasp of complex issues. (12 –13)	Wide knowledge and depth of understanding of complex and/or specialised principles and concepts and the development of ideas and practice. (12 –13)	Evidence of extensive reading of current supplementary sources. (9 –10)	Comprehensive referencing with current sources. (4)	Very good presentation, logically structured, using correct grammar, spelling and referencing. (7)
50 – 59	Some critical evaluation and synthesis of key issues and material. Reasonably well argued. Largely descriptive. (15 –17)	Evidence of relevant applications and/or empirical data, where applicable, with some links to current research in the area. (10 – 11)	Good and appropriate knowledge and depth of understanding of key principles and concepts with some understanding of the development of ideas and practice. (10 – 11)	Evidence of reading supplementary sources. (7 – 8)	Adequate referencing. Some current sources. (3)	Orderly presentation, clear structure and acceptable grammar, spelling and referencing. (6)
COMPETENT						
REQUIRING FURTHER WORK						
45 – 49	Some evaluation and synthesis of issues and material. (12 – 14)	Occasional relevant applications and/or empirical data, where applicable. (8 – 9)	Basic knowledge and depth of understanding of key principles and concepts only. (8 – 9)	Limited evidence of current reading. (6)	Limited referencing. Sources not up to date. (2)	Weak presentation and structure, grammar, spelling and referencing. (5)
31 – 44	Limited evaluation and synthesis of issues and material. (11)	Limited applications and/or empirical data, where applicable. (7)	Limited and/or superficial knowledge of key principles and concepts. (7)	Minimal evidence of current reading. (5)	Inadequate referencing. (1)	Poor presentation and structure, grammar, spelling and referencing. (4)
0 – 30	Little or no evaluation and synthesis of issues and material. (0 – 10)	Little or no evidence of relevant application and/or empirical data. (0 – 6)	Virtually devoid of any evidence of knowledge and understanding. (0 – 6)	Little or no evidence of reading. (0 – 4)	Inadequate referencing. (0 – 1)	Inadequate presentation, structure, grammar, spelling and referencing. (0 – 3)