

Northern Ireland

Social

Care

Council

Professional in Practice

**Individual Assessment Route
(IAR)**

**Method for Submission: Accreditation of
Prior Experiential Learning (APEL)
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 of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL) Submission	4
Eligibility Criteria.....	4
Word Count.....	4
APEL Submission Guidance	4
Making an APEL Claim (Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning)	4
Guidance for candidates:	5
Assessment Process.....	5
Content of Submission	6
Marking Grid.....	7

Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL) Submission

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).

Candidates should discuss, with their Line Manager and Professional in Practice Representative, the particular focus of learning activity and which Requirements can be met by an APEL submission.

Word Count

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

There is a maximum of 600 words per Requirement. 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 600 words and the remainder allocated to the commentary for another Requirement.

APEL Submission Guidance

The Professional in Practice (PiP) Framework makes provision for candidates to obtain credit for and acknowledgement of learning and/or achievement gained elsewhere. This process is known as Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL). PiP requirements can be claimed using learning that has been obtained informally or through practice experience and applied to practice experience. This is referred to as Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL).

Candidates wishing to make an APL claim should refer to the *Guiding Principles and Arrangements for Accreditation of Prior Learning within the Professional in Practice Framework, revised NISCC, 2011*

Making an APEL Claim (Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning)

APEL claims can be made in respect of learning achieved through experience and critical reflection outside of education or training systems. Examples of experiential learning are wide and varied and may include: practice initiatives; involvement in the improvement or development of practice, policies or service provision, publication of material, articles, and research or service evaluation.

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

- A completed Claim Form for APL (sections 1 & 2), countersigned by their line manager
- A brief introductory statement on the context of the work, including the candidate's job role and responsibilities. This is NOT included in the word count.
- A mapping matrix identifying where within the body of work the Professional in Practice requirements are evidenced. This is NOT included in the word count.
- Commentaries (600 words per Requirement claimed) identifying how the work produced, the learning applied to, and taken from, practice, meets the Professional in Practice Requirements being claimed.
- Evidence of the work on which the submission is based.

Please note: where the learning experience the candidate is drawing on has taken place more than 5 years ago, the submission must include an additional commentary piece contemporising the original learning. This requires you to demonstrate that your competence is current.

This should be a maximum of 500 words per submission.

NB: It is not the experience or engagement in the learning activities alone that will evidence the Requirement claimed, but more importantly, it is the demonstration of learning and the impact on practice that is being assessed.

Guidance for candidates:

- The focus of the written statements (commentary) must be on making links between the learning activity and the Professional in Practice requirements.
- The Requirement(s) being claimed must be evident in the following places:
 - (1) The evidence of competence (examples).
 - (2) Supplementary evidence provided for the APEL submission (if relevant).
 - (3) The commentary of the APEL submission.

Assessment Process

There are four components to the APEL submission; all four must be submitted to the Social Care Council at the relevant submission point:

- Completed APL claim form (Sections 1, 2, and 4).
- Completed Mapping Matrix linking the evidence provided to PiP requirements claimed.
- Commentary statements demonstrating how the evidence provided meets PiP requirements claimed.
- Evidence section containing all items referred to in the Mapping Matrix.

Content of 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 APEL 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 1,2 & 4)		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. 	<p>A maximum of 600 words per Requirement across all awards.</p> <p>There is flexibility in the allocation of word count across the submission.</p>	Yes
Contemporising piece where evidence is over 5 years old.	A maximum of 500 words	No
Evidence of 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)