

## **Simplified SASC Assessment Practising Certificate Report Criteria**

[effective date 1 January 2020]

### **A Guide for consistency across issuing bodies for evaluation of reports for Assessment Practising Certificate renewal applications**

The APC renewal process offers an opportunity both for individual professional development through feedback on assessment reports and for issuing bodies to support the overall aim of the review to underpin and improve assessment practice standards. These criteria should be used by training providers and also apply where a report may be required in the initial application for an Assessment Practising Certificate.

Assessment reporting practice should evidence:

- **Accessibility** – to ensure assessment reports and their conclusions and recommendations are easily understood by and useful to the person assessed and to other relevant individuals, organisations and institutions e.g those who administer the Disabled Students' Allowance, Special Educational Needs Coordinators, school, college or university support services and workplace supervisors, human resources managers or similar.
- **Consistency** – in reporting standards
- **Reliability** – to ensure that the identification of a student with a specific learning difficulty (e.g. dyslexia / dyspraxia / Developmental Co- ordination Disorder), is a robust diagnostic conclusion based on converging evidence from the developmental history, background information, observation, discussion and results of the tests administered. The evidence required will closely relate to a referenced definition of the relevant SpLD (s) and to the relevant diagnostic criteria
- **Clarity** – in reporting test results, within the body of the report on interpretive comment, showing how and why key elements of test performance contribute to cognitive and attainment profiles that do or do not lead to the subsequent identification of the person assessed with a specific learning difficulty. Synopses and commentary must contribute to a consistent picture throughout the report. If there are unusual results or irregularities in any area, they must be explained.
- **Efficiency and usefulness** –the writing style of the report should aim to achieve clarity, transparency and succinctness while presenting sufficient detail to support conclusions reached. Assessors should consider reader accessibility by using dyslexia-friendly formatting.

Certificate renewal is dependent upon demonstrating, through diagnostic report evidence, practice meeting SASC guidelines. The first three renewals of an APC rely upon successful completion of a CPD log and production of an effective assessment report written within the previous eighteen months. SASC believe it is important that all bodies that undertake to review APC applications apply a consistent standard and adopt a consistent policy in their responses. Therefore, the following revised brief structure and feedback process will be adopted as a framework for all issuing bodies for reports received by issuing bodies from **1 January 2020**.

Any report written by an assessor holding a current APC / HCPC registration at the time of assessment, has the potential to be used to support in the future to attract possible funding and further support, regardless of the age of the individual. It is therefore mandatory to use the appropriate SASC report format proforma to ensure consistency in approach.

Reviews must be holistic and consider the overall aim of the review to approve assessment meeting recognised quality standards. Underlying these guidelines is the experience and professionalism of those undertaking the reviews.

Although not necessarily demonstrated through the report evidence submitted, it is understood that for the assessment process the following issues have been incorporated into practice:

- test selection takes into consideration equal opportunity
- pre-testing requirements and conditions for assessment have been considered
- there are clear arrangements for feedback
- security and confidentiality of test materials and report are maintained
- practice is in accordance with the professional body's code of ethics and standards of practice.

## **The below structure for review sets out criteria considered to be essential for all “effective” assessment reports**

### **All reports should demonstrate that:**

- 1.** Confidentiality is maintained throughout the report.
- 2.** The assessor has a thorough understanding of how cognitive processing contributes to the identification of the SpLD/s under consideration.
- 3.** A range of background information has been gathered from a variety of sources and that this has been used to inform the assessment and the diagnostic decision.
- 4.** Age appropriate assessment materials have been chosen to cover all core components as relevant to the SpLD(s) under consideration (note that where adults are over 25, and no appropriate adult-normed test is available, tests can be used diagnostically, without quoting standard scores or level descriptors).
- 5.** Information in the report reflects that tests have been administered correctly and all scores are calculated, converted and reported with 100% accuracy.
- 6.** There is a thorough understanding of statistical terms and of different scoring systems used by different tests and subtests.
- 7.** Judicious and accurate use is made of relevant statistical data within test manuals (for example prevalence).
- 8.** Scores are related to the average with consistency and unexpected differences in performance are acknowledged and discussed.
- 9.** Scores are accompanied by relevant qualitative analysis, observation and evaluation of performance, noting the possible effect on test performance of any compensatory strategies that might have been used.
- 10.** All information is drawn together to provide a clear interpretation and synthesis of the assessment evidence.
- 11.** The diagnostic decision is clearly stated and supported by evidence contained within the report, including the background information.
- 12.** The diagnostic decision is mapped to an up to date and recognised definition of the SpLD(s) under consideration.
- 13.** The impact of the identified SpLD(s) on the individual is recognised and outlined.
- 14.** Recommendations are clear and individually tailored.
- 15.** Accessibility has been considered for the non-specialist in terms of sensitive and professional language, format and length.

## Possible outcomes following review of report submitted for evaluation

A	Criteria met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APC Issued</li> <li>• If a minor scoring error is identified an amendment of the inaccurate scores identified is requested. Once received and approved, APC issued</li> </ul>	 <p>Any supporting document the reviewer feels necessary can be requested at any stage</p>
B	Criteria not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback supplied</li> <li>• Second report requested</li> </ul>	

Each criterion can attract marks as follows:

Criterion met – 2 marks;

Criterion met in part – 1 mark;

Criterion not met - 0

The successful outcome of the review will then be based on two premises:

1. There are no marks of zero
2. The total score does not fall below the agreed base standard of 23 marks out of 30 [77%]

**Please Note:** Any second submitted report is evaluated using same criteria. If this report also fails to meet the standard the APC will not be awarded. The candidate will have to submit new assessment evidence to complete the process in full.

### Response when APC application is not successful

- Assessor’s listing on SASC website indicates,, on expiry, APC not current
- Assessors advised to undertake individual mentoring from an experienced colleague, or other further training
- Assessors asked to provide evidence of mentoring or other additional training when re-applying for APC
- Re-applications not to be considered within 2 months