

**SASC Assessment Practising Certificate Report Criteria**

[effective date 1 January 2026]

The APC renewal process provides an opportunity for individual professional development through feedback on assessment reports. It also enables issuing bodies to support the overarching goal of enhancing and maintaining high standards in assessment practice.

Assessment reporting practice should evidence that reports are:

* **Accessible** - to ensure assessment reports and their conclusions and recommendations are easily understood by and useful to the individual assessed and to other relevant individuals, organisations and institutions.
* **Reliable** - to ensure that the identification of a SpLD 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 and to the relevant diagnostic criteria.
* **Clear** - in reporting test results, there will be an emphasis on interpretative comment, showing how and why key elements of test performance support/do not support the identification of a SpLD.
* **Consistent** - to encourage a consistent and best practice approach in SpLD diagnostic assessment. Synopsis and commentary must contribute to a consistent picture throughout the report. If there are unusual results or irregularities in any area, these must be explained.
* **Efficient and Useful** - although the total length and design of an assessment report will inevitably vary depending on choice of font, font size and spacing, number of relevant appendices etc., 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.

The renewal of an Assessment Practising Certificate is dependent upon demonstrating, through diagnostic report evidence, practice which meets SASC guidelines. The first three renewals of an APC rely upon successful completion of a CPD log and production of an assessment report written within the previous eighteen months, which meets SASC guidelines. 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 by all issuing bodies for reports received for APC renewal from **1 January 2026**.

Any report written by an assessor holding a current APC or HCPC registration at the time of the assessment may be used, in the future, to support applications for funding or additional support, regardless of the individual's age. Therefore the SASC report format proforma should be used to ensure a consistent and standardised approach.

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 the report are maintained

• practice is in accordance with the professional body’s code of ethics and standards of practice.

**The structure for review given below sets out criteria considered to be essential for all SASC compliant assessment reports**

**All reports should demonstrate that:**

1. The confidentiality of individuals and restricted materials is maintained throughout the report.
2. The assessor demonstrates 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 to provide a reliable history of the individual’s challenges and strengths.   
   This has been gathered, where possible, from a variety of sources and has been reported sensitively and with care.
4. Age-appropriate assessment materials have been chosen to cover all core components, as relevant to the SpLD(s) under consideration, with due regard to the background information and STEC test list.

Optional assessment materials, when used, have been chosen as appropriate, avoiding over-testing.

Basal/ceiling ages of tests have been considered, and tests chosen appropriately.

1. Scores are converted, calculated and reported with 100% accuracy, clarity and consistency.

Level descriptors are accurately reported in the main body and appendices.

Information in the report indicates that tests have been administered correctly.

1. Relevant statistical terms have been used in the report. These terms have been defined in Appendix 1 and used accurately throughout the report.
2. Where statistical data are contained within test materials, these have been considered and referred to if appropriate. This includes statistical significance and prevalence.

There is a thorough understanding of implications of the age limitations of the normative data provided.

1. Unexpectedness and differences in performance across the areas of assessment are acknowledged and discussed.
2. All areas of assessment discussed are accompanied by relevant qualitative analysis, i.e. observation and evaluation of performance, noting the possible effect on test results of any compensatory strategies that might have been used.
3. Quantitative and qualitative information across the report is consistent and areas of assessment are linked to provide a clear interpretation and synthesis of all the assessment evidence.
4. The diagnostic decision is clearly stated and supported by evidence contained within the report, including the background information.

The decision has been made with due regard to professional limits.

1. The definition(s) used for the SpLD(s) under consideration are complete versions, up to date, recognised and referenced.
2. The report clearly outlines areas of strength or challenge and how these may impact on learning or other areas of life.
3. Recommendations are clear and individually tailored.
4. Accessibility has been considered for the non-specialist in terms of sensitive and professional language. The format is in accordance with SASC guidance.

**Possible outcomes following review of report submitted for evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | Criteria met | * APC Issued | } | Any supporting document the reviewer feels necessary can be requested at any stage |
| B | Criteria not met | * Feedback supplied * Second report requested |
| 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. | | | | |