

**WELCOME!**

**WAMITAB ASSESSOR/VERIFIER  
FORUM**

**Armada House**

**2 OCTOBER 2014**



# Recognition of Prior Learning

Ray Burberry – Qualifications Manager  
Assessor Forum 2014



# RPL query raised by a Centre

- If someone has WM1a, 'Manage the reception of Hazardous Waste', can we automatically claim WM1b, 'Manage the reception of non-hazardous waste', for them if they go on to complete a 2nd (non-haz) qualification? The same query would arise with other units where there is a hazardous and a non-hazardous derivative.
- My thoughts are 'probably', but I am thinking that it might need to involve an RPL exercise rather than a blanket exemption. The RPL would be pretty straightforward as most of the LOs and ACs are the same - the only difference might be some additional questioning on duty of care to make sure that they are aware of the different arrangements with transfer notes compared to consignment notes.



# Principles of RPL

The ability to recognise prior learning during the assessment process is not new.

Terms such as:

- Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL)
- Recognition of Experiential Learning (REL)
- Validation of Informal Learning (VIL)
- Accreditation of Prior Experience (APE)
- Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA)

... All have similar relevance...



# What do we mean by RPL?

- “RPL means not having to do the same thing twice”
- **Unit ‘Exemptions’** (certificated learning outside QCF)
- **Unit ‘Equivalence’** (QCF Units deemed ‘equivalent’ in value to another Unit)
- **Credit Transfer** (Unit Credit Value  $\geq$  Unit required; Same Level or higher; from within the QCF)
  
- ‘RPL’ is often generalised by the first statement above
- Included in ‘RPL’ are the processes shown above, within which evidence may fall and be considered for ‘RPL’ review as appropriate



# RPL Within the QCF

- Within the QCF RPL is defined as:  
***“A method of assessment that considers whether a learner can demonstrate that they can meet the assessment requirements for a Unit through knowledge, understanding or skills they already possess and do not need to develop through a course of learning”***



# RPL in the QCF

- The QCF definition of RPL adds that:  
***“In the QCF, RPL refers particularly to previously un-certificated learning.***  
***Achievements through RPL always lead to the award of credit”***
- In the waste industry many ‘Technically Competent Persons’ are required to present previously **certificated** learning towards future achievement:
- From the NQF (NVQ Units: **using WAMITAB’s ‘Exemption Table’ for example**)
- And increasingly certificated Units achieved ***from within the QCF.***



# Purpose of Activity

- To consider instances where a Learner has already achieved the QCF Unit:

***‘Manage the reception of hazardous waste’  
(WM1a)***

And wishes to use ‘recognition of prior learning’ towards the achievement of:

***‘Manage the reception of non-hazardous waste’ (WM1b)***



# First views:

- The two units **are** different units (different accreditation codes etc.)
- Therefore they are not seen as 'equal' to each other (the type of waste is clearly an influencing factor here)
- They are similar with the exception of the 'waste' described
- Also, Environment Regulators (EA, NRW, SEPA, NIEA) identify that 'Hierarchy' of the activity is permitted. (Managers of Hazardous Waste facilities can manage Non-Hazardous/Inert waste facilities of the same type etc.)



# RPL/Exemption/Equivalent

- Within the QCF, the above terms specify instances where previous learning can be recognised for the award of Credit:
- **RPL** – Previously relating to un-certificated achievement external to QCF
- **Exemption:** *“the opportunity for a Learner to claim ‘exemption’ for some of the achievement requirements (Units) of a QCF qualification, using evidence of certificated, non-QCF achievement deemed to be of equivalent value”*
- i.e. WAMITAB ‘Exemption Table’ - NQF:QCF



# RPL/Exemption/Equivalent (cont.)

- **Key focus for today:**
- **‘Equivalent Unit’:** A unit(s) from a different QCF qualification or submitted by another recognised organisation that is/are deemed to be of ‘equivalent value’ to the ‘target’ Unit
- In order to be accepted as an ***equivalent unit***, the unit(s) ***must have the same credit value or greater*** than the ‘target’ unit and be set at the ***same level or higher***



# As an Assessor, consider:

- What are the operational (competence) differences for these two units
- What are the processes involved, including the incidents that may occur on relevant sites for the activity to receive waste
- What do you perceive the differences to be between the reception of wastes in the two instances for hazardous and non-hazardous sites?
- Are the procedures such that **'Unit equivalence'** is indeed **an acceptable proposition for the target Unit?**



# Review Units

Reference documents:

- ***Guidance for the Recovery and Disposal of Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste***
- ***How to comply with your waste permit: Waste Operations (pp 51)***



# Summary

- What do you consider with regard to ‘WM1a’ and ‘WM1b’? Is there is potential for this (and possibly other units within similar contexts) to be identified as having ‘equivalent’ value: In this case regarding ‘WM1a’ to ‘WM1b’ ***but not vice versa***



# Thank you

## Views and Questions?

WAMITAB  
Peterbridge House  
3 The Lakes  
Northampton  
NN4 7HE

Tel: 01604 231950

Email: [info.admin@wamitab.org.uk](mailto:info.admin@wamitab.org.uk)

Web: [www.wamitab.org.uk](http://www.wamitab.org.uk)

