APC Preliminary Review Feedback Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Candidate name** |  |
| **Membership number** |  |
| **Pathway** |  |

**Result** <select one of the following two options>

* Your submission is suitable for you to proceed. However, please consider the following:
* Any feedback below is provided to support you. You should seek to revise your submission to address the feedback given, in particular where the element has been marked as not suitable. You and your counsellor must be confident you have addressed the comments below before you submit for final assessment.
* Your CPD, and other elements of your submission where necessary, should be updated to reflect your experience since this preliminary review.
* Ask other people to read your submission to check for errors. Friends and family can check the compliance (A1) and standard of writing (A2) elements. Your colleagues, counsellor, supervisor or mentor can check the RICS assessment (A3) and content requirements (section 2) elements.
* The submission is used by the assessment panel to develop questions for the interview. Therefore, a good submission will allow for a better opportunity for you at the interview.
* All your selected competencies, including conduct rules, ethics and professional practice, will be tested fully at the interview.
* Remember, the submission is only one element of the APC so a good submission does not mean you will succeed at interview. Questions at interview will be based on your pathway, presentation, submission, the mandatory competencies and your technical competencies, and relevant RICS and industry developments.
* Your submission is not currently suitable for you to proceed. Please consider the following:
	+ Any feedback below is provided to support you. You need to revise your submission to address the feedback given, in particular where the element has been marked as not suitable. You and your counsellor must be confident you have addressed the comments below before you resubmit for preliminary review.
	+ All your submission, including CPD, should be updated to reflect your experience since this preliminary review.
	+ Ask other people to read your submission to check for errors. Friends and family can check the compliance (A1) and standard of writing (A2) elements. Your colleagues, counsellor, supervisor or mentor can check the RICS assessment (A3) and content requirements (section 2) elements.
	+ Remember, the submission is used by the APC assessors to develop questions for the interview. Therefore, a good submission will allow for a better opportunity when you proceed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Preliminary reviewer summary** |
|  |

**A Format requirements**

1 Compliance

Word count: The summary of experience word count is split between the mandatory (maximum 1,500 words) and technical (maximum 4,000 words) competencies. The case study must be a maximum 3000 words. You must state No if the word count is exceeded. Provide advice on how the candidate may be able to reduce the word count and if possible highlight significant areas the candidate should focus on. You may also state No if the word count is low and results in the submission lacking detail. In this situation the additional word allowance provides an opportunity for the candidate to expand their submission and you can highlight significant areas the candidate should focus on.

Case study: The case study must refer to experience within the last 24 months. The project could have started over 24 months ago but you must state No if the candidate is attempting to demonstrate competence by only referencing activities performed over 24 months ago. If possible, your advice should indicate where elements of the project could be used.

CPD record: Candidates must record 48 hours of CPD for the last 12 months and at least 50% of the CPD should be formal (defined by RICS Regulation – visit rics.org/cpd). The CPD must also be consistent with the candidate’s pathway, employment and summary of experience. If you determine that the candidate has failed to provide a valid CPD record for any reason, please indicate what your concerns are.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Word count | Y – N |  |
| Case study date | Y – N |  |
| CPD record | Y – N |  |

2 Standard of writing

Spelling, punctuation and grammar: The expectation is that there should not be any errors however you should be considerate where the candidate’s first language may not be the language they are being assessed in. If the candidate has notified us of a disability that may affect their submission we will provide you with advice. We will always recommend that candidate’s ask others to read their submissions to check for errors.

Structure: This refers to the order in which they present their experience. Does it demonstrate the candidate’s progression? Is it logical? If No, state how the candidate could arrange their evidence more effectively and if possible highlight significant areas the candidate should focus on.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Spelling, punctuation and grammar | Y – N |  |
| Structure of evidence | Y – N |  |

3 RICS assessment

APC framework: Consider the candidate’s understanding of the concepts of competence, levels of competence, and how the summary of experience and case study provide an opportunity for the candidate to present learning and progression of experience. Consider the candidate’s pathway choice and how the selected competencies match the candidate’s experience.

RICS vision and obligations: Consider the candidate’s understanding of conduct rules, ethics and professional practice, the purpose of CPD and RICS professional standards (including international standards, professional statements, guidance and information).

Professionalism: Consider the candidate’s ability to meet RICS and client expectations in producing professional reports.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of APC framework | Y – N |  |
| Understanding of RICS’ vision and member obligations | Y – N |  |
| Standard of professionalism for client report | Y – N |  |

**B Content requirements**

1 Summary of experience

Accuracy: This refers to the correct use of terminology and references to the correct process and policy by the candidate. Do the statements indicate the candidate can perform the required activities? You are not required to comment on the local legislation or standards but should make your judgement based on what is universally accepted within the industry and consistent with RICS expectations globally.

Clarity: This refers to the logical and clear expression of the candidate’s experience. Does the style of writing allow you to understand the candidate’s experience? You are not required to comment on the level or type of experience but should make your judgement based on what the competency states.

Level of detail: This refers to the quality and quantity of the information provided. Do the statements allow the assessors to ask informed questions at interview? You are not required to comment on what questions assessors may ask but should make your judgement based on the objective of the interview to challenge on what the candidate has written and allow the candidate to expand on this. This is also an opportunity for you to highlight areas where the candidate can increase or reduce their word count.

**Mandatory competencies**

|  |
| --- |
| **Ethics, rules of conduct and professionalism** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Client care** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Communication and negotiation** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Health and safety** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Accounting principles and procedures** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Business planning** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conflict avoidance, management and dispute resolution procedures** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Data management** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Sustainability** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Diversity, inclusion and teamworking** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Inclusive environments** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

**Technical competencies**

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **<insert competency name>** |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Understanding of the competency | Y – N |  |
| L1 evidence of knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L2 example(s) of applying knowledge | Y – N |  |
| L3 example(s) of reasoned advice/further knowledge | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |

2 Case study

The case study elements are adapted from the case study criteria listed in the candidate guide.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **Suitable** | **Comments** |
| Project suitable as case study | Y – N | <if case study is not suitable (N), state if the candidate should select a different project for the case study><if case study is suitable (Y), use the appropriate instruction below plus any other comments you have><remove if prelim result is ‘not suitable to proceed’>Remember, your case study is only valid for a limited time as it must refer to experience within the last 24 months. You can apply for the next available final assessment session in your market using this case study. If you choose to apply for final assessment at a later session your case study must, if necessary, be updated to meet the 24-month requirement.<remove if prelim result is ‘suitable to proceed’>Remember, your case study is only valid for a limited time as it must refer to experience within the last 24 months. You can apply for the next available prelim review session in your market using this case study. If you choose to apply for prelim review at a later session your case study must, if necessary, be updated to meet the 24-month requirement. |
| Identified level of responsibility | Y – N |  |
| Identified at least 1 issue, anomaly or challenge of project and relevant to core competencies | Y – N |  |
| Solutions considered and good reasons for rejecting options | Y – N |  |
| Chosen solution supported by reasoned judgement and problem-solving skills demonstrated | Y – N |  |
| Summary of how project completed or prognosis of outcome  | Y – N |  |
| Evaluation and an understanding of lessons learned in conclusion | Y – N |  |
| At least one Level 3 competency demonstrated | Y – N |  |
| Case study consistent with summary of experience | Y – N |  |
| Accuracy, clarity and level of detail | Y – N |  |