



## Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Assessors Report

<b>Applicant's Name:</b>	
<b>Email Address:</b>	
<b>Employer/Country of Origin</b>	

Module Code (if available)	Module name

**Please indicate which one of the following procedures has been applied for:**

- ☐ 1. Recognition of prior formal, informal and non-formal learning
- ☐ 2. Credit transfer
- ☐ 3. Content module assessment

**What evidence has been submitted by the applicant:**

	Type of evidence	File name of evidence included
<input type="checkbox"/>	Work experience	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Qualification certificates, diploma supplements, etc.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Training attended – EASO, EUAA or other	
<input type="checkbox"/>	References or other testimony	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project work, reports drafted, etc.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Records of voluntary work	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Observation of practice or simulations	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other. Kindly specify:	

### Marking rubrics and scoring:

Assessment Criteria	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
<b>Relevance of Evidence</b>	Evidence is highly relevant and directly aligned with the learning outcomes.	Evidence is mostly relevant and aligns well with most learning outcomes.	Evidence is somewhat relevant with partial alignment to learning outcomes.	Evidence is not relevant or does not align with learning outcomes.





<b>Authenticity of Evidence</b>	Evidence is clearly authentic, with strong verification (e.g., certificates, references).	Evidence appears authentic with some verification.	Authenticity is uncertain or poorly supported.	Evidence lacks credibility or is unverifiable.
<b>Comprehensiveness of Evidence</b>	Evidence comprehensively addresses all required competencies/learning outcomes.	Evidence addresses most of the required competencies.	Evidence addresses only some competencies; gaps are evident.	Evidence is superficial and does not cover the necessary competencies.
<b>Supporting Documentation &amp; References</b>	All documentation is clear, complete, and properly referenced.	Most documentation is clear and referenced.	Some documentation is missing or unclear.	Documentation is missing, incomplete, or lacks references.

**Total Score**                      **maximum 16 points**

14–16	RPL fully granted
10–13	RPL granted with minor supplementary evidence
7–9	RPL not granted; further evidence or assessment needed
Below 7	RPL not granted; formal study required

Total score	Outcome or action required	
Score between 14-16	RPL fully granted	
Number of credits awarded		

Total score	Outcome or action required
Score between 10-13	Minor supplementary evidence needed
Please provide details as to how the supplementary evidence was provided and any change to the total score awarded.	
Supplementary evidence:	
Revised Score:	
Date:	

Total score	Outcome or action required
Score below 7	Further evidence or assessment needed
Please provide details as to how the further evidence was provided or assessment undertaken and any change to the total score awarded.	
Further evidence of assessment:	
Revised Score:	
Date:	



Total score	Outcome or action required
Score between 7 - 9	Formal study required
Please provide a detailed justification to be sent to the applicant and any suggestions/recommendations for future applications:	

**Any other comments:**

---

**Final decision:**

---

**Name and signature of assessor(s):**

---

**Date:**

***For any queries or assistance, feel free to reach out to [registrar@euaa.europa.eu](mailto:registrar@euaa.europa.eu)***