

BTEC Assessment malpractice Policy

Policy Owner:	Mr D Howkins, Vice Principal
Approved by Curriculum & Standards Committee:	28 th February 2013
Ratified by Curriculum & Standards Committee:	28 th February 2013
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2015
Approved by Local Governing Body:	20 th April 2016
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2017
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2018
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2019
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2020
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2021
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2022
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2023
Reviewed:	Autumn Term 2024
Date for further review	Autumn Term 2025

BTEC Assessment Malpractice Policy

Aim:

1. To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners
2. To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively
3. To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness
4. To report all alleged, suspected, and actual incidents of malpractice to Pearson
5. To protect the integrity of this centre and BTEC qualifications

In order to do this, Ormiston Sudbury Academy will:

- Foster a culture in which all learners and staff feel able to report any concerns of wrongdoing by anyone
- Seek to prevent malpractice by using the induction period and the learner handbook to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the sanctions for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
- Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources
- Require learners to declare that their work is their own
- Ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used
- Advise learners of the centre's rules regarding whether AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT) can be used and, if so,
 - Require learners to acknowledge the use of artificial intelligence (AI) sources and provide copies of any interactions with AI tools made in the production of their work
- Report to Pearson all alleged, suspected and actual incidents of malpractice in accordance with JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures
 - [Malpractice - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications](#)
 - If Ormiston Sudbury Academy discovers or suspects a learner or member of staff of having committed malpractice, the individual will be made fully aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven
 - Cases of suspected learner malpractice in external assessments will be reported to Pearson immediately. The Head of Centre will complete JCQ Form M1 and submit this along with all supporting documentation to Pearson's Investigations Processing team at candidatemalpractice@pearson.com

- Cases of suspected learner malpractice in internal assessments will be reported to Pearson if the learner has signed the declaration of authentication. The Head of Centre will complete JCQ Form M1 and submit this along with all supporting documentation to Pearson's Investigations Processing team at candidatemalpractice@pearson.com
- For internal assessment, where learners have not completed a declaration of authentication, Ormiston Sudbury Academy will follow the internal assessment malpractice/academic misconduct policy in resolving the matter as this does not need to be reported to Pearson
- Where required, gather information for an investigation in accordance with Pearson instructions. Such an investigation will be supported by the Principal / CEO and all personnel linked to the allegation
- Comply with the requirements as set out in the Pearson policy

Where malpractice is proven, Pearson will determine the sanctions to be imposed.

Learner Malpractice

This list of examples is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism of any nature, including the misuse of AI tools
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying)
- Deliberate destruction of another's work
- Fabrication of results or evidence
- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test

Staff Malpractice

This list of examples is not exhaustive:

- Improper assistance to learners
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the learners' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation
- Failing to provide reasonable adjustments where these have been approved, such as having a scribe or reader
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or fabrication
- Improper certificate claims, e.g., claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment

How to minimise the risk of learner malpractice

- Internal Assessors check validity and authenticity of learners' work. Assessors are aware of their learner's styles and abilities
- Induction period and student handbook outline malpractice and penalties
- Learners shown appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites & use of AI

- Checking learners don't take prohibited material into an exam / supervised session

How to minimise the risk of staff malpractice

- Ensure all internal assessors work is sampled by Programme Leads

How malpractice is dealt with

- Report to Pearson all alleged, suspected and actual incidents
- Make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven
- Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made
- Conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Principal and all personnel linked to the allegation. It will proceed through the following stages:
 1. Initial Interview with Learner conducted by Assessor
 2. Meeting with Learner & Parent/Carer chaired by Assessor & Programme Lead
 3. Meeting involving Assessor, Programme Lead, Principal, Quality Nominee
- Document all stages of investigation
- Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgement made

Informing Pearson of any malpractice

- Report to Pearson all alleged, suspected and actual incidents as soon as disclosed

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the Quality Nominee