

# King Alfred's BTEC Assessment Malpractice Policy

Document Control	
Date agreed by the SLT	5/9/2023
Date to be reviewed ( <i>maximum 12 months after date above</i> )	5/9/2024
Senior Leadership Team member accountable for review	Chloe Butterfield

**Person responsible for policy: Emma Frost**

**Revised: 05/09/2023  
Version No: 9**

## **KING ALFRED'S** **BTEC ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE POLICY**

### **Aims**

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

### **What is malpractice?**

JCQ defines Malpractice as which includes maladministration, as any act, default or practice which:

- compromises, or attempts to compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification, or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding organisation or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding organisation or centre. (Centre Guidance malpractice maladministration guide, 2018)

### **Malpractice by students**

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

- Plagiarism of any nature.
- 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 in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.

## Malpractice by staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

- Improper assistance to candidates.
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.
- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.
- Fraudulent claims for certificates.
- Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- 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.
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment.
- Failing to provide reasonable adjustments where these have been approved, such as having a scribe or reader.

## King Alfred's will

- Restrict the chances of malpractice by minimizing opportunities for staff or students to make mistakes
- 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 and reference the use of AI where necessary.
- Report to Pearson all alleged, suspected and actual incidents of malpractice in accordance with JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures ([Malpractice Feb23 v1.pdf \(jcq.org.uk\)](#))
- Where required, gather information for an investigation in accordance with Pearson instructions. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre (Jon Smart) and all personnel linked to the allegation.

- Foster a culture in which all learners and staff feel able to report any concerns of wrongdoing by anyone
- Where malpractice is proven, Pearson will determine the sanctions to be imposed.
- Keep comprehensive records of any internal investigation into malpractice
- Maintain a central system that will investigate any example of malpractice in any subject areas quickly and objectively
- To apply any relevant sanctions should, after full investigation, incidents of malpractice be proven
- To protect students, staff and the authority of assessment decisions by maintaining appropriate procedures
- Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice.
- Ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used.
- Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.
- Check that the controls are put in place to stop learners from accessing and using another person's work.
- Inform Pearson of any malpractice or attempted acts of malpractice.
- Conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the **Head Teacher & QN** and all personnel linked to the allegation.
- Check that learners do not take prohibited material into an exam.
- We use the following principles to reduce malpractice including:
  1. Providing supervised sessions where learners complete their assignment.
  2. Altering briefs on a regular basis.
  3. Assessors assess work for an assignment in a single session for the whole cohort.
  4. Verbally checking understanding of students work.
- Ask learners to declare that their work is their own. This includes:
  1. For internally assessed units, Internal Verifiers are responsible for checking the validity and authenticity of the learners' work. This ensures that there is no plagiarism.
  2. Learners are verified before they take an external examination.
  3. If assessment is to be conducted in another language other than English then we must ensure that provision is made for such work to be verified and authenticated.

### How will this be achieved?

By minimising the risk of malpractice	<p><b>King Alfred's:</b> promote a culture and ethos where learners take individual responsibility for their learning and respect the work of others. Hold Assemblies; Parent Information Evenings; induction of new staff; Transition Days to inform learners of the Centre's policy on Malpractice &amp; the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of Malpractice.</p> <p><b>Assessors:</b> design activities that reduce the opportunity for</p>
---------------------------------------	--

	<p>students to cheat. Clear instructions about content and the use of information, course handbook, headers &amp; footers on word processed work, selective use of witness statements, use of citations and bibliographies. <b>Internal Verifier, Lead Verifier:</b> thorough checks for malpractice <b>Quality Nominee:</b> to inform Edexcel of any acts of malpractice <b>Head Teacher:</b> lead any investigation into malpractice</p>
<p>By keeping records of any investigation</p>	<p><b>Staff</b> Records of any investigation will be maintained by the <b>Head of Centre</b>. If a member of staff is suspected to be guilty of malpractice or maladministration it is reported to the Head of Centre and they notify the exam board within 24 hours. <b>This is done through the JCQ Form M2(a)</b>. They will submit a JCQ Form M2(b) with supporting documentation to <a href="mailto:pqsmalpractices@pearson.com">pqsmalpractices@pearson.com</a> within 7 working days. These records will include signed and dated statements, records of interviews and copies of the final letter describing the outcome. Our Quality Nominee will inform centre staff of suspected malpractice of their responsibilities and rights. Penalties: - Suspected malpractice will be dealt with under the staff disciplinary proceedings. In the case of malpractice or maladministration the policy states that the individual will be informed immediately of the process.</p> <p><b>Students</b></p> <p>Malpractice by a candidate in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examined assessment discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not to be reported to the awarding body (JCQ suspected Malpractice 2018).</p> <p>Stage 1: - If malpractice is suspected by the assessor then the assessor will stop marking the work and return it to the learner unmarked. The assessor will discuss with the learner the content of the assessment. This will ascertain the level of risk. This will happen within 2 days of the work being marked.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the centre to make the individual aware at the first possible opportunity of the nature of the allegation. This will be completed in writing. They must also be informed possible consequences if malpractice is proven. They will be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation in writing. They will be informed of how to appeal against the allegation. Standard KAs misconduct paper work will be used and kept in student files. Records of the investigation will be made available for Pearson by the <b>Quality Nominee</b>, where necessary.</p> <p>Stage 2 - If the assessor is not satisfied the work is their own, the assessor should complete the malpractice form after the meeting, showing details of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The reasons for their suspicions of</li> </ol>

	<p>malpractice</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Details of the student's response and questioning regarding the alleged malpractice</li> <li>iii. The document should be signed and dated</li> <li>iv. A copy of the work should be attached</li> </ol> <p>Stage 3 - Reported to Programme Manager and discussion held between tutor and learner. This should occur within 2 days of initial meeting.</p> <p>Stage 4 - Reported to faculty heads, within a week of initial suspicion of malpractice, with a follow up discussion on severity of case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.</li> <li>• Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgement made</li> <li>• Document all stages of any investigation.</li> </ul> <p>A decision will be made by the Quality Nominee and the Examinations Officer regarding the incident and the assessor and learner will be informed in writing of the outcome. This will occur within 2 weeks of the initial incident.</p> <p>The learner has 14 days to appeal. In the event of an appeal, the Principal will be required to review the case and make a final judgement.</p> <p>The learner does have the opportunity to submit new evidence but it is accepted as late. Therefore, whatever grade was achieved would be the final grade for that assessment.</p> <p>Penalties: - Learner given a verbal warning, which is kept on file. Their teacher is made aware. If it continues then they will be given a written warning of which is sent to parents of heads of faculty. Final warnings are given if malpractice continues and parents are invited to a meeting with the assessor, head of faculty and student manager. This leads to leaving of the programme with recorded evidence kept on file.</p> <p>When there is a malpractice for an externally assessed unit where it affects the learners assessment outcomes, the Head of centre is</p>
--	--

	<p>required to inform Pearson along with a JCQ form M1 with the supporting documentation to <a href="mailto:candidatemalpractice@pearson.com">candidatemalpractice@pearson.com</a> within 7 working days however, the incident is initially reported to Pearson within 24 hours.</p> <p>If the malpractice is to be found after certificates have been issued then we will contact <a href="mailto:pqsmalpractice@pearson.com">pqsmalpractice@pearson.com</a> immediately.</p> <p>Our Quality Nominee will inform learners of suspected malpractice of their responsibilities and rights.</p> <p>Penalties for external assessment: - reported to the exam board and it their decision to the outcome of the student.</p> <p>In cases of severe and deliberate malpractice, the individual will be withdrawn from the course and Edexcel advised.</p>
<p>By maintaining a System that is consistent, rapid and fair</p>	<p>King Alfred's have a responsibility to investigate. The Head of centre, exams officer &amp; curriculum leader and all personnel linked to the allegation will be part of the process. However, the head of centre is ultimately in charge. It will proceed in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The individual will be made fully aware of the accusation at the earliest possible opportunity, preferably in writing. This should explain the nature of the malpractice and of the possible consequences. This will be done in a fair and equitable manner.</li> <li>• The individual will be given the time and any support necessary to enable them to respond to the accusation</li> <li>• The individual will be made aware of possible sanctions should the accusation be upheld</li> <li>• The individual will be made aware of his/her right to appeal and support will be provided, where necessary, to enable this appeal to be enacted.</li> </ul> <p>Any investigation has to be commensurate with the severity of the accusation but is likely to go through the following stages</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. collection of witness statements, analysis of evidence</li> <li>2. formal interview conducted by Headteacher</li> <li>3. conclusive report and formal meeting to discuss recommendations and action points.</li> </ol>
<p>By applying relevant sanctions</p>	<p>Depending on severity, when malpractice is proven, sanctions for <b>students</b> are likely to be:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with parents and internal KA sanctions (copying, impersonation, collusion)</li> <li>• Cross siting (destruction of other students' work)</li> <li>• Exclusion (more serious destruction of other students' work)</li> </ul> <p><b>Staff</b> misconduct will be subject to OCC misconduct procedures</p>
<p>By maintaining the integrity of Edexcel course</p>	<p>Through application of all of the above in a consistent fashion</p>

Other useful documents:

- Pearson Centre Guidance on Dealing with Malpractice and Maladministration in Vocational Qualifications

- Centre Guide to Quality Management Review
- Centre Guidance Malpractice Maladministration Guide

Policy due to be reviewed in 05/09/2024

Signed: [efrost@kaacademy.org](mailto:efrost@kaacademy.org) - Quality Nominee

Signed: [cbutterfield@kaacademy.org](mailto:cbutterfield@kaacademy.org) - Deputy Headteacher