



BTEC Plagiarism and Assessment Malpractice Policy

Ludlow Church of England School

Purpose/Scope

- To ensure that Ludlow CE School has policies and procedures in place to deal with malpractice.
- To ensure that issues are dealt with in an open, fair and effective manner.
- To ensure that Ludlow CE School provide appropriate deterrents and sanctions to minimise the risk of malpractice.
- 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 impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.
- To protect the integrity of this Centre and BTEC qualifications.

Definitions/Terminology

Learner Malpractice: Any action by the learner which has the potential to undermine the integrity and validity of the assessment of the learner's work. (Plagiarism, collusion, cheating, etc.)

Assessor Malpractice: Any deliberate action by an assessor which has the potential to undermine the integrity of BTEC qualifications.

Plagiarism: Taking and using another's thoughts, writings, inventions, etc. as one's own.

Minor Acts of Learner Malpractice: Handled by the assessor by, for example, refusal to accept for marking and learner being made aware of malpractice policy. Learner resubmits work in question.

Major Acts of Learner Malpractice: Extensive copying/plagiarism, second or subsequent offence, inappropriate for assessor to deal with.

Definition of Malpractice by Learners

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

- Plagiarism of any nature, including the misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI).
- 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.

Definition of Malpractice by Centre 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.

Responsibilities

Head of Centre

Responsible for promoting a positive culture that encourages learners to take individual responsibility for their learning and respect the work of others.

Responsible for any investigation into allegations of malpractice.

Assessor

Responsible for designing assessment opportunities which limit the opportunity for malpractice and for checking the validity of the learner's work.

Internal Verifier

Responsible for malpractice checks when internally verifying work.

Quality Nominee

Required to inform Pearson of any acts of malpractice.

Procedures

Ludlow CE School will:

- Promote positive and honest study practices and seek to avoid potential malpractice by informing learners of the resources available to them for the task they are working on and what is and isn't allowed according to the specifications set by Pearson. This includes informing candidates of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice.
- Collect statements from learners declaring that work is their own and check the validity of their work.
- Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.
- Ensure learners use appropriate citations and referencing for research sources.
- Ensure assessment procedures help reduce and identify malpractice e.g. Use of free online plagiarism checkers when assessing work for example:
<https://smallseotools.com/plagiarism-checker/>
- Ensure staff are aware of the contents of the Malpractice Policy (Exams), NEA Policy, the most recent JCQ documents on the use of AI in examinations and any plagiarism documents issued by JCQ, and comply with its contents.

Procedure for dealing with malpractice:

- Inform the individual of the issues and of the possible consequences.
- Inform the individual of the process and appeals rights.
- Give the individual the opportunity to respond.
- Investigate in a fair and equitable manner.
- Inform Pearson of any malpractice or attempted acts of malpractice, which have compromised assessment. Pearson will advise on further action required.
- Document all stages of any investigation.
- Penalties should be appropriate to the nature of the malpractice under review.
- Gross misconduct should refer to learner and staff disciplinary procedures.

Where learner malpractice is proven, this centre will apply the following penalties / sanctions:

1. Learner given a verbal warning with a record kept on file.
2. If continued malpractice occurs, learner given a written warning, a copy is sent to parents and heads of departments made aware. Learner is placed on appropriate discipline policy.
3. Final warning if malpractice continues. Parents invited into a meeting attended by assessor, head of department, year team leader. Recorded evidence kept on file.
4. Learner leaves the programme with recorded evidence kept on file.

Linked Policies

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Whistleblowing Policy (Exams)

Signed: P. Hearle

Position: Head of Centre

Current Date: Oct 23

Review date: Oct 24