



## **Assessment Malpractice Policy**

Date: September 2020

Date of last review: September 2023

---

### **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.

To do this, St Thomas More High School will:

- Foster a culture in which all learners and staff feel able to report any concerns of wrongdoing by anyone
- 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
- Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources
- Ask 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 (add link)
- Where required, gather information for an investigation in accordance with Pearson instructions. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre / Principal / CEO and all personnel linked to the allegation.

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

**The Quality Nominee and/or BTEC assessors at St Thomas More High School should follow these procedures in the event of malpractice:**

- Details of any malpractice should be documented & dated and immediately referred to the Exams Officer and Quality Nominee
- The individual involved should be made aware of the alleged malpractice and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven
- The individual should be given the opportunity to respond to the allegations made and should be informed of the procedures used to appeal against any judgement made
- Inform learners of the malpractice policy and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
- Teach learners the appropriate formats of how to record cited texts and other materials or information sources & provide evidence that they have acknowledged any sources used
- Ensure learners can declare that their work is their own
- Conduct an investigation if required to do so after seeking advice from the Leadership Team and the Exams Officer. All stages must be recorded and kept
- 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 and inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made
- Ensure that any sanction awarded will be in accordance with the policy and the awarding body.

**Definition of malpractice by learners:**

- 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.

### **Definition of malpractice by centre staff**

- 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 or claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment
- 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 does not belong to the learner 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
- 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.

[Centre guidance: Dealing with malpractice and maladministration \(pearson.com\)](#)

[BTEC Centre Guide to Plagiarism \(pearson.com\)](#)

[Plagiarism-Factsheet.pdf \(pearson.com\)](#)

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the Quality Nominee which is currently Mrs E Hinkins.