



EXAMS POLICY BTEC MALPRACTICE

Mount St Joseph Document Control Table			
Document Title:	Exams Policy BTEC Malpractice	Author name / post:	Deputy Headteacher
Version Number:	1.1	Document Status:	Approved
Date Approved:	01.09.2017	Approved By:	SLT
Effective Date:	01 Sept 2026	Date of next review:	September 2027
Publication method:	Website	Date published	Sept 2026
Superseded Version:			

Document History		
Version	Date	Notes on Revisions
1.0	16 th Sept 2018	Reviewed – no amendments recommended
1.0	1 st Sept 2019	Reviewed – no amendments recommended
1.0	1 st Sept 2020	Reviewed – no amendments recommended
1.0	1 st Sept 2021	Reviewed – no amendments recommended
1.1	1 st Sept 2022	Reviewed with minor amendments made to wording
	1 st Sept 2023	Reviewed – no amendments recommended
	1 st Sept 2024	Reviewed – no amendments recommended
	2nd Sept 2025	Reviewed - no amendments recommended
	1st Sept 2026	Reviewed – no amendments recommended

A Community of Learners, Believers, Friends

We believe that every child is uniquely created and loved by God and called by Him to fulfil a special purpose. It is our privilege to help each child to identify, nurture and use his/her talents to build a better world. To this end we will work in partnership with parents, parishes our community of schools and with the wider community.

Introduction

The guidance should be read in conjunction with the latest issue of the JCQ General and Vocational Qualifications Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments Policies and Procedures (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice).

If suspected malpractice occurs at a Mount St Joseph, further guidance can also be found in the JCQ Public Interest Disclosure Act (Whistleblowing) document (www.jcq.co.uk/exams-office/malpractice).

If you wish to report an incident of suspected malpractice, or would like to discuss your concerns, please contact Pearson's Investigations Team by email at pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

In the interests of learners and centre staff, Mount St Joseph needs to respond effectively and openly to all requests relating to an investigation into an incident or a suspected incident of malpractice.

It is the Head of Mount St Joseph's responsibility to ensure that appropriate measures have been taken to prevent and identify learner malpractice in internally assessed units and that work submitted is the learner's own and has been accurately assessed.

Mount St Joseph has its own malpractice policy for dealing with incidents of malpractice. Cases of suspected learner malpractice relating to internally assessed units should be dealt with in accordance with the Mount St Joseph's malpractice policy.

If Mount St Joseph identifies that malpractice has occurred after certificates have been issued, it will immediately inform Pearson's Investigations Team via pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Where learners are suspected of malpractice in relation to externally assessed units of vocational qualifications (such as examinations within BTEC NQF).

In such cases, the Head of Mount St Joseph will inform Pearson at the earliest opportunity, preferably by completing a JCQ Form M1 (www.jcq.co.uk/exams-office/malpractice), and submitting this and all supporting documentation to the Investigations Team at pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

The Head of Mount St Joseph will inform Pearson's Investigations Team of any incidence of alleged or suspected malpractice by centre staff, **before** any investigation is undertaken.

The Head of Mount St Joseph will inform the Investigations Team by submitting a JCQ Form M2(a) (downloadable from www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice) with supporting documentation to pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Malpractice discovered by Mount St Joseph

Any incident of malpractice or attempted malpractice by Mount St Joseph staff will be reported by the centre to Pearson at the following email address: pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Any malpractice or attempted act of malpractice by learners relating to externally assessed units will also be reported to Pearson via the same email address.

The Head Teacher of Mount St Joseph will inform Pearson's Investigations Team of any incidence of suspected malpractice by Mount St Joseph staff **before** any investigation is undertaken.

The Head of Mount St Joseph will inform the Investigations Team by submitting a JCQ Form M2(a) (downloadable from www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice) with supporting documentation to pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Cases of suspected learner malpractice relating to internally assessed units will be dealt with in accordance with the Mount St Joseph's malpractice policy.

Where Mount St Joseph identifies that malpractice has occurred after certificates have been issued, the Head of Mount St Joseph will immediately inform Pearson's Investigations Team via pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Where learners are suspected of malpractice in relation to externally assessed units of vocational qualifications (such as examinations within BTEC NQF), The Head of Mount St Joseph will inform Pearson at the earliest opportunity, preferably by completing a JCQ Form M1 (www.jcq.co.uk/exams-office/malpractice), and submitting this and all supporting documentation to the Investigations Team at pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Dealing with malpractice

Mount St Joseph will co-operate fully with any independent investigation.

If Mount St Joseph discovers or suspects anyone of malpractice, the Head of Mount St Joseph will make the individual 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.

Appeals

Mount Joseph has an appeals policy which would be made available to any learner where a malpractice penalty has been applied. Learners are informed of the Mount St Joseph's malpractice and appeals policy during the induction period.

Definitions of malpractice and maladministration:

JCQ defines 'Malpractice', 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.

For Pearson centres offering SQA Accreditation accredited qualifications, please note that SQA Accreditation defines 'Maladministration' and 'Malpractice' as:

- Maladministration: Any actions, neglect, default or other practice that compromises the accreditation or quality assurance process including the integrity of accredited qualifications, the validity of any certificates, or the reputation and credibility of SQA Accreditation.
- Malpractice: Any deliberate actions, neglect, default or other practice that compromises the accreditation or quality assurance process including the integrity of accredited qualifications, the validity of any certificates, or the reputation and credibility of SQA Accreditation.

Ways that can reduce malpractice and maladministration

Mount St Joseph will check that learners declare that their work is their own, for instance:

- For BTEC internally assessed units, internal assessors are responsible for checking the validity and authenticity of the learners' work.
- For learners' work taught and/or assessed using distance learning/assessment.

- For NVQs/SVQs and competence based qualifications, Mount St Joseph and its learners will provide a written declaration that the evidence is authentic and that the assessment was conducted under the requirements of the assessment specification.
- Mount St Joseph will verify the identity of a learner before they take an examination.
- Where assessment is to be conducted in a language other than English, Mount St Joseph will ensure that provision is made for such work to be verified and authenticated.

It is the Headteacher's responsibility to ensure that measures have been taken to prevent and identify learner malpractice in internally assessed units and that work submitted is the learner's own and has been accurately assessed.

Mount St Joseph will reduce learner malpractice by:

- Using the induction period and the student handbook to tell learners about the policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice.
- Showing learners, the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites. Learners will not be discouraged from conducting research; indeed, evidence of relevant research often contributes to the achievement of higher grades. However, the submitted work will show evidence that the learner has interpreted and understood appropriate information and has acknowledged any sources used.
- Mount St Joseph will remind students they must not use other people's work.
- Students will be checked so that they are not taking prohibited material into an exam.
- Procedures are in place for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice such as plagiarism, collusion or cheating. These procedures may include:
 - Periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assignments/tasks/coursework is produced by the learner.
 - Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis.
 - The assessor assessing work for a single assignment/task in a single session for the complete cohort of learners.
 - Using oral questions with learners to check their understanding of the work.
 - Assessors getting to know their learners' styles and abilities.

Suspected malpractice or maladministration

In the case of suspected malpractice, Mount St Joseph will make the individual 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.

Any incident will be reported straight away of:

- malpractice or attempted malpractice by centre staff;
- maladministration by centre staff; and
- malpractice or attempted malpractice by learners in relation to externally assessed units.

Incidents will be reported to Pearson using the following email addresses:

- Learner malpractice: candidatemalpractice@pearson.com
- Centre/centre staff malpractice: pqsmalpractice@pearson.com
- Maladministration: pqsmalpractice@pearson.com

Suspected learner malpractice relating to internally assessed units

- Cases of suspected learner malpractice relating to internally assessed units will be managed in accordance with Mount St Joseph's own malpractice policy. If malpractice has occurred after certificates have been issued, you should immediately contact our Investigations team by emailing pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Suspected learner malpractice relating to externally assessed units

- Where learners are suspected of malpractice in relation to externally assessed units of vocational qualifications (such as examinations within BTEC NQF), the Headteacher will inform Pearson at the earliest opportunity, preferably by completing a JCQ Form M1, and submitting this and all supporting documentation to our Investigations team at candidatemalpractice@pearson.com.

Suspected centre staff malpractice

The Headteacher is required to inform Pearson's Investigations team of any alleged or suspected malpractice by centre staff, **before** any investigation is undertaken. The Headteacher needs to contact Pearson's Investigations team by submitting a JCQ Form M2(a) with supporting documentation to pqsmalpractice@pearson.com. Where Pearson receive allegations of malpractice from other sources (for example Pearson staff or anonymous informants), THE Investigations team will conduct the investigation directly or may ask the Headteacher to assist.

Headteachers or their nominees will inform learners and centre staff of suspected malpractice of their responsibilities and rights; see 6.14 and 6.15 of JCQ General and

Vocational Qualifications Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments Policies and Procedures.

Pearson may withhold results or certificates while an investigation into suspected cases of malpractice is in progress. Depending on the outcome of the investigation results/certificates may be released, withheld or modified.

Appeals

There are procedures for appeals against penalties and sanctions resulting from malpractice/maladministration. Appeals against a decision made by Pearson will normally be accepted only from the Headteacher (on behalf of learners and/or members of staff) and from individual members of centre staff (in respect of a decision taken against them personally). For further information on appeals please refer to the JCQ document 'A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes'.

Risk Assessment for Controlled assessments

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Timetabling			
Assessment schedule clashes with other activities	Plan/establish priorities well ahead (e.g. start of academic year) for all subjects or lines of learning	Plan dates in consultation with school calendar – negotiate with other parties	Heads of Department (HoDs)
Too many assessments close together across subjects or lines of learning	Plan assessments so they are spaced over the duration of the course	Space assessments to at least allow candidates some time between assessments	HoDs to discuss at their meetings
Accommodation			
Insufficient space in classrooms for candidates	Once group sizes are known at the start of the year, flag instances where regular classroom space may not be suitable to conduct controlled assessment	Use more than one classroom or multiple sittings where necessary	HoDs/EO/DKS4/DoS
			HoDs/EO/DKS4/DoS

Insufficient facilities for all candidates	Careful planning ahead and booking of rooms / centre facilities		
--	---	--	--

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff)
	Forward planning	Action	
Control levels for task taking			

Assessment is undertaken under incorrect level of control (time, resources, supervision and collaboration)	Ensure teaching staff/assessors know what level is applicable and understand what is involved. Provide training if required	Seek guidance from the awarding body	HoD's TO UPDATE ALL THEIR STAFF ON REQUIREMENTS WELL BEFORE TEST TAKES PLACE
Supervision			
Student study diary/plan not provided or completed*	Ensure teaching staff/assessors are aware of the need for study diary/plans to be completed early in course	Ensure candidates start, continue and complete study diary/plans that are	HoD's/TEACHERS

		signed after every session	
Teaching staff/assessors do not understand supervision of controlled assessment is their responsibility	Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand nature of controlled assessments and their role in supervision		HoD's
Suitable supervisor has not been arranged for an assessment where teaching staff/assessors are not supervising	A suitable supervisor must be arranged for any controlled assessment where a teacher/assessor is not supervising, in line with the awarding body specification.		HoD's

*Not all controlled assessment whether for the Diploma or GCSEs will require the completion of a study diary or study plans

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Task setting			
Teaching staff/assessors fail to correctly set tasks	Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body specification**	Seek guidance from the awarding body	HoD's
Assessments have not been moderated as required in the awarding body specification	Check specification and plan required moderation appropriately	Seek guidance from the awarding body	HoD's
Security of materials			
Assessment tasks not kept secure before assessment	Ensure teaching staff understand importance of task security	Request/obtain different assessment tasks	HoD's/DKS4
Candidates' work not kept secure during or after assessment	Define appropriate level of security, in line with awarding body requirements, for each department as necessary	Take materials to secure storage	HoDS TO ENSURE THEY HAVE LOCKABLE STORAGE FOR THESE ASSESSMENTS FROM THE BEGINNING

Insufficient or insecure storage space	Look at provision for suitable storage early in the course	Find alternative spaces	HoD's AS ABOVE
--	--	-------------------------	----------------

** All tasks whether set by the awarding body or the centre/consortium must be developed in line with the requirements of the specification.

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Deadlines			
Deadlines not met by candidates	Ensure all candidates are briefed on deadlines/penalties for not meeting them	Mark what candidates have produced by deadline and seek guidance from awarding body on further action.	STUDENTS/TEACHERS/ HoDs
Deadlines for marking and/or paperwork not met by teaching staff/ assessors	Ensure teaching staff/assessors are given clear deadlines (prior to awarding body ones) to complete marking/paperwork so the exams office can process and send off marks ahead of AB deadlines	Seek guidance from awarding body	HoDs/TEACHERS
Authentication			

Candidate fails to sign authentication form	Ensure all candidates have authentication forms to sign and attach to work when it is completed before handing in	Find candidate and ensure form is signed	HoD's
Teaching staff/assessors fail to complete authentication forms or leave before completing authentication	Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand importance of authentication forms and the requirement of a signature	Return form to staff for signature. Ensure forms are signed as work is marked, not at end of season	HoDs/DKS4

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff (use 'RACI' to determine who should be listed)
	Forward planning	Action	
Marking			
Teaching staff/assessors interpret marking descriptions incorrectly	Ensure appropriate training and practicing of marking. Plan for sampling of marking during the practice phase.	Arrange for remarking. Consult awarding body specification for appropriate procedure	HoDs/TEACHERS

Centre does not run standardisation activity as required by the awarding body	Plan against the requirements for standardisation for the awarding body when and how this activity will be conducted.	Check with the awarding body whether a later standardisation event can be arranged.	HoDs/TEACHERS
---	---	---	---------------