Cardinal Langley RC High School

Exams Policies & Procedures 2025-26

BTEC PLAGIARISM & MALPRACTICE POLICY

Reviewed by:	Mrs L Barton
Date:	Spring 2026
Review frequency:	Annually
Next review:	Autumn 2026 / Spring 2027

1. Rationale and Aim

Cardinal Langley is committed to ensuring that standards of assessment are consistent, transparent and in line with the requirements of our awarding bodies. This policy's objective is to identify the risk of malpractice by students and staff, outline response procedures and the recording of any investigation.

The policy covers all Vocational courses currently offered and will cover any further additions from a Vocational context.

Aims

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 impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.
5. To protect the integrity of this centre and BTEC qualifications.

In order to do this, Cardinal Langley will:

- Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the learner 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.
- Conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre / Principal / CEO and all personnel linked to the allegation.
  It will proceed through the following stages:
- 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.
- Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made.
- Document all stages of any investigation.

2. Minimising the risk of learner and staff malpractice

BTEC assessors, Internal Verifiers and Lead Internal Verifiers will receive annual training and guidance to support the prevention and identification of assessment malpractice and plagiarism and how to deal with any incidents identified.

Staff & Learners will be made aware of plagiarism and the consequences of it.

https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/btec-centre-guide-to-plagiarism.pdf

The assessment malpractice and plagiarism policy will be disseminated to all staff who deliver BTEC courses at Cardinal Langley to ensure they are able to provide suitable guidance. This is to be overseen by the Quality Nominee for Cardinal Langley.

Cardinal Langley will seek to design assignment briefs and processes that help to reduce assessment malpractice and plagiarism.

Course leads are to reinforce this policy when inducting students on their BTEC courses and at regular points thereafter as appropriate. Students are required to provide a signed and dated authenticity statement with every BTEC assignment brief to acknowledge that the work produced is their own and that they understand the penalties that will be imposed on students who do submit plagiarised work.

Staff will take reasonable steps to monitor student work carefully for assessment malpractice and plagiarism. Detection methods could include, but are not limited to, standardisation of marked work, comparing student work, checking work for unfamiliar words and grammar, a change in the quality of work produced, identification of unreferenced familiar text.

Staff teaching on BTEC courses will also follow robust quality assurance processes including Internal Verification, audited record keeping, tracking and certification claims in order to minimise and identify any malpractice.

3. Definition of Malpractice

Malpractice consists of those acts which undermine the integrity and validity of assessment and the certification of qualifications; and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment and certification.

4. Definitions 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
- 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.

5. 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 a Reader, 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.

6. Dealing with and Investigating Alleged Malpractice

Student:

Cardinal Langley takes instances of assessment malpractice and plagiarism extremely seriously. In the event of acts of malpractice and plagiarism being suspected:

Where the student has not yet signed the student authentication declaration form:

- The subject teacher and / or course leader will undertake a thorough investigation; speaking first to the student(s) involved in order to seek clarification on how they sourced the material, assessment material, etc.
- In cases where plagiarism has been proved (and depending upon the seriousness of the offence) for a first-time offender, the student will be interviewed by the Quality Nominee
- Given a verbal warning and reminded of the Assessment Malpractice and Plagiarism Policy. Details of the meeting will be recorded on Cardinal Langley's SIMS system.
- The student's work will be withdrawn scoring no marks and the student will be given an opportunity to amend the work and resubmit the piece of work within an agreed time-frame. BTEC rules will be applied and students will not be given the opportunity of a further resubmission or retake.
- Whenever there is a case of malpractice the student's parent(s) or guardian(s) will be informed and invited to attend a meeting with the Quality Nominee and Course Lead.
- The student's work will then be withdrawn scoring no marks and the student will be given an opportunity to amend the work and resubmit the piece of work within an agreed time-frame. BTEC rules will be applied and students will not be given the opportunity of a further resubmission or retake.
- In cases whereby either there is a second or further offence, or the first-time breach is of serious magnitude, Cardinal Langley may contact the appropriate examination board.
- Examination boards have at their disposal a range of sanctions that they may wish to invoke:
- The student being withdrawn from one or all of their current examination series.

- The piece of work being awarded zero marks.
- Student being barred from being entered for the qualification for a specified period.

Actions to be taken will include:

- The learner must be informed of the evidence that has brought to light the accusation
- The learner must be informed of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven;
- The investigating officer must inform the learner of the appeals procedure.
- The learner's parents/guardian must be contacted and informed of the allegation, unless the learner is over the age of 18.
- The learner has 48 hours in which to prepare a response to the allegations.
- The investigating officer must convene an interviewing body consisting of no more than three people including the head of department.
- The interviewing body must interview the learner affected by the alleged malpractice within an appropriate timeframe.
- Should the learner so wish, he/she can be accompanied by an appropriate adult or friend during the investigating interview.

Where the student has signed the student authentication declaration form:

If Cardinal Langley discovers an irregularity after a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, or if Cardinal Langley suspect any malpractice by a candidate during an examination, The School shall submit full details of the case to the examination board at the earliest opportunity by emailing a JCQ Form M1 with supporting documentation.

Staff

- A full and thorough investigation will be conducted by the Headteacher or their nominated representative.
- The School will make the accused fully aware, in writing, of the alleged malpractice and of possible consequences, should the malpractice be proven.
- The School will give the accused the opportunity to respond and the right of appeal should a judgment be made against them.

7. Penalties for Malpractice

Student

- If Cardinal Langley discovers any irregularity in the internally assessed components of examinations before a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, Cardinal Langley may not need to report this to the exam board.
- Written warning – the learner is issued with a written warning. The learner is issued with a warning that if the offence is repeated, further specified sanctions will be applied.
- Pearson Investigations Team will review the documentation that is provided and advise the school on the next steps.
- Possible outcomes could result in disqualification from certification for the specific unit subject to malpractice or disqualification from the course.

Staff

- Sanctions will follow the code laid down in the **Staff Disciplinary Procedure**. Any alleged malpractice involving the administration of learner work will be reported immediately to the respective awarding body.
- Where a member of staff has committed malpractice or that maladministration of the qualification may have occurred, the exam board will be contacted by emailing a completed

JCQ M2a Form to pqsmalpractice@pearson.com. Pearson Investigations Team will review the documentation that you provide and advise Cardinal Langley on the next steps.

8. Grounds for Appeal

Grounds for appeal against an assessment grading may be started in the following situations:

- The learner feels the work has not been assessed according to the assessment criteria.
- The internal verification process contradicts the assignment/unit grades awarded.
- Valid, agreed, extenuating circumstances were not taken into account at the time of assessment, which the assessor and IV/Lead IV were aware of prior to the deadline.
- The decision to reject an assignment was made on the grounds of malpractice that was unfound. The learner can apply to the Quality Nominee within 5 days of being informed of the disciplinary action. The Quality Nominee will undertake a review of the case and will make a final binding judgment within 5 working days of receipt of the appeal.

Definition of Maladministration

Maladministration is defined as any activity or practice, which results in noncompliance with administrative regulations and requirements and includes the application of persistent mistakes or poor administration within the Centre (e.g. inappropriate learner records). Below is a list not exhaustive or definitive.

- Failure to adhere to our learner registration and certification procedures.
- Failure to adhere to Centre recognition and/or qualification requirements and/or associated actions assigned to the Centre.
- Late learner registrations.
- Unreasonable delays in responding to requests and/or communications (e.g. Centre postponement of visits by External Quality Assurers and Gateway Qualifications staff for more than 6 months).
- Failure to train invigilators adequately.
- Failure to invigilate to awarding body requirements.
- Failure to ensure that assessment venues meet the awarding bodies' requirements.
- Inaccurate claim for certificates.
- Failure to maintain appropriate auditable records (3 years), e.g. certification claims and/or forgery of evidence.
- Withholding of information, by deliberate act or omission, from the awarding body which is required to assure them of the Centre's ability to deliver qualifications appropriately.
- Failure to adhere to, or attempts to circumnavigate, the requirements of the awarding bodies' Reasonable Adjustments and Special Considerations Policy.