



CHATHAM & CLARENDON GRAMMAR SCHOOL

BTEC/CTEC Policies

Agreed by Governors: March 2026

This document contains policies regarding

1. Registration, entry and Certification
2. Assessment
3. Internal Verification
4. Malpractice and Misconduct
5. Misuse of Artificial Intelligence Apps
6. Appeals
7. Conflict of interest with Examination boards

1. BTEC/CTEC Registration and Certification Policy

Aim:

- To register individual learners to the correct programme within agreed timescales.
- To claim valid learner certificates within agreed timescales.
- To construct a secure, accurate and accessible audit trail to ensure that individual learner registration and certification claims can be tracked to the certificate which is issued for each learner.

In order to do this, the centre will:

- Register each learner within the awarding body requirements
- Provide a mechanism for programme teams to check the accuracy of learner registrations
- Make each learner aware of their registration status
- Inform the awarding body of withdrawals, transfers or changes to learner details
- Ensure that certificate claims are timely and based solely on internally verified assessment records
- Audit certificate claims made to the awarding body
- Audit the certificates received from the awarding body to ensure accuracy and completeness
- Keep all records safely and securely for three years post certification.

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the QN

2. BTEC/CTEC Assessment Policy

Aim:

- To ensure that assessment methodology is valid, reliable and does not disadvantage or advantage any group of learners or individuals
- To ensure that the assessment procedure is open, fair and free from bias and to national standards
- To ensure that there is accurate and detailed recording of assessment decisions.

In order to do this the centre will:

- Ensure that learners are provided with assignments that are fit for purpose, to enable them to produce appropriate evidence for assessment
- Produce a clear and accurate assessment plan at the start of the programme/academic year
- Provide clear, published dates for handout of assignments and deadlines for formative and summative assessment
- Assess learner's evidence using only the published assessment and grading criteria
- Ensure that assessment decisions are impartial, valid and reliable
- Not limit or 'cap' learner achievement if work is submitted late
- Develop assessment procedures that will minimise the opportunity for malpractice
- Maintain accurate and detailed records of assessment decisions
- Maintain a robust and rigorous internal verification procedure
- Provide samples for standards verification as required by the awarding organisation
- Monitor standards verification reports and undertake any remedial action required
- Share good assessment practice between all Btec programme teams
- Ensure that BTEC assessment methodology and the role of the assessor are understood by all BTEC staff
- Provide resources to ensure that assessment can be performed accurately and appropriately.
- NQF external assessments are planned within assessment plans and are booked by the exam officer. Exam invigilators are used when tests are complete.

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months the QN

3.BTEC/CTEC Internal Verification Policy

Aim:

- To ensure there is an accredited Lead Internal Verifier in each principal subject area
- To ensure that Internal Verification is valid, reliable and covers all Assessors and programme activity
- To ensure that the Internal Verification procedure is open, fair and free from bias
- To ensure that there is accurate and detailed recording of Internal Verification decisions.

In order to do this, the centre will ensure that:

- Where required by the qualification, a Lead Internal Verifier is appropriately appointed for each subject area, is registered with Pearson and has undergone the necessary standardisation processes
- Each Lead Internal Verifier oversees effective Internal Verification systems in their subject area
- Staff are briefed and trained in the requirements for current Internal Verification procedures
- Effective Internal Verification roles are defined, maintained and supported
- Internal Verification is promoted as a developmental process between staff
- Standardised Internal Verification documentation is provided and used
- All centre assessment instruments are verified as fit for purpose
- An annual Internal Verification schedule, linked to assessment plans, is in place
- An appropriately structured sample of assessment from all programmes, units, sites and assessors is Internally Verified, to ensure centre programmes confirm to national standards
- Secure records of all Internal Verification activity are maintained
- The outcome of Internal Verification is used to enhance future assessment practice.

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the QN

4. BTEC/CTEC Assessment Malpractice Policy

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 work for marking and learner being made aware of malpractice policy. Learner resubmits work in question
- Major acts of learner malpractice: extensive copying/plagiarism, 2nd or subsequent offence, inappropriate for the Assessor to deal with.

Responsibilities

- Centre: should seek proactive ways to promote a positive culture that encourages learners to take individual responsibility for their learning and respect the work of others
- Assessor: responsible for designing assessment opportunities which limit the opportunity for malpractice and for checking the validity of the learner's work
- Internal Verifier/Lead Internal Verifier: responsible for malpractice checks when internally verifying work
- Quality Nominee: required to inform Pearson of any acts of malpractice
- Heads of Centre or their nominees: responsible for any investigation into allegations of malpractice.

Gross Misconduct in BTEC/CTEC –

Gross misconduct should refer to learner and staff disciplinary procedures. In order to do this, the centre 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 source used
- Conduct investigations into 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 personal linked to the allegation. It will process through the following stages:
 1. Inform the QN for discussion with the Head of Centre
 2. The QN to take statements from all parties and collate work sample from suspected parties
 3. Head of Centre informs Edexcel if formal action is deemed necessary.
 4. 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

5. Give the individual the opportunity to respond to allegations made Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgement made Document all stages of any investigation.

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

1. Refuse to forward assessment/entry to board
2. The QN will reassess all subject entries
3. Head of Centre will inform Edexcel for proceedings to take place by the board.

Definition of Malpractice by Learners:

This list is not exhaustive and other instance 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.

Definition of Malpractice by Centre Staff:

This list is not exhaustive and other instance 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 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.

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the QN

5. BTEC/CTEC Misuse of Artificial Intelligence Policy

Definition

AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications. When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice if AI is misused. It is important that teachers and students are aware that the range of AI tools and their capabilities is expanding quickly, and that there are limitations to their use such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

Responsibilities of Student

Student work submitted for assessment must be in their own words and not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool and must reflect their own independent work. Students must demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set.

Staff addressing Misuse of Artificial Intelligence in work entered by student

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own.
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content.
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations.
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information.
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools.
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

To ensure compliance with the regulations, teachers, assessors and other staff must:

- regularly review the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing use of AI by students in their school, college or exam centre.
- make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment. In doing so, they may wish to use the JCQ support materials referenced in the Executive Summary.

- make students aware of the Centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.
- consider how to best communicate with parents/carers to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the Centre's approach and centres must:
 - a) Explain to students the importance of submitting work that is a result of their own independent efforts for assessments, and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice.
 - b) Regularly review the Centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used, how it should be acknowledged and how teachers will authenticate work);
 - c) Ensure the Centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must reference appropriately (including websites);
 - d) Ensure the Centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on Acknowledging AI use);
 - e) Ensure teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments and the What is AI misuse by students' sections).

Centres' responsibility

- f) Ensure, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited.
- g) Ensure each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents) document.
- h) Reinforce to students the significance of their declaration where they confirm the work they submit is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject.
- i) Remind students that awarding organisations staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the Awarding Organisations actions section below and the examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations in Appendix A: AI misuse examples at the end of this document).
- j) Ensure teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see AI use and marking section below).
- k) Ensure teachers and Heads of Department are clear about their responsibility to only authenticate and submit work for assessment by the awarding organisations that they are confident is the student's own.
- l) Have a process in place for teaching staff to follow where misuse of AI is suspected before the student has signed the declaration form as this does not need reporting to the awarding organisations and must be dealt with in the centre directly.

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the QN

6. BTEC/CTEC Appeals Policy

Appeals

Purpose/Scope

- That there are clear procedures for learners to enable them to enquire about, question or appeal an assessment decision
- That any appeal is recorded and documentation is retained for 18 months following the resolution of the appeal
- That the Head of Centre facilitates the learner's ultimate right of appeal to Pearson, once the centre's appeal procedure is exhausted.

Definitions/Terminology

- Appeal: a request from a learner to revisit an assessment decision which s/he considers disadvantaging him/her
- Appeals procedure: a standard, time limited, sequenced and documented process for the centre and learner to follow when an appeal is made.

Responsibilities

- Learner: responsible for initiating the appeals procedure, in the required format, within a defined time frame, when s/he has reason to question an assessment decision
- Assessor: responsible for providing clear achievement feedback to learners. If assessment decisions are questioned, the Assessor is responsible for processing the learner's appeal within the agreed time
- Internal Verifier/Lead Internal Verifier/Senior Management: responsible for judging whether assessment decisions are valid, fair and unbiased
- Head of Centre: responsible for submitting an appeal in writing, to Pearson if the learner remains dissatisfied with the outcome of the centre's internal appeals procedures.

Procedures

- Learner induction: Should inform the learner of the appeals procedure
- Learner appeals procedures: A staged procedure to determine whether the assessor:
 - o used procedures that are consistent with Pearson's requirements
 - o applied the procedures properly and fairly when arriving at judgements
 - o made a correct judgement about the learner's work

7. Appeals procedure stages:

Stage 1 – Informal: Learner consults with Assessor within a defined period of time following the assessment decision, to discuss an assessment decision. If unresolved, then the issues are documented before moving to stage 2

Stage 2 – Review: Review of assessment decisions by Manager and/or Internal Verifier/Lead Internal Verifier. Learner notified of findings and agrees or disagrees, in writing, with outcome. If unresolved, move to stage 3

Stage 3 – Appeal hearing: Senior Management hears the appeal: last stage by the centre. If unresolved, move to stage 4

Stage 4 – External appeal: The grounds for appeal and any supporting documentation must be submitted by the centre to Pearson within 14 days of the completion of Stage 4: a fee is levied

Recording appeals: each stage should be recorded, dated and show either agreement or disagreement with decisions. Documents must be kept for a minimum of 18 months

Monitoring of appeals undertaken by Senior Management/QN to inform development and quality improvement.

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the QN

8. Conflict of interest with Examination boards

Who and what is this policy for:

All staff (including assessment associates and moderators) need to be aware of the potential for a conflict of interest with school interests for students and the best possible grades for students in school.

As a regulated awarding organisation, the General Conditions of Recognition and the Regulatory Principles require us to publish a conflict-of-interest policy that helps us to identify, manage and mitigate conflict of interest, are recognised by the school and will be strictly adhered to in a professional manner.

The approach the school will take will be consistent and we will endeavour to meet regulatory requirements laid out by the examination governing boards. These policies are designed to support centres and learners with the design, delivery and award of Pearson qualifications and services.

What is a conflict of interest?

A conflict of interest is a situation in which an individual, or organisation, has competing interests or loyalties. In the case of an individual, the conflict of interest could compromise or appear to compromise their decisions if it is not properly managed.

Conflicts of interest can arise in a variety of circumstances relating to awarding organisations or Teachers who work additionally as exam board assessors/moderators. The following are examples of conflicts and do not represent an exhaustive list:

Where the training delivery function and the awarding function rest within one organisation

When an individual has a position of authority in one organisation that conflicts with his or her interests in another organisation

Where someone works for or carries out work on our behalf, who has friends or relative taking our assessments or exams

When an individual has interested that conflicts with his or her professional position

Where someone works for or carries out work on our behalf but may have personal interests –paid or unpaid- in another business which either uses our products and services or produces similar products. Our commitment to managing conflict of interests

We will:

Make sure that when one part of any examination awarding organisations creates and follows a procedure, it does not conflict with our regulatory responsibility as an awarding organisation and our staff who also work as examination assessors or moderators for those boards. In alignment with OFQUAL.

Review our processes every year to make sure that all conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest are managed and resolved. Any issues will be dealt with by the examinations office and SLT.

Make sure that anyone with access to confidential assessment material for a qualification or as examination assessors or moderators for those boards does not deliver or is present at training events regarding that product.

Make sure that all staff and assessors of end-point assessment declare any interest of friends or family sitting any upcoming assessments via the awarding examination bodies.

- Promote positive and honest study practices

- Learners should declare that work is their own: check the validity of their work
- Use learner induction and handbook to inform about malpractice and outcomes
- Ensure learners use appropriate citations and referencing for research sources
- Assessment procedures should help reduce and identify malpractice

Addressing staff malpractice:

- Staff BTEC induction and updating should include BTEC requirements
- Use robust Internal Verification and audited record keeping
- Audit learner records, assessment tracking records and certification claims

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
- Penalties should be appropriate to the nature of the malpractice under review

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the QN

All reviews by QN are in line with JCA and exam boards directives.