BTEC Policies

Centre name	The Roundhill Academy
Centre number	25327
Date policy reviewed	31 October 2026
Policy approved by	Natalie Teece
Policy reviewed by	Julia Rann James Longley
Date of next review	30 September 2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Names
Head of Centre	Natalie Teece
SLT Member with responsibility for Exams	Julia Rann
Quality Nominee	James Longley
Examinations Manager	Tania Taylor

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure compliance with current requirements and regulations.

To be read in conjunction with:

- Access arrangements policy
- Alternative rooming arrangements (exams)
- Certificate issue procedure and retention policy
- Complaints policy
- Conflict of interest policy
- Examination contingency plan
- Internal appeals procedure (internal assessment decisions)
- Internal appeals procedure (review of results and appeals)
- Malpractice policy (exams and assessments)
- Non-Examination Assessment policy
- Non-Examination Assessment risk assessments
- Special consideration policy

BTEC 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, of 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

BTEC 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 follows the standards set by Pearson
- 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 where applicable
- 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 Exams Manager. Exam invigilators are used when tests are completed.

BTEC Internal Verification Policy

Aim:

- To ensure there is an accredited Lead Internal Verifier in each principle 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.

BTEC Assessment Malpractice Policy

Purpose/Scope

● That centres have policies and procedures in place to deal with malpractice

● To ensure that issues are dealt with in an open, fair and effective manner

● That centres provide appropriate deterrents and sanctions to minimise the risk of malpractice.

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, use of AI, 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 including AI

● 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, second 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 that 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.

Procedures

Addressing learner malpractice:

- 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
- Gross misconduct should refer to learner and staff disciplinary procedures.

Assessment Malpractice Policy

Aim:

- 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.

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
- Brief candidates at key moments regarding rules and sanctions or BTEC assessment
- 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 an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre and all personnel linked to the allegation. It will processed through the following stages:

Inform the Quality Nominee (QN) for discussion with the Head of Centre

1. The QN to take statements from all parties and collate work sample from suspected parties Head of Centre informs Pearson if formal action is deemed necessary.
2. 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
3. Give the individual the opportunity to respond to allegations made
4. Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgement made
5. 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 Pearson 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 and AI 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 (including online)
- 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 scribe, 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

BTEC Appeals Procedure

Aims of this policy

- To enable the learner to enquire, question or appeal against an assessment decision
- To attempt to reach agreement between the learner and the assessor at the earliest opportunity
- To standardise and record any appeal to ensure openness and fairness.
- To facilitate a learner's ultimate right of appeal to the awarding body, where appropriate
- To protect the interests of all learners and the integrity of the qualification

Our School Appeals Policy

We ensure that:

- Internal assessments are conducted by members of the teaching staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skills in this area.
- Assessment evidence provided by candidates is produced and authenticated according to the requirements of the Awarding Body for the subject concerned.
- The consistency of internal assessment will be maintained by internal verification and standardisation.
- All student work being assessed by teaching staff for external qualifications is carried out fairly, consistently and in accordance with the rules and regulations of the specification relating to the qualification.

BTEC Appeals Procedure

1. BTEC Lead Internal Verifier will manage all appeals. Should the appeal be against the Lead Internal Verifier then another Lead Internal Verifier will be brought into review the original decision.

2. Appeal should be made in writing stating the details of the complaint and the reasons for the appeal within seven working days of receiving the feedback and grade of work in question.

3. The teacher who made the assessment decision will be given a copy of the appeal and will respond in writing to this to the Lead Internal Verifier within five working days.

4. The Lead Internal Verifier will then make a decision on the grading and give written feedback to both the student and the teacher involved within a further three working days.

5. Student raising the appeal will have an opportunity to a personal hearing if they are not happy with written response received. The student will be given reasonable notice of the hearing date and should have sight of all relevant documents to the case in advance of the hearing. Where the student is presenting their own case they are allowed to bring along a carer/friend. The teacher(s) and student will have the opportunity to hear each other's submission to the panel at the hearing.

6. The panel will comprise of a Lead Internal Verifier from another subject area, the Quality Nominee and the Exams Manager. A written record of the appeal and hearing will be taken including the outcome of an appeal and reason for that outcome. This will be kept at on file for 18 months and the student will also receive a hard copy.

7. The school will inform the awarding body if there is any change to an internally assessed grade as a result of an appeal.

If a student still considers that a decision made by the School continues to disadvantage them even after the outcome of the internal appeals procedure, then the examination manager can give them advice on how to appeal to the relevant awarding body. Where appeals to awarding bodies can only be made by centre examination staff it will be at the discretion of the head of the centre whether such an appeal will be

submitted. When an external appeal is submitted at the request of a student and after the internal appeals decision has been made, there may be some financial cost incurred by the student.