

BTEC Registration and Certification Policy

Aim:

Registering individual learners to programmes within relevant timeframes is important for claiming valid learner certificates within appropriate timescales. Therefore, this Policy describes a secure, precise, and accessible audit process to ensuring the reliability of individual learner registration and certification processes.

Procedures:

- Learners will be registered within the awarding body requirements, and within 60 days of starting a programme. We shall provide regular opportunities for programme leaders to check the accuracy of learner registrations. Learners' transfers shall be monitored by administration staff approved by the quality nominee (QN), exam officer (EO) and program lead (PL) to initiate the summary of units achieved (to enable unit accreditation), then information is passed to the EO within 14 days to be able to inform the awarding body of changes. EO shall inform the awarding body of any withdrawals, transfers or changes to learner details.
- Each learner shall be aware of their registration status via registration summaries available with termly reports and on a VLE. In BTEC team meetings, any concerns regarding long absences of learners shall be recorded and relevant names shall be recorded in order that learners can be monitored appropriately.
- All certificate claims shall be made in a timely fashion and based solely on internally verified assessment records. The EO will inform PL and QN of dates for entry on Edexcel Online. Entry of marks (Progress to Date) for completed units at the end of the 1st year shall be encouraged and can be upgraded prior to full accreditation.
- We shall audit certificate claims made to the awarding body. Department databases are checked by a PL prior to sending to the EO who then enters the results online.
- Certificates received from the awarding body will be audited to ensure accuracy and completeness. The EO will verify certificates prior issuing to the PL, who must then check against the relevant database prior issuing these. Any inconsistencies shall be reported to the QN, EO and then to the awarding body.

All records shall be kept safely and securely for three years post-certification. Records held by departments and those received by the EO shall be held on the BTEC archive for 3 years.

Definitions/Terminology :

Registration: Inform Edexcel about learners at the beginning of a programme of study.

Key Dates and Actions: Deadlines for registration and certification appear in the Centre Handbook:

Certification Claim: The process of informing Edexcel of learner achievement.

Unit Certification: Learners who have not completed a sufficient number of units to receive the full award can be certificated for the units that they have achieved.

Key Responsibilities :

Exams Officer: Responsible for timely, accurate and valid registration, transfer, withdrawal and certificate claims for learners.

Programme Leader: Responsible for ensuring learner details held by Edexcel are accurate and that an audit trail of learner assessment and achievement is accessible.

Quality Nominee: Responsible for coordinating and monitoring the learner details held with Edexcel.

Senior Management: Responsible for overseeing the registration, transfer, withdrawal and certificate claims for learners to ensure that awarding body deadlines are met.

Procedures :

Registration: Registration initiates the external verifier's allocation. Learners should be registered within 60 days of when they start the programme. Centre procedures need to facilitate accurate, timely registration.

Progress to Date: At end of 1st year fully achieved units can be reported to Edexcel. Certification is not claimed and improved grades can be reported later to Edexcel.

Transfer: Learners can transfer their registration and achievement to date between centres. Transfer between programmes is permitted. Procedures need to ensure transfers are accurate and timely. They should also ensure that adequate information about the transferee's position and progress is communicated.

Withdrawal: Centres must advise Edexcel when a learner leaves before completion. A withdrawal will not prevent the registration from being reopened at a later date.

Certification Claims: Full award or unit certification is claimed through Edexcel Online: paper claims can only be made on request. Claims can be made at any time of year. Centre claims procedures should prevent fraudulent or inaccurate claims.

BTEC Malpractice/Maladministration Policy

Introduction:

This policy covers examples of misconduct or mismanagement by both college staff members and learners. It outlines the procedures to be followed when an allegation of such behavior is reported. Misconduct involves any planned act that fails a threat to the fairness and integrity of assessment, thereby endangering the accuracy of the result or certification granted. Maladministration refers to any non-deliberate activity, neglect, default or other practice which compromises or threatens to compromise the process and integrity of assessment, and as a result the validity of the result or certification awarded. All college staff and learners are responsible for staying attentive regarding any situations that might lead to misconduct or mismanagement. If they suspect such incidences, it is their duty to promptly report them to the relevant Quality Nominee or Program Lead. This ensures that appropriate measures can be taken in accordance with the established procedures.

The Quality Nominee holds the responsibility of notifying the relevant awarding body about alleged or confirmed cases of misconduct or mismanagement. This ensures that appropriate actions can be introduced in line with the well-being of the learners and the integrity of the educational processes.

Objectives:

- To recognize and minimise the risk of malpractice/maladministration by learners.
- To find and minimise the risk of malpractice/maladministration by staff.
- To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively.
- To standardize and record any investigation to ensure honesty and fairness.
- To protect the integrity of the college and awarding body.

In order to do this, the college will:

- Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the learner handbook. for vocational and BTEC programmes to inform learners about the center's policy on malpractice.
- Communicate the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy to learner.
- Communicate the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy to staff.
- Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information source.

- Ask learners to declare that their work is their own.
- Ask learners to provide evidence that they have taken and created appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used.
- Conduct investigations in a form equal with the nature of any malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Dean of Academics, Quality Nominee and IV. It will proceed through the following stages:
 - Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.
 - Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against the judgement made.
 - Document all stages of any investigation.
- Ensure the handling of individual cases takes account of the needs of the individual, including those arising from protected characteristics.

Expectations:

All learners are expected to:

- Avoid sharing their work (electronic or physical) with another learner.
- Avoid sharing passwords with other learners.
- Only submits work for assessment that is their own original work.

All assessors/teachers are expected to:

- Declare conflict of interest.
- Keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.
- Work within the professional teaching standards in relation to assessment practices.
- Check for malpractice/maladministration when assessing or moderating work.
- Comply with awarding bodies procedures.

All centre staff are expected to:

- Declare conflict of interest.
- Comply with awarding bodies procedures.

Examples of Malpractice/Maladministration by Learners:

This list is not thorough and other instances of malpractice/maladministration may be considered by the college;

- Plagiarism of any nature.
- Collusion refers to collaborating with other learners to create work that is then submitted as an individual learner's work.
- Careful 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.
- Inappropriate behavior during an internal or external assessment that causes disruption to others. This includes shouting and/or aggressive behavior or language and having an unauthorized electronic device that causes a disturbance in the examination room.
- Inclusion of inappropriate, offensive, discriminatory or obscene material in assessment evidence. This includes vulgarity and swearing that is outside of the context of the assessment, or any material of a discriminatory nature.
- Unauthorized aids - physical possession of unauthorized materials (including mobile phones, electronic devices, etc.) in the examination room, unless a concession has been agreed in advance.
- Misuse or incorrect referencing of AI tool – see section below on Misuse of AI.

Examples of Malpractice/Maladministration by assessors:

This list is not comprehensive and other instances of malpractice/maladministration may be considered by the college,

- Improper assistance to candidates.
- Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Failure to provide information on 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, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment.
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves assessors producing work for the student.
- 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 student's own to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- Misusing the condition for Special Learner requirements e.g. support.
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
- Failure to comply with awarding organizations procedures for managing and transferring accurate learner data.
- Knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments including the use of AI.

Examples of Malpractice/Maladministration by Centre Staff:

- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the condition for Special Learner requirements e.g. support.
- 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.
- Failure to comply with awarding organizations procedures for managing/transferring and storing accurate learner data.
- Failure to distribute certificates.

AI use in Assessments:

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications. The misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

A learner must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both safeguarding that the final product is in their own words, and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and the learner is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work 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.

How to use and reference AI Tools in line with the regulations:

It is essential that sources which are used are referenced when producing work for an assessment. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments.

If a learner uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the learner and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, learner should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used. In addition, the AI used must also be acknowledged and learner must show clearly how they have used it. Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student’s acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2023.

The learner must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot), and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

Reporting alleged malpractice/maladministration:

All college staff have a responsibility for reporting any alleged malpractice/maladministration of staff to their Quality Nominee or Dean of Academics.

- Alleged malpractice/maladministration may be reported to the college by awarding bodies.
- The college will consider allegations that are made verbally but will request in all cases that allegations are put in writing with any supporting evidence that is available.

Investigations:

All investigations will adhere to the following principles:

- **Confidentiality** – by their very nature investigations usually necessitate access to information that is confidential to a Centre or individuals. All material collected as part of an investigation must be kept secure.
- **Impartiality** - investigations will be undertaken by a nominated investigating officer and assessed against the specific facts/evidence of the case in arriving at a decision about intention and culpability.
- **Rights of individuals** – where an individual is alleged of malpractice/maladministration they should be informed of the allegation made against them (preferably in writing) and the evidence that supports the allegation. They should be provided with the opportunity to consider their response to the allegation and submit a written statement or seek advice if they wish to. They should also be informed of what the possible consequences could be if the malpractice/maladministration is proven and of the possibility that other parties may be informed e.g., the regulators, the police, the funding agency and professional bodies. The appeals process should also be communicated to them.
- **Staff Interviews** - these interviews should be carried out in line with the college's Staff Disciplinary Policy and Procedure. College staff may request that they are accompanied by a friend or colleague.
- **Candidate Interview** – a learner may request that they are accompanied by a friend or colleague.
- **Retention and storage of evidence and records** – all relevant documents and evidence should be retained in line with awarding organizations policy and procedures.
- **Decisions and action plans** – all conclusions should be based on evidence. A course of proposed action should be identified, agreed between the college and awarding organizations.
- **Proportionality** – any decision on the outcome must reflect the weight of evidence and the nature of the case – the staff member or learner does not have to admit malpractice.
- **Sanctions** – any sanctions applied should be proportionate to the extent of maladministration/malpractice identified (and evidenced) during the investigation.

Investigation of alleged malpractice/maladministration by assessors/center staff:

If malpractice/maladministration is alleged by assessors/center staff there will be a process of investigation, commissioned by the Dean of Academics and Quality Nominee to establish the full facts and circumstances of any allegations or evidence.

The Quality Nominee and Dean of Academics will nominate an investigating officer. To avoid conflicts of interest investigations into alleged malpractice/maladministration should not be delegated to the Lead IV, team or Program Lead involved in the alleged malpractice. Any disciplinary investigation will proceed as described in the College's Staff Disciplinary Policy and Procedures, and include provision for:

- The member of staff to be informed about the concerns and possible consequences.
- Possible suspension depending on the circumstances of the case.
- The member of staff to be allowed to be accompanied to interviews.
- Collection of evidence related to the alleged malpractice/maladministration.
- The review of evidence and production of a report.
- A decision to be made on whether or not to proceed to a formal disciplinary hearing.
- If necessary, a formal hearing with a right of representation.

Possible actions taken by the College:

In cases where it is believed, following an investigation and hearing, that there is clear evidence of malpractice/maladministration:

- The appropriate awarding organizations will be informed by the college of the malpractice and they will be given the supporting evidence.
- The college may take internal disciplinary action in line with staff disciplinary committee. This action will be equivalent with the seriousness of the malpractice/maladministration.

Investigation of alleged malpractice/maladministration by learner:

If malpractice/maladministration is alleged by learner there will be a process of investigation undertaken by the nominated investigator to establish the full facts and circumstances of any allegations or evidence.

Investigations will proceed through the following stages:

- The learner will be informed about the issues, possible consequences and right of appeal.
- The learner may be requested to give a written initial statement in the case of external assessment which can be reviewed in line with malpractice procedure.
- Collection of evidence related to the alleged malpractice/maladministration.
- The review of evidence and production of a report.
- A formal interview between the program lead and the learner against whom an allegation has been made.

Possible actions taken by the College

In cases where it is believed that there is clear evidence of malpractice/maladministration:

- The appropriate awarding organizations will be informed by the College of the malpractice/maladministration and they will be given the supporting evidence.
- Assessors and centre staff have the right to appeal against the decision and/or any penalty imposed as a result of a malpractice/maladministration investigation through the staff disciplinary policy process. A learner has the right to appeal against the decision and/or any penalty imposed as a result of a malpractice/maladministration investigation directly to Quality Nominee, Dean of Academics and centre. Appeals should be made within 20 working days of the date they were notified of the decision detailing the fact that they are appealing and their grounds for doing so. Appeals will be dealt with within 20 working days.

Links

Malpractice and Plagiarism:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/exams/examinationguidance/malpractice.html>

Reporting Suspected Malpractice:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/contact-us/students/reporting-suspected-malpractice.html>

Internal Verification Policy – BTEC Qualifications

Aims of the Policy:

- To ensure there is a Programme Lead 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, College will:

- Where required by the qualification, an appropriate Lead Internal Verifier is appointed for each subject area, is registered with Pearson and has undergone the relevant standardization processes.
- Each Lead Internal Verifier/Program Lead 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 and Internal Verification is promoted as a developmental process between staff.
- Standardized 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 conform to national standards.
- Secure records of all Internal Verification activity are maintained.
- The outcome of Internal Verification is used to enhance future assessment practice.

Staff Involved (External):

- SSV Senior Standards Verifier SV
- Standards Verifier

iQualify UK Staff (Internal):

- Head of Centre (HOC)
- Quality Nominee (QN)
- Examinations Officer (EO)
- Assessors
- Programme Leader (PL)
- Internal Verifier (IV)
- Lead Internal Verifier (LIV)

Registration Status :

- Lead Internal Verifier (LIV) Registrations

IV Schedules:

We recommend that all BTEC programmes have an ‘internal verification plan’ at the start of the course/unit to identify an appropriate sample size. This will be based on risk factors such as:

- Standards verification feedback about the unit or assessor in previous years
- Assessor experience
- Whether the unit has been delivered before
- Any significant changes to the delivery of the unit

To deal with issues that are subject to potential change, teams may need to reflect on the sample once delivery and assessments have commenced.

A Lead IV/Internal Verifier/Programme Lead, should become aware of a range of issues that may need to be taken into account when it comes to selecting an internal verification sample such as:

- Grades awarded by assessors
- Student feedback
- Staff issues such as absence or role changes
- Feedback obtained at Quality Management Review or other Pearson quality assurance processes

Once assessment has taken place and assessment decisions have been made, it is possible to choose to change the number of students sampled for internal verification. For example, if a group has been awarded high grades it may be judged appropriate to increase the number of students sampled for these grades.

Lead IV Registration:

When a unit or assignment is delivered and assessed by more than one person, standardization should be implemented before any formal assessment and internal verification has taken place. The standardization process is to agree the standard of student work by discussing and mutually assessing a sample of student work to reach a consensus. This should be done with reference to the assessment criteria and assessment guidance provided by Pearson in the qualification specification.

Once agreement has been reached, the Assessors can then individually assess the work for their appointed students, after which internal verification will take place. Standardization can also be used as a staff development tool. We provide standardization materials for each principal subject area, where the Lead Internal Verifier can access work via the VLE. Further details are to be available via a staff briefing / annual updating. iQualify UK, as a college, uses Academic Leadership teams as the starting point for dissemination to teams of any changes or updates to Pearson qualifications. This may include updates instigated by the Pearson Centre.

IV of Assignments

The Internal Verifier should check that the assignment brief:

- Has accurate unit and programme details
- Has clear deadlines and an appropriate timeframe for assessment
- Has a suitable vocational scenario or context
- Shows all relevant assessment criteria for the unit(s) covered in the assignment
- Indicates relevant assessment criteria targeted against each task
- Clearly states what evidence the student needs to provide
- Is likely to generate evidence which is appropriate and sufficient

When it is planned to re-use an assignment from a previous academic year, dates and deadlines are checked to ensure these are updated to ensure the assignment is appropriate for a new group of students.

IV of Assessment Decisions

Lead Internal Verifiers should ensure that a suitable internal verification process is completed which is based on risk. This is to ensure support is provided to colleagues, when needed.

During the programme, sampling from Assessors must cover the following as a minimum:

- Every Assessor
- Every unit
- Work from every assignment
- Every assessment site (for multi-site and consortia centres)

There is no requirement that all students must have been internally verified during the lifetime of a programme.

There is no prescribed sample size but a well-constructed sample should consider:

- The full range of assessment decisions made, e.g. pass, merit, distinction criteria should all be included in the sample, where appropriate
- The experience of the Assessor, e.g. new or less experienced assessors should have more work internally verified than may be needed for an experienced assessor
- New BTEC programmes, e.g. when a unit or programme is first introduced, the sample size may be increased
- The size of the group of students
- Known issues with internal verification, where these have been identified

Internal Verifiers should use the general comments section on the form to provide advice and guidance to the Assessor, if appropriate. Any actions identified must be detailed by the Internal Verifier in the 'actions required' section. Internal Verifiers should make any actions clear, using Smart principles. The Internal Verifier reviews the Assessor's judgements against the learning aims, unit content, assessment criteria and assessment guidance as published in the qualification specification.

This will include checking:

- The student work against the assessment criteria and judge whether it has been assessed accurately
- The assessment criteria. This represents the national standard, and all BTEC students are measured against it
- Coverage of the unit content in conjunction with the assessment guidance to see if the Assessor has taken this into account. It is not a requirement of the unit specification that all the content is assessed. However, the indicative content will need to be covered in a

programme of learning for students to be able to meet the standard determined in the assessment and grading criteria

- The feedback from Assessor to student is accurate and linked to the assessment criteria

Following internal verification, if there are any assessment concerns, feedback should be provided to the Assessor with any actions applied to the whole cohort and not just the sampled students. If an action is identified by the Internal Verifier, the Assessor must complete this and return it to the Internal Verifier for sign-off prior to an Assignment being issued to students.

If a request for a resubmission is made, and providing there have been no issues with the Assessor's decisions at the first submission stage, then the resubmission does not need to be internally verified if the student's grade has not improved. However, the Lead Internal Verifier should check the decisions if the student's grade has shown improvement to safeguard against any potential malpractice issues. Completing best practice internal verification at the first submission stage should avoid issues around resubmission.

Maintenance of IV Records:

iQualify UK expects the Internal Verifier and Lead Internal Verifier to keep records of all decisions and subsequent actions. Internal verification documentation, along with the assessment tracking documents should be stored securely for a minimum of three years after the date of certification. Student work must be retained for 12 weeks after the date of certification.

Standards Verification:

Pearson allocate a Standards Verifier, who is a subject expert, to conduct sampling of assessment instruments and assessed student work in order to provide judgements and feedback. Standards Verifiers support the college in identifying good practice and areas for further development, giving teachers guidance on how they can improve their assessment.

If the Pearson Standards Verifier concludes that students have not demonstrated the standard outlined in the specification through their work, the college will agree actions that need to be completed before Pearson will be able to issue certificates to our students. This will include providing a second sample to show that the college has responded to the Standards Verifier's feedback. The process for Standards Verification may be slightly different depending on the type of programme delivered.

Reference Documents:

Further information can be found on the Pearson BTEC Website under the Support tab:

- BTEC Quality Assurance Centre Guide
- BTEC Centre Guide to Internal Verification
- BTEC Centre Guide to Standards Verification
- BTEC Centre Guide for Lead Internal Verifiers
- Assessment & verification tools/ template.

Contingency and Adverse Effect Policy

Aims:

This policy is designed to ensure a consistent and effective response in the event of major disruption to the course delivery and assessment system affecting significant numbers of learners. The plan will be implemented in the event of major disruption to the educational system, such as widespread illness, travel disruption, bad weather or power failures. Any actions taken will be subject to the advice of the official agencies dealing with the specific circumstances being faced.

Implementing the plan will safeguard the interests of learners while maintaining the integrity of the assessment system and safeguarding qualification standards. The contingencies applied will be selected based on the context of the disruption.

The priority when implementing contingencies will be to maintain the following principles:

- Delivering courses to published timetables.
- Delivering assessments to published timetables.
- Delivering results to published timetables.
- Complying with regulatory requirements in relation to assessment, marking and standards.

Communication:

- In the event of local disruption, communication to tutors and learners will take place through the administration teams following agreement with the Executive Director.
- In the event of major disruption, details of specific contingencies agreed across organizations involved in the examinations process will be confirmed and proactively communicated to relevant stakeholders.
- This includes communications between the organizations involved in the response and communications to stakeholders, such as centres, candidates, parents, and the public.
- The Centre is committed to:

- sharing timely and accurate information as required to meet the aims of the plan.
- communicating with stakeholders so they are aware of disruption and contingency measures being implemented and any actions required of them as a result.
- ensuring that any messages are clear and accurate.

Key Risks and Associated Actions:

Key Risks	Associated Actions
Teaching staff extended absence	Arrange alternative teaching staff within the institution concerned at the earliest opportunity.
Learners extended sickness	Learners will have opportunity to defer their study or re-sit any portion of the learning and assessment process that they miss.
Lack of appropriately trained and qualified assessor or IV and their absence	Keep abreast of the planning, hiring, training, etc. of all assessors at least 2 weeks prior to the course start and arrange alternative staff as necessary.
Lack of appropriate rooms or main venues unavailable at short notice	Liaise with the external partner organizations to make use of their spaces.
Failure of IT systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Maintain secured backup for all types of assessment and feedback ● Support learners with printing versions of the course materials during class time. ● Liaise with the Awarding body to let them know about the failure of the system and get help from their contingency plan.

<p>Disruption of teaching time/ Centre closed for an extended period</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate with learners about the potential for disruption to teaching time and plans to address this. • Establish liaison between tutors and learners so that learner can make correspondence with tutor and get course materials and submit assignments online. • Arrange alternative teaching space at partner venue
<p>Assessment evidence is not available to be marked (large scale damage or destruction)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce this risk, active scripts remain on site for the absolutely minimum time. • It is the responsibility of the Head of Centre to communicate this immediately to the relevant awarding organization(s) and subsequently to learners.
<p>Centre unable to distribute results as normal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact to be made immediately to the awarding bodies about alternative options. • Contact to be made immediately to the learners explaining the situation.
<p>Withdrawal of Qualifications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Centre is committed to putting the interests of learners first and undertakes to take all reasonable steps to protect the interests of learners should a qualification or unit be withdrawn for whatever reason and by whichever body. The Centre will make every effort to ensure that learners are not registered onto qualifications that are due to be withdrawn before the date that learners could reasonably be expected to complete the qualification. Where there appear to be learners unlikely to complete prior to the qualification end date, The Centre will take all reasonable steps to identify an alternative qualification, or for an alternative Centre and to make the necessary transfers and other arrangements in order to enable the learners to achieve the qualification, wherever reasonably possible.

BTEC Appeals Policy

Aims of this Policy are:

- To advise a learner appealing against an assessment decision.
- To support reaching an agreement when there is an assessment dispute between the learner and the assessor, and to do so at the earliest opportunity.
- To standardise and record any appeal, ensuring openness and fairness.
- To facilitate a learner's ultimate right of appeal to the awarding body, and protect the interests of all learners and the integrity of the qualification.

The Appeals Policy

We ensure that:

- Internal assessments are conducted by members of the assessors' 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 BTEC Awarding Body for the subject concerned.
- The consistency of internal assessment will be maintained by internal verification and standardisation.
- All learners' work assessed by assessors' staff for external qualifications is carried out fairly, consistently and in accordance with the rules and regulations of the specification relating to the qualification(s).

BTEC Appeals Procedure

- 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 in to review the original decision.
- An appeal should be made in writing stating the details of the complaint and the reasons for the appeal, and within 7 working days of receiving the feedback and grade for the work in question.
- The assessors 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 5 working days.
- The Lead Internal Verifier will decide on the grading and give written feedback to both the Learner and the assessors involved within a further 3 working days.
- Learners raising the appeal will have an opportunity for a personal hearing if they are not happy with the written response received.
- The learners will be given reasonable notice of the hearing date and should have sight of all relevant documents for the case in advance of the hearing. When learners present their own case, they are allowed to bring along a carer/friend. The assessor and learner will have the opportunity to hear each other's submission to the panel at the hearing.
- The panel will be comprised of a Lead Internal Verifier from another subject area, the Quality Nominee and the Exams officer.
- 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 on record for 18 months and the Learner will also receive a hard copy.
- The College will inform the awarding body if there is any change to an internally assessed grade as a result of an appeal.

BTEC Assessment Policy

Assessment Procedures

Assignment Design / Assignment Brief

We shall use the Pearson assignments where possible and if it is required, context may be changed to a local context. All assignments will be discussed with the Lead Internal Verifier and any changes will be approved. The assignments will be created in MyBTEC and sent for verification by the Lead Internal Verifier for the subject at least two weeks before the assignment is due to be issued to students to allow for any feedback to be actioned by the assessor. The Lead Internal Verifier will verify the assignment on MyBTEC must be completed before it is issued to students.

Assessment Plans

Assessment Plans are to be created in MyBTEC at the start of the academic year for the students entering in HN year 1. These must be verified by the Lead Internal Verifier before the session starts. The assessment plan for HN Year 2 students should be revisited at the start of the academic year on MyBTEC and any changes made. The changes must be verified by the Lead Internal Verifier before the session.

Assessment

Assessments will be issued to learners by the class teacher (assessor) on the date agreed with the Lead Internal Verifier, as laid out in the assessment plan. In case of a learner's absence, a note will be made and the next available opportunity will be used to issue the assignment to the previously absent student. Following the current guidelines, assessments must be handed out when learners are physically in college.

Assessment Recording / Tracking for Learners

The paperwork will be completed for each learner, this includes:

- The assignment with deadlines.
- Learners' authentication declaration.
- Assessment record.
- Record of Activity.
- Lead Internal Verifier Declaration.

These must be available for the Quality Nominee to check throughout the academic year.

When the work is submitted, the assessor will:

- Record the assessment result and confirm achievement against specific assessment criteria.
- Confirm the evidence submitted is authentically the learner's own work.
- Confirm the assessment criteria the learner has and has not achieved (explaining the reasons for this decision).

Using the Assessment Record, the feedback given to students should include:**Achievement:**

- Which assessment criteria the learner has achieved and what the learner has done well.
- Which assessment criteria the learner has not achieved and what was missing.

Guidance:

- Information or guidance available to the learner they could have drawn on (e.g. class notes; handouts; resources in Assignment Brief etc.).
- General behavior and conduct, approach and grammar.

Resubmission/Retakes:

The Lead Internal Verifier may authorize one opportunity to resubmit evidence for each assignment if they identify that:

- The learner has met all the initial deadlines or agreed extensions.
- It is judged that the learner will be able to provide improved evidence without further specific guidance.
- It has been confirmed that the evidence originally submitted was authentically the learner's own work.

Resubmission will be agreed with the Lead Internal Verifier for the subject and the dates agreed on the assessment plan will be followed:

- The decision of the Lead IV will be recorded on the assessment form.
- A resubmission deadline will be set within 15 working days of the learner receiving the original assessment decision (within the same academic year, within term time). This needs to be checked against the original assessment plan.
- If the grade has not improved then no internal verification needs to take place.
- If the grade has improved, the Lead Internal Verifier needs to check the decisions made, the deadline is set on the assessment plan in MyBTEC.

If a student is eligible for a retake:

A new task or assignment is set targeted only at the Pass Criteria not achieved in the original assignment. The assessor cannot award a merit or distinction grade for a retake.

- The same procedure for submission and authentication of evidence is followed.
- Standards Verifiers will need to see evidence of retakes in sampling.
- Normally, no further submissions or retakes are allowed after this attempt.