

VOCATIONAL COURSE POLICY



ORIGINATOR: Oliver Teasel
SLT LINK: Robert Kerley

April 2026

CONTENTS

1. RATIONALE.....	1
2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	1
3. APPEALS	2
4. INTERNAL APPEALS.....	2
5. EXTERNAL APPEALS.....	2
6. PROTOCOL DOCUMENT.....	2
7. REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION.....	3
8. ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE INCLUDING THE MISUSE OF AI	3
9. INVESTIGATING ALLEGED MALPRACTICE.....	4
10. BLENDED LEARNING.....	5

1. RATIONALE

- 1.1 Within this policy, ‘we’ and ‘us’ means Harington School.
- 1.2 Courses run by the Leadership Skills Foundation (for example, Sports Leaders Award Level 3) form part of our Academic Enrichment programme on a Wednesday Afternoon. These courses are assessed through a combination of teacher-marked assignments, the completion of a portfolio and by running sporting events. The courses are respected and understood by employers, and Further and Higher Education providers.
- 1.3 This policy relates to all such vocational courses offered at Harington School during 2024/2027.
- 1.4 We have arrangements to keep strong course evidence securely for three years from the course start date.

2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 2.1 Roles and responsibilities chart for 2024/2027:

Centre Manager / Head of Centre – Oliver Teasel

Courses	Tutor	Internal Verifier	Assessor
Sports Leaders Award – Level 3	Oliver Teasel	Holly Jackson	Oliver Teasel

These roles are clearly defined by the Leadership Skills Foundation (LSF) and the above staff will complete the appropriate training before delivery of the courses commences.

3. APPEALS

- All of our students have the right to enquire, question or appeal against an assessment decision on a vocational qualification.
- We will attempt to resolve any disagreement about an assessment decision at the earliest opportunity and will follow a range of steps in order to achieve this.
- We will record any appeal to ensure openness and fairness. This will be done on the student tracking document.
- Where appropriate, we will facilitate a student's appeal to the awarding body. (Parents'/guardians' consent will be required as the students are under 18 years).
- At all times we will seek to uphold the integrity of the vocational qualifications.
- The appeals process will be communicated by the tutor to students at the start of the course as part of the introduction lesson.
- The Head of Centre will record, track and validate any appeal.
- Any appeals will be forwarded to the awarding body (LSF) when a student (with parents'/guardians' consent as the student is under 18) considers that a decision continues to disadvantage him/her after the internal appeals process has been exhausted.
- We will keep any appeals records for 3 years for inspection by the awarding body.
- We have a 3-stage internal appeals process.

4. INTERNAL APPEALS

4.1 Stage 1 – Informal:

The student consults with the allocated tutor within two weeks of receiving the internally verified assessment decision. If the student remains unhappy with the assessment decision it will be moved to Stage 2.

4.2 Stage 2 – Review:

The original assessment decision should be reviewed by the IV. The student will be notified of the outcome in writing with the findings and will have the opportunity to agree/disagree. If the student/parents disagree and the outcome remains unresolved, the appeal will move to Stage 3.

4.3 Stage 3 – Appeal Hearing:

The Senior Leadership Team member will hear the appeal in line with our appeals protocol (as students are under 18 years of age they must provide a letter from a parent/guardian). If at this stage the appeal remains unresolved, the Head of Centre will contact the awarding body and request an external appeal.

5. EXTERNAL APPEALS

5.1 The Head of Centre will contact the awarding body. All grounds for appeal by the student and all supporting documentation must be submitted by us to the awarding body within 14 days of the completion of Stage 3.

5.2 The Head of Centre needs to take appropriate action to protect the interests of other students and the integrity of the qualification if at any stage the outcome of an appeal questions the validity of other students' results.

6. PROTOCOL DOCUMENT

6.1 We do not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice by students, staff or other stakeholders in connection with any assessments and certification. We will impose disciplinary proceedings where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice have been proven. Where assessment malpractice is proven, awarding bodies may also be informed and may choose to impose penalties or sanctions.

7. REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 As stated above, students will be informed of our protocol on assessment malpractice and plagiarism during course induction. Students will be shown the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information including websites. We will use assessment procedures which reduce the opportunity for malpractice including, for example:

- Periods of controlled sessions during which evidence for assessments is produced by the student.
- Altering assessment assignments/task/tools on a regular basis.
- Establishing that members of staff (Assessor and IV) are responsible for checking the validity of the student's work.
- Building in oral sessions to check student's understanding, skills and knowledge of their presented material.
- Ensuring access controls are installed to prevent students from accessing and using other people's work when using networked computers.
- Students should make a written declaration that their work is their own when submitting assessments – see student booklet.

7.2 Incidents of student assessment malpractice should be reported to the Head of Centre.

7.3 If the malpractice is discovered after the awarding body declaration sheet has been signed, the incident should also be reported to the awarding body.

7.4 Incidents of staff assessment malpractice should be reported to the Head of School or his/her nominated representative.

7.5 When a case of alleged assessment malpractice has been reported, the incident should be investigated using the appropriate disciplinary procedure for staff or student. The alleged incident should be reported to the awarding body as appropriate at the earliest opportunity by the Head of Centre.

8. ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE INCLUDING THE MISUSE OF AI

8.1 Assessors and tutors are responsible for preventing the misuse of AI. They must clearly inform students whether AI tools are permitted in any component of the subject and, if so, how any use of AI should be referenced in accordance with the requirements of that qualification. Teaching staff must provide clear guidance on what is deemed as malpractice, including but not limited to AI misuse, plagiarism and collusion. Students must be guided on how to avoid committing malpractice. Malpractice procedures will be communicated by assessors to students at the start of the course as part of the induction lesson.

8.2 AI misuse occurs when a student uses AI tools when not allowed or fails to acknowledge the use of an AI tool in any material it has produced. AI misuse is considered malpractice and may lead to disciplinary action, including possible disqualification from the subject. Teaching staff will identify potential AI misuse using guidance outlined in JCQ's AI Use in Assessments.

https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/AI-Use-in-Assessments_Apr25_FINAL-1.pdf

8.3 Assessment malpractice including the use of AI, consists of those acts which undermine the integrity and validity of assessment, the certification of qualifications and/or damage of authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment certification. This protocol relates to malpractice in any assessment and certification context, and sets out the rights and responsibilities with regard to malpractice of students and staff.

8.4 The following are examples of malpractice by students. This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by us at our discretion.

- Plagiarism by copying and passing off, as the student's own, the whole or part(s) of another person's work, including artwork, images, words, computer generated work (including internet sources), thoughts, inventions and/or discoveries, whether published or not, with or without the originator's permission and without appropriately acknowledging the source.
- Using a prohibited AI tool.
- Collusion by working collaboratively with others to produce work that is submitted as individual student work.
- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another.
- Fabrication of results or evidence.
- Failing to abide by instructions.
- Misuse of assessment and/or examination material.
- Introduction of unauthorised material.
- Alteration of any results document.
- Cheating to gain an unfair advantage.

8.5 The following are examples of malpractice by staff. This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by us at our discretion.

- Failing to keep confidential assessment mark schemes secure.
- Alteration of assessment mark scheme.
- Alteration of awarding bodies' assessment and grading criteria.
- Assisting students 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 staff producing work for the student.
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated.
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff not to be the student's own, to be included in the student's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- Misusing the conditions of special access arrangements.
- Failing to keep student files secure – electronic or otherwise.
- Falsifying records/certificates or obtaining unauthorised access to assessment/examination/test material prior to an assessment/examination/test.

9. INVESTIGATING ALLEGED MALPRACTICE

9.1 When dealing with alleged malpractice, the Head of Centre or the nominated representative will:

- Deal with the alleged malpractice in an open and fair manner.
- Involve the student and others in the investigation process. This may occur, for example, when a student's account of events is inconsistent with that of the centre.
- During the investigation period the release of results/certificates may be withheld, with the permission of the awarding body, pending the outcome of the investigation.

9.2 The Head of Centre or the nominated representative will carry out an investigation into allegations of malpractice. Investigations into any alleged malpractice against the Head of Centre will normally be conducted by the Executive Principal or the Chair of the Governing Body or an appointed nominee.

9.3 If we discover or suspect anyone of malpractice, we will make the accused fully aware, in writing, at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven. If this relates to a student, his/her parent/guardian must also be informed.

- The accused will be given the opportunity to respond, in writing, to the allegations made.
- The accused will also be informed of the avenues for appealing should a judgment be made against them.
- A record of the investigation and outcome of the alleged practice will be retained, in line with staff and student disciplinary policies.

10. BLENDED LEARNING

Staff responsible for the implementation of vocational programmes will:

- Ensure classwork is placed on One Drive and Show My Homework (SMHW) platform for students requiring to work remotely.
- Ensure that teaching/delivery/assessment staff are timetabled to support blended learning when students are working remotely.
- Ensure there is a process to manage feedback on assignments, questions are constructively answered, and feedback is provided in a timely manner.
- Ensure the setting of assignments is undertaken in the face-to-face sessions and that deadlines are clear.
- Ensure that when students submit work, measures are taken to ensure the work is authentic and has been completed by the student.
- Maintain and securely store all assessment and internal verification records in accordance with LSF requirements.