

**The London Institute of Banking & Finance Code of Practice for Quality Assurance
(Higher Education)**

Chapter 7: Assessment

7.1 Introduction

The London Institute of Banking & Finance recognises that the assessment outcomes associated with its awards in terms of the achievement of students against published standards may be used for a variety of different purposes, for example:

- i. diagnostic
- ii. feedback upon learning
- iii. certification
- iv. selection
- v. public accountability

by a range of different stakeholders, including:

- i. students
- ii. academic community
- iii. public educational and funding bodies
- iv. employers

The London Institute of Banking & Finance has, therefore, devised, and reviews at regular intervals, the learning, teaching and assessment strategy. The strategy informs and underpins the design, development and implementation of delivery of assessment for The London Institute of Banking & Finance awards. The strategy is reviewed and monitored by the Learning and Teaching Committee with any changes recommended to the Academic Board.

7.2 The Principles

7.2.1 Assessment should be integral to curriculum design and review

7.2.1.1 The use of assessment, both formative and summative, is an essential part of the learning process and needs to be undertaken in a secure manner throughout the process.

7.2.1.2 Formative assessment helps identify how well students are progressing and what they could do to improve, whilst summative assessment is more concerned with measuring students' level of achievement against intended learning outcomes.

7.2.1.3 Whilst learning outcomes describe, in terms of breadth and level, the learning to be achieved within a module or programme, and are thus fundamental to any curriculum development activity, it is equally important that this learning can be measured and reported.

7.2.1.4 Thus the development of the summative assessment to measure achievement of the learning outcomes for a given module or programme must be concurrent and integrated with the development of the

learning outcomes as part of the module specification. Where appropriate, this may involve different stakeholders, eg employers in the development of the assessment of work based activities.

7.2.1.5 For both formative and summative assessments, the assessment tools used should be chosen carefully so as to provide evidence of performance against the intended learning outcomes, thus maximising the validity of the assessment by measuring the knowledge and skills expected to have been learnt. The full range of assessment tools are to be considered, ie written examination, objective testing, short response items, essay questions, data response questions, case studies, dissertations / project work, coursework assignments, workplace assessment / observation etc.

7.2.1.6 Furthermore, the development of assessment as part of the curriculum design process should take into account the impact that assessment has on the learning; it should aim to encourage meaningful learning and not simply allow assessment to drive the learning process.

7.2.2 The basis on which assessment and grading is carried out must be transparent to stakeholders, and in line with The London Institute of Banking & Finance General and Academic Regulations for Students

7.2.2.1 Whilst the achievement of learning in its own right is fundamental to any learning activity, the influence of assessment on learning cannot be ignored. Evidence suggests that assessment is a key factor in determining the approach that students take to learning.

7.2.2.2 Furthermore, in the interests of fairness, students (and their lecturers) have a right to know the manner in which they will be assessed and the criteria which will be used in making judgments regarding their achievements.

7.2.2.3 Consequently, students and lecturers must be provided with the assessment and / or grading criteria which will be used when assessing their work in order that they can recognise what is important in the assessment.

7.2.2.4 Opportunities must also be provided for students and lecturers to understand the application of such assessment criteria in order to reinforce their understanding of the requirements and standards associated with positive achievement.

7.2.2.5 Information regarding the weightings and contribution of different assessment criteria / components to the final assessment for a module is to be published within the module and / or programme specifications so as to allow students to make informed decisions regarding allocation of learning effort.

7.2.2.6 Students must also be provided with information regarding the process / timing of assessment and the assessment instruments to be used for a given module and / or programme, in order to prepare appropriately and reduce potential anxiety.

7.2.2.7 Finally, it is essential that the nature, processes and criteria applied during assessment are consistent with those published and therefore expected by students and other stakeholders. All processes relating to assessment and grading are monitored by the Faculty Support team to ensure that they are fair to students and consistent with published criteria.

7.2.3 The academic quality and standards on which awards are based must be clear and recognisable to all stakeholders

7.2.3.1 The academic currency and recognition of awards depend on those awards being based upon clear and well understood standards and benchmarks.

7.2.3.2 The assessment associated with awards should be designed to measure student achievement in a manner consistent with externally published standards and benchmarks, such as the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), subject benchmark statements, etc.

7.2.3.3 Clear and unambiguous programme specifications, which exhibit clear links to such benchmarks, and which make explicit the relationship between assessment and learning outcomes, must be available in the public domain so as to allow external stakeholders the opportunity to understand the breadth, depth and level of knowledge and skills associated with the achievement of a given award.

7.2.3.4 To engender confidence in the quality of the standards associated with an award, publicly defensible and transparent quality control and quality assurance systems must be implemented and maintained.

7.2.4 The design and implementation of assessment must seek to ensure fairness and avoid bias or opportunities for malpractice

7.2.4.1 All stakeholders need to have confidence in the outcomes of assessment. Students need to have certainty that their abilities are assessed fairly and purely on the basis of any work submitted for assessment; The London Institute of Banking & Finance needs to be sure that its qualifications are being awarded in a fair and consistent manner; whilst external stakeholders need to have confidence in the academic ability of holders of any given award.

7.2.4.2 As far as possible, all assessment decisions, from initial marking to the determination of final degree classifications, should be undertaken anonymously, without reference to the gender, colour, ethnic or national origin, race, disability, age, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, religious or political beliefs, family circumstances or other irrelevant distinction of the student.

7.2.4.3 Assessment activities must be designed and prepared to ensure that students are not disadvantaged as a result of their gender, colour, ethnic or national origin, race, disability, age, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, religious or political beliefs, family circumstances or other irrelevant distinction. Assessment arrangements should allow students with disabilities to demonstrate their true potential against the learning outcomes. The London Institute of Banking & Finance's [Equality and Diversity policy](#).

7.2.4.4 The language used within any assessment activity must be considered both in terms of the level and focus of the task being assessed and the wider context in which the assessment is placed.

7.2.4.5 The choice of assessment devices and procedures used in any situation must be made carefully so as to maximise both the validity and the reliability of the assessment, whilst also minimising opportunities for any form of malpractice, eg plagiarism.

7.2.4.6 In terms of validity (assessing what is meant to be assessed without undue bias), the choice should be strongly influenced by reference to the level of knowledge and skills described by the learning outcomes being assessed.

7.2.4.7 In terms of reliability (assessing consistently), careful consideration should be given to the choice of assessment devices and / or assessment related procedures, eg double marking or moderation systems for marking.

7.2.4.8 The opportunities for malpractice should be considered when developing assessment models and strategies for its avoidance investigated, eg balance of formal examinations vs. coursework, technology (eg use of plagiarism detection software), amount of collaborative work.

7.2.5 Assessment and grading should be criterion-referenced not norm-referenced.

7.2.5.1 In the interests of fairness, consistency of standards and transparency, the assessment and grading of students should be based upon how well they perform against common standards, eg FHEQ, defined by explicit assessment and grading criteria (criterion-referencing), rather than how well members of a specific cohort perform against each other (norm-referencing).

7.2.5.2 A criterion-referenced approach to assessment and grading:

- i. is fair to students in terms of establishing a common standard across cohorts which is independent of differences in ability across cohorts
- ii. provides a reference point over time for comparison of performance by stakeholders
- iii. allows for the identification and investigation of potential underlying issues which may impact upon performance and / or the maintenance of academic standards

7.2.5.3 An assessment and grading methodology based upon criterion-referencing must not be expected to yield identical performance data; it is reasonable to expect a measure of variance in performance between cohorts which may be evidenced by small differences in mark / grade distributions.

7.2.5.4 However, in a criterion-referenced system, major differences in mark / grade distributions, and / or emerging trends in performance, may be indicators of important underlying issues such as standards drift – (positive or negative) or changes in the quality of student learning that could be caused by a range of factors. Such issues may be less easily identified in a norm-referenced system.

7.2.6 Effective feedback and reporting mechanisms should apply to all assessment

7.2.6.1 In order to judge how well they are doing, and where they may need to improve, students need to receive effective feedback, upon the assessment of their performance, providing opportunity for reflection, consideration of professional practice and subject specific and educational scholarship. Feedback will be monitored against set criteria to ensure students receive consistent high standards of effective feedback for each piece of assessment. Students will also benefit from receiving feedforward to aid their development as they progress through their programme of study (Please refer to the [Assessment Feedback Policy](#)).

7.2.6.2 The nature of the feedback will depend upon the nature of the assessment, ie formative or summative, but, in each case, it needs to be prompt, clear and easily related to the learning outcomes (knowledge, skills etc) against which the student has been assessed.

7.2.6.3 The purpose of any feedback should be considered from the perspective of its usefulness to the student, in terms of content, style and promptness.

7.2.6.4 In order to be useful, feedback should be provided whilst the student is able to remember the assessment exercise and thus act upon any advice contained within the feedback. Thus rapid, less detailed feedback may be more appropriate than detailed feedback that takes a long time to prepare and communicate to the student. Expected turnaround times for students' results and feedback will be clearly communicated to students on their Virtual Learning Environment and within the student handbook. In the event of a delay with the marking, communication will be provided to students affected with a revised expected timeframe.

7.2.6.5 Feedback should be clearly relevant to the assessment task; should provide positive constructive advice and encouragement to students; be developmental and be recognisable against the assessment criteria and learning outcomes that the student was attempting to achieve.

7.2.6.6 More widely, all assessment activities should be monitored and reviewed in terms of their effectiveness in fairly and consistently assessing student performance.

7.2.7 Assessment should be designed to be effective in the light of the resources available and should avoid unnecessary overload on all those involved in the assessment process

7.2.7.1 Assessment plays an important part in the learning process, and therefore an appropriate amount of time and resource must be devoted to ensuring that assessment is efficient and effective.

7.2.7.2 However, excessive assessment can detract from both effective learning and teaching. Teaching may be too focused upon the demands of the assessment at the expense of true internalisation of the learning whilst, for students, excessive assessment can result in increased anxiety and a superficial approach to learning.

7.2.7.3 Assessment overload is, therefore, undesirable educationally, and the design of module or programme assessment should seek to use assessment instruments that can assess the required learning outcomes effectively at an appropriate level and without undue repetition.

7.2.7.4 To be effective, assessment must also be constructed in a manner that can both be appropriately resourced and is scalable in terms of physical, financial and human resources without compromising quality or academic standards.

7.2.7.5 The resource impacts of maintaining assessments in the face of widening diversity in the student body should also be considered when designing assessments, as should the provision of non-standard assessments for students with disabilities

7.3 Policy Guidelines

7.3.1 These guidelines apply to all taught programmes offered by The London Institute of Banking & Finance, at both undergraduate and postgraduate level.

7.3.2 These guidelines have been developed with reference to the QAA's Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B6: Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning.

7.3.3 These guidelines are implemented in line with the principles established within The London Institute of Banking & Finance assessment strategy.

7.3.4 These guidelines may be varied in the case of programmes awarded by a collaborative partner institution.

7.3.5 Everyone involved in the assessment of students is competent to undertake their roles and responsibilities. This competence is developed through initiatives such as the Academic Development programme, the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCHE), fellow / associate of the Higher Education Academy, ongoing examiner training and development and lecturer training for marking coursework assignments.

7.3.6 Everyone involved in the administration of assessment is provided with clear information detailing their roles, responsibilities and powers, which are consistent with the regulations provided to students.

7.3.7 All regulations pertaining to the assessment of students on matters such as conduct of examinations, deadlines for submission and malpractice are made clear to students at the start of their studies and on The London Institute of Banking & Finance website.

7.3.8 If any person involved in the assessment process, eg invigilator, marker, student, suspects that any form of malpractice may have occurred, that person should, in the first instance, and as soon as possible, bring the matter to the attention of the Head of Admissions and Operations. Such matters are dealt with as described in The London Institute of Banking & Finance Code of Practice [Chapter 9: Malpractice](#).

7.4 Design and Development of Assessment

7.4.1 The assessment regime associated with a module is clearly detailed within the module specification, which provides guidance regarding:

- i. The number of, and relative weighting across, the separate assessment components which contribute to the overall module assessment; and
- ii. The type of assessment used within each assessment component along with an indication of size, eg length of coursework assignments and duration of examinations.

7.4.2 The assessment regime associated with a module is designed to use appropriate assessment instruments that allow the measurement of the published learning outcomes for that module and provide every student with an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement.

7.4.3 The scheduling of the assessment associated with a programme, both overall and for each module, is designed and implemented to ensure an appropriate fit with the associated learning and teaching requirements of the programme / module.

7.4.4 All assessment regulations are reviewed periodically to ensure that assessment remains appropriate. Factors that may negate a review include: changes to the external environment or a change to the way that the programme is structured.

7.4.5 The design of assessment, both summative and formative, encourages assessment practice that promotes effective learning; this is exemplified by the mandatory coursework assignment at Level 4 and by the provision of formative and summative assignments at Levels 5, 6 and 7.

7.4.6 The procedures established for the setting of assessments are designed to ensure that the assessments presented to students are:

- i. consistent with the set of learning outcomes associated with the module;
- ii. in line with the reasonable expectations of students as generally based upon published guidance and previous examples;
- iii. appropriate in terms of the nature of the module and its academic standard;
- iv. technically accurate and presented clearly in appropriate language, both in terms of content and the examiner's requirements of students;
- v. consistent with published assessment criteria and / or grade descriptors; and
- vi. capable of completion within the timeframe allowed.

All assessments are subject to a rigorous moderation process that includes internal and external moderation from experts who are practitioners within the industry at a senior level and from academics in the field of study. This moderation process ensures that there is a consistently high standard of assessment throughout The London Institute of Banking & Finance's programmes which meet the above criteria.

7.4.7 As appropriate, clear guidance is provided to students with, or in advance of, any assessment on matters such as:

- a.
 - i. the duration of, and regulations applying to, formal examinations, weightings of assessments, date of examinations and coursework submission;
 - ii. the format, length, submission date and regulations applying to coursework, including penalties for late submission (if applicable);
 - iii. the requirements of the assessment task;

- iv. the nature of any supporting materials permitted in an examination;
 - v. the relevant assessment criteria, linkage to the QAA's FHEQ and Subject Benchmark Statement(s) (where applicable) and / or The London Institute of Banking & Finance grade descriptors;
 - vi. access to The London Institute of Banking & Finance policies and procedures on:
- b. Malpractice (see [Chapter 9: Malpractice](#) of the Code of Practice)
- c. Extenuating circumstances which include [reasonable adjustments](#) and [special considerations](#) (section 7.13); and
- d. Student appeals and complaints (see [Chapter 10: Student Complaints and Academic Appeals](#) of the Code of Practice).

7.4.8 All assessments are prepared at the same time as their associated marking schemes / assessment criteria.

7.4.9 Where there is more than one assessment component for a module, careful consideration is given to ensure that appropriate coverage of the syllabus is applied between assessments and is moderated consecutively.

7.4.10 All assessments are prepared in line with agreed procedures that must include a formal process of approval by the individual(s) ultimately responsible for the overall management of programmes at the level in question prior to their publication and / or use.

7.5 External Examiners

7.5.1 The external examiner for each programme and module (where relevant) is responsible for ensuring that all assessments are appropriate for the level of award and are fair to all students. More information on the role of the external examiners can be found in [Chapter 8: External Examining](#) of the Code of Practice.

7.5.2 Assessments set by internal examiners, together with their associated marking scheme / assessment criteria, and which contribute to a final award, are reviewed by an External Examiner. Assessments, completed by students and marked by internal examiners, are reviewed by the External Examiner.

7.6 Marking and Moderation of Assessment

7.6.1 All assessments are marked / moderated in line with the marking schemes / assessment criteria prepared and approved in conjunction with the assessment.

7.6.2 All assessments are marked / moderated in line with the [principles and procedures for The London Institute of Banking & Finance Assessment Boards](#) that include a formal process of approval by the module assessment board prior to the publication of confirmed results.

7.6.3 Every submitted piece of assessment will receive appropriate and timely feedback to students on assessed work that promotes learning and facilitates development but does not increase the burden of assessment.

7.6.4 All marking / moderation processes are numerically based, unless specifically identified to be simply Pass / Fail as appropriate.

7.6.5 Every submitted assessment that contributes towards a final award must either be double marked by an internal marker or subject to a process of internal moderation based upon second marking by a senior examiner of a defined and representative sample of submitted work chosen from across the mark range. The

first marker must clearly identify where marks have been awarded for the clarity of the second marker and the external examiner.

7.6.6 Where feasible and appropriate, scripts (whether examination or coursework) submitted for marking and moderation in respect of assessments contributing to the final overall grade for a module are anonymised such that those undertaking the marking have no knowledge of any student's personal details, eg name, age, nationality, gender, employer, or of any reasonable adjustments approved in advance of the assessment. Where it is not possible for scripts to be anonymised, this is clearly communicated.

7.6.7 Any adjustment to the marking of an internal examiner as a result of double marking or moderation should follow the procedures set down for the programme and level of award. These include a specification of the degree of difference in marks that must be referred, agreed and signed off, and to whom this referral must be made. Any mark changes or reconciliations between internal examiner and moderator (or first and second marker) must be clearly justified with a record retained of the process by which the revised mark has been reached.

7.6.8 The performance of individual markers and marking teams is monitored on a sessional basis within the Higher Education team and linked to any emerging trends in terms of mark distributions (by component and overall), relative contribution to overall award, etc.

7.6.9 Where the initial marking has not been carried out in line with the approved marking scheme / assessment criteria, and / or is inconsistent in terms of the academic standards applied, then all the affected work is remarked by another marker.

7.6.10 An archive of assessment tasks and student work is maintained for each assessment component across all modules so as to allow for monitoring of standards both between modules and over time. All assessed work is retained for a period of 7 years following the study period concerned.

7.6.11 If a request by a student for reasonable adjustments has been approved and implemented effectively, no further consideration is normally applied during the marking process.

7.6.12 If a request for extenuating circumstances has been received from a student, no account of the circumstances surrounding the request is normally taken during the marking of any assessment submitted by the student who may have been affected by those circumstances (see section 7.13 for procedures relating to extenuating circumstances).

7.7 Resit / Resubmission

7.7.1 All students will normally be provided with at least one opportunity either to resit or, where appropriate, (eg in respect of research projects, work-based learning etc) re-submit an assessment component failed at the first attempt.

7.7.2 All students at undergraduate level are permitted to retake a module in its entirety after failing the initial resit / resubmission, subject to the prevailing time limits. (see the [General and Academic Regulations](#) for further details)

7.7.3 Students at postgraduate level are not permitted to retake a module after failing the resit / resubmission attempt.

7.8 Award of Credit

7.8.1 The credits associated with a module are clearly stated in the module specification as well as in the relevant programme specification(s).

7.8.2 The requirements in terms of modules and / or credits at each level are explicitly documented in the programme specification and are made up of:

- i. The achievement of all core / compulsory modules at that level; and
- ii. The achievement of sufficient optional units to meet the overall credit requirements for that level.

7.8.3 The credits associated with a module are normally gained on passing that module; they cannot be subdivided and allocated to individual assessment components within the module.

7.8.4 The pass mark for a module is defined within the relevant module specification. Within a module, different pass thresholds may apply to particular assessment components.

7.8.5 Any penalties associated with failure, either for a particular assessment component or for a complete module, are made clear to students at the start of their studies together with the requirements and regulations associated with any opportunities available in terms of re-sits and / or re-submission.

7.8.6 Students should refer to the [General and Academic Regulations for Students](#) and / or programme specification for regulations relating to passing modules, the award of credit and progression to the next level of study (where relevant). Regulations relating to compensation and condonement are set out in the [General and Academic Regulations for Students](#).

7.9 Compensation

7.9.1 Where relevant to an undergraduate programme, and depending upon the nature and design of the assessment components for a module, a fail within 5% of the pass mark, on one assessment component may be compensated by good performance on the other assessment components within the module. Any such compensation arrangements, and minimum requirements for compensation, are clearly and explicitly documented in the [General and Academic Regulations for Students](#) or relevant programme and / or module specification.

7.9.2 At Level 7, a fail in one or more assessment component may be compensated by good performance on the other assessment components within the module. To be eligible for compensation, students must, in the examiner's academic judgement, have made a serious attempt at all assessment components within the module.

7.10 Condonement

7.10.1 Where relevant to a programme, modules may be achieved, and their associated credits awarded, for certain failed modules at a given level (condonement) on the basis of compensatory performance in the other modules at that level. The maximum number of credits which may be condoned at any given level is set out in the [General and Academic Regulations for Students](#) or relevant programme specification.

7.10.2 The acceptance of the award of credit via condonement may impact upon the type and / or classification of the award made to students should they complete the programme.

7.10.3 Compulsory and option modules within a programme will be eligible for condonement. Students must study and pass core modules. Regulations relating to condonement can be found in the [General and Academic Regulations for Students](#) (or programme specification, where relevant, for awards validated by a collaborative partner organisation).

7.11 Types and Classifications of The London Institute of Banking & Finance Awards

7.11.1 Classifications for each award can be found in the [General and Academic Regulations for Students](#) (or programme specifications for programmes awarded by a validating partner).

7.11.2 Aegrotat degrees are awarded at the discretion of the programme assessment board to any students who, because of extenuating circumstances beyond their control, and having exhausted all other reasonable solutions, are unable to complete all the assessment requirements of a programme. Further details can be found in the [General and Academic Regulations for Students](#).

7.12 Assessment Boards

7.12.1 At the end of each assessment session, The London Institute of Banking & Finance module assessment boards shall be run in accordance with their terms of reference, as stated in the [Principles and Procedures for Assessment Boards](#) document. The module assessment board considers the assessments of modules and takes into consideration data and feedback from a range of sources which include, but is not limited to:

- i. Analysis of detailed student performance data;
- ii. Lecturer and student feedback;
- iii. Examiner and / or second marker feedback; and
- iv. External Examiner feedback.

7.12.2 The module assessment board confirms the marks to be awarded for all modules on each programme.

7.12.3 The module assessment board also considers extenuating circumstances claims associated with the session and may:

- i. Approve additional attempts for the module and / or a programme time extension for the student; and
- ii. Flag the case for further consideration at the programme assessment board when considering the student's progression or classification of award.

7.12.4 The module assessment board also considers any cases of potential malpractice associated with the session and makes decisions according to The London Institute of Banking & Finance's Code of Practice (The London Institute of Banking & Finance [Chapter 9: Malpractice](#)).

7.12.5 Students may appeal against the decisions of the module assessment board in line with the Student Complaints and Academic Appeals policy as set out in [Chapter 10: Student Complaints and Appeals](#) of the Code of Practice.

7.12.6 All discussions at the module assessment board are confidential and are not disclosed to students without the approval of the Chair. Minutes are kept of all meetings of the module assessment board.

7.12.7 The programme assessment board shall be run in accordance with its terms of reference, as stated in the [Principles and Procedures for Assessment Boards](#) document.

7.12.8 All members of the programme assessment board are required to declare any possible conflicts of interest.

7.12.9 All discussions at the programme assessment board are confidential and not disclosed to students without the prior approval of the Chair. Minutes are kept of all meetings of the programme assessment board.

7.12.10 The programme assessment board normally meets at the end of each session associated with a programme. Dates are published and communicated to all attendees at the start of the year.

7.12.11 The programme assessment board exercises delegated authority for the academic standards of the programme under its authority and, in particular, for making decisions regarding student progression and / or classification of award.

7.12.12 When deciding on student progression and / or classification of award, the programme assessment board has the discretion to consider the overall performance profile of borderline students and / or to take into account additional evidence when considering their cases or those where students have been affected by extenuating circumstances.

7.12.13 Students may appeal against the decision of the programme assessment board in line with the Academic Appeals and Student Complaints policy of The London Institute of Banking & Finance's Code of Practice [Chapter 10: Student Complaints and Academic Appeals](#).

7.13 Extenuating Circumstances

7.13.1 The London Institute of Banking & Finance recognises that students might not be able to demonstrate their true level of ability during their assessment as a result of circumstances beyond their control (Please refer to the [Special Consideration Policy](#)).

7.13.2 Where such potential disadvantage can be identified prior to the assessment, it is addressed through the [Reasonable Adjustments policy](#). The London Institute of Banking & Finance recognises two major categories of special needs that may lead to the provision of reasonable adjustments:

- i. Permanent or long-standing disability, illness or special educational need, eg blindness, dyslexia; or
- ii. Temporary disability, illness or indisposition, eg broken arm, chronic pain.

7.13.3 The London Institute of Banking & Finance will endeavour to make appropriate arrangements prior to the assessment to mitigate the impact of the identified disadvantage.

7.13.4 Claims for cases of disadvantage that occur immediately before or during an assessment are addressed through Special Consideration and include;

- i. Circumstances which, whilst affecting the student's ability to perform to the best of his / he ability, are nonetheless beyond the control of The London Institute of Banking & Finance, eg accident, sudden illness on the day of the examination, family bereavement, external events with severe unforeseen impacts; and
- ii. Circumstances arising from aspects of the assessment process that are under the control of The London Institute of Banking & Finance, eg disruption within the assessment venue, incorrect information supplied to the student, technical difficulties with e-testing technology.

7.13.5 Students are made explicitly aware, at the start of their programme of study, both of the existence of the range of extenuating circumstances provision and where they can access detailed guidance regarding The London Institute of Banking & Finance policy and procedures for either type of extenuating circumstance.

7.13.6 Extenuating circumstances cases are not normally taken into consideration during the marking process. Any individual cases would need to be assessed and communicated to the Programme Assessment Board.

7.14 Reasonable Adjustments

7.14.1 Requests for Reasonable Adjustments must normally be supported by independent evidence of need and be submitted in sufficient time to allow the appropriate arrangements to be put in place.

7.14.2 When approving a request for Reasonable Adjustments The London Institute of Banking & Finance endeavours to implement a reasonable solution that is best suited to the student's individual needs, whilst maintaining academic standards.

7.14.3 In cases where Reasonable Adjustments are implemented effectively in response to a specific student request, no further compensation for the identified disadvantage is considered.

7.14.4 Fraudulent reasonable adjustment claims are considered as malpractice and The London Institute of Banking & Finance reserves the right to withdraw any award made as a result of assessments undertaken in such circumstances.

7.14.5 All cases of Reasonable Adjustments are reported to the module assessment board and the programme assessment board.

7.15 Special Consideration

7.15.1 Claims for [Special Consideration](#) must be fully supported by independent evidence.

7.15.2 Claims for Special Consideration must normally be notified to the Head of Operations and Registrations. Claims relating to examinations must be submitted within five working days of the assessment. Claims relating to written assignments must be submitted on or before the date of submission. **Please note that for part-time undergraduate student claims must be accompanied by an electronic copy of the assignment that has been completed at that date.**

7.15.3 In order to be considered in support of a Special Consideration claim, any evidence must normally be received within 28 days of the examination date / coursework submission date.

7.15.4 Claims for Special Consideration that are based upon the student acting against medical advice are not normally accepted.

7.15.5 Claims for Special Consideration are considered anonymously by the concessionary board and the outputs from this are shared with the module assessment board.

7.15.6 The minutes of both the module assessment board and the programme assessment board record any discussion of cases of extenuating circumstances.

7.15.7 Records of extenuating circumstances claims are maintained to allow monitoring of both the procedures and possible abuse by claimants.

7.16 Monitoring and Review

7.16.1 The procedures and guidelines contained within this Code of Practice are subject to regular monitoring within The London Institute of Banking & Finance and subsequent review by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, Learning and Teaching Committee and Academic Board.