

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

**Chapter 9: Malpractice**

**9.1 General principles**

**9.1.1** These guidelines apply to all taught programmes offered by The London Institute of Banking & Finance, at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. They may be varied in the case of programmes which form part of a dual or joint award delivered collaboratively with a partner institution. For dual / joint awards, the involvement of the academic partner may be sought at any point during the investigation of an alleged case of malpractice.

**9.1.2** All cases of malpractice will be dealt with fairly. Clear reasons for decisions taken should be given, and those making such decisions must be unbiased.

**9.1.3** Malpractice is defined as:

'Any act or omission, intentional or otherwise, by a student or other individual or organisation involved in the delivery of a programme, to gain improper advantage in any way by infringement of rules or through deception or fraudulent means; or any attempt to assist another student to gain improper advantage or to cause direct or indirect disruption to the studies and / or assessment of other students following The London Institute of Banking & Finance programmes.'

**9.1.4** The London Institute of Banking & Finance is responsible for ensuring that students, other individuals or organisations involved in the delivery of a programme have access to its rules and regulations regarding malpractice, and that they are provided with appropriate guidance to enable them to avoid committing malpractice.

**9.1.5** It is the student's responsibility to ensure that they understand the rules regarding malpractice and seek advice and guidance as needed to ensure that they avoid committing malpractice.

**9.1.6** Acts of malpractice are not acceptable in any circumstances. Where such acts are shown to have occurred, an appropriate penalty will always be enforced.

**9.1.7** The London Institute of Banking & Finance will investigate all cases of failure to abide by its regulations that might constitute malpractice in the same manner except that where a case is reported anonymously; an investigation will only proceed if the information provided establishes a prima facie case.

**9.1.8** In line with the obligation imposed in respect of the assessment process ([Chapter 7, Assessment](#)), it is incumbent upon any stakeholder aware of a suspected case of malpractice to bring it to the attention of The London Institute of Banking & Finance.

**9.2 Acts that constitute malpractice**

**9.2.1 By students**

Malpractice can take a number of forms including, but not limited to, the following examples:

- i. Obtaining assessment material without authorisation;
- ii. Copying from the work of another student or knowingly allowing a student to copy from their own work;

- iii. Colluding with another student or individual, by any means, to complete an assessment unless in situations where collaboration is specifically authorised within the assessment instructions;
- iv. Communication in any form, when undertaking assessment in a controlled environment, for example verbally or electronically with another person, including other students. This also includes accessing other sources of information;
- v. Possession of any material in the assessment room, regardless of whether or not they are relevant to the assessment or whether or not the student refers to them during the assessment process, for example books, dictionaries, notes, electronic devices including mobile telephones, calculators (when prohibited). This also includes accessing other sources of information unless permitted by the assessment rubric;
- vi. The unauthorised removal of assessment materials from the assessment room;
- vii. Impersonation of another student by undertaking, or attempting to undertake an assessment on their behalf;
- viii. A student arranging for someone else to complete, or attempt to complete an assessment on their behalf;
- ix. Including offensive / inappropriate material in an assessment submission;
- x. Committing plagiarism by using the work of another person, either intentionally or unintentionally without acknowledging that person;
- xi. Committing plagiarism by rewriting the work of another person in the student's own words without acknowledging that person;
- xii. Allowing another person access to the student's work which is then used without acknowledgement;
- xiii. Using all or part of a previous assignment or work submitted without acknowledgement, otherwise known as self plagiarism;
- xiv. Purchase or acquisition of work from internet sites or other sources which is then submitted as a student's own;
- xv. Misrepresentation: that is, presenting work as being that of another person\*, to lend credibility to the student's own work;
- xvi. Fabrication of evidence / results set down within an assessment;
- xvii. Failure to adhere to published The London Institute of Banking & Finance regulations, including those for assessment;
- xviii. Failure to adhere to instructions given by an assessment invigilator in relation to the assessment regulations, for example continuing to work beyond the allotted assessment time, refusing to hand in the assessment script and / or assessment paper when requested, not adhering to warnings relating to conduct during the assessment;
- xix. Fraudulent claims for reasonable adjustments or special consideration of extenuating circumstances;
- xx. Disruptive behaviour (including offensive language and aggressive / violent conduct);
- xxi. Damaging another student's work;
- xxii. Tampering with, or forgery of, results documentation, including Records of Achievement or Certificates;
- xxiii. Falsely obtaining, by any means, a Record of Achievement or Certificate for a component, module or qualification;
- xxiv. Contacting, or attempting to contact an external examiner appointed by The London Institute of Banking & Finance or one of its strategic partners.

\*'Another person' is defined as anyone and everyone else apart from the student, even where the individual(s) is / are anonymous or unknown and 'work' may include written work (formal or informal), thoughts (for example notes, correspondence), conversations (for example radio programmes, phone discussions), electronic communications (for example emails, web pages, faxes) or graphics (for example diagrams, tables, exhibits, models).

### **9.2.2 By persons other than students**

Malpractice can also be undertaken by others, to advantage or disadvantage students. Examples of malpractice by others, including assessment invigilators or lecturers are listed below. These examples are not exhaustive and all incidents of suspected malpractice, whether or not described below, will be fully investigated by The London Institute of Banking & Finance, where there are sufficient grounds to do so.

- i. Failure to keep assessment materials, examination question papers and assessment scripts secure before, during or after an assessment;
- ii. Failure to adhere to the relevant The London Institute of Banking & Finance regulations and procedures, including third party and centre approval, security undertaking and monitoring requirements as set out by The London Institute of Banking & Finance;
- iii. Failure to implement procedures to verify a student's identity;
- iv. Knowingly allowing an individual to impersonate a student;
- v. Allowing a student to possess and / or use material or electronic devices that are not permitted in the assessment room;
- vi. Allowing a student to communicate by any means during an assessment or examination in breach of regulations;
- vii. Allowing a student to copy another student's work, or allowing a student to let their own work be copied;
- viii. Allowing students to work collaboratively during an assessment, unless specified in the assessment instruction;
- ix. Completing an assessed assignment for a student or providing them with assistance beyond that 'normally' expected;
- x. Allowing a student to work beyond the allotted assessment time;
- xi. Damaging a student's work;
- xii. Leaving students unsupervised during an assessment that requires supervision;
- xiii. Allowing disruptive behaviour or unacceptable conduct at the assessment centre, for example, offensive language or aggressive / violent conduct;
- xiv. Divulging any information relating to student assessment performance and / or results to anyone other than the student;
- xv. Producing, using or allowing the use of forged or falsified documentation, including but not limited to:
  - a. personal identification;
  - b. supporting evidence provided for reasonable adjustment or special consideration applications; and
  - c. The London Institute of Banking & Finance results documentation including a The London Institute of Banking & Finance certificate.
- xvi. Failing to report a suspected case of student malpractice to The London Institute of Banking & Finance.

**9.2.3** The instances recorded under 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 are to be regarded as exemplars only; they are not intended to represent an exhaustive list. Other activities may be considered malpractice by The London

Institute of Banking & Finance if it considers the activity to fall within the remit of the definition of malpractice, as set down in section 9.1.3.

**9.2.4** If the student elects to continue with their studies while a malpractice case is being considered they do so at their own risk in that marks for assessment sat / submitted may not be valid as a result of the decision on the case and any fees paid will not be reimbursed.

### **9.3 Procedure for reporting and dealing with suspected malpractice**

**9.3.1** Evidence of suspected malpractice may arise from a variety of sources, eg invigilator, examiner, lecturer, Work-based Learning tutor, project supervisor, employer, another student, from text matching software or from an external source (for example another university).

**9.3.2** The identifier of the suspected malpractice should report his/her concerns to the Faculty Support Officer. The report will be acknowledged within five working days of receipt.

**9.3.3** In all cases where a student is suspected of malpractice during a supervised assessment, the student will first be warned by the assessment invigilator that their actions are in breach of The London Institute of Banking & Finance regulations and therefore might constitute malpractice and then:

- i. The invigilator will make a full written record of the student's activities. This record will be considered during any subsequent investigation by The London Institute of Banking & Finance.
- ii. The student will be informed by the invigilator that a full written report is being made and will be submitted to The London Institute of Banking & Finance. The student has the right to provide a signed statement explaining their conduct that will be included in the assessment invigilators report. The statement can be in written or oral form; if the latter the invigilator will write this down and ask the student to sign the statement to verify its accuracy. The student is not obliged to provide a statement. In such cases the invigilator will record the student's decision not to provide a statement in their report to The London Institute of Banking & Finance.

**9.3.4** In cases where a student is discovered to be in possession of any unauthorised material during a supervised assessment, the assessment invigilator will:

- i. Confiscate the materials;
- ii. Note on the student's assessment script the time and point within the script when the discovery was made. The student will be requested to sign the note to confirm its accuracy;
- iii. Make a list of the confiscated materials, which the student will be asked to sign to confirm accuracy, provide a copy of the list to the student and inform them that the materials will be submitted to The London Institute of Banking & Finance with the invigilator's written report.

**9.3.5** In cases where the invigilator suspects that students may have been communicating/collaborating with each other, the assessment invigilator will note on the assessment script of each of the students concerned the time and point within the script at which the discovery was made. Each student will be requested to sign the note to confirm its accuracy.

**9.3.6** In all cases of suspected malpractice in the assessment room (9.3.3, 9.3.4 and 9.3.5 refer) students will be allowed to continue working for the remainder of the assessment without prejudice to the final outcome.

**9.3.7** Suspected cases of malpractice identified by the examiner after the supervised assessment or submission of coursework assignments should be reported in writing to the Faculty Support Officer within five working days of discovery.

**9.3.8** In cases of suspected malpractice where more than one individual is involved, eg where students are suspected colluding, the Faculty Support Officer will separately contact each individual concerned.

**9.3.9** The Faculty Support Officer will decide whether there is a case to answer that needs to be considered by the Malpractice Committee.

**9.3.10** If the Faculty Support Officer decides that the Malpractice Committee is to review the case, they will contact the student(s) or other persons concerned outlining the issue, providing an indication of the timeframe for dealing with the individual case and asking for a written response by a given date.

**9.3.11** Cases are considered by the Malpractice Committee, which takes into account all the evidence, including any response from the student(s) or other persons concerned, before making a judgement on the case.

**9.3.12** Where plagiarism (paragraphs 9.2.1, i,iii,x,xi,xii,xiii and xiv) is suspected, the report generated by the text matching software through which all submissions are presented will be used to aid any investigation.

**9.3.13** Students are not permitted to attend a Malpractice Committee in person unless specifically invited.

**9.3.14** No Malpractice Committee hearing will normally involve legal representation by any party.

**9.3.15** If the judgement of the Malpractice Committee is that malpractice has occurred, then a range of measures may be implemented by the Malpractice Committee;

For students these include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. Awarding the mark given by the examiner and a warning given to the student;
- ii. Awarding a minimum pass mark for the assessment component in which malpractice has been deemed to have occurred;
- iii. Awarding a mark of zero in the assessment component in which malpractice has been deemed to have occurred;
- iv. Awarding a mark of zero for all the assessment components for the assessment period concerned;
- v. Notification to other departments within The London Institute of Banking & Finance for additional sanctions, which will be considered through the disciplinary policy.

For persons other than students these include, but are not limited to, the following;

- i. A warning given to the person;
- ii. Requirement to undertake training
- iii. Requirement to be supervised whilst carrying out their The London Institute of Banking & Finance role for a period;
- iv. Exclusion from their The London Institute of Banking & Finance role for a fixed period;
- v. Permanent exclusion from their The London Institute of Banking & Finance role.

**9.3.16** The measure(s) implemented by the Malpractice Committee will be informed by any previous advice that it has given to the student on malpractice.

**9.3.17** The measure(s) implemented by the Malpractice Committee will be reported to the Module Assessment Board for consideration when approving the module completions.

**9.3.18** The individual(s) will be notified of the decision of the Malpractice Committee within seven working days of the committee meeting.

## **9.4 Appeals**

**9.4.1** Appeals against malpractice decisions will be considered under The London Institute of Banking & Finance's Code of Practice [Chapter 10, Student Complaints and Academic Appeals](#).

**9.4.2** The individual(s) will be notified of any requirement of The London Institute of Banking & Finance to report cases of proven malpractice to the relevant authorities/regulators, subject to completion of the process and only after time for appeal has passed or the appeal process has been completed.

## **9.5 Monitoring**

**9.5.1** The outcomes of malpractice cases are monitored and reviewed by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee to ensure that procedures are fair and effective.