

## The Chartered Institute of Marketing Awarding Body Malpractice Policy (Policy 3)

### 1.0 Introduction

The Chartered Institute of Marketing (CIM) takes responsibility for communicating this Malpractice Policy to all relevant stakeholders. The Institute will report any cases of malpractice to the Regulations and Standards team at the Office of Qualifications (Ofqual).

This Malpractice Policy aims to:

- establish the malpractice process under which assessments operate
- define malpractice in the context of examinations, assignments and awards
- set out the rights and responsibilities of all parties regarding malpractice
- describe the procedures to be followed if malpractice is suspected.

For the purposes of this policy, malpractice is defined as any act through which an individual(s) has gained advantage and/or that threatens the integrity of the assessments for the Institute's qualifications and/or their proper certification, and/or compromises the reputation of the Institute's Awarding Body.

Copies of the Malpractice Policy can be downloaded from the Learning Zone website. For hard copies, please phone the Customer Contact Centre on +44 (0)1628 427120 or fax on +44 (0) 44 1628 427158 or email [qualifications@cim.co.uk](mailto:qualifications@cim.co.uk). Study Centres are sent electronic copies of this Policy for their files. They can also access it via the Tutors' website, or request a hard copy by ringing +44 (0)1628 427113.

### 1.1 Studying members and malpractice

Malpractice by studying members is described below, but is not limited to these statements. The Institute reserves the right to deem as malpractice other acts that might occur. Malpractice by studying members is deemed to occur when unauthorised means are used to gain an unfair advantage in an assessment situation.

Examples of studying member malpractice include:

- plagiarism (please see appendix for full Awarding Body definition)
- collusion between studying members to pass off work carried out jointly as though it were one studying member's work only
- impersonation of another studying member during an examination or assessment
- fabrication of results and/or evidence

- failing to abide by the Institute's regulations or advice from an Accredited Examination or Study Centre, assessor, examiner and/or invigilator
- misuse of assessment material
- alteration of any results documents, including certificates
- attempting to deceive examiners
- possession of unauthorised material in the examination or assessment room
- failure to adhere to the Institute's published assessment regulations
- disruptive behaviour in the examination room, eg offensive language, aggressive, violent or noisy conduct.

## **1.2 Accredited Study Centres, Examination Centres and malpractice**

CIM Accredited Study and Examination Centres are required to have their own policy on malpractice. Any malpractice, or attempted acts of malpractice, detected by the Study or Exam Centre must be reported immediately to the Institute (see Malpractice Process below).

Malpractice by a Study or Examination Centre is described below, but is not limited to these statements. The Institute reserves the right to deem as malpractice other acts that might occur.

Malpractice by a Study or Examination Centre is deemed to occur when a Study or Examination Centre uses unauthorised means that result in a studying member gaining an unfair advantage in an assessment. Future entries and/or registrations might not be accepted should Study or Examination Centres not co-operate with the Awarding Body.

Examples of Study and Examination Centre malpractice include:

- failure to keep assessment papers or marking schemes secure
- altering mark schemes in any way
- altering assessment or grading criteria in any way
- assisting students in the production of work for assignments or examinations beyond the accepted level of good educational practice. Good practice would include guidance, advice and facilitation in preparing the student for an assessment
- allowing evidence to appear in an assignment or examination that Centre staff know is not the student's own
- misusing conditions set for special learner requirements
- falsifying Institute records or Institute certificates
- failure to keep student computer files secure
- allowing fraudulent certificate claims to be made by staff or students
- allowing/obtaining unauthorised access to assessments prior to examination or test
- disruptive conditions when examinations are in progress (as reported by candidates)
- failure to adhere to the Institute's regulations relating to invigilation
- failure to adhere to the Institute's instructions relating to the handling of completed student assessments. This includes examination scripts and assignments.

## **2.0 The malpractice process**

Any malpractice should be reported immediately to the Head of Awarding Body at the Institute by either telephone or in writing on + 44 (0)1628 427453, or to the address:

Education Department, The Chartered Institute of Marketing, Moor Hall, Cookham,  
Berkshire SL6 9QH

The alleged instance of malpractice (with accompanying evidence) can be reported by a Study Centre, Examination Centre, moderator, examiner, invigilator or studying member. The Institute will conduct an investigation of any reported incident, and may request further information.

The Institute's Academic Malpractice Committee will meet to review the evidence and will issue a decision. The party accused of malpractice can appeal against the Malpractice decision. If they wish to do so, they should consult the CIM's Appeals Policy.

The Institute is required by the UK regulatory authorities to report cases of malpractice to them and to include details of action taken. The Institute may have to notify funding authorities, or share information with other awarding bodies, or report certain cases to the police.

Any alleged instance of malpractice brought to the Institute's attention after the issuing of certificates will result in an investigation by the Institute. Depending upon the outcome, certificates may be recalled and declared invalid.

### **3.0 Penalties and sanctions applied**

Where malpractice has been proved, the Institute will consider whether the integrity of its assessments have been jeopardised, and will take action to protect and ensure the integrity of assessments in the future. In accordance with the UK's regulatory authorities' regulations, any actions taken will be commensurate with the gravity of the malpractice.

#### **3.1 Study centre penalties and sanctions**

These may include the refusal to accept assessments from a Study Centre where malpractice has been established, and/or the Institute reserving the right to withdraw Study Centre or programme approval where malpractice has been identified. All Institute decisions will be conveyed in writing to the Study Centre's Course Director and to the Head of the Study Centre, and to any other participants, including the studying member(s) involved or affected.

#### **3.2 Student penalties and sanctions**

The Institute may, at its discretion, and depending on the seriousness of the proved allegation, impose one or more penalties on the studying member, who will be informed in writing. If the student is below 18 years of age, their guardian will also be notified.

The studying member may be issued with a written warning from the Institute, or lose all marks for an assessment(s) where malpractice has been proved.

In serious cases, the Institute reserves the right to invalidate all marks awarded to the studying member, or disqualify them from studying for any Institute qualification.

#### **4.0 Malpractice committee's terms of reference**

The Malpractice Committee is an Awarding Body panel that falls under Awarding Body regulations. The purpose of this committee is to review all alleged cases of malpractice and their related evidence.

The Malpractice Committee comprises a minimum of five people who are appointed by the Director of Education. The Director in turn is appointed by the Institute's Board of Trustees. The committee members comprise the Director of Education, the Head of Awarding Body, the Assessments Manager, the Assessments Registrar and the Chief Examiner. The quorum shall be three members of the committee. Other Awarding Body staff or professional advisors may be asked to attend in an advisory or secretarial capacity.

The Malpractice committee shall meet up to four times a year, under the chairmanship of the Director of Education or a designated member of the panel. Meetings may be held by teleconference or videoconference, or any other means that enables a quorate of committee members to participate at the same time.

The Malpractice committee shall regulate its proceedings in accordance with Awarding Body regulations and shall have minutes of its meetings taken by the Secretary to the committee. The Malpractice committee shall review all alleged instances of malpractice referred to it and has the power to make decisions whether to uphold the allegation or decide against the allegation. All decisions made are recorded by the secretary to the Panel and formally reported to the relevant Examination Board.

## **Appendix on Plagiarism**

### **What is it?**

- The deliberate or unwitting passing off of someone else's work as your own
- It amounts to academic dishonesty and is regarded as a serious breach of Awarding Body assessment procedures
- It occurs when ideas, research, theories, text or diagrams are incorporated within your work without reference to or acknowledgement of the originator or source
- It includes direct copying of work, paraphrasing or précising and over-reliance on someone else's work without appropriate referencing

### **How does it happen?**

- Deliberate attempt to copy, collude, or pass off work as your own
- Carelessness in reproducing notes which were originally taken from other sources
- Lack of awareness of the originator
- Students collaborate and do not acknowledge the other person's work
- Incomplete or inadequate referencing
- Indiscriminate use of the web and electronic sources e.g. copy and pasting without referencing

### **What are the Awarding Body's expectations?**

- Academic honesty
- Academic integrity
- Rigorous referencing
- No collusion

### **How plagiarism will be monitored?**

- Studying member has to sign declaration sheet to say that the work submitted is their own and that all sources used have been appropriately attributed
- Tutor signs the Summary Sheet to say that to the best of his/her knowledge the work submitted is the student's own; where they have any concerns that these are identified for the Awarding Body to investigate further Rigorous assessment process marking, second marking, careful scrutiny
- Study Centre plagiarism guidelines or procedures are applied when reviewing studying member's work
- Awarding Body procedures are applied when submitting hard copy and electronic copy of studying members' work for marking and moderation

### **What happens if plagiarism is suspected?**

- The script would be sent from the examiner to the Senior Examiner for the unit, and Level Verifier
- The Awarding Body would do the following:
  - a report from the examiner and Senior Examiner is considered by the Director of Education
  - if evidence of plagiarism or collusion is found, the script is referred to the Reasonable Adjustment and Malpractice Committee. The Committee will make recommendations as to the appropriate sanction(s) to be applied, that can range from a loss of some to all marks for a repeated offence, studying member may be disqualified from membership
  - all studying members have the right of appeal