

CIPR Malpractice Policy

A guide for teaching centres and candidates

Malpractice can be the result of any of the following actions:

- Plagiarism or deliberate copying of another's work, passing it off as one's own.
- Recycling one's own work in its entirety or reusing portions of a previously written text while authoring new work.
- Falsification – knowingly presenting fictitious or distorted data and/or information as genuine.
- Using the services of somebody else to produce work submitted for assessment.
- Failing to appropriately reference the use of AI tools
- Bringing undue pressure and influence to bear on assessors thereby compromising their impartiality.

CIPR assessments may require candidates to demonstrate understanding of relevant theory and practice which might involve reference to academic and other publications. Any such work that is used in this way, whether by direct quotation or paraphrasing, should be indicated by proper referencing and supported by a full bibliography. (Teaching centres will provide instructions on appropriate referencing systems; i.e. Harvard).

If malpractice is suspected, the tutor must first inform the Course Leader, who will in turn call a meeting with the candidate as soon as possible to investigate the matter. If the Course Leader feels that malpractice has indeed occurred, the work will be marked as ungraded and the CIPR Awarding Body (CIPR AB) informed. The teaching centre will be expected to run this script through recognised anti-plagiarism software to confirm their findings before informing the CIPR AB. The CIPR AB will refer the matter to the Board of Examiners who have the power to take the action more fully as set out in Section 7 of the Course Regulations. If the investigation that has been carried out by the teaching centre indicates, without doubt, that a genuine oversight has occurred on the candidate's part regarding correct referencing, the teaching centre will recommend to the Board of Examiners that the candidate be allowed to resubmit that assessment **ONE** more time only.

If the Board of Examiners determines that malpractice has, indeed, taken place the Chair of the Board of Examiners will submit a report to the Head of Membership & Qualifications with recommendations as set out in 7.2.5 of the Course Regulations.

The Course Leader/course tutor must provide appropriate guidance regarding malpractice before the candidate attempts the assessment again.

Teaching centres should be aware that they may have candidates who work closely together for the same employer and that they may want to pursue topics for their individual assessments that are largely similar. When negotiating these topics, and later, when assessing candidates' submissions, teaching centres need to pay particular attention to a natural tendency to collaborate over such work, and that this must not be allowed to lead to the unfair advantage of one or more candidates in relation to the objectives of the assessment exercise. Teaching centres are therefore encouraged to negotiate topics with individual candidates that obviate, so far as may be, such an eventuality.

Teaching centres must discuss the use of AI in assessments and the appropriate referencing of this, if used, with candidates before work on assessments begins. Candidates should also be made aware of the following documents which provide guidance on the use of AI in assessments:

- The Guide to use of AI in candidate assessment submissions
- The student handbook
- The cover sheet which includes a separate 'Candidate AI Reflective Statement' that must be completed by **ALL** candidates

Candidates should be aware that AI tools are constantly being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content, or producing answers which, however convincing they may seem, may contain incorrect or biased information. Candidates should also be aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work and that if any sections of assessment submissions are reproduced directly from AI-generated responses the candidate will probably not have met the marking criteria and, therefore, their work may not meet the required standards to attain a Pass.

CIPR Awarding Body

March 2026