



Chartered
Governance
Institute
UK & Ireland

Candidate Malpractice Policy



February 2026

Introduction

This policy sets out the Chartered Governance Institute United Kingdom and Ireland's (CGIUKI) approach to preventing and managing any form of malpractice which undermines the credibility of assessment and the award of qualifications.

The policy is for all candidates taking a CGIUKI assessment for qualifications in the following programme areas:

- Foundation Programme
- Qualifying Programme
- International Finance and Administration Programme
- Sector Qualifications

The policy applies to all assessments.

1. Malpractice Definition

Malpractice generally involves some form of intent. It may also include circumstances where an individual has been negligent or reckless during the assessment leading to a breach of student rules and regulations or the Professional Code of Conduct.

The clearest example of potential malpractice is cheating in an assessment.

2. Malpractice Examples

The following are examples of candidate malpractice.

- **Cheating.** Using unauthorised materials or devices such as notebooks, study materials. or using a second monitor to access unauthorised websites during the assessment
- **Plagiarism.** Using someone else's ideas, words or work without the correct reference or acknowledgement.
- **Misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI).** Using AI tools inappropriately, such as generating content without due reference or acknowledgement.
- **Fabrication.** Making up data, results or information and presenting this as genuine.
- **Impersonation:** having someone else take an assessment on your behalf.
- **Collusion.** Working with others to produce a piece of work such as a written assignment that is supposed to be completed individually.
- **Improper conduct.** Communicating with other candidates or unauthorised person during the assessment
- **Offensive or abusive language** directed at invigilators, other candidates, CGIUKI staff or any other person that the candidate comes into contact with during the assessment
- **Reasonable Adjustment breach.** Failure to adhere to the terms set out for the application of approved Reasonable Adjustments.

This list is not exhaustive and is intended for guidance only.

3. Identifying Malpractice

CGIUKI is committed to maintaining the integrity of assessments, and the validity of the qualifications they lead to, by taking any form of malpractice very seriously. Several approaches are employed to identify suspected malpractice.

- **Proctoring and Invigilation.** During assessments, candidates are monitored by proctors or invigilators who watch for any suspicious behaviour that might indicate malpractice. This includes actions such as looking at a second monitor, accessing unauthorised websites, using notes, or communicating with others. This list is not exhaustive. All suspicious behaviour is reported to the Learning and Assessment team to be investigated after the assessment has taken place.
- **Recording of Assessments.** All online assessments are recorded. Recordings may be viewed where suspected malpractice has been raised by, for example, a proctor/invigilator, examiner.
- **Identification Checks.** Confirmation of candidate identity is collected at the start of all assessments. Where the identify is not clear or where the presented identification does not appear to match the candidate, this will be investigated by the Learning and Assessment team.
- **Plagiarism Detection Software.** Software tools will be used to check for similarities between a candidate's work and existing sources. The tools will also check for AI misuse. All written assignments will be checked by a plagiarism detection tool.
- **Analysis of Answer Patterns.** Examiners will look for patterns in answers such as responses that are identical or very similar to study text and mark schemes.
- **Post-Assessment Interviews.** Interviews may be conducted with candidates after the assessment to help identify inconsistencies in their knowledge and the answers they provided.

4. Investigating Suspected Malpractice

All cases of suspected malpractice will be referred to the Learning and Standards Lead for investigation. This will adopt the following process.

1. **Preliminary Review.** An initial review will be carried out to determine if there is sufficient evidence to support a claim of malpractice.
2. **Formal Investigation.** If the preliminary review suggests malpractice, a formal investigation will be carried out. This will include reviewing all evidence and relevant materials, such as exam scripts, digital logs, and assessment recordings.
3. **Candidate notification.** The candidate will be notified by email that suspected malpractice has been reported and that is being formally investigated.
4. **Malpractice Report.** The findings of the investigation will be documented in a report. This will include who/how the suspected malpractice was identified, what this is and what evidence there is to support the case for malpractice.
5. **Review and Decision.** Suspected malpractice will be reported to the Assessment Review Panel who will review the evidence and recommend a course of action. The recommendation may be:
 - a) insufficient evidence of malpractice: no further action.
 - b) insufficient evidence of malpractice but the candidate is to be contacted to remind them of good conduct in assessments.
 - c) sufficient evidence to support malpractice and that the candidate is sanctioned.
6. **Candidate notification.** The candidate is notified of the decision of the Assessment Review Panel. If there is sufficient evidence of malpractice, the candidate will be informed that their results will be withheld pending notification of sanctions. If there is insufficient evidence, the candidate will be informed that either no further action will be taken or reminded of good conduct in assessments.

7. **Sanctions.** If malpractice is confirmed, appropriate sanctions will be applied. Possible sanctions are detailed in section 5 of this policy.

Evidence of malpractice will be judged on the balance of probability that malpractice has occurred.

The investigation of malpractice will be completed within 30 working days of the candidate being notified that malpractice is suspected.

5. Sanctions

Where there is sufficient evidence to prove that malpractice has taken place, a recommendation on the level of sanction will be made to the Director of Education and Learning.

1. **Formal Warning.** A formal warning may be issued, indicating that any future incidents will result in more severe consequences.
2. **Assessment Voided.** The assessment is voided meaning that even it was a pass, the candidate is not credited with this. A voided assessment will count as a failed attempt and the candidate will have to pay the exam registration fee and sit it again.
3. **Revocation of Qualifications.** If an investigation of suspected malpractice identifies instances where malpractice has occurred in a previous exam or exams, the qualification awarded for that exam or exams may be revoked.
4. **Disciplinary hearing.** Where the candidate has been found to be in breach of the CGIUKI Code of Professional Ethics and Conduct, specifically bylaw 23.8, disciplinary proceeding will be taken against the candidate.

This list is not exhaustive and is intended for guidance only.

5. Appeal.

The candidate has the right to appeal. If an appeal is made the evidence of malpractice will be reviewed by an unconnected member of the Executive Team.

An appeal is to be sent to the Learning and Standards team within seven days of the outcome of the malpractice investigation being notified to the candidate.