

Malpractice, Maladministration and Conflict of Interest Policy (Including Plagiarism and AI Misuse)

1. Introduction

Malpractice and/or maladministration can cause reputational damage to cHRysos HR as a business, apprenticeship provider and CIPD centre and threaten the integrity of our awards and the quality of the learner experience.

As an apprenticeship provider and CIPD centre, cHRysos HR is subject to external regulation and must meet the regulatory requirements set by Ofsted, The Apprenticeship Service, ESFA and awarding bodies e.g., CIPD and Highfields.

2. Policy Purpose

cHRysos HR will take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice or maladministration, in the development, delivery, assessment and administration of its programmes. Where it is not possible to prevent malpractice, maladministration, or conflict of interest, cHRysos HR Solutions Limited will deal with such cases quickly, thoroughly, and effectively.

The purpose of this policy is to:

- provide operational definitions of the terms malpractice and maladministration with examples
- explain the actions cHRysos HR will take if malpractice or maladministration is discovered
- promote better understanding of roles and responsibilities in preventing malpractice and maladministration
- provide guidance on the steps to be taken if malpractice or maladministration is discovered.

3. Scope

This policy covers:

- Centre malpractice and maladministration
- Staff malpractice, maladministration and conflict of interest
- Learner or Apprentice malpractice

This policy applies to cHRysos HR:

- Shareholders and Directors
- Employees
- Associates
- Learners and Apprentices enrolled on any cHRysos HR programme of study

Poor academic practice is out of scope of this policy (see separate guidance). Poor academic practice is defined as academic practice that has been judged to be an unintentional breach of assessment

regulations, resulting from a lack of understanding of the correct methods of referencing or where the extent of failure to reference is very slight.

4. Definitions

Malpractice refers to any act, omission, or practice by a person involved in the delivery, assessment, or management of training and qualifications that intentionally or negligently breaches professional standards, regulatory requirements, or ethical guidelines. It includes any behaviour or practice that compromises the integrity, validity, or fairness of assessment, certification, or training delivery.

Maladministration refers to any actions, neglect, or poor administrative practice in the management and delivery of training, assessment, or qualification processes that result in a failure to comply with regulations, standards, or agreed procedures. It includes mistakes, delays, inaccurate record-keeping, or any other administrative errors that may affect the fairness, validity, or reliability of the qualification or service provided.

Conflicts of interest arises when an individual's personal interests, relationships, or external activities could compromise (or be perceived to compromise) their impartiality or professional judgement.

Centre malpractice may include:

- Insecure storage of assessment instruments and marking guidance
- Misuse of assessments, including inappropriate adjustments to assessment decisions
- Failure to comply with CIPD policy and procedures on reasonable adjustments
- Failure to comply with requirements for accurate and safe retention of learner evidence, assessment, and internal moderation/verification records
- Failure to comply with awarding/regulatory body procedures for managing and transferring accurate learner data
- Excessive direction from assessors to learners/apprentices on how to meet the required standards
- Deliberate falsification of records to claim certificates
- Persistent failure to adhere to learner registration and/or certification procedures.
- Unreasonable delays in responding to CIPD communications and requests for information
- Failure to use current assessment materials
- Inaccurate claims for certification
- Failure to maintain auditable records
- Failure to advise CIPD of errors or suspected issues.

Centre staff malpractice means malpractice committed by a current or former member of staff or associate of cHRysos HR Solutions Limited. It can arise through, for example:

- A breach of security (e.g., failure to keep material secure, tampering with coursework etc.)
- A breach of confidentiality (e.g., failure to maintain confidentiality of assessment materials)
- Deception (e.g., manufacturing evidence of competence, fabricating assessment, or internal verification records)
- The provision of improper assistance to learners/apprentices (e.g., permitting the use of a reasonable adjustment over and above those permitted by the awarding bodies' guidelines;

prompting learners/apprentices in assessment by means of signs or verbal or written prompts)

- Provision of inaccurate or misleading information to support staff about qualifications/achievements
- Failure to adhere to the regulations laid down by the associated professional and regulatory bodies

Learner malpractice is malpractice committed by a learner during their studies and may occur in:

- the compilation and authentication of portfolios and assessment evidence
- the presentation of practical work
- the preparation and authentication of coursework
- conduct during an examination
- conduct during an internal assessment
- conduct during an external assessment
- conduct during apprenticeship end point assessment

Examples of learner malpractice may include:

- Plagiarism/AI Misuse:
 - Passing off work of others (including a writing service or work generated via AI technology such as Chat GPT) as their own
 - quoting from published or unpublished work of other persons, including other learners/apprentices, without crediting the source and referencing in accordance with scholarly academic convention
- Collusion:
 - with others to produce assessment evidence when an assessment must be completed by an individual learner
- Copying:
 - Copying or attempting to copy from another learner (including using ICT to do so)
- Impersonation
 - Impersonation of another learner or allowing themselves to be impersonated
- Cheating:
 - getting someone else or using AI technology such as Chat GPT to produce part of or all evidence submitted for assessment
 - using unauthorised aids during assessment/examination
 - communicating or attempting to communicate with another learner or individual who is neither an invigilator nor a member of centre staff
- Falsification
 - resubmitting their own previously assessed/graded assessment evidence
 - fabricating results from experiments, research, interviews, or observations
- Inappropriate behaviour during internal/external assessment that causes disruption to others
- Inclusion of inappropriate, offensive, discriminatory, or obscene material in assessment evidence. This includes vulgarity and swearing that is outside of the context of the assessment or any material of a discriminatory nature.
- Frivolous content: producing content that is unrelated to the question in scripts or coursework

Irrespective of the underlying cause or the people involved, all allegations of maladministration or malpractice in relation to delivery and assessment need to be investigated to protect the integrity of cHRYSOS HR Solutions Limited and to be fair to all staff, associates, and learners/apprentices

5. Minor and Substantial Malpractice or Maladministration

The terms minor malpractice or maladministration and serious malpractice or maladministration indicate cHRysos HR's view of the gravity of the impact of the alleged breach of this policy. Staff applying this policy will determine what constitutes minor or substantial malpractice or maladministration, according to the following definitions.

- **Minor malpractice or maladministration** is behaviour that is judged to be a minimal threat to the integrity of assessment processes or to be the result of the individual's lack of understanding of the appropriate policy.
- **Substantial malpractice or maladministration** is behaviour that is judged to be either a significant threat to the integrity of assessment processes or behaviour where the individual's level of experience might reasonably be interpreted as evidence that the individual was aware that the behaviour was not in keeping with standards or ethical practices or both.
- The following instances of alleged malpractice/maladministration will always be treated as substantial misconduct:
 - a. Once an individual has been found to have committed minor or substantial misconduct, any subsequent allegation will be regarded as substantial misconduct.
 - b. All allegations of misconduct in the assessment process; and
 - c. All allegations of collusion.
 - d. All cases where a conflict of interest has not been declared

6. Policy Statement

cHRysos HR is committed to academic and procedural integrity and honesty. All stakeholders are expected to respect these values and uphold them within the framework laid down within this Policy and by the associated professional and regulatory bodies. Actions by staff, associates and learners/apprentices as outlined above are not permitted. These actions will be treated as malpractice or maladministration and will be penalised.

- Staff will be dealt with via disciplinary procedures (see separate policy)
- Associates will be interviewed by the Managing Director as part of an investigation into any allegations. As these individuals are not employees of cHRysos HR Solutions Limited the disciplinary procedures do not apply, however any investigation will ensure the ethos of impartial investigation of the evidence is adhered to. Proven allegations of serious malpractice/maladministration will result in further contracts not being offered.
- **See Appendix A - Policy guidance on Managing and Preventing Plagiarism and AI misuse within assessment.**

7. Conflict of Interest

Where a member of cHRysos HR Solutions Limited staff or associate finds there is a conflict of interest in their relationship with an enrolled learner this must be declared via email a completed conflict of interest form (See Appendix B) to the Managing Director immediately. Once a conflict of interest is identified that cHRysos team member must not be involved in the assessment, moderation, or verification stage for that learner.

Failure to notify a conflict of interest will be considered as serious malpractice.

Examples of conflict of interest are:

- Family relationships
- Close personal relationships such as a partner
- Friendships (although not acquaintances). [If in doubt please speak to the Managing Director for advice.]
- Familial relationships with your own friends (for example: daughter of a friend)
- An individual with whom you do business with elsewhere or their family members.

8. Notification of suspected malpractice/maladministration to the Professional/Regulatory Body

When internal investigations indicate evidence that there has been an instance of malpractice and/or maladministration, cHRysos HR will notify the relevant professional/regulatory body using the proforma at Appendix C.

This proforma will be passed via the relevant external contact for onward transmission to their professional body or in the case of apprentices directly to the ESFA/Apprenticeship Service (as appropriate), so that that they are able to follow their own procedures in relation to any issues arising.

9. CIPD jurisdiction

As a CIPD study centre, cHRysos HR are approved to offer CIPD qualifications that are accredited by the CIPD for membership purposes. All centres are required to meet CIPD performance criteria and as part of the approval and ongoing quality assurance, CIPD check that centres have policies and procedures for the prevention and management of malpractice and maladministration particularly in relation to academic misconduct.

CIPD has jurisdiction to consider all cases of malpractice by all CIPD registered learners and where substantiated, the CIPD's Sanctions policy will be engaged.

It is always preferable to prevent malpractice or maladministration than to deal with it once it has occurred, therefore, the CIPD will take all reasonable steps to:

- prevent, wherever possible, malpractice or maladministration
- provide procedures for the investigation of suspected or alleged malpractice or maladministration
- keep under review centre arrangements for preventing, investigating, and reporting malpractice and maladministration
- provide guidance to centres (upon request) as how best to prevent, investigate, and deal with malpractice and maladministration
- identify and share good practice amongst centres to encourage and support high quality delivery and assessment
- assess the risk posed by each centre relating to the potential for malpractice/maladministration and take appropriate steps in response to that perceived level of risk
- investigate suspected or alleged malpractice or maladministration
- take appropriate and proportionate action, with the cooperation of third parties as appropriate, against those who are responsible for the malpractice/maladministration

- promptly take all reasonable steps to prevent or mitigate any adverse effects arising from the malpractice/maladministration
- carry out or oversee investigation of cases (or suspected cases) of malpractice/maladministration to establish whether it has occurred
- apply appropriate sanctions consistent with CIPD's published policy
- inform centres and other awarding organisations of the malpractice/maladministration as appropriate
- report the incidence of malpractice to the relevant regulatory authorities
- taking steps to prevent malpractice or maladministration from reoccurring.

10. Responsibilities

CHRysos HR staff are responsible for:

- taking all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice/maladministration arising, including:
- using assessments in a manner that does not encourage malpractice
- being vigilant to possible instances of malpractice/maladministration
- checking all CIPD learner assessments using plagiarism/AI detection software (Turnitin) and where plagiarism is suspected, investigating this in a robust and fair manner
- complying with this policy
- advising learners of this policy
- requiring learners to authenticate work as their own and evidence submitted for assessment
- implementing agreed systems and procedures to investigate and record all suspected instances of malpractice/maladministration and making this information available to awarding bodies and other relevant institutions
- notifying the appropriate body of any incidents of malpractice/maladministration promptly
- co-operating with the appropriate body's malpractice/maladministration investigations
- carrying out investigations of malpractice as required by the awarding bodies
- implementing any actions required by the appropriate body during and after investigations into a case of malpractice
- taking action required to prevent the recurrence of malpractice/ maladministration.

Failure by CHRysos HR to report and deal with an identified issue may constitute centre malpractice.

Policy review

This policy will be reviewed annually to ensure its appropriateness and approach is fit for purpose.

Author	Sheila Moore
Position	Managing Director
Last reviewed	July 2025
Date for next review	July 2026
Signature	

Appendix A

Guidance on Managing and Preventing Plagiarism and AI Misuse within Learner Assessment

1. Purpose

This policy guidance sets out cHRysos HR's approach to managing and preventing plagiarism and the misuse of artificial intelligence (AI) tools within learner assessments. It supports our commitment to integrity, ethical learning, and professional development and is aligned with awarding body regulations. It should be read alongside cHRysos HR's Malpractice, Maladministration and Conflict of Interest Policy.

Allegations about malpractice or suspected malpractice may be raised by staff, learners, external quality assurance representatives, whistle-blowers, or other stakeholders.

All investigations of alleged academic misconduct by learners are to be conducted with close regard for procedural fairness. The processes described in this Policy for the hearing of allegations provide learners with opportunities to respond to allegations and, on specified grounds, to appeal decisions.

2. Definitions

Plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct whereby a learner presents the work or ideas of someone else without appropriate referencing or acknowledgement. This may take the form of direct copying and pasting from existing published sources or reproducing or paraphrasing ideas and submitting them within an assessment without appropriate acknowledgement.

AI misuse refers to learners using AI software to create information or content for their CIPD and end point assessments and passing this off as their own work. This can include copying and pasting what the AI wrote or rewording it slightly to make it seem original.

Both plagiarism and AI misuse (if proven) are regarded by cHRysos HR as deliberate and purposeful breaches of assessment regulations, intended to gain an unfair academic advantage.

Poor academic practice is an unintentional breach of assessment regulations, resulting from a lack of understanding of the correct methods of referencing or where the extent of failure to reference is very slight.

3. Scope

This policy applies to all learners enrolled on cHRysos HR qualifications and/or apprenticeship programmes

Any cases of poor academic practice will be managed outside of this policy guidance and where this is identified the learner must be informed of this and given constructive feedback about how to reference their work correctly and/or ensure they acknowledge all sources.

The assessment must be referred and the learner given the opportunity to resubmit the same assessment in line with assessment policy. The learner must be advised that any further proven cases of poor academic practice in the case of their CIPD assessments must be referred for consideration to a CIPD independent panel in line with the CIPD Centre's Guide to Plagiarism and AI Misuse V1.1.

4. Communication

It is important that all learners are fully informed and aware of the cHRysos HR Policy on Plagiarism and AI misuse. This is fully embedded into cHRysos HR programme induction (delivered via e-learning and within online live sessions). This information also ensures that learners are clear about what constitutes plagiarism and how they can avoid it by following correct academic referencing conventions, including for the use of AI when instructed within an assessment. Other methods of communication include:

- Welcome pack
- Commitment Statements
- Learner handbooks
- Orientation materials

Reinforcement of the importance of adhering to the cHRysos Malpractice, Maladministration and Conflict of Interest Policy (Including Plagiarism and AI Misuse), is further communicated at key points within each programme of study, for example during assessment briefings and when assessments are submitted to Moodle, which is cHRysos HR's chosen virtual learning environment (VLE) via a signed learner declaration of authenticity.

5. Turnitin Similarity Reports

All learner assessments are checked using plagiarism detection software (Turnitin). This is a requirement for all CIPD centres.

The Turnitin software is integrated with Moodle (VLE) and cHRysos have provided access for learners before the final cut-off date for assignment submission. This is a powerful way to support academic writing skills, foster understanding of academic integrity, and help learners become more confident, ethical researchers.

For learners:

The following guidance may be useful to understand how to use similarity reports formatively for learner development:

Promote Understanding of Academic Integrity

- Use the similarity report to teach what constitutes proper referencing, paraphrasing, and citation.
- Show examples of acceptable versus problematic matches.
- Emphasise that the goal is to develop original thought supported by evidence, not just avoiding a high score.

Early Submissions

cHRysos HR allows learners to submit early versions of their assignment and access their similarity reports before final submission.

We encourage learners to review:

- Highlighted matches
- Match sources
- Whether quotes and citations are formatted correctly

This helps them self-identify and correct issues such as:

- Overuse of direct quotes
- Poor paraphrasing
- Missing or incorrect citations

Provide Guided Reflection

We encourage learners to self-reflect on their similarity reports by asking themselves questions such as:

- What parts of my text are highlighted?
- Are those matches properly cited?
- Did you rely too heavily on source material?
- What will you revise before submitting the final version?

Develop Skills Over Time

It is feasible for learners to track progress across assignments using Moodle (VLE) and may wish to ask themselves:

- Is my similarity score going down because of better paraphrasing?
- Are my citations improving?
- What further support and development do I need?

Create Learning Opportunities from 'False Positives'

Similarity reports may also help learners to understand that not all matches are bad as the report can show them:

- Common phrases
- Correctly quoted material
- Distinguish between legitimate matches and improper use.

In addition to learner self-reflection, cHRysos HR will use similarity reports to inform our curriculum development, for example:

- Academic writing workshops
- Induction and the use of self-reflection
- Showing learners how to interpret scores and flags, and what they do or do not mean.
- Academic study skills session content
- Use this data to guide individual writing support, especially at-risk learners

For the cHRysos teaching, assessment, and quality assurance teams:

Turnitin provides tools to help team members interpret and investigate similarity reports, which identify content matches between a submitted work and Turnitin's database of sources.

To investigate similarity reports effectively and consistently the teaching team will be fully trained and understand what the similarity score means and crucially that it is not a plagiarism score (as it represents the percentage of the submitted text that matches other sources). Furthermore, it is important that learners know that a high score does not automatically mean plagiarism, and a low score does not guarantee originality.

The following checklist is provided for the teaching, assessment and quality teams and is part of our assessment and quality assurance practices:

- Quoting and referencing: Is the match correctly cited?
- Common phrases or terminology: Are the matches due to discipline-specific language?
- Excessive similarity: Is the paper overly reliant on source material, even if cited?
- Have you used filters and exclusions to refine your review of the report as this helps isolate problematic overlaps from legitimate or trivial matches?
 - Exclude quotes: Removes text within quotation marks.
 - Exclude bibliography: Prevents references from skewing the similarity score.
 - Exclude small matches: Ignores matches below a set word count and/or percentage.
- Have you identified any patterns of concern?
- Have you investigated improper paraphrasing: slight word changes with the same structure can be plagiarism.
- Have you considered patchwriting: Reassembling text from different sources without originality.
- Is there evidence of self-plagiarism: Reuse of the student's own previously submitted work.
- Consider if the report shows evidence of contract cheating: inconsistencies in writing style or level of proficiency.
- Are you considering context:
 - Look at the assignment type as some have naturally higher similarity scores (e.g., literature reviews).
 - Cross-reference with the assessment expectations.

6. Suspected Plagiarism

All reports will be reviewed; however, we accept that all assessments will show a % match due to text being common within the CIPD's assessment template and other common phrases are likely.

Where investigation of the report determines that a learner may have engaged in plagiarism, this will be considered further by an internal panel. The assessor who conducted the investigation will summarise why they are referring the assessment to the internal panel, such as the learner is suspected of intentionally presenting another person's work, including that of ghostwriters or content sourced from the internet.

The internal panel will consist of the programme lead (unless they have assessed the similarity report; in which case a programme lead from another level of programme with the appropriate academic level of teaching experience) and a member of the internal quality assurance team.

- After the internal panel has reviewed the evidence presented by the assessor, if suspected plagiarism can be justified, the following action must be implemented:
- The programme lead informs the learner that they have been found to have plagiarised, provides the evidence to support this, and informs them that they must submit a new assessment, using a different assessment brief
- The learner is issued a warning that a second academic misconduct offence for the same or a different unit will result in referral to the CIPD's Code of Conduct and Ethics Panel for investigation.

- In the most serious cases, (for example: intentional copying of substantial work with the intention to deceive) the learner may be immediately withdrawn from the CIPD qualification without the opportunity to submit another assessment and be referred to the CIPD Code of Conduct and Ethics Panel.
- Learners should be informed of the appeals process.

7. Misuse of AI

Turnitin software used by cHRysos HR also includes reporting on potential AI misuse. This report is only made available to the assessor. Turnitin's AI detection report analyses a submitted text to estimate how much of it may have been generated by an AI model, such as ChatGPT or other Large Language Models (LLMs). This is presented as a percentage.

It should be noted that Turnitin does not 'catch' AI tools directly, as it uses machine learning to analyse writing style and compare it against AI text patterns. It looks at:

- Sentence structure (e.g., overly consistent, or formulaic phrasing)
- Vocabulary complexity (e.g., generic but coherent word choices)
- Lack of personal style or voice
- Punctuation and rhythm patterns
- Perplexity and burstiness or metrics for randomness and variation

These traits are statistical markers, not hard evidence and therefore can present false positives, especially with well-edited writing or non-native speakers. This is why cHRysos HR team members are fully aware that they should be assessed with caution, and they are not shared as a development tool with learners, as with similarity reports.

The following is a summary of the Turnitin AI scoring:

Score	Meaning	Common interpretation
0-20%	Likely mostly human-written	Usually safe, may contain minor AI influence
21-49%	Mixed signals	Could be partially AI-assisted
50 – 79%	Heavily AI-styled	Strong likelihood of AI authorship
80% +	Nearly fully AI-generated	Often flagged as academic integrity risk

All cHRysos assessors must note that Turnitin's own documentation warns that their tool should not be used alone to accuse students of misconduct as it is only a signal.

For this reason, the AI indicator is just one tool that cHRysos HR use in their investigations into AI misuse and a holistic view of the learner's work considering the CIPD Study Centres guide to Plagiarism and AI misuse (June 2025). This states that assessors should also be trained to identify the following within an assessment and cHRysos HR will also assess the following within their investigations:

- A default use of American spelling and terms (although AI tools can be instructed to use different languages).

- A default use of language and vocabulary not expected for the level of qualification.
- A lack of references or quotations when these are expected (although AI tools can produce references when asked).
- References included that cannot be verified (AI can provide false references).
- A difference in language style compared to the learner's previous work, including use of verbose or hyperbolic language (although AI can clone a tone or style when asked).
- A variance of language style within an assessment which may indicate that AI has been used for some questions.
- Content being generic rather than tailored to specifically respond to the question being asked or the case study.
- The inadvertent inclusion of AI prompts or warnings.
- Inclusion of statements that do not relate to a previous statement in an otherwise coherent assessment submission.

(Adapted from JCQ guidelines for AI use in assessments, latest version 2025).

8. Misuse of AI

Where, after a holistic review of a learner's work, cHRysos HR determine that the learner has potentially misused AI to generate some or all of their work, the learner will be invited to a professional discussion.

At the beginning of the discussion, the cHRysos HR team member will discuss the AI report with the learner and give them the opportunity to account for the score. The centre should note this discussion and then decide whether to continue with a professional discussion about the learner's work.

Where the learner admits AI misuse, it will not be appropriate to continue, and they will be advised of next steps to be taken (see below) *

The purpose of the professional discussion is to allow the learner the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by answering questions directly from the evidence submitted which relate to the assessed learning outcomes and assessment criteria.

Where the learner demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding and is therefore likely to have undertaken the work towards assessment, the assessment may then be graded.

A record of the professional discussion will be retained with the learner's work and if selected for sampling this will be sent to CIPD for consideration as part of their own moderation.

Where the learner is unable to demonstrate sufficient knowledge and understanding, this will be referred to the CIPD for review via an independent panel. Where the CIPD panel concludes that a learner has misused AI, the CIPD will ask cHRysos HR to take the following action*:

- inform the learner that they have been found to have misused AI, and that they must submit a new assessment, using a different assessment brief.
- issue a warning to the learner that a second academic misconduct offence for the same or a different unit will result in referral to the CIPD's Code of Conduct and Ethics Panel for investigation.

- In the most serious cases, the learner may be immediately withdrawn from the CIPD qualification without the opportunity to submit another assessment and be referred to the CIPD Code of Conduct and Ethics Panel.
- Learners should also be informed of the appeals process.

9. Appeals process

An appeal will be heard by either the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance. If the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance judge that there appear to be valid grounds for an appeal, they will arrange a meeting to hear the appeal.

The meeting will be held no later than 14 working days from the date on which the appeal is received and the learner will be given no less than seven working days' notice of the meeting.

Where a referral has been made to the CIPD Code of Conduct and Ethics Panel, they will be informed that an appeal hearing is taking place.

The Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance will advise the learner, by email of the date, time, and place of the meeting, and will send copies of all papers to be considered at the meeting and invite the learner to attend, to present a case via an online Teams call. They will also inform the learner that a member of cHRysos HR staff (who has not been involved in the investigation to date) will attend to ensure procedural fairness and that the learner may be assisted at the meeting by a fellow enrolled learner or a different team member of cHRysos HR.

In the case of an apprentice, copies of all correspondence will be sent to the apprentice's employer, and the employer will be invited to attend the appeal hearing.

In hearing an appeal, the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance will investigate any procedural irregularities referred to in the learner's letter of appeal and the evidence on which the determination was made by the internal panel. After such a hearing the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance will:

- allow the appeal, if the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance considers that the original decision to confirm the occurrence of plagiarism or other academic malpractice e.g., AI misuse should be set aside, and/or that the outcome should be varied, in the light of demonstrated procedural irregularities or the available evidence; or
- dismiss the appeal, if the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance considers that the decision and/or the outcome should not be set aside or varied; or
- dismiss the appeal against a determination of plagiarism or other academic malpractice, but vary the outcome imposed, subject to the following conditions:
 - that, if the appeal is made on procedural grounds, the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance may not impose a more severe outcome than that originally agreed; and
 - that, if the appeal is made based on new evidence now available, the Managing Director will determine an appropriate course of action from among those that are available to them, as provided above.

In the case of an apprentice, copies of all correspondence will be provided to the apprentice's employer and any decision in relation to the outcome of the appeal hearing will be communicated before contacting the apprentice.

Following the appeal meeting:

- The Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance will, within 5 working days of the conclusion of the meeting to hear the appeal, advise the learner in writing, by letter or email (where this is agreed in advance), of the outcome of the appeal.

In the case of an apprentice, a copy of this letter or email will be sent to the apprentice's employer.

The decision made by the Managing Director or Chair of the Board of Governance in relation to the appeal outcome is final.

10. Use of assistive technology

When reviewing assessments for potential plagiarism or misuse of artificial intelligence, cHRysos HR will consider whether the learner has used assistive technology as part of a reasonable adjustment. This context is crucial, and careful consideration will be taken as it may affect how the learner's work is produced and subsequently scored using plagiarism and AI detection tools. A support plan will be discussed and agreed, which may include alternative support options to replace the use of assistive technology.

Declaration of Conflict-of-Interest Form

Team member's name	
Learner's name	
Programme of Study	
Nature of Relationship	
Staff member's signature	
Date	
Managing Director's comments and outcome	
Managing Director's signature	
Date	

Report of Suspected Malpractice Form

Centre Name	
Centre Number	
Contact Name	
Contact address, phone number and e-mail.	

Qualification Title	Apprenticeship Title

Qualification Unit Code	Unit Title

Learner Number	Learner Name

Please give nature of the incident including who it was reported to and dates

--

Describe the actions taken by the Centre

If there are any other details you feel are relevant to this incident including mitigating circumstances, please give further information below

All malpractice and maladministration events must be reported to the relevant awarding/regulatory body who will then follow their own procedures in relation to any issues arising.