



2025

SAiGE **Connect.**
Create.
Certify_

SKILLS FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN GLOBAL EDUCATION

Malpractice and
Maladministration Policy

Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Introduction

The aim of this policy is to provide guidance for staff, associates at SAIGE and its approved centres on the management of malpractice and maladministration. In addition, learners should be provided with this policy, so they are aware of the different types of malpractice and maladministration, how they can be avoided and the possible sanctions that may be imposed.

SAIGE takes issues relating to malpractice and maladministration seriously.

Definition of Malpractice

SAIGE defines malpractice as 'non-compliance with the procedures and policies relating to the assessment and quality assurance processes required in centres, which may adversely affect the integrity of a qualification and its assessment'.

Malpractice includes:

- maladministration
- failure to maintain appropriate records or systems
- the deliberate falsification of records or documents
- acts of plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct which are not detected or challenged by centres

Issues of malpractice which are not managed effectively damage the reputation and credibility of centres and SAIGE.

Centre responsibility

It is important that learners understand SAIGE policy on malpractice from the very beginning of their programme of learning and therefore they must be directed to this information as part of their induction. Centres are required to have their own Malpractice and Maladministration policies which staff understand and implement robustly. SAIGE staff and associates are expected to reinforce information and check for malpractice during their visits to centres.



Learners will be encouraged to adopt good academic practice in terms of preparing their work. Centres must ensure that learners understand the preferred referencing technique of the centre. This should be applied consistently by learners, in all work which is submitted for assessment and external quality assurance.

Centre staff and associates must ensure that learners understand the different forms of malpractice.

These can include:

Collusion

This is when a learner submits work as their own, when in reality it is done in collaboration with another person. This also includes actions where a learner knowingly permits another participant to copy all or part of their work and submit it as an original piece of work.

Falsifying Data

This could take place in for example research projects when learners need to gather and make use of primary data to support an argument.

Fraudulent Claims for special considerations

This might include forged or falsified documentation associated with a bogus illness or disability.

Ghosting

This occurs when a learner submits work as their own when it has been produced in whole or part by another person on their behalf. This includes the buying of assignments from the internet. In addition, it includes attempting to pass off work created by AI as your own. See more information relating to AI below.

Plagiarism

This is defined as the presentation of work by learners as their own, without appropriate acknowledgment that the source belongs to others. This would include the summarising of someone else's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation; the inclusion of another person's work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the sources; the use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source; copying the work of another participant.

This list is not exhaustive, and action will be taken against all forms of dishonest practice.



Managing the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI)

The table below provides **examples** of the risks associated with student use of generative AI and how to mitigate them (this is not an exclusive nor exhaustive listing). For all assessments developed SAIGE will review the assessment to ensure the risk of committing malpractice using generative AI is reduced.

Assessment Vehicle	Risks	Possible Mitigating Actions
Written Assignment	Learners could use AI to generate assignment content.	- Include real world and current events in the assessment. - Combine with another type of assessment such as a professional discussion or presentation. - Include a personal reflection in the assessment.
Presentation	Learners could use AI to generate presentation content.	- Include interactive elements such as a question and answer session. - Ask learners to include a personal reflection from their experience.
Portfolio of Evidence	Learners could copy and paste AI generated text and pass it off as their own	- Focus on real world tasks, particularly where workplace evidence is used. - Include personal reflection from their experience as required evidence. - Include witness statements where possible.
Reports or Briefings	Learners could copy and paste AI generated text or images and pass it off as their own.	Give learners a specific topic which requires depth of research.

In some circumstances assessment briefs may be developed that allow the use of AI, where this is allowed the use of AI should be appropriately referenced.

Centres must ensure learners understand the research benefits of AI but also the risks and how inappropriate use could lead to malpractice



Requirements of Centres

All centre staff involved in the assessment and quality assurance of SAIGE qualifications should be fully aware of the contents of this policy. Centres should also ensure learners studying for SAIGE qualifications are duly aware of the contents of the policy. When a centre applies for approval, it will need to confirm that relevant staff have read and understood this policy. In addition, approved centres are required to establish and publish their own malpractice policy which states how they will prevent, identify, investigate and manage cases of malpractice. Centres should keep their malpractice policy under review to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

SAIGE needs to be informed when cases of alleged malpractice have taken place and will take action as appropriate. A failure by a centre to report suspected or actual cases of malpractice or maladministration, or a failure to have in place effective arrangements to prevent such cases, may lead to sanctions being imposed by SAIGE.

Examples of situations where centres should inform SAIGE are as follows:

- a member of staff is suspected of malpractice
- the issue of malpractice potentially involves learners and/or staff in 2 or more centres
- malpractice is systemic across a group of learners
- the malpractice or maladministration calls into question the validity of a previous result
- forged/fake certificates have been identified

The list above is not exhaustive, and advice should be sought from SAIGE where centres are not sure what cases should be reported. In addition, a centre that requires advice and guidance on how to prevent and investigate cases of malpractice should also contact SAIGE.

SAIGE will periodically check centres compliance with this policy and how the centre has developed and implemented its internal policies.

Managing Cases of Malpractice

SAIGE believes it is important to have clearly described workable systems for investigating and managing cases of malpractice. These must be understood by staff, associates and centres so that relevant parties know their responsibilities and rights, including the right of appeal against any decisions taken. Individuals must be clear to whom they should report suspected cases of malpractice, how this should be done and within what timescales. This will normally require a written statement from the individual, so that the basis for the allegations is in place and a documented trail of information is established.

It is evident that types of malpractice are likely to vary but it is important that all are promptly and rigorously investigated in order to avoid possible adverse effects. The purpose of the investigation will be to establish the full facts and circumstances, and, in some cases, no further action may be required.

Records of all investigations will be retained by SAIGE for a period of five years.



On completion of an investigation, the centre will be informed of the outcome and any sanctions if appropriate. In serious cases Ofqual and other regulators will be informed. In addition, in some cases other 3rd parties will be informed, such as the Home Office or other awarding organisations.

Process

The Allegation

The identifier of the potential malpractice should state their concerns, in writing and send them to the Head of Quality and Assessment along with any evidence. The identifier may be an individual at the centre (staff or learner), a SAIGE External Quality Assurer (EQA), a regulator, member of the public or an internal member of the SAIGE team. Where the alleged malpractice involved the Head of Quality and Assessment the communication should be sent to the SAIGE Chief Executive.

Acknowledgement

The Head of Quality and Assessment will acknowledge the communication within 3 days or earlier should the situation warrant it.

Investigation

The Head of Quality and Assessment will conduct an investigation into the allegations within 10 working days.

The investigation will aim to

- review the allegations and those involved
- identify and, if necessary, take action to minimise the risk to current learners
- evaluate any action already taken by the centre, if any
- determine whether action is required to reduce the risk to current learners
- establish whether any action is required in respect of certificates that have already issued
- obtain evidence to support any sanctions
- identify any patterns of malpractice, either relating to the centre in question or with the relevant qualification/s
- identify any changes to policy SAIGE may need to make

The investigation may include interviewing individuals associated with the allegations and reviewing evidence submitted by the initial identifier or other parties.

Upon completion of the investigation the Head of Quality will submit a written report to the Chief Executive which will summarise the outcomes and proposed sanctions, if appropriate. The Chief Executive will sign off any actions against the centre, learner/s or other individuals deemed to have committed the malpractice. The Head of Quality will write to the parties in question with the outcome of investigation with reasons behind any sanctions if sanctions have been applied.

Investigation Outcomes

The outcome of the investigation will depend on whether malpractice has taken place and the nature and severity of the incident/s.



The outcomes may include

- no action taken
- warning letter issued
- sanctions applied (see sanctions section below)
- where appropriate we reserve the right to inform other relevant external organisations, such as other Awarding Organisations and/or regulators

The management team at SAIGE will review the outcomes of malpractice investigations to ensure lessons are learnt.

Please note the timescales stated above are estimates and the exact timescales will depend on a number of factors.

Sanctions

SAIGE's role as an awarding organisation is to uphold the standards of the qualifications it awards, where malpractice has been found to occur appropriate sanctions will be applied to ensure the ongoing validity of the qualifications.

Examples of sanctions include

- mandatory training for centre staff
- additional centre monitoring
- withdrawal of centre approval
- suspension of learner registrations on one or more qualifications
- withdrawal of already issued certificates
- withdrawal of individual learner registrations

Appeals

Centres and learners may appeal against any action taken by SAIGE by following the process stated in the **Enquiries and Appeals Policy**.

Note – Alleged malpractice by SAIGE staff or associates will be dealt with through internal disciplinary procedures.



Review

Document ID	Document Title	Work Area	Version Number	Issue Date	Review Date	Author	Ofqual Related
POL	MALPRMALAD	ADM	v0.2	March 2025	March 2026	J Jones/ R Palmer	Y

Version Control

Version Number	Summary of change	Date Changed	New Review Date

