



# **SPEEDLINK INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATIONS (SITI)**

Policy and Procedure: Malpractice and Maladministration Policy and Procedure

Policy Number: SITI-QA-MAL-001

Version: 1.0

Effective Date: 1st, February 2026

Approved By: SITI Board of Directors

# 1. Purpose

To protect the credibility and value of SITI's certifications, assessments, and training records by:

- Defining and prohibiting malpractice (deliberate acts of dishonesty by students, tutors, or staff).
- Defining and preventing maladministration (systemic or repeated failures in SITI's processes that harm students or compromise quality).
- Establishing clear investigation and sanction procedures.
- Ensuring compliance with partner requirements (e.g., EC-Council, other certification bodies).

This policy upholds SITI's mission of delivering industry-aligned, practical, and job-ready skills with Excellence and Integrity.

# 2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- All students enrolled in any SITI training pathway (Individual, Corporate, Partner/Donor-supported, NYSC, SIWES).
- All tutors, lecturers, and guest speakers engaged by SITI.
- All staff (Training Coordinator, Admin, Technical, Marketing, Project Managers, Ushers, Janitors, Protocol).
- All contractors and vendors whose actions affect assessment or certification (e.g., invigilators, printing vendors for certificates).
- All activities including: lectures, quizzes, exams, project submissions (Business Development Plan, graduation projects), LMS usage, certificate issuance, and record-keeping.

# 3. Definitions

Term	Definition
Malpractice	Any deliberate act, omission, or behaviour by a student, tutor, or staff member that compromises the integrity of SITI's assessment, certification, or admission processes. Malpractice is typically intentional

	and benefits or attempts to benefit the perpetrator.
Maladministration	A systemic failure, repeated error, or significant oversight in SITI's administrative or operational processes that adversely affects students, partners, or the integrity of SITI's awards. Maladministration is usually unintentional but results from poor processes or lack of training.
Plagiarism	Using another person's work (text, code, design, idea) without proper acknowledgment, and presenting it as one's own.
Collusion	Unauthorised collaboration between students on an assessment intended to be completed individually.
Impersonation	Having another person take an assessment or complete work on one's behalf.
Falsification	Creating, altering, or fabricating documents, records, or data (e.g., falsifying attendance logs, grade sheets, certificates).
Bribery	Offering, giving, receiving, or soliciting anything of value to influence an assessment outcome, admission, or certification decision.
Leakage	Unauthorised disclosure of assessment materials (exam questions, project topics) before or during the assessment period.
Due Diligence	The level of care and proactive process management reasonably expected from SITI to prevent maladministration.

## 4. Policy Statement

SITI has zero tolerance for malpractice. Any proven act of malpractice by a student, tutor, or staff will result in serious consequences, up to and including expulsion, termination, or legal action.

SITI is committed to preventing maladministration through robust procedures, staff training, and continuous improvement. Where maladministration occurs, SITI will promptly remedy the harm to affected students and correct the underlying process failures.

## 5. Categories and Examples

### 5.1 Malpractice by Students

Category	Examples
Cheating in assessments	Copying from another student during a test; using unauthorised notes or devices; accessing the internet during a closed-book exam.
Plagiarism	Copying code, project reports, or business development plans from online sources or other students without citation.
Collusion	Working with others on an individual assignment or project without authorisation.
Impersonation	Paying someone else to take a quiz, exam, or present a project.
Falsification	Submitting fake medical certificates to excuse absence; forging a tutor's signature on an attendance sheet.

Tampering	Hacking into the LMS to change grades; altering submitted work after marking.
Unauthorised sharing	Sharing exam questions or model answers with students in a later cohort before they take the same assessment.
Bribery	Offering a tutor money, gifts, or favours in exchange for a higher grade or certificate.

## 5.2 Malpractice by Tutors or Staff

Category	Examples
Improper influence	Changing a student's grade in exchange for personal benefit.
Leakage	Sharing exam questions or project topics with students before the authorised time.
Falsification	Submitting false attendance records, grade sheets, or completion certificates.
Plagiarism	Using copyrighted or uncredited materials in training content without permission.
Bribery	Soliciting or accepting payment to admit a student who does not meet requirements.
Neglect of duty	Failing to invigilate properly, allowing widespread cheating.

## 5.3 Maladministration (Institutional Failures)

Category	Examples
Record-keeping failures	Losing student files, grades, or attendance records; failing to maintain backups (contrary to Section 5.1 of main SOP).
Assessment errors	Miscalculating grades; applying the wrong marking scheme; losing submitted assignments.
Certification errors	Issuing certificates with wrong names, dates, or programs; failing to update the verification portal (per Section 4.7.2 of main SOP).
Communication failures	Not notifying students of assessment dates, venue changes, or results in a timely manner.
Procedural violations	Failing to follow the published academic calendar; not uploading LMS materials 24 hours before lectures (per Section 4.3.3).
Data protection breaches	Exposing student personal data without consent (LMS, ID cards, enrollment forms).
Inequitable treatment	Applying admission or grading criteria inconsistently across cohorts.

## **6. Procedure for Handling Malpractice (Student or Staff)**

### **6.1 Discovery and Reporting**

Any person (student, tutor, staff, invigilator) who suspects or witnesses malpractice must report it immediately to the Training Coordinator (or Board Secretary if the Coordinator is implicated).

Reporting methods:

- Verbal report (followed by written summary within 24 hours).
- Written report using the SITI Malpractice Report Form (Appendix A).
- Anonymous reports accepted but may limit investigation.

Timeline: Report should be made within 5 working days of the incident or discovery.

### **6.2 Initial Assessment (within 3 working days)**

The Training Coordinator (or an appointed investigator, if impartiality requires) will:

1. Acknowledge receipt of the report.
2. Determine whether the allegation, if proven, would constitute malpractice (vs. simple error or minor misconduct).
3. Decide whether to:
  - Dismiss (trivial or no evidence) – notify reporter in writing.
  - Investigate (reasonable grounds exist).
  - Refer to another policy (e.g., Complaints Procedure, Grievance Policy).

### **6.3 Investigation**

Investigator: Training Coordinator, unless the Coordinator is accused or has a conflict of interest. In that case, the Board Secretary appoints an independent investigator (e.g., a Board member or external consultant).

Process:

1. Notify the accused individual in writing of the allegation, their right to respond, and the potential consequences.

2. Gather evidence: examination papers, LMS logs, CCTV (if available), witness statements, email/WhatsApp records.
3. Interview the accused, the reporter, and any witnesses. Interviews may be recorded.
4. Complete the investigation within 15 working days (extendable by up to 10 working days for complex cases, with written notice to all parties).

Standard of proof: Balance of probabilities (i.e., it is more likely than not that malpractice occurred).

## 6.4 Decision and Sanctions

The investigator issues a written report with findings and recommended sanctions to the Training Coordinator (or Board Secretary for Coordinator cases). The decision is communicated to the accused within 5 working days of completing the report.

### Sanctions for Students

Severity	Examples of Malpractice	Possible Sanctions
Minor (first offence, low impact)	Minor plagiarism (a few sentences without citation); unauthorised collaboration on a low-stakes quiz.	Written warning; zero on the specific assignment; mandatory academic integrity training.
Serious	Copying on a final exam; significant plagiarism (entire project); impersonation; bribery attempt.	Zero on the assessment with no resit opportunity; suspension from program for one batch; notation on student record.
Very Serious (repeat offence or major fraud)	Selling exam papers; hacking LMS; forging a certificate; second serious offence.	Expulsion from SITI (no refund); revocation of any certificates already issued; ban from future enrollment; referral to law enforcement if criminal (e.g., forgery).

## Sanctions for Tutors or Staff

Severity	Examples	Possible Sanctions
Minor	Negligent invigilation (not intentional).	Written warning; retraining; increased supervision.
Serious	Leaking exam questions; favouritism in grading; falsifying attendance.	Suspension without pay; termination of contract; ineligibility for future engagement.
Very Serious	Bribery; certificate forgery; systemic falsification of records.	Immediate termination; legal action (criminal or civil); reporting to professional bodies (e.g., EC-Council).

## 6.5 Right to Appeal

The accused student or staff member may appeal the finding or sanction using the SITl Appeal Procedure (for academic decisions) or the SITl Grievance Procedure (for employment decisions). The appeal must be filed within 10 working days of receiving the decision.

## 7. Procedure for Handling Maladministration

Unlike malpractice (individual acts), maladministration is a systemic or process failure. The goal is remedy and prevention, not punishment (though repeated maladministration may lead to staff performance management).

### 7.1 Identification

Maladministration may be identified through:

- Student complaints (per SITl Complaints Procedure).
- Internal audits (e.g., LMS content upload checks, certificate verification audits).
- Tutor or staff reports.
- External partner feedback (EC-Council, corporate clients).

- Monthly reporting (Section 5.2 of main SOP).

## 7.2 Reporting and Logging

Any person who identifies a potential maladministration issue reports it to the Training Coordinator using the SITI Maladministration Report Form (Appendix B). The Coordinator maintains a Maladministration Log containing:

- Date of report.
- Description of the failure.
- Students/staff affected.
- Root cause (process, training, resource issue).
- Action taken.
- Date resolved.

## 7.3 Investigation and Remedy

The Training Coordinator (or Board Secretary for systemic issues) will:

1. Acknowledge the report within 3 working days.
2. Investigate root cause within 10 working days (may involve department heads: Technical, Admin, Marketing).
3. Implement remedy for affected students, which may include:
  - Regrading or reassessment.
  - Re-issuing corrected certificates.
  - Extending deadlines or offering catch-up sessions.
  - Compensation (e.g., fee waiver for a future course, refund of a portion of fees) – only where demonstrable financial loss occurred.
4. Correct the process to prevent recurrence (e.g., update SOP, retrain staff, improve LMS backup procedures).
5. Notify affected students of the remedy within 5 working days of completion.

## 7.4 Reporting to External Bodies

If maladministration affects the validity of certifications recognised by EC-Council or another partner, the Training Coordinator must notify the partner within 10 working days of confirmation, and follow their required remediation process (e.g., re-examination, audit).

## 8. Prevention and Quality Assurance

### 8.1 Student Awareness

- The Student Code of Conduct (separate document) and this policy summary are included in orientation (Section 4.2.2 of main SOP).
- Students must acknowledge understanding of malpractice rules before LMS access is granted.
- Reminders before major assessments (exams, project submissions).

### 8.2 Tutor and Staff Training

- All tutors and invigilators receive training on malpractice prevention (e.g., proper invigilation, plagiarism detection, secure handling of assessment materials).
- Staff handling certificates and records are trained on data integrity and verification portal procedures (Section 4.7.2).

### 8.3 Technical Safeguards

- LMS (per Section 4.3.3) will, where feasible, include: plagiarism detection tools, time-stamped submissions, and access logs.
- Certificate verification portal is updated within 48 hours of graduation (Section 4.7.2) to prevent fraudulent certificates.

### 8.4 Audits

The Training Coordinator conducts a quarterly internal audit of:

- Random sample of graded assessments for consistency.
- LMS content upload timeliness (24-hour rule from Section 4.3.3).
- Certificate issuance and verification records.
- Student file completeness (Section 4.2.1).

Audit findings are reported to the Board in the monthly report.

## 9. Documentation and Records

Record	Responsible Party	Retention
Malpractice investigation files (reports, evidence, decisions)	Training Coordinator	5 years after case closed
Maladministration log and remedy actions	Training Coordinator	3 years
Audit reports	Training Coordinator	5 years
Student acknowledgment of malpractice policy	Admin	Duration of student file (5 years post-graduation per main SOP Section 5.1)

## 10. Reporting

The Training Coordinator includes in the monthly report to the Board (Section 5.2 of main SOP):

- Number of malpractice allegations (by type: student, tutor, staff).
- Number upheld, dismissed, pending.
- Sanctions imposed (summary, anonymised).
- Number of maladministration reports.
- Remedies provided and process improvements made.
- Audit findings and corrective actions.

## 11. Related Documents and Policies

- SITI Comprehensive SOP (Version 2.0, April 2026)
- SITI Appeal Procedure
- SITI Complaints Procedure
- SITI Code of Conduct for Students (to be developed)
- SITI Code of Conduct for Staff (to be developed)
- SITI Data Protection Policy (to be developed)
- EC-Council Examination Integrity Policy (as applicable)

## 12. Policy Review

This policy will be reviewed biannually as part of SITI's SOP review cycle (Section 5.3 of main SOP) and whenever a significant malpractice or maladministration incident occurs, or when a certification partner updates its integrity requirements.

---

### Appendix A: SITI Malpractice Report Form

*(For reporting alleged malpractice by a student, tutor, or staff member)*

Field	Information
Reporter Name (may be anonymous)	
Role (Student / Tutor / Staff / Other)	
Date of Report	
Contact (if not anonymous)	
Alleged Malpractice By	<input type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Tutor <input type="checkbox"/> Staff <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Name(s) of Alleged Perpetrator(s)	
Date(s) of Incident(s)	
Location / Context (e.g., LMS, final exam, project submission)	
Description of Alleged Malpractice (what happened, what rule was violated)	
Supporting Evidence (attached: screenshots, photos, witness names)	

---

---

Witnesses (names and contact if known)

---

Has this been raised informally?  Yes (with whom?)  No

---

Signature (if not anonymous)

---

Date

---

For Official Use Only (Training Coordinator):

- Received on: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Acknowledged to reporter (if named) on: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Initial assessment:  Dismiss  Investigate  Refer to \_\_\_\_\_
  - Investigator appointed:  Coordinator  Board Secretary  External
  - Investigation completed on: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Decision issued on: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Sanctions applied: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Accused informed on: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Appeal filed:  Yes (by \_\_\_\_\_)  No
  - Case closed on: \_\_\_\_\_
- 

## Appendix B: SITI Maladministration Report Form

*(For reporting systemic or process failures)*

Field	Information
Reporter Name	
Role	
Date of Report	
Description of Failure (what went wrong, which process)	

---

---

Students or Parties Affected (number or names)

---

Potential Impact (e.g., delayed certificates, incorrect grades)

---

Suggested Remedy (if any)

---

Signature

---

For Official Use Only (Training Coordinator):

- Received on: \_\_\_\_\_
- Root cause identified:  Process gap  Staff error  Technical failure  Other
- Remedy provided to affected students on: \_\_\_\_\_
- Process correction implemented (describe): \_\_\_\_\_
- Affected students notified on: \_\_\_\_\_
- Case closed on: \_\_\_\_\_
- Referred to Board for policy change:  Yes  No

**SPEEDLINK**

Institute of Technology and Innovation

---