



The International Association of Maritime Institutions

IAMI

IAMI Assessment Malpractice and IAMI Employee Maladministration Policy

Approved by:	Version:	Issue Date:	Review Date:	Contact Person:
IAMI Directors	Ver 4	Oct 2023	Dec 2025	Secretary, IAMI

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Scope of Policy
3. Definition
4. Malpractice and Maladministration examples.
5. Investigation procedure.
6. Responsibility
7. Policy review

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This policy applies to all assessments carried out by the International Association of Maritime Institutions – henceforth known as IAMI.
- 1.2 The purpose of this policy is to ensure that all candidates and apprentices who undertake an assessment are undertaken with established assessment practices and that IAMI assessors / employees ensure all processes are undertaken in a fair and transparent manner.

2. Scope of policy

This policy applies to:

- 2.1 All persons from either the IAMI membership organisation (e.g. employer or training provider, who may act as an examination centre) or IAMI employee involved in the arrangement, assessment and audit of any assessment.

3. Definition

- 3.1 IAMI undertake to deliver assessments that are fair, accessible and do not include any unnecessary barriers to assessment.

4.1 IAMI assessor or employee malpractice

Defined as any deliberate action by an IAMI assessor, employee, or at an employers' premises that has the potential to undermine the integrity of the assessment process.

The following are examples of malpractice; this list is not exhaustive and other examples of malpractice may be considered by the IAMI Directors at their discretion.

- 4.1.1 Improper assistance to candidates.
- 4.1.2 Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (course work or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.
- 4.1.3 Fraudulent submissions that could lead to false claims for certificates.
- 4.1.4 Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- 4.1.5 Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the candidate has not generated.
- 4.1.6 Allowing evidence, which is known not to be the candidate's own, to be included in a candidate's assignment / task / portfolio / coursework.
- 4.1.7 Facilitating and allowing impersonation.

- 4.1.8 Misusing the conditions for special candidate requirements, where the support provided has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
- 4.1.9 Failing to keep assessment / examination / test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination test, or failure to comply with the examination centre requirements as detailed within IAMI form G1.
- 4.1.10 Falsifying records/certificates. For example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.

4.2 Candidate malpractice

Any action by the candidate that has the potential to undermine the integrity and validity of the assessment of the candidate's work.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates; this list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the IAMI Directors at their discretion:

- 4.2.1 Plagiarism of any nature, including the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)
- 4.2.2 Collusion by working collaboratively with other candidates to produce work that is submitted as individual candidate work.
- 4.2.3 Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying).
- 4.2.4 Deliberate destruction of another's work.
- 4.2.5 Fabrication of results or evidence.
- 4.2.6 False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
- 4.2.7 Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination.

4.3 Maladministration

Maladministration is any non-deliberate activity, neglect, default or other practice that results in IAMI or the candidate not complying with the specified requirements for delivery of the qualifications or assessment as set out in the relevant controlled IAMI procedures for EPA assessment

5. Procedures used to deal with malpractice and maladministration

- 5.1 Where the IAMI assessor or employee or IAMI member discovers or suspects an individual, or individuals, of malpractice or maladministration then this will be reported to the IAMI Secretariat at secretary@iami.org.uk
- 5.2 Such an investigation will be initially undertaken by the IAMI Secretary with evidence supplied by the reporting individual/s. Where the malpractice or maladministration involves the IAMI Secretary, then the IAMI Chair must be informed, and they will undertake the role of investigation official. chairman@iami.org.uk

5.3 The investigation will proceed through the following stages:

Stage 1: Preliminary investigation, conducted by the IAMI Secretariat, into the allegation to determine whether a full investigation is necessary. If the allegation appears to have substance, then one or more of the following actions will be undertaken:

- 5.3.1 for candidate malpractice, then all assessments for that candidate should be halted until the investigation is complete
- 5.3.2 for IAMI employee or assessor malpractice or maladministration, then that employee / assessor will be suspended from further assessments until the investigation is complete
- 5.3.3 For employer premises used for assessment, then that that premises will be suspended from undertaking further assessments until the investigation is complete

5.4 Stage 2: should it be determined from stage 1 that a full investigation is necessary it shall be conducted by an independent IAMI Director who has no links with the candidate, employer, training provider and/or assessment process. The independent Director who will be assigned as the Investigating Officer must have existing experience in undertaking academic investigations of this nature. The Investigating Officer may request further written evidence from the candidate, the assessor assigned to the candidate, the centre used for assessment and/or IAMI member.

All personnel linked to the allegation will be interviewed. All data evidence within the IAMI EPA portal will be retained for a minimum of 12 months.

5.5 The Investigating Officer shall produce a report of their findings for attention of IAMI Directors, and where appropriate the External Quality Assurance (Ofqual) – stage 3. This report should determine as a minimum whether:

- 5.5.1 The assessment under investigation should be annulled and retaken
- 5.5.2 Other assessments by the person/s accused of malpractice should be re-examined or investigated
- 5.5.3 The assessor should be retained for future EPA assessments
- 5.5.4 The employer's premises should be retained for future EPA assessments
- 5.5.5 IAMI policies and processes require modification or change
- 5.5.6 Recommendations that will prevent further malpractice or maladministration from recurring

6 Responsibility

The ultimate responsibility for the monitoring of this policy rests with the IAMI Board of Directors. All assessments irregularities are brought to their attention at a formal meeting, and the subsequent findings and actions recorded.

7 Policy Review

The effectiveness of this policy will be reviewed every three years considering experience and best practice. This mechanism recognises that changes as a result of experience may prompt a review of the policy before the end of this three-year period.