



ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY

Previous Date of Policy	August 2024
Reviewer(s)	Assistant Principal Academic
Approved by	Principal September 2025
Review by Date	January 2027

Roles and Responsibilities:

Principal	Dr Ian Gross
Vice Principal	Ms Liz Jennings
Assistant Principal Academic	Ms Rebecca Champion
Director of UFP	Mr Jonathan Hawkins

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Plagiarism.....	2
Collusion.....	3
malpractice	3
International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme	5
Related Policies	5

INTRODUCTION

The school believes academic honesty to be an essential part of school life that should be upheld by all teaching and support staff, and students, with all work produced (in lessons, and outside lesson time; and in exam situations).

The school deems an authentic piece of work to be one that is based on the author's original ideas with the ideas and work of others fully acknowledged. It is expected that all work should use the candidate's own language, expression, and ideas. Also, that all sources are fully and appropriately acknowledged, including in written exams. The school uses Turnitin software (all languages) to check the integrity of work submitted by students for assessment purposes. In addition, documentation is provided for staff and students to support them in adhering to current guidelines, specifically the use of AI. Students are encouraged to independently use Editor's Similarity checker as a feature available in Microsoft Word to raise the visibility and importance of this issue.

The school recognises the following departures from academic honesty and the Academic Team is required to be vigilant in watching for these:

PLAGIARISM

Definition: Any representation of the ideas or works of another person as one's own.

This ranges from large scale copying of information from the internet to failing to acknowledge the use of another's image. All ideas and works of another person, photographs, maps, diagrams, illustrations, and data must be acknowledged according to the referencing style being utilised. Not giving due accreditation to others' work or attempting to pass others' work off as the candidate's own is intellectual property theft, is considered as malpractice by examining bodies, and can result in disqualification. As stated earlier, the school uses the software Turnitin to

check for plagiarism. Use of generative AI that is not referenced will be considered as plagiarism.

COLLUSION

Definition: Any situation where one candidate's work is presented as the work of another.

In most circumstances, students are expected to work independently, and all submitted work must be expressed in their own words. Collusion occurs when candidates work together in a way that undermines the authenticity of their work. Examples include one student producing an entire piece of work for another to submit, or substantial similarities (such as identical paragraphs) appearing in two candidates' essays or exam scripts.

There can be a fine line between acceptable collaboration and collusion. If students are unsure whether a particular form of cooperation is permitted, they are strongly encouraged to seek clarification from the Academic team before submitting their work.

MALPRACTICE

Definition: Any deliberate act of wrongdoing, contrary to the rules of examinations designed to give a candidate an unfair advantage.

Codes of conduct for examinations are published in advance of exams on the examinations noticeboards and can be obtained from the Examinations Officer. They should prevent academic malpractice and ensure that students complete exams and assessments independently. As routine, the Examinations Officer reminds students of the codes of conduct, in advance of examinations. Additionally, students have internal assessments throughout the year under examination conditions, to enable them to become familiar and compliant before they take any external examinations.

The responsibility for academic honesty is as follows:

- It is the responsibility of the Principal, Vice Principal and the Assistant Principal Academic to ensure that all students, and teaching and support staff, are aware of the definition of academic honesty and what constitutes academic dishonesty. It is also their responsibility to establish a school culture that promotes academic honesty.

- It is the responsibility of teaching and support staff to ensure to the best of their ability that all submitted work is the authentic work of the candidate, and to remain vigilant for plagiarism and collusion. Teachers must also give specific guidelines that encourage candidates to develop their own ideas through problem solving, comparison, precise hypothesis, analysis, and techniques.
- It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that all sources are fully and appropriately acknowledged and that the work submitted is authentically their own and submitted within the deadline set.
- In examinations, it is the responsibility of the invigilator or examiner to be vigilant and report to the school Examinations Officer or Examining Body any cases of suspected plagiarism, collusion, or cheating. This includes those employed by the school to invigilate exams, whether internal or external. Examining bodies regularly spot check individuals' work for plagiarism.

If academic dishonesty is detected:

- By the teacher: the student will be allowed one opportunity to revise and resubmit work (e.g. coursework).
- By the teacher / Examinations Officer during an internal on-line assessment / examination: the student evidence will be reviewed by the teacher / Curriculum Director and/or House Pastoral Director / Assistant Principal Academic (depending on severity/number of offences) and the student will subsequently be interviewed (viva voce) and presented with the evidence. If it is determined that the offence is upheld, the student will be issued with a U Grade for that assessment, the offence recorded on iSAMS, if the offence is plagiarism the student will be enrolled on the Plagiarism Awareness Course (via iSAMS note under 'Academic Honesty') and a disciplinary Stage issued according to the severity / number of offence(s).
- By the Examining Body: a formal investigation will be launched by the Assistant Principal Academic (or Director of UFP if the offence occurs during an official UFP examination), and a report will be produced and submitted to a committee of the examining body.

For example, for the IB, evidence would be gathered for a report to the IB's Final Award Committee, which would include statements from the Assistant Principal Academic, the teacher and the candidate. If the committee decides that malpractice has occurred, in the most extreme cases no mark will be given for the subject, and the Diploma will not be awarded. A similar outcome would occur for A Levels, UFP, and GCSE programmes of study.

Sanctions

- School sanctions are illustrated on the Discipline Ladder and may be applied in addition to any action taken by Examination Boards – see school Student Behaviour Policy.
- Students have the right of appeal under the Complaints Policy, and they will be given the opportunity to explain before formal action is taken.

INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE DIPLOMA PROGRAMME

This policy incorporates guidelines and strategies contained in the IBO's 'Academic Integrity Policy' (updated 2025): [Academic Integrity - International Baccalaureate®](#). All IB students and teachers have access to the IBDP guidance and documentation. It is their responsibility to read and implement the most up-to-date requirements including 'Guidance on the use of artificial intelligence' (Academic Integrity Policy, Appendix 6): [Artificial intelligence \(AI\) in learning, teaching, and assessment - International Baccalaureate®](#) and 'Effective citing and referencing' (IBO, 2022) [Effective citing and referencing](#).

RELATED POLICIES

- Student Behaviour
- Attendance
- Teaching and Learning, Assessment and Reporting
- Exams
- Learning Resource Centre and Library
- Online Safety