

ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY

Date of policy review:	June 2025
Date for Review:	September 2027
Lead for Review:	Deputy Head Academic

Contents

Contents.....	2
Preface	3
Recognising Academic Dishonesty.....	3
Plagiarism.....	3
Collusion.....	3
Artificial Intelligence (AI).....	4
Referencing Systems	4
Detecting Academic Dishonesty	4
Cheating in Exams	5
Irregular/Non-Attendance	5
Responsibilities regarding academic honesty.....	5
Dealing with Academic Dishonesty.....	6
Student Sanctions	6
Related Policies	6
Appendices.....	8
Appendix 1 – AI Detection Measures.....	8

Preface

At Guildhouse School, we are committed to fostering a culture where students are encouraged to Aim High Work Hard and Be Kind . Academic honesty is central to this mission. By upholding integrity in all academic work, students not only show respect for their own learning but also for the efforts of their peers and teachers. This policy sets out clear expectations and consequences around plagiarism and cheating, ensuring that all achievements reflect genuine effort and personal growth.

The school deems an authentic piece of work to be one where all work should use the candidate's own language, expression and ideas, and that all sources are fully and appropriately acknowledged, including during exams.

The school uses Turnitin (https://www.turnitinuk.com/login_page.asp) software to check the integrity of coursework or other work submitted by students.

Recognising Academic Dishonesty

The school recognises the following circumstances whereby teachers are required to be vigilant in watching for these:

Plagiarism

Any representation of the ideas or works of another person as your 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 in the same way as a quotation from a book. Not giving due accreditation to others' work or attempting to pass others work off as the candidates own is intellectual property theft and is considered as malpractice by examining bodies and can result in disqualification.

For formal coursework or assignments, a specific referencing system (most likely Harvard) must be used in line with the requirements of the course and subject.

Collusion

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

In most circumstances, independent working is expected, and work should be produced in a candidate's own words.

Collusion includes one candidate producing an entire piece of work for another to submit, or identical paragraphs appearing in two candidates' essays or exam scripts. Collusion has occurred in both situations.

There is a fine line between what is considered co-operation and what is collusion. Guidance should be sought if there is any doubt.

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The use of AI chatbots to write essays or complete assessed work is considered a form of plagiarism. However, AI can be used to assist with assessed work in some cases. For example, AI can be used to:

- Generate ideas.
- Improve writing style.
- Check for plagiarism.

Students should always ask their teacher if they are unsure whether it is permitted to use AI for a particular assignment.

If you use AI, you must reference the use of which chatbot and for what purpose it was used specifically for. If the use was to create your work, your work may be detected for academic dishonesty and dealt with (as per the other sections of this policy).

Referencing Systems

The school uses a variety of referencing systems depending on the subject and the type of assessment.

Students will be informed by their teacher which referencing system to use for each assignment. Any referencing must also include any AI chatbots used as well as for what reason if it was used.

For example:

Referencing a book:

Smith, J., & Doe, J. (2024). The role of large language models in academic research: A systematic review. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 78, 123-156.

Referencing a web page:

Brown, John. "The Impact of AI on Education." *Technology Today*, 15 Mar. 2023, www.yahoo.com/AI/Education. Accessed 4 Nov. 2024.

Referencing a journal:

Smith, J., & Doe, J. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence on education. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(1), 15-30. www.journals.com/AI/Education

Referencing the use of AI:

Google. (2023). *Gemini Advanced*. Accessed November 4, 2024. Input question 1: "What are the main ethical concerns surrounding the use of large language models in academic research?"

Google. (2023). *Gemini Advanced*. Accessed November 4, 2024. Input question 2: "Tell me a list of news reports on ethical concerns regarding AI?"

Detecting Academic Dishonesty

The school employs a multi-layered approach to detecting academic dishonesty, utilising both technological tools and the expertise of our educators.

- Technology-Assisted Detection:
 - Plagiarism Detection Software: We utilize plagiarism detection software, such as Turnitin, to compare student work against a vast database of academic and online

resources. This software identifies textual similarities and flags potential instances of plagiarism.

- AI Detection Tools: The school is actively exploring and implementing AI detection tools to identify work that may have been generated by AI chatbots. These tools analyse text for patterns and characteristics common in AI-generated content.
- Expertise:
 - Teacher Vigilance: Teachers play a crucial role in detecting academic dishonesty. Their familiarity with students' writing styles, knowledge of subject matter, and careful review of work enable them to identify inconsistencies or irregularities that may indicate plagiarism, collusion, or AI use. Teachers also analyse student work for signs of critical thinking, originality, and engagement with the subject matter, which can help distinguish authentic work from AI-generated content.
 - Professional Development: The school provides ongoing professional development to equip teachers with the knowledge and skills to effectively detect academic dishonesty, including recognising the signs of AI-generated work.
- Collaborative Approach:
 - The school fosters a collaborative approach to detecting academic dishonesty, encouraging communication and information sharing between teachers, curriculum directors, and other relevant staff members. This collaborative effort ensures a comprehensive and effective system for upholding academic integrity.

Cheating in Exams

Codes of conduct for examinations are published in advance of exams by JCQ and can be obtained from the Examinations Officer.

Students are also presented with these guidelines on appropriate and dishonest behaviours in an assembly session.

Copying, taking study materials or communication devices into the examination and any form of communication between candidates, among other things, are prohibited during exams.

Irregular/Non-Attendance

The school considers regular attendance of classes and activities to be a compulsory part of academic honesty, since failure to do so is a failure to fulfil obligations to parents, sponsors, teachers and fellow students.

Responsibilities regarding academic honesty

The responsibility for academic honesty is as follows:

1. It is the responsibility of the Curriculum Directors to ensure that all students and 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.
2. It is the responsibility of the teaching 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" (IBO, 2009).

3. 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.
4. It is the responsibility of the invigilators and Examinations Officer to be vigilant and report to the examining body any cases of suspected plagiarism, collusion or cheating. Examining bodies regularly spot check individuals work for plagiarism.

Dealing with Academic Dishonesty

If academic dishonesty is detected:

- **By the teacher**
 - The teacher and respective Curriculum Director holds a 1:1 meeting with student to share concerns and provide opportunity for the student to feedback. Further discussion will take place to verify the authenticity of the work submitted and a joint decision will be made between the subject teacher and the Curriculum Director on whether to accept, decline, allow resubmission or discount marks.
 - The incident and outcome must be recorded on Shackleton. The student is informed of the outcome by the Curriculum Director, who also reinforces the severity of the issue and that it is not to be repeated. The Pastoral Director is to be kept informed as a Stage Warning will likely be attached to the outcome.
- **By the examining body**
 - A formal investigation will be launched, and a report will be produced and submitted to a committee of the examining body.
 - For example, for the UFP, evidence would be gathered for a report to the UFP Final Award Committee, which would include statements from the Deputy Head, 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 UFP qualification will not be awarded. A similar process would occur for A Level, Pre-A Level, CSVPA and AEM programmes.

Any investigation will be reviewed, as required, by an academic panel which will include at least one member of the Senior Leadership Team. The investigation outcome will consider the report of the academic dishonesty, any viva (or similar) and any historical occurrences.

Student Sanctions

The school discipline policy may also be applied in addition to any action taken by examination boards – see school 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.

Related Policies

School Behaviour Policy

Complaints Policy

Examinations Policy

Attendance Policy

Guidance Document from JCQ - AI Use in Assessments https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/AI-Use-in-Assessments_Feb24_v6.pdf

CSVPA Policies available here: <https://www.csvpa.com/policies/> (Academic Misconduct, Academic Integrity, Extenuating Circumstances)

UFP Policies available here:

<https://catscolleges.sharepoint.com/sites/THEDENUFP/Public/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FTHEDENUFP%2FPublic%2FPolicy%20Documents&FolderCTID=0x012000E86BD2EE376E834D9CB0EEFD3C93235A>

Appendices

Appendix 1 – AI Detection Measures (JCQ)

Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in pupils' work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

- a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*
- b) A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level*
- c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- d) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
- e) Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
- f) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a pupil in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- g) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a pupil has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- h) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- i) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- j) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the pupil themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- k) The inadvertent inclusion by pupils of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability.
- l) The submission of pupil work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- m) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit
- n) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- o) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the pupil's usual style

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content. However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.



GUILDHOUSE SCHOOL
LONDON



Creating tomorrow's change makers.