

Global Paradigm International School

Academic Honesty Policy

All students at Global Paradigm International School are expected to be conscientiously honest in the way in which they carry out and present their work. All parts of internal or external work submitted for assessment must either be original to the student and or must be properly cited.

As an IB student at Global Paradigm International School, students are expected not only to follow with the GPIS Academic Honesty Policy but also to advocate and reinforce it with peers.

In striving to become the ten IB Learner Profile attributes students would have a deep understanding of academic honesty, plagiarism and the importance of proper citation of all works in all subjects. In striving to become principled and knowledgeable students would understand the importance of intellectual rights. In striving to be inquirers and thinkers students would probe into different ways of citation and acknowledging other people's work. In striving to be caring, open minded and balanced students could be honest to their audience(s) as well as be honest to the creator(s) of the work. In striving to be reflective and communicators students could lead sessions on plagiarism and proper citation to their peers to help them distinguish between own words, illustrations, findings and ideas and the words and work of other creators.

Malpractice

The Regulations define malpractice as behavior that results in or may result in the candidate or any other candidate gaining an unfair advantage in one or more assessment component.

Malpractice includes:

- **plagiarism:** this is defined as the representation of the ideas or work of another person as the candidate's own
- **collusion:** this is defined as supporting malpractice by another candidate, as in allowing one's work to be copied or submitted for assessment by another
- **duplication of work:** this is defined as the presentation of the same work for different assessment components and/or diploma requirements
- any other behavior that gains an unfair advantage for a candidate or that affects the results of another candidate (for example, taking unauthorized material into an examination room, misconduct during an examination, falsifying a CAS record).

Academic misconduct may also involve:

- Copying material from a textbook, the internet, or another student and presenting it as one's own work.
- Taking unauthorized material into an examination room (e.g., an electronic device other than a permitted calculator, own rough paper, notes, books and/or a mobile phone) regardless of whether this material is used or potentially contains information pertinent to the examination.

- Misconduct during an examination, including any attempt to disrupt the examination or distract another candidate.
- Exchanging or in any way supporting, or attempting to support, the passing on of information that is related to the examination.
- Failing to comply with the instructions of the invigilator or other member of the school's staff responsible for the conduct of the examination.
- Impersonating another candidate.
- Stealing examination papers.
- Using an unauthorized calculator during an examination.
- Disclosing or discussing the content of an examination paper with a person outside the immediate school community within 24 hours of the end of the examination.

This list is not exhaustive; these examples are from the IB publications on Academic Honesty. For more details kindly refer to the IB Diploma Programme *Academic Honesty*, *Academic honesty in the IB educational context* and *Effective citing and referencing*.

The distinction between legitimate collaboration and unacceptable collusion or plagiarism:

Group work in the Diploma Programme is strongly encouraged and is acceptable. However, there is a huge and clear difference between legitimate collaboration and collusion or plagiarism. Any written work presented must be the original authentic work of each student; one student cannot do the writing for another under any condition.

Examples of unintentional malpractice in DP subject groups might be due to the following incidents:

- Some candidates seem to believe that because the internet is in the public domain and largely uncontrolled, information can be taken from websites without the need for acknowledgment. On the contrary, candidates must record the addresses of all websites from which they obtain information during their research, including the date when each website was accessed. The uniform (or universal) resource locator (URL) constitutes the website address for this purpose. Simply stating the search engine that was used to find the website is not acceptable and does not, in the view of the final award committee, constitute a form of acknowledgment. The requirement to cite the source of material includes the copying of maps, photographs, illustrations, data, graphs and so on.
For example, to cut and paste a graph from a website without acknowledging its source constitutes plagiarism. CD Roms, DVDs, email messages and any other electronic media must be treated in the same way as the internet, books and journals.
- Copying works of art, whether music, film, dance, theatre arts or visual arts, without proper acknowledgment, may also constitute plagiarism. There are circumstances where the creative use of the work of another artist is acceptable, but the original source must always be acknowledged. Candidates must understand that passing off the work of another person as their own is not acceptable and constitutes malpractice, regardless of whether the act was intentional.
- Copying text, or other material, is not always a deliberate attempt by a candidate to present the ideas or work of another person as their own.
For example, a candidate may copy one or two sentences from a book, journal or website without showing it as a quotation, but indicating its source in a footnote or the bibliography. Although each

case requires a separate judgment, in general such cases are the result of negligence or a lack of awareness on the part of the candidate and do not warrant an allegation of malpractice. These cases may attract the penalty applied to an academic infringement, and not malpractice. The judgment as to whether “academic infringement” is the appropriate decision will be partly based on the quantity of text (or other media) that has been copied by the candidate. (If this is the case for a student, then if the final award committee decides that an academic infringement has been established, no mark will be awarded for the component or part(s) of the component. The candidate will still be eligible for a grade in the subject or diploma requirement concerned. No further penalty will be imposed and the case will not be recorded as malpractice.)

- For most assessment components candidates are expected to work independently but with support from their subject teacher (or supervisor in the case of extended essays). However, there are occasions when collaboration with other candidates is permitted or even actively encouraged, for example, in the requirements for some internal assessment. Nevertheless, the final work must be produced independently, despite the fact that it may be based on the same or similar data as other candidates in the group. This means that the abstract, introduction, content and conclusion/summary of a piece of work must be written in each candidate’s own words and cannot therefore be the same as another candidate’s.

For example, if two or more candidates have exactly the same introduction to an assignment, the final award committee will interpret this as collusion (or plagiarism), and not collaboration.

- **Example: Group 3:** In geography, for example, candidates might be presented with a research question by the teacher and then be required to work as part of a group to collect data together in the field. However, each candidate must write up their report of the fieldwork individually. The reports will have a similar research question and may have the same information collection in the appendices, but the way the information collection is described, analysed and evaluated must be different from the work of other candidates with whom they collected the information and must be entirely their own work.

- **Example: Group 4:** In group 4 subjects, including design technology, no collaboration is allowed in assessment tasks except in the area of data collection. Although there are different requirements depending on the subject, candidates ideally should work on their own when collecting data. When data collection is carried out in groups, the actual recording and processing of data must be undertaken independently if this criterion is to be assessed. For more subject-specific details, refer to the appropriate subject guide. (This does not apply to the group 4 project, which by its very nature is a collaborative project and is assessed for personal skills only.)

- **Example: Group 5:** Candidates must be aware that the written work they submit must be entirely their own. When completing a piece of work outside the classroom, candidates must work independently. Although group work can be educationally desirable in some situations, it is not appropriate for the mathematics HL or mathematics SL portfolio. For mathematical studies SL, group work must not be used for projects. Each project must be based on different data collected or measurements generated.

- The presentation of the same work for different assessment components and/or diploma requirements is a duplication of work and therefore constitutes malpractice.

For example, if a candidate submits the same or a very similar piece of work for history internal assessment and for an extended essay in history, this would be viewed as malpractice. However, it is perfectly acceptable for a candidate to study one aspect of a topic for internal assessment and another aspect of the same topic for an extended essay.

- Fabrication of data is a further example of malpractice. If a candidate manufactures data for a table, survey or other such requirement, this will be interpreted as an attempt to gain an unfair advantage in

an assessment component. Consequently, the final award committee will find the candidate guilty of malpractice. Using authentic data is a matter of academic honesty.

- Many candidates for the Diploma Programme are fluent in two or more languages and are therefore able to conduct their research in more than one language, perhaps with the aid of the internet. Such candidates must be aware that copying a passage of text, translating this passage into another language, then using the translated text in their work without acknowledging its source still constitutes plagiarism.

Action to be taken by the school, if a candidate is found guilty of malpractice:

In Global Paradigm School, we condition our students to gain values and knowledge. Malpractice in any of the above forms or equivalent will not be tolerated under any condition.

First offence: Intervention with the student to correct the behavior and a meeting with the parent might be required depending on the nature of the malpractice. No mark will be awarded.

Second or subsequent offence: Meeting with the parent is essential. No mark will be awarded. A committee will meet to discuss the nature of the second offence, the school handbook and the IB academic policies. A student might be dismissed from the GPIS Diploma Programme depending on the malpractice and the final decision of the committee.

Using Turnitin.com:

Global Paradigm school has an open, running account to Turnitin.com. Turnitin is an online tool that checks students' work for improper citations or potential plagiarism by comparing it against the world's largest academic database. All internal and external assignments for all subjects offered in DP must be posted on Turnitin.com for checking originality of student work.

Understanding and promoting academic honesty at GPIS

- Educating GPIS students
 - Starting from Grade 1 students are educated to the importance of not using other people's words, ideas, designs and material without acknowledging this use. Simple everyday examples are used to successfully lead to this understanding for the young ones. The internet, being a primary educational tool is a good example when referring to pictures, films and music.
 - Starting from G8, GP students are trained to the program of Turnitin.com and are aware of the academic honesty policy of our school. They are taught the basic info on MLA citation.
 - Library sessions include sessions on plagiarism and proper citation using MLA and APA to all grades at GPIS in the Middle and High school departments.
 - Session on plagiarism associated with the Extended Essay briefing, including an educational session on proper citation and referencing is conducted by IB teachers of different subjects.
 - The importance of academic honesty is highlighted in all parent/student sessions that take place throughout the year. Some IB subject teachers might present examples of how academic honesty is vital in internal and external assessments in their specific subjects.
 - The GPIS Academic Honesty Policy, the IB Academic Honesty publication and the IB Effective citing and referencing documents are handed out in sessions and orientations.

- Resources for students:
 - Academic Expectations
 - Coursework and Information on Exams
 - Writing References using MLA style
 - IB College Regulations for IB Courses
 - Global Paradigm International School Academic Honesty Policy
 - Global Paradigm International School Student/Parent Handbook
 - The IB DP Academic Honesty
 - The IB Effective citing and referencing
 - The IB Academic honesty in the IB educational context

Penalties

Penalties are imposed on a candidate found guilty of malpractice in order to:

- ensure that the candidate does not gain an unfair advantage
- maintain the integrity of the examination session by excluding those candidates who have abused the system
- deter other candidates from taking the same action.

Some of these penalties are found below; kindly refer to the IB DP *Academic Honesty* publication for further detail:

- 11.5 If the final award committee decides that an academic infringement has been established, no mark will be awarded for the component or part(s) of the component. The candidate will still be eligible for a grade in the subject or diploma requirement concerned. No further penalty will be imposed and the case will not be recorded as malpractice. In such a case, the decision regarding academic infringement will be notified in accordance with section 13.1.

- 11.6 If the final award committee decides that a case of malpractice has been established, no grade will be awarded in the subject concerned. (No lesser penalty for malpractice is available to the final award committee.) In the case of a Diploma Programme candidate the consequence is that no diploma will be awarded to the candidate. However, a Diploma Programme courses results will be awarded for other subjects in which no malpractice has occurred.

- 11.9 If a candidate is found guilty of malpractice in the production of one (or more) of several assignments required for a component, the candidate is not eligible for a mark based on his or her performance in the remaining assignments for the component; no grade will be awarded for the subject. For example, the internal assessment requirement for a subject may require a portfolio of four separate assignments. If a candidate is found to have plagiarized all or part of one assignment, a mark for his or her internal assessment will not be based on the remaining three assignments: no grade will be awarded for the subject.

- 11.10 If a case of malpractice is very serious, either because of its nature or because the candidate has already been found guilty of malpractice in a previous session, the final award committee may decide that the candidate will not be permitted to register for examinations in any future session.

- 11.11 An IB diploma, or a certificate, may be withdrawn from a candidate at any time if malpractice is subsequently established. This includes the enquiry upon results service when, for example, a senior examiner may identify plagiarism in a piece of work that previously went unnoticed by the teacher or other examiner.