



Academic honesty policy

WORLD SCHOOL 002988

The good practices are expected to be introduced, modeled and used throughout the school. This policy is presented to candidates before they begin the Diploma Programme and then is reminded throughout the two years of the programme by a coordinator and each IB teacher. For us, at IX Liceum Ogólnokształcące academic honesty of our teachers and students is a crucial part of the teaching/learning process.

Academic honesty

Following the IBO definition of academic honesty stating that: ‘Academic honesty must be seen as a set of values and skills that promote personal integrity and good practice in teaching, learning and assessment.’ (Academic Honesty 2) IB World School 002988 has developed its own Academic Honesty Policy based on the rules and values promoted by IBO.

All IB students are acquainted with the most important concepts and definitions related to Academic Honesty such as:

Intellectual property

Intellectual property includes: patents, registered designs, trademarks, moral rights and copyright. Students need to be aware that the rights of authors of works of literature, art and music are protected by law. The role of the school in this respect is to develop law-abiding people who recognize the significance of broadly defined honesty.

Authenticity

According to IBO: ‘An authentic piece of work is one that is based on the candidate’s individual and original ideas with the ideas and work of others fully acknowledged. Therefore, all assignments for assessment, regardless of their format, must wholly and authentically use that candidate’s own language, expression and ideas. Where the ideas or work of another person are represented within a candidate’s work, whether in the form of direct quotation or paraphrase, the source(s) of those ideas or the work must be fully and appropriately acknowledged.’ (Academic Honesty 2)

Malpractice

Forms of malpractice:

- ‘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’ (Academic Honesty 3)

The above mentioned points refer not only to DP examination components but to all school assignments within a two-year course (tests, projects, presentations, oral and written tasks etc.).

- Falsifying CAS reports
- Copying from another student during a test
- Copying from the homework of another student
- Handing in work as his/her own that has been copied
- Doing homework for another student
- Giving another student his/her own work to copy.
- Submitting work done by another student, a parent, a friend or a private tutor
- Copying the internal assessment work of other students
- Giving another student his/her work to copy
- Using notes during a test unless allowed by the teacher or permitted by the examination rules
- Purchasing and submit pieces written by someone else
- Writing essays for other students
- Taking unauthorized material into an examination room (eg. mobile phones Smart Watches and any other electronic devices)
- Any form of disrupting the examination or distracting another candidate
- Exchanging information between candidates during an exam
- Not complying with instructions of invigilators
- Using an unauthorized calculator or stationary during an examination or test
- Disclosing or discussing the content of an examination paper with a person outside the immediate school community within 24 hours after the examination

The distinction between legitimate collaboration and unacceptable collusion made by the IBO

1. ‘ (...) 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).
2. There are occasions when collaboration with other candidates is permitted or even actively encouraged, for example, in the requirements for some internal assessment.

3. 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. It is essential that both teachers and candidates are aware of the distinction between collaboration and collusion. Teachers must pay particular attention to this important distinction to prevent allegations of collusion against their candidates. Whether or not candidates are allowed to work together on the requirements for internal assessment varies between groups and subjects.

- 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.

- 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).

- 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 (...)' (Academic honesty 4)

Monitoring processes and sanctions

Actions which will be taken by the school if a candidate is suspected of malpractice and subsequently found guilty

When a teacher has reason to believe that malpractice has occurred, the following steps will be taken:

- The teacher will investigate the matter with the student(s) involved.
- The teacher will communicate the outcome of his/her investigation to the Coordinator.
- The Coordinator will inform the Head of the school
- The Coordinator and the Head in consultation with the teacher, may decide to issue a consequence. When a candidate has signed the cover sheet the IBO will be informed immediately about this fact.

Actions which will be taken by the IB if a candidate is suspected of malpractice and subsequently found guilty

1. 'If questions arise about the authenticity of a candidate's work before submission for assessment, the situation must be resolved within the school. If possible academic misconduct (for example, plagiarism, collusion) is identified after a candidate's work has been submitted to the IB Organization for assessment, the school's DP coordinator must inform the IB Organization as soon as possible. For work that is internally assessed, "submission" refers to the deadline by which teachers' marks must be submitted to the IB Organization. For work that is externally assessed, other than the scripts from the written examinations, "submission" refers to the candidate signing the declaration of authenticity for their work.
2. When a school, an examiner or the IB Organization establishes evidence to suspect academic misconduct by a candidate, the school will be required to conduct an investigation and provide the IB Organization with statements and other relevant documentation concerning the case. If a school fails to support the investigation into possible academic misconduct, no grade will be awarded to the candidate in the subject(s) concerned.
3. If the IB Organization notifies a school that a candidate is suspected of academic misconduct and that the IB Organization has the intention of initiating an investigation, at the discretion of the head of school it is permissible for the candidate to be withdrawn from the session or from the subject(s) in which academic misconduct may have occurred. However, at the discretion of the IB Organization the investigation into the suspected academic misconduct by the candidate may still proceed and a decision be reached on whether to uphold or dismiss academic misconduct. If a candidate is withdrawn from a subject no mark for that subject may contribute to the award of a grade in a future examination session.
4. Candidates suspected of academic misconduct must be invited, through the school's DP coordinator, to present a written statement that addresses the suspicion of academic misconduct. If a candidate declines to present a statement, the investigation and decision on whether the candidate is in breach of regulations will still proceed.
5. The majority of cases of suspected academic misconduct will be presented to a sub-committee of the Final Award Committee. The sub-committee will normally comprise IB Organization staff, school representatives, and chief/deputy chief examiners, but any group or combination of these persons may make decisions on cases subject to the approval of the Final Award Committee. The subcommittee will be chaired by the chair or vice-chair of the Final Award Committee, or a chief examiner nominated by the vice-chair.
6. Decisions of the sub-committee are made on behalf of and under the supervision of the Final Award Committee. After reviewing all statements and evidence collected during the investigation, the sub-committee will decide whether to dismiss the suspicion of academic misconduct, uphold it, or ask for further investigations to be made. If the

sub-committee is unable to reach a decision then the case will be referred to the Final Award Committee.

7. If the sub-committee decides that a case of academic misconduct has been established, a penalty will be applied in the subject(s) concerned. The penalty will, in the judgment of the sub-committee, be commensurate with the severity of the misconduct. If a case of academic misconduct is considered by the Final Award Committee to be very serious, the Final Award Committee may decide not to issue a grade for a candidate in the subject(s) concerned and additionally prohibit the candidate from being registered in any future examination sessions.
8. If no grade is issued for a subject that contributes to a candidate's IB Diploma, no IB Diploma will be awarded to the candidate. DP Course Results will be awarded for other subjects in which no academic misconduct has occurred. Except in cases of serious or repeat misconduct, the candidate will be permitted to register for future examination sessions, which may include the session that follows six months later, if the relevant registration deadlines are met. In the case of an IB Diploma Candidate, if the session in which the academic misconduct has been established is the candidate's third examination session towards achieving the award of the IB Diploma, no further IB examination sessions will be permitted.
9. If the candidate has already been found in breach of regulations in any previous session, this will normally lead to disqualification from participation in any future examination session.
10. If there is substantive evidence, the IB Organization is entitled to conduct an investigation into academic misconduct after a candidate's results have been issued. If academic misconduct is subsequently established by the Final Award Committee, or its sub-committee, the candidate's grade for the subject(s) concerned may be withdrawn from the candidate which will also result in the withdrawal of their IB Diploma where applicable.' (General regulations: Diploma Programme 2014, 13-14)

Resources supporting the policy:

Effective citing and referencing 2014

<https://turnitin.com/static/index.php> (analyze works for plagiarism detection)

Library resources

MLA

