



Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy

Runnymede College is committed to academic honesty. In order to learn and advance our ideas and thoughts, we believe that academic honesty should be at the core. We hope each pupil at Runnymede will develop a sense of pride in their work, knowing that it is their own. Pupils are encouraged to use a range of books, websites, articles in order to support their learning, but should ensure that work is never plagiarised and is referenced appropriately, as guided by the teacher or the assignment guidelines.

Definitions of academic misconduct

Plagiarism: This occurs when a student presents someone else's work or ideas as their own without proper attribution. This includes content from books, journals, emails, videos, and the Internet, as well as images, charts, and data.

Collusion: This involves one student allowing another to copy their work or submit it as their own. Even in collaborative settings, students must submit their own independent work for assessment.

Duplication of Work: This happens when a student submits the same or very similar work for different assessments or diploma requirements, such as using the same content for an internal assessment and an extended essay.

Fabrication of Data: This refers to creating false data instead of using authentic data for assignments.

Cheating: This includes taking unauthorized materials into an exam, exchanging information with others during an exam, or using unauthorized tools like certain calculators.

Roles and Responsibilities

Senior Leadership Team Responsibilities:

- Ensure the candidate and their parent/guardian understand the Academic Honesty Policy by having them sign a waiver.
- Collaborate with educators to offer sessions on academic honesty, focusing on source reliability, paraphrasing, and citation techniques.
- Encourage teachers to report any incidences to SLT and to the appropriate Head of Year.
- Record any incidences of misconduct and apply the behaviour policy, with cheating being one of the Headmasters Red Lines. See *RC Promoting Positive Behaviour Policy*.
- Notify the candidate and their parents if the SLT is investigating possible misconduct.

Subject Teacher Responsibilities:

- They school check the authenticity of the pupils work, verifying the originality of student work using plagiarism detection tools like Turnitin.
- Lead by example, demonstrating academic honesty and informing students of the academic policies and consequences of violations.

- Provide explicit instructions for assignments and design tasks that foster critical thinking, making it difficult for students to engage in academic dishonesty.
- Teach students how to reference appropriately in a number of different styles and including the referencing of websites and AI sources.

Pupil Responsibilities:

- Submit original work and properly cite all sources, including various media and data formats.
- Ensure that even in group work, the final submission is independently crafted and written in their own words.
- Take accountability for their work and seek assistance from teachers as needed.
- Sign a coversheet for each assessment component to confirm the authenticity of their work.

Artificial Intelligence

To maintain academic integrity while integrating AI tools into education, this policy outlines the acceptable use of AI to ensure that student work reflects their own abilities. Students must produce original work, with AI tools used solely to support, not replace, their own writing, analysis, and ideas. Any contributions from AI, such as text, code, or other content, must be clearly acknowledged and cited according to academic standards.

Definitions of AI

As defined by the JCQ "AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.

While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots can be the following:

- Answering questions
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality".
- Generating images, video or music

Use of AI

Although AI might become a standard workplace tool in the future, it is crucial for students to avoid relying on such tools when demonstrating their knowledge, understanding, and skills for qualifications to ensure their own academic progression.

Runnymede College defines AI misuse in the same manner as the JCQ Guidelines:

- AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

Misusing AI tools, including failing to cite AI-generated content properly or misrepresenting it as original work, will be deemed academic malpractice, leading to disciplinary actions as per the school's academic integrity procedures. The policy will be regularly reviewed and updated to reflect advancements in AI technology and best practices, with ongoing collaboration with educational technology experts to ensure its effectiveness and relevance.

Acknowledging AI use in student work

AI tools may assist with brainstorming, proofreading, and summarising, but must not generate substantial portions of assessment work or substitute for the student's own effort. Teachers are responsible for monitoring any irregularities in students' work, such as sudden changes in style or content, that might indicate misuse of AI tools. If misuse is suspected, a formal investigation, including discussions with the student and a review of their process and understanding, will be conducted.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example:

ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2025.

The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

Students using and referencing AI appropriately may be unable to score some credit in their work if the use of AI stops them being able to demonstrate the assessed skills independently.

Preventing AI misuse

As a school, we are responsible for educating staff and students about AI use and detection. In all cases, we aim to prevent misuse, or to detect and investigate before candidates sign declaration forms.

- Senior leaders will ensure that updated information and guidance is shared with Heads of Department, teachers and assessors in each academic year.

- Teachers will share guidance with pupils about AI misuse in advance of non-examination assessments or coursework elements begin
- Staff will use plagiarism detection tools such as Turnitin and AI detection tools to authenticate student work, as well as evidence of students' prior work.

Based on the JCQ guidelines, the policy for investigating academic malpractice involves:

- *Initial Assessment:* Teachers will observe for irregularities in students' work, such as significant shifts in writing style or the presence of AI-generated content. If suspicion arises, the teacher will conduct an initial review and discuss concerns with the student to clarify their use of AI tools.
- *Formal Investigation:* A formal investigation will be led by the teacher and include the Head of Department or other relevant staff. All evidence, including the student's work and communications, will be carefully documented. The student will be asked to explain their use of AI tools and how it was incorporated into their work. The SLT will review the work in question, focusing on the integration and citation of AI-generated content. The team will compare the suspect work with the student's previous submissions to assess consistency and authenticity.
- *Outcome and Actions:* The team will make a decision based on the gathered evidence and discussions. If academic malpractice is identified, the findings will be documented. The student and their parents or guardians will be informed of the decision and any resulting actions.
- *Reporting:* As per JCQ's policy, the Head of centre will notify the appropriate awarding body (or bodies) of cases of malpractice through the appropriate channels detailed by the relevant awarding body (or bodies). In the case of student misuse of AI being discovered in controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessment before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate, the school will follow the internal procedures outlined above, and, as stated by JCQ, may not lead to a formal report to the awarding body.
- *Consequences:* If academic malpractice is confirmed, appropriate disciplinary measures will be applied in line with the RC Promoting Positive Behaviour Policy. The student may receive additional educational support to address any identified gaps in understanding or skills.

Reviewed: September 2025

Next review: January 2026