



**GBS HE Malta Limited
Malta Campus
International House
Mdina Road
Mriehel BKR3000
Malta**

GBS Academic Good Practice and Academic Misconduct Policy

©2025 GBS Malta Limited

Version Control

Document title: GBS Academic Good Practice and Academic Misconduct Policy	No of pages: 19
Version Number: 1.0	Date first published: September 2021
Approved by: Malta Further and Higher Education Authority (MFHEA)	Last review date: January 2025
Date approved: May 2022	Due for next review: September 2026

Related policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• GBS Student Complaints Policy and Procedure▪ GBS Student Charter▪ GBS Student Code of Conduct▪ GBS Equality and Diversity Policy▪ GBS Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Procedure▪ GBS Academic Appeals Policy
External Reference
N/A

Contents

1. Academic integrity.....	3
2. Principles	4
3. Definitions and Examples.....	4
4. Procedures for dealing with Academic Misconduct: Stage 1 and Stage 2	6
5. Penalties for academic misconduct.....	9
6. Student Right of Appeal	9
Annex 1 - Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Form: Stage 1	10
Annex 2 - Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Form: Stage 2	12
Annex 3: Academic Misconduct Panel	15
Annex 4: Tariff and indicative list of penalties.....	17
Annex 5: Good Academic Practice and the Use of AI	19

GBS HE Malta Limited Academic Good Practice and Academic Misconduct Policy

1. Academic integrity

- 1.1 Every student of GBS HE Malta Limited is expected to act with integrity at all times in relation to the production and presentation of their academic work. Academic integrity is central to academic and professional life and requires that students are honest and responsible in acknowledging the contributions of others in their work.
- 1.2 In all assessed work students should take care to ensure that the work presented is their own and that it fully acknowledges the work and opinions of others. It is also the responsibility of students to ensure that they do not undertake any form of cheating (plagiarism or inappropriate use of AI) or attempt to gain unfair advantage in any other way.
- 1.3 In order to assure GBS Malta that assessed work is that of the student and that the work and opinions of others have been properly and fully acknowledged, students must take care to follow the appropriate standards to ensure good academic practice. This includes:
- i) Providing full citation of all sources (books, articles, web sites, newspapers, images, artefacts, data sources, programme code, etc.) which have been drawn on in the preparation of an assignment. Normally this will be done in the reference/bibliography section which must be included with the assignment.
 - ii) Properly referencing the sources of the arguments and ideas in an assignment using a recognised referencing system (as specified in programme and module guidelines). It is not only quotations that must be referenced but also paraphrasing of the arguments of others and the use of their ideas, even if explained in the student's own words.
 - iii) Following other guidelines for preparing and presenting coursework as defined in the relevant programme handbooks, module guides and assignment briefs.
 - iv) Using mechanisms provided by GBS for checking a student's own work, including Turnitin text-matching software, and support and advice given by teaching staff.
 - v) Not using Artificial Intelligence through the use of Apps such as ChatGPT and Gemini to generate summative assessments for submission to meet module assessment requirements. Inappropriate use of AI may be treated as academic misconduct with penalties for academic misconduct applied (as detailed in Section 5 below). Students suspected of the inappropriate use of AI will be given a viva interview with their tutor after which further steps will be identified. GBS Malta has developed a Good Academic Practice and Use of AI to guide students and staff with respect to how AI may be used to support student learning and when its use may be regarded as academic misconduct (see Annex 5: Good Academic Practice and the Use of AI).
- 1.4 Proof-reading entails the identification of grammatical, spelling or punctuation mistakes in text, etc. The use of a proof-reading service may constitute academic misconduct if the service includes any editorial activity which entails re-writing or re-wording the student's original work. It is best not to use any external service of this sort to ensure academic integrity.
- 1.5 Work that does not meet appropriate standards of academic practice will be graded/marked at a lower level than work that does meet appropriate academic standards and may leave the student open to further action under this policy and procedure.

2. Principles

- 2.1 The work submitted by a student for assessment must have been entirely undertaken by the student.
- 2.2 Academic misconduct includes cheating or inappropriate behaviour during an examination or class test.
- 2.3 The determination of whether cheating, plagiarism or any other form of academic misconduct has occurred is not a matter for an Assessment Board.
- 2.4 The facts must be established before an Assessment Board can consider the effect of the alleged incident on a student's performance.
- 2.5 An allegation of cheating, plagiarism or other form of academic misconduct is not the same as proof of the incident.
- 2.6 Allegations of academic misconduct will be investigated with full regard to principles of equity and fairness.
- 2.7 Once the facts have been established, it is then for the Assessment Board to judge the seriousness of the case and to exercise discretion, accordingly, having regard to institutional precedent, where appropriate.

3. Definitions and Examples

There are different forms of academic misconduct, all of which may be the subject of the procedures described in this document. The following are different examples of academic misconduct but do not constitute a complete or exhaustive list.

3.1 Poor academic practice

Poor academic practice is characterised by limited or inadequate technical skills or lack of adherence to academic conventions, whether through negligence or insufficient understanding. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that they fully understand the academic conventions described in programme material, such as the appropriate referencing system and use of quotation marks, and make use of the support that is available.

3.2 Cheating in an Examination

- i) communicating with or copying from any other student during an examination except insofar as the examination regulations may specifically permit this, eg group assessments.
- ii) communicating during an examination with any person other than a properly authorised Invigilator or another authorised member of staff.
- iii) introducing any written or printed materials into the examination room unless expressly permitted by the examination or programme regulations.
- iv) introducing any electronically stored information into the examination room, unless expressly permitted by the examination or programme regulations.
- v) gaining access to any unauthorised material relating to an assessment.

3.3 Plagiarism

Plagiarism may be defined as: *the unacknowledged incorporation in a student's work of material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another*. Examples of plagiarism include:

- i) the inclusion in a student's work of more than a single phrase from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the source(s).
- ii) the summarising of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement.
- iii) the use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source.
- iv) the unacknowledged use of images (digital or otherwise) music, patents or other creative material either in the entirety or in the creation of a derivative work.
- v) copying the work of another student, with or without their knowledge or agreement. See section 3.4 on Collusion.
- vi) the unacknowledged re-submission of work the student had previously submitted to gain academic credit at GBS or elsewhere.

3.4 Collusion

Collusion exists where a student:

- i) submits as entirely his/her own, work done in collaboration with another person.
- ii) collaborates with another student in the completion of work which is submitted as that other student's own unaided work.
- iii) enables another student to copy all or part of his/her own work and to submit it as that student's own unaided work.

3.5 Falsification

Examples of falsification include:

- i) The falsification of data. The presentation of data in laboratory reports, projects or other forms of assessment based on experimental or other work falsely purported to have been carried out by the student, or obtained by unfair means.
- ii) The falsification of references, including the invention of references and/or false claims.

3.6 Personation

Personation is the legal term for what is usually referred to by the lay person as *impersonation*. Personation where one person takes on or assumes the identity of another person with intent to deceive or to gain unfair advantage. It may exist where:

- i) one person assumes the identity of a student (where that is a different person), with the intention of gaining unfair advantage for that student.
- ii) the student is knowingly and willingly impersonated by another with the intention of gaining unfair advantage for himself/herself.

3.7 Ghost Writing

Ghost writing exists where:

- i) a student submits as their own, work which has been produced in whole or part by another person on their behalf, for example, the use of a *ghost writing service* or similar.
- ii) A student will also be guilty of academic misconduct if he/she deliberately makes available or seeks to make available material to another student whether in exchange for financial gain or otherwise, with the intention that the material is to be used by the other student to commit academic misconduct.

3.8 Inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The use of AI may constitute academic misconduct in a number of different ways as follows:

- Plagiarism since material from an unidentified or properly referenced source is being used.
- Commissioning is where work produced by another person or sources is being used. In the context of AI, the company who owns the AI software.
- Fabrication is where the AI app creates or makes up the material being used in assessed work.
- Where a piece of assessed work is created, in full or part, using generative AI and represented as a student's own work will be regarded as contract cheating in the same way as commissioning a third party to produce the piece of assessed work.

The **Turnitin similarity report** that is produced for assessed work submissions has embedded within it any use of generative AI. This detects and reports on the percentage of AI in a submitted piece of student coursework. Evidence of AI in a piece of assessed work reported through Turnitin at or above 20% will be considered and evaluated by the tutor to determine whether or not academic misconduct has taken place. In such cases the GBS Malta Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure will be used and followed (see Section 4 below).

3.9 Other academic misconduct

Any other form of academic misconduct not identified in the above examples.

4. Procedures for dealing with Academic Misconduct: Stage 1 and Stage 2

4.1 Stage 1: Procedure for in-course assessment

4.1.1 When academic misconduct is suspected, the member(s) of academic/teaching staff concerned should first discuss the matter in a meeting with the student(s) concerned and the Associate Dean/Programme Leader/Lecturer and give the student the opportunity to present his or her case. This process may also include conduct of a viva voce examination (this may be used especially where inappropriate use of AI is suspected), with review and discussion of working papers, to establish the student's understanding of the work submitted.

4.1.2 The student(s) should be given written notification of the time and place of the meeting, provided with details of the alleged academic misconduct and informed that they may be accompanied by a friend during the meeting.

- 4.1.3 If the conclusion of the Stage 1 meeting is that academic misconduct has not occurred, this will be reported to the Associate Dean/Programme Leader using the *Academic Misconduct Report Form*¹ and no further action will be taken. That will be the end of the matter for all concerned.
- 4.1.4 If the student admits to academic misconduct, this should be indicated on the Academic Misconduct Report Form and confirmed by the student's signature. Details of the alleged academic misconduct should be recorded on the form. The Associate Dean/Programme Leader is responsible for ensuring that the matter is reported to the next scheduled meeting of the Assessment Board. The Board will take this into account when considering the grade/mark for the assessment and the overall grade for the unit to be awarded and the action to be taken, in accordance with section 4.4 below.
- 4.1.5 The student should also be given the opportunity at the Stage 1 meeting to declare academic misconduct in any other work that they have submitted. The report to the Associate Dean/Programme Leader should contain details of any other academic misconduct declared and also a statement by the Module Leader/Lecturer about any other cases of proven or admitted academic misconduct in the student's record. In cases of plagiarism, collusion or falsification, the report should also contain a statement from the first marker for the module/unit on whether or not there is evidence of the learning outcomes for the assessment having been met by the student/s involved, despite the misconduct.
- 4.1.6 In the exceptional circumstances, where a student claims that there had been a procedural error in stages 4.1.1 to 4.1.5, which resulted in them erroneously admitting to academic misconduct, they should immediately inform the Associate Dean/Programme Leader that they now wish to withdraw their admission and contest the allegation of academic misconduct. Any such change of admission must be conveyed in writing to the Associate Dean/Programme Leader within five working days of receiving the decision of the Stage 1 meeting. The Module Leader/Lecturer will advise the Associate Dean/Programme Leader and an investigation will be carried out by an Academic Misconduct Panel, according to section 4.3 below.

¹ Annex 1: *Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Form: Stage 1*

- 4.1.7 If the Stage 1 meeting does not resolve the matter, the member(s) of staff concerned will then, within five working days or as soon as reasonably practicable following the discovery or allegation, report the matter in writing to the Associate Dean/Programme Leader. The report should contain full details about the circumstances surrounding the alleged irregularity including, if appropriate, photographs of images or artefacts or photocopies of the student's work together with reports from plagiarism detection software where used. The Associate Dean/Programme Leader will notify the student that a report has been made and that a Stage 2 investigation will be undertaken in accordance with section 4.3 below. The Associate Dean/Programme Leader will initiate this process.
- 4.1.8 An allegation of academic misconduct may be made after the work has been marked and returned to the student (see 4.4.8).
- 4.1.9 If a student believes academic misconduct to have taken place in any form of course/unit assessment, it is the student's responsibility to bring this to the attention of the Unit Leader and/or the Associate Dean/Programme Leader.

4.2 Initial procedure for examinations

- 4.2.1 Where academic misconduct is suspected in an examination, the invigilator concerned will inform the student of his/her suspicions and clearly annotate the student's script. The student will also be advised by the Invigilator that a full report will be submitted following the examination.
- 4.2.2 The invigilator will seek to confiscate any relevant evidence (for example, any unauthorised material) and allow the student to continue with the examination. However, if the student persists with the irregularity s/he will be expelled from the examination and the room. The student will also be expelled from the examination and the room if s/he refuses to submit any suspected material to the invigilators.
- 4.2.3 Immediately following the examination the invigilator will submit a full report of the matter using the Academic Misconduct Report Form. If academic misconduct is admitted, this should be indicated on the form and confirmed by the student's signature. This form will be returned to the Associate Dean/Programme Leader along with the scripts and other examination stationery. The Associate Dean/Programme Leader will then ensure that the report is immediately sent to the Unit/Module Leader for the unit/module in question. The invigilator's report should be accompanied by any relevant evidence.
- 4.2.4 If the student(s) concerned has admitted to academic misconduct at the point of being challenged by the invigilator, then the Associate Dean/Programme Leader is responsible for ensuring that the matter is reported to the next scheduled meeting of the Assessment Board. The Assessment Board will take this into account when considering the mark to be awarded and action to be taken, in accordance with section 4.4 below. The Associate Dean/Programme Leader will also ensure that the Assessment Board is informed of any other cases of academic misconduct on the student's record.
- 4.2.5 If the student disputes the allegation of misconduct then it is the responsibility of the Associate Dean/Programme Leader to convene a Stage 1 meeting and follow the procedures as specified in 4.1 above. If this does not resolve the issue then the procedures for initiating a Stage 2 investigation specified in section 4.3 will be followed.
- 4.2.6 If a student believes academic misconduct to be taking place during an examination, it is their responsibility to bring this to the attention of the invigilator. However, no further action can be taken unless the suspected academic misconduct is subsequently verified by the invigilator.
- 4.2.7 Where alleged academic misconduct is identified after an examination has taken place, the procedure set out in Section 4.1 and, if necessary, Section 4.3 should be followed.

4.3 Stage 2: Academic Misconduct Panel

- 4.3.1 Where an allegation of academic misconduct has been made in accordance with section 4.1 or 4.2 and not admitted or resolved through the Stage 1 process, the matter will be investigated as soon as reasonably practicable following the discovery or allegation of the misconduct by an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 4.3.2 Further details concerning the Academic Misconduct Panel are given in Annex 2.

4.3.3 The decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel is final and the student has no further recourse to challenge the decision of the Panel.

4.4 Action by Assessment Boards

4.4.1 If an Academic Misconduct Panel is satisfied that there has been academic misconduct, or if the student admits (under sections 4.1 or 4.2) that academic misconduct has taken place, the Assessment Board will take all the factors reported and evidence submitted into account in its consideration of the student's case and decide on action to be taken appropriate to the gravity of the case. This includes the power to fail the student for all or part of the assessment in respect of which academic misconduct has been found to have occurred, and to determine whether the student should be permitted to continue on the programme with or without reassessment, or whether the student is not permitted to continue on the programme.

4.4.2 It is the Assessment Board's responsibility to decide the results for the unit affected by academic misconduct by applying relevant action and determining whether or not the student can continue on the programme in the light of the overall performance.

4.4.3 Members of the Assessment Board who have been involved with the formal investigation of academic misconduct may contribute to the discussion of the matter by the Board, to provide contextual information, but may not be involved in the Board's decision on action to be taken. If the Chair of the Assessment Board has been involved in the investigation, he/she should not chair the discussion.

4.4.4 The Assessment Board will have regard to the guidelines given below when arriving at a decision on what action is appropriate. It should be noted that the guidelines are not mandatory. Decision on the penalty rests with the Assessment Board in the light of the details of the case.

4.4.5 Cases of academic misconduct will be recorded by the Associate Dean/Programme Leader.

5. Penalties for academic misconduct

The decision concerning whether a student may be permitted to resubmit work shown to have resulted from academic misconduct, maximum grade permitted for resubmission and whether a resubmission is permitted must take account of the guidelines and assessment regulations provided by the awarding body.

Please see Annex 4 for Tariff and indicative list of penalties.

6. Student Right of Appeal

6.1 The student has a right of appeal against the decision of the Assessment Board in accordance with GBS Malta's Academic Appeals Policy.

Annex 1 - Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Form: Stage 1

This form should be used to record a Stage 1 investigation of Academic Misconduct, as specified GBS' Academic Good Practice and Academic Misconduct Policy. It should be completed by the appropriate member of GBS staff.

The student should be asked to complete the declaration of admission (Part B) if academic misconduct is admitted.

Part A: Details of alleged academic misconduct

Student Name:		Student ID:	
Academic year:		Semester:	
Programme title:		Programme level:	
Unit/module title:		Unit/module code:	
Assessment component:		Component weighting:	%
Type of alleged academic misconduct			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cheating	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plagiarism¹
<input type="checkbox"/>	Personation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ghost Writing
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Collusion
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Falsification
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify):

Names/titles of staff involved in Stage 1 meeting:

--

Name of accompanying friend (if applicable):

--

Date of meeting

--

Details of alleged academic misconduct, with relevant evidence.

Note: this could be a 'Report of Suspected Academic Misconduct in an Examination' if an incident has occurred during an examination and is disputed by the student.

--

Details of any mitigating circumstances raised by student.

--

¹ Plagiarism includes the inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). See GBS Malta Good Academic Practice and the Use of AI (Appendix 5).
GBS Malta Academic Good Practice and Academic Misconduct

Part B: Declaration of academic misconduct

Statement of academic misconduct, including any admitted by the student in addition to the original allegation.

--

I, the undersigned, admit to academic misconduct as described in Part A.

This will be reported to the Assessment Board and taken into account when considering the grade to be awarded for the assessment unit and any decision about resubmission of the work.

Student signature:

Date:

Part C: Checklist

Write in answer: **Yes**, **No**, or **N/A** for not applicable

Was the student given the opportunity to view the evidence prompting the investigation before the meeting?	
If so, did the student take this opportunity?	
Was the purpose of the Stage 1 meeting explained to the student?	
Was the allegation and evidence explained to the student in detail?	
Is student aware of type of academic misconduct under consideration?	
Has student been given the opportunity to explain/comment upon the case presented?	
Is the student clear about what happens next?	
If allegation of academic misconduct ACCEPTED by student:	
Has the declaration of admission (Part B) been signed by student?	
Has the student asked for other instances of academic misconduct to be taken into consideration (if so, detail below)?	
If allegation of academic misconduct NOT ACCEPTED by student:	
Will a Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Panel be convened?	
Is the conclusion that academic misconduct has not occurred?	

Signature of member of staff:

Name:			
Signature:		Date:	

Annex 2 - Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Form: Stage 2

This form should be used to record a Stage 2 investigation of academic misconduct, as specified GBS' Academic Good Practice and Academic Misconduct Policy. It should be completed when an Academic Misconduct Panel is convened following an allegation of academic misconduct that cannot be resolved through a Stage 1 Investigation.

Part A: Details of alleged academic misconduct

Student Name:		Student ID:	
Academic year:		Semester:	
Programme title:		Programme level:	
Unit/module title:		Unit/module code:	
Assessment component:		Component weighting:	%
Type of alleged academic misconduct			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cheating	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plagiarism²
<input type="checkbox"/>	Personation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ghost Writing
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Collusion
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Falsification
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify):

Part B: Details of Academic Misconduct Panel

Date of meeting		Panel Secretary:	
------------------------	--	-------------------------	--

Names/titles of Panel members:

--

Names of unit/module tutor and other staff witnesses:

--

Name of accompanying friend (if applicable):

--

² Plagiarism includes the inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). See GBS Malta Good Academic Practice and the Use of AI (Appendix 5).

Part C: Panel Report Summary of allegation

Evidence base

Student's response to allegation

Details of any mitigating circumstances raised by the student

Summary of issues

Panel decision

For use by GBS staff only Stage 2

Academic Misconduct Investigation Check List

Write in answer: **Yes**, **No**, or **N/A** for not applicable.

Was the student given formal notification of the academic misconduct panel?	
Did the student attend the panel meeting?	
Was the purpose of the panel meeting explained to the student?	
Was the allegation and evidence explained to the student in detail?	
Has the student/s been verbally informed of the panel decision?	
If decision is that academic misconduct occurred:	
If plagiarism, collusion or falsification, have learning outcomes been met for the assessment component (give explanation below)?	
Has the student asked for other instances of Academic Misconduct to be taken into consideration (if so, detail below)?	
Date student(s) given formal notification of panel decision?	
Assessment Board decision:	
Date student given formal notification of Assessment Board decision:	

Copies of this report should be circulated to the panel members and to the student

Annex 3: Academic Misconduct Panel

1. An Academic Misconduct Panel will be comprised of:
 - i) Director of Quality (Chair of Panel).
 - ii) Associate Dean/Dean (as appropriate)
 - iii) At least one member of teaching staff without direct involvement in teaching and assessing the unit/module.

The Chair will appoint the secretary and convenor of the Academic Misconduct Panel.

If the academic misconduct in question involves more than one student then the same Panel membership should normally consider each case.

2. The Academic Misconduct Panel secretary will notify the members of the Panel and the student(s) concerned of the date, time and place of the meeting of the Panel. Notification should take place within five working days of receipt of the report, or as soon as reasonably practicable. If alleged misconduct comes to light during a set of examinations, and the candidate still has some examinations to sit, this timescale shall be extended to five working days after the end of that particular set of examinations.
3. The student(s) will be provided, by the Secretary, with full details of the alleged misconduct and informed of his/her right to appear before the Panel, accompanied by a friend of his/her choice and to submit a written statement concerning the alleged misconduct. Failure by the student/s to appear before the Panel or to submit a statement will not prevent the investigation proceeding.
4. The Panel may call witnesses, as appropriate, to substantiate the allegations, and will not unreasonably refuse permission for the member of staff or student/s concerned to call such witnesses as they deem appropriate.
5. The Panel will interview the student/s, staff, and witnesses as appropriate, consider the student's written statement, and come to a decision on the basis of the student(s) statement and the supporting evidence. The student(s) will withdraw while the Panel deliberates.
6. The order of proceedings is as follows:
 - i) statement of the case against the student(s), production of evidence in support of it and responses of those presenting that case to questions from the panel.
 - ii) statement of the case for the student(s), production of evidence in support of it and responses by the student(s) to questions from the panel.
 - iii) reply to the case of the student(s).
 - iv) reply to the case against the student(s).
7. Evidence may be received by the Panel by oral statement, written and signed statement, or statutory declaration. The Chair of the Panel shall decide, after taking account of the evidence assembled, whether the evidence from each party can be heard in the other's presence.
8. Each member of the Panel has equal status and, in the event of a disagreement about the decision, the decision shall be made by a majority of panel members.

9. If the student(s) has attended, he/she will be informed of the Panel's decision at the conclusion of the meeting. The secretary will report the outcome in writing to the student/s normally within five working days of the Panel's decision.
10. If the conclusion of the Panel meeting is that academic misconduct has not occurred, this will be recorded on the Academic Misconduct Report Form and no further action will be taken. No report will be submitted to the Assessment Board.
11. If the conclusion of the Panel meeting is that academic misconduct has occurred, the student(s) should also be given the opportunity to declare academic misconduct in other work that they have submitted.
12. The student(s) should be advised that they have the right to appeal against the finding of academic misconduct within ten working days of receiving the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel. The appeal should be made in writing to the appropriate Associate Dean/Programme Leader clearly stating the grounds for the appeal (for example, evidence not available to the Panel at the time, procedural irregularity, etc.).
14. The report of the findings of the Academic Misconduct Panel must be made on the Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Form: Stage 2². This report form will be considered by the Assessment Board.

² Annex 2: Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Form: Stage 2

Annex 4: Tariff and indicative list of penalties

Level	Category	Key Indicators / Examples	Indicative penalty range
MINOR	Poor academic practice	Student has not yet learnt the correct academic conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No formal penalty, work marked according to criteria. The student is required to take an academic integrity tutorial No formal penalty. Strike out the offending passages from the assignment component and work marked according to criteria. The student is required to take an academic integrity tutorial
		Student is unclear on the correct academic conventions	
	Plagiarism	Up to 20% taken from an individual source or 30% from combined sources*	
	Inappropriate use of AI	Between 20% and 30% generated by AI as shown on Turnitin report.	
MODERATE	Repeated poor academic practice	Where clear guidance on academic conventions has been provided by the department and the student has previously been provided with direct feedback on techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awarded 'Refer' and required to revise and resubmit the same assignment for a maximum unit mark of Pass Awarded 'Refer' and required to produce a new piece of work and achieve a pass in the component for a maximum unit mark of Pass
	Plagiarism	30-50% taken from either an individual or multiple sources.* Critical concepts plagiarized with no attempt to attribute source	
	Inappropriate use of AI	More than 30% generated by AI as shown on Turnitin report.	
	Self-plagiarism	The student reuses his/her own work from another summative assessment on the same/other unit(s)	
	First offence in the following:		
Collusion	Work done in collaboration with another person or collaborates with another student in the completion of work which is submitted as that other student's own unaided work.		

	Falsification	Falsification of data, references including the invention of references and/or false claims.	
	Personation	The student is knowingly and willingly impersonated by another with the intention of gaining unfair advantage for himself/herself	
	Ghost Writing	A student submits as their own, work which has been produced in whole or part by another person on their behalf, for example, the use of a ghost writing service or similar.	
SERIOUS	Cheating in examinations	Student found with notes. Student found with a mobile phone switched on.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awarded 'Refer' and required to revise and resubmit the same assignment for a maximum unit mark of Pass. • Awarded 'Refer' and required to produce a new piece of work and achieve a pass in the component for a maximum unit mark of Pass. • Awarded 'Refer' for the resubmission. It will be at the discretion of the Assessment Board whether the student is eligible to retake the module. • The Academic Misconduct Panel recommends to the awarding body that the student is withdrawn from the programme. It will be at the discretion of the Assessment Board whether any eligible interim award or credit is awarded.
	All repeat offences at Level 4 and 5 of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarism Including repeated inappropriate use of AI. • Self-plagiarism • Collusion • Falsification • Personation • Ghost Writing 	See 'Moderate' section above for key indicators and examples.	

**Please note this is a guide only. This may vary based on individual cases.*

Annex 5: Good Academic Practice and the Use of AI

GBS Malta

Good Academic Practice and the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Contents

1. *Good Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct*
2. *Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessed Work*
3. *How to Avoid Academic Misconduct Using AI*
4. *Misuse of AI*

1. Good Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct

1.1 All students are required to demonstrate good academic practice through academic integrity when producing assessed work. The principle of academic integrity underlies good academic practice where you are expected to demonstrate your learning through the production of assessments that are your own work. Academic integrity means that students should submit summative assessed work that is honest, ethical and respects to work of others. This ensures that student assessment is fair and reflects student's own work.

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) through the use of Apps such as ChatGPT and Gemini for written text and Midjourney and Dall-E for images offer a number of ways in which students can support their learning and/or work creatively.

1.2 Over-reliance on AI through the use of these and other similar tools may demonstrate poor academic practice which may result in academic misconduct. Where inappropriate use of AI is suspected students will be asked to attend a viva interview with their tutor after which next steps will be identified as to whether or not academic misconduct has taken place. This will result in the matter being referred to the Academic Misconduct Panel for determination of outcome for the student.

1.3 GBS Malta advises students **not to use AI** to generate summative assessments for submission to meet module assessment requirements unless students have been explicitly and clearly told by their teacher that they may or must do so. (See 2.4 and 2.5 below).

1.4 As a general rule, students are advised **not to use AI** to generate text or images for assessments and if used extensively may be treated as academic misconduct. (See 2.4 and 1.6 below).

1.5 Students are encouraged to limit AI-generated content copying to 5-8 words at *a time*; *should they exceed this limit, proper referencing akin to other resources is required.*

1.6 The use of AI can constitute academic misconduct in a number of different ways:

- Plagiarism since material from an unidentified or properly referenced source is being used
- Commissioning is where work produced by another person or sources is being used. In the context of AI, the company who owns the AI software
- Fabrication is where the AI app creates or makes up the material being used in assessed work.
- Where a piece of assessed work is created, in full or part, using generative AI and represented as a student's own work will be regarded as contract cheating in the same way as commissioning a third party to produce the piece of assessed work.

1.7 By submitting a piece of assessed work for summative assessment, GBS Malta assumes that you are representing the work as your own and not the product of generative AI use. When submitting summative assessed work students are required to confirm that it is their own work and provide a signature to confirm this.

1.8 GBS Malta requires all students to submit their summative assessed work through Turnitin. Evidence of AI in a piece of assessed work reported through Turnitin at or above 20% will be considered and evaluated by the tutor to determine whether or not academic misconduct has taken place. In such cases the GBS Malta Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure will be used and followed.

1.9 The Turnitin similarity report that is produced for assessed work submissions has embedded within it any use of generative AI. This detects and reports on the percentage of AI in a submitted piece of student coursework. Evidence of AI in a piece of assessed work reported through Turnitin at or above 20% will be considered and evaluated by the tutor to determine whether or not academic misconduct has taken place. In such cases the GBS Malta Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure will be used and followed.

1.10 Where academic misconduct is suspected, through Turnitin or other means, with the use of generative AI it will be treated in the same way as other forms of academic misconduct. GBS Malta's policy and procedure for dealing with cases of suspected academic misconduct will be used. See <https://gbs.edu.mt/media/aeqkqvs5/gbs-he-malta-limited-academic-good-practice-and-academic-misconduct-policy-v10-rm-vfinal.pdf>.

2. Use of Artificial Intelligence in Assessed Work

2.1 GBS Malta's approach to the use of generative AI technologies by students to support learning and assessed work requires openness and transparency by acknowledging both how it has been used and why it has been used. As with the use of published sources (journal articles, books, online material, for example, Wikipedia) good academic practice requires students to ensure that **all** sources used in the assessed work are acknowledged both within the text and in the reference section at the end of the assessment. The same principle should be applied to the use of generative AI.

2.2 GBS Malta recognises that the use generative AI applications by students in specific aspects of learning may be useful. This includes:

- To aid in the understanding of course material
- Helping to structure or organise existing work

- Spelling and grammar checks
- Creating prompts for image making
- Obtaining a quick overview of a topic using, for example, ChatGPT or Gemini
- As a research tool similar to the use of the internet
- Summarising a longer published document
- To create ideas
- To generate key words for online searches.

2.3 Higher education institutions have adopted a number of ways to acknowledge or cite the use of AI tools in student assessed work. The important requirement that where a student uses a generative AI tool that in their assessment that it is acknowledged in some way.

2.4 GBS Malta may allow up to a maximum of 30% of text³, etc. produced by generative AI. It is for the tutor marking a student's assessed work to make a judgement concerning what may be allowed and what constitutes potential academic misconduct.

2.5 Good academic practice requires that students primarily rely on their own efforts when producing assessed work. Generative AI should only be used when explicitly permitted, and its use must be appropriately acknowledged in line with the guidance provided in section 3.2 below.

3. How to Avoid Academic Misconduct Using AI

3.1 The following guidelines are provided to help students ensure that they do not engage with academic misconduct in relation to the use of generative AI:

- (i) Avoid incorporation of any material produced using generative AI in assessed work
- (ii) Where material produced using generative AI, either text or images, acknowledge in both the text and reference section at the end stating which generative AI app/website was used and clearly show in the main body of the assessment what has been generated in this way. Note that incorporation of large chunks of material using generative AI should be avoided since it is the students own work that is marked not that which is produced by AI.
- (iii) Keep records of any draft notes or work so that teachers can see this if required
- (iv) Do not use generative AI to correct/check assessed work prior to submission. Use of generative AI in this way increases the risk that a student's work may be viewed as produced by the use of AI.
- (v) Students are advised to refrain from using paraphrasing tools such as QuillBot, particularly when working with AI-generated text, to uphold academic integrity and originality.

3.2. Acknowledging use of any generative AI tools in assessed work must be provided in the text and the reference section. There is no universally accepted way of doing this at present. A short statement at the beginning or end of the reference section could be as follows:

- List all generative AI tools/apps used

³ Turnitin produces a reliable assessment of the percentage of AI used in a piece of work at 20% and above.

- Provide a short explanation of what each tool/app was used for and where it occurs in the main text (for example, to improve clarity of writing, to aid understanding of a theory/concept, topic or course materials to produce new ideas or plan the assessed work, to check fact, analyse data)

3.3 Use of one or more of the following sentences may be helpful to include in the reference section:

- I acknowledge the use of *<insert name(s) and url>* to generate information for background research and at the drafting stage of the writing process with the creation of an outline structure for this essay.
- I acknowledge the use of *<insert name(s) and url>* to identify improvements in the writing style.
- I acknowledge the use of *<insert name(s) and url>* as an information source to generate materials that were included within my final assessment in my own words.
- I acknowledge the use of *<insert name(s) and url>* to create the images included in this presentation.
- No content generated by AI technologies has been presented as my own work.

3.4 If in doubt ask teachers for further guidance.

4. Misuse of AI

4.1 A student may be asked to attend a viva interview with their tutor if there is a suspicion that work submitted for assessment includes unacknowledged or forbidden AI-generated contributions. Where there is a serious mismatch between the quality of the assessed work submitted and the performance of the student in discussion of their assessed work with their teacher academic misconduct may be considered to have taken place. The student's assessed work will then be dealt with using GBS Malta's academic misconduct policy and procedure (<https://gbs.edu.mt/media/aeqkqvs5/gbs-he-malta-limited-academic-good-practice-and-academic-misconduct-policy-v10-rm-vfinal.pdf>.) and the matter referred to the Academic Misconduct Panel for determination of outcome for the student.

4.2 Where it is determined that the use of AI has been shown to constitute academic misconduct penalties will be applied. These are set out in the academic misconduct policy.

