



Global Banking School
+44 (0) 207 539 3548

info@globalbanking.ac.uk

www.globalbanking.ac.uk

891 Greenford Road, London
UB6 0HE

GBS Academic Good Practice and Academic Conduct

Contents

1. Policy Statement of Purpose	5
2. Scope MC4486.1145904605921en Q.EMC../Span./MCID.26/Lang.(en-GB)> BDC.q0.00008874 0 5	6
3. Principles	6
4. Definitions and Examples	7
5. Poor Academic Practice Procedure	13
6. Academic Conduct Breach Procedure	15
7. Detecting Poor Academic Practice and Academic Conduct Breaches.....	20
8. Indicative Breaches and Penalties	20
9.	

2.4 GBS will work with students to strive towards early achievement of academic integrity.

We recognise that students who are new to higher education will need some time to achieve this goal. For these early stages, this policy ref000tETQq0.000008874 0 595.5 841.98 re

3.6 Confidentiality will be respected in conducting all aspects of the investigation. Details of academic conduct under investigation are only disclosed to those immediately involved and/or those whose participation is necessary for the investigation.

3.7 Students involved in suspected Academic Conduct Breaches shall have the right to be accompanied to any discussions, meetings, or panel by a friend who supports but may not speak on their behalf. Legal representation is not permitted at any discussion, meeting or panel.

3.8 GBS staff who are involved in cases either as investigators or by providing evidence must remain impartial and should not advocate for or against a particular outcome.

3.9 When deciding if a student has committed an Academic Conduct Breach, GBS must

the breach

3.10 In this

4. Definitions and Examples

Good Academic Practice and Integrity

4.1 Every GBS student is expected to act with academic integrity in relation to the production and presentation of their academic work. Academic integrity is central to academic and professional life and requires that students be honest and responsible in acknowledging the contributions of others in their work.

4.2 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 the



regulations. Students are required to confirm this via a declaration at submission.

4.3 To assure GBS that assessed work is that of the GBS neS ssed

- (c) The use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the
- (d) 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
- (e) Copying the work of another student, with or without their knowledge or agreement.

As stated in 4.7, at levels 3 and 4, an educative approach will be taken, appropriate to the student and the situation. At level 5 and above, plagiarism will be seen as an Academic Conduct Breach.

4.10 **Self-Plagiarism**

The unacknowledged re-submission of work the student had previously submitted and gained academic credit at GBS or elsewhere. This may include the re-use of text, research data or other information.

4.11 **Collusion**

Collusion exists where:

- (a) Two or more students collaborate in producing a piece of work without authorisation and each submits the work as if it were their individual effort.
- (b) A student allows another student to copy all or part of their work and to submit it as their individual effort.
- (c) There is unauthorised collaboration between a student and another person in

Where assignments require use of a template, some module specific resources or supplied sources, similarity between student submissions is expected. Collusion can

same. Collus
copied or is the same.

As stated in 4.7, at levels 3 and 4, an educative approach will be taken, appropriate to the student and the situation. At level 5 and above, collusion will be seen as an Academic Conduct Breach.

(b) If Poor Academic Practice is deemed not to have taken place, this is recorded on the relevant Student Casework Tracker. The ASQO Student Casework Team is advised and sends an outcome letter to the student.

5.9 If the student does not attend the meeting, Poor Academic Practice is deemed to have taken place and the suggested penalty is applied. The ASQO Student Casework Team send a letter to the student to confirm this. The student should be signposted to central Good Academic Practice resources by the Faculty. The use of these should be tracked and student engagement with them should be monitored by the Faculty.

5.10 Cases of Poor Academic Practice will not normally proceed to a formal investigation of an Academic Conduct Breach for first- and second-time breaches. However, where it becomes apparent that a minor or serious Academic Conduct Breach may have occurred on the balance of probabilities the case may proceed to Stage 1 of the Academic Conduct Breach Procedure (please see section 6 below).

6. Academic Conduct Breach Procedure

Stage 1

6.1 If a student is ction endsstan

- (a) If the student does not reply to the communication within the above timescale, the penalty is confirmed, and the student is notified of this. The student should be signposted to central Good Academic Practice resources.
- (b) If the student accepts the Academic Conduct Breach finding within the above timescale, the penalty is confirmed, and the student is notified of this. The student is invited to a meeting with academic support staff and should be signposted to central Good Academic Practice resources.
- (c) If the student denies the Academic Conduct Breach finding, they are invited to a Faculty Academic Conduct meeting, see point 6.6 below.

6.6 The student is invited by the Faculty to an Academic Conduct meeting to discuss their work and the Academic Conduct Breach. The letter advises the student of the consequences of not attending the meeting. The meeting invitation should be sent within five working days of the students' response to the Academic Conduct Breach, and the meeting should be held as soon as is reasonably practical. The meeting should take place with the Associate Dean (Assessment) and a member of staff with sufficient knowledge of the module, normally the Module Leader or the member of staff who raised the original case. The student can bring in another person, such as a friend, family member, student representative or a member of the Student Welfare team, to support them in the meeting, who may not speak on their behalf. This meeting

Tracker. The ASQO Student Casework Team is advised and sends an

- 6.12 An Academic Conduct Panel can have the following outcomes:
- (a) The student is found to have breached academic conduct regulations and the original penalty stands;
 - (b) The student is found to have breached academic conduct regulations and a different penalty from the original is given;
 - (c) The student is not found to have breached academic conduct regulations and no penalty is applied.
- 6.13 The ASQO Student Casework Team will inform the student of the outcome of the Academic Conduct Panel.
- 6.14 If the Academic Conduct Breach is classed as at the highest and most serious breach (see section 7 below) the Stage 3 procedure is followed but the composition of the Academic Conduct Panel is as follows:
- (i) A Chair who is a representative of another Faculty (normally an Associate Dean (Assessment));
 - (ii) Two members of academic staff from the same Faculty as the student, who have not been involved with the case previously and are not known to the student;
 - (iii) present the case to the Panel;
 - (iv) A member of staff from the Academic Standards and Quality Office Student Casework Team, who will support the Panel members on policy adherence and act as Secretary for the meeting.
- 6.15 The meeting can have one of three outcomes as outlined above in 6.12.

Repeated Breaches

- 6.16 In considering repeated instances of Poor Academic Practice, the Level Leader (or nominee) may decide to proceed to a consideration of a breach of academic conduct regulations, however:
- (a) Concurrent instances of Academic Conduct Breaches should be treated as one instance.

(b) Repeat Academic Conduct Breaches may still be treated as Poor Academic Practice if the student has not had sufficient time to engage with academic support.

6.17 Repeated instances of Poor Academic Practice can be deemed to have breached academic conduct regulations if the student has failed to engage with academic support.

6.18 For second and subsequent breaches of academic conduct regulations, the procedure above should normally be followed from Stage 1 onwards as appropriate. On the Academic Conduct Form, the fact that it is not a first breach of academic conduct regulations should be noted. Any penalty that is applied should consider that it is not a first breach of academic conduct regulations.

7. Detecting Poor Academic Practice and Academic Conduct Breaches

7.1 To support the detection of poor academic practice and Academic Conduct Breaches GBS uses:

Turnitin plagiarism detection software.

Vivas that are conducted with a randomly selected sample of students to verify the authenticity of their summative assessed work. Vivas are typically used in relation to written work such as essays, reports and case studies.

Targeted vivas where it appears that the authenticity of student work is in question.

7.2 GBS reserves the right to carry out other forms of authenticity checking in relation to student work to support the integrity of the assessment process.

8. Indicative Breaches and Penalties

8.1 The table below provides examples of indicative breaches of academic conduct regulations, and the penalties to be applied, this is not an exhaustive list:

Poor Academic Practice				
Category	Indicative Breach Details	Level	Penalty (First Breach)	Penalty (Subsequent Breach)
Poor Academic Practice	Unintended plagiarism, over reliance on sources, or collusion, or has not yet learnt the correct academic conventions.			

	another student when work is presented as that of a single student.			mark capped at pass mark (Pass or 40 UG/50 PG).
Examination Conduct	Taking materials into the examination room other than those permitted. Unauthorized use of external sources during an examination. Any attempt to talk to, or gain access to the examination script of, another student during an examination.	All Levels	Written warning.	Written warning. Work is marked. Component mark capped at pass mark (Pass or 40 UG/50 PG).
Falsification	Presenting false data in laboratory reports, projects or other forms of assessment based on experimental work. Presenting false references.	Level 3 and 4	No penalty. Work is marked on its merits, discounting falsified sections.	Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting falsified sections.
Serious Breach of Academic Conduct Regulations				
Category	Indicative Breach Details	Level	Penalty (First Breach)	Penalty (Subsequent Breach)
All	Four minor breaches as defined above.	All Levels	Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment for a maximum component mark of Pass/40 (UG) or 50 (PG).	Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment for a maximum unit or module mark of Pass/40 (UG) or 50 (PG.)
Plagiarism, including use of AI tools without referencing (up to 50% of content)	Unreferenced and verbatim or paraphrased. Taking of ideas from a source without referencing the source and copying it verbatim or acknowledging the original source or without sufficient attribution of ideas.	Levels 5, 6 and 7	Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections. Component mark capped at pass mark (Pass/40 UG/50 PG).	Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment for a maximum component mark of Pass/40 (UG) or 50 (PG).

<p>Plagiarism, including use of AI tools without referencing (more than 50% of content) Self-Plagiarism</p>	<p>Unreferenced and verbatim or paraphrased. Taking of ideas from a source without referencing the source and copying it verbatim or acknowledging the original source or without sufficient attribution of ideas. No reference to assignment previously submitted and awarded credit or development of previous</p>	<p>Levels 5, 6 and 7</p>	<p>Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment for a maximum component mark of Pass/40 (UG) or 50 (PG).</p>	<p>Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment for a maximum unit or module mark of Pass/40 (UG) or 50 (PG.)</p>
---	---	--------------------------	---	--

			(UG) or 50 (PG).	
Contract Cheating	A student submission of work as their own which has been produced by another person on their behalf. Commissioning work through an external essay writing service or similar.	All Levels	Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment for a maximum component mark of Pass/40 (UG) or 50 (PG).	Awarded a mark of 0 for the unit or module. No reassessment opportunity given.

Absence of Ethical Approval

	<p>Impersonating another student or getting someone else to impersonate you.</p> <p>Unauthorised absence from the examination room during an examination.</p> <p>Using or attempting to use an external source during an authorised absence from the examination room during an examination.</p> <p>Three or more breaches of minor examination conduct.</p>			
Highest Breach of Academic Conduct Regulations				
Category	Indicative Breach Details	Level	Penalty (First Breach)	Penalty (Subsequent Breach)
All	Four serious breaches as defined above.	All Levels	Not applicable.	<p>Not permitted to continue on the programme. Immediate expulsion from GBS.</p> <p>Optional: certification given for any credits completed.</p>

9. Right of Review

9.1 A student has the right to request a review against the outcome of an Academic Conduct Breach Procedure on one or both of the following grounds:

- (a) Procedural irregularity in the Academic Conduct Breach Procedure;
- (b) There is new evidence that can be substantiated, including exceptional circumstances, which were not known at the time and may have affected the outcome had it been known to the Panel, and there is a valid reason for not making it known at the time.

9.2 The requests for review must be sent to the Director of Academic Standards and Quality (or nominee) via studentcasework@globalbanking.ac.uk within 10 working days of the date of the letter informing the student of the outcome.

9.3 If the Director of Academic Standards and Quality determines that grounds for review have been demonstrated, the request for review is upheld and the case referred to a further Academic Conduct Panel. The Panel members must have had no previous involvement in the case. The Panel will be supported by a nominee of the Director of Academic Standards and Quality, their decision is final.

9.4 A final decision will be communicated to the student in writing by ASQO Student Casework Team

Annex 1: GBS Poor Academic Practice Form

This form should be used to record cases of Poor Academic Practice as specified in GBS Academic Good Practice and Conduct: Policy and Procedure. Part A should be completed by the member of GBS staff suspecting Poor Academic Practice before referring to the Level Leader. Investigating Level Leader to complete Part B.

PART A: DETAILS OF SUSPECTED POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE			
Student Name:		Student GBS ID:	
Student GBS Email Address:		Student Campus	
Programme Title:	[REDACTED]		
Unit/module title:			
Assessment component:			

GBS
 Nam 841.8 21 reW



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
SIGNATURE OF MEMBER OF STUDENT CASEWORK STAFF			
Name:		Position:	



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY SIGNATURE OF MEMBER OF STUDENT CASEWORK STAFF			
Name:		Position:	
GBS Staff			

- (d) reply to the case for the student(s).
8. Evidence may be received by the Panel by oral statement, written and signed statement, or further 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.
 9. In the event of a disagreement about the Panel decision, the final decision shall be made by the Panel Chair.
 10. of the meeting. The secretary will report the outcome in writing to the student(s) normally
 11. If the conclusion of the Panel meeting is that an Academic Conduct Breach has not occurred, this will be recorded on the Academic Conduct Investigation Report Form and no further action will be taken.
 12. If the conclusion of the Panel meeting is that an Academic Conduct Breach has occurred, the student(s) should also be given the opportunity to declare breaches in other work that they have submitted.
 13. The student(s) should be advised that they have the right to appeal against the finding of an Academic Conduct Breach within ten working days of receiving the decision of the Academic Conduct Panel. The appeal should be made in writing to ASQO Student Casework Team clearly stating the grounds for the appeal (for example, evidence not available to the Panel at the time, procedural irregularity, etc.).
 14. The student(s) should be advised that they have the right to make a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (www.oiahe.ac.uk) if they remain dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal.
 15. The report of the findings of the Academic Conduct Panel must be made on the Academic Conduct Investigation Report Form. Where a penalty is applied that affects the outcome of
or
Examination Committee.

Annex 4: Types of Evidence to Evaluate and Present in Suspected Breaches of Academic Conduct

The guidance below provides examples of types of evidence to evaluate and present in suspected breaches of academic conduct, this is not an exhaustive list.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected plagiarism:

Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in sections of text acknowledgment. **-alone**
justification for suspected breaches of plagiarism.

Absence of clear acknowledgement of source of text/idea/image in citations or narratives.

Heterogeneity of font/pica/style of sections of text; variations in spellings (UK/US).

Absence of elements of bibliographical details.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected collusion:

Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in texts between two students in same cohort.

Annex 5: Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) Software

Related policies:

[Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure](#)

[Student Charter](#)

[Student Code of Conduct](#)

[Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure](#)

Introduction

The use of Generative AI (such as ChatGPT DALLE-2, CoPilot, and Google Gemini) should be considered within the principles and regulations of academic integrity. Ensuring the efficacy of the assessment process is essential to maintaining the validity of qualifications. GBS takes seriously its obligations to ensure that students are awarded qualifications that reflect their genuine knowledge and understanding of the subject material.

Data generated by AI can be unreliable and its use can breach privacy laws. For example, its use can risk contravention of Intellectual Property law, The Data Protection Act 2018 and the UK GDPR, and the Equality Act 2010. It can also produce fake references or create computer code which has drawn information from an illegal code library or contains security flaws.

However, Generative AI can also be helpful for tasks such as proofreading text, summaries of text, understanding concepts, and analysing large datasets. The UK government is currently consulting on [_____](#)

Acceptable uses of Generative AI preparation

In the case of preparing for an academic assessment, Generative AI can be a useful tool. For example, it would be acceptable to explicitly **learning**

and preparation for an assessment by:

Summarising published work in such a way as it provides an explanation of a concept with the tool, sources and outcome reached cited in the assignment when submitted.

Re-wording information such that it

Create a piece of text as part of an assessment where the constructive use of Generative AI as a valid tool is included in published learning outcomes.

Provide content where an assessment requires students to undertake critical analysis of Generative AI-produced text.

full declarations of use of AI tools are required listing the name and version of the Generative AI system used, how it has been used, and the date on which it was accessed. [This article](#) provides a variety of references in a range of styles such as MLA and Chicago.

Unacceptable uses of Generative AI

The use of Generative AI **must not** be used to produce the original text required in submitted assessments. This includes:

Ensuring that assessment parameters are not too generic can be useful: while all assessments require critical evaluation of the output of any Generative AI tools used,