



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: Policy and Procedure

2024 Global Banking School

Document title	GBS Academic Good Practice and Conduct: Policy and Procedure
Version	7.1
Approved by (Oversight committee)	Academic Board
Policy lead (Staff member accountable)	Provost
Date of original approval	September 2022
Date of last review	July 2025
Changes made at the last review	Deletion of section 7 setting out detection of poor academic practice and of academic conduct breaches. This information is now provided in a separate guidance document.
Date effective from	July 2025
Date of next review	July 2026

Related GBS policies

- GBS Academic Appeals Policy
- GBS Anti-Harassment and Anti-Bullying Policy
- GBS Assessment and Feedback Policy
- GBS Code of Practice for Ethical Conduct of Research
- GBS Equality and Diversity Policy
- GBS Research Governance and Integrity Policy
- GBS Student Charter
- GBS Student Code of Conduct
- GBS Student Complaints Policy and Procedure
- GBS Student Disciplinary Policy
- GBS Student Protection Plan
- GBS Support to Study Policy

External Reference Points

1. [Office of the Independent Adjudicator](#) in 'Good Practice Framework: Handling Student Complaints and Academic Appeals'. Third edition, (2022).

2. [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#), Advice and Guidance: enabling student achievement.
3. Information Commissioner's Office, Accessed online at: <https://ico.org.uk/>
4. UK Public General Acts, *Data Protection Act 2018*, Accessed online at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2018/12/contents/enacted>
5. UK Public General Acts, *Equality Act 2010*, Accessed online at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>
6. QAA Academic Integrity Charter, Accessed online at: [Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education \(qaa.ac.uk\)](#)
7. ICAI International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI, 2021) at: https://academicintegrity.org/images/pdfs/20019_ICAI-Fundamental-Values_R12.pdf

Contents

1. Policy Statement of Purpose.....	5
2. Scope	5
3. Principles.....	6
4. Definitions and Examples	7
5. Poor Academic Practice Procedure	13
6. Academic Conduct Breach Procedure	15
7. Indicative Breaches and Penalties	20
8. Right of Review	26
9. Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE)	26
10. Roles and Responsibilities.....	27
11. Policy Amendment and Administration	27
12. Data Protection and Confidentiality.....	27
13. Alternative Format	27
Annex 1: GBS Poor Academic Practice Form.....	28
Annex 2: GBS Academic Conduct Form.....	30
Annex 3: GBS Academic Conduct Panel	33
Annex 4: Types of Evidence to Evaluate and Present in Suspected Breaches of Academic Conduct.....	35
Annex 5: Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) Software	36

1. Policy Statement of Purpose

- 1.1 Global Banking School (GBS) bases its policy on the expectations for standards and expectations for quality outlined in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2023) and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE) Good Practice Framework for Disciplinary Procedures (2018).
- 1.2 GBS has a duty to maintain academic standards by ensuring the integrity of all aspects of the assessment process and to ensure that the regulations and policies governing the assessment of courses at GBS are fully and fairly implemented.
- 1.3 To this end, GBS will investigate where a student is suspected of possible breaches of academic conduct regulations (i.e. Academic Conduct Breaches). If a student is suspected of an Academic Conduct Breach, GBS will follow the Academic Conduct Breach Procedure. This will apply in all cases where an unfair advantage could be gained over other students, whether that breach is inadvertent through negligence or with deliberate intent. This aligns with the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's (QAA) Quality Code Advice and Guidance for assessment that institutions ensure that "students do not obtain credit or awards through any form of unacceptable academic practice relating to assessment."

2. Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all students enrolled or previously enrolled on higher education programmes at levels 3 to 7 at GBS leading to GBS, Oxford Brookes University, and Pearson awards. It covers Academic Conduct Breaches in any form of assessment including written examinations, assessed coursework (in whatever form the coursework might take) and oral/practical assessments.
- 2.2 For programmes at GBS leading to awards of our partner Universities, the policy and procedure for academic practice and conduct breaches published on that University's website will normally apply, unless it has been otherwise determined that the GBS policy should apply.
- 2.3 For a given programme, this policy should be read alongside the academic regulations of the provider conferring the award, whether this be GBS itself or one of its academic partners.

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 students in the early stages of their studies, this policy reflects the intention to address Poor Academic Practice through pedagogical, formative approaches.

2.5 There is no time limit beyond which Academic Conduct Breaches will not be investigated. Suspected breaches, whether discovered before or after graduation, will be investigated and dealt with in accordance with this policy. Where an Academic Conduct Breach is found after work has been formally assessed, this may lead to the withdrawal of credit previously ratified by an Assessment Board/Examination Committee or withdrawal of a conferred award.

3. Principles

3.1 Academic integrity is the basis for ethical decision-making and behaviour in an academic context. This is reflected in norms of acceptable academic practice and is informed by the values of honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness, respect, and courage (ICAI, 2021).

3.2 If it is suspected that a student has breached Academic Conduct Regulations, then the academic practice will be investigated.

3.3 In exceptional circumstances, the breach may come to light after an Assessment Board or Examination Committee has met and ratified marks/grades have been published, including cases where the individual concerned is no longer a registered student. Where an Academic Conduct Breach is confirmed, the Academic Conduct Panel will recommend a penalty for ratification by the appropriate Assessment Board or Examination Committee. Where so ratified, the Assessment Board or Examination Committee will withdraw the relevant credit from the student, which may in turn also result in the withdrawal of any award already conferred on the student.

3.4 The Academic Standards and Quality Office Student Casework Team has oversight of all Academic Conduct Breach cases.

- 3.5 All investigations of suspected Academic Conduct Breaches are dealt with in a timely manner and through processes which are clear, straightforward and transparent.
- 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 be confident, having carefully considered the available evidence, that it is “more likely than not” that the breach has occurred. This is called proof on “the balance of probabilities”. Decisions must be supported by evidence.
- 3.10 In this policy, “days” are defined as GBS working days.

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 responsibility of students to ensure that they do not breach academic conduct regulations. Students are required to confirm this via a declaration at submission.
- 4.3 To assure GBS 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:

- (a) Providing full citation of all sources (books, articles, websites, newspapers, images (digital or otherwise), music, patents or other creative material, artefacts, data sources, programme code etc.) which have been drawn on in the preparation of an assignment. Normally this will be done using in-text citations and a reference/bibliography section which must be included with the assignment.
- (b) Properly referencing the sources directly consulted for the arguments and ideas used 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.
- (c) Following other guidelines for preparing and presenting coursework as defined in the relevant programme handbooks, module guides and assignment briefs.
- (d) Proofreading work to check that spelling, grammar, and formatting are correct.
- (e) Meeting expectations regarding ethical behaviour in assessment and research including gaining approval of supervisors required for work through the ethical approval process.
- (f) Using mechanisms provided by GBS for self-checking work, including the practice Turnitin submission link via the VLE, along with support and advice given by teaching staff.

Poor Academic Practice

4.4 Poor Academic Practice is defined as limited or inadequate academic technical skills or not following academic conventions, resulting from an individual's lack of knowledge, understanding and practice of the skills required to demonstrate good academic practice.

4.5 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, use of quotation marks, paraphrasing and make use of the support (for example Academic Support Team, information on GBS VLE, etc.) that is available.

4.6 For the purposes of this policy the understanding of Poor Academic Practice is based on the following considerations:

- (a) A student in their early stages of study (level 3 and 4) who may not have gained the knowledge and skills to demonstrate standards of good academic practice. This could be, for example, a lack of full understanding on the use of references in academic writing.
- (b) Instances of unintended plagiarism, over reliance on sources, overuse of artificial intelligence sources, or minor collusion, as defined below, that occur at the early stages of a student's studies (level 3 and 4) can normally be considered as Poor Academic Practice.
- (c) A student who shows intent to meet good academic practice, but fails in its execution, can be considered to show Poor Academic Practice.

4.7 Addressing cases of Poor Academic Practice requires supportive, constructive and educative approaches by programme and faculty teams and members of the learning support services, working with the active participation of the student.

Academic Conduct Breaches

4.8 There are different forms of Academic Conduct Breaches, all of which may be the subject of the procedures described in this document. An Academic Conduct Breach can take many forms, but is, in essence, an action which may result in a student gaining or potentially gaining an unfair advantage over others. The following are examples of Academic Conduct Breaches, but do not constitute a complete or exhaustive list:

4.9 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the incorporation of published or unpublished material produced by another person into a student's work without appropriately referencing the source material. Examples of plagiarism include:

- (a) The inclusion in a student's work of significant phrases of a sentence or more from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the source(s).

- (b) The paraphrasing of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement.
- (c) The use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source.
- (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 work.
- (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 producing a piece of work that is submitted as the student's own work.

Where assignments require use of a template, some module specific resources or supplied sources, similarity between student submissions is expected. Collusion can be described as "minor" when small parts of the work have been copied or are the same. Collusion can be described as "serious" when the majority of the work has been 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.

4.12 Falsification

Examples of falsification include:

- (a) 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.
- (b) The falsification of references, including the invention of references and/or false claims.

4.13 Impersonation

Impersonation happens when:

- (a) A person assumes the identity of a student with the intention of gaining unfair advantage for that student.
- (b) A student is knowingly and willingly impersonated by another with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage.

4.14 Bribery

Bribery occurs when a student pays, or offers some other inducement, in an attempt to gain an unfair advantage in an assessment.

4.15 Custom Writing or Contract Cheating

Custom writing is also referred to as Contract Cheating. This occurs when a student commissions or obtains work that has been written in full or in part by another person, where input from another person is not allowed as part of that assessment. Commissioning refers to all situations where someone other than the student has completed the work, whether it is an “essay mill”, friend or family member. Money does not have to have been exchanged for work to be commissioned.

4.16 Examination Conduct Breaches

Examination conduct breaches cover instances where a student breaches regulations related to examinations in any way, whether before, during or after the examination, to gain an unfair advantage in the examination. Examples of this could include:

Minor breach of examination conduct:

- (a) Attempts to take materials into the examination room other than those permitted.
- (b) Attempts to make unauthorised use of external sources during the examination, including (but not limited to) mobile devices, smart watches, apps, software, and websites.
- (c) Any attempt to talk to, or gain access to the examination script of, another student during an examination.

Serious breach of examination conduct:

- (a) Offering or attempting to offer financial incentives to those concerned with the examination process (a form of bribery).
- (b) Gaining or attempting to gain access to unseen examination papers before the time of the examination.
- (c) Deliberate unauthorised removal of any part of an examination script, or tampering with examination scripts after they have been handed in.
- (d) Copying from the script of another student during an examination.
- (e) Inappropriately receiving help or gaining help from another student during an examination.
- (f) Impersonating or attempting to impersonate another student or asking someone else to impersonate you.
- (g) Unauthorised absence from the examination room during an examination.
- (h) Using or attempting to use an external source during an authorised absence from the examination room during an examination.
- (i) Repeat breaches of examination conduct.

4.17 **Artificial Intelligence**

The use of Generative AI should be considered within the principles and regulations of academic integrity, which can be found on the relevant programme pages on Moodle.

The use of an artificial intelligence tool/source/programme/platform such as ChatGPT to generate material which is submitted as if it was the student's own work without

clear referencing is not permitted. Generative AI should not be used to produce the original text required in summative assessments. This includes:

- (a) The summary and analysis of peer reviewed literature.
- (b) The summary and analysis of original data.
- (c) The synthesis of ideas, discussion or conclusions.
- (d) The generation of new findings or creation of graphs, charts or images.

These components of an assessment should be relied on to evidence that the student has independently achieved the learning outcomes and must therefore remain solely the ownership of the author.

There are specific situations where it is appropriate for Generative AI to be used in the creation of an assessment. For example, students may appropriately use Generative AI to support the planning or structuring of their work, such as generating initial ideas, outlining essay formats, or drafting non-assessed preparatory materials. In such cases, students must clearly acknowledge the use of AI and reflect on how it informed their thinking, ensuring transparency and academic honesty.

4.18 Absence of Ethical Approval

This covers failure to obtain signed ethical approval forms indicating ethical approval to carry out research with human or animal participants in accordance with Faculty and partner procedures.

5. Poor Academic Practice Procedure

5.1 If the assessed work can be considered as Poor Academic Practice (particularly in the early stages of a programme at level 3 or 4) then it should not normally be considered under the more extensive Academic Conduct Procedures at point 6 of this policy.

5.2 Where Poor Academic Practice may have occurred, the evidence should be gathered by the academic member of staff who identified the poor practice, and Part A of the Poor Academic Practice Form should be completed. The case should be referred to the relevant Level Lead (or nominee) within five working days, who will record the case as Poor Academic Practice on the relevant Student Casework Tracker.

- 5.3 Details of the Poor Academic Practice should be outlined clearly on the form. The ASQO Student Casework Team monitors the completion of these forms. Clear evidence should be provided as follows:
- (a) A copy of the affected assessment, with annotation or highlighting to identify the extent of the Poor Academic Practice (where applicable);
 - (b) Any other evidence relevant to the case, for example the assignment brief, formative activities or correspondence with the student.
- 5.4 Where a student has submitted more than one unit/module at the same time and is suspected of Poor Academic Practice for both assessments, the cases should be considered concurrently.
- 5.5 On receipt of the information from the academic member of staff, the Level Lead should consider the case and evidence for this and determine one of the following outcomes:
- (a) If the Level Lead does not agree that Poor Academic Practice has occurred, the work is marked in the normal way, and this concludes the procedure. Details of the case should remain on the Student Casework Tracker, noting the decision that this was not a case of Poor Academic Practice.
 - (b) If the Level Lead agrees that Poor Academic Practice has occurred, they should complete Part B of the Poor Academic Practice Form and refer the case to the relevant Module Leader (or nominee) so that they can follow up a 'poor academic practice meeting' with the student.
- 5.6 The student should be invited to a meeting by the relevant Module Leader (or nominee) to discuss their work. The meeting invitation should be sent within five working days and the meeting should be held as soon as is reasonably practical (preferably within 7 working days). The meeting should take place with a member of staff with sufficient knowledge of the module, normally the Module Leader, and the relevant Module Lecturer. This meeting is organised by the Faculty and may include a viva discussion of the student's work.
- 5.7 The nature of the meeting will be supportive. The student will be given the opportunity to explain their assessment or conduct. The Faculty member of staff will take a

constructive, educative approach, and shall provide guidance to the student on Good Academic Practice and signpost them to further resources.

5.8 Potential outcomes of the meeting:

- (a) If Poor Academic Practice is deemed to have taken place, this is recorded on the relevant Student Casework Tracker. A written warning would be given but no penalty would be applied, and the work would be marked on its merits. The ASQO Student Casework Team is advised of the outcome and sends an outcome letter to the student.
- (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 suspected of breaching academic conduct regulations, the evidence should be gathered by the academic member of staff who raises the suspicion. Part A of the Academic Conduct Form should be completed. The case should be referred within five working days to the relevant Level Lead (or nominee) who will record the case on the relevant Student Casework Tracker. Details of the suspected Academic Conduct Breach should be outlined clearly on the form. The Academic Standards and

Quality Office Student Casework Team supports and monitors the completion of these forms. Clear evidence must be provided as follows:

- (a) A copy of the affected assessment, with annotation or highlighting to identify the extent of the suspected breach of academic conduct regulations (where applicable);
- (b) Any other evidence relevant to the case, for example the assignment brief, formative activities or correspondence with the student.

6.2 Where a student has submitted more than one unit/module at the same time and is suspected of an Academic Conduct Breach for both assessments, the cases should be considered concurrently.

6.3 On receipt of the completed form (Part A) and relevant evidence from the academic member of staff, the Level Lead should consider the proposed breach and evidence for this and determine one of the following outcomes:

- (a) If the Level Lead finds no Academic Conduct Breach, the work is marked in the normal way, and this concludes the procedure. Details of the case should remain on the Student Casework Tracker, noting the decision that this was not an Academic Conduct Breach.
- (b) If the Level Lead finds there is a case to investigate, they should complete Part B of the Academic Conduct Form and refer the case to the Associate Dean (Assessment) or nominee within five working days.

6.4 On receipt of the completed form (Parts A and B) and relevant evidence from the Level Lead, The Associate Dean (Assessment) or nominee should consider the case and evidence for this, and complete Part C of the Academic Conduct Form within five working days. They will determine one of the following outcomes:

- (a) If the Associate Dean (Assessment) or nominee finds no Academic Conduct Breach, the work is marked in the normal way, and this concludes the procedure. Details of the case should remain on the Student Casework Tracker, noting the decision that this was not an Academic Conduct Breach.

- (b) If the Associate Dean (Assessment) or nominee finds there is a case to investigate, the case will proceed to Stage 2 of the Academic Conduct Procedure.

Stage 2

6.5 When a case progresses to Stage 2, the student is sent a letter containing details of the suspected Academic Conduct Breach, together with a copy of the relevant evidence. The letter advises the student of the consequences of not engaging or attending the meeting. The student is asked to respond to the letter within 5 working days and advise if they wish to accept or deny the Academic Conduct Breach case:

- (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 is organised by the Faculty and may include a viva discussion of the student's work.

6.7 The Academic Conduct meeting will be held online and recorded. The outcome will be notified to the ASQO Student Casework Team who maintain and update the Student Casework Tracker.

6.8 Potential outcomes of the meeting:

- (a) If an Academic Conduct Breach is deemed to have taken place, the ASQO Student Casework Team record this on the relevant Student Casework Tracker. If the breach is classed as a minor Academic Conduct Breach, the ASQO Student Casework Team is advised and sends an outcome letter to the student. The student should be signposted to central Good Academic Practice resources.
- (b) If an Academic Conduct Breach is deemed not to have taken place, the ASQO Student Casework Team records this on the relevant Student Casework Tracker. The ASQO Student Casework Team is advised and sends an outcome letter to the student. The student's work can be marked as normal.
- (c) If the student does not attend the meeting, an Academic Conduct Breach 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.
- (d) If the Academic Conduct Breach is classed as a serious breach, the case will progress to Stage 3.

Stage 3

6.9 If the suspected Academic Conduct Breach is classed as a serious breach, the ASQO Student Casework Team will follow the procedure below:

- (a) The student is sent a letter containing details of the Academic Conduct Breach, together with a copy of the relevant evidence. The letter advises the student of the consequences of not attending the meeting. The student is asked to respond within 5 working days and advise if they wish to accept or deny the Academic Conduct Breach.
- (b) If the student accepts the Academic Conduct Breach or does not reply to the communication within the above timescale, the penalty is confirmed, and the student is notified of this.
- (c) If the student denies the Academic Conduct Breach, they are invited to an Academic Conduct Panel meeting.

6.10 Academic Conduct Panels will be held online and recorded. The ASQO Student Casework team supports the Panel meeting.

- 6.11 An Academic Conduct Panel is comprised of:
- (i) A Chair who is a representative of another Faculty (normally an Associate Dean (Assessment));
 - (ii) A member of academic staff from the same Faculty as the student, who has not been involved with the case previously and is not known to the student;
 - (iii) A member of staff from the student's Faculty whose role is to present the case to the Panel;
 - (iv) A member of staff from ASQO Student Casework Team, who will support the Panel members on policy adherence and act as Secretary for the meeting.
- 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. The student's work can be marked as normal.
- 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) The Associate Dean (Assessment) from the student's Faculty whose role is to 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. Indicative Breaches and Penalties

7.1 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.	Level 3 and 4	No penalty. Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting poor practice sections. Student must undertake Academic Good Practice training.	No penalty. Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting poor practice sections. Student must undertake Academic Good Practice training.
Minor Breach of Academic Conduct Regulations				
Failure to attend Poor Academic Practice Meeting	Failure to attend Poor Academic Practice Meeting.	Level 3 and 4	Resubmission of assessment. Component mark uncapped. Student must undertake Academic Good Practice training.	Resubmission of assessment. Component mark capped at pass mark (Pass or 40 UG/50 PG). Student must undertake Academic Good Practice training.
Self- Plagiarism	No reference to previous assignment or development of previous ideas.	Level 3 and 4	No penalty. Work is marked on its merits, discounting self-plagiarised sections.	No penalty. Work is marked on its merits, discounting self-plagiarised sections.
Plagiarism, including use of AI tools without referencing (any amount)	Unreferenced and paraphrased OR verbatim. No referencing to use of AI tools or sources. This can include the use of word spinners/synonyms.	Level 3 and 4	No penalty. Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections.	Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections. Component mark capped at pass mark (Pass or 40 UG/50 PG).
Collusion	Making work available to another student either intentionally or as a result of neglect. Collaboration with	Level 3 and 4	No penalty. Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting highlighted sections.	Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting highlighted sections. Component

	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).

Plagiarism, including use of AI tools without referencing (more than 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	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.)
Self-Plagiarism	No reference to assignment previously submitted and awarded credit or development of previous ideas.	Levels 5, 6 and 7	Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections. Component mark capped at pass mark (Pass or 40 UG/50 PG).	Written warning. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections. Unit or Module mark capped at pass mark (Pass or 40 UG/50 PG).
Collusion	Making work available to another student either intentionally or as a result of neglect. Collaboration with another student when work is presented as that of a single student.	Levels 5, 6 and 7	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).
Falsification	Presenting false data in laboratory reports, projects or other forms of assessment based on experimental work. Presenting false references, or misrepresenting sources.	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).
Impersonation	A student has allowed another person to assume their identity with the attention of gaining an unfair advantage.	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).
Bribery	Offering money or some other inducement to gain an unfair advantage in an assessment.	All Levels	Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment for a maximum component mark of Pass/40	Awarded a mark of 0 for the unit or module. No reassessment opportunity given.

			(UG) or 50 (PG).	
Contract Cheating	<p>A student submission of work as their own which has been produced by another person on their behalf.</p> <p>Commissioning work through an external essay writing service or similar.</p>	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	Ethical approval to carry out research with human or animal participants has not been obtained in accordance with Faculty and partner procedures.	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.
Examination Conduct	<p>Offering or attempting to offer financial incentives to those concerned with the examination process.</p> <p>Gaining or attempting to gain access to unseen examination papers before the time of the examination.</p> <p>Deliberate unauthorised removal of any part of an examination script, or tampering with examination scripts after they have been handed in.</p> <p>Copying from the script of another student during an examination.</p> <p>Inappropriately receiving help or gaining help from another student during an examination.</p>	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.

	<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>

8. Right of Review

8.1 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.

8.2 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.

8.3 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.

8.4 A final decision will be communicated to the student in writing by ASQO Student Casework Team within 20 working days of receipt of the student's request for a review. This is the end of GBS internal procedures.

9. Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE)

9.1 If a student requests the review of the outcome resulting from an Academic Conduct Breach case and the request is not upheld, the student will be deemed to have exhausted the procedures of GBS and a Completion of Procedures Letter will be issued to the student. If the student remains unhappy with the outcome of the request for review, they may make a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.

9.2 Details about the OIAHE can be found at: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/>. Further guidance about submitting a complaint to the OIAHE is available at: www.oiahe.org.uk/students/how-to-complain-to-us

10. Roles and Responsibilities

- 10.1 The Faculty is responsible for completing the Academic Conduct Form, ensuring that details of the suspected breach are clear, and that valid evidence is presented alongside the case. The Faculty is also responsible for maintaining information pertaining to the case using the relevant Student Casework Tracker.
- 10.2 The ASQO Student Casework Team is responsible for sending correspondence to the student and organising the Academic Conduct Panel.
- 10.3 The ASQO Student Casework Team is responsible for advising the Faculty of the outcome of an Academic Conduct Panel and updating this on the relevant Student Casework Tracker.
- 10.4 The Faculty is responsible for progressing any actions that need to take place because of an Academic Conduct Breach Procedure, for example if a student needs to re-submit their work, they need to be advised accordingly.

11. Policy Amendment and Administration

- 11.1 This policy may be amended by GBS at any time. If there are any queries relating to policy administration, please contact the Academic Standards and Quality Office at asqo@globalbanking.ac.uk.

12. Data Protection and Confidentiality

- 12.1 GBS is registered with the Information Commissioner's Office as a Data Controller. Details of the School's registration are published on the [Information Commissioner's website](#). GBS as a Data Controller implements appropriate technical and organisational measures to ensure that processing of personal information is performed in accordance with the UK General Data Protection Regulations (UK GDPR) and under the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA).

13. Alternative Format

- 13.1 This policy can be provided in alternative formats (including large print, audio and electronic) upon request. For further information, or to make a request, please contact the Governance Team at governance@globalbanking.ac.uk.

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:		Level:	
		Cohort:	
Unit/module title:		Unit/module code:	
Assessment component:		Component weighting:	%

GBS STAFF MEMBER (Notifying Poor Academic Practice)			
Name:		Position:	
Date:			

Details of suspected Poor Academic Practice with relevant evidence
<p>Poor Academic Practice case details: (Unintended plagiarism, over reliance on sources, collusion, or not yet learnt the correct academic conventions or other)</p> <p>Evidence Provided: (previous investigation records, assignment brief, student work, Turnitin similarity report):</p>

PART B: LEVEL LEADER'S DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATION OUTCOME			
Name:		Position:	
Date:			
<p>Please indicate whether you agree with the Poor Academic Practice outlined above and that you have reviewed the evidence provided:</p>			

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

Annex 2: GBS Academic Conduct Form

This form should be used to record suspected Academic Conduct Breaches, as specified in GBS Academic Good Practice and Conduct: Policy and Procedure. Part A should be completed by the member of GBS staff alleging possible Academic Conduct Breaches before referring to the Level Leader. Investigating Level Leader to complete Part B. The Associate Dean (Assessment) to complete Part C to ratify findings and determine suggested penalty.

PART A: DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC CONDUCT BREACH			
Student Name:		Student GBS ID:	
Student GBS Email Address:		Student Campus	
Programme Title:		Level:	
		Cohort:	
Unit/module title:		Unit/module code:	
Assessment component:		Component weighting:	%

GBS STAFF MEMBER (Notifying Academic Conduct Breach)			
Name:		Position:	
Date:			

Details of suspected Academic Conduct Breach, with relevant evidence
<p>Academic Conduct Breach details:</p> <p>Evidence Provided: (previous investigation records, assignment brief, student work, Turnitin similarity report):</p>

PART B: LEVEL LEADER'S DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATION OUTCOME			
Name:		Position:	
Date:			
<p>Please indicate whether you agree with the Academic Conduct Breach outlined above and that you have reviewed the evidence provided:</p>			

PART C: ASSOCIATE DEAN ASSESSMENT'S VERIFICATION AND PENALTY TO BE APPLIED			
Name:		Position:	
Date:			
<p>Category of Academic Conduct Breach: Minor/Serious/Highest (delete as appropriate):</p> <p>Is this a first or subsequent breach? (If a subsequent breach, please indicate how many previous breaches there are)</p> <p>Minor breaches: If the breach is minor, please confirm that a meeting has taken place within the Faculty and what the outcome of the meeting is. Please provide details of penalty to be applied:</p> <p>Serious/Highest breaches: If the breach is serious or at highest level, please provide indicative penalty:</p> <p>Any further comments:</p>			

PART D: CHECKLIST	
Stage 2 cases – to be completed by Faculty	
Date of student meeting:	
Attendees:	
Brief notes of meeting discussion:	
Stage 3 cases – to be completed by Student Casework	
Please enter Yes/No/Not Applicable	
Was the student given the opportunity to view the evidence prompting the investigation before the meeting?	
Was the purpose of the panel meeting explained to the student?	
Was the breach and evidence explained to the student in detail?	
Is student aware of type of Academic Conduct Breach under consideration?	
Was the student given the opportunity to explain/comment on the case presented?	
Have the next steps been explained to the student?	
Is the outcome of the Academic Conduct Procedure accepted by the student? Yes/No	

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

Annex 3: GBS Academic Conduct Panel

1. An Academic Conduct Panel will be constituted by ASQO Student Casework Team and comprised as defined in sections 6.11 and 6.14 of the policy.
2. If the Academic Conduct Breach in question involves more than one student, then the same Panel membership should normally consider each case.
3. The Academic Conduct 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 suspected Academic Conduct Breaches come 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 set of examinations.
4. The student(s) will be advised by the Secretary:
 - (a) of the full details of the breach of academic conduct regulations
 - (b) that the case will be heard by an Academic Conduct Panel
 - (c) provided with a copy of all available evidence
 - (d) their right to be accompanied by a friend or student representative
 - (e) of their right to provide a written statement for the Panel
5. The Panel may call staff members or others, as appropriate, to substantiate the claims, and will not unreasonably refuse permission for the member of staff who is the subject expert or student/s concerned to call such witnesses as they deem appropriate. If these participants do not attend, the meeting will proceed in their absence.
6. The Panel will interview the student(s), staff, and others called as appropriate, and come to a decision based on the discussion and supporting evidence. The student(s) will wait outside of the Panel meeting while the Panel deliberates.
7. The order of proceedings is as follows:
 - (a) 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.
 - (b) 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.
 - (c) reply to the case against the student(s).

- (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. If the student(s) has attended, they 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.
 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 a student's assessment, this will be considered by the relevant Assessment Board 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 plagiarism detection software indicating matches in sections of text – cross referenced against student’s referencing for absences of acknowledgment. **Note: a high similarity ‘score’ is not acceptable as a stand-alone justification for suspected breaches of plagiarism.**
- Unacknowledged text/idea/image that in the marker’s judgement is not ‘in the public domain’ but comes from an identifiable source/set of sources.
- 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.
- Students’ use of language about their ownership of text/idea/image.
- Students’ responses to viva/informal questions.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected collusion:

- Data from plagiarism detection software indicating matches in texts between two students in same cohort.
- Marker’s comments and evaluation of students’ assessments.
- Level of cooperation/group work that exceeds set parameters.
- Set requirements of assessment brief on acceptable limits of group work activity.
- Students’ responses to viva/informal questions.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected contract cheating:

- Module leaders’ and markers’ familiarity with students’ work – unexplained grade shifts.
- Failure of essay to align to assignments as set, and to content of lecture(s).
- Errors/inconsistencies in use of English (UK/US), changes in style, voice or syntax, heterogeneity in fonts/styles.
- Outcome of investigative interview / viva with student.
- Third party evidence (other students).
- IT forensics.
- E mail and other engagement with essay mill or essay bank services.
- Full guidance available from [Contracting to Cheat in Higher Education \(qaa.ac.uk\)](http://qaa.ac.uk)

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

Related policies:

[Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure](#)

[Student Charter](#)

[Student Code of Conduct](#)

[Student Conduct 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 [AI Regulation as a 'pro-innovation approach'](#).

Acceptable uses of Generative AI to support students' learning and assessment 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 use Generative AI to support a student's **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 supports access to background information, for example to access materials for students who speak English as an additional language.

Generative AI would also be reasonably used **for inclusion in a submitted piece of work** where students have been asked to:

- 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.

In all 'acceptable cases', 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:

- The summary and analysis of peer reviewed literature.
- The summary and analysis of original data.
- The synthesis of ideas, discussion or conclusions.

These components of an assessment should be relied on to evidence that the student has independently achieved the learning outcomes and must therefore remain solely the ownership of the author. It is therefore important that students do not claim work generated by AI as their own original work, as this would amount to an Academic Conduct Breach.

Working with Generative AI

There is a range of good practice which acknowledges and accommodates the existence of Generative AI. This includes:

- The auditing of assessments for vulnerability to the misuse of Generative AI and, as part of curriculum review processes, concerted efforts to update them in order to increase resilience to its misuse.

For example:

- 'Take-home' exams or essays written at home may increase the use of Generative AI.
- On-site handwritten exams, or exams undertaken onsite on computers not networked to the internet may increase resilience to these problems.

- Ensuring 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, including assessments tasks which require students to include content about their own lived experience or local community or context are more difficult to process through Generative AI.

GBS also recognises that it is good practice to:

- Train staff and students in the uses of Generative AI as a standard workplace tool.
- Embed the above into curriculum in such a way as is relevant to the subject matter.
- Train staff and students on the negative impact which Generative AI can have on Academic integrity, and how to avoid this impact.