



International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Diploma Programme

Academic honesty



Academic honesty



Diploma Programme Academic honesty

First published August 2009
Updated July 2011

Published on behalf of the International Baccalaureate Organization, a not-for-profit educational foundation of 15 Route des Morillons, 1218 Le Grand-Saconnex, Geneva, Switzerland by the

International Baccalaureate Organization (UK) Ltd
Peterson House, Malthouse Avenue, Cardiff Gate
Cardiff, Wales CF23 8GL
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 29 2054 7777
Fax: +44 29 2054 7778
Website: www.ibo.org

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2009

The International Baccalaureate Organization (known as the IB) offers three high-quality and challenging educational programmes for a worldwide community of schools, aiming to create a better, more peaceful world. This publication is one of a range of materials produced to support these programmes.

The IB may use a variety of sources in its work and checks information to verify accuracy and authenticity, particularly when using community-based knowledge sources such as Wikipedia. The IB respects the principles of intellectual property and makes strenuous efforts to identify and obtain permission before publication from rights holders of all copyright material used. The IB is grateful for permissions received for material used in this publication and will be pleased to correct any errors or omissions at the earliest opportunity.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the IB, or as expressly permitted by law or by the IB's own rules and policy. See <http://www.ibo.org/copyright>.

IB merchandise and publications can be purchased through the IB store at <http://store.ibo.org>. General ordering queries should be directed to the Sales and Marketing Department in Cardiff.

Phone: +44 29 2054 7746
Fax: +44 29 2054 7779
Email: sales@ibo.org

IB mission statement

The International Baccalaureate aims to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect.

To this end the organization works with schools, governments and international organizations to develop challenging programmes of international education and rigorous assessment.

These programmes encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right.

IB learner profile

The aim of all IB programmes is to develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world.

IB learners strive to be:

Inquirers	They develop their natural curiosity. They acquire the skills necessary to conduct inquiry and research and show independence in learning. They actively enjoy learning and this love of learning will be sustained throughout their lives.
Knowledgeable	They explore concepts, ideas and issues that have local and global significance. In so doing, they acquire in-depth knowledge and develop understanding across a broad and balanced range of disciplines.
Thinkers	They exercise initiative in applying thinking skills critically and creatively to recognize and approach complex problems, and make reasoned, ethical decisions.
Communicators	They understand and express ideas and information confidently and creatively in more than one language and in a variety of modes of communication. They work effectively and willingly in collaboration with others.
Principled	They act with integrity and honesty, with a strong sense of fairness, justice and respect for the dignity of the individual, groups and communities. They take responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that accompany them.
Open-minded	They understand and appreciate their own cultures and personal histories, and are open to the perspectives, values and traditions of other individuals and communities. They are accustomed to seeking and evaluating a range of points of view, and are willing to grow from the experience.
Caring	They show empathy, compassion and respect towards the needs and feelings of others. They have a personal commitment to service, and act to make a positive difference to the lives of others and to the environment.
Risk-takers	They approach unfamiliar situations and uncertainty with courage and forethought, and have the independence of spirit to explore new roles, ideas and strategies. They are brave and articulate in defending their beliefs.
Balanced	They understand the importance of intellectual, physical and emotional balance to achieve personal well-being for themselves and others.
Reflective	They give thoughtful consideration to their own learning and experience. They are able to assess and understand their strengths and limitations in order to support their learning and personal development.



Contents

Introduction	1
Understanding academic honesty and malpractice	2
1 Academic honesty	2
2 Malpractice	3
Maintaining academic honesty	7
3 Roles and responsibilities	7
4 The prevention of malpractice	8
5 The detection of plagiarism	11
6 Authenticating candidates' work	12
Investigating malpractice	14
7 The procedure for an investigation	14
8 The rights of the candidate	15
9 The role of a grade award meeting	16
10 The role of the final award committee	16
11 Offences and their penalty	17
12 Breaches to regulations: scenarios for malpractice cases	18
13 Notification of decisions made	22
14 Reconsideration	23
15 Appeals	24
16 Arbitration	24



Introduction

This publication is primarily for IB World Schools that offer the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme. It may also be a useful reference for schools that offer the Middle Years Programme. It is the expectation of the International Baccalaureate (IB) that each head of school will make this publication available to the school's Diploma Programme coordinator (henceforth "coordinator"). It is also for use by IB staff involved in investigations into suspected malpractice and members of the IB's final award committee who review each case and uphold or dismiss an allegation of malpractice. The final award committee, which comprises the director general, the chair of the Examining Board, chief examiners and IB staff, meets prior to the issue of results to review the examination session, consider candidates affected by special circumstances (such as those allegedly in breach of regulations) and authorize the issue of results.

In cases where an IB Diploma Programme candidate (including both anticipated and retake candidates) or Diploma Programme courses candidate, does not show academic honesty, the actions of that candidate may constitute malpractice, which is a breach of the *General regulations: Diploma Programme* (henceforth "Regulations"). Although malpractice takes many forms, plagiarism is certainly the most prevalent form, followed by collusion. Accordingly, the main focus of this publication is on how to prevent and detect plagiarism.

This publication aims to:

- define academic honesty and malpractice in the context of the Diploma Programme
- establish the roles and responsibilities of the IB, heads of school/coordinators, teachers, candidates and examiners in preventing and/or detecting malpractice
- offer advice to schools on the prevention and detection of malpractice
- explain the IB's requirements for authenticating candidates' work
- describe the procedure followed by the IB when investigating instances of suspected malpractice and the role of the school in supporting an investigation
- explain the rights of a candidate under investigation for suspected malpractice
- describe the role of grade award meetings and the final award committee in pursuing cases of alleged malpractice
- explain the penalties the final award committee imposes on candidates found guilty of malpractice
- clarify the distinction between malpractice and an academic infringement
- provide a brief description of the procedures for requesting a reconsideration and an appeal on a decision made by the final award committee.

In this publication reference is made to "the head of school", the assumption being that the head of school normally has overall responsibility for school policy and for resolving significant issues that arise within the school. In practice, the head of school may delegate tasks, such as establishing a school policy on academic honesty or investigating a case of alleged malpractice, to the coordinator or other senior colleague.

The policy and guidance in this publication apply to all candidates for Diploma Programme examinations, regardless of their registration category.

Understanding academic honesty and malpractice

1 Academic honesty

- 1.1 Academic honesty must be seen as a set of values and skills that promote personal integrity and good practice in teaching, learning and assessment. It is influenced and shaped by a variety of factors including peer pressure, culture, parental expectations, role modelling and taught skills. Although it is probably easier to explain to candidates what constitutes academic **dishonesty**, with direct reference to plagiarism, collusion and cheating in examinations, whenever possible the topic must be treated in a positive way, stressing the benefits of properly conducted academic research and a respect for the integrity of all forms of assessment for the Diploma Programme.
- 1.2 All Diploma Programme candidates must understand the basic meaning and significance of concepts that relate to academic honesty, especially intellectual property and authenticity. However, a conceptual understanding alone is not sufficient; candidates must have the knowledge and practical skills to apply such concepts to their work.
- 1.3 The concept of intellectual property is potentially a difficult one for candidates to understand because there are many different forms of intellectual property rights, such as patents, registered designs, trademarks, moral rights and copyright. Candidates must at least be aware that forms of intellectual and creative expression (for example, works of literature, art or music) must be respected and are normally protected by law. By implementing measures to prevent plagiarism schools are helping to combat illegal out-of-school activities (for example, illegal music downloads, peer-to-peer/P2P file sharing) for which candidates may face legal proceedings.
- 1.4 In both conceptual and practical terms, candidates may not understand the difference between collaboration and collusion, and therefore require guidance. Collaboration may be loosely defined as working together on a common aim with shared information, which is an open and cooperative behaviour that does not result in “allowing one’s work to be copied or submitted for assessment by another” as defined in the Regulations. For further details, see section 2.5.
- 1.5 An authentic piece of work is one that is based on the candidate’s individual and original ideas with the ideas and work of others fully acknowledged. Therefore, all assignments for assessment, regardless of their format, must wholly and authentically use that candidate’s own language, expression and ideas. Where the ideas or work of another person are represented within a candidate’s work, whether in the form of direct quotation or paraphrase, the source(s) of those ideas or the work must be fully and appropriately acknowledged. This requirement includes a candidate’s responses to examination papers in May and/or November. All quotations in a candidate’s examination script must be properly acknowledged.
- 1.6 Although the principles of academic honesty apply equally to all subjects, there are issues that are particularly relevant to the arts, where imitation, influence and inspiration have a respectable tradition. The observation of form and its resemblance to nature, or to another artist’s work, is a skill to be nurtured. There is an expectation that candidates may be influenced by the work of other artists and writers, whose works may inspire the candidates’ own creativity.¹ Thus there are circumstances where the creative use of the work or ideas of another person is acceptable, but the original source must always be acknowledged. The imitation of another artist’s work may be acceptable in contexts that are well defined by the teacher, but candidates must understand that passing off the work of another person as their own is not acceptable and constitutes malpractice.

¹The ideas conveyed in this section are based on a paper written by Nicholas Connolly (*Theatre and Academic Honesty*, 2008).

- 1.7 Although the Regulations clearly define plagiarism as the representation of the ideas or work of another person as the candidate's own, this definition alone does not provide candidates with sufficient information or guidance on what constitutes plagiarism and how it can be avoided. Candidates must receive guidance on when and how to include acknowledgments in their work. Similarly, the practice of paraphrasing is a skill that must be taught so that candidates do not simply copy a passage, substitute a few words with their own and then regard this as their own authentic work. When using the words of another person it must become habitual practice for a candidate to use quotation marks, indentation or some other accepted means of indicating that the wording is not their own. Furthermore, the source of the quotation (or paraphrased text) must be clearly identified along with the quotation and not reside in the bibliography alone. Using the words and ideas of another person to support one's arguments is a fundamental part of any academic endeavour, and how to integrate these words and ideas with one's own is an important skill that must be taught.

2 Malpractice

- 2.1 The Regulations define malpractice as behaviour that results in, or may result in, the candidate or any other candidate gaining an unfair advantage in one or more assessment component. Malpractice includes:
- plagiarism: this is defined as the representation of the ideas or work of another person as the candidate's own
 - collusion: this is defined as supporting malpractice by another candidate, as in allowing one's work to be copied or submitted for assessment by another
 - duplication of work: this is defined as the presentation of the same work for different assessment components and/or diploma requirements
 - any other behaviour that gains an unfair advantage for a candidate or that affects the results of another candidate (for example, taking unauthorized material into an examination room, misconduct during an examination, falsifying a CAS record).
- 2.2 Some candidates seem to believe that because the internet is in the public domain and largely uncontrolled, information can be taken from websites without the need for acknowledgment. On the contrary, candidates must record the addresses of all websites from which they obtain information during their research, including the date when each website was accessed. The uniform (or universal) resource locator (URL) constitutes the website address for this purpose. Simply stating the search engine that was used to find the website is not acceptable and does not, in the view of the final award committee, constitute a form of acknowledgment. The requirement to cite the source of material includes the copying of maps, photographs, illustrations, data, graphs and so on. For example, to cut and paste a graph from a website without acknowledging its source constitutes plagiarism. CD-Roms, DVDs, email messages and any other electronic media must be treated in the same way as the internet, books and journals.
- 2.3 The issue of plagiarism is not confined to subjects in groups 1 to 5 of the Diploma Programme. Copying works of art, whether music, film, dance, theatre arts or visual arts, without proper acknowledgment, may also constitute plagiarism. There are circumstances where the creative use of the work of another artist is acceptable, but the original source must always be acknowledged. Candidates must understand that passing off the work of another person as their own is not acceptable and constitutes malpractice, regardless of whether the act was intentional.

- 2.4 Copying text, or other material, is not always a deliberate attempt by a candidate to present the ideas or work of another person as their own. In fact, in the experience of the final award committee it is apparent that many candidates are not aware of when or how to acknowledge sources. It is essential that candidates are taught this important academic skill. For example, a candidate may copy one or two sentences from a book, journal or website without showing it as a quotation, but indicating its source in a footnote or the bibliography. Although each case requires a separate judgment, in general such cases are the result of negligence or a lack of awareness on the part of the candidate and do not warrant an allegation of malpractice. These cases may attract the penalty applied to an academic infringement, and not malpractice. For further details, see sections 11.4 and 11.5.
- 2.5 For most assessment components candidates are expected to work independently but with support from their subject teacher (or supervisor in the case of extended essays). However, there are occasions when collaboration with other candidates is permitted or even actively encouraged, for example, in the requirements for some internal assessment. Nevertheless, the final work must be produced independently, despite the fact that it may be based on the same or similar data as other candidates in the group. This means that the abstract, introduction, content and conclusion/summary of a piece of work must be written in each candidate's own words and cannot therefore be the same as another candidate's. For example, if two or more candidates have exactly the same introduction to an assignment, the final award committee will interpret this as collusion (or plagiarism), and not collaboration. It is essential that both teachers and candidates are aware of the distinction between collaboration and collusion. Teachers must pay particular attention to this important distinction to prevent allegations of collusion against their candidates. Whether or not candidates are allowed to work together on the requirements for internal assessment varies between groups and subjects.
- Group 3: In geography, for example, candidates might be presented with a research question by the teacher and then be required to work as part of a group to collect data together in the field. However, each candidate must write up their report of the fieldwork individually. The reports will have a similar research question and may have the same information collection in the appendices, but the way the information collection is described, analysed and evaluated must be different from the work of other candidates with whom they collected the information and must be entirely their own work.
 - Group 4: In group 4 subjects, including design technology, no collaboration is allowed in assessment tasks except in the area of data collection. Although there are different requirements depending on the subject, candidates ideally should work on their own when collecting data. When data collection is carried out in groups, the actual recording and processing of data must be undertaken independently if this criterion is to be assessed. For more subject-specific details, refer to the appropriate subject guide. (This does not apply to the group 4 project, which by its very nature is a collaborative project and is assessed for personal skills only.)
 - Group 5: Candidates must be aware that the written work they submit must be entirely their own. When completing a piece of work outside the classroom, candidates must work independently. Although group work can be educationally desirable in some situations, it is not appropriate for the mathematics HL or mathematics SL portfolio. For mathematical studies SL, group work must not be used for projects. Each project must be based on different data collected or measurements generated.
- 2.6 The presentation of the same work for different assessment components and/or diploma requirements is a duplication of work and therefore constitutes malpractice. For example, if a candidate submits the same or a very similar piece of work for history internal assessment and for an extended essay in history, this would be viewed as malpractice. However, it is perfectly acceptable for a candidate to study one aspect of a topic for internal assessment and another aspect of the same topic for an extended essay.

- 2.7 Fabrication of data is a further example of malpractice. If a candidate manufactures data for a table, survey or other such requirement, this will be interpreted as an attempt to gain an unfair advantage in an assessment component. Consequently, the final award committee will find the candidate guilty of malpractice. Using authentic data is a matter of academic honesty.
- 2.8 Many candidates for the Diploma Programme are fluent in two or more languages and are therefore able to conduct their research in more than one language, perhaps with the aid of the internet. Such candidates must be aware that copying a passage of text, translating this passage into another language, then using the translated text in their work without acknowledging its source still constitutes plagiarism.
- 2.9 Malpractice most commonly involves plagiarism or collusion. However, there are other ways in which a candidate may commit malpractice and in so doing be in breach of the Regulations. The following examples of malpractice do not constitute an exhaustive list and refer only to the written examinations:
- taking unauthorized material into an examination room (such as cell/mobile phone, written notes).
 - leaving and/or accessing unauthorized material in a bathroom/restroom that may be visited during an examination
 - misconduct during an examination, including any attempt to disrupt the examination or distract another candidate
 - exchanging information or in any way supporting the passing on of information to another candidate about the content of an examination
 - failing to comply with the instructions of the invigilator or other member of the school's staff responsible for the conduct of the examination
 - impersonating another candidate
 - stealing examination papers
 - using an unauthorized calculator during an examination, or using a calculator when one is not permitted for the examination paper
 - disclosing or discussing the content of an examination paper with a person outside the immediate school community within 24 hours after the examination.
- 2.10 Taking unauthorized material (for example, own rough paper, notes, a mobile/cell phone or an electronic device other than a permitted calculator) into an examination is the most common type of malpractice after plagiarism and collusion. At the start of an examination candidates must be given the opportunity to declare any unauthorized material in their possession. However, even if this opportunity is not given by the invigilator, a candidate will still be found guilty of malpractice by the final award committee if unauthorized material is in their possession. "In their possession" may be taken to mean on the person of the candidate, in the candidate's immediate proximity (such as on the floor or desk) or placed somewhere (such as a bathroom/restroom) for access during the examination. It is very important to note that guilt will be confirmed by the committee regardless of whether this material is used, was or was not intended for use or contains information relevant or potentially relevant to the examination. The actual possession of unauthorized material constitutes malpractice; the final award committee is not required to establish whether the candidate used or intended to use the material. No leniency is shown to a candidate who claims that they were unaware the material was in their possession.

2.11 Cases of possible malpractice during an examination are normally identified by the coordinator/ invigilator. If a candidate is suspected of malpractice in an examination the coordinator must send a report to the IB information desk (not to the regional office). The report must reach the IB within ten days after the examination in which the incident occurred. It is expected that a report will include:

- a seating plan for the examination
- a statement from each invigilator
- a statement from the candidate
- the unauthorized material (depending on the nature of the material).

2.12 Breaches of regulations are not confined to candidates; inappropriate conduct by a coordinator or teacher may be brought to the attention of the final award committee. The following are examples of unacceptable actions that will be investigated by the IB:

- the unauthorized rescheduling of an examination
- failing to keep the examination papers secure prior to an examination
- opening examination paper packets prior to an examination
- providing a candidate with undue assistance in the production of any work (whether written or oral) that contributes to the assessment requirements of the Diploma Programme
- leaving candidates unsupervised during an examination
- releasing an examination paper, or otherwise disclosing information about the content of a paper, within 24 hours after the examination.

In consultation with the head of school, and with the utmost discretion, the IB will conduct an investigation into an alleged breach of regulations by a coordinator or teacher. The purpose of an investigation will be to establish whether:

- the coordinator or teacher is in breach of IB regulations
- the security or integrity of assessment has been compromised
- the results of any candidate (or candidates) have been affected.

Maintaining academic honesty

3 Roles and responsibilities

3.1 The role of the **International Baccalaureate** is to:

- provide the regulations and instructions that govern the conduct of each examination session
- offer guidance to schools on what constitutes malpractice and how it can be prevented
- investigate cases of alleged malpractice, in liaison with the school concerned
- review all available statements and evidence collected during an investigation and decide whether to dismiss or uphold the allegation
- notify the head of school of the decision of the final award committee
- if requested, reconsider a decision made by the final award committee on submission of new factual evidence
- if requested, implement the appeals procedure on decisions made by the final award committee.

During each examination session the IB takes a random sample of candidates' work and submits it to a web-based plagiarism prevention service. However, the fact that the IB is doing this does not enable schools to abrogate their responsibility for ensuring that work submitted for assessment, whether internally or externally assessed, is the authentic work of each candidate.

3.2 The **head of school**, or his or her nominee, must ensure that all candidates:

- understand what constitutes academic honesty, an authentic piece of work and intellectual property
- receive guidance on study skills, academic writing, how to conduct research and how to acknowledge sources
- understand what constitutes malpractice (particularly plagiarism, collusion and misconduct during an examination)
- know the consequences of being found guilty of malpractice.

It is also the responsibility of the head of school to establish a school policy that promotes good academic practice and a school culture that actively encourages academic honesty. It is assumed that part of this responsibility will be delegated to the coordinator and teachers.

The school is the IB's first line of defence against malpractice and schools are therefore expected to support the IB fully in the prevention, detection and investigation of malpractice. In the event of a candidate being investigated for malpractice, the school has additional responsibilities. For further details, see section 7.

3.3 It is the responsibility of each **teacher** to confirm that, to the best of his or her knowledge, all candidates' work accepted or submitted for assessment is the authentic work of each candidate. This includes all work for internal assessment where teachers' marks are entered on the IB information system (IBIS), the secure web-based service for schools. When a school has implemented all prevention measures, teachers are expected to detect any plagiarism, collusion or duplication of work. Teachers are also expected to support and act on the school's policy on good academic practice and provide candidates with advice whenever necessary. In this respect teachers must act as good role models for the candidates.

- 3.4 The **candidate** is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all work submitted for assessment is authentic, with the work or ideas of others fully and correctly acknowledged. Candidates are expected to comply with all internal school deadlines; this is for their own benefit and may allow time for revising work that is of doubtful authorship before the submission of the final version.
- 3.5 The principal responsibility of an **examiner** is to mark (or moderate) the work of candidates against prescribed assessment criteria or a markscheme. It is not the role of examiners to search for plagiarism, collusion or any other form of malpractice. However, examiners are experienced educational practitioners who are familiar with the texts and websites that deal with their subject area. As examiners are well placed to identify plagiarism they are expected to be vigilant and report to the IB any cases where there is evidence to support an allegation of malpractice. Senior examiners may be asked to write reports on work submitted for assessment that shows evidence of malpractice.

4 The prevention of malpractice

School policy

- 4.1 When a student enrolls for the Diploma Programme in an IB World School (or entity) it is the expectation of the IB that the school will use its best endeavours to ensure that the student and his or her legal guardian(s) receive a copy of the *General Regulations: Diploma Programme* and understand its content. Each candidate's attention must be drawn to the provisions relating to malpractice and its consequences. Candidates and their guardians may be given access to the Regulations by directing them to the IB's public website. (This can be done by placing a link to the Regulations on the school's website.)
- 4.2 It is an IB requirement that every IB World School that offers the Diploma Programme has a policy to promote academic honesty. This policy must be shared with candidates before they begin the Diploma Programme and be followed by reminders throughout the two years of the programme. The way in which this policy is shared with candidates is left to the discretion of the head of school. However, it is recommended that candidates receive formal tuition in research and study skills, receive a copy of the policy and are made aware that the coordinator and teachers are available to offer further advice and guidance. Whether or not candidates are required to sign an "honour code" is left entirely to the discretion of the school.
- 4.3 All subject areas must contribute to the development of a policy on academic honesty so that candidates gain a clear idea of what constitutes plagiarism in a variety of disciplines. The need to acknowledge the source of data, works of art, computer programmes, photographs, diagrams, illustrations, maps, etc must also be made clear to candidates by their subject teachers. It is advisable that a policy on academic honesty should be a whole-school policy that is not confined to Diploma Programme candidates and those subjects offered by the programme.
- 4.4 The school policy may draw upon the attributes of the IB learner profile, which express the values inherent to the IB continuum of international education. The profile is a clear and concise statement of the aims and values of the IB, and an embodiment of what the IB means by "international-mindedness". Attention may be drawn, for example, to IB learners striving to be "principled", which means that candidates act with integrity and honesty, with a strong sense of fairness, justice and respect for the dignity of the individual, groups and communities. They take responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that accompany them.
- 4.5 A school policy on academic honesty should at least include:
- the IB definitions of plagiarism, collusion and the duplication of work
 - appropriate reference to the IB learner profile

- advice on and/or examples of what constitutes academic dishonesty, intellectual property, plagiarism, the duplication of work and authentic authorship
- examples of conventions for citing and acknowledging original authorship
- guidance on the distinction between legitimate collaboration and unacceptable collusion
- information on what action will be taken by the IB if a candidate is suspected of malpractice and subsequently found guilty
- an extract from the provisions of the Regulations relating to malpractice.

Schools are advised to include in their policy a requirement for every candidate studying the Diploma Programme, regardless of their registration category, to sign a declaration stating that all work they submit for assessment will be their own authentic work. This would effectively cover all class assignments, homework assignments and work undertaken for IB assessments. However, this does not negate the need to sign the candidate declaration on coversheets submitted with work for assessment or moderation.

- 4.6 It is important that the policy is not confined to or does not emphasize the penalties that will be applied to candidates who neglect to acknowledge their sources. The policy must be a means of promoting good practice: a practical reference that is used and perceived in a positive way. The emphasis should be on prevention, not detection and penalties.
- 4.7 The policy may refer to the existence of internet sites that can be used to detect plagiarized text. In fact, candidates must be warned that the IB randomly checks candidates' work for plagiarism using a web-based plagiarism prevention service. An additional deterrent is the vigilance of examiners who are adept at identifying text and material that is not the authentic work of a candidate.
- 4.8 Plagiarism (and other forms of malpractice) must not be viewed as a trivial offence with only minor consequences. It must be viewed as a serious academic transgression with a community attitude that shows no tolerance and imposes severe penalties when it is discovered.
- 4.9 Teachers should take advantage of the role and expertise of the school librarian. Trained librarians are fully aware of issues associated with plagiarism, copyright and other ethical issues. School librarians will teach and employ good academic practice for documenting sources used. Their knowledge of resources available and their search skills can be used to validate sources cited, and they are often able to trace the origins of suspect passages. More importantly, the librarian's skills in locating, evaluating and using information can help students find and use authoritative and reliable information from a variety of sources, print, online, people, and more.
- 4.10 In addition to subject teachers and the school librarian, the support of candidates' legal guardians can be enlisted to promote good academic practice and consistent standards. In fact, for schools where the candidature reflects a variety of cultural backgrounds it is important to inform legal guardians about the standards the school is trying to uphold. Parental and legal guardians' understanding and cooperation is an important factor in encouraging academic honesty and should not be overlooked.
- 4.11 Due to the fact that conventions differ according to the discipline and geographic region, it is not possible to give closely defined rules for attribution, except to say that whatever accepted convention is chosen by a school or individual candidate it must be applied consistently. One suggestion is to use the format provided by the Modern Language Association (MLA), which produces the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, by Joseph Gibaldi, now in its seventh edition (2009). The MLA maintains a website at <http://www.mla.org>.

Teaching support

- 4.12 Teachers (including extended essay supervisors) must provide candidates with a convention for acknowledging all sources. To ensure there is an organized and consistent approach across subjects, this may be done by or in consultation with the coordinator. It is equally important to ensure that

teachers themselves are fully aware of such conventions, and are actively using them when providing candidates with reference material. In fact, all teachers for the Diploma Programme must epitomize good academic practice and act as role models for the candidates. A school policy on academic honesty should require teachers to observe the same procedures as candidates. Teachers will find it difficult to persuade candidates of the value of correct practice if they do not observe it themselves.

- 4.13 Teachers are advised to provide candidates with examples of how to acknowledge sources. The examples must include a variety of sources (including CD-Rom, DVD, photographs, illustrations, artwork and data) in addition to journals, books and websites.
- 4.14 Candidates and teachers must be aware that the requirement to acknowledge sources extends beyond text taken from the internet, CD-Rom, books, magazines and journals. The concepts of intellectual property and academic honesty include the use of footnotes or endnotes to acknowledge the source of an idea that is not the candidate's own. For example, a candidate could provide a footnote or endnote in the following manner if an idea emerged as a result of discussion with, or listening to, a fellow student, a teacher or any other person: "The basis of this idea was originally expressed by a fellow student during a theory of knowledge seminar."
- 4.15 Schools are encouraged to make use of online databases and libraries of books and journals, especially those providing materials that have been through an editorial or peer-review process. Some of these libraries enable candidates (and teachers) to keep properly referenced notes, simplifying the documentation process. Students might also be encouraged to use an online citation generator as an aid in achieving full and consistent documentation of sources used.
- 4.16 A number of online services are available to detect matches between text in students' work and text available elsewhere. Matches do not necessarily indicate plagiarism, most notably when a student clearly indicates use of a quotation (through indentation or quotation marks) and accurately cites the source. Online detection services have their limitations, and should be used with caution. Many schools use such services not as plagiarism detectors but to help students improve their writing, avoiding plagiarism and also over-reliance on other people's work.
- 4.17 Paraphrasing is the rendition of another person's words presented in a new style and integrated grammatically into the writing. If done correctly, paraphrasing is a legitimate way to use a source. However, because paraphrasing uses the ideas of another person, it is still necessary to acknowledge the source. Candidates must be taught this skill; they cannot be expected to understand the difference between legitimate and illegitimate paraphrasing without receiving guidance. If paraphrasing is not done correctly it will be treated as plagiarism.
- 4.18 Teachers must help candidates by structuring assignments to avoid generalized "reports" involving little more than information gathering. Instead, teachers must give specific guidelines that encourage candidates to develop their own ideas through problem solving, comparison, precise hypothesis, analysis and other techniques. Hence, a carefully devised assignment can reduce the chances of a candidate copying material without proper citation.
- 4.19 Teachers are encouraged to provide a formative assessment structure for investigative reports that includes planning and the evaluation of sources, and reflects the need for candidates' work to be authentic. The formative assessment structure might include:
 - a carefully developed thesis
 - the evaluation of sources
 - planning for an investigation
 - personal critique or analysis
 - evidence of higher thinking in a proposal of alternative solutions to the issue under discussion
 - in-class research assignments.

- 4.20 When marking regular class and homework assignments that are not being submitted to the IB for assessment, teachers should take into account each candidate's use and acknowledgment of sources. A portion of the marks awarded could be available for assessing the degree to which a candidate has correctly acknowledged all sources. Reinforcing good academic practice in this and other ways must routinely extend to all subjects and requirements within the Diploma Programme hexagon.
- 4.21 At all times the advice to candidates must be to acknowledge as honestly and accurately as possible the ideas and work of others. When the source cannot be stated with absolute accuracy the candidate must declare this in an appropriate way, such as in a footnote.
- 4.22 Teachers must guard against what might be described as "academic negligence". In other words, teachers must warn candidates about the consequences of being careless when recording sources, or displaying a cavalier disregard for the origin of material within their work. The internet has made a significant contribution to academic negligence, making it all too easy to cut and paste material into a piece of work in electronic format. Negligence is not a valid excuse for plagiarism.

5 The detection of plagiarism

- 5.1 As mentioned in section 3.4, the candidate is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all work submitted for assessment is authentic, with the work or ideas of others fully and correctly acknowledged. Candidates are expected to review their own work before submission for assessment and before the coversheet is signed to identify any passages, data, graphs, photographs, computer programs, etc that still require acknowledgment.
- 5.2 When reading candidates' work teachers must be vigilant for obvious changes in a candidate's style of writing. Equally significant is a style that seems too mature, too error free and perhaps more characteristic of an experienced academic than a secondary school student. Over the two-year period of the Diploma Programme teachers will become very familiar with the style and quality of each candidate's work in their teaching groups. Therefore, it is the subject teachers who are in the best position to identify work that may not be the authentic work of a candidate.
- 5.3 Although in most cases of plagiarism the candidate has copied passages from a website, there is still plagiarism from books and journals, in addition to the illicit use of photographs, graphs, data and computer programs from a variety of sources. In most cases it is likely that the teacher is familiar with the books being used by candidates; they may be standard textbooks for the subject, or books that are readily available in the school library. The teacher must be vigilant for familiar passages and, if necessary, check that such passages have not been copied from a textbook. In the case of an extended essay, the supervisor may quiz the candidate on the content of the essay at any point during their supervision or during the summative viva voce to determine whether the work is in fact that of the candidate.
- 5.4 With the continued growth of the internet the abuse of electronic media is now prevalent within the academic community. Aside from the immense number of legitimate websites, there are an increasing number of sites that actively encourage students to plagiarize and even purchase essays. Little can be done to prevent the emergence of these sites, but the internet can also be used for detecting academic dishonesty. Several of the more efficient search engines can be used to detect the source of passages that have been plagiarized. Also, there are several websites that offer a useful service in detecting plagiarism from the internet.

6 Authenticating candidates' work

- 6.1 It is the responsibility of Diploma Programme teachers to support candidates in the preparation of their work for assessment and to ensure that all candidates' work complies with the requirements of the relevant subject guide. Therefore, teachers (or supervisors in the case of extended essays) are in the best position to judge whether a candidate's work is authentic. Ongoing support and guidance will help with the early detection of unintentional plagiarism and will dissuade candidates from deliberate plagiarism because they know their work is regularly subject to scrutiny. However, what is realistic and what can be achieved within the usual constraints of time and workload must be left to the discretion of teachers and the coordinator. Ultimately, the candidates are responsible for ensuring that the final version of any work is authentic. Candidates themselves must bear the consequences if they submit any work for assessment that is not their own, regardless of whether the plagiarism was deliberate or the result of poor research skills. The same principle applies to collusion.
- 6.2 Teachers must be vigilant for cases of collusion or plagiarism where a subject is taught by more than one teacher. Candidates in classes for the same subject taught by different teachers may assume that their work will be read by only one teacher and therefore they can copy each other's work without being detected. Candidates fail to realize that all work for that subject, such as theory of knowledge essays, may be sent to the same examiner and the examiner will then identify work that is the same or very similar.
- 6.3 On reviewing the draft of a candidate's work a teacher may have reason to suspect that part or all of the work may be in violation of the principles of academic honesty and therefore constitute malpractice. In such circumstances the teacher must draw the candidate's attention to this risk and to the requirement to respect academic honesty.
- 6.4 Every candidate must sign a coversheet for each externally assessed component (except examination scripts) and all internally assessed components to confirm that his or her work is authentic and that the work being submitted for assessment constitutes the final version of the work. (Increasingly, candidates' work is being submitted to the IB through an electronic environment rather than hardcopy, but there is still a requirement to digitally sign a version of the conventional coversheet.) If suspected plagiarism is detected before a candidate signs the coversheet the issue must be resolved within the school and not brought to the attention of the IB. If malpractice is suspected, it is not appropriate to permit or encourage the candidate to sign the coversheet in order that the IB may resolve the situation, rather than doing so within the school environment.
- 6.5 The principle of signing the declarations on the coversheet (either on hardcopy or an electronic version) applies equally to all assessment components, regardless of whether the component will be internally or externally assessed. In the case of internal assessment the coversheet must still be signed even if the work is not being submitted as part of a sample for the purpose of moderation.
- 6.6 Once a candidate has submitted his or her work to a teacher (or the coordinator) for external or internal assessment together with the coversheet signed to the effect that it is the final version of the work, neither the work nor the coversheet can be retracted by the candidate. If the candidate is subsequently suspected of plagiarism or collusion, it is no defence to claim that the incorrect version of the work was submitted for assessment.
- 6.7 After a candidate has signed the coversheet to the effect that his or her work is authentic and constitutes the final version of that work, the candidate's teacher (or supervisor in the case of an extended essay) must also sign and date the coversheet to the effect that to the best of his or her knowledge it is the authentic work of the candidate. Any suspicion of malpractice that arises after the candidate has signed the coversheet must be reported to the IB information desk for investigation. However, if there is no tangible evidence of malpractice (such as the source of plagiarism) the candidate must be given the benefit of any doubt and the coversheet must be signed by the teacher/supervisor. It is not acceptable for the teacher to:

- delete the declaration and then sign the coversheet
- submit the work for assessment without his or her signature
- sign the declaration and then write comments on the work or coversheet that raise doubts about the work's authenticity.

In the above circumstances the IB will not accept the work for assessment (or moderation) unless confirmation is received from the school that the candidate's work is authentic.

- 6.8 If a teacher is unwilling to sign a coversheet owing to a suspicion of malpractice, the matter must be resolved within the school. The coordinator has the option of informing the IB information desk that the work will not be submitted on behalf of the candidate (resulting in no grade being awarded for the subject or diploma requirement). As stated in section 6.7, it is not acceptable to submit the work for assessment, or for a teacher to assess the work in the case of internal assessment, without the teacher signing the declaration on the coversheet.
- 6.9 Teachers, supervisors or the coordinator must not create their own version of a coversheet omitting one or both of the declarations and then use this alternative version. If suspected malpractice subsequently comes to the attention of the IB the case will still be investigated and the school's failure to follow correct procedure will be brought to the attention of the final award committee.
- 6.10 To avoid any ambiguity as to when the submission of work took place, the declarations signed by the teacher and candidate must be correctly dated. Again this applies to both the conventional hardcopy and electronic versions of "coversheets". Coordinators are strongly advised to provide candidates with a timetable that clearly indicates the deadlines for the submission of work to subject teachers, as well as a timetable for teachers that shows when the coordinator expects to receive the work.
- 6.11 If the IB identifies a coversheet that has not been signed by the candidate and/or teacher (although this is not possible in the case of electronic coversheets), the grade for the candidate in the subject concerned will remain pending until the signature(s) has been received. The IB will normally contact the coordinator in such cases prior to the issue of results to bring this to his or her attention. If confirmation of authenticity has not been received by the close of the examination session (15 September for a May session, or 15 March for a November session) the pending grade will be converted to "N", resulting in no grade awarded.

7 The procedure for an investigation

- 7.1 The following circumstances are those that most commonly give rise to an investigation.
- A coordinator informs IB Cardiff that he or she suspects that work submitted to the IB for assessment (or as part of a sample for the purpose of moderation) may not be the authentic work of the candidate.
 - A coordinator informs IB Cardiff that malpractice may have taken place during an examination.
 - An examiner suspects malpractice and provides evidence to justify his or her suspicion.
 - An IB member of staff randomly checking assessment material identifies possible plagiarism using a web-based application.
- 7.2 If the IB initiates an investigation into malpractice it will do so soon after the evidence of malpractice is brought to the attention of the IB manager for academic honesty who will inform the relevant coordinator by email that a candidate/candidates is/are being investigated for possible malpractice. It is a requirement that the coordinator acknowledges receipt of this email and without delay informs the head of school that a candidate/candidates is/are suspected of malpractice.
- 7.3 For all cases of malpractice by a candidate the coordinator will be asked to provide a report after he or she has conducted an investigation. In the case of suspected plagiarism the coordinator's report, which must be prepared and handled in a manner that respects the need for confidentiality (such as referring to a candidate's registration number rather than her/his name), will normally include:
- a statement from the teacher of the candidate for the subject concerned (or supervisor in the case of an extended essay)
 - a statement from the coordinator
 - a statement from the candidate
 - a summary of an interview with the candidate regarding the allegation of plagiarism, if an interview is conducted.
- It is not mandatory to include a summary of an interview with the candidate; this is left to the discretion of the coordinator.
- 7.4 It is essential that the investigation and subsequent reporting to the IB are undertaken without delay; otherwise a decision on the case by the final award committee will not be given until after the issue of results. However, to avoid distracting a candidate from examination preparation, it is acceptable to delay raising the issue with the candidate until after the candidate's last written examination. To protect the candidate's personal rights the investigation must be discreet and all information relating to the investigation must remain confidential.
- 7.5 It is normal practice to interview the candidate, with a relative or friend in attendance as an advisor or observer. The candidate must be shown the evidence and be invited to present an explanation or defence. Accusatory statements about the candidate, whether written or verbal, must be avoided. (In cases of suspected collusion, a helpful procedure is to interview the candidates separately but simultaneously so they cannot collude on a "story" to explain whatever occurred.) With the candidate's permission, a transcript of the interview may be taken and submitted to the IB as part of the coordinator's report on the investigation. The candidate must be given the opportunity to provide a written statement that is sent to the IB on the candidate's behalf by the coordinator.

- 7.6 The content of a coordinator's report will depend on the nature of the alleged malpractice. The report may include a seating plan (in the case of written examinations), rough notes produced by the candidate for the work concerned or early drafts of the candidate's work. If appropriate, a coordinator may be asked to submit examples of the candidate's coursework for comparison with the work under investigation.
- 7.7 If a statement from the candidate is not included with the coordinator's report and no evidence of an interview is provided, the coordinator will be asked to confirm in writing that the candidate has been given the opportunity to be heard and to provide a statement. The IB will not resolve a case of suspected malpractice until either this confirmation or the statement itself has been received.
- 7.8 The IB will normally make available to a school all evidence relating to a case of possible malpractice. Evidence may be withheld to protect the identity of an informant or if the disclosure of that evidence compromises the privacy of another person.
- 7.9 The IB reserves the right to withhold the results of a candidate or group of candidates until an investigation is completed. In practice this tends to occur when the IB has not received all requested statements.
- 7.10 Occasionally, suspected malpractice by a candidate is brought to the attention of the IB after the issue of results. In compliance with the Regulations, which state that an IB diploma or Diploma Programme courses results, may be withdrawn from a candidate at any time if malpractice is subsequently established, the IB will still initiate an investigation. Although the candidate may no longer attend the school, the IB will seek advice and support from the school in resolving a late case of alleged malpractice.

8 The rights of the candidate

- 8.1 As stated in section 4.1, when a student enrolls for the Diploma Programme in an IB World School (or entity) it is the expectation of the IB that the school will use its best endeavours to ensure that the student and his or her legal guardian(s) receive a copy of the *General Regulations: Diploma Programme* and understand its content.
- 8.2 If a candidate is under investigation for possible malpractice, the coordinator must inform the candidate. Whether the candidate's legal guardians are informed of the allegation and involved in the investigation is left to the discretion of the school, bearing in mind any relevant circumstances such as whether the candidate has reached the age of legal majority.
- 8.3 The candidate and his or her legal guardians have a right to see evidence, statements, reports and correspondence about the case. Any decision to withhold such information rests entirely with the head of school or coordinator. Evidence may be withheld to protect the identity of an informant.
- 8.4 It is the policy of the IB that any candidate being investigated for malpractice is given the opportunity to be heard and to submit a written defence to the final award committee. The school has no right to prevent this process, to edit or unduly influence the candidate's statement. The candidate is expected to make the content of the statement available to the coordinator, but may request that the statement remain confidential to the IB.
- 8.5 The candidate must be given sufficient time to prepare a response to the suspicion of malpractice. The IB information desk must be contacted for advice if the candidate may not be able to meet the deadline imposed by the IB.

9 The role of a grade award meeting

- 9.1 In preparation for the meeting of the final award committee, a case of suspected malpractice may be referred to the appropriate grade award meeting for a recommendation from the chief examiner, chief assessor or examiner responsible (henceforth “senior examiner”), as appropriate to the subject. A case is normally referred to a grade award meeting when subject expertise is required. A senior examiner will be asked to review the work and recommend whether the allegation should be upheld or dismissed.
- 9.2 In cases of suspected collusion or plagiarism during an examination, a senior examiner will be asked to review candidates’ scripts and consider whether the candidates’ similar or identical answers are, for example:
- a coincidence
 - a result of misinterpreting the information or questions in the examination paper
 - the result of a particular technique taught by their teacher
 - so unusual that they can only be accounted for by collusion, plagiarism or some other form of malpractice.

In the case of a candidate who has produced a correct answer without showing any working or method of achieving the answer, a senior examiner will consider how likely this is without malpractice in view of the candidate’s performance on other parts of the paper and in other papers for the subject and level.

- 9.3 In a case of suspected malpractice where a senior examiner finds no grounds for establishing malpractice, the recommendation of a senior examiner will be accepted, resulting in no further action. The case will not be presented to the final award committee. Where grounds for establishing malpractice are identified, the case will then be presented to the final award committee.
- 9.4 In cases where the allegation of malpractice is supported by a senior examiner, he or she submits to the final award committee:
- the work under suspicion
 - evidence to support the allegation of malpractice
 - a written report on the case
 - a recommendation on the action that should be taken by the final award committee.

10 The role of the final award committee

- 10.1 According to the Regulations the final award committee considers and makes the final decision in all special cases with respect to the award of IB diploma and Diploma Programme courses results, which includes cases of suspected malpractice. In practice, the task of resolving the majority of cases is delegated to a sub-committee comprising chief examiners, senior IB staff and representatives from IB World Schools (usually coordinators). Decisions are ratified by the full final award committee and, where appropriate, cases are escalated to the final award committee for consideration.
- 10.2 After reviewing all evidence collected during the investigation, the committee will decide with full discretion whether to dismiss the allegation, uphold it, or ask for further investigations to be made. If the final award committee deems evidence of malpractice insufficient, the allegation will be dismissed and a grade will be awarded in the normal way. If no consensus is reached about a case, the decision will be that of the majority of the final award committee.

- 10.3 In reaching a decision on each case of suspected malpractice, the chair of the final award committee will ensure that:
- all evidence is reviewed in an objective manner before a decision is reached on the innocence or guilt of the candidate (or candidates)
 - discussion is coordinated, impartial and relevant to the case
 - a clear majority decision is reached regarding the action to be taken.
- 10.4 Any member of the final award committee who has a personal interest in a case, and is therefore not independent from the case, must declare that interest and not take part in any discussion or voting. The chair will ask the colleague to leave the meeting while the committee discusses the case.
- 10.5 Where appropriate, in reaching a decision on whether a candidate is guilty of malpractice the committee will take into consideration any similar cases that may have set a precedent for a case of its kind. Nevertheless, each case of suspected malpractice will be judged on its own merit, taking into account all the evidence and information that is available about the case. Where appropriate to the case under discussion, the committee will comply with certain well-established precedents.
- 10.6 If the investigation of a case is incomplete, or the committee requires additional information, no result will be issued for the candidate (or candidates) in the subject under investigation until all inquiries are complete and a final decision has been reached. This includes any candidate involved in the case. If statements and any other information requested by the IB are not received by the close of the examination session (15 September for a May session and 15 March for a November session) no grade will be issued to the candidate(s) concerned.
- 10.7 No final decision regarding the guilt of a candidate accused of malpractice will normally be reached unless a statement from that candidate has been received and considered by the committee. In cases where a candidate has not been heard and produced a statement, the coordinator must state in writing that the candidate declined the opportunity of being heard and of producing a statement. In these circumstances the coordinator is advised to consider whether a colleague should witness the candidate declining the opportunity to be heard or to produce a statement.

11 Offences and their penalty

- 11.1 Penalties are imposed on a candidate found guilty of malpractice in order to:
- ensure that the candidate does not gain an unfair advantage
 - maintain the integrity of the examination session by excluding those candidates who have abused the system
 - deter other candidates from taking the same action.
- 11.2 The committee will not take into account the consequences of imposing a penalty; the penalty will be imposed according to the nature of the offence. However, the committee will take into consideration all the information presented by teachers and the coordinator in their statements on the case. This information may include mitigating circumstances.
- 11.3 When judging a case of alleged malpractice the committee will disregard the registration category of the candidate. If a candidate is found guilty, the aim is to penalize the candidate only for the subject in which he or she has been found guilty of malpractice. For example, if a retake candidate is guilty of malpractice in one subject the grade for that subject obtained in a previous session will be carried over to the current session and any higher grades in other retake subjects will be counted in the current session.
- 11.4 Work submitted by a candidate for assessment may contravene standard academic practice by failing to acknowledge the ideas or words of another person using quotation marks (or some other accepted practice). However, if there is some attempt by the candidate to acknowledge the source

in the bibliography or in a footnote, the final award committee may designate a case of this type an academic infringement and not malpractice. The judgment as to whether “academic infringement” is the appropriate decision will be partly based on the quantity of text (or other media) that has been copied by the candidate.

- 11.5 If the final award committee decides that an academic infringement has been established, no mark will be awarded for the component or part(s) of the component. The candidate will still be eligible for a grade in the subject or diploma requirement concerned. No further penalty will be imposed and the case will not be recorded as malpractice. In such a case, the decision regarding academic infringement will be notified in accordance with section 13.1.
- 11.6 If the final award committee decides that a case of malpractice has been established, no grade will be awarded in the subject concerned. (No lesser penalty for malpractice is available to the final award committee.) In the case of a Diploma Programme candidate the consequence is that no diploma will be awarded to the candidate. However, a Diploma Programme courses results will be awarded for other subjects in which no malpractice has occurred.
- 11.7 If a candidate is found guilty of malpractice in his or her third attempt at achieving the diploma or improving the number of points for the diploma, the candidate will not be permitted a fourth examination session in which to achieve the diploma or improve the number of diploma points.
- 11.8 If a candidate is found guilty of malpractice the candidate will be permitted to register for future examinations sessions in which malpractice was established, including the session that follows six months later (subject to the provisions of sections 11.7 and 11.10, and other restrictions stated in the Regulations or *Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme*).
- 11.9 If a candidate is found guilty of malpractice in the production of one (or more) of several assignments required for a component, the candidate is not eligible for a mark based on his or her performance in the remaining assignments for the component; no grade will be awarded for the subject. For example, the internal assessment requirement for a subject may require a portfolio of four separate assignments. If a candidate is found to have plagiarized all or part of one assignment, a mark for his or her internal assessment will not be based on the remaining three assignments: no grade will be awarded for the subject.
- 11.10 If a case of malpractice is very serious, either because of its nature or because the candidate has already been found guilty of malpractice in a previous session, the final award committee may decide that the candidate will not be permitted to register for examinations in any future session.
- 11.11 An IB diploma, or a certificate, may be withdrawn from a candidate at any time if malpractice is subsequently established. This includes the enquiry upon results service when, for example, a senior examiner may identify plagiarism in a piece of work that previously went unnoticed by the teacher or other examiner.
- 11.12 Although a case may not warrant a penalty against one or more candidates, on occasion a letter may be sent to the head of school on behalf of the final award committee insisting that greater care be taken to avoid a similar incident occurring again.

12 Breaches to regulations: scenarios for malpractice cases

The following scenarios are intended as examples of malpractice encountered during an examination session. Each scenario is followed by the principle that applies to a case of its kind and the penalty that is normally applied. Depending on the circumstances of a case, at its discretion, the final award committee may apply a lesser penalty than is indicated for any of these or other scenarios.

12.1 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as the representation of the ideas or work of another person as the candidate's own.

12.1.1 Scenario—There is clear evidence in the form of source material to support a decision that the candidate has plagiarized text without any attempt to acknowledge the source(s). This includes the use of unacknowledged text in oral examinations and the use of other media, such as graphs, illustrations and data.

Principle—If there is clear evidence of plagiarism with no acknowledgment of the source(s), the candidate will be found guilty of malpractice without regard for any alleged lack of intent to plagiarize. A statement from the candidate, teacher or coordinator stating that the copying was the result of an oversight or mistake by the candidate will not be considered as a mitigating factor.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.1.2 Scenario—There is clear evidence in the form of source material that text (or other media) has been plagiarized without correct citation (for example, placing text within quotation marks, or indenting the text). However, the amount of plagiarism is minimal and the bibliography includes the source or at least an attempt to show the correct source.

Principle—If the amount of text (or other media) copied is minimal in the judgment of the final award committee and there is an attempt to acknowledge the source(s), the candidate may be found guilty of an academic infringement. However, a substantial amount of copying will result in a finding of malpractice; a decision that would be reinforced if some copied text has no form of acknowledgment.

Penalty—If a candidate is found guilty of an academic infringement, zero marks will be awarded for the assessment component concerned. The candidate will still be eligible for a grade in the subject concerned.

12.1.3 Scenario—A candidate takes text from the Internet and translates it into another language for use in his/her work without acknowledging the source.

Principle—Regardless of whether text has been translated by the candidate, the ideas or work of another person must be acknowledged. This is still plagiarism.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.1.4 Scenario—A candidate copies a work of art without acknowledging the source.

Principle—Plagiarism as a breach of regulations includes all media and is not confined to text.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.1.5 Scenario—An alleged case of plagiarism where the examiner, coordinator and/or teacher believe the candidate has plagiarized all or part of the work, but there is no evidence in the form of a source (or sources) that has been copied.

Principle—No candidate will be found guilty of plagiarism unless there is clear evidence in the form of source material that has been copied. A case of alleged plagiarism will only be brought to the attention of the final award committee when there is evidence of plagiarism; suspicion of plagiarism is not sufficient.

Penalty—No penalty.

12.1.6 Scenario—A candidate's work is very similar to source material, such as text on a web site, and the source has been paraphrased by the candidate. The source has not been cited by the candidate.

Principle—Paraphrasing may be interpreted as plagiarism if the source material is not cited because this still constitutes representing the ideas or work of another person as the candidate's own. However,

the degree of similarity with the source, whether the source has been cited and the extent of the paraphrasing, will be taken into account when deciding whether the candidate is guilty of malpractice.

Penalty—If the candidate is found guilty of plagiarism no grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.1.7 Scenario—A candidate submits a piece of work with the coversheet signed to the effect that it is his/her authentic work and is the final version of that work. There is clear evidence of plagiarism. The candidate claims in his/her statement that the wrong version was submitted by mistake.

Principle—By signing the coversheet the candidate has declared the work to be the final version of the work, therefore it is that work which will be considered and not another version. However, if the school was able to provide compelling evidence to prove it was a genuine mistake by the candidate, the correct work would be accepted and no further action taken.

Penalty—If the candidate is found guilty of malpractice no grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.2 Collusion

Collusion is defined as supporting malpractice by another candidate, as in allowing one's work to be copied or submitted for assessment by another.

12.2.1 Scenario—A candidate allows another candidate to copy all or part of his/her work. The candidate who copies the work then submits that work as his/her own.

Principle—A candidate who allows his/her work to be copied constitutes behaviour that results in, or may result in, another candidate gaining an unfair advantage, which constitutes malpractice.

Penalty—Both candidates will be found guilty of malpractice and no grade awarded for the subject concerned.

12.3 Duplication of work

Duplication of work is defined as the presentation of the same work for different assessment components and/or IB requirements.

12.3.1 Scenario—A candidate hands in work that is the same or substantially similar for two different assessment components.

Principle—Depending on the specific requirements of a subject, a candidate may use the same topic for different assessment components, but that topic must be researched, written or otherwise presented using an entirely different approach. Using work that is the same or substantially similar for two different components is not acceptable.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subjects concerned.

12.4 Misconduct during an examination

Malpractice includes any behaviour that gains an unfair advantage for a candidate or that affects the results of another candidate.

12.4.1 Scenario—The candidate is found to be in possession of unauthorized material during a written or oral examination (for example, a cell/mobile phone, textbook).

Principle—Possession of unauthorized material is sufficient reason to find a candidate guilty of malpractice. Whether or not a candidate did gain, could have gained, or intended to gain, an advantage by using the unauthorized material will not be taken into account.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.4.2 Scenario—The invigilator suspects that a candidate (or candidates) possessed unauthorized material during a written or oral examination but there is no tangible evidence of this material other than rumour among other candidates.

Principle—A candidate will not be found guilty of malpractice based on rumour or hearsay. The invigilator, coordinator or other responsible adult must have seen or subsequently have in their possession the unauthorized material. Alternatively, a guilty decision may be upheld if there are named witnesses among other candidates in the same examination.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.4.3 **Scenario**—A candidate disobeys the instructions of the invigilator. The instructions are in compliance with the IB regulations for the conduct of examinations.

Principle—If the conduct of the candidate is such that he/she gains an unfair advantage (for example, continuing to write answers to questions when told to stop) or may affect the results of another candidate (for example, behaviour that is a distraction to other candidates), this will constitute malpractice.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.4.4 **Scenario**—A candidate communicates or tries to communicate with another candidate during an examination.

Principle—If the conduct of the candidate is such that he/she may gain an unfair advantage or the conduct may affect the results of another candidate, this will constitute malpractice.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.4.5 **Scenario**—A candidate (or candidates) leaves notes, a textbook, cell/mobile phone, calculator or other unauthorized material in a bathroom that is accessed, or could be accessed, during an examination. Alternatively, a candidate may access or endeavour to access unauthorized material left by another candidate.

Principle—If the conduct of the candidate is such that he/she may gain an unfair advantage or the conduct may affect the results of another candidate, this will constitute malpractice.

Penalty—No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned.

12.4.6 **Scenario**—There is clear evidence that a candidate (or candidates) has copied the work of another candidate during an examination. It is not clear which candidate is guilty of malpractice, or whether some form of collusion has taken place.

Principle—If the conduct of the candidate is such that he/she may gain an unfair advantage this will constitute malpractice; this includes communicating with another candidate during the period of the examination. If the evidence and statements are insufficient to identify which candidate (or candidates) is guilty of malpractice the school will be asked to undertake further investigation and send a report to the IB at the earliest opportunity.

Penalty—With the cooperation of the school concerned the case will be investigated further until it is established, before the close of the examination session, which candidate has copied or whether there was collusion between the candidates. No grade will be awarded in the subject concerned to the guilty candidate or both candidates, as appropriate.

12.4.7 **Scenario**—The invigilator allows or instructs candidates to use a calculator during an examination in which calculators are prohibited.

Principle—If there is a clear statement from the school to the effect that the candidates were given permission to use calculators, no candidate will be found guilty of malpractice. However, not all marks for the examination paper will be accepted because candidates will have had an advantage. Depending on the actual circumstances of the case, the missing mark procedure may be applied for the assessment component in question.

Penalty—No penalty.

12.5 Miscellaneous

Malpractice includes any behaviour that gains an unfair advantage for a candidate or that affects the results of another candidate.

12.5.1 Scenario—A candidate acts in an irresponsible or unethical manner in breach of the IB guidelines for ethical conduct or animal experimentation. For example, producing work which includes offensive or obscene material, conducting experiments without the consent of participants, conducting experiments that inflict pain on humans or animals.

Principle—Candidates are required to act in a responsible and ethical manner throughout their participation in the Diploma Programme and assessment. The IB is entitled to refuse to mark or moderate assessment material if a candidate has acted in an irresponsible or unethical manner in connection with that part of assessment for the Diploma Programme. For example, if a candidate includes offensive or obscene material that is unrelated to the content of assessment. In such cases the final award committee is entitled to award a mark of zero for the component or part(s) of the component that are not assessed due to such irresponsible or unethical behaviour.

Penalty—Depending on the circumstances of the case, the IB may refuse to mark the work or award zero marks for the assessment component concerned.

12.5.2 Scenario—Malpractice by a candidate becomes evident after a grade has been issued for the subject concerned and there is clear evidence to support the case. For example, plagiarism is identified during a re-mark of a candidate's work for the enquiry upon results service.

Principle—The IB is entitled to withdraw a grade from a candidate if malpractice is subsequently established after the issue of results.

Penalty—The grade awarded to the candidate in the subject concerned will be withdrawn and new results documentation issued. The withdrawal of the grade will be communicated through the university results service (if appropriate), but not the reason for the withdrawal of the grade.

12.5.3 Scenario—A candidate falsifies his/her record for creativity, action, service (CAS).

Principle—Malpractice includes any behaviour that gains an unfair advantage for a candidate or that affects the results of another candidate. This includes all requirements for the diploma.

Penalty—The candidate will need to complete the CAS requirements within 12 months to be eligible for the diploma, but the diploma will not be issued until one year after the candidate's diploma session.

12.5.4 Scenario—Suspected malpractice by more than one candidate in an examination.

Principle—The IB reserves the right, if not satisfied that an assessment has been conducted in accordance with the regulations, according to the seriousness of the violation, to declare the assessment null and void, to disqualify any or all candidates involved. The grades for all candidates in the subject concerned will be withheld until the case has been fully investigated and resolved.

Penalty—Whether or not a penalty is applied to all candidates, or individual candidates, would depend on the outcome of the investigation.

13 Notification of decisions made

13.1 In all cases where the final award committee has considered a breach of regulations, the appropriate head of school will be notified of the decision reached by the final award committee. At present, this notification is by a letter sent to the head of school, although in the interests of efficiency this method of notification may change in favour of providing the information on the IB information system (IBIS). Such notification may be copied to the chair of the examining board, appropriate IB staff (including the regional director) and the coordinator at the school concerned. The letter will not include any

details about the case, such as the reasons why the final award committee reached its decision; it will only state whether the candidate was found guilty of malpractice (or an academic infringement).

- 13.2 It is the responsibility of the head of school (or his or her nominee) to inform the candidate of the IB's decision.
- 13.3 No form of documentation sent to a school or university, college or admissions centre shows that a candidate has been found guilty of malpractice. This information appears only on the IB information system and is not included on the screens used by universities to access candidates' results. However, a university will see that no grade has been awarded for a subject.

14 Reconsideration

- 14.1 Final award committee decisions are only open to reconsideration if the candidate establishes the existence of facts that were unknown to the final award committee when making its original decision. To be admissible the request for reconsideration must:
- be filed by the candidate or his/her representative via the school's Diploma Programme coordinator, who must inform the head of school
 - be received by IB Cardiff from the school within three months from the date of the original decision by the final award committee
 - contain a full description of the new facts invoked and of the reasons why a reconsideration is being requested.
- 14.2 Once all documents have been collated and are ready for submission, the request for reconsideration must be sent to the IB information desk, preferably by email. The manager for academic honesty will then acknowledge receipt of the request.
- 14.3 All requests for reconsideration will be examined and decided by a subcommittee of the final award committee. The membership of the subcommittee will be:
- the chair or vice-chair of the final award committee (chair)
 - a member of the examining board
 - the assessment director, assessment operations director or chief academic officer.
- All of these subcommittee members must have served on the final award committee that made the original decision.
- 14.4 The subcommittee is entitled to refuse to reconsider the case if it deems that the request is not based on new facts. If the subcommittee accepts the request to reconsider the case, it may ask the candidate and/or school for whatever explanations and evidence it deems useful but will not be obliged to accept further written submissions by the candidate and will not hear the candidate orally. The subcommittee will announce its decision upon reconsideration, in principle within one month from the date IB Cardiff receives the request for reconsideration.
- 14.5 There is no fee for requesting a reconsideration of a decision by the final award committee.
- 14.6 For further details about reconsideration, refer to the Regulations and the *Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme*.

15 Appeals

- 15.1 In cases where a request for reconsideration is possible, as defined in the Regulations, the reconsideration must precede any appeal. Appeals are possible against any decision of the final award committee, but only on the grounds that the procedures defined in the Regulations that led to the decision of the final award committee being appealed were not respected.
- 15.2 For further details about appeals, refer to the Regulations and request the document that describes the appeals procedure from the IB information desk.

16 Arbitration

- 16.1 Any dispute arising from, or in connection with, the Regulations and/or the *Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme*, that has not been finally resolved by means of reconsideration or appeal procedures, or is not subject to those procedures, shall be finally settled by one arbitrator in accordance with the Swiss Rules of International Arbitration of the Swiss Chambers of Commerce.