ERUNI UNIVERZITNÍ GYMNÁZIUM
ERUNI UNIVERZITNÍ STŘEDNÍ PEDAGOGICKÁ ŠKOLA
ERUNI, univerzitní gymnázium a střední odborná škola Praha, z.ú.
Politických vězňů 1419/11, Nové Město, 110 00 Praha 1, www.eruni.eu

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

1. Rationale and Philosophy

At ERUNI, the University Grammar School in Prague, academic integrity is more than a set of rules; it is a fundamental expression of the IB Learner Profile. We expect our students to be principled, acting with integrity and honesty, and taking responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that accompany them.
This policy is aligned with IB publications, including Academic integrity policy (2026). While it meets the rigorous standards of the International Baccalaureate, this policy serves as a unified ethical code for all ERUNI students, including those in the Czech national curriculum.
The school aims to:

- Foster a culture of honesty, trust, and responsibility.
- Support the development of authentic student work.
- Ensure a shared understanding of ethical academic practices.
- Provide clear procedures for preventing and addressing academic misconduct and school maladministration

Academic integrity is not just the absence of cheating; it is a positive commitment to learning. Whether a student follows the IB DP Pathway or the National Pathway, Good Practice at ERUNI means:

- **Authenticity:** The student is the true author of the work. Every essay, coursework, presentation, or any other form of assessment reflects the student's own language, effort, and unique perspective.
- **Transparency:** If a student uses an idea, a quote, or a tool, they clearly and honestly acknowledge it. Nothing is hidden.
- **Ownership of Learning:** Students take pride in their progress. They manage their time to avoid the "panic-cheating" that happens at the last minute.
- **Intellectual Respect:** Students understand that ideas are valuable. Using someone else's work without credit is seen as a breach of respect toward the creator.
- **Ethical Collaboration:** Students know the difference between *working together* (brainstorming) and *copying* (collusion). They support their peers but never by doing the work for them.
- **Academic Courage:** When a student finds a task difficult, they ask the classroom teacher or subject teacher for help rather than resorting to dishonest shortcuts.

2. Student Academic Misconduct

At ERUNI, we uphold the integrity of all forms of assessment—whether they are IB DP components, Czech national curriculum tests, or daily coursework. Academic misconduct is defined as any action that gives a student an unfair advantage or undermines the school's ethical standards.
Academic misconduct may include:

Plagiarism	Copying from external sources or peers. *Example: A student copies three paragraphs directly from a Wikipedia article or a scientific magazine into History essay without using quotation marks or citing the source, presenting the text as their own writing*
Facilitating plagiarism	Student facilitating the sharing or copying of their work, or the work of third parties, to peers and/or forums/essays. *Example: A student shares their completed Lab Report file via WhatsApp with a classmate "just for inspiration," knowing or allowing the classmate to copy significant portions of the content.*
Collusion	Secret or unauthorised collaboration between students. All students must submit individual and unique work for IB assessment or National Pathway assessment, even when the subject guide permits data collection or practical group work. Collusion covers cases where students use a common write-up for a group rather than writing their own. This applies to all types of media (text, visuals, audio, infographics, code). *Example: Two students perform a Physics experiment together in the laboratory (which is allowed). However, instead of writing independent reports, they write the analysis and conclusion together, submitting identical or lightly paraphrased text.*
Duplication of work	Presentation of the same work by the same student for different assessment components and/or school requirements when it is contrary to the regulations of either the school or the external body assessing the work. *Example: A student submits an essay on environmental policy that they previously wrote for Social Studies class as their draft for the IB Extended Essay in Global Politics.*
Making up data for an assignment/falsification of data	Creating fake data, altering actual experimental results, or inventing research findings, survey responses, or source materials for an assignment.

	Example: A student forgets to conduct their Biology IA experiment on enzyme activity. Instead of carrying out the lab, they invent plausible numerical data, plot artificial graphs, and write an analysis based on fictitious measurement results.
Falsifying teachers' records	Altering, forging, or tampering with school documents, teacher feedback, grade reports, attendance records, or official signatures. *Example: A student modifies a score or teacher comment on a corrected paper before showing it to their parents or forges a teacher's signature/initials on an official IA progress tracking sheet or CAS log.*
Taking unauthorised material into the examination room	Possession or use of unauthorised notes, study guides, unauthorised electronic devices (smartphones, smartwatches, programmable calculators), or formula sheets during a formal examination or test. *Example: A student enters a Math paper exam with formulas written on their hand or inside their pencil case or keeps a mobile phone in their pocket during a closed-book test, regardless of whether they actually accessed it.*
Misbehaving during an exam	Actions during an examination that disrupt the testing environment, distract other candidates, communicate with peers, or refuse to follow invigilator instructions. *Example: During an exam, a student turns around to make eye contact or pass non-verbal signs to a classmate, or continues writing on their exam paper after the invigilator has loudly announced the end of the examination session.*

2.1 Referencing and Citation

ERUNI officially adopts the Harvard citation style across all subjects and pathways.

Students must follow Harvard citation guidelines for citing various sources, including books, articles, websites, and multimedia materials. See below for resources and guidance on how to correctly format citations.

Example 1: Lack of citation
Student writing: Climate change is the defining crisis of our time and its impacts are global in scope and unprecedented in scale.

Issue: Direct word-for-word copy from the UN website without quotation marks or citation.

Correct citation: Global climate shift represents an unprecedented challenge that affects ecosystems worldwide (United Nations, 2023)

The student rephrased the idea in their own authorial voice and cited the original source according to Harvard citation standards.

Example 2: Uncredited AI usage
Student writing: Photosynthesis consists of light-dependent reactions and the Calvin cycle, where ATP and NADPH drive carbohydrate synthesis.

Issue: Text generated directly by AI pasted into an essay without disclosure.
Correct citation:
In-text acknowledgement: The biochemical stages of photosynthesis were outlined with the assistance of Generative AI (OpenAI, 2026).
In Bibliography / Appendix

- ***Reference:*** *OpenAI (2026) ChatGPT (GPT-4 version) [Large language model]. Available at: https://chat.openai.com (Accessed: 12 October 2026).*
- ***AI Declaration:*** *"ChatGPT (GPT-4, OpenAI) was used on 12 October 2026 to outline the biochemical stages of photosynthesis. Prompt used: 'Explain the Calvin cycle for a high school biology paper.' All final text was synthesized, verified, and written independently by the author."*

2.2 Responsibilities: Cultivating Good Academic Practice

To maintain the culture of honesty and transparency defined in the previous section, all members of the ERUNI community have specific roles.

Students
Students of both pathways take ownership of their learning and must:

- Ensure Authenticity: All submitted work must reflect their own understanding and be their own original creation.
- Master Referencing: Acknowledge all sources accurately and in a consistent manner.

- Document the Process: Keep records of sources and maintain all drafts/checkpoints as evidence of the work's evolution.
- Use Tools Ethically: Acknowledge the use of AI tools where applicable and be prepared to explain the prompts and logic used.
- Formal Commitment: Submit a signed *Declaration of Authenticity* for major DP components (IA, EE, TOK) and key national curriculum projects.
- Proactive Communication: Seek clarification from the Classroom Teacher or subject teacher when unsure about integrity expectations.

Teachers & Classroom Teachers

The faculty acts as mentors in the process of academic inquiry and must:

- Explicit Instruction: Directly teach referencing, research skills, and the ethical use of AI within their specific subjects.
- Clarify Collaboration: Provide clear, subject-specific guidelines on what constitutes acceptable collaboration versus forbidden collusion.
- Scaffolded Learning: Monitor progress through a mandatory system of checkpoints and drafts to ensure authenticity throughout the process.
- Verification: Conduct interviews (viva voce) or discussions if there is any doubt regarding the authorship of a student's work.
- Reporting: Report any suspected incidents of misconduct to the IB Coordinator.

Senior Leadership & IB Coordinator

Leadership ensures the integrity of the school's qualifications and must:

- Regulatory Alignment: Ensure that all school practices align with IB regulations and Czech educational standards.
- Oversee Investigations: Lead the formal investigation process into suspected misconduct, ensuring fairness and consistency.
- Documentation & Communication: Maintain official records of misconduct and communicate with the IB organisation when required.
- Final Authority: Make the final decision regarding the authentication of work and the application of school-level sanctions.

Parents and Guardians

Parents are our partners in maintaining ethical standards and should:

- Support Independence: Encourage the development of independent work habits rather than focusing solely on grades.
- Provide Environment: Create a home environment conducive to study and effective time management.
- Maintain Boundaries: Strictly avoid editing, rewriting, or producing any part of the student's work.
- AI Guidance: Encourage responsible and transparent use of AI tools as research aids, not as substitutes for the student's own writing.
- Open Dialogue: Communicate with the Classroom Teacher if concerns arise regarding the student's workload or academic pressure.

2.3 Policy on Generative AI

The school recognises that Generative AI is a powerful tool. In line with IB guidance, ERUNI promotes "AI Literacy" where AI is used ethically to enhance, not replace, the learning process.

Acceptable use:

- Brainstorming and Outlining: Using AI to generate ideas, structure a piece of work, or overcome "writer's block".
- Language Support: Using AI for grammar checks, stylistic suggestions, or to help understand complex terminology.
- Research Guidance: Using AI to find initial information or to explain difficult concepts.

Example 1: Brainstorming
A student is struggling to start their essay in Social Studies (national pathway). They ask an AI tool: "What are five potential research questions comparing the impact of sugar taxes on consumer behaviour in European countries?"

Why it is acceptable: The student uses AI as an interactive brainstorming partner to overcome writer's block. They select one idea, refine it significantly, conduct their own research using peer-reviewed sources, and write the entire essay independently.

Required Action: The student discloses the tool in their appendix/bibliography: "ChatGPT (GPT-4o) was used on November 5, 2026, to generate initial research question ideas for Economics. All selected ideas were further developed and researched independently."

Example 2: Language and grammar
A student whose first language is not English writes a draft for a Biology lab report. They paste a paragraph they wrote themselves into an AI tool with the prompt: "Check this paragraph for grammatical errors and suggest clearer transitions."

Why it is acceptable: The core content, data, analysis, and original phrasing belong to the student. The AI acts merely as an advanced proofreader.

Required Action: The student ensures that the AI does not write new content or alter the underlying scientific analysis.

Example 3: Explaining complex concepts
A student does not understand the concept of epigenetics in Biology. They ask AI to "Explain epigenetics using an analogy suitable for a high school student.

Why it is acceptable: The AI is used as a personal tutor to enhance understanding. The student then applies this understanding to write their assignment in their own words.

Unacceptable use / Misuse:

- AI as a Ghostwriter: Submitting any text, code, or analysis generated by AI as if it were the student's own writing.
- Hidden AI Input: Using AI to generate content and failing to acknowledge the tool or the specific prompts used.
- Paraphrasing AI Output: Taking AI-generated text and merely changing a few words to bypass detection; the core idea and structure remain unoriginal.
- Factual Negligence: Presenting AI-generated "hallucinations" (false data, fake citations, or incorrect facts) as verified research.

Example 1: AI as a Ghostwriter
A student enters the prompt "Write a 1,000-word analysis of character development in Shakespeare's Macbeth" into ChatGPT, copies the generated text, and submits it as their draft essay.

Why it is unacceptable: The work is entirely inauthentic. The student did not produce the text, analysis, or ideas, presenting AI-generated work as their own authorial voice.

Example 2: Hidden AI Synthesis, paraphrasing
A student asks an AI tool to generate an answer for a History question.

Why it is unacceptable: Changing a few words or paraphrasing AI output without attribution is still plagiarism. The intellectual structure, synthesis, and arguments belong to the AI, not the student.

Example 3: Fabricated citations and "hallucinations"
A student uses Perplexity or ChatGPT to produce an essay and includes academic citations provided by the AI (e.g., "Smith, J. (2022). The Economics of Renewable Energy"). Upon verification by the teacher, it turns out the paper and author do not exist.

Why it is unacceptable: Presenting fake data or fabricated sources generated by AI breaches the core principles of authenticity and empirical rigour.

Student responsibility:

- Submitted work must always reflect the student's own understanding and their unique authorial voice.
- Students must be able to explain the content, the vocabulary, and the logic of their work during a viva voce or classroom discussion.

Transparency and verification:

- Students must acknowledge the use of AI tools in a dedicated section (e.g., Bibliography or Appendix), including a description of how the tool was used and a list of key prompts.
- If a student cannot explain key ideas, arguments, or the specific language used in their work, the school will not authenticate the work, and an investigation will follow.

2.4 Procedures and Sanctions for Student Academic Misconduct

Academic integrity is a core value of the ERUNI community. The school maintains a unified standard of honesty for all academic work.
All cases of suspected academic misconduct will follow a fair, transparent, and documented process:

1. *Investigation*
- Collection of evidence (student work, drafts, sources, AI use),
- Discussion with the student,
- Opportunity for the student to respond,
- In the case of the IB pathway, the collected evidence is presented to the IB for a decision.

2. *Decision-making*
3. *Outcomes*. Our objective is to maintain a fair and individualised approach. When determining the consequences of a breach of integrity, ERUNI considers the overall context of the student's situation as well as the severity of the misconduct. The following framework serves as the basis for addressing serious instances of academic malpractice.
    a. Internal sanctions
    b. External sanctions

Internal sanctions

Level	Severity	Action
Level 1	**Minor - Non-coursework Offence**: Referencing errors due to negligence, minor AI misuse in formative tasks, or simple paraphrasing mistakes. **Serious - Coursework:** Significant plagiarism identified in a draft or final version of an official IB component (IA, EE, ToK)/National pathway components (quarterly exams)	<u>IB DP pathway</u> The subject teacher holds a guided integrity discussion with the student. The IB DP Coordinator and Classroom Teacher are notified. A written warning is recorded in the school management system. The student is required to rewrite and resubmit the draft or assignment under teacher supervision to ensure authenticity. No formal IB penalty is applied yet, as the task has not been submitted to the IB. <u>National Pathway:</u> The student receives a grade **5** for the compromised test, assignment, or project. The classroom teacher is notified, and a note is recorded in the school portal. The student may be required to retake an equivalent version of the task to demonstrate mastery, with the original mark for misconduct remaining on record in accordance with the *Assessment Policy*.
<u>Example</u>: A student looks at a peer's paper during a routine 15-minute Biology test and copies two answers.		

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Applied Sanction:
1. The test is confiscated immediately and awarded a grade 5 for the breach of integrity.
2. The classroom teacher is notified, and a record of the disciplinary incident is entered into Bakaláři.
3. The student is allowed to take a retake test during a standardized department session to demonstrate mastery, but the original grade 5 for misconduct remains recorded in accordance with the Assessment Policy.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 2</td><td>Repeated Misconduct: A second instance of any breach of the integrity policy, regardless of the subject.

Intentional Cheating: Significant and deliberate plagiarism or collusion in key academic projects.</td><td><u>IB DP pathway</u>
A formal meeting is conducted with the student, parents, and the IB DP Coordinator. A second official written warning is issued and recorded. For an official IB component draft (IA/EE/TOK), the draft is rejected and must be restarted completely with a new topic/research question under strict supervision. For internal mock examinations, a score of 0 / N-grade is awarded for the affected paper.

<u>National Pathway:</u>
Issuance of a formal disciplinary measure by the Head of School in accordance with the Czech School Act—specifically a Reprimand from the Head of School or Lower Mark in Conduct on the official term report. A formal meeting with legal guardians is mandatory.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"><u>Example:</u> During the final draft review of a Theory of Knowledge essay, the teacher discovers that two full pages were generated by AI, and the student cannot explain the underlying arguments during a viva voce.

Applied Sanction:
1. A formal meeting is convened with the student, parents, subject teacher, and IB DP Coordinator.
2. A formal written warning (Level 2) is issued and recorded in the student's file.
3. The submitted TOK essay draft is rejected and cancelled. The student must restart the component completely with a new topic and research question under strict supervision.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>Critical: A third repeated instance of academic misconduct.

Severe Breach: Cheating during final IB examinations/National examinations, professional</td><td><u>IB DP pathway</u>
The Head of School and IB DP Coordinator conduct a formal hearing where the student presents their case.
• Non-Authentication: The school refuses to sign the Declaration of Authenticity for the compromised component.</td></tr>
</table>

	essay mill use, or gross falsification of records.	Consequently, the work cannot be submitted to the IB portal, resulting in an **"F" (Fail) or "N-grade" (No Grade)** for that subject/core component. • **Ineligibility for Diploma:** Awarding an N-grade or F in any DP component automatically disqualifies the student from receiving the IB Diploma. • **Exam Malpractice:** Cheating during final IB examinations is immediately reported to the IB via the *Academic Integrity Incident Report*, leading to formal investigation by the IB Final Award Committee and potential disqualification from future examination sessions. National Pathway: In cases of severe or repeated breaches (e.g., cheating during official school leaving/matriculation examinations or extreme malpractice), the Head of School may initiate formal proceedings for conditional expulsion or expulsion from the school pursuant to Section 31 of Act No. 561/2004 Coll. (the Czech School Act). The student and their legal guardians are granted the statutory right to present their case prior to the final administrative decision.
Example: A student repeatedly breaches academic integrity for a third time, or is caught cheating during the official state school-leaving examinations. ***Applied Sanction:*** 1. *The examination session is immediately interrupted and invalidated in accordance with the Czech School Act (Act No. 561/2004 Coll.).* 2. *The Head of School initiates formal administrative proceedings for **conditional expulsion** or **expulsion from the school** pursuant to **Section 31 of Act No. 561/2004 Coll.*** 3. *Written notification is formally delivered to the student and legal guardians, granting them the statutory right to present their response prior to the final administrative decision.*		

External sanctions

IB DP Pathway: Official IB penalty matrices are applied strictly as published in IB Academic Integrity Policy (Appendix 2: Student Academic Misconduct).

National Pathway: Any academic misconduct during state-standardized or national examinations is governed directly by the relevant provisions of the Czech School Act (Act No. 561/2004 Coll.) and associated ministerial decrees, which may result in the immediate invalidation of the examination session.

Rights of the Student During an Investigation: Any student suspected of academic misconduct is guaranteed the following procedural rights:

- Right to written notification: to be formally informed in writing of the specific allegations and evidence within 2 business days.
- Right to representation: to be accompanied by a parent/legal guardian and/or a chosen support person (e.g., Classroom Teacher) during all formal meetings or hearings.
- Right to be heard: to present their explanation, drafts, research logs, and defence prior to any decision being made.
- Right to appeal: to submit a formal written appeal against any Level 2 or Level 3 internal sanction to the Head of School within 5 school days of receiving the decision.

3. School maladministration

At ERUNI, we are committed to upholding the highest standards of academic integrity, not only for our students but also for the institution itself. *School Maladministration* is defined as any action by the school or an individual formally associated with ERUNI that infringes upon IB rules and regulations, potentially threatening the integrity of IB examinations and assessments.
Unlike student misconduct, maladministration is an institutional failure. However, the ERUNI recognises that students must not gain an unfair advantage from such actions; therefore, the consequences often impact both the school and the student.

School maladministration may include:

- *Coursework and Internal Assessment:*
  - Teachers providing excessive assistance or multiple edits to student work beyond what is allowed in subject guides.
  - Providing templates or frameworks that curtail student creativity and negate the nature of the task.

Example: During the drafting process of a Biology coursework, a subject teacher directly edits and rewrites several sentences on a student's draft instead of providing high-level annotations and general diagnostic comments.

- *Conduct of Examinations:*
  - Granting unauthorised additional time to students.
  - Allowing subject teachers to enter the examination hall or assist students during an exam.
  - Failing to ensure security (e.g., not checking calculators, dictionaries, or unauthorised materials).
  - Inadequate training or an insufficient number of invigilators.

Example: During a formal examination session (e.g., an official IB DP Mock Exam or final external examination), an invigilator notices that several students have not finished their essay in the final minutes. Out of sympathy, the invigilator unilaterally decides to grant the entire class an additional 15 minutes to complete their papers beyond the official cutoff time.

- *Security of Materials:*
    - Failure to securely store examination papers or access examination content before the scheduled time.

3.1 Responsibilities: Cultivating Good Academic Practice

- *Head of School, IB Coordinator:* Responsible for ensuring all IB regulations are met, training staff, and maintaining the security of all assessment materials.
- *Teachers*: Responsible for following subject-specific guidelines regarding the amount of support provided during the drafting process.
- *Invigilators*: Responsible for the strict conduct of examinations as per the *Conduct of Examinations* booklet.

3.2 Procedures and Sanctions for School Maladministration

ERUNI is committed to a "zero-error" culture regarding the administration of exams and the supervision of coursework. We recognise that even well-intentioned actions—such as a teacher providing too much help or an invigilator being lenient—can jeopardise a student's final results and the school's standing with the IB.

Key Principles of our Maladministration Policy:

- Institutional Responsibility: The school takes full ownership of administrative errors.
- Fairness to Students: We aim to minimise the impact of school errors on students, while adhering to the IB rule that unauthentic work or compromised exams cannot be graded.
- Continuous Improvement: Every reported case is treated as an opportunity to refine our internal processes and training.

All cases of suspected school maladministration will follow a rigorous, fair, and documented process to ensure the continued validity of our assessments:

1. *Investigation*

- Notification: The IB Coordinator or Head of School initiates the process upon receiving an allegation or identifying a discrepancy.
- Collection of Evidence: This includes gathering examination seating plans, storage logs, internal assessment tracking documents, teacher-student communication records (drafts and feedback), and training logs.
- Formal Interviews: Any staff member implicated is informed in writing and given a formal opportunity to respond to the allegations. Interviews are conducted with at least one witness present for each party.
- IB Reporting: For the IB DP pathway, a full report (using the School Staff Statement template) and all collected evidence are submitted to the IB Global Centre for review.

2. *Decision*-making

- In internal cases, the Head of School (or an independent investigator if a conflict of interest exists) determines the outcome.
- In external cases (official IB components), the final decision regarding the compromise of the assessment process rests with the IB Education Office or the Final Award Committee.

3. *Outcomes:* Our objective is to resolve the breach transparently while maintaining the standards of the IB. When determining consequences, ERUNI considers the nature of the administrative error and its impact on the student cohort. The following outcomes may apply:
    a. Internal Sanctions.
    b. External Sanctions.

Internal Sanctions

Severity	**Action**	**Severity**
Level 1	Minor administrative errors that do not jeopardise the assessment outcome (e.g., incorrect seating plan, missing training for one invigilator, slightly excessive guidance on a single draft).	**Internal Review:** Meeting between the staff member and the Head of School to discuss the error. **Educational Correction:** Mandatory retraining in the specific area of concern (e.g., invigilation protocols). **Internal Record:** Documentation of the incident for internal evaluation and quality assurance purposes.
Example: During an internal mock exam, an invigilator fails to complete the official seating plan layout chart or forgets to log the exact start and end time on the whiteboard. *Applied Action:* • *The error is documented in the internal quality assurance registry.* • *The IB Coordinator conducts a brief refresher briefing for all invigilators prior to the next exam session.*		
Level 2	Repeated negligence, providing unauthorised templates to an entire cohort, failure to secure examination materials, or ignoring clear warning signs of student misconduct.	**Formal Letter of Reprimand:** An official written warning issued by the Head of School. **Performance Improvement Plan:** Implementing strict supervision over the staff member's future duties.

		Mandatory Reporting: Formal notification of the incident to the IB Global Centre (if related to official IB components).
An invigilator leaves an active examination hall unattended for 10 minutes during a formal exam session. *Applied Action:* • *The staff member is placed under a Performance Improvement Plan and removed from future invigilation duties for that exam session.* • *The IB DP Coordinator immediately reports the invigilation breach to the IB via an official School Staff Statement and incident report.*		
Level 3	Intentional manipulation of results, falsification of school records, leaking examination content before the scheduled time, or systemic failure to follow IB regulations.	**Employment Termination:** Termination of the employment relationship. **Professional Ban:** A permanent ban from any future roles associated with IB programmes (upon IB's request). **Legal Action:** Potential legal proceedings if the misconduct caused significant financial or reputational damage to ERUNI.
Example: A teacher or administrator falsifies records for a student piece of work that they know was plagiarized or purchased from an essay mill. *Applied Action:* • *Immediate dismissal of the staff member.* • *Permanent reporting to the IB Organisation.* • *Potential legal proceedings if the action causes significant reputational or legal harm to the institution.*		

External sanctions
For external sanctions, the IB Penalty matrices are applied (as per IB, Academic integrity policy, Appendix 2: School maladministration).

4. Recording and Monitoring

Recording and Monitoring of Misconduct Cases:

- Central Registry: All formal warnings and sanctions (Level 1–3) are centrally recorded in the student's confidential file in the school management system.
- Monitoring over Time: The IB DP Coordinator and Head of School review the registry quarterly to track systemic patterns, monitor repeat offences across subjects, and evaluate the effectiveness of academic integrity instruction.

Data Privacy: Incident records are strictly confidential and accessible only to the School Leadership, IB Coordinator, and Classroom Teacher.

5. Policy Accessibility and Communication

Academic integrity at ERUNI is not treated as a passive rulebook, but as an active, ongoing part of daily teaching, learning, and skill development across all subjects.
The complete *Academic Integrity Policy* is permanently published and accessible to students, staff, parents, and the public on the school's official website.

Students engage with the policy continuously throughout the academic year. Rather than relying on a single, isolated event, academic integrity expectations are revisited and reinforced contextually whenever students undertake research, drafting, or assessment tasks.

The school actively promotes academic integrity across both educational pathways through structured instructional support:

- Interactive skill-building sessions integrated into lessons focusing on effective referencing, advanced research methodologies, source evaluation, and AI literacy.
- Specialized guidance and scaffolded support for complex academic projects, particularly the IB Extended Essay, Theory of Knowledge, and Internal Assessments.
- Direct, diagnostic teacher feedback provided throughout the learning process. Teachers use early drafts as diagnostic teaching opportunities (Level 1) to correct referencing errors and reinforce ethical practices before final submission.

Ethical academic practice and research literacy are embedded directly into the curriculum through IB Approaches to Learning skill frameworks across all subject groups:

- **Languages**
  - Practical instruction on accurate paraphrasing, avoiding "patchwriting" (near-verbatim copying), and maintaining authentic authorial voice.
  - Direct training on applying Harvard style citation formatting within essays and analytical responses.
- **Sciences and Humanities:**
  - Focus on data integrity, accurate recording of experimental results, and preventing data fabrication.

  - Ethical research methodology, including the proper evaluation and attribution of primary, secondary, and digital sources according to Harvard referencing standards.
  - Subject-specific guidance on acceptable collaboration during laboratory or fieldwork versus unauthorized collusion during final write-ups.
- **Mathematics, ICT:**
  - Ethical creation and sharing of code, algorithmic logic, and visual/multimedia content.
  - Explicit rules on what constitutes independent problem-solving vs. unauthorized assistance.
- **Theory of Knowledge:**
  - Critical reflection on the ethics of knowledge ownership, intellectual property, and copyright.
  - Philosophical and practical evaluation of Generative AI, exploring the boundaries between human creativity, machine input, and academic authenticity.

Policy Review and Maintenance
The *Academic Integrity Policy* is a dynamic institutional document. To ensure ongoing alignment with IB Diploma Programme requirements and Czech national legislation, this policy is subject to a formal annual review cycle (or earlier if triggered by major regulatory changes).

Policy Owner: Head of School / IB DP Coordinator
Primary Review Authority: School Leadership Team (SLT)
Consulted Stakeholders: DP Subject Teachers, Student Council representatives, and Parent Association representatives (where applicable).

Revisions

date	role	Summary of key changes
March 2026	IB DP coordinator	Initial policy drafting
September 2026	IB DP coordinator, Head of School	Initial policy drafting
November 2026	All DP faculty	Final policy approved
November 2027	All DP faculty	Scheduled annual review and operational audit.

Next Review: November 2027 (IB DP coordinator, Head of School, Teaching Staff)

Sources:

1. International Baccalaureate (2023) *The IB and Artificial intelligence (AI) tools*. Geneva: International Baccalaureate Organization.
2. International Baccalaureate (2025) *Effective citing and referencing*. Geneva: International Baccalaureate Organization.
3. International Baccalaureate (2026a) *Academic integrity policy*. Geneva: International Baccalaureate Organization.
4. International Baccalaureate (2026b) *Conduct of examinations booklet*. Geneva: International Baccalaureate Organization.

ERUNI, univerzitní gymnázium a střední odborná škola Praha, z.ú.
Politických vězňů 1419/11, Nové Město, 110 00 Praha 1, www.eruni.eu

FAQ:

Q: Can I work on my History coursework with a classmate?
A: You may discuss general ideas and sources together (collaboration). However, your research question, outline, source analysis, and final text must be 100% individual (collusion is forbidden).

Q: What happens if I make a referencing mistake by accident?
A: Unintentional referencing errors in early drafts are treated as a learning opportunity (Level 1) where you will be guided on how to correct your Harvard citations.

Q: Am I allowed to use Grammarly or AI for spellchecking?
A: Basic spelling and grammar checkers are permitted. However, using generative AI to write, rewrite, or paraphrase sentences for you is strictly prohibited.