



GMBS Academic Integrity & Plagiarism and AI Policy

1. Purpose, binding force, and linkage to the IQA framework

This Policy governs academic integrity at GMBS, with a specific focus on the prevention, detection, and handling of plagiarism and related breaches in a fully online learning environment. The Policy constitutes an implementing instrument of the GMBS internal quality assurance system and is grounded in the fact that the GMBS internal regulation on IQA is the core IQA document and defines responsibilities and procedures for all processes affecting the quality of education (IQA, Article 1(1)–(5)). The Policy is binding on students and on all employees and persons involved in the delivery and assessment of education, as the IQA explicitly establishes the binding nature of the internal regulatory framework for all those implementing quality processes (IQA, Article 1(5)). Given the online nature of GMBS study provision, the rules of this Policy are applied within GMBS systems (in particular the LMS), while GMBS simultaneously ensures the protection of personal data and privacy in online teaching and in any recording of teaching activities under the GMBS GDPR regime, including access rules and retention requirements (IQA, Article 1(6)).

2. Definition of academic integrity and plagiarism under GMBS conditions

GMBS understands academic integrity as the student's obligation to achieve learning outcomes honestly and not to use dishonest practices in any form of knowledge verification. GMBS explicitly prohibits plagiarism and the submission of another person's work as one's own (GMBS Code of Ethics, Article 2(3)(c)–(d)). For the purposes of GMBS, plagiarism includes, in particular, the use of text or ideas without proper source acknowledgement, including verbatim copying, paraphrasing without citation, and mosaic copying, as well as presenting another person's work as one's own; this prohibition is explicitly established as a student obligation in the Code of Ethics (GMBS Code of Ethics, Article 2(3)(c)–(d)). In the area of creative and research activity, GMBS applies a principle of zero tolerance towards fraud, falsification, and plagiarism in the creation and publication of outputs, while also protecting copyright and intellectual property rights (GMBS Code of Ethics, Article 3(1)(b)–(c)).

3. Preventive rules and “online-by-design” implementation

Within the GMBS online environment, every assessed assignment must be configured so that the student is informed in advance of originality expectations, rules for working with sources, and the consequences of any breach. A fundamental requirement is that student assessment must be fair, objective, impartial, and transparent, and these principles are reflected in the way originality is evaluated (GMBS Code of Ethics, Article 2(2)(f)). In relation to final theses, GMBS explicitly requires originality and compliance with the rules for working with sources, prohibits infringement of third-party copyright, and requires the student to cite in accordance with the relevant standard (Final Thesis Processing Rules, Article 3(2)–(4)).

4. GMBS plagiarism detection framework

Plagiarism detection at GMBS is based on a combination of (i) the mandatory originality of the final thesis, (ii) formal originality checking via an anti-plagiarism tool for final theses, and (iii) expert academic review by lecturers, supervisors, and assessors. For continuous (non-thesis) assignments, detection is grounded in the student's ethical obligation not to plagiarise and not to cheat and in the principle of transparent assessment. The lecturer is entitled to apply proportionate tools to verify originality and, where suspicion arises, to request an explanation, supplementary materials, or to conduct an expert authorship verification, provided that all steps are impartial and properly documented. It is essential that a student's breach of the Code of Ethics may constitute a breach of obligations under GMBS study regulations, with the possibility of disciplinary proceedings (GMBS Code of Ethics, Article 4(4), in conjunction with Article 2(2)(f) and Article 2(3)(c)–(d)).

5. GMBS competence model

Where student plagiarism reaches the intensity of a disciplinary offence, the matter falls under the competence of the Disciplinary Board as the academic self-governing body designated to consider student disciplinary misconduct, including the proposal of disciplinary measures (Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 1; Article 2). The Chair of the Disciplinary Board is the Vice-Rector for Science, Research and Education, and the Disciplinary Board acts upon a proposal submitted by the Rector (Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 2; Article 4). The ethical dimension applies in particular where the matter is submitted as a complaint alleging a breach of ethical principles; the Ethics Committee considers breaches of the Code of Ethics on the basis of a written complaint. At the same time, a breach of the Code of Ethics by a student may lead to disciplinary proceedings (GMBS Code of Ethics, Article 4(1)–(4)).

6. Procedure following the detection of plagiarism

Upon identifying a suspicion of plagiarism, GMBS ensures that the factual circumstances and evidence are documented. For final theses, the primary evidence is the Originality Check Protocol and the expert assessment of originality in accordance with the rules for working with sources and citations (Final Thesis Processing Rules, Article 4(2) and Article 3(2)–(4)). Where the suspicion reaches the level of disciplinary misconduct, disciplinary proceedings are conducted before the Disciplinary Board upon a proposal by the Rector. The Disciplinary Board is obliged to commence proceedings within fourteen days of receipt of the proposal (Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 4). The student must be summoned to the online hearing at least two weeks in advance; the summons is delivered by email or otherwise in writing. The hearing is not public and the student has the right to comment on the circumstances of the case (Rules of Procedure of the Disciplinary Board, Article 2(2); Article 3(1) and Article 3(3)). The Disciplinary Board decides on the proposal for measures by voting in the student's absence; the voting is generally public, and upon a member's request it may be secret (Rules of Procedure of the Disciplinary Board, Article 4(1)–(3)).

7. Sanctions and the Rector's decision

For a disciplinary offence, the student may be issued an admonition, a conditional exclusion from studies with specified conditions and a deadline, or an expulsion from studies



(Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 3). The Rector imposes the disciplinary measure within fourteen days of receiving the proposal from the Disciplinary Board and may not impose a stricter measure than that proposed by the Disciplinary Board. When imposing a measure, the manner of conduct, circumstances, consequences, efforts to remedy consequences, and the student's prior conduct are taken into account (Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 3). The Rector may impose expulsion only where it is proven that the student acted intentionally, repeated the misconduct, or committed a criminal offence with a final conviction (Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 3).

8. Request for review of the decision and its effects

The student may submit a request for review of the Rector's decision within eight days from the date of delivery, and such a request always has suspensive effect (Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 5(1) and Article 4). The Rector forwards the matter to the Chair of the Board of Directors, who requests an opinion from the GMBS Legal Department on whether the decision is inconsistent with generally binding law or GMBS internal regulations. The Chair of the Board of Directors subsequently confirms, modifies, or annuls the Rector's decision and issues a final written decision within thirty days of receipt of the request for review; this decision is final and no further appeal is permitted (Disciplinary Regulations for Students, Article 5(2)–(3)).

9. Parallel protection of student rights through the complaint mechanism

If the student challenges the conduct of GMBS bodies (for example, conflict of interest, procedural impartiality, or other rights violations), the student may submit a complaint under the Complaint Handling Policy. This policy establishes the competence of the Rectorate to address complaints, a specific regime where the complaint is against the Rector (jurisdiction of the Board of Directors), and the prohibition that a complaint be investigated by the person against whom it is directed. GMBS is obliged to resolve the complaint within 60 working days, with a possibility of extension by 30 working days (Complaint Handling Policy, Article 4(1)–(4) and Article 4(3)–(4)).

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Context of Academic Integrity

GMBS recognises that artificial intelligence tools represent a significant technological development that may enhance learning, analytical thinking, language refinement and the efficient use of information. At the same time, GMBS considers it essential to clearly define the boundaries of acceptable AI use in order to safeguard academic integrity, fairness in assessment and the credibility of academic outputs.

The use of artificial intelligence within GMBS is permitted solely as a supportive instrument and strictly within the limits defined by this policy and related internal regulations. Students may use AI only within the framework of this directive; any use beyond these rules shall be considered impermissible. GMBS is guided by the principle that the core of higher education lies in the student's personal intellectual development, critical reasoning and independent academic work. In this sense, AI cannot be regarded as the "author" of academic work, but only as technical assistance whose use must be responsible, transparent and proportionate.

- AI is understood as a supportive tool, not a substitute for academic work.
- Students may use AI only within the limits of this policy and related rules.
- Impermissible use of AI constitutes a breach of academic integrity.
- Academic work must always reflect the student's own intellectual contribution.



Permitted Use of AI by Students and Limits of Acceptability

Students may use AI tools primarily in ways that support, but do not replace, their own academic work. Permissible uses include language editing, stylistic refinement, structuring ideas, outlining documents, preparing notes or generating exploratory questions that are subsequently critically analysed and independently developed by the student.

It is impermissible to use AI to generate an entire academic work or a substantial portion thereof without demonstrable personal intellectual contribution. The use of AI during examinations or assessed activities is prohibited unless explicitly authorised by the lecturer or clearly defined in the module syllabus. Submitting AI-generated content as one's own work without acknowledgement constitutes a breach of academic integrity and may be treated as plagiarism or other academic misconduct.

- AI may support work but must not replace the student's own contribution.
- Generating substantial parts of work without intellectual input is prohibited.
- AI use during examinations is forbidden unless expressly permitted.
- Undeclared AI-generated content may constitute academic misconduct.

Lecturer Responsibility and the Nature of Academic Decision-Making

In teaching, assessment and academic decision-making, responsibility always rests with a qualified lecturer or the competent academic body. AI must not replace the lecturer in teaching, student supervision, decisions concerning academic progression, or the determination of final grades. This principle applies equally to online provision. AI may only serve as a complementary instrument that facilitates certain processes, but it may not replace professional academic judgement.

Where individual academic evaluation is required, the lecturer's professional judgement is decisive. AI may assist in preparing materials, conducting preliminary text analysis or identifying potential risk indicators; however, it can never function as an autonomous decision-making mechanism.

- Responsibility for teaching and assessment lies with the lecturer or academic body.
- AI may not independently assign grades or determine academic progression.
- Online provision does not diminish the requirement for human academic oversight.
- AI may assist but cannot act as an autonomous evaluator.

Permitted Use of AI by Students and Limits of Acceptability

Students may use AI tools primarily in ways that support, but do not replace, their own academic work. Permissible uses include language editing, stylistic refinement, structuring ideas, outlining documents, preparing notes or generating exploratory questions that are subsequently critically analysed and independently developed by the student.



It is impermissible to use AI to generate an entire academic work or a substantial portion thereof without demonstrable personal intellectual contribution. The use of AI during examinations or assessed activities is prohibited unless explicitly authorised by the lecturer or clearly defined in the module syllabus. Submitting AI-generated content as one's own work without acknowledgement constitutes a breach of academic integrity and may be treated as plagiarism or other academic misconduct.

- AI may support work but must not replace the student's own contribution.
- Generating substantial parts of work without intellectual input is prohibited.
- AI use during examinations is forbidden unless expressly permitted.
- Undeclared AI-generated content may constitute academic misconduct.

Transparency and Obligation of Declaration

Transparency is a fundamental condition for trust in the academic environment. Where AI has had a meaningful influence on the development of a piece of work, the student is required to declare its use clearly and proportionately. Such declaration should specify, at minimum, the name of the tool and the purpose for which it was used, and, where appropriate, the stage of the work in which it was applied (for example, language editing or structural outlining).

Failure to declare AI use, particularly where AI has generated content or significantly influenced argumentation, shall be regarded as a breach of academic integrity. Transparency protects both the fairness of the assessment process and the student from allegations of misconduct.

- AI use must be declared where it influences the final output.
- Declarations must be clear and proportionate.
- Undeclared AI use may be treated as plagiarism or misconduct.
- Transparency safeguards fairness and academic credibility.

AI in Final Theses and Research-Based Outputs

In coursework, projects and especially final theses, students are expected to demonstrate independent scholarly reasoning, methodological awareness and critical engagement with sources. AI may serve only as a supportive instrument in preliminary or auxiliary stages and may not replace research design, interpretation of findings, formulation of conclusions or critical literature review.

Students must be prepared to defend both the substance of their work and the process by which it was developed. Where doubts arise, GMBS may require additional clarification, supporting drafts, research notes or an oral explanation of the work's development. In this context, AI is addressed not only as an ethical matter but also as a quality assurance concern related to the credibility of academic awards.

- Final theses must demonstrate independent academic and research effort.
- AI must not substitute research design, interpretation or conclusions.
- Students must be able to explain and defend the development of their work.



- Additional clarification may be required where reasonable doubt exists.

Originality Control and Verification Procedures

GMBS reserves the right to employ appropriate tools to verify originality and academic integrity, including systems designed to identify patterns consistent with automated content generation. Where reasonable suspicion exists, a student may be requested to explain the method by which the work was produced or to demonstrate personal intellectual contribution.

Verification may include supplementary oral defence, discussion with the lecturer, or submission of supporting documentation demonstrating the development of the work. Such procedures are intended to protect fairness and institutional credibility rather than to create a punitive environment.

- GMBS may use tools to monitor originality and integrity.
- Students may be required to clarify the production process of their work.
- Supplementary defence or documentation may be requested.
- Verification aims to protect fairness and academic credibility.

Review and Updating

This section of the policy is subject to regular review. GMBS will take into account technological developments, practical experience and any changes in regulatory expectations to ensure continued relevance and appropriateness.

The objective of ongoing review is to ensure that AI supports educational quality while preserving academic integrity and the credibility of GMBS academic awards.

- The policy will be reviewed regularly in light of technological developments.
- Practical implementation experience will inform updates.
- Regulatory expectations and standards will be reflected where applicable.
- The aim is to safeguard the credibility of GMBS qualifications.