



NGI003 – INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY POLICY¹

Effective Date 1 July 2025

Last amended May 2025

Designated Officers Chief Academic Officer

 Registrar

Amendments

Version Review	Designation	Date	Date of Approval
1	CAO/Registrar	January 2023	November 2022
2	CAO	May 2025	30 May 2025

¹ Name changed to Intellectual Integrity Policy

2	Purpose and Scope of Policy	4
3	Definitions of intellectual integrity, plagiarism, cheating and ethical engagement with AI	4
3.1	Intellectual Integrity.....	4
3.2	Plagiarism.....	4
3.3	Ethical engagement with AI	5
3.4	Cheating.....	5
4	NGI approach to the promotion and protection of intellectual integrity.	5
4.1	General	5
4.2	Expectations of lecturers and other staff.....	6
4.3	Student obligations	6
5	Use of similarity and AI detection tools.....	7
6	Referencing and acknowledging sources	7
6.1	Extent of requirement	7
6.2	Quality of referencing requirements	7
6.3	Referencing permitted collaboration and groupwork	8
7	Ethical use of Artificial Intelligence	8
8	Process: lack of integrity concerns in submitted work.....	9
8.1	General principles.....	9
8.2	First transgression	9
8.3	Second transgression.....	10
8.4	Third transgression.....	10
9	Process: Lack of integrity in invigilated assessments	10
9.1	Context and first steps.....	10
9.2	Flagged students.....	10
10	Record	12
11	Acknowledgement.....	12
12	Policy review	12

1 Purpose and Scope of Policy

Intellectual Integrity is a key value at NewBridge Graduate Institute. Developing the skills and understanding to appropriately credit the work of others, and to leverage the tools available ethically, is a core intended graduate attribute.

This policy therefore creates the context and requirements for the development of values and skills necessary to demonstrate academic and intellectual integrity. It also outlines how students will be held accountable if they fail to exercise these values and skills.

2 Definitions of intellectual integrity, plagiarism, cheating and ethical engagement with AI²

2.1 Intellectual Integrity

Intellectual integrity encompasses a commitment to honesty, clarity, fairness, and responsibility in the pursuit, presentation and dissemination of knowledge.

To have intellectual integrity includes:³

- (1) Not cheating – not being dishonest about any aspect of one’s work. Not seeking an unfair advantage over others.
- (2) Acknowledging sources – properly crediting the ideas (and the forms in which those ideas are expressed) of others.
- (3) Acknowledging sources (2) – properly crediting the information provided by or through engagement with technology including AI.
- (4) Objectivity – presenting facts and findings without distortion or bias and applying critical thinking skills to information.
- (5) Respecting the work of others – valuing the intellectual property of others
- (6) Being open to critique and feedback – accepting constructive input and developing one’s own work based on sound reasoning and evidence.
- (7) Accurate credit for one’s own work – not presenting the work of others or of AI as being one’s own work and not seeking to create an impression of having done work one has not done or having knowledge one does not have.
- (8) Breaches of intellectual integrity, including cheating, plagiarism and unethical use of AI, will be handled in terms of this policy and the NGI018 Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary and may result in a penalty as severe as expulsion.

2.2 Plagiarism

- (1) Plagiarism is taking credit for the ideas or work of others, either purposely or accidentally, by not citing sources.
- (2) NGI supports this broader understanding for the avoidance of doubt: “Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else’s work, words, images, ideas, opinions, discoveries, artwork, music, recordings or computer-generated work (including circuitry, computer programs or software, websites, the Internet or other electronic resources) whether published or not, as one’s own work, or alternatively appropriating the work, words, images, ideas, opinions, discoveries, artwork, music, recordings or computer-generated work (including circuitry, computer programs

² AI = Artificial Intelligence

³ This is based on, and developed from, The Library and Information Science Education Network position as accessed last on 26 May 2025.

or software, websites, the Internet or other electronic resource) of others, without properly acknowledging the source” (University of Pretoria, Plagiarism Prevention Policy, 2022).

- (3) Referencing (using the required format and conventions) is the key way to avoid plagiarism.
- (4) Where referencing skills are lacking such as when a student is new to post school study, plagiarism can occur without there having been an intentional breach of intellectual integrity. However, once a student has the skills to reference then failure to do so is also a breach of intellectual integrity.
- (5) The following are always plagiarism and may also be cheating:
 - a) Using an idea without acknowledging the person and place you read or saw the idea
 - b) Direct use of someone’s word(s) without both quotation marks AND a full citation
 - c) Translations without crediting the original source
 - d) Paraphrasing or summarising without crediting the source
 - e) Cutting and pasting without crediting the sources
 - f) Paying someone else to do the work for you (this is also cheating)
 - g) Using or manipulating an image or other representation of an idea without crediting it or in contravention of any copyright restrictions.

2.3 Ethical engagement with AI

- (1) Artificial intelligence (AI) is not only aggregation of existing knowledge – AI has the capability to invent or create or generate new ideas. It is however a “trained” technology and there is no guarantee of the ethics, bias, accuracy or honesty of information or insights it generates.
- (2) Where students or lecturers use AI to avoid doing work (including learning) themselves or to create work that they misrepresent as their own this use of AI is not aligned with commitment to intellectual integrity.
- (3) Appropriate referencing and recognition of AI is necessary but insufficient if its use stands in the way of developing critical thinking and knowledge management skills in students.

2.4 Cheating

- (1) NewBridge Graduate Institute has a zero-tolerance approach to any activity where a student has, or has attempted to, take credit for thinking and ideas and work that is not their own.
- (2) Cheating includes but is not limited to having someone else complete your work, purchasing completed assignments, accessing sources or information when not permitted to do so during assessments, presenting the work of others or machines as one’s own work, collaboration when individual work is required and collusion of any form to get credit for work that has not been honestly completed.
- (3) Cheating is normally undertaken to avoid presenting one’s own work for assessment and is thus a serious violation of the rules and standards of NGI.

3 NGI approach to the promotion and protection of intellectual integrity.

3.1 General

- (1) Cheating is a disciplinary offence for which a sanction as severe as expulsion may be given.
- (2) NGI has a zero-tolerance approach to lack of intellectual integrity.
- (3) Students will be taught how to practise intellectual integrity including but not limited to referencing, use of credible resources and ethical use of AI and are then expected to use that knowledge with integrity.
- (4) The tools for developing skills and checking compliance are available to all.
- (5) Violations are consistently dealt with.
- (6) Lecturers are trained to identify and give feedback on conduct that is of concern.

3.2 Expectations of lecturers and other staff.

- (1) Lecturers and staff will act with intellectual integrity including referencing all sources correctly and acknowledging their use of AI.
- (2) NGI will set and communicate standards for the prevention of plagiarism.
- (3) Lecturers will inform and train students on the required skills and other requirements.
- (4) Lecturers will set assignments that require students to:
 - a. Demonstrate critical thinking about concepts and information
 - b. Analyse ideas and situations/ problems
 - c. Integrate and synthesis information to make arguments
 - d. Demonstrate mastery of skills
- (5) Lecturers will act consistently and fairly when plagiarism or a lack of intellectual integrity are identified.
- (6) Lecturers may not ignore plagiarism or suspected breaches in intellectual integrity expectations.
- (7) Lecturers must check the reports of the similarity detection software submitted with assignments and follow the required procedures including logging breaches on the SIMS (Student Information Management System).

3.3 Student obligations

- (1) Students may not cheat or attempt to cheat.
- (2) Students must use the opportunities provided in class and online and in specific sessions to learn the skills they need. Failure to use the opportunities provided is an aggravating⁴ factor when considering an alleged breach.
- (3) Students may not use available technology and tools to avoid learning.
- (4) Where tools are used to support learning, sufficient detail must be provided so that the contribution of the student can be accurately assessed.
- (5) Students must keep drafts and planning documents and make these available on request to prove the originality of their work. This includes drafts of work prior to its submission to authoring assistance tools such as Grammarly.
- (6) Students must master the necessary skills to reference the work of others.
- (7) Students must not act without integrity or collude or collaborate with others to act dishonestly.
- (8) Students must make use of resources that are:
 - a. Available through the EDS and related subscriptions
 - b. Full text only (not just abstracts)
 - c. Not behind a pay wall to which NGI does not subscribe unless they have access to the full text and can produce it for verification purposes
 - d. Academically credible
 - e. Accessible for verification on request
- (9) Students must seek support and assistance where they are not confident of their own skills.
- (10) Students must submit their assignments through the recognised similarity detection software which also provides a report on the likelihood of AI involvement in the production of the work.

⁴ Aggravating means to make a situation worse – in other words, failure to use the opportunity to learn something when that opportunity is provided will result in a more severe sanction and is not viewed as an excuse for conduct.

4 Use of similarity and AI detection tools

- (1) NGI makes use of an integrated, online, web-based similarity tool to help detect plagiarism. Students are required to submit their work through this tool. Lecturers are required to consider the information/ report from the tool and to use the information when marking the work of students.
- (2) The same tool generates a report on the likelihood of the use of AI – this report must also be examined by the marker and clarifying questions asked if there are concerns.
- (3) The tool indicates what needs to be looked at but the decision about further steps is based on the analysis and engagement and not on the tool on its own.
- (4) The tool only helps to point out examples and things to be considered. The tool is not responsible for the management of plagiarism at NGI. People are.
- (5) NGI also makes use of an application (the App) to invigilate students who are writing their assessments without human invigilation. Where students are flagged for violating the rules associated with the tool the consequence can include formal discipline and/or not being permitted to continue to use the App for assessments. Where the App flags students for potential use of AI similar consequences (see below) are likely.

5 Referencing and acknowledging sources

5.1 Extent of requirement

- (1) Education is a process of “standing on the shoulders of giants” meaning that each of us develops as a student and then graduate by learning from what others have already documented and building our own understanding beyond that. You can demonstrate that you are a strong student by showing evidence of building your knowledge and understanding by citing the work of people (intellectual giants that came before you) that you have read or looked at.
- (2) All work and ideas of others must be referenced – this includes:
 - a) Written (printed in any form including online) including articles, books, blogs, notes, course material, projects, e-mails, code.
 - b) Visual including images, photos, drawings, designs, graphics, books, illustrations, video.
 - c) Music including compositions, lyrics, recordings, scores, sound bites
 - d) Spoken including speeches, audio recordings, lectures, interviews
- (3) The responsibility to reference fully does not fall away if or when the student has changed the words (paraphrased or summarised) or any other part/ dimension/ aspect of something that was created by someone else. This includes:
 - a) quoting (using the exact words of another)
 - b) paraphrasing (using the ideas of another in your own words)
 - c) summarising (using the main points of another)
 - d) Integrating or consolidating ideas, concepts, or representations
 - e) translating the original text with or without summarising or paraphrasing it.
- (4) Any presentation of the works or ideas of another person as if they were your own is plagiarism.
- (5) Students must use the required referencing convention which is normally the APA (v7).
- (6) Lack of intention to plagiarise is not accepted as a reason/ excuse for doing so.
- (7) Lack of skills after training and information has been provided, is not accepted as an excuse for plagiarism.

5.2 Quality of referencing requirements

- (8) Referencing or citing a source means providing all the necessary information to help another person find your original source – that includes hyperlinks. Names, dates, publishers, URL and date and time accessed are all critical to this process and must be presented in the required format.

- (9) The reference provided must easily lead the reader (marker) to the original work without requiring additional information from the student.
- (10) It is also necessary to reference the use of AI tools.
- (11) Required formats and standards must be used.

5.3 Referencing permitted collaboration and groupwork

- (1) The assessment instructions will tell students if the assignment is individual or if collaboration is permitted or required. There is no harm in working with others to understand material but if the assignment intends to assess independent work, then independent work is required.
- (2) In the case of a group submission, sources must be correctly acknowledged, and each member of the group assumes responsibility for an assignment that is submitted by the group. Each member of the group is thus responsible for any plagiarism in that assignment. It is thus critical that each member reads the assignment before it is submitted.
- (3) In the case of individual submissions made after group or collaborative work, it is the responsibility of each individual student to ensure that the submission they make is their own work and where they have cooperated is clearly cited.

6 Ethical use of Artificial Intelligence

- (1) The person setting the assessment must indicate what level of AI usage is acceptable – ranging from no use through to use for planning or idea generation or full use to produce a product that is then critiqued or improved on. The instructions must be followed.
- (2) Any use of AI to avoid doing the work oneself is unethical and viewed as cheating.
- (3) It is a reality of modern technology that proving use of AI is complicated and that the development of technology will continue to make simple detection difficult. It is thus critical and required that students retain evidence of their own work in the form of drafts, declared prompts, or other stipulated requirements.
- (4) In the case of work that does not include drafts (such as invigilated assessments) students may be required to prove that they have not used AI by submitting to additional assessment, not being able to make use of at home app invigilated assessment opportunities or providing other examples of their writing and comprehension. Protecting the integrity of assessment and qualifications supersedes the associated inconvenience. A request to provide or submit to these measures is intended to clarify. If this then results in the need for an accusation (and disciplinary process) that will follow and will be explicit.
- (5) If AI is used, students need to provide the prompt that was used (the question you asked) and they need to keep a copy of the output and produce it on request. Failure to do so will result in a negative assumption.
- (6) If AI is used to assist with grammar they are required to keep a copy of the work that was done before the tool was used, so that they can be compared. Failure to do so will result in a negative assumption,
- (7) Students are required to keep drafts of their work to show evidence of the original work and planning. Failure to do so will result in a negative assumption.
- (8) Use of AI must be referenced in text and in the list of resources/ references.
- (9) Failure to provide the above information when required will be understood negatively – that is, the assumption will be made that the use was not ethical.

7 Process: lack of integrity concerns in submitted work

7.1 General principles

- (1) Lecturers are required to apply their disciplinary and professional judgement to the work they are assessing and may not ignore any concerns.
- (2) The process below applies to plagiarism and use of AI except where cheating is evident in which case a referral for disciplinary investigation is immediate. This referral must be noted on EMC as must the outcome.
- (3) The lecturer must open and analyse the report from the similarity and AI detection tool before marking.
- (4) Each potential concern marked up in the report must be looked at to either dismiss it or accept it as a concern.
- (5) If a lecturer notes a concern, this **MUST** be logged on the student profile on EMC along with notes about actions taken and follow up outcomes.
- (6) Unless cheating appears evident, in which case disciplinary action must be taken by referring the student's work to the Vice Principal: Academic Operations, the first offence of a student is treated as an opportunity to correct the way the student works with no disciplinary consequence. Subsequent transgressions are handled differently and may ultimately result in expulsion.
- (7) The lecturer must:
 - a. Review the report and make a considered assessment.
 - b. Check if there are other transgressions on EMC and select the process accordingly
 - c. Implement the required process.
- (8) The student must:
 - a. Retain evidence of their work
 - b. Submit that evidence or any other evidence when asked to do so
 - c. Check their NGI e-mail daily to ensure that messages related to intellectual integrity clarifications and investigations are received. Failure to check mail or read the message will be viewed as aggravating⁵ in any further action.
 - d. Resubmit work within required timeframes or receive 0% or a more severe disciplinary process.

7.2 First transgression⁶

- (1) After reviewing the report and reaching the conclusion that clarification is needed and confirming that no other transgressions have been loaded the lecturer must send the student a mail detailing the concerns and asking them to come and talk to the lecturer or submit the evidence or revised submission within 72 hours of the mail being sent.
- (2) The standard mail template should be used.
- (3) The lecturer logs sending the mail and loads a copy of the mail on EMC.
- (4) The lecturer opens myNGI for a resubmission for that student and indicates that a second submission is permitted.
- (5) The student has 72 hours to comply. The student should seek assistance from the lecturer or the Information Centre if they have technical queries.
- (6) The work is then re-assessed and if the concern is resolved then the work is fully marked, and this is added as a note on EMC.

⁵ Aggravating means to make something worse so if behaviour is aggravating it means it may make the penalty or consequence worse and it is not accepted as an excuse or explanation.

⁶ A transgression is "breaking a rule" – doing something that is not permitted.

- (7) If evidence has been provided that the work was indeed independent and is not an intellectual integrity infraction the original note on EMC must not be deleted but must be marked as “Evidence satisfactory” and it will not be counted as a first transgression.

7.3 Second transgression

- (1) If there is already a transgression on EMC that has not been marked as “evidence satisfactory”, the lecturer will communicate accordingly with the student and provide 72 hours for resubmission or evidence. The process is the same as for the first transgression.
- (2) If the note on EMC indicates that “evidence satisfactory” then the matter is treated as a first transgression.
- (3) If the resubmission resolves the concerns the work is marked but the mark is capped at 50% and the notes completed on EMC.
- (4) If evidence proves that this was indeed independent work, then the same process is followed as per 7 above. Both notes remain but no transgression has been counted.

7.4 Third transgression

- (1) The process for the third transgression is that a record is placed on EMC and a mark of 0% is entered and the student is referred to the campus disciplinary officer for investigation. No opportunity for resubmission is provided.
- (2) After the disciplinary process the sanction is recorded on EMC with instructions to any future lecturers on how further transgressions by this student are to be handled.

8 Process: Lack of integrity in invigilated assessments

8.1 Context and first steps

- (1) Any student found cheating in an assessment invigilated by a human or where a human identifies cheating when the student is being invigilated in the application or when the invigilation app flags a transgression that suggests cheating (such as being out of the application or speaking to someone else) is immediately handled in terms of the NGI018 Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Policy, as well as the NGI004 Assessment Policy.
- (2) This section relates to assessments that have been flagged for potential use of AI when using the Invigilator App⁷ (or any other similar tool).
- (3) The confidence level of the App has been set in 2025 to 85% and thus the chances of false positives (flagging) have been drastically reduced although they still exist. In addition, a flag at 85% means that some AI use may go undetected and thus the lecturer is still required to exercise caution and judgement.
- (4) The analysis team in the central office will engage with the module lead when more than one student in a module is flagged in a similar way to eliminate false positives related to templates and other formats.
- (5) If a student has been flagged at the 85% confidence level and the module lead confirms that the reason is not assessment structure related one or more of the following procedures will be followed.

8.2 Flagged students

- (1) As the flag analysis is done as soon as assessments are written, a student flagged in one module may or may not be flagged in another module in the same period.

⁷ The Invigilator App (2025) is the tool used to allow students to write their assessments off campus if they wish to do so. It requires a commitment to integrity. This is referred to as the App in this policy.

- (2) Analysis and marking cannot be delayed until all assessments are complete and thus the action for one flagging and the first flagging in a period⁸ that then is followed with additional flags in the period are the same.
- (3) The central team will send the student the details of the flagging and will provide the option to either plead guilty and accept the sanction or opt for a disciplinary hearing.
- (4) If the student admits guilt:
- A mark of 0% is entered for the assessment and any other assessment flagged in the same period.
 - The student is permitted to write the June examination even if they have not qualified for exam admission and may do so using the App.
 - Normal requirements in terms of 50% for the module will still apply in order to pass.
 - The admission will be logged on to EMC.
 - If this student is flagged again in another period, they will immediately forfeit their right to use the App again until they graduate or a shorter period determined by the Manager: Academic Development and Student Support. They may also be subject to disciplinary hearing.
- (9) If the student appeals and claims they are not guilty the following apply:
- The student will not be permitted to write using the App for the next cycle/ period for any modules so that their performance without access to the App can be compared to their performance when using the App.
 - The student is required to provide a statement explaining the reason for their appeal given that the confidence level has been lifted to 85% before they are flagged.
 - The student is required to rewrite the assessment/s or part of the assessment/s on campus on a Saturday (Friday if Saturday is not suitable for religious reasons) so that their knowledge can be compared to the knowledge demonstrated in the flagged assessment.
 - Failure to present for the rewrite in any flagged module will result in a mark of 0% for the assessment AND the student not being permitted to use the App again until they graduate or a shorter period as determined by the Manager of Academic Development and Student Support.
 - If the rewritten assessment does not demonstrate as high a level of knowledge with a 5% latitude as the flagged assessment did, the student will get 0% for the assessment and will not be permitted to proceed with completing the module – they will fail the module in its entirety and will need to repeat it.
 - The student will also not be permitted to use the App for future assessments until they graduate from their current qualification, or after a shorter time as determined by the Manager of Academic Development and Student Support.
 - The student may also be subject to a disciplinary process which may result in their expulsion.
 - If the timing of this process does not enable a decision before the next assessment period, a student may complete the next assessment on campus (not using the App), but it will not be marked until the above process is complete.
 - If a student who has followed the above process with a negative outcome is flagged again, they will be suspended pending the outcome of a disciplinary process.

⁸ A period is either a test week or an examination cycle.

9 Record

- (1) NGI will keep a student record of transgressions and offences as well as an institutional record of all cases taken to the disciplinary level.
- (2) The record carries over from one year of study to the next even into a different qualification.

10 Acknowledgement

https://www.up.ac.za/media/shared/1/ZP_Files/s5106-19-plagiarism-prevention-policy.zp181077.pdf

Accessed on 22/11/2022

https://www.ru.ac.za/media/rhodesuniversity/content/law/documents/10-students/plagiarism_policy.pdf Accessed 22/11/2022

<https://www.wisdomlib.org/concept/intellectual-integrity> Accessed 26 May 2025

<https://www.lisedunetwork.com/what-is-intellectual-integrity/> Accessed 26 May 2025

11 Policy review

The policy will be reviewed at least once every three years.

