

अवगत हुई तथा परिशीलनोपरान्त अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया।

कार्यवाही: निदेशक, सी०ए०एस०, लखनऊ

मद संख्या 60.30 सेंटर फार एडवांस्ड स्टडीज में संकाय सदस्यों एवं छात्र-छात्राओं हेतु Winter Vacation दिनांक 28 Dec to 3<sup>rd</sup> Jan (01 सप्ताह) तक और Summer Vacation दिनांक 1<sup>st</sup> June – 15<sup>th</sup> July (कुल 45 दिन) तक लागू किये जाने पर विचार।

सेंटर फार एडवांस्ड स्टडीज में संकाय सदस्यों एवं छात्र-छात्राओं हेतु Winter Vacation और Summer Vacation लागू किये जाने हेतु डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया नेशनल ला विश्वविद्यालय, लखनऊ, आई०ई०टी० लखनऊ तथा आई०आई०टी० कानपुर में प्रचलित Winter Vacation और Summer Vacation के प्रस्ताव से परिषद अवगत हुई तथा परिशीलनोपरान्त यह निर्देश दिया गया है कि विश्वविद्यालय के अन्य संस्थानों सी०ए०एस०, आई०ई०टी०, एफ०ओ०ए० एवं यू०पी०आई०डी० के निदेशक/प्राचार्य मा० कुलपति के अध्यक्षता में एक बैठक करने के उपरान्त निर्णय लेंगे।

कार्यवाही: निदेशक, सी०ए०एस०, लखनऊ

मद संख्या 60.31 सेंटर फार एडवांस्ड स्टडीज में अध्ययनरत पीएच.डी. छात्रों हेतु Ordinary Leave, Academic Leave और Medical Leave लागू किये जाने पर विचार।

सेंटर फार एडवांस्ड स्टडीज में वर्तमान में शोध छात्रों हेतु आर्डिनेंस में अवकाश का प्रावधान न होने के कारण शोध छात्रों अवकाश दिये जाने के प्रस्तावित नियमावली से परिषद अवगत हुई तथा अन्तिम रूप दिये जाने हेतु मा० कुलपति महोदय की अध्यक्षता में निम्न सदस्यों की एक समिति का गठन किया गया—

1. निदेशक, आई०ई०टी०, लखनऊ।
2. निदेशक, सी०ए०एस०, लखनऊ।
3. निदेशक, यू०पी०आई०डी०, नोएडा।
4. अधिष्ठाता, वास्तुकला संकाय, लखनऊ।
5. कुलसचिव, ए०के०टी०यू०, लखनऊ।

कार्यवाही: निदेशक, सी०ए०एस०, लखनऊ

मद संख्या 60.32 विद्या परिषद की 58वीं बैठक के मद संख्या 58.13 पर सेंटर फार एडवांस्ड स्टडीज में अध्ययनरत एम०टेक० एवं पीएच.डी. छात्रों को Conference / Workshop/Short term Course/ Certification courses / Membership हेतु प्रतिपूर्ति किये जाने संबंधी नियम में संशोधन पर विचार।

एम०टेक० एवं पी-एच.डी. छात्रों को Conference/ Workshop/ Short term Course/ Certification courses/ Membership हेतु प्रतिपूर्ति तथा पुरस्कार दिये जाने के प्रस्ताव पर परिषद अवगत हुई तथा नियम विन्दु संख्या 1(b) में संशोधन पर कम से कम एक दिन का भी प्रतिपूर्ति किये जाने का अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया।

कार्यवाही: निदेशक, सी०ए०एस०, लखनऊ

मद संख्या 60.33 छात्रों द्वारा Plagiarism अर्थात् शैक्षिक उपलब्धियों की चोरी/नकल इत्यादि को रोकने के दृष्टिगत Core Policy Document on Plagiarism पर विचार।

परिषद द्वारा पूर्व में लिये गये निर्णय के क्रम में शैक्षिक उपलब्धियों की चोरी/नकल इत्यादि को रोकने के दृष्टिगत Core Policy Document on Plagiarism पर एक समान पालिसी के प्रस्ताव से अवगत हुई तथा परिषद अवगत हुई तथा परिशीलनोपरान्त अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया।

कार्यवाही: निदेशक, सी०ए०एस०, लखनऊ

मद संख्या 60.34 डा०ए०पी०जे० अब्दुल कलाम प्राविधिक विश्वविद्यालय, लखनऊ द्वारा अखिल भारतीय स्तर पर आयोजित भारतीय विश्वविद्यालय संघ की विभिन्न प्रतियोगिताओं में प्रतिभाग किये जाने हेतु सात विश्वविद्यालय की टीम का चयन तथा प्रतिभागियों के सम्बन्ध में विचार।

डा०ए०पी०जे० अब्दुल कलाम प्राविधिक विश्वविद्यालय, लखनऊ द्वारा अखिल भारतीय स्तर पर आयोजित भारतीय विश्वविद्यालय संघ की विभिन्न प्रतियोगिताओं में प्रतिभाग किये जाने हेतु सात विश्वविद्यालय की टीम का चयन तथा प्रतिभागियों के

**Center for Advanced Studies**  
**Dr APJ Abdul Kalam Technical University U.P.**  
**Lucknow**

**Core Policy Document on Plagiarism**  
**January 2019**

**Academic Misconduct - the basics**

Below is an extract which details the academic misconduct procedures. These are the procedures that are followed when a member of faculty/examiner suspects that a student has submitted a piece of work for assessment that contains plagiarised material. The procedures are the same for both Master's and Doctoral cases.

**1. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

***General Principles***

- 1.1 All work submitted by students for assessment must be the student's own work.
- 1.2 It is an offence for any student to be guilty of, or party to, plagiarism, the fabrication of research results, or any other act which may mislead the examiners about the development and authorship of work presented in assessments, including misleading examiners about the source of information included in an assessment.
- 1.3 All work must fully acknowledge, in an approved format, all sources of information used in preparing the work being submitted. This includes acknowledging all written and electronic sources.
- 1.4 The development of academic skills is an important part of student learning. It is recognized that students new to higher education may be inexperienced, and may need time to develop good academic referencing skills. For this reason, to benefit the students a separate document will be prepared to educate them about the plagiarism.

***Definitions***

**Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of other people, and the act of representing the ideas or discoveries of another as one's own in written work submitted for assessment. To copy sentences, phrases or even striking expressions without acknowledgement of the source (either by inadequate citation or failure to indicate verbatim quotations), is plagiarism; to paraphrase without acknowledgement is likewise plagiarism. Where such copying or paraphrase has occurred the mere mention of the source in the bibliography shall not be deemed sufficient acknowledgement; each such instance must be referred specifically to its source. Verbatim quotations must be either in inverted commas, or indented, and directly acknowledged.

## **2. Identifying Academic Misconduct**

2.1 The University assessment procedures are designed to enable the identification of plagiarism, and the University may make use of electronic means in reviewing student work. Where there is evidence indicating that there may be a case of plagiarism the assessment is referred to an Investigating Officer (member of the faculty and qualifies to be the examiner of such submission) who will investigate the case in detail.

### ***Investigating Officer***

2.2 An investigating officer is appointed for each subject. Investigating Officers may also act as Misconduct Panel members in cases where they have not determined the *prima facie* case.

### ***Types of Misconduct***

2.2 Misconduct is categorised as 'minor' or 'major'.

### ***Determination of minor and major cases of misconduct***

2.3 The Investigating Officer should bear in mind the following when defining misconduct as either major or minor:

(a) The assessment *impact* is not a relevant issue. For example, plagiarism will not be condoned just because the work in question is not heavily weighted in terms of the overall mark for the unit, or the course itself is not a significantly weighted course within the programme. Level of study is not germane to the decision;

(b) The *extent* of the misconduct is a key factor: a piece of work which has been downloaded *verbatim* from the internet will inevitably be regarded as a *prima facie* case of major misconduct whereas the lack of proper citation in one or two articles or where it is incorrectly formatted might be seen as a minor case of misconduct;

(c) Consideration of the extent of the pre-meditated intention involved in the misconduct. Where the evidence suggests the student has been sophisticated in their use of unattributed material, e.g. deliberate minor editing of plagiarised text to give the impression that it is their own work, what appears initially to be a quantitatively minor breach might instead be deemed major. Conversely, a large but single and un-edited example of non-attribution within an essay which is otherwise properly referenced might justify deeming an apparently major case as minor.

### ***Minor misconduct***

2.4 Minor misconduct is where a small proportion of a piece of assessed work is found to be plagiarized.

2.5 Misconduct is more likely to be considered 'minor' when a student is inexperienced **and** the misconduct relates mainly to the poor use of referencing protocols.

2.6 Multiple instances of minor misconduct are likely to lead to a charge of 'major' misconduct.

### ***Major misconduct***

2.7 Major misconduct is where a significant proportion of a piece of work is found to be plagiarized, where there is evidence of serial minor misconduct.

2.8 Where the Investigating Officer is unable to decide whether a case is either major or minor misconduct they should refer the case to the Misconduct Panel.

### ***No Case***

2.9 If the Investigating Officer believes that the evidence presented does not constitute a *prima facie* case, they will return the material to the examiner with a request for more information. If this is not forthcoming, the Investigating Officer will not proceed with the case.

### ***Misconduct Panel***

2.10 The Misconduct Panel is a sub-committee of Academic Council. Members of the Misconduct Panel are appointed by the Council for periods of three years and are expected to consider both postgraduate and doctoral cases of misconduct.

***Procedures for determining allegations of misconduct***

2.11 Where it is suspected that a student has committed misconduct in the preparation and/or presentation of their work, the examiner should take appropriate steps to identify all instances of misconduct in the assessment exercise and highlight these for easy reference.

2.12 The Controller of the Examinations will be responsible for ensuring that the Investigating Officer receives appropriate assistance in undertaking the initial determination in relation to reviewing the submitted assessment.

2.13 **Where the allegation is plagiarism**, the examiner should mark the work taking the plagiarism into account. If a piece of work is plagiarised, in whole or in part, the mark should be reduced in proportion to the extent of the plagiarism identified. Non plagiarised sections should be marked as standard. Therefore, the final mark should reflect a combination of the extent of the plagiarised passages, and the quality of the non plagiarised work; it may or may not be a fail mark.

2.14 The Investigating Officer may consult with course coordinators, examiners, and will determine whether or not a *prima facie* case for suspecting a student of misconduct has been presented.

2.15 If a *prima facie* case has been presented, the Investigating Officer shall determine whether the alleged misconduct is either a minor or major case of misconduct.

2.16 Once the Investigating Officer has made a determination that the case is either minor or major, the Controller of Examinations will send a letter to the student to inform them that their work is under investigation, and what will happen next.

***Procedure for a first case of plagiarism***

2.17 Where plagiarism is identified in work submitted for assessment, and there is no previous incident of plagiarism logged on the student's record, the student will be referred to an Academic Practice Workshop. This will apply whether the case is determined to be minor or major.

The evidence file will be forwarded to the concerned Investigating Officer who will make the usual determination whether the case is minor or major.

The Controller of Examinations will be responsible for arranging to see the student to explain why the work is problematic, and will refer the student to an Academic Practice Workshop. The student should be seen within 10 working days of the case being identified. The course Controller of Examinations will tell the student the proportion of the work judged to be plagiarised, and that it has been marked on that basis.

The student may accept the referral to the Academic Practice Workshop, or decline, or choose to challenge the allegation.

The plagiarism incident will be recorded against the student's assessment record (marks sheet and certificates); attendance and satisfactory engagement at the Academic Practice Workshop will be recorded by the Examination Office and will be checked if a second incident of plagiarism occurs.

After seeing the student, the Controller of Examination will return the evidence file to the Examination Office for retention.

Where a second case of plagiarism related misconduct occurs, the full Academic Misconduct Procedure, as set out 2.18 onwards below will be applied.

NB: Where the evidence file alone is not sufficient for the Investigating Officer to be able to define

the suspected misconduct precisely (e.g. where a case might be plagiarism) the Investigating Officer may refer the case directly to the Academic Misconduct Panel for a fuller investigation into the facts.

***Procedure for minor misconduct (other than a first case of plagiarism)***

2.18 For minor misconduct, the Investigating Officer shall send the details to the Secretary of the Misconduct Panel who will then send the case to the relevant Board of Studies for consideration and determination. The Chairman, Board of Studies may nominate another member of academic faculty to undertake the task of dealing with all minor misconduct cases. The Chairman, Board of Studies (or nominee) will consider the case presented and interview the student about the allegation. The Chairman, Board of Studies may dismiss the case or may apply a penalty as set out below.

2.181 The application of penalties which would result in the overall failure of the course are reserved for major breaches and must be administered by Panels. If Chairman, Board of Studies (or nominee) feels minded to apply such a penalty, they must refer the case to the Misconduct Panel.

2.182 The way that the range of penalties open to the Chairman, Board of Studies (or nominee) relate to those available to Panels is outlined above. The student may also be directed to undertake some form of remedial academic skills coaching. The Secretary to the Misconduct Panel will formally inform the student of the outcome, and record the penalty on the marks/certificate database. A formal record will be kept in the student's file. The evidence file from the case will be returned to the Panel Secretary for archiving.

2.19 Where the case is not proven, the Chairman, Board of Studies (or nominee) will dismiss the allegation. No record of the incident will appear in the student's file. The original copy of the suspected exercise will be returned to the student.

***Procedure for major misconduct (other than a first case of plagiarism)***

2.20 For major misconduct, the Investigating Officer shall send the details to the Secretary of the Misconduct Panel who will inform the Chairman, Board of Studies of the subject.

2.21 The Secretary of the Misconduct Panel will organise a misconduct hearing which will comprise a Chair and two members from the membership of the Misconduct Panel. The Convenor, Board of Studies will normally act as Presenter at the hearing. In cases where the convenor cannot be the Presenter they will be asked to identify an appropriate substitute Presenter, which may be the original examiner or the Investigating Officer.

2.22 The student shall be informed in writing by the Secretary of the date and purpose of the misconduct hearing which will be at least 5 days (including weekends) from the date of the letter. The student will be provided with notice of the allegation made against them stated in broad terms. The student has a right to be accompanied at the hearing by a member of faculty or the Students' supervisor.

2.23 Students are entitled (but not required) to attend a hearing. The student shall notify the Secretary at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing whether they will attend the hearing and who will accompany them. If the student does not attend they may submit a written statement. The evidence file will be available at an appropriate place for inspection by the student and their representative prior to the hearing and copies of the evidence will be provided to the student on request. Hearings may proceed in the absence of the student unless the panel decides the student's presence is key to reaching a conclusion.

2.24 An anonymised set of misconduct case histories will be circulated to the Chairs of Misconduct Panels for information and guidance on an annual basis. Panel members are required to familiarise themselves with the evidence before the panel in advance of the hearing - the hearing must not depend entirely on the presentation of the case on the day of the Hearing. At the hearing,

panel members will establish the facts and come to a conclusion as to whether or not misconduct has taken place.

### ***Conduct of the hearing***

2.25 The hearing will be conducted as follows:

- (a) The Chair will explain to the student the procedure of the hearing. It will be made clear that the panel will seek, initially and as far as possible, to exclude the issue of 'intent' from the stage of determining whether misconduct has occurred or not, and will reach a decision on that point on the basis of the facts presented. The panel may consider 'intent' as a legitimate factor in considering mitigation or aggravation.
- (b) The Chair will read out the accusation, including the relevant definitions of misconduct, and will then ask the student whether they admit or deny the accusation.

### ***Admission of accusation***

- (i) If the student admits the accusation, the hearing will be concerned with assessing the gravity of the offence and considering any evidence in mitigation. The presenter will be invited to assess the extent of the misconduct. The student will be invited to respond with the help of their representative.

### ***Denial of accusation***

- (b) If the student denies the accusation, the hearing will first be concerned to establish whether misconduct has taken place. The presenter will make the case against the student. The student will defend their case with the help of their representative. Members of the panel may intervene from time to time to raise a question.
- (c) Where the Chair of a misconduct panel considers it to be beneficial in resolving a case (either in advance of a hearing or during a hearing), the Chair may invite an academic from the relevant subject (but not the person responsible for marking the work) or the external examiner or other person of independent status and of equivalent expertise to attend the misconduct hearing and to question the student on the academic content of the work under investigation. The purpose of the questioning will be to establish the student's knowledge of the work in question, knowledge of the methods used to produce the work, and knowledge of the sources (cited or otherwise) informing the work. In the case of this requirement emerging during a hearing, the meeting will be adjourned and a new date established.
- (d) Once the Chair deems that all the relevant evidence has been heard, they will invite the student, the student's representative and the presenter to withdraw, while the panel members reach a conclusion (by simple majority vote in the absence of unanimity). The Chair will then ask the student, the student's representative and the presenter to return and hear the panel's conclusion on whether the student has been found guilty or not guilty.

### ***Not guilty***

- (e) If the student is found not guilty, the evaluation decision will stand and be used for progress record. The student will be told, at the end of the hearing, the outcome and the Secretary to the hearing will so inform the student, in writing, within ten working days from the date of the hearing.

### ***Guilty***

- (f) If the student is found guilty the panel will then hear evidence in mitigation. Once the student, the student's representative and the presenter have left the room, the panel will agree an appropriate penalty.
- (g) The student will be told, at the end of the hearing, the penalty to be applied. The panel

reserves the right to defer its decision for a short period but the student will be informed informally as soon as possible once a decision has reached. The Secretary to the hearing will formally inform the student, in writing, within ten working days from the date of the hearing of the penalty (if any) and will give the student a copy of the report sent to the Controller of Examination.

(j) The decision of the panel will then be sent to the Controller of Examinations for application and will not be open for revision.

### ***Second offence***

(k) If a student is found guilty of a second offence of misconduct, the hearing will, in determining the penalty for the subsequent offence, take into account any previous offence(s) and reserve the right to disqualify the student from the award of a degree.

### ***Penalties to be applied***

2.26 The following penalties are available to the Vice Chancellor or a Misconduct Panel:

i) A caution, and referral to guidance on referencing (usually reserved for a first offence where improvements to referencing would be sufficient to avoid a charge).

ii) Require student to correct the referencing in order to receive the grades for the assessment (usually reserved for a first offence, or where mitigation applies).

iii) Require the student to repeat (i.e. resubmit) the assessment unit (or equivalent) in order to receive an uncapped mark.

iv) Require the student to repeat (i.e. resubmit) the assessment unit (or equivalent) in order to receive a capped mark (the capping must be at the level required for the student to progress on their programme).

Note: a record of the minor misconduct decision and penalty will be held on the student record.

2.27 The following penalties are available **only to a formal Misconduct Panel**:

i) Require the student to repeat (i.e. resubmit) the assessment.

ii) Disqualify from award of degree

2.28 Academic Council will not proceed to confirm the award of degree whilst an allegation of academic misconduct is outstanding in relation to a student.

### ***Appeals***

1.44. Students shall have the right of appeal against decisions concerning academic misconduct, on the following grounds:

(a) that there is evidence of procedural irregularity (including administrative error) in the consideration of the student's case of such a nature as to cause doubt as to whether the result might have been different had there not been such an irregularity; or

(b) that there existed circumstances affecting the student's case of which those who determined the penalty were not aware when they made their decision, and which could not reasonably have been presented to them; or

(c) that there exists evidence of prejudice or of bias on the part of those making the decision.

Operationally, the appeals will operate according to the procedures for all academic matters.

---