**Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism: An Investigation of Indian Universities**

Academic Integrity is a set of six core values comprising honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage ( ICAI, 2012) in learning, teaching and research. Violation of academic integrity values is generally referred to as academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty encompasses a wide range of misbehaviours ranging from writing examinations using crib notes to publishing research papers using plagiarized content. Plagiarism, the unauthorised use of others words and ideas is considered as the most heinous form of all types of dishonesty practices and sometimes it is referred to as a synonym for academic dishonesty [1].

Plagiarism and other types of misconducts are a common threat in the higher education institutions across the world. In order to tackle these issues, the institutions of higher learning are adopting various strategies such as education, training, support and guidance to the academic community on scholarly writing, sensitization on the consequences of unethical academic practices and disciplinary actions against those who violate the norms. [[[[[ (Kibler, 1993a; Cole & McCabe, 1996)]]]]]]

Several studies have pointed out that formulation of appropriate policies and guidelines on academic integrity and plagiarism is the preliminary step to curb the menace of academic dishonesty [[[[(Kibler, 1993a; Mitchell and Wisbey, 1995) Cole & McCabe, 1996, Cole and Conklin (1996). ]]]]. Policies and guidelines facilitate effective conveyance of the importance of academic integrity as well as the consequences of misconduct. Brown and Howell (2001) observed that institutional policy statements on cheating and plagiarism changed the students’ perception of the seriousness of plagiarism as an academic problem. However, instances of confusion were also reported due to inconsistency in policy implementation among the institutions especially on matters related to punitive action against plagiarism and other misconducts. [[ Tennant, Rowell, & Duggan, 2007; AUQA,2010]

Here comes the importance of framing national level policies and guidelines applicable for the institutions across a country. Shala, Leka and Morgenella (2018) emphasised the need for developing clear guidelines and integrity policies at the national level and effective legislation and implementation of procedures for handling integrity breaches at the institutional level.

In several countries, the national agencies and accreditation bodies are taking initiatives in introducing policies and guidelines related to academic integrity and plagiarism at the national level realising the fact that academic integrity is the key point in ensuring quality and standard of education. The efforts at the national level also will ensure consistency in formulation and practices across the institutions. A 3-year project on the Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe (IPPHEAE 2010–2013) reported that European countries like UK, Sweden, Austria, Ireland, and Slovakia took significant steps not only at institutional levels but also at national to identify and address threats to academic standards. [[European Perspectives of Academic Integrity/ [Irene Glendinning](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Irene_Glendinning?_sg%5B0%5D=cPVal1XNB5OW8_ru5ta_DG7jsrlKh6GNlRiG2ZrSBmKo3n6B1JPOAzvuG7xhKhUXDxGF-cM.zkSw4KhfXJ8A3Brn5GmyG7DYTyPtTKSkyM71dC4bCf8GZG-4f-Uo-BRuawueWM7iO8dlPx_BUCMpeLiT3wWrWA&_sg%5B1%5D=WvT8qNgtCPb3TXm2rbL0vkzkssq2FdfDf-tMNxcFFElhfOWZVEZz_aefAOi2ISbnyxh5amM.XM-sB5Mq5JCX03Ihfs5Cq9u1bkvqJTgdOBKC_8RHA_7eCs62bZUlbmyK6mbgys4HHP_J6i0n7WtAKBiiFqNmHg) // In book: Handbook of Academic Integrity, 2016]]].

Realising the importance of the issue, the University Grants Commission of India (UGC), the apex government body mandated to coordinate and determine the standards of higher education in the country, notified the regulations on academic integrity and plagiarism in July 2018 under the title Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Education Institutions, Regulations, 2018. (Hereafter *UGC Regulations*).

This paper investigates the level of implementation of UGC of India’s guidelines on academic integrity and plagiarism by the higher education institutions (HEI) in the country. The paper is organized into five sections. In addition to the present introductory section, there are Methods, Major Recommendations of the UGC Regulations, 2018, Data Analysis, Discussion and Conclusion.

**Method**

Previous studies on institutional policies and procedures on academic integrity and plagiarism investigated the practices in a single organization or a group of organizations in a particular country or a geographical area. The studies adopted mainly three methods of data collection: (1) Survey of academic community members like students and faculty [[ ]] (2) Analysis of official documents and press releases [[ ]] (3) Interviewing the institutional administrators [[ ]]. East (2009) presented a checklist of practices for educational institutions to ensure the implementation of academic integrity in align with policy, teaching and learning, decision making and review processes. Based on the analysis of academic integrity policies of 39 Australian universities, Bretag et al (2009) identified five core elements of exemplar academic integrity policy, namely, Access, Approach, Responsibility, Detail and Support. Using these five core elements Bretag et al (2009), Khan et al (2019) reviewed the academic integrity policies of the Universities accredited to the UAE Ministry of Higher Education. The study was based on the open access academic integrity policy documents available on the official websites of the Universities under study. In line with this, Stoez et al (2019) also used the core elelemnt framework outlines by Bretag (2009) to analyse the academic integrity and contract cheating policy of colleges in Ontario, Canada. The openly accessible academic integrity policy documents of 24 publicly funded universities were analysed for the said study.

The present study adopted the following methods to study the implementation status of the UGC Regulations among the universities in India.

**Sample organizations:** As per the official website of the UGC, India, there are 935 universities in the country comprised of state Universities (409 nos.), Deemed to be Universities (127 nos.), Central Universities (50 nos.) and Private Universities (349 nos.). Of these 20 % each of the state universities (82 nos.), deemed to be universities (26 nos.), Central Universities (10 nos.) and private universities (70 nos.) was taken as samples.

**Data collection**: The data for the study were collected from the documents available on the official websites of the sample universities. All the official documents such as policies, procedures, guidelines, regulations, instructions, notifications etc. available on the official website and plain descriptions on the websites on academic integrity, plagiarism and related topics are collected for analysis. The homepage and inner pages of the official website of each of the selected university were manually searched for relevant information. In addition, using the find option (Control F) the following keywords were searched: academic dishonesty, academic integrity, awareness programmes, cheating, code of ethics, copyright violation, digital repository, disciplinary action, ethical research, examination malpractice, fraud, guidelines, institutional repository, originality report, penalty, PhD thesis, plagiarism, postgraduate dissertation, regulations, research ethics, research repository, similarity check, Shodhganga, suspension, termination, training, UGC, unethical practice, workshop. In addition, each of these terms were searched using google in combination with the name of the University.

**Summary of UGC Recommendations**

 In recent years, the UGC, India has taken a number of initiatives to uphold the quality and standard of higher education and research in the country such as setting up of a Consortium of Academic and Research Ethics, known as UGC-CARE, preventive measures to stop research paper publication in predatory or dubious journals, constitution of a committee on Promoting and improving the quality of research in Indian universities/colleges. In a landmark move, the UGC notified its regulations on academic integrity and plagiarism in the official gazette of India on 22nd July 2018 with directives to the HEI in the country to establish institutional mechanism for promoting academic integrity and preventing plagiarism. A summary of recommendations of the UGC regulations, 2018 to the HEI are given below.

1. **Education and training**

The UGC emphases on the importance of education and training in curbing the menace of plagiarism and other academically dishonest behaviours in academic settings. The regulations direct the HEIs it take necessary steps to conduct appropriate educational programmes for the students, faculty, researchers and staff on topics related to the academic integrity and plagiarism. They must be urged to maintain ethics and quality in the research, and provided with examples and types of research misconduct. Also, the organizations should impart in them the scholarly writing skills required for preparing PG dissertations, Ph.D. theses and other research papers, explain the characteristic features of sources of information in various disciplines, international citation conventions and practices applicable for different domain areas and teach them how to use plagiarism detection and reference management tools through workshops and training programmes. In addition to organizing short-term educational programmes, the Universities must seriously consider the inclusion of topics on academic integrity as mandatory course modules of the their long-term academic programmes at the undergraduate and post-graduate levels and in the doctoral course works as a mandatory topic.

1. **Facility and Mechanism for detecting Plagiarism**

In order to tackle plagiarism, the HEIs must establish a technology-based facility equipped with plagiarism detection software. All the members of the research community of the organization should be permitted to use the facility so that they can check their draft research papers for similarity with the existing published literature and make sure that the final paper is free from plagiarism.

1. **Declaration and Certification**

The postgraduate dissertations, doctoral theses and other research documents submitted to the HEI must be accompanied by an undertaking by the researcher that the document is an original research work without any plagiarised content and it is prepared by him/her. The supervisor of the research work also should certify to that effect.

1. **Policy Document on Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Prevention**

The HEIs must develop a policy document explaining the ways of handling plagiarism and upholding academic integrity at the institutional level. It is mandatory to upload the policy document on the home page of the official website of the organization.

1. **Digital Research Repository**

It is mandatory for the HEIs in the country to upload the copies of the degree awarded PhD and M.Phil works on to the Shodhganga, the national digital repository of Indian theses and dissertations maintained by INFLIBNET (Information and Library Network), a constituent of the UGC as per another UGC regulation titled ‘UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for awards of M.Phil / PhD degree Regulation, 2009’.

In the present UGC Regulation, 2018, the UGC re-iterates its earlier direction and instructs the HEIs to submit the theses and dissertations within a month of awarding the degree for uploading onto the Shodhganga. In addition, UGC insists the HEIs to build own institutional repository on the institute website by incorporating theses, dissertations, in-house publications and other research papers.

1. **Types of Research Documents and Exclusion from Similarity Check**

According to the Regulations, the doctoral theses, postgraduate dissertations and similar works submitted for assessment or opinion leading to the award of master and doctoral level degrees, books, book chapters and research papers for publication in print or electronic format generated by the HEI research community must be subjected to plagiarism checking. However, the Regulation excludes academic works like assignments, term papers, project reports, course works, essays and answer scripts from checking. Also, the abstract or summary, hypothesis, observations, results, conclusions and recommendations sections of a research document shall not have any similarities with the already published literature whereas all quoted work reproduced with all necessary permission and/or attribution, references, bibliography, table of content, preface and acknowledgements, generic terms, laws, standard symbols and standards equations etc. can be excluded from plagiarism checking. The Regulations also permit to exclude a common knowledge or coincidental terms, up to fourteen consecutive words from similarity check.

1. **Quantification of Plagiarism**

Based on the percentage of the content that matches with the already published literature as identified by the plagiarism detection software, the Regulation categorise plagiarism in a research document into four levels ranging from Level 0 to Level 3. Of these, level 0 represents similarity upto 10%, level 1 represents similarity between 10 % to 40%, level 2, 40% to 60% and level 3, 60% and above.

1. **Managing Plagiarism**

Each HEI should establish a two-tier system for detecting, reporting and handling plagiarism. At the bottom-tier, each Department of the organization should constitute a three-member Departmental Academic Integrity Panel (DAIP) consisting of the Head of the Department as the Chairman, a senior academician from outside the Department as the first member and a person well-versed with anti-plagiarism tool as the second member. At the top tier, there should be four-member Institutional Academic Integrity Panel (IAIP) consisting a senior academician, Pro-Vice Chancellor or Dean as the Chairperson, another senior academician as the first member, a person from outside the organization as second member and a person well-versed with anti-plagiarism tools as the third member.

The cases of plagiarism have to be reported at the DAIP which should investigate the matter and submit a report to the IAIP with recommendation on penalties to be imposed based on the level of plagiarism. Formulate

1. **Penalties**

The Regulations instruct the HEI to impose penalty for the defaulters based on the severity of the case determined by the level of plagiarism mentioned earlier. The details are given in table 1. Separate clauses of penalty have been framed for plagiarised content in theses / dissertations and publication manuscripts. The Level 0 plagiarism mentioned earlier is exempted from penalty. In case of faculty and staff committing plagiarism in publication manuscript their increment needs to be cancelled and research guideship suspended depending upon the level of plagiarism. The Regulations

**Table 1: Penalty for plagiarism**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Plagiarism Level | Type of research work |
| Thesis & Dissertation\* | Publication manuscript\*\* |
| Level 0 (Up to 10% similarity) | No penalty | No penalty |
| Level 1(Similarity between 10% to 40%) | Revision of the work within 6 months | Withdrawal of manuscript  |
| Level 2(Similarity between 40% to 60%) | 1 year debarment from the programme | Manuscript withdrawal,forfeiture of annual pay raise for one year & prohibition from research supervision of students for 2 years |
| Level 3(Similarity above 60 %) | Termination from the programme  | Manuscript withdrawal, forfeiture of annual pay raise for two years & prohibition from research supervision for 3 years |

Note: \*In case of repeated plagiarism the student will be punished for one level higher than the previous level committed. In case the highest level was committed previously, it will be repeated. Also, in case the plagiarism is proved after the award of the degree, the degree will be kept in abeyance. \*\* In case the faculty and staff repeat plagiarism in publication manuscript, in addition to the withdrawal, he/she will be punished for one level higher than the level committed. In case the highest level was committed previously, then disciplinary action like suspension/ termination as per the service rule has to be taken. Also, in case the plagiarism is identified after obtaining the credit based on the publication, such credit should be kept in abeyance.

**Development of Checklist**

A checklist of practices has been derived from the UGC regulations, 2018 as given in table 2 to assess the status of implementation of the Regulations in the universities selected for the study. Each of the practices mentioned in the checklist was cross-checked with the information collected and documents retrieved from the official websites of these universities.

**Table 2: Checklist**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sl.No** | **Item** |
| **Policy document / Guidelines**  | 1. Availability of a comprehensive policy document on academic integrity and plagiarism.
2. **In case there is no comprehensive policy document, are** there any instructions or guidelines comprising of
3. Instruction to include plagiarism free declaration and certificate in the thesis / dissertation with templates for declaration/ certificate?
4. Is there a definition of the type of research documents to be taken for plagiarism check?
5. Is there a quantification of plagiarism?
6. Is there a mentioning of exclusion & inclusion from similarity check
7. Penalty clause for detected cases of plagiarism
8. Procedure for penalising
 |
| **Education & training** | 1. Is there a system for conducting short-term training /workshop/ awareness programme on academic integrity, plagiarism and related topics
2. Number of training /workshop/ awareness programme conducted in the last one year
3. Did any topics on academic integrity in UG/PG/ PhD Course work syllabus
4. Is there mentioning of faculty responsible for providing education and training?
 |
| **Infrastructure Facility** | 1. Is there a facility for detecting plagiarism with free access to academic community
2. Is there an Institutional repository
3. Is there information on deposition of thsese in Shodhganga
 |
| **Penal System** | 1. Is there a description of procedures in detected cases of plagiarism?
2. Is there an Institutional academic integrity Panel
3. Are there Departmental academic integrity Panel
 |

**Data Analysis**

**Discussion**

the institution needs to develop clear policies on how the tools

should be deployed and guidelines for the interpretation and use of the outputs.

The institution should consider establishing procedures to allow the reporting of

cases of academic misconduct

To address the disparity in policies and practices across different faculties within HEIs,

institutional leaders should initiate an internal review of local policies and practices

with a view to establishing an institution-wide working group that will co-ordinate

the development and implementation of common institutional strategy, policies

and systems for academic integrity.

The institution should consider establishing procedures to allow the reporting of

cases of academic misconduct (“whistle-blowing”) by either students or teachers,

and particularly by students.

**Conclusion**

UGC regulations…… to achieve consistency across the institution

Education ministries and accreditation and quality agencies in

the region do not provide strong guidance or oversight for policies relating to academic

integrity.

Austria is to be commended for the national focus on plagiarism guidance and advice. It is clear from the responses that much more support and training is needed for both teachers and students. The national agencies should be supported to continue and extend their work in this area with a view to cascade the good practice to ensure all institutions are equipped to manage the dissemination, guidance and advice.

National governments, education ministries, and accreditation and quality agencies

should proactively provide oversight for and guidance in strengthening policies and

procedures for academic integrity in HEIs as a crucial component of quality assurance

for both public and private HEIs. Research into and development of policies and

systems for academic integrity should be encouraged, ideally through the provision

of small-grant funding

The development of national policies for academic integrity in Austria is a major step. This process will include formulating policy, hopefully using inclusive evidence-based approaches, designing and implementing the associated processes across disparate institutions, gaining acceptance from management and academic staff and subsequently monitoring and reviewing the operation. Suggestions were included earlier (paragraph 6) about previous initiatives that may be of relevance.

Reaching a common national agreement on what constitutes plagiarism and good academic practice may prove difficult.

To complement the policies and procedures described in 7.2.2, an institutional strategy should be developed for discouraging student plagiarism and misconduct. This may include training, guidance, effective use of digital “anti-plagiarism” software, but should also incorporate pedagogic innovations to encourage more critical thinking and application of knowledge in student work, which present barriers for plagiaristic behaviour.

It would make sense to open discussions with these companies regarding possible

complexities connected with processing documents in the local languages, and

how these could be overcome.

Education ministries in the region should facilitate communications between institutions

within the country and across national borders in order to learn from positive

experiences and share ideas that have proved effective in countering corruption

and academic malpractice.

Where software tools are acquired for aiding the detection of plagiarism and collusion

between students, the institution needs to develop clear policies on how the tools

should be deployed and guidelines for the interpretation and use of the outputs

Institutions should develop a standard set of penalties for plagiarism, examination

cheating, ghost-writing and other forms of academic dishonesty. These penalties

should be made known to academic teachers and students, and procedures should be

put in place to ensure that they are applied fairly and consistently for each violation.

However, it must also be acknowledged

that self-selection of institutions for participation, combined with low volumes of

data for a minority of countries in both the IPPHEAE project and SEEPPAI (particularly

Montenegro), mean that these results cannot be seen to represent the full picture

in every country.

The IPPHEAE study findings indicated that much more could and should be done in every country studied to strengthen policies for encouraging scholarly practices and implementing consistent but proportional measures for deterring malpractice in both education and research

►► The national accreditation agency for higher education does not currently

include policies for academic integrity as a routine part of institutional audits.

an emphasis on prevention (through education and deter rence), supported by sound procedures for detecting plagiarism in students’ work

and by a robust and transparent system for dealing with it, including a ladder of

penalties.

a well-developed policy is only one part of the process, furthermore, unless a university takes an aligned approach to promoting and supporting academic integrity there will not be consistency in dealing with plagiarism, and without consistency students are likely to be cynical of university practice and fearful of punishment

higher education institutions in the country are as follows:

The study surveyed all the official websites of the HEIs using the keywords .. Also, all the pdf documents have been checked

According to the official website of the UGC, there are totally, 935 universities in the country constituted of the following four types.

1. State Universities (409 nos.)
2. Deemed to be Universities (127 nos.)
3. Central Universities (50 Nos.)
4. Private Universities (349 Nos.) **35**.

A representative sample of Indian HEI were taken to determine

20% of the Universities from all the four types

Care has been taken to represent

Analysis of documentary sources available on the official websites

 The survey tools developed for the IPPHEAE project provided a suitable starting

point

The present study

Institutional policies in many institutions are designed to ensure quick, consistent and fair responses and outcomes after accusations of academic misconduct

The institutions with plagiarism policy in place could convey the consequences of the menace to the students more effectively.

Cole and Conklin (1996) claim that students learn from institutions’ responses to academic dishonesty and from institutions’ expectations about students’ response to the dishonesty of others.

Institutions must take the responsibility for ensuring academic standards and for emphasising, to both students and faculty, the importance of maintaining the highest standards of integrity in academic research. Centralised rules and regulations, imposed across a large and diverse higher education system, cannot serve as a substitute for strict and vigilant internal academic processes at our institutions. [[Report of the UGC Committee for promoting and improving quality of research in Indian universities and colleges]]]]

However, many studies have reported inconsistency among the institutions with respect to the academic integrity policies especially on penalty on plagiarism (Tennant, Rowell, & Duggan, 2007; AUQA,2010)

 --Differential treatment for similar offences is unfair between institutions

consistent practices across the organizations, several countries have taken initiative

In Croatia, the Agency for Science and Higher Education (the national accreditation agency) requires codes of ethics of institutions to be updated every five years for re-accreditation [[[[[ETINEDVol5]]]

**In Slovakia a** national policy has been introduced to implement software across all HEIs for aiding with detecting and deterring student plagiarism

Sweden has a nationally prescribed policy for handling accusations of academic misconduct, involving an institutional panel chaired by the university vice-chancellor

**In Ireland, i**nconsistencies between institutions in the maturity of policies and systems for academic integrity.

**UGC regulations, 2018**

 In recent years, the UGC, India has taken a number of initiatives to uphold the quality and standard of higher education and research in the country such as setting up of a Consortium of Academic and Research Ethics, known as UGC-CARE, preventive measures to stop research paper publication in predatory or dubious journals, constitution of a committee on Promoting and improving the quality of research in Indian universities/colleges. In a landmark move, the UGC notified its regulations on academic integrity and plagiarism in the official gazette of India on 22nd July 2018 with directives to the HEI in the country to establish institutional mechanism for promoting academic integrity and preventing plagiarism. The major highlights of the UGC regulations, 2018 are discussed below.

1. **Education and training**

The UGC emphases on education and training to curb the menace of plagiarism and other academic dishonest behaviours in academic settings. The regulations direct the HEIs it take necessary steps to conduct educational programmes for the students, faculty, researchers and staff. They must be sensitized to their obligation to conduct ethical and quality research and provided with examples and types of research misconduct. Also, the organizations should impart in them the scholarly writing skills required for preparing PG dissertations, Ph.D. theses and other research papers, explain the characteristic features of sources of information in various disciplines, international citation conventions and practices applicable for different domain areas and teach them how to use plagiarism detection and reference management tools through workshops and training programmes. They also should be encouraged to register on any international research registry. More importantly, the HEIs must incorporate the values and principles of academic integrity in their long-term academic programmes at the undergraduate and post-graduate levels and in the doctoral course works as a mandatory topic.

1. **Facility and Mechanism for detecting Plagiarism**

In order to tackle plagiarism, the HEIs must establish a technology-based facility equipped with plagiarism detection software. All the members of the research community of the organization should be permitted to use the facility so that they can check their draft research papers for similarity with the existing published literature and make sure that the final paper is free from plagiarism.

1. **Declaration and Certification**

The postgraduate dissertations, doctoral theses and other research documents submitted to the HEI must be accompanied by an undertaking by the researcher that the document is an original research work without any plagiarised content and it is prepared by him/her. The supervisor of the research work also should certify to that effect.

1. **Policy Document on Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Prevention**

The HEIs must develop a policy document explaining the ways of handling plagiarism and upholding academic integrity at the institutional level. It is mandatory to upload the policy document on the home page of the official website of the organization.

1. **Digital Research Repository**

It is mandatory for the HEIs in the country to upload the copies of the degree awarded PhD and M.Phil works on to the Shodhganga, the national digital repository of Indian theses and dissertaions maintained by INFLIBNET (Information and Library Network), a constituent of the UGC as per another UGC regulation titled ‘UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for awards of M.Phil / PhD degree Regulation, 2009’.

In the present UGC Regulation, 2018, the UGC re-iterates its earlier direction and instructs the HEIs to submit the theses and dissertations within a month of awarding the degree for uploading onto the Shodhganga. In addition, UGC insists the HEIs to build own institutional repository on the institute website by incorporating theses, dissertations, in-house publications and other research papers.

1. **Types of Research Documents and Exclusion from Similarity Check**

According to the Regulations, the doctoral theses, postgraduate dissertations and similar works submitted for assessment or opinion leading to the award of master and doctoral level degrees, books, book chapters and research papers for publication in print or electronic format generated by the HEI research community must be subjected to plagiarism checking. However, the Regulation excludes academic works like assignments, term papers, project reports, course works, essays and answer scripts from checking. Also, the abstract or summary, hypothesis, observations, results, conclusions and recommendations sections of a research document shall not have any similarities with the already published literature whereas all quoted work reproduced with all necessary permission and/or attribution, references, bibliography, table of content, preface and acknowledgements, generic terms, laws, standard symbols and standards equations etc. can be excluded from plagiarism checking. The Regulations also permit to exclude a common knowledge or coincidental terms, up to fourteen consecutive words from similarity check.

1. **Quantification of Plagiarism**

Based on the percentage of the content that matches with the already published literature as identified by the plagiarism detection software, the Regulation categorise plagiarism in a research document into four levels ranging from Level 0 to Level 3. Of these, level 0 represents similarity upto 10%, level 1 represents similarity between 10 % to 40%, level 2, 40% to 60% and level 3, 60% and above.

1. **Managing Plagiarism**

Each HEI should establish a two-tier system for detecting, reporting and handling plagiarism. At the bottom-tier, each Department of the organization should constitute a three-member Departmental Academic Integrity Panel (DAIP) consisting of the Head of the Department as the Chairman, a senior academician from outside the Department as the first member and a person well-versed with anti-plagiarism tool as the second member. At the top tier, there should be four-member Institutional Academic Integrity Panel (IAIP) consisting a senior academician, Pro-Vice Chancellor or Dean as the Chairperson, another senior academician as the first member, a person from outside the organization as second member and a person well-versed with anti-plagiarism tools as the third member.

The cases of plagiarism have to be reported at the DAIP which should investigate the matter and submit a report to the IAIP with recommendation on penalties to be imposed based on the level of plagiarism. Formulate

1. **Penalties**

The Regulations instruct the HEI to impose penalty for the defaulters based on the severity of the case determined by the level of plagiarism mentioned earlier. The details are given in table 1. Separate clauses of penalty have been framed for plagiarised content in theses / dissertations and publication manuscripts. The Level 0 plagiarism mentioned earlier is exempted from penalty. In case of faculty and staff committing plagiarism in publication manuscript their increment needs to be cancelled and research guideship suspended depending upon the level of plagiarism. The Regulations

**Table 1: Penalty for plagiarism**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Plagiarism Level | Type of research work |
| Thesis & Dissertation\* | Publication manuscript\*\* |
| Level 0 (Up to 10% similarity) | No penalty | No penalty |
| Level 1(Similarity between 10% to 40%) | Revision of the work within 6 months | Withdrawal of manuscript  |
| Level 2(Similarity between 40% to 60%) | 1 year debarment | Manuscript withdrawal,denial of one Increment & suspension of guideship for 2 years |
| Level 3(Similarity above 60 %) | Programme cancellation | Manuscript withdrawal, denial of two Increment & suspension of guideship for 3 years |

Note: \*In case of repeated plagiarism the student will be punished for one level higher than the previous level committed. In case the highest level was committed previously, it will be repeated. Also, in case the plagiarism is proved after the award of the degree, the degree will be kept in abeyance. \*\* In case the faculty and staff repeat plagiarism in publication manuscript, in addition to the withdrawal, he/she will be punished for one level higher than the level committed. In case the highest level was committed previously, then disciplinary action like suspension/ termination as per the service rule has to be taken. Also, in case the plagiarism is identified after obtaining the credit based on the publication, such credit should be kept in abeyance.

**Method**

 **One of the**

**East (2009) presented a checklist** of practices for educational institutions to ensure the implementation of academic integrity in align with policy, teaching and learning, decision making and review processes. Based on the analysis of academic integrity policies of 39 Australian universities, Bretag et al (2009) identified five core elements of exemplar academic integrity policy, namely, Access, Approach, Responsibility, Detail and Support.

Using these five core elements Bretag et al (2009), Khan et al (2019) reviewed the academic integrity policies of the Universities accredited to the UAE Ministry of Higher Education. The study was based on the open access academic integrity policy documents available on the official websites of the Universities under study. In line with this, Stoez et al (2019) also used the core elelemnt framework outlines by Bretag (2009) to analyse the academic integrity and contract cheating policy of colleges in Ontario, Canada. The openly accessible academic integrity policy documents of 24 publicly funded universities were analysed for the said study.

In the majority of countries in the European Union HE institutions were seen to have inadequate policies and procedures for detecting and deterring plagiarism and academic dishonesty. [[[Glendinning I. (2013), “Comparison of policies for academic integrity in higher education across the European Union”, available at http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/ (click on the link “Wide report”), accessed 24 August 2017]]]

Many institutions have adopted proactive strategies to tackle student plagiarism, involving integrated campus initiatives, including honour codes, communication, training, assistance and support for academic staff, disciplinary policies and processes and promotion of academic integrity

An institutional approach to dealing with plagiarism by students should set plagiarism clearly into context as a breach of academic integrity, frame it as inappropriate and unacceptable behaviour rather than criminalizing it, embed it into the academic rules and regulations and promote it throughout the institution. An enlightened and positive approach would place the emphasis on prevention and education, backed up by robust and transparent procedures for detecting and punishing plagiarism.

All institutions of higher education are confronted with the challenge of dealing appropriately with plagiarism by students and many are devising institutional frameworks and strategies to do so

According to …… each institution’s response to student plagiarism must be informed by institutional culture and context.

National governments should consider engaging with (text matching/similarity checking) software companies to negotiate an affordable nationwide license for use across the higher education (HE) sector.

**Academic Integrity in Indian Universities**

* Academic integrity practice in India, unlike in the west and parts of the Asia Pacific region, is still in its infancy. A ready-to-handle countrywide database of academic integrity in terms of policy, planning, and implementation remains elusive. While the issue is of concern to sections of teachers, parents, policy makers, and academic administrators, organized efforts at the institutional level are yet to make an impact on the Indian educational scene. It must be admitted that though belated, the drive toward academic integrity in India, largely equated with anti-plagiarism practices, is a welcome development receiving increasing support among the different stakeholders. There is a realization that there is a need to move quickly on this front if Indian higher education is to play its rightful role at the global level. [[[Academic Integrity Practice: The View from India**/** Sachidananda Mohanty///In **Handbook of Academic Integrity Ed. By** Tracey Bretag]]]]]

“Plagiarism and data manipulation are issues of great concern, which

* damage the credibility of research emanating from our institutions.”
* It is relatively common for students to receiving training in techniques for academic writing in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina [[[ETINEDVol5]]]
* It is unusual for software tools to be available within institutions for helping to detect plagiarism, and currently there is no national corpus of academic sources available in the Albanian language to use for text matching [[[[[ETINEDVol5]]]
* In Croatia , the Agency for Science and Higher Education (the national accreditation agency) requires codes of ethics of institutions to be updated every five years for re-accreditation [[[[[ETINEDVol5]]]
* Apart from the updated code of ethics, no policies for academic integrity are required by the accreditation agencies or national government in Croatia [[[[[ETINEDVol5]]
* The **Montenegro** education ministry is exploring options to purchase text-matching software to help with detecting plagiarism [[[[[ETINEDVol5]]
* Where an ethics committee was used to identify issues of academic dishonesty, students were encouraged to bring an advocate with them, such as a student union representative in **Montenegro** [[[[[ETINEDVol5]
* In former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, all master’s and doctoral theses are required to be deposited in a national database with software tools that can be used to check their originality [[[[[ETINEDVol5]
* The national accreditation agency for higher education in **all six countries of** South-East Europe does not currently include policies for academic integrity as a routine part of institutional audits [[[[[ETINEDVol5]
* In the majority of countries in the European Union HE institutions were seen to have inadequate policies and procedures for detecting and deterring plagiarism and academic dishonesty. [[[Glendinning I. (2013), “Comparison of policies for academic integrity in higher education across the European Union”, available at http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/ (click on the link “Wide report”), accessed 24 August 2017]]]
* The surveys revealed a strong demand for training, personal development or collaborative workshops in academic writing skills, understand plagiarism and facts about policies for academic misconduct from most student and teacher respondents. [[[Glendinning I. (2013), “Comparison of policies for academic integrity in higher education across the European Union”, available at http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/ (click on the link “Wide report”), accessed 24 August 2017]]]
* All UK HEIs use some form of software tool for aiding the detection of plagiarism; increasingly more institutions have introduced a policy and system for systematic use of such tools . Many institutions have implemented sophisticated techniques to counter plagiarism, by “designing out” plagiarism or through formative use of software tools in the classroom.

 [[[Glendinning I. (2013), “Comparison of policies for academic integrity in higher education across the European Union”, available at http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/ (click on the link “Wide report”), accessed 24 August 2017]]]

* Institutional policies in many institutions are designed to ensure quick, consistent and fair responses and outcomes after accusations of academic misconduct [[[Glendinning I. (2013), “Comparison of policies for academic integrity in higher education across the European Union”, available at http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/ (click on the link “Wide report”), accessed 24 August 2017]]].
* No standard policies and systems in HEIs for academic conduct in Austria.
* in Austria, nationally coordinated response and requirements for academic integrity policies in research by the Austrian Agency for Research Integrity (OeAWI)
* In Belgium , the complex governance arrangement with HEIs for different language groups complicate any national response to improving academic integrity
* In Belgaria, there is no repository in the Bulgarian language for academic theses and papers or for collecting student work
* In Estonia , there is no national level repository of sources exists for theses and academic papers in the Estonian language.
* In Finland, national systems exist and policies are being developed for research integrity and ethics
* In Finland, there appears to be no priority to develop institutional policies for academic dishonesty and plagiarism by bachelor and masters students.
* In Finland the software tools are not yet being applied systematically
* In France, a report was commissioned by the French government into academic fraud in higher education, published in 2012, which made recommendations about necessary improvements to policies and systems (Mazodier et al 2012) .
* Effective policies for deterring and managing plagiarism and academic misconduct are uncommon in French HEIs, either at institutional or departmental level
* A few HEIs in Germany have implemented strong policies for addressing plagiarism ad academic dishonesty
* In Germany, there is no national or regional body that provides oversight on academic quality or integrity
* In Germany, the federal system makes it impossible to implement national educational policies.
* In Germany, some student organisations and HEIs are using arguments about copyright against policies for uploading student work to academic repositories for originality checking.
* The Hellenic Quality Assurance Accreditation Agency (HQAAA) is the agency in Greece for providing oversight of quality in higher education institutions. However, the HQAAA publications do not include information about policies for student plagiarism or academic misconduct in HEIs, nor do they contain any statistics on misconduct cases that have arisen and the outcomes
* Very few universities in Greece use software tools for checking the originality of students work
* In Hungary, a national network of academics and librarians is helping to spread good practice including developing a repository for academic paper in the Hungarian language
* In Hungary some local institutional databases are being used to help to detect and deter plagiarism
* In Hungary no national repository exists yet for academic sources
* A software tool has been developed and successfully tested to search and match to Hungarian language sources
* **In Ireland, i**nconsistencies between institutions in the maturity of policies and systems for academic integrity
* **In Ireland**, no national system of oversight for quality and integrity in higher education
* In Italy, a serious lack of interest by all institutions contacted about policies and procedures for academic dishonesty and plagiarism.
* In Italy, lack for policies and systems for academic conduct on any level
* In Latvia, there is evidence that a national database is being created for the Latvian language for storing theses and to be utilised for originality checking of student work
* Lithuanian National Digital Library of academic sources contains doctoral and masters’ theses
* In Lithuania searching tools are being implemented to allow this tool to be used for originality checking of student work
* In Luxumberg, recent focus on developing policies and training for research ethics. No policies and systems in place at present at bachelor or master’s level
* In Luxumberg little evidence for use of software tools for aiding detection or deterrence of plagiarism.
* Most Dutch universities use software tools for checking the originality of student work.
* In Netherlands, there appear to be no common standards available in HEIs on penalties for academic misconduct, leading to inconsistencies in decisions and sanctions applied for plagiarism and academic misconduct
* In Poland, discussions have begun at national level concerning the support for acquisition of software licences to allow HEIs to be able to systematically check student work for plagiarism
* In Poland there is a national digital repository in the Polish language for storing doctoral and master’s theses.
* In Poland software tools are available for text matching in parts of some Polish HE institutions
* In Poland, Institutional and faculty policies do not normally support deterrence of plagiarism
* It is uncommon to have institutional policies for plagiarism and academic misconduct in Portuguese HEIs.
* In Romania no institutional policies were identified relating to plagiarism and academic misconduct.
* In Romania the use of software tools to aid plagiarism detection is uncommon, although some institutions are using free tools.
* **In Slovakia a** national policy has been introduced to implement software across all HEIs for aiding with detecting and deterring student plagiarism. However, In consistency in policies and student outcomes both within and across institutions
* **In Slovakia**  a national repository of master’s and doctoral theses has been created for the Slovak language.
* Most HE institutions in Slovenia have no specific policies or measures for either detecting or deterring student plagiarism . Penalties for plagiarism and academic dishonesty are not proportional to the offence
* In Spain there are no national policies or guidance for academic integrity and many institutions do not have effective policies for deterring or for managing plagiarism and academic dishonesty
* Guidance and training for students and teachers on the wide range of issues comprising academic integrity is weak or absent in many HEIs in Spain . There appears to be no consistency or transparency for decisions on cases of student plagiarism and academic misconduct
* Swedish universities include training in aspects of academic conduct and integrity in many bachelor and masters’ programmes
* Sweden has a nationally prescribed policy for handling accusations of academic misconduct, involving an institutional panel chaired by the university vice-chancellor
* Many Swedish universities make use of software tools for aiding detection of and discouraging student plagiarism.

UGC of India

Majority of the Institutions in the western countries have well-established policies and procedures to curb the menaces.

The descriptions of these levels limit the focus to that of plagiarism rather than encompassing broader issues of academic integrity

The paper argues that awareness of what is entailed in academic integrity needs to be built into the curriculum, and this needs to be documented

The Academic Misconduct Policy provides the worthwhile direction that

Reporting processes about cases of academic dishonesty and penalties are clearly specified in the policy, with Faculty Academic Misconduct Committees and the Academic Misconduct Review Committee reporting to the Director, Academic Services, who then reports to the University Academic Committee. Such reporting deals with formally recorded cases of academic misconduct, and ensures that when academic misconduct has been reported through the proper channels it is recorded and dealt with according to the guidelines. It does not deal with whether lecturers have taken on their teaching responsibilities, nor whether these have been effective, nor can it report on cases that have not been formally dealt with

Reporting processes about cases of academic dishonesty and penalties are clearly specified in the policy, with Faculty Academic Misconduct Committees and the Academic Misconduct Review Committee reporting to the Director, Academic Services, who then reports to the University Academic Committee. Such reporting deals with formally recorded cases of academic misconduct, and ensures that when academic misconduct has been reported through the proper channels it is recorded and dealt with according to the guidelines. It does not deal with whether lecturers have taken on their teaching responsibilities, nor whether these have been effective, nor can it report on cases that have not been formally dealt with.

The current policy calls for all suspected instances of plagiarism to be reported to Heads of Schools, but there is no direction for these Heads to receive training or support in making decisions about plagiarism. Without moderation, these Heads make decisions alone.

University could not verify if a student in one school would be treated the same way as a student in another school. While the policy does give guidelines for appropriate penalties for misdemeanours, understanding of what constitutes a serious offence varies from person to person (cf. Carroll, 2002). The policy defines plagiarism as copying without “proper acknowledgment”, and gives examples which help support the definition (Academic Misconduct Policy, 2007, p. 1). If every case of copying that was not properly acknowledged were brought to the Heads of Schools, they would be inundated.

From a learning perspective, the development of citation skills takes time and practice and requires explanation, guidance and modelling. Formative assessment can be a means for students to learn how to avoid plagiarism, attribute sources and use quotations to provide evidence. While explanations about the problem of plagiarism and models of good practice can be accessed on websites and through class activities, without the impetus of assessment, students would be unlikely to use these sources. Students are alert to assessment, and feedback from assessment is a powerful teaching strategy (Biggs & Tang, 2007, p. 97).

Some Australian universities in implementing academic integrity have taken a comprehensive approach, which involves education, detection, and explicit designation of responsibility and accountability. These universities have an office assigned to deal with issues of academic integrity, and they not only allocate time for academic staff to deal with suspected instances of academic misconduct, they also provide staff development and support for staff who have taken on the role of academic integrity officers. The University of Newcastle, in reaction to a public outing of poor handling of student plagiarism, investigated ways to avoid further instances of academic misconduct and became a leader in setting standards for academic integrity. The University of Newcastle (2008) has comprehensive resources and staff development, a central register for student breaches of academic conduct, and a group of Student Academic Conduct Officers (appointed by Heads of Schools). Similarly, as part of its academic integrity approach, the University of South Australia (2008) has Academic Integrity Officers. They have a central coordinator and a comprehensive program of moderation, support and a discussion forum

Macdonald and Carroll (2007, pp. 241-243) point out that a holistic approach ensures that staff as well as students get the message about academic integrity. They argue for a proactive analysis and tracking of procedures as follows. Documenting evidence of teaching about academic integrity and conventions

1. Recording when and how students are informed of regulations and responsibilities

2. Recording the ways in which the university promotes academic integrity

3. Ongoing staff development

4. Preventing individual decision making – which leads to inconsistency and unfairness

5. Systematic collection of data on plagiarism and how it is treated

6. Checking for under reporting

Finally, like Devlin they argue for “assessment-led solutions” (p. 243) in which formative assessments are used to teach students how and why to avoid plagiarism.

Bertram Gallant (2007, p. 108) in her review of the literature suggests that an educational approach has more impact on students than do statements about cheating (see also Twomey et al., 2009).

The UGC directed the HEIs in the country to implement the guidelines in their respective organization. Major guidelines are:

* Formulation institutional policies and procedures on academic integrity and plagiarism
* Development of Institutional repositories
* Organizing traing and education on reference management and plagiarism
* Inclusion of topics in UG & PG syllabus
* Development of IT based mechanism for curbing plagiarism

**Institutional Policy**

Formulation of policies and procedures are considered as one of the major measures for curbing plagiarism [[[ ]]]]

Institutional policy has an important role to play in managing the issue of student plagiarism and other forms of unacceptable academic practice (e.g.data fabrication, duplication, ‘contract cheating’).There have been concerted responses in HEIs to address these difficult issues, as institutions have developed relevant regulations, so that cases are consistently recorded, procedures are followed, and appropriate penalties are determined and applied.Co-ordinated institutional activity, guidance and good practice recommendations have recognised that the development of robust policy and procedures are part of a wider institutional approach, which must also look to teaching, learning and assessment strategies to ensure that students have opportunities to acquire literacies and skills for good academic practice (Carroll and Appleton, 2001; JISC, 2005; Macdonald and Carroll, 2006; Park, 2004).

Within higher education, it has also become clear that there are issues in how policy is applied and implemented. In recent years, studies have highlighted significant concerns as inter- and intra-institutional variation in the use of penalties for student plagiarism has been reported (Badge and Scott, 2008; Tennant and Duggan, 2008; Yakovchuk, Badge and Scott, 2009).

The second phase of the Academic Misconduct Benchmarking Research (AMBeR) project, involving a survey of UK HEIs, investigated the recorded incidences of plagiarism in an academic year and the penalties applied. It was found that there was inconsistency across the sector in how penalties for student plagiarism were applied and it was recommended that HEIs use more effective “recording procedures to aid transparency and communication within the sector” (Tennant and Duggan, 2008, p19).

-An earlier study of 27 EU member states conducted in 2010-13 by some members of the SEEPPAI team, Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe (IPPHEAE), provided the starting point and initial resources for the new study

- Council of Europe established the Platform

on Ethics, Transparency and Integrity in Education (ETINED). One of the initiatives of

ETINED is to extend to other regions in Europe the EU-funded research conducted

in 27 EU countries during the IPPHEAE project in 2010-13.

- IPPHEAE project, which focused on EU countries..

- The methodology adopted for the IPPHEAE project formed the basis of this new

Research

- The research explored policies nationally and institutionally for deterring

and detecting academic dishonesty (SEEPPAI)

- The methodology adopted for the IPPHEAE project formed the basis of this new

research. The previous project and subsequent related research included a mixed

methods survey that generated over 5 000 survey responses from HEIs in 27 EU

countries (excluding Croatia, which was not an EU member during the data collection

period). The research explored policies nationally and institutionally for deterring

and detecting academic dishonesty, focusing on bachelor and master’s levels

rather than doctoral studies and research. The findings revealed some examples of

effective practice, but also showed that there are inconsistencies in how policies are

implemented, both within and between institutions, in every EU country studied

(IPPHEAE results).

The analysis demonstrated policy weaknesses in many of the participating institutions.

Where policies were in place, there was often a lack of understanding and little

transparency. It was recommended by the majority of participants that the provision

of more information and training regarding policies and penalties to both students

and academic teachers would raise awareness and help to develop scholarship and

encourage a culture of academic integrity (Glendinning 2013).

The present study investigates extend of implementation of the policies and procedures in India higher education institutions as it is nearing two years.

====

“suggests that, where there are policies in place, much more could be done to inform students about the policies and consequences to them” =

[[[ ***Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe:* Plagiarism Policies in Austria */***  *Irene Glendinning , Prof. Krzysztof Jóźwik, Agnieszka Michałowska-Dutkiewicz , 2013)*

=====

institutional policies and systems in Austria are still quite immature

[[[ ***Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe:* Plagiarism Policies in Austria */***  *Irene Glendinning , Prof. Krzysztof Jóźwik, Agnieszka Michałowska-Dutkiewicz , 2013)*

*====*

Austrian HEIs are already developing policies and procedures for encouraging good academic practice to sit alongside the processes for detecting and penalising poor practice

[[[ ***Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe:* Plagiarism Policies in Austria */***  *Irene Glendinning , Prof. Krzysztof Jóźwik, Agnieszka Michałowska-Dutkiewicz , 2013)*

*====*

there appears to be a particular gap with bachelor level student work, policies and processes need to be developed with some urgency to ensure all students begin to develop necessary skills and values for academic integrity when they enter higher education

[[[ ***Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe:* Plagiarism Policies in Austria */***  *Irene Glendinning , Prof. Krzysztof Jóźwik, Agnieszka Michałowska-Dutkiewicz , 2013)*

*===*

Some guidance on limitations and applications of digital tools could be developed nationally (or perhaps internationally) for use in education and research, based on research elsewhere

[[[ ***Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe:* Plagiarism Policies in Austria */***  *Irene Glendinning , Prof. Krzysztof Jóźwik, Agnieszka Michałowska-Dutkiewicz , 2013)*

Institutions need to ensure that a set of effective and clear policies and procedures are in place applying across all levels and types of student work. The policies must be effectively communicated to academic staff and students to ensure a fair, transparent and consistent response to any accusations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty

[[[ ***Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe:* Plagiarism Policies in Austria */***  *Irene Glendinning , Prof. Krzysztof Jóźwik, Agnieszka Michałowska-Dutkiewicz , 2013)*

*Price (2009), Davis(), and* Pecorari (2001)  *reported that the definition of the term ‘plagiarism’ is not clear and consistent in the institutional policy documents.*

*====*

When deans, vice-deans or teachers at HEIs were asked about policies concerning

plagiarism and academic integrity, typically they mentioned the following:

►► code of ethics;

►► ethics committee;

►► national standards for accreditation (in some countries).

Codes of ethics can be set either at faculty or university level. However, the existence

of a university-level code of ethics does not exclude the existence of regulations on

ethics for faculty, which are usually more specific and oriented towards particular

fields of study. In some countries (such as Croatia), there are national recommendations

on the content of codes of ethics prescribed by the Agency for Science and

Higher Education (AZVO).

In all countries in the study where faculty members said that they had high autonomy,

policies on academic integrity differed by faculty. In some institutions, the policies

are not defined at all. In some institutions the policies are defined, but not really

followed. In addition, management’s awareness of academic integrity issues differs

between institutions [[[**ETINED Volume 5]]]**

======

National governments, through their education ministries and accreditation and

quality agencies, should proactively provide oversight for, and guidance in, strengthening

policies and procedures for academic integrity in HEIs as a crucial component

of quality assurance. Where institutional policies are deficient, accreditation should

be conditional on their continuing development. Accreditation and quality agencies

should be empowered to monitor the quality of education and academic integrity in

both public and private HEIs. Research into and development of strategies, policies

and systems for academic integrity should be encouraged, preferably through the

provision of small-grant funding.

[[[**ETINED Volume 5]]]**

=====

National governments should consider engaging with (text matching/similarity

checking) software companies to negotiate an affordable nationwide licence

[[[**ETINED Volume 5]]]**

===

The project Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe (IPPHEAE 2010–2013) aimed to explore how academic integrity was understood and managed in different parts of the EU. The geographical scope of the research was confined to the then 27 member states of the EU.

 there were indications across many of the countries and higher education institutions (HEI) studied of lack of awareness and immaturity in institutional responses for assuring integrity and academic quality affecting all parts of the educational process

=====

-Digital tools or other techniques are available at your institution for helping to detect plagiarism

-Students are required to sign a declaration about originality and academic honesty

**Methodology**

**Discussions**

the institution needs to develop clear policies on how the tools

should be deployed and guidelines for the interpretation and use of the outputs.

The institution should consider establishing procedures to allow the reporting of

cases of academic misconduct

To address the disparity in policies and practices across different faculties within HEIs,

institutional leaders should initiate an internal review of local policies and practices

with a view to establishing an institution-wide working group that will co-ordinate

the development and implementation of common institutional strategy, policies

and systems for academic integrity.

The institution should consider establishing procedures to allow the reporting of

cases of academic misconduct (“whistle-blowing”) by either students or teachers,

and particularly by students.
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