

NUMIL
Anti-
Plagiarism
Policy

2024

National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad



Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. NUML’s Mandate to Prevent Plagiarism.....	4
3. Principles of the Policy	5
4. Definition of Plagiarism.....	5
5. Common Types of Plagiarism.....	6
6. Aim of the Policy	7
7. Applicability.....	8
8. Awareness of the Policy	8
9. Lodging a Plagiarism Complaint.....	9
10. Investigating Plagiarism Complaints	10
11. Role of the University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee	12
12. Submission of Findings by UAPSC	12
13. Penalties for Plagiarism	13
13.1 Grounds to Determine the Penalty	13
A. Grounds for Major Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers / Students	13
Major Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers	13
B. Grounds for Moderate Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers / Students.....	14
Moderate Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers	14
C. Grounds for Minor Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers / Students	15
Minor Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers	15
13.2 Co-author(s)/Declarations	16
14. Additional Actions Required.....	16
15. National Plagiarism Standing Committee	17
16. Appeal	18
17. Spurious/Malicious Accusations of Plagiarism	19
18. Guidelines for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs	20
19. General Guidelines	22
Annexure-1:.....	25
Annexure-2:.....	27
Note	32



List of Abbreviations

APA	American Psychological Association
CNIC	Computerized National Identity Card
COPE	Committee on Publication Ethics
DAI	Degree Awarding Institution
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
E&D	Efficiency and Discipline
EDS	Electronic Detection System
HEC	Higher Education Commission
HEI	Higher Education Institution
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
MLA	Modern Language Association
NPSC	National Plagiarism Standing Committee
QEC	Quality Enhancement Cell
R&D	Research and Development Organizations
RD	Regional Director
TOR	Term of Reference
UAPSC	University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee
RECTOR	Rector/Competent Authority of the Institution



1. Introduction

- 1.1 National University of Modern Languages (NUML) is committed to establishing and sustaining a transparent, as well as creative, academic environment, for quality, meaningful and original output to the academia. NUML shares its vision of academic integrity and authenticity with the Higher Education Commission (HEC), which has formulated policy guidelines on Plagiarism. This policy broadly documents possible steps to combat plagiarism in academia, thus reinforcing and promoting the culture of academic integrity and originality. These steps are taken to ensure compliance of research work and publications produced in Pakistan, with international standards and quality. The HEC reinforces and provides the use of Turnitin, for checking plagiarism.
- 1.2 To address the issues observed in application of HEC's policy and use of Turnitin at NUML, the following policy is a comprehensive set of rules to be implemented by all programs and publications of NUML. These are devised to address the issues raised by instructors and students/researchers alike. The effort is targeted at a more effective and carefully managed system of implementing use of Turnitin for ensuring transparency and authenticity.

2. NUML's Mandate to Prevent Plagiarism

- 2.1 NUML is an HEC recognized university therefore it's mandate is as per the policies of HEC. The HEC's mandate is based on following:
- The Higher Education Commission (HEC) Ordinance of 2002, under section 10(a), demands that the Commission needs to develop guidelines or policies for improving and promoting quality and ethical research culture. The relevant section of the Ordinance is reproduced below:
- Section 10 (a): *Formulate policies, guiding principles, and priorities for higher education institutions for the promotion of socio-economic development of the country.*
- 2.2 Given the quoted section, the HEC tasked the Experts Committee on June 29, 2021, to review and revise the Anti-Plagiarism Policy (HEC Plagiarism Policy 2007). This revised Policy intends to uphold the autonomy and responsibility of HEIs/DAIs to ensure the authenticity of ethical research and eliminate the scourge of plagiarism.
- 2.3 Anti-plagiarism is just one component of the broader policy framework that deals with Academic Dishonesty and Research Ethics (Gift authorship, Dispute of authorship, Citation Racketeering, etc.).
- 2.4 The National University of Modern Languages constituted a committee in the year



2023 to adopt and implement the HEC Revised Anti-Plagiarism Policy (2023).

3. Principles of the Policy

3.1 The policy is based on the following general principles:

- a. Awareness for Preventing Plagiarism: The university and faculty members should arrange regular capacity-building activities, within each calendar year, to create awareness about avoiding plagiarism in its various forms.
- b. Following Research Ethics: The university, faculty, students, and staff should follow research ethics to avoid plagiarism in their academic and research contributions.
- c. Respecting Intellectual Contribution: Researchers/Scholars and Faculty members should acknowledge other researchers' intellectual work, as per the norms of their respective disciplines.
- d. Devising Process for Probing Plagiarism: Plagiarism is considered a serious matter, and there is a need to curb this menace through proper, detailed, and defined processes.

4. Definition of Plagiarism

The online Oxford Learner's Dictionary defines the term *Plagiarism* as follows:

“The practice of copying another person's ideas, words or work and pretending that they are your own.”

The online Merriam-Webster dictionary's definition of *Plagiarism* is as follows:

“To steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own: use (another's production) without crediting the source.”

4.1 Furthermore, the following acts fall within the scope and definition of plagiarism:

- a. To steal and present the ideas or words of others as one's own
- b. To use another person's production, without citing and crediting the source
- c. To commit literary theft
- d. To present as a new and original idea or product derived from an existing scholarly source.
- e. Turning in someone else's work as one's own
- f. Copying words or ideas from someone else without giving credit
- g. Failing to put a quote or quotation marks, when copying the exact language from a source
- h. Giving incorrect information about the source of a quotation



- i. Changing words but copying the sentence structure of a source without giving credit
 - j. Copying a bulk of words or ideas from other references and including them in your work, whether you give credit or not.
- 4.2 The following activities are prevalent in today's technology-driven society. Despite their everyday use, they still count as academic cheating and plagiarism if done without permission from the original artists/creators.
- a. Copying media (especially images) from other websites to paste them into your work or websites.
 - b. Making a video using footage from others' videos or copyrighted art and music as part of a soundtrack.
 - c. Performing another person's copyrighted music (i.e., playing a cover) without permission.
 - d. Composing a piece of music which is heavily borrowed from another composition.
- 4.3 Indeed, some media can create challenging situations to determine if the copyrights of a work are being violated. For example:
- a. A photograph or scan of a copyrighted image (using a picture of a book cover to represent that book on one's website)
 - b. Recording audio or video in which copyrighted music or video is playing in the background.
 - c. Re-creating a visual work in the same medium. (Shooting a photograph that uses the same composition and subject matter as someone else's photograph)
 - d. Re-creating a graphic work in a different medium (making a painting closely resembling another person's photo without permission).
 - e. Re-mixing or altering copyrighted images, videos, audio, or other artistic expressions.
 - f. Use of ChatGPT and similar machine-generated text.

For determining/avoiding unauthorized use of somebody else's copyrighted material, guidelines from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) are available at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Guidelines> .

5. Common Types of Plagiarism

- a. **Students Collusion:** Working with other students on an assignment meant for individual assessment.



- b. **Word-for-Word Plagiarism:** Copying and pasting content without proper attribution/reference.
- c. **Self-Plagiarism:** Reusing one's previously published or submitted work without proper attribution.
- d. **Mosaic Plagiarism:** Weaving phrases and text from several sources into one's work. Adjusting sentences without quotation marks or attribution.
- e. **Software-based Text Modification:** Taking content written by another person and running it through a software tool (text spinner, translation engine) to evade plagiarism detection.
- f. **Contract Cheating:** Engaging a third party (for a fee, for free or in-kind compensation) to complete an assignment and representing that as one's work, if proven.
- g. **Inadvertent Plagiarism:** Forgetting to properly cite or quote a source or unintentional paraphrasing or violation of stylistic norms.
- h. **Paraphrase Plagiarism:** Rephrasing a source's ideas without proper attribution.
- i. **Computer Code Plagiarism:** Copying or adapting source code without permission from, and attribution to, the original creator.
- j. **Data Plagiarism:** Falsifying or fabricating data or improperly appropriating someone else's work, putting a researcher, institution, or publisher's reputation in jeopardy.
- k. **Manual Text Modification:** Manipulating text with the intention of misleading the plagiarism detection software.
- l. **Source-based Plagiarism:** Providing inaccurate or incomplete information about sources which do not exist.
- m. Any other definition of plagiarism provided by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) or Higher Education Commission (HEC) in due course of time or may emerge from the use of Artificial Intelligence in text generating / processing systems.

6. Aim of the Policy

- 6.1 This policy seeks to create awareness about avoiding all kinds of plagiarism among the stakeholders i.e., students, mentors/supervisors, researchers, faculty members, and staff of the university and regional campuses. It addresses a central problem regarding academic dishonesty and the processes involved in probing any complaint of plagiarism.



7. Applicability

- 7.1 The policy applies to students, employees of the university, faculty members, researchers, and staff of the university. The policy applies to all degree programs at undergraduate and graduate levels.
- 7.2 In this context,
- a. A “Student” is a person who, on the date of the submission of his/her paper/work, is a registered student at the university, constituent, or affiliated college, recognized by the Higher Education Commission (HEC).
 - b. A “Faculty Member/Researcher” includes a faculty member or equivalent at a university, constituent or affiliated college, or researcher of the organization or any such other person as may be declared so by regulations. A Faculty Member/Researcher may be working on a regular, contractual, visiting, ad hoc, or adjunct basis, or engaged online.
- 7.3 All such scholars/supervisors/stakeholders, who are researching in the university and have placed their CVs or any other publication(s) on the institutional website, and are applying for any benefit, based on their published or presented works, which later prove to be plagiarized, will be liable to be punished, as per the prescribed rules.

8. Awareness of the Policy

- 8.1 National University of Modern Languages ensures effective dissemination of this Anti-Plagiarism Policy to its students, faculty members, researchers, staff and stakeholders.
- 8.2 The university policy is available in print and on its website, in addition to the orientation sessions, meetings and dialogue sessions with the stakeholders that author(s) is deemed individually and collectively responsible for the contents of their paper(s)/book i.e., published work of literature or scholarship (<https://www.britannica.com/topic/book-publication>)/book chapters, etc. Please see ‘*Sample Undertaking*’ in **Annexure-1**.
- 8.3 The university provides orientation to young scholars, embarking on ethical research activities, in a bid to spread awareness among them regarding the recognized manuals, such as the MLA Style Sheet, APA User Manual, and other international scholarly norms of conducting, reporting, and sharing of research.
- 8.4 Violations of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), including Plagiarism, is a severe crime with legal ramifications. For details, please visit <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Guidelines>



- 8.5 Faculty members/supervisors/researchers are strongly encouraged to use their subject knowledge and familiarity with the skills/aptitude of students to confidently reinforce in them the highest ethical standards, in terms of discouraging any kind of plagiarism and academic cheating, through the existing detection and academic evaluation mechanisms at their disposal.

9. Lodging a Plagiarism Complaint

- 9.1 A complaint regarding plagiarism may be lodged with the Rector of the University for further probing.
- 9.1.1 In cases, where the accused person is the Rector, the complaint should be forwarded to the National Plagiarism Standing Committee (NPSC), through Chairperson HEC / Quality Assurance Division of HEC, with a copy to the Appointing Authority i.e., Chancellor/President as well as the Provincial Higher Education Department/Commission.
- 9.1.2 However, the findings/decision of the NPSC shall be shared with the Appointing Authority/HEIs for implementation/action.
- 9.2 The complaint may be forwarded to the respective institution or organization through post, fax, email, or other means.
- 9.3 The complainant may be a faculty member, student, or researcher of any of the HEC-recognized universities/DAIs or a concerned citizen.
- 9.4 To file a complaint, the complainant is required to share:
- a. A copy of his/her own Computerized National Identity Card (CNIC), if from Pakistan, or Passport, in the case of foreigners, or other legally valid proof of identity
 - b. Citation of the original paper or document or idea, which was plagiarized, (paper title, author(s), publication title, month and year of publication, and the journal, in which it was published, with all the details)
 - c. Citation of the alleged plagiarized paper (paper title, author(s), publication title, month and year of publication, volume and issue numbers, the journal details where it was published along with the DOI number, if available). If the report is unpublished (e.g., institutional, technical writing, media-briefing, policy draft etc), the complainant must provide as much information as possible to ensure proper investigation.



- d. Original Journals or Certified Copies of both the allegedly plagiarized document and the original document e.g., papers or theses or electronic copy with DOI number, where applicable.
- e. Any other information that would help the university/DAI or HEC to efficiently probe the claim/allegation.
- f. Name, Designation, Organization, email address, and telephone number of the complainant.
- g. In case there is a report of an examiner or reviewer that indicates a thesis/work is plagiarized, that report can become the basis of a plagiarism case/investigation. This also applies to a report by a concerned citizen.
- h. In case of failure, on the part of the university, to take up the case as per the procedure, within 90 days, HEC may forward the complaint to the Rector, NUML for information.
- i. The Rector may become the complainant if there is overwhelming evidence of plagiarism. However, anonymous complaints shall not be considered for any further action.

10. Investigating Plagiarism Complaints

10.1 For initial (preliminary complaint review) investigation of plagiarism complaints, the following internal committee will be formed:

- i. Director General, NUML or a nominee by the Rector NUML
- ii. Director, QEC (Member)
- iii. One Internal Subject Expert (Member)
- iv. 2x Senior Faculty Member of any other department (Member)
- v. One External Subject Expert (Optional)

In case, a committee member is complainant or accused then he/she will not serve as the member of this committee.

10.2 The findings and recommendations of the internal committee shall be submitted to the Rector.

10.3 For further investigation of plagiarism cases, as per HEC guidelines, as per recommendations of the internal committee, the Rector shall:

- a. Consider an allegation of plagiarism by students, faculty, and others and constitute a “University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee” (UAPSC) with the following composition:



- i. Assurance Division, HEC, who will nominate a faculty member, well-conversant with the HEC Anti-plagiarism policy)
- ii. The nominated, senior dean and two (02) senior professors from outside university.
- iii. Three subject experts: one from the university, and two (02) from other universities to be nominated by the Academic Council and approved by highest statutory body.
- iv. The university should maintain a panel of experts, preferably from all major disciplines, duly approved by the Academic Council.
- iv. Director QEC as a member/secretary
- b. Senior faculty members who have unblemished careers and integrity and who meet other parameters indicative of a commitment to research ethics and excellence. The quorum of the committee will be comprised of four (04) members. The seniority/rank of the University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee members should be equal to or greater than the accused, keeping in view the seniority/rank of the individual being investigated and the nature and gravity of the offense. The opinion of the subject experts should be given due weightage. However, the decision shall be based on principle, not on the majority. The senior member will chair the UAPSC.
- c. Provide clear Terms of Reference (ToR) to the UAPSC for the investigation. Sample ToRs are enclosed as Annexure-2.
- d. Provide a fair opportunity to the accused or author(s) under investigation to defend the originality of their concepts and research work. A similar opportunity will also be provided to the author(s) whose paper(s) is/are deemed to have been plagiarized and/or the complainant (if any), to testify to the veracity of the allegations in the plagiarism complaint.
- e. Facilitate the UAPSC to use all available means, including legal and E&D provisions, to investigate the plagiarism case.
- f. All members of the UAPSC are to sign confidentiality and conflict of interest statements. If a conflict of interest occurs, the member(s) are to recuse themselves. During the investigation, the committee members will not disclose any individual author's name, paper titles, referees, or any other personal or specific information concerning the plagiarism complaint under investigation, nor shall they reveal their names.



- g. The findings of the respective committee would be placed before the Rector for review and necessary action.
- h. In case of a complaint against the Rector, the HEC can assist the Appointing Authority. This would apply to rectors currently serving or those who are retired if the allegation corresponds to their tenure(s) as rectors.
- i. The University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee will submit an investigation report to the Head of the institution within 60 days which will also be shared with the complainant. In case of disagreement, the complainant may file an appeal to the rector within the next 30 days.
- j. The head of the Institution or Registrar or Director QEC will notify the outcome/ decision to the complainant, accuser (s), and HEC.

11. Role of the University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee

11.1 The University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee shall conduct the investigation. Depending on the details of the complaint, the investigation may include the following steps:

- a. Automated Check through Electronic Detection System (EDS) for content similarity or its extent by the Subject expert(s). Please see Annexure-3.
- b. Hard copies/Manually generated content can be scanned and converted to a searchable format.
- c. Determine the magnitude and quantum of significant material plagiarized.
- d. Solicit comments from the publishers and other relevant quarters.
- e. Contact relevant witnesses to gather and record statements when necessary.
- f. If needed, interview the present and/or past employers / supervisors / collaborators or any other persons of interest related to the author(s).
- g. Consult with the legal counsel of the concerned University on all related matters throughout the inquiry process.
- h. Take any other necessary step(s), if deems fit to take.

12. Submission of Findings by UAPSC

- 12.1 The UAPSC will submit its findings and recommendations to the Rector within sixty (60) days. It should also be communicated to the publisher where applicable.
- 12.2 Decisions made by the committee and approved by the Rector are to be implemented as soon as possible.



- 12.3 Appeal against the decision of UAPSC will be made before the Rector within thirty (30) days of UAPSC decision.
- 12.4 No appeal will be entertained after the expiry of the time period mentioned in the clause 12.3.
- 12.5 The decision of the Rector (UAPSC) will not be liable to challenge in any court of law or any other forum.

13. Penalties for Plagiarism

Plagiarism is an unacceptable intellectual offense. As such, the penalties for plagiarism should be commensurate with the severity and recurrence of the offense as well as based on the impact of the academic standing of the offender. This entails a proportional increase in punitive action with minimum punishment for a first-time offense by a student/scholar who copies a homework assignment to a maximum punishment for a teacher / researcher / staff who publishes plagiarized material.

13.1 Grounds to Determine the Penalty

13.1.1 When an act of plagiarism, as described above, is established, the UAPSC in its recommendations, **DEPENDING UPON THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE PROVEN OFFENCE**, will advise the Competent Authority of the University to take any one or a combination of the following disciplinary action(s) against those found guilty of the offence:

A. Grounds for Major Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers / Students

If the act of plagiarism is determined to be (in any one of the following):

- a. Deliberate
- b. Constitutes much of the publication.
- c. Is a duplicate publication claimed for credit more than once by the author(s)
- d. Is between **35% and 50%** in the similarity index and/ or over **30%** in the findings.
- e. Is simply a translation of another work.
- f. The result of collusion or falsification.
- g. Is a work of junk science (presenting untested and unproved theories, as scientific facts are known as junk science).
- h. Is material in which reference to the original material is not given.

Major Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers (in individual cases UAPSC may recommend any one or more of the following penalties)

- a. Removal from service from the university as a faculty/non-faculty employee.
- b. Dismissal from the services as faculty/ non-faculty employee



- c. The awards/grants/benefits received based on plagiarized content shall be withdrawn, including promotion.
- d. HEC or University/DAI may debar the offender from sponsorship of research funding, travel grant, scholarship, fellowship, or any other funded program for two (02) years.
- e. In the case of a published work, University or DAI should inform the publisher about the findings and request them to withdraw the plagiarized work forthwith.
- f. The offender may be stopped for supervision of new students (MPhil & Ph.D. students) for two (02) years. However, the students who are already in supervision will continue as supervisees of the offender(s).
- g. A notice may be circulated among all academic institutions and research organizations.

Major Penalty for Students (in individual cases UAPSC may recommend any one or more of the following penalties)

- a. Expulsion from the university
- b. Suspension of studies for two (02) semesters
- c. The offender may be barred from joining any institution of Higher Education in Pakistan for one year

B. Grounds for Moderate Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers / Students

If plagiarism is determined to be (in any one of the following):

- a. Deliberate
- b. Spread over a substantial part of the paper.
- c. Is between **25% and 35%** in the similarity index (exclusive of tables, figures, and references) and/or **20-30%** in the findings.
- d. The results of collusion or falsification.
- e. Is a work of junk science (presenting untested and unproved theories, as scientific facts are known as junk science?)

Moderate Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers (in individual cases UAPSC may recommend any one or more of the following penalties)

- a. The offender may be stopped from increments/promotions/new appointments for two (02) years.



- b. The offender may be stopped for supervision of new students (both MPhil & Ph.D. students) for one (01) year. However, the students who are already in supervision will continue as supervisees of the offender.
- c. The offender shall not be eligible to seek and avail the funding for any national/international projects/grants and will not be eligible to become part of any joint project for one (01) year.

Moderate Penalty for Students (in individual cases UAPSC may recommend any one or more of the following penalties)

- a. The offender may fail the course

C. Grounds for Minor Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers / Students

If the plagiarism is determined to be (in any one of the following):

- a. Unintentional; however, neither claimed for benefit nor mentioned in the CV.
- b. Concentrated on one part of the paper.
- c. Not more than **20 to 25%** similarity index overall and/ or **10%** in the findings
- d. Does not materially affect the results.
- e. Due to an error or omission or lapse of judgment.

Minor Penalty for Faculty Members / Staff / Researchers (in individual cases UAPSC may recommend any one or more of the following penalties)

- a. Mandatory to pass the “Research Ethics Course” before completing the degree.
- b. The offender may be given a formal warning which must be placed in the dossier/personal file.

Moderate Penalty for Students

- a. Proposal revision

Illustration/Examples

1. In this scenario, a paper has over 25% Similarity Index (SI) and 15% of that is in the findings because the author did not properly rephrase the paper and was derived from an existing theoretical model. The author accepts the error while the findings are credible. The UAPSC, in this case, may award a minor penalty.
2. In this scenario, a paper is found to have been deliberately copied in part and is clearly the result of collusion among several authors. However, the findings are not necessarily



inaccurate, and the SI is around 35% overall and 15% in the findings. In this case, a moderate penalty can be imposed.

3. In this scenario, the author(s) have published modified versions of the same paper in multiple journals and claimed credit for them. There is clear evidence of collusion and intent to defraud academia. This is a case that merits a severe penalty.
4. If a paper is published in a supervisor-student relationship, then the student (s) will be the first author. This condition applies when a student is enrolled in a degree program and the supervisor is advising him/her in research work i.e., thesis or dissertation.

Note: It is worth noting that UAPSC may impose one or more than one penalty in all cases i.e., minor, moderate, and major penalties. Of course, it needs to be emphasized that these guidelines are meant to be employed with due caution and reason on the part of the UAPSC, keeping in view the particularities of a given case.

13.2 Co-author(s)/Declarations

- a. The primary responsibility for plagiarism in a publication lies with the Principal Authors (Corresponding Author/First Author).
- b. Any co-author(s) may be deemed partly responsible for plagiarism if the UAPSC investigation reveals that they were aware of the wrongdoing and chose to benefit from it, with their consent for publication duly taken.
- c. If the published work is part of a thesis of student and the co-author is not a supervisor, then justifications will be required in the form of no conflict of interest in publication.
- d. All authors/co-authors of a publication must sign a declaration that the material presented is not plagiarized (Sample attached as Annexure-1) and must exercise caution and diligence in associating themselves with any research work.

14. Additional Actions Required

- 14.1 In addition to the above punishments/considerations, the following additional actions must be taken, if the offence of plagiarism is established:
 - a. If the plagiarized publication is accessible on the webpage, its access will be retracted.
 - b. The publication itself will be kept in the database for future research or legal purposes.



- c. The author(s) will be asked to write a formal letter of apology to the authors of the original publication that was plagiarized.
- d. If the publication is submitted but not published, the draft publication will be rejected. However, a written warning shall be served to the author/ co-authors.

15. National Plagiarism Standing Committee

- 15.1 The HEC will establish a National Plagiarism Standing Committee (NPSC) to probe complaints against Rectors.
- 15.2 If a plagiarism complaint is not addressed by the university despite multiple attempts by the complainant, the complainant has the option to forward that complaint to HEC NPSC through the Chairperson, HEC, or the Head of the Quality Assurance Division.
- 15.3 However, to have his/her complaint considered, the complainant shall be required to produce evidence that he/ she has submitted the complaint to the Vice Chancellor of the concerned university at least three (03) times.
- 15.4 Once the complaint is forwarded to HEC, the matter will be taken up with the university to place the complaint before the UAPSC.
- 15.5 The University will be liable to submit a report to HEC within sixty (60) days.
- 15.6 In case of non-compliance by the university, HEC NPSC will take up the matter for resolution and the Rector will receive a formal '*Note of Displeasure*' consequently.
- 15.7 Membership of the National Plagiarism Standing Committee (NPSC) shall be for an initial period of two (02) years, extendable for another term(s). If a member does not show up consecutively for three (03) meetings without any strong justification, membership may be replaced.
- 15.8 The NPSC will comprise of:
 - a. Chair of the Committee- The Executive Director, HEC will Chair the Committee.
 - b. Eminent Educationist/ Professors of known integrity to be nominated by the Chairperson, HEC.
 - c. Four (04) subject experts to be proposed by the Quality Assurance Division in consultation with Academics and Research & Innovation Division from the broad disciplines viz. (medical, engineering, agriculture, and social sciences) of the study. The Executive Director of HEC will approve the experts from the jointly suggested list.
 - d. Director General/Head of the Quality Assurance Division.



- e. The Quality Assurance Division shall provide the Secretariat Support to NPSC. The Chairperson HEC will approve the recommendations of NPSC.
- f. The Convener of the NPSC may co-opt additional members if needed. The quorum of the committee will be two-thirds of the members including at least one (01) subject expert.

16. Appeal

16.1 HEC NPSC will be responsible to process the appeal in the following scenarios:

- a. All plagiarism complaints against students, faculty members, researchers, and other stakeholders shall be lodged at the university.
- b. The University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee shall investigate and conclude the matter.
- c. The first appeal against the UAPSC decision shall be lodged in the university through the Rector within 30 days of the notification of the UAPSC decision.
- d. The decision of the Rector (UAPSC) will not be liable to challenge in any court of law.
- e. However, the complainant/accuser may lodge the second appeal to NPSC through Chairperson, HEC/ Head of Quality Assurance Division of HEC within six (06) months of the first complaint.
- f. No appeal will be entertained after the expiry of the time period mentioned in clause “e” of article 16.1.

16.2 The process of appeal for the University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee (UAPSC) is given below:

- a. Appeals filed by the complainant/accused in plagiarism case(s) should be submitted before the rector in writing through application in hard form or email.
- b. No anonymous complaint(s) will be lodged or entertained.
- c. The complainant / accused will provide information i.e., Complete official / legal name, CNIC number, Email ID, Contact number (mobile & landline number), Affiliation with designation (*if any*), and complete postal address.
- d. The UAPSC shall review the appeal and co-opt the subject expert (s) accordingly (if required).
- e. The complainant and accused shall be given the opportunity to justify or provide evidence before the appeal committee in their defense.



- f. The UAPSC shall review complaint(s) in the light of evidence/ justification produced by the accused.
- g. UAPSC may also seek legal opinion through University Law Officer.
- h. The Minutes of the Meeting shall be recorded by the Secretary of the Committee/ by his/ her supporting staff and approved by the Chairperson with the consent of the members.
- i. The final decision made by the Committee shall be conveyed to the appellant and Rector.
- j. A copy of the decision shall also be forwarded to the Head of the Quality Assurance Division.
- k. In case of dissatisfaction, the accused may file an appeal to the Chairperson HEC/ Head of the Quality Assurance Division.

17. Spurious/Malicious Accusations of Plagiarism

- 17.1 If the case of plagiarism is not proven, and it is suspected that a spurious allegation was lodged, the Rector may initiate disciplinary proceedings under the Organization's Statutes and E&D/Student University Disciplinary rules against the accuser.
- 17.2 Defamation Laws (The Defamation Ordinance 2002 or any amendments done by the Government of Pakistan time to time and case to case basis) may also be applicable, in case of loss of reputation.
- 17.3 If the accuser is from another organization, the Head of the Organization will be informed about the false allegation(s) with the request to proceed with disciplinary action against the accused keeping HEC in loop.
- 17.4 If the accuser is from International Organization, the Head of the Organization will be informed about the false allegation(s) with the request to proceed with disciplinary action against the accused whereas the Ministry of Education (*of that country*) and HEC, Pakistan will be kept in loop.
- 17.5 The name(s) of the false accuser(s) be subject to blacklisting as specified on the HEC website for a fixed period. Further, false accusers will not be eligible for the award of any grant/benefit from HEC.
- 17.6 At each step of the process, HEC will be informed by the university.



18. Guidelines for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

18.1 Graduate Programs/MS/MPhil/PhD

- a. All theses are to be sent to **Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC)** for **Turnitin Originality Report** through office of concerned Deans. In case of Regional Campuses, the theses will be sent through Regional Directors (RD).
- b. There is a provision of only **Two ATTEMPTS (First Submission + one Revision Attempt)** for achieving equal to or less than **19%** of similarity index.
- c. Any single source should be less than **5%**.
- d. In case of third attempt the case will be forwarded to BASR through FBS (**3rd Attempt of "Turnitin" – by BASR**). BASAR Meeting was held on **17-18 October 2016**. Followings decisions were taken regarding 3rd Attempt.
 - i. QEC-NUML used to provide three "Turnitin" attempts to the student(s) in the past. It has been decided in the BASR meeting that the students will be allowed only **TWO** attempts. Permission for the third attempt is subject to the approval of BASR.
 - ii. QEC-NUML will process only **TWO** attempts in repository and the applications for the third attempt will be placed by the concerned Dean/Regional Directors/HoD's in the BASR meetings along with FBS meeting minutes.
 - iii. This policy is implemented with immediate effect. The amendment is issued with the approval of the Rector.
- e. A thesis submission to QEC (from concerned Deans/ Regional campuses RDs) should consist of the following:
 - i. A Filled Thesis Submission Proforma (see Annexure -4)
(available at the offices of concerned Deans & QEC)
 - ii. A **Hardcopy of Full Thesis** (spiral-bound)
 - iii. A **Soft Copy of Thesis**- Excluding Initial Pages, Bibliography, Appendices and (preferably) Endnotes/Footnotes. (via email or CD).
- f. The whole Thesis must be:
 - i. in a Single MS Word File, PDF, or Html (as required by Turnitin)
 - ii. under 20MB in size (as required by Turnitin)
 - iii. under 400 Pages (Preferably) (as required by Turnitin)



- iv. Images (used in the thesis) with more than 20MBs will be provided separately in the same thread of email.
- v. Songs or movie created / produced will be provided in the same thread of email if size is more than 20MBs.
- g. All course assignments, project reports, term papers, etc. will be run through *Turnitin* by **Instructors ONLY from their NUML Turnitin accounts only**. There is a provision of only **TWO ATTEMPTS (First Submission + One Attempt)** for achieving equal to or less than **19%** of Similarity Index. Failing to do so will result in Minor, Moderate or Major Penalty.
- h. The *Turnitin* Originality reports of all course assignments, project reports, term papers, etc. should be appended by instructor, with the course result/evaluation, submitted to concern Deans offices.
- i. Results of students will be withheld whose *Turnitin Originality reports* are not attached with the course assessment sheet/award list.
- j. In case of major revision suggested by any examiner, the Thesis will be sent to QEC for processing through Turnitin in lieu of Examination policy 2023 under article 4.25 clause “i”.
- k. In cases of **re-defence of a thesis**, it will be processed through *Turnitin* again at the time of resubmission. The revised copy will be sent to QEC through the office of concerned Deans / RDs of regional campuses for a revised/new *Turnitin Originality report*.
- l. In case the student has availed THREE attempts of processing the thesis through Turnitin, the case will be deal as per Examination policy.
- m. In case an author produces an MS/MPhil/PhD Thesis, **based on his/her own thesis (of any level)**, which has also been processed through Turnitin earlier, **access to the Turnitin account used must be provided (username and password)** to QEC for verification.

18.2 Undergrad Programs/ Bachelors Programs

- a. All theses and Final Seminar papers are to be run through *Turnitin* by QEC. The focal person of each department/campus will work as a liaison between students and QEC.
- b. A student must submit a hard copy and soft copy to the Focal Person, to be passed on to QEC.



- c. There is a provision of only **Two ATTEMPTS (First Submission + Revision Attempt)** for achieving below **19%** of Similarity Index. Failing to do so will result in the case being forwarded to BASR.
- d. All course assignments, project reports, term papers, etc. should be run through **Turnitin** by relevant **Instructors ONLY from their NUML Turnitin accounts only**. There is a provision of only **TWO ATTEMPTS (First Submission + One Attempt)**. The similarity index should be equal to or less than **19%**.
- e. Any single source should be less than **5%** of Similarity Index.
- f. The **Turnitin** Originality reports of all course assignments, project reports, term papers, etc. should be appended with the result/evaluation submitted to Department/Examination section. Results of students will be withheld whose **Turnitin Originality reports** are not attached with the course assessment sheet/award list.

19. General Guidelines

19.1 Nomination of the Focal Person (Departments & Campuses)

Head of respective departments and RDs of campuses will nominate one Faculty Member as a focal person for dealing and managing the Turnitin process related tasks of department and campuses and through official letter inform to Anti-Plagiarism QEC.

19.2 SOPs for Departmental and Campuses Focal Person for Anti-Plagiarism & Turnitin

- a. Due to the nature of plagiarism and the time constraints involved, departments need to ensure that students and supervisors are responsible to submit the research theses in proper research academic writing style with no earlier plagiarism check through any account.
- b. Each departmental focal persons are requested to submit all theses at one time. For this purpose, it is recommended that a deadline be given for submission to all students.
- c. Please provide list of student writing research theses. Please submit all theses with complete list of students' names with sessions (Morning, Evening, Weekends).
- d. Our shared goal is to provide a fair and consistent approach to managing cases of alleged plagiarism and ensuring that the penalties for plagiarism are clear and readily understandable by faculty and students.
- e. QEC NUML has designed a new Proforma for all theses Turnitin verification. This Proforma is mandatory for all disciplines. (See Annexure -5)



- f. Before sending theses for Turnitin verification, please ensure that the hard copy and soft copy are same and no content is missing in both, then submit to QEC Anti-Plagiarism unit for verification. At any stage of an investigation into alleged plagiarism, relevant focal person of department is responsible for consistency in soft copy and hard copy sent to QEC.
- g. Turnitin account on official email address is mandatory for all focal persons.
- h. For any assistance focal person may visit QEC branch or call at Ext 2245.

19.3 For Students / Researchers

- a. **Using one's personal or anyone else's Turnitin Account** for processing personal work, intended for submission to NUML (Research Publication/ Thesis), and is not acceptable.
- b. In any such instance where anyone processes her/his work before submission to NUML, **access to the Turnitin account (login & password)**, used for processing should **be provided to QEC or the submission shall be rejected**.
- c. In case of a higher **Similarity Index** (more than **19%**), the researcher should work towards improving his/her work, in consultation with Subject instructor/ Supervisor.
- d. All Thesis/Paper submitted to **Anti-plagiarism unit QEC** must be on parameters mentioned in article 18.1 clause "f".

19.4 For Instructors / Focal Persons

- a. The following acts can lead to termination of Turnitin account and disciplinary action.
 - i. Manipulating/Tempering Turnitin reports
 - ii. Sharing account details with others
 - iii. Willful, as well as repeated, violation of NUML Plagiarism Policy.
 - iv. Concealing Turnitin account details, to avoid verification of an early submission.
- b. **Separate chapters (of Thesis) / Segments (of course assignments, project reports, term papers, etc.)** should not be run through **Turnitin**, as it may hamper the final percentage, once the work is complete.



Annexure-1

The work is original and is neither plagiarized (in any form) nor AI generated (all-inclusive for example processed text/concepts/ideas/images/visuals). If any of it is found ever in the text submitted for the award of credit/benefit/award, degree and/or publication, approved penalties shall be applicable.

Annexure-2

Terms of Reference (ToR)

AI TORs are awaited and will be sent by HEC.

Annexure-3

Guidelines for Use of Electronic Detection System: Interpreting and Applying the Similarity Index

Annexure-4

Pro forma for submission of thesis for Turnitin verification & word count

Annexure-5

Turnitin verification



Annexure-1:

Sample Undertaking



HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN

(Monograph & Textbook Writing Scheme)

Monograph/Textbook Proposal Submission

Undertaking



Corresponding Author(s) name: _____

Corresponding Author(s) Address: _____

Title of Work: _____

The Higher Education Commission (Publisher) and the Monograph/Textbook Proposal Author (Authors if a multi-author Work) agree on the following:

1. The Monograph/Book will contain the original work of the author(s).
2. It will not violate the copyright or intellectual property rights of any person or entity.
3. It will not contain previously published material in whole or in part for which permission from the concerned parties has not been secured.
4. The author(s) recognize that if any material submitted for consideration to the HEC is found to be plagiarized, the HEC may bar the author(s) from participating in all HEC programs, and a public notice to this effect may be issued in print as well as electronic media. The HEC reserves the right to recover all amounts spent on evaluation/publication etc. and may take any other action deemed necessary to serve as deterrence against plagiarism.
5. The author(s) shall indemnify and hold the publisher harmless against loss or expenses arising from breach of any such warranties.
6. In consideration of the HEC's agreement to publish the work, the author(s) hereby grants HEC a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to print, publish, reproduce, or distribute the work throughout the world by all means of expression, including electronic format. The author(s) further grants HEC the right to use the author's name



in association with the work in published form and promotional materials.

7. The copyrights are duly reserved by the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan.

All authors are requested to sign this form. If not signed by all authors, the corresponding author acknowledges that s/he is signing on behalf of all the authors and with their authorization. Faxed signatures and multiple forms are acceptable provided the corresponding author collates all the material and submits it in one batch.

Author Signature: _____ Name: _____ Date: _____

Author Signature: _____ Name: _____ Date: _____

Author Signature: _____ Name: _____ Date: _____

Similar Schemes could be developed for authors or theses etc.



Annexure-2:

Sample TORs for UAPSC

1. Director QEC/Registrar/Authorized Officer shall check that the complaint is not anonymous and shall verify the identity of the complainant.
2. They shall run an initial plagiarism test to verify that the complaint is genuine.
3. Experts may be engaged (if required) and asked to provide their individual opinion on the case.
4. They shall prepare questions for the hearing opportunity to the complainant and accused.
5. The convenor shall complete the final report on the case.
6. The investigation process must be completed within 60 days.
7. The committee recommendations shall be notified by the Director QEC/Registrar/Rector/Vice Chancellor of the University

It is important to consider that each institution should create its terms of reference (TORs) for assessing and evaluating a plagiarism complaint based on the given sample and then seek approval from their statutory bodies.



Annexure-3:

Guidelines for Use of Electronic Detection System: Interpreting and Applying the Similarity Index

1. The similarity score is just a percentage of material in the paper that matches sources in the Electronic Detection System (EDS) databases. The Similarity Index is meant as a guideline and an alert but is not by itself conclusive evidence of plagiarism.
2. Text that is quoted and cited may appear as a match in the Similarity Report if quotes have not been excluded from the report; this offers a great opportunity to check for proper citation.
3. The similarity score must be interpreted in the context of the assignment and the actual writing. The only way to do this is to look at the Similarity Report.
4. If similarities in the Electronic Detection Systems (EDS) report are significant, i.e., without citation of the source, then the scholar/student or Faculty may be guided accordingly. In case, if he/she repeats the same action (Plagiarism) then it may be reported to the University Anti-Plagiarism Standing Committee with relevant evidence.
5. The similarities in the EDS report may contain matches with the author's previous work, i.e., thesis, paper, or report; these may be ignored if properly cited and are not too much. This is decided by the respective Instructor/subject expert.
6. Bibliography, Quoted/Cited material may be excluded from the EDS report after verification. Furthermore, the use of multiple sources without proper citations is also not acceptable.
7. Common phrases, proper nouns, universal truths, formulae, etc. may also appear as similarities in the EDS report, therefore every instructor/faculty member may ignore these. This also applies to small matches of less than five to ten words.
8. The EDS Similarity Report/Originality report will show similarities from three major sources: the Internet (Information available publicly), periodicals (subscribed sources i.e., Academic databases), and Student repository (Database of documents uploaded in the Turnitin by Instructors or Students). Similarity with student repository may be ignored if it is the author's work as principal investigator. Similarities from the Student repository may help detect complicity in the documents.

9. EDS is a text-matching tool, therefore, similarity across graphs, formulae, mathematical equations, models, and other pictorial materials cannot necessarily be discerned with this software.
10. The similarity score must be interpreted by the relevant subject expert or faculty member supervising the student as they know the context of the assignment/paper/thesis/report, etc. In case of forwarding a complaint, the EDS report can be used as evidence if it supports the allegations raised by the complainant.
11. For submission of assignments, theses, and research papers, the **19%** Similarity Index score for all disciplines is indicative of the possibility of plagiarism. In the case of theses/dissertations etc., the Ph.D./Supervisory Committee will function as an Expert Committee in this regard.
12. The Similarity index should be considered very seriously in the section of findings and conclusion of the document. The similarity index for that section should not be more than **9%**. The results, conclusion, and recommendations may be separated in a suitable searchable format for uploading to EDS distinct from the remainder of the document.
13. If the report has a minimum similarity index $\leq 19\%$, then the benefit of the doubt may be given to the author but, in case, any single source has a similarity index $\geq 5\%$ then it needs to be checked as a basis of potential plagiarism; due to its drawing upon the author(s) own work(s), these may be considered acceptable and not be used to penalize the author(s), provided it does not result in a duplicate publication. Levels of EDS may also be considered for further interpretation as per the EDS Manual

Note: Before the availability of Turnitin services in Pakistan, the ability of supervisors to verify that student's work i.e., Thesis, Research Papers, Reports, Assignments, etc. was limited in terms of checking similarities with previous works. Therefore, it is recommended that the applicability of the collective responsibility of supervisor/student be limited to the period from January 1, 2008. Any act of plagiarism committed before January 1, 2008, shall be treated as the individual responsibility of the author(s) and after January 1, 2008, supervisors and principal investigators will be responsible for any act of plagiarism committed by their students/co-author(s).



Annexure-4:

PROFORMA FOR TURNITIN VERIFICATION

Department: _____

Date: _____

(For Supervisor)

I, _____ have checked the thesis (both Hard & Soft copy) of my supervisee _____ . Content of both copies are the same.

Supervisor's Signature

Supervisor Name: -----

Email Address: -----

Contact #: -----

(For Focal Person)

The Content of Hard and soft copy of thesis are same and submitted for Plagiarism checking.

Focal Person's Signature

Focal Person Name: -----

Department: -----

Contact #: -----



Annexure-5:

Proforma for Submission of Thesis for Turnitin Verification & Word Count

For office use only:

Soft copy attachment

Hard copy

Hard copy & Soft copy
Sender's name

1. Full Name (as on Thesis/Dissertation):

2. Gender: Male Female
3. Email:

4. Supervisor's Name:

5. Supervisor's Email:

6. Registration No:

7. Have you had this Thesis (full or any part) run through Turnitin before?
8. Yes No
(In case of YES, the following details are compulsorily needed, as per NUML's Plagiarism Policy) a. Turnitin Login (Used): b. Password:
9. Thesis/Dissertation Title:

Compulsory Information: -

Sr#	Detail	First Submission	2 nd Submission & Revision 1	3 rd Submission & Revision 2
1	Word Count			
2	Types of Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative	<input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed Method
3	Number of pages on 1 st draft, 2 nd draft, and 3 rd draft.			
4	Date on which soft copy sent to Turnitin account.			
5	1 st Attempt report ID			



6	2 nd Attempt report ID			

Note

Kindly ensure that:

1. All chapters of your thesis are in **ONE MS WORD** document (There should not be separate files of a different chapters, and submitting multiple soft copies of the same Thesis should be avoided).
2. The Bibliography / Endnotes is/are excluded from your soft copy (submitted for Turnitin verification)
3. A Hard Copy should accompany every Soft Copy you submit for Turnitin verification (be it the first time or revision(s))
4. There is no over-writing or cutting on this form and it is filled legibly.
5. Word count should be as per university guidelines (verified by relevant Dean)

Supervisor's Signature

Candidate's Signature

Dean ()

Date: _____

Sender's Signature