

Central European University's Policy on Student Plagiarism

The Policy applies to all CEU students, including degree and non-degree (exchange, visiting) students.

ARTICLE 1 - DEFINITION OF PLAGIARISM

1. Plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct. It is a practice that involves taking and using the work of a person, persons or a machine and claiming it, directly or indirectly, as one's own. Plagiarism occurs when words, ideas or arguments are reproduced verbatim or by paraphrasing or summarizing without sufficient acknowledgment. Further clarification and examples can be found in the Guidelines (Annex 1).
2. CEU's Code of Ethics also recognizes as academic dishonesty the submission of work previously submitted for credit to another course without the permission of the instructor; and the submission of theses or dissertations that have been previously submitted to a university or program in any language, and the use of unauthorized aids or another person to write a paper, take an exam, or complete any kind of assessment without permission. Such submissions will be treated in a similar way to plagiarism and be subject to the procedures and measures outlined in this Policy. Unauthorized use or misuse of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) by students falls within the scope of the Plagiarism Policy.
3. Plagiarism, as a form of academic dishonesty, is in breach of Annex 4 of the CEU's Code of Ethics. This Policy shall be interpreted in accordance with the Code of Ethics, which shall also prevail in questions not regulated by this Policy.
4. While both students and faculty may be guilty of plagiarism, this policy only addresses student plagiarism. Faculty cases of plagiarism should be dealt with according to the appropriate section of the [Code of Ethics](#).

ARTICLE 2 - RESPONSIBILITIES

1. It is the responsibility of all students and teaching staff to ensure that work submitted for purposes of assessment is in fact the student's own work and has not been previously submitted for credit, unless if allowed by academic units and prior permission has been given by the instructor.
2. It is the **responsibility of students** to:
 - a. ensure that work submitted for purposes of assessment is their own;
 - b. ensure that the words and arguments of others are appropriately cited and referenced using an accepted referencing style;
 - c. ascertain if academic units allow the submission of work that has been previously submitted in whole or in part and, where it is allowed, to gain permission from the relevant faculty member prior to submission; and
 - d. ensure that any use of GAI¹ in a piece of submitted work has been explicitly authorized by the department and/or course instructor and is consistent with the scope and intentions of that authorization. Said authorization must be in writing and appear in one or more of the following places: course syllabus, written assignment instructions, or course e-learning platform, and must be consistent with any parameters set out in departmental handbooks.
3. It is the **responsibility of academic units and of teaching staff** to:
 - a. inform students of the unethical nature of plagiarism. Programs should ensure that students receive appropriate academic skills training in an effort to prevent unintended plagiarism.
 - b. It is also each academic unit's responsibility to ensure that all students are fully informed about CEU's Policy on Student Plagiarism and the consequences if they fail to comply; and to ensure that students are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to enable them to cite and reference appropriately. It is a requirement that all student handbooks provide clear reference to the most up-to-date version of this policy.
 - c. It is the responsibility of the academic unit to regulate the multiple submission of work similar in whole or in part by students for credit. Individual academic units may refuse to accept such submissions, or they may allow them with permission from the course instructor.
 - d. In cases where the use of GAI is fully or partially allowed in work submitted for assessment, it is the responsibility of the teaching staff member to clearly communicate the conditions of use. Places of such authorizations are limited to course syllabi, written assignment instructions, and the university's e-learning platform. Any authorization must be consistent with any parameters for the use of GAI as set out in departmental handbooks.
 - e. In individual cases in which a student has been granted an accommodation to use GAI to assist with assignments in accordance with the Policy on the Rights of Students with Disabilities, the scope of this authorization must be officially

¹ GAI is a subset of artificial intelligence that creates new content- such as text, images, code, and other media- learned from existing data.

documented in writing between the unit head/program director, the Disability Officer and the student. The Unit head/program director must communicate this authorization to those instructors assessing that student's work.

- f. It is the responsibility of each academic unit to establish a Committee on Academic Dishonesty and ensure that there are clear written policies in place for its operation, in line with the guidelines set out in this policy, and that these are communicated to their students. It is the responsibility of the unit head to appoint a committee chair. As the unit head acts as the first line of appeal, he or she must not be part of this committee. It is the responsibility of the committee chair to ensure that all members are familiar with: 1) the specific written policies relating to the given committee's operation, 2) the correct use and operation of the university's online plagiarism detection software, 3) the CEU Code of Ethics and the CEU Policy on Student Plagiarism.

4. **CEU technical support staff** will ensure that appropriate technical means to assist teaching staff in the detection of plagiarism are maintained (see Article 3 below).

ARTICLE 3 - THE DETECTION OF PLAGIARISM

1. The instructor teaching a course should take all possible measures unless explicitly prohibited below to detect plagiarism if it occurs in graded student work. Once detected, it should be recorded and the instructor must assist in ensuring appropriate action is taken.

Among the tools available to instructors to detect possible plagiarism, CEU makes use of online similarity detection services that compare student papers against extensive databases of material in order to detect similarities between the student text and other texts. Instructors are required to use these services or other methods to help in the detection of possible plagiarism in written material submitted for grade. When using such online services, the instructor must ensure that any options designed to detect GAI in pieces of writing, are not enabled. Furthermore, online similarity detection services that are not supported by CEU are strictly prohibited and must not be used by those assessing a student's work in any way.

2. Because CEU reserves the right to use online originality checking services, and because student material submitted to these services may be retained for the purpose of detecting similarities in future submissions, there are data protection and copyright issues surrounding the use of these systems.

3. The following is intended to clarify these issues:

By enrolling at CEU students agree to the submission of their work to the plagiarism service used by CEU. Further, they agree to the following:

- the transfer of written assignments submitted for assessment at CEU, and data relating to this work, to third parties for the purpose of present and future originality checking;
- the processing of such work and related data for the purposes of originality checking and the provision of information to CEU relating to this work;
- the future use and storage of this material in the database of the originality checking service.

The above will be carried out only for the purposes of originality checking, and will involve:

1. comparison with other works, published or unpublished, either on the internet or other electronic form;
2. comparison with works previously submitted by students for assessment and maintained on the databases of the third party supplier of originality checking services;
3. adding work submitted by students to the relevant databases used for originality checking by the third-party supplier.

ARTICLE 4 - ACTION ON DETECTION OF PLAGIARISM

1. Responsibility of Instructors

The instructor teaching the course should identify whether there may have been an offense. If they consider that an offense has taken place (s)he should temporarily assign an incomplete grade for the assignment and notify the head of the academic unit hosting the course (with no grade communicated to the student).

In the case of multiple-instructor courses, the course instructor who detects the possible offense has the responsibility.

In the case of university-wide courses, shared courses or in case of doubt, the procedure is the responsibility of the academic unit to which the course is administratively attached. If doubt remains, the instructor should approach the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee for guidance as to which academic unit should handle the matter.

2. First Offenses that are less Serious Plagiarism

If the offense is a first offense in addition to being a relatively mild infringement (per Table 1 "less serious plagiarism"), the instructor, in consultation with the head of unit, may use her/his own judgment to handle the case in accordance with the Guidelines for the implementation of the plagiarism policy below. Alternatively, they can also decide to refer the case to the academic unit's Committee on Academic Dishonesty.

3. Serious and Second or Subsequent Offenses

If the offense is serious (Table 1 "Serious Plagiarism") or a subsequent offence of serious or less serious plagiarism by the student (in any CEU course), the case must be referred to the Committee on Academic Dishonesty of the academic unit from which the course was provided. The Committee decides on appropriate measures in accordance with the Guidelines set out below.

4. Referral to the Disciplinary Committee

Where the offense is a repeat offense of a less serious nature, or a first offense of a serious nature, the academic unit head or Committee on Academic Dishonesty may refer the case to the CEU Disciplinary Committee for it to make a formal determination.

5. Outcomes & Sanctions

The available sanctions are set out in Annex 1 to this policy – “2. Sanctions in cases confirmed as plagiarism”.

All sanctions must be:

- Communicated to the student without delay, clearly stating the steps to be taken by the student and their right to appeal (and to whom).
- Recorded in the hosting academic unit's central log.
- Communicated to the head of the student's home academic unit (if different to the sanctioning academic unit) and recorded in that unit's central log.

All serious sanctions, including those listed in paragraphs 2 to 4 of Annex 1, must also be communicated in writing to the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee.

6. Record Retention

In all cases, evidence of plagiarism should be carefully gathered, documented and retained.

The academic unit's Committee on Academic Dishonesty and/or the instructor is responsible for adequately documenting the case. These records must be centrally stored within the academic unit for five years after the discovery of plagiarism. If the student does not graduate or otherwise leave CEU within five years of discovery, records should be kept until the student graduates or otherwise leaves the university.

7. Confidentiality

Issues relating to plagiarism by an individual student or students are confidential matters and should be treated as such. All records should be kept with due concern for confidentiality and the need for evidence.

It is the responsibility of the unit head to ensure that records relating to instances of plagiarism are kept for the required length of time for those records and are appropriately destroyed once the period of time required for their retention has elapsed.

8. Academic Unit Recording & Reporting

Academic units are required to create and maintain a centralized record of all instances that give rise to action under this policy under Article 4. This is particularly important in order to be aware of repeat offences.

Where the student is from another CEU unit than the one in which the offence took place, the head of unit must inform the head of the student's home unit. In cases of a repeat offence, the head of the student's home unit must share details of the previous case with the head of unit in which the offence took place. The offense and outcome must also be recorded in the plagiarism records of the student's home unit.

ARTICLE 5 - APPEALS

1. Students have the right to appeal the decision of an instructor and/or of the academic unit's Committee on Academic Dishonesty. Appeals may not be made against a decision under Article 4(2-4) to refer an issue to the Committee on Academic Dishonesty/head of unit/Disciplinary Committee.
 - a. Appeals against the decision of an instructor under Article 4(2) may be made to the academic unit's Committee on Academic Dishonesty.
 - b. Appeals against the decision of the Committee on Academic Dishonesty under Article 4(2 & 3) may be made to the head of the academic unit. Where the unit head is the instructor who has identified the plagiarism, the appeal may be made to a designated academic staff member, normally the relevant program director, who will act in lieu of the unit head for the purposes of the appeal.
2. Appeals against decisions made by the unit under Article 5(1)(b) may be made to the Pro-Rector for Teaching and Learning (in case of bachelors' and masters' students) or the Pro-Rector for Faculty and Research (in case of doctoral students). Where, in the view of the Pro-Rector, the matter is a serious one, or some mishandling of the case or accusation of discrimination or unfair treatment is made by the student, the Pro-Rector may refer the matter to the Disciplinary Committee for its consideration and determination of the matter.
3. Where the case has been referred to the Disciplinary Committee including pursuant to Articles 4(4) or 5(2), the appeal may be made to the Grievance Committee in line with the procedure set out in the Code of Ethics.
4. All appeals under paragraphs 1 and 2 must be made in writing by the student within **10 working days** of receipt of the communication of the decision and sanction.

ARTICLE 6 - GUIDELINES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CEU'S POLICY ON PLAGIARISM

The Annex 1. Guidelines to the CEU's Policy on Plagiarism ("Guidelines") are intended to guide faculty in making decisions about possible cases of plagiarism. The Guidelines should be read in conjunction with the Policy.

Annex 1: Guidelines to the CEU's Policy on Student Plagiarism

1. Examples of Plagiarism in Written Assignments

Article 1 of the CEU's Policy on Plagiarism states that (p. 1):

Plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct. It is a practice that involves taking and using the work of a person, persons or a machine and claiming it, directly or indirectly, as one's own. Plagiarism occurs when the words, ideas or arguments are reproduced verbatim or by paraphrasing or summarizing without sufficient acknowledgment.

Plagiarism can be intentional or unintentional, but intent (as far as it can be established) may be a factor in establishing appropriate measures, and also in establishing whether the case was plagiarism or rather poor scholarship. Faculty and committees are encouraged to include a dialogic element, alongside an analysis of the text, when investigating possible plagiarism. During such a dialogue, the student may be asked about his or her knowledge of what constitutes plagiarism and about any attempts s/he made to avoid plagiarism. Any such information must be balanced against an analysis of the text and against facts about the training and orientation the student received; indeed such analysis may be a more reliable indicator of intent. These guidelines are intended to help faculty and academic units decide on the relative seriousness of an act of plagiarism, it cannot replace individual judgment of each case and should be read in that spirit.

Table 1 categorizes some examples of offending strategies that may occur in student writing. This list is neither exhaustive nor definitive. Examples will be found that lie in a grey area between two categories. A committee may also have to deal with, and apply a similar logic to, cases of suspected plagiarism in non-writing elements of student assessment, such as with digital media or with data driven assignments. For this reason, each case must be considered on its own merits and within its own context. Greater stringency should be applied in three cases:

1. Repeat offences must be considered more seriously than first offenses.
2. Offenses with features that strongly suggest the student knowingly committed plagiarism, and that s/he sought or stood to benefit by a better grade from misusing sources should be punished more severely.
3. *Ceteris paribus*, offenses by doctoral students should be considered more serious than those by Masters, Bachelors or non-degree students, as higher standards of scholarship are expected at doctoral level.

Table 1: Offending Strategies in Writing

Severity of Offense	Example
Serious Plagiarism	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submitting as one's own work a text largely or wholly written by another person, persons or machine.• Copying or paraphrasing substantial sections² from one or more works of other authors into one's own text, without attribution, that is, omitting any reference to the work(s) either in the body of the text, in footnotes, or in the bibliography/reference list.• Submitting a thesis as part of masters or doctoral requirements which has been previously submitted to another institution in English or in another language.
Less Serious Plagiarism	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paraphrase of a substantial section or several smaller sections of another text or texts without any reference in the body text, but the work is included in the bibliography/reference list.• Copying verbatim two or three not necessarily consecutive phrases, or one or two not necessarily consecutive sentences, from the work of others without attribution.• In cases where the use of GAI has been explicitly authorized in writing by the department and/or course instructor, submitting a work that uses GAI beyond the scope and intentions of that authorization.• Copying verbatim one substantial or several smaller sections from another text without quotation marks but with reference provided within the student's text.• Submitting without permission one's own work that has been largely or wholly submitted for credit to another course.

² The word 'section' is understood here to mean more than one consecutive sentence. A copied section that has had a small number of extra words inserted by the student may still be considered as copied.

<p>Poor Scholarship (not a breach of the policy)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copying verbatim one small section, for example a paragraph, or several sentences from another text without quotation marks but with clear reference provided within the student's text. • Summarizing an author's ideas at length but only mentioning the author or the source at the end of the paragraph. • Mentioning an author with appropriate citation in an early sentence but no attribution in subsequent sentences, so that it is unclear whether the author's ideas are continuing or the writer's own comments being offered. • Including a correctly referenced short fragment from another text but without quotation marks. • Using an author's work with incomplete reference (e.g. page number is missing, or the work appears only in a footnote/parenthesis and is missing from the reference list. • Using GAI as an aid when translating interviews that appear in the body of a submitted work but not acknowledging that fact in the body of the text or in a footnote.
---	--

2. Sanctions in Cases Confirmed as Plagiarism

(1) In the case of a single first offense classified as *less serious plagiarism*, the student should:

- a. receive an oral or written reprimand (not reflected on the transcript), and
- b. rewrite the assignment and receive a lowered grade (usually a retake pass C+).

(2) In the case of a second/subsequent offense of *less serious plagiarism*, or in the case of a first offense of *serious plagiarism* that the academic unit considers does not warrant the most serious sanctions, the student should:

- a. receive a written reprimand (not reflected on the transcript), and
- b. rewrite the assignment and receive a lowered grade (usually a retake pass C+) or be given a fail grade.

(3) In the case of multiple offences, or of a single particularly serious offence, students should:

- a. receive a written reprimand (that will appear on the student's transcript)
- b. receive a fail grade, with or without the possibility of retake (this often depends on whether the course is compulsory or elective).

(4) In very serious cases, such as plagiarizing a major part of an assignment, or where there have been more than two instances of serious plagiarism despite written warnings and other sanctions described above, the academic unit should consider initiating formal procedures towards expelling the student from the University in accordance with the applicable policies, such as Student Rights, Rules and Academic Regulations.

In the case of multiple simultaneous minor offences, the academic unit should decide whether these repetitions stem from ignorance (in which case they may be treated as a single offence) or the intent either to deceive or to avoid work, either of which may justify more severe action.

The instances listed in the last category in Table 1 (*Poor Scholarship*) should be attributed to poor

ability, unclear thinking or carelessness. As such, they should not be considered academic dishonesty but should be penalized in the same way as other poor-quality work, namely by a decrease in the final grade commensurate with the negative impact they have on the assignment as a whole.

The CEU's Policy on Student Plagiarism and CEU's Student Rights, Rules and Academic Regulations shall prevail in questions not regulated by these Guidelines.

The CEU's Code of Ethics shall be applicable with the exceptions and deviations set out in the present Guidelines.

3. Process to be Followed in all Cases of Suspected Plagiarism

The course instructor:

- a. evaluates the case and if considered possible plagiarism temporarily assigns an INC grade in SITS.
- b. notifies the student of the situation.
- c. checks if the student has any previous record in the academic unit's Plagiarism Tracker and enters the case details to the tracker.
- d. communicates with the head of unit as to their initial finding.

If the case, after review, is deemed not serious, an agreement is made with the head of unit (per article 2(4) of the Policy). The course instructor must ensure the instance is properly logged and documented in the tracker for future reference.

The outcome must be communicated to the student by the course instructor, copying the program director.

If the case is deemed serious, then the course director must notify the Committee on Academic Dishonesty via email including online originality checking final markup (as applicable), original paper, whole article of cited paper (if necessary), bullet point reasoning why the paper raises questions, % or weight of paper in course and its implications for the student (passing/failing).

Procedure before the Committee on Academic Dishonesty

The Committee must investigate the case within 10 working days. Sanctions should be in line with the CEU Student Plagiarism policy.

The outcome is communicated to the course instructor. The findings and reasonings for the outcome must be explained. The Committee communicates to the student about the findings and outcome.

Where the offense is a repeat offense of a less serious nature, or a first offense of a serious nature, the academic unit head or Committee on Academic Dishonesty may refer the case to the CEU Disciplinary Committee for it to make a formal determination.

Appeals

Student may appeal per the Policy (Article 5).

Document information	
Type	Policy
Number	P-1405-1 v 2311
Title	Central European University's Policy on Plagiarism
Distribution	Internal
Filename	P-1405-1 v 2311 CEU Policy on Student Plagiarism
Notes	
Related documents	Code of Ethics Student Rights, Rules, and Regulations Doctoral Regulations
For final documents	
Approved by:	Senate
Date of approval	May 30, 2014, amended October 2020, August 2021, January 2022, September 1, 2023 and November 17, 2023.
Enters force	This version enters force on November 27, 2023.
Lead unit	Center for Academic Writing