Order No. CVV/RO/OO/065/0106/2026 **Date: 21.08.2026**

OFFICE ORDER

Office of the Registrar

Sub: Release and Implementation of the Policy on Academic Integrity, Prevention of Plagiarism, and the Use of Artificial Intelligence – CVV–AIPAI Policy 2026

In accordance with the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018, and in furtherance of the University's commitment to promoting academic honesty, ethical scholarship, responsible research practices, originality, and the responsible use of emerging technologies, the Policy on Academic Integrity, Prevention of Plagiarism, and the Use of Artificial Intelligence – CVV–AIPAI Policy 2026 is hereby released and brought into effect.

All Deans, Heads of Schools/Departments/Centres, Directors, Faculty Members, Research Supervisors, Officers, and other concerned functionaries are requested to take note of the provisions of the Policy and ensure its effective dissemination and implementation within their respective domains.

The Policy shall be applicable from the Academic Year 2026–27 and all concerned are advised to familiarise themselves with its provisions and adhere to the principles, procedures, responsibilities, and requirements contained therein.

This is issued with the approval of the Competent Authority.

CHINMAYA VISHWA VIDYAPEETH * VELIYANAD, ERNAKULAM-682 313 *

// By Order //

Dr. P. Rajendran
Registrar i/c

REGISTRAR
Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeeth
Deemed to be University Under the Section 3 of UGC Act 1956
Ernakulam - 682 313 Kerala

Encl.: CVV–AIPAI Policy 2026 – Policy on Academic Integrity, Prevention of Plagiarism, and the Use of Artificial Intelligence.

Copy to:

1. Office of the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor
2. Office of the Registrar
3. All Deans
4. Office of the Controller of Examinations
5. Office of the Finance and Accounts
6. Office of the IQAC
7. All Heads of Schools and Departments
8. All Faculty and Staff
9. Media / University Website
10. Office Copy

CHINMAYA VISHWA VIDYAPEETH

(Deemed to be University)

Policy on
Academic Integrity, Prevention of Plagiarism, and the Use of Artificial Intelligence

CVV–AIPAI Policy 2026

(Effective from Academic Year 2026–27)

In accordance with the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018

1. SHORT TITLE, COMMENCEMENT, AND AUTHORITY

1.1 This Policy shall be called the "Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeeth Policy Governing Academic Integrity, Prevention of Plagiarism, and the Use of Artificial Intelligence (CVV–AIPAI Policy), 2026."

1.2 This Policy shall come into force with effect from the Academic Year 2026–27, upon approval by the competent authority, and shall supersede all earlier guidelines or orders on the subject issued by the University.

1.3 This Policy has been framed in accordance with the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018 (hereinafter referred to as "UGC Regulations, 2018"). In all matters not expressly covered herein, the UGC Regulations, 2018 shall apply.

1.4 The office of the Dean Academic Affairs (DAA) shall be responsible for the overall administration and implementation of this Policy.

1.5 In case of any ambiguity or dispute in interpretation, the decision of the Vice Chancellor shall be final and binding.

2. DEFINITIONS

In this Policy, unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms shall have the meanings assigned to them:

2.1 "Academic Integrity" is the intellectual honesty in proposing, performing, and reporting any activity which leads to the creation of intellectual property. It encompasses the cardinal values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility in all academic endeavours.

2.2 "AI-Generated Content" means text, images, data, code, or any other output that has been produced primarily or substantially by any Artificial Intelligence tool/s without sufficient human intellectual engagement, critical analysis, or original contribution by the Author.

2.3 "AI Tool" means any software application, platform, or service powered by artificial intelligence or large language models that is capable of generating, summarising, paraphrasing, translating, or otherwise producing academic content. Examples include, but are not limited to, ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot, Grammarly (AI-assist mode), and similar tools.

2.4 "Author" includes a student, faculty member, researcher, or staff of CVV who claims to be the creator of the work under consideration.

2.5 "Common Knowledge" means a well-known fact, quote, figure, or information that is known to most people within a discipline.

2.6 "CVV" means Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeeth, Deemed to be University.

2.7 "DAA" means the Dean of Academic Affairs coordinating and managing all academic programmes of the University.

2.8 "DAIC" (School/Department/Centre Academic Integrity Committee) means the body constituted at the School, Department, or Research Centre level to investigate allegations of plagiarism and AI misconduct. For the purposes of this Policy, this body shall be referred to as the School/Department/Centre Academic Integrity Committee (SDCAIC).

2.9 "HoS / HoD / HoC" means the Head of School, Head of Department, or Head of Research Centre respectively.

2.10 "IAIC" (Institutional Academic Integrity Committee) means the body constituted at the University level to consider recommendations of the SDCAI Committee and to take appropriate decisions on allegations of plagiarism and AI misconduct and the penalties to be imposed.

2.11 "Information" includes data, message, text, images, sound, voice, codes, computer programmes, software, and databases or computer-generated microfiche.

2.12 "Plagiarism" means the practice of taking someone else's work or idea and presenting it as one's own, without proper acknowledgement. It includes copying phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, images, or longer extracts from published or unpublished works — including internet sources — without acknowledging the source, and submitting AI-generated content as one's own original work.

2.13 "Programme" means a programme of study leading to the award of an undergraduate, postgraduate, master's, or research-level degree offered by CVV.

2.14 "Researcher" refers to a person conducting academic or scientific research at CVV.

2.15 "Script" includes research paper, thesis, dissertation, chapters in books, full-fledged books, and any other similar work submitted for assessment, or for publication in print or electronic media, by students, faculty, researcher, or staff of CVV. It excludes assignments, term papers, project proposals and reports, course work, essays, and answer scripts at the UG level unless otherwise specified by the concerned School/Department.

2.16 "Self-Plagiarism" means reproducing, in part or whole, one's own previously published work without proper reference or disclosure, and without appropriate permission from the publisher where required.

2.17 "Source" means the published primary and secondary material from any source — including written information and opinions gained directly from other people, eminent scholars, public figures, and practitioners — in any form, as also data and information in electronic form.

2.18 "Undergraduate (UG) Student" means a person duly admitted to and pursuing a Bachelor's degree programme at CVV, whether in a three-year or four-year format, in any mode of study (full-time or part-time). For the purposes of this Policy, a UG student is subject to the similarity thresholds and penalties applicable to the Undergraduate level as prescribed in Sections 8 and 13.

2.19 "Postgraduate (PG) Student" means a person duly admitted to and pursuing a Master's degree programme at CVV, whether a one-year programme following a four-year Bachelor's degree or a two-year programme following a three-year Bachelor's degree, in any mode of study (full-time or part-time). For the purposes of this Policy, a PG student is subject to the similarity thresholds and penalties applicable to the Postgraduate level as prescribed in Sections 8 and 13.

2.20 "Research Scholar" means a candidate registered for the Ph.D. programme (both Full Time and Part Time) at CVV.

2.21 "Postdoctoral Fellow" means a person who holds a doctoral degree and is engaged in advanced academic or scientific research at CVV on a fixed-term appointment, typically under the mentorship of a faculty member, for the purpose of developing research expertise and generating scholarly output. A Postdoctoral Fellow shall be treated on par with a Researcher for the purposes of this Policy, and shall be subject to the Ph.D. / Research level similarity thresholds and the faculty publication penalties prescribed in Sections 8 and 13.2.

2.22 "Faculty" refers to any person who is teaching and/or guiding students enrolled at CVV in any capacity whatsoever, and includes the following categories:

2.22.1 Full-time Faculty: a permanent or tenured member of the teaching and research staff of CVV, engaged on a full-time basis under a regular employment contract with the University.

2.22.2 Part-time Faculty: a faculty member engaged by CVV on a part-time basis, contributing to teaching, supervision, or research for a defined number of hours, courses, or credits per semester, without a full-time employment commitment.

2.22.3 Visiting Faculty: a faculty member from another institution, industry, or professional body who is invited to teach, lecture, deliver a course, or contribute to research at CVV for a limited and defined period.

All three categories of faculty are fully bound by this Policy in respect of any academic or research work produced, submitted, or published under CVV affiliation.

2.23 "Year" means the academic year in which a proven offence has been committed.

3. SCOPE AND APPLICATION

3.1 This Policy shall apply to all students, faculty members, researchers, and staff of CVV, across all Schools, Departments, and Centres, and shall cover all programmes offered by the University including Undergraduate (UG), Postgraduate (PG), and Doctoral (PhD) programmes.

3.2 This Policy shall apply to all academic and research submissions including, but not limited to:

- Thesis, dissertations, and research proposals
- Research papers, journal articles, book chapters, books and conference papers and workshops.
- Assignments, term papers, project proposals and reports, and case studies (at UG, PG and Ph.D. levels)
- Teaching and research case studies submitted for publication
- Any other academic work submitted for the purpose of evaluation or publication

3.3 Faculty members submitting academic publications, applying for promotions, or presenting research outputs under CVV affiliation shall also be bound by this policy.

4. OBJECTIVES

4.1 To create awareness about responsible conduct of research, academic writing, and the promotion of academic integrity among students, faculty, researchers, and staff.

4.2 To establish an institutional mechanism through education, training, and systematic processes to facilitate responsible conduct of research, deter plagiarism, and ensure originality of academic work.

4.3 To develop systems and set up mechanisms to detect plagiarism and AI misconduct, and to prevent and penalise the commission of such acts by members of the academic community.

4.4 To promote a culture of academic honesty that values, authentic intellectual effort, critical thinking, and original contribution to knowledge.

4.5 To provide a principled, developmental, and fair framework for the use of Artificial Intelligence tools in academic work — one that augments learning rather than substituting it.

5. AWARENESS PROGRAMMES AND TRAINING

5.1 CVV shall instruct students, faculty, researchers, and staff about proper attribution, the seeking of permission from the author wherever necessary, acknowledgement of source compatible with the needs of the discipline, best practices, and compliance with international conventions and regulations governing the source.

5.2 It shall conduct sensitisation seminars and awareness programmes every semester on the responsible conduct of research, thesis, dissertation writing, publication ethics, academic integrity, and the ethical use of AI tools, for students, faculty, researchers, and staff.

6. CURBING PLAGIARISM

6.1 CVV shall use Turnitin, or such other approved plagiarism detection software as may be notified from time to time, to check all thesis, dissertations, research papers, and other academic submissions for plagiarism.

6.2 Every student submitting a thesis, dissertation, or any other such document to CVV shall submit an undertaking indicating that the document has been prepared by him or her, that it is his or her original work, and that it is free of any plagiarism. The undertaking shall also confirm that the document has been duly checked through the plagiarism detection tool approved by CVV, and that it has not been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma to any other Higher Educational Institution.

6.3 Each Research Supervisor shall submit a certificate indicating that the research work done by the researcher under his or her supervision is plagiarism-free and is the original work of the researcher.

6.4 The plagiarism check report, generated through approved software, placed in the institute library, shall be submitted along with the Synopsis and the final thesis. The Plagiarism Similarity Index (PSI) must comply with the thresholds prescribed in Clause 8 of this policy.

6.**7** Similarity Index: Faculty members and researchers are expected to check the similarity index of their work using the CVV-approved plagiarism detection software before submitting it to any journal, conference, or publisher. This check shall be conducted as a matter of standard practice prior to external submission, and the resulting report shall be retained for institutional records.

The prescribed threshold for faculty and researcher publications is a Plagiarism Similarity Index (PSI) of up to 10% (Level 0), in accordance with the UGC Regulations, 2018. CVV recognises, however, that certain reputed journals — particularly in the sciences and social sciences — routinely permit similarity levels of up to 15%, owing to the standard use of technical terminology, methodology descriptions, and domain-specific phrasing. In such cases, the following shall apply:

(i) Where a faculty member or researcher submits work to a journal whose stated editorial policy explicitly permits a similarity threshold higher than 10% but not exceeding 15%, that journal's threshold shall be treated as acceptable for the purposes of this policy, provided the faculty member submits documentary evidence of the journal's policy to the HoS / HoD / HoC at the time of submission.

(ii) Where the similarity index exceeds 15%, regardless of the journal's own policy, the work must be reviewed and revised before submission. CVV's responsibility extends to the integrity of its affiliated researchers' outputs, and institutional affiliation carries institutional accountability. The review and revision will be done by the author(s) of the publication.

(iii) In all cases, the faculty member remains responsible for ensuring that any similarity is attributable to proper citation and standard disciplinary usage, and not to unacknowledged borrowing.

7. SIMILARITY CHECKS — EXCLUSIONS FROM PLAGIARISM

7.1 The following shall be excluded from similarity checks conducted for the purpose of determining plagiarism:

(i) All quoted work reproduced with all necessary permission and / or attribution, where the quotation is properly enclosed in quotation marks or otherwise clearly identified.

(ii) All references, bibliography, table of contents, preface, and acknowledgements.

(iii)All generic terms, laws, standard symbols, and standard equations.

7.2 Research work carried out by the student, faculty, researcher, or staff shall be based on original ideas and shall include the abstract, summary, hypothesis, observations, results, conclusions, and recommendations. These shall not have any similarities. Common knowledge or coincidental terms, up to fourteen (14) consecutive words, shall be excluded from the similarity check.

8. LEVELS OF PLAGIARISM

8.1 Plagiarism shall be quantified into the following levels in ascending order of severity. These levels shall apply to thesis, dissertations, and academic/research publications:

Level	UG Programmes (Similarity Index)	PG Programmes (Similarity Index)	PhD. / Research (Similarity Index)	Similarity Index	Description
Level 0	Up to 30%	Up to 20%	Up to 10%	Up to 10%	Minor similarities — No penalty
Level 1	Above 30% to 50%	Above 20% to 40%	Above 10% to 40%	Above 10% to 40%	Moderate similarities — Penalties as prescribed in Section 14
Level 2	Above 50% to 70%	Above 40% to 60%	Above 40% to 60%	Above 40% to 60%	High similarities — Penalties as prescribed in Section 14
Level 3	Above 70%	Above 60%	Above 60%	Above 60%	Severe similarities — Penalties as prescribed in Section 14

Note: The thresholds above reflect the different nature of academic work at each level. UG students are in the early stages of learning to engage with sources, and a higher threshold acknowledges this developmental stage while still requiring proper attribution. PG students are expected to demonstrate greater independent synthesis. PhD scholars and researchers are held to the strictest standard of originality in line with the UGC Regulations, 2018.

8.2 The Plagiarism Similarity Index (PSI) shall be computed after applying all exclusions specified in Clause 7.

8.3 Note on repeated plagiarism: A student or researcher who commits plagiarism more than once shall be penalised for plagiarism at one level higher than the previous level of plagiarism committed by him or her. Where the highest level of plagiarism has been committed, the punishment for the same shall be operative.

8.4 Note on plagiarism discovered after award of degree or credit: If plagiarism is proved on a date later than the date of award of degree or credit, the degree or credit shall be put in abeyance for a period recommended by the IAIC and approved by the Vice Chancellor.

9. POLICY ON THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI)

9.1 Preamble

The accelerated development and adoption of Artificial Intelligence tools across all dimensions of human life presents both opportunities and serious challenges for academic institutions. CVV recognises that AI tools are increasingly used by students and researchers, and that a measured, developmental, and principled response is more appropriate than a blanket prohibition. The aim of this policy is not to resist AI but to ensure that it augments — rather than substitutes — the intellectual and cognitive development that lies at the heart of education.

CVV's vision, rooted in the pursuit of genuine understanding and the formation of the whole person, demands that academic work reflect authentic human engagement with knowledge.

9.2 Aims

The aims of this AI Policy are to:

- Promote ethical and transparent use of AI tools in academic work.
- Preserve academic integrity and the originality of student and researcher output.
- Encourage the redesign of assessment practices to ensure authentic learning.
- Protect the cognitive development of students by ensuring that AI supplements but does not replace genuine intellectual effort.
- Develop a shared institutional understanding of where AI adds value and where it undermines the educational process.

9.3 Framework: AI as Cognitive Tool vs AI as Cognitive Substitute

CVV draws a fundamental distinction between two modes of AI use:

(a) Acceptable Use — AI as a Cognitive Tool:

AI may be used legitimately as a tool to support the author's own intellectual work. Acceptable uses include:

- Brainstorming and generating initial ideas for further development by the student.
- Structuring an outline or organising thoughts before the author writes independently.
- Clarifying concepts, definitions, or background information as a starting point for further reading.
- Refining grammar, sentence structure, and language — provided the substance and ideas are the author's own.
- Translating content where the ideas are the author's and AI assists only in language.
- Generating code or computational scripts where the student understands and critically evaluates the output.

(b) Unacceptable Use — AI as a Cognitive Substitute:

AI must not be used in ways that replace or bypass the author's own intellectual effort. Unacceptable uses include:

- Generating full assignments, essays, reports, or thesis chapters without critical engagement by the author.
- Submitting AI-generated content as one's own original work, with or without minor editing.
- Using AI to bypass conceptual understanding, critical analysis, or the synthesis of knowledge.

- Paraphrasing sources using AI tools and presenting the result as the author's own writing.
- Using AI to fabricate references, citations, data, or research findings.
- Using AI to complete take-home examinations, viva preparation responses, or any individually assessed work.

9.4 Mandatory AI Disclosure

(i) All students, researchers, faculty, and staff submitting academic work to CVV must include a declaration of AI use as part of their submission. The declaration shall specify:

- Whether AI tools were used in the preparation of the submission.
- The name(s) of the specific AI tool(s) used.
- The nature and extent of AI use (e.g., grammar checking, brainstorming, drafting).
- The steps taken by the author to verify, critically engage with, and take ownership of the content.

(ii) Failure to disclose the use of AI tools when AI has in fact been used shall constitute academic misconduct and shall be treated on par with undisclosed plagiarism. Penalties shall be as prescribed in Clause 13.

(iii) For thesis and dissertation submissions, the AI disclosure declaration shall be submitted alongside the plagiarism check report, the originality undertaking, and the supervisor's certificate.

9.5 Classification Framework for AI Usage

For the purpose of assessing the degree of AI reliance in a submission, the following classification framework shall be applied by faculty and the SDCAIC:

TABLE 9.5 (Source: UGC Regulations, 2018; CVV internal committee, March 2026)

Category	Description	Typical Indicators
AI-Dominant	Majority of the content is AI-generated with minimal human intellectual contribution.	Over-complete, uniform, formulaic structure; absence of personal voice or experiential depth; highly polished language with no stylistic variation.
AI-Assisted (Mixed)	AI has been used to support the author's own work; the author retains intellectual ownership.	Uneven tone; partial originality; combination of personal voice with AI-refined sections; AI use disclosed by the author.
Human-Dominant	Work is predominantly authored by the student or researcher with little or no AI involvement.	Imperfection and natural stylistic variation; personal voice; selective depth; partial understanding visible;

Category	Description	Typical Indicators
		contextual and experiential grounding present.

9.6 Indicators of AI Use

Faculty members, supervisors, and the SDCAIC/IAIC shall not rely solely on AI detection software when assessing submissions. The following indicators shall also inform their reasoned professional judgement:

(a) Linguistic Indicators:

- Excessively polished and uniform language throughout the submission.
- Absence of stylistic variation, personal idiom, or disciplinary voice.
- Repetitive use of academic phrasing patterns typical of large language model output.

(b) Conceptual Indicators:

- Over-comprehensive coverage of all possible themes related to the question posed.
- Balanced but generic critical evaluation without depth or disciplinary specificity.
- Absence of ambiguity, struggle, or partial understanding — qualities that characterise genuine human intellectual engagement.

(c) Impersonal Indicators:

- Absence of personal perspective, contextual grounding, or experiential reference.
- Overcertainty and absence of hedging language where genuine reflection would naturally produce uncertainty.
- No evidence of the author's own position, voice, or critical stance.

(d) Detection Tools:

AI detection tools such as GPTZero, Turnitin AI Detection, Originality.ai, or such other tools may be used to supplement the above indicators. These tools shall be treated as advisory instruments and not as definitive evidence of AI misconduct. A reasonable investigation process, as described in Clauses 13 and 12, must be followed before any determination is made.

9.7 Faculty and Supervisor Responses

CVV adopts a developmental, rather than a solely punitive, approach to AI misconduct. Faculty and supervisors are expected to exercise professional judgement and respond as follows:

(a) For AI-Dominant Submissions:

- Initiate a non-punitive academic conversation with the student to assess comprehension.

- Ask the student to explain key concepts orally or reconstruct arguments without notes.
- Require resubmission with a substantive reflective commentary demonstrating personal engagement.
- Refer to the SDCAIC where the evidence of AI dominance is clear and the student cannot demonstrate genuine understanding.

(b) For AI-Assisted (Mixed) Submissions:

- Encourage greater personal engagement with the ideas and arguments.
- Ask for reflective sections (e.g., "What do you think?"; "How does this apply to your experience?").
- Provide formative feedback directed at developing the student's own analytical voice.

(c) For Human-Dominant Submissions:

- Recognise and reinforce authentic intellectual effort.
- Provide developmental feedback for improvement without penalising honest disclosure of minor AI assistance.

9.8 Penalties for AI Misconduct

Where a submission is determined by the SDCAIC / IAIC to constitute unacceptable AI use as defined in Clause 9.3(b), and where the student, researcher, or faculty member has failed to make the mandatory disclosure required under Clause 9.4, the following penalties shall apply:
TABLE 9.8 (Source: UGC Regulations, 2018; CVV internal committee, March 2026)

Category of AI Use	First Offence	Repeat Offence
AI-Dominant (undisclosed)	Resubmission with formal warning; academic counselling.	Zero marks / Null and void submission; notation on academic record; referral to IAIP.
AI-Dominant (thesis / dissertation)	Treated as Level 2 or 3 plagiarism depending on extent; penalties under Section 14 apply.	Registration for that programme cancelled; referral to Vice Chancellor.
Non-disclosure of AI use (any level)	Formal written warning; resubmission required within a stipulated timeframe.	Treated as academic misconduct; penalties equivalent to Level 1 plagiarism under Section 13.

The SDCAIC / IAIC shall use their discretion in applying penalties, giving due weight to the nature, extent, and intent of AI use, and to whether the student voluntarily disclosed AI use prior to any investigation.

10. DETECTION, REPORTING, AND HANDLING OF PLAGIARISM/AI MISCONDUCT

10.1 If any member of the CVV academic community suspects, with appropriate proof, that a case of plagiarism or AI misconduct has occurred in any document, he or she shall report it to the School / Department / Centre Academic Integrity Committee (SDCAIC) of the School, Department, or Research Centre concerned.

10.2 Upon receipt of such a complaint or allegation, the SDCAIC shall investigate the matter and submit its recommendations to the Institutional Academic Integrity Committee (IAIC) of CVV.

10.3 The authorities of CVV may also take suo moto notice of an act of plagiarism or AI misconduct and initiate proceedings under this policy. Similarly, proceedings may be initiated on the basis of findings of an examiner. All such cases shall be investigated by the IAIC.

10.4 All investigations shall be conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The person against whom an allegation is made shall be given a reasonable opportunity to present their case and to defend themselves.

10.5 Plagiarism proceedings shall not be initiated solely on the basis of a software-generated report. The SDCAIC and IAIC shall conduct a holistic review of the work, taking into account all relevant circumstances before arriving at a finding.

11. SCHOOL / DEPARTMENT / CENTRE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SDCAIC)

11.1 All Schools, Departments, and Research Centres of CVV shall constitute an SDCAIC whose composition shall be as follows:

- Chairperson: Assoc Dean of respective Faculties
- Member: Head of the respective School / Department / Research Centre (HoS / HoD / HoC).
- Member: A senior academician from outside the School / Department, nominated by the Dean Faculties.
- Member: A faculty member well-versed with plagiarism and AI detection tools, nominated by the respective Assoc Dean Faculties.

The tenure of the members in respect of the second and third positions above shall be two years. The quorum for meetings shall be 2 out of 3 members, including the Chairperson.

11.2 The SDCAIC shall follow the principles of natural justice while deciding on allegations of plagiarism and AI misconduct against the student, faculty, researcher, or staff.

11.3 The SDCAIC shall have the power to assess the level of plagiarism or AI misconduct and to recommend penalties accordingly, subject to confirmation by the IAIP.

11.4 The SDCAIC, after investigation, shall submit its report with recommendations on penalties to the IAIC within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of the complaint or initiation of proceedings.

12. INSTITUTIONAL ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (IAIC)

12.1 CVV shall constitute an Institutional Academic Integrity Panel (IAIP) whose composition shall be as follows:

- Chairperson: Dean Academic Affairs
- Member: One External member nominated by the Vice Chancellor.
- Member: A Senior Academician of CVV other than the Chairperson, nominated by the Vice Chancellor.
- Member: Assoc Dean of the respective Faculties
- Member: A person well-versed with anti-plagiarism and AI detection tools, nominated by the Chairperson.

The Chairperson of the SDCAIC and the Chairperson of the IAIC shall not be the same person. The tenure of the Committee members, including the Chairperson, shall be three years. The quorum for meetings shall be 3 out of 4 members, including the Chairperson.

12.2 The IAIC shall consider the recommendations of the SDCAIC and shall decide on appropriate penalties in accordance with this policy.

12.3 The IAIC shall also investigate cases of plagiarism and AI misconduct as per the provisions mentioned in this Policy.

12.4 The IAIC shall follow the principles of natural justice while deciding on allegations against any student, faculty, researcher, or staff of CVV.

12.5 The IAIC shall have the power to review the recommendations of the SDCAIC, including penalties, with due justification.

12.6 The IAIC shall send its report and recommendations on penalties to the Vice Chancellor within 15 days from the date of receipt of the SDCAIC's recommendations or complaint/initiation of proceedings, whichever is earlier.

12.7 The IAIC shall provide a copy of the report to the person(s) against whom the inquiry report has been submitted.

12.8 Where an allegation of plagiarism or AI misconduct is made against the Chairperson or a member of the SDCAIC or IAIC, such member shall not participate in meetings where the case is under consideration.

13. PENALTIES

Penalties in cases of plagiarism and AI misconduct shall be imposed on students, researchers, faculty, and staff of CVV only after academic misconduct on the part of the individual has been established beyond doubt, when all avenues of appeal have been exhausted, and when the individual in question has been provided enough opportunity to defend himself or herself in a fair and transparent manner.

13.1 Penalties in Case of Plagiarism in Submission of Thesis and Dissertations

The IAIC shall impose penalties considering the severity of the plagiarism, as follows:

TABLE 13.1 (Source: UGC Regulations, 2018; CVV internal committee, March 2026)

Level	Similarity Index	Penalty
Level 0	Up to 10%	Minor similarities. No penalty.
Level 1	Above 10% to 40%	The student/research scholar shall be asked to submit a revised script within a stipulated period of no more than six (6) months.
Level 2	Above 40% to 60%	The student/research scholar shall be debarred from submitting a revised script for a period of one (1) year.
Level 3	Above 60%	The student's/research scholar registration for that programme shall be cancelled.

Note 1 — Repeated plagiarism: Such a student/research scholar shall be penalised for plagiarism of one level higher than the previous level of plagiarism committed by him or her. Where plagiarism of the highest level has been committed, the punishment for the same shall be operative.

Note 2 — Where degree or credit has already been awarded: If plagiarism is proved on a date later than the date of award of the degree or credit, as the case may be, then the degree or credit shall be put in abeyance for a period recommended by the IAI and approved by the Vice Chancellor.

13.2 Penalties in Case of Plagiarism in Academic and Research Publications

The IAIC shall impose penalties considering the severity of the plagiarism in academic and research publications by faculty, researchers, and staff, as follows:

TABLE 13.2 (Source: UGC Regulations, 2018; CVV internal committee, March 2026)

Level	Similarity Index	Penalty
Level 0	Up to 10%	Minor similarities. No penalty.
Level 1	Above 10% to 40%	Shall be asked to withdraw the manuscript.
Level 2	Above 40% to 60%	(i) Shall be asked to withdraw the manuscript. (ii) Shall be denied the right to one annual increment. (iii) Shall not be allowed to be a supervisor to any new Master's, M.Phil., or PhD student or scholar for a period of two (2) years.
Level 3	Above 60%	(i) Shall be asked to withdraw the manuscript. (ii) Shall be denied the right to two successive annual increments. (iii) Shall not be allowed to be a supervisor to any new Master's, M.Phil., or PhD student or scholar for a period of three (3) years.

Note 1 — Repeated plagiarism: The author shall be asked to withdraw the manuscript and shall be penalised for plagiarism of one level higher than the lower level committed by him or her. Where plagiarism of the highest level has been committed, the punishment for the same shall be operative. If the Level 3 offence is repeated, disciplinary action including suspension or termination as per the relevant service rules shall be taken by CVV.

Note 2 — Where benefit or credit has already been obtained: If plagiarism is proved on a date later than the date of benefit or credit obtained, as the case may be, then the benefit or credit shall be put in abeyance for a period recommended by the IAIC and approved by the Vice Chancellor.

13.3 Penalties for Plagiarism in UG and PG Coursework

The following penalties shall apply to students enrolled in Undergraduate (UG) and Postgraduate (PG) programmes who submit plagiarised work in course assignments, term papers, project proposals and reports, and similar submissions, in accordance with the levels prescribed in Section 8:

TABLE 13.3 (Source: UGC Regulations, 2018; CVV internal committee, March 2026)

Level	Similarity Index	Penalty
Level 0	Up to 10%	No penalty.
Level 1	Above 10% to 40%	Formal written warning. Resubmission required within a timeframe specified by the concerned faculty member, not exceeding four (4) weeks.
Level 2	Above 40% to 60%	Zero marks for the submission. Academic counselling by the concerned faculty member. One repeat submission opportunity within six (6) weeks, which shall carry a maximum of 50% of the originally allocated marks.
Level 3	Above 60%	Zero marks for the submission. Referral to the SDCAIC. Depending on SDCAIC recommendation, the student may receive a failing grade for the course or, in cases of repeat offence, face deregistration from the course or suspension from the programme for one semester.

14. GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL MECHANISM

14.1 Any student, researcher, faculty member, or staff aggrieved by a decision of the Institutional Academic Integrity Panel (IAIP) made under this Policy may appeal to the CVV Academic Integrity Appellate Committee (AIAC), constituted as follows:

- **Chairperson:** Dean, Research and Development
- **Members:** All other Deans of CVV
- **Member Secretary:** Registrar

14.2 The Appellate Committee shall be constituted by the Vice Chancellor and shall have a tenure of three years. The quorum for any meeting of the Committee shall be the Chairperson, at least two members, and the Member Secretary.

14.3 An appeal must be submitted in writing to the Member Secretary within thirty (30) days of receipt of the IAIP's decision. Appeals submitted after this period shall not ordinarily be entertained unless the Appellate Committee is satisfied that sufficient cause existed for the delay.

14.4 The Appellate Committee shall review the case on the basis of the records of the SDCAIP and IAIP proceedings, the IAIP's decision, and the written grounds of appeal submitted by the aggrieved party. The Committee may, at its discretion, call for additional information or hear the parties concerned.

14.5 The Appellate Committee shall communicate its decision within forty-five (45) days of receipt of the appeal.

14.6 The decision of the Appellate Committee shall be final and binding on all parties concerned, and shall be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for record.

14.7 No member of the Appellate Committee who was involved, directly or indirectly, in the original investigation or IAIP proceedings shall participate in the consideration of the related appeal.

15. MISCELLANEOUS

15.1 Institutional Records: The SDCAIC and IAIC shall maintain proper records of all complaints, investigations, and decisions under this policy. These records shall be maintained for a minimum period of five (5) years.

15.2 Confidentiality: The identity of the complainant and the details of any ongoing investigation shall be kept confidential to the extent permissible under the principles of natural justice.

15.3 Prohibition of Victimisation: No person who, in good faith, reports a suspected case of plagiarism or AI misconduct shall be subjected to any disciplinary action or adverse treatment as a result of making such a report.

15.4 Undertakings at the Time of Admission: At the time of admission to any programme, all students and Research Scholars must give an undertaking that they have read and understood the CVV Academic Integrity, Plagiarism Prevention, and AI Use Policy, and that they will abide by this Policy throughout their period of study.

15.5 UGC Regulations as Supplementary Authority: In all matters not expressly covered by this Policy, the UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018, shall apply.

16. CHANGE OF POLICY

(i) The Academic Council of CVV may revise, amend, or modify this Policy from time to time.

(ii) Any clause not covered in this Policy shall be referred to the UGC Regulations, 2018 for guidance.

(iii) Any discrepancy or matter not covered by this Policy or by the UGC Regulations, 2018 shall be referred to the Vice Chancellor, whose decision shall be final and binding.

ANNEXURE I

STUDENT / RESEARCHER UNDERTAKING

(Academic Integrity, Plagiarism, and AI Use)

I, _____ (Name), bearing Registration / Enrolment No. _____, enrolled in the Programme _____ at Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeeth, do hereby solemnly undertake as follows:

(i) The work submitted herewith, titled _____, has been prepared by me and is my own original work, free of plagiarism.

(ii) The work has not been submitted elsewhere, in whole or in part, for the award of any degree, diploma, or other qualification.

(iii) All sources used have been duly acknowledged, and proper citations and references have been provided throughout. The work has been checked for plagiarism using the CVV-approved plagiarism detection software and complies with the permissible similarity thresholds prescribed under the CVV–AIPAI Policy, 2026.

(iv) With respect to the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools:

- I have / have not *(delete as applicable)* used AI tools in the preparation of this work.
- If AI tools were used, the details are as follows — Tool(s) used: _____; Nature of use: _____
- I confirm that the ideas, arguments, analysis, and conclusions presented are my own, and that AI has been used only as a cognitive tool and not as a cognitive substitute.

(v) I understand that any breach of the above undertakings shall constitute academic misconduct and shall make me liable to penalties under the CVV–AIPAI Policy, 2026.

Name: _____

Programme / Department: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

ANNEXURE II
SUPERVISOR'S CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINALITY

This is to certify that the thesis/dissertation/research paper/proposal titled _____, submitted by _____ (Name), bearing Registration No. _____, for the award of the degree of _____ from Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeeth, is a record of bonafide research work carried out by the candidate under my supervision.

I further certify that:

(i) The work presented in this thesis/dissertation has been carried out by the candidate independently and constitutes original research.

(ii) The Plagiarism Similarity Index (PSI) of the work has been checked using _____ (name of approved software) and is _____%, which complies with the CVV–AIPAI Policy, 2026.

(iii) The candidate has made a proper disclosure of AI tool usage (if any) as per the CVV–AIPAI Policy, 2026, and I am satisfied that AI has been used appropriately and, in a manner, consistent with academic integrity.

(iv) The thesis/dissertation has not been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma to any other Higher Educational Institution.

(v) The candidate has complied with all requirements of the CVV PhD / PG Policy and the CVV–AIPAI Policy, 2026.

Name of Supervisor: _____

Designation: _____

School / Department / Research Centre: _____

Date: _____

Signature and Seal: _____