

APPROVED by  
Order No. A-115 of the Rector of Kaunas  
University of Technology of  
24 March 2022

## **GUIDELINES FOR PLAGIARISM PREVENTION IN THE WRITTEN WORKS OF THE STUDENTS OF KAUNAS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY**

### **CHAPTER I GENERAL PROVISIONS**

1. The Guidelines for Plagiarism Prevention in the Written Works of the Students of Kaunas University of Technology (hereinafter – Guidelines) regulate the procedures for similarity check in semester's written works and final degree projects (hereinafter – written works) of students and unclassified students of the first, second cycle, integrated and professional studies (hereinafter – students) of Kaunas University of Technology (hereinafter – University), types and scope of plagiarism, measures for plagiarism prevention, procedure for plagiarism detection, settlement of academic violations and implementation of academic penalties.

2. The process “Perform Similarity Check and Plagiarism Detection in the Written Works of the Students and Unclassified Students of the First and Second Cycle, Integrated and Professional Studies of Kaunas University of Technology” is prepared according to the Guidelines and provided in Appendix 3 to the Guidelines.

3. Each member of the academic community must follow the principle of academic integrity and provisions of academic ethics. The students, who sign a learning agreement, undertake to comply with academic discipline, the Code of Academic Ethics and the procedures set out by another internal legislation of the University, perform their tasks independently and honestly.

4. The violations of academic ethics (for example, plagiarism, counterfeiting/forgery, copying, submission of the same written work for the assessment of several study modules, submission of the written work prepared by another person or its results as their own, etc.) are not tolerated and can be examined at the University as well as the Office of Ombudsman for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania or in court.

5. The similarity check system “Turnitin” (hereinafter – “Turnitin”) integrated into the virtual learning environment of the University “Moodle” (hereinafter – “Moodle”) is used for the similarity check of written works and other sources. It automatically detects the similarities between the submitted written work and other information sources, identifies the possible cases of student fraud in text formatting. The “Turnitin” identifies the similarities in written works, determines a total percentage of similarities and prepares a comprehensive summary of the originality report. This system allows the lecturers to give feedback to students using the tools for commenting and evaluation. In addition (in the case of art studies – as an alternative), other electronic similarity check systems, online search systems can be used; similarities can be detected manually or by applying several methods of similarity check.

6. Key terms used in the Guidelines:

6.1. Written work – a semester's written work prepared by the student during studies (for example, internship report, laboratory report, research paper, essay, project or another written work), which is used as an assessment for the intermediate or final task of semester's individual work, and a final degree project;

6.2. Plagiarism – intentional or unintended (due to ignorance) appropriation of the copyrights of discovery, invention, research work, work of art or literature, or a part thereof, and its publication

in his/her name without the proper reference or improper reference to the author and the source (without complying with quotation requirements or providing a misleading link);

6.3. Similarity – matching of the inspected written work with the text of the previously prepared written works or other sources. The similarity is not plagiarism in itself, because a text from another written work can be provided in accordance with established quotation requirements. The lecturer of the study module who is assessing the written work decides whether these similarities can be considered plagiarism;

6.4. Similarity check – a process of inspection of the written work using an electronic similarity check system and identifying the similarities between the texts in the written work and other sources. The results of the similarity check – a comprehensive summary of the originality report specifying a total percentage of similarities and similarities between the text and other sources; the similarity check may also be conducted using the online search systems or using the expert evaluation method.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **TYPES AND SCOPE OF PLAGIARISM**

#### **7. Types of plagiarism:**

7.1. Plagiarism of an idea or style – conveying or rephrasing (as well as translation from other languages) another person's idea or theory as your own;

7.2. Self-plagiarism – repeated submission or publication of the same or similar work of your own, aiming to get one more result of studies or research; using a part or parts of your own published work in another work providing no references to the source;

7.3. Verbatim plagiarism – verbatim copying of the work by another author providing no references to the source;

7.4. Plagiarism by rephrasing or changing a word – changes of the text copied from the work by another author (used inversion of words, changed grammatical structure, changes of words or sentences, abbreviation), creating an impression that it is the author's text;

7.5. Plagiarism using synonyms – improperly rephrased text from the work by another author (as well as translated from other languages) when individual words are replaced by synonyms;

7.6. Compiled text – non-independent text consisting of the fragments copied from various sources, even when the sources in the text are quoted correctly but there is no original text;

7.7. Translation plagiarism – translation of the work published in another language providing no references to that work;

7.8. Image plagiarism – the use of images (for example, photographs, videos, graphic data) without the proper consent of the author and providing no references to the source;

7.9. Multimedia plagiarism – the use of multimedia (for example, audio records, photographs, videos, music and other media) providing no references to the source;

7.10. Invalid source – text providing references to non-existent or incorrectly defined sources;

7.11. Secondary sources plagiarism – re-quotation of data or information from secondary sources, providing reference to the original source;

7.12. Failure to provide references – text mentioning sources not included in the list of references, footnotes, and vice versa.

8. The similarities that are not considered plagiarism – properly provided references to the sources, quotations, general knowledge:

8.1. Source – written or oral information from your own work(s) or those of others identified by giving a reference of this (these) work(s)<sup>1</sup>. According to the quotation style, the alphabetical order

---

<sup>1</sup> Tauginienė, L., Gaižauskaitė, I., Glendinning, I., Kravjar, J., Ojsteršek, M., Ribeiro, L., Odiņeca, T., Marino, F., Cosentino, M., Sivasubramaniam, S.H., and Foltýnek, T. Glossary for Academic Integrity. Updated version, October 2018. Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris University, 2019.

or order in which the sources are provided in the text, the bibliographic descriptions of the references used (quoted, rephrased or mentioned) in the preparation of the written work<sup>2</sup>;

8.2. Quotation – relatively short extract (small paragraphs, up to several sentences) from another work used to prove the author’s statements or make them understandable or give reference to an approach or ideas by another author formulated in the original work<sup>3</sup>;

8.3. Common knowledge – information known to the general public or certain community (for example, representatives of a profession, science field, etc.) which raises no doubts and is comprehended unambiguously (for example, a structure of the water molecule (H<sub>2</sub>O), Lithuania is a member of the European Union), which original source is unknown or there are many sources. When common knowledge is provided in a written work, a reference to the original source is unnecessary. However, the same information is considered common knowledge in a certain community, while not in the others. Ideas and opinions are very rarely classified as common knowledge. Every time there is a doubt if the information is common knowledge, a reference to the original source has to be provided<sup>4</sup>. Common knowledge includes general terms that are used in the same meaning almost in all areas of science, for example, ratio, system, theory.

9. Repeated use of the text/data from the student’s previous written works providing reference to the source cannot exceed 10% of a new written work, except for the cases when the repeated use providing reference to the source is the continuation of the previous research (for example, the data of the professional internship report or the data of the research project report used in the final degree project). In this case, the repeated use cannot exceed 30% of a new written work.

10. Plagiarism in any scope is not tolerated in written works; however, the imposed academic penalties vary depending on the scope of plagiarism and other circumstances. Large-scale plagiarism or repeated plagiarism may be the basis for the termination of the learning agreement with the University.

11. The following cases are considered large-scale plagiarism in a written work:

11.1. The total amount of similarities with other sources that are considered plagiarism makes more than 15% of the entire written work;

11.2. Similarities with one source that are considered plagiarism make more than 5% of the entire written work;

11.3. The extracts of the text by another author rewritten verbatim/translated verbatim from another language providing reference to the source or not but not marking the rewritten text as a quotation make more than 600 characters in one location of the written work (without spaces) or rephrasing of the text by another author providing no reference to the source makes more than 1200 characters in one location of the written work (without spaces).

12. A written work may be considered an unoriginal work by the student if the total amount of similarities with other sources (providing reference to the source and/or not) makes more than 30% of the entire written work. In this case, the procedures for recording plagiarism and the academic penalties stipulated by these Guidelines are applied.

### **CHAPTER III MEASURES FOR PLAGIARISM PREVENTION**

13. To ensure the academic integrity of students and strengthen their skills in preparation of high-quality written works:

<sup>2</sup> Berkmanienė, A., Cesevičiūtė, I., Dervinienė, A., Maumevičienė, D., Mikelionienė, J., Rakickaitė, J., Rutkūnienė, Ž., Stravinskienė, J., Tautkevičienė, G. Methodological Guidelines for Preparation of Written Works. Kaunas: “Technologija”, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> The Law on Copyright and Related Rights of the Republic of Lithuania, [accessed on 08 03 2022]. Online access: <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.551F0CDE5B64/xGlaHuKiND>.

<sup>4</sup> a) Harvard Guide to Using Sources. The Exception: Common Knowledge. Harvard College, [accessed on 08 03 2022]. Online access: <https://usingsources.fas.harvard.edu/exception-common-knowledge>; b) Academic Integrity at MIT: A Handbook for Students, [accessed on 08 03 2022]. Online access: <https://integrity.mit.edu/handbook/citing-your-sources/what-common-knowledge>.

13.1. The Library of the University organises training and consultations for students: first-year students – during the introduction week to studies, during the study module of introduction to studies and other study modules; the final-year students – during the mandatory training; within the period of studies – during the training on the chosen topic. Training includes the topics of academic and information literacy, copyrights, plagiarism prevention, quotation of sources, making a list of references adapting them according to the year of the students' studies;

13.2. The Department of Student Affairs uses the communication channels of the University for the dissemination of information about the academic integrity of students, the introduction of the principles of the work of the University, academic ethics and moral standards to students, other plagiarism prevention.

14. A student:

14.1. Before the beginning of studies, independently reads the Code of Academic Ethics of the University, the Regulations on the Assessment of Study Modules and other legislation regulating the study process, commits to the principles of academic ethics;

14.2. Before the preparation of written works, independently leads the Methodological Guidelines for Preparation of Written Works of the University<sup>5</sup>, including the requirements for quotation of sources, making of a list of references, also reads the special requirements for preparation of written works provided by the lecturer of the study module;

14.3. Participates in the training organised by the Library of the University (Subparagraph 13.1 of the Guidelines);

14.4. Is responsible for the independent preparation and originality of the written works and the final degree project.

15. The Field's Study Programme Committee:

15.1. Periodically reviews the study methods used in the study modules, the student achievement evaluation strategies and the assessment tasks;

15.2. Before the beginning of each semester coordinates the frequency and even distribution of the assessment scheduled for the students of the study programme in the semester;

15.3. Consults the lecturers of the study modules on the organisation of assessments aiming to ensure the effective work of students during the entire semester and their academic integrity.

16. A lecturer of the study module (hereinafter – lecturer):

16.1. During the first class, informs the students about the evaluation strategy and criteria of the study module, the planned assessments, the requirements for the preparation of written works, reminds the ethical standards for students specified in the Code of Academic Ethics of the University and indicates the academic penalties applied for the failure to adhere to the principle of academic integrity;

16.2. Reminds the students that they have to read the Methodological Guidelines for Preparation of Written Works of the University independently (Subparagraph 14.2 of the Guidelines), recommends them to participate in the training organised by the Library of the University (Subparagraph 13.1 of the Guidelines);

16.3. In the study process, uses "Turnitin" for similarity check in the students' written works, improvement of quality in the written works and giving feedback to students; informs the students about the conducted similarity check and plagiarism detection in their written works;

16.4. In the study module, applies accumulative evaluation, organises intermediate reviews of the larger written works, gives the students the opportunity for preventive checks of their written works using "Turnitin".

17. A supervisor of the final degree project (hereinafter – supervisor):

17.1. Introduces the requirements for the preparation of the final degree project to students, consults, monitors the process of the preparation of the final degree project, assesses the prepared parts of the work (intermediate assessments) and the chosen sources;

---

<sup>5</sup> Berkmanienė, A., Cesevičiūtė, I., Dervinienė, A., Maumevičienė, D., Mikelionienė, J., Rakickaitė, J., Rutkūnienė, Ž., Stravinskienė, J., Tautkevičienė, G. Methodological Guidelines for Preparation of Written Works. Kaunas: "Technologija", 2019.

17.2. Conducts a similarity check of the final degree project using “Turnitin” and submits the summary of the originality report to the assigned employee of the academic department confirming that plagiarism is not detected in the final degree project. If the fact of plagiarism is detected, the procedures set out by the Guidelines are applied.

18. All members of the University community are urged to inform the administration of the University about all the observed/suspected cases of academic dishonesty, including plagiarism in the section “Report” in the information systems of the University.

#### **CHAPTER IV**

#### **PLAGIARISM DETECTION IN SEMESTER’S WRITTEN WORKS, VIOLATION SETTLEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PENALTIES**

19. The similarity check in all semester’s written works prepared according to the information from other sources is conducted in the course of the study module in the “Moodle” using the “Turnitin”.

20. The student uploads a written work in the set format to the “Moodle”. Before uploading the final version of the semester’s written work for the evaluation by the lecturer, the students are provided with the opportunity to upload the written work for the similarity check at least once (self-inspection). Any actions performed by the student aiming to impede the written work’s similarity check and correct the scope of similarities in unauthorised ways are considered an academic violation.

21. The lecturer conducts a similarity check of the semester’s written works, reviews the summary of the originality report generated by the “Turnitin” and assesses whether the submitted written work contains plagiarism.

22. If the scope of similarities detected in the semester’s written work is smaller than stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines (there are no indications of large-scale plagiarism):

22.1. The lecturer may mark the similarities that are not considered plagiarism, update the summary of the originality report and recalculate the total scope of similarities;

22.2. The lecturer reviews each detected similarity and assesses whether plagiarism essentially disproves the value of the written work (for example, when plagiarism is detected in the written work’s appendixes and information is only complementary, not essential) and other circumstances (for example, if the student tries to hide plagiarism deliberately, or the student lacks knowledge of preparation of written works while preparing the first written works, or repeatedly performs tasks dishonestly, etc.) and decides whether the written work can be evaluated;

22.3. If the semester’s written work:

22.3.1. Can be evaluated, the lecturer gives feedback to the student about the plagiarism detected in the written work, the errors made in quotation, references, etc. and can immediately evaluate the written work or suggest correcting the work and/or reduce the evaluation score;

22.3.2. Cannot be evaluated because plagiarism essentially disproves the value of the written work (for example, when false, plagiarised research results are provided), the lecturer instructs the student to prepare another work, if possible. If it is impossible to prepare a new work in the same semester, the lecturer instructs the student to prepare a new work and/or in case of aggravating circumstances (for example, the student deliberately hides plagiarism, repeatedly performs the tasks dishonestly, etc.), academic penalty (strict reprimand) is imposed on the student and academic debt is recorded, the lecturer notifies the vice-dean for studies of the faculty about the plagiarism detected in the written work, submits the completed Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Semester’s Written Work (Appendix 1), prints the summary of the originality report and related student’s written works from the “Turnitin”.

23. If similarities detected in the semester’s written work correspond at least to one of the scopes stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines (there are indications of large-scale plagiarism) or Paragraph 12 of the Guidelines:

23.1. The lecturer has to mark the similarities that are not considered plagiarism, update the summary of the originality report and recalculate the total scope of similarities;

23.2. If detected similarities in the updated summary of the originality report are lower in scope than stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines, the lecturer follows the procedure stipulated by Paragraph 22 of the Guidelines;

23.3. If detected similarities in the updated summary of the originality report correspond at least to one scope of similarities stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines or Paragraph 12 of the Guidelines, the repeated assessment of the task of semester's individual work is not allowed during the same semester and academic debt is registered for the student; the lecturer notifies the vice-dean for studies of the faculty about the plagiarism detected in the written work, submits the completed Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Semester's Written Work (Appendix 1), prints the summary of the originality report and related student's written works from the "Turnitin". If plagiarism is detected without the use of the "Turnitin" and there is no summary of the originality report, the lecturer provides a detailed explanation about the written work in the Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Semester's Written Work (Appendix 1) and attaches the written work containing the marked parts of the text with detected plagiarism.

24. If the lecturer detects the fact of plagiarism and submits the Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Semester's Written Work (Appendix 1):

24.1. The vice-dean for studies of the faculty enters a conclusion on the imposition of the academic penalty on the students in the Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Semester's Written Work (Appendix 1), notifies the student and lecturer about the academic penalty imposed on the student and makes sure the decree by the dean of the faculty on the imposition of the academic penalty is prepared;

24.2. The lecturer enters the evaluation "0" (not evaluated) next to all the student's tasks that are not assessed in the semester's assessment gradebook of the study module and enters "NA" (not assessed) in the final assessment gradebook of the study module in the Academic Information System of the University.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **PLAGIARISM DETECTION IN FINAL DEGREE PROJECTS, VIOLATION SETTLEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PENALTIES**

25. The similarity check in all final degree projects is conducted in the course of the study module in the "Moodle" using the "Turnitin".

26. The student uploads a final degree project in the set format to the "Moodle". Before uploading the final version of the final degree project for the evaluation by the supervisor, the students are provided with the opportunity to upload the final degree project for the similarity check once (self-inspection). Any actions performed by the student aiming to impede the final degree project's similarity check and correct the scope of similarities in unauthorised ways are considered an academic violation.

27. The supervisor conducts a similarity check of the final degree project, reviews the summary of the originality report generated by the "Turnitin" and assesses whether the submitted written work can be considered plagiarism.

28. If the final degree project contains no detected similarities with other sources or detected similarities are not considered plagiarism, the supervisor, considering the results of the summary of the originality report and other aspects (the content and form of the final degree project, the evaluation of the level of the correctness of the language), evaluates the final degree project by "IS" (assessed).

29. If the scope of similarities detected in the final degree project is smaller than stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines (there are no indications of large-scale plagiarism):

29.1. The supervisor may mark the similarities that are not considered plagiarism, update the summary of the originality report and recalculate the total scope of similarities;

29.2. The supervisor reviews each detected similarity and assesses whether plagiarism essentially disproves the value of the final degree project (for example, when plagiarism is detected in the appendixes of the final degree project and information is only complementary, not essential)

and other circumstances (for example, assesses if the student tries to hide plagiarism deliberately, or the student lacks knowledge of preparation of written works while preparing the first written works, or repeatedly performs tasks dishonestly, etc.) and decides whether the final degree project can be defended;

29.3. If detected similarities that are considered plagiarism do not essentially disprove the value of the final degree project, the supervisor evaluates the final degree project by “IS” (assessed);

29.4. If detected similarities that are considered plagiarism essentially disprove the value of the final degree project or in case of aggravating circumstances (for example, the student deliberately hides plagiarism, repeatedly performs the tasks dishonestly, etc.), the final degree project cannot be defended and the supervisor evaluates the final degree project by “NS” (failed), notifies the qualification commission about the plagiarism in the written work by submitting the completed Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Final Degree Project (Appendix 2) and the summary of the originality report printed from the “Turnitin”.

30. If similarities detected in the final degree project correspond at least to one of the scopes stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines (there are indications of large-scale plagiarism) or Paragraph 12 of the Guidelines:

30.1. The supervisor has to mark the similarities that are not considered plagiarism, update the summary of the originality report and recalculate the total scope of similarities;

30.2. If detected similarities in the updated summary of the originality report are lower in scope than stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines, the supervisor follows the procedure stipulated by Paragraph 29 of the Guidelines;

30.3. If detected similarities in the updated summary of the originality report correspond at least to one scope of similarities stipulated by Paragraph 11 of the Guidelines or Paragraph 12 of the Guidelines, the final degree project cannot be defended; the supervisor evaluates the final degree project by “NS” (failed), notifies the qualification commission about the plagiarism in the written work by submitting the completed Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Final Degree Project (Appendix 2) and the summary of the originality report printed from the “Turnitin”.

31. While submitting the Act of Plagiarism Detection in the Final Degree Project (Appendix 2), the supervisor provides his/her conclusion on the defence of the final degree project. If it is not allowed to defend the final degree project, the supervisor notifies the student and the qualification commission two working days before the date of the defence of the final degree project at the latest.

32. If the fact of plagiarism is detected and the student is not allowed to defend the final degree project, the repeated defence of the final degree project is allowed no sooner than 1 year after and no later than 2 years after the date of the first planned defence.

33. The final degree project submitted for defence can be inspected repeatedly if needed; it may be initiated by the reviewer, the members of the qualification commission or any other employee of the University. The repeated inspection of plagiarism can be performed at any time before, during or after the defence of the final degree project.

34. The Provisional Academic Regulations of the University regulate the procedure under which the Board of Academic Ethics examines the facts of academic dishonesty detected while preparing any final degree project submitted for defence or defended at the University in the period of ten years.

## **CHAPTER VI FINAL PROVISIONS**

35. If violations of academic ethics are detected, penalties are imposed on students according to the Provisional Academic Regulations of Kaunas University of Technology, these Guidelines and other internal legislation of the University. If large-scale plagiarism is detected in the final degree project or large-scale plagiarism is repeatedly detected in the student’s semester’s written work within one year after the academic penalty is imposed on the student for plagiarism, the student is expelled from the University by the rector’s order.

36. If plagiarism of non-textual format – images (for example, photographs, videos, graphic data) or multimedia (for example, audio records, photographs, videos, music or other media) – is detected in the part of the student's written work or another study work, the procedures for the examination of the violations in semester's written works or final degree projects and the imposition of academic penalties stipulated by these Guidelines are applied.

37. The student has the right to appeal in accordance with the Guidelines for Submission and Processing of the Students' Appeals and Complaints applied at the University.

38. The Guidelines can be amended or revoked by the order of the University's rector.

39. In all other cases not specified in the Guidelines, the decisions regarding the students' acts of plagiarism are made by the dean of the faculty in accordance with the Provisional Academic Regulations of the University and other internal legislation of the University.

---