



Swiss International  
Institute Lausanne

# ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT – TERMS AND PROCEDURES

Swiss International Institute Lausanne - SIIL

Approved by:	Academic Council
Date of Approval:	01.09.2020
Date of Next Review:	01.09.2025
Owner:	Academic Office
Contact:	t.zarubina@siil.ch

# ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT – TERMS AND PROCEDURES

Swiss International Institute Lausanne - SIIL

## Table of contents

<b>I</b>	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II</b>	<b>STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON INTEGRITY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III</b>	<b>ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES</b>	<b>4</b>
1.	Level 1: Poor Academic Practice/Conduct	4
2.	Level 2: Academic Misconduct (Minor)	4
3.	Level 3: Academic Misconduct (Major)	5
4.	Level 4: Academic Misconduct (Severe)	6
<b>IV</b>	<b>FURTHER INFORMATION</b>	<b>6</b>

## I TERMS OF REFERENCE

The present guidelines aim to:

- To develop a statement of principles for academics, administrative staff, and students which clarifies the meaning and importance of integrity within SIIIL as an academic institution and how these principles relate to its core values.
- To work with units in SIIIL to ensure that academic integrity is supported by: (i) nationally and internationally benchmarked pedagogical resources and practices for teachers and learners at all stages and (ii) the governance structures of the HEI.
- To review and improve policies and processes relating to academic conduct and misconduct (including but not limited to plagiarism and cheating) and to ensure that these are aligned with the statement of principles on institutional integrity and benchmarked against national and international best practice.
- To develop proposals to promote a culture of awareness that academic integrity is essential to our core value of responsibility, across the range of our activities, from undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and learning to research and administration.

## II STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON INTEGRITY

The following Statement on Integrity, developed by the Academic Office and approved by Academic Council, was developed for academic staff, administrative staff, and students.

In SIIIL, we commit ourselves as staff and students to acting responsibly and ethically, embracing integrity in all our actions and interactions as members of the Institute community. Understanding that integrity requires honesty, transparency and accountability, we agree to:

- Strive to do what we say we will, ensuring that we are aware of our commitments and responsibilities in order to fulfill them, and abiding by SIIIL and other relevant policies and the highest standards of conduct.
- Give credit where credit is due, recognizing and acknowledging the contributions and achievements of others in scholarship, teaching, research and service.
- Tell the truth, as a community and as individuals, speaking out and listening even when it is difficult, naming problems and honestly acknowledging mistakes.
- Hold ourselves and others to account for the things for which we are each responsible.
- Use resources for the purposes for which they are intended and be above reproach in financial dealings.
- Deal fairly, consistently and transparently with others.

### III **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES**

Academic misconduct includes offences such as plagiarism, collusion, falsification and cheating in any undergraduate or postgraduate assessment or assignment.

In cases of suspected academic misconduct, the module lead completes the Academic Integrity Form.

The form calculates an Indicative Score according to the severity of the suspected offence. The score determines the recommended consequences.



#### 1. **Level 1: Poor Academic Practice/Conduct**

Indicative Score: (1-200)

The module lead informs their Study Programme Director of the suspected academic misconduct. If the Study Programme Director agrees that Level 1 consequences are appropriate:

- an outcome letter is sent to the student.
- the student amends their work, which is then reassessed.
- the student attends mandatory academic integrity training.
- a record of the academic misconduct is added to their student record for the duration of their enrollment in the programme.

If the Study Programme Director thinks that the alleged misconduct was more serious, they review the Academic Integrity Form with the module coordinator and agree an alternative level.

#### 2. **Level 2: Academic Misconduct (Minor)**

Indicative Score: (201–350)

The module lead informs their Study Programme Director of the suspected academic misconduct.

If the Study Programme Director agrees that Level 2 consequences are appropriate, the module lead writes to the student to advise them of the suspected infringement of academic integrity and to offer them the option of an appropriate consequence if they admit that misconduct has taken place.

If the Study Programme Director thinks that the alleged misconduct requires further investigation, or if the student disputes the academic misconduct or the consequence, the matter proceeds to an Appeal Commission meeting within the Faculty.

### **3. Level 3: Academic Misconduct (Major)**

Indicative Score: (351–500)

The module lead informs their Study Programme Director of the suspected academic misconduct.

If the Study Programme Director agrees that Level 3 consequences are appropriate, the module lead writes to the student to advise them of the suspected infringement of academic integrity and to offer them the option of an appropriate consequence if they admit that misconduct has taken place.

If the Study Programme Director thinks that the alleged misconduct requires further investigation, or if the student disputes the academic misconduct or the consequence, the matter proceeds to an Appeal Commission meeting within the Faculty.

The Study Programme Director writes to the student and the student's tutor, inviting the student to attend an Appeal Commission meeting on a specified date. If the student and/or representative is unable to attend, or chooses not to attend, the meeting will take place as planned.

The Appeal Commission meeting is attended by:

- Study Programme Director or their designate (Chair);
- two academic colleagues from the Faculty (at least one from the discipline to which the module belongs);
- the student and their tutor (or a representative of the student if they wish);
- the lead of the module, if they wish, but only to present additional evidence.

The Appeal Commission meeting considers:

- the assessment or examinations(s) in question,
- the Academic Integrity Form (and any verbal submissions by the module coordinator, if present).

The Appeal Commission meeting determines at what level (if at all) academic misconduct has occurred and selects an appropriate consequence, giving due consideration to any mitigating circumstances.

The secretary completes the Appeal Commission meeting Decision Form (Minutes), which is submitted for approval to the Faculty Dean who may approve, reject, or vary the recommended consequence, or seek further information before making a decision, or refer the matter to the Academic Director. If the Faculty Dean/Academic Director approves the recommended consequence, the secretary communicates the decision to the student and their tutor.

#### **4. Level 4: Academic Misconduct (Severe)**

In cases of academic misconduct where the Indicative Score is 501 or higher, the module coordinator refers the case directly to the Academic Director.

### **IV FURTHER INFORMATION**

Specific queries on these terms and procedures and/or requests should be directed to the executive secretary (email: [e.sadovskaya@siil.ch](mailto:e.sadovskaya@siil.ch)), who will progress as appropriate.

Approved by:	Academic Council
Date of Approval:	01.09.2020
Date of Next Review:	01.09.2025
Owner:	Academic Office
Contact:	<a href="mailto:t.zarubina@siil.ch">t.zarubina@siil.ch</a>