

Date 2024-03-20

Educational Committee

Guidelines in Case of Suspected Irregularities in Connection with Examinations in the Law Programme, the Master's Programme in European Economic Law, and the Master's Programme in International Human Rights Law.

If there is a well-founded suspicion that a student is using unauthorized aid or otherwise attempting to mislead during an examination or assessment of academic performance (10 kap. 1 § och 9 § högskoleförordningen [1993:100]), the following procedure applies. This procedure serves as a guide for the faculty's obligations.

Suspicions of irregularities must be promptly reported to the Vice-Chancellor, who initiates an investigation and may decide to refer the matter to the Disciplinary Board for thorough examination and adjudication (10 kap. 9 § 2 st och 11 § högskoleförordningen [1993:100]).

The procedure is based on established practice at the faculty, follows a chronological structure, and assigns responsibilities to teachers, examiners, course coordinators, programme administrators, director of studies/master coordinator, and the head of department.

1. If a well-founded suspicion arises with a teacher, examiner (not being the course coordinator), or programme administrator, they must contact the examiner who is the course coordinator. The course coordinator must always be informed of any suspicion of irregularities.
2. The examiner in the Law Programme contacts the director of studies. In the master's programmes, the master coordinator is contacted. References to the director of studies below also apply to the master coordinator.

3. The director of studies and examiner involve the responsible programme administrator, who, if applicable, runs the student's text through procured software to detect irregularities.
4. The programme administrator schedules a meeting where the director of studies and examiner meet with the student to verbally inform them of the suspicion and the process. This should take place shortly after the suspicion arises and be held in a faculty meeting room. The student is informed by the programme administrator that they are not obliged to participate in the faculty's handling of the suspicion and is invited to the meeting. The student is also informed of available support from the Law Student Union and the Student Ombudsman, and of the possibility of bringing support to the meeting.
5. At the meeting, the director of studies and examiner explain what triggered the suspicion and clarify the process. The student is given the opportunity to provide information. It is emphasized that the meeting is not part of an independent investigation. Instead, the student is prepared to be contacted by the Vice-Chancellor (or their delegate) and the Disciplinary Board, and that everything added to the case will be communicated to the student. The student is informed of their right to continue studying pending a decision, including the right to retake the exam if they failed the component. Finally, the student is informed that the Disciplinary Board's decision may result in suspension. The director of studies takes notes during the meeting.
6. If the meeting reveals information that makes the suspicion appear unfounded, the case is dismissed, and the student is informed.
7. If no such information emerges, suspicion is reported to the Disciplinary Board. The faculty does not assess the suspicion beyond determining whether it is well-founded.

8. If the student refuses to participate or is absent from the scheduled meeting, the process continues. The director of studies supports the examiner throughout the process.
9. The examiner reports the case to the Vice-Chancellor/Disciplinary Board. The report must include all relevant documentation, such as the course syllabus and notes from the student meeting. It must also include information provided to students indicating that the alleged conduct is prohibited. The examiner is responsible for communication with the Disciplinary Board, including responding to questions and requests for additional information.
10. The examination is not paused pending the Disciplinary Board's decision but is assessed as usual. After the decision, the examination may be reconsidered in a favorable direction. Note that the decision to pass a paper or exam component and the decision to impose disciplinary action are different and based on different criteria and standards of proof.
11. The examiner participates in the Disciplinary Board's meeting.
12. The head of department receives the Board's decision and informs the director of studies, who in turn informs the reporting party, examiner, and course coordinator.
13. The director of studies is responsible for maintaining a knowledge base that collects and presents the faculty's experiences with irregularities in academic assessment. Library staff responsible for teaching academic integrity support the director of studies in this work.