

LITHUANIAN CULTURE RESEARCH INSTITUTE
CODE OF ACADEMIC ETHICS

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1 The main guidelines for the activities of the Lithuanian Culture Research Institute (hereinafter referred to as "the Institute") shall be to ensure the professionalism and originality of scientific research, to foster academic freedom and creative atmosphere in the Institute's community, to defend the core values of the Academic Community: respect for each member of the community, professional, scientific and civic responsibility.

1.2 The Institute's Code of Academic Ethics (hereinafter referred to as "the Code") sets out the following key principles cases of academic misconduct and establishes the basic principles of ethical academic behaviour, which are not directly defined by the laws of the State or by the Institute's other internal procedural documents.

1.3 The Code applies to all members of the Institute's academic community - scientific and administrative staff, doctoral students and laboratory assistants.

2. GENERAL STANDARDS OF ACADEMIC ETHICS

2.1 The right of expression of members of the Institute's community includes academic freedom, i.e. the ability to express openly one's views on the organisation and administration of studies and research, and to express critical ideas uncensored (freely and openly). The responsible exercise of this freedom requires that researchers and administrators extend the same freedom to other members of the community, upholding the tradition of critical thinking and an atmosphere of open debate. Responsible exercise of academic freedom is opposed to:

2.1.1. intolerance of others' opinions;

2.1.2. ignoring or deliberately limiting the right to express and defend one's own opinion in decisions that are of importance to the Institute's community, to its departments, or to oneself;

2.1.3. ignoring or deliberately limiting the right to respond to criticism or accusations;

2.1.4. participation in research or experiments which involve harm to human beings, nature, society or culture.

2.2 Relations between members of the Institute community shall be based on the principles of respect, goodwill, impartiality and non-discrimination. Violation of academic ethics are:

2.2.1. discrimination against a member of the community in speech, action or academic evaluation on the basis of age, gender or sexual orientation, disability, appearance, race or ethnicity, religion or belief;

2.2.2. discrimination (positive or negative) against a member of the community on the grounds of participation in political, social or cultural activities;

2.2.3. harassment of a member of the community - where the dignity of a person is violated on the grounds of age, sex or sexual orientation, disability, appearance, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief, or attempt is made to create an environment that is intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive, or conduct that violates human rights and dignity is tolerated;

2.2.4. humiliation of doctoral students or colleagues through the use of one's superiority as a researcher or administrator, unjustified patronage of researchers or doctoral students, non-compliance with the regulations and procedures adopted by the Institute's Scientific Council, etc.;

2.2.5. dissemination of unfounded information, unjustified disparagement of colleagues or their work, persistent and persistent insulting of a person.

2.3 Relationships between members of the Community shall be based on collegiality and academic solidarity, focusing on the quality and creativity of research and studies ensuring an atmosphere of quality and creativity in research and innovation. In this respect, academic ethics are violated when:

2.3.1. professional competition between colleagues takes unfair forms, involving illegal, dishonest dealings, concealed from all researchers or information intended for all researchers and doctoral students, escalation of petty conflicts and intrigues;

2.3.2. doctoral students are adversely affected by antipathy or disagreement between colleagues;

2.3.3. pressure is exerted on a member of the community to obtain undeserved recognition or seeking to undermine a colleague's integrity or to cover up dishonest academic actions;

2.3.4. confidential information about colleagues or confidential information about colleagues or subordinates (salaries, etc.) is made public or discussed in public;

2.3.5. demeaning the reputation of the Institute and its community by systematically violating academic discipline and public order.

2.4 Every member of the Institute's community must respect the general interests of the Institute and contribute to the best of his/her ability to the fulfilment of the research and educational objectives of the Institute, that is to say:

2.4.1. follow the Institute's strategy for study and research, and constructive criticism, and to provide constructive criticism the Institute's work first of all to the members of the Institute's community;

2.4.2. not to initiate and/or carry out projects in the name of the Institute if the results of such projects are not beneficial to the general interests of the Institute;

2.4.3. not to tolerate cases, which may involve corruption, fraud or attempted corruption undue influence on a member of the Institute community. Provision of information about illegal acts or disclosure of information about malpractice or negligence shall not constitute a breach of loyalty to the Institute;

2.4.4. not to exercise his/her right to vote in the Institute's Scientific Council or in the Commission for Attestation and Contests when any question of funding, penalty, incentive or any other matter relating to other matter involving a family member or business partner, i.e. which may give rise to a conflict of public and private interests;

2.4.5. not to use the name of the Institute for political, religious activities or for self-aggrandisement.

2.5 The Institute's research facilities, material resources, computer equipment and library shall be used sparingly, responsibly and only in accordance with the Institute's obligations as an institution for the fulfilment of the obligations imposed on the Institution. This provision is violated by:

2.5.1. the use of the material and financial resources of the Institute for political activities, private business or the satisfaction of personal needs;

2.5.2. misuse of the Institute's resources in the execution of projects;

2.5.3. Destruction of the property of the Institute through malice or negligence.

3. ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR THE ORGANISATION OF DOCTORAL STUDIES

3.1 The relationship between the researcher (doctoral supervisor) and the doctoral student shall be oriented towards academic requirements. Commitment to non-academic obligations may lead to a conflict of interest, and ambiguous relationships with academic staff should be avoided. Contradictions to the principles of Academic ethics include:

3.1.1. seeking an intimate relationship with a PhD student with whom one has a supervisory relationship research or otherwise a direct academic relationship;

3.1.2. assuming the role of a doctoral supervisor as a family member or close friend, in cases where it is possible to avoid such a role;

3.1.3. reception from doctoral students of direct and indirect gifts, services of a non-academic or academic nature not directly related to the study subjects of doctoral students.

3.2 The climate of trust is undermined by the disclosure of confidential information about a doctoral student. The principle of confidentiality requires:

3.2.1. in the absence of a specific reason (doctoral student's consent, legal basis, benefit to the doctoral student or foreseeable harm to others), not to disclose information about the doctoral student academic grades or penalties to third parties;

3.2.2. not to use private information about the doctoral student as part of teaching or research material, unless the doctoral student agrees;

3.2.3. ensure that comments and observations on the doctoral student's written work are not submitted for public and are not made available to third parties.

3.3 The assessment of the doctoral candidate's knowledge and skills must be fair, honest and consistent with the objectives of the course, and therefore:

3.3.1. the doctoral supervisor must respond in a principled way to the cases of doctoral students dishonesty, such as plagiarism, copying, falsification of data, falsification of examination results, use of extraneous help during examinations, submitting someone else's written work as one's own, submitting written work in one subject for the purpose of receiving evaluation for another subject;

3.3.2. confidence in the fairness of the assessment is undermined when all or a majority of doctoral students are 'mechanically' given the highest or lowest marks, without apparent regard to their knowledge and abilities;

3.3.3. evaluation cannot be linked to the doctoral students' participation in any political, social, cultural or scientific activities acceptable to the supervisor. The doctoral supervisor may not exert pressure to participate in his/her own research activities.

4. ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR DOCTORAL STUDIES

4.1 Recognising knowledge, skills and understanding as the highest values of studies and expecting to be trusted and to have their achievements fairly evaluated, doctoral students at the Institute are obliged uphold the principle of academic integrity. The following are considered to be the most serious breaches of academic integrity:

4.1.1. plagiarism - presenting someone else's ideas as one's own. Typical cases of plagiarism include:

4.1.1.1. when a foreign text is presented without citation marks, such as quotation marks or other without quotation marks or other form of distinction from the text as a whole (e.g. in a separate paragraph, in italics);

4.1.1.2. where an extraneous idea, illustrative material or data is retold or quoted without acknowledging the source.

4.1.2 Cheating in the process of evaluation for a subject or part of a subject in examinations. Characteristic features of cases of cheating:

4.1.2.1. when a student writes off or knowingly allows another to write off;

4.1.2.2. the use of stories, 'prep books' or other forms of examiner or other means not authorised by the examiner;

4.1.2.3. where the written work of another is handed over as one's own;

4.1.2.4. when the same piece of written work is submitted for multiple subjects;

4.1.2.5. when acting on behalf of another person or submitting the work of other person for evaluation;

4.1.2.6. where a source page or date of access to a website submitted is known to be false.

4.1.3 Counterfeiting. Typical cases:

4.1.3.1. when an already evaluated piece of written work is corrected without the agreement of the Assessment board in order to request a higher mark;

4.1.3.2. when the signatures, certificates, other documents of the Assessment board are forged;

4.1.3.3. falsification of data or results of academic assignments;

4.1.4. assisting another in committing a dishonest academic act: plagiarism, cheating or forgery;

4.1.5 bribery: offering or giving remuneration for academic services (personal or group);

4.1.6 measures of psychological impact for selfish purposes.

5. RESEARCH ETHICS

5.1 Research must be based on the ideals of honest inquiry and the pursuit of truth. This is violated by:

5.1.1. fabrication, falsification or manipulation of empirical data;

5.1.2. the deliberate concealment of data obtained, which contradict the hypothesis of the study;

5.1.3. deliberately misrepresenting the methodology of the empirical study;

5.1.4. theft of empirical data, computer programs, empirical material, theft or deliberate corruption of empirical materials, samples, manuscript;

5.1.5. plagiarism, i.e. representing another's text or idea as one's own;

5.1.6. unreasonable imposition of co-authorship on junior colleagues or subordinates; unjustified assumption of co-authorship by taking advantage of one's superior academic position;

5.1.7. bias in reviewing research projects or results; bias in the evaluation of examination results and dissertations of doctoral students supervised by other researchers.

5.1.8. unfair, biased criticism of a colleague's work and deliberate undermining of a colleague on the grounds of personal antipathy, competition, political or other motives not related to the research work being evaluated.

5.1.9. recommending the award of a degree, teaching title, prize or other forms of scientific recognition based on a personal or political relationship, rather than on a cogent assessment of the submitted work and the professional qualities of the applicant;

5.1.10. interference with academic freedom by the use of official position.

6. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING OF THE CODE

6.1 The Code shall be supervised and enforced by appropriate enforcement measures by the Academic Ethics Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) established by the Scientific Council of the Institute. The Commission shall act in accordance with the regulations approved by the Scientific Council of the Institute.

6.2 Every member of the academic community of the Institute shall comply with the standards and principles of conduct set out in this Code. The Code and the Regulations of the Academic Ethics Committee shall be published on the Institute's website. New members of academic

community, administrative staff, and doctoral students, normally shall be given a paper copy of this Code.

6.3 Any member of the Institute community may submit statements to the Commission concerning breaches of academic ethics.

6.4 Statements shall be submitted in writing to the Chairperson of the Commission. Statements shall be accepted for consideration only if they are clearly motivated. Anonymous statements shall not be considered.

6.5 The Commission shall examine the statement received, take a decision and reply in writing to the applicant within 30 calendar days.

6.6 The member of the academic community concerned by the statement received shall be informed of its contents and shall have the right to attend the meeting of the Commission at which the statement concerning him/her is discussed.

6.7 The Commission shall make decisions, conclusions, statements or adopt other documents on the matters under consideration.

6.8 Upon decision that the conduct of a member of the Institute community violates the Academic Code of Ethics, taking into account the nature and degree of the violation, the Commission shall have the right to apply the following measures:

- (a) instruct the Chairperson of the Commission or any member of the Commission to issue a verbal warning to the members of the Institute community. In such a case, the members of the Commission shall be under an obligation not to disclose information about the statement under consideration;
- (b) give written notice to the member of the Institute community and publish information about the Commission's decision on the Institute's website;
- (c) warn the member of the Institute's community in writing of the Commission's decision and, if the infringement has caused widespread publicity, inform the public;
- (d) to recommend to the Scientific Council and the Administration to terminate the contract with a member of the Institute community who has committed a serious breach of academic ethics.

6.9 The meetings of the Commission shall be convened and chaired by the Chairperson of the Commission. In the event of the Chairperson of the Commission being involved in the submitted statement, the meeting shall be convened and chaired by the Deputy Chairperson.

6.10. The Commission shall not consider a statement of a possible breach of academic ethics if, since the date on which the possible breach of academic ethics was committed or became apparent until the date of submission of the report more than one calendar year has elapsed. The Commission also does not examine reports or information on possible irregularities in procedures at the Institute. The Commission shall notify the person in writing of its decision not to examine the report and of the referral of the report or information to the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania no later than within 10 working days from the date of receipt of the report or information.

6.11. The Commission shall immediately notify the Ombudsperson of the Republic of Lithuania of its decision not to investigate the report and shall forward the relevant material to the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures, who shall decide whether to initiate an investigation on his/her own initiative.