
University Academic Integrity Policy

Version: 3.0

Responsible University Official: Provost

Version Effective Date: 8/21/2024

1.0 Introduction

Saint Louis University is a community of learning in which integrity and mutual trust are vital. Since the mission of the University is "the pursuit of truth for the greater glory of God and for the service of humanity," acts of integrity are essential to its very reason for existence. They also dignify and strengthen the activities of teaching, research, health care, and community service that are its primary mission.

Since the University seeks to prepare students and instructors for lives of integrity and occupations of trust, it regards academic integrity as a matter of serious import. Academic integrity is the foundation of the academic assessment process, which in turn sustains the ability of the University to certify to the outside world the skills and attainments of its graduates. Academic integrity allows those who practice it to contribute to a just and equitable learning environment that cultivates moral character and self-respect.

This policy is grounded in a respect for each faculty member's initial evaluation of an alleged academic integrity incident, for a student's right to confidential, equitable, and timely adjudication of alleged incidents, and for the shared conviction of our college/school deans and associate deans that a university-wide academic integrity policy and process best promotes equitable and consistent application.

Students are expected to adhere to the standards of academic integrity as defined in this policy and as guided by the faculty and staff supporting their educational endeavors, thus contributing to an environment in which academic integrity is respected.

The Academic Integrity Policy detailed below sets out principles implicit in the University's ethos but that call for explicit formulation to guide its practice.

2.0 Scope

The Policy on Academic Integrity set forth here is designed to promote ethical conduct within the University community by:

- Defining the responsibilities of various members of the University community.
- Defining violations of academic integrity.
- Setting minimum standards for reporting and adjudicating (making a formal judgement/decision) violations of academic integrity.
- Establishing procedures for appeals to the Office of the Provost.
- Establishing standards and procedures for maintaining records.

Saint Louis University undergraduate and graduate students' educational experience in all modalities is governed by this Academic Affairs policy except for courses delivered by the School of Law, the School of Medicine, the Center for Advanced Dentistry Education, and the Madrid campus.

Note: Alleged violations of academic integrity in scientific research will be addressed in accordance with the Research Integrity and Compliance Program in the Office of the Vice President for Research.

3.0 Definitions

This section defines academic integrity and articulates the conduct and standards considered as having violated this policy. More than one violation may apply.

Academic integrity is the commitment to and demonstration of honest and moral behavior in an academic setting. The University and wider academic community are built on shared values and norms of behavior, including honesty, fairness, and responsibility. Applying academic integrity to one's work entails practicing honesty and fairness towards others, taking responsibility for learning, and following the conventions of scholarship. The University is responsible for awarding credit for honestly conducted work, and students are responsible for demonstrating academic integrity by practicing the following:

- Using information, text, images, and all other materials incorporated into academic work appropriately, according to copyright and privacy laws.
- Acknowledging the source of information whether taken from another person, artificial intelligence, or other technology.
- Conducting research ethically, in line with the University's regulations on human research ethics.
- Reporting research truthfully.
- Acting ethically and honestly in all academic endeavors.
- Acknowledging faculty members' intellectual properties and confirming faculty support when students conduct research, apply for assistantships and/or fellowships.

Academic Integrity Incident refers to reported student conduct that violates the academic integrity standards set forth in this policy.

Falsification is the misrepresentation of fact for academic gain.

Falsification may include, but is not limited to:

- Lying to or deceiving an instructor regarding academic work.
- Fabricating or misrepresenting documentation or the data used in completing assignments.
- Misrepresenting or altering information in the academic records of an instructor, academic or administrative department, or unit of the University unless authorized to do so.

Plagiarism is the presentation or representation of content as if the content were the student's own without proper citation. Examples include thoughts, words, or data created by another source other than the student not explicitly permitted by the instructor. This definition includes self-plagiarism as the use of material prepared for one class and submitted in another without proper citation and without permission of the current instructor.

Plagiarism may include, but is not limited to:

- Directly presenting the written, artistic, or spoken work generated or created by someone other than the student, by artificial intelligence, or by other technology without quotation marks or indented quotations and without proper citation to the source.
- Paraphrasing or incorporating the ideas, concepts, arguments, observations, images, objects, music, or statements generated or created by someone other than the student, by artificial intelligence, or by other technology without proper citation of the source.
- Presenting information from the internet, produced by artificial intelligence, or by other technology so that it appears to be the student's own work.
- Submitting as the student's own, any work that has been prepared, either entirely or in part, by another person, group, commercial firm, artificial intelligence, or by other technology without proper citation.
- Claiming research advisors' research idea as the student's own and using these ideas to apply for scholarships/assistantship/fellowships without research advisors' approval/support.

Cheating is the use of unauthorized assistance to gain an advantage over others, and/or a failure to comply with any reasonable direction or instruction of an officer, employee or agent of the University relating to the conduct of a formal examination or assessment.

Cheating may include, but is not limited to:

- Copying from another student's examination or work.
- Using assistance, notes, aids, artificial intelligence or other technology, cell phones, calculators, translation software, or internet-based applications not authorized by the instructor in taking quizzes or examinations or to complete assignments.
- Acquiring, disseminating, or using any academic form of assessment belonging to an instructor or staff member without prior approval.
- Hiring or otherwise engaging in the impersonation of another person to take a quiz or examination or in fulfilling other academic requirements.
- Asking students for solutions to assignments, exams, quizzes and then submitting these solutions as their own.

Sabotage is the disruption of or attempt to prevent the academic pursuits of others.

Sabotage may include, but is not limited to:

- Intentionally interfering with work or undermining the academic success of others in the University community to negatively impact another's academic performance.
- Modifying, stealing, or destroying academic materials including, but not limited to, computer files, library materials, artwork, personal books, and papers.
- Taking any action that negatively impacts research outcomes including, but not limited to, lab tampering, falsification of data, withholding data/findings, or destruction of research resources.

Collusion is the unauthorized collaboration in a deceitful manner with another person or persons for the purpose of giving or gaining an academic advantage in the completion of an assignment, quiz, or examination that has been restricted to individual effort. Collusion does not include receiving help from authorized University assistance.

Collusion may include, but is not limited to:

- Paraphrasing another student's assignment and submitting it as their own.
- Having another individual or group do the/an assessment task.
- Giving solutions to assignments, exams, quizzes to other students.

Concealment is the failure to report to the instructor or to call to the attention of an instructor or administrator any matter where a student knows of facts indicating a significant likelihood that a violation of this Academic Integrity Policy has been or will be committed or that an academic unit requires be reported, including the behaviors described in the definitions in this section.

Preponderance of Evidence is a widely accepted standard of evidence/proof applied to academic integrity incident evaluations, proceedings, and determinations. This standard requires that a finding be proven to be 'more likely than not' to be true, based on the totality of the information or materials available to the decision maker(s) and free of bias.

Egregious is a willful act or conduct by a student who intentionally violates the university-wide Academic Integrity Policy in an impactful and a serious manner beyond a common transgression.

Restorative Educational Opportunity is a teaching and learning practice that empowers students to learn from mistakes, to recognize the impact of their actions, and to develop and enhance skills, problem-solving, and a deeper understanding of academic integrity issues.

Conflict of Interest is any interaction with a student(s), faculty, or staff involved in the Academic Integrity adjudication process that could directly and significantly affect one's responsibilities on

the Academic Hearing Panel.

4.0 Responsibilities of Members of the Community

Creating a learning environment in which high standards of academic integrity are valued requires the efforts of everyone in the University community.

Retaliation or bias by or against any community member for exercising their rights or responsibilities under this Academic Integrity Policy is prohibited and may result in sanctions as deemed appropriate by the University.

Faculty (and instructors of record) are responsible for adhering to high standards of academic integrity in their own teaching and professional conduct; sharing relevant parts of the policy on their syllabi and assignments (e.g., an explicit statement on use of artificial intelligence and/or other technology); explaining key terms and discipline/course specific academic honesty norms to students; and following procedures for reporting and adjudicating possible violations both in and out of their academic unit. Furthermore, faculty are encouraged to create assignments that minimize academic dishonesty through clear expectations and to help create an environment where academic integrity is uppermost. Participation in formal academic hearings is expected as appropriate.

Students are responsible for adhering to university standards of academic integrity and seeking clarification from their instructors when they are uncertain if a behavior is in violation of this policy, helping to create an environment in which academic integrity is respected, and reporting violations of the policy to instructors, department chairs, or administrators. Participation in formal academic hearings is expected as appropriate.

Staff are responsible for calling the attention of their supervisors to possible violations of academic integrity, for modeling high standards of academic integrity in their own teaching and professional conduct and for otherwise supporting a community of academic honesty and trust. Participation in formal academic hearings is expected as appropriate.

Academic administrators such as Deans, Chairs, and Directors are responsible for adhering to university standards of academic integrity in their teaching and professional conduct, reporting incidents as needed, and for otherwise supporting a community of academic honesty and trust. Participation in formal academic hearings is expected as appropriate.

The Office of the Provost in collaboration with Deans and Directors of academic units are responsible for integrating concepts of academic integrity into academic programs and curricula to comply with the University policy. Participation in formal academic hearings is expected as appropriate.

Director of Academic Integrity (DAI) is responsible for overseeing aspects of academic integrity as assigned by the provost and helping shape, coordinate, and maintain the academic integrity system at the University.

5.0 Reporting and Adjudication Procedures for Allegations of Violations of Academic Integrity

Confidentiality applies to all aspects of the proceedings and all University students, faculty, and staff who are subject to this policy. Each case of academic dishonesty, names of student(s), facts, comments, and material information should remain confidential. Disclosure of this information is limited to the Academic Hearing Panel and those University officials for each case who have a need to know the information in connection with discharging their official duties and responsibilities. Violation of this confidentiality clause may result in sanctions as deemed appropriate by the University.

Every effort will be made to complete the Academic Integrity process within **60 University business days** of initial reports.

- Incidents that impact graduation may require an expedited time frame.
- Incidents that impact course registration that dictates curricular progression scaffolding may require an expedited time frame.

Prior to the Formal University Academic Integrity Process

- If an instructor is unsure if what they see constitutes an Academic Integrity Incident, they should discuss how to proceed with their chair, other administrator, or the DAI.
- The course instructor communicates (in-person or in writing) with the student(s) regarding alleged Academic Integrity Incident(s).
 - Such communication should occur within a timely manner (not more than **10 University business days** from identification of alleged Incident).
- If after communicating with the student the instructor determines there was no Academic Integrity Incident, based on a preponderance of evidence, or the occurrence is appropriate for a restorative educational opportunity, the process is complete.
- If after communicating with the student the instructor determines there is or likely has been an Academic Integrity Incident, based on a preponderance of evidence:
 - The instructor shares with the student a summary of violation findings, supporting evidence, imposed and/or proposed sanction(s), and the University Academic Integrity Policy. Specific evidence may be shared with student unless:
 - The evidence is in danger of being compromised or deleted.
 - The evidence would violate the privacy of another student(s).
 - The evidence would compromise the future academic integrity of the course materials.
 - The instructor begins the formal University Academic Integrity Process.

Formal University Academic Integrity Process

- If the instructor determines there is a preponderance of evidence that an Academic Integrity Incident occurred, they shall submit an academic integrity incident report with an imposed and/or proposed sanction(s) to the DAI via the University database of confidential and permanent records account no later than **5 University business days** following initial communication with the student. The complete submission to the DAI by the instructor shall include the following:
 - Report of findings
 - Syllabus
 - Particulars of assignment
 - Evidence (copies)
 - Relevant email correspondence (if any)
 - Imposed and/or proposed sanction(s)
- Upon receipt of the submission, the DAI reviews University-wide records to determine whether the incident is a first or recurring Academic Integrity Incident and may offer suggestions to the instructor's imposed and/or proposed sanctions accordingly.
- The DAI notifies the student via their SLU email account of the finding(s), imposed and/or proposed sanctions, implications, and whether it is a first or recurring Academic Integrity Incident.
- The student must acknowledge or refute responsibility in writing via their SLU email account within **7 University business days**.
- Student failure to respond to the notification of the of account of the finding(s), imposed and/or proposed sanctions, and implications, after **7 University business days** will be treated as acceptance of responsibility. Students who do not respond to the notification may follow the new evidence appeal process. Students are eligible to initiate a new evidence appeal within **30 University business days** of notification.

If Acknowledged First Academic Integrity Incident:

- The DAI collaborates with instructor(s) to facilitate sanction equity and confirm the imposed and/or proposed instructor sanction.
- The DAI informs the student of sanction(s) implications.

- The DAI works with the student to ensure compliance to sanction(s) (if applicable).
- The DAI enters sanction(s) into the University database of confidential and permanent records.
- The DAI reports closure of case to the following (as applicable):
 - Student
 - Instructor of course
 - Associate Dean of the student's academic home
 - Department Chair/Director of course and of student's major
- Findings and sanction(s) are entered into the University database of confidential and permanent records. Saint Louis University is bound by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA)s. The files and information contained in the University database of confidential and permanent records are subject to these guidelines as student records.

If Academic Integrity Incident and/or Associated Sanction is Refuted or a Recurring Academic Integrity Incident:

- The DAI assembles a 3-person Academic Hearing Panel from members of the Academic Integrity Board, as defined by the Academic Integrity Bylaws, to adjudicate and make determination of responsibility based on a preponderance of evidence.
- The DAI appoints a Chair of Academic Hearing Panel responsible for scheduling and communicating with accused student, instructor, and Academic Integrity Office.
 - The DAI may attend Academic Hearing Panel Hearing to observe and advise on process as a non-voting, ex officio member.
 - When scheduling the hearing, every effort will be made to not interfere with a student's or instructor's academic schedule.
- Academic Hearing Panel conducts Hearing in adherence to the Academic Integrity Board Bylaws.
 - The Academic Hearing Panel may solicit input from academic and administrative units and individuals whose professional/disciplinary expertise is needed to fulfill the Academic Hearing Panel's review (i.e., the alleging faculty, other faculty from associated college/school, the associated academic department chair, the associated college/school dean's office, ITS, the Dean of Students Office, etc.).
 - The Academic Integrity Office provides the Academic Hearing Panel with all relevant reports, evidence, and pertinent information.
 - The Academic Hearing Panel confers separately with the student and the instructor.
 - The Office of Academic Integrity informs via SLU email the student/instructor of the date, time, and location of the Hearing at least **5 University business days** before the hearing.
- Hearing parameters:
 - The Academic Hearing Panel Hearing may be conducted in-person or virtually.
 - The hearing may not be recorded.
 - The accused student's participation in the hearing is compulsory. If participation results in absence from a course, the University Authorized Absence Policy applies. If the student fails to attend the scheduled hearing, they are subject to a referral to the Office of Student Responsibility. A student's lack of participation in the hearing does not prevent the Academic Hearing Panel from determining responsibility. A student's lack of participation does not constitute a presumption of responsibility.
 - The student may bring one personal advisor, e.g., parent, guardian, faith-based leader, or an attorney of the student's choosing at the student's own expense. The advisor is only present to support the student through the process but may not speak for the student, ask questions of others present, or interfere with the hearing.

- If the student wishes to speak privately with their advisor during the hearing, they may request a brief recess from the hearing.
 [Appropriate FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) Waiver required.]
- o The student, instructor, and/or Academic Hearing Panel have the right to request witnesses in advance of the hearing. The Chair of the Academic Hearing Panel (in consultation with DAI) determines whether a witness is relevant to the hearing proceedings and may allow the witness at the hearing or not. [Appropriate FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) Waiver required.]
 - The Academic Hearing Panel's determination is premised on all the materials provided, including those submitted by the instructor as part of the original Academic Integrity Incident Report and any subsequent evidence or applicable context provided by the instructor, student and/or the respective academic department and/or dean's office. A **majority vote** of voting members is required to determine the student's responsibility for the alleged violations.
 - o If the student is found responsible for the violation, based on a preponderance of evidence, the Academic Hearing Panel determines whether to uphold or adjust the originally imposed and/or proposed sanctions.
 - o If the student is found not responsible for the violation, based on a preponderance of evidence, no sanction(s) will be imposed on the student.
 - The Academic Hearing Panel Chair prepares an Academic Hearing Panel Hearing Summary including a brief synopsis of the Hearing and the final decision regarding student responsibility and sanction(s). The Summary shall be submitted to the DAI within **5 University business days** of the Hearing.
 - The DAI communicates the Academic Hearing Panel decision and sanction(s) (if any) to the student and instructor within **10 University business days** of the Hearing.
 [Notification via SLU email]
 - o If the student is found responsible:
 - The DAI will inform the student of the sanction(s) and implications.
 - The DAI will work with the student to ensure compliance with the sanction(s) (if applicable).
 - The DAI will inform the instructor of the decision.
 - The DAI will inform the Associate Dean of the student's academic home.
 - The DAI will inform the Department Chair/Director of course and of student's major.
 - The DAI will enter records of the sanctions into the University database of confidential and permanent records.
 - o If the student is found not responsible:
 - The DAI will inform the student of the process findings.
 - The DAI will inform the instructor of the findings.
 - The DAI will collaborate with the instructor to reverse any sanctions that may have been applied.
 - The DAI will inform the Associate Dean of the student's academic home if applicable.
 - The DAI will inform the Department Chair/Director of course and of student's major if applicable.
 - The DAI will destroy all case materials for students found not responsible.
 - The Academic Integrity Incident Report, supplemental materials, findings, and sanction(s) are entered into the University database of confidential and permanent records. Saint Louis University is bound by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA)s. The files and information contained in the University database of confidential and permanent records are subject to these guidelines as student records.

Right of Appeal – New Evidence Appeal or Process Appeal to the Office of the Provost

- Parties involved in the academic integrity incident may appeal the decision of the Academic Hearing Panel to the DAI based only on either of the following grounds:
 - New Evidence Appeal: New evidence not available at the time of the Academic Hearing Panel Hearing, which would have a material impact on the case's determination.
 - Process Appeal: There was a material deviation from the procedures set forth in this Academic Integrity Policy that would significantly impact the outcome of the matter or may have resulted in a different finding.
- The appeal must be submitted in writing via SLU email to the DAI within **7 University business days** of notification of Academic Hearing Panel Hearing decision.
- In the case of an appeal based on new evidence, the DAI refers the case and all relevant materials (initial report, evidence, Academic Hearing Panel Hearing summary, approved sanction(s), etc.) to the original or new Academic Hearing Panel within **5 University business days** for a new hearing and follows the procedures and timelines outlined above.
- In the case of a process appeal, the DAI refers the case and all relevant materials (initial report, evidence, Academic Hearing Panel Hearing summary, approved sanction(s), etc.) to the Office of the Provost within **5 University business days**.
 - The DAI informs the student and instructor that the appeal has been referred to the Office of the Provost or the Academic Integrity Hearing Panel.
 - The Office of the Provost will make every effort to provide a decision regarding the appeal within **10 University business days**.
- DAI shall communicate via the student's SLU email the Academic Hearing Panel/Provost Office decision and sanction(s) (if any) to the student and instructor within **10 University business days of the appeal decision**.
 - If the student is found responsible:
 - The DAI will inform the student of the sanction(s) and implications.
 - The DAI will work with the student to ensure compliance with the sanction(s) (if applicable).
 - The DAI will inform the instructor of the decision.
 - The DAI will inform the Associate Dean of the student's academic home.
 - The DAI will inform the Department Chair/Director of course and of student's major.
 - The DAI will enter records of the sanctions into the University database of confidential and permanent records.
 - If the student is found not responsible:
 - The DAI will inform the student of the appeal findings.
 - The DAI will inform the instructor of the appeal findings.
 - The DAI will collaborate with the instructor to reverse any sanctions that may have been implemented.
 - The DAI will inform the Associate Dean of the student's academic home if applicable.
 - The DAI will inform the Department Chair/Director of course and of student's major if applicable.
 - The DAI will destroy all case materials for students found not responsible.

The Office of the Provost decision is final and not eligible for further appeal.

6.0 Sanctions

Academic Integrity sanction(s) will be determined based on whether the incident is a first or recurring Academic Integrity Incident and/or egregiousness of the incident. Sanction(s) may include but are not limited to:

- The faculty may determine the incident is appropriate for a restorative educational opportunity and no formal sanction is applied.
- The student may be required to repeat/revise the assignment or complete an alternative assignment.
- The student may receive a lowered, failing, or zero grade on the examination or assignment in question.

- The student may receive a lowered or failing course grade in the course in question. The student shall have the right to continue in the course without retaliation or penalty pending final resolution.
- The student may be dismissed from their academic program/department after multiple incidents per the academic program/department dismissal policy if applicable.
- Visiting students (including 1818) may be prohibited from participating in the program/opportunity.
- The student may be suspended or expelled from the University.

The aforementioned sanctions may be accompanied by a requirement to participate in additional academic education support designed to prevent future Academic Integrity Incidents.

7.0 Historical Context

On 6/26/2015 the University adopted a university-wide Academic Integrity Policy after development with and vetting through individual academic unit's governance bodies by a committee of faculty, deans, staff, and students. To comply with the University policy, academic units were expected to amend their own academic integrity policies to align with university definitions and minimum standards. Individual academic units were to consider standards of academic and professional conduct for their own disciplines. Therefore, the University Academic Integrity Policy did not offer a single set of procedures for adjudicating violations of academic integrity at the academic unit level and only applied standards for process, record keeping, and appeals to the Office of the Provost with the exception of violations of academic integrity in scientific research (which was guided by the University's Research Integrity Policy).

The University Academic Integrity Policy creates a unified adjudication process across school/colleges and centralizes record keeping and academic integrity metrics.

Maintenance or records (see the University Policy of Maintenance of records at records (<https://www.slu.edu/provost/policies/academic-and-course/policy-records-management-and-retention.pdf>)

The current policy supersedes all previous versions. Academic units (as specified in the Scope section above) are expected to follow the Reporting and Adjudication Procedures for Allegations of Violations of Academic Integrity described above.

This policy was:

Endorsed by CADD: 5/22/2024

Approved by the Provost: 5/22/2024