Academic Integrity Policy

(Revised and Approved, February 2025)

Academic integrity is expected of seminary students in taking examinations and in preparing papers, reports, or class assignments. Academic dishonesty violates academic integrity and includes: **Plagiarism** - using another person's ideas or words without giving credit; **Cheating** - such as looking at someone else's work during an exam, covertly using pre-written notes, illicitly writing one's answers beforehand, or collaborating illicitly with other students on assignments; **Unauthorized use of AI** - using AI without proper citation or permission; **Someone else does your work** - such as having a person write a paper for you or using a pre-written paper. Academic dishonesty is a serious offence which can result in the loss of academic credit and possibly in the student's dismissal.

A decision regarding academic integrity is treated by *Saint John Vianney Theological Seminary* (henceforth SJVTS) as a formation issue: "Intellectual formation is a part of the integral formation of the priest. Moreover, it serves his pastoral ministry and has an impact upon his human and spiritual formation, which draw rich nourishment from it" (2016 *Ratio Fundamentalis,* no. 117). The Seminary's response to academic dishonesty is dictated by its overall concern for its mission of preparing candidates for the priesthood. If violations of academic integrity are suspected concerning seminarians who are taking courses from SJVTS, the following steps are to be pursued:

1. The instructor will first speak with the student. If the student admits guilt or the suspicion is not resolved, the instructor must inform the Academic Dean.

2. If the incident involves a seminarian from SJVTS, the Dean informs the Rector and the Vice Rector. If the incident involves a seminarian from *Redemptoris Mater Archdiocesan Missionary Seminary* (henceforth RMAMS), the Academic Dean will notify the Prefect of Studies of RMAMS or one of the RMAMS' formators.

3. The Academic Dean of SJVTS will oversee an Academic Advisory Committee made up of three full-time faculty members from SJVTS, chosen at random by the Academic Dean (not to include the seminarian's formator or the instructor involved). If the incident involves a seminarian from RMAMS, the Committee will be made up of two full-time faculty from SJVTS, and the Prefect of Studies of RMAMS or a formator from RMAMS.

4. The Academic Advisory Committee will meet at a specified time to examine the evidence of academic dishonesty. The instructor and suspected seminarian are permitted to attend the meeting and will have the opportunity to state or defend their cases if they desire. The committee will judge the case based on whether the evidence supports the suspicion of academic dishonesty.

5. If at least two of the three faculty members on the Academic Advisory Committee find the seminarian guilty of academic dishonesty based on the evidence, then an instance of academic dishonesty will be registered in the seminarian's record. The Academic Dean of SJVTS will inform the sponsoring diocese, the Rector of SJVTS, or the Rector of RMAMS, the pertinent Cycle Director(s), the seminarian's Academic Advisor, and the seminarian's Formator about the Committee's decision.

6. It will be at the discretion of the Academic Dean whether the seminarian fails the course or is allowed to retake the exam or the class.

7. It will be at the discretion of the rector of the pertinent seminary, and with the approval of the Archbishop, whether the seminarian could be dismissed from the respective Seminary.

8. If at least two of the three faculty members on the Academic Advisory Committee do not find the evidence compelling, the seminarian is found not guilty. The suspicion of academic Dishonesty, and its dismissal by an Academic Advisory Committee, will be recorded in the seminarian's record. The Academic Dean of SJVTS will inform the Rector of SJVTS, and if a RMAMS seminarian, the Rector of RMAMS, the pertinent Cycle Director(s), the seminarian's Academic Advisor, the instructor who made the accusation of academic dishonesty, and the seminarian's Formator about the Committee's decision.