Academic integrity is essential for an academic community, including UC San Diego. Academic integrity is built on a foundation of honest, responsible, fair and trustworthy scholarly activity.[i] Without it, the degrees we confer, the research we conduct, and our reputation all diminish in value.

Thus, the University expects that both faculty and students will adhere to its standards of academic integrity. The UC San Diego Academic Integrity Policy (herein the “Policy”) states the general rules associated with student integrity of scholarship. The Procedures for Resolving Alleged Violations of the Policy (herein the “Procedures”) are found at: /media/633239/ai-procedures.pdf and authorized by the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate’s Educational Policy Committee.

The Policy applies to all persons:
• matriculated at UC San Diego as undergraduate or graduate students
• enrolled as students in UC San Diego undergraduate or graduate courses

Medical students are governed by policies specified in the Handbook for School of Medicine Advisors and Students, as formulated by the School of Medicine Committee on Educational Policy. Pharmacy students are governed by the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS) Policy on Integrity of Scholarship as formulated by the SSPPS faculty. A separate policy exists governing integrity of research.

[i] Definition from the International Center for Academic Integrity, https://www.academicintegrity.org/

I) Roles and Responsibilities for Upholding Academic Integrity

A) Students’ Responsibility

To uphold academic integrity, students shall:

• Complete and submit academic work that is an honest and fair representation of their knowledge and abilities at the time of submission.

• Be responsible for knowing and following the standards of the class and the institution.

Thus, no student shall engage in an activity that undermines academic integrity or facilitates academic integrity violations by others. This includes, but is not limited to, the following behaviors:

a) No student shall procure, provide, or accept any material that contains questions or answers to any examination or assignment unless the student’s possession of the material has been authorized by the instructor.
b) No student shall complete, in part or in total, any academic work (e.g., examination, assignment, paper) or obtain academic credit (e.g., attendance, participation) for another person.

c) No student shall allow any academic work or academic credit to be completed or obtained, in part or in whole, for themselves by another (human or machine/artificial intelligence [i]).

[i] For examples of machine/artificial intelligence, go to: https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu.

d) No student shall plagiarize or copy the work of others (human or machine) and submit it as their own work.

e) No student shall employ aids (including artificial intelligence) in undertaking course work or in completing any assessments [i] that are not authorized by the instructor.

[i] Assessments are any form of academic work that it is submitted for academic credit; examples of assessments include, but are not limited to, exams, quizzes, or assignments.

f) No student shall alter graded assessments and then resubmit them for regrading without the instructor’s permission.

g) No student shall submit substantially the same material more than once without prior authorization from the instructor, such as a paper that was written and submitted in another class.

B) Instructors’ Responsibility

The instructor shall state in writing[i] how graded assessments will contribute to the final grade in the course. If there are any course-specific rules required by an instructor for maintaining academic integrity, the instructor shall also inform students of these in writing.

[i] “In writing” is defined as correspondence delivered either on paper or electronically via e-mail for the purposes of this Policy and the corresponding Procedures.
C) Instructional Assistants’ (IA) Responsibility

A student acting in the capacity of an instructional assistant (IA), a category including but not limited to teaching assistants, readers, and tutors, has a special responsibility to safeguard academic integrity and report suspected violations to the instructor. In this role the student functions as an apprentice instructor, under the tutelage of the responsible instructor. An IA shall equitably grade student work in the manner agreed upon with the course instructor. An IA shall not provide any student with any information or collaboration that would aid the student in completing the course in a dishonest manner (e.g., providing access to unauthorized material related to assessments). An IA who violates these responsibilities may be subject to discipline under this Policy but also under employee policies.

II) Roles and Responsibilities for Resolving Academic Integrity Violations

The responsibility for resolving academic integrity violations rests with two University authorities: the faculty and the administration. Under the Standing Order of the Regents, authority over courses and curricula is delegated to the faculty through the Academic Senate. The University of California’s Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline authorizes the UC San Diego administration to discipline students for academic misconduct (which are referred to as academic integrity violations in this Policy). Cases in which the student accepts or is found responsible for academic integrity violations will normally result in consequences, including but not limited to, academic integrity training, an academic sanction, and administrative sanction(s).
A) Academic Responsibilities

The instructor shall report all suspected academic integrity violations to the Academic Integrity Office (AIO), shall participate in the process according to this Policy and the corresponding Procedures, and, when the case is resolved, shall determine the academic sanction (the student’s grade in the course). Any violation of this Policy by the student may be considered grounds for failure in the course, although lesser consequences may be incurred in less serious circumstances. An instructor shall not assign an academic sanction for an academic integrity violation unless they have submitted an Allegation Report[i] to the AIO and there is an acceptance or final finding of responsibility. If the course concludes before a resolution is reached, the instructor will assign an “X” code for the course.

An instructor may withdraw an academic integrity allegation if they determine they have insufficient evidence to proceed and/or no longer suspect a violation occurred. An instructor cannot withdraw a charge if a student has already accepted responsibility or has been found responsible for an academic integrity violation. It is recommended that Instructors consult with the AI Office before withdrawing an allegation.

In cases where an academic integrity violation is reported in independent exams (exams held outside of coursework), such as placement exams and qualifying exams, and culminating academic work, such as undergraduate or graduate theses, dissertations, and independent study projects, the academic sanction will be determined by the faculty member or by the faculty committee that maintains ultimate responsibility for evaluating the exam or work. The sanction will establish both of the following:

1. Evaluation of the exam results or work. This may include granting a student full, partial, or no credit.
2. Provision to allow or deny a student the ability to repeat the exam or resubmit the culminating work.

[i] See the corresponding Procedures.
B) Administrative Responsibilities

There are many different administrators who have roles in the process of resolving academic integrity violations; in this Policy and the corresponding Procedures, they are all referred to as the Appropriate Administrative Authority (AAA). The responsibilities and title designations of the AAAs are as follows:

- **Decision and Resolution Phase**: the Resolution AAA may be an AIO staff member, a college Dean of Student Affairs or their designee, or the Graduate Education and Postdoctoral Affairs (GEPA) Assistant Dean of Student Affairs or their designee.

- **Sanctioning Phase**: the Resolution AAA imposes administrative sanctions unless the sanction is: (1) Suspension (not deferred), (2) Dismissal, or (3) there is any deviation from the Sanctioning Guidelines; in that case, the Resolution AAA presents the proposed sanction to the Sanctioning Body (comprised of the Council of Deans of Student Affairs, and the GEPA Assistant Dean when the case involves a graduate student), which must approve the sanction.

- **Appeal Phase**: the Appeal AAA is the student's college Provost (undergraduates), the Chair of the Council of Provosts (summer session and extension), or the GEPA Dean (graduate students). The Appeal AAA presents the appeal to the Appellate Body (comprised of the Council of Provosts for undergraduates, summer session and extension students, and the GEPA Dean when the case involves a graduate student) for a decision.

If students from two or more different units (e.g., colleges, Summer Session, Extension, or the Graduate Division) are allegedly involved in the same incident, one Resolution AAA will normally resolve all of the allegations.

The Resolution AAA will impose Administrative Sanctions in accordance with guidelines authorized by the Educational Policy Committee. Administrative sanctions range in severity, but can be applied only when a student has accepted responsibility or has been held responsible.[i] Students with multiple confirmed academic integrity violations shall be subject to dismissal from the University.

Decisions by the Appellate Body are final.

[i] Sanctioning guidelines can be found at https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/. [Am 6/9/20, Am 12/1/20]
C) Academic Integrity Office (AIO) Responsibilities

The AIO is the administrative manager for this Policy and for the processing of reported academic integrity violations, and the coordinator of the AI review and appeal process. The AIO may gather the materials necessary to fully document suspected academic integrity violations, resolve allegations as an AAA, and advise faculty and students throughout the process. The AIO oversees training of all persons serving as AAAs, Academic Integrity Review Board panelists and Presiding Officers, Review Advisors, A.S. Student Advocates, Instructors conducting Instructor-Student Resolution Meetings, and any others who are routinely involved the process for resolving academic integrity violation allegations. The AIO may extend any timelines in the Procedures when practical exigencies so dictate, in which case all involved parties will normally be notified in writing. The AIO shall maintain a record of all cases and shall report annually to the Educational Policy Committee on the number, nature, and type of cases; the pattern of decision-making; the severity and type of academic and administrative sanctions; and other relevant matters. The AIO is responsible for monitoring and reviewing the procedures that accompany this Policy and chairs the committee that reviews and updates the procedures on an annual or bi-annual basis. Proposals from the AIO to revise the Procedures will be submitted to the Educational Policy Committee for approval.

III) Policies Governing the Procedures for Resolving Suspected Academic Integrity Violations

The Procedures for resolving alleged academic integrity violations are found at:/media/633239/ai-procedures.pdf. The Procedures must be in agreement with the following Policy requirements.

A) Instructors shall report all suspected academic integrity violations to the AIO so that the formal procedures can be initiated. The Procedures explain the rights of students, which include the right to be notified of the alleged violation, the right to be heard, the right to accept or deny responsibility, the right to have the case evaluated by a Review Panel, and the right to appeal. If an instructor imposes an academic sanction without reporting the suspected academic integrity violation to the AIO, the student has the right to refer the case to the AIO to determine if formal procedures should be initiated.

B) If a student does not follow the Procedures within the established timelines, or fails to attend scheduled meetings, they can be presumed to have decided to accept responsibility.

C) If it is a multiple student case, the outcome[i] for each student must be known before the cases proceed to the sanctioning phase or an AI Review.

[i] Outcomes are defined in Procedures 2.3

1) If one of the involved students is non-responsive and any of the other involved students are proceeding to an AI Review, the Resolution AAA should proceed with Procedures 2.4.a.1 for the non-responsive student.
D) If the student does not accept responsibility, the case proceeds to an AI Review. If the possible administrative sanctions do not include suspension or dismissal from the University, the case will be scheduled for an AI Review I. If the possible administrative sanctions do include suspension or dismissal from the University, the case will be scheduled for an AI Review II.

1) If during an AI Review I, the Review Panel determines that the violation is different than originally classified and may result in administrative sanctions that do include suspension or dismissal from the University, the case will be referred back to the AIO for an assessment of the case. If the Review Panel’s assessment is supported by the AIO and the AAA, the case will be scheduled for an AI Review II.

E) If the student is held not responsible through an AI Review I or II, the matter shall be dismissed without further action against the student and the student shall be permitted either to complete the course without prejudice or to retroactively withdraw from it without indication on the student’s transcript. However, if the student does not notify the AIO of their decision within the timeline specified in the Procedures, it will be assumed that they are electing to receive the earned grade.

F) If a case of an alleged academic integrity violation might also be a violation of the Policy on Integrity of Research, then the AIO will consult with the Office of Research Affairs (ORA). If the AIO and the ORA concur that the alleged violation falls under both policies, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the AIO, may make modifications to procedure as are necessary to coordinate the two inquiries.

G) A student may appeal a responsibility determination of an AI Review I or II, the academic sanction determined by the instructor, and/or an administrative sanction of suspension or dismissal.

1) The basis for appeal of the AI Review I or II determination shall be: (i) the stated procedures were not followed; and/or (ii) there exists newly discovered important evidence that has substantial bearing on the determination of the Review Panel. If an AI Review appeal is granted, the student will receive a new Review in front of new Panel members.

2) If an AI Review appeal is not granted, the determination of the AI Review I or II shall be final and no further AI Review appeals may be submitted.

3) Appeals of the academic sanction will be considered in accordance with San Diego Senate Regulation 502. Grade Appeals.

4) The basis for appeal of the administrative sanctions shall be the student’s sanctions are out-of-line with the sanctioning guidelines. Only one administrative sanction appeal per case is allowed.

H) A record of the administrative sanction(s) shall be maintained by the AIO and the appropriate AAA.
I) Until an allegation of an academic integrity violation has been resolved, the assigned “X” grade for the course will remain, but the student’s transcript will show a blank grade for the course. The Office of the Registrar will note in the text attached to the course (i.e., not on the student’s transcript) that the grade was held due to a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty”. The grade hold will not be removed until notification from the AIO that the case has been resolved.

J) A student shall not be allowed to make any changes to a course (e.g., change grading options, change units, or withdraw) if the instructor has filed an Intent to Report or an Allegation Report to the AIO within the timeline specified in the Procedures. If a student does make any such changes, the change will be administratively reversed by the Office of the Registrar. A student may make changes to a course if the instructor does not submit an Intent to Report and the change occurs between the instructor’s deadline for filing an Intent to Report and the filing of the Allegation Report. However, in such cases the resolution process will proceed as described even if no academic sanction will be applied.

[i] See the corresponding Procedures. [AM 12/1/20]

K) If a student has been found responsible for an academic integrity violation, the grade assigned by the instructor will be counted in the GPA even if the course is retaken. The Office of the Registrar will permanently note in text attached to the course (i.e., not on the student’s transcript) that the grade was given as a result of “Academic Dishonesty”.

L) If a passing grade is assigned to a student found responsible for an academic integrity violation and a conflict arises because of the student’s enrollment in a duplicate, cross-listed, or equivalent course taken after the charge has been resolved, the Office of the Registrar shall ensure that the grade given in the course with the Academic Dishonesty charge is not removed from the GPA. All other academic regulations pertaining to duplicate course enrollment will be enforced.

M) If an involved student was enrolled at UC San Diego at the time the alleged violation occurred but ceases to be enrolled at any point during the resolution of a case, the process will continue as indicated in this Policy and the Procedures. If the student graduated before the allegation was filed, the Academic Integrity Office can elect to not initiate an allegation if there would be no academic or administrative sanctions imposed.

N) If the administrative sanction is suspension or dismissal, the fact that a student was suspended or dismissed for academic dishonesty must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the sanction.

O) The AAAs and the AIO may place Holds on the transcripts, admission, awarding of degree and registration when students have unresolved cases, overdue administrative sanctions, or imposed Suspensions or Dismissals. When Holds are placed the student will be notified in writing of the Hold, the reason for the Hold, and the process for requesting the removal of the Hold. [EN 12/1/20]
P) If there is evidence that a student fabricated information and/or furnished false information at any point during the process of resolving an academic integrity violation allegation, the student may be reported to the Office of Student Conduct for a non-academic conduct code violation and administrative sanctions may be imposed.

Q) For records retention purposes, a case pursuant to this Policy is considered closed when the outcome is decided and the student has no further appeals that could alter the outcome.

IV) Review of this Policy & its Associated Procedures

The Educational Policy Committee shall periodically review this Policy and the associated Procedures as it deems necessary. In addition, the Academic Integrity Office and Committee on Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures (CAIPP) can review and propose changes for approval by EPC. All Policy changes approved by the EPC will be forwarded to Academic Senate Representative Assembly for official approval before implementation.