

**Procedures for Resolving Alleged Violations of the
UC San Diego Policy on Integrity of Scholarship (Appendix II of the San Diego Division Manual of
the Academic Senate)**

Approved by the Educational Policy Committee, December 17, 2018 (revised 1/21/20; 08/17/20; 6/15/21)

This document details the procedures for resolving academic integrity violations as per the [UC San Diego Policy on Integrity of Scholarship](#) (herein the “Policy”). The Academic Integrity Office (AIO) is the manager of these procedures, which are approved by the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate’s Educational Policy Committee.

The procedures for responding to suspected academic integrity violations are divided into five phases: 1. Reporting Phase; 2. Decision and Resolution Phase; 3. Sanctioning Phase; 4. Appeals Phase; and 5. Closing Phase. This document also outlines the guidelines and procedures for Academic Integrity Reviews (AI Review) I and II in Appendix A.

1. The Reporting Phase

- 1.1. When an instructor has reason to believe that a student has violated academic integrity standards (Section I of the Policy), the instructor shall proceed in one of the following two ways:
 - a. Discuss the suspected violation with the student.
 1. File an Intent to Report with the AIO within five (5) business days of detecting the possible violation. Instructors are not obligated to file an Intent to Report, but it is recommended before discussing with the student. Per Section III.J. of the Policy, an Intent to Report prohibits a student from withdrawing from the course.
 2. Discuss the suspected violation with the student and, if needed, gather evidence.
 - a. If the instructor determines there is insufficient evidence to report, notify AIO and student of the retraction of the Intent to Report in writing.¹
 - b. If the instructor determines there is sufficient evidence to report, submit (as soon as possible but normally no later than fifteen (15) business days after the grades due date) an Allegation Report with the AIO.
 - i. If the student accepts responsibility with the instructor, their acceptance needs to be submitted to AIO in writing.
 1. If the student accepts responsibility with the instructor, the student can retract that acceptance within two (2) business days by contacting the AIO in writing (proceed to Section 2.1.b of these Procedures).
 - b. Report to AIO without discussing with the student.
 1. File an Intent to Report with the AIO within five (5) business days of detecting the possible violation. Instructors are not obligated to file an Intent to Report, but it is recommended if the Allegation Report cannot be submitted right away. Per Section III.J of the Policy, an Intent to Report prohibits a student from withdrawing from the course.
 2. Submit (as soon as possible but normally no later than fifteen (15) business days after the grades due date) an Allegation Report with the AIO.

¹ As per the Policy, the term “in writing” throughout this document is defined as communications delivered either on paper or electronically via e-mail.

2. The Decision and Resolution Phase

Once an instructor has submitted an Allegation Report to the AIO:

- 2.1. The AIO shall initiate the Decision and Resolution Phase, normally within two (2) business days, including assessing the written acceptance of responsibility by the student (if applicable), assigning the case to the Appropriate Administrative Authority (AAA)², and notifying the instructor and Academic Records that the process has begun.
 - a. If the student accepted responsibility with the instructor, the AIO will initiate the Sanctioning Phase (proceed to Section 3 of these Procedures).
 - b. If the student did not accept responsibility with the instructor³, the instructor did not meet with the student, or if the AIO assessed the violation type to be different than for what the student accepted responsibility, the AAA issues an Allegation Notification normally within two (2) business days of being assigned the case, which officially notifies the student of the allegation and the opportunity to resolve the allegation in a Resolution Meeting.
- 2.2. Within five (5) business days of the date of the Allegation Notification by the AAA, the Resolution Meeting between the AAA and student must be scheduled (proceed to Section 2.3 of these Procedures) or the student must accept responsibility in writing (proceed to the Sanctioning Phase, Section 3 of these Procedures).⁴
- 2.3. At the Resolution Meeting with the AAA, which can be conducted in person or virtually, there are only three possible outcomes:
 - a. Acceptance of Responsibility. The involved student accepts responsibility for violating academic integrity standards and the procedures for applying administrative and academic sanctions are initiated (proceed to Section 3 of these Procedures).
 - b. Agreement to Proceed to an Academic Integrity Review. The involved student does not accept responsibility for violating academic integrity standards and the AI Review procedures are initiated (proceed to Section 2.4 of these Procedures).
 - c. Withdrawal of Allegation. The AAA uncovers additional information that should be shared with the instructor regarding the allegation and the instructor decides to withdraw the allegation as a result (proceed to Section 2.5 of these Procedures). Note: The allegation may be reinstated if new evidence is later discovered. If the AAA determines that the behavior by the student was still concerning, even if not rising to the level of an integrity violation, they can issue a Notice of Inappropriate Conduct to the student.⁵

² The Appropriate Administrative Authority (AAA) is defined in Section II.B of the Policy.

³ It will be presumed that the student did not accept responsibility if the student retracted their acceptance or did not submit their acceptance in writing.

⁴ As per Section III.B. of the Policy, if the student does not respond to the notification, the AAA should assume that the student has accepted responsibility (“Failure to Respond”).

⁵ Per PACAOS 104.80, whether or not a hearing is conducted, campuses may provide written notice to a student that their alleged behavior may have violated University policy or campus regulations and that, if repeated, such behavior will be subject to the disciplinary process. Evidence of the prior alleged behavior as detailed in the written notice may be introduced in a subsequent disciplinary action in order to enhance the sanction.

A determination of the outcome should normally be reached within thirty (30) business days from the date that the AAA was assigned the case.

- 2.4. When a student has decided to proceed to an AI Review⁶:
- a. The AAA records the decision and notifies the involved student(s) of whether AI Review I or II procedures⁷ will apply within two (2) business days of the student's decision or in a multi-student case, within two (2) business days of the last student's decision.
 1. The AAA either directs the student to attend a Pre-Review Meeting or to formally submit to the AIO an Official AI Review Request within five (5) business days.
 2. If the student is directed to a Pre-Review Meeting, the student must formally submit to the AIO the Official AI Review Request within five (5) business days of the date of the Pre-Review meeting.
 3. If the student's Official AI Review Request is not received within five (5) business days, *and* the student is the only person in the case going to Review, it will be assumed that the student changed his/her mind and is accepting responsibility ("Failure to Respond") and the procedures for applying administrative and academic sanctions will be initiated (see Section 3 of these Procedures). If the student is involved in a multi-student case that is heading to Review, the student's case will proceed to Review with the others per Section III.D.2 of the Policy.
 - b. Normally within two (2) business days of receiving a student's Official AI Review Request, the AIO shall notify the student, the instructor, and the student's AAA in writing that the case is proceeding to an AI Review (see Appendix A of these Procedures for AI Review I and II guidelines and procedures).
 - c. If a student is held responsible through either the AI Review I or II:
 1. The AIO shall notify the student, the instructor, and the student's AAA of the AI Review decision within two (2) business days of receiving the Review decision.
 2. The procedures for applying administrative and academic sanctions will be initiated (see Section 3 of these Procedures).
 - d. If a student is held not responsible through either the AI Review I or II:
 1. The AIO shall notify the student and the student's AAA of the AI Review decision within two (2) business days of receiving the Review decision.
 2. Within five (5) business days of being notified of the Review decision, the student shall notify the AIO of their decision to either receive the earned grade or retroactively withdraw (see Section III.E. of the Policy).
 3. The AIO shall then notify the instructor and Academic Records of the student's decision within two (2) business days. The instructor shall assign a grade or Academic Records shall withdraw the student within ten (10) business days depending on the student's decision.

⁶ See Appendix A of these Procedures for AI Review guidelines and procedures.

⁷ Section III.D of the Policy describes the criteria for whether a case will be scheduled for an AI Review I or II: "If 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."

- 2.5. When an allegation is withdrawn by an instructor⁸, the instructor shall notify the AIO in writing of their decision.
 - a. The AIO shall notify the student, the student's AAA and Academic Records that the Allegation Report has been withdrawn by the instructor.
 - b. Academic Records removes any notations of the allegation from the student's academic record and directs the instructor to submit the student's earned grade.

3. The Sanctioning Phase

- 3.1. Within ten (10) business days of the resolution of the case after the student accepted responsibility or was found responsible, the student's AAA (or their designate) shall inform the student in writing, with a copy to the AIO, of the administrative consequences of the academic integrity violation.
- 3.2. Within two (2) business days of receiving the administrative consequences, the AIO shall notify the instructor and Academic Records of the outcome of the case and indicate that once the grade is submitted, the process is complete.
 - a. Academic Records shall update or remove all notations of the charge from the student's academic record and direct the instructor to assign a grade for the course.
 - b. The instructor will submit the grade within ten (10) business days after receiving the notice from Academic Records, or if the course is still in progress, at the end of the quarter when grades are due.
 - c. The Office of the Registrar will notify the AIO in writing once the final grade has been recorded.
- 3.3. If suspension or dismissal is issued, the student's AAA will place a hold on the student's record. If the suspension is occurring at the end of the student's academic program, the hold will delay conferral of the degree and defer the degree award date until after the end of the suspension (per Section III.O of the Policy).

4. The Appeals Phase

Students may appeal the determinations of an administrative sanction of suspension or dismissal from the University (Section III.G of the Policy), the AI Review I or II decision, the academic sanction determined by the instructor, and/or the failure to respond.

- 4.1. Appeal of an administrative sanction of suspension or dismissal from the University:
 - a. A student must submit in writing to the AIO the appeal of administrative sanction within ten (10) business days of receiving notice of the administrative sanction.

⁸ Per Section II.A of the Policy, "An instructor may not withdraw a charge if a student has accepted responsibility or has been found responsible for an academic integrity violation."

- b. The AIO processes the appeal and forwards to the AAA normally within two (2) business days.
- c. The AAA shall evaluate the student's appeal, make a final decision, and notify the AIO of the decision and rationale in writing within ten (10) business days of receiving the appeal.
- d. Within two (2) business days of receiving the appeal decision from the AAA, the AIO shall notify the student, the instructor, the AAA and Academic Records in writing of the appeal outcome.

4.2. Appeal of the AI Review I or II Decision:

- a. The AI Review appeal must be submitted to the AIO in writing within ten (10) business days of receiving the Review outcome notice.
- b. The AIO processes and forwards the appeal to the AAA, normally within two (2) business days.
- c. The AAA shall evaluate the student's appeal, make a final decision, and notify the AIO of the decision and rationale in writing within ten (10) business days of receiving the appeal.
- d. Within two (2) business days of receiving the appeal decision from the AAA, the AIO shall notify the student, the instructor, the AAA, and Academic Records in writing of the appeal outcome.
- e. If the appeal is granted, the AIO will put the case back in the AI Review queue and schedule it according to the AI Review Procedures.

4.3. Appeal of the Academic Sanction:

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

4.4. Appeal of the Failure to Respond

- a. Students who fail to respond due to extenuating circumstances can request a timeline extension, which is evaluated by the AIO. The request must normally be received in writing no later than 30 business days from the date the failure to respond letter was sent. The AIO decision is final.

5. The Closing Phase

- 5.1. The AIO will close the case once the grade is submitted and any imposed sanctions (requiring tracking) have been completed.

APPENDIX A. Academic Integrity Reviews

Academic Integrity Reviews are scheduled at the request of the student who does not accept responsibility for an academic integrity violation. The purpose of an Academic Integrity Review (AI Review) is to reach a conclusion as to whether there was an academic integrity violation as per the [UC San Diego Policy on Integrity of Scholarship](#) (herein the “Policy”). AI Review decisions are made by the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB).

1. Composition of the AIRB

- a. A minimum of forty-five (45) faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees.
- b. A minimum of twelve (12) graduate students appointed by the Graduate and Professional Student Association in collaboration with the Assistant Dean of the Graduate Division.
- c. A minimum of fourteen (14) upper-division undergraduate students, two from each college, appointed by the college Dean of Student Affairs.
- d. All members must be trained and cleared for service by AIO.
- e. For AI Review I, the AIO will select from the AIRB two (2) members, normally a faculty member and a student (either undergraduate or graduate) member to form the Review Panel.
- f. For AI Review II, the AIO shall select from the AIRB five (5) members (the “Review Panel”), which shall normally be composed of three faculty members, one graduate student, and one undergraduate student.
 - i. Students shall be given the option of electing to proceed with a reduced Review Panel of not less than two (2) faculty members and one (1) student (either undergraduate or graduate).

2. Standards for AI Reviews

- a. The rules of evidence used in legal proceedings do not apply.
- b. A relevant party is one with direct and material understanding of or involvement in the case, most typically the instructor, instructional assistant(s), and involved student(s). In some cases, there may be other relevant parties that can be present at an AI Review II, subject to the approval of the presiding officer.
 - i. Examples of non-relevant parties include, but are not limited to, attorneys and character witnesses.
- c. The responsibility of the Review Panel is only to determine whether a student committed an academic integrity violation.
- d. The Review Panel shall make its decision based on the preponderance of evidence (a more likely than not standard) and not based on intent or motivation of the student.
- e. Normally within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the Review Request by the AIO, the relevant parties must submit all materials, in writing, to the AIO. Relevant materials, which will be collated into the briefing packet, include:
 - i. Instructor’s report and supporting documentation (including any statements from relevant parties)
 - ii. Involved student’s statement and supporting documentation (including any statements from relevant parties)

3. AI Review I Procedures (Informal Hearing)

- i. The AI Review I procedures shall be initiated according to Section III.D of the Policy.
- ii. The AI Review I is primarily a document review process, including:
 - i. Statements and documentation submitted by the instructor and involved student(s) (see Section 2.e of this Appendix).
 - ii. A report from the AAA who met with the involved student(s) outlining the case and relating any conversations with the student(s).

- iii. All materials submitted within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the review request by the AIO (see Section 2.e of this Appendix).
- iii. Normally within five (5) business days of receiving the documentation from the relevant parties, the AIO shall make available to the instructor and student(s) all of the relevant statements and documentation.
- iv. The AIO will give each party five (5) business days to supplement the original submission or to submit a statement in response to the materials received.
- v. As soon as possible after this time, the AIO will convene an AI Review I Review Panel to review the case.
 - i. The Panel will meet to review the statements and documentation.
 - ii. The Panel is permitted to ask the AIO to arrange interviews between the Panel and any of the relevant parties if the Panel feels such interviews would be helpful.
 - iii. Within fifteen (15) business days of receiving the case, the AI Review I Panel must convey its decision to the AIO. In the event of a tie, the AIO will assign the case to a third AIRB member who must be a faculty member.

4. AI Review II Procedures (Formal Hearing)¹

- a. The AI Review II procedures shall be initiated when a student is contesting an allegation that may result in suspension or dismissal from the University.
- b. As soon as possible, and normally no longer than one quarter after receipt of the request for an AI Review, the AIO shall schedule a review of the case by an AI Review II Review Panel.
- c. AI Review IIs are facilitated by presiding officers who are UCSD community members selected and trained by the AIO.
 - i. The presiding officer shall conduct the AI Review II Review and advise the AI Review II Review Panel on the procedure, but shall not vote.
 - ii. The presiding officer shall conduct the AI Review II in such a manner as to try to ensure fairness to both the student and the instructor, to maintain order and decorum, to facilitate presentation of evidence, and to provide an opportunity for questions to be asked, including by the Panel and the Relevant Parties.
- c. The AIO shall normally provide at least ten (10) business days' notice to the student and the instructor of the time, date, and location of the AI Review II, although exceptions to the timeline can be made if both the student and the instructor agree.
 - i. In the event that the time or place is adjusted after the original notice is sent, an e-mail notifying the parties to this effect shall be deemed sufficient notice.
 - ii. Except in the case where the relevant party is central to the allegation being made against the student (e.g., a person who observed the alleged violation), it is the responsibility of the instructor and student, not the AIO, to arrange for any other relevant parties to attend.
 - iii. There is no rescheduling of AI Review IIs except under documented exceptional circumstances.
 - 1. Exceptional circumstances do not normally include the student's work or personal conflicts unless undue hardship would otherwise be experienced by the students.
 - 2. Requests for rescheduling should normally be made at least five (5) business days before the scheduled Review.
 - iv. If a rescheduling request is made, it will be decided by the presiding officer after considering information and/or documentation provided by the requester and the AIO.
 - 1. In the event that the AI Review II is rescheduled, it will not normally be rescheduled a second time.
- d. The AIO will make available to the instructor and the student a copy of the relevant statements and documents (the briefing packet) no later than five (5) business days before the date of the AI Review II. The briefing packet may also be made available to the presiding officer and the Panel ahead of the Review.

- i. Newly available documents not included in the briefing packet can be presented at the AI Review subject to the approval of the presiding officer. In such circumstances, the presiding officer should provide the Review Panel, the student, and the instructor with adequate time to review the new information.
- e. The instructor and the student shall have the right to question all relevant parties present at the AI Review II.
 - i. Normally, relevant parties are present at the AI Review only for the time they are presenting their statements and being questioned by the instructor, the student, and the Review Panel. Members of the instructional team (e.g., TAs, readers, tutors) can be present for the entire review.
 - ii. The student's absence from or silence during the AI Review II shall not imply acceptance of responsibility.
- f. The University will normally conduct a single AI Review II to address charges made against multiple students in the same incident unless the students would experience substantial prejudice as a result of a joint AI Review II. Separate decisions will be made for each student.
 - i. The presiding officer, in consultation with the AIO, hears and decides any concerns regarding prejudice.
- g. Involved students and instructional staff may be accompanied by a member of the University community who is trained by the AIO to assist in the AI Reviews.
 - i. Students and instructional staff should speak for themselves, but trained advisors may assist with questioning and procedural issues.
 - ii. The advisor may not normally appear at the AI Review II in lieu of the student or instructor, but in the event that the advisor is present but the student or instructor is not, the AI Review may continue at the discretion of the presiding officer, questions may be asked of the advisor, and the advisor may address procedural issues on behalf of the student or instructor.
- h. No AI Review II shall be undertaken without a reliable audio recording by the presiding officer. No other recording or broadcasting device shall be allowed in the AI Review II. Any recording shall be retained by the AAA according to the University's Records Retention Schedule.²
 - i. Transcripts of the AI Review II will not be made by the University, but if either the instructor or the student makes a transcript at their own expense, copies should be provided to the University and other relevant party for the reasonable cost of the copy. Procedures for such record keeping will be consistent with University policy. Any transcript received by the University shall be retained by the AAA according to the University's Records Retention Schedule.
- i. Review Panel members may recuse themselves or the student may challenge the participation of a Review Panel member only when a reasonable person would recognize a conflict of interest or an inability of the Review Panel member to be unbiased; for example, when there is a personal or authoritative relationship between the student and the Review Panel member.
 - i. The presiding officer shall make the final determination on challenges to Review Panel composition.
 - ii. In the event that the AI Review II cannot proceed owing to Review Panel composition, the presiding officer shall call for a continuance until such time as an appropriate Review Panel can be constituted.
- j. The instructor and the student, along with any other parties to the AI Review II, will be excused before the Review Panel begins its deliberations.
 - i. The Review Panel deliberations shall always be confidential and conducted in private with only the Review Panel members and the presiding officer present.
 - ii. Promptly after the deliberations, the presiding officer will notify the AIO of the Panel's decision.

¹ The AI Review II Procedures comply with the procedures requirements listed in Section 103.11 of the University California's Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline (PACAOS): <https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2710530/PACAOS-100>.

² <https://recordsretention.ucop.edu/>