The Academic Integrity (AI) Office promotes and supports a culture of academic integrity in order to reinforce quality teaching and learning.
What We Do

Academic Integrity staff and Peer Educators share fundamental values of *Honesty, responsibility, Trustworthiness, Respect, Fairness*. Through these fundamental values, Academic Integrity staff and Peer Educators work diligently to:

- Administer the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship

- Coordinate and teach educational workshops, including the Academic Integrity Seminar, to help students learn after a policy violation

- Provide UCSD faculty and teaching assistants with tools and knowledge to prevent and address academic misconduct in their classes and teach professional (academic) integrity and ethics

- Facilitate structural and systemic changes to help support academic integrity cultures

- Reinforce the academic integrity message to continuing students through education and outreach

- Educate internal and external educational partners on academic integrity to advance the values and impact the external factors that shape our internal campus culture

- Socialize all new/incoming UCSD students into the academic integrity culture, to ensure they are informed and have the opportunity to understand its norms, rules, customs, and expectations.
During 2011 - 2012, 21 UCSD students volunteered as Peer Educators to advise and teach students as well as to spread the word about academic integrity. Peer educators meet with students in group sessions, during Seminar, and during individualized meetings to help guide students through the process. Peer educators provide support to students, answer their questions and help them develop ethical decision-making and integrity skills. Our most sincere thanks and appreciation go out to our 2011-2012 Peer Educators: David Dinh, Nick Graham, Derek Cheng, Lucero Leon, Kristina Thai, Karissa Barnett, Hannah Kang, Zarina Sharifi, Shaina Hora, Bello Fausat, Damian Hall, Ben Dufour, David Tookhi, and Katherine Ball. Also, we welcomed several new Peers who joined us in Spring 2012 for training to become full Peer Educators in 2012-2013: Alan Gutierrez, Kathy Hieng, Jessica Nevarez, Hang Tran, JiHee Yun, Jonathan Wong, Philip Yoong, and Jeemin Kang.

“The peer educators were really enthusiastic and made me look forward to the second session of the seminar after meeting them.”

“I was pleasantly surprised at how engaging it was and how friendly the instructor and peer educators were. I immediately felt like I could talk to them.”

“(It) was extremely helpful/insightful! I plan to try out as a peer advisor!”

“I really appreciated the instructor’s and TA’s (PE’s) objectiveness and how they connected to the students. They weren’t strictly ‘by-the-rules’ in that they considered arguments both for and against the rules of the university.”
The Academic Integrity Seminar is a workshop created for students who have violated the UCSD academic integrity policy. The Seminar is led by a team of people: a lead facilitator, co-leader and peer educators as small group leaders.

The AI Director develops the curriculum and assignments in collaboration with the AI Seminar team.

**Academic Integrity Seminar Evaluations 2011 - 2012**

- 9 out of 10 students agree that the “Seminar is beneficial to take”
- 8 out of 10 students agree that they “learned a great deal from the Seminar”
- 9 out of 10 students agree that “peer educators added value to the Seminar”
- 10 out of 10 students agree that “the Seminar Instructor showed concern for students’ learning”

“I like how the seminar didn't have a "punishment" feel to it and that the instructor and the other two leaders weren't prejudiced. We were all treated with respect, fairness and it was almost enjoyable to be here.”

“I really found this seminar interesting. I enjoyed the more global aspects of academic integrity which were discussed in addition to the discussion of the deep-rooted causes of academic integrity.”

“I think the seminar should be mandatory for incoming freshman and maybe during orientation.”

“I found this seminar helpful in promoting my knowledge of academic integrity and really appreciated the non-intimidating environment.”
Our third annual academic integrity educational campaign occurred in 2011-2012. Once again, we ran an academic integrity contest and a face-to-face week during which we reached hundreds of UC San Diego students with the academic integrity message.

Our second annual “Honor Academic Integrity @ UC San Diego” Ceremony on April 18th was attended by 75 people. VC Subramani, Associate Dean Weinhausen (Division of Biological Sciences) and Zarina Sharifi (Peer Educator Alum) all spoke about the importance of academic integrity.

The following awards were presented at the ceremony:

**Faculty Award**
Lelli Van de Einde (Structural Engineering)

**Student Award**
David Dinh & Zarina Sharifi

**High School Student Contest Winner**
David Chau

**AI Ally Award**
ACMS, Registrar's Office & Instructional Research (for their collaborative work on labeling and mapping classroom seats in our most popular classrooms)

A SPECIAL THANK YOU TO OUR PARTNERS
Associated Students
Division of Arts & Humanities
Division of Biological Sciences
Division of Physical Sciences
Division of Social Sciences
International Center
Jacobs School of Engineering
Marshall College Dean of Student Affairs
Muir College Dean of Student Affairs
Office of Graduate Studies
Rady School of Management
Revelle College Dean of Student Affairs
Roosevelt College Dean of Student Affairs
School of International Relations & Pacific Studies
Scripps Institute of Oceanography
Sixth College Dean of Student Affairs
UCSD Libraries
Warren College Dean of Student Affairs
These two graphs chart policy violation reports by faculty over the last 9 years. The only clear trend is the gradual decline in the number of allegations not pursued by instructors (i.e., the instructor submits an X at the end of the term but then decides not to file an allegation of a policy violation).

In 2011-2012, there were 573 total allegations, a decline from the previous year. The greatest number of violation reports came from the Division of Social Sciences (n=194) while the fewest reports came from the Division of Biological Sciences (n=26). It is not suspected that there is substantial variation in the rate of student integrity violations from year to year, so this variation in reporting needs to be further examined. For example, do reporting rates vary by teaching assignments (i.e., some instructors consistently report integrity violations while others seldom do)? Do they vary by the kinds of classes (e.g., upper versus lower division) offered in a quarter or year?

Allegations Pursued and Not Pursued
As can be seen by the graph above, allegations of assignment cheating (e.g., copying another students’ lab report or paper) and exam cheating (e.g., using an unauthorized aid, copying from a neighbor) are the most common types of violations reported, with plagiarism not far behind. This seems to be relatively consistent year to year.

In the graph below, we can see that the grade point averages (GPAs) of reported students create a fairly standard bell curve, with the bulk of the students (almost 2/3) landing in the 2.5-2.99 (30%) and 3.00-3.49 (31%) GPA range. Also, exam and assignment cheating are the two most common violations by these two groups of students. However, reports of plagiarism are high for those students in the 0.00-2.49 range, so we may need to target this group for writing development, including skills in proper citation and attribution.
In fall 2011, UCSD conducted a survey of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty. This International Center for Academic Integrity survey, run by Donald McCabe (Rutgers University) is conducted annually around the world.

We had:

1202 Undergraduate
397 Graduates
131 Faculty

Complete the Survey

Although the numbers are low, the results do provide us with some indication of practical implications. For example:

- When students do not perceive that instructors discuss proper citation practices or requirements, they are more likely to self-report engagement in plagiarism.

- When students do not perceive that instructors discuss falsifying/fabricating lab data, they are more likely to self-report engagement in that behavior.

- Students who believe others are cheating are more likely to self-report engagement in academic misconduct.

- Students’ perceptions of the severity of the penalties are not correlated to self-reported cheating.
The number of AI Office visitors: 1000+

1.5 - 5

The number of hours AI staff spend on each case.

2011 - 2012 BY THE NUMBERS

311
The number of students who attended the AI Seminar

15
The number of AI volunteers per quarter

158
The number of AI cases received per quarter

100+
The number of emails processed each day by AI staff

24
Faculty

11
Undergraduates

11
Graduates

12
The number of students, faculty and staff members who voluntarily serve as Advisory Council Members

1000+
The number of people who served on the AI Review Board
The statistics and graphs provided in this report represent just a sampling of the data available. If you have a specific question or data request, please let us know.