












AI REVIEW II GUIDE

The Academic Integrity Review II (AIR II) is the University's formal process for resolving allegations of academic integrity violations. This handbook will provide you with directions and guidance so that you can fully prepare and participate in the Review process.

TABLE OF **RESOURCES**


We understand that the AI Review process can be complicated. The following resource list provides a quick guide to accessing information to help you navigate the process and prepare to participate fully in your review. Click on the icon to jump to the selected resource.

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Introduction |  |
| Glossary |  |
| AIRB Panel |  |
| Review Format |  |
| AIR II Checklist |  |
| Preparing your Statement |  |
| Review Scheduling |  |
| Request Help |  |
| Important Links |  |

INTRODUCTION TO AIR II

You have been referred to the AIR II because you meet the following three conditions:

1. you are alleged to have violated academic integrity;
2. you have denied that your actions violated academic integrity, also known as "contested";
3. if you are responsible for the violation, you (or one of the other involved students) are likely facing separation from the University, including IMP with Quarter Suspension.



An AI Review II (AIR II) is a formal hearing to determine if you violated academic integrity. About 7% of academic integrity cases are contested to the level of the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB).

[Click here to learn more about the AI Process & other Review types](#)

The primary purpose of the AI Review II is to allow an unbiased and uninvolved panel to determine if it is "more likely than not" that an academic integrity violation occurred. It is NOT a legal proceeding and is not bound by legal rules. Rather, it is an administrative meeting to determine whether a your behavior violated University standards and warrants an intervention.

The AIR II is a formal hearing, and therefore includes:

- a documentation review, and;
- affords students the right to **include relevant parties** and **ask questions** of the instructor and other involved parties.

The UC San Diego Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures outlines the expectations and guidelines governing the AI Review Board process and supersedes info in this document.

GLOSSARY

| Term | Definition |
|----------------------------|---|
| Review Board / Panel | A group of faculty members and students who are trained to serve as panelists at reviews. They are the only ones who can hold a student responsible or find them not responsible. |
| Briefing Packet | The digital packet compiled by the AI Office for the Review. The Packet contains statements and documents submitted by the involved instructor and involved student(s) |
| Full Panel / Reduced Panel | Full Panel: Consists of 3 faculty members, 1 graduate student, and 1 undergraduate student Reduced Panel: Consists of 2 faculty members, 1 student. The involved student(s) must consent to a reduced panel. |
| Presiding Officer | A non-voting member of the AI Review Board who is trained to facilitate the process. |
| Relevant Party | A person who has direct & material understanding of and/or involvement in the case. A Relevant Party is most often the instructor, an instructional assistant, and the involved student(s). |
| Advisors | People who have received some training from the University in order to participate in the process. Students can choose from UCSD provided advisors or select their own external advisor. Advisors are limited to communicating with their advisee and will not interrupt, disrupt, or directly participate in the resolution. |

THE PANEL

The Review is attended by the reporting instructor and members of the instructional team (and their Advisor if chosen), you (and an Advisor if chosen), any other involved student(s), as well as the AI Review Panel. The Panel consists of the following individuals:



Presiding Officer

The Presiding Officer is a non-voting member of the Panel & acts as the facilitator of the Review. They ensure all parties are being treated with respect and that involved parties are afforded the opportunity to participate. They also make decisions related to the introduction of evidence after the final Briefing Packet has been issued, the inclusion of relevant parties, and other procedural decisions.



Faculty Members



Student Members

Full Panel: There are three faculty, as well as one undergraduate, and one graduate student voting members. Prior to the Review they certify that they have no prior knowledge of and/or relationships with any of the involved parties.

Reduced Panel: All students are given the option of electing to proceed with a reduced Review Panel. A reduced Panel consists of not less than two faculty and one student (either undergraduate or graduate) voting members.

Consenting to a reduced panel does not mean that student(s) will not be assigned a full panel. In 2022-2023, 61% of all panels were full. A benefit of a reduced panel is that scheduling is simplified, allowing more opportunities for a review to be scheduled. Since 2019, 70% of students have elected to proceed with a reduced panel.

The outcome of the AIR II is not impacted by whether or not the decision is made by a full or reduced panel.

REVIEW FORMAT

Prior to service, all AI Review Board members must complete training and demonstrate their ability to conduct themselves with integrity. Board Members must ensure that their participation and decisions are made fairly and based on an analysis of the available evidence according to the established standard. Before making a decision, Board Members complete the following steps.



Pre-Review Meeting

At least five business days before the date of the review, the members of the review panel are sent a copy of the Briefing Packet. Board Members review all the material submitted by the involved instructor and student(s) and then meet right before the Review begins to finalize their preparation as a group.



Discussion

The Board will ask questions of the involved instructor, the involved student(s), and any relevant parties. The instructor and the student have the right to question all relevant parties present. Any Advisors present can aid their Advisees, but may not directly participate.



Deliberation

Once all other parties have left, the PO facilitates the deliberation with the Review Board which uses a Preponderance Standard, also known as a "more likely than not" standard to make a determination regarding responsibility. The University has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the student more likely than not violated academic integrity.

The AI Review Board does not consider intent or character when making their decisions.

UCSD advisors can help at no cost to you! You are also welcome to be assisted by an external (non-UCSD) advisor if you prefer.

[Click here for more information.](#)

Preparing your Material for an AI Review II

Background

The Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) will consider all the material submitted by the involved parties in coming to the decision as to whether or not you are responsible for an academic integrity violation. Therefore, it is essential that you prepare your materials in a clear and thoughtful way. By "materials", we mean writing your statement and gathering documentation that supports your statement.

Review the Documentation

Once you have submitted your written request for an AI Review, the AI Office will send you another copy of the case documentation submitted by the instructor. Review this documentation carefully.

Deadline

You will have 10 business days to submit your material. If you need more time, **request an extension** using the form linked here.

Write your Statement

Your statement should be: (a) focused and clear, communicating to the AIRB the truth and facts as you know them; (b) stick to the information that is relevant to the incident.

Do not include information about your character. Good people make bad decisions, so your character is not in question. In addition, intent is not considered by the AIRB. Rather, the question is whether your actions resulted in an academic integrity violation.

Supporting Documentation

Once you have completed your statement, re-read it and determine what documentation you have that would support what you say in your statement. Examples of supporting documentation include: your study or lecture notes; screenshots of your edit history; emails or text message chains. If any of the pieces of documentation already submitted by the Instructor supports your statement, there's no need to resubmit them. Instead, you can simply refer to any relevant documentation already submitted by the Instructor.



Connect your Statement with your Documentation

Once you've gathered your supporting documentation, go back and edit your statement to reference any documentation you are submitting. We suggest doing so in bold within the appropriate place in your statement. Here is an example (do not interpret this as an example argument to use---i.e., don't plagiarize it!--but as an example of how to reference your exhibits):

I am denying that I used an unauthorized aid during the final exam. The professor thinks that I did because I wrote things that I had read on Wikipedia. However, I actually have a very good memory **[see Exhibit 1 which is an award I won in a photographic memory contest]**. Because of this unique skill, I have developed a study strategy whereby I make copious notes of things I have read and memorizing those notes. You can see in **Exhibits 2, 3, 4** my study notes that I created for this particular exam; if you compare those to my actual exam answers (**submitted by the Instructor**), you'll see that they match. I have also included for you a statement from my roommate who confirms my photographic memory and study strategy **[see Exhibit 5]**.

Relevant Parties

If you are asking any relevant parties to attend the Review (e.g., the roommate in the above example), you must name that party and describe how they are relevant in your statement. The Presiding Officer will consider and either approve or deny any relevant parties participation during the review.

The Policy defines a relevant party as someone "with direct and material understanding of or involvement in the case, most typically the instructor, instructional assistant(s), and involved student(s)...Examples of non-relevant parties include, but are not limited to, attorneys and character witnesses."

A statement from the relevant party, including their full name and email address, should be listed as an exhibit. You need to make arrangements directly with that person to have them available for the AI Review so that the AIRB and/or instructor can ask them questions and determine the accuracy and relevancy of their statement.

The University does NOT contact that person on your behalf and rescheduling requests based on the availability of relevant parties are not normally considered.

Need Help?

UCSD advisors can help at no cost to you! You are also welcome to be assisted by an external (non-UCSD) advisor if you prefer.

[Click here for more information.](#)


Submit

Submit your documentation via the form here. Please pay close attention to the **formatting expectations!**


If you have more than 8 exhibits, submit exhibits 1-8 via the form then email the remaining to aio@ucsd.edu

AI REVIEW II TASK LIST


PREPARING YOUR MATERIAL

- 
- ☐ Write down your statement due date
 - ☐ Review the essential information below
 - ☐ Access the case documentation & critically read all the material
 - ☐ Compare the evidence to the Policy, syllabus, & course expectations
 - ☐ Write down any questions and/or evidence you want to address


STATEMENT & DOCUMENTATION

- 
- ☐ Optional: Select an Advisor to help you through the process
 - ☐ Gather evidence that supports your argument
 - ☐ Draft your statement to share with your advocate or advisor
 - ☐ Format your material
 - ☐ Submit by the deadline

PREPARE FOR THE REVIEW

- 
- ☐ Review the Briefing Packet
 - ☐ Write down any questions your want to ask during the Review
 - ☐ Consider and prepare for what types of questions the Review Board may ask you
 - ☐ Write down the Review date & time
 - ☐ Optional: Arrange for an AS Advocate or an external advisor to attend the Review with you & notify the AI Office

DAY OF THE REVIEW

- 
- ☐ Set yourself up in a private, confidential space
 - ☐ Login to the zoom room 10 min. early
 - ☐ Keep your video on
 - ☐ Ask all of your questions
 - ☐ Stay engaged & respectful

ESSENTIAL INFORMATION! ALWAYS REMEMBER:

- Intent & character are not taken into consideration
- The AIRB makes decisions based on a preponderance of the evidence standard
- If you need an extension, request one here
- Review additional material in the Resource Library
- Advisors are limited to communicating with their advisee and shall not interrupt, disrupt, or directly participate in the administrative resolution



REQUEST FREE HELP

AS Advocates

UCSD Associated Students' Student Advocates are a "free and private resource that helps students who have been accused of academic integrity violations." Student advocates are trained by the AI Office and are available to:

1. edit statements & find evidence
2. prepare students for reviews
3. attend the review

Schedule your appointment early via their website.

AIRB Advisors

Students going through the Review process can receive help from the AIRB Advisors. AIRB Advisors are members of the AIRB who have been trained by the AI Office to:

1. assist students in writing their Review statements
2. determining what would be relevant documentation
3. give their recommendations on whether existing materials meet the "more likely than not standard"

Schedule your appointment early via the website here.



Schedule Quickly! Do not wait!

If you want help, schedule a meeting as soon as you have your statement deadline date. Appointments with both AS Advocacy and AIRB Advisors are on a first come, first serve, basis and it is not guaranteed that your deadline will be extended if you cannot make an appointment.


Alternatively, you may select an external advisor to help you through the process.

SCHEDULING

WHAT TO EXPECT

Review Scheduling

All Reviews are conducted remotely via Zoom. Cases are scheduled as soon as possible, but normally not more than one full quarter after the allegation was reported. The AIO uses your class schedule in combination with the schedules of other involved student(s) and instructors to identify a review date and time that everyone can attend.



Review Notice

The AIO will email you an official "Review Scheduling Notice" to your official @ucsd.edu email at least 10 business days in advance. The notice will contain the date, time, Zoom URL, and Briefing Packet link (if finalized).

Setting up your Space

Reviews are scheduled for 2.5 hour time blocks but most reviews are completed within 90 minutes. You must be in a private space and you must have a working camera and clear audio. If you do not have the ability to meet these expectations, email aio@ucsd.edu and we can arrange a space for you.



Coordinating with Your Advisor

If you have arranged to have an Advisor attend the Review with you, you should ensure that they have all of the information needed to attend.

Conflicts with the Review Date

If you have a conflict with the date, you may request a reschedule using the following form: <https://forms.gle/Q3gxjmQdv43kqTtD9>. Reviews are rarely rescheduled and only under exceptional circumstances with supporting documentation. Personal conflicts and work does not justify a reschedule unless there is undue hardship.



IMPORTANT LINKS

UC San Diego Academic Integrity Policy

<https://senate.ucsd.edu/Operating-Procedures/Senate-Manual/Appendices/2>



Procedures for Resolving Alleged Violations

<https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/process/policy.html>




Request an Extension

<https://forms.gle/msgBymbbnjLVYUbn8>



Get Help

<https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/process/help.html#External-Advisors>



AI REVIEW II – TIMELINE

01

Review Request Form


Within **5 business days** of receiving the “Review Requested” notice, submit your official written review request using the provided form. Once you’ve submitted the form, you will receive a copy of your submission for your records.



02

Official Review Request Received Notice

Once the AIO processes your official review request, we will email a confirmation*, which will contain all the case documentation, as well as guidance on completing & submitting your Student Statement.



03

Student Statement & Advisor Notice

This is your opportunity to explain what happened and provide any relevant documentation. Submit within **10 business days** of receiving the official Review Request Received Notice. **Apply for an extension if additional time is needed. If you plan on having an AS Advocate or external advisor attend the Review, you should include the FERPA Release form at this point



04

Notice of Scheduled Review

Confirmation of the scheduled AI Review will be emailed to you at least **10 business days** prior to the AI Review date.



05

Final Briefing Packet

The final Briefing Packet will be emailed to you at least **5 business days** before the AI Review date. At that point, changes to the Briefing Packet can no longer be made without approval from the Presiding Officer.



06

Attend the AIRB

The Review will be conducted virtually via Zoom. If you have an AS Advocate or external advisor attending the Review as well, please ensure that they have the date, time and meeting URL.



07

AIRB Decision Notice

The AI Review Board makes their decision and the AIO will email it to you **normally within 2 business days** of the AI Review.



**Note: For cases involving multiple students, the Review Request Received notice will be sent once all students have submitted the form.*

***Request an Extension [here](#)*

Updated: 10/2023

Normally expect min 12 weeks