OCTOBER 2020 UPDATE ON AI REVIEW II PROCESS

The AI Office experienced a 79% increase in the number of cases reported in AY19-20 compared with AY18-19.

This case increase, as well as a doubling of the number of students contesting the allegations, has resulted in an unprecedented backlog in the AI Review waitlist. As of October 2, 2020, this backlog sits at 256 for AI Review IIs (in addition to the 90 in the AI Review I backlog).

The AI Office thanks instructors and students for their patience and cooperation during these difficult and exceptional circumstances.

We understand the challenges that this backlog creates for the involved instructors and students and regret this unavoidable situation. We hope that these FAQs, plus the webinar offered by AS Advocacy, will help students better understand the situation.

When will my case be heard?

According to the Procedures which apply to your case, an AI Review II is normally scheduled “no longer than one quarter after receipt of the request for an AI Review”. Unfortunately, given the abnormal backlog, it’s unlikely that any case will be heard within that normal timeline.

When scheduling cases to be heard this Fall 2020 quarter, AIO will prioritize integrity violation allegations that originated from FA19 and WI20 courses, as well as those cases involving students who would otherwise be graduating this quarter or should have already graduated. The actual number of cases the AIRB will be able to decide will depend on many other factors (see below) and so it is not guaranteed that all WI20 cases will be decided this fall quarter.

AI Review II cases will begin to be heard the week of November 2nd and will continue to be heard all quarter. There will be break after the quarter is over, and the Reviews will resume Week 2 of Winter quarter.

If your alleged integrity violation allegation occurred in a SP20 or SUM 20 course, it is highly unlikely your case will be heard before Winter 2021.

Why are there so many students waiting for an AI Review II?

There are so many factors that create a backlog in the AI Review II waitlist:
1. the 1800+ cases that were reported from 2019-2020 classes;
2. the increase in the number of cases going to Review (normally about 15% but currently at 24%);
3. the normal Fall quarter backlog because of the lack of availability of Presiding Officers, panel members, involved students, and participating instructors to hold Reviews over the summer; and,
4. the evolving COVID situation in the Spring 2020 quarter made it difficult to secure sufficient panel members and Presiding Officers to hold as many AI Review IIs as we normally would (i.e., only 18 instead of the traditional 30).

I was told that an “expert AIRB advisor” recommended that my case go forward to Review. Why?

When a student is alleged with an integrity violation and they contest that allegation (i.e., do not accept responsibility), there are only two possible methods for resolving the case: either the instructor withdraws the allegation (for lack of evidence) or the case is decided by an AI Review panel.
Over the summer, Instructors were given the option, per Procedures, of asking for an Advisor to help them decide if they should withdraw the case or proceed to the Review. If the Advisor recommended withdrawing, then usually the Instructor followed that advice, the allegation was withdrawn and the process is over for those students.

If the Advisor recommended proceeding, then the Instructor usually followed that advice as well. Those students still waiting for a Review are those for whom the allegation was NOT withdrawn by the instructor. This does not mean that your case has already been decided; it simply means that an Advisor to an Instructor made a recommendation of proceeding to the AI Review II.

**Can I also get an Advisor to recommend what I should do?**
Absolutely! You can either meet with an AIRB Advisor or AS Advocacy for assistance. They can go over the evidence with you and recommend whether you should accept responsibility or proceed to Review. If proceeding to Review, they can also advise you on what to include in your statement and what documentation to submit. Advisors & Advocates can also attend the Review with you if you’d like.


You can request an AIRB Advisor here - [https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/process/help.html#AIRB-Advisors](https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/process/help.html#AIRB-Advisors)

**Why hasn’t the AI Office done anything to resolve these cases?**
The AI Office does not have the authority to resolve cases. So, if the Instructor and student both want to go forward to the AI Review II, that is the only option for resolving/deciding the case.

The role of the AI Office in the AI Review II process is to:
- facilitate the collection of statements and documentation from the instructor and involved student(s);
- share the statements and documentation (aka Briefing Packet) once completed with the instructor and involved student(s);
- help instructors and students connect with an AIRB advisor if they’d like one;
- create a schedule of AI Review IIs for the quarter based on the availability of Presiding Officers and 3-5 Panel members for each AI Review II;
- schedule individual cases into the AI Review II schedule based on the availability of relevant parties (i.e., instructional team, involved students);
- send communications about scheduled Reviews;
- host the Review in Zoom; and,
- be available during Reviews for assistance if asked by the Presiding Officer.

**What is the AI Office doing to help resolve this backlog?**
There are only three ways to resolve the backlog:
1. instructors withdraw allegations;
2. students accept responsibility; or
3. AI Review panels decide the cases at an AI Review II.

Regarding #1 - Over the summer, the AIO facilitated the process of matching advisors to instructors upon request. Some professors withdrew allegations as a result.

Regarding #2 - We will also facilitate the process of providing AIRB Advisors to students upon request if they are wondering if they should accept responsibility or proceed to Review. Students can also, on their own, go to [http://asadvocacy.setmore.com/](http://asadvocacy.setmore.com/) for advice.

Regarding #3 - The AI Office has been working throughout the summer with campus partners to establish mechanisms to hold as many AI Review IIs as efficiently and as fairly as possible. This is complicated because the Policy & Procedures as written, as well as just panel availability, means that only about 30 cases have historically been resolved by the AIRB
each quarter. We are looking at ways to help the AI Review Board to decide at least double that number of cases by doing the following:

I. expanding the number of Presiding Officers who are trained and available to serve;
II. Increasing the number of people who are trained and available to serve as AIRB panel members;
III. providing more time outside of the Review slot for Panel members to become familiar with the cases they will be deciding;
IV. assigning 2 cases (instead of 1) to each Panel to resolve every time they meet; and,
V. asking students to agree to different procedures (see next question).

Is there anything else I can do?

Yes, you can:

I. provide us with your Fall Quarter availability in standard Review scheduling blocks
   a. this will help AIO maximize the scheduling of as many Reviews as possible
II. agree to have a Presiding Officer who is neither a Dean of Student Affairs or Assistant Dean of Graduate Division
   a. The Procedures (https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/process/2019-2020-Procedures.pdf) state that "the AIO shall schedule a review of the case by an AI Review II Review Panel, which shall be facilitated by a presiding officer (a college Dean of Student Affairs or the Assistant Dean of the Graduate Division, who is not the Dean or Assistant Dean of the student)."
   b. The newly adopted Procedures effective Fall 2020 (https://senate.ucsd.edu/media/389895/procedures-for-resolving-alleged-ai-violations.pdf), state that "the AIO shall schedule a review of the case by an AI Review II Review Panel. AI Review IIs are facilitated by presiding officers who are UCSD community members selected and trained by the AIO."
   c. Agreeing to proceed with a Presiding Officer who is NOT a Dean of Student Affairs or Assistant Dean of Graduate Division, almost doubles the number of possible Review dates in a quarter.
   d. Students who do not agree to this will NOT lose their spot in the AI Review II waitlist
   e. Want to learn more about agreeing to proceed as above? See this handout created by AS Advocacy - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RNWbR2M6vag-lazprZt9BKG_XOTr4P3dzOH-YzYcw4/edit?usp=sharing and attend the AS Advocacy presentation on October 15th (see below).

To submit your availability, and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the Procedural option, please submit the Availability & Procedures Agreement Form by Monday October 19th, 2020.

I’m supposed to have graduated already or graduate at the end of this quarter. How does this impact me?
We will be prioritizing any case involving a student who was to have graduated already or expecting to graduate at the end of Fall quarter. If you haven’t yet provided that information to us, please do so in the Availability & Procedures Agreement Form.

Your degree cannot be conferred until your case is resolved either by an acceptance of responsibility, an allegation withdrawal or an AI Review II decision.

Should I contact my instructor to get this resolved more quickly?
No, you shouldn’t. When you do this, it creates confusion in the process and more work for everyone involved, meaning the time of AIO is spent trying to reduce confusion rather than time on processing your case and making progress in clearing this this backlog.

Once you submit your statement and documentation, the AIO creates a “Briefing Packet” containing all of the information submitted by the Instructor and the involved student(s) and that packet is shared with those involved. The Instructor will see your statement then.

Do you have questions not yet answered?
Submit your question here – https://forms.gle/p2sK3Etqzb7T49ix5

Attend the Webinar on Thursday October 15th at 5:30 pm at https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/93909407142