

Honor Code



Last Modified on February 8, 2021

Table of Contents

Section 1. Definitions	3
Section 2. Introduction	4
Section 3. University Honor Code Statement	5
Section 4. CAI Structure	5
Section 5. Obligations and Initial Referral Procedures	6
Section 6. Resolution Processes	8
Section 7. Sanctions	15
Section 8. Records	15
Section 9. Revisions	16

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS

“**CAI**” means the Korea Campus’s Committee of Academic Integrity.

“**CAI Advisor**” means the CAI case manager for the matter or referral in question.

“**Cheating**” means the unauthorized use of, access to, or provision of academic work to misrepresent a student’s actual efforts. This includes submitting another individual’s work for a grade, soliciting solutions or assignments from online websites, unauthorized collaboration, and failing to adhere to written or verbal requirements established by the professor. Subcategories of cheating include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) Use of unauthorized material;
- (b) Use of unauthorized assistance;
- (c) Duplicate use of a student’s prior work;
- (d) Providing or benefitting from unauthorized academic material;
- (e) Submission of another individual’s work; and
- (f) Violation of course requirements regarding integrity.

“**Complainant**” means the faculty responsible for submitting the academic integrity referral to CAI and consequently initiating the respective processes in this Korea Honor Code.

“**Expedited Hearing**” means a hearing where the Respondent and the Complainant do not appear in person before the Korea Honor Committee.

“**Full Review**” means the review used when the Respondent indicates that he or she did not violate the Korea Honor Code and requests that the Korea Honor Committee reviews his or her case.

“**In-Person Hearing**” means a hearing where the Respondent and any other specified or eligible parties appear in person before the Korea Honor Committee.

“**Korea Campus**” means the University’s campus in Songdo, Incheon, South Korea.

“**Korea Honor Code**” means this George Mason University Korea Honor Code.

“**Korea Honor Committee**” means the honor committee formed pursuant to this Korea Honor Code.

“**Lying**” means providing information known to be false to bypass classroom expectations or gain an unfair advantage in completing academic work. Subcategories of lying include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) Falsifying sources, data, or information;
- (b) Providing a false excuse for missing a test or class;
- (c) Providing false information, including identifying information; and
- (d) Falsifying official correspondence.

“Plagiarism” means using another individual’s ideas or words without attribution or credit, including using prior work that has been submitted for credit or published in another venue as a new submission without citation. Using the ideas of others without proper attribution or citation is both unethical and a violation of the Korea Honor Code. Plagiarism does not include mistakes in the format of a citation if the student has clearly indicated the materials quoted or relied upon and the materials’ source/s.

Subcategories of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) Self-plagiarism;
- (b) Inadequate citation;
- (c) False citation; and
- (d) Failure to quote sources or material.

“Prehearing” means a prehearing conference where the Respondent meets the CAI Advisor and decides whether to accept or deny the Complainant’s academic integrity referral in whole or in part.

“Registrar” means the University’s Office of the University Registrar.

“Respondent” means a student or alumni accused of prohibited conduct in the Complainant’s academic integrity referral.

“Sanction-Only Review” means the review process used when the Respondent accepts responsibility in response to the Complainant’s academic integrity referral, but requests an amended sanction.

“Stealing” means obtaining or providing unauthorized access to educational materials. The materials possibly include tests or quizzes from faculty members or the work product of another student.

Subcategories of stealing include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) Removing an exam from a classroom without authorization;
- (b) Taking photos of exams or academic work without authorization or permission; and
- (c) Taking someone else’s work without their knowledge.

“University” means George Mason University.

SECTION 2. INTRODUCTION

At the University, academic integrity is demonstrated in our work, community, the classroom, and research. The University maintains this commitment to high academic standards through its honor codes. Honor codes are agreements made by the University community to not “cheat, steal, plagiarize, or lie in matters related to your academic work.” Each student signs an agreement to adhere to the University’s honor codes on his or her admission application and is responsible for being aware of his or her latest governing honor code. The honor codes allow the University to ensure that every student does his or her own work and to protect students from any students attempting to gain an inappropriate academic advantage.

Generally, the University’s students are subject to the Office of Academic Integrity’s Honor Code, regardless of program level or degree status. However, Antonin Scalia Law School students are subject

to Antonin Scalia Law School's Honor Code, and Korea Campus students are subject to the Korea Honor Code.

The honor codes include honor committees chosen to promote academic integrity as a core value in the University community. Honor committee members serve on hearing panels established to investigate and resolve alleged academic violations. Each University honor code utilizes its own distinct honor committee, and so case-specific questions should be referred to the respective committee.

The University's Office of Research Integrity and Assurance investigates and addresses issues involving research misconduct. As stated in the University's [Policy 4007](#), "Allegations of academic misconduct against graduate students are governed solely by the university's honor code, except for 1) research activities as defined above regardless of sponsorship; and 2) master's theses and doctoral dissertations, both of which are governed by this policy. Allegations of academic misconduct against undergraduate students are governed solely by the university honor code, except for sponsored research activities which are governed by this policy." For more information, contact the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at irb@gmu.edu.

SECTION 3. UNIVERSITY HONOR CODE STATEMENT

To promote a stronger sense of mutual responsibility, respect, trust, and fairness among all members of the George Mason University community and with the desire for greater academic and personal achievement, we, the student members of the university community, have set forth this Honor Code: Student Members of the George Mason University community pledge not to cheat, plagiarize, steal, or lie in matters related to academic work.

SECTION 4. CAI STRUCTURE

4.1 CAI Advisor.

4.1.1 Generally. The CAI Advisor handles CAI's administrative work (e.g., scheduling hearings and recordkeeping) and advises the parties of and during Honor Code processes.

4.1.2 Prehearing Roles. The CAI Advisor meets with the Respondent for a mandatory Prehearing to present the Complainant's academic integrity referral and evidence to the Respondent, and to inform the Respondent of his or her next steps.

4.1.3 Hearing Roles. The CAI Advisor attends each Korea Honor Committee hearing to ensure that each hearing follows the Korea Honor Code's guidelines by

- (a) Answering procedural questions,
- (b) Providing the Korea Honor Committee members with background information when necessary,
- (c) Ensuring the proceedings and deliberations are free from bias, and
- (d) Assisting the Korea Honor Committee members in thinking through the materials when necessary.

4.2 Korea Honor Committee.

4.2.1 Hearing Roles. A three-member Korea Honor Committee panel attends each Korea Honor Committee hearing. The panel is responsible for considering each referral and any additional evidence to render a decision on each respective case. The CAI Advisor shall make reasonable effort to have at least one student from a major other than the Respondent's major and at least one faculty primarily involved with a major other than the Respondent's major on each panel. The Respondent may also request a Korea Campus employee-only panel.

4.2.2 Other Roles. The Korea Honor Committee serves as a dedicated source of Korea Campus proctors and may be asked to assist CAI with other tasks throughout the semester (e.g., awareness campaigns).

4.2.3 Membership Qualifications.

4.2.3.1 Application. The Korea Honor Committee's application generally opens at the start of fall and spring semesters. However, the application does not open when membership is full.

4.2.3.2 Size. Membership is limited to 15 Korea Campus student members and 15 Korea Campus faculty and classified staff members.

4.2.3.3 Undergraduate Students. Undergraduate students must have a 3.0 or higher cumulative grade point average at the time of application, be in good academic and conduct standing at the time of application, and successfully complete CAI's training and orientation. A Korea Honor Committee student member's membership may be revoked if his or her cumulative grade point average falls below a 3.0 or he or she is subject to any academic or conduct disciplinary actions.

4.2.3.4 Graduate Students. Graduate students must have a 3.0 or higher cumulative grade point average at the time of application, be in good academic and conduct standing at the time of application, and successfully complete CAI's training and orientation program. A Korea Honor Committee student member's membership may be revoked if his or her cumulative grade point average falls below a 3.0 or he or she is subject to any academic or conduct disciplinary actions.

4.2.3.5 Faculty and Classified Staff. Faculty and classified staff must have a master's degree or higher from an accredited program. A faculty must not hear a case where he or she is the Complainant.

SECTION 5. OBLIGATIONS AND INITIAL REFERRAL PROCEDURES

5.1 Honesty Statement. The Respondent is subject to the following honesty statement during all Korea Honor Code processes:

George Mason University students pledge to always conduct themselves with integrity and honesty. Each student is expected to only present information that is true and correct. Korea Campus students who willfully and knowingly provide false information may be referred to the Korea Campus Office of Student Affairs or the Office of Student Conduct for a student conduct violation.

5.2 Referral Obligations.

5.2.1 When to Report. All suspected Korea Campus violations must be reported to CAI within a reasonable time from the misconduct's discovery. Information on how to refer a violation may be found on the Korea Campus website ([for students](#) or [for faculty](#)). Faculty are encouraged to regularly check for violations during the semester and to report in a timely manner.

5.2.2 Providing Evidence. The Complainant is responsible for providing all necessary materials to support his or her academic integrity referral. The CAI Advisor does not investigate cases and may dismiss a case for insufficient evidence or for a lack of required submissions (e.g., syllabus).

5.2.3 Post-Resolution Obligations. Upon the case's resolution, the Complainant is responsible for updating his or her grades with the Registrar. To do so, the Complainant must first obtain a grade change form and its required signatures, and then submit the completed grade change form to the Registrar. The CAI Advisor processes any educational sanction materials and suspension or permanent dismissal documentation with the Registrar.

5.2.4 Pre-Resolution Course Withdrawal. The Respondent is not allowed to drop or withdraw from any course related to the Complainant's academic integrity referral until the matter is resolved. If the Respondent drops or withdraws from a course involving the Complainant's academic integrity referral before that matter is resolved, the Respondent will be re-enrolled, charged tuition and fees for that course, and receive an administrative hold on his or her account until that matter is resolved.

5.3 Initial Referral Procedures.

5.3.1 Right to Dismiss. The CAI Advisor reserves the right to dismiss an academic integrity referral if

- (a) The allegations do not rise to the level of an honor code violation,
- (b) There is insufficient material to support the allegation, or
- (c) The academic integrity referral is not made in a timely manner.

5.3.2 Notifying Respondent of Referral. If the CAI Advisor proceeds with the Complainant's academic integrity referral, the Respondent will be notified in writing at his or her University email. The notification will also include a request for a Prehearing. No later than seven calendar days after CAI sends that notification, including the sent date, the Respondent must both respond to the notification and schedule the Prehearing with the CAI Advisor.

5.3.3 Failure to Schedule or Show. The Respondent waives the right to participate in the initial referral process if he or she fails to

- (a) respond to a referral notification pursuant to Section 5.3.2,
- (b) schedule a Prehearing pursuant to Section 5.3.2, or
- (c) attend a scheduled Prehearing.

Consequently, the referral will be forwarded to the Korea Honor Committee for review pursuant to 6.3.3.3(d) – (e) and the Respondent’s student account may be subject to an administrative hold. The Respondent remains eligible to appeal pursuant to Section 6.5.

SECTION 6. RESOLUTION PROCESSES

6.1 Generally.

6.1.1 Resolution Options. The Respondent has three resolution options: a Prehearing (see Section 6.2), a Full Review (see Section 6.3), or a Sanction-Only Review (see Section 6.4). An appeal may also be available (see Section 6.5).

6.1.2 Determining Responsibility. The Respondent will be held responsible if he or she admits responsibility in the Prehearing, or if at least two of three Korea Honor Committee members find the Respondent responsible in a hearing using the clear and convincing evidentiary standard.

6.1.3 Accessing Referred Materials. The Respondent may submit a written request to access all information regarding his or her referral. In cases where retaliation is a legitimate safety concern, information may be redacted or presented in a manner preventing identification.

6.1.4 Witness Statements. Each witness must directly submit his or her witness statement to the CAI Advisor. Each witness statement must clearly identify the facts to which the respective witness plans to testify, and that witness shall not testify beyond that statement unless in response to questions from the Korea Honor Committee or the opposing party.

6.1.5 Respondent’s Personal Advisor. The Respondent may have one personal advisor present during any Prehearing or In-Person Hearing. The personal advisor does not represent or speak on the Respondent’s behalf or otherwise address the Korea Honor Committee, but he or she may be present to advise the Respondent only if that advisor’s presence or advice is not disruptive and does not unreasonably lengthen the time of the Prehearing or In-Person Hearing. If the personal advisor fails to adhere to Section 6.1.5 or any other applicable Korea Honor Code rules, he or she may be required to leave the respective Prehearing or In-Person Hearing or may be barred from future Prehearings or In-Person Hearings. The Respondent must submit his or her personal advisor’s name and relationship to the Respondent to the CAI Advisor at least 24 hours before the respective Prehearing or In-Person Hearing.

6.1.6 Recordings. Only the CAI Advisor may audio record Korea Honor Code processes. All In-Person Hearings are audio recorded except for the Korea Honor Committee’s deliberation

process. The audio recording is kept as part of the Respondent's record unless the Respondent is held not responsible. Expedited Hearings and appeals are not audio recorded.

6.1.7 Submissions. All submissions pursuant to this Korea Honor Code must be emailed to mkcai@gmu.edu.

6.1.8 Timing Modifications. The CAI Advisor may increase Section 6 times in good faith (e.g., due to mid-week holidays or unforeseen circumstances).

6.1.9 Online Processes. The CAI Advisor may hold any Section 6 process online using a University-approved online service (e.g., Blackboard Collaborate).

6.2 Prehearing.

6.2.1 Format. The Prehearing generally uses the following format, listed in order of occurrence:

- (a) The CAI Advisor explains the referral to the Respondent.
- (b) The CAI Advisor explains the Respondent's options.
- (c) For in-person Prehearings, the Respondent completes a form with his or her selected option at the Prehearing's conclusion. For online Prehearings, the CAI Advisor emails the form to the Respondent for him or her to complete and return within 12 hours from that Prehearing's conclusion. For both in-person and online Prehearings, failing to complete the Prehearing form in a timely manner may result in automatic acceptance of responsibility and the sanction/s, as well as a waiver of the right to appeal.

6.2.2 Accepting Responsibility and Sanction/s. The matter will conclude and the Respondent does not have the option of appealing the outcome if the Respondent accepts responsibility and the recommended sanction/s.

6.2.3 Denying Responsibility or Sanction/s. Section 6.3 applies if the Respondent denies responsibility. Section 6.4 applies if the Respondent accepts responsibility and challenges the sanction/s.

6.3 Full Reviews.

6.3.1 Hearing Types. There are two Full Review hearing types (i.e., In-Person Hearings and Expedited Hearings) and which type the Respondent is eligible for depends on the referral.

6.3.2 In-Person Hearings.

6.3.2.1 Prerequisite. The In-Person Hearing is reserved for each referral meeting at least one of the following criteria:

- (a) The reported incident is only supported by eyewitness testimony; or

- (b) The Complainant recommends a suspension or permanent dismissal sanction. A situation where a grade-related sanction triggers an academic suspension or program dismissal is insufficient.

6.3.2.2 Notice and Scheduling. The CAI Advisor shall schedule the In-Person Hearing and notify the parties as soon as practicable. The parties will be notified through University email of the In-Person Hearing's date, time, and location. The CAI Advisor may modify schedules in good faith, and it is the parties' responsibility to regularly check University email for updates.

6.3.2.3 Format. The Full Review's In-Person Hearing uses the following format, listed in order of occurrence:

- (a) The Respondent and the Complainant must each submit all documents and witness statements for use during the In-Person Hearing to the CAI Advisor no later than three calendar days after the Prehearing, including the Prehearing's date. The CAI Advisor shall share all Section 6.3.2.3(a) submissions with the respective opposing party no later than five calendar days after the Prehearing, including the Prehearing's date.
- (b) The Respondent and the Complainant may each submit any rebuttal documents or names of any rebuttal witnesses and rebuttal witness statements to the CAI Advisor at least three calendar days before the In-Person Hearing, including the In-Person Hearing's date. All rebuttal documents and rebuttal witness statements must only respond to Section 6.3.2.3(a) submissions, and the rebutting party must clearly identify each Section 6.3.2.3(a) submission that document or witness statement rebuts.
- (c) The Complainant may present his or her case, including any witnesses, for up to 20 minutes.
- (d) The Korea Honor Committee and the Respondent may ask questions to the Complainant and the Complainant's witnesses.
- (e) The Respondent may present his or her case, including any witnesses, for up to 20 minutes.
- (f) The Korea Honor Committee and the Complainant may ask questions to the Respondent and the Respondent's witnesses.
- (g) The Complainant, Respondent, and their personal advisors and witnesses leave.
- (h) The Korea Honor Committee reviews and decides the matter. The Korea Honor Committee shall consider the original referral and all Section 6.3.2.3 submissions and statements.
- (i) The CAI Advisor updates the Respondent and the Complainant with the decision through University email as soon as practicable.

The Korea Honor Committee may decline hearing from a witness if the Korea Honor Committee determines that the witness's testimony is irrelevant (i.e., it does not make a fact in question more or less likely to be true).

6.3.3 Expedited Hearings.

6.3.3.1 Application. Section 6.3.3 applies to Full Reviews not meeting Section 6.3.2.1's requirement.

6.3.3.2 Format. The Full Review's Expedited Hearing applies the following format, listed in order of occurrence:

- (a) The Respondent may submit a written statement and any supporting documentation, and the Respondent's witnesses, if any, may submit their witness statements, to the CAI Advisor no later than three calendar days after the Prehearing, including the Prehearing's date. The CAI Advisor shall share all Section 6.3.3.2(a) submissions with the Complainant no later than five calendar days after the Prehearing, including the Prehearing's date.
- (b) The Complainant may submit a written response and any supporting documentation, and the Complainant's witnesses, if any, may submit their witness statements, to the CAI Advisor no later than three calendar days after the CAI Advisor shares the Section 6.3.3.2(a) submissions, including the sent date. The CAI Advisor shall share all Section 6.3.3.2(b) submissions with the Respondent within 48 hours of receipt.
- (c) The Respondent may submit a written rebuttal and any supporting documentation, and the Respondent's witnesses, if any, may submit their rebuttal witness statements, to the CAI Advisor no later than three calendar days after the CAI Advisor shares the Section 6.3.3.2(b) submissions, including the sent date.
- (d) The Korea Honor Committee meets as soon as practicable to review and decide the matter. The Korea Honor Committee shall consider the original referral and all Section 6.3.3.2 statements and documentation.
- (e) The CAI Advisor updates the Respondent and the Complainant with the decision through University email as soon as practicable.

6.4 Sanction-Only Reviews.

6.4.1 Generally.

6.4.1.1 Hearing Types. There are two Sanction-Only Review hearing types (i.e., In-Person Hearings and Expedited Hearings) and which type the Respondent is eligible for depends on the referral.

6.4.1.2 Responsibility Implications. By choosing the Sanction-Only Review, the Respondent admits responsibility for the misconduct in the referral, but challenges the sanction/s. The underlying sanction recommendation/s will automatically apply if the Respondent's challenge is denied, but the Respondent remains eligible to appeal pursuant to Section 6.5.

6.4.1.3 Grade-Related Sanctions. Amendments to grade-related sanctions may occur only if the following criteria are met:

- (a) The Complainant agrees to an amended grade-related sanction; and
- (b) The Respondent demonstrates extenuating circumstances that justify the sanction being amended. The Respondent must show that there were external factors influencing the incident in such a way that no other option was available for the Respondent, or that the sanction as indicated is too severe for the violation the Respondent was referred for. The consequences of a sanction (e.g., suspension due to a low GPA caused by the sanction) do not create an extenuating circumstance.

6.4.1.4 Other Sanctions. The Korea Honor Committee may amend sanctions involving educational activities or suspension or dismissal from the University if the Respondent demonstrates that extenuating circumstances exist which influenced the incident in such a way that no other option was available to him or her, or that the sanction as indicated is too severe for the violation the Respondent was referred for. The consequences of a sanction (e.g., suspension due to a low GPA caused by the sanction) do not constitute an extenuating circumstance.

6.4.2 In-Person Hearings.

6.4.2.1 Prerequisite. The In-Person Hearing is only available to a Respondent facing a suspension or permanent dismissal sanction.

6.4.2.2 Notice and Scheduling. The CAI Advisor shall schedule the In-Person Hearing and notify the Respondent as soon as practicable. The Respondent will be notified through University email of the In-Person Hearing's date, time, and location. The CAI Advisor may modify schedules in good faith, and it is the Respondent's responsibility to regularly check University email for updates.

6.4.2.3 Format. The Sanction-Only Review's In-Person Hearing applies the following format, listed in order of occurrence:

- (a) No later than three calendar days after the Prehearing, including the Prehearing's date, the Complainant may submit a written statement to the CAI Advisor indicating his or her opinion on why his or her recommended sanction is appropriate and whether it would be proper to modify the sanction. The CAI Advisor shall share the Section 6.4.2.3(a) submission with the Respondent within 48 hours of receipt. Section 6.4.2.3(a) does not apply to Section 7.2 automatic suspension or dismissal sanction recommendations.
- (b) The Korea Honor Committee meets as soon as practicable with the Respondent to review the referral. Confirmation of the In-Person Hearing date must be sent to the Respondent at least three calendar days prior to the In-Person Hearing.
- (c) The Complainant's Section 6.4.2.3(a) statement, if any, is read to the Korea Honor Committee.

- (d) The Respondent may present his or her case, including any witnesses, for up to 20 minutes.
- (e) The Korea Honor Committee may ask questions to the Respondent and the Respondent's witnesses.
- (f) The Respondent and his or her personal advisor and witnesses leave.
- (g) The Korea Honor Committee reviews and decides the matter. The Korea Honor Committee shall consider the original referral and all Section 6.4.2.3 submissions and statements.
- (h) The CAI Advisor updates the Respondent and the Complainant with the decision through University email as soon as practicable.

The Korea Honor Committee may decline hearing from a witness if the Korea Honor Committee determines that the witness's testimony is irrelevant (i.e., it does not make a fact in question more or less likely to be true).

6.4.3 Expedited Hearings.

6.4.3.1 Application. Section 6.4.3 applies to Sanction-Only Reviews not meeting Section 6.4.2.1's prerequisites.

6.4.3.2 Format. The Sanction-Only Review's Expedited Hearing applies the following format, listed in order of occurrence:

- (a) No later than three calendar days after the Prehearing, including the Prehearing's date, the Complainant may submit a written statement indicating his or her opinion about why the recommended sanction is appropriate and whether it would be proper to modify the sanction. The CAI Advisor shall share the Section 6.4.3.2(a) submission with the Respondent within 48 hours of receipt.
- (b) The Respondent may submit a written rebuttal and any supporting documentation, and the Respondent's witnesses, if any, may submit their rebuttal witness statements, to the CAI Advisor no later than three calendar days after the CAI Advisor shares the Section 6.4.3.2(a) submission, including the sent date.
- (c) The Korea Honor Committee meets as soon as practicable to review and decide the matter. The Korea Honor Committee shall consider the original referral and all Section 6.4.3.2 statements and documentation.
- (d) The CAI Advisor updates the Respondent and the Complainant as soon as practicable with the decision through University email.

6.5 Appeals.

6.5.1 Generally. Each academic integrity referral may only be appealed once. If an appeal is granted, the academic integrity referral will be retried, and the resulting decision is final. If an appeal is denied, the original decision is affirmed and final.

6.5.2 Party Rights. Only the Respondent may appeal a decision. However, the Complainant may refile his or her academic integrity referral if new evidence arises that was not available for the original review.

6.5.3 Prerequisites. Appellate review may be granted only if at least one of the following exists:

- (a) New material information is available that was unavailable at the time of the original review and would likely affect the original review's decision. This does not include a Respondent who failed to show up for his or her hearing, or information available at the time of the hearing, including witnesses, that the Respondent failed to present.
- (b) A material procedural irregularity occurred. Please note that this is an allegation that the review process was not adhered to as set out by this Korea Honor Code, likely affecting the outcome. This is not an allegation of a breach of academic department policy or an immaterial good-faith departure from this Korea Honor Code's processes.
- (c) The sanction is too severe. This only applies to suspensions and permanent dismissals.

6.5.4 Requesting an Appeal. An appeal request form will be provided to the Respondent at the initial conclusion of his or her referral. The Respondent must request an appeal no later than three calendar days after receiving his or her decision notice, including the sent date. The appeal request must include a completed appeal request form with the following information:

- (a) Respondent's name and G number;
- (b) Sanction/s assigned by the Korea Honor Committee; and
- (c) A clear explanation of the Section 6.5.3 reason/s for appealing.

The Respondent may also include additional relevant information (e.g., new witness statements in cases asserting new information).

6.5.5 Standard Procedures. The Respondent and Complainant are not present during the appellate hearing. Thus, it is important the Respondent includes all available and relevant information in the appeal request (see Section 6.5.4). The decision to accept or deny the appeal is made by three Korea Honor Committee members with no prior knowledge of the respective academic integrity referral. The Korea Honor Committee will consider the Respondent's appeal request, and the appealed hearing's audio transcript if necessary and available.

6.5.6 Unavailability Procedures. If the Korea Honor Committee is unavailable to consider the appeal (e.g., during school breaks) and the appellate decision may affect the Respondent's graduation, tuition payment, or another extraordinary circumstance exists, the Korea Campus associate dean of academic affairs may review and decide the appeal. The Respondent shall decide whether to proceed with the associate dean's review or wait until the Korea Honor Committee is available.

6.5.7 Faculty Adherence. If the Complainant ignores the Korea Honor Committee's recommended sanction/s or refuses to acknowledge a finding of no responsibility (e.g., grading the Respondent's assignment as if found responsible), the Respondent may directly appeal the Complainant's action/s to his or her CAI Advisor. The Respondent is protected from retaliation pursuant to University policy.

SECTION 7. SANCTIONS

7.1 Types. The Korea Honor Committee may impose non-academic sanctions proportionate to the violation. The Respondent's failure to complete a non-academic sanction may result in an administrative hold on the Respondent's student account until that sanction is completed. Grade-related and program-related sanctions are coordinated between the Complainant and the CAI Advisor based on the Complainant's recommendation. Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to:

- (a) An assignment rewrite;
- (b) An assignment grade reduction, including complete point loss;
- (c) A course grade reduction, including automatic failure;
- (d) A writing center visit;
- (e) Non-academic suspension; and
- (f) Permanent dismissal.

7.2 Suspension or Dismissal. Recommendations for non-academic suspension or permanent dismissal are typically made in situations where an individual repeatedly demonstrates academic dishonesty or is involved in a case so egregious that such a recommendation is commensurate to the violation. Complainant-made suspension or dismissal recommendations are forwarded to the Korea Campus associate dean of academic affairs for approval. However, a suspension recommendation is automatically added if the Respondent is referred for a second violation of the Korea Honor Code and the Complainant did not already recommend a suspension for a second violation. If the Respondent is referred for a third Korea Honor Code violation and the Complainant did not already recommend permanent dismissal for a third violation, a permanent dismissal recommendation is automatically added to that referral. The Korea Honor Committee will decide whether to implement a sanction of suspension or permanent dismissal if the Respondent is found in violation for a second or third violation.

7.3 Sanction Determinations. When determining sanctions, the Korea Honor Code's non-punitive educational purpose and the Respondent's academic integrity history are considered. A failing grade or a consequential inability to continue as a University student is not considered a punitive measure. Thus, students must consider all potential outcomes when deciding whether to abide by the Korea Honor Code or to violate it. The Korea Campus [Honor Code Sanction Recommendations](#) serve as a default guideline if considering a sanction's severity for Section 6.4's purposes. However, more severe sanctions will likely be considered fair for Section 6.4's purposes if the Respondent had fair notice of those sanctions (e.g., the sanctions are clearly stated in the respective course's syllabus).

SECTION 8. RECORDS

The Korea Honor Code academic integrity referral is part of the Respondent's educational record and is subject to guidelines put forth by the Library of Virginia and any applicable laws and statutes. Educational records are protected by FERPA. Thus, the Respondent generally holds the right to access his or her educational records. However, the Respondent may sign a FERPA waiver allowing access to a third party for a specified time (e.g., for requests resulting from applying to graduate programs, internships, or jobs). Without a FERPA waiver, CAI does not share information with anyone who does not have an educational need to know.

If the Respondent is found not responsible or his or her case is dismissed prior to resolution, no record is maintained and CAI shares no information about the Respondent's involvement in the process.

Resolutions that result in altered grades do not have a Korea Honor Code designation on the Respondent's transcript. However, a resolution that results in a suspension or permanent dismissal will be noted on the Respondent's transcript with a Korea Honor Code designation. A transcript notation will also be made if the Respondent withdraws from the University while under investigation for academic dishonesty. Suspension notations are removed from the transcript upon the completion of the suspension period.

SECTION 9. REVISIONS

The Korea Honor Code may be modified at any time. This Korea Honor Code is effective from February 8, 2021 KST and applies to any Korea Honor Code process occurring after February 8, 2021 KST.