



**Academic Honesty Policy
Higher Institute for Tourism and Hospitality**

Approved by:	General Operator	Prepared by: Quality Assurance Department
Approval date:	1 st September 2020	
Number of pages:	13	

The Higher Institute for Tourism and Hospitality

ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY

Riyadh, 2020



Table of Contents

Article 1. General Provision 4

1.01 Rationale 4

1.02 General Jurisdiction 4

1.03 Institute with Jurisdiction 4

1.04 Institute to which the Policy Applies 4

1.05 Applicability of Policies 5

1.06 Compass of Actions Taken Against Students 5

1.07 Faculty or Instructor of Record Responsibility 5

1.08 Proctor or Teaching Assistant Responsibility 5

1.09 Student Responsibility 5

1.10 Purpose of Procedures 5

1.11 Amendment of Policy 5

1.12 Definitions 6

1.13 Notification 6

1.14 Retaliation 7

Article 2. Preventive Practices 7

2.01 Preventive Measures 7

Article 3. Categories of Academic Dishonesty 7

3.01 Application of the Academic Honesty Policy 7

3.02 Academic Dishonesty Prohibited 7

Article 4. Sanctions 9

4.01 Sanctions 9

4.02 Probation, Suspension, and Expulsion 9

Article 5. Before Institute Hearing 9

5.01 Before Institute Hearing 9

5.02 Conflict of Interest 10

Article 6. Institute Hearing 10

6.01 Before Institute Hearing 10

6.02 Institute Hearing Officer 10

6.03 Duties of the Institute Hearing Officer 10



6.04 Academic Honesty Panel 10

6.05 General Operator of the Institute 11

6.06 Institute Hearing Procedure 11

6.07 Group Violations of the Academic Honesty Policy 12

Article 7. Institute Manager Appeal 12

7.01 Appeal of the Panel’s Decision 12

7.02 General Operator Procedural Review 12

Article 8. Records 12

8.01 Records of Academic Honesty Proceedings 12

8.02 General Operator’s Office 12

8.03 Notations on a Student’s Transcript 12

Article 1. General Provisions

1.01 Rationale.

The Higher Institute for Tourism and Hospitality (further – the HITH) can best function and accomplish its objectives in an atmosphere of high ethical standards. It expects and encourages all students, faculty, and staff to contribute to such an atmosphere in every way possible and especially by observing all accepted principles of academic honesty. The following procedures are designed to handle these cases in fairness to all concerned: the accused student, the faculty, and the Higher Institute for Tourism and Hospitality.

1.02 General Jurisdiction.

Matters relating to academic honesty are within the general jurisdiction of the General Operator of the HITH. Academic honesty means acting with truthfulness and sincerity in carrying out all aspects of our individual and collaborative work, maintaining ownership over our work and acknowledging our debt to the work of others.

1.03 Institute with Jurisdiction.

Specific jurisdiction in academic honesty matters rests in each branch of the HITH. The institute with jurisdiction is determined by the course in which dishonesty occurs. If the student involved majors in an institute other than that offering the course, the institute offering the course has jurisdiction. If the institute with jurisdiction cannot be determined from the relationship between the alleged actions of a student or group of students and a particular course, then the General Operator will designate which has jurisdiction.

1.04 Institute to which the Policy Applies.

Students can best meet their obligation to academic honesty by adhering to the Academic Honesty Policy in all academic matters. This includes completing their work through their own honest efforts and expecting and encouraging honesty among their peers.

Faculty members, course instructors, teaching assistants and staff have the responsibility to uphold the Institute policy, model integrity in their own practices and educate students about disciplinary standards.

Administrators have the obligation to model integrity through their leadership and to provide the resources necessary to promote best practices in teaching, learning, assessment, research and citizenship.

1.05 Applicability of Policies.

All questions regarding the applicability of Institute codes or HITH policy or special provisions of either shall be determined finally by the General Operator.

1.06 Compass of Actions Taken Against Students.

Actions taken against students are institute-wide in their effect, unless otherwise specified.

1.07 Faculty or Instructor of Record Responsibility.

Faculty or instructor of record shall have the responsibility of reporting incidents of alleged academic dishonesty through their Training Manager and Registration Office supervisor to the Institute hearing officer.

1.08 Proctor or Teaching Assistant Responsibility.

Proctors or Teaching Assistants shall have the responsibility of reporting incidents of alleged academic dishonesty to the instructor of record involved, or to the appropriate authority if the alleged act is not associated with a specific class.

1.09 Student Responsibility.

Students shall have the responsibility of reporting incidents of alleged academic dishonesty to the instructor of record involved, or to the appropriate authority if the alleged act is not associated with a specific class.

1.10 Purpose of Procedures.

The purpose of these procedures is to provide for the orderly administration of the Academic Honesty Policy consistent with the principles of due process of law. Reasonable deviations from these procedures will not invalidate a decision or proceeding unless the General Operator determines, upon written appeal from the accusing and/or accused parties, that the deviation will result in prejudice to one or more of the parties involved.

1.11 Amendment of Policy.

The Academic Honesty Policy shall be reviewed every two years by a joint sub-committee comprised of representatives of both the Quality Assurance Committee and Academic Committee. Any amendments to the Academic Honesty Policy must be approved by both Committees.

1.12 Definitions.

1.12.01 Class Day.

Class days, for purposes of this policy, are defined as days the Higher Institute for Tourism and Hospitality is open and classes are meeting (excluding Fridays and Saturdays) as posted in the Institute academic calendar.

1.12.02 Internal Use.

Internal use defines who has access to a student's records. Records for internal use will be released only to HITH officials who have an educational purpose to know the information included in the student's records.

1.12.03 Academic Record.

Academic record includes documents, forms, copies, reports, statements, recordings, etc. that are acquired while a student attends the HITH. The information is available to outside sources according to the procedures established by the HITH Internal Regulations and Instructions.

1.12.04 Sanction.

Sanction means the penalty assessed for a violation of the Academic Honesty Policy.

1.12.05 Instructor.

Instructor refers to a faculty member, lecturer, teaching assistant, or teaching fellow in charge of the section in which an alleged violation of this Academic Honesty Policy has occurred. Such individuals will typically be the instructor of record of the course section in question. In instances where this is not the case, instances of alleged cheating should be reported to the instructor of record.

1.12.06 Institute Hearing Officer.

The Institute hearing officer is designated by the General Operator in each branch of HITH which the alleged violation of the academic honesty policy occurs and is responsible for facilitating the HITH procedures related to the alleged violation of the academic honesty policy.

1.12.07 Student.

Student refers to any individual who has ever registered at the HITH programs.

1.13 Notification.

All required written notices shall be addressed properly to the student personally.

1.14 Retaliation.

The HITH prohibits retaliatory action against persons who report incidents of alleged academic dishonesty under this policy, are suspected of having reported incidents of alleged academic dishonesty under this policy, who are identified to serve or have served as witnesses in any academic honesty proceeding, or who are identified to serve or have served on an Academic Honesty Panel. Any acts of retaliation will be referred to the appropriate office for review and response.

Article 2. Preventive Practices

2.01 Preventive Measures.

Instructors can help students comply with the academic honesty policy by minimizing temptation to act dishonestly. Measures instructors should consider are:

- a. Maintaining adequate security precautions in the preparation and handling of tests;
- b. Structuring the type and sequence of examination questions so as to discourage dishonesty;
- c. Providing ample room for proper spacing of students during examinations, when possible;
- d. Monitoring examinations, especially in large classes and in classes where not all students are known to the instructor or the assistant;
- e. Making clear to their students the rules concerning the use of electronic devices;
- f. Making clear to their students, in writing, what constitutes academic dishonesty, particularly in those classes where group activities (laboratory exercises, generation of field reports, etc.) are part of the instructional process;
- g. Requiring students to submit their own work and defining for their students particular aspects of dishonesty, such as plagiarism and self-plagiarism;
- h. Requiring students to show a picture ID and sign major assignments and exams; and
- i. Helping raise consciousness of the issue of academic honesty by asking students to sign an honor pledge in the first week of class and to write a short honor pledge in their own hand on their major assignments.

Article 3. Categories of Academic Dishonesty

3.01 Application of the Academic Honesty Policy.

This policy applies to those acts of dishonesty committed by a student while enrolled at the HITH.

3.02 Academic Dishonesty Prohibited.

“Academic dishonesty” means employing a method or technique or engaging in conduct in an academic endeavor that contravenes the standards of ethical integrity expected at the HITH or by a course instructor to fulfill any and all academic requirements. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, the following:

Plagiarism

- a. Representing as one's own work the work of another without acknowledging the source (plagiarism). This would include submitting substantially identical laboratory reports or other materials in fulfillment of an assignment by two or more individuals, whether or not these used common data or other information, unless this has been specifically permitted by the instructor. Plagiarism includes copying verbatim text from the literature, whether printed or electronic, in written assignments, candidacy exams;

Cheating and Unauthorized Group Work

- a. Openly cheating in an examination, as copying from another's paper;
- b. Being able to view during an examination, quiz or any in-class assignment an electronic device that allows communication with another person, access to unauthorized material, access to the internet, or the ability to capture an image, unless expressly permitted by the instructor;
- c. Using and/or possessing "crib notes," as unauthorized use of notes or the like to aid in answering questions during an examination;
- d. Giving or receiving unauthorized aid during an examination, such as trading examinations, whispering answers, and passing notes, and using electronic devices to transmit or receive information;
- e. Securing another to take a test in the student's place. Both the student taking the test for another and the student registered in the course are at fault;

Fabrication, Falsification, and Misrepresentation

- a. Changing answers or grades on a test that has been returned to a student in an attempt to claim instructor error;
- b. Using another's laboratory results as one's own, whether with or without the permission of the owner;
- c. Falsifying results in laboratory experiments;
- d. Misrepresenting academic records or achievements as they pertain to course prerequisites or corequisites for the purpose of enrolling or remaining in a course for which one is not eligible;
- e. Representing oneself as a person who has earned a degree without having earned that particular degree

Stealing and Abuse of Academic Materials

- a. Stealing, as theft of tests or grade books, from faculty offices or elsewhere, or knowingly using stolen tests or materials in satisfaction of exams, papers, or other assignments; this includes the removal of items posted for use by the students;
- b. Mutilating or stealing library materials; mis shelving materials with the intent to reduce accessibility to other students;
- c. Failing to report to the instructor or Institute hearing officer an incident which the student believes to be a violation of the academic honesty policy;

Academic Misconduct any other conduct which a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances would recognize as dishonest or improper in an academic setting.

Article 4. Sanctions

4.01 Sanctions.

The sanctions for confirmed violations of this policy shall be commensurate with the nature of the offense and with the record of the student regarding any previous infractions. Sanctions may include, but are not limited to: a lowered grade, failure on the examination or assignment in question, failure in the course, probation, suspension, or expulsion from the HITH, or a combination of these.

If a sanction of probation or suspension is assigned, it must have a specified starting and ending date, unless the sanction is expulsion, in which case, an end date is not specified. Students are not permitted enrollment under sanctions of suspension and expulsion.

A student who is found to have violated the Academic Honesty Policy before the end of an academic term may remain enrolled in the course at issue while any appeal provided for under this policy is pending. Sanctions do not become final and may not be applied while any appeal provided for under this policy is pending. Once a sanction becomes final, the Institute hearing officer will notify the General Operator.

Students may not receive a warning for courses in which they have been found guilty of a violation of the Academic Honesty Policy. If a warning is received prior to a guilty finding, the student will become liable for the Academic Honesty penalty, including failed grades.

4.02 Probation, Suspension, and Expulsion.

The terms probation, suspension and expulsion as used herein refer to these sanctions only as they are imposed as a result of violations of this Academic Honesty Policy. All policies and procedures for the imposition and appeal of these sanctions are contained within this policy.

Article 5. Before Institute Hearing

5.01 Before Institute Hearing.

When an instructor has reasonable grounds to believe that a student has committed an act of academic dishonesty, the instructor shall notify the Institute Hearing officer in writing, within five class days of discovery. Students who believe they have observed an act of academic dishonesty shall report the incident to the instructor, as soon as possible, who shall then report the incident in writing to the Institute Hearing officer within five class days.

Upon notifying the Institute Hearing officer of the alleged violation, the faculty member shall have the option of suggesting to the Institute Hearing officer a sanction for the alleged violation of the Academic Honesty Policy. Such sanctions would normally include reduced or zero credit for a test assignment, a grade of "F" in a course, or other such agreed upon sanctions. Sanctions involving disciplinary probation or sanctions requiring an Institute level hearing cannot be used.

In cases for which the instructor suggests a sanction so as to preclude the Institute hearing, within five class days of receiving the instructor's report the accused shall be notified, in writing, by the Institute hearing officer informing the accused student of the nature of violation, the recommended sanction, and ask the student to select between the choice of: (1) admitting the alleged academic honesty

violation, waiving the formal departmental hearing, and accepting the associated sanction; or (2) proceeding to a formal departmental hearing.

5.02 Conflict of Interest.

When departmental or Institute hearing officers are themselves party to a case, they shall in no way participate in the administration of the policy in that case. Such responsibilities shall pass to faculty and administrators not directly involved in the case.

Article 6. Institute Hearing

6.01 Institute Hearing.

If either the student or the instructor wishes to appeal the internal decision of the department, he or she must file a written request for a hearing with the Institute hearing officer within 10 class days of the department decision. Within 10 class days of receipt of such a request, the Institute hearing officer will set a time, date and place for the hearing. The Institute hearing is a de novo hearing in which the Panel must consider all the evidence on all the issues presented in the appeal as though no previous action had been taken.

6.02 Institute Hearing Officer.

The college hearing officer shall be appointed by the General Operator. Typically, the Institute hearing officer will be appointed for a full academic year. Correspondence with the Institute hearing officer should be addressed to the office of the General Operator.

6.03 Duties of the Institute Hearing Officer.

It shall be the duty of the Institute hearing officer to:

- a. Select an Institute academic honesty panel;
- b. Set and give notice of the time and place of the Institute hearing;
- c. Conduct the hearing in an orderly manner so that both sides are given an opportunity to state their case;
- d. Rule on procedural matters;
- e. Leave the hearing room during the panel's deliberations but remain available to answer questions on procedural matters; and
- f. Prepare and submit one copy of the decision to the General Operator, one copy to the Training Manager, and one copy to the Registration Office supervisor. The Institute hearing officer shall not take part in the vote or otherwise participate in the deliberations of the panel.

6.04 Academic Honesty Panel.

The Institute academic honesty panel shall consist of three faculty members and two students. The panel will be selected by the Institute hearing officer from faculty and currently enrolled students from the accused student's academic peer group in the college. Faculty and students serving on the panel should be from the Institute in which the alleged violation occurred, and preferably from departments

outside of either parties' academic department or program, where possible. The chair of the panel shall be a student appointed by the Institute hearing officer.

6.05 General Operator of the Institute

The General Operator of students, or his or her designee, shall be required to attend all Institute hearings to serve as HITH resource person. This individual shall not have a vote at a Institute hearing or be present during the deliberations of the panel.

6.06 Institute Hearing Procedure.

- a. The date of the hearing must be adhered to. Any delay must be approved by the Institute hearing officer. Only documented, extenuating circumstances will be considered.
- b. Three class days prior to the hearing, all parties shall notify the Institute hearing officer in writing of the names of their witnesses, if any, and the subject of their testimonies. At that time, the parties will also submit a copy of the documents they intend to present during the hearing. Upon request, the Institute hearing officer will make available to the parties the information and documents referenced in this section.
- c. The hearing shall be held in two phases. The first phase is the determination of violation, followed if necessary by the sanction phase.
- d. All parties shall be afforded the opportunity to present statements, pertinent documentation and witnesses and have an opportunity to examine the documents pertaining to the alleged violations during the hearing.
- e. The cases presented to the panel must be made by the accusing individual and the accused student. The instructor or other individuals who reported the alleged misconduct shall present the relevant information, including statements by witnesses. The accused student shall then present his/her statement and relevant information, including statements by witnesses. Neither party shall ask questions of or solicit answers directly from the other party or its witnesses. Where it appears that there are matters of disputed fact, the Institute hearing officer shall request the panel to ask appropriate questions of either or both parties and/or their respective witnesses so as to clarify the points in dispute.
- f. The panel shall have the right to question any and all witnesses and to examine documentation presented.
- g. At the conclusion of each phase of the hearing, the panel shall meet in a closed session to render a decision. A student is found in violation of the academic honesty policy by a vote of four or more members of the panel, and the sanction has to be agreed to by three or more members of the panel. Upon reaching a decision in either phase, the panel shall reconvene with all parties present and inform all parties of its judgment.
- h. The Institute hearing officer shall notify in writing all parties, including the General Operator, Institute Manager, Training Manager and Registration Office supervisor of the Institute, of the disposition of the case within three class days of receipt of the panel's judgment.

6.07 Group Violations of the Academic Honesty Policy.

In instances where two or more students are alleged to be involved in the same infraction of the academic honesty policy, at the discretion of the Institute hearing officer, the case against the whole group will be heard by a single academic honesty panel. The facts common to all cases will be presented with all students allegedly involved in attendance. Each student shall be allowed to present his/her case and/or statements to the panel separately. If requested by the presenting student, such statements shall be presented outside the hearing of the other students.

Article 7. Institute Manager Appeal

7.01 Appeal of the Panel's Decision.

Within three class days of the panel's decision, either party may file an appeal for review with the General Operator or that officer designated by the General Operator. The appeal shall be in writing and shall specifically address the issues to be reviewed.

7.02 General Operator Procedural Review.

The General Operator shall review the appeal within 15 class days of the receipt of the appeal. If either party has requested an appearance or is requested to appear by the General Operator, then both parties must be informed. Because the case was heard by a peer group, the intent of the General Operator's review is not to modify the sanction nor to substitute the judgment of the General Operator for that of the peer panel which heard the case, or hear new or additional facts on the case. The intent of this review is to ensure that the Institute hearing and judgment were not arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory, did not violate the due process of the accused, and did not violate the concepts of fair play to both parties. The General Operator shall notify all parties of the decision within three class days of the completion of the review.

Article 8. Records

8.01 Records of Academic Honesty Proceedings.

Records of proceedings under this policy are considered a student's education records in accordance with the HITH Student Records: Internal Regulations and Procedure.

8.02 General Operator's Office.

The Office of the General Operator shall maintain a record of those students found in violation of the policy at any level, including those students who have elected a waiver of the departmental hearing (See Article 5.01a).

8.03 Notations on a Student's Transcript.

A sanction of probation, suspension or expulsion under this policy will be expressly noted as such on the student's transcript, unless specified in the sanction that it should not be noted. When the specified period of time for a sanction of probation or suspension has elapsed, the student may petition the

Institute placing the notation of academic honesty violation to request that the Office of the Institute Registrar remove the notation from the transcript. It is the student's responsibility to initiate any petition to remove the notation from the transcript. Notations of expulsion because of academic dishonesty are a permanent part of a student's transcript.