

# Regulation on Student Intellectual Integrity



Overseeing application		Academic Programs Office	
Adoption (decision-making body/authority)	Date	Resolution No.	
Academic Council	February 5, 2014		
Updated	Date	Resolution No.	
Academic Council	May 29, 2024	11594.4	
Conservation		Institutional Information and Archives Management Service	
Classification		A01-02 Cadre normatif – Affaires pédagogiques	
Document revision date		October 2025	
Previous versions			
2023-oct.-11	2021-sept.-29	2020-May-06	2017-sept.-13
11495			

**TABLE  
OF CONTENTS**

---

PREAMBLE ----- 1

1. SCOPE ----- 1

2. ACADEMIC VIOLATIONS ----- 1

3. PROCEDURE ----- 2

4. SANCTIONS ----- 4

5. CONFIDENTIALITY ----- 5

6. ACCOUNTABILITY----- 5

7. EFFECTIVE DATE AND REVIEW----- 6

8. APPENDIX - DEFINITIONS ----- 7

## PREAMBLE

Integrity and rigour are fundamental values to HEC Montréal. Such values are reflected, notably in the implementation of rules intended to ensure the intellectual integrity of its student community.

## 1. SCOPE

- 1.1 The present regulation determines the review procedure for acts related to academic violations. In some cases, students may also be subject to the [Policy for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#).
- 1.2 The present regulation applies to all members of the student community of HEC Montréal.
- 1.3 The present regulation falls under the responsibility of the Academic Programs Office.
- 1.4 The present regulation is to be interpreted according to the attached definitions, which form an integral part of this document.

## 2. ACADEMIC VIOLATIONS

- 2.1 An academic violation is the commission, alone or with other persons or using an artificial intelligence tool, of any act intended to deceive, related to academic performance during an evaluation or to the fulfilment of a requirement for an academic activity, or any attempt to commit this act or incite or participate in such acts.
- 2.2 Without restricting the general scope of the definition of an academic violation set forth in the above section, the following shall be considered an academic violation:
  - a) using, in full or in part, literal or paraphrased, a text, a table, a picture, a recording or any other creation by others or by an artificial intelligence tool, in any medium, published or not, and presenting it as one's own creation or with missing reference information
  - b) using a translation, in full or in part, literal or paraphrased, a text of others or that was produced by an artificial intelligence tool, in any medium, published or not, and presenting it as one's own creation or with missing reference information
  - c) submitting for evaluation purposes an assignment that was written or done in full or in part by another person or by an artificial intelligence tool, or failing to comply with the personal nature of an individual assignment
  - d) submitting the same assignment, in full or in part, in two different courses or in the same course taken more than once, without prior written authorization from the teachers offering these courses
  - e) possessing, soliciting, obtaining, or reproducing, in full or in part, an evaluation questionnaire or its answer keys, documents, data, material or instruments, or using any of the above in preparation for or during an examination, without prior authorization from the person overseeing the activity under evaluation

- f) during an examination, using or consulting a copy of another person's examination or communicating with another person or persons
- g) using a substitute during an examination or substituting someone else's work as its own
- h) inventing facts or falsifying data in an assignment subject to evaluation, including a thesis or dissertation
- i) altering the results of an evaluation or any documents included therein, as well as obtaining an undeserved evaluation
- j) falsifying a research document or data, creating, or using a false document, in full or in part.

### **3. PROCEDURE**

#### **3.1 Reporting**

- 3.1.1 Any fact or action that may constitute a violation of this regulation must be reported to the Registrar's Office without delay.
- 3.1.2 The Registrar's Office shall immediately inform the Person Responsible for Intellectual Integrity ("PRII"), who shall coordinate all steps of the process regarding the application of the present regulation.

#### **3.2 Preliminary evaluation**

- 3.2.1 The PRII shall produce without delay a preliminary evaluation of the report and decide whether an investigation should take place.
- 3.2.2 If the PRII determines that the reporting presents grounds for an investigation, they shall communicate this decision to the person who submitted the report.

#### **3.3 Investigation**

- 3.3.1 If the PRII determines that an investigation must take place, that person shall designate an investigator to put together the investigation file, including gathering and building evidence of the alleged violation. The investigator may request the assistance of an expert in the specific field of study related to the report to help build evidence.
- 3.3.2 To build evidence, the investigator can meet with any person involved in the report, with or without the presence of an expert.
- 3.3.3 The investigator notifies the PRII of whether they believe it is probable that an academic violation has been committed or whether there is no basis for further investigation due to lack of evidence or to a clear finding that no violation has been committed.
- 3.3.4 The PRII decides whether to pursue the investigation. If they do decide to investigate, depending on the severity of the alleged violations, the student's previous offences, and the student's course of study, the PRII will determine whether the case should be brought to the Academic Offences Committee or the Academic Discipline Council's attention.

3.3.5 Cases where a preliminary evaluation indicates that suspension or expulsion of the student will not likely be involved shall be brought to the Academic Offences Committee's attention.

3.3.6 Cases where suspension or expulsion is a possible sanction are brought to the Academic Discipline Council's attention, particularly those involving a doctoral student.

### **3.4 Hearing before the Academic Offences Committee**

3.4.1 If the PRII determines that the reporting presents grounds for investigation by the Academic Offences Committee, they shall designate an academic evaluator to coordinate the student's hearing. The PRII shall also designate an administrative evaluator to participate in the hearing.

3.4.2 The PRII shall inform the student of the nature of the violation, as well as the evidence collected, offer to provide the Academic Offences Committee with the student's version of the events and give the student the opportunity to be heard. The student must be given a minimum of three working days from the time the evidence is sent to the date of the hearing.

3.4.3 When going before the Academic Offences Committee, the student may request to be accompanied by another person who is not involved in the case, who would act only as an observer.

3.4.4 The investigator who prepared the file shall bring the evidence relevant to the file forward to the Academic Offences Committee.

3.4.5 After the hearing, the Academic Offences Committee shall determine whether the student has committed a violation of the present regulation.

3.4.6 If several persons are involved, the Academic Offences Committee will determine the responsibility of each person and determine individually whether each of them has violated this regulation.

3.4.7 If the Academic Offences Committee determines that a violation was committed, it shall decide on the applicable sanction for each individual case and, within fifteen business days of the hearing, notify the teacher and the student of the nature of the sanction, indicating that they have a right to request a review of the decision or sanction. It shall ensure that all necessary notations are placed in the student's file and that the file is kept confidential.

3.4.8 Under no circumstances can the Academic Offences Committee impose a sanction of suspension or expulsion. If the Academic Offences Committee determines that such a sanction must be imposed, it shall refer the case to the Academic Discipline Council.

3.4.9 If the Academic Offences Committee finds that the student did not violate the present regulation, the PRII will notify the student and teacher so that grading may proceed and ensure the file is kept confidential.

### **3.5 Hearing before the Academic Discipline Council**

3.5.1 If the hearing is held before the Academic Discipline Council, the procedure laid out in section 3.4 shall be followed, with the necessary adjustments.

### **3.6 Lack of answer or admission of guilt from the student**

3.6.1 If, despite a formal summons, the student does not answer the Academic Offences Committee or the Academic Discipline Council or fails to attend the hearing before one of these bodies, the body in question shall be justified in considering only the report and the evidence contained in the file to determine whether the student committed the alleged violation, and may determine the applicable sanction. The student shall then be informed in writing of the decision and told that they have the right to request a review of the decision or sanction. The administrative office of the student's program shall also be notified so that the necessary notations can be placed in the student's file, with due confidentiality.

3.6.2 If the student admits guilt, the Academic Offences Committee or the Academic Discipline Council may take this into account when determining the sanction.

### **3.7 Right to review**

3.7.1 Students found guilty of a violation of the present regulation have the right to file a request to review the decision and sanction by writing to the PRII no later than ten days from receipt of the decision.

3.7.2 Within fifteen days of receiving the request for review, the PRII shall decide whether the reasons provided in the request are valid and shall inform the student of the decision. The PRII may reject a request for review if no grounds for error or serious breach of procedural fairness are raised in the request.

3.7.3 If the reasons for reviewing are deemed invalid, the file is closed. If they are deemed valid, the request is transmitted to the Academic Violation Review Committee as soon as possible.

3.7.4 The Academic Violation Review Committee shall establish the procedure to be followed and shall make a decision and communicate it to the student within fifteen days of receiving the file. The Committee must solely base its decision on the already compiled file; the student may not add any new pieces of information.

## **4. SANCTIONS**

4.1 The sanction is established based on the severity of the violation, the student's prior violations, if applicable, and the circumstances.

4.2 A member of the faculty may not impose or cancel sanctions for a violation of the present regulation.

4.3 The following sanctions may be imposed in case of violation:

- a) NOTE: a grade is added to the student's file
- b) Reduction of the grade: at the discretion of the Academic Offences Committee, the Academic Discipline Council or the Academic Violation Review Committee, the student receives a grade of zero for the work or evaluation where a violation was committed, or the overall grade is reduced by a number of points, but the student does not automatically fail the course

- c) Failure of the course: the student receives a grade of E for the course where a violation was committed
  - d) Suspension: the student may not enroll in courses or a program for a specified time period determined when the sanction is handed down. This period may not exceed two years
  - e) Permanent expulsion: the student is expelled from HEC Montréal and cannot be admitted or readmitted to a program or registered in a course at HEC Montréal or obtain a degree, diploma, certificate, or any other credentials from HEC Montréal. A student who is expelled from HEC Montréal may request a pardon from the Director of HEC Montréal no earlier than ten years after the expulsion. If this request is granted, the student may be authorized to submit a new application for admission to HEC Montréal.
- 4.4 Any other sanctions deemed appropriate may also be applied. In all cases, decisions made on sanctions are listed in the student's file.

## 5. CONFIDENTIALITY

- 5.1 All information collected in the process of an investigation into alleged academic violations or related to this process is strictly confidential.
- 5.2 The identities of students involved in the process of an investigation into alleged academic violations are confidential, unless it is absolutely necessary that they be disclosed by the staff involved in the process for the investigation to proceed, particularly if the rules of procedural fairness require it.
- 5.3 Only members of the teams investigating allegations of academic violations may have access to the notes placed in the student's file, the confidential information contained therein, and the identities of the people referred to in sections 5.1 and 5.2. The use of this information is strictly limited to purposes related to reported allegations.

## 6. ACCOUNTABILITY

- 6.1 The Academic Programs Office, through the Registrar's Office, reports annually to the Academic Council the following information:
  - 6.1.1 The number of students involved in alleged violations, the number of alleged violations and the number of students sanctioned, in total and by program
  - 6.1.2 The distribution of sanctioned students by program and by type of evaluation or event
  - 6.1.3 The distribution of sanctioned students by program and by department
  - 6.1.4 The type and number of sanctions applied to sanctioned students, by program
  - 6.1.5 The initiatives undertaken to promote intellectual integrity and reduce academic violations.

## **7. EFFECTIVE DATE AND REVIEW**

- 7.1 This regulation is effective as of the day of its adoption by the Academic Council of HEC Montréal, February 5, 2014. It must be revised at least once every four years.



## 8. APPENDIX - DEFINITIONS

- 8.1 **Academic Offences Committee:** A committee consisting of two people designated by the Person Responsible for Intellectual Integrity, namely, an academic evaluator and an administrative evaluator.
- 8.2 **Academic Violation Review Committee:** A committee consisting of three people appointed by the Director of HEC Montréal, namely, an honorary professor who acts as Chair, the Director of Academic Programs, and a faculty member.
- 8.3 **Student Community:** All persons admitted to HEC Montréal or enrolled in at least one course or participating in an internship or any other academic or research activity. This definition includes people participating in evaluated activities and training offered independently by different HEC Montréal units and hubs.
- 8.4 **Academic Discipline Council:** A committee consisted of three people designated by the Person Responsible for Intellectual Integrity, namely, an academic evaluator, the Director of Faculty Affairs, and a department director.
- 8.5 **Investigator:** A person who is designated by the Person Responsible for Intellectual Integrity and is a member of a group of a few people appointed to this role by the members appointed by the Academic Programs Office.
- 8.6 **Administrative Evaluator:** A person designated by the Person Responsible for Intellectual Integrity from among the Administrative Directors reporting to the Academic Programs Office or any other person designated by the Academic Programs Office.
- 8.7 **Academic Evaluator:** A person designated by the Person Responsible for Intellectual Integrity from a group of professors and full-time lecturers appointed by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- 8.8 **Person Responsible for Intellectual Integrity (PRII):** A person appointed by the Academic Programs Office whose general mandate is to coordinate investigation processes and ensure compliance with this regulation.