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Article 1

The Regulations were created in order to uphold academic dignity, fulfill the principles of academic discipline, and to handle cases in an impartial manner. The Regulations were formulated in accordance with the Ministry of Education’s Principles for the Handling of Academic Ethics Cases at Higher Education Institutions.

Article 2

Based on the individual requirements listed below, personnel engaged in research at the University must visit the website of the Center for Taiwan Academic Research Ethics Education, enroll in and complete the Academic Ethics Course, and then present proof that they completed the course and passed the examination.

1. A instructor or research fellow must complete six hours of the course within three years of making an application for a research-related grant or subsidy, or within three years after being awarded a grant or subsidy for a collaborative project between academia and industry.
2. An assistant for an academic research project or collaborative project between academia and industry must complete a minimum of six hours of the course within three years after applying for their work contract.
3. A graduate student must complete a minimum of six hours of the course before applying for a research grant/subsidy or the oral defense of their thesis.

Article 3

A “violation of academic ethics” refers to any one of the following:

1. Fabrication: fabricated data was included in the application, research project, or research results;
2. Falsification: altered data was used in the application, research project, or research results;
3. Plagiarism: another person’s data was used in the application, research project, or research results without proper attribution. Improper citation will be considered plagiarism in serious circumstances;
4. Ghostwriting;
5. Republication without stating that the work was previously published;
6. Large quotations from one’s previously published works without citation;
7. Translation instead of original writing, and failure to provide citation;
8. False statements on a curriculum vitae or certificate of co-authorship, or failure to specify co-authorship for a representative work;
9. The applicant or someone commissioned to act on their behalf interferes with a reviewer or the review procedure through one of the following means: making a request, lobbying, bribing, threatening, or another form of disruptive behavior; or influencing the review through illegal or inappropriate means;
10. Other forms of behavior which violate academic ethics.

If one of the situations described above is discovered, it will be handled by the Office of Research and Development. If a violation is reported, the person making the report must include their full name and submit a report along with evidence to the Office of Research and Development.

If a report is made anonymously, it will only be pursued if there is a specific violation and ample evidence.

Article 4

The University establishes an Academic Ethics Hearing Committee (hereinafter “the Hearing Committee”) to review cases of the personnel described in Article 2, and to determine whether personnel made a violation described in Article 3. The Hearing Committee is composed of seven to nine members, and convenes after receiving a case. The Vice-President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Research and Development, and the Dean of Academic Affairs are ex officio members. The President will appoint other Hearing Committee members from a list of scholars and experts recommended by the Office of Research and Development. The term of a Hearing Committee member lasts until the case has concluded. The Vice-President of Academic Affairs serves as Convener. When necessary, other experts, scholars, or related personnel may be invited to provide testimony.

A Hearing Committee resolution may only be passed when two-thirds of members are present, and with the support of two-thirds of members in attendance. A resolution that recommends any of the following actions must earn the support of three-quarters of members in attendance: suspension, termination of employment, non-renewal of contract, or expulsion.

Article 5

The Office of Research and Development will organize a case for the suspected violation of academic ethics, and must notify the accused to provide a written defense within 20 days. The written defense will be forwarded along with the details of the case to the Hearing Committee. If it is established that there was a violation of academic ethics, the results of the review must explain which type of violation was involved, list the evidence, and provide specific recommendations for disciplinary action.

With the exception of violations that involve the conferral of degrees or the qualifications to serve as an instructor at a higher education institution, the following types of disciplinary action may be recommended, based on severity: written warning, required participation in an academic ethics course (and proof of attendance), or prohibition from making future applications for University funding.

The review of a case must be completed within 3 months, beginning the day after the case was received. When necessary, this deadline may be extended, up to a maximum of three months.

Article 6

The results of the review must be provided to the accused.

If it is established that there was a violation of academic ethics, all programs involved must be notified for follow-up disciplinary action:

1. If the accused is a full-time instructor or research fellow, the results must be submitted to the University-level Instructor Evaluation Committee.
2. If the accused is a staff member, the results must be submitted to the Staff Evaluation Committee.
3. If the accused is a student, the results must be submitted to the Degree Conferral and Plagiarism Review Committee or the Committee for Rewards and Disciplinary Measures.
4. If the accused is a research assistant, the results must be submitted to the program that employs the research assistant and related programs.

Article 7

Personnel involved in the handling, investigation, or review of a case must keep all related information strictly confidential. This restriction does not apply if the case involves the public interest and necessitates an explanation from the University.

Article 8

Members of the Hearing Committee must recuse themselves in any of the following situations:

1. One of the situations described in Article 32 of the Administrative Procedure Act applies.
2. During the review, the Hearing Committee member and the accused are members of the same department, graduate institute, program, or division.
3. During the past three years, the Hearing Committee member and the accused had an advisor-student relationship for the writing of an MA or doctoral thesis.
4. The Hearing Committee member and the accused were co-authors of an article or research project within the past two years.
5. The Hearing Committee member and the accused are conducting a collaborative research project while the review is taking place.
6. Recusal is required based on regulations.
7. The Hearing Committee member has a personal interest in the matter, which is recognized by the Hearing Committee.

Article 9

A full-time instructor, research fellow, research assistant, or student from the University who is deemed to have violated academic ethics as stipulated in the Regulations must bear full responsibility for damage and financial reparations if their violation results in a subsidizing agency or third-party requesting reparations, or otherwise causes damage to the University.

Article 10

Any matters not covered in the Regulations will be handled in accordance with related laws and University regulations.

Article 11

The Regulations were passed by the Executive Council and will be promulgated and implemented after approved by the President. The same procedure will be followed for each amendment.