

# **National Taiwan University of Science and Technology Guidelines for Handling Cases Regarding the Violation of the Accreditation Regulations for Teacher Qualifications and Violation of Academic Ethics and Integrity**

*111.6.10 passed at the 82 th University Council*

1. To handle cases regarding the violation of the accreditation regulations for teacher qualifications and violation of academic ethics and integrity, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology (NTUST) has established the National Taiwan University of Science and Technology Guidelines for Handling Cases Regarding the Violation of the Accreditation Regulations for Teacher Qualifications and Violation of Academic Ethics and Integrity (hereinafter the Guidelines) in accordance with the Ministry of Education's "Guidelines for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualifications Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education" and "Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education."
2. Violations according to the Guidelines refers to any of the following situations involving the applicant submitting cases for review or the accused:
  - (1) Forgery: Falsification and fabrication of nonexistent application materials, research materials, processes, or research results.
  - (2) Falsification: Unauthorized alteration of application materials, research materials, processes, or research results.
  - (3) Plagiarism: The use of application materials, research materials, publications, or research results belonging to others without proper citation. If a source is improperly cited in a severe manner, it shall be considered plagiarism.
  - (4) Fraud: Obtaining or presenting research data or results through deceit, deception, or other dishonest means.
  - (5) Written by a ghost writer.
  - (6) Inappropriate Citation: Citing another person's research data or results without following academic norms or conventions, where the uncited parts are not central to the work or do not mislead the reader as to its originality.
  - (7) Republishing materials without authorization: Publishing the same or substantially similar academic results in another journal or book without proper acknowledgment or authorization.
  - (8) Failure to acknowledge that part of the contents has already been published: Using content, paragraphs, or results from one's previously published works without appropriate acknowledgment or citation.
  - (9) Substitution of translations for theses without proper acknowledgment.
  - (10) If the Teacher Accreditation Application and Resume Form or any coauthor's certification contains false information; if the representative work has not been truthfully documented as being coauthored and if each coauthor's certification was not submitted.
  - (11) If any educational or professional credential documents, evidence of achievement, documentary evidence that academic writing will be issued by a journal within a fixed period, or any coauthor's certification has been forged or altered.
  - (12) The applicant or the accused has solicited, persuaded, induced, threatened, or otherwise interfered with the reviewer or the reviewing process, or the applicant or the accused has influenced the reviewing process of a paper by illegal or improper means.
  - (13) Other violations of academic ethics: Other situations determined to violate academic ethics beyond the preceding twelve subparagraphs after review.
3. To accuse someone of violating the Guidelines, the informant shall submit a written account to

the Faculty Evaluation Committee, specifying the subject and content of the violation and providing supporting evidence.

Upon receipt of a complaint, the University Faculty Evaluation Committee, led by its Commissioner in conjunction with the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Dean of the College to which the accused belongs, and the Director of Personnel shall determine within five working days whether the formal requirements of the complaint are met. The internal handling process shall be confidential to prevent exposure of the informant, the applicant, or the accused.

If a report is made anonymously but specifically states a violation of Guideline provisions, it shall be handled in accordance with the preceding paragraph.

4. Regarding complaints that satisfy the formal requirements—except for those under Paragraph 12 of Point 2 that shall be handled according to Point 8—a five- to seven-member task force shall be formed within ten working days to investigate and review the case. Within four months after receipt of the informant report, said task force shall submit an investigation report and concrete recommendations to College and University Faculty Evaluation Committees for deliberation. In the case of complicated cases, when difficult obstacles are encountered, or during summer and winter vacations, the period of processing may be extended by two months, and the informant, applicant, and accused shall be notified.

Task force members consist of the Dean of the College to which the accused belongs, College Faculty Evaluation Committee members of relevant fields, and other scholars from within NTUST. External experts may be consulted if necessary. The coordinator of the task force shall be elected by its members.

Regarding complaints that fail to satisfy the formal requirements, and if the informant is known, reasons must be provided in writing to the informant.

5. During the handling of a complaint, relevant personnel who have one of the following relationships with the applicant or the accused must recuse themselves:
  - (1) The person has or has had a supervisor–student relationship in guiding doctoral or master's theses.
  - (2) Spouse, ex-spouse, blood relatives within the fourth degree of kinship, or in-laws or prior in-laws within the third degree of kinship.
  - (3) Joint participants or joint authors of a paper or research published within the past three years.
  - (4) Joint implementation of research projects in the promotion review.
  - (5) The person acts or has acted as the advocate or assistant of the applicant or the accused.

The applicant or the accused may request the recusal of persons who meet any of the following circumstances:

- (1) Where the person fails to recuse themselves in spite of the existence of any of the circumstances specified in the preceding paragraph; or
- (2) Where there are concrete facts to support sufficiently the belief that the person is likely to be biased in the exercise of their functions.

If related personnel fail to recuse themselves in spite of the existence of any of the circumstances specified in the first paragraph or if they are likely to be biased in the exercise of their functions, the audit unit shall, by its authority, mandate their recusal.

Those involved may apply for recusal on their own.

The recusal rules for experts/scholars consulted for the review also apply here.

6. Should any of the cases specified in subparagraphs of Point 2 apply, NTUST shall notify the applicant or the accused in writing, requesting them to submit a written reply to the content of the violation within two weeks. Failure to respond is considered a waiver of the right to defend. The written reply of the accused or applicant (as mentioned in the preceding paragraph) shall

be reviewed by the task force or the Commissioner of the University Faculty Review Committee following standard procedures. An exception shall be made for those requiring review by scholars/experts, who, along with the content of the violation, shall be re-examined by the original reviewer.

In terms of the re-examination by the original reviewer, said materials, if deemed necessary, shall be sent to one to three other scholars/experts for review or professional evaluation to verify the findings.

If the original reviewer is unable or refuses to review, fails to provide review comments within the required timeframe, or provides dubious or contradictory review comments, the case shall be forwarded to academic scholars/experts in the relevant field for review. The number of experts consulted shall match the number of original reviewers.

After the reviewers and academic experts have conducted their review or professional evaluation, they should provide a review report or evaluation comments, which will serve as the basis for NTUST's deliberation process.

After completion of the review in accordance with Paragraphs 2 and 3, NTUST may, if necessary, grant permission for the applicant or the accused to once again make a written or verbal reply.

In case of any difficulty in making a judgment, NTUST may list the issues to be clarified and request the original reviewer and the relevant scholars/experts to conduct a further review.

The Faculty Review Committee shall respect professional opinions, unless they can provide concrete reasons based on professional academic grounds that considerably shaken the credibility and accuracy of the professional review. Decisions should not be made solely by voting. The identities of reviewers and scholars/experts shall be kept confidential.

7. If a complaint involves a violation of the accreditation regulations for teacher qualifications, and if the University Faculty Review Committee observes any of the situations described in Point 2, the case shall be handled according to the "Guidelines for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualifications Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education." The procedures and outcomes of the deliberation shall be reported to the Ministry of Education for future reference.
8. When the applicant or the accused for accreditation of teacher qualification were found to have committed any of the acts specified in Subparagraph 12 of Point 2, NTUST shall contact the reviewer whose review process has been disrupted, make a record of the contact, and ask the applicant or the accused to voice their opinion. Further verification with the reviewer shall be conducted by the Commissioner of the University Faculty Review Committee. If the allegation is substantiated, the qualification review process shall be immediately halted, and NTUST shall notify the applicant or the accused that their applications for qualification review will not be accepted for two years starting from the date of the notification and the matter will be reported to the Ministry of Education for future reference.
9. Regarding cases that violate the Guidelines, aside from the dispositions specified in Points 7 and 8, sanctions may be imposed or combined in accordance with the type and severity of the violation, including:
  - (1) Dismissal, nonrenewal of appointment, suspension, or severance in accordance with the law.
  - (2) Becoming ineligible for the chance to apply for qualification review or rank promotion for a certain period of time.
  - (3) Requiring mandatory completion of a six-hour course on academic ethics within one year from the notification date, with the relevant completion record being submitted to the Personnel Office. Faculty and researchers who fail to complete the academic ethics course are ineligible for any university awards.
  - (4) Punishment for a certain period of time:

- i. Prohibition from sabbatical leave, overseas lecturing, or further education in Taiwan or abroad.
- ii. Restrictions against secondment and any part-time teaching or work off campus.
- iii. Becoming ineligible for extension of service period or assuming the role of Faculty Review Committee member or academic or administrative head.
- iv. Denial of applications for promotion and increases in salary.
- v. Denial of a promotion.
- vi. Becoming ineligible for any research grants.
- vii. Becoming ineligible for any university awards.
- viii. Becoming ineligible for reductions in teaching hours, extra teaching hour payments, or other changes (including written warnings).

Sanctions for violations of the Guidelines, except as specified in the first subparagraph of the preceding paragraph, which shall be handled in accordance with the Teachers' Act and other relevant regulations, must be deliberated by the College and University Faculty Review Committees. If a case violates the regulations governing accreditation of teacher qualifications, has been submitted to the Ministry of Education for future reference, and the applicant is barred from applying for teacher qualification review for more than five years, NTUST shall notify all colleges and universities as well as the Ministry of Education in accordance with the regulations, and the sanctions specified in the first subparagraph of the preceding paragraph must be approved by the Ministry of Education.

The implementation of sanctions specified in the first paragraph shall not be suspended as a result of the accused filing an appeal or engaging in administrative litigation.

10. Within ten working days after the University Faculty Review Committee's deliberation, NTUST must notify the informant, applicant, or accused in writing of the results and reasons, specifying the deadline and the unit in charge for any appeals by the applicant or the accused.

If the applicant or accused is dissatisfied with the notice of disposition mentioned in the preceding paragraph, they must submit a written appeal stating the reasons to NTUST's Faculty Appeal Review Committee within thirty days from the day following receipt of the notification.

11. If NTUST's deliberation concludes that no violation of the Guidelines has occurred, and the informant resubmits a complaint, the complaint must be reviewed by the University Faculty Review Committee. In the presence of new concrete evidence, NTUST shall investigate and address the matter in accordance with the Guidelines. In the absence of new and concrete evidence, the decision from the previous deliberation shall be reiterated to the informant.
12. If the University Faculty Review Committee identifies a complaint as frivolous, the committee shall follow the law and impose sanctions or suggest disciplinary actions to the relevant units according to the severity of the case and the identity of the informant.
13. Academic ethics cases not related to teacher qualification reviews but involving the scenarios described in Point 2 shall be handled in accordance with the Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education. Cases designated to be handled by NTUST shall follow procedures outlined in the Guidelines.

Academic Ethics Cases in the Ministry of Science and Technology shall be handled in accordance with the Guidelines for Handling and Deliberating Academic Ethics Cases in the Ministry of Science and Technology.

For teaching and research personnel other than university faculty who fall under the scenarios described in Point 2, the same procedures as outlined in the Guidelines shall be applied.

14. Matters not covered by these Guidelines shall be governed by relevant provisions set forth in the "Guidelines for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualifications Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education," "Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education," "Principles

for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education,” and “Guidelines for Handling and Deliberating Academic Ethics Cases in the Ministry of Science and Technology.”

15. The Guidelines have been approved by the University Affairs Committee before implementation. The same shall apply for all amendments to the Guidelines.

*The English version is provided for reference only.  
The Chinese version shall prevail in case of any discrepancies between the English and Chinese versions.*