

Yuan Ze University Guidelines for Handling Cases of Violations of Teacher Qualification Accreditation Regulations or Academic Misconduct

May 3, 2017, Approved by the 2nd University Affairs Meeting of the 2016 Academic Year
May 9, 2018, Approved and Amended by the 2nd University Affairs Meeting of the 2017 Academic Year
May 21, 2025, Approved and Amended by the 2nd University Affairs Meeting of the 2024 Academic Year

Article 1 Yuan Ze University (hereinafter referred to as "the University") hereby establishes the "Yuan Ze University Guidelines for Handling Cases of Violations of Teacher Qualification Accreditation Regulations or Academic Misconduct" (hereinafter referred to as "these Guidelines") in accordance with the "Guidelines for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualifications Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education" (hereinafter referred to as the Teacher Qualification Violation Handling Guidelines) for the purpose of addressing cases involving violations of teacher qualification accreditation regulations or academic misconduct in research achievements.

Article 2 The term "violation of teacher qualification accreditation regulations" in these Guidelines refers to any of the following:

1. Providing inaccurate information in the teacher qualification curriculum vitae or certificate of co-authorship; failure to indicate and provide evidence of co-authorship in representative works; improper citation; unauthorized republication; failure to acknowledge that parts of the content have already been published.
2. Plagiarism, forgery, alteration, or fraud in publications, works, exhibitions, and/or technical reports.
3. Forgery or alteration of the curriculum vitae of the applicant, proof of achievements, proof of acceptance and scheduled publication of a work by a journal, or the certificate of co-authorship; use of unlawful or inappropriate means to influence the review of a journal paper.
4. Other violations of academic ethics.
5. The applicant, or another individual acting on their behalf, has engaged in solicitation, persuasion, inducement, threats, or other forms of interference with the reviewer or the reviewing process in a serious manner.

The term "academic misconduct" refers to cases outside of teacher qualification accreditation where academic work involves plagiarism, misappropriation, forgery, alteration, or other violations of academic ethics.

Article 3 If an allegation of a teacher violating qualification accreditation regulations is deemed valid by the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee, the Personnel Office shall refer the case to the relevant college (or equivalent unit), which must form an investigation team of five to seven members within ten days. The team is responsible for reviewing and verifying the case.

The investigation team leader shall be elected from among its members. Aside from the chairpersons of the faculty evaluation committee of department (or equivalent) and faculty evaluation committee of college (or equivalent), members shall be selected based on the expertise relevant to the reported case from among the faculty evaluation committee of department (or equivalent) and faculty evaluation committee of college (or equivalent) members or senior professors. External experts and scholars may also be invited, and at least one legal expert must be included.

During the review process, the investigation team and all levels of faculty evaluation committees must adhere to principles of fairness, objectivity, efficiency, and rigor.

Personnel involved in handling reported cases shall keep confidential the name and contact information of the complainant, the identity of the respondent, the identity and review comments of reviewers, as well as all related documents and materials. However, the confidentiality obligation shall not apply under any of the following circumstances:

1. The review process and evaluations are provided to the authority responsible for handling teacher appeals and other remedial institutions.
2. Evaluation opinions or meeting resolutions are lawfully provided to relevant authorities or relevant units for investigation purposes.
3. Meeting resolutions or evaluation opinions confirming violations under Article 2 are disclosed to the applicant.
4. If the case is forwarded to a competent authority or the university for handling, the identity of the informant and relevant evidence shall be provided, and the recipient organization shall also maintain confidentiality.
5. If the case involves public interest or attracts societal attention, the University may issue an appropriate public explanation.

Article 4 For validated allegations of violations, cases falling under Subparagraphs 1, 3, or 5 of Paragraph 1 in Article 2 shall be reviewed and verified by the investigation team. If necessary, the respondent must be given an opportunity to present their statement. Once verified, the findings shall be submitted to the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee for deliberation. However, for cases under Subparagraph 5 of Paragraph 1 in Article 2, the investigation team must communicate with the affected reviewer before verification and document the interaction.

Cases under Subparagraphs 2, 4 of Paragraph 1, or under Paragraph 2, in Article 2 shall be substantively reviewed by the college-level (or equivalent) unit, with the investigation team conducting the review while ensuring adherence to recusal principles.

The investigation team must notify the respondent to submit a written defense regarding the allegation within two weeks. For cases under Subparagraphs 2 or 4 of Paragraph 1 in Article 2, both the allegation and the defense shall be re-examined by the original reviewers. If necessary, one to three experts in the relevant field shall be invited for review to cross-verify the findings, respecting professional judgments. For cases under Paragraph 2 in

Article 2, the allegation and the written defense may be submitted to one to three scholars in the relevant professional field for review.

Reviewers and expert scholars must submit a review report, which will serve as the basis for the investigation team's deliberation. The investigation team and faculty evaluation committees at all levels may allow the respondent to provide an additional oral defense during the procedure if necessary. If issues remain unclear, they may request the original reviewers or relevant scholars to reassess the case.

The investigation team shall complete its report within two months. The investigation results shall be submitted by the team leader to the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee for deliberation. If the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee determines that the allegation is substantiated, the qualification review process shall be immediately halted, and the case shall be forwarded to the appropriate faculty evaluation committee at all levels for a resolution. The Faculty Evaluation Committee of School shall notify the applicant of the decision and inform the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee.

Article 5 Investigation team members, faculty evaluation committee members at all levels, reviewers, and internal or external experts who have any of the following relationships with the respondent must recuse themselves:

1. Spouse, former spouse, blood relatives within the fourth degree, or relatives by marriage within the third degree, including those who have formerly held such a relationship.
2. A current or former spouse who shares joint rights or obligations with the respondent in relation to the case.
3. Former or current litigation representative or assistant for the respondent.
4. Former witness or expert witness in the case.
5. The informant in the case.
6. Serving in the same department, institute, division, or an equivalent-level unit within the University as the respondent.
7. A former teacher-student relationship pertaining to the supervision of doctoral dissertations or master theses.
8. A Co-researcher or co-author of papers or research results published within the past three years.
9. A collaborator on a research project within the past three years.
10. An employment, appointment, or agency relationship with the respondent within the past three years.
11. Financial transactions with the respondent involving prices, interest rates, or other terms that deviate from normal and reasonable market practices.
12. Serving as a board director, supervisor, or manager at an enterprise where the respondent is employed (except for government-appointed directors/supervisors).

13. Other circumstances requiring recusal under relevant laws and regulations.

The informant shall not serve as a member of the deliberation meeting.

The respondent may request the recusal of the following individuals:

1. Those who meet the conditions specified in Paragraph 1 but fail to voluntarily recuse themselves.
2. Those for whom there is concrete evidence indicating a potential bias in the execution of their duties.

If any relevant personnel meet the conditions specified in Paragraph 1 but do not voluntarily recuse themselves, or if there is a potential bias in the execution of their duties, the adjudicating body shall, by its authority, order their recusal.

Relevant personnel may voluntarily request recusal. Experts and scholars commissioned for review shall be subject to the recusal provisions outlined in these Guidelines.

Article 6 If an allegation against a teacher is deemed valid by the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee, the Personnel Office shall forward the case to the teacher's affiliated unit. The case shall be submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee of Department (or equivalent), Faculty Evaluation Committee of College (or equivalent), and Faculty Evaluation Committee of School, which shall, within two to four weeks, determine one or more of the following disciplinary actions based on the severity of the violation:

1. Suspension of salary increments for a specified period. If there are no available salary grades for promotion, a deduction equivalent to the difference between grades shall be applied to the monthly salary. The individual shall be prohibited from applying for promotion, secondment, external part-time employment or teaching, and from applying for various research projects, awards, and subsidies.
2. Revocation or annulment of awards related to the case, retrieval of research incentives and subsidies related to the case, suspension of payments beyond statutory salaries, or retrieval of statutory salaries as permitted by law. Any bonuses (including honorary chairs) or subsidies provided by the University shall be fully retrieved. Bonuses (including honorary chairs) or subsidies received from external sources shall be handled in accordance with the relevant regulations.
3. Prohibition from applying for sabbatical leave, overseas lectures, further study and research, extension of service, or serving as a member of faculty evaluation committee at any level or in academic administrative positions within the University for a specified period.
4. Ineligibility to receive incentives related to teaching, research, academic advice and other services for a specified period.
5. Dismissal, non-renewal of contract, or suspension, subject to approval by the Ministry of Education, in accordance with the Teachers' Act and relevant University regulations.

6. In cases involving violations of academic ethics related to teacher qualification accreditation, the University shall deny qualification approval, refuse to accept qualification applications for a specified period, request the Ministry of Education to revoke the teacher qualification from the corresponding rank, and retrieve the issued teacher certificate, in accordance with the "Regulations for the Accreditation of Teachers in Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education" and the "Guidelines for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualification Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education".
7. In cases involving academic misconduct unrelated to teacher qualification accreditation, the University may issue a written warning, require participation in academic ethics courses for a designated period with proof of completion, in accordance with the "Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education".
8. If the individual is deemed in need of academic ethics counseling, the University Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee may refer the individual to a professional counseling institution, under the supervision and administration of the employing unit.
9. Other appropriate disciplinary actions or identity-based sanctions.

The faculty evaluation committees at all levels must base their findings regarding Subparagraph 2 or 4 of Paragraph 1, or Paragraph 2, in Article 2, on the investigation report submitted by the investigation team. Professional judgments should be respected unless there are specific, academically substantiated reasons that challenge their credibility and accuracy. The decision cannot be overturned solely by a vote and must be supported by a clear rationale.

Article 7 If, during the teacher qualification review process or after accreditation, the individual is found to have committed any of the violations listed in Article 2 and is subject to disciplinary action, the University shall submit the review process and the resulting disciplinary decision to the Ministry of Education for record. If the disciplinary decision includes a prohibition from applying for teacher qualification accreditation for a period of five years or more, the University shall notify all institutions of higher education, and a copy shall be provided to the Ministry of Education. The enforcement of the disciplinary decision shall not be suspended due to any appeal, administrative remedy, or litigation initiated by the respondent.

Article 8 The University shall complete the handling of reported cases within four months. However, if the case is complex, faces significant obstacles, or falls within winter or summer vacation periods, the processing period may be extended by two months. The Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee shall notify the informant, the respondent, or external agencies accordingly.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee of School shall, within ten days after finalizing the meeting minutes, issue a written notice of the disciplinary decision to the respondent and provide a copy to the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee.

If the respondent disagrees with the deliberation outcome, they may seek remedies in accordance with the “Yuan Ze University Regulations for the Organization and Arbitration of the Faculty Plea and Arbitration Committee”, the Teachers' Act, or other applicable regulations.

Article 9 If a reported case is determined to be unsubstantiated, and the informant submits a subsequent report on the same matter, the University shall dismiss the report unless new, concrete evidence is provided that warrants further investigation.

If the informant is a faculty of the University and is found to have made repeated, groundless allegations, the University may, after deliberation by the Faculty Evaluation Committees at all levels, impose appropriate disciplinary measures based on the severity of the misconduct.

Article 10 Cases involving violations under Article 2 that are referred by the Ministry of Education or external academic research institutions shall be handled in accordance with these Guidelines.

Article 11 Any matters not covered in these Guidelines shall be handled in accordance with the “Guidelines for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualification Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education”, the “Regulations for the Accreditation of Teachers in Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education”, the “Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education”, the “Guidelines for Handling and Investigating Research Misconduct by the National Science and Technology Council”, and other relevant regulations.

Article 12 These Guidelines shall take effect upon approval by the University Affairs Meeting. Amendments shall follow the same procedure.

The English translation is for reference only. In case of any discrepancy between Chinese version and English version, the Chinese version shall prevail.