

Yuan Ze University Regulations for Handling Academic Ethics Cases

2024/11/20 Revised and passed by the 7th Administrative Council of the Academic Year 2024

- Article 1 Yuan Ze University (hereinafter referred to as "the University") has established these Regulations to ensure an objective and impartial process for handling cases involving violations of academic ethics, in accordance with the *Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases in Universities and Colleges*.
- Article 2 These Regulations apply to all faculty, staff, and students of the University.
- Article 3 The term “violation of academic ethics” as used in these Regulations refers to any of the following circumstances involving the academic work of the respondent :
1. Fabrication: Making up of application materials, research data, or research results that do not exist;
 2. Falsification: Inappropriate alteration of application materials, research data, or research results;
 3. Plagiarism: Appropriation of another person’s application materials, research data, or research results without attributing to the source; extensively citing the source improperly is considered plagiarism;
 4. Submitting academic work that was written by another person;
 5. Repeated publication without proper acknowledgment, including undisclosed prior publication by the author;
 6. Extensive use of one’s own previously published work without appropriate citation in accordance with academic norms or conventions;
 7. Substitution of a translation of an academic treatise without proper citation;
 8. Inaccurate entries in the teacher qualification résumé; submission of false information in the co-author’s certification; failure to truthfully declare co-authorship of the representative work and to submit co-author certifications from all co-authors;
 9. The submitting author, either personally or through others, has engaged in entreating, lobbying, inducing, threatening, or otherwise interfering with the reviewer or the review process, or has attempted to influence the review by illegal or improper means;
 10. Other acts in violation of academic ethics.
- Article 4 Academic ethics cases, including those reported internally or referred by external agencies (hereinafter collectively referred to as “academic ethics cases”), shall be handled by the University’s Committee for Academic Ethics and Integrity (hereinafter referred to as the “Ethics Committee”).
- Article 5 The whistleblower shall submit a written report to the Ethics Committee using their real name, address, and contact information, and must clearly identify the subject of

the report, provide a detailed account of the allegations, and include supporting evidence.

Anonymous reports will not be accepted, except where the subject is clearly identified and sufficient supporting evidence is provided.

Upon completion of the investigation of an anonymous report, the Ethics Committee may request the whistleblower to provide their real name and contact information before notifying them of the investigation results.

Article 6 Upon accepting an academic ethics case, the Ethics Committee shall verify the following matters:

1. Verify the identity of the whistleblower. If any information is found to be false, the case shall be treated as an anonymous report.
2. Examine whether the report and supporting evidence are complete. If the report is incomplete, the whistleblower shall be notified to provide supplemental information within a specified period. If the whistleblower fails to do so within the deadline, or if the supplemented materials remain insufficient, the Ethics Committee may decide not to proceed with the case and shall notify the whistleblower in writing, thereby closing the case.

The Ethics Committee shall be convened by the Vice President and shall include the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Research and Development, the Director of Human Resources, and the Chief Information Officer as ex officio members. In addition, five to seven internal or external experts and scholars shall be appointed as Ethics committee members, among whom at least one shall be a legal expert.

All Ethics Committee members shall serve without compensation; however, external members may be paid consultation fees, travel expenses, and attendance fees in accordance with relevant regulations.

Meetings of the Ethics Committee shall be convened only when at least two-thirds of the ex officio members are present. Resolutions shall require the approval of at least two-thirds of the members present.

Article 7 After an academic ethics case is accepted, the investigation and review procedures shall be conducted by the responsible administrative unit based on the nature of the case:

1. Cases involving violations of faculty qualification review regulations shall be handled by the Personnel Office in accordance with the University's "Guidelines for Handling Cases of Faculty Violations of Qualification Review Regulations or Academic Misconduct."
2. Cases involving degree theses shall be handled by the Office of Academic Affairs in accordance with the University's "Regulations for Handling Student Violations of Academic Ethics."
3. Other academic ethics violations shall be handled by the Office of Research and

Development in accordance with the relevant provisions of these Regulations.

Article 8 Procedures and Timelines for Handling Academic Ethics Cases :

1. Preliminary Review of Formal Requirements:

Upon accepting an academic ethics case and verifying the identity and content of the whistleblower, the convener of the Ethics Committee shall, together with the Dean of Research and Development and the head of the respondent's first-level unit, convene a meeting within two weeks to review the formal requirements. The purpose is to determine whether the report and supporting evidence are sufficiently specific and complete. If the case meets the formal requirements, it shall proceed to substantive investigation. If not, the Ethics Committee shall notify the whistleblower and close the case.

2. Substantive Investigation Procedure:

If the Ethics Committee resolves to proceed with the case, the respondent's first-level unit shall, within ten days, form an investigation team of five to seven members to conduct the investigation and review.

The team shall be chaired by the head of the respondent's unit. If recusal is necessary, the deputy head shall serve as chair. If no deputy exists or the deputy must also recuse, the President shall appoint a professor from the unit to serve as chair. Other members shall be experts or scholars from relevant fields, internal or external, invited by the chair, and must include at least one legal expert.

The investigation team shall notify the respondent to submit a written defense within two weeks and, if necessary, provide an opportunity for oral explanation. The team may compile a list of issues to be clarified and, along with the report, defense, and related materials, submit them to one to three external experts in the relevant field for academic ethics review. If needed, the external review opinions may be forwarded to the respondent for a second defense to assist the team in making a final determination.

The investigation must be completed within two months of the team's formation, and a written report shall be submitted to the Ethics Committee for review.

The report shall include:

- (1) Case summary (including reported items and procedures);
- (2) Respondent's defense materials (including correspondence and whether oral explanation was provided);
- (3) Investigation methods (including software tools used);
- (4) Findings corresponding to each reported item (including types of violations, if any);
- (5) Supporting evidence.

3. Confirmation of Investigation Results:

Upon receiving the investigation report, the Ethics Committee shall convene a

meeting to review it:

- (1) If procedural flaws or incomplete content are found, the report may be returned for supplementation or further investigation.
- (2) If the procedure and content are complete, the following actions shall be taken based on the findings:
 - I. If no violation is found, the Ethics Committee shall notify the whistleblower, respondent, and referring agency, and inform the responsible unit before closing the case. If necessary, the competent authority shall be informed.
 - II. If a violation is confirmed, the Ethics Committee shall, based on the respondent's identity, forward the case to the appropriate unit for further review and disciplinary action:
 - i. Faculty: Forwarded by the Personnel Office to the relevant faculty evaluation committee.
 - ii. Students: For current students, handled by the Office of Student Affairs and reviewed by the Student Disciplinary Committee; for graduates, handled by the Office of Academic Affairs.
 - iii. Other personnel: Handled by the Office of Research and Development or other authorized units.
- (3) The respondent shall be given an opportunity to present an oral explanation if necessary.

4. Review by the Responsible Unit:

The responsible unit shall respect the professional judgment of the investigation team unless it can present specific and academically substantiated reasons that sufficiently undermine the credibility or accuracy of the findings.

Prior to the review, the respondent shall be notified to submit a written statement regarding the investigation results and to attend the review meeting for oral explanation.

Depending on the severity of the case, the responsible unit may impose one or more of the following disciplinary measures within its jurisdiction:

- (4) Written reprimand;
- (5) Revocation or cancellation of relevant awards;
- (6) Recovery of part or all subsidies, bonuses, or rewards;
- (7) Suspension from applying for any internal academic research grants or awards for a specified period;
- (8) Mandatory completion of at least six hours of academic ethics-related courses, with certification;
- (9) Other suspension measures or appropriate sanctions commensurate with the respondent's status.

Disciplinary decisions shall only be passed with the presence of at least two-thirds of the responsible unit's members and the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of those present.

Following the decision, the responsible unit shall notify the respondent in writing of the disciplinary action and available avenues for appeal within ten days of the conclusion of the review. A copy of this notification shall also be sent to the Ethics Committee.

If the respondent disagrees with the decision, they may file an appeal in accordance with the relevant appeal and review Ethics Committee's organization and procedures applicable to their status.

5. Reporting of Investigation Results:

If an academic ethics violation is confirmed, the Ethics Committee shall prepare the investigation report and disciplinary decision, notify the parties involved, and report the case to the competent authority. In cases involving grants or subsidies, the funding agency shall also be notified.

Article 9 Academic ethics cases shall be concluded within four months from the day following the receipt of the report. If an extension is deemed necessary, written notification shall be provided to the whistleblower, the respondent, and/or the referring external agency.

Article 10 To ensure objectivity and fairness in the review process, all personnel involved in handling the case shall maintain strict confidentiality regarding the whistleblower's identity and contact information, the case proceedings, the identities and evaluations of reviewers, and all other related documents and materials. Any individual involved in the case who has any of the following relationships with the respondent shall recuse themselves from the review process:

1. Where the person in question is, or was, the respondent's spouse, former spouse, a blood relative within the fourth degree, or a relative by marriage within the third degree;
2. Where the person in question, his/her spouse, or former spouse has or had a relationship with the respondent as a joint holder of rights or co-obligor in the case;
3. Where the individual is currently serving or has previously served as the respondent's legal representative or assistant in the case;
4. Where the person in question was once a witness, expert or otherwise, in the matter;
5. Where the person in question is the whistleblower in the case;
6. There is an employment relationship within the same department, institute, division, or equivalent-level unit at the university;
7. There is a former teacher-student relationship pertaining to the supervision of doctoral dissertations or master theses;

8. Where the person in question has collaborated as a co-researcher or co-author with the respondent on published papers or research outputs within the last three years;
9. There is a relationship pertaining to the co-implementation of the research project within the last three years;
10. There is a relationship pertaining to employment, appointment, or agency within the last three years;
11. There have been financial transactions involving prices and interest rates that have not conformed to normal and reasonable trading principles in the market in the last three years;
12. Where the person in question serves as a board director, supervisor, or manager at an enterprise where the respondent is employed. However, it does not apply to government shareholders designated as board directors or supervisors;
13. Where the person in question is required to recuse themselves under other applicable laws or regulations.

Article 11 If an academic ethics case is reported again after a prior review, and the Ethics Committee accepts the case, a preliminary review meeting shall be convened within two weeks from the day following receipt of the report.

If no substantial new evidence is found, the Ethics Committee may respond directly to the whistleblower based on the previous decision. However, if substantial new evidence is presented, a new investigation and review shall be conducted in accordance with these regulations, and the original investigation team shall carry out the substantive investigation.

Article 12 If a faculty member, staff, or student of the University is found—upon preliminary review by the Ethics Committee—to have made a malicious or groundless report, the case may be referred to the relevant unit for appropriate disciplinary action.

Article 13 Matters not covered in these Regulations shall be handled in accordance with the *Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases in Universities and Colleges*, the *Guidelines for Handling and Investigating Research Misconduct by the National Science and Technology Council*, and other relevant laws and regulations.

Article 14 These Regulations shall take effect upon approval by the Administrative Council of the Academic. The same procedure shall apply to any amendments.

Flowchart for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at YZU

