國立臺灣師範大學教師違反送審教師資格規定及違反學術倫理與誠信案件處理要點

National Taiwan Normal University
Guidelines on Handling Cases Regarding the Violation of the Accreditation Regulations for Teacher Qualifications and Violation of Academic Ethics and Integrity

The name of the guidelines, Point 1, Point 2, Point 2-1, Point 3, Point 4, Point 7, Point 8, Point 9, Point 12, Point 13, Point 14, and Point 15 were amended and approved at the 119th University Council on November 22, 2017.

Announced in Letter Shi-Da-Ren-Zi No. 1061033345 dated December 21, 2017.

1. In order to deal with cases regarding the violation of the accreditation regulations for teacher qualifications and violation of academic ethics and integrity, the University has established these 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* 專科以上學校教師違反送審教師資格規定處理原則, *Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education* 專科以上學校學術倫理案件處理原則, and the *Guidelines for Handling and Deliberating Academic Ethics Cases in the Ministry of Science and Technology* 科技部學術倫理案件處理及審議要點.
2. Violations of the accreditation of teacher qualifications in these guidelines (hereinafter referred to as "these Guidelines") refers to any of the following cases in the applicant submitting cases for review:

(1) Inaccurate entries in the teacher qualification curriculum vitae or certificate of co-authorship; failure to indicate and provide evidence of the co-authorship of representative work; improper citation; republishing materials without authorization; failure to acknowledge that part of the contents have already been published, or other issues deemed the violation of academic ethics.

(2) Plagiarism, forgery, alteration or fraud in publications, works, exhibitions and/or technical reports.

(3) Forgery and alteration of the curriculum vitae of the applicant, proof of achievements, proof of acceptance and scheduled publication of a work by a journal and the certificate of co-authorship. The use of unlawful or inappropriate means to influence review of a journal paper.

The English version is provided for reference only.

The Chinese version shall prevail in case of any discrepancies between the English and Chinese versions.

(4) The applicant, or someone else, has solicited, persuaded, induced, threatened, or otherwise interfered with the reviewer or the reviewing process in grave violation of regulations.

2-1. The term "violation of academic ethics and integrity" in these Guidelines shall refer to any of the following cases in relation to the applicant's academic work:

(1) Forgery: Fabrication of non-existent application materials, research materials or research results.

(2) Falsification: Alteration of application materials, research materials or research results.

(3) Plagiarism: The use of application materials, research materials or research results belonging to others without attribution. If the source is improperly attributed in a grave manner, it shall be considered as plagiarism.

(4) Writing by a ghost writer.

(5) Repeated publication for public distribution without acknowledgement.

(6) Substantial quotation from one's own published work without proper citation.

(7) Substitution of translations for thesis without proper acknowledgement.

(8) Inaccurate entries in the teacher qualification curriculum vitae or certificate of co-authorship; failure to indicate and provide evidence of the co-authorship of representative work.

(9) The applicant, or someone else, has solicited, persuaded, induced, threatened, or otherwise interfered with the reviewer or the reviewing process, or the applicant has influenced the reviewing process of a paper by illegal or improper means.

(10) Other violations against academic ethics and integrity.

3. When an informant reports that the applicant has violated these regulations, he/she shall submit a written account to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee (hereinafter “UFEC”), and indicate specific the object and content of the report and attaching evidence.

Upon receipt of the report, said UFEC shall, after verifying with the informant that the report is indeed his or her own, proceed to the internal processing of the report. The convener, in conjunction with the Dean of the original college, the directors of the Department (Institute, or Degree Program) and the Office of Human Resources, shall complete a formal requirement review within one week to confirm whether the report is valid. If the formal requirements are not met and the case is not accepted, the case will be closed with a written notice served to the informant. Internal procedures shall be handled in a confidential manner to avoid exposing the informant and the concerned applicant.

The English version is provided for reference only.

The Chinese version shall prevail in case of any discrepancies between the English and Chinese versions.

If a report is made anonymously but specifically states a violation of provisions set forth in Point 2, it shall be handled in accordance with the preceding paragraph.

4. For cases that meet the formal requirements of Paragraph 1 and 3 of Point 2, the UFEC shall form a five to seven-member task force within two weeks 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 UFEC for deliberation. In the case of complicated cases, or when difficult obstacles are encountered, or during summer and winter vacation, the period of processing may be extended by two months and both the informant and the applicant shall be notified. In such cases when Paragraph 4 of Point 2 applies to said applicant, provisions Point 8 shall govern.

   The University shall notify the informant and the applicant in writing regarding the results with reasons of the proceedings within ten days after the UFEC's deliberation, and shall specify the time limit for appeal and the specific authority to receive it.

   The members of the aforementioned task force shall consist of the dean of the original submitting college, members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee of the department (institute, or degree program) in relevant professional fields, and extramural legal experts; when deemed necessary, relevant scholars may be invited to participate. However, the applicant shall be allowed to reject 1-2 reviewers he/she finds unacceptable. The convener of the panel shall be the Dean of the original college that proposed the review.

5. Members of the UFEC and the task force, reviewers and relevant scholars and experts shall be recused if they are related to the applicant in at least one of the following ways:

   (1) A teacher or student.

   (2) Blood relatives within the third degree of consanguinity.

   (3) Spouse or in-laws within the third degree of consanguinity or a previous relationship.

   (4) Academic collaborator.

   (5) Relevant stakeholders.

   (6) Recusal required under other laws and regulations.

   The UFEC shall determine the stakeholders mentioned in (5) above.

6. Based on provisions of Paragraphs 1 and 3 of Point 2, the University's investigation task force shall make a report on the investigation results and specific

recommendations to the UFEC for deliberation.

7. Should any of the cases specified in Paragraph 2 of Point 2 apply, the task force shall notify the applicant in writing, requiring him/her to submit a written reply to the content of the informant report within two weeks. The convener shall send the informant report together with the content of the reply to the original reviewer for re-deliberation. If deemed necessary, said materials shall be sent to one to three other scholars and experts for cross verification, and the University shall respect the judgments made by the professionals. The identity of the reviewers and the academic experts shall be kept confidential.

   After the reviewers and academic experts have reviewed the case, they shall submit an examination report, which shall serve as basis for the task force in drafting a report on the investigation results and in making concrete recommendations.

   After completion of the review in accordance with Paragraph 1, the UFEC may, if necessary, grant permission for the applicant to once again make an oral reply.

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

8. When the applicant for accreditation of teacher qualification were found to have committed any of the acts specified in Paragraph 4 of Point 2, the University shall contact the reviewer who has been interfered and make a record of the contact, and send it to the Dean of the original college for further verification with said reviewer, and after drafting a report of the findings and specific recommendations for handling the case, said Dean shall submit it to the UFEC for deliberation. If the allegation is substantiated, the University shall notify the applicant that his/her 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. If, based on the provisions of these Guidelines, any matter specified in Paragraphs 1 to 3 of Point 2 were found to be true in the case of the applicant in question, in addition to applying, *mutatis mutandis*, the provisions of Paragraphs 1 to 3 of Article 43 of the *Accreditation Regulations Governing Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education* 專科以上學校教師資格審定辦法, the University may also, depending on the type of violation and the severity of the case, deny the applicant the chance to apply for qualification review or rank promotion for a certain period of time, or prohibit him/her from applying for leave of absence, research, lecture, study, secondment or part-time employment (teaching)

The English version is provided for reference only.

The Chinese version shall prevail in case of any discrepancies between the English and Chinese versions.

for a certain period of time. The University may also impose sanctions such as dismissal, suspension, non-renewal of appointment, or other forms of suspension of rights in accordance with the law, or may require obtaining a certificate of attendance after participation in a course related to academic ethics and integrity for a certain period of time, or be served a written warning, or other such appropriate dispositions. The University shall report the aforementioned procedures and the results of the disposition to the Ministry of Education for future reference.

In accordance with the relevant provisions of the *Teachers' Act*, the disciplinary action to be taken against the applicant in the first paragraph involving any dismissal, suspension or non-renewal of employment shall be reported to and require approval from the Ministry of Education.

10. The University shall announce and inform all schools of the penalties for violation of these regulations after the case has been approved or referenced by the Ministry of Education, and shall not suspend the implementation of the penalties because of any appeal or administrative litigation filed by the applicant in question.
11. If, after the case has been considered and it has been determined that there is no violation of these guidelines, the informant once again files a report, matters shall be submitted to the UFEC for consideration.

    If there are no new evidence after the review of the case, the UFEC may uphold the decision made in the previous review and serve a notice to the informant. If there is any specific new evidence, said Committee shall investigate and deal with it in accordance with these Guidelines.
12. If the applicant's academic works outside those already submitted for qualification review involve any violations of academic ethics and integrity, the university shall handle matters according to the provisions of these Guidelines.
13. All reported cases handled based on these Guidelines shall be reported to the Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee of the University every semester.
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*, the *Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education* and the *Guidelines for Handling and Deliberating Academic Ethics Cases in the Ministry of Science and Technology*.
15. These Guidelines shall be implemented after approval by the University Council. The same shall apply in the case of amendments.

The English version is provided for reference only.

The Chinese version shall prevail in case of any discrepancies between the English and Chinese versions.