

Regulations for Handling Academic Ethics Cases Concerning Degree Treatises at I-Shou University

Promulgated with the consent from the President dated July 6, 2011

Amendments to the Regulations and the title adopted by the University Administration Council on December 11, 2019, and promulgated with the consent from the President dated December 19, 2019

Amendments to Articles 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-13 adopted by the University Administration Council on January 22, 2025, and promulgated with the consent from the President dated February 8, 2025

Article 1 The Regulations for Handling Academic Ethics Cases Concerning Degree Treatises at I-Shou University (hereinafter referred to as “the Regulations”) are made by I-Shou University (hereinafter referred to as “the University”) pursuant to Article 17 of the Degree Conferral Act and the Guidelines for Handling Academic Ethics Cases at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education to safeguard academic ethics and integrity and to establish an impartial and unbiased mechanism for handling academic ethics cases concerning degree treatises.

Article 2 If a student’s degree treatise, creative work, evidence of achievement, written report, technical report, or professional practice report is found to be involved in one of the following situations, they shall be regarded as having violated academic ethics:

1. falsification: making up false application information, research data, or research outcomes;
2. alteration: manipulating application information, research data, or research outcomes;
3. plagiarism: using another person’s application information, research data, or research outcomes without crediting the author (including materially improper citations);

4. engaging a third party to write the degree treatise or report; or
5. getting involved in any other matters that constitute a violation of academic ethics.

Article 3 Reports of suspected violations of academic ethics shall be made to the Office of Academic Affairs of the University by clearly identifying the violator, stating facts, providing evidence, and using the real name and address of the informant. After verifying with the informant that the report is true, the University shall proceed to handle the academic ethics case. If the identity information provided by the informant is inaccurate, the report shall be considered an anonymous one.

If the informant does not give their name but points out the violator, states facts about the suspected violation, and provides evidence, the preceding paragraph shall apply.

Article 4 After receiving a report of a suspected violation of academic ethics, the Office of Academic Affairs shall, within seven working days, review whether formal requisites are complied with and decide whether to proceed with the academic ethics case. If the academic ethics case is rejected because formal requisites are not complied with, the case shall be concluded after the informant is notified of the result in writing. If the academic ethics case is accepted, the case shall be referred to the college to which the violator belongs with the approval from the Dean of Academic Affairs. The college shall set up a review committee within ten working days and complete the investigation and deliberation within four months. An extension may be granted if necessary. The handling process for an academic ethics case shall be conducted in a confidential manner.

In the event that a student is found to have violated academic ethics with evidence provided, their degree shall be revoked, and the University shall ask them to return the degree diploma and notify other junior colleges and institutions of higher education of the revocation and invalidation of the degree and degree diploma. Furthermore, the University shall request in writing that the National Central Library and the Library of the University remove the student's degree treatise (both hard and soft copy). If the student has also been involved in any other law violations, the applicable laws shall apply. Students whose degrees have been revoked are not permitted to return to the University to continue studying for the degree, even if the prescribed duration of study has not yet expired.

Article 5 The composition of the Review Committee is as follows: one of the vice presidents, the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Research and Development, the administrative heads of the department (institute/program/degree program) and the college to which the

violator belongs, one faculty representative from the department (institute/program/degree program) to which the violator belongs, and one impartial public figure from outside the University. The list of candidates for committee membership shall be submitted by the college to the President for ratification. The Vice President shall hold the chairmanship of the Review Committee and preside at committee meetings. If necessary, the Review Committee may require the presence of the supervisor(s) of the violator during a committee meeting.

The President shall delegate one of the vice presidents as the chairperson of the Review Committee, and the section chief of the Registration Section of the Office of Academic Affairs serves as the executive secretary. With regard to the faculty representative and the impartial public figure, the administrative head of the department (institute/program/degree program) to which the violator belongs shall nominate three to five candidates, respectively, to the President for selection.

A person shall not serve on the Review Committee in either of the following circumstances:

1. having served as the supervisor or an oral defense committee member for the violator; or
2. being the spouse, the former spouse, a relative by blood within the fourth degree of kinship, or a relative by marriage within the third degree of kinship of the violator; or having had such relationship with the violator.

A quorum of at least two-thirds of the total membership will be required to validate a committee meeting, and consent from at least two-thirds of the members attending is required for resolutions. Committee members are not permitted to request a third party to attend a committee meeting or vote on their behalf.

Article 6 The violator shall be notified in writing of providing a written statement within ten days from the next day of receiving the notification or of attending a committee meeting to provide a statement in person. Failure to respond by the deadline or to attend the committee meeting in person shall be deemed a voluntary waiver of their right to a statement.

Article 7 Professional judgment on a degree treatise, creative work, evidence of achievement, written report, technical report, or professional practice report that is involved in a violation of academic ethics shall be respected. The Review Committee shall nominate at least three impartial scholars in relevant fields as reviewers, and the identity of reviewers

shall be kept strictly confidential.

Reviewers shall, within one month of receiving the academic ethics case, complete the review and produce a report, which will be an important reference for the Review Committee to deliberate the academic ethics case.

Article 8 A formal resolution shall be adopted by the Review Committee following the review process. The review report and the meeting minutes shall be submitted to the President for ratification and then delivered to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs shall then notify the informant and the violator in writing of the resolution. If the violator is dissatisfied with the resolution adopted by the Review Committee, they may, within fifteen days from the next day of receiving the resolution in writing, apply for a second review on one occasion only.

In the absence of new facts or evidence, the University may directly reply to the informant with the previous resolution if they report an academic ethics case that has been reported before and is found to have no violation of academic ethics.

Article 9 After a report has proved true, and appropriate punishment is meted out by the University, the identity of the informant shall still be kept strictly confidential.

Article 10 After a report has proved true, the department (institute/program/degree program) concerned shall impose a restriction on the number of graduate students under the supervision of the supervisor(s) of the violator.

Article 11 Students who are found to have ghostwritten (or produced and presented as done by another student) a degree treatise, creative work, evidence of achievement, written report, technical report, or professional practice report, or have attracted or coerced another person to ghostwrite (or produce and present as done by another student) a degree treatise, creative work, evidence of achievement, written report, technical report, or professional practice report shall be subject to the Regulations for Student Rewards and Punishments at I-Shou University.

Article 12 Matters not mentioned herein, if any, shall be subject to the laws of the Republic of China and the applicable regulations and rules of the University.

Article 13 The Regulations become effective on the third day of promulgation after being adopted by the University Academic Council and the University Administration Council and ratified by the President.

Note: In case of any disputes or misunderstanding regarding the interpretation of the language or

terms of the Regulations, the Chinese language version shall prevail.