

Regulations for Handling Suspected Violations of Academic Ethics in Theses and Dissertations at I-Shou University

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

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

- Article 1 The Regulations for Handling Suspected Violations of Academic Ethics in Theses and Dissertations 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 in order to safeguard academic ethics and integrity and to establish an impartial and unbiased mechanism for handling suspected violations of academic ethics pertaining to master’s theses and doctoral dissertations.
- Article 2 In the event that a thesis or dissertation (including a creative work, proof of merit, written report, technical report, and professional practice report, which is a substitute for a thesis/dissertation) with which a student of the University has earned a degree is found to be involved in a violation of academic ethics, anyone may report the suspected violation to the Office of Academic Affairs of the University. A student whose thesis or dissertation is found to have violated academic ethics shall have his/her degree revoked, and the University shall ask the student 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. Besides, the University shall request in writing the National Central Library and the Library of the University to remove the student’s thesis/dissertation (both hard and soft copy). If the student has also been involved in any other violations, the applicable laws shall apply.
- Students whose degree has been revoked are not allowed to return to the University to continue studying for the degree, even if the prescribed duration of study has not expired yet.
- Article 3 If a student’s thesis, dissertation, creative work, proof of merit, written report, technical

report, or professional practice report is found to be involved in any of the following circumstances, he/she 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 thesis, dissertation, or report; or
5. getting involved in any other matters that constitute a violation of academic ethics.

Article 4 After receiving a report of a suspected violation of academic ethics pertaining to a thesis, dissertation, creative work, proof of merit, written report, technical report, or professional practice report, the University shall set up the Academic Ethics Review Committee (hereinafter referred to as "the Review Committee") to deal with the suspected violation in a fair, objective, and clear manner.

The Review Committee shall consist of one of the vice presidents, the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Deputy Dean of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Research and Development, the administrative heads of the department (institute/program) and the college with which the accused student is affiliated, a teacher representative from the department (institute/program) with which the accused student is affiliated, and an impartial individual from outside the University. The list of candidates for committee membership shall be submitted 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 accused student during a committee meeting. Committee members shall attend committee meetings in person, and they are not allowed to authorize another person to attend or vote on their behalf.

The President shall delegate one of the vice presidents as the chairperson of the Review Committee. As for the teacher representative and the impartial individual, the administrative head of the department (institute/program) with which the accused student is affiliated shall nominate three to five candidates, respectively, to the President for selection.

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

1. having served as the thesis/dissertation supervisor or a degree examination

committee member for the accused student; 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 accused student; or having had such relationship with the accused student.

Article 5 If a report of a suspected violation of academic ethics is made in writing with clear evidence attached and the personal data of the informant provided, the University shall process the report with all due speed. Before the report is verified as a violation of academic ethics, the process shall be conducted in a confidential manner, in order to keep the identity of both the informant and the accused student confidential.

If the University receives an anonymous report of a suspected violation of academic ethics specified in Article 3, with clear evidence provided, the preceding paragraph may apply.

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

Article 7 Professional judgment on a thesis, dissertation, creative work, proof of merit, written report, technical report, or professional practice report which 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 reviewer, and the identity of reviewers shall be kept strictly confidential.

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

Article 8 The Review Committee shall, within four months from the next day of receiving a report, adopt a resolution. The aforesaid deadline may be extended, if necessary.

A formal resolution shall be adopted by the Review Committee following the review process and then submitted to the President for ratification, after which both the informant and the accused student shall be notified in writing of the review result and the reason for the resolution. If the accused student is dissatisfied with the resolution adopted by the Review Committee, he/she may, within fifteen days from the next day of receiving the notification in writing, put forward an appeal, but he/she is allowed to file such an appeal once only.

Unless there are new facts or evidence, the University may directly reply to the informant with the previous review result if the informant reports a case that has been

reported before and is found to have no violation of academic ethics.

- Article 9 After a report is verified as a violation of academic ethics, 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 is verified as a violation of academic ethics, the departments (institutes/programs) concerned shall impose a restriction on the number of graduate students under the supervision of the supervisor(s) of the accused student.
- Article 11 Students who are found to a) have ghostwritten (or produced and presented as done by another student) a thesis, dissertation, creative work, proof of merit, written report, technical report, or professional practice report or b) have attracted or coerced another person to ghostwrite (or produce and present as done by another student) a thesis, dissertation, creative work, proof of merit, 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 as well as 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. The same procedure applies to any amendments to the Regulations.

Note: In the event of any disputes or misunderstanding as to the interpretation of the language or terms of the Regulations, the Chinese language version shall prevail.