

Handling Guidelines for Cases Involving Violations of Teacher
Qualification Review and Academic Ethics by Faculty Members at
National Changhua University of Education

1. National Changhua University of Education (hereinafter referred to as the University) establishes these guidelines for handling cases of violations of teacher qualification review and academic ethics, based on the principles for dealing with violations of teacher qualification review by faculty members at institutions of higher education.

2. The term 'violations of teacher qualification review and academic ethics' as referred to in these guidelines shall include any of the following circumstances:
 - (1) Falsification: Fabricating nonexistent application information, research data, or research outcomes.
 - (2) Forgery: Falsifying application information, research data, or research outcomes.
 - (3) Plagiarism: Utilizing another person's application information, research data, or research outcomes without proper attribution. In cases where the attribution is inadequate and the circumstances are severe, it is considered plagiarism.
 - (4) Ghostwritten by other.
 - (5) Reproduction and public distribution without proper attribution.
 - (6) Heavily citing from one's own previously published work without proper attribution.
 - (7) Substituting translation for original scholarly content without proper attribution.
 - (8) Concealing that certain content is previously published results or works.
 - (9) Teacher qualification review: Falsification of curriculum vitae, inaccurate inclusion of co-authorship claims, misrepresentation in listing representative works, and submission of false co-authorship attestations.
 - (10) Other violations of academic ethics.
 - (11) The submitter, either personally or through others, engages in solicitation, influence, inducement, threat, or any other interference with the reviewers or the review process, or the submitter employs illegal or inappropriate means to influence the review of the paper.

3. The Research and Development Office of our university serves as the reporting unit, and the school and college-level Academic Evaluation Committees are responsible for the verification and deliberation of cases involving violations of regulations.

4. The school and college-level Academic Evaluation Committees shall handle cases involving suspected violations of the qualifications regulations for submitting teachers and academic ethics in accordance with the principles of fairness, objectivity, promptness, and rigor. Whistleblower cases shall be established and handled by the college-level Academic Evaluation Committee, with recommendations for disposition based on the severity of the circumstances. These recommendations shall be submitted for review by the university-level Academic Evaluation Committee. The types of cases include the following:

- (1) Written warning
- (2) Completion of academic ethics-related courses totaling 6 hours or more, with documentation of certification.
- (3) Withholding salary increase, and prohibiting applications for promotion, temporary transfers, external part-time employment, or teaching assignments for a specified period.
- (4) During a specified period, the individual is not permitted to apply for professorial leave for research, extend their service, or assume roles as members of various levels of academic evaluation committees or administrative positions in academic affairs within the university.
- (5) Process according to the regulations stipulated in Article 39 and Article 43 of the Teacher Qualification Review Measures for Higher Education.
- (6) Termination, non-renewal, suspension, and dismissal in accordance with the regulations of the Teachers Act.
- (7) Other disciplinary actions in accordance with the relevant regulations of the respective institutions.

The duration and extent of the specified period in the preceding clause shall be determined by the university-level Academic Evaluation Committee.

5. The whistleblower shall submit a report to the Research and Development Office using their real name and address, providing specific details regarding the subject, content, and supporting evidence of the report. After verifying that the reported case is indeed the one submitted

by the whistleblower, the Research and Development Office shall review the nature of the reported case. If it meets the criteria outlined in these guidelines, the case will be forwarded to the Personnel Office, which will then process the relevant operational procedures in accordance with these guidelines. Anonymous but specific reports alleging violations of the various situations outlined in point two may be processed in accordance with the provisions of the preceding clause.

The whistleblower's identity should be kept confidential, and reporting should be done in a manner that avoids exposure of the whistleblower and the submitter. The identity of the whistleblower shall be kept confidential.

6. The university-level Academic Evaluation Committee shall provide a specific conclusion within four months from the date of receiving the whistleblower report. However, in cases of complexity, obstacles in processing, and situations involving winter or summer vacation, the processing time may be extended by two months, and both the whistleblower and the accused party shall be notified.

The Personnel Office, upon receiving the reported case forwarded by the Research and Development Office, shall follow administrative procedures to request the convening of a meeting by the university-level Academic Evaluation Committee, chaired by the convener of the committee, along with the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Director of Research and Development, and the Dean of the college to which the accused belongs, or the head of the administrative unit or research and promotion unit at the university level that has a joint faculty evaluation committee. The formal review, to confirm whether the case is admissible or not, shall be completed within seven days.

7. After receiving reports of the first to tenth items in point two, the college-level Academic Evaluation Committee shall form an investigation team of five to seven members within ten days. In addition to the convener of the college-level Academic Evaluation Committee as an ex officio member, the rest of the members shall be selected from the committee's members, and if necessary, experts and scholars from inside or outside the university may be invited to join. The convener of the college-level Academic Evaluation Committee serves as the convener and chair of the investigation team.

After the convener of the college-level Academic Evaluation Committee

receives the circumstances specified in the eleventh item of point two, they should communicate with the reviewing person who has been interfered with, make a record, and submit it to the convener of the university-level Academic Evaluation Committee. After verification by the reviewing person and further examination by the convener of the university-level Academic Evaluation Committee, the case is submitted for deliberation by the university-level Academic Evaluation Committee. If the case is found to be true after the university-level Academic Evaluation Committee's deliberation, the qualification review process shall be immediately suspended. The school shall notify the submitter that, within two years from the date of notification, their teacher qualification application will not be accepted, and the case shall be reported to the Ministry of Education for reference.

8. The handling of whistleblower cases should respect the judgment of the professional field. The investigation team of the college-level Academic Evaluation Committee, following the procedure, shall first notify the accused party to submit a written defense within two weeks regarding the allegations. Subsequently, the whistleblower's content and the defense document will be submitted to one to three impartial scholars in the relevant professional field for review. If the whistleblower case falls under the first to eighth or tenth items in point two, in addition to resubmission to the original reviewer for re-evaluation, it should also be sent to one or two relevant scholars for mutual verification. In the case of academic ethics issues without an original reviewer, it will be directly submitted to relevant scholars for review. After the reviewer completes the review, they should submit their opinions to the investigation team. If necessary, the investigation team may allow the accused party to submit a further written defense within ten days. The identity of the reviewer should be kept confidential.

9. The unit responsible for handling reported cases should proactively understand the relationships between its members, reviewers, external experts in relevant fields of justice, and the accused party. If any of the following relationships or circumstances exist, those involved should recuse themselves:

(1) Having previously guided the doctoral or master's thesis of the parties involved.

- (2) Spouse, former spouse, blood relatives within the fourth degree of consanguinity, or in-laws within the third degree of affinity, or having had such relationships in the past.
- (3) Individuals who have collaborated as co-researchers or co-authors on published papers or research outcomes in the past three years.
- (4) Having jointly executed a research project when reviewing the case.
- (5) Currently or previously serving as the legal representative or assistant for the accused party.
- (6) Relevant stakeholders with vested interests.
- (7) Should recuse in accordance with other regulations.

The accused party may request the recusal of the following individuals:

- (1) Individuals who do not recuse themselves in the situations defined in the preceding clause.
- (2) Those for whom there is concrete evidence sufficient to suspect bias in the performance of their duties.

If individuals involved have not recused themselves in the situations defined in the first clause or there is a suspicion of bias in the performance of their duties, the reviewing body should, according to its authority, instruct them to recuse.

Individuals involved may apply for voluntary recusal. The identity of the reviewers should be kept confidential.

10. The investigative team of the college-level teaching evaluation committee should submit the investigation report and recommendations within two months. The report, along with the convenor's proposal, should be reviewed and confirmed by the college-level teaching evaluation committee before being forwarded to the university-level teaching evaluation committee for deliberation. The university-level teaching evaluation committee is required to make disposition decisions within six weeks according to the relevant regulations of the university. The handling of reported cases shall be conducted in a confidential manner.

11. If the university or college-level teaching evaluation committee encounters difficulties in judgment during the deliberation, the accused party may be allowed to present additional oral defenses during the process or list specific matters for clarification. Furthermore, the committee may request a review by professional scholars to provide

additional basis for further judgment.

12. When the university or college-level teaching evaluation committee deliberates on a reported case, a consensus of two-thirds or more of the attending members is required to establish a decision. However, if the resolution of the college-level teaching evaluation committee involves dismissal, suspension, or non-renewal of employment, it should be further processed in accordance with the Teacher's Law and relevant regulations of the university. The case will then be submitted for review by the department (or program, center), college, and university-level teaching evaluation committees.

13. Regarding the handling of reported cases by the university-level teaching evaluation committee, except for cases involving dismissal, suspension, or non-renewal, as stipulated in Article 14, Paragraph 3 of the Teacher's Law, which requires approval from the Ministry of Education, the university should submit the case for approval. After obtaining approval, the university should, in addition to reporting to the Ministry of Education, formally notify the complainant and the accused in writing. The notification should include the results, reasons, and decisions of the deliberation and disposition, specifying the responsible unit for appeals and the deadline for filing appeals, after recording and obtaining the endorsement of the university president.

14. For reported cases involving violations related to the qualifications of submitted teachers or the Ministry of Education's awards and subsidies, after the completion of processing by the university-level teaching evaluation committee and confirmation of the circumstances specified in the second point, the school should send a letter to the Ministry of Education reporting the processing procedures, results, and actions taken for reference.

15. Once a reported case is established, its execution should not be temporarily delayed due to appeals from the accused or administrative litigation.

16. If a reported case is determined to be unsubstantiated after review, and the complainant submits a new complaint, they should provide the

resolution of the original complaint and new evidence for the subsequent review. Only then will the case be accepted for re-evaluation. Otherwise, the decision from the original review will be upheld. If the complainant is a member of the university staff and the complaint is deemed unnecessary or frivolous, causing disruptions to campus harmony, the responsible authority should assess the severity of the situation and take appropriate measures.

17. Violations of the Ministry of Education's "Principles for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualification Submission by Teachers of Colleges and Above" that have been reviewed or documented by the Ministry of Education shall be publicly announced by the university and shared with other schools. The execution of penalties should not be temporarily delayed due to appeals from the accused or administrative litigation.

18. For matters not covered by these guidelines, relevant regulations shall apply. Researchers are subject to the provisions outlined in these guidelines.

19. These guidelines, after being approved by the Academic Council, shall be implemented upon the endorsement of the university president, and the same process applies to any future revisions.