

# **National Chi Nan University Guidelines for Handling Cases of Academic Ethics Violations in Theses and Dissertations**

Approved at the 3rd Academic Affairs Meeting of the  
99<sup>th</sup> Academic Year on December 29, 2010

Amended and approved at the 1st Academic Affairs Meeting of the  
106<sup>th</sup> Academic Year on October 18, 2017

Amended and approved at the 1st Academic Affairs Meeting of the  
108<sup>th</sup> Academic Year on October 2, 2019

1. To address cases of academic ethics violations in theses and dissertations at the University, these Guidelines are specifically formulated in accordance with the Degree Conferral Act and the Principles for Handling Academic Ethics Violations in Institutions of Higher Education.
2. The term “academic ethics violations” as used in these Guidelines refers to any of the following acts:
  - (1) Plagiarism: Refers to the use of others’ works or materials without proper citation. In cases where the citation is improper and the circumstances are serious, it shall also be deemed plagiarism.
  - (2) Fraud: Refers to improper conduct involving fabrication or falsification. Fabrication means inventing or forging non-existent data, or having the thesis written by someone else. Falsification means the dishonest alteration of data.
  - (3) Other acts violating academic ethics as determined by the University’s competent authority.

Determinations of plagiarism, fraud, or other academic ethics violations must be reviewed and confirmed by the Academic Ethics Review Committee for Theses and Dissertations, established by the relevant college of the University (hereinafter referred to as “the Review Committee”).
3. For reports of academic ethics violations concerning master’s or doctoral theses at the University, the informant must provide their real name, contact phone number, and address, along with a clear identification of the accused, the content of the allegation, and supporting evidence. Once the report is verified as legitimate, the case shall proceed to the handling process. The identity of the informant shall be kept strictly confidential.

For reports as described in the preceding paragraph, if the informant does not provide their name but clearly identifies the accused, specifies the nature of the violation, and submits sufficient supporting evidence, the case may still be handled in accordance with the preceding provisions.
4. The Office of Academic Affairs is the unit responsible for receiving reports. Upon receiving a report, the Office shall, within ten days, conduct a formal review in coordination with the Dean of Academic Affairs and relevant staff to determine whether the case meets the necessary requirements for acceptance. If the report does not meet the formal requirements, it will not be accepted, and the informant will be notified in writing and the case closed. In the case of an anonymous report, no written notification is required, and the case shall be closed directly. For accepted cases, the matter shall be referred to the college to which the accused belongs, and the handling procedures shall be carried out confidentially.

5. Each college shall form a Review Committee within one month of receiving a case involving thesis plagiarism or fraud. The Review Committee shall consist of five to nine members, including the dean of the accused's college, the chair (or director of the graduate institute or degree program) of the department concerned, and full-time faculty members from this university or other universities recommended by the dean. At least one-third of the committee members must be from outside the university. Committee members shall be formally appointed with the president's approval upon recommendation by the college. The dean of the college shall serve as the convener of the Review Committee. If the dean must recuse themselves, the convener shall be the Dean of Academic Affairs. If both the dean and the Dean of Academic Affairs must recuse themselves, the president shall designate the dean of another college to serve as convener. Anyone with any of the following relationships to the accused shall not be appointed as a member of the Review Committee:
- (1) A thesis advisor or an oral defense committee member
  - (2) A spouse or a relative by blood or marriage within the fourth degree of kinship
  - (3) Someone with an academic collaboration or a conflict of interest with the accused.
  - (4) Anyone who is required to recuse themselves under other applicable regulations
6. Each college shall, within two weeks of receiving a case involving a thesis suspected of violating academic ethics, issue a formal notice to the accused, requesting a written defense within a specified deadline. The Review Committee shall appoint at least three members to conduct a preliminary review, with at least one external member included. The preliminary reviewers shall submit a preliminary review report, which will serve as the basis for the Review Committee's deliberation. The identities of the preliminary reviewers shall be kept confidential.
7. Based on the expertise of the preliminary reviewers, the Review Committee shall reach a concrete conclusion within three months and submit the meeting minutes to the Academic Affairs Meeting for record-keeping. However, in cases involving complex circumstances, significant obstacles, or during winter or summer breaks, the review period may be extended by up to two months with the president's approval. Both the informant and the accused shall be notified of the extension. When necessary, the Review Committee may permit the accused to present an oral defense during the meeting.
8. After the Review Committee's meeting minutes are approved and recorded by the Academic Affairs Meeting, the Office of Academic Affairs shall issue a written notice to both the informant and the accused regarding the outcome of the case. The notice shall also specify the authority responsible for handling appeals and the deadline for filing an appeal.
9. If a thesis associated with a degree conferred by the University is found by the Review Committee to involve a confirmed academic ethics violation, the subsequent handling shall be carried out in accordance with Article 15 of the University's Regulations for Graduate Degree Examinations. If the Review Committee determines that the violation does not warrant degree revocation as described in the preceding paragraph, but an academic ethics violation still exists, the Committee may require the accused, within a specified period, to make revisions, issue a public apology, or take other appropriate actions.

10. For those who obtain a master's or doctoral degree from the University through a technical or practical report, any academic ethics violations shall be handled in accordance with these Guidelines.
11. These Guidelines shall be publicly announced and implemented after approval by the Academic Affairs Meeting.