

Ming Chuan University Guidelines for Dealing with Plagiarism and Teacher Qualification Screening Violations by Faculty Members

Passed at the Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee Meeting on May 27, 2013

- Article 1. These guidelines were established to maintain the academic dignity of the institution, to prevent faculty plagiarism and teacher qualification violations, and to fairly deal with plagiarism cases. These guidelines are in accordance with Ministry of Education Guidelines for Dealing with Teachers' Qualification Screening Violations at Junior Colleges or other Institutions of Higher Education.
- Article 2. Faculty plagiarism and piracy violation cases stated in these regulations indicates the person being accused violates any of the following:
1. The person deliberately includes false information in teacher qualification resume, collaborator verification, **fails to report representative work as collaborative work or has not submitted collaborator statement.**
 2. Any of the publications, works, or technical reports is proven to be pirated or plagiarized.
 3. Any of the degree certificates, certificates of work experience, proofs of achievements, or specialized publications is proven to be forged, altered, or false.
 4. **The applicant** or other person acting on the applicant's behalf seriously asks, lobbies, tempts with enticements, threatens, or otherwise interferes with reviewers or review procedures.
 5. **The person commits a violation of academic ethics.**
- Article 3. When reporting violations, person(s) making reports should provide the Executive Director of Human Resources Division with their contact phone number and address, a written statement of accused individuals' names, facts, and contents, and additional relevant evidence with their signature(s) and seal(s). After it has been confirmed the person making the report has a case or the president has determined a situation exists which merits investigation, the case should be processed as a violation matter. Anonymously reported cases, or cases reported under an alias or a name established to be different than that of the person making the report will not be processed.
- Article 4. When reported violation cases have begun to be processed, the content of the report should be provided for the person accused of violation by the Human Resources Division. The person being accused may submit a written defense responding to the content of the report within 14 days. The written defense should be sent to the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee which will in turn request the University Faculty Review and Evaluation Committee to establish a Hearing Subcommittee to process the case.
- Article 5. If violation of Clause 2, 4 or 5 of Article 2 is found during the process of screening the teacher qualification or after the teacher qualification has been verified by the Ministry of Education, the investigation of the violation will first be conducted by the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee. If violation of Clause 1 or 3 of Article 2 is found, the investigation of the violation will be sent to the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee for review once it has been proven by the original reviewer that the violation has been confirmed.
- Article 6. There must be more than five members on the Hearing Subcommittee, with the Dean of

Academic Affairs and relevant school deans acting as ex-officio members. The Dean of Academic Affairs is the convener and other members are elected by the University Faculty Review and Evaluation Committee. Members should include academicians specializing in law; scholars from off campus may be contracted when necessary.

- Article 7. The committee meetings of the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee or the Hearing Subcommittee may only begin when two thirds of committee members are present, and resolutions will only be valid with two thirds or more of the total members' agreement. Resolutions are reached through anonymous voting. Should the need arise, the person who is accused or the administrator of his or her unit may be invited to attend the meeting to provide explanation.
- Article 8. When processing reported violations of Article 2, Clause 2 or 5 has begun, the Hearing Subcommittee should submit the contents of reported cases and the written defense from the accused person to three off-campus experts for review. If the publications, works or technical reports used in application for promotion involve cheating or plagiarism, the original reviewer should review the case again and submit the case for double-checking by one to three scholars in a relevant field, and respect their professional judgment. **The identity of the reviewers and scholars must remain strictly confidential.** The investigator should submit the second Review Report to the Hearing Subcommittee for reference. Should the need arise, the person being investigated may be invited to present verbal defense during the investigation process. If difficulties are encountered making a judgment, the Hearing Subcommittee may submit the list of unresolved issues to the original reviewer and another expert to review the case. The investigator should submit the Review Report to the Hearing Subcommittee for reference.
- Article 9. If any violation of Article 2, Clause 4 is found during the process of screening the teacher qualification, the reviewer should be **contacted and the contact record should be in writing.** The investigation of the violation will be conducted by the relevant investigator before reporting to the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee.
- Article 10. The identity of reviewers must remain strictly confidential. If a reviewer and the person being accused are in any of following relationships, he or she should refrain from becoming involved with the review.
1. Student-instructor relationship
 2. Relatives of third degree
 3. Relatives through marriage
 4. Persons engaging in academic cooperation
 5. Relevant interested parties
 6. Others with conflict of interest as specified in related regulations
- Article 11. The Hearing Subcommittee should compile the opinions of reviewers and other relevant information, and submit the review report to the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee for resolution within four months of the day the case was reported. If the publications, works or technical reports used in application for promotion involve violation of academic ethic, the violation case should be merged with the promotion case. In the case of complicated cases, the review period can be extended for up to two months, for one time only. The person reporting the case and person under investigation should both be notified. The University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee shall notify the person who reports

the case, the person being investigated, and his or her unit of the processing result and reasons in writing within ten days after the case was heard. If the person being accused of is not satisfied with the result, he or she may apply for a second review to the University Faculty Appeal and Review Committee within 30 days of receiving the notification. Such an appeal is limited to one time only. Should the need arise, the person being investigated may be invited to attend the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee Meeting to present a verbal defense.

Article 12. Once it has been proven by the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee that a violation has occurred, persons charged with violation will be punished in one of the following ways, depending on the situation.

1. If the person deliberately includes false information in teacher qualification resume, collaborator verification, or authorship of representative academic publication, no application to review qualifications will be accepted for the coming one to three years.
2. If publications, works or technical reports used in application for promotion contains plagiarism, pirated material, or other fraudulent information, no application to review qualifications will be accepted for the coming five to seven years.
3. If the applicant's academic or work credentials, proofs of achievements, proof that a professional written work has been accepted by a publication for regular publication, or collaborator verification is forged or has been altered, no application to review qualifications will be accepted for the coming seven to ten years.
4. If the applicant or other person acting on the applicant's behalf seriously asks, lobbies, tempts with enticements, threatens, or otherwise interferes with reviewer or review procedures, the qualifications review procedures will be stopped immediately. No application to review qualifications will be accepted for the coming two years.
5. Other violations of academic ethics will be dealt the following punishments according to different situations:
 - (1) Contract will be terminated, suspended, or not renewed.
 - (2) No application to review qualifications will be accepted for the coming one to five years.
 - (3) Seniority pay increase or extended salary rank will be denied for one to five years.
 - (4) Sabbatical leave will be denied for five years.
 - (5) Permission to apply for Research/Study Reward will be denied for three years.
 - (6) Case will be reported to the Ministry of Education and teacher certificate of current level cancelled.
 - (7) Scholarships or awards related to publication will be required to be returned.
 - (8) All types of allowances will be cancelled. Appointment to positions as academic/administrative directors will be denied.
 - (9) Part-time faculty members shall be dismissed.
 - (10) Other appropriate punishment.

If the person being accused has been found to violate any of the abovementioned items in Clause 1-3 or Clause 5, and the facts have been reviewed and confirmed, the case shall be handled in accordance with the following methods besides what is stated above: a. If the violation occurs during the process of screening for faculty qualifications, the applicant's qualification will not be accepted by the school. Also the person being accused cannot withdraw his or her application; the case must be fully processed. b. If the applicant had

been issued a teaching certificate, the qualifications for that level shall be revoked. In addition, the institution shall report the state of its verification and handling recommendations to the MOE for review.

- Article 13. Once the punishment for violation of these guidelines has been decided by the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee, and the case has been reported to the Ministry of Education for approval, the punishment will not be suspended or revoked on the grounds that the accused person is appealing the case or an administrative dispute has occurred. If the reported case of violation lacks sufficient proof, the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee will notify the person who reported the case with a written report of the investigation, and notify the person accused of violation and his or her unit. If the punishments for violation involve suspension of employment, dismissal, or termination of service, and are approved by the president, the case should be reported to the Ministry of Education in accordance with Article 14-1 of the Faculty Employment Law for approval within ten days of receipt of the resolution notice.
- Article 14. If the person who reported the case makes a new accusation, it must be submitted to the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee with new and concrete evidence. If no concrete evidence is proven to be true, the accusation will remain the same. If the evidence is proven to be true, the case will be investigated and dealt with according to these guidelines. If the person who reports the case is not satisfied with the investigation, he or she can pursue the case through a court of law. Unless a judgment is made in a court of law on the case, the institution will not further process the case.
- Article 15. If it is established a case has been deliberately falsely reported, and that the person making the report is a faculty member at this institution, he or she will be reported to the related unit and punished in accordance with the situation. In a case of severe false accusation, the name of the informant will be publicized. If the person making the report does not belong to the university, the institution will notify the unit to which he or she belongs so that appropriate punishment can be enacted.
- Article 16. Procedures should be conducted confidentially until the violation case has been established. The identity of the person reporting the violation case, the person investigating the case, and the person under investigation must remain confidential unless the case against the accused person is proven to be false.
- Article 17. Matters not covered in these guidelines will be dealt with in accordance with the Ministry of Education Guidelines for Dealing with Teachers' Qualification Screening Violations at Junior Colleges or other Institutions of Higher Education.
- Article 18. Upon being passed at the University Faculty Hiring and Promotion Committee Meeting and approved by the president, these guidelines were implemented. Any revision must follow the same procedure.