

輔仁大學學術倫理管理實施辦法

Fu Jen Catholic University

Regulations Governing the Management of Academic Ethics

106 年 4 月 13 日 105 學年度第 7 次行政會議通過

106 年 12 月 7 日 106 學年度第 4 次行政會議通過

107 年 4 月 12 日 106 學年度第 7 次行政會議通過

Passed at the Seventh Meeting of the Executive Council for the 2016-2017 Academic Year on April 13, 2017

Passed at the Fourth Meeting of the Executive Council for the 2017-2018 Academic Year on December 7, 2017

Passed at the Seventh Meeting of the Executive Council for the 2017-2018 Academic Year on April 12, 2018

第一條 本校為維護學術尊嚴，落實學術自律原則，並公正處理相關案件，特依教育部「專科以上學校學術倫理案件處理原則」訂定本辦法。

Article 1

The Regulations were created in order to uphold academic dignity, fulfill the principles of academic discipline, and to handle cases in an impartial manner. The Regulations were formulated in accordance with the Ministry of Education's Principles for the Handling of Academic Ethics Cases at Higher Education Institutions.

第二條 本校學術研究相關人員應分別依下列各款規定，至「臺灣學術倫理教育資源中心」網站，修習學術研究倫理教育課程，通過測驗並取得修課證明：

- 一、教師及研究人員須於申請本校研究相關獎補助經費或審議通過產學合作獎勵前三年內，完成 6 小時以上。
- 二、學術研究及產學合作計畫助理須於提交約用申請表前三年內，完成 6 小時以上。
- 三、研究生須於申請本校研究相關獎補助經費及學位論文口試申請表提交前，完成 6 小時以上。

Article 2

Based on the individual requirements listed below, personnel engaged in research at the University must visit the website of the Center for Taiwan Academic Research Ethics Education, enroll in and complete the Academic Ethics Course, and then present proof that they completed the course and passed the examination.

1. A instructor or research fellow must complete six hours of the course within three years of making an application for a research-related grant or subsidy, or within three years after being awarded a grant or subsidy for a collaborative project between academia and industry.
2. An assistant for an academic research project or collaborative project between academia and industry must complete a minimum of six hours of the course

within three years after applying for their work contract.

3. A graduate student must complete a minimum of six hours of the course before applying for a research grant/subsidy or the oral defense of their thesis.

第三條 本辦法所稱違反學術倫理，指有下列情形之一：

- 一、造假：虛構不存在之申請資料、研究資料或研究成果。
- 二、變造：不實變更申請資料、研究資料或研究成果。
- 三、抄襲：援用他人之申請資料、研究資料或研究成果未註明出處。註明出處不當，情節重大者，以抄襲論。
- 四、由他人代寫。
- 五、未經註明而重複出版公開發行。
- 六、大幅引用自己已發表之著作，未適當引註。
- 七、以翻譯代替論著，並未適當註明。
- 八、教師資格審查履歷表、合著人證明登載不實、代表作未確實填載為合著及繳交合著人證明。
- 九、送審人本人或經由他人有請託、關說、利誘、威脅或其他干擾審查人或審查程序之情事，或送審人以違法或不當手段影響論文之審查。
- 十、其他違反學術倫理行為。

有前項之行為，經本校依職權發現者，應由研究發展處主動處理之；經檢舉者，應由檢舉人以真實姓名資料，向研究發展處提出附具事證之檢舉書。

匿名檢舉者，須有具體對象及充分事證，始得依前項前段之規定辦理。

Article 3

A “violation of academic ethics” refers to any one of the following:

1. Fabrication: fabricated data was included in the application, research project, or research results;
2. Falsification: altered data was used in the application, research project, or research results;
3. Plagiarism: another person’s data was used in the application, research project, or research results without proper attribution. Improper citation will be considered plagiarism in serious circumstances;
4. Ghostwriting;
5. Republication without stating that the work was previously published;
6. Large quotations from one’s previously published works without citation;
7. Translation instead of original writing, and failure to provide citation;
8. False statements on a curriculum vitae or certificate of co-authorship, or failure to specify co-authorship for a representative work;
9. The applicant or someone commissioned to act on their behalf interferes with a reviewer or the review procedure through one of the following means: making a request, lobbying, bribing, threatening, or another form of disruptive behavior; or influencing the review through illegal or inappropriate means;

10. Other forms of behavior which violate academic ethics.

If one of the situations described above is discovered, it will be handled by the Office of Research and Development. If a violation is reported, the person making the report must include their full name and submit a report along with evidence to the Office of Research and Development.

If a report is made anonymously, it will only be pursued if there is a specific violation and ample evidence.

第四條 本校設學術倫理審查小組（以下簡稱審查小組），負責審議第二條所定人員是否有第三條第一項所定違反學術倫理行為，遇有受理相關案件時由委員七至九人組成之，學術副校長、研發長及教務長為當然委員，其餘委員由校長就研究發展處推薦該案相關領域專家學者名單中遴聘之，任期至案件審查完成為止；學術副校長並擔任審查小組召集人。必要時得邀請其他專家學者或相關人員列席說明。

審查小組之決議，應有全體委員三分之二以上出席及出席委員三分之二以上同意行之。但決議對違反學術倫理人員作成停聘、解聘、不續聘或退學以上之處分建議者，應有出席委員四分之三以上同意行之。

Article 4

The University establishes an Academic Ethics Hearing Committee (hereinafter “the Hearing Committee”) to review cases of the personnel described in Article 2, and to determine whether personnel made a violation described in Article 3. The Hearing Committee is composed of seven to nine members, and convenes after receiving a case. The Vice-President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Research and Development, and the Dean of Academic Affairs are ex officio members. The President will appoint other Hearing Committee members from a list of scholars and experts recommended by the Office of Research and Development. The term of a Hearing Committee member lasts until the case has concluded. The Vice-President of Academic Affairs serves as Convener. When necessary, other experts, scholars, or related personnel may be invited to provide testimony.

A Hearing Committee resolution may only be passed when two-thirds of members are present, and with the support of two-thirds of members in attendance. A resolution that recommends any of the following actions must earn the support of three-quarters of members in attendance: suspension, termination of employment, non-renewal of contract, or expulsion.

第五條 涉嫌違反學術倫理之案件，經研究發展處受理成案後，應通知被檢舉人於 20 日內提出書面答辯，並連同該書面答辯送交審查小組進行審議。審查結果如認定違反學術倫理案成立時，應敘明違反類型，詳列事證並提出具體處分建議。

違反學術倫理案件，除涉及學位授予及大專校院教師資格送審應依各該規定處分外，其他得按其情節輕重，建議對被檢舉人為書面告誡、參加學術倫理相關課程並取得證明、不得申請本校相關獎補助或其他懲處措

施。

案件審查應於收件之次日起三個月內完成，必要時得予延長，為延長時間以三個月為限。

Article 5

The Office of Research and Development will organize a case for the suspected violation of academic ethics, and must notify the accused to provide a written defense within 20 days. The written defense will be forwarded along with the details of the case to the Hearing Committee. If it is established that there was a violation of academic ethics, the results of the review must explain which type of violation was involved, list the evidence, and provide specific recommendations for disciplinary action.

With the exception of violations that involve the conferral of degrees or the qualifications to serve as an instructor at a higher education institution, the following types of disciplinary action may be recommended, based on severity: written warning, required participation in an academic ethics course (and proof of attendance), or prohibition from making future applications for University funding.

The review of a case must be completed within 3 months, beginning the day after the case was received. When necessary, this deadline may be extended, up to a maximum of three months.

第六條 審查結果應以書面方式通知被檢舉人。

如認定違反學術倫理案成立時，應併通知相關單位進行後續處分：

- 一、被檢舉人為專任教師或研究人員時，審查結果應送本校校級教師評審委員會。
- 二、被檢舉人為職工時，審查結果應送本校職工考績審議委員會。
- 三、被檢舉人為學生時，審查結果應送本校學位授予涉及抄襲舞弊審議委員會或學生獎懲委員會。
- 四、被檢舉人為計畫助理時，審查結果應送用人單位及本校相關單位。

Article 6

The results of the review must be provided to the accused.

If it is established that there was a violation of academic ethics, all programs involved must be notified for follow-up disciplinary action:

1. If the accused is a full-time instructor or research fellow, the results must be submitted to the University-level Instructor Evaluation Committee.
2. If the accused is a staff member, the results must be submitted to the Staff Evaluation Committee.
3. If the accused is a student, the results must be submitted to the Degree Conferral and Plagiarism Review Committee or the Committee for Rewards and Disciplinary Measures.
4. If the accused is a research assistant, the results must be submitted to the program that employs the research assistant and related programs.

第七條 依本辦法受理檢舉、參與調查或審議程序之人員，於調查程序中就所接觸資訊均應予保密。但案件涉及公共利益而本校有適切說明之必要者，不在此限。

Article 7

Personnel involved in the handling, investigation, or review of a case must keep all related information strictly confidential. This restriction does not apply if the case involves the public interest and necessitates an explanation from the University.

第八條 審查小組委員與被檢舉人間有下列情形之一者，應自行迴避：

- 一、有行政程序法第三十二條所定情形之一者。
- 二、審查時任職同一系、所、科或單位者。
- 三、近三年曾有指導博士、碩士論文之師生關係者。
- 四、近二年發表論文或研究成果為共同作者。
- 五、審查時有共同執行研究計畫者。
- 六、依相關法規應予迴避者。
- 七、其他利害關係，經審查小組認定者。

Article 8

Members of the Hearing Committee must recuse themselves in any of the following situations:

1. One of the situations described in Article 32 of the Administrative Procedure Act applies.
2. During the review, the Hearing Committee member and the accused are members of the same department, graduate institute, program, or division.
3. During the past three years, the Hearing Committee member and the accused had an advisor-student relationship for the writing of an MA or doctoral thesis.
4. The Hearing Committee member and the accused were co-authors of an article or research project within the past two years.
5. The Hearing Committee member and the accused are conducting a collaborative research project while the review is taking place.
6. Recusal is required based on regulations.
7. The Hearing Committee member has a personal interest in the matter, which is recognized by the Hearing Committee.

第九條 本校專任教師、研究人員、研究計畫助理及學生，如經本辦法認定違反學術倫理，致本校遭補助機構或第三人求償或受有其他損害時，應負全部之損害賠償責任。

Article 9

A full-time instructor, research fellow, research assistant, or student from the University who is deemed to have violated academic ethics as stipulated in the Regulations must bear full responsibility for damage and financial reparations if their violation results in a subsidizing agency or third-party requesting reparations, or otherwise causes damage to the University.

第十條 本辦法未盡事宜，依法令及本校相關規定辦理。

Article 10

Any matters not covered in the Regulations will be handled in accordance with related laws and University regulations.

第十一條 本辦法經行政會議通過，報請校長核定後公布施行。修正時亦同。

Article 11

The Regulations were passed by the Executive Council and will be promulgated and implemented after approved by the President. The same procedure will be followed for each amendment.