

National Sun Yat-sen University
Guidelines for Dealing with Plagiarism, Ghostwriting and Cheating
in Writing Master's Theses or Doctoral Dissertations

Approved at the 126th Academic Affairs Council Meeting, December 13, 2010
Amendment approved by the 127th Academic Affairs Council Meeting, March 21, 2011
Amendment approved by the 129th Academic Affairs Council Meeting, October 17, 2011
Amendment approved by the 136th Academic Affairs Council Meeting, June 10, 2013
Amendment approved by the 148th Academic Affairs Council Meeting, May 30, 2016
Amendment approved by the 159th Academic Affairs Council Meeting, March 13, 2019
Amendment approved by the 165th Academic Affairs Council Meeting, October 16, 2020

- Article 1. The Guidelines were established in accordance with Article 17 of the "Degree Conferral Act" as well as Article 15 of the university's "Implementation Bylaws for Ph.D. and Master Degree Examination" to maintain teaching quality and academic ethics, prevent plagiarism, ghostwriting or cheating in the writing of Master's theses or doctoral dissertations, and establish a mechanism for fair treatment.
- Article 2. The procedure for dealing with National Sun Yat-sen University (NSYSU) Master's theses or doctoral dissertations suspected of plagiarism or other academic misconduct is as follows: When any university unit becomes aware of or receives an accusation of plagiarism or other academic misconduct regarding Master's theses or doctoral dissertations at NSYSU, the nature of the misconduct and related information shall be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs; if the accusation is signed and the concrete proof is included, once the Office of Academic Affairs has verified the accusation with the accuser then it is immediately accepted for further action. Anonymous accusations will not be accepted unless the alleged offender is clearly identified and there is sufficient material evidence. Unless the accusation has been verified, all personnel involved in the investigation or review procedure must maintain the confidentiality of all confidential information they come into contact with. The identity of the accuser must be kept strictly confidential after the accusation is proved.
- Article 3. The procedure of the review committee is as follows:
1. The Office of Academic Affairs notifies the college and department (institute, degree program) to which the accused belongs within three working days of accepting the accusation and delivers the related documents to the college. The college must form a Review Committee within 10 days of the documents being received and complete the review in a fair, equitable, objective and decisive manner within 2 months. The aforementioned review period may be extended by up to 1 month if necessary. Only one extension is allowed.
 2. The Review Committee shall consist of 5 to 7 members including the dean of the college, head of the department (institute, degree program), 1 to 2 representatives from the college faculty, 1 to 2 representatives from related college faculties, and 1 legal adviser appointed by the college of the accused and retained with the sanction of the University President. The Review Committee should invite the Office of Academic Affairs to send a representative to review meetings. The accused's current or past supervising professor, examination committee members, spouse, relatives within the third degree by blood or marriage, related through academic collaboration or other stakeholders may not serve on the Review Committee.
 3. The dean of the college serves as the convener and chairperson of the Review Committee. If the dean must avoid a conflict of interest due to being the supervising professor or on the examination committee of the accused, the vice president of academic affairs should serve as the convener and chairperson; if the dean and vice president of academic affairs must both avoid a conflict of interest, then the Dean of Academic Affairs shall serve as the convener and chairperson.
 4. When the Review Committee meets, at least a majority of members must be present and a majority of the present members is necessary to pass a resolution. The Review Committee members must attend the meeting in person and may not designate a representative to attend or vote at the meeting on their behalf.
 5. In principle, the Review Committee shall recommend at least three external and impartial

scholars as the reviewers. Those with an interest in the accused may not be appointed a reviewer. Reviewers should complete the review within 3 weeks and submit a review report. The identity of the reviewers must be kept confidential.

6. Should there be such need, the Review Committee should ask the counseling teacher of the accused and the Examination Committee to provide further explanation.

Article 4. The Review Committee should notify the accused or their stakeholders to give their statements in writing within the specified timeframe or in person at the meeting. Failure to give any statements in writing or in person within the specified timeframe will be deemed to have waived the right to make such a statement.

Article 5. The Review Committee shall issue its decision as follows: If the accusation is deemed by the Review Committee to be invalid then the review report and the meeting minutes should be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs and retained for reference once approved by the University President. The Office of Academic Affairs will also notify the accuser and the accused in writing; If the accusation is deemed valid then the review report and meeting minutes should be forwarded to the Academic Affairs Council for a decision. Unless the Academic Affairs Council can provide sufficient justification on professional and academic grounds that are sufficient to bring the reliability and correctness of the Review Committee's review into question then it should respect the judgment of the Review Committee. After the University President approves the resolution of the Academic Affairs Council to revoke the academic degree and take related actions, the Office of Academic Affairs will notify the accuser, the accused and the department (institute, degree program) of the accused in writing of the results. If the accused wishes to dispute the decision, an appeal in writing with concrete proof and reasons must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs or the Student Appeal Review Committee within 15 days of receiving the notice. Appeals to the Office of Academic Affairs shall be reviewed in writing by the original Review Committee. If the original Review Committee finds merit in the appeal, a review meeting may be re-convened. This may only take place once. Appeals to the Student Appeal Review Committee go to the Office of Student Affairs and are handled in accordance with the relevant student appeal regulations. If an appeal was rejected as being without merit then no further appeals regarding the same matter will be accepted.

Article 6. If the Review Committee finds that the thesis or dissertation (including students whose degrees were obtained through creative works, certificate of achievements, written reports, technical or professional practice reports) of the accused is counterfeited, altered, plagiarized or ghostwritten or connected with other fraudulent practice, the Academic Affairs Council shall pass a resolution for the graduation qualifications and degree of the accused to be revoked by the Office of Academic Affairs. The revocation will be posted on the university website and the accused will be notified in writing to return the granted degree certificate. Approved relevant materials will be sent to the university-level faculty review committee for deliberation and reference to clarify the responsibilities of the supervising professor. In the event of the above, the National Library and the University Library should be notified in writing to withdraw the paper and electronic files of the accused's thesis or dissertation. The revocation will also be communicated to other universities and related agencies (organizations).

A student whose graduate qualifications and degree were canceled shall be deemed to have been expelled. They will not be allowed to return to the university to continue their studies even if they have not completed their full study period.

Article 7. If an accusation has been reviewed and found to be unsupported then the same case will not be reviewed again in the absence of new facts or evidence.

Article 8. Any matters not covered by the Guidelines are governed by the relevant Ministry of Education and University guidelines.

Article 9. The Guidelines were approved by the Academic Affairs Council and sanctioned by the University President prior to implementation. Modifications shall follow the same procedure.

中英文版本如有牴觸或不相符之處，應以中文版本為準。

The regulations in English are translated from the original Chinese. In the event of any discrepancies between the two versions, the Chinese version prevails.

國立中山大學碩、博士學位論文抄襲、代寫、舞弊處理原則

99.12.13 本校第126次教務會議通過

100.03.21 本校第127次教務會議修正通過

100.10.17 本校第129次教務會議修正通過

102.06.10 本校第136次教務會議修正通過

105.05.30 本校第148次教務會議修正通過

108.03.13 本校第159次教務會議修正通過

109.10.16 本校第165次教務會議修正通過

一、為維護教育品質與學術倫理，防範本校碩、博士論文抄襲、代寫或舞弊等情事發生，並建立公正處理之機制，依據「學位授予法」第十七條與本校「研究生學位考試施行細則」第十五條規定，訂定本處理原則。

二、本校碩、博士學位論文疑涉有抄襲或其他舞弊情事之受理程序如下：

本校各單位知悉或接獲檢舉本校博、碩士學位論文有抄襲或其他舞弊情事時，應檢附具體違反情形及相關資料，送交教務處受理；對於具名並提出具體事證之檢舉者，經教務處向檢舉人查證確認其檢舉意願後，即受理處理。

前項檢舉案件以匿名檢舉，非有具體對象及充分事證者，不予受理。檢舉案未經證實成立之前，參與調查或審議程序之人員，就所接觸之資訊有予以保密之必要者，應以保密方式為之。

檢舉案經證實之後，對檢舉人之身分亦應予嚴格保密。

三、審定委員會之審議程序如下：

(一) 教務處於受理檢舉案後，應於3個工作天內通知被檢舉人所屬學院及學系（所、學位學程），並將檢舉相關文件送被檢舉人所屬學院。該學院應於收件後10日內成立審定委員會，本公平、公正、客觀、明快原則，於二個月內完成審定。前項審定期間必要時得展延一個月，展延以一次為限。

(二) 審定委員會置委員五至七人，由被檢舉人所屬學院院長、學系（所、學位學程）主管、所屬學院教師代表一至二名、相關學院教師代表一至二名及法律專家一名組成之，並由被檢舉人所屬學院簽請校長遴聘之。審定委員會召開之相關會議，應邀請教務處派員列席。被檢舉人之配偶、三親等內血親或姻親及指導教授、學位考試委員、學術合作關係或其他利害關係者皆不得擔任審定委員會委員。

(三) 審定委員會由院長擔任召集人及會議主席。若院長為被檢舉人之指導教授或考試委員而應迴避時，應由副校長擔任召集人及會議主席；若院長及副校長同時應迴避時，則由教務長擔任召集人及會議主席。

(四) 審定委員會開會時，應有委員二分之一以上出席，並經出席委員二分之一以上同意始得議決。審定委員會委員應親自出席會議，不得委任他人代理出席及表決。

(五) 審定委員會得推薦校外專業領域公正學者為審查人。審查人以三人為原則，被檢舉人之利害關係人不得擔任審查人。審查人應於三週內完成審查，並提出審查報告書，

供審定委員會審議決定參考。審查人身分應予保密。

(六) 審定委員會必要時得邀請被檢舉人之指導教授、考試委員列席說明。

四、 審定委員會應以書面通知被檢舉人或利害關係人於期限內提出書面說明或到場陳述意見。未於通知期間內提出說明書或到場陳述意見者，視為放棄陳述之機會。

五、 檢舉案件經審定委員會審議決定後，其審定報告書及會議紀錄應送教務處經校長核定，由教務處以書面通知檢舉人與被檢舉人及被檢舉人所屬學系(所、學位學程)處理結果。被檢舉人若有異議，得於收受通知後15日內以書面列舉具體事實及理由向本校教務處提出申復。

申復案由原審定委員會進行書面審理。原審定委員會認為申復有理由者，應重新召開審定委員會進行審理，以一次為限。

申復經無理由駁回者，不得就同一事件再行申復。

六、 審定委員會審定被檢舉人學位論文(含以作品、成就證明、書面報告、技術報告或專業實務報告等取得學位者)確有造假、變造、抄襲、由他人代寫或其他舞弊情事屬實經校長核定後，由教務處撤銷被檢舉人畢業資格及學位，於校內網頁公告註銷並以書面通知追繳已發之學位證書；審定相關資料送校級教師評審委員會審議參考，以釐清指導教授責任。

前項情形應函知國家圖書館及本校圖書館撤下被檢舉人之論文紙本論文及電子檔案。註銷事項通知其他大專校院及相關機關(構)。

經撤銷畢業資格並註銷學位者，以退學論處，即使未屆滿修業年限，亦不得回校繼續修讀。

七、 檢舉案經審結為不成立，除另有新事實或新證據外，對於同一案件不

予受理。

八、本處理原則如有其他未盡事宜，依教育部及本校相關規定辦理。

九、本處理原則經教務會議通過，陳請校長核定後實施，修正時亦同。