Content

Title：	Guidelines for Handling and Investigating Research Misconduct by the National Science and Technology Council Ch
Date：	2026.02.06
Legislative：	1.Promulagted on November 25, 1999 2.Amended on April 20, 200 3.Amended on February 25, 2013 4.Amended on April 8, 2014 5.Amended on October 20, 2014 6.Amended on January 6, 2017 7.Amended on April 10, 2017 8.Amended on January 19, 2019 9.Amended on November 25, 2019 10.Amended on February 15, 2020 11.Amended on August 1, 2022 12.Amended on May 2, 2024 13.Amended on February 6, 2026
Content：	**Article 1** (Objectives) The Guidelines are established by the National Science and Technology Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council" or "NSTC") to provide an objective and fair procedure for handling matters pertaining to academic ethics. **Article 2** (Applicability) The Guidelines are applicable to researchers who apply to the Council for, or obtain therefrom, any academic awards, research projects, or other related subsidies. **Article 3** (Types of Research Misconduct by Researchers) Research misconduct as defined in the Guidelines refers to any of the following behaviors of the researcher: (1) Fabrication: Making up of application materials (including all required supporting documents), research data, or research results that do not exist; (2) Falsification: Inappropriate alteration of application materials (including all required supporting documents), research data, or research results; (3) Plagiarism: Appropriation of another person's application materials, research data, or research results without attributing to the source; extensively citing the source improperly is considered plagiarism; (4) Self-plagiarism: The use of one's own work that was previously published without providing the appropriate references in a research project or paper;

(5) Duplicate publication: The repeated publication of materials without clear references;
(6) Ghostwriting: A research paper, project application, or report of research results is written by someone other than the named author;
(7) Use of illegal or inappropriate means to influence the review of the paper; and
(8) Other behaviors in violation of academic ethics that have been confirmed at the meeting of the Academic Ethics Review Committee of the Council.

Article 4 (Establishment of the Academic Ethics Review Committee)

The Council establishes an Academic Ethics Review Committee to review and investigate academic ethics cases.

Article 5 (Appointment of Committee Members)

The Academic Ethics Review Committee has a Convener, whose role is assumed by a Deputy Minister as designated by the NSTC Minister. The Committee comprises 9 to 15 members. The Convener is an ex officio member, and the rest members are appointed by the NSTC Minister from among the department heads of the Council, representatives of the Ministry of Education, scholars or experts, and lawyers.

The Academic Ethics Review Committee members are not salaried positions.

Article 6 (Term Appointment)

The term appointment of Academic Ethics Review Committee members is for two years and may be renewed.

Where the position of any member becomes vacant during the period of his/her term, a new member shall be appointed according to the preceding Article and resume the position of the original member to the end of his/her appointed term.

Article 7 (Convention of the Meeting and Resolution)

Any resolution at the Academic Ethics Review Committee meeting requires at least two-thirds of the members present at the meeting and at least two-thirds of the present members to give their approval. Where the motion of lifelong deprivation of the privilege referred to in Article 13, Clause 2 is proposed, at least three-fourths of the members present at the meeting must give their approval.

If the member representing the Ministry of Education cannot attend the meeting, the Ministry of Education may

designate a proxy to attend, speak, and vote on his or her behalf.

Any members who shall recuse themselves in any situations stipulated in Article 17 will not be included in the calculation of the number of members in attendance.

The Academic Ethics Review Committee may invite the preliminary reviewers, scholars or experts, and other relevant personnel referred to in Article 9, Section 1, Clause 1 to attend Committee meeting to share their necessary comments and explanations.

Article 8 (Handling of Research Misconduct Identified Ex Officio or by Reporting)

The Council shall take the initiative to handle academic ethics cases identified ex officio. All cases reported to the Council require the use of real names and addresses and statements with documented evidence attached.

Cases that are filed anonymously will not be handled unless there is a concrete subject and sufficient evidence indicated.

The reported cases that are identified as irrelevant to the Council's competence shall be forwarded to related responsible agencies. Where the respondent has an application being reviewed by the Council, it may be handled appropriately by the Council together with the reported case.

Article 9 (Review Procedures)

After the initial check, academic ethics cases that require further action shall undergo a two-stage review: preliminary review and secondary review.

(1) Preliminary review:

1) Departments of related fields shall invite a minimum of three scholars and experts in relevant fields to form an Inquiry Panel.

2) If the Inquiry Panel determines that there is a suspected of violating academic ethics, it shall refer the case to the school, organization, or institution for investigation. Nonetheless, if the pertinent evidence is readily available and feasible to elucidate, the Council may conduct its own investigation.

3) The school, organization, or institution to which academic ethics cases are referred shall submit an investigation report along with relevant evidence to the Council within the stipulated time frame.

4) The Inquiry Panel shall provide review comments on

the relevant evidence or the investigation report. If necessary, the representatives of the school, organization, or institution may be asked for explanations.

5) Where a violation of academic ethics is confirmed as a result of the preliminary review by the Inquiry Panel, and there is a need to submit the case to the Academic Ethics Review Committee, the report of the preliminary review shall specify the following: detailed evidence, investigation method(s), type(s) of research misconduct, and concrete suggestion(s) for punishment or penalties.

(2) Secondary review: Where a violation of academic ethics is confirmed as a result of the preliminary review, the case shall be submitted to the Academic Ethics Review Committee for the further deliberation and review.

When a suspicion of violation of academic ethics is confirmed in the preliminary review stage, the respondent shall be given the opportunity to provide a written statement, and if necessary, the opportunity to be heard. If a school, organization, or institution delays the proceeding of a case without a valid reason or if the investigation is incomplete, the departments of related fields may undertake the investigation, return the case for re-investigation, or request for supplementary information.

The investigation report of the preliminary review under Section 1, Clause 1, Item 3 shall include the following matters:

(1) Cause of action (including reported items and handling procedures);

(2) Documentation in support of the respondent’s defense (including official correspondence records, which shall specify whether the respondent was present for explanations);

(3) Investigation methods (including analysis software tools);

(4) Investigation results of each reported item (stating the results and the type(s) of violations involved for each reported item);

(5) Disciplinary decisions determined by the school, organization, or institution (the disciplinary decisions shall be submitted only after a violation of academic ethics is confirmed and the disciplinary

decisions are made accordingly); and

(6) Other supporting evidence.

Article 10 (Principles for Determining the School, Organization, or Institution for Case Investigation)

Cases involving the violation of academic ethics shall be investigated by the school, organization, or institution with which the respondent is affiliated at the time of applying to the Council for, or obtaining therefrom, any academic awards, research projects, or any other related subsidies.

If the preceding principle fails to determine the school, organization, or institution for case investigation, or if the alleged violation of academic ethics involves two or more respondents belonging to different schools, organizations, or institutions, then the following principles should prevail:

(1) The co-authors of the listed paper should be investigated by the school, organization, or institution with which the corresponding author is affiliated.

(2) If multiple papers are involved, the case should be investigated by the school, organization, or institution with which the most frequently listed corresponding author is affiliated.

If a decision cannot be made according to the preceding principles, a specific school, organization, or institution shall be designated by the Council.

For the circumstances referred to in Principles (1) and (2), relevant schools, organizations, and institutions are obliged to assist the investigating school, organization, and institution in the case investigation.

Where a case is investigated ex officio or upon complaint by the relevant schools, organizations, and institutions before the Council designates or submits it to any school, organization, or institution for investigation, the said case may be investigated by a joint panel formed by the relevant parties or otherwise coordinated or designated by the Council.

Article 11 (Timeframe of the Review)

Academic ethics cases shall be reviewed within the following timeframe:

(1) Preliminary review:

1) Preliminary reviews must be completed within six months from the next day following the acceptance of the case. The school, organization, or institution

shall complete the investigation within four months from the next day following the referral of the case by the Council. Cases investigated by the Council, the review must be completed within four months from the next day following the acceptance of the case. Extensions may be granted if necessary.

2) If a relevant party submits new evidence to the Council within the review period, the review period shall be recalculated from the next day following the last referral by the Council or the receipt of the new evidence.

(2) Secondary review: The secondary review shall be completed within two months after the completion of the preliminary review. An extension may be granted if necessary.

Article 12 (Disposal of Reported Cases Not Established or with No Violation Found)

If the reported case is not established or no violations of research misconduct are found during the preliminary review stage, the review outcomes shall be reported to the Academic Ethics Review Committee. Subsequently, the complainant shall be informed of the review outcomes in writing. If necessary, the respondent and the affiliated school, organization, or institution may be informed accordingly.

Article 13 (Disciplinary Actions)

Where the violation of academic ethics is sufficiently proven through definite evidence, one or more of the following proposed disciplinary actions may be taken by the Academic Ethics Review Committee on the respondent in accordance with the severity of the violation:

(1) Written reprimand;

(2) Suspension of the qualification of application for and execution of subsidized research projects, or of application for and acceptance of academic awards/related subsidies for one to ten years, or lifelong deprivation of the privilege;

(3) Recovery of part or all of the grants, the financial rewards, scholarships, or subsidies; and/or

(4) Withdrawal of all the related awards that have been granted.

During the period of suspension, the respondent shall not serve as a reviewer for any academic awards, research projects, or other related subsidies administered by the Council.

Article 13-1 (Aggravating Circumstances)

Where a violation of academic ethics involves any of the following circumstances and is determined by the Academic Ethics Review Committee to be of a serious nature, the respondent shall, in addition to suspension for not less than five years, be subject to recovery of part or all of the grants, the financial rewards, scholarships , or subsidies, and revocation of the related awards:

(1) Large-scale or repeated violations of academic ethics;

(2) Damage to international academic reputation or serious adverse impact on public perception; and/or

(3) Other specific evidence sufficient to establish that the violation is of a serious nature.

Article 14 (Disclosure of Information)

For academic ethics cases reviewed by the Academic Ethics Review Committee resulting in disciplinary actions, the related information should be made available to the public in accordance with the severity of the case, except for minor circumstances.

Minor circumstances mentioned above refer to the discipline to suspend the application for and the execution of a subsidized research project; to apply for, and to receive an academic award or other related subsidies, for not more than two years, in accordance with disciplinary actions described in Clause 2 of Article 13.

Article 15 (Notification of the Disciplinary Actions)

The complainant, the respondent, and the school or organization/institution with which the respondent is affiliated shall be informed of the disciplinary actions in writing, and such school or organization/institution is required to submit explanations, reviews, and improvements, and report to the Council with a copy pertaining to the handling of the research misconduct of the respondent being punished.

Article 16 (Nondisclosure Responsibility)

The personnel who are involved in the acceptance of the complainant's reporting and participation in the investigation or review procedure shall maintain confidentiality to information that is required to be classified as confidential.

The Council shall take required actions to ensure nondisclosure of the real name, address, and other information that may disclose the identity of the

complainant during the investigation procedure.

Where a violation of academic ethics involves public interests, the Council may, notwithstanding Section 1 of this Article, appropriately make statements to the public as explanation.

Article 17 (Recusal Principles for the Members and Preliminary Review Personnel of the Academic Ethics Review Committee)

The Academic Ethics Review Committee members, the preliminary review personnel, and the respondent shall recuse themselves when any of the following occurs:

(1) Any of the following circumstances referred to in Article 32 of the Administrative Procedure Act, to wit:

1) Where the person in question, his/her spouse, former spouse, any of his/her relatives by blood within the fourth degree, relative by marriage within the third degree, or a person having previously such a relationship with the person in question is a respondent;

2) Where the person in question, his/her spouse, or former spouse is connected with the respondent in a relationship of joint holders of rights or co-obligors;

3) Where the person in question is currently or was once an agent for or assistant to the respondent; or

4) Where the person in question was once a witness, expert or otherwise, in the matter.

(2) There is a co-working relationship in the same college department, institute, division, or other units;

(3) There is a former teacher-student relationship pertaining to the supervision of doctoral dissertations or master theses;

(4) There is a co-author relationship pertaining to publications of papers or research results within the last two years;

(5) There is a relationship pertaining to the co-implementation of the research project within the last three years;

(6) There is a relationship pertaining to employment, appointment, or agency within the last three years;

(7) There have been financial transactions involving prices and interest rates that have not conformed to normal and reasonable trading principles in the

market in the last three years;

(8)Where the person in question serves as a board director, supervisor, or manager at an enterprise where the respondent is employed. However, it does not apply to government shareholders designated as board directors or supervisors.

Any of the Academic Ethics Review Committee members or preliminary review personnel, who has a relationship with the spouse or a child of the respondent, as referred to in the aforementioned Clauses 6 to 8, shall recuse themselves from the review.

In the event of a dispute or dissidence raised by the Committee members or preliminary review personnel regarding the circumstances requiring recusal as specified in Sections 1 and 2, the NSTC, school, organization, or institution may make a substantive determination.

Officers in charge of the review process, who have a relationship with the respondent referred to in Sections 1 and 2, shall recuse themselves from the review.

Sections 1 and 2 of the recusal principles are applicable to the personnel who accept the report of misconduct or involve themselves in the investigation or disciplinary actions at the school, organization, or institution.

Article 18 (Responsibilities of Recipient Schools, Organizations, or Institutions and Their Duty to Cooperate in Investigations)

Where a recipient school, organization, or institution falls under any of the following circumstances, the Council may, upon the recommendation of the Academic Ethics Review Committee and in light of the severity of the case, terminate grants, academic awards, scholarships, or subsidies; recover related project subsidies; deduct amounts from subsequent project subsidies, reduce the Council's research incentive grants for universities and colleges; or lower the management fee rate for all or part of the types of projects funded by the Council:

(1) Failure to actively cooperate in the investigation of academic ethics cases or other improper handling thereof;

(2) Serious negligence in the management of research personnel with respect to their conduct in executing research projects funded by the Council, where such conduct involves violations of academic ethics.

When investigating academic ethics cases, the school, organization, or institution may request assistance from other schools, organizations, and institutions.

Article 19 (Transitional Provision)

Before the amended provisions enter into force, academic ethics cases for which the preliminary review has been completed shall be handled in adherence to the original provisions.

Data Source：NSTC Laws and Regulations Retrieving System