

Guidelines for the Review of Academic Works for Promotion of Faculty Members at National Dong Hwa University

2014.11.12 formulated by the 2nd Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 1st Semester of Academic Year 2014/15
2015.12.23 amended and approved by the 2nd Temporary Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 1st Semester of Academic Year 2015/16
2016.05.25 amended and approved by the 3rd Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 2nd Semester of Academic Year 2015/16
2016.10.12 amended and approved by the 2nd Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 1st Semester of Academic Year 2016/17
2017.01.04 amended and approved by the 4th Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 1st Semester of Academic Year 2016/17
2017.12.13 amended and approved by the 3rd Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 1st Semester of Academic Year 2017/18
2018.04.18 amended and approved by the 2nd Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 2nd Semester of Academic Year 2017/18
2020.12.30 amended and approved by the 4th Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 1st Semester of Academic Year 2020/21
2021.04.28 amended and approved by the 2nd Teacher Evaluation Committee of the 2nd Semester of Academic Year 2020/21

- I. This Guidelines for the Reviews of Academic Works for Promotion of Faculty Members at National Dong Hwa University (hereinafter referred to as “the Guidelines”) have been formulated in accordance with Article 7 and Article 9, Paragraph 2 of the *Regulations for Promotion Evaluation of Faculty Members at National Dong Hwa University*.
- II. The review of academic works related to research projects (hereinafter referred to as “the External Review”) submitted by faculty members for promotion (hereinafter referred to as “the applicant/s”) shall be conducted by the Faculty Evaluation Committee of each college during the secondary evaluation stage.
- III. For the applicants in fields such as physical education, arts, applied science, and teaching where skills and practical expertise are emphasized, works, achievement records, or technical reports may be submitted instead of academic works for review.
- IV. When the Faculty Evaluation Committee of each college approves the submission of an applicant's academic work for external reviews, a separate case review and resolution shall be conducted. A list of recommended external reviewers (hereinafter referred to as “the External Reviewers”) consisting of at least 15 experts and scholars from outside the University shall be randomly selected from the talent pool. The list of recommended external reviewers shall be submitted to the President or the Vice President authorized by the President of each college for selection. The selected external reviewers shall be forwarded to the Personnel Office for consultation and review. The Personnel Office shall conduct the

consultation process based on the selected list. If an external reviewer declines, recuses her/himself, or fails to provide an opinion within 14 days, the next person in line shall be consulted in sequential order to fill the vacancy.

If there is an insufficient number of external reviewers after the consultation process, each college shall follow the aforementioned procedure to supplement the list with a recommended number of candidates three times the shortfall, until the required number of reviewers is reached.

- V. The establishment of talent pools for each department or graduate institute shall be carried out based on the following principles:
1. The Faculty Evaluation Committee of each department or graduate institute may refer to the selection of experts and scholars with sufficient professional competence in various fields on the websites of the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Science and Technology, and the Academia Sinica, and recommend two scholars or experts from the respective field as advisory committee members.
 2. The talent pools for external reviewers in each field and/or expertise should consist of 25 to 38 reputable scholars or experts from outside the University, with the principle of including professors, researchers from the Academia Sinica, and researchers from other national-level research institutions. If suitable candidates cannot be found, individuals with the qualifications of associate professors, assistant professors as approved by the Ministry of Education, associate researchers or assistant researchers from the Academia Sinica or other national-level research institutions may be considered. Among them, current faculty members from public universities should account for at least half, and the selection should include a minimum of 10 candidates from schools (or institutions) recognized for their talent acquisition. However, if there are special circumstances that prevent meeting the above standards, the reasons should be stated and submitted to the College Evaluation Committee for approval.
 3. The content of the talent pools should include the ranks, names, affiliated universities (or institutions), academic expertise, research achievements in the past 7 years, and contact information.
 4. The list of talent pool members related to the academic expertise of faculty members in each department or institute should be reviewed and approved by the Department (or institute) Evaluation Committee and subsequently submitted to the College Evaluation Committee for final approval. If necessary, the Chair of the College Evaluation Committee may consult the recommended advisory committee members from the respective department or institute to include external reviewers in the talent pool. The talent pool may be updated once per semester, and the intention for promotion should be submitted in the previous semester of the promotion evaluation. The final approval of the talent pool should be completed during the last College Evaluation Committee meeting.
 5. In order to maintain the quality of faculty promotion at the University, if necessary, the University Evaluation Committee may request external scholars and experts to review

the appropriateness of the talent pool list and remove individuals who do not meet the qualification criteria or are deemed ineligible. In cases where the list becomes insufficient, additions to the talent pool may be considered. The revised list shall be submitted to the respective college for further processing.

VI. External Reviewer Selection and Passing Criteria:

1. Number of Reviewers: For applicants who submit academic works, artistic creations, achievement proofs, or technical reports, six external reviewers shall be selected for each submission.
2. Minimum Passing Number of External Reviewers: The minimum number of passing external reviewers shall not be less than four. For applicants applying for the professor rank, the passing score is 80 points, and the average score of the six external reviewers should be 80 points or above. For applicants applying for the associate professor and assistant professor ranks, the passing score is 70 points, and the average score of the six external reviewers should be 70 points or above. Each college may establish stricter regulations if desired.

However, according to Article 8 of the *Regulations for Promotion Evaluation of Faculty Members at National Dong Hwa University* and Article 10 of the Guidelines, the opinions of the previous external reviewers may be disregarded, and new external reviewers may be assigned to re-evaluate the application. The evaluations conducted by the replaced reviewers shall not be counted towards the total number of reviewers or the final scores. In cases where departments or institutes have their own procedures for external review, the number of external reviewers for the second review shall not be counted towards the total number of reviewers in the second stage of evaluation.

VII. The external reviewers shall have a higher academic standing and qualifications than the applicants and should meet the following criteria:

1. They have published academic works within the past 7 years.
2. They belong to the same academic field as the applicant and their expertise is relevant to the academic domain of the submitted work.

VIII. When soliciting external reviewers, individuals who have any of the following relationships with the applicant should recuse themselves from the review process:

1. Previously served as the advisor or co-advisor for the applicant's degree thesis.
2. Blood relatives within the third degree.
3. Spouse or relatives by marriage within the third degree, or individuals who have had such a relationship.
4. Co-authors or collaborators on the submitted work or referenced works.
5. Individuals with relevant conflicts of interest.
6. Required to recuse themselves according to other laws and regulations.

If a violation of the abovementioned Paragraphs 1 to 4 is reported by the respective faculty evaluation committee and verified to be true, the evaluation opinion of the external reviewer involved shall be considered invalid. Violations of Paragraphs 5 and 6 shall be determined

on a case-by-case basis by the respective College Evaluation Committee.

In the event of an insufficient number of valid external reviewers, the remaining number of reviewers needed should be sought through the established procedures stipulated in Article 4 of the Guideline, using the original list of proposed external reviewers.

- IX. The applicant may submit a list of up to three external reviewers to be recused concurrently with the application for promotion. The College Evaluation Committee shall combine and consider this list when proposing the list of external reviewers, which should be included as an attachment.
- X. In the review process by the College Evaluation Committee, when examining the list of external reviewers for the applicant's submitted work, co-authors or individuals who have collaborated on research projects with the applicant in the past five years should be excluded from serving as external reviewers.
- XI. If the faculty evaluation committee finds a significant discrepancy between the evaluation opinions and scores provided by external reviewers, or if the difference in scores is greater than 30 points, the committee may seek agreement from the College and University Evaluation Committees to request the external reviewers to reconsider their opinions and scores or to assign a new external reviewer.
- XII. Members of the faculty evaluation committees at all levels and related administrative staff should maintain confidentiality regarding the external review process, the reviewers involved, and their evaluation opinions. Except for providing such information to the appropriate authorities for appeals and other remedial measures as stipulated, confidentiality should be upheld. However, in the case of evaluation opinions that result in a failing grade, after completion of the evaluation by the evaluation committee, the identities of the reviewers should be masked before providing the opinions to the applicant. When submitting the external reviewers' evaluation opinions to the faculty evaluation committee for further review, their identities should be masked to ensure anonymity. If the evaluation opinions are handwritten, they should be transcribed and printed.
- XIII. (Deleted)
- XIV. The Guidelines have been reviewed and approved by the NDHU Teacher Evaluation Committee, and sent to the President for approval before implementation.