

YZU Guidelines for External Review of Faculty Promotion

Passed by the 1st Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of the 1st Semester of 2001 School Year, September.13, 2001

Amended by the 4th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of the 1st Semester of 2001 School Year, December.12, 2001

Amended by the 5th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of the 2nd Semester of 2002 School Year, July 17, 2003

Amended by the 3rd Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of the 1st Semester of 2003 School Year, December.10, 2003

Amended by the 5th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2006 School Year, January 18, 2007

Amended by the 6th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2008 School Year, April 15, 2009

Amended by the 4th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2010 School Year, January 13, 2011

Amended by the 8th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2012 School Year, June 26, 2013

Amended by the 9th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2016 School Year, June 21, 2017

Amended by the 6th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2017 School Year, May 23, 2018

Amended by the 2nd Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2018 School Year, November 7, 2018

Amended by the 6th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2018 School Year, May 22, 2019

Amended by the 7th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2018 School Year, June 26, 2019

Amended by the 7th Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2019 School Year, June 17, 2020

Amended by the 1st Faculty Evaluation Committee of School of 2022 School Year, September 14, 2022

1. “YZU Guidelines for External Review of Faculty Promotion” (hereafter, ‘these regulations’) are established to integrate the procedures and to keep the standards of external review.
2. The University’s database of professionals who are eligible to be the external review committee members to evaluate faculty promotion:
 - (1) A database of professionals who can evaluate the specialized publications or works are in the academic field may be offered by the faculty applying for promotion. A database of professionals who can evaluate creative works and evidence of achievement in cultural or artistic creation and exhibition field or in athletic competition field may be offered by the faculty applying for promotion. With these recommended lists, Faculty Evaluation Committee of College will come up with a database of professionals who are eligible to be the external review committee members in these fields.
 - (2) Faculty Evaluation Committee of College and Office of Research And Development will come up with a database of professionals who are eligible to be the external review committee members in the technological research and development field.
 - (3) Faculty Evaluation Committee of College and Office of Academic Affairs will come up with a database of professionals who are eligible to be the external review committee members in the teaching practice and research field.

The database of professionals who are eligible to be the external reviewers shall consist of 30 members (For faculty who possess expertise in a professional field, the number of external

reviewers shall not be less than fifteen). In the technological research and development field, Faculty Evaluation Committee of College will come up with a database of 5 professionals who are eligible to be the external reviewers; Office of Research And Development will come up with a database of 25 professionals who are eligible to be the external reviewers. In the teaching practice and research field, Faculty Evaluation Committee of College will come up with a database of 5 professionals who are eligible to be the external reviewers; Office of Academic Affairs will come up with a database of 25 professionals who are eligible to be the external reviewers. The list of external reviewers shall be approved by Faculty Evaluation Committee of School.

3. Faculty shall prepare relevant materials for teaching, research, academic advice and other services after obtaining the qualification of their current position, and submit an application for promotion review in October of each year to their affiliated department (or the same level) based on the schedule specified by the University.

Faculty applying for promotion whose performance in teaching, research, academic advice and other services shall be evaluated by Faculty Evaluation Committee of Department (or the same level) in accordance with relevant regulations stipulated by each department (or the same level). The above-mentioned score of faculty's performance in teaching, academic advice and other services shall be over 80 points for each; their research performance shall also be evaluated by Faculty Evaluation Committee of Department first before being sent to Faculty Evaluation Committee of College for recommendation.

Faculty Evaluation Committee of College shall review the score of faculty's performance in teaching, academic advice and other services based on the results from Faculty Evaluation Committee of Department (or the same level); Faculty Evaluation Committee of College shall also evaluate faculty's performance in teaching, research, academic advice and other services. The above-mentioned score of faculty's performance in teaching, academic advice and other services shall be over 80 points for each; their research performance shall also be evaluated by Faculty Evaluation Committee of College first before being sent to Faculty Evaluation Committee of School for external review.

4. For faculty who have passed the evaluation by Faculty Evaluation Committee of College mentioned in the previous article, the affiliated college shall prepare and submit the following documents to Faculty Evaluation Committee of School for external review:
 - (1) List of faculties applying for promotion evaluation;
 - (2) Information of faculty promotion review;
 - (3) List of recommended reviewers of external review (shall be confidential);
 - (4) Teacher Qualification Accreditation Form;
 - (5) Checklist of documents for promotion application;

- (6) Seven copies of documents of applicants applying for promotion in research field (include representative and reference publications);
 - (7) Two copies of documents of the achievements of teaching, research, academic advice and other services;
 - (8) Seven copies of co-author certificate (not for those who work independently);
 - (9) Statements regarding the relevance of representative publications and doctoral dissertation or representative publications of previous promotion;
 - (10) Avoidance list of Publication Review Committee (no more than 3 persons);
 - (11) Minutes of Faculty Evaluation Committee of Department (or the same level) or of Faculty Evaluation Committee of College.
5. Faculty may, in accordance with their areas of expertise or specialization, submit copies of their specialized publications, creative works, evidence of achievement, and/or technical reports to demonstrate that their research or development achievements have made contributions to theory, practice, or teaching in their specialized fields, for an accreditation review. These specialized publications, creative works, evidence of achievement, and/or technical reports shall meet the following requirements:
- (1) The specialized publications or works submitted for an accreditation review shall be the faculty's individual original work, and not simply produced by rearranging, adding to or deleting from, compiling, and/or editing the works or other non-research results of any others.
 - (2) If the specialized publications or works are in a language other than in Chinese, the faculty shall attach an abstract written in Chinese. If the specialized publications or works are written in a foreign language other than English, the abstract may be written in English instead. If it has not been possible to find reviewers in Taiwan who are in an associated field and are proficient in the foreign language in which the specialized publications or works are written when selecting reviewers, the University may request a complete translation of the works into either Chinese or English.
 - (3) Faculty who submit more than two publications for review shall select one of them as their representative work; the others will be considered reference material. Materials that are part of a series of related research may be amalgamated and presented as one representative work with no more than five items of them. For the specialized publications or works that have been published or issued (or accepted) under the name of YZU, and have previously been unqualified for the accreditation review, when resubmitting an application, more than one additional or replacement work shall be submitted for an accreditation review.
 - (4) The specialized publications or works shall have been published or issued (or accepted) since the faculty was accredited at their current level. If seniority that the faculty accrued while teaching overseas in a full-time position has been taken into account as seniority for promotion, the specialized publications or works, creative works, evidence of achievement,

or technical reports that were produced when the faculty was teaching overseas that are submitted for an accreditation review may be amalgamated.

- (5) If the submitted specialized publications or works are articles published in an academic journal, the offprint must include the name, volume, and publication date of the academic journal in which it was published; if not, photocopies of the academic journal's cover and table of contents shall be attached. For papers presented at academic conferences, the publication page of the conference proceedings (including the publisher, distributor, and release date) shall be attached. 'Published and publicly distributed' means that the work has been published and publicly distributed by a publishing house or book company, with a copyright page containing related information such as the author's name, publisher, date and location of publication, International Standard Book Number (ISBN), and Cataloging in Publication (CIP); a publishing certificate issued by the publisher or book company shall be attached as well. Works that are self-published or do not meet the above criteria will not be accepted.
 - (6) The nature of the representative work shall be related to the subjects taught by the faculty, and the work shall not be part of any degree thesis or dissertation. If the representative work is part of research that is a continuation of their degree thesis or dissertation, and the faculty has provided explanatory details on their own initiative and a professional assessment has determined that the submitted work contains a considerable degree of innovation and/or new ideas, the representative work is not subject to this requirement. However, if their highest degree thesis or dissertation has not previously been submitted for an accreditation review, the highest degree thesis or dissertation may substitute for specialized publications to be the representative work.
 - (7) If the representative work has been co-authored by several people, only one of the co-authors may submit that work for an accreditation review; the other persons shall relinquish their right to submit that work as a representative work for a review of their own individual eligibility for an accreditation. The faculty shall specify in writing the parts and proportions of the work in which they participated, the relationship with co-authors, and the other co-authors shall sign and certify the written statement.
 - (8) Regulations for external review stipulated by other departments (or the same level) and colleges.
6. If faculty submit evidence for an accreditation review that their representative work has been accepted for publication which will be published within one year from the date that the journal issued its letter of acceptance or similar notification, the faculty shall submit a copy of the work to the University for checking and filing within two months after the work is published. If for some reasons not attributable to the faculty the work is not able to be published within that one year, the maximum possible extension period is three years from the date that the journal issued

its original letter of acceptance or similar notification. If there are reasons attributable to the faculty for the failure to publish within three years of the date of the publication's letter of acceptance, the University shall reject the application and report the matter to the Ministry to disqualify the accreditation. If the teacher's accreditation has been approved and the faculty has been issued a Teacher's Accreditation Level Certificate, that accreditation will be nullified by the Ministry and they will be required to return the Teacher's Accreditation Level Certificate for that teaching level and it will be cancelled.

7. In addition to representative works and reference materials, all personal professional or academic achievements from the time of obtaining the previous level of teacher's certification until the current application for promotion may be included as reference materials for an accreditation review. The reference materials shall be listed in a categorical manner.

8. After the Chairperson of Faculty Evaluation Committee of School selects five anonymous external reviewers, the staff of Personnel Office in charge of the affairs shall contact them to carry out the external review process.

For the promotion of faculty in the technological research and development field, the Chairperson of Faculty Evaluation Committee of School shall select two external reviewers from the five anonymous external reviewers provided by Faculty Evaluation Committee of College. If three to four anonymous external reviewers are provided, one shall be selected. If only one to two anonymous external reviewers are provided, no selection shall be made, and the remaining external reviewers shall be supplemented by selecting from the anonymous external reviewer list from the database of professionals provided by Office of Research And Development.

For the promotion of faculty in the teaching practice and research field, the Chairperson of Faculty Evaluation Committee of School shall select two external reviewers from the five anonymous external reviewers provided by Faculty Evaluation Committee of College. If three to four anonymous external reviewers are provided, one shall be selected. If only one to two anonymous external reviewers are provided, no selection shall be made, and the remaining external reviewers shall be supplemented by selecting from the anonymous external reviewer list from the database of professionals provided by Office of Academic Affairs.

9. If the submitted representative work is similar in name and content to a qualified representative work that has previously been submitted for an accreditation review, the faculty shall attach a listing of the differences and similarities of the current representative work and the previously qualified representative work at the time they submit for the review; seven copies of the listing of the differences shall be provided for the review. The same requirement shall apply, if there has been any change in the name or content of a representative work.

10. Faculty who decide to file an appeal or an administrative appeal due to the failure of passing the accreditation review, they may submit a new work for a second review during the appeal period. If the new work passes the review, it will be considered as withdrawing the case from an appeal or an administrative appeal. The effective date of the faculty's promotion will be determined by the timeline when the new work is submitted, which shall be approved by the Ministry of Education.
11. Faculty applying for promotion may provide a list of not more than three experts to be avoided from serving as external reviewers. The original copies of all external review opinions provided by the external reviewers will be archived by the University. A typewritten copy of the external review opinions (with the reviewer's name omitted) will be submitted to Faculty Evaluation Committee of School for procedural review.
12. If a faculty either personally or through another person makes any requests or lobbies on the faculty's behalf, or offers any bribe or enticement or makes any threat, or in any other way interferes with any reviewer or accreditation review procedure and the circumstances are serious, Personnel Office shall stop the review process after getting the approval from the Chairperson of Faculty Evaluation Committee of School; Personnel Office shall notify the faculty, the department (or the same level) and the college, that from the date that such a decision is made, no application for accreditation review will be accepted within two years.
13. Matters not covered in these regulations shall be handled in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the University; if the regulations of the MOE are amended and the University's regulations have not been revised, they shall be handled in accordance with the amended regulations of the MOE.
14. These regulations are adopted by Faculty Evaluation Committee of School, as shall amendments when they are made.

The English translation is for reference only. In case of any discrepancy between Chinese version and English version, the Chinese version shall prevail.