

## National Central University College of Science Enforcement Directions on External Review of Faculty Publications

Discussed and Approved by the Faculty Evaluation Committee on June 19, 2018

1. The National Central University College of Science Enforcement Directions on External Review of Faculty Publications (hereafter referred to as “These Guidelines”) was stipulated by the College of Science (hereafter referred to as “The College”) of National Central University (NCU) in accordance with the NCU Guidelines on External Review of Publications for Faculty Qualification Reviews and other relevant regulations.
2. An “External Review of Publications Team” (External Review Team) should be established by the College to formulate the following list of reviewers:
  - (1) External review of publications is divided into two categories: external reviews of publications for new faculty members and external reviews of publications for faculty promotions. Where the external review of publications for new faculty members does not involve their appointment at a higher grade, the department (graduate institute) level faculty evaluation committee is authorized to decide the list of reviewers and organize the external review; for new faculty members being appointed at a higher grade (e.g. promotion assistant professor to associate professor, promotion from associate professor to professor) and the promotion of existing College faculty members, the external review of publications shall be organized by the college-level faculty evaluation committee.
  - (2) Members of the external review committee shall be primarily selected from individuals with the qualifications of a professor or equivalent.
3. The External Review Team is composed of the College Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Dean of the College is an ex officio member and team convener. The rest of the team shall consist of three members elected separately by the Faculty Evaluation Committee from among themselves for each case. Team members shall also elect a deputy convener for each case among themselves.
4. The selection of reviewers shall adhere to the following principles:
  - (1) The faculty member whose publications are to be reviewed (hereafter referred to as the “Applicant”) may submit a list of no more than 3 non-preferred reviewers for the department / graduate institute faculty evaluation committee’s reference so that a list of recommended reviewers can be proposed by the department / graduate institute.
  - (2) The corresponding department/graduate institute of the Applicant shall submit to the External Review Team a list of 5 to 8 local recommended reviewers and 5 to 8 overseas recommended reviewers. The list contains a basic profile of the reviewers, including: Name, current title and organization, specialties, contact address, and phone number.
  - (3) The External Review Team shall determine the list of reviewers in order of preferences based on the list of recommended reviewers from the two preceding paragraphs.
  - (4) The following candidates should be excluded from the External Review Committee:
    - i. Master’s and/or PhD. thesis supervisors of the Applicant.
    - ii. Close collaborators of the Applicant in academic research (e.g., co-authors or co-researchers of the Applicant).
    - iii. Related to the Applicant by blood or according to Article 32 of the Administrative Procedure Act.
5. Confidentiality of External Review Committee members
  - (1) The list of external reviewers must be kept in strict confidence.



※ This English translation is provided for reference only. In the event of any disputes, the latest passed regulations in Chinese shall prevail.

- (2) To ensure the non-disclosure of the reviewers' names, information and review opinions returned by the External Review Committee should be processed appropriately. Handwritten information should be re-typed, proofread, and then verified by the head of the unit responsible for organizing the review.
6. All information relating to the University's review process, reviewers, and review opinions shall remain confidential to uphold the impartiality of reviews.
- Exceptions may be made under of the following circumstances:
- (1) Provision of the review process and review opinions to the body handling grievances filed by the faculty member or other appeal bodies.
  - (2) If the review resulted in rejection, the review opinion can be provided to the Applicant under the following circumstances:
    - i. For matters involving violation of academic ethics as defined by the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education, or where the Applicant is asked to answer questions raised by the faculty evaluation committee during the review process in accordance with the Directions for Teacher Evaluation Committee handling of Teacher Qualifications Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.
    - ii. Where the review outcome has been finalized by the faculty evaluation committee.
7. Any matters not covered in these Guidelines shall be handled in accordance with the NCU Directions on External Review of College of Science Faculty Publications and other relevant regulations.
8. These Guidelines were approved by the College Faculty Evaluation Committee and submitted to the NCU Faculty Evaluation Committee for reference before implementation. Revisions shall follow the same procedure.

Addendum: Article 32 of the Administrative Procedure Act: In any of the following circumstances, a government officer shall recuse himself/herself from the administrative procedure:

1. Where the government officer himself/herself or his/her spouse, former spouse, any of his relative by blood within the fourth degree or relative by marriage within the third degree, or a person having previously such relationship with the government officer, is a party to the matter;
2. Where the government officer himself/herself or his/her spouse or former spouse is connected with the party in a relationship of joint holders of rights or co-obligors in the matter;
3. Where the government officer is currently or was once an agent for or assistant to the party in the matter; or
4. Where the government officer was once a witness or expert witness in the matter.