

National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology

Faculty Promotion Review Regulations

Approved by the 2nd University Affairs Meeting of 2018 Academic Year on December 26, 2018

Amended and approved by the 4th University Affairs Meeting of 2018 Academic Year on June 12, 2019

Amended and approved by the 1st University Affairs Meeting of 2020 Academic Year on October 28, 2020

Amended and approved by the 2nd University Affairs Meeting of 2020 Academic Year on December 23, 2020

Amended and approved by the 1st University Affairs Meeting of 2021 Academic Year on October 27, 2021

Amended and approved by the 3rd University Affairs Meeting of 2021 Academic Year on April 27, 2022

Amended and approved by the 2nd University Affairs Meeting of 2022 Academic Year on December 28, 2022

Article 1 To establish a system for faculty promotion reviews, National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology (NKUST) has formulated the Faculty Promotion Review Regulations (hereinafter “the Regulations”) based on the regulations stipulated in the Act Governing the Appointment of Educators, Enforcement Rules of Act Governing the Appointment of Educators, and Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education (hereinafter “the Accreditation Regulations”).

Article 2 NKUST faculty members may apply for a promotion for the following categories:

1. Academic field: Faculty members who have made specific contributions through research results in their academic fields may submit specialized publications for a review.
2. Technical reports in the field of technology research and development: A teacher who has achieved innovation, improvement, or extended application of specific research and development results in the field of technology research and development theory or practice may submit technical reports for an accreditation review. The teacher shall satisfy the scope and criteria specified in Article 15, Attachment 1 of the Accreditation Regulations.
3. The field of teaching practice research: In the field of teaching practice and research, a teacher who has adopted appropriate research methods to verify the effectiveness of the process through curriculum design, teaching materials, teaching methods, teaching aids, applications of scientific and technological media, and the use of assessment tools, with specific research (development) results of innovation, improvement, or extended application, and who has made significant and concrete contributions to the promotion of teaching on-campus and off-campus, may submit special publications or technical reports for an accreditation review. The teacher shall satisfy the scope and criteria specified in Article 16, Attachment 2 of the Accreditation Regulations.
4. Works and proof of achievements in the field of cultural and artistic creation exhibition: A teacher in field of cultural and artistic creation exhibition who has produced unique works on a sustainable basis and made major and substantive contributions to their field may submit creative works and proof of achievements in their field, and may also submit reports regarding their creative works or performances for an accreditation review. The

disciplines in this category include music, opera, theater, theater arts, dance, folk arts, audio-visual arts, visual arts, new media arts, design, and other arts disciplines. The teacher shall satisfy the scope and criteria specified in Article 17, Attachment 3 of the Accreditation Regulations.

5. Proof of achievements in the field of athletic competition: If a teacher in the field of athletic competition or any athlete coached by the teacher has participated in major domestic and/or international sports tournaments and won a major place, the teacher may submit evidence of that physical education related achievement, together with a competition-related report, for an accreditation review. The teacher shall satisfy the scope and criteria specified in Article 18, Attachment 4 of the Accreditation Regulations.

Applicants submitting academic degrees for accreditation reviews may submit the degree theses/dissertations, creative works, performed or written reports, and/or technical reports (hereinafter referred to as “degree theses/dissertations”) that they originally submitted for their master’s degrees or doctoral degrees for accreditation reviews instead of submitting copies of their academic writing.

Article 3 NKUST full-time faculty members who have served in their current ranks for three years and meet the faculty appointment qualifications as outlined in Article 16-1, Subparagraph 4; Article 17, Subparagraph 2; and Article 18, Subparagraph 2 of the Act Governing the Appointment of Educators, and who do not fall under the conditions outlined in Article 4 of the Regulations prohibiting them from applying for a promotion may apply for a promotion.

The calculation of years of service mentioned in the preceding paragraph is based on the starting month and year of salary payment recorded in the Ministry of Education’s Teacher’s Certificate, counting only the actual years of service in the rank specified in the certificate to the day before the promotion application takes effect.

Faculty members approved for full-time pursuit of further studies, research (including in-depth services), or academic exchanges may have up to one year of this time counted towards their years of service when applying for a promotion. Faculty members on approved secondment who return to teach during their secondment may have up to two years of this period counted towards their years of service when applying for a promotion.

Concerning the calculation of years of service accumulated in other research work, professional work, or professional posts, it will be based on the years of service stated in the official service certificates issued by the respective agencies/institutions (the years of service will be counted at half-time for part-time faculty members), with NKUST to determine the eligible years of service in accordance with Enforcement Rules of Act Governing the Appointment of Educators.

Faculty members who obtained lecturer or teaching assistant certificates prior to the March 21, 1997 revision of the Act Governing the Appointment of Educators and who have continued teaching without interruption may apply for a promotion under the original teacher classification system specified in the University Act.

Lecturers or teaching assistants (as mentioned in the preceding paragraph) with a doctoral degree may choose to submit applications to be promoted to assistant professors or associate

professors:

1. Assistant professor: Once an applicant has been promoted to an assistant professor, they may not submit the same degree thesis/dissertation or other works to be promoted to an associate professor.
2. Associate professor: Applicant applying to be promoted to an associate professor must meet the revised required standards for this rank. Application and review procedures should comply with the Regulations. If the applicant fails the review, they may apply to be promoted to an assistant professor.

Article 4 Faculty members are not eligible for promotion reviews if they:

1. Are engaged in a full-time pursuit of further studies domestically or abroad; research domestically or abroad; or teaching abroad during the semester in which they submit their applications to the lowest-level faculty evaluation committees (i.e., the faculty members are not actually teaching at the University). However, faculty members who are on approved leaves with pay or without pay who have fulfilled their teaching obligations by teaching at least one credit hour are exempt from this restriction.
2. Are under investigations or undergoing dismissal or non-renewal procedures due to circumstances specified in Article 14, Paragraph 1; Article 15, Paragraph 1; or Article 16, Paragraph 1 of the Teachers' Act, unless the cases involve the faculty members meeting the descriptions specified in Article 16, Paragraph 1 of the Teachers' Act because of their non-compliance with the University's promotion deadlines.
3. Are under investigations, undergoing suspension procedures, or are currently suspended due to circumstances specified in Article 18, Paragraph 1; Article 21; or Article 22, Paragraph 1 or 2 of the Teachers' Act.
4. Are under investigations or undergoing severance procedures due to circumstances specified in Article 27, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 2 or 3 of the Teachers' Act.

Article 5 For NKUST faculty member promotion, the weighting of scores for teaching, research, and service & counseling is divided according to the type of promotion applications submitted, as follows:

1. For those applying for a promotion by submitting their academic field-related specialized publications: The total score for teaching, research, and service & counseling is calculated out of 100, with teaching, research, and service & counseling accounting for 20%, 60%, and 20%, respectively.
2. For those applying for a promotion by submitting their teaching practice research field-related technical reports: The total score for teaching, research, and service & counseling is calculated out of 100, with teaching, research, and service & counseling accounting for 60%, 20%, and 20%, respectively.
3. For those applying for a promotion by submitting their teaching practice research field-related specialized publications, technical reports in the field of technology research and development, works and proof of achievements in the field of cultural and artistic creation

exhibition, and/or proof of achievements in the field of athletic competition: The total score for teaching, research, and service & counseling is calculated out of 100, with the applicants to choose one category (i.e., teaching, research, or service & counseling) to account for 60% and the remaining two categories to each account for 20%.

The evaluation items and scoring standards for teaching, research, and service & counseling as stated in the preceding paragraphs are based on the indicators and corresponding scores stipulated in Article 7, Paragraphs 1–3 of the National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology Faculty Evaluation Regulations. Each item is scored out of 100, with the following required passing scores:

1. For those applying for a promotion by submitting their academic field-related specialized publications: A score of at least 70, at least 85, and at least 70 in teaching, research, and service & counseling, respectively, is required to pass.
2. For those applying for a promotion by submitting their teaching practice research field-related technical reports: A score of at least 85, at least 70, and at least 70 in teaching, research, and service & counseling, respectively, is required to pass.
3. For those applying for a promotion by submitting their teaching practice research field-related specialized publications, technical reports in the field of technology research and development, works and proof of achievements in the field of cultural and artistic creation exhibition, and/or proof of achievements in the field of athletic competition: A score of at least 85 in one of the three categories and at least 70 in each of the other two categories is required to pass.

For NKUST lecturers applying for a promotion by submitting their degree theses/dissertations, the point distribution and passing standards for teaching, research, and service & counseling will be based on their thesis/dissertation types, and the promotion regulations specified in the two preceding paragraphs will apply.

The recognition periods and calculation methods for teaching, research, and service & counseling scores in the two preceding paragraphs are as follows:

1. The recognition period for research may extend from the time the faculty member obtained the previous rank to the end of the academic year preceding the faculty member's promotion application. However, for teaching and service & counseling scores, the recognition period is limited to five years within the current rank. The five-year period is calculated retroactively from the academic year preceding the promotion application. If the applicant was pregnant or gave birth during the recognition period, they may apply for a two-year extension by providing relevant documentation.
2. The score for each item (teaching, research, and service & counseling) will be averaged over three academic years chosen by the applicant within the recognition period. For those applying for a promotion after serving in their current rank for only three years, the scores for teaching, research, and service & counseling will be averaged over the two academic years preceding the promotion application.
3. If the applicant has prior teaching experiences at other schools that can be counted towards

promotion and that their NKUST scores do not amount to three academic years, the applicant may choose to include scores from their previous school(s) and shall provide supporting evidence. However, the total number of academic years used for score calculation shall be at least two.

Applicants shall submit a self-report summarizing their overall performance during their current rank. The faculty evaluation committees at each level will then cast their votes anonymously.

Applicants' teaching, research, and service & counseling evaluation scores must meet the standards set in Paragraph 2 of this article, and their self-reports must be approved by the faculty evaluation committees at each level through anonymous voting before the applicants can be recommended to a higher-level faculty evaluation committee for further reviews.

NKUST faculty members who hold a Teacher's Certificate issued by the Ministry of Education and who are appointed at one rank lower than their eligible rank; or lecturers who apply for assistant professor reviews upon obtaining doctoral degrees and who meet the publication requirements for new faculty members at that rank (as specified by the respective colleges) may apply for a promotion to a higher rank because they satisfy the qualifications specified in Article 16-1, Subparagraphs 1–3; Article 17, Subparagraph 1; or Article 18, Subparagraph 1 of the Act Governing the Appointment of Educators. Such applications are exempt from the three-year minimum requirement at the current rank, and are exempt from the performance requirements for teaching, research, and service & counseling specified in Paragraphs 1–4.

In accordance with Article 3, Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Regulations, teaching assistants under the previous system who apply for assistant professor reviews upon obtaining doctoral degrees are exempt from the teaching, research, and service & counseling performance requirements specified in Paragraphs 1–4.

Article 6 The specialized publications, works, proof of achievements, and technical reports submitted by NKUST faculty members for reviews must meet the following requirements:

1. The submissions must be original works and cannot be composed by merely compiling, editing, combining, or rearranging others' publications. Submissions that are not research result-based will also not be accepted.
2. If the publications are written in foreign languages, Chinese abstracts must be provided. For publications written in languages other than English, English abstracts may be used instead. If no reviewers proficient in the respective foreign languages can be found in the fields domestically, NKUST may require the publications be fully translated into either Chinese or English.
3. Applicants may select up to five works for submission and designate one as their representative work, with the remaining works to be considered as supporting materials. For research series, a maximum of five related works may be combined as one representative work, and a statement explaining their interrelatedness shall be attached. If applicants have previously been denied faculty qualifications, resubmissions must include at least one new or additional publication, still capped at five works. All professional or academic achievements attained by the applicants

after obtaining the previous faculty qualifications may be presented in list form for review references without submitting the full text.

4. The submitted works must have been published or presented after the applicants obtained their previous faculty member rank. If the applicants have been full-time faculty members abroad where the years of experience can be counted towards their promotion, the applicants' specialized publications, works, proof of achievements, or technical reports submitted for the reviews may be counted.
5. The representative works must be related to the subjects taught by the applicants and recognized by the University Faculty Evaluation Committee.
6. Published works shall be publicly distributed by publishing houses or book companies, with related information such as the authors, publishers, distributors, dates of publication, and price information clearly indicated.
7. If the representative works are co-authored, only one of the authors may submit them for reviews. At the time of submission, any individuals other than the applicants shall forfeit their rights to use the specialized publications, works, proof of achievements, or technical reports as their own representative works for reviews. Applicants shall provide detailed written statements explaining their contributions to the representative works, with signatures from the co-authors as confirmation. If the co-authors are unable to provide their signatures, the applicants shall provide detailed written statements explaining their contributions to the representative works and the reasons why they were unable to obtain the signatures of the co-authors. The signature requirement may be exempted only if reviewed and approved by the University Faculty Evaluation Committee.
8. If the titles or content of representative works submitted for reviews are similar to previously approved representative works, a comparison between the previous and current representative works shall be provided. The same applies to works with altered titles or content.

Publications submitted to faculty evaluation committees at each level for reviews shall remain consistent throughout the application process; substitutions or additions are not allowed during review periods.

Article 7 Specialized publications mentioned in the preceding article shall meet one of the following criteria:

1. They must be published, publicly available monographs or monographs with proof from publishing houses certifying that they will be published and made publicly available.
2. They must be published in domestic or international academic or professional journals, or in electronic journals with a formal review procedure, where the specialized publications are accessible and made public. Alternatively, the specialized publications may be those with proof from the aforementioned journals certifying that they will be published regularly.
3. They must be presented at domestic or international conferences with a formal review procedure. Additionally, they must be compiled as publicly available publications, issued on CDs, or published online.

Applicants who submit proof of regular publications in domestic or international academic or

professional journals as mentioned in Subparagraph 2 of the preceding paragraph shall ensure that their specialized publications are published within one year from the dates that the journals issue the acceptance letters. Within two months of publication, the applicants shall submit the specialized publications to the University for checking and archiving. If the specialized publications are not published within one year due to circumstances not attributable to the applicants, the publications may be postponed to a maximum of three years from the dates that the journals issue the acceptance letters. The University shall check whether the applicants' specialized publications are published before the acceptance letter deadlines.

Once specialized publications mentioned in the preceding paragraph have passed reviews and been approved, they may not be used for future submissions.

If applicants fail to publish their specialized publications before the deadlines due to circumstances attributable to them, or fail to publish their specialized publications within three years from the dates that the journals issue the acceptance letters (where the specialized publications were not published within one year due to circumstances not attributable to the applicants), the University shall reject their applications and report it to the Ministry of Education. If the applicants' faculty qualifications are still under review by the Ministry of Education, the University shall reject the applications. If applicants' faculty qualifications have already been approved and a Teacher's Certificate has been issued, the Ministry of Education shall revoke their faculty qualifications and either reclaim or nullify the issued Teacher's Certificate.

Article 8 NKUST faculty promotion qualifications are reviewed in three stages. First, the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts a preliminary review. Next, the college-level Faculty Evaluation Committee (hereinafter "College Faculty Evaluation Committee") conducts a secondary review. Then, the University Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts a final review. If there is no Department Faculty Evaluation Committee, the College Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts both the preliminary and secondary reviews, and the University Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts the final review. Once approved, the results will be submitted to the Ministry of Education for reference and to issue the Teacher's Certificate.

Faculty evaluation committees at each level must not allow lower-ranked committee members to review the promotion applications of applicants of higher ranks. Reviewers must be committee members who hold at least one rank higher than the applicants applying for the promotion. Members of the same rank or lower cannot participate in the reviews. Each college or department/institute must have at least five reviewers; if this number is not met, the college dean or department/institute head shall nominate members who, upon approval by the University or Department Affairs Meetings and University president (in accordance with relevant administrative procedures), will form the promotion review panel. The panel members shall be internal or external experts in related academic fields and of higher ranks. The decisions made by promotion review panels will be deemed equal to decisions made by faculty evaluation committees.

If the department heads are the applicants themselves, the aforementioned nomination will be made by the college deans. Once approved by the departmental meetings, the same promotion review

panel procedures as mentioned above will apply.

The promotion review panels shall be convened and chaired by the chairs of the Department and College Faculty Evaluation Committees. If the faculty evaluation committee chairs have a conflict of interest, another member of the promotion review panel shall be elected to convene and chair the meetings.

Promotion review panel members shall adhere to the conflict-of-interest rules governing faculty evaluation committees.

Article 9 The review procedures adopted by faculty evaluation committees at each level are as follows:

1. A preliminary review, conducted by the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee:
 - (1) Applicant shall apply to their affiliated unit by submitting their promotion materials in accordance with the Regulations and shall meet the standards set by their department or college for promotion applications.
 - (2) The department shall ensure that the specialized publications, works, proof of achievements, and technical reports submitted by the applicant comply with the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education as well as relevant provisions of the Regulations. Once confirmed, it shall review the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service & counseling.
 - (3) The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of the applicant's promotion materials in accordance with the Regulations as well as the preliminary review guidelines set by the respective department. It shall evaluate the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service & counseling, and, through anonymous voting, vote on the applicant's self-report (which details their overall performance at their current rank). If approved, the preliminary review materials are forwarded to the College Faculty Evaluation Committee for a secondary review.
2. A secondary review, conducted by the College Faculty Evaluation Committee:
 - (1) Each college shall ensure that the submitted materials comply with the Regulations as well as the preliminary and secondary review guidelines set by the college and department, and that all required materials have been submitted.
 - (2) The College Faculty Evaluation Committee shall conduct a secondary review in accordance with the Regulations and the secondary review guidelines set by the respective college. It shall evaluate the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service & counseling, and, through anonymous voting, vote on the applicant's self-report (which details their overall performance at their current rank). If approved, the applicant's promotion application-related publications as well as preliminary and secondary review materials are forwarded to the Personnel Office to convene a University Faculty Evaluation Committee final review.
3. A final review, conducted by the University Faculty Evaluation Committee:

- (1) Once the applicant's promotion application passes the college's secondary review, the University Faculty Evaluation Committee shall first evaluate the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service & counseling, and, through anonymous voting, vote on the applicant's self-report (which details their overall performance at their current rank). If approved, the application is forwarded to the Office of the Vice Presidents to initiate the external review process in accordance with Articles 12 and 13. If the external review results meet the required standards, the application is forwarded to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for a final review.
- (2) Upon passing the final review, the application is submitted to the President for approval. The Personnel Office shall verify and report the application to the Ministry of Education for reference and for the ministry to issue a Teacher's Certificate. Applicants who already hold the Teacher's Certificate for the proposed rank will not be issued a new certificate.

If the external review results show that the applicant's works fail to meet the required standards, the application shall still be submitted to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for a review.

Faculty evaluation committees at each level shall rigorously review the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service & counseling, and, through anonymous voting, vote on the applicant's self-report (which details their overall performance at their current rank). Applications are approved if at least two-thirds of the committee members are present and if at least two-thirds of the members present vote in favor for the applications to be approved. For applications that are rejected, the faculty evaluation committees must clearly state the specific reasons for the rejection.

For faculty promotion applications where the colleges themselves are the teaching units, the College Faculty Evaluation Committees shall conduct both the preliminary and secondary reviews.

Article 10 During reviews, faculty evaluation committees shall consider factors such as the applicants' performance in teaching, research, and service & counseling (as specified in the previous articles) and not the applicants' professional academic abilities. They shall avoid casting majority vote based on the applicants' professional and abilities.

If the University Faculty Evaluation Committee has doubts in the external reviewer comments during the review process, they shall handle the matters as follows:

1. If there are clear errors such as incorrect scores, comments, calculations, or other similar mistakes, the case will be forwarded to the original reviewers to provide clarification, and the University Faculty Evaluation Committee shall then make a final decision.
2. If contradictions exist between the scores and comments; if there are issues related to research methods and content; or if there are doubts that could undermine the credibility and accuracy of the professional reviews, at least two-thirds of the University Faculty Evaluation

Committee members shall attend a meeting. If at least two-thirds of the members present agree that the concerns are valid, they shall clearly state the specific reasons for the concerns raised. A professional review panel will then be formed to review the case, which will be forwarded to the original reviewers to provide clarification, and the professional review panel and faculty evaluation committee will make a final decision.

If the external reviewer comments meet any of the following conditions, that at least two-thirds of the University Faculty Evaluation Committee members are present, and that at least two-thirds of the members present approve to overrule the reviewer comments (with specific reasons provided), the reviewer comments will be overruled. The overruled reviews shall then be forwarded to a sufficient number of qualified scholars and experts to make reviews to replace the original reviews:

1. There are doubts for incorrect scores, comments, calculations, or other similar mistakes as described in Subparagraph 1 of the preceding paragraph, and that the errors have been confirmed by the University Faculty Evaluation Committee to be valid.
2. The doubts for matters described in Subparagraph 2 of the preceding paragraph are confirmed by the professional review panel and University Faculty Evaluation Committee as having valid professional academic grounds, sufficiently challenging the credibility and accuracy of the original professional reviews. However, there can only be a maximum of one overruling of external reviewer comments per faculty qualification review case for the same faculty member.

The professional review panel mentioned in Paragraph 2 shall consist of five members. The University Faculty Evaluation Committee shall appoint one member who holds at least one rank higher than the applicant's, while the Office of the Vice Presidents shall invite the remaining four members (who are external scholars or experts with professional abilities) from the list of reviewers in the field of the submitted publications, and number them according to the results of a random draw in accordance with Article 12 of the Regulations. If a member cannot serve or has a conflict of interest, the next member on the list will be invited. If the list is exhausted and four external scholars or experts cannot be gathered, the external reviewer recommendation team will select at least 15 additional candidates in accordance with Article 12 of the Regulations, who will then be invited in order.

Once established, the professional review panel shall convene its first meeting and elect a chair within 20 days, and discuss the reviewer comments identified in Paragraph 2, Subparagraph 2 as well as the decision made by the faculty evaluation committee. Specific issues requiring clarification from the original reviewers shall be listed, which will be submitted to the Office of the Vice Presidents and forwarded back to the original reviewers to provide clarification. Then, the professional review panel shall discuss and may submit written recommendations with specific suggestions concerning matters described in Paragraph 3, Subparagraph 2, which will be submitted to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for a review and to make a final decision.

Professional review panel meetings require at least two-thirds of the members to be present to begin, and decisions can only be made with at least two-thirds of the members present approving them.

Article 11 NKUST faculty promotion application reviews are conducted once per semester. The application review process shall follow the schedule outlined below:

Order	Item and schedule	Start date		Explanation(s)
		August 1 onwards	February 1 onwards	
1	The applicant applies for a promotion.	By March 1 of the current year	By September 1 of the previous year	The applicant prepares the publications (achievements) and all required application documents and submits the promotion application to their affiliated unit.
2	The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee completes the preliminary review and submits the results to the college.	By April 30 of the current year	By October 31 of the previous year	Each Department Faculty Evaluation Committee completes the preliminary review in accordance with Article 9, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 1, and submits approved application to the college.
3	The College Faculty Evaluation Committee completes the secondary review and submits the results to the Personnel Office.	By May 31 of the current year	By November 30 of the previous year	Each College Faculty Evaluation Committee completes the secondary review in accordance with Article 9, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 2, and submits approved application to the Personnel Office.

4	The University Faculty Evaluation Committee completes the first review.	By June 30 of the current year	By December 31 of the previous year	The University Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts the first review of the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service & counseling in accordance with Article 9, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 3, Item 1, and, through anonymous voting, votes on the applicant's self-report (which details their overall performance at their current rank). If the application is approved, the university-level unit initiates the publication and research result external review process.
5	The university-level unit begins the external review process.	By August 31 of the current year	By February 28 of the current year	The University Faculty Evaluation Committee forms an external reviewer recommendation team in accordance with Article 12, Paragraph 2, elects external reviewers, and numbers them based on a random draw. The Office of the Vice Presidents then contacts the external reviewers in sequence for a confidential external review.
6	The University Faculty Evaluation Committee completes the final review.	By September 30 of the current year	By March 31 of the current year	The external review results are submitted to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for a final review.
7	The University reports to the Ministry of Education for it to issue a certification.	By October 31 of the current year	By April 30 of the current year	For approved application, the University shall report it to the Ministry of Education within three months from the beginning of the semester, with the promotion effective date counted from the start of that semester.

Article 12 For NKUST faculty promotion applications, the University Faculty Evaluation Committee is responsible for managing the review of the applicant's publications. It shall send them to five external scholars or experts in related fields to review.

The requirements for passing the external reviews at each level are as follows:

1. For promotion to assistant professor or associate professor: Applicant must score at least 75 in four out of five external reviews, with an average score of at least 70.
2. For promotion to professor: Applicant must score at least 80 in four out of five external reviews, with an average score of at least 75.

When the University Faculty Evaluation Committee manages the publication review, the list of external reviewers is prepared by an external reviewer recommendation team comprising three members: the chair of the University Faculty Evaluation Committee, a member from the college faculty evaluation committee of the applicant's college, and a member from the University Faculty Evaluation Committee, all three of whom are at least one rank higher than the applicant's. The team selects at least 15 reviewers from the department reviewer database and numbers them in the order determined by a random draw. The Office of the Vice Presidents contacts the reviewers in sequence to confirm their availability for a confidential external review of the applicant's publications.

Each department reviewer database shall contain at least 50 potential reviewers. If the database is incomplete or if the external reviewer recommendation team determines that there are no suitable candidates, reviewers may be selected from the National Science and Technology Council talent database.

For faculty promotion applications where colleges are the teaching units, each college shall establish a reviewer database in accordance with the regulations specified in the preceding paragraphs.

Article 13 Principles for selecting external reviewers:

1. The reviewers selected shall have the same academic expertise as the applicant's. If the applicant's publications cover multiple fields of expertise, the field of expertise covered by the applicant's representative publication shall be used to determine the reviewers selected.
2. In principle, reviewers shall be qualified professors certified by the Ministry of Education. If no suitable professors are available, applicants applying for ranks below associate professor may be reviewed by associate professors certified by the Ministry of Education; however, associate professors may not review cases for promotion to professor.
3. For applications where technical reports, works, or proof of achievements have been submitted, reviewers with practical experience shall be selected when possible.
4. For applications where teaching practice research field-related specialized publications or technical reports have been submitted, reviewers with a record of outstanding teaching performance shall be selected.
5. When necessary, individuals without professor qualifications certified by the Ministry of Education may be selected if they possess recognized achievements equivalent to the rank of professor, including professional technicians at the professor level and research fellows at academic or industry-related research institutions equivalent to the rank of professor.

6. For unique fields or cases where it is difficult to recruit domestic reviewers, professors from foreign institutions may be selected instead.

In principle, reviewer databases must be reviewed and approved by NKUST faculty evaluation committees at each level before use. **However**, if the College Faculty Evaluation Committee chair considers the department databases insufficient, they may propose additional suitable candidates who, upon approval by the College and University Faculty Evaluation Committees, may be included in the databases. Similarly, if the University Faculty Evaluation Committee chair considers the college databases insufficient, they may propose additional candidates who, upon approval by the University Faculty Evaluation Committee, may be included in the databases.

For colleges that establish reviewer databases in accordance with the preceding article, the databases must be reviewed and approved by both the College and University Faculty Evaluation Committees before use. If the University Faculty Evaluation Committee chair deems the college-approved databases insufficient, they may propose additional candidates who, upon approval by the University Faculty Evaluation Committee, may be included in the databases.

Faculty members applying for a promotion in the first semester of the academic year shall use reviewer database lists that have been reviewed and approved by faculty evaluation committees at each level by May 31 of the current year. Faculty members applying for a promotion in the second semester of the academic year shall use reviewer database lists that have been reviewed and approved by faculty evaluation committees at each level by November 30 of the previous year.

Applicants may nominate one to three individuals to be excluded from the review process due to potential conflicts of interest. Additionally, reviewers who meet any of the following criteria shall recuse themselves from reviews:

1. They are current or past advisors for the applicants' degree theses/dissertations.
2. They are the co-authors of or have joint research involvement on the applicants' representative publications.
3. They are the co-authors of or have joint research involvement on the applicants' papers or research results within the past three years.
4. They are jointly executing research projects with the applicants at the time of reviewing the promotion applications.
5. They and the applicants are/were employed by the same departments, institutes, or institutions.
6. They and the applicants are spouses; former spouses; blood relatives within the fourth degree of kinship; or relatives by marriage within the third degree of kinship, or any past relationship of this kind.
7. They are the applicants' agents or assistants in the promotion applications.
8. Any other circumstances requiring recusal due to conflict of interest as stipulated by

other laws and regulations.

For fairness and balance in selecting external reviewers, the following principles shall be complied if possible:

1. Reviewers selected for the same promotion applications shall preferably not all be professors from the same schools.
2. Professors from the applicants' alma maters shall be avoided, especially if the applicants graduated within the last ten years and are from the same departments/institutes.
3. Reviewers who graduated from the same schools and departments as the applicants during the same periods shall be avoided if possible.
4. In addition to avoiding conflicts of interest specified in Subparagraphs 2–4 of the preceding paragraph, reviewers who have collaborated with the applicants on related research shall be avoided if possible.

If a reviewer fails to recuse themselves in violation of Paragraph 5, the review results provided by that reviewer shall be invalid and disregarded. However, any remaining valid reviews may still be included in the overall review results. If there is an insufficient number of valid external reviews, the missing number shall be reviewed and supplemented through related administrative procedures.

Article 14 Materials and review comments returned by external reviewers shall be organized, and any handwritten comments shall be retyped and proofread by the review units. When provided to faculty evaluation committee members as references, the names of the reviewers must not be disclosed.

Article 15 Publications submitted and approved for faculty promotion shall be made publicly available and preserved in the NKUST Library.

For approved applications that involved the submission of works, proof of achievements, or technical reports as mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the works, proof of achievements, or technical reports shall be published publicly in accordance with the Accreditation Regulations and submitted to the Personnel Office to be managed in accordance to the aforementioned regulations. However, if the works, proof of achievements, or technical reports contain/are confidential information, patented information, or legally restricted from publication, and if this is verified by the Department or College Faculty Evaluation Committees, the works, proof of achievements, or technical reports may be exempted from public publication or withheld from public publication for specified periods.

Article 16 For faculty promotion applications that have been rejected, the departments, colleges, or Personnel Office must provide written explanations, including external review comments deeming the applications unsatisfactory (with the names of the reviewers anonymized), within 14 days. The applicants and their affiliated units must be informed of the remedial measures and procedures for appeals if they disagree with the decisions.

Applicants must wait until the confirmation of non-promotion before reapplying for promotion for the same rank.

Article 17 If applicants disagree with the review results of the Department or College Faculty Evaluation Committees, they may file an appeal with the NKUST Faculty Grievance Committee in accordance with the NKUST Faculty Grievance Committee Organization and Review Guidelines. Alternatively, they may file for a reconsideration according to the following procedure:

1. If an applicant disagrees with the decision made by the faculty evaluation committee, they shall submit a written explanation of their reasons to the next higher-level faculty evaluation committee within 15 days from the date when the resolution is received.
2. When the College or University Faculty Evaluation Committee reviews a reconsideration case, they shall provide the applicant ample opportunities to explain their reasons. If necessary, the convenor of the previous level faculty evaluation committee may be invited to provide explanations, and the College or University Faculty Evaluation Committee shall decide whether to accept or reject the reconsideration case and notify the applicant in writing with the review results and reasons. If the reconsideration case is accepted, the case shall be sent back to the previous level faculty evaluation committee for a re-review.

The College or University Faculty Evaluation Committee mentioned in the preceding paragraph shall review the reconsideration case at the next faculty evaluation committee meeting. For reconsideration cases that have been rejected, applicants may not resubmit them again.

If an applicant disagrees with the University Faculty Evaluation Committee's decision, they shall file an appeal with the NKUST Faculty Grievance Committee and provide a written explanation of their reasons within 30 days from the day following the day when the resolution is received. If the Faculty Grievance Committee finds the appeal valid, it shall send the case back to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for a re-review and engage in appropriate further handling according to the appeal review results.

Article 18 Members of faculty evaluation committees at each level, meeting attendees, and related administrative personnel shall keep review processes, reviewers, and review comments confidential to ensure review impartiality. However, under conditions that do not reveal individual committee members' identities and violate the Personal Data Protection Act, they may provide review processes and reviewer comments to the faculty grievance agencies and other relief agencies. Review comments deeming promotion applications unsatisfactory may also be shared with applicants.

If NKUST personnel violate the confidentiality regulations specified in the preceding paragraph, they will be subject to disciplinary actions in accordance with relevant regulations. If external reviewers violate confidentiality regulations, they will no longer be eligible for appointment as NKUST external

reviewers.

Article 19 If applicants are found to have violated the faculty qualification review requirements specified in the subparagraphs of Article 44, Paragraph 1 of the Accreditation Regulations, they shall be disciplined in accordance with the Accreditation Regulations, Principles for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualification Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education, and NKUST Guidelines for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualification Accreditation.

In the aforementioned case, application for teacher qualification accreditation during the periods specified in the Accreditation Regulations will not be accepted.

If applicants are reported or found to have violated faculty qualification review requirements, they may not withdraw their qualification review applications, and the matter shall be handled in accordance with related procedures.

Article 20 All departments, institutes, degree programs, and department-level centers (hereinafter referred to as “departments”) and all colleges, college-level centers, committees, and offices (hereinafter referred to as “colleges”) shall establish their preliminary and secondary review guidelines for each type of promotion condition specified in Article 2. The guidelines shall be reviewed by the next higher-level faculty evaluation committees. Once approved, the guidelines will be in effect.

Preliminary review and secondary review guidelines shall contain the promotion application criteria. If departments or colleges have higher requirements than the Regulations in areas such as teaching, research, and service & counseling performance; publication external review scores; journal tiers; specialized publication formats; and faculty member deemed unqualified in qualification reviews, the number of required items to be added or replaced must comply with the stricter requirements when applicants reapply.

Article 21 For matters not covered by the Regulations, they will be handled in accordance with relevant laws and regulations such as Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education, and Principles for Handling Violations of Teacher Qualification Accreditation at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Article 22 Faculty qualification applications that have already been reviewed and approved by the University’s lowest-level faculty evaluation committees prior to the enforcement of the amended Regulations are subject to the provisions in place before the amendments.

Article 23 The Regulations will come into effect following approval by the University Affairs Meeting and upon the approval of the President; the same principle applies when amendments are made.