Regulations Governing Faculty Appointment and Promotion Review of the College of Management, National Chung Cheng University

Article 1. These Regulations are established pursuant to Article 7 of the University Regulations Governing the Establishment of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Article 4 of the College Regulations Governing the Establishment of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Article 2. Faculty appointment and promotion shall be handled in accordance with these Regulations. Matters not provided for herein shall follow the University Regulations Governing Faculty Appointment and Promotion Review.

Article 3. All newly appointed faculty members shall undergo external review of scholarly works. After preliminary approval by the department-, graduate institute-, or degree-program-level Faculty Evaluation Committee, the meeting minutes, appointment documents, and works from the most recent five years shall be submitted to the College Committee. For either degree-based or works-based review, the lower-level committee shall recommend at least ten off-campus scholars/experts in the field. The College Committee may add an equal or smaller number. The Committee Chair and one or two Committee members shall confidentially select and rank at least six reviewers, and the College shall send the works for external review in sequence. The review is passed when at least two-thirds of reviewers assign a score of 70 or above. Confidential selection means methods such as coded drawing of lots and ranking.

Article 4. In addition to statutory service requirements, applicants for promotion shall meet the following qualifications. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: important international academic contribution; multiple peer-reviewed publications, excluding the doctoral dissertation, including works in rigorously reviewed journals; strong teaching, counseling, and service performance at the University. Associate Professor to Professor: active participation in international academic activities; substantive and important international academic contribution with multiple rigorously reviewed publications and sustained research/publication performance; and outstanding teaching, counseling, and service performance. Calculation of service years shall follow University regulations.

Article 5. Faculty may apply under one of three tracks according to expertise: Academic Research, Industry-University Applied Research, or Teaching Practice Research. Scholarly works, creative works, evidence of achievement, or technical reports may be used to demonstrate professional theoretical, practical, teaching, research, or R&D outcomes. Academic Research applicants submit scholarly works; Industry-University Applied Research applicants submit technical reports demonstrating innovative, improved, or extended applied R&D outcomes; Teaching Practice Research applicants may submit scholarly works or technical reports demonstrating research-based improvements or innovations in course design, materials, methods, aids, educational technology, or assessment with significant dissemination contributions.

Article 6. Works submitted for promotion must have been published or presented after the applicant obtained the preceding academic rank. One work shall be designated as representative and the remainder as reference works; related series may be combined. A reapplication after an unsuccessful qualification review must add or replace at least one work. Only one co-author may use a jointly authored representative work, and other co-authors shall waive that right. The applicant shall describe contributions in writing and normally obtain co-author signatures, subject to specified exceptions for Academia Sinica Academicians and certain first/corresponding authors. Scholarly works must be publicly published/accepted monographs, journal/e-journal works under formal review, or formally reviewed conference works publicly issued in proceedings, optical media, or online. Works, achievement evidence, or technical reports that pass review shall normally be publicly issued unless confidentiality, patent, or legal restrictions justify non-publication or delayed publication.

Article 7. Promotion review includes research (A), teaching (B), and service/counseling (C) scores, weighted according to the University Faculty Promotion Scoring Form. The College shall separately establish Detailed Rules for Faculty Promotion. Departments, graduate institutes, and degree programs shall establish evaluation standards and may adopt stricter standards subject to College Committee approval.

Article 8. For promotion review, the lower-level committee shall recommend at least ten external reviewers; the applicant may name two persons considered unsuitable, with reasons. The College Committee may add reviewers. The Chair and one or two members shall confidentially select and rank at least six external reviewers. Promotion to Professor requires research at least 70, at least two-thirds of external reviewers rating “Good” or above, six external-review scores totaling at least 59, teaching at least 70, service/counseling at least 70, and total at least 75. Promotion to Associate Professor requires research at least 65, at

least two-thirds rating “Good” or above, six external-review scores totaling at least 55, teaching at least 65, service/counseling at least 65, and total at least 70. Component scores are rounded to two decimals.

Article 9. Promotion is processed twice annually. First cycle, effective August 1: apply by February 1; approved preliminary-review materials must reach the College by March 1; after external and secondary review, the case must reach the Office of Personnel by May 15. Second cycle, effective February 1 of the following year: apply by August 1; materials must reach the College by September 15; after review, the case must reach the Office of Personnel by November 20. Faculty approaching the statutory promotion deadline shall follow these schedules. Late applications are not accepted and submitted materials may not be substituted.

Article 10. If external review comments raise questions, clerical/calculation/obvious errors shall be clarified by the original reviewer and determined by the College Committee. If scores and comments conflict, or questions involving research method/content undermine review credibility, a professional review panel shall examine the issue, the original reviewer shall clarify, and the panel and Committee shall determine the matter. An unreliable external review may be excluded with specific reasons and replaced with another review; exclusion on substantive professional grounds is limited to once per case.

Article 11. Upon accepting a promotion case, the Committee shall verify authorship information and conduct formal review of the works or technical reports, retaining records.

Article 12. If the Committee questions the applicant’s materials, it may invite written explanation or oral defense. Before Committee deliberation, the External Review Opinion Form shall not be provided to the applicant. If promotion is denied, the applicant and unit shall receive an official notice stating specific reasons, failing review comments, and information on remedies.

Article 13. An applicant dissatisfied with preliminary review may petition the College Committee in writing within 30 days after receipt of notice. If sustained, the case returns to the lower-level committee. An applicant dissatisfied with the College Committee may petition the University Faculty Evaluation Committee within 30 days. If sustained, the case returns to the College Committee, which may obtain new external review. The same petition may not be filed again after denial. If a lower-level committee unlawfully fails to act despite orders from a grievance or remedial authority, the College Committee may resume processing from the stage at which the matter should have been reprocessed. A denial of reconsideration shall state reasons.

Article 14. An external reviewer shall recuse if the reviewer supervised the applicant’s doctoral/master’s thesis, co-authored or jointly researched the representative work, serves at the same university, has a family relationship requiring recusal under Article 32 of the Administrative Procedure Act, or has another recusal circumstance under University regulations. Reviewer selection should also avoid having all reviewers from one institution, recent research collaborators within five years, and persons who pursued graduate study in the same department and university during the same period as the applicant.

Article 15. Review procedures, reviewers, and comments shall be confidential, except that the process/comments may be provided to faculty grievance or other remedial authorities and failing comments may be provided to the applicant. Academic ethics violations shall be handled under University rules on academic ethics and research integrity.

Article 16. These Regulations shall take effect after approval by the College Affairs Meeting and University Faculty Evaluation Committee. The same procedure applies to amendments.

Appendix 1 - Industry-University Applied Research Review Scope and Standards

Scope	Requirements
Patents, technology transfer, innovation outcomes; professional/management case studies and technical competition awards with systematic analysis and distinctive contributions; or R&D outcomes with special contributions in industry-university cooperation, technology application, derivative outcomes, or improvement projects.	Outcomes must have been published/presented after obtaining the preceding rank; one representative outcome shall be designated when multiple outcomes are submitted; jointly produced representative outcomes may be submitted by only one collaborator with written contribution statement and co-author signatures; confidentiality may be requested for confidential portions; an integrated technical report shall cover R&D concept, theoretical basis, subject matter, methods/techniques, and contributions; and passing technical reports shall be made public unless applicable regulations permit non-publication or delayed publication.

Appendix 2 - Teaching Practice Research Review Scope and Standards

Scope	Requirements
Faculty using appropriate research methods to verify effectiveness in course design, materials, methods, aids, educational technology, or assessment, and producing innovative, improved, or extended research/development outcomes with significant dissemination contributions.	Outcomes must have been published/presented after obtaining the preceding rank; one representative outcome shall be designated when multiple outcomes are submitted; collaborative representative outcomes may be submitted by only one collaborator with contribution statement and signatures; the technical report shall include research motivation/topic, literature review, instructional design/research methods, research and student learning outcomes, and innovation/contribution; passing reports shall be made public unless regulations permit non-publication or delayed publication.