**Science Academy Directive for the Election of Members**

Updated: June 6, 2015

**PRINCIPLES**

The authority to elect members to the Science Academy (SA) resides in the members of the SA. The election of members is decided upon at the General Assembly.

In order to be elected as a member of SA, the candidate must have made significant and valuable contributions to science. The reports which will attest to the scientific significance of the candidates' studies must be based not on merely quantitative criteria and simple formulae, but on a qualitative assessment of these contributions and their impact.

The candidates must have no prior actions which go against the principles outlined in the Declaration of Academic Merit, Freedom and Integrity signed by all members of SA.

**ELECTION OF MEMBERS**

Each candidate must be nominated by 3 members of SA.

There are no limits on the number of members. While determining the rate in which its membership will increase in time -or a fixed number of members and the rate necessary to reach that figure-, SA takes into consideration factors such as the growth rate of scientific and technical production in Turkey, the growth rate of "high quality" scientific studies, and the forecasts provided by studies in the sociology of science. The Board of Directors is responsible for disclosing the methods of member election to the public in a transparent fashion.

Member elections for the Science Academy are concluded at the annual Extraordinary General Assembly held in November. The following calendar is to be applied for the election to take place at the said General Assembly (GA).

1. The files must reach the Board of Directors by April 30. Files reached after that date will be submitted to vote in November only if all necessary documents are ready.
2. The referee reports are to be completed by June 30. In case the number of referee reports is not sufficient or the reports are not satisfactory in terms of content, the summer period will be dedicated to the preparation of additional reports. In such a case, the coordinators will inform the Board of Directors about the progress made.
3. The completed files will be communicated to the relevant groups in September.
4. The groups will convene and assess the files in the second half of October latest. It is encouraged to hold meetings in multiple cities. The assessment results will be presented to the Board of Director in the form of brief reports.
5. The Board of Directors is in charge of submitting this file to the General Assembly.

Provisional Clause: The rules of the calendar for 2014 will apply in the year 2015.

For the preparation of candidate files, “Member Candidacy Forms” composed of open-ended questions are prepared. Open to revision, these forms are to be prepared in separate versions for the members who nominate the candidate, and for the referees. The assessment criteria will not be limited to the number of publications and citations. The objective here is to comprehend how much the candidate's scientific studies stand out from ordinary scientific data production or routine practice.

Forms filled out by the nominating members and the candidate, as well as 3 publications deemed important by the candidate are submitted to the SA. If these publications are articles, their electronic copies, if these publications are books or book chapters, the copies of the pages featuring the names of the publishing house and editor should be included in the candidate nomination file, accompanied by an introductory note.

Branch Committees (BC) are active in the member election process. At the most general level, these committees are divided into A) Medical, Life and Health Sciences, B) Social Sciences and Humanities, C) Natural Science, Mathematics and Engineering. Furthermore, the latter category is divided into the subgroups i) Chemistry, Biology, Geology, Environmental Sciences, ii) Mathematics, Physics and Astronomy, iii) Engineering and Applied Sciences. SA members are also a member of at least one of these committees and groups.

Every branch committee has at least three coordinators, who are invited by the Board of Directors (BD) to perform this responsibility for a period of 3 years. Every year, the branch committee coordinators can set up new groups according to the areas, number and participation of candidates. The groups carry out their activities with the participation of BC coordinators, and when necessary, other coordinators from that group are invited by the BD.

In order for candidates' files to be taken into assessment, there must be at least 3 referee reports which evaluate the significance of the candidates' studies. While designating the referees, it is ensured that there are no connections which might cast a doubt on the assessment process. The referees are informed that they will remain anonymous.

The referees need to

1. Be a member of Science Academy (international referees are excepted from this criterion).
2. Present at the end of the report an open-ended assessment of 50 words concerning the candidate's basic contribution to science.

**NOMINATOR FORM**

This form includes the candidate's name, contact details, and fields of activity. The members who nominate the candidate must present at least 3 referees, together with their academic and professional addresses. The members who nominate may also include in this form their opinion on the basic contributions of the candidate.

**CANDIDATE FORM**

The candidate nomination file is prepared by the nominator. The file consists of the curriculum vitae, list of publications, names of referees, opinions of the nominator, as well as a form composed of open-ended questions meant to reveal how the candidate's work stands out from ordinary studies, and filled out by the candidate. In time, these questions can be updated by SA.

In this file, the candidate is expected to provide information on the following:

An assessment of the importance and weight of the scientific fields that the candidate works in for current day science, a general presentation of the studies carried out and planned by the candidate, as well as

1. Theoretical and methodological contributions by the candidate
2. New perspectives introduced by the candidate,
3. Findings which cannot be explained by existing theories and require a breakthrough, out-of-the-ordinary measurements and data brought about through creative efforts
4. Important citations to her or his work (with examples of the expressions used),
5. New fields of research opened up by the candidate,
6. Contributions to the development of science in Turkey
7. Finally and most importantly, the candidate's contribution to science in brief.

When deemed necessary, Branch Committees can also place additional questions.

The SA members who nominate the candidate can fill out this form themselves after receiving the approval of the candidate.

**REFEREE FORM**

For every question in the form filled out by the candidate, the referees will mark either "I strongly agree", "I strongly agree" or "I disagree", and will write down an explanation, even if brief, for each question. Additional opinions may also be presented. The referee is asked to pen a paragraph on the candidate's contribution to science, which is considered to be the most crucial issue.

**BRANCH COMMITTEE REPORT**

After the Branch Committee analyzes the texts from BC members and reports penned by referees, and the Branch Committee or subgroups hold their meetings, an opinion is formed about the candidate, which is later written down by the coordinators. The candidate submits her or his file to the Board of Directors together with this opinion and the voting results of the Branch Committee or group. The BD discusses whether the file is satisfactory or not, and whether it is possible to reach a decision from the assessments presented, and may decide to either send the file back to the BC or submit it to the GA. According to the Bylaw, an absolute majority is required to reach a decision at the GA vote.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND ELECTION**

Candidates' files, together with referee reports and BC opinions, are sent to all the members sufficiently in advance of the General Assembly meeting. At the General Assembly, a short note prepared by the coordinators and approved by the BD is read out loud for each candidate, outlining the candidate's contributions to science. The files of the candidates are not opened up for debate at the General Assembly. However, the members which have important objections on ethical and/or scientific grounds may ask for such a debate to be held at the GA by presenting their reasons to the BD in advance. It is up to the BD to decide whether such a debate will be opened up or not.

**REASSESSMENT**

Members whose membership is not approved at the General Assembly, including those covered by the provisional clause, may again present it for the agenda at the General Assembly to be held in the 3. year or the 7. year after the General Assembly during which the initial voting was held.

2.5 years after the General Assembly when the initial voting was held, branch coordinators analyze the progress in the candidate's studies, together with those members who nominate the candidate. If the coordinators and nominators consider that there has been sufficient progress for the candidacy to be reassessed, they prepare a Candidate Information Form which underscore these new developments and present it to the branch committee, complete with referee reports if deemed necessary. The remainder of the process is managed according to the Directive for the Election of Members, up until the General Assembly.

In case the candidate is not accepted for membership at the General Assembly after this second assessment, a reassessment process may be initiated starting 6.5 years after the initial voting, to be concluded in the General Assembly to be held 7 years later. As per the Article 8 (c) of the Bylaw, candidates who are not accepted in the seven year period following their initial application, can be nominated again after a 3-year interval.

In case the candidate displays extraordinary progress in her or his research career, the branch coordinators may start the reassessment process without having to wait for the deadlines indicated above.

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

BD may revise the directive in order to simplify the processes, without going against the main principles of the directive. SA members are informed of any such changes.

**PROVISIONAL CLAUSE**

For those scientists who were Associated Members of TÜBA in August 2011 and wish to join SA, a file is prepared including a new curriculum vitae and three referee reports, and the process of assessment and voting for their membership is initiated.