

## **Science Academy Directive for Election of Principal Members**

These guidelines determine the election methods of Science Academy Principal Member candidates and Honorary Member Category IV candidates.

### **PRINCIPLES**

The authority to elect members to the Science Academy (SA) resides in the principal members of SA. Member election is finalized in the General Assembly.

In order to be elected as a member of the SA, significant and valuable contributions must be made to science. The reports that demonstrate the scientific importance of the members' works must be based not on merely quantitative criteria and simple formulae, but on a qualitative assessment of these contributions and their impact.

The new members to be elected must not have any conducts against the principles in the Academic Merit, Freedom and Integrity declaration signed by all members of the SA.

### **MEMBER SELECTION**

Each new member must be nominated by three principal members of the SA. One of the nominators also bears the responsibility of coordinating the nomination (main nominator). This member should not be from the same institution as the candidate. At most one of the other supporters of the candidate can be from the same institution, and this member must not be in the position of Deanship or above at the time of the proposal being made to the Science Academy.

Member elections of the Science Academy are finalized at the annual Extraordinary General Assembly held in November/December. The following calendar is to be applied for the election to take place in this General Assembly (GA):

- a) The files are to be delivered to the Executive Board by April 30. The files delivered after this date will be submitted to vote in November/December only if they make that date.
- b) The referee reports are expected to be completed by June. In case of inadequate number of reports or reports being unsatisfactory in terms of content, the summer term is utilized for acquiring additional reports. In this case, coordinators inform the EB on the process.
- c) The completed files are delivered to the relevant groups within the month of September.
- d) Latest by the second half of October, groups convene to assess the files. The results of the assessments are forwarded to the Executive Board as brief reports.
- e) The Executive Board assumes the responsibility of submitting this file to the General Assembly.

These forms open to being revised in time, are designed differently for nominating members and referees. The assessment will not be limited to criteria such as the number of publications and

citations. The aim is to understand in what degree the scientific works of the member candidate stands out from ordinary scientific data production or routine practice.

In order to create the member candidate file, “Principal Member Candidate Forms” comprised of open-ended questions are prepared. For the member candidates, the forms filled out by the members and the candidate and three published works by the candidate that he/she deems most important are submitted to the SA. If these works are articles, their electronic copies, if they are books or chapters of books, copies of pages featuring the names of the publishing house, the editor etc. must be included in the candidate nomination file, accompanied by an introductory note.

In the member selection process Branch Committees (BC) take charge. Within the broadest scope the branch committees are divided as follows: A) Medicine, Life and Health Sciences B) Social Sciences and Humanities, C) Science, Mathematics and Engineering Sciences. In addition to this classification, the Executive Board establishes Assessment Groups for different disciplines. SA principal members are at least members of one of these committees and groups.

Each branch committee has a coordinator. Coordinators are invited to their positions for three years by the Executive Board. Branch Committee coordinators may establish new groups every year, according to the branches of the new candidates and the areas, numbers and participation opportunities of the Branch Committee members. BC coordinators carry out the studies of the groups with the participation of the other coordinators from that group invited by the EB if necessary.

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. When determining the referees, utmost care is given that there are no connections that might cast doubt on the assessment process. The referees are informed that their identities will remain anonymous.

- a) Firstly, the referees need to be members of the Science Academy (unless they are international referees)
- b) In addition to an open-ended assessment on the essential contribution of the candidate to science, a summary text limited to 50 words is expected from the referees.

## **NOMINATOR FORM**

In this form, the name and contact information of the candidate are stated. At least three referees will be submitted by the nominating members along with their academic and work addresses. The recommending members can also add their opinions on the basic contributions of the candidate here. The Science Academy Office is responsible for calling each of the nominators to get their approvals that they assume the responsibility of recommending the person with the latest information on the file.

## **THE FORM FILLED OUT BY THE CANDIDATE / NOMINATOR**

The member nomination file is prepared by the nominator. In addition to the resume and list of, names of referees and opinions of nominating members, a form filled out by the nominator or the candidate, comprised of open-ended questions that emphasize the difference of the candidate's scientific contribution from ordinary research. These questions may be renewed by SA in time.

In the file to be prepared, the review of the importance and weight of the scientific fields of their study, a general introduction of the research conducted and planned by the candidate and explanation on the following subjects is expected. Field Committees can utilize additional questions.

- 1) As the primary and the most important point; what the candidate's contribution to science is,
- 2) Their theoretical and methodical contributions,
- 3) The different perspectives introduced by the candidate,
- 4) Findings that cannot be explained through the framework of existing theories, that require a breakthrough, an extraordinary measurements and/or data realized through a distinctive creativity,
- 5) Important references made to their work (with examples from expressions used),
- 6) New research areas created,
- 7) Contributions to science they made in our country.

The recommending SA principal members may fill out this form themselves provided that they obtain the candidate's permission.

## **REFERREE FORM**

Referees will write a short explanation for each subject in the form filled out by the candidate. Additional opinions are also welcome. As the most important point, a paragraph written by the candidate on their contribution to science is definitely expected or a recommendation letter needs to be attached.

## **BRANCH COMMITTEE REPORT**

In case of referee reports with missing parts, unanswered questions or inadequate explanations the Field Committee coordinators may not put them into process, requesting a new referee report. Following the examination of the Field Committee or sub-group files and referee reports and group reviews through meetings or correspondence an opinion is formed on the membership of the candidate written by the coordinators. The EB discusses whether the file is sufficient or not, whether if it is possible to reach an opinion with the assessments at hand and either decides to send the file back to BC or submit it to GA. EB might give the nominators the option to withdraw the candidate looking at the results of the Branch Committee. The candidate withdrawn in this manner are subject to the times and processes stated in the "Reassessment" section in this directive. According to the Bylaw, an absolute majority is required to reach a decision at the GA vote.

## **GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND ELECTION**

The candidate member files are sent to all principal members along with referee files and FC opinions in an adequate time period before the General Assembly meeting. During the General Assembly a note is

read about each candidate prepared by the coordinators and approved by the EB, explaining the contributions of each candidate to science. The candidate files are not open for debate during the General Assembly. Nevertheless, members who have significant objections on ethical and/or scientific grounds may send the EB their justifications beforehand and ask that a discussion be made in the GA. The decision for a debate is under EB's authority.

## **REASSESSMENT**

Members whose principal 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 overall 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 underscores these new developments and present it to the branch committee, complete with referee reports if deemed necessary. The remainder of the process is carried out according to the Directive for the Election of Principal 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 beginning 6.5 years after the initial voting, to be finalized 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 their research career, the branch coordinators may start the reassessment process without having to wait for the deadlines indicated above.

## **EXECUTIVE BOARD**

EB 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.