

NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY
Center for General Education
Division of General Education
Faculty Evaluation Regulations and Specific Rules

| | |
|------------------|---|
| January 24, 2018 | Passed by the General Education Committee at its 123 rd meeting |
| June 01, 2021 | Passed by the General Education Committee at its 134 th meeting |
| May 05, 2023 | Passed by the General Education Committee at its 143 rd meeting |
| May 18, 2023 | Promulgation of amended Articles 1 through 6, 8 through 10, 13 through 17, and 20 |

Article 1 National Taiwan University (NTU or “the University”) Center for General Education (“the Center”) Division of General Education (“the Division”) formulates the *Faculty Evaluation Regulations and Specific Rules* (“the Regulations and Specific Rules”) in accordance with Article 15 of the Center’s *Faculty Evaluation Regulations* to elevate the quality of teaching, research, and service provided by faculty members of the Division.

Article 2 Full-time quota-based faculty members of the Division and project instructors of the Division who wish to apply for promotion shall be subject to faculty evaluation by the Division.

Article 3 The evaluation schedule for faculty members of each rank is as follows:

1. Instructors shall be subject to an initial evaluation by the Division within their third to fifth year of service, and shall subsequently undergo an evaluation by the Division every 3 years upon passing the initial evaluation.
2. Assistant professors appointed between January 10, 1998 and July 31, 2016 (inclusive) shall be subject to an initial evaluation by the Division within their third to fifth year of service, and shall subsequently undergo evaluation by the Division every 3 years upon passing the initial evaluation; those appointed on or after August 1, 2016 shall undergo evaluation in accordance with the applicable provisions under Article 10 herein.
3. Associate and full professors shall be evaluated by the Division every five years.

In the event that a faculty member is transferred from another unit of the University to the current unit, their evaluation cycle shall be inclusive of their years of service in the previous unit(s).

In the event that a faculty member with a rank of associate professor or lower qualifies for promotion when their years of service at organizations other than the University are included, they may request an early evaluation upon approval by the Division.

In the event that a faculty member’s promotion has been approved, their next evaluation time frame shall start from the same semester in which their promotion is approved.

Article 4 Faculty members of the Division may only put forth a request for promotion after passing the evaluation.

However, assistant professors appointed on or after August 1, 2016 shall be evaluated in accordance with Article 10 herein.

Assistant professors appointed between August 1, 2012 and July 31, 2016 (inclusive) who fail to be promoted to the rank of associate professor within 8 years of securing their current rank shall be deemed as having failed the re-evaluation and shall be subject to severance or non-renewal of appointment if so determined by the Center's and the University's Faculty Evaluation Committees (collectively, "the Committees"), as stipulated in the *University Act* and the *Teachers' Act*.

The promotion schedule described under the preceding paragraph shall start counting on the date of initial employment for assistant professors appointed between August 1, 2012 and July 31, 2016 (inclusive).

Assistant professors' promotion schedule shall exclude time periods during which they have been granted a deferred evaluation or unpaid leave.

Article 5 Faculty members who have failed their most recent evaluation may not apply for associate professor's or full professor's sabbatical, and, starting from the following academic year, shall be ineligible for salary raise, off-campus adjunct positions, part-time teaching, and temporary transfers; in addition, they may not extend their service, serve on NTU faculty evaluation committees at any level, or serve as the head of any administrative or academic unit at the University.

Upon passing the re-evaluation, such faculty members' rights to take on adjunct positions, teach in a part-time capacity, be on temporary transfers, and, starting from the following academic year, be granted a salary raise will be restored. The restoration of other rights listed in the preceding paragraph shall be governed by the relevant regulations.

Article 6 In the event that a faculty member fails the evaluation, the Division shall inform the faculty member of the specific reasons for the result of not passing the evaluation and provide advice and support regarding the contents and performance of their teaching, research, and service. The Center shall also coordinate with the Division to offer assistance. The faculty member shall be re-evaluated by the Division within 2 years (counting from the semester following the failed evaluation). Faculty members who fail the re-evaluation shall be subject to severance or non-renewal of appointment if so determined by the Committees, as stipulated in the *University Act* and the *Teachers' Act*.

However, assistant professors appointed on or after August 1, 2016 who fail the initial evaluation shall be subject to the applicable provisions under Article 10 herein.

Faculty members who fail to undergo evaluation within the specified time frame or submit false/fraudulent documents which affect the evaluation results shall be deemed to have failed the evaluation.

[Promulgated on May 18, 2023]

Article 7 Faculty members of any rank who have any objection to their evaluation results may file a grievance with the NTU Faculty Member Grievances Committee or an appeal to the Ministry of Education within 30 days of the day of receipt of their evaluation results.

Article 8 Full professors who meet any of the following criteria may request an exemption from the evaluation (evaluation waiver):

1. The professor meets any of the criteria set forth in Article 10, Paragraph 1, Subparagraphs 1 through 7 of the University's *Faculty Evaluation Guidelines*.
2. The professor has an excellent track record in teaching, research, and service, and has received an international award of excellence comparable to those specified in Article 10, Paragraph 1, Subparagraphs 1 through 6 of the University's *Faculty Evaluation Guidelines*; and these accomplishments are duly recognized by the Division's Faculty Evaluation Task Force during its review process.

Those who meet any of the criteria described under the preceding paragraph shall submit the relevant supporting documents to the Division, which shall then forward the documents to the Center Faculty Evaluation Committee for review and referral to the University to grant an exemption from the evaluation.

Article 9 In the event that a faculty member approved for exemption from evaluation violates the *Teachers' Act* or fails to meet the obligations stipulated in their letter of appointment, the Division shall submit the relevant supporting documents to the Center's Faculty Evaluation Committee and the University's Faculty Evaluation Exemption Eligibility Review Panel for review and to the NTU President for approval, after which the faculty member's evaluation waiver shall be revoked.

A faculty member whose evaluation waiver is revoked shall be evaluated in the next academic year and may not apply for further evaluation waivers for three years (inclusive, counting from the semester following the revocation).

Article 10 Assistant professors appointed on or after August 1, 2016 shall be evaluated in accordance with the following provisions:

1. To facilitate assistant professors in achieving academic promotions on schedule, the Division shall notify assistant professors in their third year of service to submit a written report of their progress in teaching, research, and service, which shall be reviewed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee of the Division. The Division's Faculty Evaluation Committee shall then conduct a career assessment based on the report, provide specific recommendations, and then report to the Faculty Evaluation Committee of the Center.
2. Assistant professors shall request a promotion by their fifth year of service. Those who are granted a promotion shall be deemed as having passed the faculty evaluation simultaneously; those who fail to apply for or be granted a promotion by the stipulated deadline shall be deemed as having failed the faculty evaluation.

[Promulgated on May 18, 2023]

Assistant professors who apply for and are granted a promotion by their fourth year of service (inclusive) shall be subject to Article 3, Paragraph 4 herein. In the event that the promotion is not granted, the application shall not be included in the applicant's evaluation records.

3. In the event that an assistant professor fails the evaluation described under the preceding subparagraph, the Division's Faculty Evaluation Committee shall notify said assistant professor, specify the reasons for the result of not passing the evaluation, and provide recommendations regarding the contents and performance of their teaching, research, and service. The Center shall also coordinate with the Division to offer assistance to the assistant professor, who shall be re-evaluated in their seventh year of service at the University. During the re-evaluation, the assistant professor shall concurrently put forth a promotion request, and they shall be deemed as having passed the re-evaluation if the promotion is granted. In the event that the assistant professors fail to apply for or be granted a promotion within the stipulated time frame, they shall be deemed as having failed the re-evaluation.

Assistant professors whose early promotion request is granted while their re-evaluation results are still pending shall be subject to the provisions stipulated in Article 3, Paragraph 4 herein. In the event that the promotion is not granted, the said promotion request shall not be included in the evaluation records.

4. Assistant professors who fail the re-evaluation may no longer request a promotion and shall be subject to severance or non-renewal of appointment if so determined the Committees, as stipulated in the *University Act* and the *Teachers' Act*.
5. The Division shall submit the evaluation results and relevant meeting minutes to the Center for approval within one month of finalizing the evaluation results.

Article 11 Faculty members who give birth or are caring for a toddler under the age of 3 during their stipulated evaluation cycle may apply for a deferral of the evaluation by submitting supporting documents to the Division, the Center, and the University for approval, after which the evaluation may be deferred for 1 year, counting from the semester in which the evaluation was originally scheduled to be conducted. However, a deferral on account of childcare for a toddler under the age of 3 may only be granted once.

Faculty members who undergo a crisis or severe circumstances during their stipulated evaluation cycle may apply for a deferral of the evaluation by submitting supporting documents to the Division, the Center, and the University for approval, after which the evaluation may be deferred for one year, counting from the semester in which the evaluation was originally scheduled to be conducted. A deferral on account of a crisis or severe circumstances may be granted no more than twice within the same evaluation cycle.

Faculty members granted unpaid leave shall have the duration of the leave excluded from their stipulated evaluation cycle. However, the duration of the evaluation cycle, after deducting the period of unpaid leave, must not exceed

[Promulgated on May 18, 2023]

the maximum evaluation cycle for faculty members at each rank as stipulated in Article 3, Paragraph 1 herein.

Faculty members may not seek adjunct engagements, part-time teaching positions, or temporary transfers during the evaluation deferral period.

Article 12 Matters related to the Division's faculty (re-)evaluations shall be handled by the Division's Faculty Evaluation Task Force ("the Task Force"). The Task Force shall comprise the Director of the Division and faculty members of the Division's Faculty Evaluation Committee who are exempt from evaluation. The Director of the Division shall serve as the convener and chair of the Task Force's meetings.

The Task Force shall comprise at least 5 members. In the event that the number of members is fewer than 5 in a given academic year, the Director of the Center shall appoint faculty member(s) exempt from evaluation of the University to fill the remaining seats.

Article 13 The Task Force may only convene with at least two thirds of its membership present. Members shall attend meetings in person and may not appoint proxies. The Task Force may invite faculty members under evaluation or professionals in related fields to attend meetings to make statements or give explanations.

Article 14 The Task Force's review of faculty member performance for each evaluation item shall be based upon 2 parts, i.e., written documentation and review from the membership. The sum of scores from all items in the written documentation shall account for 70% of final total score; the score from the review from the membership shall account for 30% of final total score.

The evaluation items shall include teaching, research, and service, and the full score for all items combined shall be 100 points.

1. For full-time faculty members, the final score is tallied based on the following formula: teaching (50%), research (30%), and service (20%).
2. For teaching-focused project instructors, they can choose either of the following formulas based on their job-related contributions: teaching (60%), research (20%), and service (20%); or teaching (70%), research (20%), and service (10%).

The passing score for the evaluation is 75 or above, and the average score for each item shall not be lower than 50% for that specific item.

Article 15 The item of teaching is further divided into 2 sub-items, i.e., teaching hours and teaching evaluations, each accounting for 50 points of the final score in the item of teaching. If a leave of absence is approved by the University through administrative procedures, the teaching item shall not be counted in that particular semester.

1. Teaching hours: The base score shall be 40 points. Based on the contact hours in accordance with the faculty member's rank and position, 1 point shall be added for every extra hour taught and 2 points shall be deducted for each hour below the minimum requirement of teaching hours. Additional 2 points

[Promulgated on May 18, 2023]

are given for supervising a graduate student, with 1 additional point for supervising each extra graduate student. The sum of the above items is calculated until the full score is reached.

2. Teaching evaluations: The score for this sub-item shall be based on the average of all course evaluations during the evaluation period. A base score of 35 is given to the evaluation average score of 4.0, with 1 point added to the base score for an extra of 0.1 evaluation average and 1 point deducted for a minus of 0.1 evaluation average. The sum is calculated until the full score is reached. Additional 5 points are given for each Outstanding Teaching Award awarded by the University; additional 10 points are given for each Distinguished Teaching Award awarded by the University or each Distinguished Award for General Education Teachers awarded by the Ministry of Education. The sum is calculated until the full score is reached.

In the presence of other teaching-related achievements or specific performance of teaching excellence, the faculty member under evaluation shall provide supporting documents and the Task Force may decide whether to recognize such achievements and count them towards the sub-item of teaching evaluations.

- Article 16 The item of research is scored based on the following standards. One superlative journal article is selected and a base score is given according to the category of the journal: 60 points for A-level journals, 50 points for B-level journals, and 40 points for C-level journals. Each additional A-level article is awarded 20 points, each additional B-level article is awarded 10 points, and each additional C-level article is awarded 5 points, calculated until the full score is reached.

The level distinction for journal articles is based on the following standards.

1. A-level:

- 1) Reviewed books published on academic subjects (including collections of academic essays, general discourses, college-level textbooks, critical translations, etc.); and
- 2) Academic journal papers published in SCIE, SSCI, A&HCI, THCI, TSSCI, or other excellent (Tier 1) journals recognized by a college of the University in related fields, with approval by and acknowledgement from the NTU Faculty Evaluation Committee.

2. B-level:

- 1) Book chapters in reviewed books published on academic subjects (including collections of academic essays, general discourses, college-level textbooks, critical translations, etc.); and
- 2) Academic journal papers published in Tier 2 journals recognized by a college of the University in related fields, with approval by and acknowledgement from the NTU Faculty Evaluation Committee.

3. C-level: Other reviewed academic journal papers.

[Promulgated on May 18, 2023]

In the presence of other research-related achievements or awards, the faculty member under evaluation shall provide relevant documents and the Task Force may decide whether to recognize such achievements and count them towards the item of research.

When the work of the faculty member under evaluation is not yet published, a letter of proof stating the paper's acceptance and its being scheduled to publish must be attached; for books or book chapters, a letter of proof stating the work will be published must be attached.

If said work fails to be published by the time of evaluation held by the Division in the next academic year, and if there is no other publication of the same ranking to be submitted, the faculty member under evaluation shall be deemed to have failed the evaluation, and shall be reported to the Center.

If the faculty member's work fails to be published in 1 year, and if the situation is due to reasons that cannot be attributed to them, the faculty member shall provide a letter of proof stating the reason and a confirmed date of publication to the Task Force to apply for extension. The period of extension is limited within 3 years starting from the date of the letter of proof of publication/acceptance for said work.

Article 17 The item of service is calculated with the base score of 70 points in the presence of any event under the following sub-items. Additional 10 points are given for each extra event, calculated until the full score is reached. Applicable sub-items under the item of service include:

1. Participation in the organization of teaching/learning programs or activities offered by the Center, or assistance in the Center's administrative affairs;
2. Participation in the organization of teaching/learning programs or activities offered by the University, or assistance in the University's administrative affairs; and
3. Other service-related events as recognized by the Task Force.

Article 18 The Division shall notify faculty members failing the evaluation of their right to file a grievance or appeal in accordance with Article 7 herein.

Article 19 Matters not addressed herein shall be handled in accordance with applicable regulations.

Article 20 The Regulations and Specific Rules shall be passed by the Division's Faculty Evaluation Task Force and the Center for General Education Affairs Meeting, and then implemented on the date of promulgation.