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Article 1 National Chung Hsing University (hereinafter, NCHU or “the University”) has formulated the following *Faculty Evaluation Guidelines* (“Guidelines”) in accordance with Article 21 of the *University Act* to strengthen faculty members’ performance in teaching, research, and service.

Article 2 Full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers, as well as teaching assistants who obtained their teaching certificate on or prior to March 19, 1997 (“old-system teaching assistants”) shall be subject to regular evaluations in accordance with the provisions set forth herein unless they meet any of the following exemption criteria:  
1. They are over the age of 60.

2. They have been named an academician by Academia Sinica (or an equivalent national academic institution).

3. They have won the Ministry of Education Academic Award or Outstanding Teacher Award, or a domestic or international award of greater significance as determined by the NCHU Faculty Evaluation Committee.

4. They currently serve or have served as a chair professor at a renowned domestic or foreign institution.

5. They have won the Ministry of Science and Technology Outstanding Research Award.

6. They have been awarded tenure as a lifetime distinguished professor in accordance with the University’s *Regulations for the Establishment of Distinguished Professorships*.

7. They have been awarded a chair professorship or distinguished professorship by the University in the most recent five-year period.

8. They have been awarded the MOST Class A Research Award or headed MOST research projects (including academia-industry collaboration projects) at least ten times. A project must last at least one year to be counted, and only one project per year may be counted.

Article 3 Each college of the University shall establish a faculty evaluation task force at the beginning of each academic year. The task force shall be in charge of faculty evaluations within the college for the academic year. The composition and quorum of the task force shall be determined by individual colleges. The task force shall be composed of outstanding scholars and experts from within and outside of the University, and at least half of the members shall be unaffiliated with NCHU.

Colleges which conduct separate evaluations for faculty members in different disciplines may set a different evaluation schedule if there are fewer than 10 faculty members in a given discipline or if there are other extraordinary circumstances. The aforementioned evaluation schedule shall be implemented upon approval by the NCHU President in accordance with internal administrative procedures.

Article 4 Faculty members shall be evaluated for their performance in three areas—teaching, research, and service. Evaluations for old-system teaching assistants shall cover two areas—assistance in teaching and research, and administrative service performance. Each college shall formulate both a scoring rubric detailing the criteria for and weight given to each of the categories and a set of rules governing evaluation methods and passing scores, submit them to its faculty evaluation committee for passage, and present them to the NCHU President for approval and implementation.

The weight assigned to teaching, as described in the preceding paragraph, shall be no less than 30% of the total score.

The passing scores for both the individual evaluation areas and the total score set by each college in accordance with Paragraph 1 herein shall be no less than 70%. Individual colleges may set a higher passing score if necessary.

Faculty members who have led a university social responsibility (USR) project during the review period may receive bonus points under the service category, the standards for which shall be determined by individual colleges.

Faculty members may have penalty points deducted from their teaching category score if, during the review period, a graduate student under their advisement is found by the competent department (or graduate institute, degree program, or college) to have submitted a thesis/dissertation that is inconsistent with the professional field they are in. The standards for penalty points shall be determined by individual colleges.

Article 5 Each college shall complete all evaluation tasks by May 31 of each year. The faculty evaluation task force shall require each department (graduate institute) to fill out the necessary forms, affix the supporting documents, and submit them to the task force for review by April 30. Faculty members who refuse to provide the necessary documents shall be deemed as having failed the evaluation.

Each college shall submit the evaluation results and records together with a list of names of evaluation-exempt faculty members to the University for recordation, and shall inform each department (graduate institute) and faculty member of the evaluation results by June 10.

Article 6 Faculty members of any rank shall undergo evaluation every five years. Newly appointed faculty members shall undergo an initial evaluation after three years of service at the University. Those who fail the evaluation shall be subject to a re-evaluation in the following year. Those who fail the re-evaluation shall be subject to a second re-evaluation in the third year. In principle, faculty members may be granted up to two re-evaluations.

The University shall inform faculty members who are subject to a re-evaluation of their evaluation results and the provisions stipulated herein. Faculty members who pass the evaluation (or a re-evaluation) shall be subject to another evaluation in five years.

Article 7 Faculty evaluation task forces may nominate faculty members with outstanding teaching, research, or service performance as candidates for the NCHU Outstanding Teaching Award, Outstanding Research Award, Young Teacher Research Award, or Outstanding Service Award. Each college and department (graduate institute) may also establish their own awards based on the evaluation results.

Article 8 Faculty members who fail the evaluation shall submit an improvement plan to their department/graduate institute by June 30 of the same year. The department/graduate institute shall intervene to provide the necessary assistance and guidance and may, if necessary, refer such faculty members to the competent unit for further assistance in accordance with internal administrative procedures. Faculty members who fail the evaluation shall be subject to a re-evaluation in the following year.

Faculty members who fail the re-evaluation shall be subject to a second re-evaluation and shall submit another improvement plan to their department/graduate institute. Intervention from other competent units may be requested if necessary.

Article 9 Each college shall, at its earliest convenience, refer faculty members who fail the re-evaluation to the college- (or center- or office-) level faculty evaluation committee and then to the NCHU Faculty Evaluation Committee for review, the latter of which shall, based on the evaluation results, determine the necessary measures to be taken by June 30. One or more of the following disciplinary actions may be taken, and shall remain in effect until the faculty member in question passes the evaluation:

1. No sabbatical leave in the following year

2. No part-time engagements on or off campus in the following year

3. No part-time teaching at another institution in the following year

4. No secondment in the following year

5. Reduction of academic research funding by 5% to 10% in the following year

6. No promotions or changes of appointment in the following year

7. No or a reduced year-end bonus in the current year

8. No pay raise in the current year

9. Suspension of appointment in the following year

10.Non-renewal of appointment in the following year

Faculty members and old-system teaching assistants shall be subject to non-renewal of appointment after failing the re-evaluation twice. Except for those appointed under Article 13, Paragraph 2 of the University’s *Regulations Governing the Appointment of Project Teachers and Researchers*, all newly appointed lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors must obtain a promotion by the following deadlines:

1. Lecturers and assistant professors appointed prior to the formulation of the University’s Faculty Evaluation Guidelines on May 10, 2002 shall be exempt from deadlines for promotion.

2. Lecturers and assistant professors appointed on or between May 11, 2002 and May 13, 2005 who are unable to obtain two promotions within 10 years AND who fail two re-evaluations consecutively shall be subject to non-renewal of appointment.

3. Lecturers and assistant professors appointed on or between May 14, 2005 and January 31, 2014 who are unable to obtain a promotion within eight years OR who fail two re-evaluations consecutively shall be subject to non-renewal of appointment.

4. Lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors appointed on or after February 1, 2014 who fail to obtain a promotion within six years shall be ineligible for a pay raise. Those who still fail to obtain a promotion by the seventh year shall be subject to non-renewal of appointment.

The calculation of years of service in the preceding paragraph shall be based on academic years. Partial years of service (for faculty members who are appointed after August) shall be disregarded. To issue a resolution of non-renewal of appointment for faculty members described in Subparagraphs 2 through 4 of the preceding paragraph, the competent faculty evaluation committee must convene with at least two thirds of its members in attendance and vote with two thirds of the attending members in concurrence. The resolution shall then be presented to the Ministry of Education for approval in accordance with the applicable administrative procedures. Except for those who pass an evaluation or re-evaluation under Subparagraph 2 above, faculty members who miss the promotion deadline may no longer request a promotion before the expiry of their appointment.

Instead of facing non-renewal of appointment, any newly appointed lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors who are unable to obtain a promotion under Paragraph 2, Subparagraphs 3 and 4 herein may request an extension of the promotion deadline in accordance with Paragraph 5 herein or apply for a change of appointment to the position of project teacher pursuant to Article 13 of the University’s *Regulations Governing the Appointment of Project Teachers and Researchers*.

Faculty members who experience any of the following circumstances during the review period may be granted an extension of the promotion deadline as described in Paragraph 2 herein with the approval of the competent faculty evaluation committee:

1. A two-year extension may be granted to faculty members who have been pregnant, given birth, or been on unpaid maternity leave, or who hold a certificate of major illness or injury or who have encountered a major accident during the review period. Faculty members may only request an extension once for each major illness or injury. To receive an extension, faculty members must submit a promotion proposal and the relevant supporting documents. The proposal shall clearly indicate the faculty member’s plans during the extension period.

2. A one-year extension may be granted to faculty members whose spouse has been pregnant or given birth during the review period.

3. Faculty members who are seconded to a government agency, public research institute, state-owned enterprise, or government-funded foundation may be granted an extension of the same duration as their period of secondment. However, if the last day of the secondment falls within a semester, the extension shall only be effective until the end of that semester.

Faculty members who are on sabbatical, abroad for further studies, or on unpaid leave, or who hold a certificate of major illness or injury, are caring for a toddler, encounter a major accident, or experience any of the circumstances described in the preceding paragraph may present the relevant proof to request a deferred (re-)evaluation in accordance with internal administrative procedures.

Under any of the following circumstances, faculty members under evaluation shall be placed under supervision:

1. The faculty member is more than two thirds into their mandatory promotion period, as described under Paragraph 2, Subparagraphs 2 through 4 herein.

2. The faculty member received a passing score from the college, but their teaching, research, or service grade falls below the passing threshold described in Article 4, Paragraph 3 herein.

Departments and graduate institutes shall require the faculty members described in the preceding paragraph to submit an improvement plan, which shall be forwarded to the competent college for progress tracking.

Article 10 Faculty members who wish to dispute the evaluation results may file an appeal in writing and submit the necessary supporting documents for review within 30 days of receiving the written notification in accordance with the University’s *Guidelines for the Organization of the Faculty Appeal Committee and Its Review Procedures*.

Appellants who wish to dispute the results of an appeal may file a further appeal with the Ministry of Education’s Central Committee for Teacher Appeals.

Article 11 Matters pertaining to evaluation regulations, evaluation task forces, and evaluation tasks for faculty members who are not affiliated with any college shall be handled by the competent unit in accordance with the provisions applicable to colleges.

Article 12 The provisions set forth herein shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to full-time research fellows at the University. Each college (or office or center) shall establish a set of research fellow evaluation guidelines (including evaluation methods, scoring categories, criteria, and procedures) and shall submit them to the University for recordation and implementation.

Article 13 Full-time professors (including chair professors and distinguished professors), associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, research fellows, and old-system teaching assistants who are found to have engaged in any of the following acts shall have the fact considered in the evaluation:

1. Having directly signed a research project contract with a government agency, accepted a full-time or part-time position at an academic association, or undertaken a research project under the auspices of an academic association without going through the necessary internal administrative and contract signing procedures of the University

2. Having been found guilty of fraudulent use of research funds by a court of first instance

3. Having been found to be in violation of procurement regulations by an auditing agency

Article 14 Matters unaddressed herein shall be subject to other applicable regulations of the University.

Article 15 These Guidelines and any amendments made hereto shall be implemented upon passage by the University Council.