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Article 1 The following guidelines have been formulated in accordance with Articles 3 and 12 of the National Chung Hsing University (hereinafter, NCHU or “the University”) *Regulations for Faculty Appointments and Promotions*.

Article 2 Faculty appointment and promotion evaluations shall cover the following items:

1. Teaching:

1) Courses taught

2) Contributions to education

3) Lesson plans and teaching materials

4) Offering of core college courses or general education courses

5) Teaching evaluation results and improvement measures (teaching portfolio and self-reflection)

2. Research:

1) Academic writing: Journal papers and other academic writing (including monographs and specialized publications)

2) Educational praxis writing: Writing about educational praxis and research results

3) Technical reports: Reports on invention patents and related technology transfers or industry-academia collaboration projects

3. Service and collaborations:

1) Service and contributions to the faculty member’s department (graduate institute, office, center, or degree program), their college, the University, and shared laboratories or internship factories

2) Results of industry-academia collaboration research projects

3) Guidance for students participating in extracurricular activities and technology events, or personal participation in scholarly lectures

4) Fulfillment of social responsibility

5) Other extraordinary contributions outside of the University

Article 3 The weights of each of the grading items described in the preceding article shall be as follows:

1. Those applying for a promotion to the rank of full professor: teaching 30%, research 50%, service and collaboration 20%

2. Those applying for a promotion to the rank of associate or assistant professor: teaching 30%, research 40%, service and collaboration 30%

Individual departments and colleges may adjust the weights within ±20 percentage points, but none of the grading items shall account for less than 10% of the total score.

The total score of the three items described in Paragraph 1 shall equal 100. Candidates with a score of 70 or above may be referred to the faculty evaluation committee of the superordinate unit (see Appendix for the referral form). Current NCHU employees who obtained a lecturer/teaching assistant certificate prior to the implementation of the March 19, 1997 amendment of the Act Governing the Appointment of Educators may choose to be subject to the original faculty evaluation and publication review guidelines provided that there has been no interruption of their teaching duties.

Those applying for a change of appointment shall be subject to the same scoring items and criteria applicable to faculty promotion reviews. However, individual colleges (office, center, or independent degree program) may determine whether a non-scored evaluation may be conducted for part-time faculty members holding a teaching certificate for a higher rank who wish to apply for a change of appointment.

Article 4 Monographs and specialized publications submitted by faculty members for appointment, promotion, and change of appointment reviews must be original work in the same or a similar field as the courses they teach and may not be a compilation, extension, assemblage, or rearrangement of other people’s work. Furthermore, work submitted for consideration must meet the following requirements:

1. The representative work must have been completed after the candidate was promoted to their current rank and in the five-year period preceding the review. Supplementary works must have been completed after the candidate was promoted to their current rank. Candidates who have been pregnant or have given birth to a child during the validity period may apply for an extension of two years.

2. Academic writing must have been published or pending publication (with proof of acceptance) in a renowned international or domestic scholarly journal (including publicly accessible e-journals) with an anonymous peer review system or have been released by a publisher with an editorial review board of consisting of five editors (with a pre-publication review conducted by two anonymous reviewers). Faculty members who submit a monograph for consideration must also produce proof of formal review by the publisher or the editor-in-chief. For journal papers released both electronically and in print but on different dates, the publication date of the electronic version shall prevail provided that it has gone through a formal review process and is publicly accessible. Supplementary works submitted by faculty members seeking a promotion or change of appointment must have been published under the auspices of NCHU and while they were under the University’s employment.

3. There are no limitations as to which languages the academic writing submitted for consideration may be written in, but an abstract in Chinese must be provided for works written in a foreign language. For works written in a foreign language other than English, an English abstract may be provided in lieu of the Chinese abstract. The University may ask candidates to translate works written in a foreign language into Chinese or English if it is unable to find reviewers domestically who are well-versed in that language.

4. Please credit any citations and include them in the reference section.

5. Candidates who submit two or more works shall designate a representative work and list the others as supplementary works. A series of works that belong in the same research project may be submitted as a single entry under the representative work. A work that has previously been submitted as a representative work for review may no longer be submitted as such when applying for a promotion.

6. A co-authored work may only be submitted as the representative work by either the first author or corresponding author, and all other co-authors shall waive their right to have the work considered as their representative work. If the work is submitted by the corresponding author, proof of contribution shall be provided. The author who submits the work for consideration shall provide a written statement detailing their contribution and signed by all other co-authors. In the event that the signature of a co-author cannot be obtained, the candidate shall prepare a statement detailing the contribution of said co-author and the reason for the inability to obtain their signature, and shall present the statement to the NCHU Faculty Evaluation Committee for review in order to receive an exemption.

7. The statement of contribution for co-authored works will not be required if:

1) The candidate is an Academia Sinica academician.

2) The candidate is the first or corresponding author of the work and some or all of the co-authors are based in a foreign country.

8. Permissible publication window for representative and supplementary works, as described in Paragraph 1:

1) Representative work: Candidates wishing to receive an appointment, promotion, or change of appointment on August 1 of each year must have their representative work published (or pending publication with proof of acceptance issued by a journal or publisher) by February 15 of the same year; those wishing to receive an appointment, promotion, or change of appointment on February 1 of each year must have their representative work published (or pending publication with proof of acceptance issued by a journal or publisher) by August 15 of the preceding year. Candidates who present proof of acceptance for a publication-pending work must ensure that said work is officially published within one year of the acceptance date and must have the work printed out and submitted to the University for verification and recordation within two months of official publication. If the work is not published within one year for reasons not attributable to the candidate, the candidate shall provide a statement detailing the reason(s) why the journal/publisher is unable to publish the work and the expected publication date in order to request an extension in accordance with the applicable faculty evaluation procedures. Faculty evaluation committees must actively keep track of extended applications and shall ensure that all works are published within three years of acceptance by the journal/publisher.

2) For supplementary works, candidates must provide a proof of acceptance issued by a journal or publisher prior to the external review at the latest. Candidates must ensure that said works are officially published within one year of the acceptance date and must have them printed out and submitted to the competent college for verification and recordation and to the NCHU Faculty Evaluation Committee for reference within two months of official publication. If the works are not published within one year for reasons not attributable to the candidate, the candidate shall provide a statement detailing the reason(s) why the journal/publisher is unable to publish them and the expected publication date in order to request an extension with the college faculty evaluation committee of no more than three years from the acceptance date.

3) The proof of acceptance for journal papers described in Subparagraphs 1 and 2 above must be issued by an international journal or a Class A journal as determined by the college.

4) The preceding requirements shall also apply to academic works that have been published in multiple volumes each with a different publication date and later released in a single-volume edition.

9. Newly appointed assistant professors may submit their doctoral dissertation in lieu of the specialized publication described in Article 16-1, Subparagraph 1 of the *Act Governing the Appointment of Educators* without being bound by the five-year publication window described under Paragraph 1 herein.

10. Faculty members may submit any professional or academic achievements completed in the period between their previous promotion and the current promotion review as supplementary information.

11. Works that were already submitted for a previous promotion review may no longer be submitted as supplementary works to the faculty evaluation committee for appointment, promotion, or change of appointment reviews.

A scholarly journal, as described in the preceding paragraph, shall refer to a regularly published non-news type periodical with a review system. The publication must clearly indicate the names of the author and publisher, the time and location of publishing, and the publisher’s registration number.

Newly appointed faculty members who meet the criteria stipulated in Article 3 of the University’s *Regulations for Faculty Appointments and Promotions* may be granted an exemption from the external review, but their submitted works must still meet the requirements described in the preceding two paragraphs, except that no statement of contribution is required for co-authored works.

Faculty members may submit technical reports or pedagogical works for review in lieu of specialized publications. Technical reports shall be in a written format and shall contain five sections: R&D concept, theoretical basis, thematic content, methodology and techniques, and results and contributions. Patent reports shall include the aforementioned five sections as well as a patent certificate and proof of patent approval.

Article 4-1 Faculty members who wish to submit pedagogical works as their representative work shall ensure that such writing corresponds with the courses they teach and is distributed nationwide by a publisher with a review system or published in a renowned domestic or international scholarly journal (including e-journals that are publicly accessible) with an anonymous peer review system.

Article 5 Once an appointment, promotion, or change of appointment application is determined to be consistent with the provisions set forth under Article 4 or 4-1 herein by the faculty evaluation committee of the competent department (or graduate institute, office, center, or degree program), the convener shall compile a list of reviewers consisting of at least 10 external experts/scholars recommended confidentially by committee members. For pedagogical works submitted as representative work, three additional experts/scholars with teaching experience or who have published works in the same or a related subject area shall be recommended by the Office of Academic Affairs. The list of recommended experts/scholars shall be delivered as a confidential document to the convener of the college faculty evaluation committee. Additional external experts/scholars may be added to the list by the convener and the NCHU President, who shall select five reviewers from the list (the NCHU President shall select two while the convener shall select three). For pedagogical works submitted as representative work, the convener shall select at least one expert/scholar with teaching experience or who has published works in the same or a related subject area. Other matters related to the external review shall be handled by each competent college, office, center, and independent degree program.

Faculty evaluation committee conveners and the NCHU President shall recuse themselves if they are or have been in a teacher, student, relative within the third degree of kinship by blood or marriage, academic collaborator, or other stakeholder relationship with the candidate. In the event that the convener of a college faculty evaluation committee recuses themselves, members of the committee shall elect an acting convener from among themselves (which may be done via mail-in vote). In the event that the NCHU President or the convener of the NCHU Faculty Evaluation Committee recuses themselves, members of the Committee shall elect an acting convener from among themselves to be in charge of selecting external reviewers. Lists of external reviewers recommended by department-level faculty evaluation committees shall be delivered as confidential documents to the competent college-level faculty evaluation committee, which shall keep such lists sealed and strictly confidential.

Each individual college, office, center, and independent degree program shall establish a set of procedures or guidelines for selecting external reviewers, which shall be submitted to the NCHU Faculty Evaluation Committee for recordation.

Applications submitted by faculty members appointed directly by a college shall be handled in accordance with the preceding paragraph by the college faculty evaluation committee, which shall submit a list of recommended external reviewers as a confidential document to the convener of the NCHU Faculty Evaluation Committee. Additional external experts/scholars may be added to the list by the convener and the NCHU President, who shall select five reviewers from the list (the NCHU President shall select two while the convener shall select three). Matters related to the external review shall be handled individually by each college.

Article 6 Candidates for faculty appointments, promotions, and changes of appointment must meet the following criteria to be eligible for review by the three levels of faculty evaluation committees (each unit may set stricter criteria, which shall prevail):

1. Professors and associate professors: A final grade of B (80%) or higher from at least four reviewers

2. Assistant professors and lecturers: A final grade of C (75%) or higher from at least four reviewers, with at least three reviewers assigning a grade of B (80%) or higher

Before a case is sent to the three levels of faculty evaluation committee for review, the convener of the competent college faculty evaluation committee shall forward the opinions of each external reviewer to the faculty evaluation committees of all levels for reference.

Article 7 The provisions herein shall apply mutatis mutandis to part-time Continuing Bachelor’s Degree Program faculty members requesting a promotion review.

Article 8 Matters unaddressed herein shall be subject to the *Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education*, the *Principles for Handling Teachers in Violation of Teacher Qualifications Review Guidelines at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education*, and other applicable regulations.

Article 9 These Guidelines and any amendments made hereto shall be implemented upon passage by the University Council.