

# National Sun Yat-sen University Regulations for Faculty Evaluations

Approved at the 2<sup>nd</sup> University Assembly of 2005 Academic Year, December 23, 2005

Amended and approved by the 4<sup>th</sup> University Assembly of 2007 Academic Year, June 8, 2007

Amended and approved at the 1<sup>st</sup> University Assembly of 2009 Academic Year, October 23, 2009

Amended and approved at the 2<sup>nd</sup> University Assembly of 2009 Academic Year, December 18, 2009

Amended and approved at the 2<sup>nd</sup> University Assembly of 2010 Academic Year, December 24, 2010

Amended and approved at the 1<sup>st</sup> University Assembly of 2011 Academic Year, October 21, 2011

Amended and approved at the 2<sup>nd</sup> University Assembly of 2013 Academic Year, December 20, 2013

**Amended and approved at the 2<sup>nd</sup> University Assembly of 2014 Academic Year, December 26, 2014**

- Article 1 The regulations are established (hereinafter referred as “the Regulations”), in accordance with Articles 20 and 21 of the University Act, and Articles 58 and 60 of NSYSU Organization Regulations to improve the quality of teaching, research, counseling and services.
- Article 2 All full-time faculty members shall be evaluated in accordance with the Regulations.
- Article 3 All full-time faculty members shall be evaluated every 5 years. The academic year when the faculty members who pass the evaluation shall count that academic year as the beginning year for their next evaluation.
- Article 4 Faculty members who receive either Outstanding Research Award from **the Ministry of Science and Technology**, or Ta-You Wu Memorial Award, are exempted from evaluation for that evaluation year.
- Article 5 Faculty members are not required to undergo evaluations for any of following conditions:
1. Selected as academician of Academia Sinica.
  2. Recipients of either Academic award of Ministry of Education or the National Forum; **National Literary Award from the Ministry of Culture**; this university’s professorial chair; as well as professorial chairs from well-known universities, foreign and domestic, approved by this university.
  3. Those who have accumulated up to 15 points with the achievements listed below. Exclude research project plans for **the Ministry of Science and Technology**, which require 8 points (inclusive) or more.
    - 3.1 Research projects and rewards:
      - 3.1.1. Project plan:

Project leader for research project of **the Ministry of Science and Technology**, (starting from **MOST** 91). Each project counts as one point, maximum 3 points total per **academic** year.
      - 3.1.2. Research reward:
        - a) 5 points for Outstanding Research Award of **the Ministry of Science and Technology**.
        - b) 3 points for Outstanding Research Award of this university (formerly the Research Evaluation Award).
        - c) 2.5 points for Best Research Award of **the Ministry of Science and Technology**.
        - d) 2.5 points for Ta-You Wu Memorial Award,.
        - e) 2.5 points for Junior Research Investigators Award of Academia Sinica.

- f) 1.5 points for Outstanding Research Award for Young Scholar of this university.
  - g) 1.5 points for each Grade A Award by **the Ministry of Science and Technology**.
- 3.1.3. No additional points will be given with any of the following:
- a) Awarded the Outstanding Research Award (formerly the Research Evaluation Award) by this university as a result from winning the Outstanding Research Award of **the Ministry of Science and Technology**.
  - b) Automatically received the Young Scholar Award by this university, after winning the Ta-You Wu Memorial Award
- 3.2 Teaching plan and reward:
- 3.2.1. Teaching plan:  
Those who led teaching related research projects for the Ministry of Education, get 1 point for every NT\$300,000 of project funding received. Maximum 4 points.
- 3.2.2. Teaching reward:
- a) 3 points for Teaching Award of Excellence of the university (formerly the Outstanding Teaching Award).
  - b) 1.5 points for Best Teaching Faculty Member Award of the university (formerly the Best Teaching Award).
- 3.3 Industrial researches and rewards:
- 3.3.1. Industrial research:
- a) Those who led collaborative education programs commissioned by the governmental or a non-governmental organization (corporations and legal entities) and approved by the undertaking handling unit of this university, get 1 point for every NT\$1,000,000 of project funding received. Those disbursed with university Administrative Affair Fund get 1 point for every NT\$100,000 received, and so forth.
  - b) One point for technology transfer fee up to NT\$400,000 approved by the university's undertaking handling unit; or 1 point for every NT\$100,000 of feedback fund from any college/department of the university, and so forth.
  - c) A total of 4 points maximum may be combined by abovementioned sections a) and b).
- 3.3.2. Industrial reward:  
3 points for each Industrial Collaboration Excellence Award (formerly the Sun Yat-sen Technological Invention Award and Outstanding Industrial Collaboration Award) received.
4. Aged 60 (exclude newly appointed faculty members).
5. Those who previously received famous international academic awards or outstanding recognitions related to teaching, research and services (including sports, theatrical art and music), approved by three-level Teacher Review Committees and the university President. When awarded certificates are in question, the matter should be evaluated by Office of Academic Affairs (teaching aspect), Office of Research and Development and **Office of Industrial Collaboration and Continuing Education Affairs** (research aspect).

This rule was amended and approved in October 21, 2011. During the first evaluation after this rule was amended, all full-time faculty members appointed before that date may obtain exemption status in accordance to Article 4 prior to its amendment on December 24, 2010,

Article 6 The University conducts evaluation of full-time faculty members under principles of fairness, justice and openness. The Faculty Evaluation Committee of each college and the Center for General Education comprises of 5 to 7 members. The deans or the director of Center for General Education would be the convener of the Committee, and other 4 to 6 Committee members would be outside experts/academics chosen by the Senior Vice President (Academic) from a list of at least 8 nominees submitted by the Teacher Review Committee of each college and the Center for General Education.

Article 7 Faculty evaluations shall be conducted in an objective manner combining teaching, research, counseling and service aspects.

Each department shall enact its own Faculty Evaluation Implementation Key Points, including evaluation categories, methods, standards, procedures, etc.

Each department shall first discuss their respective Faculty Evaluation Implementation Key Points with related handling unit about specific measures, before sending it to the Faculty Evaluation Committee Meeting for approval and implementation.

**If any faculty member is prosecuted for alleged embezzlement of funds, or is involved in any procurement fraud under government investigation, or violating the University Code of Practice for Faculty members, the matter should be examined by applicable units or related university committees, together with all facts, seized evidences and documentations. The matter shall then be presented to the third-level Teacher Review Committees for approval. The implicated-faculty member's total points of faculty evaluation accumulated from counseling and services categories shall be adjusted by the Teacher Review Committee of this university.**

Article 8 Newly appointed full-time faculty members (all levels) shall be considered as passing one evaluation when their appointment contract is renewed for the first time according to the Article 6 of the University's Faculty Members and Researcher Appointment Regulations,. After appointment, full-time faculty members (all levels) passing their promotions, are considered as passing one evaluation.

Article 9 Faculty members who fail to pass the evaluation shall not receive a salary raise, apply for leave to do research, deliver courses in other universities, assume part-time positions outside of the university, or deliver courses on part-time basis in the following academic year. Those who failed the evaluation, shall have the abovementioned restrictions lifted after their "Improvement Performance Report" passed the review afterwards in the following academic year.

Article 10 Faculty members under evaluation shall supply related information for determination of the teacher evaluation. Those who did not comply are considered failing the evaluation in the academic year. Those who are on paid or unpaid sabbatical hence are not on campus and could not provide relevant information in the academic year (such as taking time-off for research, delivering courses in other universities, lecturing abroad/studying overseas, or other major causes), may delay the evaluation until they return.

Female faculty members on maternity leave during the academic year of evaluation may apply to delay the evaluation to the following academic year.

Faculty members holding a 「 Disability Handbook 」 with mild or intermediary impairments may apply to delay the evaluation for one academic year. Faculty members holding a 「 Disability Handbook 」 with severe impairments (inclusive) may apply to delay the evaluation for two academic years.

- Article 11 The calculation of years for evaluation does not include paid or unpaid sabbaticals. Faculty members promoted after passing their evaluation, the academic year where their effective promotion date falls-on shall be the base year for the next evaluation. Those who have questions regarding the calculation of their evaluation years can seek explanations from the Office of Personnel Services.
- Article 12 Members of Faculty Evaluation Committee shall retire automatically to avoid any conflict of interest if the evaluation involves themselves, a spouse, blood relations among in the third degree, political relations, or someone they have vested interest in, and refrain from any discussions or decision-making. In the event there are facts sufficient to establish that a member could unduly influence the Evaluation Committee over its review of a particular case, the faculty-under-evaluation may apply to the Evaluation Committee to request said member to be excused from the evaluation, and provide information including the background and facts supporting such claim. Members who fail to retire automatically may be asked by the Committee Chair to do so, through a resolution of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The vote of a member who should retire as they meet three of the above conditions will not be counted in the resolutions as stated. Faculty Evaluation Committee Meetings may be convened with at least two-thirds of the members present. Resolutions maybe reached by consent with the majority or more of the members present.
- Article 13 Faculty Evaluation Committee shall consider inviting the following individuals to attend its meetings as needed: Senior Vice President, Dean Academic Affairs, Dean of Research and Development, heads of related department-(college) and related professionals from the Teacher Review Committee of the University to be present at the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
- Article 14 Office of Academic Affairs shall draft the evaluation plan and timelines prior to evaluations in the academic year; Faculty Evaluation Committee shall finalize the plan and timelines, and send them to the Office of Academic Affairs before April 1 of the academic year for compilation. The plan together with timelines shall be then submitted to the University's Faculty Evaluation Committee for resolution.
- Article 15 Evaluations for full-time faculty members of the Center for Faculty Education shall be incorporated into Institute of Education for handling.
- Article 16 When a faculty memberunderevaluation objects to the Faculty Evaluation Committee resolution, they may submit a written appeal to their college or the General Education Center. Those who object to the appeal results may submit a written re-appeal request to the University's Teacher Review Committee. Those who object to the re-appeal results may submit a written letter of appeal to the University's committee of teacher grievances.

- Article 17 Evaluations of project-base faculty members, researchers and **professional technicians** are conducted the same as faculty members.
- Article 18 All matters not mentioned shall be handled according to related regulations.
- Article 19 The Regulations were passed by the University Assemblies, and implemented after the President's approval. All amendments and revisions follow the same process.

※These regulations are enacted in Chinese, which shall prevail in case of any discrepancy between the English translation and the Chinese original.

## National Sun Yat-Sen University Faculty Evaluation Implementation Guidelines

Amended and approved at the 4<sup>th</sup> University Assembly of 2005 academic year, June 20, 2006  
Amended and approved at the 4<sup>th</sup> University Assembly of 2006 academic year, June 08, 2007  
Amended and approved at the 1<sup>st</sup> University Assembly of 2007 academic year, October 26, 2007  
Amended and approved at the 1<sup>st</sup> University Assembly of 2009 academic year, October 23, 2009  
Amended and approved at the 2<sup>nd</sup> University Assembly of 2009 academic year, December 18, 2009  
Amended and approved at the 2<sup>nd</sup> University Assembly of 2010 academic year, December 24, 2010  
**Amended and approved at the 4<sup>th</sup> University Assembly of 2014 academic year, May 29, 2015**

- Article 1 The Faculty Evaluation Implementation Guidelines (hereinafter referred to as the "Guidelines") are established for evaluation of the teachers to improve the teaching quality and academic level of National Sun Yat-Sen University (hereinafter referred to as the "University").
- Article 2 The Faculty Evaluation Committee of **each** college and the Center for General Education must be established before January 15<sup>th</sup> in the academic year in which the evaluation is to be conducted.
- Article 3 The evaluation score must be calculated for the teachers of all departments (institutes) on the same proportional basis. The department (institute) may determine the proportion but the calculation method of the evaluation score must comply with the range of the proportion specified in the Guidelines.
- The teachers **who have** the **“Physical and Mental Disability Manual”** or the “Severe Disease Card” can adjust the percentage of each evaluation item within the range of the proportion. Department (including the unit with both department and institute and the Center for Teacher Education): Teaching 40% - 60%; research (exhibition & performance) 30% – 50%; service and guidance 10% - 30%;  
Independent institute: Teaching 20% - 50%; research (exhibition & performance) 40% - 70%; service and guidance 10% - 30%;  
Center for General Education: Teaching 60% – 80%; research 10% - 30%; service and guidance 10% - 30%;  
Lecturers of the department and the Center **for** General Education: Determined by the unit to which the originally belonged or teaching 60% - 70%; research 0 – 10%; service and guidance 20% - 30%.
- Article 4 The evaluation of a teacher is conducted based on the documents within five academic years (the years for leaves with or without pay as well as long sick leaves are not included) before the evaluation. The documents mentioned above are limited to those provided by the teacher.
- Article 5 The Faculty Evaluation Committee of **each** college and the Center **for** General Education shall compile the name list of the teachers who “need to undertake the evaluation” and “do not need to undertake the evaluation” and send it to related units for review and approval. It shall then submit the name list to the Office of Academic Affairs for reference at the end of January.

Article 6 When conducting the evaluation of teachers, **each** college and the Center **for** General Education must describe the process and method of the evaluation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The responsible unit can be asked to attend the meeting and give a description, if necessary.

Article 7 Resolution of the Faculty Evaluation Committee of **each** college and the Center **for** General Education:

- (1) Establishing the minimum **"pass criteria"** and the guidelines for the "pass criteria" according to the evaluation **indicators** as determined at the University Assembly.
- (2) Determining the name list of the teachers who "pass", "conditionally pass" and "fail" the evaluation.

Article 8 Process of the evaluation:

- (1) The Committee members make the name list of the teachers who "pass" the evaluation and "need to improve" based on the initial evaluation of their overall performance in teaching, research, guidance and service.
- (2) The teachers who "need to improve" must submit a two-year improvement plan to the Faculty Evaluation Committee within 10 days after receiving the notice. They will be deemed as "conditionally passing" the evaluation when the improvement plan is approved by the Committee. The teachers who do not submit the improvement plan or if the plan is not approved are deemed as failing the evaluation, unless Subsection (3) is applicable.  
The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall list the items to be improved and request the teachers who do not pass the evaluation to carry it out within one year.
- (3) For the teachers who "need to improve" and are not in the position to submit the improvement plan within 10 days for special reasons, they may apply to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. They will be deemed as not undertaking the evaluation in the current academic year if the application is approved by the Committee, and the evaluation will be postponed until the special reasons disappear.

Article 9 The Faculty Evaluation Committee of **each** college and the Center **for** General Education must finish the review before April 1<sup>st</sup> specified in Article **14** of the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines of the university. It shall compile the name list of the teachers who "need to undertake the evaluation" and "do not need to undertake the evaluation" and send it to the Office of Academic Affairs. It shall then send the name list to the University Teacher **Review** Committee for final resolution.

Article 10 The teachers who "conditionally pass" the evaluation shall submit the "Effectiveness Report of the Improvement Plan" to the college and the Center **for** General Education before the end of February in the academic year next to the following year. After compiling the reports, the college and the Center **for** General Education will send them to at least three external members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee for review. The result of the review will be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs and forwarded to the University Teacher **Review** Committee for final resolution. The teachers who do not submit the Effectiveness Report of the Improvement Plan or whose Effectiveness Report of the Improvement Plan fails the resolution will not be appointed as teachers for the next semester. Article 14 of the Guidelines for Appointment of Teachers and Researcher shall apply.  
The teachers who "fail" the evaluation shall submit the "Effectiveness Report of Improvement Items" to the college and the Center **for** General Education before the end

of February in the next academic year. After compiling the reports, the college and the Center **for** General Education will send them to at least three external members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee for review. The result of the review will be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs and forwarded to the University Teacher **Review** Committee for final resolution. The teachers who do not submit the Effectiveness Report of Improvement Items or whose Effectiveness Report of Improvement Items fails the resolution will not be appointed as teachers for the next semester. Article 14 of the Guidelines for Appointment of Teachers and Researcher shall apply.

For the teacher who is not in the position to submit the “Effectiveness Report of the Improvement Plan” or the “Effectiveness Report of Improvement Items” within the timeframe for special reasons, the Report will, subject to approval of the president, be postponed until the special reasons disappear.

Article 11 The teachers who "conditionally pass" the evaluation may only have a "pass" or "fail" in the next evaluation.

Article 12 The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall send the result of the evaluation (including the comments of the Committee) to the Office of Academic Affairs for compiling, and, in the meantime, issue a written notice to the evaluated teacher and the department (institute) to which the teacher belongs.

Where objection is to be made, the evaluated teacher may file an appeal with evidence within 15 work days after receiving the notice according to Article 15 of the Faculty Evaluation **Regulations** of the University.

Article 13 The matters that are not covered by the Guidelines are subject to related regulations.

Article 14 The Guidelines are approved at the University Assembly and implemented after approval by the president. The same procedure is applicable to the amendment of the Guidelines.

※These guidelines are enacted in Chinese, which shall prevail in case of any discrepancy between the English translation and the Chinese original.