

National Chung Hsing University Regulations for Office of Academic Affairs General Education Center Faculty Review

Enacted in the General Education Execution Committee on Sep. 15th, 2011
Amended (Articles 9,12,13 & 14) in the General Education Execution Committee on Sep. 27th, 2012
Amended (Article 14) in the General Education Committee on Apr. 13th, 2018
Amended (Article 14) in the General Education Committee on Jun. 4th, 2018
Amended (Article 14) in the General Education Execution Committee on Dec. 19th, 2018
Amended (Articles 1,2,5-8 & 11) in the General Education Execution Committee on Nov. 6th, 2019
Amended (Article 7) in the General Education Execution Committee on Dec. 27th, 2019
Amended (Article 7) in the General Education Execution Committee on Jan. 19th, 2022

Article 1 To enhance the teaching, research, and service effects of the University's teaching, the General Education Center of the Office of Academic Affairs at National Chung Hsing University (referred to as the Center) has developed the National Chung Hsing University Regulations for Office of Academic Affairs General Education Center Faculty Review (referred to as the Regulations) in line with the university's teacher evaluation standards.

Article 2 The Center has established a faculty review committee responsible for conducting teacher evaluations and comprises five members. The composition is as follows:

- 1.The Vice President for Academic Affairs is an ex officio member and convener and serves as the chair during meetings.
- 2.The Vice President for Academic Affairs appoints three scholars and experts as external committee members.
- 3.One internal committee member elected from the full-time teachers of this Center. When there is a shortage of full-time teachers at this center, the Vice President of Academic Affairs may appoint the Director of the General Education Center or recruit full-time teachers from within the university to fill the positions.
- 4.Junior-level teachers are not allowed to serve as review committee members for senior-level teachers, and teachers being evaluated that year also cannot serve as committee members.

The committee members serve a one-year term and can be re-elected.

Article 3 Full-time teachers at this center must undergo evaluation every five years according to these guidelines. Newly appointed teachers will start their evaluations after completing three years at the University.

Article 4 Teachers who meet the criteria outlined in Article 2 of the National Chung Hsing University Guidelines for Faculty Review are exempt from evaluation.

Article 5 Teachers who are on research leave, studying abroad, on unpaid leave, facing severe illness, on parental leave, experiencing unexpected major changes, or meeting the conditions specified in item 5 of article 9 of the

school's faculty review guidelines, can present proof and apply for postponement or re-evaluation through administrative procedures.

Those who request to postpone the evaluation for two consecutive years must obtain approval from the department-level faculty review committee at this center.

Article 6 By the end of March every year, the Center shall identify the teachers to be evaluated for that year and prepare their evaluation materials. These materials need to be submitted to the Center's Faculty Review Committee for review, and the evaluation process should be wrapped up by the end of May. Other related regulations are as follows:

- 1.The Faculty Review meeting can only be held if more than half (inclusive) of all committee members are present.
- 2.Review committee members must attend in person; substitution by others is not allowed.
- 3.The evaluated teacher should be informed of the result after the evaluation.
- 4.The review committee may invite the evaluated teacher to explain or report in person.
- 5.The center should submit the evaluation results, exemption criteria qualification records, and information for that year to the school for review by June 10th.

Article 7 The Center's teaching evaluation criteria consist of three components: teaching performance, research performance, and service performance. Each component is scored out of 100 points. The combined total score of these three components adds up to 100 points. A total score of 70 or above is considered passing the evaluation. Full-time teachers at this center should choose one of the evaluation schemes based on the following distribution ratios. The Category A ratio only applies to lecturers.

Category A: Teaching accounts for 70%, research for 10%, and service for 20%.

Category B: teaching accounts for 60%, research for 20%, and service for 20%.

Category C: teaching accounts for 50%, research for 30%, and service for 20%.

Category D: teaching accounts for 40%, research for 40%, and service for 20%.

Category E: teaching accounts for 30%, research for 50%, and service for 20%.

The detailed evaluation items and their respective weights for each category are specified in the National Chung Hsing University Office of Academic Affairs General Education Center Faculty Review Sheet.

For teachers who have carried out University Social Responsibility (USR) projects, extra points should be awarded under the service performance category, with a maximum of 20 points.

If the evaluated teacher is found to have supervised a thesis that does not align with their area of expertise during the evaluation period, and this is confirmed by an investigation by the graduate student's department (institute, degree program), points should be deducted from the teaching performance score. The maximum deduction is 20 points.

Teachers who have passed the evaluation but have a below 70 in any categories in teaching, research, or service performance should receive additional support.

- Article 8 The Center's Faculty Review Committee may nominate teachers with exceptional teaching performance for relevant awards at the University.
- Article 9 Teacher evaluations are limited to once a year. Those who fail the evaluation must undergo re-evaluation next year. If the re-evaluation is still not passed, the teacher must be re-evaluated again in the following year. If a teacher fails the second evaluation, the review committee should promptly forward the case to the college-level Faculty Review Committee via the Center's Faculty Review Committee, to discuss and decide on an appropriate course of action based on the reasons for the failure. If disciplinary action is required, it will be handled according to Article 9 of the University's faculty review guidelines. Teachers who have been disciplined must pass an assessment before their original rights as teachers can be reinstated. Those who fail to undergo the required evaluation shall be considered as having failed the evaluation. Individuals who complete the assessment will undergo a reassessment every five years.
- Article 10 Teachers who do not meet the evaluation criteria are required to submit an improvement plan to the Center by June 30th of that year. This is to ensure that they receive the necessary assistance and guidance. If needed, relevant departments may also be involved through administrative procedures.
- Article 11 If the teacher being evaluated disagrees with the evaluation results, they may submit an appeal within thirty days of receiving the written notification. They should include specific evidence in writing, following the school's Faculty Grievances Committee regulations.

If the appellant is not satisfied with the decision of the school's Faculty Review Committee, they may file a further appeal with the Central Faculty Grievances Committee of the Ministry of Education.

Article 12 Full-time professors (including lecture and distinguished professors), associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, researchers, and teaching assistants at this Center will be included in the evaluation criteria if they meet the following conditions:

1. Enter into direct contracts with other agencies for commissioned research or accept commissioned projects through concurrent positions with professional associations without getting permission from the school's administrative procedures and without having the school as a signatory to the contract.
2. Being convicted by a court in the first instance for fraudulently claiming research funds, or being investigated and found guilty by audit authorities for negligence in handling procurement cases, and being asked to reflect on such matters.

Article 13 For any matters not mentioned herein, please refer to related NCHU regulations.

Article 14 These regulations shall be implemented after approval by the General Education Executive Committee and subsequent approval by the President. Any amendments shall follow the same procedure.