

**NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY**  
**Center for General Education**  
**Faculty Evaluation Regulations**

November 24, 2022 Passed by the General Education Committee at its 140<sup>th</sup> meeting  
February 14, 2023 Passed by the 3,140<sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  
March 08, 2023 Articles 1, 3 through 10, 13, 17, and 18 amended and promulgated  
(Full amendment history at the end of this document)

Article 1 The National Taiwan University (NTU or “the University”) Center for General Education (“the Center”) formulates the NTU *Center for General Education Faculty Evaluation Regulations* (“the Regulations”) in accordance with Article 13 of the University’s *Faculty Evaluation Guidelines* to elevate the quality of teaching, research, and service provided by faculty members of the Center.

Article 2 All full-time faculty members of the Center shall undergo evaluation.

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 Center within their third to fifth year of service, and shall subsequently undergo an evaluation every three 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 Center within their third to fifth year of service, and shall subsequently undergo evaluation every three 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 5 herein.
3. Associate and full professors shall be evaluated by the Center 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 their current unit.

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 Center 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 5 herein.

Assistant professors appointed by the Center on or before July 31, 2016 who fail to be promoted to the rank of associate professor within eight 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*.

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

Article 5 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 Center 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 their affiliated academic program. The academic program’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. 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 in the preceding subparagraph, the faculty evaluation committees at all levels shall notify said assistant professor, specify the reasons for the result of not passing the evaluation, and provide recommendations regarding their teaching, research, and service performance. The Center shall also coordinate with the competent unit 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 professor fails 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 Center shall submit the evaluation results and relevant meeting minutes to the University for reference within one month of finalizing the evaluation results.

Article 6 In the event that a faculty member fails the evaluation, the Center 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 faculty member's affiliated academic program, office, or center (collectively, "units") to offer assistance. The faculty member shall be re-evaluated by the Center within two 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 5 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.

Article 7 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 8 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 9 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 Center Faculty Evaluation Committee during its review process.

Those who meet any of the criteria described under the preceding paragraph shall submit the relevant supporting documents to their affiliated unit, 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. Review of requests for evaluation waivers shall take into consideration the faculty member's performance of research, teaching, and service. Each of the three items shall account for 30%, 60%, and 10% of the total score respectively for faculty members who meet the requirements specified in Article 10, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 5 of the University's *Faculty Evaluation Guidelines*; or 50%, 30%, 20% respectively for all other faculty members.

Article 10 In the event that a faculty member approved for exemption from evaluation commits a violation of or fails to meet the obligations stipulated in their letter of appointment or the *Teachers' Act*, their affiliated unit 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 11 Faculty members who give birth or are caring for a toddler under the age of three during their stipulated evaluation cycle may apply for a deferral of the evaluation by submitting supporting documents to 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. However, a deferral on account of childcare for a toddler under the age of three 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 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 who are granted unpaid leave shall have the duration of the leave excluded from their stipulated evaluation cycle. However, the length of the evaluation cycle after deducting the duration of the leave must still fall within the limit 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 Center's faculty evaluations shall be handled by the Center's Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Director of the Center shall serve as convener of the Center Faculty Evaluation Committee ("the Committee") and chair of its meetings. The other members of the Committee shall be faculty members of the Center who are exempt from evaluation.

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

explanations.

- Article 14 The Committee's review of faculty member performance for each evaluation item shall primarily be based upon written documentation. The evaluation items shall include teaching, research, and service, and the full score for all items combined shall be 100 points. A faculty member who receives a score of 75 or higher from more than half of the Committee members shall be deemed as having passed the evaluation. The weights for each of the three items shall be determined by each subordinate teaching unit of the Center based on objective factors.
- Article 15 Each subordinate teaching unit of the Center shall establish its own regulations and enforcement rules for faculty evaluations in accordance with Article 14 herein and shall report those regulations and rules to the Center for reference.
- Article 16 The Center shall notify faculty members failing the evaluation of their right to file a grievance or appeal in accordance with Article 7 herein.
- Article 17 Matters not addressed herein shall be subject to other applicable regulations of the University.
- Article 18 The Regulations shall be passed by the Center for General Education Affairs Meeting and the Administrative Meeting and then implemented on the date of promulgation.

**[Full amendment history]**

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| April 25, 2002     | Passed by the General Education Committee at its 56 <sup>th</sup> meeting   |
| April 30, 2002     | Passed by the 2,241 <sup>st</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| July 05, 2005      | Passed by the 2,394 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| September 26, 2006 | Passed by the 2,449 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| December 18, 2007  | Passed by the 2,506 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| March 17, 2009     | Passed by the 2,566 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| December 01, 2009  | Passed by the 2,601 <sup>st</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| February 15, 2011  | Passed by the 2,657 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| December 13, 2011  | Passed by the 2,696 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| October 30, 2012   | Passed by the 2,736 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| January 25, 2013   | Passed by the General Education Committee at its 108 <sup>th</sup> meeting  |
| February 07, 2013  | Reported to the University for reference  |
| November 19, 2013  | Passed by the 2,787 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| June 14, 2014      | Article 4 amended by the University Council at its 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting, spring semester, Academic Year 2013-14                              |
| October 25, 2014   | Article 5 amended by the University Council at its 1 <sup>st</sup> meeting, fall semester, Academic Year 2014-15                                |
| January 10, 2015   | Article 5 amended by the University Council at its 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting, fall semester, Academic Year 2014-15                                |
| June 06, 2015      | Article 3, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 3 amended by the University Council at its 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting, spring semester, Academic Year 2014-15 |
| June 14, 2016      | Passed by the 2,909 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| July 23, 2016      | Passed by the 2,914 <sup>th</sup> Administrative Meeting  |
| April 27, 2021     | Articles 4, 6, 8, 10, and 16 amended by the 3,092 <sup>nd</sup> Administrative Meeting  |