National Taiwan University of Science and Technology Principles for Faculty Evaluation Committees Conducting Regular Faculty Evaluations

December 28, 2011 Passed by the 3rd Permanent Faculty Evaluation Committee, Academic Year 2011–12
May 15, 2015 Passed by the 7th Permanent Faculty Evaluation Committee, Academic Year 2014–15
March 19, 2021Passed by the 5th Permanent Faculty Evaluation Committee, Academic Year 2020–21
July 8, 2022 Amended and passed by the 8th Permanent Faculty Evaluation Committee, Academic Year 2021–22

1. The National Taiwan University of Science and Technology Faculty Evaluation Committee (hereinafter "the Committee") is established under the provisions of Article 5, Paragraph 4, of the Regular Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines to protect the rights of faculty members and to ensure the fairness of their regular evaluation review processes.

2. Items for evaluation, re-evaluation, and extended evaluation reviews:

   (1) Teaching: Number of teaching hours, teaching evaluation results, teaching performance, guidance provided to students conducting academic research, and other teaching matters.
   (2) Research: Academic works, research projects, research awards, patents, and industry–university cooperation performance.
   (3) Services and counseling: On-campus services, off-campus services, special achievements in other services, counseling provided to students (daily life–related matters), and counseling provided to students (academic matters).

3. Standards for evaluation, re-evaluation, and extended evaluation reviews:

   (1) Assistant professors and instructors: Teaching, research, and services and counseling account for 35%, 40%, and 25% of the total evaluation score, respectively (please refer to the evaluation score sheet in Appendix 1).
   (2) Professors and associate professors: Teaching, research, and services and counseling account for 35%, 45%, and 20% of the total evaluation score, respectively (please refer to the evaluation score sheet in Appendix 2).

   Teaching, research, and services and counseling scores are allocated proportionally, with the total maximum score being 100. A passing score is 70 or higher that is approved by at least two-thirds of the attending committee members.

4. All colleges shall provide the scores, comprehensive comments, and written information about an evaluated faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and services and counseling for the members of the Committee to review.

   Prior to performing re-evaluations and review extensions, all colleges, departments/graduate schools/divisions/offices/centers/programs, and the Office of Academic Affairs shall provide to the Committee records of assistance or counseling provided by the evaluated faculty member as reference.

   The information specified in the two preceding paragraphs shall be compiled and made available for the members of the Committee to review within a specified period before review meetings.

   If a faculty member is approved for retirement by the Ministry of Education during the evaluation, re-evaluation, or extended evaluation review period, the evaluation, re-evaluation, or extended evaluation review will be canceled.

5. Prior to a Committee meeting, a faculty member under evaluation shall be informed that they may personally report their work performance to the Committee or authorize another faculty

of the University to report their work performance on their behalf.

6. If a faculty member fails their re-evaluation and is applying to the Committee to extend their evaluation, the Committee will submit the application to external committee members for review. The external review procedure is as follows.

    (1) The external review committee members shall be school department supervisors whose academic expertise aligns with that of the faculty member undergoing re-evaluation. The evaluation will be performed by the external committee members and a project team of three individuals established by the Committee. Articles 3–6 of the University's Notices on Performing External Faculty Work Reviews shall be applicable mutatis mutandis.

    (2) The teaching, research, and services and counseling categories are scored proportionally out of 100. An extension is granted when a score of 70 or higher is given by at least two external reviewers (please refer to the external extended evaluation application review sheets in Appendices 3 and 4).

7. If a faculty member fails their evaluation, re-evaluation, extended evaluation review, or extended evaluation review, the Committee shall clearly state the reasons for the failure, notify the faculty member in writing, and inform them of their rights and channels for appealing the decision.

    If a faculty member disagrees with the review results specified in the preceding paragraph, they may appeal to the University's Faculty Appeal Review Committee within 30 days of receiving the notification.

8. The Principles and any amendments thereto are in effect after they are passed by the University Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Appendix 1

National Taiwan University of Science and Technology
Principles for Faculty Evaluation Committees Conducting Regular Faculty Evaluations

Name of faculty member under evaluation:
Rank: □ Assistant professor □ Instructor

Evaluation item	Weight	Score	Evaluation content description (overall evaluation based on previous three academic years)
Teaching	35	(A score of 24.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	1. Number of teaching hours 2. Teaching evaluation results 3. Teaching performance 4. Guidance provided to students conducting academic research 5. Other teaching matters
Research	40	(A score of 28 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	Academic works Research projects Research awards Patents Industry–university cooperation performance
Services and counseling	25	(A score of 17.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	On-campus services Off-campus services Special achievements in other services Counseling provided to students (daily life–related matters) Counseling provided to students (academic matters)
Total score	(A passing score is 70 or higher.)		
Review result (please indicate the result by applying a check mark)	Passed		
	Failed	(If this box is checked, please specify the reason(s) by checking the appropriate option(s) on the right.)	□ Performance for teaching failed to meet the standards □ Performance for research failed to meet the standards □ Performance for services and counseling failed to meet the standards □ Others: (Please specify)

Appendix 2

National Taiwan University of Science and Technology
Principles for Faculty Evaluation Committees Conducting Regular Faculty Evaluations

Name of faculty member under evaluation:
Rank: □ Professor □ Associate professor

Evaluation item	weight	Score	Evaluation content description (overall evaluation based on previous three academic years)
Teaching	35	(A score of 24.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	1. Number of teaching hours 2. Teaching evaluation results 3. Teaching performance 4. Guidance provided to students conducting academic research 5. Other teaching matters
Research	45	(A score of 31.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	Academic works Research projects Research awards Patents Industry–university cooperation performance
Services and counseling	20	(A score of 14 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	On-campus services Off-campus services Special achievements in other services Counseling provided to students (daily life–related matters) Counseling provided to students (academic matters)
Total score	(A passing score is 70 or higher.)		
Review result (please indicate the result by applying a check mark)	Passed		
	Failed	(If this box is checked, please specify the reason(s) listed on the right.)	□ Performance for teaching failed to meet the standards □ Performance for research failed to meet the standards □ Performance for services and counseling failed to meet the standards □ Others: (Please specify)

Appendix 3

National Taiwan University of Science and Technology
Principles for Faculty Evaluation Committees Conducting Regular Faculty Evaluations

Name of applicant:
Rank:□ Assistant professor □ Instructor

Evaluation item	Weight	Score	Evaluation content description (overall evaluation based on re-evaluation information)
Teaching	35	(A score of 24.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	1. Number of teaching hours 2. Teaching evaluation results 3. Teaching performance 4. Guidance provided to students conducting academic research 5. Other teaching matters
Research	40	(A score of 28 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	Academic works Research projects Research awards Patents Industry–university cooperation performance
Services and counseling	25	(A score of 17.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	On-campus services Off-campus services Special achievements in other services Counseling provided to students (daily life–related matters) Counseling provided to students (academic matters)
Total score	(A score of 70 or higher indicates approval to extend the re-evaluation period.)		
Review comments	**(Please ensure that your review comments are clear and specific. Format your comments in point form, type them on a computer, and select the appropriate review results below.)**		

Review result (please indicate the result by applying a check mark)	Extension approved		
	Extension rejected	(If this box is checked, please specify the reason(s) listed on the right.)	□ Performance for teaching failed to meet the standards □ Performance for research failed to meet the standards □ Performance for services and counseling failed to meet the standards □ Others: (Please specify)
Reviewer's signature	Reviewer:		yyyy/ mm/ /dd

Appendix 4

National Taiwan University of Science and Technology
Principles for Faculty Evaluation Committees Conducting Regular Faculty Evaluations

Name of applicant:

Rank: □ Professor □ Associate professor

Evaluation item	Weight	Score	Evaluation content description (overall evaluation based on re-evaluation information)
Teaching	35	(A score of 24.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	1. Number of teaching hours 2. Teaching evaluation results 3. Teaching performance 4. Guidance provided to students conducting academic research 5. Other teaching matters
Research	45	(A score of 31.5 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	Academic works Research projects Research awards Patents Industry–university cooperation performance
Services and counseling	20	(A score of 14 here is equivalent to a score of 70 out of 100)	On-campus services Off-campus services Special achievements in other services Counseling provided to students (daily life–related matters) Counseling provided to students (academic matters)
Total score	(A score of 70 or higher indicates approval to extend the re-evaluation period to one year.)		
Review comments	**(Please ensure that your review comments are clear and specific. Format your comments in point form, type them on a computer, and select the appropriate review results below.)**		

Review result (please indicate the result by applying a check mark)	Extension approved		
	Extension rejected	(If this box is checked, please specify the reason(s) listed on the right.)	□ Performance for teaching failed to meet the standards □ Performance for research failed to meet the standards □ Performance for services and counseling failed to meet the standards □ Others: (Please specify)
Reviewer's signature	Reviewer:		yyyy/ mm/ /dd