

This is an English translation of the original Chinese regulations. The translation is for reference only, and the Chinese version shall prevail in case of any discrepancies.

National Tsing Hua University College of Life Sciences and Medicine Clinical Faculty Evaluation Implementation Regulations

May 2, 2024 - Passed by the College Faculty Review Committee

July 17, 2024 - Amended by the College Faculty Review Committee

September 23, 2024 - Approved by the University Faculty Review Committee

- Article 1. To enhance the quality of teaching, research, counseling, and service, National Tsing Hua University College of Life Sciences and Medicine (hereinafter referred to as “the College”), in accordance with Article 11, Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Enforcement Regulations of the Act Governing the Appointment of Educators, and by reference to the second article of the Regulations Governing the Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty (專任教師評量辦法) at this university, establishes the “National Tsing Hua University College of Life Sciences and Medicine Clinical Faculty Evaluation Implementation Regulations” (hereinafter referred to as “these Regulations”).
- Article 2. These Regulations apply to two categories of clinical faculty in the College: college-appointed and department-appointed full-time clinical faculty, and externally contracted faculty. Full-time clinical faculty within the establishment follow the Regulations Governing the Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty.
- Article 3. The evaluation of clinical faculty includes teaching, research, counseling, and service. Evaluation is divided into initial review and re-review, conducted respectively by the department-level faculty evaluation committee (系級教師評量委員會) (hereinafter referred to as “department-level evaluation committee”) and the college faculty evaluation committee (院教師評量委員會) (hereinafter referred to as “college evaluation committee”). Evaluation cases for college-appointed faculty are reviewed by the college evaluation committee.
- Article 4. Apart from those exempted from evaluation, clinical faculty at all levels must undergo evaluation once every two years. Assistant professors undergo coaching assessments in the first and second evaluations after new appointment, without a pass/fail determination. The third evaluation occurs upon reappointment. Assistant professors (inclusive) and higher-ranking faculty who pass the promotion assessment or receive flexible salary and incentive subsidies are considered to have passed the evaluation for that academic year, and their evaluation cycle is reset. Assistant professors undergoing coaching assessments concurrently with promotion are exempt from coaching assessments. Conditions for exemption from or being considered to have passed evaluation are outlined in Articles 3 and 4 of the Regulations Governing the Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty (專任教師評量辦法). The evaluation period does not include periods of secondment. Female faculty may extend their evaluation period due to pregnancy and childbirth, with an extension of one year per instance. Individuals with special circumstances may be granted an extension after approval by the department-level evaluation committee and the college evaluation committee, limited to once per year and up to a maximum of two times. For faculty appointed directly by the college, extensions are granted after review by the college evaluation committee, limited to once per year and up to a maximum of two times.
- Article 5. Each department shall complete the initial review by April 15 and submit the evaluation

results (including the list of clinical faculty exempt from evaluation) and other relevant data to the College Faculty Evaluation Committee for a secondary review, which shall be completed by May 15. The evaluation cases of college-appointed full-time faculty shall be reviewed by May 15. The secondary review results for department-appointed contract full-time faculty and the review results for college-appointed contract full-time faculty shall be forwarded to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for verification. Failure to provide evaluation data, submission of inaccurate data that affects the evaluation results, or failure to undergo evaluation within the specified period will be considered as a failure in the evaluation process.

Article 6. The composition, implementation, and evaluation standards of the college evaluation committee are as follows:

- I. The College Committee is composed of six to eight professors exempted from evaluation and appointed by the dean, including one to two external committee members. Committee members serve for one year, with the dean serving as the committee convener.
- II. The College Committee requires attendance by two-thirds(inclusive) or more of the expected members, conducts anonymous voting, and considers decisions approved by half or more of the attending members as passed.

Article 7. If an evaluated faculty fails to meet any of the following requirements, they must explain the reasons in the data and propose an improvement plan. Failure to do so will result in the evaluation being considered unsuccessful.

- I. Teaching requirement: The number of teaching hours in each of the past two academic years must meet the requirements of each department.
- II. Research requirement: In the past five academic years, at least one SCI paper must have been published, and the faculty must have hosted or co-hosted a research project with a review mechanism applied by our school's research department or teaching hospital.
- III. Service and counseling requirement: In the past two academic years, the faculty must have held a position related to administrative tasks, committee work, student club guidance, or mentoring within our school.

Article 8. The evaluation criteria include teaching, research, counseling, and service, in accordance with the College's faculty appointment and the departmental-level clinical faculty appointment and promotion review regulations. A total score of 70 points (inclusive) or above passes the initial review. If an evaluated faculty achieves outstanding results in any of the aforementioned areas, they may apply for an increased weighting in that area's assessment.

Article 9. Departments of the College must formulate regulations for faculty evaluation committees, including the composition of committees, evaluation criteria, and procedures, which must be approved by the College Faculty Review Committee and approved by the University Faculty Review Committee before implementation.

Article 10. If the College Faculty Evaluation Committee does not approve the reevaluation, the case shall be referred to the Department Faculty Review Committee and the College Faculty Review Committee for discussion on suitability. If a faculty member primarily appointed by the College fails the evaluation, the case shall be sent to the College Faculty Review Committee for further discussion on suitability.

Article 11. Faculty who do not pass the initial evaluation or reevaluation shall be notified in writing by their department or the College, with details on the available appeal channels. Faculty who disagree with the departmental-level initial evaluation results may appeal to the

College Faculty Evaluation Committee. Those who disagree with the College-level reevaluation results or faculty primarily appointed by the College who disagree with the review results may appeal to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee. If faculty members wish to contest the outcome of their appeal, they may further appeal to the University Faculty Appeal Committee. All appeals must be submitted within fifteen days from the day following the receipt of the result.

Article 12. Any matters not covered in these Regulations shall be handled in accordance with relevant provisions.

Article 13. These Regulations shall be implemented after being approved by the College Faculty Review Committee and endorsed by the University Faculty Review Committee.