

National Taiwan Normal University Guidelines for the Implementation of Evaluations by Academic Units

2012.11.28 Passed during the 338th Administrative Meeting
2014.11.26 Passed during the 346th Administrative Meeting
2021.05.26 Passed during the 372nd Administrative Meeting
2021.12.01 Passed during the 374th Administrative Meeting
2022.05.18 Passed during the 376th Administrative Meeting

Article 1 The National Taiwan Normal University Guidelines for the Implementation of Evaluations by Academic Units (hereinafter referred to as the "Guidelines") were established in accordance with Article 6 of National Taiwan Normal University Self-evaluation Policy.

Article 2 Evaluation items for academic units include objectives and development, student learning, faculty development, internationalization, and social impact.

Article 3 NTNU established self-evaluation advisory committee and academic units evaluation committee of two levels (college-level and department-level evaluation committee) to enhance NTNU development features and promote the evaluation of academic units. Its composition and missions are as follows:

I. Self-evaluation Advisory Committee is established in accordance with Article 3 of National Taiwan Normal University Self-evaluation Policy.

II. College-level Evaluation Committee:

- (I) The dean of the college shall serve as the convener. Heads of teaching units are ex-officio members, and other members may include NTNU faculty members or off-campus scholars and experts nominated by the dean. The committee is responsible for conducting self-evaluations of the college.
- (II) Plan and review development features and index of evaluated unit, plan the evaluation procedure, conduct evaluations, review self-evaluation reports, and follow up on improvements based on self-evaluation results.
- (III) Each college is required to formulate its own implementation guidelines according to these Guidelines, assemble its own college-level evaluation committee, and implement the guidelines after they are passed in the college general meeting. Each college is responsible for supervising departments/institutes (including undergraduate programs) in formulating self-evaluation guidelines and establishing a department-level evaluation committee.

III. Department-level Evaluation Committee:

- (I) The department (institute) director serves as the convener, and three to five members are full-time faculty members of the department (institute). The committee is submitted to the college dean for approval and is responsible for department (institute) self-evaluations.
- (II) Plan evaluation procedures, conduct evaluations, review self-evaluation reports, and follow up on improvements based on self-evaluation results.

Article 4 Evaluation Work Group

- I. The Vice President shall serve as the convener. The group consists of the Vice President of the Office of Academic Affairs, the Vice President of the Office of Research and Development, the Vice President of the Office of

Student Affairs, the Vice President of the Office of International Affairs, the Vice President of the Office of General Affairs and deans of each college. Representative from related units shall be invited when necessary.

- II. The group plans the execution of evaluation, organize evaluation index of academic units, conduct evaluation, and review evaluation report.

Article 5 Content of Evaluation

I. Preparation phase

Office of Research and Development shall hold orientations or courses of academic unit evaluation. Before on-site evaluation, the evaluated units and their colleges shall assign at least one staff to take no less than one on- or off-campus course of evaluation. The evaluated units shall participate in at least six hours of meetings or courses of evaluation before on-site evaluation.

II. Execution phase

(I) The evaluated unit shall form a department-level evaluation committee, and divide labor based on evaluation items. The committee shall be responsible for data collection and analysis related to evaluations, discussing the contents and progress of evaluation reports for each phase, and completing evaluation reports.

(II) Colleges shall establish a college-level evaluation committee responsible for consulting on evaluations of evaluated units in each college, confirming evaluation reports, reviewing evaluation results, and assisting departments (institutes) with the planning and execution of subsequent improvements.

(III) Evaluated units may apply for co-evaluation if there is relevance or similarity of teaching and research disciplines. For co-evaluation, some procedures may be concurrently processed with the approval of the President. The procedures that may be or may not be concurrently processed are listed below.

1. May be concurrently processed: evaluation report of the evaluated unit, parts of on-site evaluation, appointment of evaluation committee members (partly or wholly). The above procedures may be processed separately or concurrently, depending on the circumstances.
2. May not be concurrently processed: evaluation reports of evaluation committee members, evaluation results, evaluation improvement plans.

(IV) The selection and composition of evaluation committee members shall comply with the following principles:

1. The evaluation committee member shall be off-campus members, and shall mainly be scholars with teaching and research experience in higher education, or representatives from related fields. The number of evaluation committee members shall be three to five.
2. The evaluated unit proposes a list of recommended evaluation committee members and list of evaluation committee members who should recuse themselves (proper cause must be given). The College-level Evaluation Committee reviews the two lists submitted by evaluated units, and delivers the lists to the Self-evaluation Advisory Committee for review and verification. Evaluation committee members are then appointed by the President, and their term lasts for three years.

(V) To abide by the principle of recusal due to conflicts of interest, evaluation committee members shall sign a guarantee to avoid conflicts of interest after agreeing to the appointment. People in any of the following cases shall not be appointed as evaluation committee members.

1. Receive honours degree from NTNU.
2. Hold a position with or without payment and have conflict of interest.
3. Have held a full-time or part-time position in the evaluated unit in the past three years.
4. Have applied for a full-time teaching position or administrative position in the university, college or department (institute) in the past three years.
5. Received the highest academic degree from NTNU no more than ten years ago.
6. Spouse or lineal relative by blood within the third degree of relationship is the faculty member or student of the evaluated unit.
7. Have any dealings of commercial interest with the evaluated unit in the past three years.
8. Any factors that are significant enough to influence the fairness and impartiality of evaluation.

(VI) For better understanding in evaluation regulations and procedure in NTNU, evaluation committee member manual shall be sent to and viewed by evaluation committee members. Before the evaluation, evaluation committee members shall attend a preparatory conference.

(VII) On-site evaluation procedures shall include a presentation by the evaluated unit, data review, site and equipment inspection, response to and discussion of problems that require clarification; interviews with related personnel (including faculty members, administrative personnel, students, and alumni) shall be arranged.

(VIII) Evaluated units shall submit evaluation data to evaluation committee members for documentary review.

(IX) If evaluated units are required by evaluation committee members to provide supplementary documents during the on-site evaluation due to insufficient or missing documents, the documents must be provided before evaluation committee members arrive at evaluation results.

(X) Evaluation committee members shall provide clear evaluation results and corresponding concrete reasons and recommendations, in order to show the strengths and weaknesses of evaluated units and areas requiring improvement.

(XI) The evaluation results are “Pass”, “Conditional Pass”, and “Fail”.

(XII) “Self-evaluation Advisory Committee” reviews the result of academic unit evaluation, and the Office of Research and Development announces the result on official website accordingly.

III. Subsequent follow-up and improvement phase

(I) After an evaluated unit receives an on-site evaluation, a department-level evaluation committee shall be convened to review evaluation results.

(II) Within one month after an on-site evaluation is completed, evaluated units shall submit forms and related meeting minutes of “Evaluation Improvement Plan” to college-level meetings for review and the Office of Research and Development for future reference. Colleges shall assist evaluated units (including general education) in making improvements.

(III) Colleges must report evaluation results and improvements of subordinate departments to the “Self-evaluation Advisory Committee”.

(IV) The self-improvement period is one year within the announcement of

evaluation result. The evaluated units shall correct or adjust their development features and index based on suggestions from evaluation committee members. "College-level Evaluation Committee" shall follow up on improvement and implementation results of subordinate evaluated units regularly, which provides recommendations for subsequent use of evaluation results.

IV. Follow-up evaluation and re-evaluation phase

- (I) Evaluated units with an evaluation result of "Conditional Pass" or "Fail" must receive a follow-up evaluation or re-evaluation by NTNU.
- (II) During follow-up evaluation of evaluated units that were approved conditionally, the units shall complete a "Follow-up Evaluation Report" based on the comments and suggestions listed in the evaluation report by on-site evaluation committee members, and the "Follow-up Evaluation Report" shall undergo documentary review and get approval from Self-Evaluation Advisory Committee. If the "Follow-up Evaluation Report" is approved, the "College-level Evaluation Committee" shall follow up the execution and improvement of evaluated units for future review of the evaluation result.
- (III) For evaluated units that were not approved, the units shall complete a "evaluation Report" and undergo on-site evaluation again. After the re-evaluation, the unit shall submit an "Improvement Plan" and complete every step required for "Follow-up and Improvement Phase".
- (IV) The Office of Research and Development shall schedule the follow-up evaluation or re-evaluation, and conduct the evaluation after reviewed by the Self-evaluation Advisory Committee. The follow-up evaluation or re-evaluation must be completed within six months after the end of the self-improvement period.
- (V) Evaluation committee members for follow-up document review and on-site re-evaluation shall be the same members who conducted the original on-site evaluation.
- (VI) The evaluated unit shall propose self-improvement plans and implementation results based on the follow-up evaluation and re-evaluation results, and include them as follow-up items for the next self-evaluation.

Article 6 Evaluated units with an evaluation result of "Approved Conditionally" or "Not Approved" may file an appeal within fourteen days after receiving the evaluation result, if any of the following condition is fulfilled.

- I. On-site evaluation fails to follow the correct procedure.
- II. The data and records of evaluated unit in the report announced by evaluation committee members are inconsistent with actual situations, rendering the final evaluation report inconsistent with facts.

To file an appeal, an application form for appeal with supporting materials shall be prepared by the evaluated unit and sent to the Office of Research and Development within the deadline regulated in the preceding paragraph. No late appeal is accepted, and for once only.

The Office of Research and Development submit the application form and supporting materials to the original evaluation committee members for review, who shall provide explanation for the evaluated unit. If the evaluated unit has objection to the explanation, the Office of Research and Development shall submit document of the appeal and explanation to Self-evaluation Advisory Committee for further review within fourteen days after the evaluated unit receives the

explanation.

The result from Self-evaluation Advisory Committee shall be officially sent to the evaluated unit by the Office of Research and Development.

Evaluated unit shall be invited by Self-evaluation Advisory Committee to the meeting when necessary.

Article 7 Meeting minutes of the evaluation, evaluation reports, evaluation results, subsequent improvement and result reports are approved data of evaluation quality assurance. The evaluated unit shall file the document for future review.

Article 8 These Regulations were passed with resolutions sought from an Administrative Meeting, and implemented with the approval of the President. The same applies to all subsequent amendments.