

National Chiao Tung University College of Electrical and Computer Engineering Instructor Promotion Review Process Regulations

Amended on December 1, 1994, at EECS* in the 1st TECC** meeting of the 1994 academic year
Amended and approved on December 29, 1994, at EECS in the 2nd college affairs meeting of the 1994 academic year
Amended and approved on November 30, 1995, at EECS in the 3rd TECC meeting of the 1995 academic year
Amended and approved on January 16, 1996, at EECS in the 2nd college affairs meeting of the 1995 academic year
Amended and approved on November 5, 1997, at EECS in the 1st college affairs meeting of the 1997 academic year
Amended and approved on October 18, 1999, at EECS in the 2nd TECC meeting of the 1999 academic year
Amended and approved on January 21, 2000, at EECS in the 1st college affairs meeting of the 1999 academic year
Amended and approved on May 2, 2002, at EECS in the 5th TECC meeting of the 2001 academic year
Amended and approved on June 5, 2002, at EECS in the 2nd college affairs meeting of the 2001 academic year
Amended and approved on June 10, 2003, at EECS in the 7th TECC meeting of the 2002 academic year
Amended and approved on August 6, 2003, at EECS in the 1st college affairs meeting of the 2003 academic year
Amended and approved on June 14, 2004, at EECS in the 6th TECC meeting of the 2003 academic year
Amended and approved on July 7, 2004, at EECS in the 4th college affairs meeting of the 2003 academic year
Amended and approved on May 18, 2005, at EECS in the 8th TECC meeting of the 2004 academic year
Amended and approved on June 7, 2005, at EECS in the 5th college affairs meeting of the 2004 academic year
Amended and approved on May 3, 2006, at ECE in the 5th TECC meeting of the 2005 academic year
Amended and approved on June 20, 2006, at ECE*** in the 4th college affairs meeting of the 2005 academic year
Amended and approved on April 22, 2008, at ECE in the 9th TECC meeting of the 2007 academic year
Approved and filed on April 29, 2008, at NCTU**** in the 10th UTEC***** meeting of the 2007 academic year
Amended and approved on May 1, 2008, at ECE in the 2nd college affairs meeting of the 2007 academic year
Amended and approved on June 4, 2008, at ECE in the 10th TECC meeting of the 2007 academic year
Approved and filed on June 27, 2008, at NCTU in the 12th UTEC meeting of the 2007 academic year
Amended and approved on July 2, 2009, at ECE in the 6th TECC meeting of the 2008 academic year
Approved and filed on September 24, 2009, at NCTU in the 1st UTEC meeting of the 2009 academic year
Amended and approved on October 15, 2010, at ECE in the 2nd TECC meeting of the 2010 academic year
Amended and approved on October 19, 2010, at ECE in the 1st college affairs meeting of the 2010 academic year
Approved and filed on January 5, 2011, at NCTU in the 4th UTEC meeting of the 2010 academic year
Amended and approved on March 17, 2011, at ECE in the 6th TECC meeting of the 2010 academic year
Amended and approved on April 14, 2011, at ECE in the 7th TECC meeting of the 2010 academic year
Approved and filed on April 20, 2011, at NCTU in the 6th UTEC meeting of the 2010 academic year
Amended and approved on March 8, 2012, at ECE in the 6th TECC meeting of the 2011 academic year
Approved and filed on March 14, 2012, at NCTU in the 7th UTEC meeting of the 2011 academic year
Amended and approved on February 27, 2014, at ECE in the 6th TECC meeting of the 2013 academic year
Approved and filed on March 12, 2014, at NCTU in the 6th UTEC meeting of the 2013 academic year
*EECS: College of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the College of Computer Science;
**TECC: Teacher Evaluation Committee of the College;
***ECE: College of Electrical and Computer Engineering;
****NCTU: National Chiao-Tung University;
*****UTEC: University Teacher Evaluation Committee

- Article 1 The Regulation was established based on the National Chiao Tung University (NCTU) Instructor Promotion Review Process Specifications and the NCTU Instructor Promotion University Teacher Evaluation Committee (UTEC) Teaching Service Grading Guidelines.
- Article 2 Instructor promotion evaluation includes evaluation of both research and teaching services, and involves a preliminary and secondary evaluations.
1. Applicants must submit all necessary review documents to the affiliate Departmental Teacher Evaluation Committee (DTEC) for approval before June 1 of each year; they must also be teaching at school during the period of review by the DTEC, Teacher Evaluation Committee of the College (TECC), and UTEC. Applicants who leave for study, research, or lecture and are not teaching at NCTU during this period may not apply for promotions.
 2. If more strict promotion qualification for each DTEC exists, it is applied to evaluate applicants' research and teaching services; the applications will then be submitted to the Teacher Evaluation Committee of the College (TECC) to be approved, filed, and implemented based on relevant established instructor review regulations.

Each DTEC evaluates the applicants' research and teaching services. Research results must be reviewed by at least three professional reviewers, and review must be completed prior to July 31 of each year. The review results, data, list of applicants (including experts and at least 10 foreign and domestic applicants recommended to the College) are submitted to the College and filed for reference.

3. The attendance of at least two thirds of all committee members are required for meetings to commence. During the preliminary evaluations of each DTEC, applicants whose research and teaching services, published points, and recommendation results match the specifications outlined in Articles 2–8 may proceed to secondary evaluation according to Article 9. The convener selects at least four foreign or domestic experts in research domains similar to the applicants for review. The review process of the College is completed before November 20 of each year.

Article 3

The review items for research include academic works, new theories, novel technological research and developments that demonstrate specific results (including authorized patents or academic works, technology transfers, awards), participation and promotion of large-scale research projects (or research groups), and competition for results and research grants.

1. Research works include journal papers, book chapters or sections, top-tier international academic conference proceedings, patents, and copyrights.

(1) Representative works must be academic works completed after the effective date when the applicant qualified for the previous instructor level and within 5 years prior to the effective date of the current promotion. Applicants who withdraw from the current promotion application after the DTEC secondary evaluation meeting may not reapply for promotion review using the same representative works.

(2) Academic reference works must be completed after the effective date when the applicant qualified for the previous instructor level and within 7 years prior to the effective date of the current promotion.

(3) Review items must comprise three representative works (proof from coauthors must be provided) and several reference academic works. A list of academic works and research results must be submitted for domestic or foreign review; the reviewed results serve as the primary basis of research results.

(4) Applicants who were pregnant or who gave birth within the aforementioned period may acquire a two-year extension from the effective date of the review data if the DTEC approves the documents of proof.

2. Review is limited to published academic works; proof must be provided prior to June 1 for applicants that have been accepted for publication. Other regulations related to academic works are processed according to Articles 11–16 of the Ministry of Education (R.O.C.) Accreditation Regulations Governing Teacher Qualifications at Institutions of Higher Education.

The aforementioned documents of proof that have been accepted for publication must be published within 1 year of the date of proof provided; within 2 months following publication, specialized academic work must be submitted for the school's approval and filing; personal excuses are not acceptable. Applicants who cannot publish within 1 year must provide proof of reasons and confirmed publication dates to apply for extensions; this is limited to 3 years from the accepted date of the publication. After passing UTEC reviews, the applications must be submitted to the Ministry of Education to be filed for reference within 1 year.

3. Academic journals, book chapters, and sections are divided into three categories:

(1) Highly recommended (Type A): Full articles count as 3 points and short articles count as 2 points (determined by the department).

(2) Recommended (Type B): Full articles count as 2 points and short articles count as 1 point (determined by the department).

(3) Those with approval systems that do not belong to Types A or B (Type C): Each academic work is considered as 1 point.

(4) Using book chapters as research results: The publication conditions and degree of influence of the book must be described; grading is subject to departmental approval.

(5) The aforementioned journal classifications are determined by departments. However, relevant data must be reported to the College for approval and filing.

4. Top-tier international academic conference papers, patents, and authorized copyrights must not exceed a sum of 2 points (determined by the department).

5. For academic works comprising more than one author, points are considered based on the following standards:

(1) Coauthors who were students at the time of publication must provide proof to be excluded from the author's list.

(2) When a publication consists of two authors, the first and second authors receive 90% and 60% of the points, respectively.

(3) When a publication contains at least three authors, the first, second, and third authors receive 80%, 45%, and 30% of the points, respectively; remaining authors are not considered for any points.

(4) Applicants must provide explanations for regional or national customs on coauthorships; points for academic works are determined by departmental working groups and submitted for DTEC approval.

6. The applicant must provide explanations for published coauthored nature or science journal papers, passed international standard proposals, completed large-scale system development, or coauthored major cross-domain cooperation project papers. The academic work points are determined by departmental working groups and submitted for DTEC approval.

Article 4 Associate professors must demonstrate independent research ability and performance to be promoted to professors. This includes the following minimum grading standard for the quantity and quality of academic works: Academic works must be published and must not be research directly related to works from previous promotions or a PhD thesis. The applicant must select three self-representative works, which must not be identical to rejected work from previous applications. The total points of the academic works are calculated using one of the following methods:

1. Within 5 years, total academic work points must exceed 15 points (including at least 5 points completed at NCTU). Instructors who served less than 2 years at NCTU but qualify for the years of service requirement for promotion must obtain 15 academic work points within 5 years (including at least 2 points completed at NCTU). The applicant must be the first author in at least two of the representative works, which must be Type A journal papers (excluding students).

2. The total number of academic work points must be at least 21 points (including at least 6 points completed at NCTU). Applicants who served less than 2 years at NCTU but qualified for the years of service requirement for promotion must obtain more than 21 academic work points within 7 years (including at least 3 points completed at NCTU). The applicant must be the first author in at least two of the representative works, which must be Type A journal papers (excluding students).

Applicants who were pregnant or gave birth prior to the current promotion may apply for a 2-year extension for submitting the review data through DTEC approval. These applicants may acquire the aforementioned 5-year total of academic work points within 7 years, or acquire the aforementioned 7-year total of academic work points within 9 years.

Article 5 Assistant professors must demonstrate independent abilities and performance to be promoted

to associate professors. The following description provides the minimal grading standard for the quality and quantity of academic works. The works submitted must be published and must not be directly related to any previous promotion or a PhD thesis. The applicant may choose three representative works that differ from those submitted for a previous promotion. The total number of academic work points can be calculated using one of the following methods:

1. The total number of academic work points must be at least 9 points (including at least 3 points completed at NCTU). Applicants who served less than 2 years at NCTU but qualified based on the number of years of services must obtain at least 9 academic work points within 5 years (including at least 2 points completed at NCTU). The applicant must be the first author of at least one of the representative works, which must also be a Type A journal paper (excluding students).

2. The total number of academic work points must be at least 12 points (including at least 4 points completed at NCTU). Applicants who served less than 2 years at NCTU but fulfilled the years of services must obtain at least 12 academic work points within 7 years (including at least 3 points completed at NCTU). The applicant must be the first author of at least one Type A journal paper (excluding students).

Applicants who were pregnant or gave birth prior to the current promotion may apply for a 2-year extension for submitting the review data through DTEC approval. These applicants may acquire the aforementioned 5-year total of academic work points within 7 years or acquire the aforementioned 7-year total academic work point within 9 years.

Article 6 The quality and quantity of academic works of the lecturer must meet the following minimum standards for the lecturer to be promoted to associate professor. The lecturer must present academic works with contributions equivalent to a PhD thesis within the past 5 years. This condition applies for applicants who assumed positions prior to March 1997.

Applicants must possess a total of at least 6 academic workpoints. The submitted academic work may contain contents related to a PhD thesis; at least one of the representative works must be a first-author Type A journal paper.

Article 7 Lecturers' academic work in the past 5 years must demonstrate contributions equivalent to a PhD thesis for the lecturer to be promoted to assistant professor.

Article 8 The following items are considered in the review of teaching services. Application materials must be research conducted after the effective date when the applicant qualified for the previous instructor level and within the 5 years before the current promotion becomes effective. Applicants who were pregnant or gave birth during the aforementioned period may apply for a two-year extension for submitting the review data through DTEC approval.

1. Teaching:

(1) All teaching evaluation results within 5 years.

(2) Lecturing hours, number of lectured courses, number of students in each course, syllabus and teaching concepts, and results and course improvements.

(3) Textbooks, teaching materials, and corresponding publication conditions.

(4) Instruction of graduate student theses, undergraduate research projects, and student exhibitions, as well as specific competition results.

(5) Teaching results of teacher evaluation.

(6) NCTU Excellent Teaching Awards, Good Teaching Awards, or other teaching incentives.

(7) On-campus years of services.

2. Services (all services specified in this regulation include counseling activities):

(1) University, college, and department administrative affairs.

- (2) Various university, college, and department committee services.
- (3) Specific proof of student counseling.
- (4) Establishing, planning, or managing research centers, teaching laboratories, or research laboratories.
- (5) Supervising national examinations.
- (6) Organizing or participating in domestic or foreign academic groups or conferences; organizing, reviewing, or editing academic publications.
- (7) Service results of teacher evaluation.
- (8) NCTU Excellent Teacher Awards or other service-related incentives.
- (9) Applicant for part-time administrative works must separately submit working experience reports for DTEC, TECC, and UTEC review after obtaining relevant unit supervisor comments.

Article 9

The promotion secondary evaluation process is specified as follows. The TECC must complete the promotion secondary evaluation process prior to November 20 of each year and arrange applicant oral presentations when necessary. The TECC may agree to conduct the applicants' teaching, service, and research secondary evaluations simultaneously. However, teaching and service evaluations must be graded before research evaluations. The two evaluations are independently graded; promotion is only recommended when the following specifications are fulfilled in the grading of research, teaching, and service categories.

1. Teaching and services:

Grading is provided by the attending committee members based on comprehensive evaluations of the applicants' teaching and service results; passing grades (> 80) from at least two thirds of the attending committee members are required (specific reasons must be provided for failing grades; failure to provide explanations renders the grade invalid).

2. Research:

(1) The DTEC must select at least 10 foreign or domestic experts in relevant domains for each applicant to provide professional review on the research results for the TECC convener's reference.

The TECC convener must select and appoint at least four reviewers to provide professional review on the research results of each applicant and submit the reviewers list and the DTEC reviewers list to the UTEC convener to be filed for reference prior to review.

(2) The list of reviewers (comprising off-campus experts) must not be recommended by the applicant; the applicant may provide an avoidance list containing **at most three** possible reviewers. The avoidance list must be submitted to the conveners of the DTEC, TECC, and UTEC to be filed for reference. Reviewers who fulfill the following conditions should be avoided:

1. The applicant's research instructor.
2. The applicant's coauthor or coresearcher.
3. Reviewers who served at the same school as the applicant.
4. Reviewers who possess filial relationships with the applicant or relevant regulations specified in Article 32 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(3) Reviewers must provide an opinion on the applicants' research results using the 4-point grading scale provided as follows:

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Average

4. Below average

The college recommendation standard for the promotion of the applicant is only qualified when at least two thirds of the reviewers (including DTEC professional reviewers who process the applicants' research results) considered the applicants' research results excellent or good; the promotion of associate professors and professors requires a score of excellent from at least one quarter and one third of the reviewers, respectively.

(4) The CTEC must respect the professional reviews of the research results. When CTEC committee members identify major flaws in the professional review procedure, provide reasons for questioning the review comments on professional academic bases, or remain unsure of the influence of review comments on the credibility and accuracy of the professional review, at least one half of the attending committee members must agree to resubmit the results to the reviewers for professional review. The number of reviewers for the resubmission is determined by the number of reviewers whose comments are appealed against, which is doubled in a list provided by the DTEC and subsequently decided by the CTEC convener. The college promotion recommendation standard is only met when more than two thirds of the grading submitted by the CTEC and the professional review results were excellent or good for associate professors, and more than one quarter or one third of the results was excellent for professors.

The existing regulation applies for full-time instructors who have been working (as lecturer or assistant or associate professor for more than 3 years) and qualify for promotions prior to the amendment of the NCTU Instructor Promotion Review Process Specifications on March 1, 2012. Applicants who have not previously qualified and are currently applying for promotions within 2 years of the implementation of this specification must follow the promotion regulations prior to the amendment. Qualifications for promotions are processed based on Articles 16–18 of the Act of Governing the Appointment of Educators.

- Article 10 If the applicant did not qualify for recommendation, the CTEC must provide printed notification and explanations. Applicants who remain dissatisfied may submit a written appeal to the CTEC within 5 days. Applicants may only appeal once, and the original decision may be changed when at least two thirds of the attending committee members approve the appeal. Instructors who object to the results of the appeal must reappeal against the committee according to the NCTU Committee of Teacher Grievances and Teacher Grievance Guidelines.
- Article 11 Newly recruited instructors at NCTU must first pass teacher evaluations before applying for promotions.
- Article 12 Please refer to relevant regulations for matters not covered in this guideline.
- Article 13 This guideline has been approved by the TECC and implemented after the approval and filing by the UTEC; this procedure also applies for relevant amendments.