

國立臺灣師範大學學術單位評鑑實施要點

中華民國 101 年 11 月 28 日 第 338 次行政會議通過

中華民國 103 年 11 月 26 日 第 346 次行政會議通過

中華民國 110 年 5 月 26 日 第 372 次行政會議通過

中華民國 110 年 12 月 1 日 第 374 次行政會議通過

- 一、為落實學術單位評鑑工作之執行，特依據「國立臺灣師範大學自我評鑑辦法」第六條規定，訂定「國立臺灣師範大學學術單位評鑑實施要點」(以下簡稱本要點)。
- 二、本校學術單位評鑑項目包括發展目標與規劃、學生學習、教師發展、國際化及社會影響力等。
- 三、本校為配合學校之發展特色及推動學術單位評鑑業務，設置自我評鑑指導委員會及學術單位二級評鑑委員會(分別為院級及系級評鑑委員會)，其組成及任務如下：

(一)自我評鑑指導委員會：依本校自我評鑑辦法第三條規定設置。

(二)院級評鑑委員會：

1. 由院長擔任召集人，所屬教學單位主管為當然委員，並得由院長提名校內教師或校內外專家學者組成，負責辦理該學院院務評鑑相關事宜。
2. 規劃/審核受評單位之發展重點及指標、規劃受評單位之評鑑程序、執行評鑑業務工作、審查所屬受評單位評鑑報告書及辦理所屬受評單位評鑑結果之追蹤改進。
3. 各學院應依本要點訂定評鑑實施要點，組成院級評鑑委員會，經院務會議通過後發布施行；各學院需督導院內所屬系所(含學位學程)訂定評鑑作業要點，組成系級評鑑委員會。

(三)系級評鑑委員會：

1. 由系(所)主管擔任召集人，委員三至五人，並由系(所)專任教師組成，報請所屬學院院長核備，負責該系系務評鑑相關事宜。
2. 規劃評鑑程序、執行評鑑業務工作、審查評鑑報告書及辦理評鑑結果之追蹤改進。

四、評鑑工作小組：

- (一)由副校長擔任召集人，教務長、研發長、學務長、國際長、總務長、各學院院長組成之，並得視議案需求邀請相關單位代表列席。
- (二)規劃評鑑實施計畫及學術單位評鑑指標、協助執行評鑑業務工作、審查評鑑報告書。

五、評鑑實施內容：

(一)前置作業階段：研究發展處應依業務推動需要，辦理學術單位評鑑說明會或相關評鑑研習課程。各受評單位及其學院應於實地訪評前，指派至少一人參加校內外相關研習課程至少一場以上，且各受評單位應於實地訪評前參與評鑑相關會議或研習課程時數至少六小時。

(二)辦理評鑑階段：

1. 受評單位應組成系級評鑑委員會，依評鑑項目進行分工，負責評鑑相關資料蒐集與分析、依階段需要討論評鑑報告書內容與進度，以及撰寫評鑑報告書等事宜。
2. 各學院應成立院級評鑑委員會，負責院內受評單位評鑑作業諮詢、評鑑報告書確認、評鑑結果總檢討、協助系所後續改善規劃並推動執行。
3. 受評單位因學門相關或教學研究領域相近，得申請共同評鑑，部分評鑑程序得合併作業，惟須經校長核准後始得辦理之。其得合併及不得合併辦理之內容如下：
 - (1)得合併辦理：受評單位自評報告書、部分訪視流程、訪評委員之聘任（可一部分或全部共同聘任）等。上述得合併辦理者，受評單位亦可視情形分開辦理之。
 - (2)不得合併辦理：訪評委員訪視報告、受評單位之評鑑結果、評鑑改善計畫。
4. 訪評委員遴選及組成應循下列原則進行：
 - (1)訪評委員應由校外人士擔任且具高等教育教學與研究經驗之學者、或相關專業領域之業界代表組成，訪評委員人數以三至五人為原則。
 - (2)由各受評單位提出訪評委員建議名單及迴避名單，並送「院級評鑑委員會」審核並彙整後提送「自我評鑑指導委員會」審查確認，並由校長聘任之，任期三年。
5. 訪評委員於同意聘任後應簽署利益迴避保證書，以完備利益迴避程序。有下列情事之一者，不得聘任為訪評委員：
 - (1)接受本校頒贈之榮譽學位
 - (2)擔任本校有給或無給職之職務且具利害關係者。
 - (3)過去三年曾在受評單位擔任專兼任職務。
 - (4)過去三年內曾申請受評單位之專任教職或校、院、系(所)行政職務。
 - (5)最高學歷為本校畢(結)業且未滿十年者。
 - (6)配偶或直系三親等為受評單位之教職學生。
 - (7)過去三年內與受評單位有任何形式之商業利益往來。
 - (8)其他足以影響訪評作業公平及公正之情形。
6. 為使訪評委員了解本校評鑑相關規定及作業流程，實地訪評前一周應將訪評委員工作手冊送交訪評委員閱覽，並請訪評委員參與評鑑預備會議。
7. 實地訪評程序應包含受評單位簡報、資料檢閱、場地與設備檢視、待釐清問題回覆及座談，並得依需要安排相關人員(含教師、行政人員、學生，及畢業系所友等)晤談。
8. 受評單位應將評鑑資料，送請訪評委員進行書面審閱。
9. 受評單位於實地訪評期間，因資料準備不足或欠缺，經訪評委員要求受評單位提供補充資料，應於訪評委員做成評鑑結果前補件。
10. 訪評委員應給予明確之評鑑結果及相對應之具體理由與建議，以呈現各受評單位之優缺點與應興革事項。

11. 本評鑑結果分為「通過」、「有條件通過」及「未通過」。
12. 「自我評鑑指導委員會」審查學術單位評鑑結果，研發處依指導委員會審查結果，將評鑑結果公告於網站。

(三) 追蹤改善階段：

1. 受評單位於接受評鑑實地訪評後，應針對評鑑結果召開系級評鑑委員會進行評鑑結果總檢討。
2. 受評單位應於實地訪評結束後一個月內將「評鑑改善計畫」及相關會議紀錄送院級評鑑委員會審查及研究發展處備查；學院應協助受評單位進行改善。
3. 各學院須至「自我評鑑指導委員會」報告所屬受評單位評鑑結果及協助改善情形。
4. 受評單位於評鑑結果公布一年內為自我改善期，各受評單位得依訪評委員之建議，滾動修正或調整其發展重點及指標，並由「院級評鑑委員會」定期追蹤所屬受評單位改善情形及執行成效，作為評鑑結果後續運用之建議。

(四) 追蹤評鑑與再評鑑階段：

1. 評鑑結果為「有條件通過」或「未通過」之受評單位，須分別接受校方「追蹤評鑑」或「再評鑑」。
2. 評鑑結果為「有條件通過」之受評單位，於追蹤評鑑時，須針對實地委員訪評報告所提問題與缺失撰寫「追蹤評鑑報告」並再次進行書面審查，若通過則由「院級評鑑委員會」定期追蹤所屬受評單位改善情形及執行成效，作為評鑑結果後續運用之建議。
3. 評鑑結果為「未通過」之受評單位，於再評鑑時，應針對所有評鑑項目重新撰寫「自評報告書」並再次進行實地訪評，繳交「評鑑改善計畫」並完成「追蹤改善階段」各項行政流程。
4. 研究發展處應規劃追蹤評鑑及再評鑑作業期程，經「自我評鑑指導委員會」審議後辦理。追蹤評鑑及再評鑑作業須於自我改善期間結束後六個月內完成。
5. 追蹤評鑑之書面審查委員及再評鑑之實地訪評委員以原實地訪評委員為原則。
6. 上述受評單位針對追蹤評鑑及再評鑑結果，提出後續自我改善規劃與執行成果，同時納入下一週期評鑑追蹤評核內容。

六、受評單位對評鑑結果為「有條件通過」及「未通過」，認為有下列情形之一，得於收到評鑑結果之次日起十四日內，提出申復：

- (一) 實地訪評過程違反程序。
- (二) 訪評委員總結報告內容所載之數據、資料及其他文字與受評單位之實況有所不符，致訪評委員總結報告與事實不符。

受評單位提出申復時，須於前項規定期限內填具申復申請書並檢附具體事證，送

交研究發展處，逾時不受理，且以一次為限。

受評單位之申復案，由研究發展處將受評單位提具之申復申請書及所附具體事證，送請原受評單位之訪評委員進行檢視，並請其提出回覆說明後通知受評單位。受評單位對於訪評委員提出之回覆說明仍有不服時，應於收到訪評委員回覆說明十四日內，簽請研究發展處將該單位申復案文件，提送自我評鑑指導委員會審議，並由研究發展處將最終審議結果函知申復單位。

自我評鑑指導委員會審議申復案件時，得視需要請申復單位列席說明。

- 七、各受評單位辦理評鑑作業所產生之會議紀錄、評鑑報告、評鑑結果、後續處理情形及改善成果報告等相關文件均為評鑑品保認可資料，各受評單位應完整建檔，以利評鑑查核之需。
- 八、本要點經本校行政會議通過，報請校長核定後發布實施，修正時亦同。

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

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 Affairs 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: self-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 who are either scholars having 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) may be arranged **when necessary**.
- (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. 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 "Self-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.