

Regulations on Faculty Performance Evaluation

Chapter 1 General Provisions

Article 1 (Purpose)

The purpose of these regulations is to define detailed matters concerning the evaluation of faculty performance and competencies (hereinafter referred to as “Performance Evaluation”), which is implemented to enhance the quality of faculty education and student guidance, research and creative activities, industry-academic cooperation and service, and overall faculty capabilities at Woosong University (hereinafter referred to as “the University”).

Article 2 (Scope of Application)

These regulations apply to full-time faculty members employed under tenure-track contract systems (including industry-academic cooperation–focused faculty), non-tenure-track contract full-time faculty focused on industry-academic cooperation, and non-tenure-track contract full-time faculty dedicated to education (hereinafter referred to as “Faculty”) who are currently in service. However, evaluations for invited faculty, adjunct faculty, etc., may be separately determined by the President.

Article 3 (Categories of Performance)

The areas of faculty performance evaluation shall include the following.

1. Education and student guidance
2. Research and creative activities
3. Industry-academic cooperation and service
4. Industry-academic collaboration
5. Faculty competency

Chapter 2 Evaluation Procedures and Deliberative Bodies

Article 4 (Evaluation Timing and Procedures)

- ① Faculty performance evaluation shall, in principle, be conducted once annually.
- ② Only performance records submitted by the faculty member, along with supporting documents, to the relevant administrative departments within the designated period shall be recognized.
- ③ The responsible administrative departments for each evaluation category shall be as follows.
 1. The Planning Office shall serve as the primary department for faculty performance evaluation.
 2. Matters related to educational development, teaching, and student enrollment rates shall be overseen by the Academic Affairs Office.
 3. Matters related to admissions shall be overseen by the Admissions Office.
 4. Matters related to student guidance shall be overseen by the Student Affairs Office.
 5. Matters related to international exchange shall be overseen by the Office of International Affairs.
 6. Matters related to industry partners and club activities shall be overseen by the Industry-Academic Cooperation Foundation.
 7. Matters related to employment shall be overseen by the Career Development Center.
 8. Matters not specified in Items 2 through 6 shall be overseen by the Planning Office.
 9. Evaluation of faculty competency shall be overseen by the Planning Office.
- ④ The criteria for faculty competency evaluation shall be as follows.
10. For tenure-track contract full-time faculty (including industry-academic cooperation–focused faculty), 40% shall be based on the evaluation by the dean of the respective college, and 60% shall be based on the evaluation by the President, with detailed criteria specified in [Appendix 1].

[4-3-5a-wsuk]

11. For non-tenure-track contract industry-academic cooperation–focused faculty, 40% shall be based on the evaluation by the dean or head of the Industry-Academic Cooperation Foundation, and 60% shall be based on the evaluation by the President, with detailed criteria specified in [Appendix 2].

Article 5 (Recognition Period of Performance)

- ① Faculty performance evaluation shall be based on achievements from November 21 of the previous year to November 20 of the current year.
- ② For non-tenure-track contract industry-academic cooperation–focused faculty, evaluation shall be based on achievements from June 1 of the previous year to May 31 of the current year.
- ③ Each responsible department shall review, verify, and supplement performance data and submit results to the Planning Office by November 20 each year.
- ④ Performance data for non-tenure-track contract industry-academic cooperation–focused faculty shall be submitted by May 31.
- ⑤ The Head of the Planning Office shall review submitted materials and request evaluation by the Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee.
- ⑥ The Committee shall evaluate and deliberate results, and the President shall finalize and notify each faculty member individually.

Article 6 (Objection and Handling)

- ① Faculty members may file an objection within five days from notification of results through the Planning Office to the President.
- ② If deemed valid, the President may refer the case to the Committee for reconsideration.
- ④ Reconsideration decisions shall require a majority of members present and two-thirds approval of those present, and results shall be promptly notified.

Article 7 (Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee)

- ① A Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “Committee”) shall be established to deliberate important matters.
- ② Members shall be appointed by the President, and the Academic Vice President (Academic Affairs) shall serve as Chair.
- ③ The Committee shall deliberate the following.
 1. Basic principles of evaluation
 2. Verification and validation of evaluation results
 3. Objections and reconsideration
 4. Other related matters
- ④ Administrative affairs of the Committee shall be handled by the Planning Office.
- ⑤ Meetings shall be convened and chaired by the Chair.
- ⑥ Decisions shall be made by a majority of members present and a majority vote, with the Chair deciding in case of a tie.

Chapter 3 Performance Evaluation

Article 8 (Types of Evaluation)

Evaluation types shall be categorized as follows to reflect academic characteristics and maximize faculty capabilities.

1. Education-centered
2. Education-research-centered
3. Research-centered

[4-3-5a-wsuk]

4. Industry-academic cooperation-centered
- 5.

Article 9 (Evaluation Criteria and Scoring)

- ① Evaluation shall assess achievement against annual targets.
- ② Evaluation indicators and scoring criteria are defined in [Appendices 3–6].
- ③ Detailed scoring standards shall be separately determined.

Article 10 (Exclusion and Consideration)

- ① Faculty with less than one year of service due to leave, sabbatical, or dispatch may be excluded.
- ② Faculty appointed after September 1 shall be excluded from that year's evaluation.
- ③ Non-tenure-track industry-academic cooperation faculty appointed after March 1 shall be excluded.
- ④ Targets may be adjusted proportionally based on months of service.
- ⑤ The same applies to non-tenure-track industry-academic cooperation faculty appointed before March 1.
- ⑥ Faculty assigned special duties by the President may be evaluated separately.

Chapter 4 Management and Utilization of Evaluation Results

Article 11 (Management of Results)

- ① Each administrative department shall manage and retain evaluation data.
- ② The Planning Office shall compile and manage final results.
- ③ Evaluation results shall be treated as confidential in principle.

Article 12 (Utilization of Results)

Evaluation results shall be used for the following.

1. Promotion and reappointment decisions
2. Selection of outstanding faculty
3. Selection of sabbatical candidates
4. Selection for special research funding
5. Tenure review decisions
6. Determination of incentive payments

Article 13 (Supplementary Provisions)

Matters not specified in these regulations shall be determined by the President following deliberation by the Committee or the Academic Affairs Committee.

Faculty Performance Evaluation System

(Contract Full-Time Faculty including Industry-Academia Cooperation Key Faculty)

◎ Performance Evaluation and Competency Evaluation System

1. **Performance Evaluation**

Performance evaluation is divided into the following areas.

1. **Education and Student Guidance**

Evaluation of teaching activities for students (on-campus and off-campus) and industry-academia activities such as employment support and field training.

2. **Research and Creative Activities**

Evaluation of academic research activities, industry-academia outcomes such as patents and technology transfer, and external academic activities.

3. **Industry-Academia Cooperation and Service**

Evaluation of contributions to society and the University through professional knowledge and experience, including industry management and employment-related activities.

4. **Industry-Academia Cooperation**

Evaluation of collaboration activities with industry such as internships, joint research, technology transfer, commissioned education, patents, and student employment outcomes.

Competency Evaluation : Competency evaluation consists of the following components.

1. Competency evaluation is composed of 60% evaluation by the President and 40% evaluation by the Dean of the respective college.
2. **Common Competencies (Individual Evaluation)**
Evaluation of general competencies required of faculty members, including basic competencies and special activities.
3. **University Indicator-Based Department Competencies (Department Evaluation)**
Evaluation based on key university indicators such as enrollment rate and employment rate.
※ Department-level evaluation is conducted by reflecting recruitment and employment rates of each department.
4. **University/Department Development Competencies (Individual Evaluation)**
Evaluation of faculty capabilities including student competency development, operation of the four-semester system, and industrial management performance.

Overall Faculty Evaluation

Final evaluation score = Performance Evaluation (60%) + Competency Evaluation (40%)

Final Evaluation Rating System

1. Final ratings are assigned as S, A, B, C, and D based on ranking of final scores.

Rating	S	A	B	C	D
Specific Gravity (%)	15		35	35	15
Grading method	Around 15%		Around 35%	Around 35%	Around 15%

2. Evaluation for industry-academia cooperation key faculty follows the same distribution principle applied to full-time faculty.
3. Faculty scheduled for retirement in the following year may be evaluated separately by the Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee.

◎ Types of Performance and Competency Evaluation

Segmentation	Education and Student Guidance	Research and creative activities	Industry-Academia Collaboration and Service	Mold				
Performance Evaluation (Full-time faculty member under the tenure track contract system)	40 %	40 %	20 %	Research Orientation				
	50 %	30 %	20 %	Education/Research Center				
	60 %	20 %	20 %	Education Center				
	※ The performance evaluation of teachers who do not have a department (liberal arts education center, etc.) is calculated based on the weight according to the type selection, but is evaluated separately. (1) "1.2 Class Evaluation – 1.5 Student Guidance" in the Education and Student Guidance Achievement Area: Weight 22% (2) Research and creative activity achievement area: 100% weight (3) Industry-academia cooperation and service achievement area: Weights can be selected (4) Separate special activities for the relevant faculty member (quantitative and qualitative goals assigned): Weight = 300% - ((1) + (2) + (3)) ※ The performance evaluation of faculty members who are graduate students in their departments is calculated based on the weight according to the type selection, but is evaluated separately. (1) Education and Student Guidance Achievement Area: Weight can be selected (2) Research and creative activity achievement area: 100% weight (3) Industry-academia cooperation and service achievement area: Weights can be selected (4) Separate special activities for the relevant faculty member (quantitative and qualitative goals assigned): Weight = 300% - ((1) + (2) + (3)) ※ Special assignment activities (assignment of quantitative and qualitative goals) must be submitted within one month from the implementation date of the performance evaluation of the year. It is submitted to the planning office with the approval of the president (dean, dean) and vice president of the affiliated institution. (For experienced teachers in industrial companies, the sum of the weights for each area may be different.)							
Segmentation	Education and Student Guidance	Research and creative activities	Industry-Academia Collaboration and Service	Industry-Academia Collaboration	Mold			
Performance Evaluation (Full-time faculty under the tenure track contract system (Industry-Academia Cooperation Key Faculty))	40 %	60 %			Industry-Academia Cooperation Center			
※ In the case of faculty members focusing on industry-academia cooperation, the sum of weights in the education and student guidance areas is fixed at 67 out of 250 points, and the sum of weights in other areas must be selected as 173.								
Competency Assessment	Common Competencies		University Indicators Department Competencies		University/Department Development Capabilities			Mold
	Common Competencies	Special Assignment activities	Current Students Recruitment rate	Employment rate (Health Insurance DB)	Student Competencies Strengthening Performance	4 semesters Operational Performance	Industrial Management Performance	
	20 %	10 %	20 %	20 %	18 %	6 %	6 %	Research Orientation
	20 %	10 %	20 %	20 %	12 %	12 %	6 %	Education/Research Center
	20 %	10 %	20 %	20 %	9 %	15 %	6 %	Education Center
20 %	10 %	20 %	20 %	9 %	3 %	18 %	Industry-Academia Cooperation Center	

◎ Competency Evaluation Details

Competency Assessment	Competency Classification	Competency Breakdown	Details
	Common Competencies	Common Competencies (Achievement-oriented, responsible, mutual respect)	1. Presenting a way to achieve the goal / Creating an achievement-oriented culture 2. Challenging goal setting / efficient work promotion 3. Have a basic attitude to achieve your goals
			1. Establishing a sense of responsibility / leading the spread 2. Setting an example of responsibility compliance 3. Have a responsible work attitude
			1. Create an organizational atmosphere of mutual respect 2. Establish friendly relationships between internal and external members 3. Understanding the other party / smooth work cooperation
	Special Assignment Activities	1. Special activities such as national treasury project research fellow (writing committee member) and national treasury project program operation	

	University Indicators Department Competencies	Enrollment rate	1. General leave of absence and expulsion (dropout) status by department (department) as of the current year 2. Enrollment rate of the current year (as of April 1 and October 1)
		Employment Rate (Health Insurance DB)	1. Employment rate by department (department) as of June 1 of the current year (health insurance DB) and September maintenance employment rate
	University/Department Power generation capabilities	Student Empowerment Achievements	1. Operation of programs related to student empowerment (improvement of TOEIC scores, etc.)
		4th semester system operation performance	1. Management and operation of the 4-semester system
		Industrial Management Performance	1. Management and operation of industrial companies by major

- ※ Evaluation Criteria: In cases where the department name has been changed, the evaluation shall be calculated by reassigning it to the current department.
- ※ Evaluation Authority: The student enrollment rate and employment rate (based on Health Insurance DB) shall be evaluated comparatively by the university headquarters at the department level.
- ※ Special Assignment Activity Evaluation: Performance in special assignments—such as participation in major university strategic initiatives including government-funded projects and educational capacity enhancement programs (e.g., project groups, research fellows, and editorial committee members)—shall be evaluated comparatively by the university headquarters.

◎ Achievement and competency evaluation factor grading system

Performance evaluation (education and student guidance, part of research and creative activities, industry-academia cooperation and service), competency evaluation

Rating	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
	(Far Exceed)	(Exceed)	(Meet)	(Improving)	(Challenged)	(Needs Improvement)	
Points	100	80	60	40	20	0	-20
Quantitative Objectives	130% or more	115% or more	More than 100%	More than 85%	More than 60%	Less than 60%	Less than 40%
Qualitative Objectives	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Far beyond the level Outstanding performance Show	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Excellent beyond the level Show an achievement	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Satisfaction commensurate with the level Show good results	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Not satisfied with the level Showing poor performance	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Subpar and inadequate Show performance	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Far below the level indicates the performance	Enrollment rate Applies to items only

◎ Performance evaluation factor rating system (internationally renowned / internationally general / domestic prestigious journals)

Example: Achievement allocation if the target value is 150 points

Publication Performance (Scoring Criteria)	Goal Achievement	Conversion Score
300 points	Achieved 200% (Recognition of evaluation score up to 150% of the target)	150 points
225 points	150% achieved	150 points
150 points	100% achieved (Minimum Requirement met)	100 points
75 points	50% achieved (target missed)	50 points
60 points	Achieved 40% (Introduction of a deduction system from less than 40% of the target)	40 points
45 points	30% achieved (target not met)	- 10 points
30 points	20% achieved (target not met)	- 20 points
0 points	0% achieved (target missed)	- 40 points

[Appendix 2]

Faculty Performance Evaluation

(Non-Tenure Track Industry-Academia Cooperation Full-Time Faculty)

◎ **Evaluation Structure**

1. Total Evaluation = Performance (50%) + Competency (50%)

1) Performance Evaluation Areas

- Education and Student Guidance
- Research Activities

2) Industry-Academia Cooperation and Service

3. Competency Evaluation

- Dean/Head: 40%
- President: 60%

◎ **Evaluation Types AND Evaluation Weights**

Segmentation	Education and Student Guidance	Conducting Research	Industry-Academia Cooperation and Service	Mold
Performance Evaluation (Based on 100%)	40%	20%	40%	Education Center
	20%	40%	40%	Research Orientation
	20%	20%	60%	Industry-Academia Cooperation Center

※ Faculty members belonging to the Industry-Academia Cooperation Group and concurrent faculty members of research institutes (centers) choose the research-oriented type.

Competency Assessment	Common Competencies		University Indicators Department Competencies		University/Department Development Capabilities		Mold
	Common Competencies	Special Assignment activities	Current Students Recruitment rate	Employment rate (Health Insurance DB)	Student Competencies Strengthening Performance	Industrial Management and Research Achievements	
	20 %	10 %	15 %	15 %	20 %	20 %	Education Center
	20 %	10 %	15 %	15 %	15 %	25 %	Research Orientation
	20 %	10 %	15 %	15 %	10 %	30 %	Industry-Academia Cooperation Center

◎ ◎ **Rating Distribution**

Rating	S	A	B	C	D
Specific Gravity (%)	Around 15%		Around 35%	Around 35%	Around 15%

◎ **Detailed Evaluation Scale**

Rating classification	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
	(Far Exceed)	(Exceed)	(Meet)	(Improving)	(Challenged)	(Needs Improvement)	
Points	100	80	60	40	20	0	-20
Quantitative target achievement	130% or more	115% or more	More than 100%	More than 85%	More than 60%	More than 40%	Less than 40%
Qualitative target achievement	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Far beyond the level Outstanding performance Show	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Excellent beyond the level Show an achievement	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Satisfaction commensurate with the level Show good results	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Not satisfied with the level Showing poor performance	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Subpar and inadequate Show performance	Schedule against target, quality Expectations from the enemy side Far below the level indicates the performance	Enrollment rate Applies to items only