

# 國立政治大學評鑑報告

受評單位：通識教育相關單位

訪視評鑑日期：102年12月19日至12月20日

評鑑報告文件

受評單位	文件
博雅通識	評鑑報告
	評量表
語文通識	評鑑報告
	評量表(外語)
	評量表(中文)
書院通識	評鑑報告
	評量表
生活通識	評鑑報告
	評量表

## 評鑑報告

(通識教育 博雅通識)

### 壹、全人通識教育最具特色項目

項目	特色
1. 理念、目標與特色	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 本校通識教育主要採芝加哥大學模式發展，以核心課程方式呈現。</li><li>2. 本校之核心能力指標係經長期研討，具完整性與可行性。</li><li>3. 學校係採廣義通識概念，整合四大教育區塊，值得肯定。</li></ol>
2. 課程發展與設計	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 核心課程採「寬口徑，厚基礎」理念設計，成效優良。</li><li>2. 新發展之「核心素養融入專業」以及「社會參與式」通識課程亦有可觀之處，宜納入一般通識中課程，整體規劃。</li></ol>
3. 教師素質與教學品質	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 以增撥員額方式，處理師員來源，並深化與各院之聯繫，可供效法。</li><li>2. 核心課程之教與學品質在水準之上，一般通識課程則優劣參半。</li></ol>
4. 學習資源與環境	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 本校學習資源多元豐沛且良善，學生滿意度高。</li><li>2. TA 的提供，在核心課程中非常完備，宜再推至一般通識。</li><li>3. 各類書院提供教育興革功能之試點，成效顯著。目前正朝與通識課程搭配的方向思考。</li></ol>
5. 組織、行政與自我改善機制	缺
6. 學生學習成果與表現	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 同學對通識教育改革後滿意度相當高，值得肯定。</li><li>2. 多元學習與評量方式逐漸增加於正式課程與書院課程中，甚值鼓勵。</li></ol>
7. 其他特色	

## 貳、待改進事項

### 一、可公開評議項目

(一) 有關理念特色宜含政大歷史發展脈絡之簡要論述；另外既以「博雅」之名為核心，除各種能力培養外，於情、意方面亦宜多著墨。

(二) 核心課程之向度分類仍應再精進，首要之務再深化核心之內涵，若為學科基礎則需討論各向度與學門之簡要關連，若為議題導向或跨領域等亦可再多加說明。目前之「世界文明與歷史思維」以及「區域發展與全球思維」顯然與其他向度略有不同。

(三) 中、外語文通識在課程內容是否與一般通識有重疊或互補之處應可再檢視以增加課程之系統性與豐富度。

(四) 除核心通識課程外，其他通識課程之發展以及其與核心通識之關連性亦應規劃反映。

(五) 「寬口徑、厚基礎」之操作型定義如何呈現請加費心，否則可能淪為口號。除有共同課綱以提示教學討論內容外，從學生端而言，如何「厚基礎」與「寬口徑」？

(六) 雖有增撥員額以支撐核心通識，但仍有四、五個學院參與通識之情況並不理想，學校應採措施，或在課程認定或獎勵上，鼓勵其它學院課程加入。

(七) 目前通識教育組織架構圖仍有問題，宜改善之。在層級上有些不明，一個單位既隸屬教務處之下，不應又使校長或副校長主持；此外，究其功能在行政業務與前瞻政策規劃上又混屬一單位，其功能必然不彰，建議政策規劃部分應獨立成立通識教育諮議委員會，納入領域召集人、一般通識以及數位關心通識之校內外專家，以定期集思廣益，籌謀將來。

(八) 除「厚基礎、寬口徑」之外，「跨領域，統整與轉化」的學習，尤其跨領域之操作型意涵亦應論述，目前既有「核心素養融入專業」與「社會參與式課程」之推展宜應納入論述。

(九) 在「人才培育再概念化」部分中，核心能力與專業知識兩名詞之呈現似有不協調之處，在粉紅色封面之自我評鑑報告中，頁全人—6 與—7 (圖3 與表1)，一者並列，一者內含 (亦即核心能力包含專業知識)，頗不一致。

(十) 目前核心通識與一般通識，無論在教學探討、教學要求、TA 搭配，學校重視程度皆有一國兩制之情形，造成兩社詳間的潛在對立，宜速改善以免影響士氣。

(十一) 教師評分落差情形甚為普遍，學生至表關心；建議評分可再考慮改為等第式或班排名同列，或規範班平均、標準差等方面作些改革，盡量拉近與專業系所的平均分數。評分不公或偏高，若情況普遍，將傷害通識教育。

(十二) 自然領域課程目前上課成效不甚彰顯。一般毛病在於多以專業課程方式授課，建議通識中心能取法教育部通識網之相關教學內容，或再加以整理上課大綱之設計原則，以供教師參考。或請傑出之自然通識教師傳授課程規劃與授課方式。

(十三) 為加強各院支援通識課程，通識中心宜就各院送交中有爭議之課程內容，於召開課程委員會之前，先行私下溝通協調，以創雙贏結果。

(十四) 學校教師之教學負擔普遍沉重，聘任博士生教學似乎難以減少，有教師反映應從培養博士生角度看待兼課一事。

(十五) 由於通識課程異質性高，建議學校宜採自助選題方式設計學生評量題目群組，以增加合適度與信效度。

參、總結(請針對受評之通識教育類別做一簡要的評鑑總評，篇幅約 300-500 字左右)

一、博雅通識無論在設計理念、課綱設計以及教學成效上而言，皆屬優質。政治大學最近十年來之努力耕耘，成果相當豐碩。

二、通識教育在政大採廣義解釋，故結合了四大面向，此種視野，應予高度肯定，惟在彼此間的整合與系統性上可再精進。

三、目前之通識組織架構，在研議大政方針、興革發展以及整體協調上仍有不足，宜再調整。

四、核心通識與一般通識間的連結與論述仍舊缺少，應予補強。

五、政大學生素質優良，教學資源亦豐沛，整體學習成效在優質水準。

#### 肆、結果

結果	5	4	3	2	1
班別	特優	優	通過	有條件通過	不通過
博雅通識		V			

(備註：經評為特優或不通過之單位，請務必提出具體理由)

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：

評鑑報告附錄：不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

受評單位：全人通識教育- 博雅通識

【評鑑目的在自我改善精進，請以各受評單位近五年之自我改進情形作為評量基準。】

評量項目		5 特優	4 優	3 通過	2 有條件 通過	1 不通過
個別 評鑑 面向	1. 「理念、目標與特色」成果表現		V			
	2. 「課程發展與設計」成果表現		V			
	3. 「教師素質與教學品質」成果表現		V			
	4. 「學習資源與環境」成果表現		V			
	5. 「組織、行政與自我改善機制」成果表現				V	
	6. 「學生學習成果與表現」成果表現			V		
重點 學習 內涵	7. 「跨領域統整」成果表現			V		
	8. 「知識統整」成果表現		V			

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：



## 評鑑報告 (通識教育 語文通識)

### 壹、全人通識教育最具特色項目

項目	特色
1. 理念、目標與特色	教育理念及核心著重語言溝通表達、書寫能力及文化素養，以奠定學生國際移動之能力。理念、目標及特色明確。
2. 課程發展與設計	大學英文課程整合語言技能的設計，是很好的全方位思維。大學英文三強調專業英語的學習，很能符合學生的學習動機與需求。此外，提供二十多種外語課程的多元廣度，是相當重要的特色。
3. 教師素質與教學品質	外語中心教師素質優良，不僅在教學上表現傑出，在研究上也有不錯的表現。此外，中心教師透過「午餐的約會」教師社群教學分享活動，相互切磋教學經驗與心得，此般用心非常值得肯定。
4. 學習資源與環境	外語中心所屬自學中心，提供豐富的學習資源及活動，讓學生可透過非正式的學習情境，持續培養學習動機與外語能力，值得高度肯定。此外，外語中心結合校內國際生的外語人力資源，以義工方式舉辦許多文化、語言活動，提供學生與外籍生交流互動的機會，對於營造整體校園外語學習環境，有相當大的貢獻。外語中心在欠缺經費挹注的情況下，能以創新的方式，透過義工的招募舉辦活動，值得肯定。
5. 組織、行政與自我改善機制	外語中心由 8 位具博士學位的教師及 15 位講師組成，能各自發揮專長，貢獻於外語教育之推展，亦可避免國內許多大學博士級英文老師不願意擔任或參與非外語本科系課程及行政事務的困境，值得肯定。
6. 學生學習成果與表現	現有的英語畢業門檻，確實能確保多數畢業學生英語基本聽力與閱讀能力，值得肯定。此外，學生對於出國交換、參與外語中心舉辦之語言、文化學習活動熱衷，展現出極高的學習熱忱與動機，亦值得讚許。

7. 其他特色	外語中心能在經費逐年遞減的情況下，仍持續密集舉辦眾多廣受歡迎的外語學習活動，這樣的努力，值得肯定效尤。特別是能透過招募義工輔導老師，以不花經費，自力救濟的方式繼續舉辦活動，是非常不容易的。
---------	--

## 貳、待改進事項(外語)

### 一、可公開評議項目

1. 目前英語課程的數量及學期分佈嚴重不足，無法確保多數學生在四年的求學期間，英文都有所進步。學生訪談所獲致的結果是，約四分之一的學生認為有進步、約 40% 的學生認為持平、約 40% 的學生認為退步了。建議校方針對畢業生對英語能力滿意度及英語能力的修課需求進行更廣泛的調查，釐清英語課程不足的問題。

有關通識課程各類別的學分數上限，建議予以鬆綁。亦即，放寬（取消）各類別認可之修課上限時數，如外國語文領域目前上限學分數為 6，建議允許學生以不超過通識學分上限 32 學分，且修完每個領域的最低下限學分（共十八學分）的前提下，允許學生針對個人志趣，專注於某一類別之課程選修。如新聞系學生如擬朝科技新聞領域發展，於完成基本通識類別要求後，可專注於自然科學領域之通識課程。外交系學生可專注於某一外語之精熟。亦即在通識專才的培養上，給予學生更適性發展的空間與支援。總之，無上限通識課程之作法或許太寬鬆，但現行制度並不利於學生自我探索，深化通識領域之學習。建議適度調整之。

2. 英語為國際學術領域最共通的語言，建議思考評估如何引導學生提升專業英語能力，亦即，在學系的專業課程中，如何與外語通識英文課程相銜接，培養學生足夠的專業英語能力，以應付專業領域中的英文聽、說、讀、寫需求。可評估 Language across Curriculum 在政大推行的可能性。

3. 雖然大學英文的課程設計為統整性語言技能，但課程並未清楚規範口說，寫作練習的份量，且寫作課程較為不足，建議更明確規範各課程的具體要求。

4. 校園英語化可更普及，如藝文中心活動簡介都有英文版，但學生社團「就愛玩社團」的宣傳冊子完全沒有英文版。建議爾後能鼓勵學生撰寫英文版社團簡介，除了語言練習外，更可提供外籍生融入校園生活，促進本地生與國際生交流的機會。

5. 中心自我改善機制可以更落實。從每年自我檢視核心問題，提出改善方案等，達成循環自我循環改善機制。

6. 基於語言學習「用進廢退」，不進則退的法則，建議將英語課程由目前大一四學分，大二兩學分（僅約 50% 學生修習）的制度，改成八個學期，每學期一學分的課程設計。

7. 學生訪談過程表示，大學英文一、二對英語學習的幫助較有限，大致僅能維持高中程度。而大學英文三由於著重於專業英語，不僅能提升學習動機，亦能學到

更多。

8. 可更深化大學英語課程，除了英語技能的培養外，融入其他專業或學術基本訓練，如學術英文寫作、學術論文研讀、學術口語簡報、甚至其他專業領域之英語授課，如學習焦慮、語言習得等，引導學生銜接專業英語之能力。

9. 校方提供英語課程助教（35 人以上）及外語課程助教（需 70 人以上）的門檻不一，導致不公平的現象，值得重新檢討、改善。

**叁、總結(請針對受評之通識教育類別做一簡要的評鑑總評，篇幅約 300-500 字左右)**

整體而言，外語中心無論在課程設計、教學、學習活動推動上，均展現出優秀的團隊精神與專業知能，值得高度肯定。以政大優良的學風、認真辦學的嚴謹態度，相信透過持續自我改善機制，必能成為國內外語教學領導性的教育殿堂。期許外語中心教師持續現有的團隊精神及突破困境的意志力與企圖心，持續精進。

#### 肆、結果

結果	5	4	3	2	1
班別	特優	優	通過	有條件通過	不通過
語文通識		V			

(備註：經評為特優或不通過之單位，請務必提出具體理由)

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：

評鑑報告附錄：不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

受評單位：全人通識教育- 語文通識(外語)

【評鑑目的在自我改善精進，請以各受評單位近五年之自我改進情形作為評量基準。】

評量項目		5 特優	4 優	3 通過	2 有條件 通過	1 不通過
個別 評鑑 面向	1. 「理念、目標與特色」成果表現		V			
	2. 「課程發展與設計」成果表現		V			
	3. 「教師素質與教學品質」成果表現	V				
	4. 「學習資源與環境」成果表現	V				
	5. 「組織、行政與自我改善機制」成果表現	V				
	6. 「學生學習成果與表現」成果表現	V				
重點 學習 內涵	7. 「語文溝通」成果表現		V			
	8. 「文化素養」成果表現	V				

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：

## 貳、待改進事項(中國語文)

### 一、可公開評議項目

(一) 中文系由傳統大一國文，轉化為「中國語文通識」，理念正確，目標明確、益以全力投入，宜獲肯定。

(二) 中國語文通識，大一課程採「統整」及「奠基」，大二以上可依興趣修習「進階國文」，漸次深入，由博而專，頗能符合課程之設計。

(三) 中國語文通識，開設科目計古典有詩、散文、小說、戲曲，現代有小說、臺灣文學，以及中國思想名作、中國語言文字名作等選讀，涵蓋頗廣，不致偏枯。

(四) 中國語文通識，統整、奠基階段，有習作批改後騰清全校展出，可策勵學生認真學習，彰顯學習成果。

叁、總結(請針對受評之通識教育類別做一簡要的評鑑總評，篇幅約 300-500 字左右)

中國語文通識，設計十六課程，兼含古典與現代、中國與臺灣，不限於傳統國文之辭章、義理與考據，頗為全面。師資整齊，盡心投入，益以習作、批改，公開展示，以加強其學習成果。部分教學教材陳舊，系統不一，應予更新。

#### 肆、結果

結果	5	4	3	2	1
班別	特優	優	通過	有條件通過	不通過
語文通識		V			

(備註：經評為特優或不通過之單位，請務必提出具體理由)

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：



評鑑報告附錄：不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

受評單位：全人通識教育- 語文通識(中國語文)

【評鑑目的在自我改善精進，請以各受評單位近五年之自我改進情形作為評量基準。】

評量項目		5 特優	4 優	3 通過	2 有條件 通過	1 不通過
個別 評鑑 面向	1. 「理念、目標與特色」成 果表現	V				
	2. 「課程發展與設計」成 果表現	V				
	3. 「教師素質與教學品質」 成果表現	V				
	4. 「學習資源與環境」成 果表現		V			
	5. 「組織、行政與自我改善 機制」成果表現		V			
	6. 「學生學習成果與表現」 成果表現		V			
重點 學習 內涵	7. 「語文溝通」成果表現		V			
	8. 「文化素養」成果表現		V			

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：

## **Further deliberation on the 2013 Qualitative Review of the General Education Programmes and Chengchi Colleges<sup>1</sup> during the Freshman Year of Study at NCCU, Taiwan.**

Prof. Lichia Saner-Yiu, CSEND, Geneva  
29<sup>th</sup> January 2014

### **Preamble**

This reflection is based on the review conducted on 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> December 2013 on campus upon the invitation by Prof. Wu, Se-Hua, President of the NCCU. My assignment, as member of the Review Team, was to review the performance of the General Education programme (GEP) and its Chengchi College (CCGEP) components implemented in NCCU for foundational learning geared toward a comprehensive personhood development (the “全人通識教育”) during the freshman year on campus.

The main focus of this reflection aims at elaborating in more detail on the recommendations made and presented in the *points for continual improvement* section of the final report.

The said report is presented in Annex 1 of this paper for easy reference.

### **Introduction**

Although the external review was carried out in very limited time, the methods used, such as group interviews, documentation review, in-situ visits and multiple perspectives are tested audit methods. These mixed methodologies provided confidence and validity to the findings. Observations made by the internal assessment team were corroborated by the external team which consisted three members, namely, Prof. LIN Se-Lin and Prof. Chu Jianmin.

In general the preliminary review was very positive and supportive of the pedagogical

---

<sup>1</sup> Adopted a similar orientation and approach to that of Oxford and its Tutorial Teaching Approach. This approach is defined by the Oxford Learning Institute at <http://www.learning.ox.ac.uk/support/teaching/resources/teaching/>

approach employed for GEP and CCGEP and the learning effect appears to be laudable. Therefore the concern expressed by the team was less pedagogical but rather institutional. The questions of coherence, consistency and sustainability underpinned the recommendations for a more systemic and quality management based approach to the GEP in general and CCGEP in particular.

### **Recommended Actions**

A total of three recommendations were made in the initial report submitted. They are:

1. Missing of a documented quality assurance system which compiles policy, process and division of labour, procedures, instructional guide and reporting template/records.
2. Lack clear guidelines regarding measurable indicators for learning outcome(s).
3. Issue of institutionalization of the innovative “pilots”書院.

Each of these recommendations will be elaborated below with brief explanation and reasoning for the need to act, and the risk of doing nothing.

#### **Recommendation 1:**

“Missing of a documented quality assurance system which compiles policy, process and division of labour, procedures, instructional guide and reporting template/records.”

#### **Rationale**

The pedagogical approaches adopted for the “Transversal” GEP programme (the “全人通識教育”) and its CCGEP (“書院通識”) components share the same mission of providing more “person” oriented learning experiences and of fostering personhood development in addition to specific cognitive and skill learning. Therefore learning outcomes or effectiveness of these programmes tend to be contingent on different factors, such as student characteristics, teacher/tutor characteristics, organizational support for the

instructional methods adopted, teacher-student compatibility and the integrity of the execution, just to name a few.

CCGEPs has been in operation since 2008. The past five years (2008-2013) can be considered as the “pilot” phase of a new form of higher education in view of developing a new modality in delivering higher education to the future generations. This new modality of higher learning is geared more to the comprehensive development of the personhood and civic leadership (“大人”), rather than to a narrower focus aiming at the development of professional competence and preparation for the labour market. The first mentioned educational objectives are more fitting to a true democratic and highly sophisticated society of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. However, the model is more suited for niche production, rather than industrial scale, due to its high density of teacher-learner interactions. With relatively higher investment, manifested through high personal engagement of the mentor/instructor and the students alike, a rigorous quality management system for learning (QMS-L) is required to ensure higher return.

At the moment, NCCU enjoys a relative “healthy” teacher-student ratio, around 1:20. It is indeed feasible to ponder the possibility of replicating this “mentoring” or “transformative learning”<sup>2</sup> approach used within CCGEP to the rest of the GEP learning processes and beyond. Over all, it could be envisioned that NCCU as a whole might adopt this mentoring approach throughout its diverse curricula cutting across academic disciplines.

Modification and the right mix between “transformational learning” (mentoring or 人師) and “transactional education”<sup>3</sup> (traditional way of delivering knowledge or information, 經師) fitting with different levels of the university education and subject matters would be the

---

<sup>2</sup> Transformative learning, pioneered by Jack Mezirow, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Transformative learning is about “expansion of consciousness” through the transformation of basic worldview and specific capacities of the self. Accessed at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transformative\\_learning](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transformative_learning) on 30.01.2014.

<sup>3</sup> A term that I am using to describe the relationship between teachers and students as service providers and clients. Teachers provide knowledge, while students be served after paying their tuition.

necessary next step of R&D in the innovative process of revamping the existing curricula and core pedagogical approach of NCCU.

In so doing, a fully documented “Quality Management System” with its entailed codification of methods, processes, toolbox and standardised reporting requirements would foster more efficient and effective ways for knowledge management, transmission and utilisation specific to the design, delivery and teaching of CCGEP.

Secondly, in order to ensure minimum effectiveness and consistency of the learning process regardless of variation of teacher or student characteristics, a quality management system should be put in place. This can be easily elaborated by adapting the existing quality assurance tools, policies, procedures, instructional guide and templates for reporting to the GEP and CCGEP. Systematic tracking of the learning process would provide not only the necessary feedback but also opportunities for continual improvement. Such a documented operational manual would also be necessary for scaling up of the operation.

### **Risks**

The risks involved in the current state of CCGEP structure are quite a few. The most important ones are:

1. Loss of core competences related to the CCGEP and GEP pedagogy

The issues of “succession” in terms of the human capital embodied by the groups of senior mentors (總導師), academic mentors, counsellors and tutors is part of the organisational life, but seems not being planned yet. A technical solution to this could be the use of QMS for knowledge management. Interested faculty and volunteers could be better supported in taking up their roles since the needed knowhow has been translated into more explicit knowledge and could be more easily shared.

2. Unchecked deviation from known best practices in achieving transformational learning.

3. Worthy innovations which has achieved higher level of learning, using the term of Benjamin Bloom<sup>4</sup>, are not captured, reused and therefore lost.

### Recommendation 2:

Lack of clear guidelines regarding measurable indicators for learning outcome.

#### Rationale

In order to secure sustained funding support, any innovative and “experimental” forms of teaching need to be held accountable for its immediate or long term effect, may it be tangible thus measurable, or intangible thus harder to track. Through such transparency of performance or learning outcome, the merits of the transformational value of CCGEP could then be established and more importantly be used to measure the progress made by the students and the effective of pedagogy deployed.

#### Targeted Measures.

Learning objectives for the GEP and CCGEP have been clearly articulated (see Table 1 below).

### 政治大學博雅核心能力

校訓	親愛精誠							
人才特色	專業創新		人文關懷			國際視野		
教育目標	學術目標		個人目標		社會目標		就業目標	
核心能力	專業能力	博雅精神	新思辨力與創	自主發展	公民素養	社會關懷	隊溝合作及團	能國際力移動
內涵說明	專業知識	跨宏領域知識	批判力思考	健全自我身主樂實學活現習習	科美資民倫學學訊主理元素素媒法素養養體治養素素、與環公社境養養共會參環	多城關關與懷懷人自文然重	解團書溝決隊寫通問合能表題作力達能力	外國語國際溝觀通能力
成效檢核單位	專業系所	通識中心	通識中心	通學體政識務育大中處室書心院	通學教政通識務務大識中處處書中心院心		學政通務大識處書中院心	外國文合中處心

Table 1: Core Competences of holistic personhood (NCCU)

<sup>4</sup> Reference to Benjamin Bloom’s taxonomy of learning (cognitive, affective and skill or psychomotor) can be accessed at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloom%27s\\_taxonomy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloom%27s_taxonomy)

Research has been carried out to identify existing metrics used by similar educational programmes abroad resulting in a preliminary measurement rubrics (see Table 2). In view of the significant potential contributions that these in-house assessment metrics could bring, NCCU is urged to undertake a foundational research project in order to define the needed *rating scale* for each rubrics. Example of such a rating scale is presented in Table 3.

## 政大已發展的評量尺規Rubrics

1. 創意思考評分量尺 (Creative thinking value rubric) – 譯
2. 批判性思考評分量尺 (Critical thinking value rubric) – 譯
3. 自主學習評量尺規 - 政治大學通識教育中心評閱相關資料編製  
• 自主學習自評表
4. 終身學習評量尺規 (Foundations and skills for lifelong learning value rubric) – 譯
5. 口語溝通評分量尺 (Oral communication value rubric) – 譯
6. 寫作溝通評分量尺 (Written communication value rubric) – 譯
7. 團隊合作評分量尺 (Teamwork value rubric) – 譯  
• 團隊合作互評表
8. 問題解決評分量尺 (Problem-solving value rubric) – 譯
9. 公民參與評分量尺 (Civic engagement value rubric) – 譯
10. 整合學習評分量尺 (Integrative learning value rubric) – 譯
11. 倫理思辨評分量尺 (Ethical reasoning value rubric) – 譯
12. 跨文化知識與交際能力評分量尺 (Intercultural knowledge and competence value rubric) – 譯



資料來源 [http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/All\\_Rubrics.pdf](http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/All_Rubrics.pdf)  
政大下載專區<http://cis.nccu.edu.tw/CourseMap/CMFrontPage.aspx?FrameSrc=DnfileList.aspx>

Table 2: the Proposed NCCU Measurement Rubrics (2013)

Benefits from rapid development of such targeted measures with clear rating scale will be:

1. To allow for the formulation of more precise teaching plans and evidence based assessment of the experiential features of the GEP and CCGEP.
2. To establish firmly the rationale for replication to other curricula on campus wherever applicable.
3. To provide students with yardsticks to measure their own development and progress. Therefore the experience itself can be motivating for self-directed learning and development.

Written and Verbal Communication Skills		
Writes and speaks clearly, fluently, and with imagination.	7	Student uses creativity and imagination in written assignments.
	6	
	5	Student follows guidelines provided regarding assignments (such as footnote form, paper formats, etc.)
	4	Student participates in informal peer group discussions.
Usually gets the point across but is sometimes confusing	3	Student doesn't proofread papers
	2	Student isolates him/herself from peers
Confusing presentation of ideas or no communication at all.	1	

From Borman, Dunnette, and Hough (1976).

Table 3: Example of a rating scale developed by using Critical Incident Techniques

It is recognised, not all things can be measured. For instance, identity literacy<sup>5</sup> of students is often not formally addressed or consciously included in the lesson plans. Yet, this particular learning objective is an integral part of the CCGEPs as professed in their respective mission statements. When attending some classes last December, I observed that individual faculty members were experimenting with this important aspect of learning and identity formation. Ongoing efforts in measuring “what a university does” and “how well a university does it” will encourage innovation for new forms of teaching, learning and assessment. Overtime, a well-structured measurement system would contribute to the

---

<sup>5</sup> Identity literacy, defined by Schachter & Galiti-Schachter (2012), as readers’ proficiency and willingness to engage the meaning systems embedded within texts and to consider adopting them as part of their own personal meaning system—that system within which they define themselves and their relation to the world. Setting identity literacy as a goal of teaching frames the practice of teaching texts differently than other more common models used such as cultural literacy and critical literacy. Accessed at <http://www.tcrecord.org/library/abstract.asp?contentid=16415> on 02.02.2014.



performance of NCCU and in turn could also contribute to the overall performance of the higher education sector of Taiwan.

### **Risks**

Potential risk in setting up more stringent learning outcome measures, in my view, is as follows:

1. Quantitative measures tend to be reductionist and constraining. While on the one hand setting up a set of operationalisable measures and indicators would improve the teaching and learning performance of the CCGEP and GEP; it could also stifle creativity, intrapreneurial spirit and run the risk of missing the point (irrelevance).

It therefore is also necessary to leave enough space to accommodate intangible, developmental and hard to quantify outcomes. By having such a policy remit that leaves room for flexible interpretation and imagination, GEP and CCGEPs would avoid falling into the trap of delivering primarily measurable but not centric nor critical aspects of student transformation.

On a meta level, relevance of learning is essential in improving educational effectiveness. While the society continues to evolve in Taiwan, the geopolitical contexts and corresponding trading system has changed as well. Some target ambiguity or calling it “innovation” space, could allow the GEP and CCGEP curricula to continue to experiment, adapt and remain “relevant” to the evolving times.

Potential risks in NOT setting up more stringent learning outcome measures are a few:

1. CCGEP programmes could remain experimental with the risk of becoming idiosyncratic and falling into the trap of “everything goes”.
2. Lack of systematic feedback also deprives the CEGEP programmes opportunities to fine tune its innovative approach and to establish prototypes for replication and to upscale from lab to massive production.
3. Losing appeal to the potential “clients” as there is no externalised and objectified “benefits” for individuals who make extra efforts in taking the “hard” route of joining the CCGEP.

Therefore it is recommended that once core measurements are in place, a pre and post tests should be administered to all incoming freshmen for before and after assessments and comparison.

### **Recommendation 3:**

Issue of institutionalization of the innovative “pilots”書院, CCGEPs.

#### **Rationale**

Higher education and universities around the world with exceptions, by and large, have failed to live up to the expectation on different accounts – for instance in educating students to become responsible citizens, productive employees, civic leaders, entrepreneurs and creative and self-directed individuals. Globalisation, technological developments and

changing societal expectations have driven accelerated changes in most sectors of the society. Universities and their structure, pedagogy, curricula and role definition of a professor with corresponding and reinforcing reward system (promotion and recognition) remain more or less stable, reflecting a bygone era and post WWII mentality when education in general and higher education in specific were virtuous on and by itself. No clear accountability nor transparency of performance is provided and/or asked for.

Taiwan is no exception. The primary objective of higher education has been meeting the output targets without purposefully addressing the outcome questions, such as characters, responsible citizenship and employability. Stakeholder groups (students, parents, industries, employers and society at large) have learned to accept the status quo. This “business as usual” mode of interaction has allowed many universities to continue to run on auto-pilot and enjoy impunity of performance outcome in a seller’s market. Changes however are in the making due to overcapacity of universities.

It is in this context, where the criticality of institutionalising the CCGEP methodology and its innovativeness lay. Mutual commitments to learning and development between teachers and students, and between peers, and field engagement through service learning and other

experiential learning activities and exercises are hallmarks of the CCGEPs. These approaches and activities are time consuming and not necessarily rewarded by the university’s personnel policies. It is not clear whether faculties engaged in the CCGEPs are recognised for their personal commitment to teaching and mentoring. However, such recognition is a must for the longer term performance of the programmes should they last beyond the initial starting up and experimenting phase.

Reframing the operating conditions within NCCU, is consequently necessary conditions to the sustainability of CCGEPs.

- When faculty are in general busy publishing in SSCI rated journals, a very small group of faculty are giving more importance to teaching possibly at the expense of their personal career development and gains. This situation is not viable nor sustainable. The HR policy regarding faculty performance and contribution must be reviewed and realigned to the dual mission of NCCU, i.e., research and teaching.
- In addition to promotion criteria, the “load factor” of teacher-student interaction needs to be reconsidered. To ensure high quality teaching pool of human capital, some rebalancing between classrooms only type of teaching and that of mentoring and life-centred learning is also called for.
- Modulation of the teaching material and instructional plans can be another way of institutionalisation. However, the adoption of those teaching modules would require collaborative behaviour of the teaching faculty. Shorting of proper incentivisation and cultural change as discussed in previous sections, adaptation of best practices could be doubtful.

### **Risk**

In the current education administration structure of Taiwan, it is understandable that NCCU enjoys limited space for managerial decision making and authority in coming up with its unique blend of human resource policies and management approach concerning teaching staff and related performance requirements. A centralist approach at the ministry level would make sense if it concentrates on ensuring that higher education is sufficiently agile in responding to the national development needs and its multi-stakeholder group demands. The Ministry of Education should focus on the enabling conditions, rather than on controlling by 1) setting standards, 2) establishing policy frameworks, 3) monitoring and evaluation regarding policy implementation, 4) ensuring resources and policy space for innovation and excellence, 5) stakeholder consultation and benchmarking, and 6) education fairness and social inclusion, etc. The universities are left to deliver the agreed educational

outcomes by managing their work effectively and efficiently.

Institutionalising the CCGEPs, therefore, might not be possible if there is no managerial authority to define the consequential human resource policies.

Potential risk of no action? Probability of remaining as an “experiment” is high, instead of becoming mainstreamed as the unique offer or “brand feature” of the NCCU. Spinning off

certain effective elements will be there but adaptation would be at best ad-hoc resulting in sub-optimal utilisation of the accumulated knowledge and insights of a more transformative learning approach developed on campus.

## **Concluding Remark**

The CCGEPs are innovative and worthwhile. After five-years of implementation, time has come to institutionalise the CCGEP approach and their basic philosophy of transformative learning.

Concrete actions have been proposed, covering the following:

1. Developing a fully documented quality management system to track and codify the learning processes taking place with the CCGEPs.
2. Developing a set of targeted measures for assessment of progress and learning acquisition and personal development.
3. Embedding the supporting mechanisms and policies for university wide adoption of best practices when appropriate.
4. Recognising the unique contribution of mentoring to foster comprehensive learning and personhood formation by adopting personnel policies for recruitment, promotion and teaching load accordingly.

CCGEP approach to university education could and should become the NEW NORMAL!



strength and challenges, Section II: rating.

項目	特色
1.理念、目標與特色	<p>書院通識 is an innovative approach to higher learning with the objective of provide an broad based foundation (cognitive, affect and behavior) to self development in the classic tradition of “大人” or the European tradition of Renaissance Man.</p> <p>This approach is valid especially when it aims at developing individuals who would become civic leaders of the future, which is increasingly globalised, fragmented, transparent and uncertain. Issues confronting the sustainability of our communities, societies and global system are evolving in an accelerated manner, individuals as well as leaders of all spheres of life need to have the well ground foundation and high level analytic abilities and empathy to make positive contributions to the new century.</p> <p>The vision, objectives and unique proposition of 書院通識 are laudable, wherein lies also its challenges.</p>
2.課程發展與設計	<p>The curriculum development and course design are in line with the established wisdom and good practices. In essence, they are better matching with small batch delivery and niche segment of the higher education at NCCU.</p>
3.教師素質與教學品質	<p>While the beauty of the course design is in its intimacy, proximity and tight interactions between mentor, tutor and learners, these very features post also resource constraints and input limitations. These inputs and resource limitations include the manpower.</p> <p>Constraints on Human Resources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional workload. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculties, mentors and tutors alike seem to devote substantial amount beyond its call of duty for personal care and guidance to each individual learners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Consistency in approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When a larger number of faculty members are involved in delivery</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

	<p>the same topic e.g., 新生書院 with a coverage rate of all of the freshman population; the existing quality assurance tools might not be sufficient to safeguard significant deviation. Such variation might cause non-compliance of the educational objectives and learning outcomes. While it is understood that 新生書院 has</p> <p>since stopped been compulsory, question of wide variation without supporting quality assurance measures and robust review mechanism remain between faculty members and generations.</p> <p>3. Limited human capital When the faculty are selected &amp; promoted for their specialists qualifications and achievements, NCCU needs to make special</p> <p>effort in recruiting and cultivating high level generalists who can assume the role of Senior Advisory in order to oversee the evolution &amp; growth of 書院.</p> <p>Challenge: Knowledge management and maintaining the same level (at least) and continual improvement.</p>
<p>4.學習資源與環境</p>	<p>Good</p>
<p>5.組織、行政與自我改善機制</p>	<p>Mechanisms and instruments are set in place. Substantial investment made and work done. The next phase of development is to move beyond construction/start up phase but shift the attention and effort in improving internal coherence and moving up the level of self-insight.</p> <p>Lack of coherence can be seen between the unclear linkages and complementarity amongst the following elements: specification of core competence, operational definition and Rubrics (see annex 1).</p>
<p>6.學生學習成果與表現</p>	<p>Students assessment based on the limited sample is very positive. Their personal development and growth could not be achieved in a traditional classroom setting.</p> <p>For the students who were self-motivated to rise to the challenge to participate in a comprehensive and intensive learning process, 書院 approach has indeed created value for individual students.</p>

7.其他特色	By products and some social impact achieved by the service learning.

貳、待改進事項

一、可公開評議項目

- 1. Missing of a documented quality assurance system which compiles policy, process and division of labour, procedures, instructional guide and reporting template/records.**
- 2. Lack clear guidelines regarding measurable indicators for learning outcome.**
- 3. Issue of institutionalization of the innovative “pilots”書院.**

叁、總結(請針對受評之通識教育類別做一簡要的評鑑總評，篇幅約 300-500 自左右)

書院通識 is an innovative approach to higher learning with the objective of provide an broad based foundation (cognitive, affect and behavior) to self development in the classic tradition of “大人” or the European tradition of Renaissance Man.

This approach is valid especially when it aims at developing individuals who would become civic leaders of the future, which is increasingly globalised, fragmented, transparent and uncertain. Issues confronting the sustainability of our communities, societies and global system are evolving in an accelerated manner, individuals as well as leaders of all spheres of life need to have the well ground foundation and high level analytic abilities and empathy to make positive contributions to the new century.

The vision, objectives and unique proposition of 書院通識 are laudable, wherein lies also its challenges. They are:

1. Coherence of logic. Lack of visible and documented coherence or linkages between different elements of the 書院通識, undermines the potential impact of this innovative and needed approach and creates unnecessary barriers for scaling up and replication.



2. Consolidation of collective learning and good practices of the accumulated experiences through the 書院 approach is urgent after five years of operation. The questions of institutionalization and mainstreaming the best practices should be the task of next level of development for the NCCU. It is about transferring innovation and prototype to other parts of the NCCU in order to achieve the transformational effect and resulting in achieving the University of Excellence outcome.

Overall, the 書院通識 pilot curricula is a courageous and far reaching experimentation. It has achieved initial success through the demonstration of learning outcomes and deriving limited demonstration effect. This approach needs to be maintained and replicated throughout the university.

Such a high investment approach requires greater than average educational investment. However the final measure is not in accomplishing efficiency but in achieving EFFECTIVENESS of learning. With higher value of human capital as a result of this unique educational approach, the return in total impact cannot be fully predicted now.

A vision of transforming NCCU into a larger scale 書院 in its learning approach could be the final destination for an university situated in a knowledge based economy and diverse and democratic society.

#### 肆、結果

結果	5	4	3	2	1
班別	特優	優	通過	有條件通過	不通過
書院通識		V			

(備註：經評為特優或不通過之單位，請務必提出具體理由)

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：

評鑑報告附錄：不同通識類別評量表(5 分量表)

不同通識類別評量表(5 分量表)

受評單位：全人通識教育- 書院通識

【評鑑目的在自我改善精進，請以各受評單位近五年之自我改進情形作為評量基準。】

評量項目		5 特優	4 優	3 通過	2 有條件 通過	1 不通過
個別 評鑑 面向	1. 「理念、目標與特色」 成果表現	V				
	2. 「課程發展與設計」成 果表現		V			
	3. 「教師素質與教學品 質」成果表現		V			
	4. 「學習資源與環境」成 果表現		V			
	5. 「組織、行政與自我改 善機制」成果表現				V	
	6. 「學生學習成果與表 現」成果表現		V			
重點 學習 內涵	7. 「八大元素：通識、語 文、藝文、創意、多元包 容、社會關懷、生涯定 向、健康促進」成果表現		V			

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：

Annex 1.

## 政治大學博雅核心能力

校訓	親愛精誠							
人才特色	專業創新		人文關懷			國際視野		
教育目標	學術目標		個人目標		社會目標		就業目標	
核心能力	專業能力	博雅精神	新思辨力與創	自主發展	公民素養	社會關懷	隊溝合作及團	能國力際移動
內涵說明	專業知識	跨宏領觀域知識	創批造判力思考	健自終自康我身主樂實學學活現習習	科美資民倫學學訊主理素素煤法素養養體治養素、與環公社境養養共會	多境關關與懷懷人自文然	解團書溝決隊寫通問合能表題作力達能力	外國語際溝觀通能力
成效檢核單位	專業系所	通識中心	通識中心	通學體政識務育大中處室書心院	參環通學教政通識務務大識中處處書中心院心		學政通務大識處書中院心	外國文合中處心

### 2-2 發展博雅核心能力內涵與操作型定義

親愛精誠	專業創新 人文關懷 國際視野	個人目標	自主發展	<p><b>自主學習</b> (參考相關文獻自訂評量尺規內涵)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 能設定目標與選擇可行方案之能力。(目標設定與策略規劃)</li> <li>2. 能主動學習並適時調整學習策略之能力。(策略規劃與動機)</li> <li>3. 能主動尋找替代方案，展現解決問題之決心。(動機)</li> </ol> <p><b>終身學習</b> (參考相關文獻自訂評量尺規內涵)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 能保持好奇心以及追求知識的熱誠。(好奇心與主動)</li> <li>2. 能運用先前的經驗學習新知識與技能的能力。(轉化)</li> <li>3. 能積極擴充課堂以外的知識與能力。(獨立)</li> </ol> <p><b>自我實現</b> (參考相關文獻自訂)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 能追求個人成長與改變，使潛能得以發揮之能力。</li> <li>2. 能熱愛所感興趣的事物，以實現自我理想的能力。</li> <li>3. 能探索自我能力、興趣、發展、情緒和價值觀之能力。</li> </ol> <p><b>健康樂活</b> (參考台大課程地圖資料)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 能體認運動對健康的重要，並培養規律運動的習慣。</li> <li>2. 能鑑賞各類或專項運動並知悉一般常見的運動規則。</li> <li>3. 能樂觀面對困境並具備自我療癒的能力。</li> </ol>
------	----------------------	------	------	---

## 政大已發展的評量尺規Rubrics

1. 創意思考評分量尺 (Creative thinking value rubric) – 譯
2. 批判性思考評分量尺 (Critical thinking value rubric) – 譯
3. 自主學習評量尺規 - 政治大學通識教育中心評閱相關資料編製
  - 自主學習自評表
4. 終身學習評量尺規 (Foundations and skills for lifelong learning value rubric) – 譯
5. 口語溝通評分量尺 (Oral communication value rubric) – 譯
6. 寫作溝通評分量尺 (Written communication value rubric) – 譯
7. 團隊合作評分量尺 (Teamwork value rubric) – 譯
  - 團隊合作互評表
8. 問題解決評分量尺 (Problem-solving value rubric) – 譯
9. 公民參與評分量尺 (Civic engagement value rubric) – 譯
10. 整合學習評分量尺 (Integrative learning value rubric) – 譯
11. 倫理思辨評分量尺 (Ethical reasoning value rubric) – 譯
12. 跨文化知識與交際能力評分量尺 (Intercultural knowledge and competence value rubric) – 譯



資料來源 [http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/All\\_Rubrics.pdf](http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/All_Rubrics.pdf)  
政大下載專區<http://cis.nccu.edu.tw/CourseMap/CMFrontPage.aspx?iFrameSrc=DnfileList.aspx>

## 評鑑報告 (通識教育 生活通識)

### 壹、全人通識教育最具特色項目

項目	特色
1. 理念、目標與特色	<p>1. 生活通識之學習重點在於社會關懷、美學素養與職涯輔導，以非正式課程補充正式課程之不足，並擴大通識教育的範圍，皆屬值得肯定者。</p> <p>2. 強調「服務學習」與「專業」結合，「美學」與「生活」結合，能顯校方對美學教育之重視。</p> <p>3. 在服務學習方面，目標之一在於開拓國際視野，發展國際移動能力。這方面的參與學生人數漸有增加，但是在全體學生中仍屬少數。</p> <p>4. 美學素養之負責單位為藝文中心，以生活美學為發展重點，目標定位清楚，活動豐富，參與學生人數逐年成長。</p>
2. 課程發展與設計	<p>1. 以「校園馬拉松」方式，鼓勵學生養成運動習慣，有助「學生」健康樂活之目標達成，也充分利用校園自然環境之便利。</p>
3. 教師素質與教學品質	<p>1. 「生活通識」功能相關人員具有合適之學經歷背景，尤其大部分具有學生社團議會之經驗，有益其規劃相關活動及輔導之工作。</p>
4. 學習資源與環境	<p>1. 根據書面報告，學校資源提供仍算充分。</p> <p>2. 體育場館雖然略嫌分散，仍能提供多樣化的運動場地，並開設多樣化的課程，以滿足同學的興趣與需求。</p>
5. 組織、行政與自我改善機制	<p>1. 針對服務學習活動、藝文活動等要求心得回饋與滿意度調查。</p> <p>2. 職涯輔導在大學教育中日益受到重視，但以目前職涯中心的人力與經費將難以滿足日益提高之外界期望，或可思考結合系所與校友之資源。</p> <p>3. 體育室在行政組織上屬於一級單位，直接隸屬校長。但仍可思考如何加強上一層級之統整或溝通機制，以確定體育室在通識教育方面的教學定位，並與其他單位配合，以達成政治大學整體通識教育</p>

	目標。
6. 學生學習成果與表現	本次評鑑所呈現學習成果佳。
7. 其他特色	

## 貳、待改進事項

### 一、可公開評議項目

1. 「生活通識」的範圍及次級目標宜再具體釐清。本項以學務處之「課外活動組」、「藝文中心」、「職涯中心」及「體育室」四個次級單位別展現「生活全人」之意涵，似缺乏目標、核心概念及重點策略與執行方法之間有系統的整體觀。
2. 建議校方針對「生活通識」或「生活全人」之意涵宜召集相關人員對話，定義出內涵、指標，從而做為相關單位在目前傳統功能之餘，是否要加以調整的依據。
3. 有關本次評鑑所展現的藝文中心，藝文教育等豐富的教學與活動，在該校核心能力中，未有具體對照，只放在內涵說明欄，比例間不太對稱。
4. 若確認有關「健康樂活」為體育教學之責任，則體育教學目標、設計及活動宜根據此目標加以調整。
5. 整體建議：  
有關學務處、體育室完成該校通識博雅教育之部分，目標與特色之概念關係及角色宜有系統的重新釐清。然後有系統的呈現對絕大多數同學的共同培育、活動規劃與輔導，以有別於書院(實驗性質)之活動。
6. 有關「多元活動」之自我改善機制似停留在參與經驗的感受瞭解，宜再進一步完備機制。



叁、總結(請針對受評之通識教育類別做一簡要的評鑑總評，篇幅約 300-500 字左右)

有關學校生活通識之目標，範圍及內涵與校級整體目標之間重新釐清關係。生活通識的培育單位，可能不只學務處與體育室，若學校採取〔廣義的〕生活通識，那麼可能還包括學生在學院及學系的生活與師生互動。

本次評鑑將〔生活通識〕之責任交給學務處及體育室等單位來說明，未能看到生活通識的全貌。建議校方如欲繼續使用生活通識之概念，宜強化相關人員的對話與溝通，使學校各級目標間應層級連結，功能分擔之相關單位宜有既有之連結，成果檢測也應指標明確，統整檢測。

#### 肆、結果

結果	5	4	3	2	1
班別	特優	優	通過	有條件通過	不通過
生活通識			V		

(備註：經評為特優或不通過之單位，請務必提出具體理由)

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：

評鑑報告附錄：不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

不同通識類別評量表(5分量表)

受評單位：全人通識教育- 生活通識

【評鑑目的在自我改善精進，請以各受評單位近五年之自我改進情形作為評量基準。】

評量項目		5 特優	4 優	3 通過	2 有條件 通過	1 不通過
個別 評鑑 面向	1. 「理念、目標與特色」成 果表現		V			
	2. 「課程發展與設計」成 果表現			V		
	3. 「教師素質與教學品質」 成果表現		V			
	4. 「學習資源與環境」成 果表現		V			
	5. 「組織、行政與自我改善 機制」成果表現			V		
	6. 「學生學習成果與表現」 成果表現		V			
重點 學習 內涵	7. 「多元學習」成果表現			V		
	8. 「健康樂活」成果表現			V		

評鑑訪視委員：

簽名

日期：