

# COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ICISA

An Official Publication of the International Chinese Information Systems Association

Fall 1997

## *Feature: MIS Education and Career in Taiwan*

### *In This Issue:*

|   |                 |    |
|---|-----------------|----|
| President's Message.....                | David C. Chou   | 1  |
| President-Elect's Message.....          | Eldon Y. Li     | 2  |
| Editor's Message .....                  | Eldon Y. Li     | 2  |
| Future Conferences .....                | Editor's Office | 4  |
| 1998 Faculty Position Opening.....      | Editor's Office | 16 |
| 1997 ACME Meeting News.....             | Editor's Office | 35 |
| 1998 ACME Meeting Site Set .....        | Editor's Office | 35 |
| 1998 DSI's Taipei Conference.....       | Editor's Office | 36 |
| IS Papers in ACME 1997 Conference ..... | Editor's Office | 36 |
| Member's News .....                     | Editor's Office | 35 |
| Membership Re-newal Form.....           | Editor's Office | 37 |
| Information for ICISA Authors .....     | Editor's Office | 24 |

### **Sharing Moment:**

- Wiring Formosa ..... Michael J. Shaw 3

### **Feature Articles:**

- A Study of MIS Curriculum in Taiwan's Undergraduate Programs ..... Houn-Gee Chen 5
- Measuring Faculty Performance: A Model Made in Taiwan ..... Eldon Y. Li 10
- Key Issues of Accounting Information Systems in Taiwan..... Jinsheng Roan 17  
and Chiu-Yen Lee
- Building A Data Warehouse: An Overview ..... Joseph H. Wen, 25  
David C. Chou, and David C. Yen

\*\*\*\*\*  
The Printing and Mailing of this issue is sponsored by Professor David Chou of West Texas A & M University, U.S.A.  
\*\*\*\*\*

---

---

# Measuring Faculty Performance: A Model Made in Taiwan

**Eldon Y. Li**

California Polytechnic State University - San Luis Obispo, U.S.A.

---

## Abstract

*Developing an objective and clear measure of faculty performance is a complex task. Conventionally, a faculty's performance is measure with three categories of criteria: teaching, research, and services. At the National Chung Cheng University (NCCU) in Chia-Yi, Taiwan, student guidance is also measured in addition to the universal three criteria. This article describes the development of a structured approach to measuring faculty performance in the Graduate Institute of Information Management at the NCCU. The four categories of criteria are fully discussed. It provides a point of reference for those who are in search of a similar measure. They may adopt the evaluation process and tailor these criteria to their own expectations.*

**Keywords:** Faculty appointment; Tenure system; Promotion; Performance criteria; Performance evaluation

---

The educational system in Taiwan has been changing dramatically for the past few years, especially in the university system. In the midst of 1980's, the Legislative Yuan (Taiwan's Congress) upheld the old constitutional requirement that 15% of the annual national budget must be allocated to educational system. Since then, the higher educational system has been prosperous. National Chung Cheng University is one of several institutions that were established during the peak of educational funding allocation. The university began its operations in the Fall of 1989 with five colleges in place: College of Literature, College of Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Management, and College of Social Sciences. The College of Management currently consists of 4 undergraduate and 5 graduate programs. These include Economics, Business Administration, Finance & Banking, Accounting, and Information Management. Only the Information Management program does not offer an undergraduate degree. However, it has been approved to offer a B.S. degree in the Fall of 1998.

Another big change is the new University Law passed recently by the Legislative Yuan, which broke the traditional faculty ranking and tenure system. The old ranks include Teaching Assistant, Instructor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The new ranks are Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The latter system is consistent with the current American system. However, the Legislative Yuan until recently did not approve the salary scale for this new system. Therefore, all of the new faculties with a fresh Ph.D. were hired as either an Associate Professor or an

Instructor during the last 5 years. Beginning this Fall (1997), any new Ph.D. graduate has been hired as an Assistant Professor.

As for the tenure system, traditionally there is none. A faculty once being hired is on tenure track for two years. The contract is then renewed annually. However, after two renewals the institution must provide the same annual contract continually unless the faculty resigns or has an intolerable conduct. Normally, a faculty will be virtually tenured after two years of service. At that time, it will be impossible to terminate a faculty with poor performance in every aspect. The new law abandons this regulation and allows an institution to establish a tenure system. And, many have done so today.

After two years of planning, the National Chung Cheng University (NCCU) began a tenure system in the Fall of 1996. This tenure system provides an Assistant Professor with 8 years of probationary period. However, Full Professor is considered to be a tenured position while Associate Professor is left to be in a gray area. Of course, a faculty with Associate Professor would become officially tenured if he or she passed the promotion review process. Furthermore, a department can establish its own rules on renewing the contract for associate professors since these are not specified in the bylaw of the university. For example, the Graduate Institute of Information Management (GIIM) at NCCU has institutionalized a rule that any new faculty holding an associate professor or lower rank shall be evaluated for re-appointment after serving the current rank position for four years. Those who do not pass

the evaluation shall be given one year as the terminal year.

Due to the aforementioned changes, the criteria for being hired or promoted to Associate or Full Professor have become tougher. Nevertheless, this does not affect the Graduate Institute of Information Management (soon to be the Department of Information Management once it offers an undergraduate program) at the NCCU because it already had the toughest criteria among the MIS programs in Taiwan. During the Fall of 1993, a Founding Director was selected and appointed by the NCCU to plan for setting up the GIIM. He soon recruited 3 more faculties who all have worked for 6 or more years in the U.S. During that year, he supervised the admission examination, design the curriculum and purchased the computer equipment for the Institute, and recruited an administrative assistant for the office. Finally, the Institute began its operations in the Fall of 1994. Through teamwork, the faculties of the Institute began to establish standards, policies, and procedures; one of them is the set of faculty appointment and promotion criteria.

This set of criteria at that time was the most specific, objective, and vigorous one among the various MIS programs in Taiwan because they established these criteria with the expectation of Assistant Professor rank coming soon in effect. The purpose of this article is to share these criteria with other MIS colleagues around the world in the hope that these would provide them some points of reference in the event of developing faculty performance measures.

### **The Process of Faculty Promotion in Taiwan**

In Taiwan, the Ministry of Education (MOE) oversees every faculty appointment or promotion in a higher educational institution. Every faculty must receive a "Certificate of Faculty Rank" awarded by the MOE. Most colleges or universities must submit their faculty application packages for appointment or promotion to the MOE after they completed their own internal review and approval process. The MOE then subject these applications to an official review process. There are only a few national universities that are authorized by the MOE to perform such review process (NCCU is one of them). The process requires each application package be distributed to two or three external reviewers. Each reviewer will receive a form asking for information based on two review criteria: 1) The detailed quality of and comments on a representative work, selected by the applicant and published during the past five years, and 2) The quality and quantity of all published work for the past five years. The former is assigned with 60% weight and the latter 40%. Each reviewer must follow the official point system to classify the applicant into four categories: Strongly Recommend

(≥90%), Recommend (≥80%), Reluctantly Recommend (≥70%), and Not Recommend (<70%). Only those that consistently fall into the first two categories have the chances to be approved by the MOE. Finally, the MOE processes the approved cases and mail each applicant the appropriate Certificate of Faculty Rank. In our opinion, this official review process in most cases does significantly the quality of faculty appointment and promotion in Taiwan.

### **An Objective Measure of Faculty Performance**

Since its inception, the GIIM of NCCU has been striving for an objective measure of faculty performance. Conventionally, the common criteria around the world seem to include three categories: teaching, research, and services. The only difference from one institution to another is the weights of these criteria. At the NCCU, however, one additional category, student guidance, is required. Although a true objective measure is impossible to arrive, the goal is to minimize the subjectivity. To do so, the Institute's faculty evaluation committee adopted two methods: 1) the use of a point system, and 2) the use of group opinions, specifically, published surveys of journal quality and composite average of performance scores assigned by the committee members. In addition, the university regulations dictate the minimal size and qualification of the review committee (5 members with ranks higher than the applicant) and the maximal weight of the research category (60%). The following materials are adapted from the "Guidelines for Faculty Appointment and Promotion" developed by the GIIM at the NCCU.

- **The Point System:** The Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) evaluates the promotion of a faculty based on a point system. The system assigns 60 points to Research Work, 20 to Teaching, 15 to Services, and 5 to Guidance, as the maximal weighted scores for each category.
- **Research:** The work of research may include published papers, books, and project reports during the last 5 years or shorter.)
  - A faculty must have the following conditions to qualify for promotion:
    - Promotion to Full Professor: In addition to having the conditions for promoting to Associate Professor rank as listed below, one must have published, during one's current rank position, at least one Class A article and two Class B articles, and at least one single-authored article in Class A or B journals. Furthermore, one must have published at least four articles in Class A, B, or C journals.

- **Promotion to Associate Professor:** In addition to doctoral thesis, one must have published, during one's current rank position, at least one Class A article and one Class B article, and at least one single-authored article in Class A, B, or C journals. Furthermore, one must have published at least five articles in Class A, B, or C journals.
- The representative work designated by the applicant for promotion evaluation must be related to MIS field and completed within the last five year. It must not be a part of one's degree thesis.
- **Classes of Research Work:**
  - Class A: Internationally well known and rigorously refereed journal articles,
  - Class B: Other rigorously refereed international journal articles,
  - Class C: Other refereed journal articles, books, or book chapters,
  - Class D: Conference proceedings papers or project reports,
  - Class E: Other published work being recognized by the DFEC.

The amendment of the journals listed in each of the above categories shall be approved by the DFEC.
- **The Point System:** The points received by each class of work are:
  - Class A: 13~20 points
  - Class B: 8~15 points
  - Class C: 3~10 points
  - Class D: 1~5 points
  - Class E: 1 point

The points of a short research work shall be determined by the DFEC based on its quality.

The points of a work with multiple authors are adjusted by:

$$\left(\frac{\text{The points of the work as if it is single authored}}{\text{The number of authors}}\right) \times 1.4$$
- **Non-MIS related journal articles** may be accepted and evaluated by their qualities. However, the number of such journals shall not exceed one-third of the total quantity of journal articles in Class A, B, or C.
- **Teaching:** The evaluation is based on the applicant's years of teaching, instructional contents,

thesis advising work and student evaluation at this university during his/her current rank position. A faculty transferred from another university may submit evidence of teaching performance at that university for promotion evaluation.

- **Services:** The evaluation is based on the years of services provided by the applicant during his/her current rank position, as well as the types and outcomes of volunteer work relating to one's university, college, department, or own profession. Such services are of two types: an administrative service refer to the volunteer work within or outside this university that is related to one's university or profession; an academic service refer to the work of obtaining contracts/funds/aids, hosting professional conferences, editing academic publications, etc.
- **Guidance:** The evaluation is based on the types and outcomes of volunteer work relating to student guidance at this university that were performed by the applicant during his/her current rank position. These may include class advisor, living advisor, club advising, summer studies, student exchanges, etc.
- **Minimum Requirements:** The applicant must have at least 60% of the points allocated to each category, namely, research, teaching, services, and guidance. Furthermore, the total weighted points of the four categories must be at least 70 points.
- **Provision for Appeal:** If the applicant does not agree with the outcome of the first-level reviews process, he or she may file a written appeal to the College Faculty Evaluation Committee (CFEC) within 15 days after receiving the notice of the reviews outcome. If the appeal is denied by the CFEC, one must not file an appeal at any other level.

### Discussion

The point system used by the GIIM indicates that the faculties of the Institute emphasize research performance (60%) much more than anything else. They also encourage collaboration between colleagues by assigning a factor of 1.4 to a published work with joint-authorship. They anticipate a faculty to publish at least one journal article per year. They expect a balance in quantity and quality of the journal articles. They foresee that a young faculty will be striving for the quantity of the articles while a senior faculty will be establishing his/her reputation by publishing high quality articles. In order to identify journal quality objectively, they reviewed two published surveys, one from *MIS Quarterly* (December 1991, pp. 447-452) and the other from *Communications of the ACM* (March 1995, pp. 93-

107). After careful comparison, they found that the lists of the top 13 journals are very consistent between the two surveys and decided to accept them as the Class-A journals. The names and rankings of these journals are listed in Table 1. Note that three additional high quality journals (see No. 9, 14, 15 in the list of Class-A journals) as suggested in *MIS Quarterly* survey are included. In order to assure the quality of various *ACM Transactions* and *IEEE Transactions*, all members of DFEC dully reviewed and evaluated the above journals in the NCCU library. They identified 7 corresponding journals (see No. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 11, 12 in the list of Class-A journals) which are included as well. The total number of Class-A journals is thus up to 19.

**Table 1. Reported Rankings of Journals**

| Name of the Journal  | MISQ 1991 <sup>a</sup> | ACM 1995 <sup>b</sup> |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>List of Class-A Journals:</b>   |                        |                       |
| 1. <i>ACM Computing Surveys</i>  | 9                      | 10                    |
| 2. <i>ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction</i>                         | 7                      | 6                     |
| 3. <i>ACM Transactions on Database Systems</i>                                   | 7                      | 6                     |
| 4. <i>ACM Transactions on Information Systems</i>                                | 7                      | 6                     |
| 5. <i>ACM Transactions on Modeling &amp; Computer Simulation</i>                 | 7                      | 6                     |
| 6. <i>ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology</i>               | 7                      | 6                     |
| 7. <i>Communications of the ACM</i>  | 3                      | 2                     |
| 8. <i>Decision Sciences</i>  | 4                      | 8                     |
| 9. <i>Decision Support Systems</i>   | *                      | 11                    |
| 10. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>   | 10                     | 9                     |
| 11. <i>IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering</i>                             | 8                      | 5                     |
| 12. <i>IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics</i>                    | 8                      | **                    |
| 13. <i>Information &amp; Management</i>  | 12                     | 12                    |
| 14. <i>Information Systems Research</i>  | *                      | 3                     |
| 15. <i>International Journal of Man-Machine Studies</i>                          | *                      | **                    |
| 16. <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>                             | 5                      | 7                     |
| 17. <i>Management Science</i>  | 1                      | 4                     |
| 18. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>   | 2                      | 1                     |
| 19. <i>Sloan Management Review</i>   | 13                     | 13                    |
| <b>List of Class-B Journals:</b>   |                        |                       |
| 1. <i>Computers and Industrial Engineering</i> (not including conference papers) |                        |                       |
| 2. <i>DATA BASE</i>  | 19                     | 20                    |
| 3. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>                                |                        |                       |
| 4. <i>Expert Systems with Applications</i>                                       |                        | **                    |
| 5. <i>Human Computer Interaction</i>   |                        | **                    |

|  |    |    |
|--|----|----|
| 6. <i>I/S Analyzer</i>   |    |    |
| 7. <i>IEEE Computer</i>  | 11 | ** |
| 8. <i>IEEE Software</i>  |    | ** |
| 9. <i>IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering</i>                              |    |    |
| 10. <i>INFOR: Canadian Journal of Operational Research and Information Processing</i>      |    | ** |
| 11. <i>Information and Decision Technologies</i>   |    |    |
| 12. <i>Information Management</i> (London, UK: IDPM Publication)                           | 18 |    |
| 13. <i>Information Processing and Management</i>   | 23 |    |
| 14. <i>Information Resources Management Journal</i>  | 16 | ** |
| 15. <i>Information Society</i>   | 27 |    |
| 16. <i>Information Systems</i> (Oxford, UK: Pergaman Press)                                | 15 | ** |
| 17. <i>Information Systems Management</i> (Boston, USA: Auerbach)                          | 14 | 17 |
| 18. <i>Interfaces: An International Journal of TIMS and ORSA</i>                           |    |    |
| 19. <i>International Journal of Information Management</i>                                 |    |    |
| 20. <i>Journal of Computer Information Systems</i>   | 20 | 22 |
| 21. <i>Journal of Information Technology</i>   |    |    |
| 22. <i>Journal of Organizational Computing</i>   |    |    |
| 23. <i>Journal of Strategic Information Systems</i>  |    | ** |
| 24. <i>Journal of Systems Management</i> (Discontinued in 1996)                            | 17 | 21 |
| 25. <i>OMEGA: The International Journal of Management Science</i>                          | *  | 15 |
| 26. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>                            |    | ** |
| 27. <i>Simulation and Gaming: An International Journal of Theory, Design, and Research</i> |    |    |
| 28. <i>Software Engineering Journal</i> (UK)   |    |    |
| 29. <i>Software Practice and Experience</i>  | 24 |    |

<sup>a</sup> Rankings are adopted from Gillenson, Mark L. and Stutz, Joel D. [1991]

<sup>b</sup> Rankings are adopted from Walstrom, Kent A., Hardgrave, Bill C., and Wilson, Rick L. [1995].

\* This journal is recommended by the respondents to be of significant quality.

\*\* This journal is suggested by the authors be an additional publication outlet.

**Table 2. Checklist for Performance Criteria**

|  |                               |                                |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. The <b>research</b> category points received by the applicant are <b>not below 60</b> out of 100 points.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual points received: _____ |
| 2. The <b>teaching</b> category points received by the applicant are <b>not below 60</b> out of 100 points.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual points received: _____ |
| 3. The <b>services</b> category points received by the applicant are <b>not below 60</b> out of 100 points.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual points received: _____ |
| 4. The <b>guidance</b> category points received by the applicant are <b>not below 60</b> out of 100 points.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual points received: _____ |
| 5. The <b>weighted total points</b> received by the applicant are <b>not below 70</b> out of 100 points.   | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual points received: _____ |
| 6. The applicant's <b>representative work</b> is related to MIS field and published within the last five year.   | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False |                               |
| 7. The applicant's <b>representative work</b> is not a part of his/her degree thesis.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False |                               |
| 8. The applicant's total number of non-MIS related journal articles in Class A, B, or C <b>does not exceed one-third</b> of the total number of journal articles in these three classes. | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False |                               |
| <b>Promotion to Associate Professor:</b> (Please skip if not applicable.)  |                               |                                |                               |
| 9. The applicant has published at least <b>1</b> article in <u>Class A</u> journal.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| 10. The applicant has published at least <b>1</b> article in <u>Class B</u> journal.   | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| 11. The applicant has published at least <b>5</b> articles in <u>Class A, B, or C</u> journals.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| 12. The applicant has published at least <b>1</b> <u>single-authored</u> article in <u>Class A, B, or C</u> journals.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| <b>Promotion to Full Professor:</b> (Please skip if not applicable.)   |                               |                                |                               |
| 9. The applicant has published at least <b>2</b> article in <u>Class A</u> journal.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| 10. The applicant has published at least <b>3</b> article in <u>Class B</u> journal.   | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| 11. The applicant has published at least <b>9</b> articles in <u>Class A, B, or C</u> journals.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| 12. The applicant has published at least <b>1</b> <u>single-authored</u> article in <u>Class A or B</u> journals.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |
| 13. The applicant has published at least <b>2</b> <u>single-authored</u> article in <u>Class A, B, or C</u> journals.  | <input type="checkbox"/> True | <input type="checkbox"/> False | Actual quantity: _____        |

The **Class-B** journals listed in Table 1 are adapted from two sources. One is from the two published surveys of journal quality. The other is from a list of journals identified by all members of the GIIM as of comparable and consistent quality with each other, after they dully reviewed and evaluated all the MIS related journals in the NCCU library. As for the Class-C publications, any other refereed journal articles, books, and book chapters are classified as such.

When assigning the points for journal articles, it may occur that different articles manifest different qualities even in the same journal, that two articles of different classes may have the same quality, and that a lower-class article may have a quality higher than a less significant upper-class article. Therefore, in the first case, the two articles may be assigned with different point scores. For example, two articles in a Class-A journal, one may receive 13 points while the other 20 points. In contrast, the two different-class articles may receive the same point score in the second case. For example, two articles in Class-A and Class-B journals, the Class-A article may receive 13 points while the Class-B one may receive 13, or even 14, or 15 points if its quality is as good or better than the Class-A one.

Note that the committee acknowledges that the MIS field includes many social science and engineering disciplines. An MIS faculty may publish research work not related to MIS. However, the quantity of such work should be limited. Otherwise, one should not call oneself as an MIS faculty. In this sense, the committee accepts and counts such kind of journal articles under one restriction that the quantity of these articles must not exceed one-third of the total quantity of all journal articles. In addition, the representative work designated by the applicant must be MIS related and completed within the last five year. It must not be a part of one's degree thesis.

In order to facilitate the evaluation process using the point system, a form of faculty promotion evaluation was designed. The form requires the evaluator to write down all the information used to evaluate the applicant, to assign ranking to each category of performance, and to make comments on each category of performance. Finally, the rankings are weighted by the 60-20-15-5 weights in order to come up with a total weighted point. Moreover at the end, a checklist is provided to ensure that the applicant passes all the criteria stated in the promotion evaluation document (see Table 2).

All these provide the applicant with a clear message of whether his or her performance meets the expectation of the Promotion Evaluation Committee. If not, the applicant can obtain the information from

the form on what he or she needs to do in order to meet the expectation. Such an evaluation practice provides a measure that can be used to compare across different faculties and disciplines. It ensures clear communications between the applicant and the committee. This in turn avoids any favoritism, dispute, antagonism, and disharmony in the department.

### Conclusions

The document for promotion criteria and process developed by the GIIM at the NCCU is very clear, objective, and reasonable. In order to develop such document, the committee must be open-minded, unselfish, rational, and foresighted. After reviewing this document, several conclusions can be drawn:

- There should be a committee large enough that cannot be dominated by any one or two persons in the committee.
- A faculty should publish on average at least one journal article per year.
- The evaluation process only measures the performance that a faculty has accomplished in the last five years. This keep the faculty on his or her toes.
- Promotion to Full Professor should emphasize quality while promotion to Associate Professor should emphasize quantity.
- There should be a balance in quality and quantity of journal articles.
- The quality of a journal should be determined first by credible published surveys then by committee as a whole.
- There should be a limitation of the quantity of non-MIS related work published by an MIS faculty.
- A faculty must have both single-authored and co-authored journal articles.
- The performance criteria should measure four categories: Research, Teaching, Services, and Guidance.
- The point system is a viable means to measure and compare the faculty performance across different ranks and disciplines.

The rationale and approach taken by the GIIM at the NCCU to develop and implement the evaluation criteria are clearly described in the document. As the university system advances, the criteria for tenure and promotion in Taiwan is getting tougher each year. For example, one university already requires their faculties to have double-digit quantity of journal articles and a single-authored representative work. I am sure that the GIIM at the NCCU will soon follow suit and update its criteria document to meet the changing demand.

## References

1. "Guidelines for Faculty Appointment and Promotion," Graduate Institute of Information Management, National Chung Cheng University, Chia-Yi, Taiwan, 1995.
2. Gillenson, Mark L. and Stutz, Joel D. "Academic Issues in MIS: Journals and Books," *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 4, December 1991, pp. 447-452
3. Walstrom, Kent A., Hardgrave, Bill C., and Wilson, Rick L. "Forums for Management Information Systems Scholars," *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 38, No. 3, March 1995, pp. 93-107.

---

**About the Author:** *Eldon Y. Li* is Professor and former coordinator of MIS area at the College of Business, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, USA. He was Professor and the Founding Director of the GIIM at the NCCU. He holds a bachelor degree from National Chengchi University in Taiwan and M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Texas Tech University. During his tenure in Taiwan, he received the prestigious "Most-Outstanding 1995 Research Award" from the National Science Council of R.O.C. He has published over 70 papers in the areas of human factors in information technology (IT), strategic IT planning, software engineering, quality assurance, and information management. His papers have appeared in *Information & Management*, *Information Resources Management Journal*, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *Journal of Systems Management*, *Quality Data Processing*, *The Journal of Computer Information Systems*, among others. He currently serves as a member of the editorial board for *The Journal of Quality Assurance Institute* (U.S.A.). In addition to serving as an officer of the ICISA, he is the V.P. Special Arrangements for the Western Decision Sciences Institute (WDSI) in 1997-98. (Web: <http://www.calpoly.edu/~eli>)

◆**ICISA**

\*\*\*\*\*

### 1998 Faculty Position Opening

\*\*\*\*\*

#### National Chung Cheng University

National Chung Cheng University in Chia-Yi, Taiwan began its operations in the Fall of 1989. Today it has established a decent reputation in Taiwan. Its newly constructed campus facilities and layout have been rated several times the #1 campus by the Ministry of Education in Taiwan. There are many National Science Council (Taiwan) funded

projects undergoing in the university. Its research facilities and budget are abundant. The Department of Information Management has been established in the fall of 1994. Currently, it offers a Master of Science program. It will start its B.S. program in 1998. The department has 5 full-time faculty members and is recruiting for three opening positions at all ranks in the fall of 1998. Please help us circulate the following position announcement.

#### **RANK:**

Assistant, Associate or Full Professor, depending on qualification

#### **STIPENDS:**

Similar to the other national university in Taiwan

#### **QUALIFICATION:**

1. Ph.D. or DBA degree from an AACSB accredited institution major in Management Information Systems, or related areas.
2. For senior position (Associate or Full), at least 4 years of full-time working experiences after receiving terminal degree.

#### **EXPECTATIONS:**

Demonstrated excellence in the classroom, capability for quality research and publication, willingness to participate as a team member in service efforts at all levels.

#### **LANGUAGES:**

Proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in Mandarin Chinese is required.

#### **DEADLINE:**

March 1, 1998 or until filled

#### **TO APPLY:**

Send resume, publications, three letters of reference, and copy of passport information (the page containing your photo)

#### **SEND TO:**

Dr. Houn-Gee Chen  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Information Management  
College of Management  
National Chung-Cheng University  
160 San-Hsin, Ming-Hsiung  
Chia-Yi 621, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Phone: 886-5-2721500

Fax: 886-5-2721501

Email: [mishgc@mis.ccu.edu.tw](mailto:mishgc@mis.ccu.edu.tw)

WWW: <http://www.mis.ccu.edu.tw/~mishgc>