



## Mahidol University Regulation

### Regarding performance evaluation criteria and methods for Workers in Mahidol University B.E. 2565

.....

By the resolution of the Human Resource Management Committee in the meeting number 15/2564 on 11 August 2564 B.E. that it is expedient to revise the criteria and methods used in Mahidol University Workers' performance evaluation for greater clarity and applicability,

With their formal authority pursuant to section 24 (3) of the Mahidol University Act B.E. 2550, in the meeting number 579 on 20 April 2565 B.E., Mahidol University Council enacted the regulation as follows:

Section 1 This Regulation is known as the "Mahidol University Regulation regarding performance evaluation criteria and methods for Workers in Mahidol University B.E. 2565".

Section 2 This Regulation shall become effective as of the date of promulgation and thereafter.

Section 3 The following regulations shall be repealed:

(1) The Mahidol University Regulation regarding performance evaluation criteria and methods for Workers in Mahidol University B.E. 2559

(2) The Mahidol University Regulation regarding performance evaluation criteria and methods for Workers in Mahidol University (Issue No. 2) B.E. 2561

Section 4 In this Regulation,

"University" refers to Mahidol University;

"President" refers to the President of Mahidol University;

"Department" refers to the University Council Office, the Office of the President, campuses, faculties, and departments called by other names with status equivalent to faculty;

"Division" refers to a unit of work that the University appointed to be part of a department;

"Department committee" refers to department committees pursuant to the Mahidol University Regulation regarding department administration, and also the Faculty of

Graduate Studies Administrative Committee, International College Administrative Committee, College of Music Administrative Committee, College of Management Administrative Committee, and other committees called by other names with similar responsibilities;

“Head of Department” refers to Deans, Directors, or department heads called by other titles, or Vice-Presidents that are appointed by the President to supervise a campus (exception: the Head of Department of the Office of the President refers to the President);

“Management position” refers to management positions pursuant to the Mahidol University Notice on position names and position determination for University Staff, or individuals who are appointed by a department or division to assume administrative responsibilities which are not mentioned in the University Notice;

“University Worker” refers to University Staff, government officials, and employees;

“University Staff” refers to budget university staff, university staff (department-based), income-based university staff, and also university staff;

“Government officer” refers to civil officials in higher education institutions;

“Employee” refers to budget employees and revenue-based employees;

“Budget employee” refers to full-time and temporary employees hired in accordance with the Ministry of Finance Regulation regarding full-time employees of government sectors;

“Revenue-based employee” refers to full-time and temporary employees hired with the University’s or a department’s revenue;

“Evaluator” refers to immediate supervisors, direct supervisors, individuals who have received a written assignment to act as a supervisor, or individuals with the authority to assign, supervise, or examine an subject’s performance;

“Subject” refers to University Workers that are affiliated with a department and a division;

“Mahidol University Talent” refers to individuals who have passed the screening process done by the department or the University based on the University’s criteria for having outstanding abilities and accomplishments, having innovative ideas, being able to analyze and develop a workflow for the department or the University, being able to communicate effectively both internally and externally to achieve results quickly and efficiently, as well as possessing professional integrity, morals, and ethics (abbreviated: MU Talent);

“Performance Agreement” refers to a mutual agreement between the evaluator and the subject about task assignments, metrics, and targets of success, all of which shall be specific, tangible, and appropriate for their job requirements (abbreviated: PA);

“Performance evaluation” refers to the performance evaluation of a University Worker based on the PA, taking into account work results or assignment successes (for which the evaluator and the subject must together define metrics or ways to prove while using a predetermined standard or goal as reference) and Core Competency-related behaviors displayed during execution of tasks;

“Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form” refers to a form required by the University to produce a Performance Agreement and performance evaluation of a University Worker;

“Promise” refers to a declaration of intent by an subject whose evaluation result is “Needs improvement”, in the form of a letter promising their evaluator that they will improve their performance in the following evaluation period to meet what was agreed upon in the Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form;

“Evaluation committee” refers to a committee that evaluates the performance of University Workers in each department or division;

“Evaluation period” refers to the period of work taken into account when performing a performance evaluation for each kind of University Worker pursuant to this Regulation;

“HRMC” refers to the Human Resource Management Committee.

Section 5 The President shall supervise the execution of this Regulation.

In the event of a compliance problem, the President may issue directives as deemed appropriate, which shall be taken as final.

## Chapter 1

### General provisions

Section 6 The criteria and methods outlined in this Regulation shall be utilized to evaluate the performance of University Workers in every position.

The position of President, as well as any other position regulated differently by the University Council, is subject to relevant regulations.

Section 7 The President, with the HRMC's approval, may establish a different set of performance evaluation criteria and methods for MU Talents or other positions described by the University as applicable. This matter shall be evidenced by a University Notice.

Section 8 The Head of Department, with the Department committee's approval, may specify additional details regarding the weighing, metrics, and targets in order to better accommodate the subject, all of which must be specific, tangible, and relevant to the department's mission. The purpose of this action is to enhance performance to meet department-specific job requirements and responsibilities that go beyond this Regulation. This matter shall be evidenced by a Department Notice, and the University Workers in the department shall be notified in advance at least two months prior to the corresponding evaluation period.

Section 9 The President, with the HRMC's approval, shall determine a Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form, a Performance follow-up form, a Performance report form, a Performance evaluation result summary and notification form, an Individual Development Plan form, a Promise declaration form, and an Operation report form produced by the performance evaluation results screening committee. This matter shall be evidenced by a University Notice.

The department, with the Department committee's approval, may specify additional details to the forms mentioned in the previous paragraph and announce them via a Department Notice. However, the Promise declaration form shall comply with the University's provisions.

## Chapter 2

### Producing a Performance Agreement

Section 10 The evaluator and the subject shall collaborate to develop a personal PA as specified in the Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form, with these criteria in mind:

(1) The tasks assigned by the evaluator must be appropriate and relevant to the subject's duty as determined by their job requirements, position, and capabilities. They should be assigned in accordance with the University, department, and/or division's strategies, plans, and/or goals. Also, the following unfulfilled responsibilities from the previous year's evaluation period may be included in the PA:

(1.1) responsibilities that are relevant to the University, department, and/or division's strategies, plans, and/or goals;

(1.2) positional responsibilities as outlined in the job requirement description;

(1.3) assigned responsibilities, for example, additional assignments offered to enhance the job's quality and the subject's competency through Project Assignment, Job Enlargement, Job Enrichment, etc.;

(1.4) public service responsibilities, for example, attending sporting events, cultural and religious activities, or the University, department, and/or organization's events.

(2) For each responsibility, define targets, metrics, weighing, evaluation criteria, or proof of success, all of which must be tangible, specific, appropriate, and relevant to the University, department, and division's mission.

If the PA needs to be adjusted in the middle of an evaluation period, the evaluator and the subject may revise it and make changes as applicable. This matter must be evidenced by a notice signed by both parties, and the entire process must be completed one month before the end of the evaluation period.

Section 11 A PA specified in the Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form shall be produced, and the evaluator and the subject shall sign it in writing as evidence.

The PA may be produced digitally by a system that allows a mutual agreement procedure. This PA shall be held in the same regard as that in the first paragraph.

Section 12 In the event that the evaluator and the subject are unable to collaborate to develop a PA, the Head of Department or the person authorized by them shall be the one who makes the final decision.

Section 13 The PA shall be produced in each evaluation period in the following manner.

(1) University Staff

The evaluator and the subject collaborate to develop a PA once a year, the period of which runs from 1 July to 30 June of the following year. The PA must be completed before its corresponding evaluation period begins.

(2) Government officials and employees

The evaluator and the subject collaborate to develop a PA twice a year:

(2.1) The first period runs from 1 July to 31 December of the same year. The PA must be completed before its corresponding evaluation period begins;

(2.2) The second period runs from 1 January to 30 June of the same year. The PA must be completed before its corresponding evaluation period begins.

The Head of Department shall ensure that the affiliated University Workers produce the PA specified in the Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form in accordance with the time periods for (1) or (2). However, in the event of failure to do so, the Head of Department shall obtain approval from the President to finish the Performance Agreement within a month of the evaluation period's start date. In the PA produced subsequently, the remaining working time in the current evaluation period shall be taken into account.

Section 14 As for the evaluation of University Workers in the positions of Vice-President, Assistant to the President, Head of Department, and Head of Department in the Office of the President, the subject shall collaborate with their respective President or Vice President, as the case may be, and develop a PA once a year, including responsibilities from 1 October to 30 September of the following year. The PA must be completed before its corresponding evaluation period begins. Also, the last paragraph of section 13 applies, *mutatis mutandis*, by the University Council Chairman's approval.

Section 15 In the event that any University Worker's duration of work does not cover the entire evaluation period, the PA shall be developed according to their actual duration of work. However, if it is less than three months, a PA is not necessary.

The first paragraph applies to University Workers who are appointed to a management position, University Workers who are removed from a management position, and University Workers who change their position in the middle of an evaluation period.

Section 16 Any University Worker who does not agree to produce a PA as required by Section 10 is deemed to be unwilling to participate in the performance evaluation and will not be considered for salary adjustments, as well as any benefits and compensation that must be based on the performance evaluation results. This case shall also be deemed as a disciplinary offense against the supervisor's order and a violation of the University's regulations, notices, and orders.

The disciplinary offense case in the first paragraph shall be addressed in accordance with the University Regulation on disciplinary proceedings.

Section 17 In the event that any University Staff or revenue-based employee fails to produce a PA as required by Section 10 without good reason, the Head of Department shall take the following actions.

(1) In the event that a University Staff fails to produce a PA twice in the span of three years, the department shall discharge that University Staff from duty in accordance with Section 45, and their employment contract shall be deemed terminated. Still, they are eligible for compensation as stated in the Mahidol University Regulation regarding personnel management for University Staff.

(2) In the event that a revenue-based employee fails to produce a PA four times in the span of three years, the department shall discharge that Revenue-based employee from duty in accordance with Section 45.

Section 18 In the event that any Head of Department fails to ensure that the workers associated with them produce their PAs, it shall be deemed a violation of the University's regulations, notices, and orders. The President shall ensure that this information is considered in the Head of Department's performance evaluation as well.

Section 19 The evaluator shall follow up on the subject's performance according to the PA on a frequent basis in order to monitor the progress of the responsibilities that were agreed upon, as well as offer advice and suggestions to the subject, enabling them to improve, rectify, or develop themselves to succeed and achieve targets.

### Chapter 3

#### Performance evaluation

Section 20 The President or the Head of Department, as the case may be, shall appoint a performance evaluation committee for the subjects in each department or division. The committee may be composed of up to nine members:

- (1) The evaluator shall be the President of the committee;
- (2) The individuals nominated by the evaluator, with preference given to those in positions higher than or equivalent to the subject, those with similar job responsibilities to the subject, and those who can evaluate the subject's performance, shall be committee members;
- (3) The individuals nominated by the subjects, a number equal to one-third of the entire evaluation committee, shall be committee members.

Each department or division's subjects must be grouped by the department or division in question, who will then issue a public notice about this matter.

The acquisition method of the committee members under (3) shall be suitable for each department's circumstances. The nominees from each evaluation group must be

University Workers affiliated with the same department or division who are familiar with the subject's performance.

In the event that the maximum number of committee members allowed under (3) is one but the nominee is under a prohibition under Section 21, the next nominee in line will serve as the evaluation committee member specifically for that subject.

Section 21 Members of the evaluation committee shall not be under the following prohibitions:

- (1) being the subject;
- (2) being engaged with or married to an subject;
- (3) being biologically related to the subject, that is, being their parent or descendant (regardless of steps), or being their sibling or cousin (within three steps), or being relatives by marriage (within two steps);
- (4) being a creditor or debtor of the subject;
- (5) having any serious condition that may impair the performance evaluation.

Section 22 The department or division must complete the process of appointing the performance evaluation committee within two months of the start date of the corresponding evaluation period and issue a public notice before the performance evaluation begins.

Government officials and employees will be evaluated by the same evaluation committee for both evaluation periods.

Section 23 In the event that any subject or evaluation committee member notices that a committee member is under a prohibition under Section 21, they may submit an objection to their Head of Department or the Head of Department's immediate supervisor within fifteen days of the date the committee appointment order was announced. If no objection is made, the outcome is deemed final.

In the event that an objection arises, the Head of Department or the Head of Department's immediate supervisor shall take it into consideration, the outcome of which shall be deemed final.

Section 24 In the event that an evaluation committee position becomes vacant, the department or division shall appoint a replacement within thirty days, unless the evaluation is less than fifteen days away, in which case there is no need to designate a replacement committee member.

Section 25 The performance evaluation score is categorized into five levels:



- (1) Excellent: the range between 90.00 - 100.00 points;
- (2) Great: the range between 80.00 - 89.99 points;
- (3) Good: the range between 70.00 - 79.99 points;
- (4) Average: the range between 60.00 - 69.99 points;
- (5) Needs improvement: below 60.00 points.

Section 26 A performance evaluation consists of two elements:

- (1) Performance evaluation: evaluation of work results or success based on the PA and the particulars provided in the Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form;
- (2) Competency evaluation: evaluation of talents, qualities, skills, and/or work behaviors as described below:

(2.1) Those in academic positions and support positions (Practitioner Level) shall be tested for Core Competency and Functional Competency;

(2.2) Those in management positions shall be tested for Core Competency and Managerial Competency.

For those in management positions who are still performing the duties of an academic position or support position, additional Functional Competencies may be evaluated as discussed with the supervisor.

Section 27 The elements of performance evaluation shall be proportionate, with Performance accounting for 80% of the score and Core Competency accounting for 20%.

The Head of Department, with the Department committee's approval, may have Performance and Core Competency proportionated to 70% and 30%, respectively, in accordance with the subject's position and level, as well as the department's mission. This matter shall be evidenced by a Department Notice.

The proportion of Performance and Core Competency under the first and second paragraphs shall be prescribed for each position and type of position. Also, the same proportion must apply to the entire department.

Section 28 The department shall decide on a Competency evaluation method: they may conduct a holistic assessment, have the evaluation committee perform the assessment, or use other methods as applicable. Each department may use different formats of Competency evaluation and announce them via a Department Notice.

Section 29 University Workers who are appointed to a management position, University Workers who are removed from a management position, and University Workers who change their position in the middle of an evaluation period whose duration of work does not

cover the entire evaluation period shall present the performance evaluation result from their previous position as part of the current evaluation process. The result shall be proportionate to the duration of work in that position. However, if the duration of work in the previous position is less than three months, it is not necessary to take the evaluation result into account when evaluating performance.

Section 30 The performance evaluation shall be completed within the following duration:

(1) University Staff shall undergo one performance evaluation per year, which must be completed within one month after the evaluation period ends;

(2) Government officials and employees shall undergo two performance evaluations per year: the first one within one month of the end of the first evaluation period, and the second one within one month of the end of the second evaluation period;

(3) University Workers in the positions of Vice-President, Assistant to the President, Head of Department, and Head of Department in the Office of the President shall undergo one performance evaluation per year, which must be completed within one month after the evaluation period ends.

The actions under Section 19 shall be conducted throughout the evaluation period.

Section 31 The procedure for performance evaluation is as follows.

(1) Prior to the performance evaluation, the subject must report their work results and evaluate their own performance based on the responsibilities outlined in the PA and submit it to the evaluator; If the subject fails to report their work results and/or evaluate their own performance, their evaluator must conduct a preliminary evaluation.

(2) The procedure during the performance evaluation is as follows:

(2.1) The performance evaluation committee shall evaluate the Competencies according to the corresponding department's preferred format, taking into consideration the Competency evaluation results and Performance evaluation, and then utilize the Functional Competency evaluation results and/or Managerial Competency evaluation results, as the case may be, to further improve the University Worker's performance so that they work more efficiently and effectively;

(2.2) The evaluator shall present the evaluation results under (1) and (2.1) to the evaluation committee, which will then collectively review and approve them, provide a summary and feedback for improvements, and then sign their names in the subject's

Performance Agreement and performance evaluation form (any committee member who disagrees with the evaluation result must provide their comments);

(2.3) The evaluator shall determine the evaluation result score level based on Section 25 and present it to the Head of Department or Head of Division within seven days of the committee's completion of the evaluation. The score level shall be used in personnel management pursuant to Section 34.

Any subject whose performance evaluation result level is "Needs improvement" shall not be considered for salary adjustments, and the department or division shall take further action in accordance with Section 4 of this Regulation.

Section 32 The procedure following the performance evaluation is as follows.

(1) The evaluator shall inform the subject individually of their evaluation results, strengths, and areas for improvement. Then, the evaluator and the subject shall sign the Performance evaluation result summary and notification form within fifteen days from the date the Head of Department or Head of Division certifies the evaluation results with their signature. The subject may request a copy of their performance evaluation result.

(2) After the acknowledgment of the subject's performance evaluation result, the subject and the evaluator shall collaborate to develop an Individual Development Plan (IDP). The IDP must be submitted to the department's Human Resource team, which will then analyze the department's overall IDP before reporting to the Department committee.

The Head of Department or Head of Division shall ensure that the subject develops an IDP pursuant to the University or the department's provisions, as the case may be, in order to improve their performance.

(3) The department or division shall announce the names of University Workers whose performance evaluation result level is "Excellent" or "Great" to the public in order to recognize and motivate them to improve their next performance evaluation result.

Section 33 In the event that any subject does not agree to sign their name to acknowledge the performance evaluation result under 32 (1), the evaluator shall deliver the Performance evaluation result summary and notification form to the subject's workplace. By having witnesses sign the form, it shall be deemed that the result of the evaluation has been communicated pursuant to this Regulation.

In the event that the evaluator communicates the performance evaluation result digitally, the action counts as a valid form of communication. It is then presumed that the subject has acknowledged their performance evaluation result pursuant to this Regulation.

Section 34 The evaluation results are used in human resource management as follows:

(1) The Performance and Core Competency evaluation results are used in human resource management such as salary adjustment, annual reward, other remuneration, incentives, contract renewal, employment type change, employment contract amendments, career advancement considerations, and optimizations for the sake of efficiency and effectiveness;

(2) The Functional or Managerial Competency evaluation results are used to improve the University Workers' performance, for the sake of efficiency and effectiveness.

Section 35 The President shall appoint a performance evaluation results screening committee as proposed by the Head of Department, who has obtained approval from the Department committee. The body of the committee is as follows:

(1) The Head of Department shall be the President of the committee;

(2) At least one but no more than three Deputy Heads of Department shall be committee members;

(3) At least one academic University Worker representative from the department shall be committee members, except for departments that do not have one.

(4) At least one support University Worker representative from the department shall be committee members.

The total number of committee members under (3) and (4), when combined, cannot be less than one-third of the total number of committee members.

The committee members under (3) and (4) shall be appointed through nomination or election in each relevant job classification, as deemed applicable by each department.

For the Office of the President, the President, with the Mahidol University Executive Committee's approval, shall appoint a performance evaluation results screening committee. As for the Office of the University Council, the Head of the Office of the University Council shall present nominated committee members to the President. In this regard, the body of the committee under the first paragraph may be applied, *mutatis mutandis*.

Section 36 The performance evaluation results screening committee shall have the following powers and duties:

(1) to advise on the standards and fairness of a performance evaluation as well as present their comments on the overall performance evaluation results for a department's University Workers to the President through the form required by the University;

(2) to request that the performance evaluation committee explain or revise a questionable evaluation result, or correct an inaccurate one;

(3) to appoint a sub-committee that executes tasks assigned to it.

Section 37 The department shall develop a two-way communication system for supervisors and University Workers to provide feedback, justify performance evaluation results, and foster a positive relationship.

Section 38 The department or division shall establish a performance evaluation results storage system so that the results can be used in human resource management. The performance evaluation scores are kept confidential and may be stored physically or digitally.

The performance evaluation scores under the first paragraph must be retained for a period of five years, except for those involving a lawsuit, which may be retained for more than five years.

## Chapter 4

### Performance improvements

Section 39 In the event that a University Staff's performance evaluation result level is "Needs improvement", the evaluator shall notify both the Head of Department and the University Staff in question. The department must then take one of the following actions.

(1) If the University Staff decides to retire from work, they shall make a request to the Head of Department. If approved, the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45, and then the University Staff's employment contract is deemed terminated. The University Staff will be eligible for compensation pursuant to the Mahidol University Regulation regarding personnel management for University Staff.

(2) The department shall have the University Staff participate in performance enhancement activities by doing the following.

(2.1) The evaluator and the University Staff shall collaborate to make a promise in accordance with the form required by the University and create an annual PA within two months of the end of each corresponding evaluation period. There will be two performance evaluations; the first one must be completed by January, and the second must be completed by July.

(2.2) For any University Staff who fails to make the promise under (2.1) without good reason, the Head of Department shall order them to do so within fifteen days of the end of the period specified under (2.1).

(2.3) For any University Staff who fails to comply with (2.2), the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45, and then the University Staff's employment contract shall be deemed terminated. In this case, the University Staff is not eligible for any compensation.

Section 40 For any University Staff who, despite having participated in performance enhancement activities, has their first performance evaluation result under Section 39 (2.1) fall to "Needs improvement", the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45, and that University Staff's employment contract shall be deemed terminated. In this case, the University Staff is eligible for compensation pursuant to the Mahidol University Regulation regarding personnel management for University Staff.

If the first performance evaluation result under Section 39 (2.1) is not "Needs improvement" but the second one is, the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45, and that University Staff's employment contract shall be deemed terminated. In this case, the University Staff is eligible for compensation pursuant to the Mahidol University Regulation regarding personnel management for University Staff.

Section 41 In the event that a revenue-based employee's performance evaluation result level is "Needs improvement", the evaluator shall notify both the Head of Department and the employee in question. The department must then take one of the following actions.

(1) If the revenue-based employee decides to retire from work, they shall make a request to the Head of Department. If approved, the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45 and cancel their employment order.

(2) The department shall have the revenue-based employee participate in performance enhancement activities by doing the following:

(2.1) The evaluator and the revenue-based employee shall collaborate to make a promise in accordance with the form required by the University and develop an annual PA within two months of the end of each corresponding evaluation period. Also, they shall complete a performance evaluation within one month after the evaluation period ends;

(2.2) For any revenue-based employee who fails to make the promise under (2.1) without good reason, the Head of Department shall order them to do so within fifteen days of the end of the period specified under (2.1);

(2.3) For any revenue-based employee who fails to comply with (2.2), the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45 and cancel their employment order.

Section 42 For any revenue-based employee who, despite having participated in performance enhancement activities, has their performance evaluation result under Section 41 (2.1) fall to “Needs improvement”, the department must take one of the following actions.

(1) If the revenue-based employee decides to retire from work, they shall make a request to the Head of Department. If approved, the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45 and cancel their employment order.

(2) The department shall have the revenue-based employee participate in performance enhancement activities by doing the following:

(2.1) The evaluator and the revenue-based employee shall collaborate to make a promise in accordance with the form required by the University and develop an annual PA within two months of the end of each corresponding evaluation period. Also, they shall complete a performance evaluation within one month after the evaluation period ends;

(2.2) For any revenue-based employee who fails to make the promise under (2.1) without good reason, the Head of Department shall order them to do so within fifteen days of the end of the period specified under (2.1);

(2.3) For any revenue-based employee who fails to comply with (2.2), the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45 and cancel their employment order.

(3) The department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45 to the revenue-based employee and cancel their employment order.

For any revenue-based employee who, despite having participated in performance enhancement activities, has their performance evaluation result under (2.1) fall to “Needs improvement”, the department shall issue a discharge order under Section 45 and cancel their employment order.

Section 43 For any Head of Department whose performance evaluation result level falls to “Needs improvement” twice in a row, the President shall propose that the University Council proceed with appropriate directives.

Section 44 Any government official or budget employee whose performance evaluation result level is “Needs improvement” shall undergo procedures pursuant to the criteria and methods specified in the Higher Education Commission Regulation regarding discharging civil officials in higher education institutions from government service due to inability to perform official functions efficiently, or the Ministry of Finance Regulation regarding full-time



employees of government sectors, which incorporates the Civil Service Commission regarding discharging ordinary civil officials from government service due to inability to perform official functions efficiently, *mutatis mutandis*, as applicable.

## Chapter 5

### Discharge orders

Section 45 Discharge orders are issued as follows:

(1) For budget university staff, government officials, and budget employees, the department shall propose to the President that a discharge order be issued, and then notify the person within seven days of the date the order is signed by the President. The discharge order becomes effective after fifteen days from the date of signature;

(2) For university staff (department-based), income-based university staff, University Staff, and revenue-based employee, the department shall propose a discharge order to the University for consideration. Once the University considers that the department has operated in accordance with this Regulation, the Head of Department shall issue a discharge order and then notify the person within seven days of the date the order is signed by the Head of Department. The discharge order becomes effective after fifteen days from the date of signature.

After an action in the first paragraph (2) is done, it shall be reported to the University.

## Chapter 6

### Objections and appeals

Section 46 In the event that any subject believes that the performance evaluation is unfair or inaccurate, the subject shall submit a performance evaluation objection letter to the Head of Department or the Head of Department's immediate supervisor within fifteen days from the date the performance evaluation result is acknowledged. If the letter is not submitted within this time limit, it is presumed that the subject accepts the performance evaluation result.

Once the Head of Department or the Head of Department's immediate supervisor receives the performance evaluation objection letter, they shall submit it to the subject's performance evaluation committee so that the subject can offer more information. The performance evaluation committee shall complete the performance evaluation result revision



and notify the Head of Department or the Head of Department's immediate supervisor within fifteen days from the date the performance evaluation objection letter is received. In this regard, the Head of Department, the Head of Department's immediate supervisor, or the designee shall communicate the revision outcome to the subject in writing within five days from the date the revision outcome from the evaluation committee is received.

In the event that the subject does not sign their name to acknowledge the performance evaluation result revision outcome, Section 33 applies, *mutatis mutandis*.

In the event that the subject disagrees with the revision outcome under the second paragraph, they may appeal pursuant to the guidelines specified in Mahidol University Regulation regarding objections and appeals.

Section 47 Objections or appeals pursuant to this Regulation shall not delay or suspend a PA, a promise, or the performance evaluation for the following evaluation period.

### Transitory Provisions

Section 48 As for the performance evaluation of University Workers in the positions of Vice-President, Assistant to the President, Head of Department, and Head of Department in the Office of the President in the evaluation period B.E. 2565, the PA must be completed by November 2565, and must include responsibilities from 1 July 2565 to 30 September 2566. The performance evaluation shall be completed by October 2566 so that the results from such evaluation period can be used to supplement the salary adjustment consideration on 1 October 2566.

Section 49 Any action taken in connection with any ongoing performance evaluation of University Workers pursuant to the Mahidol University Regulation regarding performance evaluation criteria and methods for Workers in Mahidol University B.E. 2559 and additional amendments thereof (Issue No. 2) B.E. 2561 before this Regulation becomes effective shall be carried out until completion.

Section 50 A University Worker's PA for evaluation period B.E. 2566 shall be completed by July 2565.

Announced on 3 May 2565, B.E.

*Piyasakol S.*

(Clinical Professor Emeritus Piyasakol Sakolsatayadorn, M.D.)

Chairman of Mahidol University Council

Remarks: The reasons for the promulgation of this Regulation are to adjust the number of evaluations and to revise the language to be more comprehensive, specific, and complete in practice. It is therefore necessary to enforce this Regulation.

---