

Publication Review Form for New Faculty of College of Engineering, National Sun Yat-sen University

Rank of application	Full-time	<input type="checkbox"/> within the manning quota	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor	Name		Department/ Institute	
		<input type="checkbox"/> beyond the manning quota					
	<input type="checkbox"/> joint employment <input type="checkbox"/> adjunct position						
Title of Representative Work							
Review Comments (Note: The transcribed comments shall be disclosed to the applicant.):							
(Attach additional A4 pages if necessary.)							

advantage(s)	shortcoming(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> contents rich in insights and innovation <input type="checkbox"/> conclusions of academic value <input type="checkbox"/> conclusions of practical value <input type="checkbox"/> rich in resources and rigorous structure <input type="checkbox"/> good research capability <input type="checkbox"/> excellent research results <input type="checkbox"/> others:	<input type="checkbox"/> no originality <input type="checkbox"/> low in academic value <input type="checkbox"/> low in practical value <input type="checkbox"/> weak in research methodologies and theoretical basis <input type="checkbox"/> not conforming with the paper format in respective academic category
Others: <input type="checkbox"/> having potential for winning NSTC Outstanding Research Award <input type="checkbox"/> having potential for winning NSTC Ta-You Wu Memorial Award <input type="checkbox"/> having potential for winning other research awards, e.g. _____	<input type="checkbox"/> lack of in-depth analysis <input type="checkbox"/> incomplete contents <input type="checkbox"/> contents of no personal originality; composed by rearranging, editing, combining, or reformatting works of others <input type="checkbox"/> contents involving with plagiarism or other academic ethics violation (Note: Please specify with concrete reasons in the comments column above.) <input type="checkbox"/> Others:
<p>If the applicant is involved with either one of the two shortcomings of “contents of no personal originality...” or “contents involving with plagiarism or other academic ethics violation”, the reviewer shall tick the “disagree to recommend” box below in accordance with Article 21, 22, and 43 stipulated in <i>Accreditation Regulations Governing Teacher Qualifications at Institutions of Higher Education</i>.</p>	

※ Amended and approved at the 419th University Faculty Evaluation Committee Meeting on December 15, 2022.

Evaluation Items and Standards of Representative Work				Research Performance in the Last Five Years (Applicants applying for joint or adjunct position are exempt from this column.)
items	1. Research Topic and Purpose: importance of research in academia and practical application	2. Research Methodology and Writing: -methodology is accurate, reliable, and innovative; -citation is appropriate and accurate; -structure is rigorous, conformed to standard format; -writing is clear, detailed, and smooth	3. Research Capabilities and Results: -competence in reasoning, judgement, and equipment operation; -research results of innovation with major findings; - potential contribution and referential value in academia or practical application	1. Qualitative standards of research achievement 2. Quantitative standards of research achievement. 3. Applicant's research attitude
Evaluation	excellent - good - average - poor <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	excellent - good - average - poor <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	excellent - good - average - poor <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	excellent - good - average - poor <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation Items		Result (Please check an appropriate box)		
1. Foresight in Research Field		<input type="checkbox"/> Booming Field <input type="checkbox"/> Traditional Science & Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Practical science <input type="checkbox"/> No originality		
2. Ability in Academic Research Independence		<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		
3. Prospect of Obtaining NSTC Projects in the Future (Applicants applying for joint or adjunct position are exempt from this column.)		<input type="checkbox"/> ($\geq 90\%$) <input type="checkbox"/> (89-80%) <input type="checkbox"/> (79-70%) <input type="checkbox"/> ($\leq 69\%$)		
4. Prospect of Promotion in Five Years Based on Current Performance (applicants for professor, adjunct or joints position are exempt from this column)		<input type="checkbox"/> ($\geq 90\%$) <input type="checkbox"/> (89-80%) <input type="checkbox"/> (79-70%) <input type="checkbox"/> ($\leq 69\%$)		

This form was translated from the original Chinese. In the event of any discrepancies between the two versions, the Chinese always takes precedence.

Overall Result	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree with the recommendation (For a full-time position, this box can only be checked if the possibilities in Field 3 and Field 4 > 80%) <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree with the recommendation (Note: Please specify with concrete evidence in the evaluation opinions above for any work involved with plagiarism or other academic ethics violation.)		
Reviewer's Signature or Stamp		Review Date	MM/DD/YYYY

Contact Number: (07) 5252000 ext. 4001 or 4003

Notes:

1. Please mark "√" on the above evaluation columns.

Example: excellent - good - average - poor

2. The representative publication shall be included in research performance of the last five years.