College of Liberal Arts (NTU) Faculty Publications Evaluation Form (Promotion)

Publication No.		Rank	☐Professor ☐Associate Prof ☐Assistant Prof	Name		Institution	
Title of Representative Work(s)							

Evaluation Comments on Representative Work(s): (Please type your comments. The review comments can be displayed in an itemized list. It is advised to type and print your comments on a separate sheet of A4 paper. If the promotion application does not get approved after evaluation, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as a reference to the administrative execution.)

> Please see the 2nd page for the scoring and evaluation standards.

Evaluation Comments on the Supporting Works: (Please type your comments. The review comments can be displayed in an itemized list. It is advised to type and print your comments on a separate sheet of A4 paper. If the promotion application does not get approved after evaluation, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as a reference to the administrative execution.)

(Please attach additional pages if there is not enough space available.)

Recommendation Rank (please check)	☐ Highly Recommended (**88**) ☐ Recommended (**82**) ☐ Not Recommended (**70**) *** The promotion application fails if one receives TWO "Not Recommended" reviews.**

Merits	Demerits
☐The work is comprehensive and original in content ☐The work is of high academic value ☐The work is of high practical value ☐The work demonstrates strong research capability ☐The work shows coherent organization of materials ☐The author has a strong research record Others:	☐The work lacks distinctive originality ☐The work has little academic value ☐The work has little practical value ☐The author has little independent research capability ☐The author has a poor research record ☐The methodology and theoretical foundation are weak ☐The form is inconsistent with academic standards ☐The analysis is lacking in depth ☐The content is incomplete ☐The publications do not display originality and are composed through collation, additions or deletions, combination, editing or compilation of other authors' writings ☐The publications under review are part of the applicant's degree dissertation and do not have innovations to some extent. ☐The work is suspected of plagiarism or violates academic ethics (Please provide concrete evidence in the comments above) Others:

Evaluator's Rank & Title		Evaluator's Signature		Date of Evaluation	

※To pass the publication evaluation, the Recommendation Rank must be "**Recommended**" or above.

※If the reviewer checks in the Demerits column one of the three items: "**The publications don't display originality**…", "**The publications under review are part of the applicant's degree dissertation**…" and **"The work is suspected of plagiarism or violates academic ethics**", the Recommendation Rank should be "**Not Recommended**" according to Articles 21, 22 and 43 in Accreditation Regulations Governing Teacher Qualifications at Institutions of Higher Education.

***Evaluation standards for the work:**
 Professor: distinctive and continued publication in academic field; important and substantial contribution
 Associate Professor: continued publication in academic field; substantial contribution to the field.
 Assistant Professor: quality of a Ph.D. Dissertation; evidence of independent research.
 Instructor: quality of an M.A. Thesis.

***Remarks:**
 1. Works that are composed through collation, additions or deletions, combination, editing or compilation of other authors' writings will not be accepted for evaluation.
 2.**Master's and doctoral theses or dissertations (whether in part or in full) will not be accepted for evaluation** in and above the rank of Assistant Professor, except that they have not been previously submitted for application in academia.
 3. The College accepts representative and secondary works published within the period between the applicant's present rank and the time of the application for promotion to a higher rank.