

國立中興大學教師以學術著作送審教師資格審查意見表

編號：_____

送審單位：_____ 姓名：_____

擬送審等級：教授 副教授 助理教授 講師

代表著作名稱：_____

審查意見：(請具體明確，逐條敘述，審查意見表格不足時，請向下延伸評述。)

代 表 著 作 評 分 項 目 及 標 準					參考著作及前一 等級至本次申請 等級間之學術研 究成績
項 目	研究主題	文字與結構	研究方法及參考資 料	學術貢獻或應用價 值	
教 授	10%	5%	20%	25%	40%
副 教 授	10%	10%	25%	20%	35%
助理教授	10%	15%	25%	20%	30%
講 師	10%	20%	35%	15%	20%
得 分					
總 分	(請將上列五項評分加總)				
優 點			缺 點		
<input type="checkbox"/> 內容充實見解創新 <input type="checkbox"/> 研究方法恰當，推理嚴謹 <input type="checkbox"/> 所獲結論具學術或實用價值 <input type="checkbox"/> 觀點正確有學理依據 <input type="checkbox"/> 研究能力佳 <input type="checkbox"/> 取材豐富組織嚴謹 <input type="checkbox"/> 研究成果優良 <input type="checkbox"/> 其他：			<input type="checkbox"/> 無特殊創見 <input type="checkbox"/> 學術或實用價值不高 <input type="checkbox"/> 析論欠深入 <input type="checkbox"/> 內容不完整 <input type="checkbox"/> 研究方法及理論基礎均弱 <input type="checkbox"/> 論文寫作格式不符 <input type="checkbox"/> 研究成績差 <input type="checkbox"/> 涉及抄襲或其他違反學術倫理情事(請於審查 意見欄指出具體事實) <input type="checkbox"/> 其他：		
審查人簽章			審畢日期	年 月 日	

附註：

1. 教授：應為在該學術領域內有重要貢獻或創見之著作。
2. 副教授：應為在該學術領域內有持續性並有具體貢獻之著作。
3. 助理教授：應為具有博士學位論文相當水準以上之著作。
4. 講師：應為具有碩士學位論文相當水準以上之著作。
5. 總評等級區分四級：
 - A 級：總分 ≥ 90 分，傑出 (Excellent)
 - B 級：80 分 \leq 總分 < 90 分，優良 (Good)
 - C 級：75 分 \leq 總分 < 80 分，普通 (Average)
 - D 級：總分 < 75 分，欠佳 (Below Average)
6. 委員評分時，請斟酌審查意見與評分應相符。

National Chung Hsing University

External Review of Academic Publications Submitted for

Qualification as a Teacher

Number : _____

Academic unit : _____ Name : _____

Academic level : Professor Associate professor Assistant Professor
 Instructor

Representative publication : _____

Comments: (If more space is needed, attach additional sheets or write on the back of this sheet.)

Items and standards of grading					Achievement shown in other publications
Item	Research topic	Language and structure	Research method and references	Academic contribution and practical value	
Professor	10%	5%	20%	25%	40%
Associate Professor	10%	10%	25%	20%	35%
Assistant Professor	10%	15%	25%	20%	30%
Instructor	10%	20%	35%	15%	20%
Score					
Total	(Sum up the total points of the five items above)				

Advantages		Disadvantages	
<input type="checkbox"/> Complete content with creative visions <input type="checkbox"/> Good methodology <input type="checkbox"/> High academic contribution and practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Strong and well-grounded views <input type="checkbox"/> Great research competency <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient materials/data and good organization <input type="checkbox"/> Great research results <input type="checkbox"/> other :		<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of creative visions <input type="checkbox"/> Low academic contribution and practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of depth in analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete content <input type="checkbox"/> Improper method or weak in theoretical basis <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable format of writing <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfactory research results <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism or violation of academic ethics (please give a note in the space for comments, if any). <input type="checkbox"/> other :	
Reviewer's signature		Date of Review	yyyy mm dd

Notes:

1. To qualify as a full professor, the applicant should, through his/her publications, show a highly significant or original contribution to his/her field of study.
2. To qualify as an associate professor, the applicant should, through his/her publications, show a continuous and concrete contribution to his/her field of study.
3. To qualify as an assistant professor, the applicant should, through his/her publications, show ability (more than) equal to writing a Ph.D. dissertation.
4. To qualify as an instructor, the applicant should, through his/her publications, show ability (more than) equal to writing a master thesis.
5. The levels of grading are four :
 - A (excellent): total points 90 or over 90
 - B (good) : total points 80 or over 80 but below 90
 - C (average): total points 75 or over 75 but below 80
 - D (below average): total points below 75