

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Scholarly Works in Science, Engineering, Medicine, and Agriculture
(Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §14) **Form No.: A**

Work No.		Screening Institution			
Rank for Screening:		Name			
Title					
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points.					
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works			Reference Works	Total Score
	Research Topic	Research Methods and Capabilities	Academic and Practical Contributions		
Professor	5%	10%	35%	50%	
Associate Professor	10%	20%	30%	40%	
Assistant Professor	20%	25%	25%	30%	
Lecturer	25%	30%	25%	20%	
Score					
Reviewer Signature and Seal			Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained publications in the academic field and have made significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained publications in the academic field and have made concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have publications equivalent to the level of a doctoral dissertation and possess the ability to conduct independent research.
4. Assistant Professor: Should have publications equivalent to the level of a master dissertation and possess the ability to conduct independent research.

※ Notes:

1. Edited works formed by compiling, adding to or deleting from, combining, or arranging the works of others, or other works that are not forms of research, may not be submitted for screening.
2. The representative work submitted for screening may not be a degree thesis or any part thereof. However, if the degree thesis has not previously been submitted for screening for any teacher rank, or if the submission consists of continued research based on the degree thesis, and the work has been published with an accompanying explanation, it may be exempted from this restriction if the professional review determines that the work demonstrates a substantial degree of innovation.
3. The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Scholarly Works in Science, Engineering, Medicine, and Agriculture
(Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §14)

Form No.: A

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			

Instructions:

1. Do not use only the tier, ranking, Impact Factor, or similar metrics of the journals to which the works were submitted as the basis for screening.
2. Provide specific reviews and written comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation.
3. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper.
4. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Substantive content with innovative insights <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions have academic value <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions have practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Rich materials and rigorous organization <input type="checkbox"/> Strong research capability <input type="checkbox"/> Strong research outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> No distinctive innovations <input type="checkbox"/> Low academic merit <input type="checkbox"/> Low practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Weak research methods and theoretical foundation <input type="checkbox"/> Does not conform to the academic writing format of this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient depth of analysis and discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete content <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks independent research capability <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory research performance <input type="checkbox"/> Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works <input type="checkbox"/> Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for screening without a sufficient degree of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail

2. If any of the following three boxes under “Weaknesses” are checked — “Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others’ works,” “Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for review without a sufficient degree of innovation,” or “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” — the case shall be rated Fail pursuant to Articles 21, 22, and 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Specialized Scholarly Works – Humanities and Social Sciences

(Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §14)

Form No.: B

Work No.		Screening Institution				
Rank for Screening:		Name				
Title						
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.						
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works				Reference Works	Total Score
	Research Topic	Text and Structure	Research Methods and References	Academic or Applied Value		
Professor	10%	5%	20%	25%	40%	
Associate Professor	10%	10%	25%	20%	35%	
Assistant Professor	10%	15%	25%	20%	30%	
Lecturer	10%	20%	35%	15%	20%	
Score						
Reviewer Signature and Seal			Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____		

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained publications in the academic field and have made significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained publications in the academic field and have made concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have publications equivalent to the level of a doctoral dissertation and possess the ability to conduct independent research.
4. Assistant Professor: Should have publications equivalent to the level of a master dissertation and possess the ability to conduct independent research.

※ Notes:

1. Edited works formed by compiling, adding to or deleting from, combining, or arranging the works of others, or other works that are not forms of research, may not be submitted for screening.
2. The representative work submitted for screening may not be a degree thesis or any part thereof. However, if the degree thesis has not previously been submitted for screening for any teacher rank, or if the submission consists of continued research based on the degree thesis, and the work has been published with an accompanying explanation, it may be exempted from this restriction if the professional review determines that the work demonstrates a substantial degree of innovation.
3. The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Specialized Scholarly Works – Humanities and Social Sciences

(Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §14)

Form No.: B

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			
Review Comments:			
<p>Instructions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not use only the tier, ranking, Impact Factor, or similar metrics of the journals to which the works were submitted as the basis for screening. 2. Provide specific reviews and written comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation. 3. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper. 4. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation. 			
Strengths		Weaknesses	
<input type="checkbox"/> Substantive content with innovative insights <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions have academic value <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions have practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Rich materials and rigorous organization <input type="checkbox"/> Strong research capability <input type="checkbox"/> Strong research outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Other:		<input type="checkbox"/> No distinctive innovations <input type="checkbox"/> Low academic merit <input type="checkbox"/> Low practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Weak research methods and theoretical foundation <input type="checkbox"/> Does not conform to the academic writing format of this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient depth of analysis and discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete content <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks independent research capability <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory research performance <input type="checkbox"/> Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works <input type="checkbox"/> Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for screening without a sufficient degree of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Overall Evaluation			
<p>1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70. I rate this case as: <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail</p> <p>2. If any of the following three boxes under "Weaknesses" are checked — "Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works," "Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for review without a sufficient degree of innovation," or "Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics" — the case shall be rated Fail pursuant to Articles 21, 22, and 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.</p>			

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Scholarly Work Teaching Practice Research (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §16)

Form No.: C1

Work No.				Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:				Name		
Title						
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.						
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works				Reference Works	Total Score
	Research Motivation and Topic	Literature Review and Research Methods	Instructional (Curriculum) Design	Research Outcomes, Learning Effectiveness, and Contributions	(Other research work between the previous rank and the current application rank)	
Professor	10%	10%	20%	20%	40%	
Associate Professor	10%	10%	20%	25%	35%	
Assistant Professor	10%	10%	25%	25%	30%	
Lecturer	15%	10%	25%	30%	20%	
Score						
Reviewer Signature and Seal				Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have original and sustained teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, demonstrate good teaching results, and make tangible contributions to dissemination.
2. Associate Professor: Should have original and sustained teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, demonstrate good teaching results, and make tangible contributions to dissemination.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have excellent teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, engage continuously in teaching practice research, and demonstrate good teaching results.
4. Lecturer: Should have good teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, engage continuously in teaching practice research, and demonstrate good teaching results.

※ Notes:

1. Edited works formed by compiling, adding to or deleting from, combining, or arranging the works of others, or other works that are not forms of research, may not be submitted for screening.
2. The representative work submitted for screening may not be a degree thesis or any part thereof. However, if the degree thesis has not previously been submitted for screening for any teacher rank, or if the submission consists of continued research based on the degree thesis, and the work has been published with an accompanying explanation, it may be exempted from this restriction if the professional review determines that the work demonstrates a substantial degree of innovation.
3. The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Scholarly Work Teaching Practice Research (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §16)

Form No.: C1

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			
<p>Review Comments:</p>			
<p>Instructions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not use only the tier, ranking, Impact Factor, or similar metrics of the journals to which the works were submitted as the basis for screening. 2. Provide specific reviews and written comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation. 3. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper. 4. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation. 			
Strengths		Weaknesses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research topic is innovative. <input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research philosophy and design align with the instructional objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> The instructional plan has a solid theoretical basis and practical applicability. <input type="checkbox"/> The research methods are rigorous. <input type="checkbox"/> The course (curriculum) design and content demonstrate diversity, innovation, or refinement. <input type="checkbox"/> The learning assessment methods reflect learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Student learning outcomes are significantly improved. <input type="checkbox"/> The overall results of the teaching practice research are applicable or scalable. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research topic lacks innovation. <input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research philosophy and design do not align with the instructional objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> The instructional plan lacks a theoretical basis. <input type="checkbox"/> The research methods are not rigorous. <input type="checkbox"/> The course (curriculum) design and content lack diversity, innovation, or refinement. <input type="checkbox"/> The learning assessment methods fail to reflect learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> The overall results of the teaching practice lack applicability or scalability. <input type="checkbox"/> Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works <input type="checkbox"/> Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for screening without a sufficient degree of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 	
Overall Evaluation			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail 2. If any of the following three boxes under "Weaknesses" are checked — "Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works," "Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for review without a sufficient degree of innovation," or "Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics" — the case shall be rated Fail pursuant to Articles 21, 22, and 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education. 			

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Technical Report, Technology R&D (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §15)

Form No.: D

Work No.		Screening Institution					
Rank for Screening:		Name					
Title							
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.							
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works			Reference Works	Total Score		
	Research and Development Concept and Theoretical Basis (parenthetical: Innovation in the R&D or creative concept and the underlying fundamental theory)	Subject Content and Methods/Techniques (parenthetical: May include detailed content of the R&D or creative subject, analytical reasoning, technological innovations or breakthroughs, and descriptions of the methods or techniques adopted)	Outcomes and Contributions (parenthetical: Innovation, feasibility, forward-looking nature or significance of the R&D or creative outcomes, their practical value, and concrete contributions to the profession or industry)				
	Professor	10%	10%			30%	50%
	Associate Professor	10%	10%			30%	50%
	Assistant Professor	15%	15%			30%	40%
	Lecturer	15%	15%			50%	20%
Score							
Reviewer Signature and Seal			Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____			

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Continuously engages in academic, technological, or practical R&D, and should have original and sustained publications or R&D outputs within the profession or industry and across disciplines, with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Continuously engages in academic, technological, or practical R&D, and should have sustained publications or R&D outputs within the profession or industry, with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Continuously engages in academic, technological, or practical R&D, with strong contributions from the R&D outputs and demonstrable independent R&D capability.
4. Lecturer: Continuously engages in academic, technological, or practical R&D, with R&D outputs and contributions of a commensurate standard.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Technical Report – Technological R&D (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §15)

Form No.: D

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			
<p>Review Comments:</p>			
<p>Instructions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation. 2. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper. 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation. 			
Strengths		Weaknesses	
<input type="checkbox"/> Shows innovation and breakthroughs <input type="checkbox"/> R&D outcomes have practical value <input type="checkbox"/> R&D outcomes make a substantial contribution to the profession/industry <input type="checkbox"/> R&D outcomes make a substantial contribution to society, culture, or ecology <input type="checkbox"/> R&D content is complete <input type="checkbox"/> Strong R&D capability; methods are appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Strong R&D performance <input type="checkbox"/> High level of sustained R&D engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Rigorous R&D attitude <input type="checkbox"/> Strong technology transfer performance <input type="checkbox"/> Suitable for instructional practice <input type="checkbox"/> Can integrate with industry and enhance industrial technology <input type="checkbox"/> Other:		<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks notable innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Low practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Limited contribution to the profession/industry <input type="checkbox"/> Limited contribution to society, culture, or ecology <input type="checkbox"/> Content or format is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Research methods are inappropriate <input type="checkbox"/> R&D results are unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient sustained R&D engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks rigor in R&D attitude <input type="checkbox"/> Poor technology transfer performance <input type="checkbox"/> Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works <input type="checkbox"/> Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for screening without a sufficient degree of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Overall Evaluation			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail 2. If any of the following three boxes under “Weaknesses” are checked — “Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others’ works,” “Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for review without a sufficient degree of innovation,” or “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” — the case shall be rated Fail pursuant to Articles 21, 22, and 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education. 			

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Technical Report: Teaching Practice Research (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §16)

Form No.: C2

Work No.				Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:				Name		
Title						
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.						
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works				Reference Works	Total Score
	Research Motivation and Topic	Literature Review and Research Methods	Instructional (Curriculum) Design	Research Outcomes, Learning Effectiveness, and Contributions	(Other research work between the previous rank and the current application rank)	
Professor	10%	10%	20%	20%	40%	
Associate Professor	10%	10%	20%	25%	35%	
Assistant Professor	10%	10%	25%	25%	30%	
Lecturer	15%	10%	25%	30%	20%	
Score						
Reviewer Signature and Seal				Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have original and sustained teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, demonstrate good teaching results, and make tangible contributions to dissemination.
2. Associate Professor: Should have original and sustained teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, demonstrate good teaching results, and make tangible contributions to dissemination.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have excellent teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, engage continuously in teaching practice research, and demonstrate good teaching results.
4. Lecturer: Should have good teaching practice research outcomes in the faculty member's field of instruction, engage continuously in teaching practice research, and demonstrate good teaching results.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Technical Report-Teaching Practice Research (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §16)

Form No.: C2

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			
<p>Review Comments:</p>			
<p>Instructions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation. 			
Strengths		Weaknesses	
<input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research topic is innovative. <input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research philosophy and design align with the instructional objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> The instructional plan has a solid theoretical basis and practical applicability. <input type="checkbox"/> The research methods are rigorous. <input type="checkbox"/> The course (curriculum) design and content demonstrate diversity, innovation, or refinement. <input type="checkbox"/> The learning assessment methods reflect learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Student learning outcomes are significantly improved. <input type="checkbox"/> The overall results of the teaching practice research are applicable or scalable. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:		<input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research topic lacks innovation. <input type="checkbox"/> The teaching-research philosophy and design do not align with the instructional objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> The instructional plan lacks a theoretical basis. <input type="checkbox"/> The research methods are not rigorous. <input type="checkbox"/> The course (curriculum) design and content lack diversity, innovation, or refinement. <input type="checkbox"/> The learning assessment methods fail to reflect learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> The overall results of the teaching practice lack applicability or scalability. <input type="checkbox"/> Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works <input type="checkbox"/> Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for screening without a sufficient degree of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Overall Evaluation			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail If any of the following three boxes under "Weaknesses" are checked — "Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works," "Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for review without a sufficient degree of innovation," or "Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics" — the case shall be rated Fail pursuant to Articles 21, 22, and 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education. 			

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements- Arts- Music (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No. : ☐ E1 Creative Works ☐ E2 Conducting, Performance (Vocal), and Collaborative Piano ☐ E3 Other

Work No.		Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name		
Title				
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.				
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.		
Professor	40%	40%	20%	
Associate Professor	45%	35%	20%	
Assistant Professor	45%	35%	20%	
Lecturer	50%	30%	20%	
Score				
Reviewer Signature and Seal		Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements- Arts- Music (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ E1 Creation ☐ E2 Conducting, Performance (Vocal) and Collaborative Piano
☐ E3 Other

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

Instructions: 1. Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation.
 2. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

- The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
- If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Traditional Chinese Opera (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ F1 Playwriting ☐ F2 Performance ☐ F3 Wenchang/Wuchang Performance ☐ F4 Music Design ☐ F5 Directing

Work No.			Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer		Name		
Title					
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.					
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score	
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.			
Professor	30%	40%	30%		
Associate Professor	40%	35%	25%		
Assistant Professor	45%	30%	25%		
Lecturer	50%	30%	20%		
Score					
Reviewer Signature and Seal			Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Traditional Chinese Opera (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ F1 Playwriting ☐ F2 Performance ☐ F3 Wenchang/Wuchang Performance ☐ F4 Music Design ☐ F5 Directing

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

Instructions:

1. Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation.
2. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper.
3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Drama (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ G1 Scriptwriting ☐ G2 Directing ☐ G3 Performance

Work No.			Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer		Name		
Title					
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.					
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score	
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.			
Professor	30%	40%	30%		
Associate Professor	40%	35%	25%		
Assistant Professor	45%	30%	25%		
Lecturer	55%	25%	20%		
Score					
Reviewer Signature and Seal			Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※ Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Drama (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ G1 Scriptwriting ☐ G2 Directing ☐ G3 Performance

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation.
 2. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Theatre Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ H1 Theatre Design ☐ H2 Interdisciplinary Theatre

Work No.		Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name		
Title				
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.				
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.		
Professor	40%	40%	20%	
Associate Professor	45%	35%	20%	
Assistant Professor	50%	30%	20%	
Lecturer	60%	30%	10%	
Score				
Reviewer Signature and Seal		Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Theatre Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ H1 Theatre Design ☐ H2 Interdisciplinary Theatre

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation.
 2. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Dance (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ I1 Creation ☐ I2 Performance

Work No.			Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer		Name		
Title					
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.					
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score	
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.			
Professor	40%	30%	30%		
Associate Professor	40%	30%	30%		
Assistant Professor	40%	30%	30%		
Lecturer	40%	30%	30%		
Score					
Reviewer Signature and Seal			Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※ Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Dance (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ I1 Creation ☐ I2 Performance

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall rating.
 2. The above comments are recommended to be presented in a bulleted format and computer-typed on A4-size paper, with no fewer than 300 words as a general rule.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Folk Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ J1 Creation ☐ J2 Performance ☐ J3 Acrobatics

Work No.		Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name		
Title				
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.				
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.		
Professor	30%	40%	30%	
Associate Professor	40%	35%	25%	
Assistant Professor	45%	30%	25%	
Lecturer	55%	25%	20%	
Score				
Reviewer Signature and Seal		Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Folk Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ J1 Creation ☐ J2 Performance ☐ J3 Acrobatics

Work No.		Screening College (Department, Graduate Institute)	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall rating.
 2. The above comments are recommended to be presented in a bulleted format and computer-typed on A4-size paper, with no fewer than 300 words as a general rule.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Audiovisual Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ K1 Feature Film ☐ K2 Short Film Production ☐ K3 Documentary ☐ K4 Animation ☐ K5 Digital Game

Work No.		Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name		
Title				
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.				
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.		
Professor	25%	50%	25%	
Associate Professor	35%	45%	20%	
Assistant Professor	40%	40%	20%	
Lecturer	50%	35%	15%	
Score				
Reviewer Signature and Seal		Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Audiovisual Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ K1 Feature Film ☐ K2 Short Film Production ☐ K3 Documentary ☐ K4 Animation ☐ K5 Digital Game

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

Instructions:

1. Please provide specific review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall rating.
2. The above comments are recommended to be presented in a bulleted format and computer-typed on A4-size paper, with no fewer than 300 words as a general rule.
3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Visual Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ L1 Two-Dimensional Works ☐ L2 Three-Dimensional Works ☐ L3 Mixed-Media Works ☐ L4 Other

Work No.			Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name		
Title				
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.				
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.		
Professor	30%	50%	20%	
Associate Professor	40%	45%	15%	
Assistant Professor	45%	40%	15%	
Lecturer	50%	35%	15%	
Score				
Reviewer Signature and Seal	Date of Completion of Review		Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – Visual Arts (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ L1 Two-Dimensional Works ☐ L2 Three-Dimensional Works ☐ L3 Mixed-Media Works ☐ L4 Other

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall rating.
 2. The above comments are recommended to be presented in a bulleted format and computer-typed on A4-size paper, with no fewer than 300 words as a general rule.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – New Media Art (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ M1 Digital Audiovisual Art ☐ M2 Interactive Digital Art ☐ M3 Virtual Reality ☐ M4 Multimedia Art and Other

Work No.		Screening Institution		
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name		
Title				
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.				
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.		
Professor	30%	50%	20%	
Associate Professor	40%	45%	15%	
Assistant Professor	45%	40%	15%	
Lecturer	50%	35%	15%	
Score				
Reviewer Signature and Seal		Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※ Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements – Arts – New Media Art (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ M1 Digital Audiovisual Art ☐ M2 Interactive Digital Art ☐ M3 Multimedia Art ☐ M4 Virtual Reality and Other

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall rating.
 2. The above comments are recommended to be presented in a bulleted format and computer-typed on A4-size paper, with no fewer than 300 words as a general rule.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly creative <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent compositional technique or performance technique <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Possesses academic value and substance <input type="checkbox"/> Creation (performance) report is professional <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding performance over the years <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic caliber of the performance or work is not high <input type="checkbox"/> Technique is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Creative output is unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive approach is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks artistic substance <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Design (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ N1 Environmental and Spatial Arts ☐ N2 Product Design ☐ N3 Visual Communication Design ☐ N4 Experiential Visual Design ☐ N5 Fashion Design

Work No.			Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name		
Title				
※ The passing threshold score for this case is 70 points.				
Scoring Items and Standards	Representative Works (Between the previous rank and the current application rank)		Reference Works (Other research or creative works between the previous rank and the current application rank in the relevant teaching field)	Total Score
	Techniques, artistic substance, and creativity of the work (performance)	Report on the work (performance): including concept of creation or performance, theoretical basis, content and form, methods and techniques, artistic value, and contributions, etc.		
Professor	35%	50%	15%	
Associate Professor	45%	40%	15%	
Assistant Professor	60%	30%	10%	
Lecturer	70%	20%	10%	
Score				
Reviewer Signature and Seal	Date of Completion of Review		Year ____ Month ____ Day ____	

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: Should have distinctive and sustained works in the academic field with significant and concrete contributions.
2. Associate Professor: Should have sustained works in the academic field with concrete contributions.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have creative works at a level equivalent to a doctoral standard.
4. Lecturer: Should have works at a level equivalent to a Master of Arts in Fine Arts standard.

※ Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B)

Review Category: Works and Achievements—Arts—Design (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §17)

Form No.: ☐ N1 Environmental and Spatial Arts ☐ N2 Product Design ☐ N3 Visual Communication Design ☐ N4 Experiential Visual Design ☐ N5 Fashion Design

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:	<input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer	Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall rating.
 2. The above comments are recommended to be presented in a bulleted format and computer-typed on A4-size paper, with no fewer than 300 words as a general rule.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> The work demonstrates cultural and social relevance <input type="checkbox"/> Strong functionality <input type="checkbox"/> Solid creative techniques <input type="checkbox"/> Presents novel insights in research/creation <input type="checkbox"/> Artistic value <input type="checkbox"/> Strong applicability to industry <input type="checkbox"/> Patent obtained <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> The work lacks cultural and social relevance <input type="checkbox"/> Functionality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Techniques and content are poorly executed <input type="checkbox"/> Creative insights are insufficiently articulated <input type="checkbox"/> Artistic value is low <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial applicability is limited <input type="checkbox"/> Originality is inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If the “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” box is checked under Deficiencies for this case, it shall be graded as a failing result pursuant to Article 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Works and Achievements - Sports (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §18)

Form No.: ☐ O1 Individual Achievement ☐ O2 Teaching/Coaching Achievement

Work No.		Screening Institution			
Rank for Screening:		Name			
Title					
※ The passing threshold score for this case is 70 points.					
Scoring Items and Standards	Evidence of representative achievement	Practical report on representative achievement in competition		Reference achievements	Total Score
	Teacher's own competitive achievements:	Contents include: (1) Case description (2) Theoretical foundation (3) Personal training (including competition) plan or the plan for coaching others' training (including competition) (4) Personal training process and outcomes (including competition) or the process and outcomes of coaching others' training (including competition)			
	Competitive achievements in sporting events				
	Teacher's coaching of athletes' competitive achievements: Achievements of coached athletes				
Professor	25%	45%	30%		
Associate Professor	30%	40%	30%		
Assistant Professor	35%	35%	30%		
Lecturer	40%	30%	30%		
Score					
Reviewer Signature and Seal		Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____		

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Professor: In the relevant sport, participate in important international and domestic sporting events or serve as a coach training others who participate, with distinctive and sustained achievements and a competition practice report (or publication), and with concrete, outstanding results.
2. Associate Professor: In the relevant sport, participate in important international and domestic sporting events or serve as a coach training others who participate, with sustained achievements and a competition practice report (or publication), and with excellent results.
3. Assistant Professor: In the relevant sport, participate in important international and domestic sporting events or serve as a coach training others who participate, with good results, and submit a competition practice report equivalent in standard to a doctoral dissertation and demonstrate an ability to conduct independent research.
4. Lecturer: In the relevant sport, participate in important international and domestic sporting events or serve as a coach training others to participate, with results, and submit a competition practice report equivalent in standard to a master's thesis.

※Note: The applicant may select up to five items and shall designate one as the representative research work. Related studies that form a series may be combined as the representative research work, with the remaining items listed as reference research works. Categories include: specialized scholarly works for academic research, technical reports for technology research and development, specialized scholarly works or technical reports for teaching practice research, creative works or performance reports for literary and artistic creation and performance, and practical reports for sports competitions. The total number of items shall not exceed five.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Works and Achievements - Sports (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §18)

Form No.: ☐ O1 Individual Achievement ☐ O2 Teaching/Coaching Achievement

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

- Instructions:
1. Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation.
 2. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper.
 3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Shows innovation and breakthroughs <input type="checkbox"/> Has practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Competition practice report is complete in content and form <input type="checkbox"/> Athletic performance/instructional ability is good <input type="checkbox"/> Applicable to training or instructional practice <input type="checkbox"/> Overall sports research outcomes are excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Both quantity and quality are strong <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks innovation or breakthroughs <input type="checkbox"/> Low practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Competition practice report is incomplete in content or form <input type="checkbox"/> Athletic performance/instructional ability is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable to training or instructional practice <input type="checkbox"/> Overall sports research outcomes are unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works <input type="checkbox"/> Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for screening without a sufficient degree of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation

1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: ☐ Pass ☐ Fail
2. If any of the following three boxes under "Weaknesses" are checked — "Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works," "Representative work is wholly or partly a degree thesis previously submitted for review without a sufficient degree of innovation," or "Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics" — the case shall be rated Fail pursuant to Articles 21, 22, and 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form A) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Thesis (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §19)

Form No.: P

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			
※ The minimum passing score for this case is 70.			
Work evaluation items (including research topic, writing and structure, research methods and references, academic or applied value, etc.)			
Rank for Screening:	Total Score		
Associate Professor			
Assistant Professor			
Lecturer			
Reviewer Signature and Seal		Date of Completion of Review	Year ____ Month ____ Day ____

※ Review and Rating Criteria:

1. Associate Professor: Should have sustained publications in the academic field and have made concrete contributions.
2. Assistant Professor: Should have publications equivalent to the level of a doctoral dissertation and possess the ability to conduct independent research.
3. Assistant Professor: Should have publications equivalent to the level of a master dissertation and possess the ability to conduct independent research.

※ Notes:

1. Edited works compiled by organizing, adding to, deleting from, combining, or arranging the works of others, or other works that are not research works, may not be submitted for review.
2. Pursuant to Article 30-1 of the Act Governing the Appointment of Educators, an applicant for associate professor may submit a doctoral dissertation for screening, provided that it still meets the post-reclassification standard for the rank of associate professor.

Teacher Qualification Review Opinion Form (Form B) for Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education

Review Category: Thesis (Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education §19) **Form No.:** P

Work No.		Screening Institution	
Rank for Screening:		Name	
Title			

Review Comments:

Instructions:

1. Please provide specific assessments and written review comments separately for the representative work and the reference works, and check the boxes for strengths, weaknesses, and overall evaluation.
2. Present the above comments in bullet-point form and submit them typewritten on A4 paper.
3. If the case is not approved, the review comments may be provided to the applicant as the basis for an administrative disposition, with an explanation.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<input type="checkbox"/> Substantive content with innovative insights <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions have academic value <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions have practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Rich materials and rigorous organization <input type="checkbox"/> Strong research capability <input type="checkbox"/> Strong research outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> No distinctive innovations <input type="checkbox"/> Low academic merit <input type="checkbox"/> Low practical value <input type="checkbox"/> Weak research methods and theoretical foundation <input type="checkbox"/> Does not conform to the academic writing format of this discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient depth of analysis and discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete content <input type="checkbox"/> Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others' works <input type="checkbox"/> Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics (please specify concrete facts in the review comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Overall Evaluation
1. The minimum passing score for this case is 70 points. I rate this case as: <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail 2. If any of the following three boxes under “Weaknesses” are checked — “Not original; primarily compiles, adds to/deletes from, combines, or arranges others’ works,” and “Involves plagiarism or other violations of academic ethics” — the case shall be rated Fail pursuant to Articles 21, 22, and 44 of the Regulations Governing Accreditation of Teacher Qualifications at Junior Colleges and Institutions of Higher Education.