

JABEE Evaluation Guide
for
Accreditation of Professional Education Programs
Applicable in the year 2019 and later

The Japanese version of “JABEE Evaluation Guide for Accreditation of Professional Education Programs Applicable in the year 2019 and later” is official.
English translation is for informational purpose only.

JABEE

Kenchiku Kaikan 4F, 5-26-20 Shiba, Minato-ku, Tokyo 108-0014



Telephone: +81 3-5439-5031
Facsimile: +81 3-5439-5033
E-mail: info@jabee.org
URL: <http://www.jabee.org/english>

Table of Contents

- 1 Preamble
- 2 Mission and Tips of Evaluators
 - 2.1 Principle of Evaluation and Accreditation
 - 2.2 Mission of the Evaluators
 - 2.3 Tips of the Evaluators
 - 2.4 Mission and Tips of Candidate for Evaluator
 - 2.5 Confidentiality
 - 2.6 Expenses for Evaluation and Logistical Assistance
- 3 Cases where multiple programs within the same Higher Education Institution are evaluated simultaneously
- 4 Items to be Considered and Points of View of Evaluation
 - 4.1 Basic way of thinking in Judgment
 - 4.2 Interpretation of Accreditation Criteria and Documents to be applied to the Evaluation
 - 4.3 Accordance of Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation
 - 4.4 Outcomes-based Evaluation
 - 4.5 Confirmation on Degree of Accordance to the Items Related to Accreditation Criteria
 - 4.6 Measures to be taken if sufficient explanation or evidences is not provided at On-site Visit
 - 4.7 Items to be Considered at the time of Determining Judgment Result
 - 4.8 Benchmark
 - 4.9 Point of View of Evidential Document and Guideline for Preparation
 - 4.10 Method of Presentation of Evidential Documents
 - 4.11 Proof of Degree of Achievement by Substantial Graduates
 - 4.12 Items to be Considered at Continuous Evaluation
 - 4.13 Judgment on Large Category of Review Item
 - 4.14 Items to be Considered at Interim Evaluation
- 5 Items to be Considered and Point of View of Evaluation related to each Review Item

- 5.1 Concreteness of the Learning Outcomes
- 5.2 Publicizing of the learning Outcomes
- 5.3 Relation among each item of Criteria
- 5.4 Evaluation of Education on Engineering Design Ability
- 5.5 Evaluation of Class Hours
- 5.6 Handling of Credits which a Student of the Program earned in other Educational Institutions and of Credits which a transferred Student earned prior to Admission to the Program
- 5.7 Implementation of Syllabus based Education
- 5.8 Items to be Considered for Description of Judgment Result of Admission and Credit of the Students Moving into the Program
- 5.9 Items to be Considered for Judgment on Admission, Course Registration, Admission of Transferred into or Moved into the Program (*This item of Evaluation Guide is not translated (not applicable)*)
- 5.10 Items to be Considered for Judgment Related to Students' Moving
- 5.11 Continuous Improvement
- 6 Flow of Tasks and Items to be Considered by the Evaluation Panel
 - 6.1 Coordination of Schedule and Request for Arrangements of On-site Visit with Higher Education Institution and/or Program Operating Organization
 - 6.2 Preparation for On-site Visit by the Program Review Report (prior to On-site visit)
 - 6.3 Preparation of the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit)
 - 6.4 Confirmation and Interview at On-site Visit
 - 6.5 Items to be Considered to Fill in the Program Review Report (Exit Interview at On-site Visit)
 - 6.6 Exit Meeting at On-site Visit
 - 6.7 Correspondence with the Program Operating Organization after the On-site Visit and Report of Evaluation Result to the Evaluation Committee by Field
 - 6.8 After completing Activities as the Evaluation Panel
- 7 Items to be considered for the description of Review Reports
 - 7.1 Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit/ Post On-site Visit), Evaluation Report

7.2 Executive Summary

8 Prohibited Matters at the Evaluation

List of Referential Documents

Attachment 1 Standard Task Schedule of the Evaluation Panel

Attachment 2 On-site Visit Schedule (Reference)

JABEE Evaluation Guide

1 Preamble

This Evaluation Guide describes items to be considered and points of view of tasks during process from the appointment to the completion of the tasks of Evaluators (Chair of the Evaluation Panel, Deputy Chair of the Evaluation Panel, Lead Evaluator, Sub-evaluator are all together referred to as “Evaluator” and separately, Candidate for Evaluator). Also, this document is publicized to increase the fairness and the transparency of Evaluation and Accreditation through understanding the points of view of Evaluation and Accreditation by the Program Operating Organization. This document is applied for the evaluation for the Accreditation Criteria of 2019 and later.

2 Mission and Understanding of Evaluators

2.1 Principle of Evaluation and Accreditation

Evaluators shall make efforts in implementing Evaluation in accordance with the concept of “In cooperation with academic societies and industry and based on the unified criteria, JABEE accredits professional education programs provided by higher education institutions such as universities”. By promoting professional education in Japan as well as overseas and ensuring international substantial equivalency of professional education in Japan and through fostering international professionals with a view to contributing to the development of the society and industry” as described in Article 3 of JABEE Charter.

2.2 Mission of the Evaluators

The Evaluators shall judge that the professional education programs which have applied for Evaluation meet each item of the JABEE Accreditation Criteria based on Self-review Report, On-site Visit, Support Document, Report for Additional Explanation, Written Opposition and Improvement Report. The Evaluators conclude its result to the Evaluation Team Report and report to the Evaluation Committees by Field.

2.3 Understanding of the Evaluators

The Evaluators shall consider the following for the Evaluation:

- Always be conscious about the position of self as who improves professional

education together with the educational program,

- Always be conscious about the position of self as at an equal level as educational institution which is being evaluated,
- Make reasonable determination focusing on substance from the perspective of educational improvement,
- Do not load excessive burden to the educational institution,
- Understand that Evaluation is neither assessment nor ranking,
- Make objective determination based on the Accreditation Criteria and do not bring personal educational views to the Evaluation,
- Do not make personal comments or directions to the educational institution,
- Fully pay attention to the handling of Self-review Report, Evaluation related documents and academic record (Answer sheet of the test or original of academic record etc.) if those include personal information of the faculty and the students,
- Fully consider interviewees not to suffer from disadvantages if reflecting interview results of the faculty or the students to the evaluation result,
- Comply with Evaluators Code of Ethics and Confidentiality.

All individuals who involve with the accreditation activities should show a respect to each other while keep in mind that accreditation decisions, either accredited or not-accredited, have nothing to do with the superiority or inferiority of the programs.

2.4 Mission and Understanding of Candidate for Evaluator

- The Candidate for Evaluator is expected to gain the same experience as Evaluators. Therefore, participate the on-site visit while reviewing Self-Review Report and submit its result to the Lead Evaluator as same as Sub-evaluator based on the direction of Lead Evaluator.
- The result of Self-Review Report submitted by the Candidate for Evaluator shall be handled as reference.
- Candidate for Evaluator is allowed to make comments at the request of the Lead Evaluator only when the discussion take place among Evaluation Team, however, they cannot involve with judgment.
- Candidate for Evaluator is not allowed to make comment at the interview with the Program Operating Organization or the students.

- Take any actions by taking account of tips of Evaluators as stated in item 2.3.

2.5 Confidentiality

Evaluators shall not leak the following information other than relevant parties (JABEE Board of Directors, JABEE Secretariat, JABEE Committees Members, Evaluation Committees by field and the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organizations). Evaluators shall fully pay attention to minimize risk of information leakage based on the regulation concerning the destruction or collection of the documents which were produced during the evaluation. So, the evaluation information should be exchange via web-based system provided by JABEE which can only be utilized by the registrants. Evaluators shall consider ways to avoid immediate information leakage even if electronic data is handed in to the third parties by errors or accidents by setting up password to the electronic file, withholding Program Title and/or using secret language in the case of exchanging evaluation information via e-mail or its attachments. Evaluators also have responsibility of confidentiality for the information of other programs learned that could only be known by the process of evaluation.

Additionally, the contents of the confidentiality of Evaluation & Accreditation to the relevant parties including the higher education institutions are separately described in the “Notice for Evaluation and Accreditation relevant parties (confidentiality)”.

- (1) Name of the program under evaluation, relevant departments, and/or educational institution (hereinafter collectively called as “Name of the Program”), period of On-site Visit, Person in Charge of JABEE Matter and Person in Charge of the Program (if evaluators arrange business trip through their affiliated organization, explain personnel that the matter is subject to confidentiality and ask special consideration to minimize the number of people involved in the trip arrangement).
- (2) Personal information of the Panel Members for the program under evaluation.
- (3) Specific impression, situation and prediction of Accreditation or Non-accreditation of the program under evaluation.
- (4) Name of the program, Person in charge of JABEE Matter and Person in Charge of the Program which could only be known by participating evaluations in the past.
- (5) Name of the program which has been evaluated but not accredited.
- (6) Name of the program which has already been accredited but not publicized

yet.

- (7) Term of Validity of accredited programs.
- (8) Number of applications by each field.
- (9) In addition, confidential information on Evaluation and Accreditation in progress.

2.6 Expenses for Evaluation and Logistical Assistance

The Evaluators shall not cause any financial burden to the Program Operating Organization other than evaluation fees. The following are the examples of expense which should be paid by the Evaluation Panel.

- Transportation cost between hotel to the educational institution
- Meals during On-site Visit period
- Cost if utilizing university accommodation
- Room charges for a meeting of the Evaluation Panel and/ or the Evaluation Team within the hotel
- Room charges of sweet room or a meeting room located outside of the hotel if the Evaluation Panel found it is more reasonable than using meeting room within the hotel

Note that the following assistance could be provided by the Program Operating Organization to proceed the smooth evaluation. However, the cost should be reasonable and determined in advance if it occurs.

- Accommodation of copy of or distribution of documents for the evaluation (including Candidate for Evaluator and observers)
- Accommodation of meeting rooms and locking in the educational institution during On-site Visit period
- Utilization of PC, printer and projector of the educational institution
- Utilization of permanent facilities in the educational institution such as copying machine or communication device
- Assistance to order lunch or call for taxi (payment shall be made by the Evaluation Panel)

3 Cases where multiple programs within the same Higher Education Institution are evaluated simultaneously

In the case of multiple programs within the same educational institution being

evaluated in the same academic year, the evaluation is to be conducted by a single Evaluation Panel composed of multiple Evaluation Teams that will each evaluate the relevant multiple programs. In this case, the On-site Visit is to be implemented on the same schedule. However, depending on the circumstances, it is also possible to implement the evaluation by dividing the multiple Evaluation Teams into multiple Evaluation Panels, in which case the On-site Visit may be implemented on the same schedule or on different schedules. How the Evaluation Panel is composed is decided through prior coordination between the educational institution and JABEE, and JABEE notifies it to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization in advance of the team's composition. For further details on the simultaneous evaluation of multiple programs within the same educational institution, refer to the "Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation" and the instructions and related documents from the Evaluation & Accreditation Coordination Committee.

4 Items to be Considered and Points of View of Evaluation

The following are items to be considered and points of view of evaluation and supplemental items related to the Accreditation Criteria

4.1 Basic way of thinking in Judgment

JABEE Evaluation is to confirm with evidences that the professional education program continuously meets JABEE Accreditation Criteria and the quality of professional education, which the educational institution has publicized to the society, has been ensured. Therefore, it is required to confirm with evidences to back up performance, improvement measures in progress and plausibility of actualization to be able to determine the policies and procedures are appropriately and effectively operated based on the confirmation of existence of concrete policies and procedures which could guarantee appropriate operation of the educational program. If all meet, a six-year accreditation is granted. If there are problems in the degree of meeting to the Accreditation Criteria, the term of validity of accreditation will be shortened.

4.2 Interpretation of Criteria and Documents to Apply to Evaluation

Judgment shall be made objectively and fairly based on publicized documents such as "JABEE Accreditation Criteria" and "Criteria Guide". Evaluation shall be implemented by application of "Criteria Guide" and Program Review Report/ Evaluation Report separately prepared for each Category of Accreditation.

Accreditation Criteria is separately defined into Common Criteria and Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria although practical documents and formats related to the evaluation are prepared for each Category of Accreditation in combination of necessary items.

Accreditation Criteria is consisted of the “Common Criteria” and “Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria” which define supplemental items for some parts of Common Criteria and judgement on degree of accordance shall be made vis-a-vis Common Criteria including Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria for the evaluation. Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria is consisted of “items under the direct scope of Evaluation” and “items which are not direct scope of evaluation although the interpretation of Common criteria is given”. “Items under the direct scope of Evaluation” is called “Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria (Requirement)” and “items which are not the direct scope of evaluation although the interpretation of Common criteria is given” is called “Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria (Highly Recommended Items/ Items to be Considered)” respectively. The Common Criteria including Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria (Requirement) are equivalent to the Evaluation Items at the Accreditation Criteria therefore, the Program Operating Organization has to describe its degree of accordance to the Self-review Report and the Evaluators make judgment based on its description based on the confirmation at on-site if necessary. On the contrary, Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria (Highly Recommended Items/ Items to be Considered) are not the evaluation items by themselves so that the evaluators neither directly confirm nor make judgment on degree of accordance. The evaluators make judgement on degree of accordance to the applicable Common Criteria through the explanation of how the program considers as to the items in Self-review Report correspond to the Common Criteria in relation to the Category-and Discipline-specific Criteria (Highly Recommended Items/ Items to be Considered).

4.3 Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation

The Evaluation Panel are required to be faithfully follow the rules and procedures as defined in “JABEE Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation”. The Evaluation Panel is not allowed to abbreviate some of the items or to deviate from rules and procedures. The Evaluation Panel shall contact to Evaluation Committee by fields or to JABEE to receive specific directions prior to the Evaluation if evaluation as described in “Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation”

could not be implemented with exceptional circumstance belong to the Program.

4.4 Point of View of Outcomes-based Evaluation

JABEE Accreditation is based on the outcomes-based evaluation. Therefore, if the learning outcomes of the students, as demonstrated by their knowledge and abilities of the Program, have been achieved, JABEE would respect creative approach to achieving the learning outcomes. The Evaluators are required to consider that the JABEE evaluation system allows high flexibility and diversified approaches and respects the uniqueness and the originality of the Program. The most critical point to be confirmed at the evaluation is whether the Program has established clear and specific learning outcomes and how they assure their achievement. Therefore, the final judgment relies mostly on the degree of assurance of learning outcomes as defined by the Program if question arises during evaluation process including evaluation items other than learning outcomes.

4.5 Point of View of Confirmation on Degree of Accordance to the Items Related to Accreditation Criteria

Degree of Accordance to the Accreditation Criteria shall be judged by the Evaluation Panel whether the “explanation provided by the Program based on evidence of meeting Criteria” in the Self-review Report or at the On-site Visit are reasonable or not. The Evaluators carefully confirm the Self-review Report then so that will allow the Evaluators to focus on confirmation at on-site which could not be confirmed by the Self-review Report such as achievement of the learning Outcomes. It is expected to the Program Operating Organization to include fully understandable evidences and explanations of degree of accordance to the Accreditation Criteria even from the third-parties to the maximum extent to the Self-review Report. On the other hand, those involved in the Evaluation are required to confirm the contents of the Self-Review Report with respect, at the same time, to make a fair judgment on the degree of accordance after confirming what is necessary at the On-site Visit based on the confirmation of the Self-Review Report. In particular, those involved in the Evaluation should pay utmost attention to ensure that the evaluation respects the uniqueness of the program and supports the improvement of the education of the program operating organization. It relied on independent determination of the Program Operating Organization for what kind of evidence and proof they provide and how they explain about meeting criteria. Contents of Self-review are indicated vis-à-vis items of criteria in the “Criteria Guide” so the evaluation should be implemented based on its guide.

4.6 How to take measures for the situation if sufficient explanation or evidences is not provided at On-site Visit

If the Evaluation Team considers the explanation or the evidences of Self-review Report is insufficient, the Lead Evaluator shall arrange smooth confirmation at the On-site Visit by requesting support documents (which describe or explain the items to be confirmed. Should not mandate its form, etc.) to the Program and narrowing down items to be confirmed at the On-site Visit as much as possible through communication with the Program (prior to On-site Visit). The Lead Evaluator shall make maximum effort to confirm review items which could not be confirmed even at the On-site Visit by requesting additional explanation to the Program or by investigating relating documents to see that the Program took measures in accordance with the concept of applicable Review Item in some way. At the end of On-site Visit, the Lead Evaluator shall reach mutual convergence for the concerns of the Program and to share common understanding between the Evaluation Team and the Program on the concerns at least for Review Items left with “W” or “D”. If by the end of On-site Visit sufficient explanation or evidences have not been provided by the Program and if the gap of understanding has remained, the Lead Evaluator shall explain to and confirm with the Program (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit), that there remains a gap of understanding between the Program and the Evaluation Team. The Lead Evaluator shall mention it in detail in the Program Review Report (Exit Interview at On-site Visit), Program Review Report (post On-site Visit) and the Evaluation Team Report so that the coordination and evaluation by the field and among fields will have sufficient materials to judge.

4.7 Items to be Considered at the time of Determining Judgment Result

Judgment to the Accreditation Criteria shall be objectively implemented based on the evaluation of Self-review Report, confirmed document or contents of interview at On-site Visit in principle therefore, the Evaluation Team Members shall especially take consideration on not making inappropriate “superior judgment” (making S judgment whereas item should be judged as W, or W or S judgment whereas item should be judged as D) based on inappropriate assumption or prediction. The reason why it is important to refrain from making “superior judgment” is such inappropriate judgment could be reversed into strict way at evaluation and coordination of the Evaluation Committee by Field or Evaluation and Accreditation Coordination Committee and could cause significant

disadvantage to the Program Operating Organization. It is possible for the Program Operating Organization to take necessary measures by submitting Report for Additional Explanation or Written Opposition or implementation of improvement or submission of Improvement Report if appropriate judgment was made based on the shortcomings pointed out at On-site Visit. If the shortcomings are not appropriately informed to the Program Operating Organization in appropriate period of time, the Program will miss opportunities to take measures against the shortcomings. Additionally, it is important for the Evaluation Panel to fully understand the Accreditation Criteria and its guide by careful reading not to make inappropriate “superior judgment” as a result of lack of confirmation of the items which supposed to be done due to lack of understanding of the Accreditation Criteria.

4.8 Point of View toward Benchmark

The Program is required to assure that the graduates meet “benchmark required by the society”. The benchmark should be appropriate with each level of education of bachelor or master expected in professionals and should be the level allowing international mutual recognition. The benchmark differs by each field and varies time to time. Therefore, it is difficult to specifically and clearly describe. So, the Evaluators determines and evaluate the relevance of the explanation on what basis the Program Operating Organization established benchmark at the time of establishing the learning outcomes or outcomes to be achieved by each course.

“Benchmark required by the society” which is required by the Accreditation Criteria indicates level of education appropriate to bachelor or master expected in professionals and the level allowing international mutual recognition. The Evaluation Team should determine the relevance of the benchmark established by the Program Operating Organization based on the understanding of actual condition of level of education that is provided by the Program Operating Organization and explanation of on what basis its level of education is established. The Evaluation Team shall understand the actual condition of level of education by comprehensive judgment of the learning outcomes and contents of the courses for students to achieve its learning outcomes, evaluation methods of degree of achievement or evaluation standard of each item of learning outcomes for individual course. The syllabus of major courses corresponding to each item of learning outcome, answer sheet of tests, evaluation methods and evaluation standard shall be the source of judgment in addition to the learning outcomes and

its explanation documents, Table 2 of Self-review Report. In the case if degree of achievement of the learning outcomes are evaluated other than courses its evaluation methods and evaluation standard could also be the source of judgment.

There are diverse examples of level of education which could be the reference of benchmark and the source to determine its appropriateness at the time of designing Learning Outcomes such as, the discipline-specific reference standards of the Science Council of Japan: (<http://www.scj.go.jp/ja/member/iinkai/daigakuhosyo/daigakuhosyo.html>(Japanese-ONLY)), core curricula of academic associations in Japan and abroad, and deliverables in Japan and abroad which are used as indicators in the field such as knowledge and skill items of qualification examinations related to the field. It is also helpful to refer to the contents and levels of representative textbooks in Japan and abroad, as well as levels of teaching materials and examination questions published on websites and other media by HEIs in Japan and abroad.

The Evaluation Team shall make maximum effort to confirm the appropriateness of benchmark by making opportunities to get sufficient explanation from the Program Operating Organization until the end of On-site Visit if the Evaluation Team could not judge appropriateness of explanation of benchmark provided by the Program Operating Organization. If the mutual agreement of understanding between the Evaluation Team and the Program Operating Organization has not reached at the end of On-site Visit, the Evaluation Team shall explain the gap in detail at Exit Meeting at On-site Visit and confirm it to the Program Operating Organization. The Evaluation Team Members shall report it on the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit), the Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) and the Evaluation Team Report.

4.9 Point of View of Evidential Document and Guideline for Preparation

Evidential documents are the source to determine the effectiveness and the feasibility of rules and systems set-up by the Program Operation Organization. It is the Program Operating Organization, in principle, it is the Program Operating Organization, in principle, to determine what kind of evidential documents will be provided based on its own decision. These evidential documents are also fundamental documents collected to be utilized for the implementation of continuous improvement as required by Criterion 4 and needed by the Program Operating Organization itself. Therefore, the Evaluation Panel should require sufficient explanation for level of recognition of importance or necessity of the

evidential documents to the Program Operating Organization, if determined as not sufficient. The Evaluation Panel shall search for common ground by requesting explanation which substitutes those evidential documents depending on necessity. The Evaluation Panel shall not make perfunctory determination based on with or without or lack of evidential documents. Therefore, the Evaluation Team is required to make final determination of level of problem for judging degree of accordance to the Accreditation Criteria from the holistic perspective. To avoid giving excessive load to the Program Operating Organization, the Evaluation Panel shall not request evidential documents on the learning outcomes more than the range of documents to be prepared by the Program Operating Organization prescribed as follows.

- (1) In principle, the Program Operating Organization is requested to prepare past two-year evidential documents (e.g. syllabus, academic record, tests and its answer sheets, report, production of student work, undergraduate thesis and master's thesis etc.) of courses which required for the evaluation of degree of achievement of the learning outcomes from the courses in all academic year of the program. However, it is acceptable if reasonable amount of documents have been provided so that the Evaluation Team is able to confirm the appropriate achievement of the learning outcomes. The program Operating Organization could primary decide "the course required for the evaluation of degree of achievement of the learning outcomes" by own judgment. However, it is required to include major courses as mentioned in Table 4 of Self-review Report. Also, in the case the achievements of learning outcomes other than courses are evaluated, the Program Operating Organization is required to prepare its evidential document depending of necessity.
- (2) The Program Operating Organization, in principle, is required to prepare representative sample of at least bottom-line academic records on the boundary of passing or failing since it is important for the Evaluation Team to confirm the assurance of benchmark by the Program Operating Organization. "Representative sample" here indicates academic records which are selected based on the determination of necessity to prove appropriate evaluation on degree of achievement of the course by the Program Operating Organization. It is preferred for the Program Operating Organization to organize bottom line academic records on the boundary of

passing or failing to be able to recognize easily if the Program Operating Organization prepares academic records other than those typical samples. Bottom line sample means for instance, if the Program has four levels of score “excellent, good, passing and failing”, the bottom line is “passing”. Even if the Program Operating Organization prepares only bottom-line academic records on the boundary of passing or failing, it is preferred for the Program Operating Organization to prepare some of academic records with good evaluation as a reference.

- (3) For courses that are commonly implemented for both JABEE and non JABEE students, the program operating organization may select the minimum passing score from among the scores of all students in the course, regardless of whether they are enrolled in the JABEE program or not, at its own discretion. However, in this case, the evaluation method and criteria must be the same for all students in the course, and the program must not set any additional condition for the assessment and evaluation of degree of achievement other than credit acquisition.
- (4) In the case the Program Operating Organization judges passing or failing by result of several or multiple tests or other, the Program Operating Organization shall clarify “how the result of those tests are considered for evaluation” and prepare major result of tests which are emphasized in evaluation.
- (5) In the Evaluation and Accreditation for the Category of Accreditation of Architectural and Architectural Engineering Education Programs at Bachelor and Master Level, The Program Operating Organization, in principle, should provide evidential documents (academic record, design and planning, assignment production, tests questions and answer sheets, report, undergraduate thesis and master’s thesis or design etc.) which are used to confirm benchmark achieved by the graduates by indicating three kinds of sample: highly achieved sample which indicates excellent outcomes of the Program, average sample which indicates middle level of benchmark, bottom line sample on the boundary of passing or failing.

If self-inspection and third-party evaluation are implemented so that each item of the accreditation criteria can be matched in the evaluation by other accreditation organizations, such as university evaluation, it is recommended from the perspective of reducing the burden of the evaluation to use the materials from such

evaluations. However, if JABEE Evaluation and Accreditation is used as the third-party evaluation required by other accreditation bodies, it is essential to avoid a roundabout citation relationship.

4.10 Method of Presentation of Evidential Documents

There are two ways of providing evidential documents: provide as attachments of Self-review Report and provide as documents which should be confirmed at On-site Visit. The former case applies attachments of Self-review Report which require as essential resource or other documents which require to be fully evaluated with sufficient time for backing up contents of description on the Self-review Report. The Program Operating Organization may just indicate URL of website of where referential information is posted. Document which should be confirmed at On-site Visit are either documents inappropriate to be attached with Self-review Report or documents with large quantity. The Program Operating Organization may attach only representative sample of attachments to the Self-review Report if the attachments are large quantity and may provide the whole documents at On-site Visit. Document which should be confirmed at On-site Visit could be either by paper form or electronic form unless it affects smooth implementation of the evaluation.

4.11 Proof of Degree of Achievement by Substantial Graduates

In order to confirm students' achievement of the learning outcomes at the time of completion of the program, the Evaluation Team shall evaluate with the evidential documents the degree of achievement of the learning outcomes of the students who have actually completed the program. For the case of newly established program applying for accreditation for which there is no actual graduates, the degree of achievement of the learning outcomes of Substantial Graduates shall be evaluated. Substantial Graduates mean past graduates, by whom the knowledge and abilities of the students at the time of completion of the program could be estimated. Namely, it indicates students who graduated with education as equivalent as the program applying for accreditation and were educated more than 70 to 80 % of knowledge and abilities required to complete the program. Evaluation shall be made by confirmation of whether substantial graduates approximately achieved the learning outcomes as set by the program applying for accreditation if the degree of achievement of the substantial graduates is evaluated. Confirmation on the achievement of the learning outcomes shall be made by requesting to the Program Operation Organization explanations based on

evidential documents showing the difference between education given to substantial graduates and education provided by the program applying for accreditation, and showing the level of influence of its difference over the achievement of the learning outcomes in terms of knowledge and abilities of the substantial graduates at the time of graduation compared to learning outcomes of the program applying for accreditation. In the case there are learning outcomes, which the substantial graduates have not achieved, the Evaluation Team shall also judge if they can approve substantial assurance for the achievement of the learning outcomes of the graduates by confirming whether appropriate measures to supplement part of outcomes have been taken.

4.12 Items to be Considered at Continuous Evaluation

In the case of Continuous Evaluation, for accurate and efficient evaluation, it is important for the Evaluation Team to evaluate the contents of the most recent evaluation, which evaluated for all Accreditation Criteria (New Evaluation, previous Continuous Evaluation and Evaluation by Changes) and confirm the contents of Final Evaluation Report for Interim Evaluation to understand preexisting shortcomings of the program.

4.13 Judgment on Large Category of Review Item

The judgment on large category of review item shall be, in principle, identical to the lowest judgment result of review items under the large category of review item ^(note 1). The Evaluation Team shall describe judgment results in Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit), Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) and Evaluation Team Report strictly in accordance with the principle as mentioned above. The Evaluation Panel shall clearly indicate comment and its reason of superior judgment in the "Remarks" column, if the Panel determine it is appropriate to make superior judgment ^(note 2) as described in the large category of review item by some reason. The case appropriate to make superior judgment is, for example, a case where the program has already been taking valid measures to supplement review item from the perspective on assurance of the learning outcomes which is judged as the lowest under the applicable large category of review item. Additionally, in terms of judgment on large category of review item in Interim Evaluation, in principle, should be identical to the lowest judgment result made in comprehension of review result of evaluation items evaluated in the applicable Interim Evaluation and result of previous evaluation out of all review items under the large category of review item. Judgment is not necessary for the large category

of review item, if there is no evaluation item under the large category of review item in the applicable Interim Evaluation.

(note 1): If the lowest judgment result of several review items in Criterion 2 are D, then the judgment of the large category of review in Criterion 2 should be D.

(note 2): If the Panel believes that, overall, it is appropriate to assign W instead of D to the large category of review, for example, in the above example.

4.14 Items to be Considered at Interim Evaluation

The Interim Evaluation is to implement evaluation and judgment for the review items (evaluation items) as designated by JABEE so it is not the evaluation to confirm only the “response” against the items pointed out in the previous evaluation. Namely, Self-review of the prescribed review items by the Program Operating Organization and evaluation and judgment by the Evaluation **Panel** shall be implemented to all the contents of the review items selected as the evaluation items. Evaluation shall be implemented by taking special consideration on contents as indicated in “remarks” in the previous evaluation.

Since academic year 2019, evaluation items for Interim Evaluation were those review items judged as “W” in the previous evaluation whereas, evaluation items prior to academic year 2018 were those review items judge as “W” and correlated “C”. Therefore, evaluation items of Interim Evaluation which will be implemented in and after the academic year 2019, “W” and correlated “C” determined based on evaluation prior to the academic year 2018 are still valid.

5 Items to be Considered and Point of View of Evaluation related to each Review Item

Understanding of each review item of Accreditation Criteria shall be in accordance with “Criteria Guide” as explained for the Evaluation. In addition, this section describes items to be considered and supplemental items of point of view of Evaluation.

5.1 Concreteness of the Learning Outcomes

The program is required to clearly indicate the degree of achievement and what are to be achieved by the students in terms of knowledge and abilities assured to be achieved at the completion of the program. If the learning outcomes themselves do not sufficiently show its concreteness, the Evaluation Team shall evaluate the curriculum in Criterion 2.1 and the Self-review Report and evidential documents

related to evaluation on degree of achievement in Criterion 3 also from the point of view of learning outcomes. By taking those measures, if the contents or level assuring the achievement of the learning outcomes has been judged as substantially clear, the Evaluation Team could evaluate for Criterion 1 based on assumption that the learning outcomes are reasonably in accordance with Criterion 1. However, the Evaluation Team shall point out that the expression of the learning outcomes lacks the concreteness and shall reflect it to the judgment.

5.2 Publicizing of the learning Outcomes

In Criterion 1, the leaning outcomes of the program and profile of the professionals to be fostered are required to be well defined, broadly publicize and to be made well-known to the students and faculty. Made well-known here does not mean requiring students and faculty to memorize them but expecting the students and faculty to understand the meaning of acquiring knowledge and abilities of the learning outcomes and implementing educational activities and learning with always keeping them in mind. In light of this purpose, On-site Visit shall evaluate the actual understanding.

5.3 Relation among each item of Criteria

It is required to implement education in line with the concept of (a) to (i) of knowledge and abilities in Criterion 1.2 and assure their outcomes as whole concept of the Accreditation Criteria. As to assure the learning outcomes of the program, it is required to appropriately relate and holistically implement by appropriately establishing the learning outcomes as expected in Criterion 1, the educational methods as expected in Criterion 2.1 as well as 2.2 and the evaluation of the learning outcomes as expected in Criterion 3. Therefore, whether the educational methods in Criterion 2 and the evaluation on achievement of leaning outcomes in Criterion 3 are appropriate in accordance with whole concept of Accreditation Criteria largely relies on the appropriateness of establishment of learning outcomes in Criterion 1. In the case the learning outcomes of the program is not appropriately established in accordance with Criterion 1, the educational methods or the evaluation on achievement of the learning outcomes established and implemented are off the concept of whole Accreditation Criteria from the perspective on requirements of Criterion 1. Also, in the case there is a problem in curriculum design or in evaluation methods in terms of educational methods, it could influence the adequacy of evaluation on achievement of learning outcomes implemented with whole concept of the Accreditation Criteria.

From all of above, it is required to consider the accordance of Criterion 1 namely, appropriate establishment of the learning outcomes for the judgment of Criteria 2.1, 2.2 and 3. It is also necessary to consider the accordance of Criterion 2.1 and 2.2 for the judgment of Criterion 3. It is required to holistically analyze the influence of the relation among each item of Criteria with whole concept of Accreditation Criteria.

5.4 Evaluation of Education on Engineering Design Ability

The fundamental of education on Engineering Design is to foster an ability to solve problems based on performance of various abilities expected in outcomes of professional education (hereinafter referred to as “comprehensive ability”). The Evaluation Team shall, after the confirmation of the range and the validity of benchmark of design ability which the program intends for students to acquire, confirm appropriate implementation and evaluation of the learning outcomes which assure the achievement of the learning outcomes with understanding the explanation of applicable section from the “Guide for Accreditation Criteria” and contents of items to be considered from Category and Discipline-specific Criteria. If the education to foster design ability is separately implemented in various courses, the Evaluation Team shall take account whether the program fosters the design ability to synthesize abilities acquired from each course. If education on design ability is implemented in undergraduate research or graduation research, the Evaluation Team shall confirm the scope of target of the design and whether the design ability is assured in relation to the knowledge and abilities of Criterion 1.2 and shall confirm implementation of appropriate evaluation on achievement of the learning outcomes established in relation to the design ability by the program. If several faculty members are in charge of implementation of education on design ability such as in undergraduate research or graduate research, the Evaluation Team shall confirm the educational method which allows any faculty to educate appropriate design ability.

5.5 Evaluation of Class Hours

The Category- and Discipline-specific Criteria related to the amount of education of the field vis-à-vis entire curriculum has also not been defined in the Accreditation Criteria (academic year 2019) and later. Therefore, evaluations based on these criteria should not be implemented. However, whether the structure of the curriculum is appropriate to achieve the Learning Outcomes and to produce professionals in the relevant field has been included in the Common

Criteria (2.1 after academic year 2019).

5.6 Handling of Credits which a Student of the Program earned in other Educational Institutions and of Credits which a transferred Student earned prior to Admission to the Program.

If the program accepts the transfer of credits and of result of courses (credits which a student of the program earned in other educational institutions, credits which a transferred student earned prior to admission to the program and result of outside examinations) as credits required to complete the program, the program shall define measures or methods of how to accept the credit transfer and shall provide explanation in accordance with the evaluation on degree of achievement of the learning outcomes of the program. In this case, if the degree of involvement in the achievement of Learning Outcomes is low, a detailed explanation is not necessary. On the other hand, if the degree of involvement in the achievement of Learning Outcome is high, the program shall clarify that the transferred credit is recognized as equivalent to a course the program provides based on the appropriate confirmation of the degree of achievement of courses provided outside the program. As to methods to confirm the degree of achievement, which the program assures for the courses outside the program, appropriate and realistic scope to confirm the consistency based on the educational outcomes or contents as described in syllabus, or results of the transfer examination is sufficient. It is not required for the Evaluation Team to force excessive burden to the Program Operating Organization such as to make them request answer sheets from other Educational Institutions for the confirmation. The Evaluation Team shall implement evaluation which emphasizes on substance of the program while considering the flexibility of the Program Operating Organization to demonstrate measures in various ways since there are various methods to confirm the degree of achievement, which the program assures for the courses outside the program.

5.7 Implementation of Syllabus-based Education

Criterion 2.2 requires implementation of syllabus-based education. This item requires the program to implement education as described in the syllabus. It is important that the program encourages active learning of the students. Therefore, it is allowed to implement education by making appropriate changes in the contents of course described in the syllabus taking consideration of the degree of student understanding. Therefore, it is favorable to make appropriate changes to syllabus which was prepared at the time of admission or distributed as handout prior to the

implementation of the courses. The Evaluation Team shall respect the program's various educational considerations for the implementation of the courses and evaluation methods and shall determine the validity of outcomes as mentioned in syllabus by taking account of actual condition from the perspective on how the program assures its outcomes.

5.8 Items to be Considered for Description of Judgment Result of Admission and Credit of the Students Moving into the Program

If the program defines specific methods to accept transferred students into the program or to evaluate methods of credit earned in other education institutions prior to admission to the program in terms of Criterion 2.4 and 3.1 but there are no practical examples not because of the responsibility of the program, the Evaluation Team shall make judgment of S, W, D to the appropriateness of the specific methods of admission of students moving into the program. If all students are automatically enrolled to the program at the time of admission, such as for the case the program is equivalent with whole department, so that there is no system to determine enrollment of the students to the program after the admission in terms of Criterion 2.4, or the program has neither system for students to transfer into the program nor system to approve transferred credit into the program and none of the specific methods are defined in terms of Criterion 2.4 and 3.1, those will not be applied to the evaluation items. Note that the Evaluation Team shall describe that the item is not applicable for the evaluation in the cell of evidence and findings.

5.9 Items to be Considered for Judgment on Admission, Course Registration, Admission of Transferred into or Moved into the Program (*This item of Evaluation Guide is not translated (not applicable)*)

5.10 Items to be Considered for Judgment Related to Students' Moving

"Students' Moving" in the Accreditation Criterion 2.4 does not specify criteria for transferring students from the program to another program. Therefore, Criterion 2.4 does not apply to the evaluation of the number of students transferred from the program to another program or the timing of such transfers. However, if the number of students transferred from the program to another program exceeds a reasonable level, it is considered that there is some problems in the operation of the program, and the program is judged based on Criterion 4 to see if the program is taking measures for improvement. Also, the Evaluation Team shall evaluate whether the procedure of moving into the program is defined and implemented while taking account of educational contents, which is provided after moving into

the program, for students to be able to achieve the learning outcomes for the case of moving into the applicable program from the other program.

5.11 Continuous Improvement

The program is required to implement continuous improvement based on self-review of education defined in Criterion 4 at the same time required to assure the outcomes of learning and education by the learning outcomes as established by the program. Educational improvement is recognized as an important factor from the perspective on assurance of the educational quality therefore the program which have the problems remaining unsolved for long period of time might have problem in review item related to the self-review of education or continuous improvement. If the program implements same education without revision for long period of time, the Evaluation Team shall confirm the result of the self-review of education which indicates any reasonable reasons of not updating the educational contents. The Evaluation Team shall respect measures implemented by the program for continuous improvement on daily basis as much as possible while considering the following from the perspective on smooth implementation of the educational improvement at the evaluation:

- (1) Whether the major parts of and fundamental concept of the learning outcomes are inherited and the consistency of the program is maintained and those are made understandable to the public,
- (2) Whether appropriate educational opportunities are provided to all students regardless of year of admission and appropriate evaluation on achievement of the learning outcomes are implemented in the process of continuous improvement.

6 Flow of Work and Items to be Considered by the Evaluation Panel

The Evaluation Panel shall follow “Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation”. This section indicates the point of view, supplemental explanation and items to be considered in accordance with flow of work of the Evaluation Panel described in the “Flow of Evaluation” of “Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation”. It is recommended to refer to “Attachment 2 Standard Task Schedule of the Evaluation Panel” at the foot of the document for the time flow of work of the Evaluation. It is also recommended to refer to “Attachment 3: On-site Visit Schedule” to set up the contents and schedule of the On-site Visit.

6.1 Coordination of Schedule and Request for Arrangements of On-site Visit with Higher Education Institution and/or Program Operating Organization

- (1) The Lead Evaluator shall consolidate the requests from all the Evaluation Team Members for the schedule of On-site Visit and for the arrangements of accommodation, transportation and meeting room and shall contact to the Higher Education Institution and/or Program Operating Organization as a focal point.
- (2) The Evaluation Panel Members shall confirm in advance the way to contact among the Panel Members, with the Higher Education Institution and/or Program Operating Organization and to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization (or JABEE) in an emergency case where an Evaluation Panel Member fails to participate in On-site Visit due to an unexpected event (sudden illness or accident) on the day of the On-site Visit. If the first day of On-site Visit drops on a holiday, the Evaluation Panel should be fully aware of difficulty to contact with the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization or JABEE.

6.2 Preparation for On-site Visit by the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit)

- (1) On-site Visit is implemented at a maximum of 2 to 3 days therefore the Evaluation Panel should note that the time is limited. Additionally, On-site Visit is important from the perspective to assure the learning outcomes by understanding actual condition including the learning outcomes and its related benchmark and interviewing the faculty and students. It is also important to spend as many hours as possible for the evaluations which could only be possible at the site of Educational Institution. So that it is expected to complete reviewing as many review items as possible for the Self-review Report during the correspondence with the Higher Education Institution and/or Program Operating Organization prior to the On-site Visit.
- (2) Prior to the On-site Visit, the Evaluation Panel shall sort “confirmed items of requirements of the Criteria” and “unconfirmed items of requirements of the Criteria” based on the contents of Self-Review Report by utilizing document sheets of “Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Visit” of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit). As regards “unconfirmed items of requirements of the Criteria” the Evaluation Team shall differentiate them into “support documents to be requested to submit Prior to the On-site Visit”, “Documents to be confirmed at On-site Visit

(referential documents for On-site Visit)” and “Interview Contents with Elucidator/Interviewee at the On-site Visit” as a confirmation method. Chair of the Evaluation Panel and Lead Evaluator shall consolidate Program Review Reports (prior to On-site Visit) which have been separately prepared by each Evaluation Team Members and send to the Higher Education Institution and/or Program Operating Organization within the period as prescribed and request necessary actions.

- (3) The Chair of the Evaluation Panel shall prepare the plan of On-site Visit by filling necessary items on the sheet of “Plan document for On-site Visit” based on the contents of “Response Form from the Program” of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit). The Chair shall give the same task number for confirmation of the same documents or things which could be confirmed by the same interview. Sorting the sheet by the task numbers, it allows the Evaluation Team to prepare the plan document so that the documents confirmation and the interviews at On-site Visit could see chronologically. The Lead Evaluator shall clarify each document confirmation or interview relates to which Review Items and shall efficiently implement the On-site Visit. Depending on the necessity, the Chair could add minimum extra courtesy interviews with the dean of faculty, the head of department or the president which are not directly linked to the evaluation of Review Items. Appendix 2 on the trailing paragraph indicates, for reference, the time schedule of On-site Visit and for a case where On-site Visit could be shortened into 2 days and 1 night. The duration necessary for On-site Visit shall be decided by taking consideration on the volume of documents and interviews and the time needed for its confirmation and the transport to the educational institution.
- (4) Among the Evaluation Team Members and between the Chair of Evaluation Panel shall share the information on the process of preparing Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit). The Evaluation Team shall submit Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) for sharing information if directed by Evaluation Committee by Field or JABEE. Additionally, if multiple programs are evaluated in the same year at the same educational institution, the Evaluation Team shall share the information with other Evaluation Teams in accordance with direction of Evaluation Committee by Fields or JABEE.

6.3 Preparation of the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit)

- (1) The Lead Evaluator shall complete Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) except items which could not be determined until making confirmation at On-site Visit.
- (2) The Lead Evaluator shall finalize the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) by adding judgment results and revised results of judgment made before the On-site Visit depending on necessity based on the contents confirmed at On-site Visit.
- (3) The Chair of Evaluation Panel and the Lead Evaluator shall prepare, based on the judgment results prior to the On-site Visit, a draft of Executive Summary which will be read out at the Exit Meeting at On-site Visit.

6.4 Confirmation and Interview at On-site Visit

- (1) The Evaluation Team shall constantly add notes of judgment results and its evidence on the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) based on the items confirmed with its accordance to the Accreditation Criteria by confirming documents at On-site Visit or having interviews with the related party. The Evaluation Team shall further continue confirmation to the items which could not be sufficiently confirmed yet with its accordance to the Accreditation Criteria. Regarding the result of consideration for these items, the Evaluation Team shall describe judgment results in a rather strict way (in addition to the Self-review Report, the contents of documents which could be confirmed at that moment and the results of judgment made only based on interviews). The Evaluation Team shall never give lenient judgment by assuming that documents will be confirmed afterwards. It may lead missing or forgetting the confirmation later on.
- (2) The Evaluation Team shall take the behavioral record of items confirmed at On-site Visit or the contents of interviews for the preparation for the Evaluation Team Report.
- (3) Interviews with students are implemented to confirm the actual status of items which students need to be aware of are made well-known to them. The interviews shall be implemented efficiently by clarifying the items need to be confirmed in advance such as what to confirm related to which review items. It is not required for the Evaluation Team to have interviews with the graduates if the interviews with the current students are sufficient. It is preferred to have group interviews such as a set of groups of interviewees and group of Evaluation Team or the Panel to get accurate information by

reducing sense of tension of the students. The faculty of the Program Operating Organization is not, in principle, accepted to be present at the interviews with students. The Evaluation Team shall not undertake oral test on the degree of achievement of the students (refer "Prohibited matter at the Evaluation and Accreditation").

- (4) For the interviews the dean of faculty, head of department, faculty members and staff, the Evaluation Team shall clarify the purposes of interviews such as what to confirm related to which review items. The interviews would be ideally implemented separately to get honest opinions of each. It is also effective to implement interviews with more faculty by dividing the Evaluation Panel or the Team into several small groups.

6.5 Items to be Considered to Fill in the Program Review Report (Exit Interview at On-site Visit)

- (1) The Evaluation Team shall describe judgment results, the basis and remarks in detail in each review item of the Program Review Report.
 - Description in "Basis" column
Regardless of Judgement Result, describe the documents on which the judgement was based and items at On-site Visit. The standard format for completing the form can be found in the "Program Review Report and Evaluation Report" form (Excel file).
 - Description in "Remarks" column
Describe the problems and findings for improvement based on the rationale provided in the "Basis" column. Also note remarkable item such as particularly outstanding efforts. The standard format for completing the form can be found in the "Program Review Report and Evaluation Report" form (Excel file).
- (2) The description of the basis of judgment for the Program Review Report shall be detailed and specific enough for the third party to be able to make verification of judgment result afterwards.
- (3) If the Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation Team have not reached mutual understanding in the case the Program Operating Organization could not provide sufficient explanation or evidence to meet the Accreditation Criteria, the Evaluation Team shall provide information on the opinions and reasons of both the Program Operating Organization and the

Evaluation Team in detail in the column of “remarks” for the applicable review items on the Program Review Report. And the Program Review Report will be provided for the source of decision making at the coordination and discussion within the field and among the fields. If the Evaluation Team wishes to determine that it is reasonable to make superior judgment of Large Category of Review, it shall describe its rationale in the “remarks” column in detail to be able to coordinate and discuss validity of its proposal.

6.6 Exit Meeting at On-site Visit

- (1) The Evaluation Team hands in Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) to the Higher Education Institution and the Program Operating Organization and read out the Executive Summary for the conclusion of the Evaluation activity. The primary reason why the Executive Summary shall only be read at the Exit Meeting at On-site Visit to the Higher Education Institution and the Program Operating Organization is that it is not necessary reflecting final result of the evaluation since the contents of Executive Summary is not more than opinion of the Evaluation Panel at the completion of On-site Visit so it should not be left in an official form and information provided by the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) includes enough information for the Higher Education Institution and the Program Operating Organization to take measures after the On-site Visit. Therefore, the program does not need Executive Summary in paper. Based on its concept, when the Executive Summary is read out the, it is prohibited for the Higher Education Institution and the Program Operating Organization to record or videotape it except taking memos.
- (2) The Chair of the Evaluation Panel shall explain that the contents of Executive Summary or Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) are based on the judgment of the Evaluation Panel at the completion of On-site Visit only and it is not necessarily the final version to the Program Review Report. The Chair of the Evaluation Panel shall also explain the process of modification of Program Review Report by taking account of Report for Additional Explanation, Written Opposition and Improvement Report and of the process of accreditation or non-accreditation through the coordination by fields and harmonization among fields within JABEE in accordance with “Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation”, if necessary. At the exit meeting, Chair of the Evaluation Panel shall explain the rules and

procedures objectively and shall refrain from referring to any prejudgment of the Evaluation Panel or final determination on accreditation or non-accreditation.

6.7 Correspondence with the Program Operating Organization after the On-site Visit and Report of Evaluation Result to the Evaluation Committee by Field

- (1) The Evaluation Team shall, after discussing within the Evaluation Panel and the Team, take necessary measures in accordance with procedures as described in “Rules & Procedures for the Evaluation and Accreditation” if Report for Additional Explanation for the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) or Written Opposition or Improvement Report for the Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) is submitted by the Program Operating Organization.
- (2) If the Evaluation Team reflects the contents as described on the Improvement Report to the evaluation result, the Evaluation Team shall make comprehensive determination in examining the time required for the expected substantial improvement or in judging whether the effectiveness of improvement will cover the final year students at the year of evaluation. Improvement for the learning outcomes, implementation of education and evaluation of education could be achieved and function only after the improvement of rules or systems are in effect. Therefore, in general, taking immediate remedies right after the evaluation could not completely and sufficiently solve the deficiencies or weakness. On the contrary, for facilities, immediate remedies to the improvement could be effective. The Evaluation Team shall note the fact that the final year students of the year of evaluation would be the graduates of the Program if the Program under the Evaluation is accredited. Therefore, the Evaluation Team shall determine whether the effectiveness of the improvement covers the graduates of the program in the year of Evaluation. Items needed to be communicated to the Program regarding judgment of the Evaluation Team for the contents as described in the Improvement Report shall be described in the “remarks” column of applicable review item in the Evaluation Team Report.
- (3) If the Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation Team have not reached mutual understanding even having communications after On-site Visit, the Evaluation Team shall deliver information of the opinions and reasons of Both the Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation

Team in the Evaluation Team Report in detail, which allows coordination by the Evaluation Committee by Field or JABEE Evaluation & Accreditation Coordination Committee.

- (4) The Evaluation Team should save documents related to the Evaluation under strict confidentiality in an organized way to respond to future inquiries of Evaluation Result or Contents of Evaluation Team Report by the Evaluation Committee by Field.

6.8 After completing Activities as the Evaluation Panel

- (1) The Evaluation Panel Members shall keep all the written Evaluation Related documents such as, Self-review Report, Support Documents, Report for Additional explanation, documents acquired at the On-site Visit and Program Review Report or Evaluation Report prepared during On-site Visit, until the period as prescribed and completely dispose those documents by the date and methods as prescribed by JABEE or the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.
- (2) The Evaluation Team Members shall report to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization that they have done in accordance with the methods as prescribed after completing the process of item (1) above.

7 Items to be considered for the description of Review Reports

7.1 Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit/ Post On-site Visit), Evaluation Report

The following points should be noted in describing the judgment result (S, W, D) for each Review Item of the Accreditation Criteria, and the "Basis" and "Remarks" columns.

- (1) Description in "Basis" column
 - Briefly describe, such as by itemization, basis of judgment for all the review items regardless of judgment result (S, W, D).
- (2) Description in "Remarks" column
 - Describe things noteworthy or improvement is desirable if there is any for the review item with S judgement and note "N/A" if there is not any.
 - Specific and in simple way, describe the reason of judgement and problems as for the review items with W or D judgement.

- For the Interim Evaluation, summarize and transcribe the shortcomings which were indicated in “Evaluation Result” of the previous evaluation in the beginning of description of each evaluation item. Summarize the contents in case of lack of description space. Also, describe “remarks from previous evaluation” and “evaluation results of this time” with headline by sorting into the separate line.
- Express reasons of judgment as objective as possible by referring the explanation of the Accreditation Criteria mentioned in publicized documents such as “JABEE Criteria for Accreditation of Professional Education Programs” and “JABEE Criteria Guide” to be in accordance with concept of the Accreditation Criteria.
- The judgment results shall be based solely on the documents or facts confirmed at the time of determination. The Evaluation Team shall strictly refrain from making “superior judgment” based on documents or facts which may be provided later or with any expectation or prediction.
- Describe the expression of reason depending on types of judgment result is as follows:

S (Satisfy)

Case with no Remarks:

In the case of Interim Evaluation

- XX is in accordance with YY by ZZ
- XX meets YY by ZZ

Describe “N/A” if there is no particular point to mention besides case of Interim Evaluation.

Case with Remarks:

- improvement is expected for XX by YY
- Have concern on XX by YY by ZZ

W (Weakness)

XX is not sufficient and expected to improve by YY.

XX is expected to improve by YY,

D (Deficiency)

XX clearly does not exist by YY

XX is not in accordance with Accreditation Criteria by YY.

Have defect on XX by YY,

(N/A)

Evaluation item does not apply by YY.

(3) Other

- For the Large Category of Review, fill out the judgment result in accordance with the principle (S, W, D) based on the recognition of judgment result of relating items. If the Evaluation Team considers its judgment result made to Large Category of Review differs from the general rules above, it shall specifically describe judgment result and its rationale in the “remarks” column.
- The column of “Opinion of the Evaluation Team” in the Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) is a space where enables the Evaluation Team to summarize the result of evaluation and describe the issue which the Evaluation Team would like to convey the most to the Program, to the Evaluation Committee by Field or to the evaluation and Accreditation Coordination Committee such as, “outstanding point of the Program” or “Major issues of the program”. The evaluation Team may also comment on referential opinions. Items described in this column shall be communicated to the Program by the Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) and reflected as “additional remarks” to the Final Evaluation Report if necessary.
- the column of “Written Opposition/ Improvement Report and its countermeasures” in the Evaluation Team Report is the place where enables the Evaluation Team to describe the contents of Written Opposition or Improvement Report vis-à-vis comment to those reports. The Evaluation Team shall also describe countermeasures and its basis to the Written Opposition or the Improvement Report in the “Remarks” of applicable review item.

7.2 Executive Summary

Executive Summary shall be prepared with the following structure as standard. The Chair of Evaluation Panel and/or the Lead Evaluator shall, first of all, appreciate the strengths of the Program Operating Organization and then comprehensively indicate items which do not meet Accreditation Criteria or items which require improvement. Indication or comments which are not appropriate to be mentioned in specific column of review item in the Program Review Report could be included in the Executive Summary. It is not necessary to redundantly mention the judgment results, “Basis” and “Remarks” for each item of the Criteria

in the Executive Summary since those items are already included in the Program Review Report which is handed in to the Program at the exit meeting of the On-site Visit.

- Gratitude for the efforts to educational improvement and for the cooperation for JABEE Evaluation by the Program Operating Organization
- Strengths of the Higher Education Institution and the Program
- Comprehensive indication on problems of the Higher Education Institution and the Program vis-a-vis the Accreditation Criteria
- Following procedures (e.g. Allowed to submit Report for Additional Explanation within 1 week after the On-site Visit)

In the case of an Evaluation Panel consisting of several Evaluation Teams, the Chair of Evaluation Panel first acknowledges the institution, lists the outstanding efforts of the institution as a whole, and reports on common areas. Each Lead Evaluator should then report on the program and finally, the Chair of Evaluation Panel should provide an explanation of the procedures to be followed.

8 Prohibited Matters at the Evaluation

- Shall not Test on the Students at Interview
Verbal Examination to directly check the degree of achievement must not be implemented on students at the interview. It is responsibility of the Program Operating Organization to evaluate and to assure the degree of achievement of the students, therefore, the Evaluator shall determine whether the Program Operating Organization is appropriately implementing evaluation and assurance throughout the Evaluation activity.
- Shall not Separately Contact with the Program Operating Organization except Chair of the Evaluation Panel or the Lead Evaluator

The Chair of the Evaluation Panel or the Lead Evaluator shall consolidate requests for support documents prior to the On-site Visit or arrangement of accommodation and contacts to the Higher Education Institution and/ or the Program Operating Organization. The Evaluation Team Members shall not separately contact to the Program Operating Organization. This is to avoid confusion of information and to decrease burden of the Higher Education Institution and the Program Operating Organization. Also, it is important in a

way to keep transparency of the evaluation process.

- Shall not Contact with the Program Operating Organization Unofficially
The Evaluation Panel or its members should avoid informal contact and communication with the Higher Education Institution and/ or Program Operating Organization regarding the evaluation other than official communication through On-site Visit and Program Review Report as defined in "Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation" and the communication implemented under the direction of JABEE or the Evaluation Committee by Field, as it may raise doubts in terms of ensuring transparency of the evaluation.
- Evaluation Panel and/or the Evaluation Team shall not Request Documents not Related to the Judgment
When requesting support documents prior to On-site Visit or requesting new documents to be confirmed at On-site Evaluation, only those documents that are essential for determining accordance of the Accreditation Criteria shall be requested, so as not to place an unnecessary burden on the Higher Education Institution or The Program Operating Organization. If support documents are requested after the submission of Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit), the Evaluation Team shall provide the Program with explanations of why and for which review items require those support documents. The Higher Education Institution and the Program Operating Organization could refuse requests if clear explanations are not provided.
- No Recording and Videotaping
Recording and videotaping of the conversations at On-site Visit are prohibited both to the Higher Education Institution/ Program Operation Organization and to the Evaluation Panel/ Team. The reason why these are prohibited is to avoid causing unnecessary confusion by its recoded media to be released even if the discussion and judgment made during On-site Visit are just temporary decision and they could be changed in the process of discussion and coordination later on. Photo shooting is allowed within limited occasion and situation. Photo shooting is not permitted for Higher Education Institution or the Program Operating Organization that would identify individuals such as evaluators or leave specific details of the Evaluation Method. When the Evaluation Panel takes photographs, it is permitted to do so under the responsibility of the Chair of Evaluation Panel, provided that the photographs are limited to the minimum

content necessary as the basis for judgment against the Accreditation Criteria.

- No Advice and Direction

The task of the Evaluation Panel is to judge whether the program which applied for Evaluation meets Accreditation Criteria or not, therefore, the Evaluation Panel shall refrain from giving advice or direction to the program. It is necessary to reach common ground between the Evaluation Panel and the Higher Education Institution and/or the Program Operating Organization through repeated discussions if sufficient explanation or evidence of satisfying the Accreditation Criteria is not provided. This is meant to provide the Higher Education Institution and/or the Program Operating Organization with sufficient opportunities to explain to the Evaluation Panel until all the questions, which the Evaluation Panel has raised, have clarified. Therefore, the Evaluation Panel is permitted to explain the concept or point of view of Accreditation Criteria unless they give specific direction of what must be done to the Program Operating Organization.

- Shall not Overburden the Program Operating Organization for Accommodation Arrangement

As it is explained in item 2.6, the Evaluation Panel shall not cause burden of expense related to the Evaluation to the Program Operating Organization not more than the fee as prescribed for the evaluation. Also, it is required to take consideration on not causing extra burden to the Program Operating Organization other than monetary expense. For example, it is reasonable to request information on accommodation to the Program Operating Organization in terms of selecting hotel, however, it is still required for the Evaluation Panel to minimize burden to the Program Operation Organization.

- Shall Refrain from Making Unnecessary and Unofficial Comments

The Evaluation Panel shall not make unnecessary and unofficial comments to the Education Institution and the Program Operating Organization related to the Evaluation during On-site Visit and prior to and Post On-site Visit. Especially prediction on the final Accreditation or Non-accreditation and prediction on the coordination, which will be made by the Fields or JABEE are strictly prohibited, since those might cause unnecessary confusion. Candidate for Evaluator is not permitted to make any comments to the Program Operating Organization, including comment to the faculty members, to the students and to the graduates during the interview.

- Shall not Change Document Format of Program Review Report and Evaluation Report

Use the prescribed Excel File, which is applicable to the academic year, downloaded from JABEE website for preparation and submission of Program Review Report and Evaluation Report without change. Fully confirm to choose and use an appropriate format of applicable Category of Accreditation as prepared separately. Changing the format of Program Review Report and Evaluation Report at the time of submission causes significant adverse effect to confirm consistency of evaluation result by operating excel file with other programs therefore, the Evaluation Panel shall strictly refrain from changing the format. However, the Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Visit – FOR EVALUATOR-) is a form to be used within the Evaluation Panel therefore, it may be modified accordingly. Evaluation Panel may change Program Review Report and/or Evaluation Report into working file for internal use however, the file should be a completely separate file from the one used for submission.

List of Referential Documents

Referential documents related to the tasks of the Evaluation Team and documents related to rules for JABEE are as follows.

The Evaluation Team Members shall read carefully and fully understand the contents prior to the evaluation.

- JABEE Fundamental Framework for Accreditation of Professional Education Programs
- JABEE Common Criteria for Accreditation of Professional Education Programs
- JABEE Criteria Guide for Accreditation of Professional Education Programs
- JABEE Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation
- Guideline for Conducting Evaluation of the Programs in the Same Higher Education Institution
- JABEE Standard for Formation of the Evaluation Panel
- JABEE Standard for Formation of the Evaluation Team (Simultaneous Evaluation Method)
- JABEE Ethical Code for Evaluators
- Reminder for the Individuals Related to Evaluation and Accreditation (Confidentiality)
- Guideline for Reimbursement of Expense Related to the Evaluation
- Administrative Instructions for Usage, Archive and Termination of the Evaluation Documents

Attachment 1 Standard Task Schedule of the Evaluation Team

Following are the standard task schedule of the Evaluation Team. It is recommended for the Lead Evaluator and the Evaluation Team Members to use following sheet as checklist in order to prevent missing task.

- Standard task schedule implemented with On-site Visit (apply to all cases except Interim Evaluation implemented without On-site Visit)

Period	Contents of Task	Fill in the date of completion
Beginning of May to End of May	Correspond to the participation request made by the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization	
Middle of June to End of June	Receive letter of appointment and make necessary administrative procedure at affiliated school or work place (Due to the administrative procedure, evaluation activities may be started in the case of delay in publishing letter of appointment)	
	The Chair of Evaluation Panel confirms communication method of evaluation related information by contacting all Member of the Evaluation Panel.	
	The Chair of Evaluation Panel decides date of On-site Visit by confirming and coordinating Program Operating Organization and all Members of the Evaluation Team (Note: In the case of Evaluation Panel consisting of multiple Evaluation Teams, this task is usually not necessary since the date of implementation has already been determined).	
	The Chair of Evaluation Panel notifies date of On-site Visit to all the Evaluation Panel Members, Person in-charge of JABEE Matter, Person in-charge of the Program and the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	In the case of an Evaluation Panel consisting of a single Evaluation Team, the Lead Evaluator (who also serves the Chair of Evaluation Panel) shall appoint a Deputy Chair of Evaluation Panel from among the Sub-evaluators.	
Beginning of July	Receive Self-review Report	
	The Chair of Evaluation Panel confirms receipt of Self-review Report by all the Evaluation Panel Members.	

	The Chair of Evaluation Panel requests preparing "Unconfirmed items and Arrangement Requests" worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit –FOR EVALUATOR-) based on careful reading of the Self-review Report to all the Evaluation Panel Members and send it to the Lead Evaluator 8-weeks prior to the On-site Visit.	
July to August	The Chair of or the Evaluation Panel Members participate JABEE Evaluator Training Seminar of the applied academic year and share information acquired within the Evaluation Panel.	
8 weeks prior to the On-site Visit	The Chair of Evaluation Panel requests information regarding accommodation and meeting room during On-site Visit to the Person in-charge of JABEE Matter and/or the Person in-charge of the Program and makes arrangements based on the coordination with the Evaluation Panel Members.	
	The Chair of Evaluation Panel receives "Unconfirmed items and Arrangement Requests" worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit – FOR EVALUATOR-) from all the Evaluation Panel Members.	
6 weeks prior to the On-site Visit	The Lead Evaluator shall compile the contents including Items required by Criteria unable to confirm, Items requested for Support Documents, Documents to be Confirmed at On-site Visit and Interviewee at the On-site Visit to the "Unconfirmed Items and Requests for Arrangements" worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit – FOR EVALUATOR-) prepared by all members of the Evaluation Team and the Lead Evaluator, and send it to the Chair of Evaluation Panel and the Person in-charge of the Program. The Lead Evaluator requests the Person in-charge of the Program to describe arrangement status of requested documents or interviewees on the "Response Sheet" of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) and to send them back 4 weeks prior to the On-site Visit and to send back support documents 3 weeks prior to the On-site Visit if possible.	
	For Evaluation Panel consisting of multiple Evaluation Teams, The Chair of the Evaluation Panel describes common items apply to all Evaluation Teams, including Items required by Criteria unable to confirm, Items requested for Support Documents, Documents to be Confirmed at On-site Visit and Interviewee at the On-site Visit to the "Unconfirmed Items and Requests for Arrangements" worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit –FOR EVALUATOR-) and send it to the Person in-charge of JABEE Matter 6 weeks prior to the On-site Visit. The Chair of the Evaluation Panel requests the Person in-charge of JABEE Matter to describe	

	<p>arrangement status of requested documents or interviewees on the "Response Sheet" of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) and to send them back 4 weeks prior to the On-site Visit and to send back support documents 3 weeks prior to the On-site Visit if possible. Communication between the Chair of the Evaluation Panel and the Person in-charge of JABEE Matter shall be shared among all Evaluation Teams.</p>	
	<p>The Chair of Evaluation Panel determines whether it is possible to shorten the duration of On-site Visit to 2 days and 1 night at this moment, fixes the dates in consultation with the Person in-charge of JABEE matter and informs the Lead Evaluator. The Lead Evaluator shall notify the final dates of On-site Visit to the Evaluation Team Members and the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.</p>	
4 weeks prior to the On-site Visit	<p>The Chair of Evaluation Panel and the Lead Evaluator receive response sheet of Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) from the Person in-charge of JABEE matter and Person In-charge of the Program.</p>	
	<p>The Chair of Evaluation Panel and the Lead Evaluator shall review the contents of the "Response" worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit), and fill in the documents to be confirmed during the On-site Visit, draft content of the interview and expected interviewees, and the estimated time for each Evaluation Item to be worked on in the "On-site Visit Plan" worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit), then send the completed worksheet to all members of the evaluation panel, requesting them to communicate their opinions no later than three weeks prior to the On-site Visit. The Lead Evaluator shall prepare the On-site Visit Plan of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) based on the opinions from the Sub-evaluators and Candidates for Evaluator, and send it to the Chair of Evaluation Panel.</p>	
3 weeks prior to the On-site Visit	<p>The Chair of Evaluation Panel and the Lead Evaluator receive support documents which could be send prior to the On-site Visit from the Person in-charge of JABEE matter and Person In-charge of the Program.</p>	
2 weeks prior to the On-site Visit	<p>The Chair of Evaluation Panel completes On-site Visit Plan Worksheet of Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) by taking consideration of comments from each Lead Evaluator and of support documents sent from the Program Operating Organization.</p>	

	<p>If The Lead Evaluator determines it is possible to shorten the duration of On-site Visit to 2 days and 1 night, fix the dates in consultation with the Person in-charge of JABEE matter or the Person in-charge of the Program and inform it to the Lead Evaluator. The Lead Evaluator shall notify the finalized dates of On-site Visit to the all members of Evaluation team and the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.</p>	
	<p>The Chair of Evaluation Panel prepares the time schedule of On-site Visit based on the On-site Visit Plan Worksheet of Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) and sends it to the Person in-charge of JABEE matter or the Person in-charge of the Program and the all members of Evaluation Panel and ask confirmation and comments. The Chair of Evaluation Panel shall prepare the modified version if there is any comment.</p>	
	<p>The Lead Evaluator prepares in advance a draft of the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) and Executive Summary based on understanding of Self-review Report, Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) and support documents sent from the Program Operating Organization. The Chair of the Evaluation Panel prepares in advance a draft of the Executive Summary which covers evaluation result of all programs under the Panel based on the evaluation status of each program. All of the information shall be shared with all members of Evaluation Panel.</p>	
1 week prior to the On-site Visit	<p>The Chair of the Evaluation Panel makes final confirmation of the time schedule for On-site Visit with the Person in-charge of JABEE matter or the Person in-charge of the Program and all members of Evaluation Panel.</p>	
	<p>The Chair of the Evaluation Panel confirm and communicates the way to contact among the Evaluation Panel Members and transportation process.</p>	
On-site Visit		
1 week after the On-site Visit	<p>All members of Evaluation Teams submit reimbursement form of expense incurred at On-site Visit to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization. In the case of Chair and Deputy Chair of the Evaluation Panel who are dispatched by JABEE, submit reimbursement form of expense incurred at On-site Visit to JABEE.</p>	
1 week after the On-site Visit	<p>The Chair of Evaluation Panel and/or Lead Evaluator receives Report for Additional explanation. Make final Confirmation of submission to the Program Operating Organization if it has not submitted yet.</p>	

Approximately 2 weeks after the On-site Visit	The Evaluation Team(s) and the Chair of the Evaluation Panel determine correspondence to Report for Additional explanation if submitted by the Program Operating Organization based on the discussion among the Evaluation Panel Members.	
2 weeks after the On-site Visit	The Lead Evaluator prepares Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) based on the consultation among all the Evaluation Team Members and the Chair of Evaluation Panel and sends it where as prescribed.	
4 weeks after the On-site Visit	The Chair of Evaluation Panel and/or Lead Evaluator receives Written Opposition or Improvement Report. Make final Confirmation of submission to the Program Operating Organization if it has not submitted yet.	
Approximately 6 weeks after the On-site Visit	The Lead Evaluator determines correspondence to the Witten Opposition or Improvement Report if submitted by the Program Operating Organization based on the discussion among the Evaluation Team Members and the Chair of Evaluation Panel.	
6 weeks after the On-site Visit	The Lead Evaluator prepares Evaluation Team Report based on the consultation among all the Evaluation Team Members and the Chair of Evaluation Panel and sends it where as prescribed.	
Beginning of January to Middle of January	The Lead Evaluator attends Evaluation Committee by Field if requested and explains Evaluation Results of the program evaluated.	
	The Lead Evaluator responds to inquiries from the Evaluation Committee by Field.	
Beginning of February	The Chair of Evaluation Panel (except when the Evaluation Panel consists of a single Evaluation Team) shall attend the Evaluation and Accreditation Coordination Committee meetings at the request of said committee to explain the results of the evaluation of the multiple programs for which The Chair of Evaluation Panel is responsible.	
From the date of Accreditation Commission of the applicable academic year for Evaluation to end date of the term of the evaluator appointment	The Evaluation Panel Members shall keep all the written Evaluation Related documents such as, Self-review Report, Support Documents, Report for Additional explanation, documents acquired at the On-site Visit and Program Review Report prepared during On-site Visit or Evaluation Report as confidential documents, until the period as prescribed and completely dispose those documents by the date and methods as prescribed by JABEE or the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	After above process is completed, the Evaluation Panel Members report the details of termination to JABEE or the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	

■ Standard task schedule implemented without On-site Visit (Apply some of Interim Evaluation)

Period	Contents of Task	Fill in the date of completion
Beginning of May to End of May	Correspond to the participation request made by the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization	
Beginning to June to End of June	Receive letter of appointment and make necessary administrative procedure at affiliated school or work place (Due to the administrative procedure, evaluation activities may be started in case of delay in issuance of letter of appointment)	
	The Lead Evaluator (hold post of the Chair of the Evaluation Panel concurrently) confirms communication method of Evaluation related information by contacting all Member of the Evaluation Team.	
	The Lead Evaluator is communicated by the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization about Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation as prescribed	
	The Lead Evaluator informs date of submission of Document Evaluation and Comprehensive time schedule until date of submission of Document Evaluation to all the Evaluation Team Members and Program Operating Organization.	
Beginning of July	The Evaluation Team Members receive Self-review Report.	
	The Lead Evaluator confirms that all the Evaluation Team Members received Self-review Report.	
	The Lead Evaluator requests preparing “Unconfirmed Items and Arrangement Requests” worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit –FOR EVALUATOR-) based on careful reading of the Self-review Report to all the Evaluation Team Members (No need to prepare items related to the On-site Visit) and sends it to the Lead Evaluator.	
July to August	The Lead Evaluator or the Evaluation Team Members participate JABEE Evaluator Training Seminar of the applied academic year and share information acquired within the Evaluation Team.	
Approximately, 9 weeks prior to the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator receives “Unconfirmed Items and Arrangement Requests” worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit –FOR EVALUATOR-) from the all members of Evaluation Team.	
Approximately, 8 weeks prior to the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator organizes contents of “Unconfirmed Items and Arrangement Requests” worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit –FOR EVALUATOR-) which are	

	prepared by all the Evaluation Team Members, items could not confirm satisfying the Criteria, items requested for support documents to the “Unconfirmed Items and Arrangement Requests” worksheet of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Visit –FOR EVALUATOR-) and sends it to the Program Operating Organization. The Lead Evaluator requests the Program Operating Organization to describe arrangement status of requested documents on the “Response Sheet” of the Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) and to send it back 4 weeks prior to the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation.	
Approximately, 4 weeks prior to the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator receives worksheet of “response sheet” of Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) and support document from Program Operating Organization.	
Approximately, 2 weeks prior to the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator prepares draft of Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) by taking consideration on contents of worksheet of “response sheet” of Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit) and support document and sends it to all the Evaluation Team Members and requests for their feedback.	
Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator completes the Program Review Report (Post On-site Visit) by taking consideration on feedback received from all the Evaluation Team Members and sends it to where as prescribed based on the consultation among all the Evaluation Team Members.	
2 weeks after the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator receives Written Opposition or Improvement Report. Make final Confirmation of submission to the Program Operating Organization if it has not submitted yet.	
Approximately 4 weeks after the submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator determines correspondence to the Witten Opposition or Improvement Report if submitted by the Program Operating Organization based on the discussion among the Evaluation Team Members.	
4 weeks after the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Lead Evaluator prepares Evaluation Team Report based on the consultation among all the Evaluation Team Members and sends it where as prescribed.	
Beginning of January to Middle of January	The Lead Evaluator attends Evaluation Committee by Field if requested and explain Evaluation Results of the program evaluated.	
	The Lead Evaluator responds to inquiries from the Evaluation Committee by Field.	

From the date of Accreditation Commission of the academic year applied for Evaluation to expiration date of designation of Evaluator	The Evaluation Team Members shall keep all the written Evaluation Related documents such as, Self-review Report, Support Documents, Program Review Report prepared during On-site Visit or Evaluation Report as confidential documents, until the period as prescribed and completely dispose those documents by the date and methods as prescribed by the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	After above process is completed, the Evaluation Team Members report the details of termination to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	

Attachment 2 On-site Visit Schedule (Reference)

The following is an example of schedule for On-site Visit (in the case of two days and one night On-site Visit). Term and contents of On-site Visit largely relied on number of and contents of items which could not confirm the status of accordance to Accreditation Criteria therefore, evaluators should make effort to maximize number of review items which completed confirmation prior to the On-site Visit by effectively utilizing correspondence with program through Program Review Report (prior to On-site Visit). It is recommended for the Evaluation Panel to make the most efficient evaluation schedule and to implement On-site Visit at the shortest possible schedule to confirm review items left as unconfirmed. Additionally, time to start or to end On-site Visit relied on time required for moving to the educational institution therefore, it should be considered when fixing schedule of On-site Visit.

Day 1

12:00 - 13:00 (Lunch)	Meeting among the Evaluation Panel (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirmation of the schedule and contents of On-site Visit - - Information sharing among the Evaluation Members for items to be considered for the evaluation of this year
13:00 - 13:30	Plenary Meeting among the Evaluation Panel, Higher Education Institution and program-involved party. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of members - Remarks from head of Faculty, head of graduate school and Person in Charge of the Program - Remarks from The Chair of the Evaluation Panel and The Lead Evaluator - General description of Higher Education Institution and the program by the Person in Charge of JABEE Matter and the Person in Charge of the Program
13:30 - 14:30	Interview with program-involved party (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final confirmation of the schedule and contents of On-site Visit - Confirmation on arrangement of on-site tour and interview and the final confirmation of preparation on document to be confirmed at On-site Visit - Explanation on accordance of the items which could not be confirmed vis-à-vis Accreditation Criteria from the Person in Charge of the Program and Q & A
14:30 - 14:45	Break
14:45 - 17:00	Inspection on Documents related to the Learning Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspection of answer sheets and reports of major courses (allocate courses by each evaluator) - Inspection of undergraduate thesis and arrangement made for undergraduate research

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspection of reports and productions of courses related to development of engineering design ability
17:00 - 17:30	<p>Meeting among the Evaluation Panel (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arrangement of issues based on the inspection on documents related to the Learning Outcomes
17:30 - 18:00	<p>Interview with program-involved party (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Q &A based on the inspection on documents related to the Learning Outcomes
18:00 - 18:30	Moving to the Hotel
18:30 - 19:30	Dinner
19:30 - 21:30	<p>Meeting among the Evaluation Panel (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Day 1 overview of On-site Visit - Arrangement of issues on accordance of the items which could not be confirmed vis-à-vis Accreditation Criteria - Confirmation of draft of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) and Executive Summary - Confirmation of schedule and contents of evaluation Day 2

Day 2

8:00 - 8:30	Moving
8:30 - 9:00	<p>Interview with program-involved party (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirmation of schedule and arrangement of On-site Visit Day 2 - Information sharing of plausible items and contents to be evaluated as “W” or “D”. - Q & A regarding previous item above and request to show the explanation documents depend on necessity.
9:00 - 10:00	<p>Interview with faculty involved with program (implement by allocating tasks to each Evaluation Team Member)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interview with professor and associate professor - Interview with assistant professor - Interview with technical staff - Interview with staff involved educational affairs
10:00 - 10:15	Break
10:15 - 11:00	<p>Interview with students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group interview of third and fourth year students (junior/ senior) - Interview with graduates (students from graduate school)
11:00 - 12:00	<p>Inspection of document for On-site Visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspection of document for educational review and educational improvement - Inspection of judgment record of graduates
12:00 - 13:00 (Lunch)	<p>Meeting among the Evaluation Panel (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary of inspection and interview result - Arrangement of issues on accordance of the items vis-à-vis Accreditation Criteria

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) and Executive Summary
13:00~14:00	<p>On-site Facility Tour (if necessary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tour on lecture room - Tour on laboratory, equipment for experiment and training - Tour on environment where undergraduate research was implemented - Tour on welfare facilities
14:00~15:00	<p>Meeting among the Evaluation Panel (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final summary for the result of inspection and interview - Final arrangement of issues on accordance of the items vis-à-vis Accreditation Criteria - Preparing final version of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) and Executive Summary
15:00 - 15:30	<p>Exit Meeting at On-site Visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Debriefing (Executive Summary) - Confirmation and explanation of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Visit) - Confirmation of further evaluation tasks and communication of related documents - Q & A - Gratitude for cooperation of Evaluation
15:30	Dismiss