JABEE Evaluation Guide

Only the Japanese version of "JABEE Evaluation Guide applicable in the years 2014 -"
is official.

English translation is for informational purpose.

(Revised as at 10 July 2015)

JABEE

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

Table of Contents

8   Prohibited Matters at the Evaluation

List of Referential Documents

Attachment 1   Standard Task Schedule of the Evaluation Team

Attachment 2   Standard Confirmation Method of each Evaluation Item

Attachment 3   On-site Evaluation 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 Team, the Evaluation Team Members and Observers). Also this document is publicized to intend to ensure the fairness and the transparency of Evaluation and Accreditation by delivering the points of view of Evaluation and Accreditation to the Program Operating Organization.

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 Chair of the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team Members

The Chair of the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team Members 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 Evaluation, Support Document, Report for Additional Explanation, Written Opposition and Improvement Report. The Chair of the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team Members conclude its result to the Second Evaluation Report and report to the Evaluation Committees by Field.

   2.3   Understanding of the Chair of the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team Members

The Chair of the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team Members 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) 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.

- Be in accord with Evaluators Code of Ethics and Confidentiality.

2.4   Mission and Understanding of Observers

- The Observers who are Candidates to become Evaluators are expected to gain the same experience as Evaluators.

- Observers are allowed to make comments at the request of the Chair of the Evaluation Team only within the discussion among Evaluation Team, however, they are not allowed to participate for judgment.

- Observers are not allowed to speak at the interview with the Program Operating Organization or the students.

- Behave similarly as the Chair of the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team Members" as stated in previous item 2.3.

2.5   Confidentiality

Evaluators shall not leak the following information other than to related 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 other than to the related parties based on the regulation concerning the destruction or collection of documents which were produced during the evaluation. Specifically, in case if exchanging evaluation information via e-mail or its attachments, evaluators shall consider ways to avoid immediate information leakage by setting up password to the electronic file, withholding Program Title and using secret language even if electronic data is accidently handed in to the third parties by error or accident. Evaluators also have similar responsibility of confidentiality for the information on other programs during the evaluation which could only be known by the process of evaluation.

Additionally, the contents of the confidentiality of Evaluation & Accreditation the related parties including the educational institution are separately described in "Notice for Evaluation and Accreditation related parties (confidentiality)".

(1) Name of program under evaluation, name of related department, name of educational institution (hereinafter collectively called as "Program Title"), period of On-site Evaluation, Person in Charge of JABEE Matter and Person in Charge of the Program (In case if evaluators arranges business trip through their own affiliation, explain them that the matter falls in the scope of confidentiality and ask to minimize the number of people involved in the trip arrangement).

(2) Personal information of the Evaluation Team Members which forms the Evaluation Team of the evaluated program.

(3) Specific impression, situation and prediction of Accreditation or Non-accreditation of the evaluated program.

(4) Program Title, Person in charge of JABEE Matter and Person in Charge of the Program which could only be known by participating in the past evaluations.

(5) Program Title of the Program which has been evaluated but not accredited.

(6) Program Title of the Program which has already been accredited but not publicized yet.

(7) Term of Validity of accredited programs.

(8) Number of application programs by each field.

(9) In addition, confidential information on Evaluation and Accreditation in process.

2.6 Expenses for Evaluation and Logistical Assistance

The Evaluation Team 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 Evaluators.

- Transportation cost between hotel to the educational institution

- Meals during On-site Evaluation period

- Cost if utilizing university accommodation

- Room charge for a meeting of the Evaluation Team held within hotel

- Room charge of sweet room if the Chair of the Evaluation Team considers it is more reasonable to use a meeting room located within hotel

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

- Provision of copy of documents or distribution for the evaluation (including for observers)

- Provision of meeting rooms and keys in the educational institution during evaluation period

- Utilization of PC, printer and projector of the educational institution

- Utilization of permanent facility 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 Team)

3   *This item of Evaluation Guide is not translated (not applicable)*

This item of Evaluation Guide, "How to take measures for on-site evaluation of multiple programs in one educational institution" is not applicable for the accreditation of the programs operated by the foreign Education Institution therefore, not translated.

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   General Point of View of 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 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". *Last five sentences from first paragraph and second paragraph of this item are deference of interpretation of Criteria and Documents to Apply to Evaluation between Criteria applicable from the year 2012- and other applicable from the year 2010 – 2015 therefore, not translated)*

4.3   Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation

The Evaluation Team Members are required to be faithfully follow the rules and procedures as defined in "JABEE Rules & Procedures for Emanation and Accreditation". The Evaluation Team is not allowed to abbreviate some of the items or to deviate. The Evaluation Team Members shall contact to Evaluation Committee by field 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 indicated as knowledge and abilities as the Program assured are achieved, its approach to achieve the learning outcomes is not questioned. 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 its 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 "explanation provided by the Program based on evidence of meeting Criteria" in Self-review Report or at On-site Evaluation by 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.

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

If the Chair of Evaluation Team considers the explanation or the evidences of Self-review Report is insufficient, the Chair of the Evaluation Team shall arrange smooth confirmation at the On-site Evaluation by requesting additional documents to the Program and narrowing down items to be confirmed at the On-site Evaluation as much as possible through communication with the Program (prior to the On-site Evaluation). The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall make maximum effort to confirm review items which could not be confirmed even at the On-site Evaluation 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 Evaluation, the Chair of the Evaluation Team shall reach mutual convergence for the concerns of the Program and to share common understanding between the Evaluation Team Members and the Program on the concerns at least for Review Items left with "W" or "D". If by the end of On-site Evaluation sufficient explanation or evidences have not been provided by the Program and if the gap of understanding have remained, the Chair of the Evaluation Team shall explain to and confirm with the Program (at the exit meeting of On-site Evaluation), that there remain a gap of understanding between the Program and the Evaluation Team. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall mention it in detail in the Program Review Report, the First Evaluation Report and the Second Evaluation 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 Evaluation in principle therefore, the Evaluation Team Members shall especially take consideration on not making inappropriate "superior judgment" (making C or A judgment whereas item should be judged as W or making judgment W, C, or A 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 Evaluation. 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 Team Members 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 with the time. Therefore, it is difficult to specifically and clearly describe. So the Evaluators determines and evaluate the validity 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" 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 appropriateness 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 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 such as, contents or level of major textbooks inside and outside of Japan, contents or level of teaching materials or evaluation questions publicized on the university website of inside and outside of Japan, contents or level of evaluation problems which are required to acquire related engineering qualifications inside and outside of Japan and learning outcomes for the engineering education or investigation results related to requirements of the society.

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 Evaluation if the Evaluation Team could not judge appropriateness of explanation of benchmark provided by the Program Operating Organization. If the mutual agreement on the gap of understanding between the Evaluation Team and the Program Operating Organization has not reached at the end of On-site Evaluation, the Evaluation Team shall explain the gap in detail at Exit Meeting of On-site Evaluation and confirm it to the Program Operating Organization. The Evaluation Team Members shall report it on the Program Review Report, the First Evaluation Report and the Second Evaluation Report.

4.9 Point of View of Evidential Document and its Rough Indication 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, to determine the preparation of evidential documents as determined as necessary. 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. Therefore, the Evaluation Team should require sufficient explanation for level of recognition of importance or necessity of evidential documents to the Program Operating Organization. The Evaluation Team shall search for common ground by requesting explanation which substitutes those evidential documents depending on necessity. The Evaluation Team shall not make formal determination based on with or without or lack of evidential documents. However, 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 Team 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 sheet, report, production, 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 which covers 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 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) In 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.

(4) 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 sheet, 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.

4.10 Presentment 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 Evaluation. 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 Evaluation 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 Evaluation. Document which should be confirmed at On-site Evaluation 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 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 item under the large category of review item. The Evaluation Team shall describe judgment results in Program Review Report (at Exit Meeting of On-site Evaluation), First and Second Evaluation Report strictly in accordance with the principle as mentioned above. The Evaluation Team shall clearly indicate comment and its reason of superior judgment in the column of "reasons and indication (Basis and Remarks)", if they determine it is appropriate to make superior judgment 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

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 prescribed by JABEE so it is not the evaluation to confirm only the "response" against the items indicated in the previous evaluation. Namely, Self-review of the prescribed review items by the Program Operating Organization and evaluation and judgment by the Evaluation Team shall be implemented to all the contents of review items. Evaluation shall be implemented by taking special consideration on contents as indicated in "reasons and indication" in the previous evaluation.

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

Understanding of the 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. 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 learning outcomes lack 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. On-site Evaluation 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 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 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 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 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 and 3. It is also necessary to consider the accordance of Criterion 2.1 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 to Accreditation Criteria" and contents of items to be considered from Category-dependent 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 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 *This item of Evaluation Guide, "Evaluation on Course Hours", is not translated (not applicable to the Criteria applicable from the year 2012-.)*

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. Therefore, 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 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. If transferred credit to be accepted is less relevant to the achievement of learning outcomes of the applicable course, it is sufficient enough to apply a simpler method for the contents of achievement than mentioned above, (*Last paragraph of this item is not applicable to the Criteria applicable from the year 2012- therefore, not translated)*

5.7 Implementation of Syllabus based Education

Criterion 2.2(1) 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 allowed 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(3), 2.4(4) and 3(2) but there are no practical examples not because of the responsibility of the program, the Evaluation Team shall make judgment of A, C, 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(2), 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(3), 2.4(4) and 3(2), the Evaluation Team shall mark "-"in the cell of judgment result as not applicable item for the evaluation. 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 *This item of Evaluation Guide, "Items to be considered for the admission policy on College of Technology", is not translated due to the characteristics of the College of Technology which is Japanese-specific tertiary education system.*

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

"Students' Moving" in criterion 2.4(4) has 2 cases: student's moving into the program from other program or students of the program moving out to other program before completion of the program. The Evaluation Team shall evaluate whether student's moving out from the program within the same department to be not an easy path and does not damage the actual condition of the program where a simple administrative procedure is required or no procedure required to change

program. The Evaluation Team shall not include a case of moving out if the department or faculty, where students moving into, determines the acceptance or no acceptance of students by evaluation implemented independently from the program. 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 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 could not find solutions to the problem 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 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 (including Continuous Evaluation and Evaluation by Changes):

(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 Team

The Evaluation Team 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 Team 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 Team" at the foot of the document for the time flow of work of the Evaluation. It is also recommended to refer to "Attachment 2 Standard Confirmation Method of each Evaluation Item" and "Attachment 3 On-site Evaluation Schedule" to set up the contents and schedule of the On-site Evaluation.

6.1 Coordination of Schedule for On-site Evaluation with Program Operating Organization and Request for Arrangements

(1) The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall consolidate the requests from all the Evaluation Team Members for the schedule of On-site Evaluation and for the arrangements of accommodation, transportation and meeting room and shall contact the Program Operating Organization as a focal point.

(2) The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall confirm in advance the way to contact among the Evaluation Team Members, between the Evaluation Team and the Program Operating Organization and between the Evaluation Team and JABEE (or the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization) in an emergency case where an Evaluation Team Member fails to participate in On-site Evaluation due to an unexpected event (sudden illness or accident) on the day of the On-site Evaluation. If the first day of On-site Evaluation drops on a holiday, the Chair of the Evaluation Team should be fully aware of difficulty to contact with the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization or JABEE.

6.2 Preparation for On-site Evaluation by the Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation)

(1) On-site Evaluation is implemented at a maximum of 2 to 3 days therefore the Evaluation Team specifically should take consideration that the time is limited. Additionally, On-site Evaluation 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 Program Operating Organization prior to the On-site Evaluation.

(2)   Prior to the On-site Evaluation, the Evaluation Team 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 Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation). 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 Evaluation", "Documents to be confirmed at On-site Evaluation (referential documents for On-site Evaluation)" and "contents of interview of elucidator or interviewee at On-site Evaluation" as a confirmation method. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall consolidate Program Review Reports (Prior to the On-site Evaluation) which have been separately prepared by each Evaluation Team Members and send to the Program Operating Organization within the period as prescribed and request necessary actions. The Evaluation Team shall make maximum effort with the Program Operating Organization to complete confirmation prior to the On-site Evaluation for the review items marked as "X" in the column of "items to be confirmed by Self-Review Report" of appendix 2 on the trailing paragraph.

(3)   The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall prepare the plan of On-site Evaluation by filling necessary items on the sheet of "Plan document for On-site Evaluation" based on the contents of "Response Form from the Program" of the Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation). 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 Evaluation could see chronologically. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall clarify each document confirmation or interview relates to which Review Items and shall efficiently implement the On-site Evaluation. 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 3 on the trailing paragraph indicates, for reference, the time schedule of On-site Evaluation and for a case where On-site Evaluation could be shortened into 2 days and 1 night. The duration necessary for On-site Evaluation 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) The Evaluation Team Members shall share the information on the process of preparing Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation). The Evaluation Team shall submit Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation) 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 Evaluation)

(1) The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall complete Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation) except items which could not be determined until making confirmation at On-site Evaluation.

(2) The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall finalize the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation) by adding judgment results and revised results of judgment made before the On-site Evaluation depending on necessity based on the contents confirmed at On-site Evaluation.

(3) The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall prepare, based on the judgment results prior to the On-site Evaluation, a draft of Executive Summary which will be read out at the exit meeting of On-site Evaluation.

6.4 Confirmation and Interview at On-site Evaluation

(1) The Evaluation Team shall constantly add notes of judgment results and its evidence on the Program Review Report (at the exit meeting of On-site Evaluation) based on the items confirmed with its accordance to the Accreditation Criteria by confirming documents at On-site Evaluation 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 judgment A by assuming that documents will be confirmed

afterwards. Giving A may lead missing or forgetting the confirmation later on.

(2) The Evaluation Team shall take the behavioral record of items confirmed at On-site Evaluation or the contents of interviews for the preparation for the Second Evaluation Report.

(3) Interviews with students are to confirm whether the students are aware of the things to be recognized by the students. 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 group of interviewees and group of evaluators 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 practical opinions of each. It is also effective to implement interviews with more faculty by dividing the Evaluation Team into several small groups.

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

(1) The Evaluation Team shall describe not only judgment results but also the reasons in detail in each review item of the Program Review Report. The reasons for not only C, W, D but also A should be given. For A, the Evaluation Team shall not simply describe "meets Criteria", but describe how the determination was made based on what is confirmed.

(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, which will be used for the decision making at the coordination and discussion within the field and among the fields in the column of "reason and indication" for the applicable review items on the Program Review Report. 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 "reason and indication" column in detail to be able to coordinate and discuss validity of its proposal.

6.6　Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation

(1)　The Evaluation Team hands in Program Review Report (at the exit meeting at On-site Evaluation) to 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 Evaluation to 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 Team at the completion of On-site Evaluation so it should not be left in an official form and information provided by the Program Review Report (exit meeting at On-site Evaluation) includes enough information for the Program Operating Organization to take measures after the On-site Evaluation therefore, the program does not need Executive Summary in paper. Based on its concept, when the Chair of the Evaluation Team read out the Executive Summary, it is prohibited for the Program Operating Organization to record or videotape it however, the Program Operating Organization is allowed to take memos.

(2)　The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall explain that the contents of Executive Summary or Program Review Report (at the exit meeting at On-site Evaluation) are based on the judgment of the Evaluation Team at the completion of On-site Evaluation only and it is not necessarily the final version to the Program Review Report. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall 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 among fields within JABEE in

accordance with "Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation". At the exit meeting, the Chair of the Evaluation Team shall explain the rules and procedures objectively and shall refrain from referring to any prejudgment of the Evaluation Team or final determination on accreditation or non-accreditation.

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

   (1)   The Evaluation Team shall, after discussing within the Evaluation 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 (at the exit meeting of On-site Evaluation) or Written Opposition or Improvement Report for the First Evaluation Report 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 column of reasons and indications of applicable review item in the Second Evaluation Report.

   (3)   If the Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation Team have not reached mutual understanding even having communications after On-site Evaluation, the Evaluation Team shall deliver information of the opinions and

reasons of Both the Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation Team in the Second Evaluation 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 Second Evaluation Result by the Evaluation Committee by Field.

6.8 After completing Activities as the Evaluation Team Members

(1) The Evaluation Team Members shall return all the written Evaluation Related documents such as, Self-review Report, Support Documents, Report for Additional explanation documents acquired at the On-site Evaluation and Program Review Report or Evaluation Report prepared during On-site Evaluation to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization within the period as prescribed. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall request the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization to separately save support documents which have severely influenced the judgments together with Self-review Report.

(2) The Evaluation Team Members shall delete all electric date related to the Evaluation as much as possible at the time of returning documents mentioned in item above.

(3) 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) and (2) above.

7 Items to be considered for the description of Review Reports

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

Describe by taking consideration on the followings the judgment result (A, C, W, D) of each review item of the accreditation Criteria and "reasons and indication" for its review items.

- Describe reasons of judgment for all the review items regardless of judgment result (A, C, W, D).

- For the Interim Evaluation, transcribe the shortcomings which were indicated in "Evaluation Result" of the previous evaluation in the beginning of description for "reasons and indication" of each evaluation

item. Summarize the contents in case of lack of description space.

- Express reasons of judgment as objective as possible by referring to explanation of the Accreditation Criteria mentioned in publicized documents such as "JABEE Criteria for Accreditation of Professional Education Programs" or "JABEE Criteria Guide" as much as possible to be in accordance with concept of the Accreditation Criteria.

- The judgment results shall be determined only based 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 as follows:

  A (Accept)

  XX is accepted based on YY.

  Meets XX by YY,

  C (Concern)

  Expected to improve XX by YY.

  Have concern on XX by YY,

  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.

- Fill out the judgment result (A, C, W, D) of Large Category of Review based on the recognition of judgment result of relating items in principle. 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 "reasons and indication" column.

- The column of "Opinion of the Evaluation Team" of the Evaluation Report

(First, Second, by the Fields and Final) is a space for the Evaluation Team could describe the reasons or indication which could not be classified into each item of the Accreditation Criteria such as, "specifically excellent point of the Program", "item which relates to several items for the Accreditation Criteria" or "key to develop features of the program by the Educational Institution". The texts which are described in the column of Opinion of the Evaluation Team shall be communicated to the Program together with the result of the evaluation. In this column, the Evaluation Team could describe messages, depending on necessity, which should be communicated, in addition to the items previously mentioned, to the Program even though it did not directly influence on the evaluation result. Examples include comments related to the measures reported in the Improvement Report or referential opinion related to the items other than evaluation items at the Interim Evaluation.

7.2 Executive Summary

Executive Summary shall be prepared with the following structure as standard. The Evaluation Team 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 results of judgment, reasons and indication 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 Evaluation.

- Gratitude for the efforts to educational improvement and for the cooperation for JABEE Evaluation by the Program Operating Organization

- Strengths of the Program

- Comprehensive indication on problems of the Program vis-a-vis the Accreditation Criteria

- Following procedures (e.g. Allowed to submit Report for Additional Explanation within 2 weeks)

8   Prohibited Matters at the Evaluation

- Shall not Test on the Students at Interview

  Verbal Examination to directly check the degree of achievement shall 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 Evaluation Team shall determine if the Program Operating Organization is appropriately implementing evaluation and assurance throughout the Evaluation.

- Shall not Separately Contact the Program Operating Organization

  The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall consolidate requests for support documents prior to the On-site Evaluation or arrangement of accommodation and contacts the Program Operating Organization. The Evaluation Team Members shall not separately contact the Program Operating Organization. This is to avoid confusion of information and to decrease burden of 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 Team Members shall avoid contacting the Program unofficially to cause doubt on transparency in terms of Evaluation other than On-site Evaluation as defined by the "Rules & Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation" or official contact to the Program Operating Organization by Program Review Report or contact implemented by the direction of Evaluation Committee by Field.

- Shall not Request Documents not Related to the Judgment

  If the Evaluation Team requests Support Document prior to the On-site Evaluation or disclosure of documents newly at On-site Evaluation, it shall request only requisite documents to determine accordance of Accreditation Criteria. The Evaluation Team shall not put unnecessary burden to the Program Operating Organization. If additional documents are requested after the submission of Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation), the Evaluation Team shall provide the Program with explanations of why and for which review items require those additional documents. The Program Operating Organization could refuse requests if clear explanations are not provided.

- Prohibition of Audio Recording and Videotaping

Recording and videotaping of the conversations at On-site Evaluation are prohibited both to the Program Operation Organization and to the Evaluation 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 Evaluation are just temporary decision and they could be changed in the process of discussion and coordination later on. Additionally, photo shooting is allowed within limited occasion and situation. Photo shooting which might identify Evaluation Team Members or photo shooting which might memorize evaluation method in detail is prohibited in case of the Program Operating Organization wishes to take photo. Photo shooting limited to minimum necessary evidence for judgment to the Accreditation Criteria is allowed with responsibility of the Chair of the Evaluation Team in case of the Evaluation Team Members wish to take photo.

- Shall not Give Advice and Direction

  The task of the Evaluation Team is to judge whether the Program Operating Organization which applied for Evaluation meets Accreditation Criteria or not, therefore, the Evaluation Team shall refrain from advising or directing what Program Operating Organization to do. It is necessary to reach common ground between the Evaluation Team and 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 Program Operating Organization with sufficient opportunities to explain to the Evaluation Team until all the questions, which the Evaluation Team has raised, have become clear. Therefore, it is allowed for the Evaluation Team 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 Put Excessive Burden to the Program Operating Organization Relating to the Arrangement of Accommodation

  As it is explained in item 2.6, the Evaluation Team 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 to the Program Operating Organization information on accommodation in terms of selecting hotel, however, it is still required for the Evaluation Team

to minimize burden to the Program Operation Organization.

- **Shall Refrain from Making Unnecessary and Unofficial Comments**

  The Evaluation Team shall not make to the Program Operating Organization any unnecessary and unofficial comments related to the Evaluation during On-site Evaluation and prior to and after the On-site Evaluation. Especially prediction on the final Accreditation or Non-accreditation and prediction of the coordination, which will be made by the Fields or JABEE are strictly prohibited, which might cause unnecessary confusion. Observers shall not be allowed to make any comments to the Program Operating Organization.

- **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 Homepage for preparation and submission of Program Review Report and Evaluation Report without change. Fully confirm to choose and use an appropriate format of applicable Accreditation Criteria and 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 Team shall strictly refrain from changing the format. However, the Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation –FOR EVALUATOR-) is a form to be used within the Evaluation Team therefore, it is allowed to change depends on necessity. It is allowed to make working file by changing Program Review Report and Evaluation Report to use within the Evaluation Team depend on necessity however, the file should be a completely separate file from the one used for submission.

List of Referential Documents

Referential documents related to the task 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

- JABEE Standard for Formation of the Evaluation Team

- 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 Chair of the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team Members to use following sheet as checklist in order to avoid missing task.

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

Period	Contents of Task	Fill in the date of entry
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 delegate 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 publishing letter of delegate)	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team confirm communication method of evaluation related information by contacting all Member of the Evaluation Team.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team decides date of On-site Evaluation by confirming and coordinating Program Operating Organization and all Members of the Evaluation Team.	
	Chairs of the Evaluation Teams Coordinate date of On-site Evaluation if one educational institution has several programs to be evaluated at the same time.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team notifies date of On-site Evaluation to all the Evaluation Team Members, Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team appoints Vice-Chair of the Evaluation Team.	
Beginning of July	Receive Self-review Report	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team confirms if all the Evaluation Team Members receive Self-review Report.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team requests preparing document sheets "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluateed at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation –FOR EVALUATOR-) based on careful reading of the Self-review Report to all the Evaluation Team Members and send it to the Chair of the Evaluation Team 8-weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation.	
July to August	The Chair of or the Evaluation Team Members	

	participate JABEE Evaluator Training Seminar of the applied academic year and share information acquired within the Evaluation Team.	
8 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of Evaluation Team requests to provide information regarding accommodation and reservation of meetings held during On-site Evaluation to the Program Operating Organization and makes arrangements based on the coordination with the Evaluation Team Members.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team receives document sheets "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation –FOR EVALUATOR-) from all the Evaluation Team Members.	
6 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team organizes contents of the document sheets "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation –FOR EVALUATOR -) which are prepared by all the Evaluation Team Members, items could not confirm satisfying the Criteria, items requested for additional documents and interviewee at the On-site Evaluation to the document sheets "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation) and sends it to the Program Operating Organization. The Chair of the Evaluation Team requests Program Operating Organization to describe arrangement status of requested documents or interviewee on the "Response Sheet" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation) and to send them back 4 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation. The Chair also requests for the Program Operating Organization to send back additional documents 3 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation if possible.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team determines whether it is possible to shorten the duration of On-site Evaluation to 2 days and 1 night at this moment, fixes the dates in consultation with the Program Operating Organization and informs the Evaluation Team Members. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall notify the final dates of On-site Evaluation to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
4 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation	The–Chair of the Evaluation Team receives response sheet of Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation) from the Program Operating Organization	

	The Chair of the Evaluation Team evaluates the contents of the response sheet from Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation) and writes down his opinions, which shall be confirmed at On-site Evaluation, draft contents which shall be implemented to interviewees and On-site Evaluation Plan Document of Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation) which includes a prospect time schedule for each items at On-site Evaluation and sends the document to requests Team Members to provide feedback within 3 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation.	
3 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation	Additionally, The Chair of the Evaluation Team requests the Program Operating Organization to send additional documents within 3 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation.	
	The Chairs of the Evaluation Teams within same educational institution coordinate contents of and detailed schedule of On-site Evaluation by mutually contact if the On-site Evaluation is implemented in the same day.	
2 weeks prior to the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team completes On-site Evaluation Plan Document of Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation) by taking consideration of comments from each Evaluation Team Member and of additional documents sent from the Program Operating Organization.	
	If The Chair of the Evaluation Team determines it is possible to shorten the duration of On-site Evaluation to 2 days and 1 night, fixe the dates in consultation with the Program Operating Organization and inform it to the Evaluation Team Members. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall notify the final dates of On-site Evaluation to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team prepares the time schedule of On-site Evaluation based on the On-site Evaluation Plan Document of Program Review Report and sends it to the Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation Team Members and ask confirmation and comments. The Chair of the Evaluation Team shall modify if there are comments.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team prepares in advance a draft of the Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation) and Executive Summary based on understanding of Self-review Report, Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation) and additional documents sent from the Program Operating Organization. All of these information shall be shared with the Evaluation Team Members.	

1 week prior to the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team makes final confirmation of the time schedule for On-site Evaluation with the Program Operating Organization and the Evaluation Team Members.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team confirm the way to contact among the Evaluation Team Members and transportation process.	
On-site Evaluation		
1 week after the On-site Evaluation	Submit reimbursement form of expense incurred at On-site Evaluation to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
1 week after the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team receives Report for Additional explanation. Make final Confirmation of submission to the Program Operating Organization if it is not submitted.	
Approximately 2 weeks after the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team determines correspondence to Report for Additional explanation if submitted by the Program Operating Organization based on the discussion among the Evaluation Team Members.	
2 weeks after the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team prepares First Evaluation Report based on the consultation among all the Evaluation Team Members and sends it to where as prescribed.	
4 weeks after the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team receives Written Opposition or Improvement Report. Make final Confirmation of submission to the Program Operating Organization if it is not submitted.	
Approximately 6 weeks after the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team 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.	
6 weeks after the On-site Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team prepares Second Evaluation Report based on the consultation among all the Evaluation Team Members and sends it to where as prescribed.	
Beginning of January to Middle of January	The Chair of the Evaluation Team attends Evaluation Committee by Field if requested and explains Evaluation Results of the program evaluated.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team 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 return completely all of written documents related to evaluation; Self-review Report, Support Document, documents acquired at On-site Evaluation, Program Review Report prepared at the process of evaluation, Evaluation Report document, to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	

Period	Contents of Task	Fill in the date of entry
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team informs to archive important documents together with Self-review Report which influenced making judgment except Self-review Report to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	The Evaluation Team Members terminate electric data related to the evaluation as much as possible in complete methods.	
	The Evaluation Team Members report procedures of return and termination of data in accordance with methods as prescribed after completion to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	

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

Period	Contents of Task	Fill in the date of entry
Beginning to 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 delegate 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 publishing letter of delegate)	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team confirm communication method of Evaluation related information by contacting all Member of the Evaluation Team.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team will be informed about Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation as prescribed by the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team 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 Chair of the Evaluation Team confirms that all the Evaluation Team Members received Self-review Report.	

	The Chair of the Evaluation Team requests preparing document sheets "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation –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 Evaluation)	
July to August	The Chair of 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 Chair of the Evaluation Team receives document sheets "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation –FOR EVALUATOR -).	
Approximately, 8 weeks prior to the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team organizes contents of the document sheets "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation –FOR EVALUATOR -) which are prepared by all the Evaluation Team Members, items could not confirm satisfying the Criteria, items requested for additional documents to the document sheet "Unconfirmed items and requests for documents to be evaluated at On-site Evaluation" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation) and sends it to the Program Operating Organization. The Chair of the Evaluation Team requests the Program Operating Organization to describe arrangement status of requested documents on the "Response Sheet" of the Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation) 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 Chair of the Evaluation Team receives document sheet and support document of "response sheet" of Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation) from Program Operating Organization.	
Approximately, 2 weeks prior to the Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team prepares draft of First Evaluation Report by taking consideration on contents of document sheet and support document of "response sheet" of Program Review Report (Prior to the On-site Evaluation) and sends it to all the Evaluation Team Members and requests for their feedback.	
Due Date of Submission of Document Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team completes the First Evaluation Report 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	The Chair of the Evaluation Team receives Written Opposition or Improvement Report. Make final	

Document Evaluation	Confirmation of submission to the Program Operating Organization if it is not submitted.	
Approximately 4 weeks after the submission of Document Evaluation	The Chair of the Evaluation Team 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 Chair of the Evaluation Team prepares Second Evaluation Report based on the consultation among all the Evaluation Team Members and sends it to where as prescribed.	
Beginning of January to Middle of January	The Chair of the Evaluation Team attends Evaluation Committee by Field if requested and explain Evaluation Results of the program evaluated.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team 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 return completely all of written documents related to Evaluation; Self-review Report, Support Document, documents acquired at On-site Evaluation, Program Review Report prepared at the process of evaluation, Evaluation Report document, to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	The Chair of the Evaluation Team informs to archive important documents together with Self-review Report which influenced making judgment except Self-review Report to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	
	The Evaluation Team Members terminate electric data related to the evaluation as much as possible in complete methods.	
	The Evaluation Team Members report procedures of return and termination of data in accordance with methods as prescribed after completion to the Evaluation Team Dispatching Organization.	

Attachment 2　Standard Confirmation Method of each Evaluation Item

Following are standard confirmation method of determining status of accordance of items to the Accreditation Criteria. Following contents are standardized therefore, confirmation method could vary depending on actual condition of each program.

Description of following column, "Item to be confirmed by Self-review Report"

  X: Confirm by Self-review Report or Support Document in principle however if things need to be confirmed left, confirm them with Person in Charge of the Program by interview at On-site Evaluation.

  R: In addition to the evaluation by Self-review Report, Confirm by document and On-site inspection, and interview at the On-site Evaluation.

  No Marks: Mainly confirmed at On-site Evaluation.

Number	Review Item	Item to be confirm by Self-review Report	Document and On-site inspection at On-site Evaluation	Interview at On-site Evaluation
1	Criterion 1:　Learning Outcomes			
1(1)	The program shall define its profile of autonomous professionals to be fostered. The program shall take account of traditions, resources and fields of graduates to define the profile of professionals. The profile of professionals shall be defined by giving consideration to the requirements of the society and the demands of the students. The program shall broadly publicize the profile of professionals. The profile shall be made well-known to the students and faculty.			
1(1)[1]	Is profile of autonomous professionals which program intends to foster defined?	X		
1(1)[2]	Are traditions, and resources of the program, fields of the graduates, taken account of profile of professionals mentioned above?	X		
1(1)[3]	Is profile of professionals mentioned above given consideration to the requirements of the society and the demands of the students?	X		
1(1)[4]	Is profile of autonomous professionals mentioned above broadly publicized?	X		
1(1)[5]	Is profile of autonomous professionals mentioned above made-well known to the students and faculty?			Confirm publicized situation by interviewing the faculty and the students

1(2)	The program shall establish its learning outcomes that the graduates are supposed to surly acquire at the time of completion of the program by taking account of profile of autonomous professionals. The learning outcomes shall be knowledge and abilities distinctively defined with benchmarks covering the contents of (a) to (i) listed below. The program shall broadly publicize the learning outcomes. The learning outcomes shall be made well-known to the students and faculty. The learning outcomes shall be established by taking account of items which Category-dependent Criteria specifies in items (a) to (i):			
1(2)[1]	Is the learning outcomes that the graduates are supposed to surly acquire at the time of completion of the program established by taking account of profile of autonomous professionals?	X		
1(2)[2]	Is the learning outcomes established by taking account of items which Category-dependent Criteria specifies in items (a) to (i)?			
1(2)[2](a)	An ability of multidimensional thinking with knowledge from global perspective	X		
1(2)[2](b)	An ability of understanding of effects and impact of professional activities on society and nature, and of professionals' social responsibility	X		
1(2)[2](c)	Knowledge of and ability to apply mathematics and natural sciences	X		
1(2)[2](d)	Knowledge of the related professional fields, and ability to apply	X		
1(2)[2](e)	Design ability to respond to requirements of the society by utilizing various sciences, technologies and information	X		
1(2)[2](f)	Communication skills including logical writing, presentation and debating	X		
1(2)[2](g)	An ability of independent and life-long learning	X		
1(2)[2](h)	An ability to manage and accomplish tasks systematically under given constraints	X		
1(2)[2](i)	An ability to work in a team	X		
1(2)[3]	Are the learning outcomes established including benchmarks?	X		
1(2)[4]	Is the learning outcomes broadly publicized	X		
1(2)[5]	Is the learning outcomes made well-known to the students and faculty?			Confirm publicized situation by interviewing the faculty and the students
2	Criterion 2 Educational Methods			
2.1	2.1 Curriculum Design			
2.1(1)	The program shall design the curriculum for students to achieve the leaning outcomes. The curriculum shall be made well-known to the students and faculty. The program shall clearly indicate relation of set of courses and the learning outcomes in the curriculum. Standardized course term and educational contents shall satisfy the items as defined in Category-dependent Criteria.			
2.1(1)[1]	Is the curriculum designed for students to achieve the learning outcomes?	X		

2.1(1)[2]	Is the curriculum made well-known to the students and faculty?	X		Confirm disclosure situation by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.1(1)[3]	Is the relation of set of courses and the learning outcomes clearly indicated in the curriculum?	X		
2.1(1)[4]	Is standardized course term and educational contents shall satisfy the items as defined in Category-dependent Criteria?	X		
2.1(2)	The program shall prepare the syllabus for each course in accordance with the curriculum. The syllabus shall be made well-known to the students and faculty. For each course, the syllabus shall clearly describe its position in the curriculum, the educational components and methods, the learning outcomes and the evaluation methods and the evaluation criteria. The course hour shall be specified either in its syllabus or in related documents.			
2.1(2)[1]	Is syllabus for each course prepared in accordance with the curriculum?	X	Confirm if there is anything not included in Self-review report	
2.1(2)[2]	Is the syllabus made well-known to the students and faculty?	X		Confirm disclosure situation by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.1(2)[3]	For each course, is the position in the curriculum, the educational components and methods, the learning outcomes and the evaluation methods and the evaluation criteria clearly described in the syllabus?	X	Confirm if there is anything not included in Self-review report	
2.1(2)[4]	Is the course hour specified either in syllabus or in related documents?	X	Confirm if there is anything not included in Self-review report	
2.2	2.2 Implementation of Learning & Education			
2.2(1)	The program shall implement education as described in the syllabus			
2.2(1)[1]	Is education implemented as described in the syllabus?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.2(2)	The program shall encourage active learning of the students and shall commit to ensure sufficient self-learning hours for the students.			
2.2(2)[1]	Are active learning of the students encouraged and committed to ensure sufficient self-learning hours for the students?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.2(3)	The program shall make students regularly review the degree of achievement for each learning outcome to reflect it to their learning.			
2.2(3)[1]	Does the program make students regularly review the degree of achievement for each learning outcome to reflect it to their learning?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.2(3)[2]	Is the degree of achievement for each learning outcome regular reviewed by the students reflected to their learning?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.3	2.3 Faculty			

2.3(1)	The educational institution shall provide a sufficient number of faculty members to implement the curriculum with appropriate educational methods and to yield intended educational results, and shall provide the faculty with institutional support on education.			
2.3(1)[1]	Are sufficient number of faculty members provided to implement the curriculum with appropriate educational methods and to yield intended educational results, and the faculty with institutional support on education?	X		
2.3(2)	The educational institution shall have communications network among faculty for close collaboration among courses set in the curriculum to obtain better educational results. The activities of the communications network shall be implemented.			
2.3(2)[1]	Does Educational institution have communications network among faculty for close collaboration among courses set in the curriculum to obtain better educational results?	X		
2.3(2)[2]	Are the activities of communications network among faculty implemented mentioned above?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.3(3)	The educational institution shall promote Faculty Development (FD) to encourage the faculty's educational abilities. The system shall be made well-known to the faculty and FD activities shall take place in the program.			
2.3(3)[1]	Is Faculty Development (FD) promoted to encourage the faculty's educational abilities?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.3(3)[2]	Is the system mentioned above made well-known to the faculty?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.3(3)[3]	Are FD activities taken place in accordance with the system mentioned above?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.3(4)	The educational institution shall have a system to institutionally evaluate faculty's educational activities. The system shall be made well-known to the faculty. The system shall result in improving education.			
2.3(4)[1]	Is the educational institution have a system to institutionally evaluate faculty's educational activities?	X		
2.3(4)[2]	Is the system mentioned above made well-known to the faculty?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.3(4)[3]	Are the activities for educational improvement implemented in accordance with system mentioned above?	R		Listen in actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.4	2.4 Process of Admission			

2.4(1)	The program shall establish concrete admission policies and procedures in order to admit students with proper knowledge and abilities for the course curriculum designed to achieve the learning outcomes of the program. The program shall publicize the admission policies and procedures, and implement its admission in accordance with the policies and procedures.			
2.4(1)[1]	Are concrete admission policies and procedures defined in order to admit students with proper knowledge and abilities for the course curriculum designed to achieve the learning outcomes of the program?	X		
2.4(1)[2]	Are concrete admission policies and procedures publicized in order to admit students with proper knowledge and abilities?	X		
2.4(1)[3]	Are students 'selective admission implemented in accordance with the concrete admission policies and procedures, in order to admit students with proper knowledge and abilities?	X	Confirm by inspecting record related to admission.	
2.4(2)	In case the program consists of two tiers, the first of which is common to some number of programs, and the second of which is specific to the program, and the selective admission of students to the second tier takes place on their completion of the first tier, the educational institution shall establish concrete admission policies and procedures for this selective admission. The policies and procedures shall be made well-known to the students and faculty. The students' selective admission shall be implemented in accordance with the policies and procedures.			
2.4(2)[1]	Are the concrete admission policies and procedures defined in case the program consists of two tiers, the first of which is common to some number of programs, and the second of which is specific to the program, and the selective admission of students to the second tier takes place on their completion of the first tier?	X		
2.4(2)[2]	Are the concrete policies and procedures mentioned above made well-known to the students and faculty in case the program consists of two tiers, the first of which is common to some number of programs, and the second of which is specific to the program, and the selective admission of students to the second tier takes place on their completion of the first tier?	R		Confirm actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.4(2)[3]	Are the students' selective admission implemented in accordance with the concrete policies and procedures mentioned above in case the program consists of two tiers, the first of which is common to some number of programs, and the second of which is specific to the program, and the selective admission of students to the second tier takes place on their completion of the first tier?	R	Confirm by inspecting record related to determination of registration for the courses.	
2.4(3)	In case the program admits students from other educational institutions to transfer into the program, the program shall establish and publicize concrete policies and procedures for such transfer. The students' transfer shall be implemented in accordance with the policies and procedures.			

2.4(3)[1]	Are the concrete policies and procedures established in case the program admits students from other educational institutions to transfer into the program?	X		
2.4(3)[2]	Are the concrete policies and procedures mentioned above publicized in case the program admits students from other educational institutions to transfer into the program?	X		
2.4(3)[3]	Are students' transfer implemented in accordance with concrete policies and procedures mentioned above in case the program admits students from other educational institutions to transfer into the program?	R	Confirm by inspecting record related to the students' transfer.	
2.4(4)	In case the program allows students move between the courses within the educational institution, the program shall establish concrete policies and procedures of moving in and out. The policies and procedures shall be made well-known to the students and faculty. The students' moving between the courses shall be implemented in accordance with the policies and procedures.			
2.4(4)[1]	Is concrete policies and procedures of moving in and out defined in the case the program allows students move between the courses within the educational institution?	X		
2.4(4)[2]	Is concrete policies and procedures of moving in and out made well-known to the students and faculty in the case the program allows students move between the courses within the educational institution?	R		Confirm actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.4(4)[3]	Are students' moving between the courses implemented in accordance with the policies and procedures mentioned above in the case the program allows students move between the courses within the educational institution?	R	Confirm by inspecting record related to students' moving.	
2.5	2.5　Educational Environment and Student Support			
2.5(1)	The educational institution shall be equipped with classroom, laboratory, exercise room, library, information related equipment, self-learning and rest facilities, cafeteria, etc. necessary for the students to achieve the learning outcomes of the program. The program shall make efforts to ensure necessary financial resources to maintain, improve, and operate the educational environment.			
2.5(1)[1]	Is the educational institution equipped with classroom, laboratory, exercise room, library, information related equipment, self-learning and rest facilities, cafeteria, etc. necessary for the students to achieve the learning outcomes of the program?		Confirm by taking tour at major on-site facilities.	
2.5(1)[2]	Is the efforts made to ensure necessary financial resources to maintain, improve, and operate the educational environment?	R	Confirm by inspecting related documents.	
2.5(2)	The program shall have a system as for educational environment and for students' learning, such as to help students better understand lectures, and to enhance students' learning motivation, and to take account of the demands of the students on such support. The system shall be made well-known to the students, faculty and staff.			

2.5(2)[1]	Does the program have a system as for educational environment and for students' learning, such as to help students better understand lectures, and to enhance students' learning motivation, and to take account of the demands of the students on such support?	R		Confirm actual condition by interviewing the students
2.5(2)[2]	Is the system mentioned above made well-known to the students, faculty and staff?	R		Confirm actual condition by interviewing the faculty and the students
2.5(2)[3]	Are activities in accordance with the system mentioned above implemented?	R	Confirm by inspecting activity records.	
3	Criterion 3 Achievement of Learning Outcomes			
3(1)	The program shall evaluate, on each course, the degree of achievement of the learning outcomes for each student in accordance with the evaluation criteria and methods defined in the syllabus.			
3(1)[1]	Are the degree of achievement of the leaning outcomes for each course evaluated in accordance with the evaluation methods and evaluation criteria defined in the syllabus?		Confirm by examining academic document such as answer sheet and original of academic record of the major courses as indicated in Table 4. Also confirm actual condition of evaluation meets degree of achievement established as benchmark in Criterion 1(2)[3].	
3(2)	The program shall have evaluation methods for credits, which the students have earned in other higher educational institutions and the credit transfer shall be accepted in accordance with the defined evaluation methods. The program shall also have evaluation methods for credits earned by the transferred students in the previous educational institutions and the credit transfer shall be accepted in accordance with defined evaluation methods.			
3(2)[1]	Are the evaluation methods defined for credits, which the students have earned in other higher educational institutions and is the credit transfer accepted in accordance with the defined evaluation methods?	X		
3(2)[2]	Are the credits, which the students have earned in other higher educational institutions, transferred and accepted in accordance with defined evaluation methods mentioned above?	R	Confirm by inspecting record of credits recognition.	
3(2)[3]	Are the evaluation methods defined for credits earned by the transferred students in the previous educational institutions and is the credit transfer accepted in accordance with defined evaluation methods?	X		
3(2)[4]	Are the credits, which the transferred students have earned in the previous educational institutions, transferred and is credit transfer accepted in accordance with defined evaluation methods?	R	Confirm by inspecting record of credits recognition.	
3(3)	The program shall provide evaluation criteria and methods to holistically evaluate the degree of achievement of each learning outcome of the program. The evaluation shall be made in accordance with the evaluation criteria and methods.			

3(3)[1]	The program shall provide holistic evaluation methods and evaluation criteria to evaluate the degree of achievement of each learning outcome of the program. The evaluation shall be made in accordance with the evaluation methods and evaluation criteria.	x		
3(3)[2]	Is the evaluation made in accordance with the evaluation methods and evaluation criteria?		Confirm by inspecting record of evaluation result.	
3(4)	All the graduates of the program shall have achieved all the learning outcomes of the program.			
3(4)[1]	Are all the graduates of the program achieved all the learning outcomes of the program?	R	Confirm by inspecting record of evaluation result.	
3(5)	By achieving all the learning outcomes of the program, all the graduates of the program shall have acquired the contents of (a) to (i) of Criteria 1(2).			
3(5)[1]	By achieving all the learning outcomes of the program, are all the graduates of the program acquired (a) to (i) of Criteria 1(2)?	R	Confirm benchmark of degree of achievement of major courses related to (a) to (i) by academic document such as answer sheet based on Table 4.	
4	Criterion 4 Educational Improvement			
4.1	4.1 Self-review of Education			
4.1(1)	The program shall have a self-review system of educational activities in accordance with Criteria 1 to 3 on the basis of evaluation results of the degree of achievement of the learning outcomes. The self-review system shall be made well-known to the faculty. The self-review shall be implemented in accordance with the system.			
4.1(1)[1]	Does the program have a self-review system of educational activities in accordance with Criteria 1 to 3 on the basis of evaluation results of the degree of achievement of the learning outcomes?	X		
4.1(1)[2]	Is the self-review system made well-known to the faculty?	R		Confirm actual condition by interviewing the faculty
4.1(1)[3]	Is the self-review implemented in accordance with the system?		Confirm by inspecting related record.	Confirm actual condition by interviewing the faculty
4.1(2)	The system shall include structure to take account of the requirements of the society and the demands of the students. The system itself shall have self-checking structure.			
4.1(2)[1]	Does the system include structure to take account of the requirements of the society and the demands of the students?	X		
4.1(2)[2]	Is the self-review implemented in accordance with the system?	X		
4.1(3)	The minutes of meetings and committees relating to the system shall be accessible to the faculty. Records of any meetings relating to the system shall be accessible to the faculty.			
4.1(3)[1]	Are the minutes of meetings and committees relating to the system accessible to the faculty?	R		Confirm actual condition by interviewing the faculty
4.2	4.2 Continuous Improvement			

4.2	The program shall have a system to continuously improve its educational activities based on the self-review results. The activities for continuous improvement shall be implemented in accordance with the system.			
4.2[1]	Does the program have a system to continuously improve its educational activities based on the self-review results?	X		
4.2[2]	Are activities for continuous improvement implemented in accordance with the system?	R		Confirm actual condition by interviewing the faculty

Attachment 3　On-site Evaluation Schedule (Reference)

Following are example of schedule for On-site Evaluation (in case of two days and one night On-site Evaluation). Term and contents of On-site Evaluation largely relied on number of and contents of items which could not confirm 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 Evaluation by effectively utilizing correspondence with program through Program Review Report (prior to the On-site Evaluation). Based on those effort, it is recommended for the Evaluation Team to make the most efficient evaluation schedule and to implement evaluation at the shortest possible schedule to confirm review items left as unconfirmed. Additionally, time to start or to end On-site Evaluation relied on time required for moving to the educational institution therefore it should be considered when deciding schedule of On-site Evaluation.

Day 1

12:00 - 13:00 (Lunch)	Meeting among the Evaluation Team (1) - 　Confirmation of the schedule and contents of On-site Evaluation - 　- 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 Team and program related party. - 　Introduction of the related party - 　Remarks from head of Faculty, head of graduate school and Person in Charge of the Program - 　Remarks from The Chair of the Evaluation Team - 　Detailed explanation of the program by the Person in Charge of the Program
13:30 - 14:30	Interview with program related party (1) - 　Final confirmation of the schedule and contents of On-site Evaluation - 　Confirmation on arrangement of on-site tour and interview preparation of document to be inspected at On-site Evaluation - 　Explanation from the Person in Charge of the Program in terms of accordance of the items to the Accreditation Criteria which could not be confirmed during evaluation and Q & A
14:30 - 14:45	Break
14:45 - 17:00	Documents inspection of the Learning Outcomes - 　Inspection of answer sheet and report of major courses (divide courses by each evaluator) - 　Inspection of arrangement made for undergraduate thesis and research - 　Inspection of reports and productions of courses related to development of engineering design ability

17:00 - 17:30	Meeting among the Evaluation Team (2)
	- Organization of the problems based on the documents inspection of the Learning Outcomes
17:30 - 18:00	Interview with program related party (2)
	- Q &A based on the documents inspection of the Learning Outcomes
18:00 - 18:30	Moving
18:30 - 19:30	Dinner
19:30 - 21:30	Meeting among the Evaluation Team (3)
	- Day 1 overview of On-site Evaluation
	- Organization of problem of status of accordance to the Accreditation Criteria
	- Confirmation of draft of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation) and Executive Summary
	- Confirmation of schedule and contents of evaluation Day 2

Day 2

8:00 - 8:30	Moving
8:30 - 9:00	Interview with program related party (3)
	- Confirmation of schedule and arrangement of On-site Evaluation 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	Interview with program related faculty (implement by dividing task to each Evaluation Team Member)
	- Interview with professor and associate professor
	- Interview with assistant professor
	- Interview with technical staff
	- Interview with curriculum related staff
10:00 - 10:15	Break
10:15 - 11:00	Interview with students
	- Group interview of third and fourth year students (junior/ senior)
	- Interview with graduate of the program(students from graduate school)
11:00 - 12:00	Inspection of document for On-site Evaluation
	- Inspection of document for educational review and educational improvement
	- Inspection of judgment record of graduates
12:00 - 13:00 (Lunch)	Meeting among the Evaluation Team (4)
	- Summary of inspection and interview result
	- Organization of problem of status of accordance to the Accreditation Criteria
	- Preparation of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site

	Evaluation) and Executive Summary
13:00～14:00	On-site Tour (facility and equipment)
	- Tour on lecture room
	- Tour on experiment room, experiment and equipment in laboratory
	- Tour on environment where undergraduate research was implemented
	- Tour on welfare facilities
14:00～15:00	Meeting among the Evaluation Team (5)
	- Final summary for the result of investigation and interview
	- Final organization of problem of status of accordance to the Accreditation Criteria
	- Preparing final version of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation) and Executive Summary
15:00 - 15:30	Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation
	- Read out Executive Summary
	- Confirmation and explanation of Program Review Report (Exit Meeting at On-site Evaluation)
	- Confirmation of proceeding further evaluation task and correspondence of related documents
	- Q & A
	- Gratitude for cooperation of Evaluation
15:30	Dismiss