

University Accreditation Results
(Results for Certified Evaluation and Accreditation for University)

Asia University



Basic Information of the Institution	
Ownership: Private	Location: Tokyo, Japan
Accreditation Status	
Year of the Review: 2019	
Accreditation Status: Accredited (Accreditation Period: April 1.2020 – March 31.2027)	

Certified Evaluation and Accreditation Results for Asia University

Overview

With the founding principles of “self-help and cooperation,” Asia University (hereinafter referred to as the “University”) has as its goal “to nurture individuals who can contribute to the development of Asia and other parts of the world.” The University’s mission and purpose are based on these principles and goal. In order to achieve its founding principles and purpose, the University has established the mid- to long-term plan Asia Future Roadmap 2025, presenting further detailed policies in the form of four visions. Therefore, the University is making efforts to improve its educational and research activities. The University continues to implement various programs toward achieving its founding principles, including the Asia University America Program (AUAP) in which many students have participated since its launch in 1988.

The University is committed to disclosure. It has laid down policies and procedures for internal quality assurance and has made relevant information accessible via its website and other means. The University is actively engaged in self-assessment and review. It has established a Self-Assessment and Review Committee as an organization responsible for internal quality assurance across the whole University. However, improvement should be made to clarify the Self-Assessment and Review Committee’s relationship with other internal quality assurance organizations such as the Internal Quality Assurance Inspection Committee and the Three-Year Mid-Term Action Plan Implementation Committee, its roles, and its authority in the regulations.

Regarding education, faculties and graduate schools have established and announced their degree award policies and curriculum design and implementation policies (curriculum policies) in line with the characteristics of their respective disciplines, based on the University’s overall degree award policy (diploma policy). The curriculum of each faculty and graduate school is systematically structured in line with the curriculum design and implementation policy, and subjects are provided according to four criteria that have been established to foster social and professional independence among students. In order to develop globally-minded individuals, the University encourages students to learn in a way that corresponds to its principles. For example, it offers four study abroad programs each with different features.

The “Deai-no-Hiroba,” an orientation event for freshmen, which has been held for over half a century as introductory education for new students, enhances new students’

sense of belonging to the University through a variety of programs, and functions effectively as a way to encourage active participation in learning and on-campus activities after enrollment. The “Deai-no-Hiroba” workshop is remarkable in that senior students offer guidance to the new students as assistants, which contributes to the growth of the senior students as well.

There are, however, several issues that need to be resolved. First, the three policies (degree award policy, curriculum design and implementation policy, and admission policy; hereinafter referred to as the “Three Policies”) for the Master’s Course and Doctor’s Course are identical in some graduate schools, even though they provide different degrees. This should be corrected. As noted above, the relationship, roles, and authority of the organizations involved in internal quality assurance are not clearly defined in the regulations; the learning outcomes of students that are indicated in the degree award policy are not appropriately grasped or evaluated; and the regulations for several committees in charge of discussing university-wide matters pertaining to management of the University, such as the Directors Council Regulations and the Deans Council Regulations, do not clearly define the specific agendas, quorums, and resolution methods of the committees in question. These issues should be corrected.

Going forward, we hope the University solves these issues through internal quality assurance efforts and accelerates its remarkable initiatives for further development of its program.

Notable Strengths

Student Support

- As introductory education, new students participate in an orientation on student life held in April, after enrollment. Furthermore, the University holds the “Deai-no-Hiroba”, an orientation event for freshmen. It involves exchange between new students, faculty members, and current students and a three-day program for practical introductory education, and aims to enable new students to adapt to university life and develop a sense of belonging to the University. Senior students who have taken part in multiple training sessions participate in the “Deai-no-Hiroba” as assistant students. The senior students develop their own team-building skills and leadership through the training sessions and providing guidance to the new students. These initiatives have been continually improved and implemented for over half a century since 1969, and represent the University’s efforts to implement its founding principles of “self-help

and cooperation.”

Suggestions for Improvement

Internal Quality Assurance

- Although the Self-Assessment and Review Committee has been established as an organization responsible for the promotion of internal quality assurance, its relationship with other internal quality assurance organizations such as the Internal Quality Assurance Inspection Committee and the Three-Year Mid-Term Action Plan Implementation Committee, roles, and authority of the respective organizations are not clearly indicated in the regulations or in terms of actual operation. Therefore, the internal quality assurance system is not functioning effectively. This situation should be corrected.

Curricular & Learning Outcomes

- Faculties carry out a questionnaire survey at the time of graduation to grasp students' learning outcomes that are indicated in the degree award policy. However, the survey only covers matters such as students' satisfaction of student life in general, and does not enable faculties to fully grasp the learning outcomes that are indicated in the degree award policy. Though graduate schools hold mid-term presentation meetings and carry out thesis examinations, the relevance of these activities with the learning outcomes indicated in the degree award policy are unclear. Therefore, faculties and graduate schools should use diversified methods to appropriately grasp and evaluate the learning outcomes indicated in the degree award policy.

Student Enrollment

- The ratio of student enrollment to the student enrollment cap is low at 0.43 in the Master's Course in the Graduate School of Economics and 0.20 in the Doctor's Course in the Graduate School of Asian and International Business Strategy, and there are no students in the Doctor's Course in the Graduate School of Economics and the Doctor's Course in the Graduate School of Law. Therefore, significant improvement should be made in graduate school quota management.

University Management and Finance

- The regulations for several committees in charge of discussing university-wide matters pertaining to management of the University, such as the Directors Council Regulations and the Deans Council Regulations, do not clearly define the specific agendas, quorums, resolution methods, and procedures for revision and repeal. The Directors Council Regulations define the Directors Council as the “supreme decision-making body regarding the daily business of the University,” and does not include provisions for ensuring the ultimate authority of the President. The Regulations for the Board of Acting Directors state that the Board of Acting Directors is a deliberative body, not a determining body. However, in the actual management process, the Board of Directors determines important University matters that are outside the scope of its agenda, such as policies related to budget formation. Such flaws in the university-wide regulations pertaining to management of the University should be corrected appropriately.
- According to the School Regulations and Faculty Council Regulations, each Faculty Council is capable of discussing and determining matters related to curriculum organization and the examination of the educational and research achievements of faculty members. This is hardly appropriate in light of the revision of the School Education Act on university governance reform (enacted on April 1, 2015). Similar provisions are included in the Graduate School Regulations and Graduate School Committee Regulations. The situation should be improved.

Recommendations

Curricular & Learning Outcomes

- The degree award policy for the Master’s Course and Doctor’s Course is identical in the Graduate School of Asian and International Business Strategy and the Graduate School of Economics, respectively, even though the courses provide different degrees. This should be corrected.
- The Master’s Course and Doctor’s Course in the Graduate School of Asian and International Business Strategy and the Graduate School of Economics, respectively, have the same curriculum design and implementation policy, even though the courses

provide different degrees. This should be corrected.

Student Enrollment

- The admission policy for the Master's Course and Doctor's Course is the same in all graduate schools, even though the courses provide different degrees. This should be corrected.