

Kobe Institute of Computing, Graduate School of Information Technology (神戸情報大学院大学)

Evaluation summary

Standard 1. Mission and Objectives, etc.

The University, launched in 1958 cites the history and track record of being “the computer technology educational institute with the longest history in Japan” as its notable feature, and stipulates its mission, goals and educational objectives as being the “fostering of sophisticated ICT personnel with a sense of humanity.” In addition to the acquisition of basic knowledge and applied technology in information and communication technology (ICT), the University seeks to nurture practical investigation (“tankyu”) abilities consisting of knowledge about social issues and a capability to discover and resolve real issues, and treats this “Tankyu Practice” etc. as a course that are promoted in an integrated manner centering on the President.

The mission and goals are communicated and passed on at the Business Project Sharing Council and faculty and staff orientations, and the understanding and support of executives, faculty and staff is being obtained.

- The basic principle of “fostering of sophisticated ICT personnel with a sense of humanity” is clear, and the establishment of Tankyu Practice as a course to realize this goal and the way that integrated education is implemented to achieve the human resources development aimed for centered on the President are all worthy of evaluation.
- The convening of Business Project Sharing Council meetings, communication and passing on of missions and goals to all faculty and staff, imbuing them with these concepts, and the fact that faculty and staff are participating in the formulation of policies towards their realization all merit evaluation.

Standard 2. Students

The admission policy is clearly stipulated and a diverse range of entrance examinations conducted. In recent years the numbers of entrants have stabilized, and students are being appropriately secured in line with the University’s enrollment quotas and total capacity.

Student support is conducted through collaboration between faculty and staff, and reports by supervisors are presented each month at the Faculty Council. A meticulous instructional system has been developed, which includes Trainee Research Assistants (TRAs) who provide support for learning and class instruction. As a professional graduate school support is provided through an educational curriculum that is in its entirety directly linked to career education. Data regarding target human resources to be fostered and the learning plans is shared among supervisors through a Self-Assessment Sheet, and this enables wide-ranging career guidance covering students’ daily lives and job seeking aspects. The facilities requisite for attaining educational objectives have been developed and are effectively used.

Class Evaluation Questionnaires regarding all courses are conducted, and in addition to these ascertaining the opinions and requests of students, the faculty in charge of each course is expected to create a Teaching Report based on the questionnaire results, and a mechanism for constant improvements to be conducted is in place.

- Varied entrance examinations for the cultivation of highly sophisticated professionals are conducted, and the way in which the selection of entrants is fairly implemented merits evaluation.
- The state of progress of students' research is shared not only among supervisors but also the faculty and staff through the Faculty Council, and the fact that an integrated support system for students facing trouble with their learning is in place merits evaluation.
- The TRAs in the ICT Innovator Course are fulfilling the function of guiding international students to resolve all sorts of learning issues they face is worthy of evaluation as support for learning and class instruction.
- Self-Assessment Sheet is contributing to each student being able to objectively obtain a picture of themselves and clarify their targets and plans, and the way that this is useful in the sharing of information between employment supervisors and research supervisors is worthy of evaluation.
- The class evaluation questionnaire is conducted mid-semester and at the end of the semesters, classes with low evaluation scores are identified and the fact that a mechanism has been created to reflect the points to be improved in the course in question merits evaluation.

Standard 3. Educational curriculum

The evaluation of learning achievement is conducted pursuant to clear perspectives and criteria in line with the diploma policy. The University has devised evaluation methods for factors that cannot be measured by academic ability alone, and in order to improve the objectivity of evaluations implements results presentations, research plan presentations, mid-term review presentations and completion presentations. Evaluation items and criteria are clearly stipulated beforehand, and based on these the entire faculty make evaluations and final academic achievement is decided upon after consultation between faculty members. Score results are appropriately provided as feedback to students, and this meticulous approach is achieving effective learning guidance.

The curriculum policy is clear, made concrete based on the University's principles and consistent with the diploma policy. In line with this curriculum policy, not only knowledge-based teaching but also active learning and Project Based Learning/Problem Based Learning (PBL) educational methods are employed, leading to the achievement of highly practical education. Furthermore, the use of a curriculum road map contributes to the formulation by students of course registration plans.

- With regard to the evaluation of learning achievement in line with the diploma policy, after the entire faculty has evaluated evaluation items and evaluation criteria that have been previously set final academic achievement is established, feedback on score results provided to students. And effective learning guidance achieved, all of which are worthy of evaluation.
- The curriculum policy is clear and the ways that in line with the policy educational methods such

as Tankyu Practice, Specific Theme Study A, Specific Theme Study B, and other active learning and PBL are incorporated into teaching methods leads to the implementation of highly practical education, merit evaluation.

Standard 4. Faculty and Staff

The President, though in a part-time position, attends every session of the Faculty Council, retains the final authority to decide matters regarding the administrative affairs of the university, and conducts the overall governance of the University. The faculty is secured in line with their educational objectives and curriculum, and there is an appropriately assigned required number of full-time faculty that satisfies the stipulations of the Standards for Establishment of Universities. The faculty achievement evaluation system has been reformed, and the setting of targets, interview system and evaluation system are in place.

The FD/SD Committee stipulates an annual plan and selects opportune themes, and planned Faculty Development (FD) is being conducted. With regard to Staff Development (SD), systematic training is conducted from the time of joining the University onwards, and a system is in place in which through a twice-a-year hearings the staff's problem resolution skills are honed.

Standard 5. Management, Administration and Finance

Regulations are prepared and laws adhered to for the sake of the maintenance of management discipline and integrity, auditors and an auditing firm perform audits, and the University makes continuous efforts to achieve the mission and goals. Board of Directors is appropriately convened and enters into debate as the final decision-making body. Furthermore, in line with the Detailed Regulations for Enforcement of Articles of Endowment, the Management Council sits once a week, debates important matters relating to the important matters for the University's incorporated entity and conducts swift decision-making. A Management Liaison Council in which both management-level and administrative staff participate is convened, and management, education and learning collaboration is promoted.

The University's incorporated entity's financial base is stable due to the jointly instituted Kobe Institute of Computing - College of Computing being in the black, and while the University is in a severe fiscal state, as a result of efforts in preparing its educational program etc., in the 2017 academic year the fiscal balance of the University (non-consolidated) moved into the black. There have been no recent borrowings, and the budget is executed and according to its accounting system.

Standard 6. Internal Quality Assurance

Based on the points indicated during the previous Institutional Evaluation and Accreditation, a Self-Inspection and Evaluation Committee was launched in 2011, organized self-inspections and evaluations are implemented every other year, and educational reforms are being promoted in line with the previous evaluation. The results of self-inspections and evaluations are compiled in a Self-Inspection and Evaluation Report, and the main problems and issues are sorted as "major response issues," all of which serves as a mechanism for attempting improvements.

Improvements to the quality assurance of education and teaching are implemented through the class questionnaire and submission of Teaching Reports and Research Activity Reports. Based on these, FD activities such as Faculty Study Groups are carried out, and an evaluation-based PDCA cycle has been established and leads to improvements. .

In summary, the University is exercising its powerful distinctive quality of pioneering computer education, promoting education to nurture practical investigation (“tankyu”) abilities, being inventive in its evaluations of learning achievement that cannot be measured through academic achievement alone, and trying to cultivate its students. Though prone to difficulties arising from its small size, the University pursues impassioned initiatives to enrich education, meticulous learning guidance, and there are many outstanding points in its evaluation and improvement systems, and it is to be hoped that in the future there will be further comprehensive initiatives and fully-fledged progress.

Note that with regard to the University’s unique standards, the general comments on “Standard A. Fostering of sophisticated ICT personnel with a sense of humanity” and “Standard B. Social Innovation by ICT and Yourself” should be referred to.

It should be noted that the University has cited the following remarks.

1. Various project to create meeting points with society
2. Collaborations with companies, local governments and organization such as the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO), the Council for Promotion of Local Information, Communication and Technology (COPLI) and the Japan Electronics and Information Technology Industries Association (JEITA).