

(For implementation in 2025)

Institutional certified evaluation and accreditation for colleges of  
technology

Evaluation Implementation Manual

National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of  
Higher Education

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Purpose and Implementation System of Evaluation .....	1
I About the evaluation implementation manual .....	1
II Purpose, basic policy, and standards of evaluation. ....	1
III Contents of evaluation.....	2
IV Main schedule .....	2
V Evaluation implementation system (role of the Evaluation Committee).....	3
1 Committee for Institutional Certified Evaluation and Accreditation for Colleges of Technology .....	3
2 Evaluation subcommittee and evaluation team .....	4
3 Steering Subcommittee, Specialized Subcommittee, and Opinion Examination Subcommittee .....	4
4 Response Status and Supplementary Review Subcommittee.....	4
5 Expert Members Selection Committee.....	5
6 Points to note regarding the Evaluation Committee members and expert members.....	5
VI Survey and analysis in the Evaluation Subcommittee .....	6
Chapter 2 Evaluation Method.....	7
I Implementation framework and method of document analysis .....	7
1 Implementation framework of document analysis .....	7
2 Method for conducting document analysis .....	7
II Confirmation of the purpose, etc., of the college of technology.....	7
III Analysis of self-assessment reports, etc. ....	7
IV Site Visits .....	9
Chapter 3 Finalization of Evaluation Results.....	9
I Composition and description of the evaluation results (original draft).....	9
1 CEA results (determination of conformity to <i>the Standards</i> ) .....	9
2 Evaluation for each Standard defined in Areas 1 to 6 .....	9
II Confirmation of evaluation results .....	10
Chapter 4 Confirmation of Response Status .....	10
I Summary of response status.....	10
Chapter 5 Supplementary Review .....	11
I Summary of supplementary review .....	11
Attachment 1 .....	12

# Chapter 1 Purpose and Implementation System of Evaluation

## I About the evaluation implementation manual

Institutional certified evaluation and accreditation for colleges of technology (hereinafter referred to as the “CEA”) aim to maintain and improve the level of education and research at colleges of technology and contribute to their unique and diverse development based on the general principles and standards for evaluation and accreditation of colleges of technology. The National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education (NIAD-QE) implements these programs based on the objectives of each college of technology so that the individuality and characteristics of each college of technology can be fully demonstrated.

This *evaluation implementation manual* is compiled so that the members (evaluators) of the evaluation subcommittee, who are involved in the CEA conducted by NIAD-QE, can fully understand the significance and methods of evaluation and perform their duties based on a common understanding.

This manual consists of five chapters, and “Chapter 1 Purpose and Implementation System of Evaluation” describes the basic content and implementation system of this evaluation. “Chapter 2 Evaluation Method” and “Chapter 3 Finalization of Evaluation Results” describe specific evaluation methods as a manual for the evaluators. “Chapter 4 Confirmation of Response Status” describes how to confirm response status reports submitted after the fiscal year following the evaluation implementation year.

This manual is intended for use by evaluators; however, from the perspective of ensuring the transparency of the evaluations, it is publicly available on the NIAD-QE website (<https://www.niad.ac.jp/>).

## II Purpose, basic policy, and standards of evaluation.

The purpose and basic policies of the CEA are described in Sections I and II of the General Principles of Institutional Certified Evaluation and Accreditation for Colleges of Technology (hereinafter referred to as *the “General Principles”*). The evaluation standards are described in Section III of *the “General Principles”* and Standards for Evaluation and Accreditation of Colleges of Technology (hereinafter referred to as *the “Standards”*).

Target colleges of technology (hereinafter referred to as “evaluated colleges”) should undergo the CEA once within seven years based on Article 109, paragraph 2, Article 123 of the School Education Act, and Article 40 of School Education Act Enforcement Order. In addition, as stated in Section VII of *the General Principles*, if the evaluation standards are not met, the evaluated college should undergo a supplementary review. As stated in VI of *the General Principles*, the evaluated college should receive a check on the status of responses to standards pointed out as “points to be improved” after the evaluation.

Regarding these evaluations, the NIAD-QE has prepared and published *the General Principles, the Standards, the “Guidelines for Self-assessment”* that summarize the methods of preparing documents to be submitted by the evaluated colleges to the NIAD-QE, *the “Guidelines for Site Visit”* that summarize the methods of conducting site visits, and *this Evaluation Implementation Manual* that summarizes the evaluation methods for evaluators. In other words, both the college of technology undergoing evaluation and the evaluators conduct the evaluation processes based on these five published documents.

Prior to the start of the evaluation process, as described in Section IV (2) of *the General Principles*, NIAD-QE provides training to evaluators to deepen their understanding of the purpose, content, and methods of CEA so that

they can proceed with fair, appropriate, and smooth evaluations based on a shared understanding.

### III Contents of evaluation

This evaluation is based on *the Standards* established by the NIAD-QE, targeting the overall situation of education and research activities, management and administration, and finances of each evaluated college. *The Standards* consist of 37 standards classified into 6 Areas: “Area 1 Internal Quality Assurance System in Education,” “Area 2 Educational Organizations, Faculty Members and Educational Support Staff,” “Area 3 Learning Environment and Student Support,” “Area 4 Financial Foundation and Administrative Management,” “Area 5 Status of Educational Activities in the Regular Course Program,” and “Area 6 Status of Educational Activities in the Advanced Course Program.” In addition, the internal quality assurance standards (Standards 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3) are positioned as “priority evaluation items” and are emphasized when judging whether the evaluation standards are met.

This evaluation determines whether the target college satisfies the standards for areas 1–6. If all standards are met, the college will be judged as “conforming to *the Standards*.” If any criteria are unmet, all the standards and special notes will be analyzed. As a result, if there are no serious concerns about the management of education and research activities and it is possible to confirm that the quality of education and research activities is ensured, the college is judged as “conforming to *the Standards*.” If such confirmation cannot be made, the college is judged as “not conforming to *the Standards*.” However if Standard 1-1 (An organizational structure for internal quality assurance system should be clearly defined.), Standard 1-2 (Procedures for internal quality assurance should be clearly defined), or Standard 1-3 (Results of self-assessment and third-party evaluation should be linked to improving and enhancing the quality of education), which are positioned as priority evaluation items, are judged to be inadequately developed and not met, the college is judged as “not conforming to *the Standards*,” regardless of the status of other standards.

The results of the evaluation consist of the following items:

- (1) A judgment as to whether the college conforms to *the Standards*;
- (2) The grounds and reasons for a judgment of non-conformity with *the Standards*;
- (3) A judgment as to whether Standards 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3 for priority evaluation items are met, the grounds and reasons for such judgments;
- (4) Identification of best practices for each standard;
- (5) Identification of points to be improved for standards that are not met;
- (6) A judgment as to whether the evaluated college meets each standard; and
- (7) The grounds and reasons for the judgment in item (6) regarding whether each standard is met.

### IV Main schedule

[Previous fiscal year of evaluation]

End of September: Deadline for submission of applications for the following fiscal year’s evaluation

[Fiscal year of evaluation]

June: Implementation of training for evaluators (subcommittee members)

End of June: Deadline for submission of self-assessment reports from evaluated colleges

From July: Conducting document analysis and site visits

End of January: Notification of the evaluation results (draft) to the evaluated colleges to allow them to express their statements of objection

Mid-February: Deadline for receipt of statements of objection from evaluated colleges

Late March: Finalization and publication of the evaluation results

[The fiscal year following the evaluation year and thereafter] (Only for colleges of technology required to submit responses)

End of June: Submission of a report on the status of responses from the evaluated colleges

(Note) The overall evaluation schedule is shown in Attachment 1, “Institutional certified evaluation and accreditation schedule for colleges of technology.”

## **V Evaluation implementation system (role of the Evaluation Committee)**

To conduct the evaluation, the following framework will be established based on the arrangements described in sections IV and V (2) of *the General Principles*.

### **1 Committee for Institutional Certified Evaluation and Accreditation for Colleges of Technology**

- (1) The Committee for Institutional Certified Evaluation and Accreditation for Colleges of Technology (hereinafter referred to as the “Evaluation Committee”) establishes the basic policy for the evaluation, deliberates on the specific content and methods required for its implementation, oversees the overall evaluation process, and makes the final decision on the evaluation results.
- (2) The chairperson and vice-chairperson of the Evaluation Committee are elected by mutual election among the members of the Evaluation Committee.
- (3) Under the Evaluation Committee, Evaluation Subcommittees are organized to conduct specific investigations and analyses, including deliberations on the specific evaluation content and methods. Depending on the number of colleges evaluated, multiple subcommittees may be organized.
- (4) Based on (3), when multiple Evaluation Subcommittees are organized, a Steering Subcommittee is established under the Evaluation Committee as necessary to coordinate the Evaluation Subcommittees. The Steering Subcommittee also arranges proposals for meetings of the Evaluation Committee, as necessary.
- (5) When conducting specific investigations and analyses in the Evaluation Subcommittee, specialized subcommittees may be established under the Evaluation Committee if it is necessary to conduct investigations, analyses, etc. on specialized matters from the perspective of contributing to the deliberations of the Evaluation Subcommittee.
- (6) An Opinion Examination Subcommittee is established under the Evaluation Committee to deliberate on the statement of objection concerning the evaluation results (draft).
- (7) When it is necessary to conduct investigations or analyses of response status report submitted by evaluated colleges or to conduct supplementary reviews, the Response Status and Supplementary Review Subcommittee is established under the Evaluation Committee.

- (8) An Expert Members Selection Committee is established under the Evaluation Committee.
- (9) Other matters necessary for the operation of the Evaluation Committee are determined by the Evaluation Committee.

## **2 Evaluation subcommittee and evaluation team**

- (1) The Evaluation Subcommittee conducts document analysis and site visits based on the basic policies established by the Evaluation Committee. Additionally, based on the investigation results, the evaluation results (original draft) are prepared and submitted to the Evaluation Committee.
- (2) The Evaluation Subcommittee consists of the Evaluation Committee members and expert members appointed by the Evaluation Committee as evaluators. The Evaluators are responsible for investigations and analyses of the evaluated colleges.
- (3) Each Evaluation Subcommittee has a chairperson, who is elected by mutual election among the Evaluation Committee members and expert members belonging to the subcommittee. The chairperson of the subcommittee summarizes the opinions of the subcommittee, coordinates activities within the subcommittee and liaises with the Evaluation Committee. In addition, the subcommittee chairperson appoints a vice chairperson from among the Evaluation Committee and expert members belonging to the subcommittee. The vice chairperson assists the chairperson.
- (4) Evaluation teams are formed in the Evaluation Subcommittee to conduct document analysis and site visits for each evaluated college. The chairperson of the Evaluation Subcommittee appoints the lead evaluator of the evaluation team from among the members of the Evaluation Subcommittee. The lead evaluator oversees the work related to the evaluation of the college and assists the chairperson of the Evaluation Subcommittee.

## **3 Steering Subcommittee, Specialized Subcommittee, and Opinion Examination Subcommittee**

- (1) The Steering Subcommittee and Specialized Subcommittee comprise Evaluation Committee members and expert members nominated by the chairperson of the Evaluation Committee. A chief examiner is assigned to each subcommittee to manage their affairs. The chief examiner is elected by mutual election of the Evaluation Committee members and the expert members belonging to the subcommittee. A deputy chief examiner is appointed to assist the chief examiner and is designated by the chief examiner from among the Evaluation subcommittee members and expert members belonging to the subcommittee.
- (2) The Opinion Examination Subcommittee comprises expert members who are not involved in the evaluation of the relevant college in the current evaluation year. The expert members are nominated by the chairperson of the Evaluation Committee. The chairperson is appointed to the Opinion Examination Subcommittee to manage its affairs. The chairperson is elected by mutual selection among expert members. A vice-chairperson is appointed to assist the chairperson and is designated by the chairperson from among the expert members.

## **4 Response Status and Supplementary Review Subcommittee**

- (1) The Response Status and Supplementary Review Subcommittee comprises the Evaluation Committee members

and expert members appointed by the Evaluation Committee. A chairperson is appointed to the subcommittee and elected by mutual election among the Evaluation Committee members and expert members belonging to the subcommittee. In addition, the chairperson appoints a vice chairperson from among the Evaluation Committee members and expert members belonging to the subcommittee. The vice chairperson assists the chairperson.

## **5 Expert Members Selection Committee**

- (1) The Expert Members Selection Committee selects candidates for expert members from among the candidates, from a professional perspective, in accordance with the selection policy determined by the Evaluation Committee and reports the results to the Evaluation Committee.
- (2) The Expert Member Selection Committee consists of Evaluation Committee members, expert members, and other relevant persons nominated by the chairperson of the Evaluation Committee.
- (3) The chairperson of the Evaluation Committee appoints a chairperson from among the Evaluation Committee members belonging to the committee. The chairperson coordinates the opinions of the committee, coordinates activities within the committee and liaises with the Evaluation Committee.

## **6 Points to note regarding the Evaluation Committee members and expert members**

- (1) To properly deal with conflicts of interest, the Evaluation Committee members and evaluators shall not participate in CEA-related work or deliberations concerning colleges of technology with which they are affiliated.
- (2) Evaluators should be careful about handling the fact that they are involved in the evaluation of the college in the current evaluation year until it is announced at the end of the current fiscal year. In particular, expert members should be treated with great care until the fact that they have been appointed is announced at the end of the fiscal year.
- (3) When evaluating a college, if an individual case arises, the Evaluation Subcommittee or the Steering Subcommittee discusses such cases as needed and conducts the evaluation based on a unified view.
- (4) The evaluators shall not disclose any personal information they have acquired as evaluators or data related to the evaluation contents of the college. During site visits, evaluators shall take sufficient care not to intrude into personal privacy beyond what is necessary. In addition, due care shall be taken to ensure that the responses provided during site visits do not result in any disadvantage to the respondents.
- (5) Evaluations are conducted with full consideration given to the purpose of establishment, history and tradition, scale and resources, human and physical conditions, and geographical conditions of the evaluated college.
- (6) The purpose of this evaluation is to contribute to the improvement and enhancement of the educational and research activities of the evaluated colleges, so that they can further develop as colleges of technology with outstanding individuality in a competitive environment. Therefore, the college's unique efforts, innovations, and improvement efforts are evaluated while considering those that have not necessarily achieved sufficient results.

## **VI Survey and analysis in the Evaluation Subcommittee**

Surveys and analyses conducted by the Evaluation Subcommittee consist of conducting document analysis, site visits, and preparing draft evaluation results.

Specifically, the Evaluation Team of the Evaluation Subcommittee (comprising multiple Evaluation Committee members and expert members belonging to the Evaluation Subcommittee) is responsible for document analysis, site visits, and preparing draft evaluation results for the evaluated college.

In the document analysis, the self-assessment reports (including supporting materials and data) submitted by the evaluated college as well as the materials and data that collected independently NIAD-QE are examined and analyzed.

In the site visits, matters that could not be confirmed through the document analysis are primarily investigated.

## **Chapter 2 Evaluation Method**

### **I Implementation framework and method of document analysis**

#### **1 Implementation framework of document analysis**

- (1) Document analysis are mainly conducted by the evaluation team organized for each evaluated college in the Evaluation Subcommittee. The lead evaluator of the team determines their roles and assignments.
- (2) Necessary adjustments are made within the Evaluation Subcommittee regarding the results of the document analysis. If a problem requiring coordination among the Evaluation Subcommittees arises, it is discussed by the Steering Subcommittee.

#### **2 Method for conducting document analysis**

- (1) The evaluation team conducts the investigation, analysis, and judgment of each standard as document analysis. Specifically, regarding each standard of the self-assessment report submitted by the evaluated college based on the objectives of the college of technology, the evaluation team investigates, analyzes, and makes judgments for each analysis item based on the results of the analysis by the evaluated college and the materials and data that serve as the evidence for those items. The Evaluation Subcommittee compiles the results.
- (2) In the process of document analysis, if there are any unclear points or if the materials and data that serve as the evidence for self-assessment are insufficient, the evaluation team makes an inquiry to the evaluated college or asks them to submit additional materials and data through the NIAD-QE secretariat as necessary.

### **II Confirmation of the purpose, etc., of the college of technology**

The evaluation criteria are designed to ensure that a self-assessment of education and research activities is conducted based on the objectives of the evaluated college, so that the individuality and characteristics of the college of technology can be fully demonstrated. Therefore, a thorough understanding of the purposes of the evaluated college is required.

The self-assessment report “I Current situation and characteristics of colleges of technology” describes the overall picture of the evaluated college, and “II Purpose” describes the college's mission, basic policies for conducting educational and research activities, and basic outcomes to be achieved, including the image of human resources to be trained. It also describes the purpose of training human resources for each department and major, as well as other educational and research purposes. It is necessary to fully understand the overall purpose of a college based on these.

The content of the purpose itself is not subject to evaluation but is treated as a premise when conducting analysis and assessment.

### **III Analysis of self-assessment reports, etc.**

In the document analysis, the self-assessment reports (including the materials and data that serve as evidence) submitted by the evaluated college and the materials and data that the NIAD-QE independently collects are investigated and analyzed.

(1) Analysis of the self-assessment reports

Analysis of the self-assessment reports is conducted by the Evaluation Subcommittee concerning the following points, based on self-assessment report (including the evidence materials), Appendix forms, supplementary materials, and other available materials:

[1] Confirmation and analysis of “Perspectives” established for each “Standard.”

The “Perspectives” are analyzed based on the status of the “Self-assessment items.”

[2] Analysis of “Special notes” provided in “Perspectives.”

The individuality and characteristics of activities and efforts that cannot be self-assessed from “Perspectives” alone and things to keep in mind when referring to materials are entered in the “Special notes,” so the “Special notes” are analyzed based on [1].

[3] Evaluation of “Standards.”

Based on the analysis results of the “Perspectives” and “Special notes” that make up the “Standards,” judgments are made as to whether each “Standard” in Areas 1 to 6 is met.

[4] Extraction of best practices and points to be improved for each “Standard.”

Based on [3], the best practices and the points to be improved for each “Standard” in Areas 1 to 6 are identified. Refer to (2) for the identification concept.

[5] Extraction of “Confirmation items.”

If the analysis of the self-assessment report does not confirm the content necessary for judgments regarding standards, the evaluation team may request explanations and submission of supporting materials and data during the site visits. When requesting descriptions, materials, etc., the requested contents are extracted as “Confirmation items.”

(2) Identification of best practices and points to be improved.

Based on the purpose of the evaluated college, when extracting points that are considered particularly important, the best practices and points to be improved are extracted for each “standard” based on the following principles.

Best practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Items for which the efforts and achievements of the evaluated college are judged to be high.</li> <li>2) Items judged to represent unique efforts that have been made with original ingenuity.</li> <li>3) Other items judged to be worthy of special mention as best practices.</li> </ul>
Points to be improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Items judged to require efforts and initiatives for improvement, including cases where violations of laws or regulations such as <i>the Standards for Establishment</i> are recognized, or where internal quality assurance framework is ineffectively developed and the educational quality assurance system may not function effectively.</li> <li>* “Standards” that require improvement are judged as not meeting the standards. For items identified as points to be improved, the evaluated college is required to report on the status of the response.</li> <li>2) Other items judged to require special mention as a point to be improved.</li> </ul>

\* “Perspectives” and “items” that are “analyzed as more desirable initiatives” in *the Guidelines for Self-Assessment Attachment 2* will be extracted as best practices when excellent institutional outcomes are confirmed. In addition, evaluations for the above “perspectives” and “items” will not be considered in the judgment of the

standards.

## **IV Site Visits**

The site visits investigate the situation at the evaluated college, focusing on matters that could not be confirmed by document analysis. The purpose of the site visits is to communicate the findings of the investigations to the evaluated colleges and to develop a shared understanding regarding the situation of the college.

Site visits are conducted in accordance with *the Guidelines for Site Visits*.

## **Chapter 3 Finalization of Evaluation Results**

### **I Composition and description of the evaluation results (original draft)**

The Evaluation Subcommittee adds findings obtained from the site visits to the results of the document analysis to create the evaluation results (original draft).

The structure and content of the evaluation results (original draft) prepared by the Evaluation Subcommittee are as follows.

#### **1 CEA results (determination of conformity to *the Standards*)**

(1) The Results of the CEA are described as follows:

- Conforms to *the Standards*.
- Does not conform to *the Standards*.

\*If it is determined that the college does not conform to *the Standards*, the reasons are also stated.

(2) Whether the evaluated college meets *the Standards* is determined as follows:

[1] If all standards set for Areas 1 to 6 are met, the college is judged as conforming to *the Standards*.

[2] When one or more standards are not met, all standards and special notes are analyzed. If serious concerns are not identified regarding the management of educational and research activities and it is confirmed that the quality of educational and research activities is being ensured, the college is judged as conforming to *the Standards*. If this cannot be confirmed, the college is judged as not conforming to *the Standards*.

[3] Regarding the internal quality assurance system (Standards 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3), which is positioned as priority evaluation items, if a point is identified as requiring improvement the college is judged as not conforming to *the Standards*, regardless of the status of other standards.

#### **2 Evaluation for each Standard defined in Areas 1 to 6**

(1) The Evaluation Subcommittee evaluates each Standard based on the status of each Perspective shown in *the Guidelines for Self-Assessment Attachment 2*. Based on the analysis results examined and organized through document analysis and the site visits, the Evaluation Subcommittee describes the evaluation of each standard as follows.

- Meets Standard X-X.
- Does not meet Standard X-X.

(2) The evaluation of each Standard is described with the following components: evaluation results, grounds and reasons for the results, best practices, and points to be improved.

## II Confirmation of evaluation results

- 1 The Evaluation Committee receives the evaluation results (original draft) prepared by the Evaluation Subcommittee, deliberates on the original draft, and summarizes them as the evaluation results (draft). The Evaluation Committee will notify the evaluated college of the evaluation results (draft) through the NIAD-QE secretariat before finalizing the evaluation results.
- 2 If the evaluated college has an objection to the evaluation results (draft) notified by the NIAD-QE, it may file an objection.
- 3 If an objection is filed against the evaluation results (draft), the Evaluation Committee will discuss it again. When deliberating on objections, the Opinion Examination Subcommittee established under the Evaluation Committee, will conduct deliberations as necessary. The Evaluation Committee will finalize the evaluation results while considering the deliberation results of the Opinion Examination Subcommittee.
- 4 The final evaluation results are summarized in an evaluation report. The evaluation report will be sent to the evaluated colleges and their establishers and reported to the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology. Additionally, it will be made widely available to the public by posting it on the NIAD-QE website (<https://www.niad.ac.jp>).

## Chapter 4 Confirmation of Response Status

### I Summary of response status

If the evaluated college that is judged to be conforming to *the Standards* has any items identified as points to be improved, it should report on the response status (or the status of completion if improvement has been completed) to the NIAD-QE by the third fiscal year, with the fiscal year following the year in which the evaluation was conducted defined as the first year, recognizing that the improvement is to be carried out as a continuous effort of the evaluated college.

NIAD-QE confirms the response status, and if it is confirmed that improvements have been made, adds a statement to that effect to the evaluation results and makes them public.

If it is not confirmed that the sufficient response have been made regarding the points to be improved by the deadline, or if no response status report has been submitted, NIAD-QE notifies the fact to the establisher accordingly and makes this information public on the NIAD-QE website (<https://www.niad.ac.jp>).

## Chapter 5 Supplementary Review

### I Summary of supplementary review

A college that is judged not to meet *the Standards* must undergo a supplementary review by the third fiscal year, with the fiscal year following the year in which the evaluation was conducted defined as the first year.

If, as a result of the supplementary review, the college is judged to conform to the Standards, this fact is published as the supplementary review results together with the results of the previous evaluation.

In addition, if the standards determined not to be met have not been adequately addressed by the deadline, it has not been confirmed that the college conforms to *the Standards*, or if no application of the supplementary review has been submitted, NIAD-QE notifies the fact to the establisher accordingly and makes this information public on the NIAD-QE website (<https://www.niad.ac.jp>).

The system and methods for the supplementary review are separately determined by the Evaluation Committee.

# Attachment 1

## Institutional certified evaluation and accreditation schedule for colleges of technology

\*The schedule below is a guideline and will be determined each year. Additionally, changes may occur depending on the progress of the evaluation work.

		NIAD-QE	Evaluated college	
FY two years prior to the evaluation FY	June-Sep.		Periodic self-assessment and implementation of improvements based on the results	
			Briefing sessions on the CEA and workshops for internal assessors in Charge of Self-assessment.	
FY prior to the evaluation FY	Sep.	Acceptance of application for evaluation	Application for evaluation	
The evaluation FY	April	Notification of evaluation fee		
	May			
	June	<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Evaluation Subcommittee</div>	Submission of self-assessment report, payment of evaluation fee	
	July		Document analysis	Selection of interviewees, etc.
	Aug.			
	Sep.		[Sent to evaluated colleges by September] • “Status by document analysis” and “confirmation items at the site visits” • Web questionnaires form	[Submit by specified deadline] • Explanation of the “confirmation items at the site visits,” collection of materials and data, etc. • The decision of a route for inspecting educational sites and investigating the status of learning environments • Responses to questionnaires
	Oct.			
	Nov.		[Site Visits (implemented by visiting the site and using a web conference system)] • Confirmation of answers to the “confirmation items at the site visits” • Interviews, surveys of educational and learning environments, etc.	
	Dec.		Preparation of evaluation results (original draft)	
	Jan.		<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">[Evaluation Committee]</div> Notification of evaluation results (draft) to evaluated college	Examination of evaluation results(draft) and submission of statement of objection.
	Feb.			
	Mar.		Response to the statement of objection, finalizing and publishing evaluation results	
	FYs following the evaluation FY			
June				Submission of response status report
July			Investigation of response status reports, etc.	

\*See Chapter 5 for the schedule in the case of a supplementary review.