1. Decision of institutional certified evaluation and accreditation

The National Institute of Technology, Sendai College, complies with the Standards for the Establishment of Colleges of Technology and other relevant laws and regulations and meets the Standards for Evaluation and Accreditation of Colleges of Technology set by the National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education (NIAD-QE). It fulfills all the requirements defined as priority evaluation items in Viewpoint 1-1.

The best practices identified by the review committee include the following:

1) As part of its comprehensive student support system, Sendai College set up a study support room (SSR), in which three education coordinators provide individual study guidance daily. It also stationed two full-time counselors in the student counseling room to facilitate the "Delivery Type Psycho-Education Workshop."

2) Sendai College, as a base school in the IoT field for "COMPASS 5.0, a project to develop future technology human resources suitable for Society 5.0," designed a new curriculum and created teaching materials for the development of IoT human resources. To promote education in the IoT field at institutes of technology across the country, the college distributed the designed curricula and teaching materials to 11 institutes nationwide.

3) As part of their course internship in the third quarter of their first year, which aims to improve problem-solving skills, students helped local companies by identifying and solving company issues.

4) The employment rate (the number of students employed divided by those seeking postgraduate employment) for associate and diploma courses is extremely high, with graduates employed in manufacturing and other industries to which the engineers that the college hopes to produce are well-suited. The rate of students advancing to higher education (the number of students advancing to higher education divided by those wishing to do so) for associate and diploma courses is also extremely high, with graduates advancing to diploma courses at colleges of technology, engineering faculties, or graduate schools related to their associate and diploma courses.

Points to be improved:

1) The system used for collecting and accumulating data and materials, which serve as the basis for self-assessment, is not clearly defined [Viewpoint 1-1-(2)].

2) Responses to the improvement points indicated in the previous institutional certified evaluation and accreditation report have not been discussed by the relevant internal quality assurance committees [Viewpoint 1-1-(4)].

3) The following points, as indicated in the previous institutional certified evaluation and accreditation report, have not been addressed: "Some course subjects have used the same exam questions for several years, or in the final exam and re-examination," "Grade evaluations for some course subjects were not employed as

described in the syllabus, or exam answers were not graded appropriately," and "Grade evaluation materials such as student answer sheets, which should have been collected and stored in the Academic Affairs Planning Office and the Department Planning Office, were not stored properly" [Viewpoint 1-1-(4)].

4) Oral examinations given to students with poor grades do not ensure the objectivity and rigor of performance evaluations [Viewpoint 5-3-(1)].

5) No organizational check system is in place to ensure objectivity and rigor in grade evaluations. Additionally, the evaluation system is not functioning adequately [Viewpoint 5-3-(1)].

6) It is unclear how interviews are evaluated in the admissions selection process (academic ability selection) for the diploma course [Viewpoint 8-2-(1)].

The NIAD-QE has translated this document with consent from the college for reader information only.