

MEXT Project 2011 Leading Program in Doctoral Education

Phoenix Leader Education Program
(Hiroshima Initiative)
for Renaissance
from Radiation Disaster

FY2015
External Evaluation Report



– Hiroshima University –

Contents

I. Overview

1. Notably exceptional aspects are as follows.	p.1
2. Aspects requiring improvement are as follows.	p.3
3. Other aspects for which future improvement is desirable are as follows.	p.5

II. Evaluation by criteria

Criterion 1: Purpose of the Program

Point 1: Does the purpose of the Phoenix Leader Education Program (Hiroshima Initiative) for Renaissance from Radiation Disaster (hereafter “the Program”) comply with the purpose of the Leading Program in Doctoral Education, sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT): fostering leaders who have a broad perspective and creativity and who will be active in global academic, industrial, and governmental arenas?	p.6
--	-----

Criterion 2: Implementation Structure

Point 2-① Does the Program have guidance and student-support systems appropriate for achieving its purpose?	p.8
Point 2-② Does the Program have planning, operating, and partnership-building systems appropriate for achieving its purpose?	p.8
Criterion 2 Implementation Structure Overall evaluation	p.9

Criterion 3: Program Members and Education Supporters

Point 3-① Does the Program have a clear policy to build an organization of faculty members? Does it clarify the responsibilities of respective members for education and research activities?	p.11
Point 3-② Does the Program have faculty members capable of achieving the purpose of the Program: to foster Phoenix Leaders, who will conduct interdisciplinary and integrated management of recovery programs in regions suffering from complex damage caused by radiation disasters?	p.11
Criterion 3 Program Members and Education Supporters Overall evaluation	p.12

Criterion 4: Status of Accepting Students

Point 4-①	Does the Program have a definite policy and criteria for admitting students? Does the University publicize those criteria?	p.14
Point 4-②	Does the Program employ an appropriate system to select students according to its admission policy? Does the system function well?	p.14
Point 4-③	Does the Program have a system to verify that screening methods comply with the admissions policy? Are verification results reflected in improving the screening methods?	p.15
Criterion 4	Status of Accepting Students Overall evaluation	p.15

Criterion 5: Contents and Means of Education

Point 5-①	Does the Program have systematic curriculums appropriate to fulfill its goal and suitable for granting academic degrees? Are subjects to be taught well arranged in line with the purpose of the Program?	p.18
Point 5-②	Does the Program have means to guide students of diverse backgrounds to the goal of obtaining degrees? Does the Program have means to allow students to confirm their achievement levels?	p.18
Point 5-③	Does the Program have advanced educational functions sufficient to offer high-level practical curriculums?	p.19
Point 5-④	Does the Program have a mechanism to develop students' communication and negotiation abilities so as to foster active leaders who will address global challenges?	p.19
Point 5-⑤	Are appropriate syllabuses being prepared and utilized in line with the purpose of the curriculum's organization?	p.20
Point 5-⑥	Is consideration systematically given to students undertaking independent study as well as students taking subjects related to fields outside their field of specialization?	p.20
Point 5-⑦	When conducting classes for mature-aged students etc., in remote locations, have implementation methods been prepared for teaching lessons using printed materials, etc. (including correcting students' work, etc.), broadcast lessons, interview lessons (including screenings, etc.), or lessons using media, and are appropriate guidance and supervision provided?	p.21
Criterion 5	Contents and Means of Education Overall evaluation	p.21

Criterion 6: Outcomes of Education

Point 6-①	Does the Program have an appropriate system to evaluate students' achievement levels in terms of their academic performances and credentials, as well as their progress towards the goal of developing abilities required for Phoenix Leaders?	p.25
Point 6-②	Judging by the results of questionnaires and other hearings of students' opinions, are educational results and/or effectiveness improving?	p.25
Criterion 6	Outcomes of Education Overall Evaluation	p.26

Criterion 7: Student Support Systems

Point 7-①	Does the Program offer an ideal environment where excellent students can inspire and compete with each other?	p.28
Point 7-②	Does the Program offer financial support to students to enable them to concentrate their efforts and time on studies and research activities?	p.28
Point 7-③	Does the Program support students in preparing and carrying out their autonomous and original research plans?	p.29
Criterion 7	Student Support Systems Overall evaluation	p.29

Criterion 8: Facilities and Equipment

Point 8	Does the University have facilities and equipment sufficient for educational and research activities of the Program, and suitable for providing the curriculums?	p.31
---------	--	------

Criterion 9: System for Quality Enhancement and Improvement of Education

Point 9	Does the Program have an appropriate system to evaluate its implementation processes?	p.32
---------	---	------

III. Summary sheet of evaluation points p.33

IV. Issues Pointed out by the External Evaluation Committee p.34

V. Phoenix Leader Education Program for Renaissance from Radiation

Disasters, External Evaluation Committee Meeting Agenda p.37

I . Overview

* To protect personal information and ensure fair evaluation, each external evaluation committee member is indicated anonymously by assignment of a letter of the alphabet.

1. Notably exceptional aspects are as follows.

Member A: I highly appreciate that Hiroshima University has striven to further improve the Phoenix Leader Education Program by seriously addressing issues pointed out by the evaluation committee or identified through student surveys.

Also deserving of great recognition is the fact that the University has clarified the criteria for students' learning levels and completed a system that enables students and their instructors to always recognize the learning results and reflect them in better guidance.

A remarkable improvement has been added to the Teaching Handbook.

Member B: I would like to pay my sincere respect to Hiroshima University for its great endeavors in enabling this new, difficult program to be established so successfully thus far.

Member C: Hiroshima University has a clear purpose of developing global leaders who will have the determination and judgment to take the best possible actions in response to radiation disasters. To fulfill this purpose, the Program has been appropriately designed in terms of the acceptance of students, education content and student support, thereby reaching an extremely high degree of perfection. Worthy of special note is the fact that the Hiroshima Initiative is an internationally unparalleled and unique program, featuring an educational system that Japan can boast of to the world.

Member D: The Phoenix Leader Education Program has established a new discipline, Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies, by integrating a wide range of interdisciplinary areas, including diverse specialized fields pursued by students. The Program has been elaborated to achieve a high level of completion. Faculty and staff members inside and outside Hiroshima University work in collaboration in many fields, in order to achieve the purpose of the Program. Effective efforts are also under way to encourage active participation in various international symposiums and exchange programs with other universities, and organize field training programs in Fukushima and other relevant locations. In addition, Program Members endeavor to ensure the steady improvement of the Program, by resolving the issues pointed out in the previous fiscal year, including clarification of the processes of guiding students to the goal of earning their degrees. Hiroshima University has a well-established learning environment, and is strengthening programs to help students improve their language proficiency, provide students with economic support, and offer careful support to students during their long-term activities outside the University when they participate in exchange programs held through coordination with overseas partner institutions. In this manner, the University has made steady progress in its initiative to nurture students with a global mindset and a strong leadership.

Member E: The programme continues to be truly unique, by virtue of its distinctive cross-disciplinary aspect. The programme has strong administrative and academic foundations, with an integrated feedback and improvement process involving students, teachers, mentors and external evaluators. Areas for improvement identified through the interim evaluation conducted by the Steering Committee for the Programme for Leading Graduate Schools are being addressed.

Member F: I think one of the best aspects of the program is the quality of the students who were attracted to the program. This was evident by the quality of the presentations of their work, such as the very important research exhibited on the development of the clinical use of micronuclei.

Such students will certainly ultimately give great recognition and credibility to the Phoenix program.

Following Chernobyl and Fukushima the need for people who are capable of a comprehensive response to all aspects of such disasters is also obvious—so, the program is satisfying a great scientific and psychosocial, world need—I know of no other such program.

Member G: Efforts in recent years to strengthen the practical expertise dimension of the Program, in particular through field visits, have undeniably allowed a qualitative leap in the understanding by students of the key challenges of radiation disasters and their consequences.

In this perspective adapted field visits could be organized as early as possible in the course of the Program (Why not even before starting the academic work?) in order to help students to become aware of the key challenges raised by radiation disasters and their consequences and consequently have early in their studies a better understanding of the general spirit, structure and ultimate goals of the Program.

The very positive evolution of the Program over the recent years could be enhanced by encouraging students to select the topics of their individual researches based on issues identified by themselves at the occasion of the field visits. This would allow to establishing a more practical link with the real human and social dimensions of radiation disasters and their consequences.

Member H: The Phoenix Leader Education program continues to excel and the recent category A assessment by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences is an endorsement of the hard work and excellent training outcome of the program director and faculty members of this program.

An early discussion on the future of the Phoenix program when funding from the MEXT in the spring of 2017 finishes is important and speaks volume of the leadership and vision of this program.

2. Aspects requiring improvement are as follows.

Member A: Common subjects of the Program don't seem to include any subjects regarding radiation risks. I think the curriculum needs to be improved in this regard.

Member B: I would like to list the aspects that Hiroshima University should undertake to improve the Program in the future, as follows:

1. Graduates' employment: If students who will have completed the Program can find employment in attractive international organizations, this will have a great positive impact on the number of applicants for the Program in the future. This holds true not only for applicants in Japan but also those from overseas countries.

2. Continuance of the Program: The Program's continuous existence at Hiroshima University is greatly meaningful for the students who are going to enroll in it, as well as for those who have already entered the Program. I have heard that MEXT's support is slated to be completed after a specified period of time. However, I expect that Hiroshima University will make all-out efforts to continue the Program even after the completion of the government funding.

3. Cooperation with international organizations: I believe that cooperation from international organizations is necessary to continue the Program. I had the impression from a comment released at an evaluation committee meeting that international organizations were willing to provide cooperation.

Member C: The number of students admitted to the Program is decreasing compared to when the Program was initially started. To constantly secure the appropriate number of students is a significant task that determines the Program's success or failure. As for the Program's continuance after the completion of the MEXT subsidy period, it is important to secure other funds for the Program. In addition, Hiroshima University should bring greater efficiency to its educational content so that the Program can be incorporated as part of regular graduate education provided by Hiroshima University.

Member D: The mechanisms for feeding back students' opinions, requests and evaluations concerning educational content have been prepared. However, I think that Hiroshima University should also disclose these survey results to external evaluation committee members, etc., so as to clarify the results as issues presented by students and announce the aspects that have been improved.

I recommend that the scope of short-term internship destinations should be expanded from a limited number of institutions and companies, to include institutions that respond to accidents, disasters and other emergencies, as well as news organizations. This will enable students to have hands-on experience in collecting, organizing and disseminating information in emergency situations, and in functional organization management. Such experience will prove useful in enhancing the leadership of students.

The Program should be designed to help students deepen their knowledge of the politics, religions, languages, customs and historical backgrounds of the respective regions, in order to play active roles in the international arena and quickly respond to emergencies in a region where a disaster occurs.

Member E: - Strengthen the programme outreach in medical universities to increase the recruitment of Japanese and international medical doctors by conducting seminars and webinars on the PLEP. Consider also advertising the PLEP programme in medical students boards, newsletters and other communication media.

Member F: Some of the students mentioned a need for more time with their mentors.

Member G : The management structure and the curriculum map of the Program have reached a high level of maturity.

However further efforts should be deployed to ensure and verify that:

- Faculty members have now acquired a shared vision of the scientific, ethical, social and political dimensions at stake in radiation disasters and their consequences as well a coherent philosophy for addressing the challenges related to these complex situations.

- The most advanced students have also gained this shared vision.

In this perspective the future Phoenix Symposia could be an opportunity to engage such reflection (See Criterion 5. Overall evaluation)

Member H: It is not clear to this reviewer how competitive is our trainees of the Phoenix Leader Education program in their fundamental knowledge of radiological sciences including radiation biology and radiation physics. These trainees, upon completion of the program, are expected to be in the front line of any radiological event and be able to explain to the public their radiation risk and provide assurance and counseling.

As such, they must be well trained in radiological science prior to other social science curriculum. This requirement cannot be overstated.

3. Other aspects for which future improvement is desirable are as follows.

Member C : Since considerable attention is given to the way in which students who have completed the Program will contribute to society, I expect the Program to strengthen activities to deliberate on the future career paths of the students.

Member D : This education program aims to develop excellent human resources who have the abilities to lead recovery activities following a radiation disaster. I think that the research findings that can be obtained from the human resource development process (regarding the situations of environmental and infrastructure recovery, problems relating to support for affected residents, etc.) should be announced not only in specialist magazines but also to the general public, thereby helping to promote the recovery efforts. These measures are considered to be effective in enhancing the meaning of the existence of this Program, as well as in improving students' motivation for learning.

It is also necessary to promptly determine the strategies for continuing the Program after completion of the government subsidy.

Member E : - Encourage students to publish the results of their reports in peer-reviewed journals or in conference proceedings.
- Strengthen the mentorship programme by including international mentors from academia, industry, medical universities, research centers and international organizations.

Member G : For the long term the Phoenix Leader Education Program should consider the option of creating an International Training Center on Radiation Disaster Recovery in cooperation with foreign and international organizations using the experience accumulated so far through the academic and practical works developed within the Program.

II. Evaluation by criteria

* The evaluation scores are calculated based on selection by each committee member with assignment of points as follows: 4 points for “satisfied,” 3 points for “mostly satisfied,” 2 points for “requires partial improvement,” and 1 point for “requires major improvement.”

* Final evaluation is indicated by placing a check mark in the box next to the appropriate evaluation, with an average score of 0 to less than 1.5 being “requires major improvement,” 1.5 to less than 2.5 being “requires partial improvement,” 2.5 to less than 3.5 being “mostly satisfied,” and 3.5 and higher being “satisfied.”

Criterion 1: Purpose of the Program

Point 1 Does the purpose of the Phoenix Leader Education Program (Hiroshima Initiative) for Renaissance from Radiation Disaster (hereafter “the Program”) comply with the purpose of the Leading Program in Doctoral Education, sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT): fostering leaders who have a broad perspective and creativity and who will be active in global academic, industrial, and governmental arenas?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 1 is satisfied
- Criterion 1 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 1 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 1 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

[Comments]

Member A: The Phoenix Leader Education Program underwent an interim evaluation by the Committee for Programs for Leading Graduate Schools of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, and the Program was assessed as “Category A: Efforts have been made in accordance with the plan, and if ongoing efforts are continued, it is expected to successfully achieve the intended program goals.” I would like to express my respect for the Program for obtaining such a remarkable evaluation.

Member B : Ever since its first year, this Program has been improved in accordance with consistent criteria each year.

Member D : The Phoenix Leader Education Program is unique in that it integrates diverse academic fields in a comprehensive and cross-disciplinary manner. This Program features practical curriculums focusing on field activities in a disaster-hit region. In addition, the Program gives consideration to nurturing the autonomy and positive attitudes of students. For these reasons, I think that this Program complies with the purpose of the Leading Program in Doctoral Education of “fostering leaders who have a broad perspective and creativity and who will be active in global academic, industrial, and governmental arenas.”

Member E : The programme is designed in a way to give students a multi-disciplinary mind set for problem solving. Field work and internship programmes add tremendous value to the programme.

Member G : The Program is now well established with the explicit title of ‘Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies’ and is properly designed to meet the requirements of the MEXT Leading Program in Doctoral Education i.e. to train leaders able to analyze the situation and take appropriate decisions in case of radiation disasters and also to effectively support the process of rehabilitation of the living conditions following the disaster.

Member H : The purpose of the Phoenix Leader Education program continues to be well defined and well-focused.

The recent program assessment as a category A program by the Committee for Program for Leading Graduate Schools of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science further reaffirm the notion that this Program is on target.

Criterion 2: Implementation Structure

Point 2-① Does the Program have guidance and student-support systems appropriate for achieving its purpose?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 2-① is satisfied
- Point 2-① is mostly satisfied
- Point 2-① requires partial improvement
- Point 2-① requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

Point 2-② Does the Program have planning, operating, and partnership-building systems appropriate for achieving its purpose?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 2-② is satisfied
- Point 2-② is mostly satisfied
- Point 2-② requires partial improvement
- Point 2-② requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3.25

Criterion 2 Implementation Structure

Overall evaluation

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 2 is satisfied
- Criterion 2 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 2 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 2 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3.75

[Comments]

Member A : The aspects that deserve recognition are described below:

With regard to Issue 1, concerning the necessity for more active involvement of faculty members from the social sciences, improvement has been carried out as the professor of the Department of Management Studies, the Graduate School of Social Science, has participated in the Program. Students' learning activities are supported by Teaching mentors, Student Consultant (staff) mentors, and SENPAI (student) mentors. A monthly lunch meeting system for students and mentors has also been launched. Through these efforts, the Program's implementation structure has been strengthened.

As for Issue 2 regarding the continuance of the Program, the Organization of the Leading Graduate Education Program is continuing discussions. Although this issue is difficult, efforts are being made to find a solution.

Member B : The presentations in the field of social science have reached a certain level, and the system for cooperation among instructors has been improved.

Member C : I have heard that the Program's continuity is currently under discussion. However, it is about time that specific strategies to continue the Program be announced.

Member D : ○ Response to last year's issue (concerning the continuity of the Program)

In this matter, I request that Hiroshima University review the organization structure and curriculum, and clarify the prospect for economic support programs for students within fiscal year 2015 to ensure that the Program can be continued after the government subsidy is terminated.

Member E : - The programme is well structured with a teaching handbook, a mentorship programme, e-portfolio, career portfolio manual and implementation guides.

- A programme improvement system is in place and takes into account students' feedback. It is recommended to strengthen the feedback system by collecting anonymous evaluation from students on relevant aspects of the programme.

Member G : The overall management structure supporting the Program including the partnership with academic, industrial and international organizations is now appropriate to meet the Program requirements.

Member H : This interdisciplinary program is nicely planned and executed. The newly addition of a monthly lunch meeting of trainees with faculty advisors provides further open dialogue and feedback opportunities in a more relaxed environment.

The initiative taken by the program director and his staff in an early discussion on the future of the Phoenix Leader Education program when the financial support from the MEXT finished in March 2017 is considered a strength.

Criterion 3: Program Members and Education Supporters

Point 3-① Does the Program have a clear policy to build an organization of faculty members? Does it clarify the responsibilities of respective members for education and research activities?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 3-① is satisfied
- Point 3-① is mostly satisfied
- Point 3-① requires partial improvement
- Point 3-① requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

Point 3-② Does the Program have faculty members capable of achieving the purpose of the Program: to foster Phoenix Leaders, who will conduct interdisciplinary and integrated management of recovery programs in regions suffering from complex damage caused by radiation disasters?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 3-② is satisfied
- Point 3-② is mostly satisfied
- Point 3-② requires partial improvement
- Point 3-② requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3.50

Criterion 3 Program Members and Education Supporters

Overall evaluation

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 3 is satisfied
- Criterion 3 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 3 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 3 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3.75

[Comments]

Member A: It is appreciated that improvements have been made to make the Teaching Handbook easier to understand, by such means as the inclusion of a curriculum map that allows an at-a-glance view of class objectives. I believe that current students can understand the curriculum well by using this map. On the other hand, for prospective students who are going to enroll in the Program, it would be better to prepare tables that show the names of the subjects to be studied and the class overviews regarding start-up common subjects, advanced common subjects and special subjects for each of the Radiation Disaster Medicine Course, the Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course, and the Radioactivity Social Recovery Course.

I think that Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies has not yet been fully established as an academic discipline, and it is now in the process of being developed through this Program. Active discussions taking place at education seminars can be evaluated highly. I expect that Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies will be established through this Program.

Member B: I highly value the various efforts being made by Program Members and Education Supporters.

Member D: The Teaching Handbook has been improved through discussions among faculty and staff members. I would like to ask for their continued efforts to make further improvement, in accordance with the progress in the implementation of the Program.

Member E: The Teaching Handbook is a good platform to spell out clear learning objectives and facilitates the review of the students' achievement. It will be good to get feedback on its practical implementation and identify ways to simplify or improve its contents.

Member G: The establishment of the Teaching Handbook was a real improvement.

As it stands this Handbook gives a clear picture of the structure and the objective of the Program as well of the curriculum. However it does not present in plain language the shared vision of the Faculty Members concerning the key features and main challenges of managing a radiation disaster and its consequences. Such vision would greatly facilitate the coherence of the various lectures prepared by the Faculty Members and other external lecturers as well as the understanding by the students of the general objective of the program and the logic of its structuration.

Member H: The inclusion of specialists in radiation and recovery from radiation disasters is considered a strength in the program as it provides first hand experience what the trainees are likely to experienced in the field.

Criterion 4: Status of Accepting Students

**Point 4-① Does the Program have a definite policy and criteria for admitting students?
Does the University publicize those criteria?**

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 4-① is satisfied
- Point 4-① is mostly satisfied
- Point 4-① requires partial improvement
- Point 4-① requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3.88

**Point 4-② Does the Program employ an appropriate system to select students according to
its admission policy? Does the system function well?**

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 4-② is satisfied
- Point 4-② is mostly satisfied
- Point 4-② requires partial improvement
- Point 4-② requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Point 4-③ Does the Program have a system to verify that screening methods comply with the admissions policy? Are verification results reflected in improving the screening methods?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 4-③ is satisfied
- Point 4-③ is mostly satisfied
- Point 4-③ requires partial improvement
- Point 4-③ requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.75

Criterion 4 Status of Accepting Students
Overall evaluation

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 4 is satisfied
- Criterion 4 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 4 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 4 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3.75

[Comments]

Member A: Hiroshima University has started to conduct a recommendation entrance examination for the Quota of Physicians Protecting Lives from Radiation Disaster, based on recognition of the necessity for acquiring persons with a physician's license who can engage in diagnosis and treatment as experts in radiation disaster medicine in Japan. I highly evaluate the inauguration of this recommendation entrance examination, since it is an appropriate measure for addressing the problem "There is an issue of how to acquire Japanese students from medical schools. Greater efforts should be made to accept physicians who work in society as students," which was pointed out in the interim evaluation by the JSPS Committee for the Program for Leading Graduate Schools. I expect that this measure will achieve positive results in the future.

Member B : I am concerned about the acceptance of students in the future, but I will describe this in the Overall section.

Member C : Between 2014 and 2015, the number of students admitted to the Program decreased. In particular, the Program accepted no Japanese graduates in those two consecutive years. Hiroshima University's efforts for stricter implementation of entrance examinations and overseas public relations can be highly regarded. However, it is recommendable to give more proactive consideration to how to demonstrate the attractive features of the Program to Japanese undergraduate students.

Member D : ○ Selection criteria for overseas students
Foreign applicants are required to submit a transcript of Japanese proficiency examinations, etc., for the preliminary evaluation for application eligibility. Is this regulated by MEXT?
(In my opinion, the submission of such a transcript of a Japanese proficiency examination is not necessary, because it may constitute a barrier to students from overseas countries who wish to apply for the Program.)

Member E : The students come from diverse backgrounds and countries, although most of them are from Asia. Efforts should continue to recruit students from other regions such as Europe or Africa. The international stakeholders such as IAEA and ICRP can help in the dissemination of information on the programme to increase its outreach.

Member F : I think that there would be more applicants from the US if some more publicity about the program is done –perhaps by sending brochures to universities in the US.

Member G : The Flyer and Application guide for admission should clearly mention the academic field in which the Program fits i.e. 'Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies'. They should also emphasize its multidisciplinary approach and the mix of academic lectures and practical expertise. At present both documents are too much reflecting the administrative structure of the program and not enough the objectives and the novelty of the studies. A revision of both documents should be emphasized to make them more appealing for the potential students and more understandable by potentially interested foreign and international organizations.

Member H: Enrollment advertisement placed in Experimental Medicine, in the opinion of this reviewer, is not helpful. Promotion should be aimed for radiation journal, for example Radiation

Research, Int. J. Radiation Biology, Int. J. Radiation Oncology, Biol. Phys. etc. Moreover, on line advertisement, which is usually free, can be placed on the website of the Radiation Research Society.

Criterion 5: Contents and Means of Education

Point 5-① Does the Program have systematic curriculums appropriate to fulfill its goal and suitable for granting academic degrees? Are subjects to be taught well arranged in line with the purpose of the Program?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 5-① is satisfied
- Point 5-① is mostly satisfied
- Point 5-① requires partial improvement
- Point 5-① requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	2	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	3.38

Point 5-② Does the Program have means to guide students of diverse backgrounds to the goal of obtaining degrees? Does the Program have means to allow students to confirm their achievement levels?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 5-② is satisfied
- Point 5-② is mostly satisfied
- Point 5-② requires partial improvement
- Point 5-② requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Point 5-③ Does the Program have advanced educational functions sufficient to offer high-level practical curriculums?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 5-③ is satisfied
- Point 5-③ is mostly satisfied
- Point 5-③ requires partial improvement
- Point 5-③ requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Point 5-④ Does the Program have a mechanism to develop students' communication and negotiation abilities so as to foster active leaders who will address global challenges?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 5-④ is satisfied
- Point 5-④ is mostly satisfied
- Point 5-④ requires partial improvement
- Point 5-④ requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

Point 5-⑤ Are appropriate syllabuses being prepared and utilized in line with the purpose of the curriculum's organization?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 5-⑤ is satisfied
- Point 5-⑤ is mostly satisfied
- Point 5-⑤ requires partial improvement
- Point 5-⑤ requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

Point 5-⑥ Is consideration systematically given to students undertaking independent study as well as students taking subjects related to fields outside their field of specialization?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 5-⑥ is satisfied
- Point 5-⑥ is mostly satisfied
- Point 5-⑥ requires partial improvement
- Point 5-⑥ requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.75

Point 5-⑦ When conducting classes for mature-aged students etc., in remote locations, have implementation methods been prepared for teaching lessons using printed materials, etc. (including correcting students' work, etc.), broadcast lessons, interview lessons (including screenings, etc.), or lessons using media, and are appropriate guidance and supervision provided?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 5-⑦ is satisfied
- Point 5-⑦ is mostly satisfied
- Point 5-⑦ requires partial improvement
- Point 5-⑦ requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.75

**Criterion 5 Contents and Means of Education
Overall Evaluation**

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 5 is satisfied
- Criterion 5 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 5 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 5 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	2	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3.50

[Comments]

Member A:

Aspects that deserve appreciation

- Contributions have been made toward students' autonomous learning by incorporating a field trip to Fukushima in the short-term fieldwork, thereby strengthening preparatory training for "History of Hiroshima Restoration," one of the start-up common subjects.
- Internships have been carried out at international organizations and at companies in Japan that were newly added to the list of internship destinations.
- The Teaching Handbook has been revised and the Learning e-portfolio has been improved, so as to make it easier for learners to understand the process of guiding students to the goal of obtaining a degree.
- The educational functions have been augmented, by offering opportunities for receiving high-level practical training and for taking lectures delivered by experts from the industry, academia and government, and seeking consultations with these experts, and by conducting global field visits to organizations in Japan and in other countries.
- English education has been improved, instructors specializing in the social science fields have taken part in the Program, and facilities have been developed that could be used to offer classes and conduct examinations in remote locations.

Aspects that seems to need improvements

When I checked the outline of each subject in the revised Teaching Handbook, I noticed that no common subjects covered radiation risks (although I may have failed to notice such descriptions when reading the materials released so far.) The risks associated with radiation exposure differ considerably depending on the radiation dose. However, the risks related to low-dose and low-dose-rate exposure were matters of grave concern in the Fukushima nuclear power accident. Without understanding these risks, or without having their own opinions about them, it would be impossible for students to answer if asked a question about whether or not residents can return to a place where the radiation dose rate is slightly high. I therefore hope that subjects regarding radiation risks will be included in common subjects.

(If a radiation risk-related subject has actually been provided, please change my evaluation results in Point 5-① and Overall evaluation of Criterion 5: Contents and Means of Education, to "Point 5-① is satisfied" and "Criterion 5 is satisfied," respectively.

My opinions for reference

If possible, Hiroshima University should consider introducing a measure whereby a senior student is in charge of part of the lectures or exercises for undergraduates, based on the knowledge that the senior student has acquired through the Program. I recommend such a measure because I think that learning to teach someone else will be more effective in deepening students' understanding than simply passively learning from instructors.

Also, it may be a good idea to have senior students launch a project that can be implemented and completed with the participation of volunteers (including local volunteers), and for Hiroshima University to provide necessary support if the project is deemed worthwhile. Through such experience, the senior students could learn firsthand about what is necessary to work as a Phoenix Leader.

Member B: I realize that Project Members have made extraordinary efforts.

Member C: Internships are among the distinctive features of the Program, and finding more organizations that accept the Program students on internships is the task to be addressed. While I understand that IAEA and Mazda are major internship destinations, I have the impression that the policy for expanding the number of such organizations has not been fully discussed yet, from the perspective of promoting student diversity. I expect that diversity in society will be reflected in internships in the Program.

Member D: ○ Expanding the number and range of internship destinations

During the emergency response immediately after the occurrence of a disaster, accurate information collection and dissemination will determine the success or failure of the initial response at the disaster site. In long-term activities to recover from a disaster, it is necessary to carefully grasp the actual situations and take appropriate action, to prevent such problems as the solitary deaths of evacuees. In this sense, it is recommended that the Program consider offering training regarding how to gather, organize and disseminate information, and how to set up and effectively manage an organization, through internships at emergency response and relief agencies, news organizations, metrological information organizations, etc.

It will also be effective in enhancing students' learning motivation to disclose the survey and research results regarding the problems at the disaster recovery sites, not only in specialist magazines but also to the general public as a whole, thereby helping promote faster recovery. I feel the need for the activities to reflect the opinions from the disaster site in the Program.

○ Is there no need to include subjects related to politics and religions in lecture programs?

I am afraid that global activities may be limited due to the politics, religions, customs, languages, and backgrounds of the region. When multinational members are involved in activities, and when an emergency response or long-term recovery support is conducted, the above knowledge will be required to ensure smooth information sharing with local residents.

Member E: The impact of the existing mechanisms to develop students' leadership abilities is not clear. I do believe that leadership skills can be taught and learned, but is important to have well-motivated and interested students in learning emerging leadership skills to be successful leaders. It is suggested that applicants are requested to attach a motivation letter to their application. Simple evaluation criteria to assess the level of motivation of candidates could be developed.

Member G: As mentioned earlier (See Criterion 3. Overall evaluation) although still perfectible

the establishment of the Teaching Handbook was a real improvement for the implementation of the Program. The development of the Global Field Visit program is another powerful means to help students to catch the interdisciplinary nature of the 'Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies' and also to help them to integrate the academic contents received during classes.

Given the experience accumulated since the beginning of the program it would now be appropriate to consider to engage a collective reflection of the Faculty Members and the most advanced Students, together with outside experts with proven experience of the management of radiological disasters and their long term consequences, on the contribution of the Program to the understanding of the strategic issues at stake. The forthcoming Phoenix Symposium could be an opportunity to engage such reflection but other mechanisms (e.g an internal workshop) could be also envisaged.

Member H: From the report, it is not clear how competitive is the Phoenix Leader Education Program, ie. how many students applied and what is the acceptance rate? How is this program compared with the graduate program of Hiroshima University?

The inclusion of research institutions that handle radiation emergency such as the Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/ Training site at the Oak Ridge Institute is so fundamentally linked to the theme of the Phoenix Leader Education program that this practical training option should be made mandatory to all trainees of this program.

A debate session in the training program should be considered as it will train students to sharpen their thoughts and be concise with their public statement.

Criterion 6: Outcomes of Education

Point 6-① Does the Program have an appropriate system to evaluate students' achievement levels in terms of their academic performances and credentials, as well as their progress towards the goal of developing abilities required for Phoenix Leaders?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 6-① is satisfied
- Point 6-① is mostly satisfied
- Point 6-① requires partial improvement
- Point 6-① requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

Point 6-② Judging by the results of questionnaires and other hearings of students' opinions, are educational results and/or effectiveness improving?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 6-② is satisfied
- Point 6-② is mostly satisfied
- Point 6-② requires partial improvement
- Point 6-② requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3.63

Criterion 6 Outcomes of Education Overall Evaluation

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 6 is satisfied
- Criterion 6 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 6 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 6 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3.75

[Comments]

Member A: It can be evaluated that the Qualifying Examination (QE) consists of a written exam and an interview to check students' understanding and achievement levels; also, the Curriculum Map and the Rubric are prepared to explicitly show the learning content to be studied by the students and their required achievement levels.

The students' questionnaire results reveal that students are satisfied with the lectures, seminars and discussions conducted under the Program. However, some students answered that they were not satisfied or were slightly dissatisfied, which makes me feel that the requirements for the Phoenix Leaders have not been fully imparted to the students. Given the importance of this matter, continued efforts are necessary to further improve the Program.

Member B: After listening to students' presentations, I highly evaluate the educational outcomes of the Program.

Member D: ○ Results of hearings of students' opinions

It is necessary to publicly announce the results of the hearings of students' opinions on the content of the entire Program, as well as the specific improvements carried out in response to the results.

(The Reference Materials for Self Study Report contain the results of the questionnaire survey of students regarding the seminars, but do not contain the questionnaire results concerning the entire Program content.)

Member E : Students' feedback is very positive regarding all the efforts to stimulate opinion exchanges through retreats, cross-disciplinary exchange forum, symposia and field work. They also appreciate the attention given to them by the programme coordinator and lecturers.

Member G : As part of the Qualifying Examination an oral exam by international experts with

concrete experience in the management of radiation disasters and their consequences could usefully complement the evaluation process already in place. Such additional exam would certainly raise the international profile of the Program and favor the insertion of students at the international level. This could also be an element of attractiveness for potential candidates.

Member H: The survey result should be able to provide some quantitative assessment on how successful the short term fieldwork was. As such, on a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied the students were to the experience. The term "positive" evaluation is too vague and not very informative.

Criterion 7: Student Support Systems

Point 7-① Does the Program offer an ideal environment where excellent students can inspire and compete with each other?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 7-① is satisfied
- Point 7-① is mostly satisfied
- Point 7-① requires partial improvement
- Point 7-① requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

Point 7-② Does the Program offer financial support to students to enable them to concentrate their efforts and time on studies and research activities?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 7-② is satisfied
- Point 7-② is mostly satisfied
- Point 7-② requires partial improvement
- Point 7-② requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Point 7-③ Does the Program support students in preparing and carrying out their autonomous and original research plans?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Point 7-③ is satisfied
- Point 7-③ is mostly satisfied
- Point 7-③ requires partial improvement
- Point 7-③ requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3.88

Criterion 7 Student Support Systems
Overall evaluation

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 7 is satisfied
- Criterion 7 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 7 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 7 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

[Comments]

<p>Member B: I am concerned about the student support system in the future. I will describe it later.</p>
<p>Member D : I found some improvements regarding the diversity of research themes I commented on last year. I hope that the Program will expand its research themes to cover other serious disasters (such as heavy rain, typhoons and tornadoes). Through investigating and studying both different and common points in promoting emergency response to and recovery from various types of disasters, students can obtain beneficial effects, including improvements in leadership qualities.</p>
<p>Member E : The student support system is truly unique and includes an excellent financial support, mentorship programme, e portfolio, students' feedback system and various forums for opinion exchanges.</p>
<p>Member H : Compared with other graduate training programs, students in the Phoenix Leader Education program are well supported.</p>

Criterion 8: Facilities and Equipment

Point 8 Does the University have facilities and equipment sufficient for educational and research activities of the Program, and suitable for providing the curriculums?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 8 is satisfied
- Criterion 8 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 8 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 8 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

[Comments]

Member E: The list of equipment available at the Hiroshima Phoenix Training Centre includes the main items needed for radiation dose monitoring and measurements, and items needed for decontamination. Students should also have access to small activity sources to perform verification tests on some radiation dose monitoring equipment.

Criterion 9: System for Quality Enhancement and Improvement of Education

Point 9 Does the Program have an appropriate system to evaluate its implementation processes?

[Evaluation Result] Please place a checkmark in the box next to the most appropriate evaluation.

- Criterion 9 is satisfied
- Criterion 9 is mostly satisfied
- Criterion 9 requires partial improvement
- Criterion 9 requires major improvement

Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88

[Comments]

Member B: The Program has favorable systems for giving explanations to the evaluation committee and showing students' research presentations to the public.

Member D: ○ Students' evaluations of the educational content as a whole
I hope that students' opinions, requests, and evaluations regarding the entire educational content of the Program, and the improvements made in response to this feedback from students will be announced in the reference materials for the external evaluation committee (Reference Materials for Self Study Report).

Member E: A good feedback and evaluation system is in place.

Member F: Overall, the University of Hiroshima faculty has undertaken an enormous and very important challenge –and, in the relatively short time since implementation of the Phoenix program, the University is to be highly commended ,since great progress has been made -- this program must be continued !

III. Summary sheet of evaluation points

Member		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Average /Criterion
Criterion 1		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
Criterion 2	Point ①	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88
	Point ②	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3.25
	Overall evaluation	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3.75
Criterion 3	Point ①	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88
	Point ②	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3.50
	Overall evaluation	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3.75
Criterion 4	Point ①	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3.88
	Point ②	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
	Point ③	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.75
	Overall evaluation	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3.75
Criterion 5	Point ①	2	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	3.38
	Point ②	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
	Point ③	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
	Point ④	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88
	Point ⑤	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88
	Point ⑥	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.75
	Point ⑦	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.75
	Overall evaluation	2	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3.50
Criterion 6	Point ①	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88
	Point ②	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3.63
	Overall evaluation	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3.75
Criterion 7	Point ①	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88
	Point ②	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
	Point ③	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3.88
	Overall evaluation	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88
Criterion 8	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00	
Criterion 9	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.88	
Average /Member	3.71	3.96	3.79	3.96	3.64	3.50	3.86	3.96	3.80	

IV. Issues Pointed out by the External Evaluation

Committee

On the four point evaluation scale the average score overall for all of the items has increased from last year's score of 3.63 to 3.80 this year. Most overall evaluation scores for each Criterion showed a point total of 3.7 or higher with only the overall evaluation score for Criterion 5 showing a marginally lower score of 3.5.

Moreover, the majority of the evaluation scores for each discreet Point have increased from the previous year. The scores for fourteen of the nineteen Points averaged a 3.7 or higher. The average scores for three other Points that were also evaluated highly came in at 3.5. On the other hand, the scores of Point 2-②(Criterion 2) and Point 5-①(Criterion 5) were less than 3.5. The following section summarizes issues that were raised and comments that were made about "aspects requiring improvement" by the External Evaluation Committee members.

As for comments on other criterion that were evaluated highly, all relevant committees are still required to closely examine each of them and attempt to identify points that could still be improved by the Program management in this fiscal year.

1. Issues Related to "Point2-②: Does the Program have guidance and student-support systems appropriate for achieving its purpose?", "Criterion 2: Implementation Structure"

[Evaluation Results]

The average score for Point2-② dropped to 3.25 from last year's 3.78.

[Issues]

The Committee members expressed their concern for the continuation of the Program, and an immediate discussion on the future of the Program following the end of MEXT financial support must be carried out.

2. Issues Related to "Point5-①: Does the Program have systematic curriculums appropriate to fulfill its goal and suitable for granting academic degrees? Are subjects to be taught well arranged in line with the purpose of the Program?", "Criterion 5: Contents and Means of Education"

[Evaluation Results]

The average score for Point5-① dropped to 3.38 from last year's 3.67.

[Issues]

The issues are shown below① - ③.

①Contents of Education

- Subjects regarding radiation risks should be included in common subjects.
- Subjects related to politics and religion should be included in lectures or programs that address global activities.
- Practical training options at institutions that handle radiation emergencies such as the Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/ Training site at the Oak Ridge Institute should be made mandatory for all trainees of this program.

②Means of Education

- A measure whereby a senior student is in charge of part of the lectures or exercises for undergraduates should be introduced to deepen senior students' practical understanding, knowledge and experience.
- The senior students should learn firsthand about what is necessary to work as a Phoenix Leader through experience that would launch a project to be implemented and completed with the participation of volunteers (including local volunteers). Hiroshima University should provide the necessary support if the project is deemed worthwhile and gains official approval.
- The survey and research results regarding problems and challenges should be disclosed at the disaster recovery sites in order to enhance students' motivation to learn and grow. Thus far the results have only been released in specialist magazines when in fact it is the general public as a whole that needs this information. This expanded information dissemination approach would increase overall awareness thereby helping to promote a faster recovery.
- It should be clear just how competitive the Phoenix Leader Education Program is, and the impact of the existing mechanisms for developing students' leadership abilities
- Faculty members, the most advanced Students, in conjunction with experienced, outside experts in the management of radiological disasters and their long term consequences, should cooperate to contribute to the management of the strategic issues of the program.

③Internship

- The Program should consider offering practical training on how to gather, organize and disseminate information, and on the approach to setting up and effectively managing an organization, through internships at emergency response and relief agencies, news organizations, metrological information agencies, etc.

- The diversity in society should be reflected in the Program internships from the perspective of encouraging and promoting student diversity.

3. Issues Related to the Findings in the Overview Evaluation

[Evaluation Results]

The issues are shown based on “aspects requiring improvement” for the Overview Evaluation.

[Issues]

Overview 1:

To support students in finding employment in attractive international private and public organizations

Overview 2:

To establish and deepen cooperation with international organizations

Overview 3:

To constantly strive to secure the appropriate number of students

Overview 4:

To bring greater efficiency to the educational content so that the Program can be incorporated as part of the regular graduate education provided by Hiroshima University.

Overview 5:

To disclose and clarify the aspects of the program that have been improved based on previous student feedback.

Overview 6:

To strengthen the program’s outreach to medical universities in order to increase the recruitment of Japanese and international medical doctors by expanding and conducting a greater variety of seminars and webinars about the Phoenix Leader Education Program.

Overview 7:

To advertise the program on medical school’s information boards, and in newsletters and other communication media.

Overview 8:

The students must be well trained in radiological science.

V. Phoenix Leader Education Program for Renaissance from Radiation Disasters External Evaluation Committee Meeting Agenda

1. Objective of FY 2015 External Evaluation

The Phoenix Leader Education Program (Hiroshima Initiative) for Renaissance from Radiation Disaster (hereinafter referred to as “the Program”), which was adopted as one of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) FY2011 Leading Programs in Doctoral Education, is a Hiroshima University doctoral program inaugurated in October 2012. Since then, with the Program’s main purpose foremost in our minds we have been working to develop and foster global leaders (Phoenix Leaders), capable of undertaking the best possible actions in a radiation disaster scenario based on extensive interdisciplinary knowledge. The program graduates will be able to provide strong leadership during the disaster recovery process by exercising appropriate judgment and having a clear vision for what is needed.

Following the most recent midterm evaluation, carried out by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science in FY2014, the Program received an overall ‘A’ evaluation. It was indicated that given the present circumstances the Program would be able to achieve its intended goals by continuing in the current manner. However, with this positive evaluation in mind, certain specific issues of concern were identified.

The objective of the FY 2015 External Evaluation Committee Meeting is to gather valuable suggestions from External Evaluation Committee members regarding the past evaluation results and the highlighted points of concern identified at the midterm evaluation in order to make steady progress and improvement within the program.

2. Date & Venue

Date: Saturday, February 13, 2016, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Venue: Saijo HAKUWA HOTEL, “Rouge”



3. Members of External Evaluation Committee

Name	Title/Post
Tokushi Shibata	Executive Director, Japan Radioisotope Association (JRIA)
Shigenobu Nagataki	Director, Radiation Effects Association
Kiyoshi Miyagawa	Professor, Graduate School of Medicine of the University Tokyo
Takashi Yamashita	Chairman, Chugoku Economic Federation
Ahmed Meghzifene	Head, Dosimetry and Medical Radiation Physics, Division of Human Health, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
Albert Lee Wiley	Head, Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site (REAC/TS)
Jacques Lochard	Vice Chairman, International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) Director, Centre d'étude sur l'évaluation de la protection dans le domaine nucléaire (CEPN)
Tom K.Hei (Document evaluation)	Professor and Vice- Chairman of Radiation Oncology, Columbia University Medical Center

4. Members of Phoenix Leader Education Program

Post	Name	Affiliation	Responsibility in Program
Vice President	Kenji Kamiya	Reconstruction Support/Radiation Medicine, Research Institute for Radiation Biology and Medicine	Program Director Chairperson, the Evaluation Committee, the Degree Examination Committee, the Career Paths Committee
Professor	Masao Kobayashi	Institute of Biomedical & Health Sciences	Program Coordinator
Professor	Shinya Matsuura	Research Institute for Radiation Biology and Medicine	Radiation Disaster Medicine Course Leader Chairperson, the Education Committee
Professor (Special Appointment)	Kiyoshi Shizuma	Institute of Engineering	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course Leader
Professor	Kiriko Sakata	Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences	Radioactivity Social Recovery Course Leader
Professor	Satoru Endo	Institute of Engineering	Chairperson, the Entrance Examination Committee
Professor (Special Appointment)	Hironori Deguchi	Graduate School of Science	Chairperson, the Student Life Committee
Professor	Toshinori Okuda	Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences	Chairperson, the International Exchange Committee
Student	Lin Yen Hwa	Graduate School of Biomedical & Health Sciences	Radiation disaster Medicine Course SENPAI Mentor
Student	Masaya Tsujimoto	Graduate School of Science	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course SENPAI Mentor
Student	Fumie Yamaguchi	Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences	Radioactivity Social Recovery Course SENPAI Mentor

5. Agenda

Time	Event	Person
9:00	Opening Remarks	Program Director
9:05	Guidance on Evaluation Process	Program Director
9:10	Explanation and evaluation of program areas in need of improvement identified following the FY2014 External Evaluation	Program Coordinator
10:00	Break	
10:10	Discussion	All Participants
11:00	Discussion and Sum up of the morning's activities	Program Director
11:20	Closing Remarks	Program Coordinator

【Inquiries】

Phoenix Leader Education Program Office, Hiroshima University

1-1-1 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima, 739-8524

TEL: 082-424-4689・4638

E-Mail: phoenix-program@office.hiroshima-u.ac.jp

URL: <http://www.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/lp/program/ra/>