

MEXT Project 2011 Leading Program in Doctoral Education

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

**FY2014  
External Evaluation Report**



— Hiroshima University —

# Table of Contents

## I. Overview

1. Notably exceptional aspects are as follows.	p. 1
2. Aspects requiring improvement are as follows.	p. 4
3. Other aspects for which future improvement is desirable are as follows.	p. 6

## 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. 7
--	------

### Criterion 2: Implementation Structure

Point 2-①: Does the Program have guidance and student-support systems appropriate for achieving its purpose?	p. 9
Point 2-②: Does the Program have planning, operating, and partnership-building systems appropriate for achieving its purpose?	p. 9
Criterion 2: Implementation Structure Overall evaluation	p. 10

### 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. 12
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. 12
Criterion 3: Program Members and Education Supporters Overall evaluation	p. 13

#### 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. 15
Point 4-②: Does the Program employ an appropriate system to select students according to its admission policy? Does the system function well?	p. 15
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. 16
Criterion 4: Status of Accepting Students Overall evaluation	p. 16

#### 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. 24
Point 6-②: Judging by the results of questionnaires and other hearings of students' opinions, are educational results and/or effectiveness improving?	p. 24
Criterion 6: Outcomes of Education Overall Evaluation	p. 25

**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. 27
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. 27
Point 7-③: Does the Program support students in preparing and carrying out their autonomous and original research plans?	p. 28
Criterion 7: Student Support Systems Overall evaluation	p. 28

**Criterion 8: Facilities and Equipment**

Point: Does the University have facilities and equipment sufficient for educational and research activities of the Program, and suitable for providing the curriculums?	p. 30
---	-------

**Criterion 9: System for Quality Enhancement and Improvement of Education**

Point: Does the Program have an appropriate system to evaluate its implementation processes?	p. 31
--	-------

**III. Summary sheet of evaluation points . . . . . p. 32**

**IV. Issues Pointed out by the External Evaluation Committee . . . . . p. 33**

**V. Phoenix Leader Education Program for Renaissance from Radiation**

**Disasters, External Evaluation Committee Meeting Agenda . . . . . p. 35**

# 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:** Appropriate improvement measures have been taken to address issues pointed out by the External Evaluation Committee last year, which deserves appreciation. I am sure that the enhancement of the social science faculty as Program members at the Radioactivity Social Recovery Course, employment of full-time English faculty members, increased opportunities for international communication, and students' membership in an evaluation committee are producing favorable results in the Program.

**Member B:** Three years have passed since the Program received the first batch of students in 2012. To be honest, at the outset of the Program, I felt doubtful whether a program of this kind would work in Japan, particularly in terms of securing capable advisers. Now three years later, knowing students' educational achievements at voluntary training sessions, I cannot help but give honor to Hiroshima University and all Program members for their concerted and strenuous efforts. To ensure the continued implementation of this significant Program, I expect that the university will embark on advance preparations to continue to receive financial support from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), without losing the Program's scientific neutrality.

**Member C:** Students, who were the first to enroll the Program, have advanced to the third year. During the past three years, the Program has successfully achieved in improving students' qualifications as global leaders who are capable of undertaking the best possible actions in radiation disasters based on cross-discipline knowledge and appropriate judgment. Particularly, students' ability to analyze the current situation of disaster-stricken areas and international communication skills have shown remarkable progress. Also, students have been steadily acquiring basic academic skills necessary for obtaining a doctoral degree.

**Member D:** This Program has attained remarkable achievements in "Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies," "fostering of global-minded students with strong leadership," and "development of effective education/instruction mechanisms."

"Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies" is a distinctive cross-disciplinary area of study that Hiroshima University has independently established by unifying its long-accumulated wealth of human/ intellectual resources, and experts from both Japan and abroad and lessons learned from the nuclear disaster in Fukushima Prefecture.

As to "fostering of global-minded students with strong leadership," the Program has conducted various effective initiatives, including the holding of presentations/discussions on research achievements in English, encouragement of students' independent management of

symposiums/seminars, and students' membership in a program evaluation committee.

For "development of effective education/instruction mechanisms," the Program has established distinctive instruction mechanisms for students (the adviser system, the mentoring system, the Student Life Committee, the board of qualifying examinations, etc.), and communication systems between students and the faculty (opinion exchange meetings, retreats, e-learning portfolios, questionnaire surveys, etc.), all of which are expected to bring about favorable results in the future. I suggest continued improvement of these mechanisms, so that they can develop into exemplary education/instruction methods at the university.

**Member E:** 1) In general, the Phoenix PhD Program is a very unique and important program.  
2) The Univ. of Hiroshima has very important and unique resources, laboratories and data centers (such as the Hiroshima Radiation Research Foundation) which are readily available to students at the Univ. of Hiroshima.  
3) There are very excellent Professors and other teachers available to students at the Univ. of Hiroshima who have special and unique knowledge and experience on all socio-economic, psychological and clinical aspects of exposure to ionizing radiations.  
4) The collaborations between Univ of Hiroshima and other excellent centers such as NIRS and Univ of Fukushima also provide the Phoenix students with especially unique and practical educational experiences.

**Member F:** The FY2014 External Evaluation Committee meeting clearly showed that the Phoenix Leader Education Program had now reached its cruising speed. The recruitment process of the students, the overall structure of the curriculum, the practical activities (short field visits, short-term fieldworks and internships) and the support arrangements for the students are now well established. Altogether the Program shows great consistency.  
The 4th International Symposium on the Phoenix Leader Education Program that followed the External Evaluation Committee meeting has also demonstrated the global effectiveness of the arrangements put in place since the inception of the Program in terms of students' growing power. The quality of the organization but also the quality of the presentations of the students demonstrated that they had taken the measure of the expectations resting on them from all the team in charge of the program. Their command of English has improved significantly and they show a more and more pronounced self-confidence. It also seems that the field visits helped them to better understand the issues and challenges at stake in the post-accident situation.

**Member G:** -Exceptional Program leadership:  
-Dr Okamoto dedication and passion about Phoenix  
-Dr Kamiya staunch support to the operation of Phoenix  
-International approach with radiation experts working with some social science experts (mostly from IAEA team of STS experts)  
-Diversity of student body from international background  
-Student support services to students are excellent  
-Financial support

**Member H:** • The Phoenix Leader Education Program continues to improve upon completion of its third academic year. Many of the strong and positive aspects of this program identified in the last report, e.g. excellent organizational structure of the program, an unparalleled and superb student support structure and network, excellent student performance, continue to excel in the current year.

- The program has been extremely responsive to comments and suggestions made by the committee in the last review and steps have been taken to rectify some of the previous concerns made. As such, the program as a whole is stronger than ever.
- The program is more "global" and international than previous terms.

**Member I:** • The program is unique and the students are motivated and multi-dimensional.

- The leadership is dedicated to continuous improvement of the program and are flexible in developing and implementing recommendations of the committee and feedback from the students.
- The mix of classroom and real life experience leads to well-rounded individuals who can help develop real world solutions.
- The international exposure in symposia and internships enhances the global understanding by the students.

2. Aspects requiring improvement are as follows.

<p><b>Member A:</b> It is a good idea to prepare a teaching handbook. However, the handbook is confusing and difficult to understand. My detailed comments on this point are found in the “Criterion 3” section.</p>
<p><b>Member C:</b> It must be ensured that all faculty members share the recognition of the continued implementation of the Program. To this end, as part of faculty development efforts, small-group discussions need to be conducted so that each faculty member can freely express his/her opinion on the contents of education of the Program.</p>
<p><b>Member D:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Research themes of Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course students are concentrated on “a survey on the current situation of radioactive contamination in Fukushima.” Students should be instructed to select a theme from among diverse and a wider range of alternatives.</li><li>● To enhance students’ broader perspectives and creativity, it is required to expand the Program’s partner organizations and host institutions of students on internship to natural/man-made disaster response organizations, not limiting to nuclear/radiation-related institutes.</li></ul>
<p><b>Member E:</b> Acquiring Sustainable Funding for the Phoenix Program in general, now appears to be the most important need for improvement. The Univ. of Hiroshima because of all it’s unique and world -respected faculty and physical resources is absolutely the best place in the world to sponsor this very important type of educational program. The world urgently needs people trained to respond to all types of world emergencies—radiation as well as other types of mas casualty events.</p> <p>And, since the general “template for response and remediation” to all other scenarios, besides radiation- associated incidents, is very similar, the Phoenix students will certainly become world leaders in all kinds disaster response.</p> <p>It would be great tragedy, if the Phoenix PhD Program cannot be sustained due to funding ...</p>
<p><b>Member F:</b> If the Program appears to be broadly coherent and efficient, it remains difficult to understand it in a simple and concise way. The multiplicity of the structures at the level of the management, of the disciplines at the level of the curriculum and of the means of education does not facilitate its apprehension and readability.</p> <p>I think this difficulty is an obstacle for the evaluators but also for the students and even more so for those outside to the Program to understanding its general objective and spirit. Now that almost all arrangements are well in place, it would certainly be useful to initiate at the level of the External Evaluation Committee a reflection in cooperation with the students aiming at giving a clearer picture of the Phoenix Leader Education Program.</p>
<p><b>Member G:</b> -More committed local social sciences lecturers -More committed local basic/clinical sciences lecturers -Training local lecturers to acquire shared values about the spirit and goals of Phoenix</p>
<p><b>Member H:</b> • As indicated by this reviewer in the last review cycle, the overall goal of this Phoenix program is to train radiological scientists that can serve as societal leaders in radiation</p>



disaster management. As such, one of the primary training objective of the program SHOULD BE outstanding radiological scientists that can stand in front of an audience of lay people and explain in no uncertain terms during a radiation disaster the health risk and other social issues that the citizens are facing. Trainees must therefore be an expert in either radiobiology, radiation physics or radiation medicine to be qualified for the task.

- Social sciences such as ecology and psychology are important but they are only SECONDARY to a thorough and solid foundation in basic radiological sciences.
- In essence, the trainees have to "know" in order to "lead" at a time of need during a radiological incidence.

**Member I:** • No major issues noted.

- Specific recommendations are made under the sections.
- Mainly, in addition to development of the student. Development of teachers through interaction with graduate schools globally to share teaching methods and interdisciplinary communication.

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

<p><b>Member A:</b> Based on valuable comments and opinions on the Program that students have expressed in various questionnaire surveys, appropriate improvement measures should be taken as necessary.</p>
<p><b>Member C:</b> Students' possible career paths after completing the Program should be discussed and specified in more detail.</p>
<p><b>Member D:</b> This Program is an excellent educational initiative that aims to foster human resources equipped with advanced expertise. I suggest that the Program's instruction mechanisms and methods, which have increasingly proven to be effective, be applied to other education/class programs offered both inside and outside Hiroshima University, thereby contributing to the entire quality improvement of university education in Japan.</p>
<p><b>Member E:</b> There is a need for better promotion/publicity of the program in countries outside Japan so as to attract the interest of prospective students in other countries throughout the world –especially in those countries with existing and planned Nuclear Power Plants.</p>
<p><b>Member G:</b> -More ACTIVE learning methods: Decrease number of lectures/increase number of seminars (because Phoenix students are graduate students)</p>
<p><b>Member I:</b> • Should the common coursework include radiation biology and genetics?</p>

## 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	I	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.89

[Comments]

**Member A:** The fact that the Program was highly recognized by IAEA at the first international meeting on science, technology, and society (STS) deserves appreciation.

**Member D:** This Program offers the unique “Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies,” unifying Hiroshima University’s long-accumulated intellectual/human resources in a broad range of disciplines (including medicine, engineering, and humanities and social science) and domestic and overseas advanced examples/specialists/expertise concerning the recovery from radiation disasters. I admit that the Studies conforms to the purpose of the Program: to foster global leaders who are able to be actively involved in industrial, academic and governmental arenas based on broader perspectives and enhanced creativity.

Various program committees have been also established to hear the opinions of program evaluation group members, university staff members, students, and external evaluators. I highly evaluate the continued improvement efforts that have been made based on these opinions, ensuring the appropriate management and contents of education to achieve the purpose of the Program.

**Member G:** Leadership skills and creativity can be further enhanced through team projects (research or field works), seminars or internship.

Number of lectures should be decreased significantly as they turn students into passive and dependent graduates.

Independent learning foster initiative taking, and sense of responsibility. Hence making phoenix graduate better leaders.

**Member H:** • The collaborative effort of this Program with the IAEA is considered a strength of the program.

• Other international, radiological advisory bodies such as ICRP should be considered as a training partner as the program matures.

**Member I:** The program affords its students a wide array of experiences that enhance their ability to think globally and across disciplines. The mix of real life as well as classroom experiences broaden their perspective.

## 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	I	Average
Score	4	3	4	4	3	3	2	4	4	3.44

**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	I	Average
Score	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3.78

**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	I	Average
Score	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	3.56

[Comments]

**Member A:** The points I highly evaluate regarding the instruction systems of the Program are as follows:

- An instruction system, under which each student receives instruction from one primary adviser and one or more co-adviser(s) from each course, has been introduced.
- Two faculty members of the Graduate School of Letters have been assigned to the Radioactivity Social Recovery Course as a Program member.
- A student support system by faculty mentors, peer-mentorship among students, and senior student mentors has been established. A mentoring handbook has been also prepared.
- As part of the Program’s administrative framework restructuring, the Phoenix Program General Meeting, Steering Committee for the Phoenix Leader Education Program, and the Career Path Committee have been established.
- Short-term internship programs at seven businesses/research institutes, and seminars/fieldwork units with 14 collaboration institutions were conducted.

**Member D:**

- The Program offers attentive instruction/support mechanisms to students, covering from class-related matters to other aspects of daily school life. Such mechanisms include the Program adviser system, the mentoring system, the Student Life Committee, and the board of qualifying examination (QE) system.
- Most partner organizations of the Program are limited to nuclear/radiation-related institutes so far. Considering that the Program focuses on “Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies,” it is

required to expand the partner organizations to a wider range of institutions involved in the response to natural/man-made disasters caused by typhoons, earthquakes, accidents, etc. Such disaster response institutions may be possible alternatives to host students on internship.

- Various training seminars have been conducted to help improve students' leadership and practical skills in the field of medicine. These effective seminars should be increased. I also highly evaluate the Program since it encourages students to participate in the planning and management process of seminars and symposiums.

**Member G:** More social science teachers should be contributing to the program.

More important than the number is their commitment to the program.

**Member H:** • The role of the primary advisor for each student should be emphasized in case of conflicting recommendations given to the student by other co-advisors. Difference in opinions among academic faculty is not uncommon and a mechanism should be in place to protect the student from such scenario.

• The career path counseling and short term internship are considered additional strength of this program.

**Member I:** • Five teachers (new) participated in the social recovery course and environment protection course

• \*\* Recommend further support with regulations e.g. taxes for students. Commend the initiative that some teachers joined the student life committee

• \*\* The career path committee establishment is an important step. Greater emphasis on identifying future employers and placement opportunities should be undertaken and those relationships fostered.

• Recommend greater access to teachers to discuss research project and guidance.

### 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	I	Average
Score	2	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	4	3.22

**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	I	Average
Score	3	3	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	3.44



**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	I	Average
Score	2	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	3.44

[Comments]

**Member A:**

The preparation of the teaching handbook deserves appreciation, but the handbook is confusing and difficult to understand. For example, the handbook specifies learning goals and rubric (seemingly too detailed) for Common Items C1, C2 and C3. However, for Radiation Disaster Medicine Course (M4 - M9), Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course (E4 - E7) and Radioactivity Social Recovery Course (S4 - S9), the handbook sets out learning goals and learning objectives alone, without mentioning rubric.

Moreover, although learning objectives of the Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course (E4) contain “enhanced knowledge about the principles and structure of a nuclear reactor, and the nuclear fuel cycle,” there are no subject names that seem to acquaint students with such knowledge among Phoenix Leader Special Subjects. I suppose that necessary nuclear-related lectures are offered during short-term field visits. But no mention of the lectures can be found in the teaching handbook, which may cause students to hesitate to take a short field visit without knowing the details. Probably, detailed explanations on the contents of subjects are provided to students at various guidance opportunities. Still, the teaching handbook may make applicants feel confused or worried about their learning in the Program.

**Member C:** Some students’ comments on the faculty imply their insufficient recognition of the contents of education in the Program. In addition to information sharing by the teaching handbook, it is also required to provide opportunities for all faculty members to confirm the purpose of the Program and discuss how to instruct students in the Program.

**Member D:**

- A multi-faceted instruction system is ensured in the Program because the Program advisers and the board members of qualifying examinations (QE) are comprised of several faculties' members of the university and non-university external members. Also, the teaching handbook clarifies the contents of education, helping advisers and students share information on the educational policy of the Program.
- Explanations on curriculum maps, attainment standards (rubric), e-learning portfolios, and syllabi were given at education seminars. They have been attracting attention as effective means to guarantee high-quality university education; an increasing number of universities have introduced them in recent years. However, there are also opinions that they have not yet produced satisfactory results due to limited usage in universities. To make these means more effective and easier to use for the Program students, it is required to clarify points to be improved and take necessary improvement measures.

**Member G:** Distribution of teaching handbook is necessary but not sufficient for effective teaching. There is a need for a "training the trainers" to guarantee that All teachers understand the spirit and goals of phoenix program.

To make sure that interdisciplinary seminars are effectively run. Who will evaluate the quality of those seminars Full time English teacher: Outstanding performance as shown by the improvement of English skills among students.

**Member H:** The addition of a native English speaking faculty to teach English and presentation skill and the enforcement of using English in class room teaching will be helpful to improve the English speaking and comprehension ability of the trainees.

**Member I:** • The hiring of the English teacher has filled an important gap in the program and is commended.

- Further educational seminars such as the one described should continue.
- Interaction between the teachers and outside graduate schools is recommended to exchange ideas and teaching method innovations.

## 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	I	Average
Score	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.67

**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	I	Average
Score	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3.56

**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	I	Average
Score	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3.56

**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	I	Average
Score	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.78

[Comments]

**Member A:** Explanatory meetings to fully introduce the Program to applicants have been held both inside and outside Japan, which I highly evaluate. It is also a good idea to conduct a one-night camp for interview screening of prospective students.

In the class schedule example for mature-age students learning in the Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course, key subjects such as “Radiation Chemistry” and “Meteorology” are missing. Of course, it is not necessary to include all subjects in the example. However, because there is no mention that this is a “sample schedule,” I am afraid that some misunderstandings may arise among students.

**Member D:**

- Most international students learning in the Program are from South East Asian countries. Further efforts to broadly publicize the Program need to be conducted to recruit an increasing number of students from around the world, particularly from countries that are steadily advancing construction plans of nuclear power stations, such as Central and East European countries (Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, and Bulgaria) and Middle East countries (Turkey, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia).
- The application guideline specifies the Program’s admission policy, describing four (1-4) requirements for expected human resources with a global perspective. However, I feel that the guideline is a little bit abstract and insufficient to clearly convey the Program’s details to applicants. An overview of the three courses (Radiation Disaster Medicine Course, Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course, and Radioactivity Social Recovery Course), possible career paths after completing the Program, and other details should be added to the application guideline. It is desirable to ensure that applicants can clearly understand and capture the Program’s concept by just reading an application guideline organized on a sheet of paper.

**Member G:** Diversity of students is remarkable

This would guarantee the international nature of Phoenix program

**Member H:** • In Point 4-2, from the report, it is not clear whether the scholastic background of the student is a factor, which it should, for consideration of admissions into the training program.

• From the report, it was not clear how many students applied for the Phoenix Leader Program; how many candidates were interviewed before the six new students were accepted into the program. In essence, how competitive is the Phoenix Leader Education Program?

**Member I:** • The utilization of society meetings to raise awareness of the program is recommended; e.g. radiation societies JASTRO, ASTRO, ESTRO, etc.

• The diversity of students suggests greater reach; however no clear method is suggested to verify that screening methods are effective.

## 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	I	Average
Score	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3.67

**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**

[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	I	Average
Score	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3.56

**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	I	Average
Score	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3.67

**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	I	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.78

**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	I	Average
Score	2	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3.33

**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	I	Average
Score	3	4	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	3.22



**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	I	Average
Score	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3.67

**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	I	Average
Score	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3.33

[Comments]

<p><b>Member A:</b> As I commented in the criteria 3 and 4 sections, there are some points to be improved as to the teaching handbook and the class schedule example for mature-age students.</p>
<p><b>Member C:</b> It is not clear how students' diverse academic backgrounds are considered in the degree-granting process based on cross-discipline instruction in the Program. It is also required to focus on faculty development efforts to further enhance educational functions of the Program.</p>
<p><b>Member D:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Various initiatives to help foster global-minded human resources with strong leadership have been conducted, including presentations/discussions on research achievements in English, students' independent management of symposiums/seminars, and students' membership in a program evaluation committee. As a result of these initiatives, students have increasingly improved their English conversation skills and become more independent and highly motivated learners.</li><li>● As to internship programs, it is important to avoid discrepancies in the recognition of educational policy and contents between the university/students and host businesses/organizations. To this end, academic needs of the university/students based on the Program's principal concepts of "radiation disaster responses" and "Radiation Disaster Recovery Studies" must be clearly conveyed to host businesses/organizations. In-depth discussions and detailed arrangements in advance are essential to make internship programs a rewarding and satisfactory learning opportunity for students.</li></ul>
<p><b>Member G:</b> Give students more freedom to take elective courses at Hiroshima University or abroad to compensate the shortage/ low commitment of social sciences teachers</p>
<p><b>Member H:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The curriculum should place more emphasis on proficiencies in radiological sciences as indicated in the overall evaluation section.</li><li>• Given student autonomy is a good thing but structured autonomy that does not deviate too much from the main goal of this leadership program should be emphasized.</li><li>• On p.17 of the Self Study Report, it was stated that "<i>The Phoenix Leader Education Program's curriculum has been devised from the viewpoint of fostering students' abilities in three key areas: interdisciplinary abilities, management abilities, and the abilities to deal with international issues</i>". However, it should also be stated that these criteria are under and encompassing the broad theme of potential radiation hazard.</li></ul>
<p><b>Member I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Perhaps the addition of specific leadership courses would be helpful.</li><li>• The long-term field work for seniors is helpful. However the concern that advances in the field may not be addressed in the greater time away from classes. Perhaps a short refresher review to touch on any advances would be helpful.</li><li>• All the issues in Point 5 (1) were appropriately addressed.</li><li>• Bb9 incorporation led to increased efficiency and ease of communication.</li><li>• The hiring of an English teacher and encouraging students to present at conferences will enhance their communication and leadership skills.</li></ul>

- Recommend the use of testing to evaluate personality type + strengths + weaknesses as well as formal leadership courses
- A number of electives allow students flexibility with course subject.

## 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	I	Average
Score	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3.67

**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	I	Average
Score	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3.56

**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	I	Average
Score	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.78

[Comments]

**Member A:** I highly evaluate the university for conducting various questionnaire surveys to collect opinions and evaluations from students, and reflecting them in the improvement process of the Program.

According to the results of the questionnaire survey on the short-term field visit, some students did not bring a necessary file that had been distributed in advance at orientation. Such a problem can be easily avoided and immediately addressed if an e-mail sent to students prior to a short-term field visit reminds them of what to bring.

As to a group visit to temporary housing for disaster victims, some students answered that they had no time to discuss with group members what to ask the temporary housing residents because they were grouped just before the visit. This problem also seems to have been immediately addressed.

For the results of questionnaire surveys on the second and third retreats, the same kinds of problems were pointed out as “items to be improved.” This implies no improvement measure had been made in the duration between the two surveys. It is required to take necessary actions as early as possible.

**Member D:**

- Attentive efforts to ensure constant communication between students and the faculty have been made by means of opinion exchange meetings, retreats, e-learning portfolios, and questionnaire surveys. The plan-do-check-act (PDCA) system to improve the Program has been also established.

- At opinion exchange meetings between students and the faculty, some students complained about the heavy burden of classes and tight class schedule. It is required to provide adequate and case-by-case support for students who have difficulty coping with both regular curriculum subject studies and extracurricular learning activities.

**Member I:** •Suggest method to better coordinate the curriculum detail between teachers to avoid overlaps and repetition; committee is available and meets twice monthly but sharing materials recommended.

•Students seemed very positive of their experiences and the level of teaching and attention given to them.

## 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	I	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3.89

**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	I	Average
Score	4	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	I	Average
Score	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3.67

**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	I	Average
Score	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3.78



[Comments]

**Member D:**

- Although almost all research themes of third-year students learning in the Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course are “a survey on the current situation of radioactive contamination in Fukushima,” a wider range of comprehensive alternatives are desirable. Students should be instructed to take up a comprehensive and multi-faceted theme..

For example, I suggest an inquiry into the current situation/problems on and lessons learned from measures against radioactive contamination in Fukushima from the perspective of organizations, social regimes, techniques, and methodology.

Likewise, in the Radioactivity Social Recovery Course, it would be an intriguing research theme to survey the status and progress of social recovery in Fukushima, relevant problems, and countermeasures against the problems, in comparison with other examples of social recovery from a radiation disaster.

**Member G:** Autonomy to students should be increased But Closer relation between supervisor and student should be encouraged in order to "monitor" that relative autonomy.

Teacher should make themselves available as needed.

**Member H:** This training program has a superb student supporting plan in place.

**Member I:** • The students led the Phoenix symposium and such activity satisfies pt. 7 (1).

- Excellent support financially.
- Environment encourages debate as well as collaboration between the students.

## Criterion 8: Facilities and Equipment

**Point: 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	I	Average
Score	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.67

[Comments]

**Member A:** There is almost no mention of the Hiroshima Phoenix Training Center in the evaluation report. Because the center plays a critical role in implementing the Program, details of the center should be described. It may be also a good idea to enable evaluation committee members to visit the center.

**Member C:** Development and improvement of facilities/equipment have been making good progress. However, more ideas to use them on a permanent basis need to be devised.

**Member I:**

- Excellent radiation detection and training resources
- Information regarding laboratories e.g. in radiobiology and genetics not clear.

## Criterion 9: System for Quality Enhancement and Improvement of Education

**Point: 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	I	Average
Score	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

[Comments]

**Member D:** The Program aims to acquaint students with sufficient practical knowledge to take the best possible actions in case of a radiation disaster. In light of this, I recommend that the External Evaluation Committee include representatives from organizations/businesses/administrative agencies, who are actively responding to radiation disasters on the front line. Their practical evaluations and comments will be surely helpful for further improvement of the Program.

**Member I:** •The two evaluation committees and the inclusion of students in the external committee allows a well-rounded evaluation of the program.  
•Recommendations are seriously considered and implementation is sought.

### III. Summary sheet of evaluation points

Member		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Average /Criterion
<b>Criterion 1</b>		4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	<b>3.89</b>
<b>Criterion 2</b>	Point ①	4	3	4	4	3	3	2	4	4	<b>3.44</b>
	Point ②	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	<b>3.78</b>
	Overall evaluation	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	<b>3.56</b>
<b>Criterion 3</b>	Point ①	2	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	4	<b>3.22</b>
	Point ②	3	3	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	<b>3.44</b>
	Overall evaluation	2	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	<b>3.44</b>
<b>Criterion 4</b>	Point ①	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	<b>3.67</b>
	Point ②	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	<b>3.56</b>
	Point ③	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	<b>3.56</b>
	Overall evaluation	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	<b>3.78</b>
<b>Criterion 5</b>	Point ①	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	<b>3.67</b>
	Point ②	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	<b>3.56</b>
	Point ③	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	<b>3.67</b>
	Point ④	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	<b>3.78</b>
	Point ⑤	2	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	<b>3.33</b>
	Point ⑥	3	4	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	<b>3.22</b>
	Point ⑦	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	<b>3.67</b>
	Overall evaluation	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	<b>3.33</b>
<b>Criterion 6</b>	Point ①	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	<b>3.67</b>
	Point ②	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	<b>3.56</b>
	Overall evaluation	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	<b>3.78</b>
<b>Criterion 7</b>	Point ①	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	<b>3.89</b>
	Point ②	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	<b>4.00</b>
	Point ③	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	<b>3.67</b>
	Overall evaluation	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	<b>3.78</b>
<b>Criterion 8</b>	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	<b>3.67</b>	
<b>Criterion 9</b>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	<b>4</b>	
<b>Average /Member</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>3.63</b>	

## IV. Issues Pointed out by the External Evaluation

### Committee

According to the external evaluation results, all criteria except for criteria 3 and 5 were judged as being “satisfied.” As a notable improvement over the last year’s evaluation results, Criterion 6 has improved from being “mostly satisfied” to being “satisfied.” On the other hand, criteria 3 and 5 remained being “mostly satisfied,” the same result as the previous year. This section summarizes issues pointed out by the External Evaluation Committee, referring to the findings that evaluation members described as “aspects requiring improvement” in section I (Overview), and comments on criteria 3 and 5 that they wrote in section II (Evaluation by Criteria).

As to comments on criteria (other than criteria 3 and 5) that were evaluated as being “satisfied” with an overall average score of 3.5 or higher (cf. page 31 for details), all relevant committees are required to closely examine each of them and identify points to be improved in the Program operation this fiscal year.

#### 1. Issues Related to “Criterion 3: Program Members and Education Supporters”

##### [Evaluation Results]

The overall average score for Criterion 3 was 3.44. By points of evaluation, the average score was 3.22 for point 3-① and 3.44 for point 3-②. As a whole, Criterion 3 was evaluated as being “mostly satisfied.”

##### [Issues]

###### Point 3-①-(1):

The teaching handbook, which is designed to fill recognition gaps among the faculty about the Program, needs to be made easier to understand.

###### Point 3-②-(1):

It is required to offer training opportunities for faculty members to discuss how to instruct students and share the recognition of the purpose of the Program.

#### 2. Issues Related to “Criterion 5: Contents and Means of Education”

##### [Evaluation Results]

The overall average score for Criterion 5 was 3.22. By points of evaluation, the average score was 3.33 for point 5-⑤ and 3.22 for point 5-⑥. Point 5-①~④ and point 5-⑦ were evaluated as being “satisfied.” As a whole, Criterion 5 was evaluated as being “mostly satisfied.”

##### [Issues]

###### Point 5-⑤-(1):

The teaching handbook needs to be made easier to understand.

Point 5-⑤-(2):

The process to receive a doctoral degree based on cross-discipline studies should be clarified.

Point 5-⑥-(1):

To address the shortage of faculty members in the field of social science, it is required to expand opportunities for students to take elective subjects outside the Program.

Point 5-⑥-(2):

Learning opportunities of leadership should be increased.

Point 5-⑥-(3):

As to long-term off-campus study activities, it is required to establish a mechanism to understand the progress of study of individual students.

### 3. Issues Related to the Findings in the Overview Evaluation

[Evaluation Results]

In the “I. Overview” section (cf. pages 1-6), several findings were presented as “aspects requiring improvement” (cf. pages 4-5). Based on the findings, issues other than those mentioned above concerning criteria 3 and 5, and necessary improvement measures, are described below.

Because the following issues were pointed out by several external evaluation members, particularly close attention to them is necessary in taking improvement measures of the Program going forward.

[Issues]

Overview 1:

Measures to ensure the continued implementation of the Program must be devised. It is also required to build a common recognition of the measures among all faculty members.

Overview 2:

Students should be instructed to take up a research theme from among diverse and a wider range of alternatives.

Overview 3:

It is required to expand host institutions of Program students on internship to various organizations, such as natural/man-made disaster response organizations, not limiting to nuclear/radiation-related institutes.

Overview 4:

To not only facilitate smooth evaluation by evaluators but also effective learning by students, the entire operational framework of the Program should be explained in an easy-to-understand manner.

Overview 5:

It is required to ensure that an increasing number of faculty members in the field of science are actively involved in the Program (lectures).

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

## 1. Objective of FY2014 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. The purpose of the Program is to foster global leaders (Phoenix Leaders), who are capable of undertaking the best possible actions in a radiation disaster based on multidisciplinary knowledge, and providing strong leadership in the recovery process from the disaster based on appropriate judgment and a clear vision.

Considering that FY2014 marked the third anniversary of the Program, the External Evaluation Committee focused on a “general inspection” this year and reexamined the Program against nine criteria for the accreditation of university educational programs. The objective of external evaluation is to gather evaluation results and valuable suggestions for improvements from leading figures in industrial, academic, and governmental circles inside and outside Japan, thereby helping the Program develop into a personnel training initiative that can meet expectations from around the world.

## 2. Date & Venue

Date: Saturday, February 14, 2015, a.m. 8:30-p.m. 12:00

Venue: RIHGA Royal Hotel Hiroshima, “AKI NO MA” (3F)



### 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
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)
Rethy K. Chhem	Director, Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI)
Tom K.Hei	Professor and Vice- Chairman of Radiation Oncology, Columbia University Medical Center
May Abdel-Wahab	Director, Division of Human Health, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)



#### 4. Members of Phoenix Leader Education Program

Post	Name	Affiliation	Responsibility in Program
Executive and Vice President	Tetsuji Okamoto	Industry-Academia-Government Collaboration and Community Relations, Public Relations, Information	Program Director Radiation Disaster Medicine Course Member
Vice President	Kenji Kamiya	Reconstruction Support/Radiation Medicine, Research Institute for Radiation Biology and Medicine	Program Coordinator Radiation Disaster Medicine Course Member
Professor (Special Appointment)	Kiyoshi Shizuma	Institute of Engineering	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course Leader Teaching Mentor
Professor	Kiriko Sakata	Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences	Radioactivity Social Recovery Course Leader
Professor	Chisa Shukunami	Institute of Biomedical & Health Sciences	Radiation disaster Medicine Course Member
Professor	Yoshio Hosoi	Tohoku University	Radiation disaster Medicine Course Member
Professor	Toshinori Okuda	Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course Member
Professor (Special Appointment)	Shoken Miyama	Office of the President	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course Member
Professor (Special Appointment)	Hironori Deguchi	Graduate School of Science	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course Member Teaching Mentor
Associate Professor (Special Appointment)	Dion Clingwall	Institute of Biomedical & Health Sciences	Radiation disaster Medicine Course Member
Associate Professor (Special Appointment)	Shuji Takahashi	Graduate School of Science	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course Member Teaching Mentor
Assistant Professor (Special Appointment)	Yuki Yoshimoto	Institute of Biomedical & Health Sciences	Teaching Mentor
Student	Uranchimeg Tsegmed	Graduate School of Biomedical & Health Sciences	Radiation disaster Medicine Course SENPAI Mentor
Student	Momo Takada	Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences	Radioactivity Environmental Protection Course
Student	Mariko Komatsu	Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences	Radioactivity Social Recovery Course SENPAI Mentor

## 5. Agenda

Time	Event	Person
8:30	Opening Remarks	Tetsuji Okamoto (Program Director)
8:35	Introductions	Members of Phoenix Leader Education Program
8:40	Introductions	Members of External Evaluation Committee
8:45	Guidance on Evaluation Process	Tetsuji Okamoto
8:50	Explanation and evaluation on points improved after the FY2013 External Evaluation Committee Meeting	Kenji Kamiya (Program Coordinator)
9:50	Break	
10:00	Explanation and evaluation on improvement measures for specific issues pointed out at the FY2013 External Evaluation Committee Meeting	Tetsuji Okamoto
11:00	Discussion Sum up	Tetsuji Okamoto
12:00	Closing Remarks	Kenji Kamiya

**【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/>**