

Supplementary Review Results

Tokyo Medical University



Basic Information of the Institution	
Ownership: Private	Location: Tokyo, Japan
Accreditation Status	
Year of the Review: 2020	
Accreditation Status: accredited (Accreditation Period: April.1.2021 – March.31.2025)	

Supplementary Review for Tokyo Medical University

Overview

Regarding Tokyo Medical University, in response to the scandal surrounding the selection of prospective students at the School of Medicine coming to light—namely, the bribery of senior MEXT officials and the subsequent fudging of entrance examination scores—we established an investigatory subcommittee under the University Accreditation Committee of the Association in 2018, and investigated the validity of the University Accreditation (Certified Evaluation and Accreditation) Results for said University that we conducted in 2017. This consequently verified major issues in “Student Enrollment,” “Management,” and “Internal Quality Assurance” and as a result, the determination of the 2017 University Accreditation Results stating that the University conformed to University Standards was overturned and the University was deemed noncompliant.

In response to these issues surrounding the selection of prospective students, an emergency meeting of the Board of Trustees was held at Tokyo Medical University, the Internal Investigatory Committee and Third-Party Committee were promptly established, and fact-finding and causal analysis of the case in question were conducted in said committees. Besides compiling a list of preventative measures in response to the results of these investigations and the problem areas indicated in the investigation results by the Association, the University is implementing measures such as governance and entrance examination reforms after first formulating a progress schedule. In tandem, the University receives consideration and approval every three months with regard to the progress of those reforms at the Board of Trustees and promotes reforms while seeking advice and guidance from MEXT, and it is endeavoring toward building a framework that leaves no room for corruption. Consequently, in addition to swift and appropriate action having been taken since the scandal was uncovered in July 2018, concrete reform measures are being promoted, and we conclude that the University satisfies the University Standards.

First of all, with regard to Student Enrollment among the three serious issues, individual scores were fudged for particular entrance examinees and scores were fudged according to attributes such as gender and age since the 2006 entrance examination, and the situation was such that we could not say “fair and proper enrollment following the admission policy” required by the University Standards was being implemented. In response to these problem areas, the University established the Entrance Examination Committee, which is independent of its authorities, along with the Admission Center.

When making acceptance judgements, the University decided that the board of education and the faculty council, which are responsible for considerations, will in all cases consider acceptance using materials that only show examination scores, and is substantiating deliberations. Furthermore, the University established the Entrance Examination Audit Committee, which consists of three external members, after the scandal was uncovered, and with regard to the 2019 and 2020 entrance examinations, it implemented audits and verifications by said committee. Besides the aforementioned, the University reformed the environment for entrance examination work, installing such precautions as surveillance cameras and a finger vein authentication system in the computer lab that the personnel in charge use as well as implementing anti-fraud countermeasures in entrance examination office work, such as introducing a system that records access logs and prevents fraudulent point additions. It proactively discloses information concerning entrance examinations and endeavors to assure fairness and transparency in them. Moreover, regarding the Entrance Examination Committee, the University verifies the acceptance rate by gender and age based on the final acceptance results after the confirmation of admission applicants, and confirms that it is generally unbiased. Furthermore, the University conducts a review of its entrance examination implementation system, including reforms to the entrance examination problems and assessment standards, by posing a questionnaire to all faculty members in charge of entrance examinations each year; and in addition, from the fact that verification is being continuously implemented based on the Entrance Examination Audit Committee Bylaws, we can expect that endeavors toward reform will continue to be made. In this manner, the problem areas that were indicated have been drastically improved. However, the fact that a graph showing a positive correlation between household income and academic achievement appeared among the problems used in the 2020 oral examination for the School of Medicine is improper, and likewise for an example question that would lead to ascertaining the financial situations of examinees' families appearing in the oral examination manual. While the University has already decided to eliminate said example from the oral examination manual for the following year, we hope that it thoroughly implements measures so that, hereafter, it can verify the appropriateness of the oral examination content based on the questionnaire it gives after the entrance examination each year, and that cases like these inviting misunderstanding do not occur.

With regard to the problem area of Management, the University's framework for governance being completely dysfunctional was an issue, stemming from issues such as the supervisory function by the Board of Trustees over the Chair and President, the function of the Internal Audit Office and the internal reporting program, the audits

conducted by auditors, and the supervision by the Board of Councilors losing their substance. In response, the previous Chair and President resigned, a new Chair and President were appointed, and the framework for governance was reformed. Moreover, the University has made modifications to the Articles of Endowment, and restructuring has been implemented in addition to building a framework for the Board of Trustees under new Bylaws for the Appointment of Trustees. In other words, besides increasing the number of external experts among the trustees and incorporating opinions from an external perspective, the University has made the area of teaching and learning—including entrance examinations—subject to audit by adding teaching and learning to the expertise of the auditors, and has reinforced on-campus monitoring, such as by permanent auditors and university attorneys witnessing acceptance judgements by the Entrance Examination Committee. Moreover, along with holding an Operational Liaison Committee meeting prior to the monthly regular Board of Trustees meeting for the purpose of expanding monitoring by the Board of Trustees over the operational trustees, the University has increased the number of external experts among the members in the Board of Councilors. Besides the aforementioned, the University has revised the relevant regulations of the internal reporting system, and reports on the misconduct of the Chair and trustees are covered. In this manner, the situation is generally improved with regard to this problem area, and we can conclude that the framework for governance has been reconstructed. Hereafter, we hope that the University will continue to conduct proper administration under the reformed framework.

Concerning Internal Quality Assurance, descriptions contrary to the facts were given in the Checks and Reviews Report, and it came to light that a system capable of performing checks and assessment as well as improvement and progress of its own conduct did not come to fruition. In response to this issue, the University enacted the Internal Quality Assurance Regulations in 2020, and the Internal Quality Assurance and Promotion Committee was newly established as a framework for promoting internal quality assurance. Accordingly, the Self-Assessment Committee compiles the checks and reviews of each area in charge of teaching and learning based on the basic policy of checks and reviews formulated by said committee, and the University is building a framework for internal quality assurance in which the Internal Quality Assurance and Promotion Committee verifies those results from a University-wide perspective. Additionally, the University holds workshops for faculty development (FD) and staff development (SD) on internal quality assurance, and on-campus developmental activities for teaching and learning management are conducted in accordance with the internal quality assurance system. Hereafter, as it is planning to establish an External Review Committee for Internal

Quality Assurance to verify the internal quality assurance system, we hope that the University steadily implements it and enhances the framework for internal quality assurance.

Next, with regard to the problem areas indicated in the previous University Accreditation (Certified Evaluation and Accreditation), improvements have been made to the research guidance plan, which was an area of serious concern, and to the enactment of qualification review standards for faculty members, which was a suggestion for improvement. However, with regard to the following two areas, continual endeavors toward further improvements are needed.

With regard to the entry “Students of the Graduate School for Working Adults & Clinical Research may substitute a dissertation with a paper recommended by the senior professor and three case reports” in the Educational Guidelines for the Doctoral Program, concerning the passages under “Educational Program, Methods, and Outcomes” that required the University to make the entry appropriate in light of the Standards for Establishment of Universities and clarify its consistency with the definition of a dissertation by the university in question (i.e. “a paper that has been published or accepted for publication in a journal requiring peer review”), we can acknowledge improvement in the case of the University changing that entry of the dissertation requirements to have an international perspective based on the Tokyo Medical University Graduate School Regulations. However, from the fact that, in practice, applications for dissertations written in Japanese are also possible, we hope to see the University make improvements so that it conducts assessments of dissertations based on the academic regulations, such as making it a condition to publish in an authoritative international journal.

In the problem area of Student Enrollment, concerning the fact that the ratios of student enrollment to the student enrollment cap are high in the School of Medicine, the University has made various endeavors aiming to reduce the number of holdover students, such as reviewing educational programs for acquiring fundamental academic skills and improving the framework for student mental healthcare; however, as the improvement of said ratio is not yet sufficient, we hope to see the University make further considerations.

In this manner, improvement initiatives are being implemented regarding the areas of serious concern and suggestions for improvement indicated in the 2017 University Accreditation (Certified Evaluation and Accreditation). It takes time for the effects of improvements to institutions to become clear in many cases, and while the final outcome is expected hereafter as the outcome of internal quality assurance through improvement activities based on the results of checks and reviews, we can conclude that, as immediate reform measures, they are generally satisfactory. We expect the University

to continue to make its internal quality assurance function effectively, endeavor to verify its reform measures in addition to endeavoring toward improving its problem areas, and make further strides in improving its education.

Suggestions for Improvement

Student Enrollment

- We hope to see the University continue to make improvements as the ratio of student enrollment to the student enrollment cap in the School of Medicine was still high at 1.03 in 2019.