



Internationalization Strategies Advisory  
Service (ISAS (2.0))

**International Association of  
Universities**

**Hokkaido University**

**ISAS (2.0): Assessing Strategy  
and Monitoring Achievements**

**FINAL REPORT  
DECEMBER 2016**

## Background

In January 2010, the International Association of Universities (IAU) conducted a review of internationalization programs and strategies at Hokkaido University (HU) as part of its Internationalization Advisory Strategy Service (ISAS). Hokkaido University was the first university to participate in ISAS and between 2010 and 2016, approximately a dozen universities from all over the world partnered with IAU to conduct similar reviews. Additionally, IAU conducted a nation-wide project where more than 20 institutions in one country did the same. In 2016, IAU revised and expanded the ISAS program, creating ISAS (2.0). ISAS (2.0) is a more diversified service, enabling institutions to focus their review and to earn learning badges for different aspects of advancing strategic internationalization. The four possible institutional strands of service are 1) Planning and Strategy, 2) Assessing Strategy and Monitoring Achievements 3) Enhancing a Specific Area of Internationalization, and 4) Achieving Comprehensive Internationalization. The 2016 ISAS (2.0) review of HU focused on Assessing Strategy and Monitoring Achievements.

Having launched its Future Strategy in 2014 and having succeeded in securing one of the Top Global University grants from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Hokkaido University invited IAU once again to collaborate in a review of the Hokkaido Universal Campus Initiative (HUCI). Preparations for the review began with a self-study and culminated with a site visit by an expert panel which took place from 4 to 7 October 2016. The panel was selected by IAU with the advice and input of HU. Members of the expert panel were:

- Kent Anderson, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Community and Engagement), The University of Western Australia
- Eva Egron-Polak, Secretary-General and Executive Director, International Association of Universities
- Madeleine Green, Senior Fellow, International Association of Universities and NAFSA: The Association of International Educators
- Akira Ninomiya, President, Hijiya University, Japan

The Expert Panel wishes to take this opportunity to thank President Keizo Yamaguchi and Executive and Vice President Ichiro Uyeda for their dedication to the HUCI initiative, their support for the very thorough and open process that characterized the self-study, and for their active participation in the Panel's visit. The Panel commends the Steering Committee for its outstanding self-study report, one of the very best such documents produced since the ISAS program was launched in 2010. It was comprehensive and well organized, covering a breadth of programs and structures in a very clear manner. Of special note was the openness of the self-study and the willingness of the Steering Committee to be frank about challenges the University is facing in implementing HUCI. The focus groups and

surveys were an excellent addition to the self-study, yielding important and useful information for the Panel and for HU in its future campus discussions.

Special thanks go to Vice President Hiroaki Terao and to Ms. Riyuki Takemura, Senior Coordinator, Institute for International Collaboration, for their extraordinary work in coordinating the deliberations and input of the Steering Committee and organizing a highly productive visit for the Panel.

### **Scope of the Review**

The timing of the review was quite propitious. The HUCI has been in place for approximately two years, providing an opportune time for HU to take stock both of the progress made in HUCI and overall advances in internationalization since the 2010 review and visit. As stated in the self-study, the purpose of the review was to “reflect on progress and activities undertaken to date and find more effective measures for achieving the targets set in HUCI.” Although HUCI is intended to be a comprehensive institutional reform program, covering primarily internationalization, governance, and education, the Panel was invited to focus on the 21 specific projects described and analyzed in the self-study document. We recognize that there are a host of other activities at HU that contribute to and may constrain efforts to advance its internationalization strategy that are beyond the scope of this report. In addition, there are institutional practices and conditions that have an impact on the achievement of HU’s internationalization goals and of HUCI that were not specifically described in the self-study. Some of them surfaced in the Panel’s interviews, but not all. Thus, we emphasize that our report is based on an analysis that is limited in scope.

### **Structure of the report**

HU is undertaking many activities and implementing numerous projects both within the scope of HUCI and beyond. There have also been numerous developments since the initial 2010 visit and the Panel wished to remark on those as well. Thus, the report is structured into three parts, starting with Commendations, noting the Main Observations that the Panel wished to underline, and finally, a set of Recommendations informed by five key concepts developed that reflect HU’s current context.

### **Commendations**

We commend HU for the considerable progress it has made in internationalization since 2010. Examples of this progress include the award of the Top Global University Project (for which HU proposed the HUCI initiative), the growth in outgoing and incoming student mobility, increases in the number of international faculty members, the number of courses offered in English, and publications co-authored with researchers outside of Japan. More specifically, we commend Hokkaido University for the following achievements:

- We applaud the institution for adopting many of the recommendations resulting from the 2010 review and visit (for example, the Modern Japanese Studies Program, consolidated English instruction for international students and faculty, and more consistent visual image and branding of the University)

- The overall institutional Future Strategy leading up to the celebration of the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary in 2026 is a creative vision for the future of the University. HUCI aligns very well with the Future Strategy, and indeed internationalization is integral to its implementation.
- We commend the University's leadership for having seized the opportunity provided by the Top Global University project to advance internationalization at HU and to support the implementation of its own long-term Future Strategy.
- The 1-4-4 framework for the HUCI initiative wisely situates internationalization in a larger institutional reform agenda, and envisions internationalization not as a goal unto itself, but as a lever for institutional improvement and progress.
- We applaud the University for emphasizing the centrality of collaboration in this phase of institutional development and making it a key concept in the successful implementation of HUCI. We are pleased to note that HU is developing structures and considering strategies to achieve greater internal collaboration.
- We commend HU for the innovativeness and creativity of the signature programs of HUCI—Hokkaido Summer Institutes, Learning Satellites, Nitobe College and School. Gi-CoRE (Global Institution for Collaborative Research and Education) (although not technically part of the HUCI) is also a very strong program to promote strategic internationalization and interdisciplinarity.

## **Main Observations:**

### **Changed financial environment**

Since HU was awarded the funding for HUCI, the financial circumstances of the University have changed considerably. We learned that funding cuts have been announced by MEXT, and that HU is considering options for adjusting its overall budget, especially a reduction of personnel. The Panel heard concerns about the coming cuts during the interviews, and fears were expressed that HUCI would be jeopardized because of competing priorities and the resulting reduction in the investment of HU's own resources in the initiative. Furthermore, MEXT funding for HUCI will also experience a planned annual decline over the life of the initiative. Financial constraints will undoubtedly have an impact on overall morale of University personnel and attempts at reform; on HU's capacity to pursue certain educational activities; and on how people view internationalization. It will be important for HU to keep up the considerable momentum it has already achieved with HUCI and emphasize and demonstrate to the campus community that HUCI in general and internationalization more specifically are key tools for improving institutional quality and visibility.

### **HUCI Strategy**

HUCI is a complex undertaking, with many interrelated parts. It took the Expert Panel some time to understand the various components of HUCI, how they fit together, and the relationship of the HUCI to other HU development strategies and activities. The Panel had the strong impression as well that these linkages were not always clear for HU staff either. We concluded that HU has a strategy for internationalization and institutional reform, but that the complexity of HUCI made it difficult to discern the main elements and that the

strategy is not always clearly communicated or explained to campus stakeholders. The strategy developed for the MEXT Top Global University Project and for the launching of HUCI now needs to be clarified, communicated, and adjusted, in what might be termed as a “post-win” HU-wide strategy.

Chapter 4 of the Self-Study describes the HUCI initiative as a mosaic, with each faculty and administrative department representing an ornamental tile. We would extend this analogy to include the individual elements of HUCI as their own ornamental tiles. In all, it is easier to see the components (the tiles) of HUCI than the larger picture. The Panel’s interviews confirmed that we were not alone in struggling to see the whole. Certain pieces stand out, but the complete picture and vision need to be more clearly explained – specifically how the parts link to each other and how HUCI relates to the larger institutional vision and plan, especially as expressed in Future Strategy. The purposes of HUCI and its role in advancing institutional goals need to be more clearly (and simply) explained to a wide audience of stakeholders. Creating a whole out of the pieces does not require that each unit and faculty take the same approach at the same pace. A successful institutional strategy can be likened to a fleet of boats, with the boats being of different sizes, traveling at different speeds, but all headed in the same direction. The challenge for the HUCI strategy now is to facilitate the navigation of the various faculties and units.

In some instances, the self-study and other documents describe HUCI as an “implementation strategy.” In a sense, this is accurate, since it represents a way of realizing the vision in the Future Strategy. However, this language is also limiting, in that HUCI is also a strategy itself, underpinned by a vision of the universal campus and with ambitious goals that grow out of the Future Strategy. Thus, care should be taken to be consistent in the presentation of HUCI while ensuring that the way it is presented does not diminish its ambition, relevance, or importance to the University.

### **Communications and consultation.**

Due to the Top Global University Project competition, the HUCI proposal was developed in a short time frame, and conscious of the ambitious targets, the HU leadership moved quickly into its implementation. New programs were rapidly launched. The Panel repeatedly heard during interviews with faculty members and administrators that they perceived the initiative as “top down,” with insufficient consultation before the launch about issues of both design and implementation and with unrealistic targets set by the top without consultation as to their achievability by the areas responsible for delivery. The focus groups also expressed these concerns. Some on campus do not know much about HUCI or have a limited understanding of the initiative. With eight years left in HUCI, this is an opportune time to develop a thorough and deliberate process to engage faculty and staff in ensuring that HUCI is responsive to their needs and interests going forward, to respond to their queries and address their misgivings about HUCI. The HU leadership has already noted this issue, and we commend its recognition that many faculty members and administrative staff need to understand HUCI better in order to see how their work fits in with HUCI and why and how they might become more actively engaged in its goals and activities. Furthermore, since the launch of HUCI, HU has accepted new students who might

expect HU to provide better opportunities for preparing them for the global society. This is especially true of international students, who might have greater expectations that HU provide a higher quality education because the university was selected as a recipient of the Top Global University Project grant. Thus, students should also be consulted about their understanding and expectations of HUCI.

The reorganization and renaming of the Office of International Affairs (OIA) as the Institute for International Cooperation (IIC) is a positive step in to embed faculty members more deeply into the projects, although it is too early to know how successful the new structure will be in promoting faculty buy-in. It will be important to ensure that the mandate, operational methods of this new entity are clearly understood by the campus community. This will require a deliberate communications strategy to explain why the change was made, how IIC works and how it interacts with other units, including faculties.

Without faculty ownership of HUCI, HU will not be able to reach the ambitious targets it has established. Increasing faculty ownership and engagement can be time consuming for everyone, and the panel is cognizant of the need to balance the many demands already made on faculty members and the importance of continuing to implement HUCI. On every campus, there is a constant tension between the need for agile decision making and consultation. Finding the happy medium is difficult and inevitably leaves some stakeholders unhappy with the balance struck. But the Panel observed that the existing skepticism about HUCI is real and must be addressed by the HU leadership.

HU leaders have rightfully recognized that collaboration is a key concept going forward. Addressing the objections and misgivings of the faculty members and staff is not a matter of simply “selling” HUCI to those who are reluctant to see its value, but rather creating an ongoing two-way communication process that both keeps faculty and staff informed and genuinely solicits their input. Given the proliferation of committees and structures and some frustration with their effectiveness, creating new formal groups to enhance communications is unlikely to be effective. Similarly, creating more printed materials may not be a desirable course, since many faculty and staff perceive that they are already inundated with information. Our recommendations address some possible ways forward.

### **Integration, Complexity, and Synergy**

Perhaps because HUCI was conceived as an initiative to be separately funded by MEXT, it is seen by many on campus as merely as a discrete project added on to existing activities. The perception that HUCI represents one more thing to do - and initiated by the top leadership - undoubtedly contributes to the feeling of faculty and staff that HUCI is a burden rather than an opportunity. Adding to the perception of HUCI as separate from other HU activities and an additional set of tasks is the existence of complex new advisory and administrative structures that surround HUCI (or steer projects within its purview), which the Expert Panel had a difficult time understanding. We noted that many of the same individuals sat together on different committees to oversee various aspects of HUCI. Structures proliferate. For example, a Nitobe College Steering Committee was created to guide the effort. According to Appendix 3.4 a-1, there are also plans to create an evaluation

committee as well as an Executive Council to provide recommendations to the Principal about the future of Nitobe College. This seems like it will consume a lot of person hours and there may be a simpler way to accomplish a review of Nitobe College.

Just as HUCI requires greater integration into existing campus structures and activities, so the various programmatic initiatives of HUCI would benefit from greater integration with each other (and with Gi-CoRE). The Expert Panel saw a number of potential opportunities for synergy, which, of course, the HU campus community would need to evaluate. For example, are there ways to further integrate students taking part in the HUSTEP programs into Nitobe College? Might Gi-CoRE be linked to the Hokkaido Summer Institute or Learning Satellites? Might HU choose some partner institutions for multiple HU activities? What opportunities are there for bringing together the internationalization of research and teaching? Might HU choose partner institutions more strategically for educational exchange programs designed for undergraduate students and for research-oriented educational exchange programs for graduate students? Undergraduate education partners could be comprehensive (involving several departments and/or faculties), and partners for collaboration at the graduate level could be based on the department and/or the graduate school or program.

### **Key Performance Indices, Targets and International Rankings**

The panel noted the ambition, set by MEXT, for all Top Global University grant recipients to move into the top 100 universities in the international rankings within the next decade. It also noted the very large number (50 in total) of MEXT-imposed and self-selected Key Performance Indices. While acknowledging, and commending the aspiration and the commitment to measure progress concretely, the Panel observed a certain disconnect between those elements that the HUCI program can directly impact and those outside HUCI's remit. For example, while all four major international ranking systems (ARWU, THE, QS and USNewsWR) have a bias in favor of research indicators, the Top Global University Project emphasizes educational initiatives.

Also, the world university ranking systems were in part originally developed and promoted to help internationally mobile students to choose the right university for study abroad and to inform parents about good educational investments for their sons and daughters. Thus, one of the most important criteria of success should be how HU has improved its ability to attract more well qualified international students. Additionally, HU might want to survey students every year to learn why they come to HU and to see what, if any, were the effects of HUCI and world university rankings on their selection of HU. HU is competing for international students with many leading universities around the world and with some Japanese universities well-positioned in the world ranking. HU needs to make every effort to offer a quality experience to ensure it is not be left behind.

Within the context of rankings and attracting well-qualified students, the Panel observed the importance of aligning HU's research strategy and focus that is impressively captured within Gi-CoRE, with the educational initiatives and focus of HUCI. Thus, some of the Gi-CoRE focus in disciplines (e.g. Quantum Medical Science and Engineering, Arctic Studies,

Agriculture and Fisheries, etc) and partners (e.g, Stanford, Davis, University of Massachussets Amherst, etc) might be reinforced by incentives within HUCI.

## **HUCI Programs**

*Nitobe College and School:* These distinctive honors programs have the potential to be quite successful and to grow. We read in the self-study and heard in our interviews that some students drop out of Nitobe College because they cannot fit their participation in the College with the requirements of their undergraduate school. Focus groups revealed that some faculty members are not supportive of Nitobe College and School, seeing the demands as over and above an already full curriculum. This program, like others in HUCI, is still evolving. There have already been some useful adaptations in Nitobe College, notably the possibility of students completing two short-term study abroad experiences instead of a single longer one. If Nitobe College and School are to be successful, the undergraduate and graduate schools will need to consider how to align their requirements with the elements of Nitobe College and School. In other words, the adjustments will need to come from both partners—the faculties and Nitobe College and School— especially as there is student interest in enrolling in this kind of honor’s program and growth of quality student enrollment is one of the institutional aims.

*Hokkaido Summer Institute (HSI) and Learning Satellites (LS):* These new programs have considerable potential for advancing internationalization, but scaling them up and achieving sustainability and self-supporting status will be a considerable challenge. The bottom-up process of soliciting applications for HSIs has the advantage of being an open process and casting the net widely, but the cost is a potential lack of focus and lack of continuity in course offerings over time. This is likely to create more difficulties to build a reputation and a brand for these activities, or to align them with other institutional strategic projects. The teaching staff participate as an extra responsibility; teaching in HSI or LS does not count as part of a faculty member’s course load; nor is there extra compensation. The lack of incentives for faculty members points to sustainability problems.

*Gi-CoRE:* Gi-CoRE seems to be off to a strong start, but it also appears to be apart from the HUCI activities. There should be opportunities for greater synergy between Gi-CoRE and HSI and LS activities.

## **System Reforms for Education**

*Use of English:* The use of English for teaching and research is a feature of Japanese higher education internationalization and part of the HUCI system reform of education. It was mentioned frequently in the Panel’s interviews. The self-study highlighted progress in increasing the number of courses taught in English; in measures to test students on English proficiency; and in efforts to encourage faculty and staff to improve their English. Yet significant challenges remain. We heard from international graduate students that courses that were advertised as taught in English were actually taught in Japanese, which was a



considerable hardship for them. Some faculty members voiced the concern that the quality of courses was diminished by being taught in English. Because of the low level of students' English proficiency, the course had to be simplified. At the same time, Japanese students are reluctant to take courses offered in English. Furthermore, some faculty members had reservations about the appropriateness of a Japanese university teaching in English. Some noted the difficulty for faculty who do not speak Japanese to participate in university meetings and to generally understand what is happening at the University, since communications are generally in Japanese. Would the presence of a considerable number of international faculty require the University to conduct business in both English and Japanese? Overall, as HU recognizes, the level of student, faculty and staff proficiency in English is not where it should be if HU is to increase its offerings in English.

HU should also be aware of the recent improvements of Japanese senior high school education in preparing students to become global citizens and leaders, as illustrated by the high school project of Super Global High Schools (SGH) selected and funded by MEXT. More than 150 high schools all over Japan participate. SGH students are educated to be able to use English to address global issues. Many prominent Japanese high school students interested in global citizenship and leadership could be attracted to attend HU, especially its programs in English and Nitobe College. HU faces competition with leading world and Japanese universities to recruit and attract these high school students, which provides an additional rationale and dimension to the issue of instruction in English.

*Quarter system and academic calendar:* The Panel heard during the interviews about the uneven progress of implementing the quarter system. Some faculties are using it for some courses, while others remain on the semester system. Although this is clearly a transitional phase, it is a cause for some concern, since the uneven application of the quarter may cause confusion for both Japanese and international students. Additionally, we learned that different degree programs have different starting dates, which may also pose difficulties for students. As is the case with institutional branding, clarity about the academic calendar is essential for international students most especially.

### **Key Concepts Underlying the Panel's Recommendations:**

Several concepts that the Panel believes are key to the success of HUCI underlie the recommendations that follow. As HU considers future actions and strategies, these concepts can be used to guide decision making. Below, we outline the relevance of each concept to the future of HUCI and propose a guiding question to apply to specific decisions and actions.

#### ***Integration:***

Simply increasing the number of actions and initiatives may advance internationalization, but unless they are mutually reinforcing and part of a larger strategy, their impact will remain limited and they may be less sustainable. Also, the additive model of internationalization contributes to HUCI being seen as a separate project that adds to faculty and staff workloads, and thus contributes to their reluctance to participate fully.

Thus, to the extent possible, HUCI needs to be integrated into the ongoing work of the University and the HUCI programs need to work together synergistically.

*Guiding question:* Does the proposed action/direction serve to integrate the program/initiative into ongoing work of the University (or, by contrast, does it continue or increase its status as a separate undertaking?) Does it clarify the relationship between the activity under consideration and the larger institutional goals and strategy?

***Focus:***

HUCI includes a number of different activities, many of which include international partners and a topical or disciplinary focus. The proliferation of topics and partners may reduce the visibility and impact of HUCI by not representing the University's distinctive strengths for which it would like to be known. Thematic foci across HUCI programs and a few deeper partnerships could help HU build an even stronger reputation in certain areas as well as concentrate resources.

*Guiding question:* Does the proposed action/direction increase the focus, and thus the visibility and concentration of resources of the program or initiative? Is the proposed action/direction simply added to all the other initiatives or is there commitment to make it a priority that requires stopping a different initiative?

***Scalability:***

HUCI includes very ambitious targets. To achieve them, HU will need to scale up its activities, going from "boutique" programs and initiatives tailored to a small group of participants to larger ones. Scaling up will require an examination of forces that motivate participation as well as obstacles to it in addition to developing strategies to achieve economies of scale.

*Guiding Question:* Does the proposed action/direction move the program/initiative in the direction of significantly increasing participation or program growth? (or by contrast, does it maintain its status as a "boutique" initiative)?

***Sustainability:***

HU faces a major challenge to sustain the activities started by HUCI beyond the period of funding provided by the MEXT grant. This will require faculty and staff buy-in, as well as the ability to fund HUCI programs from new revenue streams or HU funding. Possibilities for the latter will be determined by the overall budget situation.

*Guiding question:* Does the proposed action/direction move the program/initiative in the direction of lasting beyond the funding period and becoming an enduring or stable feature of HU?

***Global presence:***

Enhancing HU's global visibility and stature will be both a result of HUCI and a driver of it. HU's ability to attract partners and program participants will, to a large extent, depend on

its visibility and reputation. HU has recognized the need to market itself internationally and to ensure that its faculty and staff publish internationally and attend international conferences. Hosting international events is also a means to increase global presence. Successful programs will also build visibility nationally and internationally over time.

*Guiding question:* Does the proposed action/direction improve the national and international visibility and reputation of HU?

### **General Recommendations:**

- We encourage the executive leadership, IIC, and the HUCI steering committee to continue to review the recommendations of the 2010 report. Of particular note is 2.c. and 3.e (pages 13 and 14) to evaluate existing institutional partnerships and attempt to strengthen and deepen a selected few; 4.g-j (page 15) concerning internationalizing the curriculum.
- It would also be useful for HU to adopt the challenges identified in the self-study report and the areas identified as needing further discussion as the basis for an agenda on which to move ahead with HUCI. The Panel concurred with HU's insightful observations outlined in its self-study, but was unable to explore potential solutions to many of them in any depth, given the wide scope of the review exercise.
- To further internationalization and the implementation of the Future Strategy, HU should consider making greater use of technology for international connectivity. Classrooms can be connected with those of partner institutions quite inexpensively using synchronous or asynchronous media for joint projects or discussion boards. Skype and other platforms can be used to connect classrooms in real-time. Similarly, HU might explore whether technology can help scale up and enhance the experience of HSI and LS, including for pre- and post-experience communication.
- In hiring new faculty members, HU should give preference to domestic candidates with strong international experience and English proficiency; it should also continue its emphasis on hiring international faculty.
- HU should consider how to use existing structures and decision making bodies to accomplish the work of HUCI, rather than create new structures. Additionally, the University should review the bodies it has already created to oversee the various HUCI programs to determine if all are useful and necessary and if any streamlining can be accomplished.
- HU should consider incentives for faculty members and staff to pursue internationalization, including recognition (perhaps modeled after the President's award for research), incorporating teaching in HSI and LS in faculty members' workloads, released time, and, where appropriate, additional compensation.
- Given the centrality of the faculties in advancing internationalization, each faculty should be asked to develop its own plan to align with HUCI. The expectation would be that not all faculties will progress in all areas, but that they will have different strengths and interests that can contribute to HUCI.

- Each faculty/department should develop not only double degree programs but also “joint degree programs,” which must be accredited and recognized by the MEXT committee. This would permit HU to work collaboratively with other leading world universities and add value to those programs. These collaborative programs would give HU an advantage in attracting high quality international students who can complete programs in English both at HU and the partner university.
- In order to strengthen HU’s research capacity and output— both central to an improved standing in international rankings— the Panel recommends that HU continue to focus on a few niche areas in which its excellence is already recognized (for example fisheries and agriculture as well as arctic studies, among others) and that it draw stronger connections between research areas and the educational programs of HUCI.

### **Specific Recommendations:**

#### **HUCI Strategy**

- The HU leadership should consider developing ways to present HUCI that explicitly link it to the Future Strategy and embed HUCI within it, emphasizing that it is not a stand-alone activity. Presentation of HUCI should also emphasize that it is a means of enhancing the quality and visibility of HU, rather than a goal unto itself. Documents and presentations might include a description of HUCI’s rationale, how it furthers the accomplishment of the Future Strategy, and the most important priority lines of action. We note that the English version of the web page on HUCI begins by linking it to the Future Strategy, but continues with more general and abstract descriptions of the main lines of HUCI. This could be modified to be more concrete and specific about HUCI initiatives. Additionally, HU might consider developing a streamlined version of the HUCI brochure (Self-study Appendix p. 37). Communications professionals could be helpful in this process.
- A revised description of HUCI as described above would be helpful to use in a series of sessions with stakeholders that we propose below (see recommendations under Communications and Consultation).

#### **Communications and Consultation**

- Given the centrality of collaboration in this phase of HUCI implementation, the senior leadership should develop a communications strategy for informing campus stakeholders about HUCI and soliciting input. Within this context, while unconventional in a Japanese university, the executive leadership should consider conducting a series of meetings at each faculty and with selected administrative units to discuss future directions of HUCI. These might be part of regularly scheduled meetings or a special series of events attended by the dean(s), faculty members, and staff. The purpose of

these sessions would be a two-way exchange in which the senior leaders review the context for HUCI; its underlying rationale, philosophy and activities; and provide an update on its progress. At the same time, the senior leaders would solicit views from the participants on their concerns and suggestions for the future. Finally, such meetings could also be very useful in determining how faculty actions may fit within HUCI and help achieve its targets.

### **Integration, Complexity, and Synergy**

- As noted above, the various programmatic elements of HUCI could be more clearly connected and produce greater synergy. Gi-CoRE has the potential to become a strategic tool through the identification of key partner institutions, important areas of research strength, and target countries for international engagement. It would be useful to look across Gi-CoRE, HSI and the LS to determine if key disciplinary strengths can be identified and strengthened across all three programs, and to determine whether and how HU might focus on fewer partner institutions and target countries, while developing larger and more stable collaborations. This would also have the advantage of connecting research and teaching more closely. The Panel recognizes that HU would still want to leave room for collaborations outside these narrower parameters, but those that do fit might receive preference in the selection process.
- Internal coordination around internationalization has been rightfully identified by HU as a priority. HU leadership and the staff of the newly constituted IIC should monitor effectiveness of this new entity carefully, with a particular emphasis on its ability to communicate across the institution and to facilitate the internationalization efforts in the faculties and units. Instead of creating additional formal coordination structures, HU should consider how to promote networking and information flows among faculty and staff engaged in internationalization. The informal working group of the Global Relations Office might be a useful model for adaptation in other areas. It is particularly important for those individuals in the faculties with responsibilities for internationalization to share information. A strategy to consider is regularly scheduled sessions (perhaps quarterly) to share experiences, successes, and challenges. Another vehicle could be to use the Faculty Development and Staff Development Sessions to focus on these same issues. Perhaps having a venue to meet for coffee or drinks on a regular basis could serve the goal of creating interconnectedness among people working towards similar aims and facing similar challenges. Finally, internationalization and HUCI should be incorporated into the agendas of ongoing meetings (for example, of executive leadership, faculties, and staff units) so that it is perceived as integrated in everyone's continuing work, and not simply an additional project for which the IIC or HUCI office has responsibility.

- Currently absent from HU’s internationalization strategy in general and HUCI in particular is a vision of the globally-oriented attitudes, skills, and knowledge that every HU graduate should possess. Since study abroad will continue to affect a small minority of students (even with significant expansion), HU will need to look to its on-campus experience to accomplish the goal of producing “globally competent” students. To this end, it might be useful to engage stakeholders across the institutions in identifying learning outcomes associated with global competency that all HU graduates should possess. A second phase would be for each academic program to adapt these general learning outcomes specifically for its field of study. Further work would entail a review of the curriculum to map which learning experiences would enable students to acquire which learning outcomes.<sup>1</sup> This exercise would help unify the disparate efforts across campus and provide a common set of goals.
- The Panel encourages HU to consider other types of cross-institutional activities that would bring together faculty members and staff from different faculties and units, such as faculty and staff development programs around internationalization and pedagogical issues (e.g. active learning, successful international partnerships, student portfolios, writing research papers in English).

### HUCI Initiatives

- Nitobe College and School are promising initiatives as a distinctive niche in Japanese higher education. We have noted the problem of students facing difficulties in fulfilling all their requirements for the major at the same time as completing NC. We recommend, in cooperation with NC and NS leadership, that each faculty undertake an examination of its curriculum and how adjustments can be made (to both its curriculum and perhaps NC and NS) to make these programs more student-friendly.
- We have noted that the absence of released time or extra compensation for faculty members will likely be an obstacle to the long-term sustainability of HSI and LS. Thus, we recommend that HU consider how to incorporate

---

<sup>1</sup> A number of good examples and resources exist. See, for example, <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/FIPSE-Project-International-Learning-Outcomes-Ranking-Document.aspx>; <http://ecahe.eu/assets/uploads/2013/11/CeQuint-An-introduction-to-International-and-Intercultural-Learning-Outcomes.pdf>; [http://www.uky.edu/international/Global\\_Learning\\_Outcomes](http://www.uky.edu/international/Global_Learning_Outcomes); <http://international.iupui.edu/doc/partnerships/learning-outcomes.pdf>  
See also, Leask, B. *Internationalization of the Curriculum in Action* <http://www.ioc.global>; and Leask, B. (2015) *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. London: Routledge. Green, M. (2012). *Measuring and Assessing Internationalization*. NAFSA: E-publication. <http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/Measuring%20and%20Assessing%20Internationalization.pdf>

teaching in these programs as part of the regular faculty member's workload and/or consider additional compensation for participation.

## **Systems Reforms**

### **Use of English**

- We encourage HU to continue its efforts to develop the capacity of faculty members, staff, and students to gain English proficiency. This will take time, and an important element will be hiring new faculty members with English proficiency (thus giving candidates with proficiency preference in the process.) Such faculty members may be non-Japanese, or Japanese with English proficiency. At the same time, the Panel advises HU to take care in delivering courses in English, so that the quality is not compromised either because of proficiency level of the teachers or of the ability of students to understand English. Team teaching or providing interpreters might be a solution. Furthermore, it is vitally important that if courses are advertised as being taught in English that they be delivered as promised and that faculty members not simply deliver a syllabus in English and/or permit students to write papers or take examinations in English.

### **Quarter System and Academic Calendar**

- We recommend that having chosen to adopt it, HU continue to implement the quarter system as uniformly as possible across HU, so that the quarter system truly predominates. Otherwise, the co-existence of two different calendars will cause confusion for students and create complications in scheduling. Similarly, HU administration needs to investigate the extent to which having different starting dates for the academic programs among various faculties is a problem for students and seek ways to address it.

## **Conclusion**

HU has accomplished a great deal towards achieving its goals and those of the Future Strategy in the two years since it launched HUCI. The current challenges, as wisely identified by HU in the self-study, are to consolidate the gains, widen the circle of supporters and participants, and make the necessary adjustments to ensure the sustainability of HUCI.

The IAU Learning Badge for Assessing Strategy and Monitoring Achievements is awarded by the International Association of Universities to those institutions that demonstrate that they have developed a sound strategy for internationalization, that have targets and indicators assigned to the strategy for monitoring purposes, and that are assessing their progress and adjusting the strategy and tactics as necessary.

The Expert Panel concludes that Hokkaido University has met these conditions and is awarded the Learning Badge. We hope that our observations and recommendations will help HU improve its efforts to clarify, integrate, and embed HUCI into the fabric of the University, thus making it an integral part of its overall, long term strategy for change and reform.