

International Christian University Self-Study External Review Report

November 14, 2000

Yasuyuki Owada
Professor Emeritus, University of Redlands

INTRODUCTION

I have visited the International Christian University (ICU) for 32 days, October 14-November 14, as part of the University's Self-Study. Prior to the visit, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Mr. Noriyuki Nakajima of the University Secretariat made available to me background material regarding Japanese University Accreditation Association and the ICU's Committee on Self-Study. During my visit I was given a large amount of printed materials about the University, its component organizations, regulations and policies, draft self-study reports from divisions, graduate programs, institutes and centers, copies of the past self-study reports and reform proposals (of the 1980s and 90s), and numerous quantified and narrative data that have been prepared for this self-study. Other reference materials included Professor Iglehart's early history of ICU, Professor Cho's history of ICU, various survey reports conducted by divisions and students, and memos prepared by individuals proffering their views on the University's current status and issues. Also during my visit I have conducted 61 interview sessions with 55 faculty, staff and administrators (six repeats), most of which were prearranged by the administration of the self-study committee. Additionally, I sought out formal and informal interviews with other faculty, administrators, students and alums. I attended various events on the campus including the weekly chapel service, ICU Church service, ICU festival, and one formal class in education. I used the University cafeteria for dining, which proved to be a fertile ground for seeking student views on their study and campus life.

In accepting my assignment as an external evaluator, it was my assumption that I was free to address issues that went beyond the immediate scope of the Accreditation Association's standards. However, because of the enormity of the scope such a comprehensive self-assessment as the current study covers, I have decided to be selective in offering my observations, which I believe to be more crucial for the development and enhancement of the quality of education at ICU in the immediate future (3 to 5 years).

OVERVIEW

Last year ICU conducted the first of a series of its Fiftieth Year Celebrations. When I arrived on the campus for the current assignment a month ago, it was not the expected festive climate of the recent past that impressed me, but rather a serious air of frustrations, disappointments, and demoralization expressed by many faculty, staff and administrators. My dominant impression was that every segment of the University was feeling (expressed in a quite personal way by a number of interviewees) either marginalized, or craving for public

acknowledgment or justification of the work they were engaged in. It has taken some time before I began to realize, however, that below the surface of such negative climate of the campus are signs and evidence of a wide range of impressive accomplishments in education and research this University has achieved since those deadly campus crises of the 60's and early 70's. The level of exhaustion and feeling of being entrapped by issues of daily life people express, appear to be partly a function of the University's very high ideals of I and C and U. Without a doubt, the serious lack of financial and human resources the University can use for the current operation toward these ideals (not just in the present but in the past also, and in fact, since the beginning of the University), has taken a heavy toll of the community psychology.

It is time, then, for the University, not just for the administrative part of it, but more importantly for the faculty and staff, to take stock of its achievements, not in general terms, but as they are loudly expressed in the quality of most of the students the University continues to attract, in the lives of its graduates, in vigorous research accomplishments of the faculty, and in the diffusion of many of the University's initiatives in Japan's higher education. It is time for the current members of the University community to celebrate their ownership of these accomplishments as the starting point of their reflection and self-evaluation. Self-reflection has to do with the past achievements and the future potentials in the light of the University's mission and goals. My observations that follow should be read in the context of such understanding about self-study.

SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

For the convenience of the readers, I have organized my observations and recommendations using the Japanese University Accreditation Association's outline of standards.

I. Self-Study Process (Standard 4-11)

A. The current study was institutionalized exactly a year ago with a seven year cycle. In spite of the interval, it is a very labor-intensive exercise for the entire University to be involved in. In order to lighten the University's load as a whole, to keep evaluation-related information (data from institutional research) updated constantly, and to develop an institutional habit of self-evaluation as a part of its routine activities, the faculty might consider instituting a schedule of divisional (including all academic units such as graduate school divisions and institutes) reviews in a cycle of six or seven years on a rotating basis. Thus, every division is expected to do its review every six or seven years, but not all at the same time. Hopefully, this would enable the University as a whole to address issues of enrollment trends and faculty positions more systematically and strategically than what the current practice affords.

B. Institutional self-evaluation is meaningful only if it is done in connection with the University's on-going planning. Otherwise, a self-study of the current magnitude results in exhaustion and disappointment, participants not knowing how or when the consequence of their work gets institutional attention. Planning means specifying a target date for each projected action for improvement or a new initiative, a person or office to be in charge, and an estimation of financial consequence. Self-study should result in such strategic planning, and the latter in

turn gets informed by the former. In the next cycle of self-study, the planning and its consequences should establish the benchmark for the new review process, and so forth.

C. Self-study is a social process. How it is done is just as important as what gets done. It is time-consuming. Still it is important for the committee to constitute a work-group and meet frequently. The assigned writers should refer their drafts to the committee members for feedback. Who in the University should participate in such a process is obviously an important question. The absence of students or their representatives in the current process is a glaring weakness. (In my review I have been benefited by a published report of a student opinion/attitude survey of 1995. This [Riso to Genjitsu no Hazama de: An Opinion Survey Report of Students by Students] was written very thoughtfully by a group of students as part of their study in the spring 1995 seminar on educational administration led by Professor Akihiro Chiba.)

II. University's Ideals and Purposes (Standard 1-1)

The notion that ICU is a liberal arts university is widely shared among those I interviewed. A statement on the ideals and purposes of the University is cogently offered in the first chapter of the College's self-study draft report. I urge the Committee to widely circulate this statement among the faculty for their review and input. FD program may wish to host such conversation among the faculty.

There are certain issues for the University community that emerge from the nature of the mission itself. I would like to address two of these:

(1) Teaching vs. Research: A good many faculty members I interviewed made a remark to the effect that the current administration places secondary importance to the role of research in university life. They would state this as their negative view of the way in which the university is run today. I believe that this dichotomy is a false issue, or rather an unproductive issue. Unproductive in the sense that it really doesn't address the faculty concern, and unproductive for the purpose of conducting the ICU education. Let me explain.

The first question the Japanese University Accreditation Association asks is whether or not the University has policies that translate its mission into education-and-research (kyoikukenkyl) activities for the purpose of developing (or educating) human resources of this society. Education-and-research-activities is one concept, and furthermore there is neither education nor research for its own sake. Kyoikukenkyl is for the purpose of developing human resources for our society at large. Both are one and the same human enterprise dedicated to enrich society in general. Following and adding to this line of thinking, I call your attention to the contribution of the late Ernest Boyer, once director of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In his *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), Boyer argued that scholarship (or gakumon) may originate in any of the four ways: to wit; the Scholarship of Discovery whereby one's scholarship encompasses traditional research that creates new knowledge through original investigation, the Scholarship of Integration whereby one's scholarly activity involves the critical evaluation, synthesis, analysis, integration, or interpretation of the research or creative work produced by others, The Scholarship of

Application through which a scholar applies disciplinary expertise or the result of existing scholarship to the investigation or solution of intellectual, social, or institutional problems, and The Scholarship of Teaching which involves the use of one's expertise as a teacher to develop, transform, and extend the skills, methodology, and resources of pedagogy in artistic, disciplinary, or interdisciplinary teaching. It includes research and other creative work that focuses on the improvement of teaching and learning such as developing new pedagogies or pedagogical models that can be applied to a particular college or elsewhere in one's field.

Applying this new definition of scholarship (which has had enormous impact on the professionals at liberal arts institutions in the US) to ICU, I would argue that the recently published study done by Professor Haruko Kazama of Biology (Ima Futatabi Chi-no-Itonami o Motomete: Liberal Arts ni Okeru Hitotsu no Kokoromi, in Science Journal Kagaku, November 2000) is a prototypical example of the fourth type of scholarship. In contrast to the traditional notion of research (kenkyu), teaching is probably the most complex human activity that there is in our life. It demands the most sophisticated intellectual and affective investment and scrutiny. Many of my recent interviews with ICU professors attest to the validity of such consideration. Among other things, they have informed me how specifically their research informs their teaching, and thoughtfully illustrated how their teaching may inform and challenge their traditional research. I invite the faculty as a whole to engage in conversation regarding such new definition of scholarship. Viewed in this manner, my claim is not in contradiction with the position that is maintained by President Kinukawa regarding the separation of research from teaching. I only hope that my position in this regard encourages the faculty to enter into a richer dialogue with their president.

(2) Japanese vs. Non-Japanese: Here is another troubling dichotomy that controls the perception of many of the ICU community members. As one of the faculty members pointed out to me, I believe this is another issue that really is a non-issue in the sense that defining campus issues using this dichotomy doesn't produce workable solutions. Issues and challenges that have been perceived as instances of the dichotomy need to be redefined. Are the usual problematics defined along the line of this dichotomy boil down to an issue of language? Of equity? Of identity? Of nationalism? In the light of the central concern of the current self-study which has to do with educational effectiveness (or institutional accountability), I believe that the dichotomized issue of Japanese vs. non-Japanese can best be translated into an issue of participation. That is, an issue of who participates in what, how, when, where and to what extent. The issue of number and balance (Japanese vs. non-Japanese) can be redefined in this context, for number is an important variable that defines people's perception in an organization, which in turn influences participatory behavior. Once the issue is redefined in this manner, ICU is in a better position to respond to the forthcoming challenge of Professor Kazuo Kitahara (via the FD Newsletter). I urge all faculty, administrators and staff to give thoughtful consideration to his contribution. Stated in this way, I am convinced that the ICU community already has its answer to the issue within its collective power.

III. Organization for Teaching/Research (Standard 1-2; 1-6)

As in any organization, the manner in which ICU's academic activities get organized (divisions, institutes, centers, etc.) produces its own problems. In the case of ICU, there is clear evidence that divisional organization is creating convincing excuses preventing a free flow of interactions among its faculty that is a prerequisite for a productive life at the University. Even though the institutes, centers, and infamous committee assignments allow faculty to converse with each other across the guild-oriented divisional lines, these appear to be far from satisfactory in addressing substantive issues of teaching and learning. The FD programming has shown some hopeful signs and consequences of faculty communication, and ICU (particularly its directors of the past and present) deserves commendation for such endeavor.

A related organizational issue of academic governance at ICU has to do with the complex processes of decision-making. (A part of this issue will be addressed again toward the end of this report in my review of the entire university administrative organization.) Bluntly put, the presence and operation of veto groups within the faculty (with shifting membership relative to time, issue, and personnel) tend to hold the entire faculty in hostage and surely immobilize the administrative leadership, thus preventing the top administration from exercising its responsibility. This is painfully evident in the handling of personnel matters. The faculty meeting rules that tend to avoid the use of a simple majority in decision-making in favor of a more stringent 2/3 or even _ vote requirement (in fact, the pervasive posture of preferring vote-taking to a more communally trust-based method of consensus-enlisting) promotes a vigorous growth of veto groups. The past unfortunate instances of personnel decision-making tending to rationalize and justify the exercise of veto power, appear to be more of instances of a lack of in-depth scrutiny or of adequate coordination in the screening processes. (Appointing a person to a faculty position requires three distinctively different—politically and professionally—phases, that is, search, screening, and selecting; and it may be that in those past instances, there was a lack of clarity about the nature of tasks and requirements involved in each of these phases.) It is my understanding that the WCAR is developing a new faculty manual, and I hope that they pose to address the concern that is expressed here.

IV. Admissions (Standard 1-3)

The opening chapter on the College to which I referred earlier contains an important idea that perhaps the current policy of admissions quota by division should be repealed in favor of a College-wide quota. In spite of the risks and technical issues implied in such a proposal, it deserves serious attention for the health of a liberal arts education at ICU. In all aspects of admissions (of the College, Graduate School, students from abroad, and the summer Japanese program), ICU needs to develop a more systematic and aggressive approach to admissions. Particularly for graduate divisions and recruitment of non-Japanese students in Japan or abroad, ICU must engage in a systematic market research, prepare publicity materials and programming, fund extensive financial aid programs and train its staff in this area which is increasingly becoming professionalized. The administrative leadership is well aware of the ramifications of such a need, and my hope is that this area of administration receives priority consideration before ICU loses completely its competitiveness.

V. Undergraduate Curriculum and Instruction (Standard 1-4-1)

No aspect of ICU has received as much thoughtful attention and deliberation of the faculty as a whole as its undergraduate curriculum and instruction. This is so since day one of its founding. The ICU faculty should be rightfully proud of its distinctive performance and accomplishments in it. What accounts for the success? It is a common sense understanding that if you have good teachers (whatever that means), good curriculum, good pedagogical tools, and motivated students, you can expect effective learning on the part of the students. Does ICU have all of these in all areas of undergraduate education? Do they explain ICU's success? In many of my interviews I tried to solicit faculty views on this. I was rewarded with many ways of answering my question, but none was as succinct and useful for institutional review as a conversation I had with some of the instructors of the ELP.

It is widely known that ICU runs superb programs of language learning in English and Japanese (for non-Japanese speaking students). I understand that they have developed good materials, good teaching methods, and get good quality students. But the instructors helped me articulate what really accounts for creating such goodness in the elements of instruction. I wish to identify these, for they are relevant to teaching in any area or discipline of learning. They told me that their strength comes from: (1) frequent (regularized and spontaneous) interactions among the faculty that are purposive and meaningful; (2) intensive and reciprocal interactions with students; and (3) giving serious attention to student feedback about their curriculum and instruction, and incorporating it in their programming and performance. Compare this information with the learning Professor Haruko Kazama gained from her teaching a biology course, to which I made earlier reference. It is good and delightful to know that ICU through its successful undergraduate program is producing such a generalization about effectiveness in education, inductively through faculty experience, that deserves national attention. There are, of course, many administrative ramifications and consequences to maintaining a quality program based on these practices and processes. The definition, for example, of an optimum class size relative to the nature of a course is extremely important.

In the course of my review, I learned that in addition to the traditional curriculum and instruction at ICU, there are certain newer programs and activities of students and faculty that greatly enhance student learning. I wish to identify these here because they are conceived or best appreciated in relation to our understanding of the psychology and aptitude of today's students. These activities center around experiential learning or hands-on learning, accompanied by risk-taking of one type or another, and a tripartite process of programming for preparation, conceptualization and reflection. The learning activities range from field observations or lab experiments in sciences to participation in an amazing variety of overseas study opportunities. These are often life-changing learning opportunities, as many students who actively participated in the ICU Festival events testified. I include physical education-related activities as well as many of the club activities in this category of learning opportunities at ICU, which demand not just intellectual, but affective and physical commitment of a total person. No class lecture of superb quality can have the kind of learning impact this type of studying can claim, partly because a student's self-identity is at stake. (The dimension of affective learning tends to be overshadowed in the mainstream curriculum and instruction at ICU. I hope that faculty discussion regarding the

educational efficacy of the programs and activities I mention here will bring out that aspect of human learning as a legitimate concern of liberal arts.)

The dean of the College, Professor Masao Okano has made a remarkable effort to activate the faculty advisor system. In nearly all the colleges and universities I have known in the US, the advisor system (or rather how to make it work) never ceases to be a topic of concern and debate. I have no ready solution to offer here. But I have found it important to note that regardless of the way in which the system works or doesn't work, it is incumbent on the administration to professionalize a key position in the Educational Affairs Office that interfaces students every day seeking professional services (curricular advice, etc.) from the staff. A person who occupies such a position needs to provide in-service training, etc., to the general staff. Such a need must also be met in the Student Affairs Office as well as the International Educational Exchange Office.

VI. Measuring Educational Effectiveness (Standard 1-4-1; 1-4-2)

ICU has experimented with assessing teaching effectiveness in different divisions and programs as well as among individual faculty members for a number of years. Such informal and semi-formal methods of asking students for their feedback and input on teaching have finally culminated in the recent faculty decision to institutionalize an ICU Teaching Effectiveness Survey. Even though the faculty still needs to agree on the specific means of executing this survey university-wide on a routine basis, the faculty decision is perhaps the single most important action of the University in many years for the improvement of teaching at ICU. The survey questions now being finalized are well thought out and the inclusion of student's reflection (open-ended) on their learning in a class to be evaluated is a critically significant component in measuring the learning outcome.

In the near future, it is recommended that the faculty and academic administration consider the following points in order to articulate further the measuring of educational effectiveness. The first is the importance of a university-wide practice of producing and distributing to students a written (on-line or otherwise) syllabus for each course. A syllabus is neither a course description nor a bibliographic list, although these are important components of a syllabus. In a profound sense, it is a contract between a professor and her/his students regarding a particular course. Proposed by a professor, it is a means to engage students as owners of their education to participate in a course of study on a particular subject. Ideally, it should be changeable in the mid-course of a term in response to the professor's dialogue with the students in the course. It is a statement about the what, why, and how of studying a subject or topic, to which the professor and students commit themselves for their learning.

Secondly, it is important for the professor to execute her/his self-evaluation of teaching. In order to maximize the level of validity of the teaching effectiveness survey, and to make it a meaningful instrument of learning for both faculty and students, we need to look at the survey in the context of faculty's self-evaluation, student's self-evaluation (page 2 of the survey), grades given, and the syllabus. When all these are placed together in their proper relationship with each other, we learn meaningfully the effectiveness of teaching and learning in a particular course.

(Professor Hiroshi Suzuki's now famous on-line communication with students covers many aspects and dimensions of student-faculty interactions I am visualizing in my mind here.)

In administering the survey, it is important for the students and faculty to have a chance to discuss its results. Ideally, it should be administered a few days before the end of a term so that a review discussion can take place between the two parties. It is then easier and more meaningful for the instructor to use the survey and the subsequent face-to-face dialogue with students for the purpose of revising and improving her/his future course design and syllabus. Ultimately, the faculty outlook (as well as that of students) will change the nature of education from teaching-centeredness to emphasis on learning. This shift is a requisite change in how we think about education if we are indeed serious about nurturing autonomous learners (a phrase used by both some of the ICU documents and the Association standards), who presumably know how to learn.

VII. Graduate Education (Standard 1-3 ; 1-4-2; 3-10-c)

The future viability of ICU's graduate programs in the current mode of operation, is questionable. ICU has a fine record of producing a small cadre of outstanding graduates from the existing programs. (The quality of some of those who have joined the ICU faculty attests to this generalization.) The University is at a critical juncture where it must make a strategic decision whether to continue all the programs it now operates without change, or to become more selective in program development, or to transform them into a different option to serve the world of higher education. In order to make such a decision, I recommend that the administration with the assistance of the faculty to engage in an aggressive market research to identify student recruitment potential and future career pathways for graduates. At the same time, they need to explore different program options. In some sense I advocate a style of exploration of alternative options for the future of ICU's graduate education similar to the one the ICU founders used in canvassing the leadership of Japan's higher education in 1949. We need to ask them as well as ourselves one question: to wit, Why graduate education at ICU?

VIII. Evaluation and Effectiveness of Faculty Performance Review (Standard 1-6-d and e)

The greatest vulnerability of ICU in its attempt to enhance the quality of education lies in a lack of a legitimate, systematic and periodic peer review of faculty performance in its total range; teaching, research and university service. Peer evaluation is already done on this campus, but only through the grapevine and behind one's back. That practice should not be tolerated for the protection of personal integrity and institutional health. Some people argue that such an institutional system is unworkable in the absence of a realistic punitive mechanism, which they say can't be done. I disagree. I believe that faculty members as human beings do welcome opportunities for professional improvement. Peer review should be considered as a mechanism for enhancing a colleague's strengths in her/his performance, and a chance to work on weaknesses with the assistance of the peers.

While there is no definitive way in which ICU may develop its faculty performance review, I offer here a few suggestions the faculty may wish to consider. (1) It is important that

faculty performance in its entire range of activities gets reviewed at the same time; to wit, teaching, research (including but not exclusively a traditional type), and university service (faculty governance services, committee assignments, directing a program, one's contributions to local and distant communities, etc.). (2) It is best to start in a more or less informal manner. For example, some faculty might utilize opportunities the FD program creates for them to share reflections on specific issues of teaching, issues of students, or advising. Or a professor might initiate an invitation to his faculty friend or division faculty to visit his class, and later engage in a conversation about the student responses or any other specific aspects of conducting a class. Such informal activity is a productive way in which one begins to identify specific aspects of one's teaching strength and suggestions for improving vulnerable areas. That professor might wish to write a short reflective essay about what he has learned from such experience in the FD newsletter. Letting other faculty know about such a small but meaningful experiment is extremely important. (3) The FD might sponsor a fish-bowl conversation of seven or eight professors in a public arena (such as the D-kan West Wing lounge) to talk about a common topic of teaching (complaints about student behavior in class, for example), and letting the student audience later reciprocate with their fish-bowl conversation where faculty members get invited as a silent audience. In fact, such events might work very well after the publication of one of those student ratings of General Education faculty performance. It would seem so natural for the NS Division faculty to reinforce their Tuesday afternoon tea session, or for the Humanities faculty to revitalize their historic faculty tea gathering, by adding such an element to their event. (The educative influence of faculty on student reflection about their learning can be enormous when the context of communication is relevant to their interest.) (4) Only when there are on-going semi-formal and informal conversations about teaching and research that become visible to a large majority of the faculty, the University is ready to begin formalizing the processes of systematic peer review. (5) Peer review is effective when it uses the self-evaluation of a professor as the basis on which to develop other referential information including letters by other faculty of the professor's choice. Such self-evaluation must be future oriented, that is, the writer laying out a plan of action for her/his professional work for the coming three to five years. (6) Once such a system becomes institutionalized, it is a matter of time before the University is ready to find ways in which the information from peer review processes becomes useful for evaluation needed for personnel decisions. It can be done. The first step is to get faculty excited about what they do get enthused about.

IX. Appropriateness of the Presidential Selection Procedures

(Standard 3-10-b)

The current procedures for the selection of the president are an outcome of many revisions since they were first established in 1960. In spite of the enormity of effort that has gone into the reform processes of the past, there still are some serious problems or implications for potential problems the current procedures contain. Simply put, the procedures tend to politicize the internal constituents of the University. One of the foreseeable, unfortunate consequences of such procedures then is that no matter who becomes the president, she or he will find it unnecessarily difficult to function in the performance of presidential duties. I urge the Board of Trustees of the University to take initiative in addressing this issue.

X. Overall Organization and Management of the University

ICU has never meant to be an easy organization to run. That is partly because of the mission of the University. Having problems in management (whether academic or more straightforwardly administrative) as it did, does, and will do, is the very reasons for its existence. It is to the credit of those who are currently engaged in the operation of the University that it indeed is sending out remarkable graduates every year. However, those problems can be minimized within some realistic range of options.

It appears that the issues of communication (no organization is without communication problems) are particularly acute between the top and the middle to lower levels of administration. It is my observation that those who serve on the lower level of organization (the front line people) have little or no idea how their input gets handled once it goes upstairs, and how that input contributes positively or negatively to a particular decision that gets handed down. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that there is little or no feedback from the top to the lower levels, and no clear explanation (or detailed rationale) for a particular decision, if it does get made, for the front line staff to execute.

As a particular decision comes down the hierarchy to a particular work station, there is no assurance that all the relevant stations to be directly or indirectly affected by that decision are informed of that decision, making it difficult to expect coordinative activities on the same task. Apparently, there has been a sophisticated flow-chart available for routine communication in the administration, but the actual practice doesn't follow it.

One way in which to address these communication issues is for section heads and chiefs to have a regularized workshop during the work hours to bring in one or two cases of the recent past for discussion. There must, of course, be some of the director-level administrators present at such a session.

As in the case of faculty personnel, the absence of systematic and regularized (annual) performance evaluation of administrators and staff at ICU is probably the biggest weakness of this organization. Again, as in the case of faculty performance evaluation, the intent must be to enhance the strengths each person brings to the organization. Otherwise, the evaluation system becomes another busy work no one is happy to deal with.

The relationship between the academic organization and the administrative organization continues to be problematic at ICU. (Again, this is nothing new to most academic entities, and shared by such organizations as hospitals where there are many professional staff members.) I am aware that there have been a number of attempts in the recent past to address issues in this area. My recommendation is to address whatever issues that become apparent promptly and in a small scale and concrete manner, and not take too much time or energy of the people affected by them (as my suggestion for a staff workshop for case study implies). It is the responsibility of the major administrators to take an inventory of such issues from time to time and to propose a larger organizational reform in connection with an institutional self-study such as the current exercise.

XI. Confronting Harassment Institutionally

ICU established last year its Sexual Harassment Policy Statement and procedures in the hope of maintaining a safe environment for every member of the University community. The institutionalization of such procedures in an educational organization does not happen easily, and ICU is to be congratulated upon for its forward looking decision. Sexual harassment, of course, is one of many types of power abuse, victimizing innocent human beings. Harassment of different types can occur on this campus, and the University needs to be ever on the alert. It is my recommendation that in view of the seriousness of the issue of on-campus harassment of different types, the program dealing with it should come under the direct oversight of the office of the president until such time when the application of the established procedures becomes a routine.

Acknowledgment:

In concluding this report, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to President Masakichi Kinukawa for his generosity in sharing his time and wisdom with me, to Vice President for Academic Affairs Norihiko Suzuki for his timely advice and patience to listen, to Vice President for Financial Affairs Ichiro Nishida for his realistic appraisal of the complex issues the University faces, to Mr. Noriyuki Nakajima of the Secretariat for his guidance about my role from the beginning to the end, to Ms. Himeko Kawakami for her daily attention to my work environment including scheduling of my appointments, and to Ms. Tomoko Kobayashi of ILC Office for responding efficiently and effectively to my 911 calls for rescue operation. It goes without saying that all my interviewees by sharing their knowledge and thought freely and generously, have challenged my thinking about ICU and given me a profound hope about this place in spite of all the issues and problems it faces. My heartfelt thanks go to each and every one of them.