

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF POST SECONDARY EDUCATION
NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN MEDICAL
EDUCATION AND ACCREDITATION

OPEN SESSION

Tuesday, March 31, 2009

10:30 a.m.

The Madison - Loews
John Adams Room A & B
1177 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

P A R T I C I P A N T S

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

DR. J. LEE DOCKERY, Chair

DR. RAYMOND F. CARON
DR. JAMES A. HALLOCK
DR. JOHN J. JUCAS
MR. PAUL LaPORTE
DR. NORMAN I. MALDONADO
DR. DAVID R. MUNOZ
DR. KIRAN H. SHAH
DR. DENNIS K. WENTZ

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

DR. MARTIN CRANE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF PRESENT:

MS. MELISSA LEWIS, Executive Director
MS. JOYCE JONES
MR. CHUCK MULA
DR. NANCY REGAN
MR. JAMES SNEED
MS. SALLY WANNER, OGC

C O N T E N T SPAGE

Open Session: Overview of Procedures for Review of Countries, J. Lee Dockery, M.D.	
Introduction and Opening Remarks, J. Lee Dockery, M.C., NCFMEA Chairperson, Ms. Melissa Lewis, NCFMEA Executive Director	4
 <u>Sweden (Tab L)</u>	
Type of Review: Redetermination	
Committee Readers: Kiran Shah, M.D. Dennis Wentz, M.D.	
Department Staff:.....	10
Mr. Chuck Mula	
Country Representatives: Mr. Lennart Stahle, Senior Advisor, The Swedish National Agency for Higher Education	
Adjourn	

1 MR. LaPORTE: I am Paul LaPorte. I
2 am an M.D. Ph.D. student at the University of
3 Chicago.

4 DR. MUNOZ: I'm Dave Munoz,
5 Internal Medicine, Geriatrics in private
6 practice, Associate Professor at Department of
7 Medicine at the University of Washington.

8 DR. CARON: Raymond Caron,
9 pediatrician in Orlando, faculty at Nova
10 Southeastern and University of Florida.

11 DR. SHAH: Kiran Shah, practicing
12 physician and a Joint Commission Surveyor.

13 DR. MALDONADO: Norman Maldonado,
14 Professor of Medicine, University of Puerto
15 Rico.

16 DR. WENTZ: Dennis Wentz, former
17 director of the American Medical Association's
18 Division of CME and a member of the Committee.

19 MS. WANNER: I'm Sally Wanner,
20 Office of General Counsel, Department of
21 Education. I'm not a member of the Committee.

22 MS. LEWIS: Good morning, Melissa
23 Lewis. Executive Director of the NCFMEA,
24 Department of Education and not a member of

1 the Committee.

2 MR. MULA: Chuck Mula, U.S.
3 Department of Education staff.

4 DR. DOCKERY: And you, sir?

5 MR. STAHLER: Lennart Stahle, Senior
6 Advisor, The Swedish National Agency for
7 Higher Education.

8 DR. DOCKERY: Thank you very much.

9 (Audience introductions.)

10 DR. DOCKERY: Thank you very much.

11 This is our second day of meeting and it's a
12 pleasure to see some of you that were here
13 yesterday and we thank all of you for
14 traveling such long distances to be with us.

15 Just a few words about the function
16 of the Committee. The Committee, its purpose
17 is to review the countries' accreditation
18 standards to determine their comparability to
19 the accreditation standards of those used by
20 the United States medical schools.

21 The request for determination of
22 comparability is voluntary. It is submitted
23 by the country. I would like to say that we
24 do not accredit medical schools and this is a

1 very important thing for us to remember, that
2 we only review the standards of comparability
3 for accreditation. We do not do medical
4 schools.

5 The reason that this is so
6 important is because those schools that are in
7 countries that have been determined to have
8 comparable standards, those students enrolled
9 in those schools are then eligible for the
10 Federal Student Education Loans that are
11 available through the United States.

12 So I would ask that when you
13 approach the microphone if you have anything
14 to say that you turn on the microphone,
15 identify yourself and be recognized.

16 I would ask Ms. Lewis if she has
17 any comments.

18 MS. LEWIS: Yes, thank you. As I
19 indicated yesterday, I'd like to thank the
20 foreign visitors for traveling such great
21 distance for joining us and also for your
22 preparation in the submissions that you've
23 sent to the Committee. And I'd also like to
24 thank the Department staff for their long,

1 hard hours in analyzing those submissions and
2 preparing recommendations.

3 In particular, I'd like to
4 acknowledge Joseph Smith who is joining us
5 today from the Federal Student Aid Office of -
6 - from the Foreign Schools team there. He's
7 the gentleman that prepares the loan charts
8 for us in advance of every meeting. So thank
9 you so much.

10 DR. DOCKERY: With that, I'd like
11 you to stand and let us recognize you, too,
12 because we do appreciate you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. LEWIS: And I'd also like to
15 thank -- well, I'd like to thank the Committee
16 members for their volunteer service on this
17 Committee, for their many hours spent in
18 preparation for the meeting itself, as well as
19 the different projects that the Committee has
20 undertaken.

21 As far as logistical items today,
22 the restrooms, the ladies room is right across
23 the hall and the men's room is -- take a right
24 out the door here and you go all the way down

1 the hall and take a quick right and then a
2 left. And that's where the men's room is.
3 And we'd appreciate if you would please
4 silence your cell phones by either changing
5 them to a vibrate mode or turning them off.

6 One moment, please. And also, I
7 wanted to note that Dr. Martin Crane and Dr.
8 John Jucas are not with us for this session.
9 Thank you.

10 DR. DOCKERY: And Dr. Maupin has
11 also resigned from the Committee.

12 Also, to just tell you a little bit
13 about process again, we will review each
14 country. The analysts will approach the table
15 and provide their report of the staff
16 analysis, following which we will ask
17 representatives from the country under
18 consideration to approach the table and to
19 make any remarks, after which we will go into
20 Executive Session to discuss the request for
21 our determination or redetermination. And
22 that session is an Executive Session. And the
23 reason for that is that those discussions are
24 confidential until that respective country

1 receives notification from the Secretary
2 giving the outcome of our deliberations.

3 **So with that, we will welcome Mr. Chuck Mula,**
4 **who is at the table, to present the**
5 **application for redetermination by Sweden.**

6 MR. MULA: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
7 and members of the National Committee. I will
8 be presenting a brief summary of the
9 application for redetermination submitted by
10 the Swedish National Agency for Higher
11 Education. Also, as a note, I would like to
12 try to include some information that was
13 received after you received your analysis so
14 that it wasn't possible to get that
15 information to you and a lot of it wasn't --
16 we weren't able to completely do enough
17 research to put it in documentation form, but
18 I would like to try to include that.

19 If you do have any questions and
20 I'm not clear, please let me know.

21 Hereafter, we referred to this as
22 the Agency. And materials can be found at Tab
23 L. And the most recent data available which
24 is dated 2007 and 2008, tells us that there

1 are approximately 26 students in the country
2 receiving \$368,750 in Federal Student Aid
3 monies.

4 We first determined a comparability
5 of the Agency's quality assurance system in
6 September 2000. At the September 2004
7 meeting, you accepted the Agency's report that
8 was requested in September 2002, and you also
9 requested another report on the Agency
10 accrediting activities from 2004 through 2006,
11 along with the country's application for
12 redetermination that was scheduled to be
13 reviewed at your September 2006 meeting.

14 However, since the National
15 Committee did not meet in 2006, the country's
16 application and the Agency's reports were not
17 received and could not be reviewed.

18 In December 2008, the country
19 submitted its application for redetermination,
20 but did not provide the Agency's reports on
21 its accrediting activities from 2004 through
22 2006, as requested. Now we've recently found
23 out that this could have been because of a
24 change of staff within the Agency. This is

1 what we believe actually happened. There was
2 intent from the Agency to submit a report, but
3 it was not done because of the missing staff.

4 While the country provided a
5 current application for redetermination, the
6 documentation submitted describing its quality
7 assurance system is the same information that
8 was provided in the initial application in
9 2000. Now that information that came in 2000
10 was a joint effort of reviewing documentation
11 and the response from the Site Review Team
12 that consisted of the Executive Director of
13 this Committee and its chair, who actually
14 went to Sweden to talk to the people at the
15 Higher Education Commission. The information
16 they brought back included actual eyewitness
17 and observation of the site, of site team
18 visits and the actual process. And they were
19 also able to talk to people within the
20 country's legal system and also in the
21 country's education evaluation system to make
22 sure that there was a comparable system.

23 The country reported that since
24 2000 there had been no changes in its laws,

1 regulations, or standards, processes and
2 procedures. The application narrative did
3 make reference to the Agency's most recent
4 comprehensive review of its medical schools
5 and that was done in 2007. This information
6 was made available by reference to a website.
7 Although we went to the website, not only
8 staff, but also our Executive Director spent a
9 lot of time at that website, we were not able
10 to find that report in English. That might be
11 because we didn't know how to look for it, but
12 we tried and it was not available.

13 Department staff could not locate
14 any English translations of the most recent
15 comprehensive review of the evaluation of
16 medical schools. The application did contain
17 a current documentation verifying
18 implementation of its recognized evaluation
19 process and its evaluation process of its
20 university systems. So we did receive that
21 and this process does -- the process for the
22 medical schools is exactly the same process
23 they use for -- we understand -- for the
24 evaluation for their university systems. And

1 if you could compare it to a regional
2 accreditor going into a university and looking
3 at the whole institution, then you'd have a
4 better idea of how that process is done.

5 Although the country does do from
6 the documentation we did receive, we were able
7 to verify that it does do a comprehensive view
8 of its evaluation of a medical system, but we
9 could not find evidence of that.

10 While the country declares that
11 there are no substantial changes in the law,
12 standards, and processes that the NCFMEA
13 determined to be comparable in September 2000,
14 the Department is not able to determine if the
15 country's accreditation activities are
16 consistent with your guidelines. Because of
17 the lack of evidence or the lack of
18 documentation, this shows us that they
19 actually did a review of their medical
20 education system.

21 The National Committee may wish to
22 request that the country provide comprehensive
23 updated reports in English with current
24 supporting documentation that verifies

1 implementation of this quality assurance
2 system.

3 Now the most ideal information that
4 we would like to see is a self study or a site
5 view report or some kind of evaluation of the
6 implementation of their standards, but we do
7 not think that this is realistic only because
8 we do not believe that we're going to be able
9 to get an entire self study translated into
10 English.

11 So what we did was recommended in
12 the analysis and to the Committee that they
13 would request from the Agency the standard
14 reporting requirements that we request when we
15 ask the country to report under accrediting
16 activities. This is the least amount of
17 information we believe will provide us with
18 enough documentation to verify implementation
19 of the process.

20 This concludes my presentation and
21 there is a representative of the country here
22 to speak to you and I will remain available to
23 answer any questions you have.

24 DR. DOCKERY: Thank you, Mr. Mula.

1 Are there any questions by members of the
2 Committee before we recognize the
3 representative from Sweden?

4 Thank you very much. Will Mr.
5 Lennart Stahle please approach the table,
6 please?

7 And would you use the microphone
8 and introduce yourself and give your
9 respective title, please?

10 MR. STAHLER: Thank you. I am very
11 grateful for being here. It's a great
12 pleasure for me to come to this Committee and
13 explain how our higher education system works.
14 I've been working within the higher education
15 system for the last 37 years as researcher and
16 administrator. Although not in medicine, I'm
17 started in Sanskrit and graduated in history
18 of religion, but that's quite suitable for the
19 job that I hold now, I think.

20 We have -- first of all, I would
21 like to regret that we weren't able to present
22 reports in English. I will go back to Sweden
23 and we will produce translation of a self
24 study of a medical school and the site review

1 report as well as a summary of the expert
2 panels of the evaluation that was carried out
3 in 2007.

4 So that will be no problem, but it
5 will take some weeks to do that.

6 So I hope you will be satisfied with that.

7 When it comes to the future, I also
8 would like to say that we always do a follow-
9 up study of our evaluations within three
10 years, so in the year 2010 we will do a
11 follow-up study of this evaluation carried out
12 in 2007. And this is mainly because also that
13 we would like to check up, if the medical
14 school has implemented the Bologna System
15 which is quite new. It's a new degree
16 ordinance that is more specified what the
17 students are supposed to know and they carry
18 out after their education. And in the future
19 our evaluation will concentrate upon these
20 goals set out in the higher education
21 ordinance and if the higher education
22 institutions can prove that they are able to
23 check these competencies and knowledge of the
24 students. So that's very important.

1 When it was started -- this
2 evaluation was finished, the last evaluation
3 was finished in 2007, the Bologna System
4 wasn't implemented in Sweden. It was
5 implemented from the first of July 2007. So
6 that's because that we would like to do a
7 closer check up with that.

8 Otherwise, as I wrote in a very,
9 very late addenda, unfortunately, I can say
10 the same as I said to Chuck that I saw your
11 report lying on my boss' desk and said oh, we
12 must attend to that in some way. So Chuck
13 asked me if he's still my boss and he is.

14 (Laughter.)

15 We did a kind of evaluation in 2007
16 and we have a very competent evaluation panel,
17 I think. Sweden is a small country. We have
18 so far done all of our evaluations in Swedish,
19 but from 2008, it's possible also to carry out
20 evaluations in English and then we are able to
21 acquire external experts that are not in
22 command of Swedish, but are in command of
23 English. So that will be an advantage and the
24 development of our quality assurance system, I

1 think.

2 I would like to mention the
3 composition of the panel. The panel was
4 shared by Professor Hans Karle at that time
5 president of the World Federation for Medical
6 Education; Professor Kurt Aspegrenn,
7 Professor of University of Southern Denmark;
8 Professor Annika Skott, Professor of Medical
9 School in Gothenburg; Torstein Vik, Professor
10 of Medicine at the University of Trondheim;
11 Professor Bjorn Bergdahl, Professor of
12 Medicine in Linkoping University; and then two
13 students representatives which is also very
14 important in the Swedish system that we also
15 have students. And I am very pleased to see
16 that there is a student present today also.
17 It was Mr. Theo Bodin and Ms. Emerlie
18 Kullring.

19 This panel did carry out site
20 visits after self-evaluations at all medical
21 schools in Sweden. As you know, there are six
22 medical schools in Sweden at present. Those
23 who are professors in Linkoping and
24 Gothenburg, they didn't take part in the site

1 visits, of course, at their respective medical
2 schools. That is self evident.

3 And I would like to read what the
4 panel said. In summary, the panel concluded
5 that the Swedish medical education at all
6 medical schools has a good overall quality and
7 prepared the students for the professional
8 work as physicians. The medical education in
9 Sweden has good standards internationally. In
10 order to compare the result of the panel a
11 comparison has also been carried with the
12 global standards of World Federation of
13 Medical Education. The result was almost
14 similar.

15 The conclusion from the agency was
16 that all schools have a good or a very good
17 quality and there were no reasons to question
18 the right of holding a degree in master of
19 medicine in science.

20 So that was the conclusion of the
21 panel from their evaluation that was carried
22 out in 2007. So I just would like to mention
23 that to you all because I think it's very
24 important to mention that.

1 And then there are some other
2 studies. It isn't necessary to present to the
3 Committee, but I sent them by mail to the
4 Department of Education. So I think that was,
5 I would like to say at the beginning, so
6 please if you have any questions.

7 DR. DOCKERY: Are there any
8 questions from the Committee before we go into
9 Executive Session?

10 If we could ask our guests, please,
11 to depart.

12 **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

13 **END OF DAY 2 OPEN SESSIONS**

14