

Sweden

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

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2

10:39 A.M.

3 **present the application for redetermination by**
 4 **Sweden.**

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

1 I would like to try to include that.

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

4 Hereafter, we referred to this as
5 the Agency. And materials can be found at Tab
6 L. And the most recent data available which
7 is dated 2007 and 2008, tells us that there
8 are approximately 26 students in the country
9 receiving \$368,750 in Federal Student Aid
10 monies.

11 We first determined a comparability
12 of the Agency's quality assurance system in
13 September 2000. At the September 2004
14 meeting, you accepted the Agency's report that
15 was requested in September 2002, and you also
16 requested another report on the Agency
17 accrediting activities from 2004 through 2006,
18 along with the country's application for
19 redetermination that was scheduled to be
20 reviewed at your September 2006 meeting.

21 However, since the National
22 Committee did not meet in 2006, the country's
23 application and the Agency's reports were not
24 received and could not be reviewed.

1 In December 2008, the country
2 submitted its application for redetermination,
3 but did not provide the Agency's reports on
4 its accrediting activities from 2004 through
5 2006, as requested. Now we've recently found
6 out that this could have been because of a
7 change of staff within the Agency. This is
8 what we believe actually happened. There was
9 intent from the Agency to submit a report, but
10 it was not done because of the missing staff.

11 While the country provided a
12 current application for redetermination, the
13 documentation submitted describing its quality
14 assurance system is the same information that
15 was provided in the initial application in
16 2000. Now that information that came in 2000
17 was a joint effort of reviewing documentation
18 and the response from the Site Review Team
19 that consisted of the Executive Director of
20 this Committee and its chair, who actually
21 went to Sweden to talk to the people at the
22 Higher Education Commission. The information
23 they brought back included actual eyewitness
24 and observation of the site, of site team

1 visits and the actual process. And they were
2 also able to talk to people within the
3 country's legal system and also in the
4 country's education evaluation system to make
5 sure that there was a comparable system.

6 The country reported that since
7 2000 there had been no changes in its laws,
8 regulations, or standards, processes and
9 procedures. The application narrative did
10 make reference to the Agency's most recent
11 comprehensive review of its medical schools
12 and that was done in 2007. This information
13 was made available by reference to a website.
14 Although we went to the website, not only
15 staff, but also our Executive Director spent a
16 lot of time at that website, we were not able
17 to find that report in English. That might be
18 because we didn't know how to look for it, but
19 we tried and it was not available.

20 Department staff could not locate
21 any English translations of the most recent
22 comprehensive review of the evaluation of
23 medical schools. The application did contain
24 a current documentation verifying

1 implementation of its recognized evaluation
2 process and its evaluation process of its
3 university systems. So we did receive that
4 and this process does -- the process for the
5 medical schools is exactly the same process
6 they use for -- we understand -- for the
7 evaluation for their university systems. And
8 if you could compare it to a regional
9 accreditor going into a university and looking
10 at the whole institution, then you'd have a
11 better idea of how that process is done.

12 Although the country does do from
13 the documentation we did receive, we were able
14 to verify that it does do a comprehensive view
15 of its evaluation of a medical system, but we
16 could not find evidence of that.

17 While the country declares that
18 there are no substantial changes in the law,
19 standards, and processes that the NCFMEA
20 determined to be comparable in September 2000,
21 the Department is not able to determine if the
22 country's accreditation activities are
23 consistent with your guidelines. Because of
24 the lack of evidence or the lack of

1 documentation, this shows us that they
2 actually did a review of their medical
3 education system.

4 The National Committee may wish to
5 request that the country provide comprehensive
6 updated reports in English with current
7 supporting documentation that verifies
8 implementation of this quality assurance
9 system.

10 Now the most ideal information that
11 we would like to see is a self study or a site
12 view report or some kind of evaluation of the
13 implementation of their standards, but we do
14 not think that this is realistic only because
15 we do not believe that we're going to be able
16 to get an entire self study translated into
17 English.

18 So what we did was recommended in
19 the analysis and to the Committee that they
20 would request from the Agency the standard
21 reporting requirements that we request when we
22 ask the country to report under accrediting
23 activities. This is the least amount of
24 information we believe will provide us with

1 enough documentation to verify implementation
2 of the process.

3 This concludes my presentation and
4 there is a representative of the country here
5 to speak to you and I will remain available to
6 answer any questions you have.

7 DR. DOCKERY: Thank you, Mr. Mula.
8 Are there any questions by members of the
9 Committee before we recognize the
10 representative from Sweden?

11 Thank you very much. Will Mr.
12 Lennart Stahle please approach the table,
13 please?

14 And would you use the microphone
15 and introduce yourself and give your
16 respective title, please?

17 MR. STAHLE: Thank you. I am very
18 grateful for being here. It's a great
19 pleasure for me to come to this Committee and
20 explain how our higher education system works.
21 I've been working within the higher education
22 system for the last 37 years as researcher and
23 administrator. Although not in medicine, I'm
24 started in Sanskrit and graduated in history

1 of religion, but that's quite suitable for the
2 job that I hold now, I think.

3 We have -- first of all, I would
4 like to regret that we weren't able to present
5 reports in English. I will go back to Sweden
6 and we will produce translation of a self
7 study of a medical school and the site review
8 report as well as a summary of the expert
9 panels of the evaluation that was carried out
10 in 2007.

11 So that will be no problem, but it
12 will take some weeks to do that.
13 So I hope you will be satisfied with that.

14 When it comes to the future, I also
15 would like to say that we always do a follow-
16 up study of our evaluations within three
17 years, so in the year 2010 we will do a
18 follow-up study of this evaluation carried out
19 in 2007. And this is mainly because also that
20 we would like to check up, if the medical
21 school has implemented the Bologna System
22 which is quite new. It's a new degree
23 ordinance that is more specified what the
24 students are supposed to know and they carry

1 out after their education. And in the future
2 our evaluation will concentrate upon these
3 goals set out in the higher education
4 ordinance and if the higher education
5 institutions can prove that they are able to
6 check these competencies and knowledge of the
7 students. So that's very important.

8 When it was started -- this
9 evaluation was finished, the last evaluation
10 was finished in 2007, the Bologna System
11 wasn't implemented in Sweden. It was
12 implemented from the first of July 2007. So
13 that's because that we would like to do a
14 closer check up with that.

15 Otherwise, as I wrote in a very,
16 very late addenda, unfortunately, I can say
17 the same as I said to Chuck that I saw your
18 report lying on my boss' desk and said oh, we
19 must attend to that in some way. So Chuck
20 asked me if he's still my boss and he is.

21 (Laughter.)

22 We did a kind of evaluation in 2007
23 and we have a very competent evaluation panel,
24 I think. Sweden is a small country. We have

1 so far done all of our evaluations in Swedish,
2 but from 2008, it's possible also to carry out
3 evaluations in English and then we are able to
4 acquire external experts that are not in
5 command of Swedish, but are in command of
6 English. So that will be an advantage and the
7 development of our quality assurance system, I
8 think.

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

1 Kullring.

2 This panel did carry out site
3 visits after self-evaluations at all medical
4 schools in Sweden. As you know, there are six
5 medical schools in Sweden at present. Those
6 who are professors in Linkoping and
7 Gothenburg, they didn't take part in the site
8 visits, of course, at their respective medical
9 schools. That is self evident.

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

22 The conclusion from the agency was
23 that all schools have a good or a very good
24 quality and there were no reasons to question

1 the right of holding a degree in master of
2 medicine in science.

3 So that was the conclusion of the
4 panel from their evaluation that was carried
5 out in 2007. So I just would like to mention
6 that to you all because I think it's very
7 important to mention that.

8 And then there are some other
9 studies. It isn't necessary to present to the
10 Committee, but I sent them by mail to the
11 Department of Education. So I think that was,
12 I would like to say at the beginning, so
13 please if you have any questions.

14 DR. DOCKERY: Are there any
15 questions from the Committee before we go into
16 Executive Session?

17 If we could ask our guests, please,
18 to depart.

19 **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

20 **END OF DAY 2 OPEN SESSIONS**

21