

Panel Discussion Summary

Q1: Was the accreditation your institution got a good match with your institution?

(Dr. Lee) Yes. The accreditation process showed us the outside world, which led to less complaints about internal problems. It also gave staff a mutual objective – to upgrade the education system – which gave a great impression to students.

(Dr. Sato) Yes. The objective of both the government and our university is to provide global standard education, which aligns with the EAEVE accreditation system.

(Dr. Horiuchi) There were both positive and negative sides to it, but overall, I think there were many benefits during the process. The accreditation process made faculty members realize the importance of continuous improvement in education. Negative factors were the amount of time it took to keep up to the standards, which ate up our time for research.

(Dr. Osterrieder) For us, AVBC and RCV are good fit because most practitioners in Hong Kong come from colleges that have been accredited with RCV, AVBC, or AVMA. International accreditation is expected by all faculty and students to enable graduates to work in Hong Kong.

Dr. Hori: Dr. Horiuchi mentioned the lack of research time. What is everyone else’s opinion?

(Dr. Lee) My opinion is that teachers should prioritize teaching rather than research.

(Dr. Sato) I agree with Dr. Horiuchi. In the beginning we had to dedicate lots of time to the accreditation work, since we didn’t know anything about it. However, as we continue with the EAEVE education we’ve gradually gotten used to it and are better able to balance it with research work now.

Dr. Hori: Another important point may be that the process of accreditation is very beneficial, as Dr. Horiuchi mentioned.

Q2: What is the difference between the international accreditation vs. national accreditation system of your country?

(Dr. Osterrieder) I have personally experienced EAEVE, AVMA, AVBC and RCVS, but the core is remarkably similar. Vets around the world do the same thing so it’s pretty understandable.

(Dr. Lee) The national accreditation system in Korea follows the AVMA standards, but there’s still a difference. The national accreditation only focuses on the education system in universities, whereas AVMA evaluates the education and competency of each student.

(Dr. Sato) I agree with Dr. Lee; the national accreditation only evaluates the core curriculum, while EAEVE also looks at our teaching methods to evaluate our educational strategy as a university.

(Dr. Horiuchi) I would like to add that AVMA and EAEVE really values the student’s opinion compared to the national system. I noticed they were trying very hard to listen to the student’s voices during visitation.

Dr. Hori: Listening to graduate and undergraduate students is definitely very important, and national education needs to change to integrate that way of thinking.

Q3: Do you think the accreditation your institution got is suitable for veterinary schools in Asia?

(Dr. Lee) AVMA may be good for some universities but too high a hurdle for others. The population of animals varies between countries, so we need to take that into account when choosing an accreditation body.

(Dr. Sato) I agree with Dr. Lee. 24-7 operating hospitals, horse emergency clinics and exotic animal medicine are some of the requirements from EAEVE that are hard to achieve in Japan. However, I do think that the education system and strategy is suitable for Asian schools.

(Dr. Horiuchi) The geographic conditions are very diverse in the Asian region, so I do not think EAEVE is suitable for Asia as a whole. However, as Dr. Sato mentioned, international accreditations are definitely beneficial in learning the educational system and method. It also allows us to foster globally active veterinarians through observation of the outside world.

(Dr. Osterrieder) I think it is very comfortable in this region, because most veterinarians go into small animal medicine, which aligns with the situation in countries like America.

Dr. Hori: I guess the situation is different in every country, but it can probably be said that every pre-existing accreditation system has a few problems when trying to apply it to the Asian region.

Q4: What is your opinion about establishment of accreditation system in Asia? Is it needed? Is it do-able? Who should take the lead?

(Dr. Lee) One thing I can say is that establishment of an Asian accreditation system is definitely needed and doable, but it will require much time and effort. If I were to choose between AVMA and EAEVE, I would say EAEVE is more suitable for Asia, but we need to moderate the level of education and accreditation according to each country's situation.

(Dr. Sato) I agree; it is better if we can establish our own accreditation system. It is probably also beneficial to the EAEVE committee, because it is a lot of work for them to send experts all the way to Asian countries. One problem is that it may take a while to establish and adapt it to our education system, considering that pre-existing systems like EAEVE have continued revising for 30 years to achieve the system they have today.

(Dr. Horiuchi) I think it is going to be very difficult, since as Dr. Sato mentioned, pre-existing accreditation systems have a very long history. One thing we could do is to start from subject specific evaluations, and then gradually build up to achieve the full curriculum evaluation in the long run. For example, since transregional diseases are a big problem in Asia, we could start with evaluations on subjects regarding that field. Another problem is: "Who is taking the lead?". As in the case in our university, establishment of accreditation is going to be a huge burden, so we need designated staff who can focus on accreditation.

(Dr. Osterrieder) I disagree with what has been said; we should focus on consolidating the existing accreditation systems, rather than trying to make more. As I mentioned before all the pre-existing systems are very similar. Ideally we should have a single system with branches around the world