



**EVALUATION
OF VETERINARY TRAINING
IN EUROPE**

**Principles and Process of Evaluation
and
Manual of Standard Operating Procedures**

**EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF ESTABLISHMENTS
FOR VETERINARY EDUCATION (EAEVE)**

**FEDERATION OF VETERINARIANS
OF EUROPE
(FVE)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EVALUATION OF VETERINARY EDUCATION IN EUROPE

BACKGROUND

- 1- EU-legislation governing basic veterinary training 1978-2005,
- 2- A new EC-Directive legislates for basic veterinary training from 27th October 2005,

THE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR EUROPEAN VETERINARY FACULTIES*

- 1- Background,
- 2- Principles of the Evaluation of Veterinary Education in Europe
 - a- *General principles,*
 - b- *A two-stage approach,*
 - c- *Main steps of the evaluation,*

THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION

- 1- Agreement for an evaluation between the Faculty and the European Committee on Veterinary Education (ECOVE), giving the stage of scrutiny intended and the period for a site visit,
- 2- The self-evaluation report/s (SER),
- 3- The group of experts,
- 4- Visit to the Faculty,
- 5- Report of the group of experts,
- 6- Review of the evaluation report by the ECOVE,
- 7- Criteria for determining approval and classification of the evaluated Faculty,
- 8- Transparency of the evaluation system,
- 9- Review of the Faculty's response to the ECOVE decision
- 10- Re-evaluation procedures,
- 11- Appeal mechanism,

GUIDELINES, REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

- Annex I:** “Guidelines, requirements and main indicators, Stages one and -two”,
- Annex II:** “Guide for the preparation of the self-evaluation report/s”,
- Annex III:** “Information to be provided in the self-evaluation report/s”,
- Annex IV:** “List of recommended essential competences at graduation: Day-one skills”,
- Annex V:** “Guide to the Faculty for the organisation of the visit/s”,
- Annex VI:** “Guide for visiting experts”,
- Annex VII:** “Guide for the liaison officer”,
- Annex VIII:** “Appeal mechanism”.

*In this Manual of Standard Operating Procedures, the term “Faculty” is used throughout to refer to Establishments of Veterinary Education in general, regardless of their local or national denomination.

EVALUATION OF VETERINARY EDUCATION IN EUROPE

BACKGROUND

1. EU-LEGISLATION GOVERNING BASIC VETERINARY TRAINING 1978-2005

The legislation governing basic veterinary training in the European Union countries (Directives 78/1026 and 78/1027/EEC) laid down the minimum compulsory requirements for all EU Member States. The European Commission (EC) Directive 78/1026/EEC regulated the principle of recognition of education, examination and other proofs of competence for veterinarians (Veterinary surgeons) in order to ensure they can be established as professionals and provide services with full freedom throughout the European market. In order to ensure that the education programmes of veterinary training are comparable among the member states of the Union, the EC-Directive 78/1027/EEC ("Veterinary Training Directive") was issued immediately thereafter. This particular Directive 78/1027 listed the minimum requirements of form and content that Veterinary education should comprise, in order to make them comparable among institutions of higher education. Since the intention was to secure a comparable high level of education, a third Directive (78/1028/EEC) was issued, which established the Advisory Committee on Veterinary Training (ACVT). One of this Committee's tasks was to help the European Commission ensure a comparably high standard of veterinary training throughout the European Community (now European Union).

After examining the available options, the ACVT concluded that the best way to achieve this objective was to establish a permanent, Europe-wide system of evaluation of veterinary faculties. The system was developed in stages. From 1986 to 1989, a pilot study, designed to review and refine the scheme, was conducted in one veterinary Faculty per Member State. The aim of the study was to ensure that veterinary training up to the stage where students are qualified to practice was of a comparably high standard throughout the European Community and, where appropriate, to put forward suggestions aimed at improving that education. The method was adopted by the ACVT as permanent at its plenary session on 20 and 21 February 1990. In 1993, the ACVT adopted a report (III/F/5171/7/92) updating the requirements of basic veterinary education.

The responsibility for administering the programme was assigned by the EC to the European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE) in 1992. Within the framework of EAEVE a specific Evaluation Unit was established, free from the parent organisation with its own finances, responsible for running and administering the evaluation system.

In 1996, the ACVT commissioned an ACVT-EAEVE joint *ad hoc* group to review the method of evaluation. This review capitalised on the experience gained from evaluations carried out in virtually all EU veterinary faculties and in many faculties in non-Member States during the first evaluation cycle (1992-1999), and on the experience acquired in the United Kingdom, Ireland and North America, where similar methods were used. The principles of the method of evaluation of veterinary faculties were adopted by the ACVT at its plenary session of 12 March 1999 and, being summarized in a Standard Operation Procedures manual (SOP), these principles were used until 2007. The method was based on a comparison between the requirements defined by the ACVT to ensure a high standard of veterinary education (**Annex I**) and the characteristics of the Faculty to be evaluated.

At their General Assembly in Naples in May 1998, the EAEVE unanimously decided to draw up a list, to be made available at the end of the second cycle of visits (about 2010), classifying each institution under one of the following three categories:

Amended in May 2012 – GA Budapest

Institutions visited and found to meet the requirements set out in the European Union Directives;

Institutions visited and failing to meet one or more of the requirements set out in the Directives and in the ACVT-updated requirements (III/F/5171/7/92) (major deficiencies);

Institutions not visited.

As an interim measure, delegates attending the Naples meeting also agreed unanimously to draw up immediately a list of establishments with no major deficiencies or where these deficiencies have been rectified. All establishments that wished, then or at a future date, to be included in this list should apply to the President of the EAEVE. In March 1999, the ACVT plenary meeting adopted this procedure and accepted the list. At the EAEVE General Assembly in Lisbon, in May 1999, the membership unanimously agreed that this list of evaluated and approved establishments should be made available on the EAEVE website.

In the year 2000, the EC disbanded the ACVT to concentrate efforts on matters of wider professional recognition and the preparation of an open market and the expansion of the EU, including the evolution of the General System Directive (1999/42/EC). Under these circumstances EAEVE, still holding the mandate given by the EC to run the evaluation system, formed, together with the Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (FVE), a common education committee (Joint Education Committee, JEC) which took over the role of the ACVT in reviewing the evaluation reports provided by the evaluation teams.

2. A NEW EC-DIRECTIVE REGULATES BASIC VETERINARY TRAINING FROM OCTOBER 27TH, 2005

The EC meeting in Lisbon 2000 and the following EC meeting in Stockholm 2001 led to Directive 2001/19/EC on Professional recognition. More recently, the EU Council adopted on June 6, 2005 the “Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the recognition of professional qualifications” proposed by the Commission of the European Communities after having passed its second reading in the European Parliament on May 10, 2005. This Directive 2005/36/EC of 7 September 2005 on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications (published in the Official Journal of the European Union, L255/22, on September 30th 2005, [http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_255/]) is the one now in effect (as from October 27th 2005), governing—among other professions- that of veterinary surgeon. The Directive establishes also that the Directives 78/1026/EEC and 78/1027/EEC are repealed with effect from the date laid down Directive 2005/36/EC, in Article 63 (Transposition) within 2 years from the date of publication in the Official Journal.

Directive 2005/36/EC establishes that the training of veterinary surgeons (“or equivalent professional denomination”) shall comprise a total of at least five years of full-time theoretical and practical study at a university or at a higher institute of education providing training recognised as being of an equivalent level, or under the supervision of a university, covering at least the study programme referred to in Annex V.4. of the Directive: **Veterinary surgeon**, which lists the requirements for knowledge and skills (5.4.1.), the study programme for veterinary surgeons as well as a clear description of extramural practical training. Directive 2005/36/EC, Annex V.4., 5.4.1., further defines the distribution of the theoretical and practical training to ensure that “the knowledge and experience may be acquired in a manner which will enable veterinary surgeons to perform all their duties”.

The study programme described in the Directive shall include “at least the subjects listed below. Instruction in one or more of these subjects may be given as part of, or in association with, other courses”. An additional subject “Professional knowledge” has been added.

A- Basic subjects:

Physics, chemistry, animal biology, plant biology, biomathematics (NB: some of these subjects can be studied prior to the entry to veterinary education)

B- Specific subjects:

Group 1: a. Basic sciences

Anatomy (including histology and embryology); physiology, biochemistry; genetics; pharmacology; pharmacy; toxicology, microbiology; immunology; epidemiology; professional ethics.

Group 2: b. Clinical Sciences

Obstetrics; pathology (including pathological anatomy); parasitology; clinical medicine and surgery (including anaesthetics); clinical lectures on the various domestic animals, poultry and other animal species; preventive medicine; radiology; reproduction and reproductive disorders; veterinary state medicine and public health; veterinary legislation and forensic medicine; therapeutics; propaedeutics.

Group 3: c. Animal production

Animal production; animal nutrition; agronomy; rural economics; animal husbandry; veterinary hygiene; animal ethology and protection.

Group 4: d. Food hygiene

Inspection and control of animal foodstuffs or foodstuffs of animal origin; food hygiene and technology; food science including legislation; practical work (including practical work in places where slaughtering and processing of foodstuffs takes place).

Group 5: Professional knowledge

Practice management; Veterinary certification and report writing; Career planning and opportunities.

The content listed in Annex V, point 5.4.2 may be amended in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 54(2) with a view to adapting it to scientific and technical progress. It is noteworthy to remember that Directive 2005/36/EC does not require all veterinary establishments to have the same curriculum. The objective (stated in the report of ACVT (III/F/5171/7/92) adopted in 1993 and terms of reference of the EEC's ACVT in 1998) is that the courses of training shall be of a comparably high standard, the objectives being as follows:

- Veterinary training institutions are to provide adequate, ethical, research-based veterinary training which enables veterinary students to examine and treat sick animals, contribute to animal production whilst maintaining the animals' health and welfare, protect humans from zoonoses and ensure high-quality food products of animal origin for human consumption. The training must cover the broad requirements for veterinary graduates in the individual states, and comply with the EU Directives in the case of EU Member States.
- In addition, the institutions should conduct research, provide postgraduate and specialist training and play a role in continuing veterinary education.
- They should, furthermore, provide services to members of the veterinary profession and the community as a whole.”

European Directive 2005/36/EC sets out, therefore, minimum training requirements for all European veterinary surgeons, stating in its Section 5, Article 38 (The training of veterinary surgeons), point 3a-h that

Training as a veterinary surgeon shall provide an assurance that the person in question has acquired the following knowledge and skills:

- (a) adequate knowledge of the sciences on which the activities of the veterinary surgeon are based;

- (b) adequate knowledge of the structure and functions of healthy animals, of their husbandry, reproduction and hygiene in general, as well as their feeding, including the technology involved in the manufacture and preservation of foods corresponding to their needs;
- (c) adequate knowledge of the behaviour and protection of animals;
- (d) adequate knowledge of the causes, nature, course, effects, diagnosis and treatment of the diseases of animals, whether considered individually or in groups, including a special knowledge of the diseases which may be transmitted to humans;
- (e) adequate knowledge of preventive medicine;
- (f) adequate knowledge of the hygiene and technology involved in the production, manufacture and putting into circulation of animal foodstuffs or foodstuffs of animal origin intended for human consumption;
- (g) adequate knowledge of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the subjects listed above;
- (h) adequate clinical and other practical experience under appropriate supervision.”

In addition, the trainees should follow instruction at a level corresponding to the state of the art while understanding the value of life-long learning. Directive 2005/36/EC requires all EU-member states to recognise the professional qualifications awarded to EU-nationals from any other member state. It also foresees the establishment of a *Committee on the recognition of professional qualifications* that shall assist the Commission on matters concerning the application of the Directive. The Committee shall comprise representatives of the Member States and be chaired by a representative of the Commission. The Commission shall ensure the consultation of experts from the professional groups, also at European level, concerned and shall provide a reasoned report on these consultations to that committee.

THE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR EUROPEAN VETERINARY FACULTIES

1. BACKGROUND

The current Evaluation method has always been expected to evolve and adapt to the changes that would inevitably take place in the training institutions, including the application of systems of quality assurance. Revisions of the Evaluation method and the procedures used (SOP) were therefore carried out (the latest in 2000/printed 2002) by EAEVE and FVE. A further revision was requested by the VET2020/EAEVE/FVE ad-hoc working group (“Suggestions for improving the educational requirements of veterinary education in Europe”) to EAEVE and FVE in September 2003. A decision to revise the Evaluation system and its SOP was taken by EAEVE and FVE in 2004.

The present document provides an evolved, **compulsory**, two-stage system for approval-accreditation of establishments responsible for veterinary training, to be automatically implemented, step-wise, in all European veterinary faculties which are members of EAEVE. The document is in the form of a Manual of Standard Operating Procedures, and provides an overview of the principles of the method of evaluation and a series of guidelines, requirements and instructions, described in **Annexes I to VIII**.

Establishments that become members of the EAEVE have agreed to “...comply with the Evaluation System promoted by the EAEVE. They should also comply with the principle of periodic international peer-group evaluation of their function as an academic institution according

to defined protocols, in particular as regards the standards of undergraduate training.” (Chapter 3, Article 5 of the Statutes of EAEVE). Moreover, member establishments can be excluded from membership “...as a result of non-compliance with the principles of the European System of Evaluation of Veterinary Training (article 5)” (Chapter 3, Article 7 of the Statutes of EAEVE). Under these statutes, the principle of evaluation is automatically compulsory for all members of the Association.

2. PRINCIPLES OF THE EVALUATION OF VETERINARY EDUCATION IN EUROPE

a- General principles

The evaluation system focuses on undergraduate veterinary education, seeking to ensure that such training is of a comparably high standard throughout the European Union, thereby making the mutual recognition of qualifications possible. A pre-requisite for this assumption is the definition of a veterinary graduate, as follows:

“A new graduate should be a veterinary surgeon capable of entering all commonly-recognised branches of the veterinary profession immediately on graduation or of being capable of undergoing further training for them by established procedures or after a generally-accepted period of practical experience”.

Such a definition complies with the Directive 2005/36/EC on the “Recognition of Professional Qualifications” Chapter III, Section 5, Article 38, point 3 and its Annex V.4 (Veterinary surgeon or equivalent professional denomination). The above definition automatically determines the presence of a core course as being that which provides an assurance that the person in question has acquired the adequate knowledge (as listed in Article 38, point 3, a-g) and skills (clinical and other practical experience under appropriate supervision) as listed in Article 38, point 3 h of the Directive. This is not “omnicompetence” but basic, essential competence at graduation. The degree awarded should cover clinical training in all the listed subjects across all common, domestic species, and all students must have acquired “day-one” competences by the time they graduate (see **Annex IV**), including general academic and professional attributes and attitudes towards professional development as well as pertinent practical skills.

The above definition allows for intercalated degrees, electives, tracking etc as the Faculty wishes or as the student desires. As stated above, Directive 2005/36/EC foresees possibilities for curricular amendments in order to provide the basis for adapting the list of knowledge and skills as well as the study course to scientific and technical progress within veterinary medicine and training for it. Completion of the 5-year full-time minimum period of undergraduate veterinary education leads to the degree of Veterinary Surgeon (or equivalent professional denomination). This degree is equivalent to the Master denomination provided by the Bologna Declaration (http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf). Within this period of education, faculties may also follow the Bologna Declaration by offering an intermediate Bachelor degree in accordance with national legislation.

Quality of education implies training the students for life-long learning. Postgraduate education and research are the basis for the advancement of veterinary science and hence have a great impact on undergraduate veterinary education. Consequently, the evaluation system will also evaluate continuing education, postgraduate training and research within a functioning, transparent and robust system of quality assurance in the Faculty.

The evaluation of veterinary faculties in Europe as a whole is carried out by the EAEVE in cooperation with the Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (FVE). The evaluation system is managed by EAEVE in cooperation with FVE through the European Committee on Veterinary Education (ECOVE).

Evaluations should be carried out periodically at 10 year intervals, depending on the legal context provided by the state where the Faculty is located. Interim visits will not interrupt this cycle. It is expected that the new evaluation system will entail 10 to 15 visits per year to veterinary institutions in Europe. Evaluations, including site visits, are only carried out in English.

b- A two-stage approach

The new evaluation system consists of **two stages** of similar mechanical steps, but with a different approach and intention. The **first stage** provides approval that the Faculty conforms with Directive 2005/36/EC, regarding the training of veterinary surgeons (Chapter III, Section 5, Article 38 and Annex V). The **second stage** provides accreditation that the Faculty is following generally accepted and appropriate academic standards and providing learning opportunities of acceptable quality. For this, the Faculty shall prove that it has the relevant methods for monitoring quality of training, assessment and learning opportunities, a sustainable system for quality assurance and a plan for quality enhancement; thus providing confidence -for all stakeholders¹- that the quality of learning of the trainees is acceptable. A Faculty that has reached this level is to be regarded as accredited by the “European Committee on Veterinary Education” (ECOVE).

c- Main steps in the evaluation

The evaluation procedure for both stages comprises several steps, the broad lines of which are described below, in accordance with the guidelines and instructions set out in **Annexes I to VIII**.

The main steps of the evaluation procedure are:

Agreement for an evaluation between the Faculty and the ECOVE, including the stage and date for a visitation.

Preparation of a self-evaluation report (SER) by the Faculty (see **Annexes I-IV**), which is to be scrutinised by a group of experts (see **Annex VI**),

Visit to the institution by a group of experts, for a duration of approximately 4 days for stage 1 and 2 days for stage 2,

Preparation of draft report A on the visit by the group of experts, including a preliminary executive summary for each stage,

Preparation of draft report B, following a factual scrutiny by the Faculty, under the guidance of the Chairperson of the visiting team,

Review of draft report B in the presence of the Chairperson and subject to clarifications required by the ECOVE,

Adoption of the Final report, following communications of its contents to the dean; preparation of the Executive Summary with the conclusions drawn and classification of the Faculty by the ECOVE,

Inclusion of the Faculty in the List of Evaluated Establishments of the EAEVE, including year of evaluation and date of ECOVE-decision, status and a link to the Executive Summary/Summaries of the evaluation/s.

¹ Stakeholders comprise the funding organizations, which in most countries are the state and, indirectly, the tax payers; the prospective and current students; the potential and current employers; the clients; the professional associations, etc.

THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION

1. AGREEMENT FOR AN EVALUATION BETWEEN THE FACULTY AND THE ECOVE, IN TERMS OF STAGE OF SCRUTINY INTENDED AND THE DATE FOR A SITE VISIT.

Albeit stage one evaluation is compulsory for EAEVE-members, Faculties are free to choose whether they request evaluation for Stage one or for Stage two or both if the Faculty has passed Stage one on a previous evaluation. Exceptions are possible in accordance with ECOVE. Only evaluated institutions found to meet the requirements set out in EC Directive 2005/36/EC by the adoption of this New System of Evaluation (Principles and process of evaluation approved in May 17th 2006 by FVE's GA and by the EAEVE's GA on June 1st 2006) are considered to hold the status of *Full approval* in Stage one and can therefore immediately apply for the second stage of evaluation (accreditation).

Application for stage one and stage two evaluation must be 2 years in advance.

A provisional schedule of visits is drawn up by the EAEVE-office well in advance of the site visit in cooperation with the institution to be evaluated. This agreement must be obtained at least one year prior to the visit. The identities of the group of experts and the identity of the liaison officer must be available to both parties 6 months in advance. Once agreed upon, further changes cannot be made, except in the event of *force majeure* and by mutual agreement.

The travel and accommodation expenses (economy rates, middle-class hotels) of the visiting team (experts, secretariat and liaison officer) are borne by the institution visited. The institution also contributes to the administrative costs incurred by the EAEVE/ECOVE for the visit.

In order to facilitate preparatory work for the visits and the task of the visiting experts, the EAEVE has prepared guides: three for the institutions to be visited (**Annexes I, II and V**), one for the visiting experts (**Annex VI**) and one for the liaison officers (**Annex VII**).

2. THE SELF-EVALUATION REPORT/S (SER)

The SER is the essential part of the evaluation, providing basic data for the group of visiting experts. The organisation of the SER is, however, different for Stage one (SER-1) and Stage two (SER-2). When preparing this report (either as SER-1 or SER-2), it is essential that the institution's administration carefully follow the instructions and requirements contained in **Annexes I to IV**.

Stage one: The SER-1 describes the aims, structures, system of organisation, methods, resources, mode of operation and results of the institution concerned, as described in **Annexe Ia**. The SER-1 must contain, in standardised form, full but concise quantitative and qualitative data to allow for a proper evaluation of the training of veterinary surgeons in conformity with Directive 2005/36/EC. In drawing up the report, the Faculty must answer all the questions contained in **Annex III**.

Stage two: The SER-2 must describe the policies and procedures that the Faculty uses to assure adequate academic standards and the provision of adequate learning opportunities for the students in the entire field of veterinary undergraduate education. The SER-2 must also describe the underlying strategy devised by the academic management for quality improvement. The SER-2 should follow the guidelines listed in **Annexes Ib, II and III**.

During the period of preparation of the report, the administration concerned may consult the evaluation system co-ordinator if in doubt about how to answer certain questions. As the SER is the essential document for the visitation, the experts must receive the SER not later than three

months prior to the start of the planned visit to determine whether it is comprehensive enough for the visit to be carried out.

3. THE GROUP OF EXPERTS

The ECOVE through the EAEVE-office appoints the membership of the visiting groups of experts. For this purpose, the ECOVE has a list of experts who have agreed to be involved in this task and, who have, if necessary, undergone training. Periodically, the ECOVE invites applications for individuals to be considered as visitors, through the EAEVE and FVE diffusion channels. The experts' personal files record, in particular, their area of expertise and knowledge of European languages.

For Stage 1 evaluation the ECOVE puts together, based on this background, a team of people with the necessary combination of subject expertise, clinical and academic experience, as well balanced as possible. The chairperson of the visiting team has normally had experience in applying the evaluation system, and will have participated in at least three visitations in the past. The chairperson is usually one who holds, or who has recently held, a senior academic position with documented knowledge of the requirements for veterinary education. If a chairperson is appointed who does not have an academic background, the team shall at least include one other person with senior academic experience who can advise on such matters as university organisation, requirements for veterinary education, etc. It is desirable that not more than one (1) member of the visitation team lacks experience as an evaluating expert.

"The group of experts for Stage one evaluation should comprise six persons, one for each of the sectors defined in Directive 2005/36/EC, Annex V.4., 5.4.1, namely basic subjects and sciences (one member), clinical science subjects (one teacher and one practising veterinarian), animal production (one member) and food hygiene (one member). Four experts should be selected from academic peers. A student (final year undergraduate or graduated in the last 12 months at the maximum will be added to the experts team. The group of experts is accompanied by a coordinator (rapporteur)."

The chairperson is nominated by the ECOVE and is ultimately responsible for the delivery of the final expert's report, following consultation and consideration with her/his team. Administrative support is provided by EAEVE-office. In consultation with the ECOVE, the institution appoints a liaison officer who is well-acquainted with that institution, but is not actively involved in its current management.

In the Stage two evaluation, the group of experts must at least comprise two persons, nominated according to the criteria provided by ENQA. The group of experts can be accompanied by a coordinator (rapporteur).

The chair person is nominated by the ECOVE and is ultimately responsible for the delivery of the final report, following consultations and considerations with her/his team. Administrative support is provided by EAEVE-office, at the visited institution-level the dean/rector/president or her /his representatives are responsible interlocutors.

4. VISIT TO THE FACULTY

The aim of the site visit/s is to verify and, where appropriate, complete the information provided in the SER/s and to give views on the level of undergraduate education, on the extent to which the minimum standards set by EU legislation are respected (Stage one) and on the ability of the Faculty to monitor, maintain and enhance quality and standards at the level of the veterinary degree (Stage two). It is also to try to put forward practical suggestions for improving training.

To help the institution prepare for the visit, an **Annex V** has been produced for use by the institution's administration, which it is advised to follow closely. To help the experts prepare for the visit, an **Annex VI** is provided.

The liaison officer has a vital role during the visit. She/he is responsible for settling material questions and providing additional information requested by the visiting team as quickly and as fully as possible. An **Annex VII** is available to help them prepare and to facilitate their work during the visit.

5. REPORT OF THE GROUP OF EXPERTS

Draft report A of the group of experts must summarise the work done by the experts during the evaluation of the SER and the site-visitation. It should be prepared along the same lines as the SER/s and take due regard of **Annex Ia** regarding Stage one and **Annex Ib** and ENQA-guidelines for Stage two. Each chapter should comprise a descriptive section under the heading "Findings" (based on the SER/s and on the findings made during the visit) and one analytical section in the form of "Comments". It should be completed, where appropriate, by a section entitled "Suggestions". A preliminary self-explanatory, two-page Executive Summary must accompany, but not be a part of, each final report delivered to the ECOVE.

In drawing up their report, it is in the experts' interest to follow closely the recommendations contained in **Annex VI**. The draft report A prepared by the experts should be sent, as soon as possible after the visit, to the head of the Faculty visited for correction of factual errors. The chairperson of the visitation team is responsible, following consultation with the visitation team, for completing draft report B and for sending it to the ECOVE. This report and the accompanying preliminary Executive Summary are sent to the members of the ECOVE before the meeting where the evaluation of the Faculty is to be discussed and its status decided. Each ECOVE-member is instructed to study all reports on visits before group discussions, objections and criticisms must be notified in writing within two weeks to the chairperson of the ECOVE.

6. ADOPTION OF THE FINAL REPORT BY THE ECOVE

The ECOVE *in plenum* discusses draft report B with the head of the institution concerned (or his nominee) and the chairperson of the group of visiting experts, asks for clarifications, draws conclusions and adopts the Final report which is communicated to the dean prior to publication.

The Final report must indicate the extent to which the institution complies with the guidelines and requirements of **Annex Ia** and with the agreed definition of graduate quality (e.g. presence of essential competences required at graduation, **Annex IV**) specified for Stage one and of **Annex Ib** for Stage two, and these are noted under one of the following headings:

Stage one:

Firstly, major weaknesses (major deficiencies) which, if allowed to persist, could lead the ECOVE to consider that the training given does not conform to the requirements of Directive 2005/36/EC.

Secondly, suggestions for changes which the team of experts conclude would improve the training, even though they relate to weaknesses that do not conform to the requirements of the above listed directives and amendments.

Stage two:

Accreditation can only be given when full approval of Stage-one has been obtained and when Stage-two evaluation has provided convincing evidence that the Faculty has qualified in providing a functional system of quality assurance. This system may be graded by providing:

Full confidence,
Limited confidence
or No confidence

Following scrutiny and discussion of the final report, the ECOVE draws a series of conclusions to be included in the Final Executive Summary and classifies the Faculty.

7. CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING APPROVAL AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE EVALUATED FACULTIES

For the evaluated study programme to be recommended for approval, the Faculty must have met, or have exceeded, Stage one: requirements laid out in **Annex Ia** and, for Stage two: requirements laid out in **Annex Ib**.

The evaluated Faculty will be classified after **Stage one** evaluation as holding the status of:

1. Approval:

An Establishment with no Major Deficiency will be approved.

2. Conditional Approval:

In case of one major deficiency ECOVE may assign Conditional Approval. The final judgement of Approval or Non-Approval must fall within 5 years of the original evaluation visit.

3. Non-Approval:

An Establishment with 2 or more major deficiencies cannot be approved.

4. Non-EU limited approval (accreditation):

A faculty outside the EU with a curriculum differing in one or another area significantly from EU-directives without compromising overall standards of acceptability can get limited approval.

The Faculty will be classified after **Stage two** evaluation as holding the status of:

- a) *Accreditation* of the Faculty. The decision indicates that the Faculty has met the set of requirements (full confidence). However, the decision giving this status may include recommendations to eliminate minor shortcomings.
- b) *Conditional accreditation* of the Faculty (for a non-renewable 5-year period). The decision indicates the Faculty has major shortcomings (limited confidence) in the set of requirements, and that these need to be eliminated or addressed in agreement between the ECOVE and the Faculty.
- c) *No accreditation*. The decision indicates that the Faculty has serious shortcomings (no confidence) and has not met the requirements.

8. TRANSPARENCY OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

When the ECOVE has adopted the final evaluation report and scrutinised the preliminary executive summary, the set of recommendations and the classification of the Faculty are orally communicated at the ECOVE meeting to the Head of the evaluated Faculty, informing her/him of the Appeal procedure and of the transparency upon which the system of

evaluation is based.

The ECOVE is responsible for the scrutiny of the data compiled and for the preparation of a Final Executive Summary of standardised format, with a very succinct non-negotiable structure, stating specific information for the stakeholders (e.g. the extent to which the graduate is suited to their purpose). The Final Executive Summary/Summaries should include:

For Stage one:

- the areas of veterinary training where deficiencies have been noted, indicating – where relevant - the presence of major deficiencies,
- a final classification of the Faculty (Full approval, Conditional approval, Non approval), and
- the most important suggestions for improvement of the Faculty's veterinary programme.
- a table of the most important recorded indicators

For Stage two:

- the areas where assessment procedures are
 - satisfactory
 - less
 - satisfactory
 - non
 - satisfactory
- a final classification of the Faculty (Accreditation, Conditional accreditation, No accreditation)
- the most important suggestions for improvement of the Faculty's quality assurance procedures

The full final report on a Faculty, including the final Executive Summary is sent by the Chairperson of the ECOVE through the EAEVE-office to the head of the Faculty visited.

The final decision and executive summary are published on the EAEVE homepage.

9. REVIEW OF THE FACULTY'S RESPONSE TO THE ECOVE DECISION

Stage one:

Institutions have the right to comment upon the conclusions drawn from the final evaluation report and address the ECOVE via the EAEVE-office about further steps, including appeal. When faculties evaluated for Stage one have Major deficiencies, the ECOVE via the EAEVE-office asks the institution concerned to provide details of the planned changes which will be introduced in the wake of the report.

Veterinary faculties whose reports reveal one or more Major deficiencies (but where it is considered possible, by agreement of the ECOVE and the Faculty, to correct them within an defined period) and were thus classed as having *Conditional approval* status, will be requested by the EAEVE-office within a year of the decision to provide information on the follow-up measures taken. Faculties shall be reminded that failure to correct Major deficiencies within a defined period will result in exclusion or removal from the list of approved faculties.

When a Faculty considers that it has rectified a Major deficiency, it should inform the EAEVE-office. The ECOVE in cooperation with the chairperson of the previous visit will then decide if a revisit to verify the situation is necessary, at the expense of the Faculty, and if so by whom. The ECOVE will inform the Faculty of the result of this investigation through the EAEVE-office. If the result is unfavourable, the Faculty is informed of its right to appeal (**Annex VIII**).

For veterinary faculties whose reports have led to *Non approval* (Major deficiencies present that could not be possibly corrected within five years), three years after the report adopted by the ECOVE has been forwarded to the institutions concerned, the EAEVE secretariat will ask the faculties to provide information on the follow-up measures taken, in particular, the changes made in order to correct Major deficiencies.

When a Faculty considers that it has rectified such shortcomings, it should inform the EAEVE-office which will notify the ECOVE accordingly. The ECOVE will then decide if a new visit to verify the situation is necessary, at the expense of the Faculty, and if so by whom. The ECOVE will inform the Faculty of the result of this investigation through the EAEVE-office. If the result is unfavourable, the Faculty is informed of its right to appeal (Annex VIII).

Stage two:

In case a Faculty has only received “Conditional accreditation” or “No accreditation” the Faculty may apply through the EAEVE-office for re-evaluation after a minimum of 2 years. This application must be accompanied by a documentation showing, that the criteria for full accreditation have been met.

The ECOVE will then decide if a new visit to verify the situation is necessary, at the expense of the Faculty, and if so by whom. The ECOVE will inform the Faculty of the result of this investigation through the EAEVE-office. If the result is unfavourable the Faculty will be informed of its right to appeal (Annex VIII).

10. RE-EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Re-evaluation is to be carried out periodically, within ten (10) years from the date of the full on-site visit for the fully approved/accredited faculties. For the conditionally-approved faculties re-assessment shall be within five (5) years after the full on-site visit.

11. APPEAL MECHANISM

Any Faculty that considers that gross injustice has been done during the evaluation at either stage, the Faculty has the right to appeal its final classification. A step-wise description of the mechanism of appeal is fully described in **Annex VIII**.