

Name: Mexico	Meeting Date: 09/20/2017	Response Submit Date: 08/18/2017	Status: Final Review	Type: Special Report
------------------------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

U.S. Department of Education

Mexico

Prepared September 2017

Background

At its September 1997 meeting, the National Committee on Foreign Medical Education and Accreditation (NCFMEA) determined that the standards used by the Asociación Mexicana de Facultades y Escuelas de Medicina (AMFEM), a non-governmental accrediting entity and association that represents and provides services to Mexico's medical schools and colleges, were comparable to those used to evaluate medical schools in the United States.

At its March 2002 meeting, the NCFMEA formally accepted the report submitted by AMFEM in which it provided information on the role of the Council for the Accreditation in Superior Education (COPAES) and the effect that any relationship between AMFEM and COPAES would have on the ongoing accreditation of medical schools in Mexico. COPAES is a "civil association" established by the Public Education Secretary (SEP) in October 2000. SEP authorized COPAES to "confer formal recognition" on foreign and domestic organizations which promote quality and improvement through an accreditation process in academic programs offered by public and private schools of higher education in Mexico. COPAES regulates accreditation for higher education in Mexico by recognizing organizations that will conduct evaluations and make accreditation decisions

In July 2002, AMFEM reported on the progress of the transition of accreditation activities from AMFEM to the Mexican Board for the Accreditation of Medical Education (Board or COMAEM). COMAEM, a civil association, totally independent from AMFEM, was established (by AMFEM) to develop accreditation standards, policies and procedures to meet COPAES's requirements. COMAEM is charged with developing and implementing all the standards, policies and procedures for the accreditation of medical schools in Mexico, replacing AMFEM in these activities.

At its Spring 2004 meeting, the National Committee on Foreign Medical Education and Accreditation (NCFMEA or the Committee) determined that Mexico's medical accreditation entity the Consejo Mexicano para la Acreditación de la Educación Médica, A.C. (the Mexican Board for the Accreditation of Medical Education), hereafter referred to as COMAEM or "the Board", used accreditation standards and evaluation procedures for medical schools comparable to those used in the United States.

In March 2007, the NCFMEA accepted COMAEM's report regarding the current status of medical schools, an overview and summary of key accreditation activities, including site reviews and accreditation decisions, changes in its laws and regulations, standards and procedures, and information about various meetings and training sessions and site visits to medical schools and clinical clerkship sites planned for 2006.

In September 2009, Drs Valasquez-Castillo and Durante-Montiel (COMAEM) attended the NCFMEA meeting and provided additional information in a lengthy discussion with the Committee. The NCFMEA accepted COMAEM's update on its accrediting activities and invited the country to submit an application for a redetermination of comparability for review at the spring 2010 meeting. The meeting was postponed and the COMAEM's application for a redetermination of comparability was considered at the Fall 2011 meeting of the NCFMEA.

At its Fall 2011 meeting the NCFMEA determined that while the accreditation system described in the narrative and documents that were provided by the country, appeared to have substantially the same components as the U.S. accreditation system, there were insufficient description and documentation of the agency's application of its policies, processes, and practices on which to support comparability between the countries, and deferred its decision. The NCFMEA asked COMAEM to submit more comprehensive descriptions and supporting documentation of its accreditation/approval standards necessary for the NCFMEA to make an informed determination of comparability in the areas of administrative personnel and authority; remote sites; curriculum; clinical experience; supporting disciplines; ethics; communication skills; design, implementation and evaluation; admissions, recruiting and publications; student achievement; student services; student complaints; finances; facilities; faculty; library; and clinical teaching facilities as well as COMAEM's review processes and procedures at its Fall 2012 meeting.

However, since the NCFMEA Fall 2011 meeting decision to defer a comparability decision for Mexico's accreditation system, the COMAEM's Executive Director had retired and the agency's professional support staff had been reassigned to different roles within the agency. The agency's application before the NCFMEA was postponed and rescheduled for Fall 2013. The application submitted for that meeting was prepared by the new Executive Director and his new staff. However, due to Tropical Storm Sandy the Fall 2013 meeting of the NCFMEA was cancelled.

At its September 2014 meeting, the NCFMEA determined that the standards used by COMAEM used accreditation standards and evaluation procedures for medical schools comparable to those used in the United States.

The NCFMEA requested that COMAEM provide in its next scheduled report the status of the development of the new standard and evaluation procedures in the areas of; Ethics, data collection, assessing medical school catalogs, publications, or advertising material, its processes and evaluation of financial management, student services, and new Conflict of Interest Standards.

The Country's appearance at the NCFMEA's September 2016 was deferred and rescheduled for September 2017. The country's response to the additional information request by NACFMEA at its 2014 meeting is the subject of this report.

Summary of Findings

Additional information is requested for the following questions. These issues are summarized below and discussed in detail under the Staff Analysis section.-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]-- The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

[]

Staff Analysis

Outstanding Issues

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation procedures in the following areas: Ethics; Program design, implementation and evaluation; admissions, recruiting, medical school catalogs, publications, and advertising material;

Country Narrative

In Ethics we included a new standard, number 20 "Humanistic and sociomedical training" and a standard towards quality Q20. Program design, implementation and evaluation now includes 2 new standards number 2 "Academic and administrative institutional autonomy" and number 16 "Responsibilities of the curricular committee" and a standard towards quality Q16. In Admission we have number 36 "Selection and admission of students" and a standard towards quality Q36. Recruiting now includes 2 new standards, number 35 "Dissemination for selection and admission", number 36 "Selection and admission of students" and a standard towards quality Q36. About Medical School Catalogs, we publish the list of accredited medical schools on our website which has been set up again even though is still in process. For Publications and advertising material we included standard number 35 "Dissemination for selection and admission.

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the country's last review the NCFMEA requested that the country consider further the development of specific standards and process for evaluation of the requirements of this section within its programs.

The country provided its Revised Review Process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing:

ETHICS: Exhibit 1, page 16 (Standard 20 Humanistic and sociomedical training).

PROGRAM DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION: Exhibit 1, page 17 (Standard 2 Academic and Administrative Institutional Autonomy) " and, (Standard 16, Responsibilities of the Curricular Committee),

ADMISSION: Exhibit 1 page 17 (Standard 36 Selection and Admission of Students).

RECRUITING: Exhibit 1 page 18 (Standard 35 Dissemination for Selection and Admission)

MEDICAL SCHOOL CATALOGS: Page 18, PUBLICATIONS AND ADVERTISING MATERIAL (Standard 35 Dissemination for Selection and Admission)

COMAEM has provided its revised standards and policies in response to the additional information previously requested by the NCFMEA regarding the development of the COMAEM's new standards and evaluation procedures. However it is unclear to Department staff as to whether COMAEM has had an opportunity to apply its new standards. The country should provide documentation demonstrating the COMAEM review of a medical school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation process in the following area: monitoring and reevaluations.

Country Narrative

In this area we include modifications to 4 standards:

Number 58 "Monitoring program and evaluation of the academic program"

number 62 "Feedback of the educational process"

Number 63 "Evaluation program of the study plan"

number 64 "Self-assessment program"

And we included the new standards towards quality: Q58, Q62, Q63, and Q65.

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the last review the NCFMEA requested that COMAEM consider further the development of specific standards and process for evaluation of the requirements of this section within its programs.

The COMAEM provided its Revised Review Process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing its monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process of each academic program. The COMAEM also provided its revised standards and process for receiving and processing student complaints about the institution and itself. (Monitoring and Reevaluation: Exhibit 1, pages 21 and 22 (Standards 58, 62, 63 and 64))

The country should provide documentation demonstrating the agency's review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards..

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation procedures in the following areas: Student Services Complaints Finances and Financial reviews:

Country Narrative

In the area of Students services we made modification to standards:

Number 39 "Advisories", number 40 "Medical services and Safety And Hygiene Committee" and we included a new one, number 41 "Representation of students"

We also included 2 quality standards Q39 and Q41.

Student complains now has the new standard number 42 "Attention to complaints"

In finances and financial review we included number 71 "financial sources" and 2 standards of quality Q71 and Q72.1.

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the COMAEM's last review it reported that it is in the process of developing standards and evaluation mechanisms for receiving and processing student complaints about the institution and itself, and how they are used in the agency's re-evaluation or ongoing monitoring of medical schools. It was also determined that the agency did not have standards and quality criteria regarding financial management, that include the clear delineation of business functions, the qualifications of the financial managers, preparation of the budget, and the expectation of effective financial management in carrying out the educational objectives.

The NCFMEA requested that the COMAEM report on the progress of developing standards and evaluation criteria that demonstrates that the institution's student services, financial management, and funding sources are reviewed in the accreditation process. The agency also needed to provide documentation of the application of this requirement.

The COMAEM provided its revised review process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing its monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process of each academic program (Financial Reviews: (Exhibit 1 pages 19 and 20 (Standards 71 and 72)). The agency also provided its revised standards and process for receiving and processing student complaints about the institution and itself.

The country should provide documentation demonstrating the agency's review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit

and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation procedures in the following areas: Conflict-of-interest standards; site visits and clinical site reviews

Country Narrative

Conflict-of-interest area now has a modified standard number 50 "Evaluation of learning" with a new one of quality Q50. Site visits and clinical site reviews, includes 2 standards, number 57 "academic programs" and number 59 "Evaluation of clinical Sites"

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the country's last review COMAEM reported that during meetings in April 2012 and July 2012, draft revisions to the agency's standards requiring it to incorporate conflict of interest by its faculty into its accreditation review process were proposed and are were in its standards development and review process. The NCFMEA requested that the new Conflict of Interest Standards and documentation of implementation during a review process be provided to the Department as soon as the country has had the opportunity to apply the new standards.

The COMAEM provided its revised review process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing conflict-of-interest standards; site visits and clinical site reviews in its monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process of each academic program (Conflict of Interest: Exhibit 1 page 20 (Standard 50))

The COMAEM should provide documentation demonstrating the agency's review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and

procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation procedures in the following areas: Substantive Changes; and monitoring and reevaluations.

Country Narrative

COMAEM's policy on substantive changes is in process. It seeks to have information on changes an institution may apply to any part of its medical education program, including any aspect that has direct influence on academic, pedagogic, administrative, financial or social factors that could affect the educational process in compliance with COMAEM standards.

We are also in the final stages of structuring a computerized system that allows the following activities by stakeholders.

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the CONAEM's last review Department staff found that it is was not clear how it is notified of an institution's substantive changes. The CONAEM and the Department agreed that more information was needed on the process used to inform the agency about substantive changes to their accredited institution's medical educational program, student body, or resources. The CONAEM committed to develop evaluation methods and processes that would describe and demonstrate how those substantive changes are reviewed during the accreditation/monitoring process.

The NCFMEA requested that at the CONAEM's next scheduled report it provide a status on their new substantive change review process and/or provide documentation demonstrating the process used to notify the CONAEM of an institution's substantive changes approved by the Secretary of Education who was the authority for reviewing and approving substantive changes.

The CONAEM narrative informs the Department that its policy and standards on Substantive Change is still in progress and no documentation was provided.

CONAEM must provide additional information explaining the timeline for the policy to be approved.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation process in the following areas: program design, implementation and evaluation

Country Narrative

Program design, implementation and evaluation now includes standard 2 modified "Academic and administrative institutional autonomy" and a new standard number 16 "Responsibilities of the curricular committee" and a standard towards quality Q16.

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the COMAEM's last review, Department staff was not clear if the data used is sufficient to assess program quality . After further review of the documentation and direct communication with the COMAEM.. Department staff had concluded that the COMAEM's guidance to its institutions could be more specific to this requirement if it developed standards and procedures requiring its institutions to develop data and data collection procedures that would satisfy the specific requirements of this section. The NCFMEA requested that the COMAEM's in its next scheduled report provide the status and an update on the development of standards and processes addressing this requirement. The COMAEM also needed to provide documentation of the application of this requirement.

The COMAEM's provided its Revised Review Process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing program design, implementation and evaluation in the monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process of each academic program. (Program Design Implementation and Evaluation: Exhibit 1 page 17 (Standards 2 and 16)).

The country should provide documentation demonstrating the agency's review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation process in the following areas: administrations, recruiting, medical school catalogs, publications, and advertising material.

Country Narrative

Recruiting now includes 2 new standards, number 35 "Dissemination for selection and admission", number 36 "Selection and admission of students" and a standard towards quality Q36.

About Medical School Catalogs, we publish the list of accredited medical schools on our website which has been set up again even though is still in process.

For Publications and advertising material we included standard number 35 " Dissemination for selection and admission.

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the last review, Department staff was unable to verify that COMAEM has any guidelines for assessing medical school catalogs, publications, or advertising material. The COMAEM affirmed that their accredited schools comply with Article 32 of the Federal Consumer Protection Law which includes the requirements for honest advertising by the country's institutions. The agency also provided a copy of the law . Department staff's communication with the COMAEM concluded in an agreement that the COMAEM would consider developing specific standards and procedures for the review and evaluation of the institution's compliance with those standards that address the requirements of this section. The NCFMEA requested that the COMAEM in its next scheduled report provided the status and details of the development of its standards and procedures that specifically address this requirement. The COMAEM also needed to provide documentation of the application of this requirement.

The COMAEM provided its Revised Review Process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing administration , recruiting, medical school catalogs, publications, and advertising material in the monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process of each academic program. (Admission: Exhibit 1 page 17 (Standard 36); Recruiting: Exhibit 1 page 18 (Standards 35 and 36); (Publication and Advertising Material: Exhibit 1 pages 18 and 19 (Standard 35)).

The country should provide documentation demonstrating the agency's review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation process in the following areas: student complaints

Country Narrative

Student complains now has the new standard number 42 "Attention to complaints"

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the COMAEM's last review it reported that during meetings in April 2012 and July 2012, draft revisions to its standards requiring it to incorporate investigating complaints from students into its accreditation process were completed and will be included in the new Self-Assessment Instrument. The NCFMEA requested that the new student complaint standards and documentation of implementation during a review process be provided to the Department as soon as the COMAEM has had the opportunity to apply the new standards.

The COMAEM provided its Revised Review Process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing student complaints in the monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process of each academic program. (Student Complaints: Exhibit 1 page 19 (Standard 42)).

The COMAEM should provide documentation demonstrating the review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation process in the following areas: finances and financial reviews

Country Narrative

In finances and financial review we included number 71 "financial sources" and 2 standards of quality Q71 and Q72.1.

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the COMAEM last review Department staff found that while the COMAEM reported that evaluation teams are trained and competent to evaluate the institution's financial resources, it did not provide any documentation that would allow Department staff to evaluate its compliance with the requirements of this section. The COMAEM affirmed that it would develop standards and quality criteria regarding financial management, that include the clear delineation of business functions, the qualifications of the financial managers, preparation of the budget, and the expectation of effective financial management in carrying out the educational objectives. The NCFMEA requested that the COMAEM provide with its next scheduled report specific standards, processes and evaluation criteria that demonstrates that the institution's financial management and funding sources are reviewed during the accreditation process. The COMAEM also needed to provide documentation of the application of this requirement.

The country provided its Revised Review Process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing finances and financial reviews in the monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process

of each academic program. (Finances and Financial Reviews: Exhibit 1 page 19 (Standard 71)).

The country should provide documentation demonstrating the agency's review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)
5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested

Please respond to the status of the development of the country's new standards and evaluation process in the following area: site visits and clinical site reviews

Country Narrative

Site visits and clinical site reviews, includes 2 standards, number 57 "academic programs" and number 59 "Evaluation of clinical Sites"

Analyst Remarks to Narrative

In the COMAEM's last review Department staff concluded that more information was needed on COMAEM's review process of clinical sites and how often they are conducted. . The NCFMEA requested that the COMEAM at its next scheduled report provide the status of its progress towards including this requirement in its accreditation standards and process and to provide documentation demonstrating the application of its new standards and processes.

The COMEAM provided its revised review process for its National Accreditation System which includes its new standards and evaluation procedures addressing site visits and clinical site reviews in the monitoring and re-evaluation as part of the follow-up process of each academic program. (Evaluation of Clinical Sites and Clinical Site Visits: Exhibit 1 page 20 and 21 (Standards 57 and 58)).

The country should provide documentation demonstrating the agency's review of a school for compliance with its new standards if it has conducted the review of a medical school in accordance with its new standards.

Country Response

Currently COMAEM has five institutions in phase of Self-assessment, they are answering the 2017 version of the Instrument in the new computerized system:

1. Facultad de Medicina de la UNAM,
2. Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (UASLP)
3. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (UAEM)
4. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL)

5. Universidad de Monterrey (UDEM)

We hope that by the end of the year the self-assessment will be concluded in one of these institutions to realize a verification visit and subsequently the opinion.

Analyst Remarks to Response

In response to the staff's draft analysis the COMAEM provided an example or a portion of its revised Self-Assessment instrument for the Universidad de Monterrey (University of Monterrey) that include instructions and the institution's responses to the standards requirements based on COMAEM's revised process and standards for its National Accreditation System. While the document is not complete and not translated into English, the documentation provided include sections with the numbers recognized as some of the revised standards provided by the COMAEM in its initial submission reviewed by Department staff. The sections 8.1 through 8.4 seem to align with the standard's regarding the institution's mission and objectives and the qualifications of its administrators. COMAEM also reports that it currently has five institutions preparing self-assessments under its new monitoring policies and procedures. However, none of them have completed the process nor does it appear that COMAEM had the opportunity to evaluate any of the institutions for compliance with its revised standards and processes. The country is due for redetermination of its comparability at its next appearance before the NCFMEA

The COMAEM needs to provide documentation demonstrating its complete review of a school for compliance with its new standards. The documentation must demonstrate a completed self-assessment, a complete review by the COMAEM site-team and a final accreditation decision by the COMAEM. The documentation also must be provided in English.

Staff Conclusion: Additional Information requested
