

## Education Committee

Agenda for the meeting to be held on 7 February 2023 at the Royal College of Nursing.

1.	<b>Welcome and Apologies for absence</b>	
2.	<b>Declarations of interest</b>	
3.	<b>Education Committee Minutes</b> a) Minutes of meeting held on 15 November 2022	Paper Attached
4.	<b>Matters arising</b>	
5.	<b>Education Department update</b>	Oral Report
6.	<b>Primary Qualifications Sub-Committee (PQSC)</b> a) Minutes from the meeting held on 6 January 2023 b) Ratify Panel members for 2023 accreditations c) AVBC RCVS MRA	Paper Attached Paper Attached Oral Report
7.	<b>SME</b> a) SME Update (candidates, new examiners and tender) b) Mitigating circumstances form	Oral Update Paper Attached
8.	<b>EMS Database Specification</b>	Paper Attached
9.	<b>Advanced Practitioner Status</b> a) Advanced Practitioners in Telemedicine b) Report from Clinical Careers stakeholder event	Paper Attached Paper Attached
10.	<b>CPD</b> Outcomes of CPD Audit 2022	Paper Attached
11.	<b>Specialist Subcommittee minutes</b> Minutes from the meeting held on 5 January 2023	Paper Attached
12.	Proposal for Direct Accreditation of EU Vet Programmes	Paper Attached
13.	<b>Risk register</b> Items to add to the Risk Register	Paper Attached
14.	<b>AOB</b>	
15.	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	<b>May 2023</b>



**Education Committee membership**

Dr Abbie Calow

Dr Niall Connell

Ms Linda Ford

Mrs Susan Howarth

Professor Tim Parkin – also Chair of Specialist Recognition Subcommittee

Dr Kate Richards (Chair)

Professor Chris Proudman

Professor Stuart Reid

Professor Susan Rhind

**Student Members:**

Ms Anna Bradbury

Ms Kate Dakin

**Operations Board member as observer:** Mrs Susan (Sue) Paterson (also chair of VetGDP subcommittee)

**Chairs of Education Subcommittees:**

Dr Melissa Donald, CertAVP

Dr Joanne Dyer, PQSC and EMS co-ordinators Liaison Group

Professor Nigel Gibbens, Accreditation Review Group

Professor Stephen May, Panel of Assessors for Advanced Practitioner Status

## Full terms of reference agreed by Council June 2015

1. The Education Committee shall set the policy for undergraduate and postgraduate education and training of veterinary surgeons and determine the requirements for those seeking registration, for the award of qualifications under the Charter, for continuing professional development, and for recognition as RCVS Advanced Practitioner and RCVS Specialist.
2. The Committee shall develop and keep under review education and training requirements for registration, and in particular shall:
  - define "day 1 competences" and advise on the content of the veterinary undergraduate curriculum;
  - oversee the approval process and ongoing monitoring of veterinary degrees and international recognition agreements, considering sub-committee reports on appointment of visitors, visitation reports, follow-up reports and annual monitoring reports from veterinary schools, sub-committee reports on overseas degrees from other accrediting bodies, and sub-committee reports on operation of the statutory membership examination;
  - make decisions on recognition of registrable veterinary degrees;
  - make recommendations to Council on the regulations governing the statutory membership examination and on the regulations governing practice by students.
3. The Committee shall develop and keep under review policy for continuing professional development, revalidation and postgraduate training and qualifications, and in particular shall:
  - define "year 1 competences" and monitor the postgraduate development phase;
  - set the requirements for and monitor continuing professional development within the profession;
  - develop and maintain a framework of College postgraduate awards, receiving reports from sub-committees on the standards for College-awarded certificates, diplomas and fellowships, examinations and accreditation of other recognised postgraduate qualifications as part of the framework;
  - define the requirements for RCVS Advanced Practitioner and RCVS Specialist status, receiving reports from sub-committees on the maintenance of lists for Advanced Practitioners and Specialists; and
  - recommend to Council amendments to the certificate and diploma and Fellowship bye-laws.
4. The Committee shall recommend fees to the Operational Board for candidates, examiners and visitors, Advanced Practitioners, Specialists and Fellows.

<b>Summary</b>	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	7 February 2023
Title	Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2022
Summary	Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2022
Decisions required	To note
Attachments	Classified Appendix
Author	Britta Crawford Senior Education officer <a href="mailto:b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk">b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk</a> / 020 7202 0777

<b>Classifications</b>		
<b>Document</b>	<b>Classification<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Rationales<sup>2</sup></b>
Paper	Unclassified	

**<sup>1</sup>Classifications explained**

Unclassified	Papers will be published on the internet and recipients may share them and discuss them freely with anyone. This may include papers marked 'Draft'.
Confidential	Temporarily available only to Council Members, non-Council members of the relevant committee, sub-committee, working party or Board and not for dissemination outside that group unless and until the relevant committee or Council has given approval for public discussion, consultation or publication.
Private	The paper includes personal data which should not be disclosed at any time or for any reason, unless the data subject has agreed otherwise. The Chair may, however, indicate after discussion that there are general issues which can be disclosed, for example in reports to committees and Council.

**<sup>2</sup>Classification rationales**

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others</li> <li>2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation</li> <li>3. To protect commercially sensitive information</li> <li>4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS</li> </ol>
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. To protect information which may contain personal data, special category data, and/or criminal offence data, as listed under the General Data Protection Regulation</li> </ol>

## Education Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2022

<b>Members:</b>	Dr Abbie Calow	
	Dr Niall Connell	
	Ms Linda Ford	- Lay member
	Professor Tim Parkin	
	Mrs Susan Howarth	
	Professor Chris Proudman	
	Professor Stuart Reid	
	*Professor Susan Rhind	
	Dr Kate Richards	- Chair
	Ms Anna Bradbury	- Student representative
	Ms Kate Dakin	- Student representative
<b>By invitation:</b>	*Dr Melissa Donald	- CertAVP Subcommittee Chair
	Professor Stephen May	- Advanced Practitioner Panel Chair
	Dr Joanne Dyer	- PQSC Chair
	Dr Susan (Sue) Paterson	- VetGDP subcommittee Chair and Observer
	Professor Nigel Gibbens	- Chair of Accreditation Review Working Party
<b>In attendance:</b>	Mr Duncan Ash	- Senior Education Officer
	Dr Jude Bradbury	- Examinations Manager
	Dr Linda Prescott-Clements	- Director of Education
	Mrs Britta Crawford	- Senior Education Officer
	Ms Claire Holliday	- Senior Education Officer
	Mr Jordan Nicholls	- Lead for Undergraduate Education
	Ms Esther Kadama	- Education Assistant
	Ms Beckie Smith	- Senior Education Officer
	Ms Jenny Soreskog-Turp	- Lead for Postgraduate Education
	Mr Kieran Thakrar	- Education Officer
	Mrs Kirsty Williams	- Quality Assurance Manager
	Ms Lizzie Lockett	- CEO

### Apologies for absence and welcome

1. Apologies were sent from Susan Rhind and Melissa Donald.

### **Declarations of interest**

2. There were no new declarations.

### **Minutes**

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2022 were agreed with a spelling correction in paragraph 7 (“Australasian” Veterinary Board) and in paragraph 8 regarding EMS, the year 2025 should be corrected to 2024.

### **Matters arising**

4. The Committee noted that all actions had been completed or were in progress.
5. Regarding the licensing of the VetGDP online learning programme for Advisers, it was reported that Dr Donald had discussed the issue with a contact at the BBC and that discussions were still ongoing. It was agreed that a paper would come back to the Education Committee in February. It was also reported that the Future of EMS policy, agreed at the last Education Committee meeting, had been published prior to the meeting and had received supportive comments.

### **Education Department update**

6. The Director of Education, Dr Prescott-Clements, gave an oral update on the work of the Education Department. The mapping document against the new Office for Students standards had been taken to the Veterinary Nursing Education Committee, who reached the same conclusions as this committee. After an enormous amount of work, it was reported that the College will be submitting the self-assessment report (SAR) for ENQA today and that there is a scheduled visit in March 2023. The Committee heard that Education department members will be presenting at the London Vet Show on the topics of CPD, the Advanced Practitioner review and EMS. The Committee was pleased to hear that the literature review, that was commissioned to inform the accreditation methodology review, has been accepted for publication in the Journal of Veterinary Medical Education.

### **Primary Qualifications Sub-Committee (PQSC)**

#### **Report of the sub-committee meetings held on the 12 October 2022**

7. The minutes of the PQSC meeting held in October were received. Members heard that the sub-committee had sought volunteers for a PQSC Vice Chair. Professor Jim Anderson had offered to take on the role and had been appointed.
8. There had been discussion around which teaching staff need to be on the RCVS practicing register, and it had been agreed that the RCVS would draft some further guidance regarding this and circulate to PQSC for consideration.



9. There had been further discussions arising from the AVBC Annual Monitoring reports PQSC had originally seen at the August meeting. Members heard that the RCVS Education team had conducted further investigation and provided some additional clarifications to PQSC queries. The remaining queries had been sent to AVBC, and PQSC were awaiting a response.
10. Members were informed that there had been discussion on the Pretoria report, however, this was an agenda item for this Education Committee, and would be detailed further at that point.
11. It was noted that during the August meeting, PQSC had also discussed the process for removing individuals from the list of RCVS accreditation panel members, considered the Statutory Membership Examination (SME) Board reports and received an update about the ENQA SAR.
12. A question was raised around removal of accreditation panel members from the database. Members wanted to know how someone would know if they had been removed and what the process would be for this. It was explained that the panel member database would act as a pool of people, rather than a list that people could be removed from. For example, if a panel member had acted inappropriately on a visit, they would not be removed, they just would no longer be appointed from the pool of potential panel members. Education Committee was informed that all panel members would receive information about the required skills and attitudes of all panel members, as well as examples of behaviours that would be considered inappropriate, during the new panel member online training modules.
13. A question was raised asking whether all panel members needed to be MRCVS. Members were informed that whilst the majority of panel members would be MRCVS, it was not required of all panel members, this would enable other educational specialists who were not MRCVS to become panel members or international experts licensed in their own country. Furthermore, a range of panel members would be selected for each accreditation event to ensure that a suitable mix of backgrounds and experience were included in each panel member team.

### **EMS Database Specification**

14. In September 2021, Education Committee approved the draft specification for the EMS Database. As work on building the database was beginning, the specification was shared with the Vet Schools Council (VSC) and the VSC EMS Coordinators Group for comment to gain some further stakeholder input. A response was received, that the committee noted as part of a paper that also summarised the main themes of the comments and feedback.
15. Based on the comments from VSC and EMS Coordinators, Education Committee were asked to consider the following:
  - a) To approve the addition of insurance forms to be supplied by placement providers, with overall step of school approval to be included in the specification,
  - b) To consider potential processes around reporting problem placements,
  - c) To approve the addition of the option to add placements that are currently not listed on the database to the specification.

16. There was a question as to whether any other stakeholders had been consulted with on the specification, and it was explained that RCVS would be holding further focus groups with EMS providers in December to gain some further feedback from their perspective.
17. There were some concerns that with the addition of the step to include insurance forms being signed off, it could appear that RCVS was taking on the responsibility of overall care for students whilst on placements, which is the responsibility of vet schools. However, it was clarified that this had not been the intention for the database, which was being designed more around the booking of suitable placements, and that overall care of students would remain the within schools' responsibility as they would be the ones signed off and approving placements, with RCVS simply hosting the database.
18. In a discussion around possible processes for reporting "problem" placements, it was agreed that ultimately this responsibility should remain within the schools' internal processes, and RCVS would only act to remove placements from the database if they were formally approached by schools to do so. This way, it would ensure that there was a process for placements to be removed without direct involvement from RCVS and could also soothe any potential concerns providers may have had in instances of RCVS "investigating" issues on placements. Therefore, essentially the same process would follow as they did currently, whereby if students or schools had any further larger concerns with placements, they would need to formally report these to RCVS through the normal existing professional conduct chain.
19. It was agreed to add in points a. and c. to the specification.

**Action: Add in additional functionality to the database specification.**

### **Future EMS roll-out plan**

20. After Education Committee had approved working towards implementing the future plans for EMS in 2024, the RCVS had published these and begun to receive a number of queries from both the veterinary schools and students as to which cohort years the future policy would apply to, as currently years 1-3 would still be enrolled as students in 2024.
21. Therefore, it was proposed that the new policy would be introduced for the in-coming first year students in 2024, and then rolled out on an annual basis following that until all cohorts would be under the new policy and system. Although it would mean that there would need to be two systems running concurrently, it would make it clearer as to who the new policy applied to and avoid complications in working out new requirements for existing cohorts and situations where students may complete less EMS in the meantime as they waited for a new system to be adopted with a reduced requirement.
22. There was a question around what would happen with the proposed timelines if it became clear during piloting that the database and / or new system may not be effective. It was acknowledged that it would be difficult to completely predict how a pilot would work out, but at the same time plans would have to be made against a timetable. However, it was clarified if there were any real concerns over the success of full implementation, the timetables could be reassessed in future.

23. Education Committee ultimately agreed to the proposal to roll out the new policy from 2024, starting with the incoming first years.

### **VetGDP: Update from the VetGDP subcommittee – minutes from the meeting on the 22 September 2022**

24. Dr Paterson presented the minutes of the VetGDP subcommittee. She informed the Committee that a three-year time limit had been set up for the VetGDP and was pleased to note graduates in almost all roles were able to successfully use the VetGDP. There had been several requests for further EPAs which had not been agreed but were useful in tweaking the current EPAs rather than creating a large bank of overlapping examples. Professor May raised the question of euthanasia and was informed that it had been discussed by the subcommittee and made more explicit within an EPA but would be discussed further at the next subcommittee meeting.

**Action: Euthanasia EPA to be discussed at next meeting of the VetGDP subcommittee**

### **CPD**

25. The Committee received and noted the minutes from the last meeting of the CPD Policy and Compliance subcommittee. Ms Ford gave a brief overview of discussions which included 1CPD usage and compliance. The data showed that some users have not reflected on their learning even though it is part of the CPD requirement for 2022. At the moment, it is not clear in 1CPD that members are not compliant simply by recording the hours, therefore the CPD Committee agreed that they could not enforce the requirement to reflect on CPD until the features were available in 1CPD. Education Committee were reassured that members would receive communication to help them understand the requirement and how to reflect using 1CPD.

### **CertAVP: minutes from the meeting 27 September 2022**

26. Mrs Crawford presented the minutes from the CertAVP subcommittee meeting held on 27 September 2022 which were received and noted.

### **Discussion on new awards**

27. Education Committee were asked to consider whether RCVS should introduce an awards system to recognise EMS providers that went over and above in giving EMS experiences to students.
28. Some members felt that this might not be the best course of action due to there already being a high number of awards available in the veterinary profession and industry, and not wanting to add to a potentially over saturated market. Also, whilst awards themselves were positive, it was argued that they only give credit to small numbers, whereas with something like EMS there would be so many more providers that could be seen to be going unrecognised if individuals were singled out and being rewarded, when all providers should really be being rewarded. Therefore, there was not an appetite to introduce an awards system for EMS providers.

29. Awards for the VetGDP were discussed with a similar response, with some feeling that it would be more appropriate to have rewards for the many rather than few. Other members questioning if a reward was appropriate for a programme which was mandatory for new graduates and the practices employing them.
30. It was suggested that the Education Department should review plans to consider how RCVS can recognise practices who are doing an excellent job in supporting students and recent graduates, and if an awards scheme based on achievements rather than nominations can be implemented.

**Action: Education Department to review plans for awards and report back to Education Committee.**

#### **Fellowship subcommittee minutes**

31. The minutes from the Fellowship Sub-Committee meeting held on 12 September 2022 were received and noted without comment.

#### **Risk Register**

32. Reference to the risk register is included in the confidential appendix.

#### **Any other business**

33. There was no other business.

#### **Date of Next Meeting**

34. The date of the next meeting is 7 February 2023 in person. Venue to be announced.

Britta Crawford  
November 2022  
[b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk](mailto:b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk)

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee (EC)
Date	7 February 2023
Title	Statutory Membership Exam (SME) Mitigating Circumstances Form
Summary	Following a review of the RCVS appeals process by a member of the General Medical Council (GMC), it was recommended that a mitigating circumstances form and process be implemented. This form is intended to be used by exam candidates experiencing extenuating circumstances in the time immediately prior to their exam or on the day of their exam. Submission of this form will allow an exam candidate to defer their exam or request a discretionary refund from the Exam Board.
Decisions required	EC are asked to approve implementation of the mitigating circumstances form for the 2023 Statutory Membership Exam.
Attachments	None
Author	Jude Bradbury Examinations Manager <a href="mailto:j.bradbury@rcvs.org.uk">j.bradbury@rcvs.org.uk</a> / 020 7050 5043

Classifications		
Document	Classification <sup>1</sup>	Rationales <sup>2</sup>
Paper	Unclassified	

## <sup>1</sup>Classifications explained

Unclassified	Papers will be published on the internet and recipients may share them and discuss them freely with anyone. This may include papers marked 'Draft'.
Confidential	Temporarily available only to Council Members, non-Council members of the relevant committee, sub-committee, working party or Board and not for dissemination outside that group unless and until the relevant committee or Council has given approval for public discussion, consultation or publication.
Private	The paper includes personal data which should not be disclosed at any time or for any reason, unless the data subject has agreed otherwise. The Chair may, however, indicate after discussion that there are general issues which can be disclosed, for example in reports to committees and Council.

## <sup>2</sup>Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others</li><li>2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation</li><li>3. To protect commercially sensitive information</li><li>4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS</li></ol>
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. To protect information which may contain personal data, special category data, and/or criminal offence data, as listed under the General Data Protection Regulation</li></ol>

## Statutory Membership Exam Mitigating Circumstances Form

Please use this form to declare mitigating circumstances if you wish to withdraw from either the written examination, or practical examination (OSCE) and request a deferred sitting or discretionary refund of the exam fee (excluding administration fees). You should indicate within Section 4 whether you are requesting a deferred sitting or discretionary refund. Submitted mitigating circumstances will be reviewed by the Exam Board at the next available board meeting.

### Important points to note:

By submitting a mitigating circumstance form you are indicating that you are 'unfit to sit' the examination. If you submit a mitigating circumstances form but then choose to sit the Statutory Membership Exam your mitigating circumstances will be disregarded, as by taking the exam you are declaring yourself as 'fit to sit'. Any parts of the exam which have been taken prior to the submission of mitigating circumstances will still be counted as an attempt to sit the exam and marked accordingly.

### Section 1: Candidate Information

Forename:	Surname:
RCVS ID:	Email:

### Section 2: Exam details

Please list which day/s of the exam were impacted by your mitigating circumstance.

Exam date/s:
--------------

### Section 3: Nature of Mitigating Circumstance (Please select the box(es) that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PERSONAL ILLNESS OR ACCIDENT</b> An illness or accident which is likely to have a significant effect on preparation or performance.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>DEATH OF CLOSE RELATIVE OR PARTNER</b> Loss of a person very close to you. This usually means a parent, sibling, child or person with whom you live.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>ILLNESS OF A CLOSE RELATIVE OR PARTNER</b> Serious illness of a person very close to you. This usually means a parent, sibling, child or person with whom you live.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PERSONAL OR OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES</b> Very serious personal unforeseeable circumstances likely to have a significant effect on your performance.

**Section 4: Supporting Statement**

Please explain the **nature** and **impact** of your mitigating circumstances for the Board to consider.

- *Please remember if you take the assessment after submitting your claim, your claim will be disregarded.*

I would like to defer my examination/request a discretionary refund (*delete as appropriate*) on the following grounds:

**Section 5: Supporting Evidence**

Is a medical certificate or other corroborating evidence attached that details the significant impact on your ability? Please note supporting evidence will be required for your mitigating circumstances to be considered.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>

If you answered NO, please explain when you will be able to provide the evidence, or why you are not able to do so.

**Section 6: Declaration**

I wish the Statutory Membership Exam Board to consider my application for mitigation in relation to my examination. I understand that by submitting this form I am declaring I am unfit or became unfit to sit the exam. I understand that if the Board offers me deferred examination, I must make myself available for that examination which may be in the next academic year.

I declare the information I have given to be true and I understand that the RCVS regards the submission of a false application for mitigation as a very serious offence which could result in permanent exclusion from the exam.



Candidate Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Additional guidance on decision making:

- a) Only genuine cases of mitigating circumstances shall be considered by the Statutory Membership Examination Board. Circumstances shall be considered to be genuine when sufficient supporting evidence is provided, such as;
  - i. A doctor's note stating the nature and extent of the illness on the exam day/s stated.
  - ii. A death certificate in the event of a bereavement (it is understood that these may not be immediately available and can be submitted at the earliest possibility).
  - iii. An accident report resulting in inability to attend the examination.
  - iv. Any other official report or document e.g police report, linking to an incident over the exam period stated.
  
- b) Based on the evidence and request submitted by the candidate the Exam Board can choose to either:
  - i. Defer the candidate to the next available assessment point (at present this would result in deferral to the following year).
  - ii. Grant a full discretionary refund of £2200. If a candidate withdraws from the exam during the normal withdrawal period (up until 28 days prior to the written exam) then the Statutory Membership Examination refund policy will apply as per the exam guidance.
  
- c) The Exam Board will consider the results of any part of the examination which may have been taken prior to the submission of mitigating circumstances.
  - i. If the candidate has failed an aspect of the examination, then the mitigating circumstances will be considered void, and the normal Statutory Membership Examination rules will be followed.
  - ii. If the candidate has passed all aspects of the examination prior to mitigating circumstances and has requested deferral, then the Board can choose to allow those results to be carried forward to the next available assessment point.
  
- d) Any candidate who is granted deferral will need to sit the examination at the next available assessment point. If the candidate is not able to sit at the next available assessment point, then any previous passing results carried forward will be void and normal Statutory Membership Examination rules will be followed.

<b>Summary</b>	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	7 February 2023
Title	Advanced Practitioners in Telemedicine
Summary	This paper gives an overview of the current issues surrounding Advanced Practitioners (APs) working in telemedicine.
Decisions required	Education Committee is asked to decide how many telemedicine cases are acceptable as part of an application for AP Status
Attachments	None
Author	Laura Hogg Senior Education Officer l.hogg@rcvs.org.uk / 020 7856 1035

<b>Classifications</b>		
<b>Document</b>	<b>Classification<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Rationales<sup>2</sup></b>
Paper	Unclassified	
<b><sup>1</sup>Classifications explained</b>		
Unclassified	Papers will be published on the internet and recipients may share them and discuss them freely with anyone. This may include papers marked 'Draft'.	
Confidential	Temporarily available only to Council Members, non-Council members of the relevant committee, sub-committee, working party or Board and not for dissemination outside that group unless and until the relevant committee or Council has given approval for public discussion, consultation or publication.	
Private	The paper includes personal data which should not be disclosed at any time or for any reason, unless the data subject has agreed otherwise. The Chair may, however, indicate after discussion that there are general issues which can be disclosed, for example in reports to committees and Council.	

## Introduction

1. 'Advanced Practitioner' (AP) status is an official recognition of a veterinary surgeon's particular knowledge and skills in a designated field of veterinary practice. Those on the list hold a postgraduate qualification in their designated area of interest, in addition to their initial veterinary degree, and have also demonstrated that they are keeping up to date with their knowledge and competence in their chosen area.
2. Over a five-year period applicants for AP status (and those renewing their status) are required to have completed 250 total hours of CPD, with 125 of those being in their designated subject area. Since 2018, APs have been required to complete 10 hours per year of "external" CPD. They must also provide a statement describing the ways in which they have been involved in clinical governance and provide at least one reference from a veterinary surgeon who has worked with them over the previous five years.

## Casework requirements for APs

3. Since 2018, Advanced Practitioners have been required to see an average of 100 cases per year in their designation area to demonstrate that they are actively working in the relevant field of clinical practice. Given the rise in the number of vets practising telemedicine during the Covid-19 pandemic, there have been questions raised by APs about whether telemedicine cases could count towards this requirement, or if all 100 cases must be seen in person. (This does not mean that APs could not be involved in telemedicine for a proportion of their work, rather, that the cases counted towards their application must be in person)
4. If a physical examination or in-person treatment became necessary during a telemedicine case, another veterinary surgeon may be required to undertake that work. This raises a question about whether an AP is "actively working in clinical practice" if they are not the vet who is undertaking several aspects of a patient's treatment.
5. While some designations may be well suited to telemedicine, others are not. For example, it would be very difficult to be "actively practising" in some designation areas such as Small Animal Surgery without the vet being able to see and treat the patient in person.
6. Regardless of how much of a consultation could be completed over the phone or online, there may always be a chance that in-person treatment could be required. Furthermore, it stands to reason that most APs in general practice are likely to have typically completed or supervised a range of necessary diagnostic tasks such as taking x-rays or biopsies themselves, rather than referring a patient to another clinic for these procedures. Therefore, allowing APs to include a significant number of telemedicine cases in their case numbers could fundamentally change the nature of an AP's work.
7. In the interest of fairness and consistency, the amendment to the policy around casework requirements should be applied equally across designations.

**Next Steps**

8. Education Committee is asked to discuss the following:

- Should APs be permitted to include telemedicine cases as part of their case number requirement on their application?
- Should APs spend a minimum percentage of their time in face-to-face practice?