



EDUCATION POLICY AND SPECIALISATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 11 FEBRUARY 2009

Present:	Professor Malcolm Bennett	
	Dr Christopher J Chesney	
	Mrs Beverley D Cottrell	
	Professor Sheila M Crispin	
	Dr Jerry V Davies	Treasurer
	Professor Gary England	Observer
	Professor Michael E Herrtage	
	Dr J Barry Johnson	
	Professor Stephen A May	Chairman
	Professor Quintin A McKellar*	
	Dr Bob Moore	SVP
	Mrs P Jill Nute	President
	Professor Stuart W J Reid	Vice-Chairman
	Mr Geoff C Skerritt	
	Mr Richard Stephenson	
	Dr Frank G R Taylor*	
	Professor A Sandy J Trees	JVP
	Dr Bradley P Viner	
	Professor Elaine D Watson*	

* Absent

In attendance:	Mrs Freda M Andrews	Head of Education
	Mr Duncan Ash	Administrative Officer
	Miss Britta Crawford	Education Officer
	Miss Janet R Etheridge	Specialisation Manager
	Miss Jane C Hern	Registrar
	Miss Anne L Jermey	Committee Secretary
	Mr Jordan Nicholls	Administrative Officer

APOLOGIES

1. Apologies for absence were received from Dr Taylor, Professor McKellar and Professor Watson.
2. It was agreed that the Chairman should write to express disappointment that three Heads of School had been unable to attend on this occasion.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3. The Chairman invited members to declare any interests that had not been recorded previously or which had a bearing on the meeting's agenda items.

Dr Christopher Chesney	RCVS Recognised Specialist, enrolled for Fellowship
Mr Richard Stephenson	Enrolled for CertAVP
Mrs Beverley Cottrell	Enrolled for Fellowship
Mr Geoff Skerritt	Practice approved to be a nursing college
Dr Bradley Viner	Enrolled for Fellowship

4. The Chairman reported that Dr Chesney had also declared a vested interest in the discussion about Emeritus Specialist status and offered to withdraw from the meeting for that discussion. The Chairman's view was that all members were able to speak from different perspectives on behalf of the profession and that it was important they were allowed to express their views. The Committee agreed.

MINUTES

5. The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2008 were accepted as a true record.

MATTERS ARISING**Letter to AVMA¹ Director of Education & Research**

6. The Head of Education's letter of 18 December 2008 to Dr Granstrom, Director of Education and Research at AVMA, was received for information. The letter related to paragraphs 59 and 60 of the October 2008 EPSC minutes and to paragraphs 7 to 12 of the December 2008 Primary Qualifications Sub-Committee (PQSC) minutes.
7. Professor Sandy Trees urged PQSC to be rigorous in its scrutiny of US graduates' education. Dr Barry Johnson, PQSC Chairman, referred to the RCVS letter of 18 December which made clear that RCVS would seek further information when necessary. Professor Stuart Reid added that the North American Deans were very happy to provide any information that RCVS requested and had been extremely helpful.

Anti-plagiarism Software

8. The Head of Education, Mrs Freda Andrews, had investigated use of anti-plagiarism software as requested in paragraphs 33 to 35 of the October 2008 EPSC minutes. A free trial of "Turnitin", the most commonly used software in universities, had detected the known case as well as further examples in the same casebook. The Head of Education reported that the software was fairly time-consuming to use, but proposed that it could be used to test a 10% sample of submitted work which would act as a deterrent and enable examiners to ask for a

¹ AVMA – American Veterinary Medical Association

check to be made in certain cases.

9. It was noted that candidates would need to be given clear guidance, including guidance on the difference between plagiarising and quoting texts, as this was commonly misunderstood.
10. It was suggested that candidates might wish to pay for this service to check their work before submission. The Head of Education said that the quote that RCVS had received did not include this and therefore she suggested that first approval be sought from Planning and Resources Committee to obtain an awarding body licence for use and that use by candidates could be looked into at a later stage.

EAEVE² MATTERS

11. The following papers were received for information:

- Notes of a meeting with the Commission, EAEVE and FVE³ on 6 October 2008 at the FVE office in Brussels
- Notes of a meeting with Robin Oakley, Director EAEVE Evaluation Programme, on 6 January 2009 at RCVS
- List of EAEVE approved/visited institutions as at end December 2008
- RCVS correspondence with SPVS⁴ about the EU Directive

12. The Chairman commended the documents to members saying that they provided a good summary of the structure and approach in Europe. It was encouraging that the two EC Directorates recognised that there were issues.
13. Professor Stuart Reid concurred and said that EAEVE had now agreed that clear distinctions should be made between schools that had been visited and approved, those that had been visited and not approved and those that had not even applied for a visit.
14. The new list would go a long way to addressing the concerns of veterinary employers in the UK as they would be able to identify veterinary surgeons from non-approved schools.
15. It was agreed that RCVS should seek editorial coverage in the veterinary press to raise awareness of the list. It was noted that there was a link to the list on the RCVS website but that it was difficult to find. The Registrar confirmed that this would be addressed as part of the work to improve the whole of the RCVS website.
16. The Chairman would write to EAEVE on behalf of the Committee to congratulate them on their part in the meeting and the progress made.

Action: Chairman

² EAEVE – The European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education

³ FVE – Federation of Veterinarians of Europe

⁴ SPVS – The Society of Practising Veterinary Surgeons

EAEVE Criteria

17. The Head of Education reported that EAEVE had now updated their evaluation criteria and therefore the RCVS visitation guidance⁵ needed to be updated.
18. EAEVE had introduced a two-stage process, but RCVS would conduct both stages during a single RCVS visitation.
19. Draft revised visitation guidance had been circulated to Heads of School for comment and it would be sent to PQSC before coming to EPSC in May.
20. Provided it was adopted, the revised guidance would be used for the visitation to RVC in 2010. Mrs Andrews reminded the Committee that RCVS needed to give RVC sufficient time to prepare its self evaluation report.
21. Professor Stuart Reid reported that within EAEVE membership, listed and approved schools were now in the minority. He would be involved in work to review voting rights since it would not be helpful for non-approved schools to use their majority to compromise the EAEVE position on standards for the primary qualification.

PRIMARY QUALIFICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

22. The minutes of the meeting of PQSC held on 10 December 2008 were received.
23. EPSC was invited to approve the names of visitors for the visitation to the RVC in 2010. As a member of RVC staff, Professor Stephen May offered to withdraw for this discussion. As one of the proposed visitors, Professor Stuart Reid would also withdraw if requested. PQSC Chairman, Dr Barry Johnson, invited both to remain.
24. Dr Barry Johnson reported that PQSC had received a follow-up report from Edinburgh following the full visitation in 2005. PQSC was satisfied that no further action was required apart from submission of annual monitoring reports as required of all approved schools.

Visitors for 2010 RVC Visitation

25. Dr Johnson said that there was a full report of PQSC's discussions and their nominations for visitors at Annex A of the minutes. He reminded the Committee that PQSC had followed RCVS procedures for the selection of visitors. However, any serious problem with any of the nominations should be raised.

⁵ RCVS visitation guidance – Criteria and Guidance for RCVS Approval of Veterinary Degree Courses in the UK and Overseas incorporating the requirements and indicators of EAEVE for the evaluation of veterinary training in Europe.

26. EPSC approved the names of visitors as follows:

Chairman	Professor Stuart Reid
Pre-clinical visitor	Professor Stuart Reid or EAEVE nominated visitor
Paraclinical visitor	Professor Susan Rhind
Veterinary Public Health visitor	EAEVE nominated visitor
Production/Animal Husbandry	EAEVE nominated visitor or Mr David Black
Large animal clinical visitor	EAEVE nominated visitor or Mr David Black
Companion Animal Clinical visitor	Professor Ed Hall

27. EAEVE would nominate two visitors including the veterinary public health visitor. AVBC would be invited to nominate an Observer.

QUEENSLAND VSAAC⁶ VISITATION REPORT SEPTEMBER 2008

28. The Committee received the executive summary of VSAAC's visitation report (attached as Confidential **Annex A**) and a paper which gave background to the concerns which RCVS had had about the veterinary degree course at the University of Queensland for a number of years.

29. Dr Barry Johnson summarised these concerns and said that PQSC recommended that Queensland's BVSc degree be conditionally approved for a period of two years.

30. The Committee discussed this matter at length. Some members felt strongly that the unsatisfactory state of affairs had been allowed to persist for too long and that it was now time to withdraw recognition of Queensland's BVSc degree. Dr Johnson reported that PQSC had recommended conditional approval for the following reasons: up until now, RCVS had continued to recognise the degree, and had not imposed conditional approval. This had been a considered response by the Committee as the Vice Chancellor had previously given written assurances that action was in hand to correct deficiencies.

31. At the time of the VSAAC visitation in September 2008, the new Dean had not been in post for very long, so there was an argument for allowing him time to effect the necessary changes which were now moving in the right direction. There was also a new Vice-Chancellor. The veterinary school was undertaking a major relocation to Gatton. Giving 'conditional accreditation' was therefore the next step in the process to give warning that RCVS would withdraw approval if deficiencies were not corrected within the given timeframe.

32. The Committee was reminded of the broader context of ongoing discussions about global accreditation. Although the mutual agreement between AVBC and RCVS allowed each body to make their own decision about recognition of veterinary degrees, it was inevitable that our relationship with AVBC would change if RCVS decided to withdraw recognition

⁶ VSAAC – Veterinary Schools Accreditation Advisory Committee

with immediate effect. AVBC did not have a category of 'conditional approval', but by agreeing to continue accreditation for a limited period of two years, this had the same effect.

33. There was a suggestion that the matter should be put to the vote, but the Committee subsequently took a consensus view.
34. It was agreed to recommend to Council that Queensland's BVSc degree be conditionally approved for a maximum period of two years, on the understanding that approval beyond that time is subject to the condition that all the remaining deficiencies noted in the AVBC report must have been rectified.

Action: Recommend to Council

EMS REVIEW WORKING PARTY

35. The report of the first meeting held on 11 December 2008 was received and noted.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PHASE (PDP) UPDATE

36. The Committee noted that 89% (564) of UK 2007 graduates had signed up for PDP of whom 204 had been signed off as having completed. Seventy-six percent (463) of UK 2008 graduates had signed up for PDP. The take up rate for the 2008 graduates was reported to be the same as the take up for the 2007 graduates this time last year. The completion rate was slightly lower than might have been hoped for at this stage in the year but it was difficult to assess how long it should take for each candidate to be signed off as the PDP was still early in its development. It was noted that 28% of those who had been signed off had done so for farm or mixed animal practice. This was higher than was expected as it was predicted that the majority of candidates would concentrate on small animal practice.
37. The Head of Education reported that the new Post Graduate Dean (PGD), Professor Agnes Winter, had taken up post as of 1st January and the team of four postgraduate deans were working well together to encourage graduates to use the system effectively. There had been some negative feedback from a questionnaire given to new graduates, although it was clear from the comments that many of those who had been critical of the system were not using it as it was intended. The PGDs were taking a pro-active approach encouraging self reflection and the better use of the "notes" section. An updated PDP leaflet telling new graduates about PDP has just been published and has been passed to all the veterinary schools for circulation to final year students. It was noted that some minor software improvements to the PDP system were in the pipeline as well as a more thorough overhaul as part of the College's general review of its database systems.
38. It was noted that it would be difficult for new graduates working in the government veterinary services to undertake PDP as the system covered practice-based competences. When the system had originally been designed, it was on the understanding that new graduates would not normally be employed in such work as Defra advice had been that some prior experience in practice would be needed. The Head of Education would raise

this issue with the Government Veterinary Surgeons team.

39. Professor Stephen May reported interest in our PDP system from colleagues in the USA. He had recently attended a conference at North Carolina State University where RCVS's approach to day one and year one competences and PDP was recognised as progressive.
40. The Committee asked about the 11% of graduates from the 2007 cohort who had not enrolled for PDP. Multiple reminders had been sent to these graduates to stress the importance of completing their PDP. It was also explained that some of these graduates might have returned to live overseas, some would be undertaking PhDs, and a few might not be working in clinical practice. The committee also questioned whether all recent graduate members from overseas were signing up for PDP. Education department staff would liaise with the Registration department to ensure that all overseas recent graduates registering with the RCVS were followed up. It was suggested that EU graduates from Universities not yet approved by EAEVE should be the focus of particular attention as they undertook their PDP.
41. It was noted that the Education and Communications Departments found it beneficial to analyse the take up of PDP by university to be assured the PDP was being effectively communicated to students in all universities equally.

RESEARCH SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT OF 30 OCTOBER 2008

42. In the absence of Professor Quintin McKellar as the Chairman of the Research Sub-Committee, Professor Sandy Trees reported that the Sub-Committee was considering how it could persuade the various interested parties in the field of research to take a strategic approach to resources with the aim of achieving more cost effective management in light of the limited funding available. Professor Stuart Reid agreed that it would be beneficial to discuss the sharing of resources in a pro-active manner as consolidation was already occurring piecemeal without a long term view.
43. Professor Trees was pleased to report that the investment from the Wellcome Trust had been extremely beneficial during its first year.

RCVS CERTIFICATES AND DIPLOMAS

44. The Committee received a Paper containing extracts from the 19 Subject Boards which had met for the annual round of meetings in autumn 2008, together with a summary of the position in regard to phasing out of the RCVS Diplomas. A table was also received showing numbers of Certificate and Diploma candidates enrolled and eligible to enter for the examination together with a list of current holders of these qualifications.
45. The main issues related to progress on development of the Modular Certificates (now the responsibility of the CertAVP Sub-Committee) and the 2008 round of examinations.

Extracts from Reports of Subject Boards 2008

46. In presenting the report, the Chairman of the Certificates and Diplomas Sub-Committee, Professor Mike Herrtage, highlighted the difficulty some Boards had experienced in appointing suitable examiners, particularly for some Diplomas which would not be subsumed. The Boards were frequently relying on the same people to act. On occasion this was sometimes related to lack of experience as well as the level of honoraria. He warned that, if the situation continued, it would become a problem in the future for maintaining standards. Mr Geoff Skerritt reported that the Specialist Recognition Sub-Committee (SRSC) was aware of this problem and proposed to apply a requirement for Specialists to be involved in the examinations.
47. In general the standard of case reports had varied from very good to very poor but with the requirement for all subjects to submit electronic versions, it was now possible to have effective checks on word counts.
48. Professor Herrtage reported on an incident of misconduct by a candidate during the clinical, oral and practical section of an examination. As a result the examiners and the Board had recommended that the individual should be barred from future examinations under the terms of the bye laws.
49. Following a review of the evidence submitted by all those involved in the incident, including a letter of apology from the candidate, it had subsequently been agreed that the candidate should only be barred from the next examination and would be allowed to have a further attempt in 2010 or thereafter; a letter from the Registrar would be sent warning that any further instances of bad behaviour during the examination could be referred to the Preliminary Investigation Committee.

Phasing out of RCVS Diplomas

50. The Committee received and noted a table setting out the latest position with regard to RCVS Diplomas being retained, those which had been subsumed into the European system and those which were still under consideration.

Board Member Nominations 2009-2010

51. The Committee received and approved the nominations for new Members to the Boards for 2009-2010.

Action: Nominations Committee to consider Chairmen appointments

FELLOWSHIP SUB-COMMITTEE - REPORT OF THE EXTRA ORDINARY MEETING ON 10 DECEMBER 2008

52. EPSC received and noted the report of the meeting which had been convened for the purpose of considering the future management and status of the RCVS Diploma of

Fellowship. In particular, it had been held in response to a paper submitted by Professor Reid on behalf of the Heads of the Veterinary Schools (HOVS).

53. In presenting the report, the Chairman, Mr Geoff Skerritt, said that an informal meeting had also been held earlier between himself, Professor Sheila Crispin and some of the HOVS and Professor Stuart Reid's paper had also encompassed some of the discussion that had taken place on that occasion.
54. The consultation with the HOVS had originally arisen because of concern by some Fellows that, despite the College's assertion that the Fellowship was its senior award, it did not appear to be considered by the universities for the purpose of appointment or promotion. In fact there did not seem to be a consistent view amongst the veterinary schools.
55. The Sub-Committee had been grateful to the HOVS for their opinions and for their readiness to broaden discussion to the whole organisation, status and award of the Fellowship. The HOVS paper had made a number of recommendations, as detailed in the minutes and the Sub-Committee had considered each in turn. The HOVS had proposed radical changes in that it was recommended that the present system of the award by thesis or MCL should be terminated and that a model be adopted that was based on that of some other learned societies. They had suggested that the Fellowship could be gained by election within one of three divisions of the profession, academic, practice, government/industry. They had been careful to preserve the availability to veterinary surgeons in practice.
56. The HOVS' recommendation in regard to Honorary Fellowships, whilst attracting discussion by the Members of the Sub-Committee, could not go further as these Fellowships are considered by Nominations Committee.
57. In addition to the HOVS paper, written comments had also been received and considered from some Past Presidents.
58. The Sub-Committee had considered that the way in which the Fellowship is currently awarded should not be radically changed. They did agree with the HOVS that there are some areas which warrant attention to bring the Fellowship into line with higher degrees of the universities e.g. close supervision, a system of quality assurance, improved guidance for examiners and provision of clear guidelines on the expected standard for candidates, as well as consideration of whether or not the RCVS should be more prescriptive about titles for theses.
59. The proposal to resurrect the examination route had not been progressed because of ongoing difficulties in appointing examiners, quality assurance requirements and the evolution of the new modular certificate scheme.
60. The Sub-Committee had been grateful to the HOVS for their ideas and for motivating ongoing discussion with a view to bringing the above proposals to fruition.

61. During the ensuing discussion it was agreed that the HOVS paper should be circulated to all EPSC members. It was also agreed that it would be appropriate to convene a further meeting to consider future developments with a wide group in order to elicit a broad range of views to allay any concerns that may have arisen because the Fellowship Sub-Committee members are all Fellows. This would also reassure the Committee and the profession in general that **all** issues (including Honorary Fellowship by Election) and points of view were being taken into account.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

Diploma of Fellowship Examination Results

62. The Committee approved the Fellowship Sub-Committee's recommendation that the award of the Diploma of Fellowship by Meritorious Contributions to Learning be made to Candidate No.MCL/104 – John Walker Finnie BVSc PhD MRCVS in the field of: *"Veterinary and Comparative Neuropathology"*.

63. The Committee also approved the Fellowship Sub-Committee's recommendation that the award of the Diploma of Fellowship by Thesis be made to Candidate No. T/708 David Robert Godfrey BVetMed CertSAD CertSAM DipABVP MRCVS in the subject of: *"Studies of degenerative joint disease in domestic cats (Felis catus)"*.

subject to minor amendments (such as typing errors and other similar corrections) being made to the thesis before it is placed in the RCVS Library.

Action: Recommend to Council

SPECIALIST RECOGNITION SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT OF 8 JANUARY 2009

64. The Report and recommendations of the Specialist Recognition Sub-Committee (SRSC) held on 8 January 2009 was received and presented by the SRSC Chairman, Mr Geoff Skerritt.

Reapplications after a 5 year period

65. A total of 31 re-applications from Specialists originally listed in 1994, 1999 and 2004 had been received and considered. All had been approved. The full list of Recommendations to Council for re-inclusion in the List of RCVS Recognised Specialists is attached at Private **Annex B**.

New Applications

66. A total of 21 new applications had been received and considered. Three had been rejected on the grounds that they did not meet the criteria. It was noted that there were no appeals to be held this year. It was agreed to recommend to Council that the names of those shown on the list attached at Private **Annex C** should be included in the List of RCVS Recognised Specialists.

Action: Recommend to Council

Nominations for Membership of SRSC

67. It was noted that the SRSC had proposed to retain the status quo for a further year.

Action: Nominations Committee to note

Recognition of the Diploma of the European College of Veterinary Behavioural Medicine

68. EPSC approved the SRSC's recommendation that Dr Jerry Davies be invited to act as the RCVS Observer for the examination of the Diploma of the European College of Veterinary Behavioural Medicine in respect of recognition for inclusion on the list of recognised external postgraduate qualifications for RCVS Recognised Specialist status.

'Emeritus' Specialist Status

69. The Sub-Committee had revisited a proposal first raised in May 2007 to establish a category of 'Emeritus' Specialist status. Since that time, a number of specialists had independently requested reconsideration of this proposal. This was unsurprising as, a number of those first listed were now approaching retirement. The SRSC had recognised the following two categories to whom this status could apply:

- those who are retired but deserving of a title in recognition of past merit
- other senior RCVS Specialists who, for various reasons, may find it difficult to meet some of the criteria for eligibility but are still active in a part time way e.g. have held all the positions that they can, are unable to sustain publications and presentation activity and are working less than the normally required hours.

70. During the discussion of the proposals, the Senior Vice President drew attention to an imminent publication of a Defra report by Professor Philip Lowe (Vets and Vet Services) which he anticipated would express confusion with regard to general understanding of the term 'specialist' and cautioned that there was more work to be done in clarifying this status for both the profession and the general public.

71. It was agreed in principle that 'Emeritus' status could be introduced provided clear criteria were available to support it. The Chairman undertook to prepare a set of guidelines outlining criteria for eligibility for 'Emeritus' status'. It was suggested that the 'Emeritus' title should be available to retired Specialists [in the non-practising part of the Register] but that, rather than create a further separate category, flexibility in the requirements would be exercised by the SRSC in respect of senior Specialists who had completed 15 years on the list, who were still practising. The '15' year rule was queried and it was agreed that further discussion of criteria was required.

Action: SRSC/Chairman of SRSC

CERTIFICATE IN ADVANCE VETERINARY PRACTICE (CERTAVP) REPORT OF MEETING OF 15 JANUARY 2009

72. Presenting the report of the CertAVP Sub-Committee, the Chairman, Dr Bradley Viner, reported that the CertAVP was in an interesting stage of development, having an increasing number of candidates, wide take up from the assessment providers (including two non-veterinary universities) and a good level of awareness amongst the profession. The process now was about learning, monitoring and fine adjustment.
73. It was noted that the Small Animal Surgery Subject Board had decided to allow a designated certificate in small animal surgery. This raised the question about designated certificates more generally. The Committee was reminded that it had been Council's decision to allow designated certificates but that the final decision about a designation was left to the individual subject boards. All the Boards had now recommended designated routes, with the exception of Ophthalmology. Dr Viner reassured the Committee that the designated certificate was not meant to denote specialist status but just to indicate a high standard of practice.
74. There was no doubt that the old Certificate in Veterinary Ophthalmology was widely used by holders to take referrals, for which the qualification had never been designed. On the other hand, ophthalmology was also an area where there was a shortage of specialists in the veterinary schools. The CertAVP would be a good starting point to encourage veterinary surgeons to gain a deeper knowledge of ophthalmology and some of them might then decide to follow a diploma route to specialisation.
75. The Chairman of the Veterinary Ophthalmology Subject Board replied that the Board was very supportive of the CertAVP and that some discussions had been held with two veterinary schools about providing assessment and support for ophthalmology modules. Her concern, however, was that completing two ophthalmology modules with the CertAVP was not sufficient to prepare someone to take referrals and it would be very misleading to the public if a designated certificate were issued. It was noted however, that it had been the Board's decision to develop only two modules, other boards had developed a wider range to cover their subject areas. Dr Viner offered to meet further with the Veterinary Ophthalmology Subject Board, if the Board wished, to discuss progression opportunities.
76. Dr Viner reported that there were interesting developments in the veterinary public health modules but it was a complex issue as it involved lots of stakeholders. The aim was to try and harmonise across the subject area so that there weren't too many overlapping modules being offered. The Sub-Committee was arranging a meeting of the interested parties.
77. EPSC approved the proposal to invite Charlotte Boardman to join the Sub-Committee as a new member.
78. Mr Richard Stephenson requested further feedback about make up of the synoptic examination. The guidelines would be forwarded to the Equine Board.

CPD CARD SURVEY

79. EPSC noted that it had been some time since the College had undertaken a survey of CPD cards. A survey concerning the motivation and attitude of veterinary surgeons towards CPD had recently been carried out by the LIVE Centre (Lifelong Learning in Veterinary Education) based at the RVC and the results were awaited. A paper with proposals for a CPD survey would be presented at a future EPSC meeting.

DEANS REPORT

80. Professor Stuart Reid reported matters from the meeting of HOVS⁷ which had been held the previous day. Bristol and Edinburgh had sent apologies. Edinburgh had taken part by telephone.
81. Professor Reid reported on the relatively poor ranking of the veterinary unit of assessment in the recent Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and commented on the adverse impact this could have on research funding.
82. HOVS, EAEVE and the North American Deans Association were concerned that the OIE World Organisation for Animal Health had organised a conference on veterinary education but had not invited all stakeholders to contribute to the design of the programme. They were lobbying through their respective Chief Veterinary Officers.
83. A Wellcome Trust grant would fund a tour of veterinary schools in 2010 by Professor Peter Doherty, leading veterinary scientist and Nobel prize winner.

Teaching of Veterinary Public Health in UK veterinary schools

84. This document had now been revised to meet EAEVE requirements and HOVS would bring it to the next meeting of EPSC for approval.
85. Professor Reid reported that EAEVE required veterinary schools to address food science and legislation but this was not a requirement in the Directive. HOVS had no wish to go against EAEVE's requirements and the teaching of veterinary public health document provided an interpretation of how to implement EAEVE's requirements in UK schools.

ITEMS FOR PUBLICATION

86. During the course of discussions, several items had been suggested:
- EAEVE list of approved, non-approved schools and those that had not requested a visit
 - Status of Queensland
 - PDP status and advice to employers to look for evidence of completion on CVs

⁷ HOVS – Heads of Veterinary Schools

87. In response to a query, some clarification about the 'Confidential' classification was given. Papers could be classified as 'Confidential' while policy was being developed and then declassified after a decision had been reached. Council would receive lists of names for Specialist Recognition so these names remained confidential until the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

2009 Share Jones Lecture

88. The Chairman was pleased to announce that Dr Sue Dyson would give her lecture, "Looking and seeing: the art of lameness diagnosis", at 6pm on Tuesday 24 November at the University of Nottingham. Further details would be available in due course, but members were asked to note the date in their diaries.
89. It was reported that RCVS had been asked for a letter of support by the HEA for a joint project, being coordinated by the Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Medicine Subject Centre, on open access learning materials. RCVS had agreed to write to support the HEA's bid for funding.
90. RCVS had been invited to submit evidence by 20 March to Alan Milburn's "Fair Access to the Professions" Panel, set up on publication of the Cabinet Office White Paper, "New Opportunities". The Head of Education was drafting a paper re-iterating comments made when the Gateways project was set up.
91. Professor Stuart Reid reported a recommendation that HOVS should not have an automatic right to sit on RCVS Council, and that there should only be one HOVS representative on Council, that was contained in the Veterinary Legislation Group's draft report, would also have an impact on the way in which EPSC worked.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

92. Wednesday 13 May 2009 at 10am.

Anne Jermey
 Committee Secretary
 February 2009
education@rcvs.org.uk