

Education Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2021

Members:	Professor Ewan Cameron	
	Mr Danny Chambers	- Also Adv Practitioner Panel Chair
	Ms Linda Ford	- Lay member
	Professor Tim Parkin	
	Mrs Susan Howarth	
	Dr Susan (Sue) Paterson	- Chair
	Dr Cheryl Scudamore	
	Dr Kate Richards	
	Professor James Wood	
	Ms Anna Bradbury	- Student representative
Ms Kate Dakin	- Student representative	
By invitation:	Dr Melissa Donald	- CertAVP Sub-Committee Chair
	Mr John Fishwick	- Chair of Specialist Sub-Committee
	Dr Joanne Dyer	- EMS Co-ordinators Liaison Group and PQSC Chair
	*Professor Nigel Gibbens	- Chair of Accreditation Review Group
In attendance:	Mr Duncan Ash	- Senior Education Officer
	Mrs Britta Crawford	- Committee Secretary
	Dr Linda Prescott-Clements	- Director of Education
	Mr Jonathan Reid	- Examinations Manager
	Ms Beckie Smith	- Education Assistant
	Mrs Kirsty Williams	- Quality Assurance Manager
	Mr Alal Uddin	- VetGDP e-learning content Manager
	Ms Lizzie Lockett	- CEO
	Dr Niall Connell	- Officer Team Observer

*absent

Apologies for absence and welcome

1. Apologies were received from Nigel Gibbens
2. The meeting was held remotely via "Teams" due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

3. The Chair thanked the Education Department for their hard work, and for maintaining all the work streams on top of all the extra work created by covid, which was reflected in the volume and depth of papers prepared for the meeting. Her thanks were appreciated.
4. The chair welcomed the new student representatives Ms Anna Bradbury and Ms Kate Deakin and commented on the useful insight brought by student representatives on the Committee.

Declarations of interest

5. Niall Connell declared that he is on the visiting accreditation team for University College Dublin at the request of the VCI. Kate Richards declared that she had been made a member of Council of the Association of Government Vets.

Minutes

6. The minutes of the meeting held on 9th February 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

Matters arising

7. The Committee heard that the chair of the CPD policy working party had been asked to join the CPD panel but that the new group would not be set up until next year and that the two groups would continue until 2022.
8. It was noted that the new EMS Policy and a proposal for an EMS database to be developed in-house were approved by the committee via correspondence in March. The work on the database had yet to commence since the proposal had been approved.
9. The proposed changes to the RCVS code of professional conduct regarding the need to engage with VetGDP had been to standards committee and were subsequently agreed by Council.

Education Department update

10. The Director of Education, Dr Linda Prescott-Clements, gave an oral update on the work of the Education Department. The Committee heard that 1809 vets had now registered their interest in being a VetGDP Adviser, with over 860 now having started the e-learning. Modules 1-3 of the e-learning package were currently available, with the 4th module hoping to go live next week and modules 5 and 6 to follow. Thanks were given to Sue Paterson for piloting the modules and providing helpful feedback.
11. The College commissioned a review of the literature as part of the accreditation review. This has been written up and submitted to the journal Medical Education for publication. The committee will be updated if and when it is accepted.

Primary Qualifications Sub-Committee (PQSC)

Report of the sub-committee held on 14 April 2021

12. The minutes of the PQSC meeting held on 14th April were received and noted.

Core Species

13. The RCVS standards for accreditation of veterinary degrees contains several references to “common UK domestic species” but does not define what these species are. This presents a challenge for visitation teams to ensure that practical teaching takes place in all species that a UK vet surgeon might commonly occur. Furthermore, there is often ambiguity for overseas veterinary schools where certain species common to the UK are not able to be kept for teaching purposes due to availability or welfare issues.

14. The Accreditation Review Working Party (ARWP) had agreed that it would be important to formalise a list of core UK species, which PQSC then considered. Education Committee were then invited to consider approving the following list of core UK species:

Dog,
Cat,
Rabbits and exotic pets,
Large and small ruminant,
Equine,
Poultry,
Pig

15. There was an initial comment that in defining a list, it could become very prescriptive and leave less room for interpretation. It was understood around the reasons for wanting to introduce it, however with the example given in the paper of CityU in Hong Kong being unable to keep sheep, in defining that sheep were a core UK species, it could make it more difficult for visitors in making a judgement about the school. For example, would having no hands-on access to one particular species be enough for RCVS to not grant accreditation?

16. It was therefore agreed that as well as (or instead of) a prescriptive list, there should be some further narrative about which species would require actual hands-on experience of, and which species students could be gaining “a knowledge of”.

17. It was also pointed out that if there were to be a full species list, it should still exhaustively list the species that were required, rather than “large and small ruminant”, for example. These are not species, but groups of species, and in theory could be still interpreted in different ways in different countries.

18. Therefore, Education Committee agreed that PQSC should be requested to re-consider the definition of core UK species.

ACTION: PQSC requested to re-consider the definition of core UK species.

Accreditation Review Working Party (ARWP)

19. The minutes of the ARWP meeting held on 1 April were received and noted.

New accreditation methodology

20. Following consideration of the results from both the literature review and the semi-structured interviews carried out with other regulatory professions, the ARWP had agreed to a set of high-level principals, which would shape the new methodology adopted by the RCVS when accrediting veterinary programmes.

21. Education Committee received the new methodology for RCVS accreditation activities as well as a flowchart summarising how this new process will work. This had been developed in line with the agreed principals:

- RCVS should take a 'hybrid' approach to the accreditation of veterinary programmes, which ensures the evidence base upon which decisions are made, against each of the standards, is clear and transparent.
- The 'hybrid' approach should consider 'inputs' (design / implementation features of the veterinary programme) and 'outcomes' data (impact of the programme on students and the profession) and take a risk-based view to ensure school visitations remain proportionate.
- Effective measures of programme outcomes will be identified and developed if necessary, to provide the evidence required to support the hybrid approach.
- A visitation will always take place, but the focus and duration of the visit will be determined through consideration of the evidence provided by the school in advance and through annual monitoring.
- Quality improvement (QI) will become an explicit component of the accreditation process.
- Expertise within the RCVS Education Department should be used to support the accreditation review panel, through an initial review of submitted evidence and reporting to the chair of the panel.
- Evidence considered in support of accreditation standards should be direct, from multiple sources and triangulated where possible.

22. It was noted that the draft had been considered and approved by ARWP and PQSC, and Education Committee was invited to consider and approve the methodology.

23. The draft methodology had also been sent to Vet Schools Council, along with the previously approved new accreditation standards.

24. Some minor wording updates to particular sections were agreed upon.

25. There was general agreement amongst the committee that a risk-based model would be much more effective than the current system. However, there were some concerns expressed about

how the methodology would work with joint accreditation visits, as other accreditors would still be using and following different processes. It was clarified that work had been done with the new standards to explicitly map the other accreditors' standards to the new standards, so although the methods may differ, each accreditor would still essentially be looking for the same evidence from the veterinary schools. It was acknowledged that there would still need to be a lot of work in preparation of the first joint visits following the new RCVS methodology, however this should not stop RCVS progressing with the work. It was an opportunity for RCVS to take a lead in bringing our approach to accreditation in line with international best practice, and introduce changes which would ultimately improve standards, provide flexibility to accommodate different programme delivery models and enhance transparency in the decision-making process.

26. The heads of vet schools on the committee still felt wary in approving the methodology without seeing the intended rubric to be used on visitations. It was clarified that this would look very different to the current rubrics in use. Rather than a prescribed description of the requirements for each (sub)standard, the new rubric would be a template into which a description of the evidence informing each standard would be entered, demonstrating transparency of evidence, its triangulation and the basis upon which the decision whether it had been met had been reached.
27. It was agreed that the rubric template would be circulated to the committee following the meeting, and that the methodology would be approved subject to the committee also approving the rubric.

Vet Schools Council (VSC) Feedback

28. As previously noted, the methodology and standards had been sent to VSC for comment, and the response and comments had been received by the committee shortly before the meeting.
29. Based on the written comments, a number of minor amendments to the standards were approved.
30. Although the standards had previously been approved by Education Committee in September 2020, the heads of vet schools on the committee shared concerns with the standards as they were being approved as final by Council. Although the standards had been shared with VSC, they had not been shared more widely with other university staff who may be better placed to make comment on them, and therefore valuable input could be lost without further consultation which could make the standards difficult to implement across the schools. It was explained that there had been wide representation from the UK vet schools on all committees that had previously considered and approved the standards (ARWP, PQSC and Education Committee), however it was agreed that further consultation would be beneficial. Therefore, it was agreed that the original plan to put the methodology and standards to RCVS Council in June would still be followed. However, instead of giving final approval, Council would be asked to approve the documents as suitable for formal consultation period with all stakeholders, including the schools, employers and the wider profession. The consultation would include the new standards and the new methodology (including the new rubric). Any changes would be made following the consultation period before a final version is put to Council for approval.

31. The time of the consultation was yet to be confirmed but would be determined by Council.

ACTION: New accreditation standards and methodology to be taken to Council to agree consultation

Statutory Membership Examination (SME)

English language testing exemptions

32. Under the newly implemented criteria for registering European veterinary surgeons, registrants now have to demonstrate their English language competency by submitting a valid set of IELTS or OET results as part of their application. Following on from a decision made by RCVS Council in November 2018 when considering language testing of veterinary surgeons once the UK had left the EU, the registrations department has been granting test exemptions to registrants who are able to demonstrate that their veterinary degree was taught and assessed entirely in English.

33. This process differs for SME candidates seeking an exemption, who also must provide additional supporting evidence to demonstrate that their first native language is English. This creates a discrepancy between registrants with recognised degrees and those who register via the SME.

34. Education Committee agreed that the SME process regarding English language test exemptions should be brought into line with the requirements of the Registration department, and that the only supporting evidence required for an exemption should be that the candidate's degree was taught and assessed entirely in English.

ACTION: Education Dept to notify registration and update guidance for SME

RCVS Covid-19 Taskforce update

35. The Committee received a paper outlining the temporary changes to Education policies made since the pandemic began, including those made to the CPD requirement, AP status professional skills evidence extension, remote synoptic exams for CertAVP, temporary EMS policy, virtual abattoir resources, temporary amendment of accreditation standards, RCVS requirements for on-line/remote assessment of veterinary and veterinary nurse students, virtual accreditation, and the Statutory Membership Exam.

36. The Committee noted the status of the different policies which have been temporarily amended and agreed that:

- The CPD and AP policy does not need any further review having now reverted to pre-covid conditions.
- The EMS policy had recently been reviewed at the end of April and will be reviewed again in July.
- The CertAVP synoptic exam, virtual abattoir, virtual visitations, online/remote assessments and Accreditation standards (PSS) policies will all be reviewed in September.
- The Statutory Membership Exam policy will be reviewed at the end of the year.

Veterinary Graduate Development Programme (VetGDP)

VetGDP Policy

37. The Committee were presented with the policy document for the VetGDP and asked for clarity regarding the statement that practices/workplaces “should ideally” be a member of the Practice Standards Scheme (PSS) or equivalent. The committee was informed that when applying to be RCVS-approved graduate development workplaces they would be directed to further information regarding the PSS if they were not already members.
38. The Committee questioned whether a minimum of one hour’s support for each new graduate was sufficient. The committee discussed the prescribed hour and how this stipulated time reflected the more formal commitment, and that support would overlap all aspects of practice and be more necessary in the early months. It was also asked if it was appropriate to delegate Adviser duties as described in the policy, for example, in a mixed practice. The Committee were assured that the practice as a whole would be encouraged to support the graduate and all vets in the practice would be encouraged to sign up to be a VetGDP Adviser.

VetGDP Sub-committee

39. The Committee were presented with a paper including the suggested Terms of Reference for a new VetGDP sub-committee and suggestions for the sub-committee’s composition. The Committee asked that there be a non-clinical member added to the group to assist with the consideration of exemptions. It was also requested that the wording regarding a member from “the original VetGDP working party” to be amended to a member with a good knowledge of the VetGDP, to future proof the document. Membership of the sub-committee would be on a fixed-term basis.

ACTION: Education Department to update the document accordingly.

VetGDP and CPD requirement

40. The Committee received and noted the paper about options for accessing the VetGDP e-portfolio and the 1CPD recording portal. The committee was asked to discuss and consider when the graduates should have access to the different recording portals.
41. In the current PDP system, PDP counts as the first year of CPD, 35 hours, and graduates can add the hours to their CPD record once their PDP has been signed off. They also have access to their CPD record and can add CPD activities that fall outside their PDP. In VetGDP, the EPAs are broader and describe all activities of the graduate’s role so it should therefore be less need to record additional CPD activities alongside their VetGDP.
42. The committee discussed what would happen if a graduate took longer than a year to complete their VetGDP, which could mean that the graduate would become CPD non-compliant. Therefore, they felt that it would be best if the graduate has access to both 1CPD and VetGDP from their registration date but that we ensure that we provide clear information to both the graduate and the VetGDP Advisers about the relationship between CPD and VetGDP.

Action: Education Department to update VetGDP/CPD guidance

Extra Mural Studies (EMS) Policy Guidance

43. Education Committee had recently approved the new EMS Policy. Accompanying guidance for the schools had been drafted which would be included in addition to the new policy within the completed new Accreditation Standards documentation and was received by the committee. The guidance aimed to help schools implement the policy and has been drafted based on comments received from the various committees who considered the new policy, as well as general questions received from schools and/or students about the current policy where relevant, and EMS more generally. PQSC had approved the guidance, and Education Committee were also invited to approve it.
44. Following the discussions earlier in the meeting around species lists, it was agreed that the list of species included for guidance on the requirement for pre-clinical placements would be reviewed, so that it was in-line with the new core species list, when approved.
45. A number of minor wording changes were agreed, and the guidance was approved subject to these amendments being carried out.

ACTION: Agreed amendments to be made to guidance

EBVM and QI

46. Following review of the new accreditation standards and Day One Competences (D1Cs) by colleagues within RCVS Knowledge, in relation to evidence-based veterinary medicine (EBVM) and quality improvement (QI), a number of amendments had been suggested. The amendments were received by the committee and they were asked to consider the proposals.
47. The changes to the Day One Competences were approved.
48. All but one change to the standards were also approved. The suggested addition to standard 6.22 to include that scientific method and research techniques should be “relevant to veterinary medicine” was not approved, as the committee agreed that scientific research training can be delivered without the need to be veterinary specific, and most forms of training are based around general scientific research and method.

ACTION: Standards to be updated

Certificate in Advanced Veterinary Practice (CertAVP)

49. The Committee noted the minutes from the CertAVP sub-committee held on 20 April 2021

Specialist Sub-committee

Specialist Criteria and Application Form

50. The Specialist criteria and guidance is reviewed annually by the Specialist Sub-Committee, and a number of updates to the document had been made. As part of the review, the sub-committee also made some changes to the application form for those applying through the “full” RCVS accreditation route, i.e. non-European Diploma holders.
51. Education Committee received the updated criteria and guidance and application form and were invited to consider the updates.
52. The updates to both the criteria and application form were approved.

Specialist Sub-Committee Membership

53. It was noted that the current Chair of the Specialist Sub-Committee, Mr John Fishwick, would be stepped down from the committee in July. The committee was currently made of 4 members and would therefore be reduced to 3 before a replacement was appointed. However, the Sub-Committee had also requested that a further member would also be appointed so that there would be 5 members on the committee. This request was noted, and it was clarified that if an extra member was not appointed as part of the standard committee restructuring, then the committee could advertise for applications to be made for the 5th member.

List of approved Advanced Practitioners

54. The list of approved Advanced Practitioners was noted.
55. Most Advanced Practitioners apply for re-accreditation, but the committee thought it would be useful to get data to review any changes in the number of applications and re-accreditations we have received since it was introduced. They felt that as part of the AP review, we need to clarify what AP status means, reasons to re-accredit but also information to practices about the benefits of having an AP in practice. The committee was reassured that these points have been identified as part of the recent review of AP status. Following the AP questionnaire that was sent out last year, the next step is to conduct focus groups and based on the data we receive, we will develop a detailed communication plan for the Education Committee to review.

Action: Education Department to provide data on number of applications and re-accreditations to next meeting in September.

Risk Register

56. Education Committee received and noted the Education Department Risk register.

Any other business

57. The Committee asked if there would be a consultation on the exit strategy and implications arising from the Covid-19 pandemic, at the College. The Committee were informed that there would be a

paper going to Council with suggestions that some Council and Committee meetings at the College would still happen in person but approximately half would remain as remote meetings.

ACTION: feedback to Education Committee after Council, at next meeting.

Date of Next Meeting

14 September 2021

Britta Crawford

May 2021

b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	14 September 2021
Title	Primary Qualifications Sub-Committee (PQSC) minutes
Summary	Minutes of the PQSC meeting held on 16 August 2021
Decisions required	To note
Attachments	1. Minutes of the PQSC meeting held on 16 August 2021. 2. Confidential minutes annex.
Author	

Classifications		
Document	Classification¹	Rationales²
Paper	Unclassified	N/A
Annex	CONFIDENTIAL	1, 2

¹Classifications 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.

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Primary Qualifications Sub-Committee (PQSC)
Minutes of the meeting held via MS Teams on 16 August 2021

Members:	Professor Jim Anderson	
	Miss Linda Belton	
	Dr Kate Cobb	
	Dr Jo Dyer	Chair
	Mr Zakarius Franek	
	Professor Debbie Jaarsma	
	Miss Ida S. Knutsen	
	Professor Liz Mossop	
	Mrs Jo Oultram	
	Mr Martin Peaty	
	Dr Kate Richards	
	Professor Ken Smith	*
	Dr Clare Tapsfield-Wright	
Professor Sheena Warman		
In attendance:	Dr Susan Paterson	Chair of Education Committee
	Dr Linda Prescott-Clements	
	Mrs Kirsty Williams	
	Mr Duncan Ash	
	Mr Kieran Thakrar	
	Dr Jude Bradbury	

*absent

Welcome and apologies for absence

1. Apologies for absence were received from Professor Ken Smith.

Declarations of interest

2. Mr Peaty declared that their practice is a commercial partner practice of the University of Surrey and part of their distributed model.
3. Dr Richards declared that she sits on the strategic steering board for Scotland's Rural College (SRUC).
4. Dr Belton declared that their practice is a commercial partner practice of the University of Surrey and part of their distributed model. Dr Belton also declared that she would be reluctant to step out of discussions relating to the distributed model, since she had insight into that area. The chair stated that it would be useful to have Dr Belton and Mr Peaty around for discussions

relating to Surrey, in order to answer any questions regarding that side of the model. At this point it was explained that this would only be acceptable if the committee were to have a general discussion about curricula models. It was explained that the Surrey item on the agenda was not about the distributed model, but rather a report of the findings of the recent accreditation visit to Surrey. The report should be treated the same as any other visitation report, relating only to accreditation of the veterinary programme. Whilst it was clarified that anyone with a clear conflict of interest should excuse themselves during related items, it was decided that both Dr Belton and Mr Peaty should stay for the discussion, but not have a vote relating to the outcome on accreditation.

5. Professor Anderson declared that he chaired the Surrey visitation.
6. Professor Mossop declared that she had chaired the CityU visitation, is a current external advisor on the RVC's Learning and Teaching committee and is also a member of the RCVS curriculum review group for the new veterinary school at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan).

Minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2021

7. The minutes from the meeting of PQSC held on 15th January were received and noted. The minutes were accepted as a true record.

Matters Arising

8. There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

Surrey visitation

9. Please see confidential annex for details.

Surrey rescheduled IMR placements

10. Please see confidential annex for details.

Glasgow visitation

11. Please see confidential annex for details.

CityU Visitation

12. Please see confidential annex for details.

CityU follow-up visitation

13. As part of the guidelines for virtual visitations, a follow-up, in person visitation is required within 12-18 months. Since the final visitation to CityU would be scheduled for 24 months, it was requested whether the 12–18-month requirement could be waived, to save the administrative burden of visiting twice within such a short frame of time. PQSC had no objections to this, and it was agreed to let the School know.

Action: RCVS to inform CityU of next visitation date.

Melbourne visitation

14. Please see confidential annex for details.

Vet School's COVID-19 plans

15. The latest updates provided by the vet schools in relation to programme changes resulting from the pandemic, along with the feedback given to schools and any notes where clarification was sought. These were received without further comment. It was noted that the next round of updates was due at the end of August.

Core species definition

16. At its previous meeting, PQSC had agreed on a core list of species to recommend to Education Committee, as the RCVS standards for accreditation of veterinary degrees contains several references to “common UK domestic species” but does not define what these species are.
17. Education Committee had felt that in defining a list, it could become very prescriptive and leave less room for interpretation. Whilst the reasons for wanting to introduce a list were understood, it was felt that this could make it more difficult for accreditation visitors in making judgements on programmes. The example given was that if a school could teach about a species, but have no hands-on experience, would this automatically exclude them from RCVS accreditation?
18. Education Committee also felt that if there were to be a full species list, it would need to exhaustively list the species that were required, rather than “large and small ruminant”, for example. The list presented was considered to be groups of species, rather than individual species, and could still be interpreted in different ways by different countries.
19. PQSC had therefore been requested to revisit whether such a list was required and, if it was, to consider the above issues when developing the next draft. Following discussion, it was agreed that in order to keep RCVS accreditation accessible to overseas schools, there should be a high level, generic statement on UK species so that non-UK schools can interpret within their own regional context. It was then highlighted that having a prescribed list also went against the proposals to move towards an outcomes focused approach to accreditation, and that the accreditation panel should be able to make a judgement on whether an institutions curriculum would sufficiently prepare a graduate to work in the UK.

20. It was agreed to not have a specific species list, and that a general statement be drafted to demonstrate that students would need to be aware of what species were common to the UK, and that visitors would need to be pragmatic about what was covered within a schools' curriculum.

Action: RCVS to draft statement ahead of the next PQSC meeting.

Extra-Mural Studies and overseas accreditation

21. Please see confidential annex for details.

Harper and Keele (HKU) progress report

22. Representatives from HKU and RCVS met on 10th May as part of the six-monthly progress meetings that are held when a new veterinary school starts up. Details of this meeting were received and noted by the committee without further comment.

University of Central Lancashire (UCLan) progress report

23. Similarly, representatives from UCLan and RCVS met on 2nd July as part of their six-monthly progress updates. The committee received and noted the report of that meeting.
24. There was a question about whether there should be concern over the lack of appointment of a Head of School, due their main point of focus being on establishing the curriculum. It was pointed out that once appointed, the Head could wish to change the curriculum. However, it was felt that this was less of a concern since the planned first intake of students had been delayed until September 2023. It was agreed that the situation would be monitored going forward.

St Georges University (SGU) substantive change

25. Please see confidential annex for details.

The Consortium on Workplace Based Education and Learning (COWBEL)

26. RCVS had received correspondence from The Consortium on Workplace Based Education and Learning (COWBEL), a new group of veterinary schools that look to inform the veterinary community regarding best practices in distributed veterinary clinical education.
27. The correspondence was received and noted by the committee.

Glasgow pre-vet year

28. Correspondence from Glasgow vet school regarding the setting up of a pre-veterinary year was received and noted. As part of the requirements for securing additional funding to support places on this new programme, the Scottish Government had requested that RCVS be consulted on proposals. As the RCVS does not currently have any remit to inspect or approve courses other than the primary veterinary programme, it would not possible to grant endorsement, however the

College had indicated that this is a positive move which would hopefully be successful in enhancing Glasgow's further work around widening participation for veterinary students.

Bulgaria veterinary degree

29. The committee received and noted correspondence between the British Embassy in Sofia, Bulgaria, and RCVS regarding acceptance of the veterinary degree from Trakia University in Stara Zagora, which recently lost its accreditation status from EAEVE.
30. It was noted that RCVS had responded, detailing the current temporary decision by RCVS Council regarding registration requirements for graduates from EU schools being explained, as well as setting out options for direct accreditation from RCVS.

Statutory Membership Exam (SME) update

31. The new RCVS Examinations Manager, Dr Jude Bradbury was introduced to the committee and was thanked on behalf of the SME Board for her great work on the OSCE examinations.

SME Results

32. It was reported that the pass rate of the written exam was 18.46%, which was similar to previous years.
33. There was a question around whether anything more could be done for those candidates who failed the written examination, given the cost of entry to the examination. It was reported that the successful candidates would be interviewed on their preparation for the examination, and the information that was obtained from those interviews would be made available to the candidates in the form of case studies.
34. Three candidates were unable to attend the OSCE due to COVID restrictions and had therefore deferred their entry until July 2022.
35. One candidate was given special permission to sit the OSCE despite appearing to have failed the written papers, as investigations were in progress into claims that complications with the software were the cause of the failed papers.
36. Ultimately, 9 out of 11 candidates passed the OSCE. Please also refer to confidential annex.
37. It was reported that 5 of the successful candidates had already registered with RCVS, with the other 4 being subject to providing further documentation.

SME Diet Evaluation Report

38. It was reported that the Evaluation Report for the SME 2021 diet would be considered at the next meeting of the SME Board on 31 August, and it was noted that the report would be put to PQSC at its next meeting.

SME OSCE fail and requirement to re-take the written examination

39. It was reported that candidates that had failed the OSCEs would not be able to carry their pass marks in the written exam forward and would have to re-take the written exam in its entirety when they next enter the exam. In 2020, the SME Board had requested that this rule be changed so that the written pass mark could be carried forward for one year. This would require RCVS Council to request a Statutory Instrument amendment from DEFRA however, due to the pandemic, DEFRA were not able to consider about Statutory Instruments at this time. With restrictions being eased, it was reported that this issue would be progressed.

SME Guidance Notes

40. It was noted that the guidance notes had been updated following the first two examination diets. It was also reported that there was a pending matter around the guidance on wearing religious and / or cultural clothing and jewellery, on which the SME Board had sought guidance from the Diversity and Inclusion Working Group. It was noted that this would be included once finalised.

Any other business

41. There were no further items of business discussed.

Date of next meeting to be held: 11th October 2021 at 10:00 a.m.

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	14 September 2021
Title	RCVS COVID-19 Taskforce update – EMS amendment
Summary	<p>As part of the on-going three-monthly reviews of the temporary EMS requirement, Taskforce considered EMS completion data submitted from schools in July.</p> <p>Due to low completion rates for the current 3rd years (Class of 2023), Taskforce agreed to reduce their requirement for clinical EMS weeks by a further 4 weeks, to 13 weeks in total. This amendment moves the class of 2023 in line with the classes of 2021 and 2022, who are also required to complete at least 13 weeks clinical EMS in total.</p> <p>The paper considered by Taskforce is attached at Annex A for information and further background.</p> <p>Going forward, the COVID-19 Taskforce has been dissolved, and all further options for review will be put to Education Committee for consideration.</p>
Decisions required	None, to note
Attachments	Annex A – Review of EMS Policy Taskforce Paper
Author	Duncan Ash Senior Education Officer d.ash@rcvs.org.uk

Classifications		
Document	Classification ¹	Rationales ²
Paper	Unclassified	1
¹Classifications 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.

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Review of EMS policy

Background

1. Since the start of the pandemic, a number of temporary amendments to Extra-Mural Studies (EMS) policy and support measures have been put in place to address the difficulties faced by students in achieving their full EMS requirement of 12 weeks Pre-clinical Animal Husbandry EMS (AHEMS) and 26 weeks Clinical EMS.
2. The RCVS COVID-19 Taskforce have previously been carrying out reviews of the temporary EMS Policy on a three-monthly basis, basing the reviews on data collected from each of the schools around EMS completion rates. The latest review took place in July, and the paper that was consider by Taskforce can be seen at **Annex A**.
3. Following the review, the decision was taken to further reduce the clinical EMS requirement for the class of 2023 by 4 weeks, to a total minimum of **13 weeks** clinical EMS. This was based on the slow completion rate throughout the cohort's progress in the 3rd year of the degree course (4th year for Cambridge students), and also moves the cohort year in line with the current requirements in place for the class of 2021 and 2022.
4. For reference, the current requirement for all year groups is shown in Table 1:

Table 1: EMS requirements in place as of 13 July 2021:

Student Cohort		AHEMS requirement (usually 12 weeks)	Clinical EMS requirement (Usually 26 weeks)
Year of programme starting in September 2020	Year of Graduation		
Year 1	2025	6 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives	26 weeks
Year 2	2024	6 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives	26 weeks
Year 3	2023	6 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives	13 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives
Year 4	2022	12 weeks	13 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives
Year 5	2021	12 weeks	13 weeks

Going forward

5. Council has agreed that the COVID-19 Taskforce should disband. However, although most / all restrictions have been lifted in each of the countries in the UK, this has not necessarily stopped any knock-on effects, and there are still many reported problems in students being able to secure EMS placements. Therefore, it has been decided that the periodic reviews of the temporary EMS policy will continue.
6. However, with no COVID-19 Taskforce in place going forward, it has been agreed that the responsibility for carrying out these reviews will now be delegated to Education Committee. Therefore, schools will be asked for their completion rates as up to date as possible in October, before the data is put to Education Committee for review at its next meeting in November.
7. Further reviews will therefore take place as standard at each Education Committee meeting until it is clear that the pandemic is no longer having an effect on the availability of EMS placements.

Review of EMS policy

Background

8. Since the start of the pandemic, a number of temporary amendments to Extra-Mural Studies (EMS) policy and support measures have been put in place to address the difficulties faced by students in achieving their full EMS requirement of 12 weeks Pre-clinical Animal Husbandry EMS (AHEMS) and 26 weeks Clinical EMS.
9. In most circumstances, AHEMS is completed in the first two years of study, prior to the student starting their clinical placements in year 3 of their programme.
10. Taskforce had agreed to review the temporary requirements periodically every 3 months for as long as the pandemic continued, with the first review taking place in November 2020. RCVS had requested data from the EMS Coordinators at each of the vet schools, detailing the average number of weeks completed per year (mean, median and range), against the number of weeks that would normally have been completed by November in a typical year.
11. After considering the data, Taskforce took the decision to lower the requirement for clinical EMS for Year 4 from 18 weeks to 13 weeks (with online top-up around personal learning objectives); and for Year 3 from 21 weeks to 17 weeks (with online top-up around personal learning objectives). The usual requirement for clinical EMS would normally be 26 weeks.
12. The amended requirements currently in place, as agreed and published on 30 November 2020, are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: EMS requirements in place as of 30 November 2020.

Student Cohort		AHEMS requirement <i>(usually 12 weeks)</i>	Clinical EMS requirement <i>(Usually 26 weeks)</i>
Year of programme starting in September 2020	Year of Graduation		
Year 1	2025	6 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives	26 weeks
Year 2	2024	6 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives	26 weeks
Year 3	2023	6 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives	17 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives

Year 4	2022	12 weeks	13 weeks with online top-up around personal learning objectives
Year 5	2021	12 weeks	13 weeks

13. The next review had been planned to take place in late February, however, further to increased restrictions being announced over the Christmas period, with the announcement of further periods of national lockdown in all countries in the UK earlier in January, Taskforce is now asked to carry out a review slightly earlier than planned.
14. As with the review in November, RCVS had requested data from the EMS Coordinators at each of the vet schools, detailing the average number of weeks completed per year (mean, median and range), against the number of weeks that would normally have been completed by January in a typical year. A summary of the data collected can be seen at **Annex A**.

Options for review

15. It was not necessarily expected that there would be any large scale changes to the figures reported at the end of November due to reported limited availability of EMS placements. Whilst this is the case, there has been further completion of EMS for varying percentages of students across all years at each school during this time.
16. As mentioned above, following the review in November, amendments were made the clinical EMS requirement for Years 3 and 4 as they were deemed to be in the most pressing situation. The latest data from January 2021 may not show a large scale change in numbers of weeks completed, but following the amendments agreed in November the picture does seem to be less critical at this time.
17. Based on the current amended policy, the next most critical stages are likely to be for be for students in Year 2 and Year 3.

Year 3: Although arguably less critical at this exact moment in time, if clinical EMS placements continue to be limited, then opportunities for the students currently in Year 3 to catch up with weeks in Years 4 and 5 will become more difficult. Students would have either not yet begun their clinical EMS at this time in Year 3, or if they have it would only be minimal, therefore the current completed numbers would not usually be a cause for concern. However, it will need closer monitoring if restrictions and lockdowns continue further into spring and summer as that is when placements would usually be expected to take place.

Year 2: All but one of the schools require their students to have completed their pre-clinical EMS before they are able to move on to their clinical years. Based on the current data, the schools

are averaging close to 50% or above of the amended requirement for the 6 weeks of in-person pre-clinical EMS which suggests that they would be more or less on track to be able to complete this before September 2021. However, if periods of heavy restriction and lockdown continue further into the spring and summer, this could continue to have an effect on placement availability going forward which may see some students struggling to meet the requirement.

The RCVS Covid-19 Taskforce is invited to consider the following three options and agree a way forward:

A: No decision to be taken at this with a further review to be taken at the end of February

With no real change in the data collected and following soon after recent amendments, no further temporary amendments will be taken at this time, with a review to take place at the end of February, in line with the original 3 month planned review cycle. With evidence to show that some students were able to complete EMS placements over the Christmas period, it could suggest that further placements may be able to take place during this current period of lockdown. With no decision being taken at this time, the promise of an earlier review would offer more reassurance to students, however it would again be likely that there would be minimal changes in completed weeks.

B: No decision to be taken at this time with a further review in April

With no real change in the data collected and following soon after recent amendments, no further temporary amendments will be taken at this time with a review to take place in 3 months time, i.e. April 2021. With evidence to show that some students were able to complete EMS placements over the Christmas period, it could suggest that further placements may be able to take place during the Easter period which would then help to gain a clearer picture for Year 2 in particular. Whilst this option would not offer any further reassurance to students, it could avoid a reduction that may eventually prove to be unnecessary.

C: A reduction of 4 weeks clinical EMS for Year 3

A reduction to the number of clinical EMS weeks required for 3rd year students to 13 weeks (with additional online top-up), which would move them in line with the current requirement for Years 4 and 5.

This would be more proactive in anticipating limited chances to complete EMS for the early part of 2021, leaving a requirement which would then be more realistic to catch up on in later years.

18. In the event of any agreed reduction, RCVS should further communicate the importance of EMS to both students and schools, and stress that the policy is the minimum requirement. Students should be strongly encouraged to seek any opportunities for further weeks of EMS even once the required number of weeks has been reached.

Annex A

Summary of data collected on EMS completion rates – January 2021

The median of completed weeks

	Graduating Year				
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Bristol	0	2	0	4.2	13.6
Cambridge	3.5	8	1.5	7.5	13
Edinburgh	0	4	0	7	13
Glasgow	0	7	2	10.3	22
Liverpool	0	5	1	6	15
RVC	2	4	0	4	15
Surrey	1	4	2	9	19

The mean of completed weeks

	Graduating Year				
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Bristol	0	2.9	0.1	5.1	13.7
Cambridge	3	7	0.9	5.7	14.6
Edinburgh	0	4	0.5	8.2	13.7
Glasgow	1	7.4	4	11.7	21
Liverpool	0	4.3	1.5	6.1	14.5
RVC	3	4.1	0	4.5	15
Surrey	1.4	5	2.9	9.1	18.4

The range of completed weeks

	Graduating Year				
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Bristol	0	12	6	16	17
Cambridge	0-10	2-13	0-2	0-21	2-23
Edinburgh	0	0-12	0-6	0-26	5-26
Glasgow	0-6	0-12	0-26	0-26	7-26
Liverpool	0	0-10	0-10	0-16	0-22
RVC	1-9	1-11	0	0-12	5-23
Surrey	2	4	5	18	24

No data supplied from Glasgow as at 7/1/21.

Data was supplied from Nottingham, however not in the specific format:

- Grad 2021: aside from 1 or 2 students, they are on track to complete EMS requirements

- Grad 2022: since Nov, approx. 50% of students have completed 1 or 2 weeks of additional EMS. The other 50% have added none.
- Grad 2023: since Nov, approx. 30% of students have completed a further 1 or 2 weeks of EMS. The other 70% have added none.
- Grad 2024: since Nov, approx. 10% of students have completed a further 1 week of EMS. The other 90% have added none.
- Grad 2025: since Nov, approx. 10% of students have completed a further 1 week of EMS. The other 90% have added none.

Summary of data collected on EMS completion rates – November 2020

The usual number of weeks to be expected, as of November

	Graduating Year				
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Cambridge	8	12	0	8	20
Edinburgh	0	10			
Glasgow	0	8	4	10	20
Liverpool	0	6	4	11	21
Nottingham	0	6	4	8	16
RVC	0	6	0	8	18
Surrey	0	12	6	26	26

(no data supplied from Bristol, and no data on clinical EMS supplied from Edinburgh)

The median of completed weeks

	Graduating Year				
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Cambridge	2	7.5	0	4	15
Edinburgh	0	4			
Glasgow	0	7	2	10	21
Liverpool	0	5	1	6	15
RVC	2	4	0	4	14
Surrey	0	7	4	10.5	16.5

(no data supplied from Bristol, and no data on clinical EMS supplied from Edinburgh)

The mean of completed weeks

	Graduating Year				
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Cambridge	3	7	0	5	14
Edinburgh	0	4			
Glasgow	0	7.4	3.9	11.5	21
Liverpool	0	4.3	1.5	6.1	14.5
Nottingham	0	6	0.24	4.8	13
RVC	2.6	4	0	4	14
Surrey	0	6	2.8	8.8	19.1

(no data supplied from Bristol, and no data on clinical EMS supplied from Edinburgh)

The range of completed weeks

	Graduating Year				
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Cambridge	0-8	2-13	0	0-21	2-23
Edinburgh	0	0-12			
Glasgow	0	0-12	0-26	0-26	0-26
Liverpool	0	0-10	0-10	0-16	0-22
Nottingham	0	0-12	0-10	1-12	5-22
RVC	1-6	1-11	0	1-11	1-24

(no data supplied from Bristol and Surrey, and no data on clinical EMS supplied from Edinburgh)

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	14 September 2021
Title	Minutes from the Certificate in Advanced Veterinary Practice subcommittee meeting held on 6 July 2021
Summary	Minutes of the meeting
Decisions required	Education Committee is asked to note the minutes.
Attachments	None
Author	Britta Crawford b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk 020 72020 0777

Classifications		
Document	Classification¹	Rationales²
Paper	Unclassified	
¹Classifications 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.
--	--

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Minutes of the CertAVP Sub-Committee meeting held on 06 July 2021

Present: Sharon Boyd
*Cathy McGowan
*Lance Voute
James Horner
Melissa Donald - Chair
*Chris Proudman
Liz Chan
Rob White
Ros Carslake

In Attendance Britta Crawford
Jenny Soreskog-Turp
Laura Hogg

*Absent

The meeting was held remotely by Microsoft Teams due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Apologies for Absence

1. Apologies were received from Lance Voute and Chris Proudman and Cathy McGowan

Declarations of interest

2. There were no new declarations of interest.

Minutes

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 20th April 2021 were approved as a true record.

Matters arising

4. There were no matters arising.

Module Template

5. The subcommittee were presented with a draft template to standardise the format of CertAVP modules outlines. The subcommittee had requested that modules were described at a high level, excluding some of the finer detail, so that the modules would not need updating on too regular a basis. The subcommittee agree that it would be sensible to ask providers applying for accreditation to include the specific module content with their application and that it should match the learning outcomes listed in the module document. The accreditation application form should

be updated accordingly. The subcommittee suggested that the assessment sections should also reference that the module needs to be pitched at level 7 (level 11 in Scotland) to ensure that the candidates are assessed at the appropriate level.

ACTION: BC to update accreditation application form

6. The subcommittee agreed that those modules that had not yet been reviewed should be looked at first and not to focus on those modules which had very little uptake. All providers who assess the same module should have input into its review.

ACTION: BC to draw up a timetable

Synoptic Exams

SAM Reports

7. The subcommittee noted the reports from the Small Animal Medicine synoptic exam, held remotely, by the RCVS. The subcommittee viewed the examiner's report and the observers' reports from the two days.

Remote Exams

8. The subcommittee were presented with a paper outlining the successes and difficulties surrounding holding the synoptic exams remotely by the RCVS, including views from the examiners, the observers and from the administrator. The subcommittee was asked for their opinions and experiences of holding remote CertAVP synoptic examinations. Those subcommittee members who are involved in holding remote synoptic exams at their institutions agreed with much of what had already been reported including technical difficulties, losing internet access and external disruptions. The members found that holding the exams remotely was easier than corralling candidates under covid regulations but agreed that there was more administration and paperwork needed to make the exams run smoothly. Edinburgh had previously used British Council facilities, to provide invigilation and IT services for exams held abroad to good effect. This had removed many of the stresses of technical difficulties.
9. The members agreed that some candidates preferred the exams to be held remotely as they were felt to be less stressful, whilst others preferred to attend in person so that they could have guaranteed time set aside and not be disturbed. It was agreed that it would be hard to justify asking candidates to travel by air for a one-hour exam now that exams had been run successfully remotely. Updated Equality Diversity and Inclusion policies would mean that remote options would need to be considered on an individual basis. The feedback will be included in a paper for Education Committee in September to decide whether exams could continue to be held remotely.

ECC Examiners

10. The subcommittee were presented with a list of potential ECC examiners and their qualifications and biographies. The potential examiners had been suggested by the current ECC examiners who had made it known that they wished to cease examining. The subcommittee requested that

each potential examiner should be asked to give their opinion of the CertAVP, the value of the synoptic exam and the A and B modules before the subcommittee could come to a decision on who would be appropriate.

VPC Synoptic Exam

11. The subcommittee were informed that there are two candidates interested in a Veterinary Primary Care synoptic exam and were asked to suggest a structure and format for the exam. The subcommittee agree that as the module combinations could be so varied between candidates that assessment would need to be based on the general aims set out in the designation document and cover aspects of clinical skills, generalist skills; and enhanced leadership, academic and management skills.
12. Rob White kindly agreed to draft a suitable format and bring it back to the subcommittee for discussion at the meeting after next.

ACTION RW to put together an exam format and bring it back to the subcommittee at a following meeting.

Edinburgh Synoptic Exam Feedback

13. The subcommittee noted the feedback from the Edinburgh exam. The subcommittee also noted that Edinburgh were no longer offering the Equine Dental Care and treatment module following the retirement of the member of staff responsible for the module.

Equivalence

14. The subcommittee considered an equivalence application for the A-FAVP.1 module and the B-SAP.1 module based on the attainment of the ECVIM qualification. The subcommittee were impressed by the application and the mapping but were concerned that there was no proof of assessment for the professional skills. It was agreed that the candidate had noted what he had learnt but not how he had learned it. The candidate is encouraged to add reflections for each section on how the skills were learnt, how they have been used and how they have been useful.

ACTION BC to inform candidate

Quality Assurance Reports

15. The subcommittee welcomed the Quality Assurance Reports from the assessment providers and thanked them for gathering the useful information. There was particular note of the clarity of Liverpool's report. The subcommittee noted that each provider had taken on board any criticism from candidate feedback and shown how they have or will address it.

CertAVP review – focus group questions

16. The subcommittee was presented with a paper with suggested questions for the different stakeholder groups based on the topics and questions put forward at the previous meeting. The subcommittee agreed that there were more questions for each group that would comfortably fit

into one focus group and that other methods of data collection could be considered, such as a workshop, taskforce or individual interviews.

Statistics

17. The statistics had not been included with the meeting bundle and would be circulated after the meeting.

Any other business

18. Sharon Boyd thanked Laura Hogg for her patience in gathering materials for the synoptic exam review given the access difficulties due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Date of the next meeting

19. 30th November 2021

Britta Crawford

July 2021

b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	14 September 2021
Title	Remote synoptic examinations
Summary	<p>In October 2020, the synoptic exam policy was temporarily changed to allow for remote examinations as a result of the challenges of hosting in-person exams during the pandemic.</p> <p>RCVS has run two successful exams and while remote exams provide more flexibility, several issues have also been identified. Education Committee is asked to agree if the temporary change to the policy should be made permanent.</p>
Decisions required	Education Committee is asked to agree whether the temporary change to the synoptic exam policy to allow for remote synoptic exams should be made permanent.
Attachments	None
Author	Laura Hogg l.hogg@rcvs.org.uk 020 7202 0736

Classifications		
Document	Classification¹	Rationales²
Paper	Unclassified	
¹Classifications 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.

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Background

1. On 1 October 2020 the RCVS Council Covid-19 Taskforce approved the temporary change for RCVS synoptic exams to be held in a remote format, due to the challenges in being able to host exams in person during lockdown.
2. At its meeting in May, Education Committee reviewed all policy changes related to Covid-19 and asked for further information to discuss if the temporary policy change to allow remote examinations should be made permanent.
3. Feedback was gathered from the examiners attending remote synoptic exams as follows:

Examiner comments from General Small Animal Surgery exams held by the RCVS in November 2020

4. This was the first time that the examinations had been held remotely. Although initially concerned about the potential for cheating, the examiners were not suspicious of this being attempted by any of the above candidates. The exams went smoothly with only two technical issues: one candidate was unable to open word documents with embedded photos (e.g. case x-rays) and so more time was allocated to this candidate to allow them time to read the radiographs during the exam whilst an examiner shared screen. The other technical issue was a loss of internet connectivity with another candidate. This was very brief and <2 minutes in total. The examiners recommend giving candidates a "minimum software requirement" for files likely to be used (e.g. Word Docs) and to have a more robust guidance about what happens if internet connectivity is lost in future examinations.

Examiner comments from Small Animal Medicine exams held by the RCVS in June 2021

5. We experienced significant technological difficulties with one candidate throughout the viva. There was a delay between the examiners sharing clinical data files via the chat function and the candidate receiving and being able to view the files. This problem did not occur in any of the other candidates and thus we don't believe the problem was caused by the examiners/RCVS. The examiners allowed the candidate a small amount of extra time for each case in recognition of the delay created by this problem (timing was paused on multiple occasions to allow them to receive the documents). In addition, some clinical data was read out to the candidate rather than presented in written format.
6. During online examinations, candidates cannot easily view all the clinical data in one screen. In comparison, during a face-to-face viva, the candidate can view the initial clinical scenario, diagnostic test results and imaging studies all at the same time if necessary. We felt that this issue sometimes contributed to the candidates forgetting the original presenting problems and initial diagnostic test results when considering appropriate diagnostic and therapeutic options for the cases. This issue is potentially more significant for disciplines which use multiple diagnostic test results such as Internal Medicine and ECC.

7. There was ample time between candidates for discussion of their performance although if there had been more candidates there may have been a problem with overrunning if further technological difficulties had been experienced.
8. The examiners feel that synoptic examinations could be held online again in the future. However, strategies would need to be in place to mitigate technological difficulties. In addition, examiners could attempt to design cases with fewer documents.

Additional comments:

9. Under normal circumstance candidates are not allowed to take the questions away with them at the end of the exam. When holding the exams remotely, questions are downloaded onto the candidate's computer meaning that these cannot be used for future examinations.
10. It is problematic from an administrative perspective to ensure that all candidates have the correct system requirements for the documents that need to be shared.
11. Internet connectivity and computer issues can cause problems for both candidates and administrators/examiners.
12. One candidate was unable to sit the exam as she has a hearing impairment and needs to lip read. This would have been manageable in a face-to-face situation but not using remote calling.

CertAVP Subcommittee comments:

13. Those present involved in holding remote synoptic exams at their institutions agreed with much of what had already been reported including technical difficulties, losing internet access and external disruptions. In some ways the providers found that holding the exams remotely was easier than corralling candidates under covid regulations but agreed that there was more administration and paperwork needed to make the exams run smoothly. Edinburgh had previously used British Council facilities, to provide invigilation and IT services for exams held abroad, to good effect. This had removed many of the stresses of technical difficulties.
14. Overall they agreed that some candidates preferred the exams to be held remotely as they were felt to be less stressful, whilst others preferred to attend in person so that they could have guaranteed time set aside and not be disturbed. It was agreed that it would be hard to justify asking candidates to travel by air for a one hour exam now exams had been run successfully remotely, and Equality Diversity and Inclusion policies would mean that remote options would need to be considered on an individual basis.

Decision required

15. Education Committee is asked to agree if the changes to the synoptic exam policy should be made permanent, either by not offering remote exams at all, only holding remote exams or offer a mixture of both remote and face-to-face examinations.

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	14 September 2021
Title	Update from the CPD Compliance Panel
Summary	Minutes from the meeting of the CPD Compliance Panel on the 26 May 2021 and 2 September 2021.
Decisions required	Education Committee is asked to agree the recommendations from the Panel and consider the membership as part of the Terms of Reference.
Attachments	Annex A – Minutes from the meeting on the 26 May 2021 Annex B – Minutes from the meeting on the 2 September 2021 Annex C – Updated Terms of Reference
Author	Jenny Soreskog-Turp Lead for Postgraduate Education j.soreskog-turp@rcvs.org.uk

Classifications		
Document	Classification¹	Rationales²
Annex A	Unclassified	
Annex B	Confidential	1
Annex C	Unclassified	
¹Classifications 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.

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Annex A
**CPD Compliance Panel
Notes of the meeting held on 26 May 2021**

Present:	Linda Ford Alison Carr Elizabeth Cox Susan Paterson Claire Roberts Neil Smith	Chair
In attendance:	Julie Dugmore Jenny Soreskog-Turp Rebecca Smith Joanne Stetzel	Director of Veterinary Nursing Lead for Postgraduate Education Education Assistant Marketing Communication Manager

Welcome and Apologies

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that Linda Prescott-Clements had sent her apologies.

Declarations of interest

2. There were no new declarations of interest.

Minutes of the meeting on the 14 January 2021

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2021 were received and approved as a true and accurate record.

Matters arising

4. There were no matter arising that was not covered by agenda items or that will be discussed at the following meeting.

Communication update/1CPD Data

5. Ms Stetzel gave an update on the CPD communication plan. CPD comms was paused during the lockdown but over the last few weeks it has started up with a focus on supporting members, either to engage with the outcome based CPD requirement or using 1CPD. We did two live webinars last week, one about reflection and another about what counts as CPD, which were well received.

We will also be sending an email to everyone who is not yet using 1CPD to offer one to one support from the RCVS team.

6. The group felt that it would be useful to have more case studies with members who are sceptical either about reflections or using 1CPD as the information may have more impact when it is not being communicated from RCVS. Some members also suggested several Facebook groups and forums that would be useful to help raise awareness and Ms Stetzel agreed that she would contact them after the meeting to discuss further. It was also suggested to contact newly elected council members to get them to help promote CPD on their platforms.

Action: JS to liaise with members about using Facebook groups/forums

7. The group noted that the uptake of 1CPD was lower in older age groups. It was also suggested that a breakdown based on where individuals graduated from would be useful to see any differences between those who graduated in the UK or overseas. It would also be helpful to track the number of users before and after any comms campaign to measure its effect.

Action: Comms/Education to review data

8. The group also discussed how to reach those members who are not digitally engaged or are reluctant to use IT. It was suggested that perhaps printed press may be a more effective way of communicating with this group rather than by email. It was also suggested that liaison with influential groups or well-known members of the profession might be an effective way to help promote and raise awareness of the ease of the 1CPD portal.

Action: Comms/Education to explore options for contacting harder to reach groups.

Follow up non-compliant cases

9. The group received a paper providing information about monitored cases.
10. The group agreed with the recommendations in the paper but felt that it was important that continue to chase up members that we are missing information from such as plans or records on a regular basis. Members who claim to change status need to be reminded that they need to keep up with the requirement until their status is changed.
11. All monitored cases will be reviewed by the Panel at the next meeting.

CPD Pause Report

12. The Panel received and noted the CPD pause report.
13. The panel was pleased to see that covid does not appear to have affected the number of pause applications as few applications are related to the pandemic. This should be reviewed again at the next meeting as members may apply retrospectively when they complete their annual renewal declaration.

CPD Audit

14. The Panel discussed the upcoming CPD audits for veterinary surgeons and nurses and how we should approach the random sample group.
15. The Panel thought it was important to emphasise that the process this year will be different to the process once 1CPD becomes mandatory in 2022. They discussed if we should have the same process as previous years to ensure consistency of data but considering the change of CPD requirement last year and the impact of Covid-19 it would be difficult to compare any numbers anyway.
16. The Panel felt that since we now have more available data through 1CPD we should make use of it to target sample groups. It was proposed to include a sample of 1CPD users that are currently non-compliant based on 1CPD data as well as a sample of non 1CPD users.
17. The Panel also discussed the need to look at quality of CPD as part of future audits and they were reassured that the Education Department is looking into a quality framework which will be presented to the Panel in due course.

Any other business

18. There was a query about the role of Panel and if they should work more closely with PIC. Next year the remit and the terms of reference for the Compliance Panel will change as the CPD Policy Working Party is dissolved. The terms of reference will be discussed at the next meeting.

Action: Updated ToR for next meeting

Next Meeting

19. The next meeting was planned for the 1 November, but the Panel felt they might need a meeting before then so meeting dates for September will be circulated.

Action: JST to circulate meeting dates for September

Jenny Soreskog-Turp

May 2021

j.soreskog-turp@rcvs.org.uk

CPD Policy and Compliance sub-committee

Terms of Reference and meeting frequency

1. The Panel is responsible for monitoring and reviewing the RCVS CPD Policy and making recommendations for changes to Education Committee and VN Council.
2. The Panel is responsible for the RCVS CPD non-compliance policy and procedures, overall engagement with CPD and 1CPD and to make decisions on whether or not to refer individual cases of non-compliance or non-response to the Professional Conduct Department. The group will:
 - a. Develop and keep under review the RCVS CPD non-compliance policy and procedures
 - b. Oversee any applications from veterinary surgeons or veterinary nurses to pause CPD.
 - c. Monitor and agree actions for CPD non-compliance cases
 - d. Decide when cases of CPD non-compliance should be referred to the Professional Conduct Department.
 - e. Monitor and review ways to improve engagement with CPD and the RCVS recording portal 1CPD.
3. The Group will report to Education Committee and Veterinary Nursing Council.
4. The Group will meet at least three times a year. Meeting will be held virtually except for any exceptional circumstances when face to face meetings will be more beneficial.

Membership

5. The group will consist of two veterinary nurses and one lay member nominated by the Veterinary Nurses Council and two veterinary surgeons and one lay member nominated by Education Committee. The panel has six members in total with a quorum of 50% and at least one veterinary surgeon and one veterinary nurse must attend each meeting.
6. Membership of the group as of the 27 August 2021:
 - Linda Ford (Chair)
 - Sue Paterson
 - Neil Smith
 - Alison Carr
 - Elizabeth Cox
 - Claire Roberts

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	14 September 2021
Title	Update from the CPD Policy Working Party
Summary	Minutes from the meeting of the CPD Policy Working Party on the 1 June 2021
Decisions required	None
Attachments	None
Author	Jenny Soreskog-Turp Lead for Postgraduate Education j.soreskog-turp@rcvs.org.uk

Classifications		
Document	Classification¹	Rationales²
Paper	Unclassified	
¹Classifications 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.	

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

CPD Policy Working Party Minutes of the meeting on the 1 June 2021 on Teams

Present: Richard Stephenson Chair
Stephen May
Shona McIntyre
Susan Rhind

* Absent Elizabeth Cox
Linda Prescott-Clements

In attendance: Julie Dugmore Director of Veterinary Nursing
Jenny Soreskog-Turp Lead for Postgraduate Education
Felix Michaux Lead Software Developer
Joanne Stetzel Marketing Communications Manager
Rebecca Smith Education Administrative Assistant

Welcome and Apologies

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that Elizabeth Cox and Linda Prescott-Clements had sent their apologies.

Declarations of interest

2. There were no new declarations of interests.

Matters arising

3. The group asked about the outcome of the Covid Task Force review into the CPD requirement for 2021 as discussed at the last meeting. The Covid taskforce discussed the CPD requirement in March and decided not to reduce the requirement for 2021 but to raise awareness about the ability to pause CPD.

Minutes of the meeting on the 14 January 2021

4. The notes of the meeting held on the 14 January 2021 were received and approved.

Communication update/1CPD Data

5. Ms Stetzel gave an update on the CPD communication plan. CPD comms were paused during the lockdown but over the last few weeks these have restarted with a focus on supporting members, either to engage with the outcome based CPD requirement or using 1CPD. We did two live webinars last week, one about reflection and another about what counts as CPD, which were well received. We will also be sending an email to everyone who is not yet using 1CPD to offer one-to-one support from the RCVS team.
6. The Working party were pleased to see that so many members had signed up for webinars and thought it was useful that the recordings would be available on the website for anyone who missed the live sessions. They thought it was good that staff were also using an individual approach by sending emails to members not yet using 1CPD and offering help and support in getting started.
7. The Working party noted that the mean hours recorded in 2021 was lower this year compared to other years and wondered if that was due to the pandemic or if members retrospectively update their record at the end of the year. The development team will look into if we can get data on the time passed between a CPD activity taking place and when it is recorded using 1CPD.

Action: Development team to explore if we can get further data on recording habits

1CPD spec and features

8. The Working Party received and noted the paper outlining the original 1CPD specification and feedback from the pilots. They were impressed to see that so many features have already been implemented and felt that is important to highlight to members that we are listening to feedback and incorporating their suggestions into 1CPD. Members welcomed reminders as a new feature but had no further suggestions or amendments to the specification.

CPD Policy

9. The Working Party received and noted the paper about the CPD policy.
10. Some other professional organisations are using digital badges to encourage CPD recording but the Working party felt that it was not appropriate and that it was not something the group wanted to explore further.
11. It was noted that members will be able to download CPD compliance certificates as part of 1CPD and the group discussed if this should instead be a certificate to prove that you are on the RCVS register and have met your professional obligations including CPD. Veterinary nurses used to receive a card to prove that were registered but we stopped doing that a few years ago. The Education Department will explore options for the form of the CPD certificate

Action: The Education Department will explore options for the CPD certificates
12. The Working Party reviewed the current CPD policy and suggested the removal of paragraph 14 because they felt that the CPD pause policy was so flexible there was no need for any review on

a case-by-case basis for members struggling to meet the requirement. The committee also suggested the section about PDP should be clarified to make it clear how much CPD graduates can claim and to clarify the policy in terms of what counts as CPD and the many media that can be used.

Action: Education Department to amend CPD Policy

13. The Working Party discussed how we can make sure that new graduates are aware of the CPD policy and understand what they can count as CPD and the committee was reassured that the RCVS are developing content including videos to introduce graduates to the VetGDP and CPD. It was suggested that the videos could be shared with universities, so that these become available as part of their internal learning resources as well.
14. In 2022 the outcomes based requirement of plan, do, record and reflect becomes part of the CPD requirement and the Working Party discussed how it should be enforced. They discussed if members need to record a minimum number of objectives to meet the requirement but felt that that would be against the ethos of the policy. Setting objectives and planning your CPD should be beneficial for the individual and can be linked with reflections.
15. They discussed reflections and felt that hours of CPD can only be counted once they have been reflected upon, but we need to be clear that reflections do not have to be long or detailed and a reflection to the effect that you have not learned anything is a valuable conclusion.

Any other business

16. There were no other items of business to discuss.

Next meeting

17. The next meeting is on the 7 October 2021

Jenny Soreskog-Turp

October 2020

j.soreskog-turp@rcvs.org.uk

Summary	
Meeting	Education Committee
Date	14 September 2021
Title	List of approved Advanced Practitioners
Summary	A list of re-approved Advanced Practitioners and a list of newly approved Advanced Practitioners, approved by the panel in July 2021
Decisions required	To note
Attachments	None
Author	Laura Hogg Senior Education Officer L.hogg@rcvs.org.uk / 020 7202 0736

Classifications		
Document	Classification¹	Rationales²
Paper	Unclassified	

¹Classifications 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.

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

List of re-approved Advanced Practitioners:

Designation	Name
Companion Animal Behaviour	Emma Brown
	Margaret Cameron
Emergency and Critical Care	David Owen
	Jurijus Komisarovas
	Rebecca Sneddon
	Nicola Roach
Equine Internal Medicine	Holly Marshall
Equine Stud Medicine	Robyn Miles
Equine Surgery - Orthopaedics	Reuben Whitaker
Small Animal Cardiology	Roger Wilkinson
Small Animal Medicine	Jan Strandskog
	Jennifer Pepper
	Rhiannon Jones
	Sarah Keir
	Emma Holt
	Menai Heyes
Small Animal Medicine - Feline	Laura Edwards
Small Animal Orthopaedics	Jane Oatley
Small Animal Surgery	Duncan Greeff
	Samantha Lane
	Matthew Smith
	John Ferguson
Veterinary Dermatology	Nicola Shaw
Veterinary Ophthalmology	Alison Rutter
	Barbara Gonella
Zoological Medicine	Violaine Colon

List of new approved Advanced Practitioners:

Designation	Name	Qualification
Emergency and Critical Care	Andrzej Glowacki	BSAVA PGC
Small Animal Medicine	Hannah Parker-Lobhan	BSAVA PGC
	Kerry Peak	CertAVP(SAM)
	Sebastian Griffin	CertAVP(SAM)
	Erin Marsh	CertAVP(SAM)
	Joshua White	BSAVA PGC
	Emily Parr	CertAVP(SAM)
	Thea Gardner	BSAVA PGC
	Jennifer Alexander	BSAVA PGC
Small Animal Surgery	Laura Pearce	Harper Adams PgC
	Kathryn Wale	CertAVP(GSAS)
	Rachel Davies	Harper Adams PgC
	Diego Bobis Villagra	Postgraduate Certificate
	Carlos Martin Bernal	BSAVA PGC
	Matthew Erskine	BSAVA PGC
	Roberto Bergamaschi	CertAVP(GSAS)
	Sara Azabal Brillo	Harper Adams PgC
	Fabio Frazzica	CertAVP(GSAS)
	Christian Donswijk	BSAVA PGC
	Nichola Davies	BSAVA PGC
	Benjamin Garland	CertAVP(GSAS)
Veterinary Ophthalmology	Edward Cutting	Harper Adams PgC
	James Smith	BSAVA PGC
	Georgina Hawkins	Harper Adams PgC
	Lucy Hughes	BSAVA PGC
	Philippa Childs	BSAVA PGC
Zoological Medicine	Ashton Hollwarth	CertAVP(ZM)