Summary

Meeting	Education Committee
Date	20 May 2025
Title	CPD Buddies
Summary	This paper proposes pilot of a new CPD buddy scheme that can offer peer support in achieving the CPD requirement.
Decisions required	Education Committee are asked to approve the CPD buddy pilot
Attachments	None
Author	Jenny Soreskog-Turp Lead for Postgraduate Education j.soreskog-turp@rcvs.org.uk / 020 7202 0701

Classifications

Document	Classification[1]	Rationales[2]
Paper	**Unclassified**	NA

[1]Classifications explained

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

[2]Classification rationales

Confidential	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	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 Introduction

1. The CPD requirement is mandatory for veterinary surgeons and veterinary nurses that are on RCVS register.

2. There is plenty of support available for anyone struggling with CPD such as information on the website, a CPD and reflection course on the RCVS Academy and dedicated staff to help with CPD enquiries.

3. The RCVS has previously had a CPD buddy system where vets and nurses volunteered to be a CPD buddy and would sign up to an RCVS mailing list to get useful information and tips about CPD, as well as any updates from the RCVS that they could share with their colleagues within the same practice/workplace.

4. At the last meeting of the VetGDP and CPD engagement group, it was agreed that further support would be beneficial and it is therefore suggested that we pilot a new voluntary CPD buddy scheme.

CPD buddy pilot

5. Having a CPD buddy may provide accountability and motivation, ensuring regular check-ins to keep professionals on track with learning goals. Peer encouragement makes it easier to stay committed to CPD activities, preventing procrastination on required hours. Discussions may also encourage active reflection, moving beyond simply 'ticking off' CPD requirements to truly integrating new skills into practice. Buddies may provide valuable feedback, helping to refine professional practice and improve overall competency.

6. It is suggested that the new CPD buddy scheme is introduced and piloted over the next 12 months. The scheme would be facilitated by the RCVS, however, participants will be individually responsible for maintaining contact with their buddy and maximising the benefit of the relationship.

7. It is suggested that, as a first step, the RCVS would advertise for volunteers to sign up as CPD buddies and volunteers can select from the following categories:
   a) Tech support buddy– to help individuals struggling with 1CPD or accessing online CPD.
   b) CPD encouragement buddy–to support peers in regularly recording and reflecting on CPD
   c) Clinical CPD buddy – to engage in discussions and reflect on clinical cases.
   d) Other - for any support that does not fall into the above categories.

8. The RCVS would compile and maintain a list for each category, including preference for in person or remote contact.

9. Once there are sufficient number of volunteers in each category, the RCVS would start to promote the scheme. Participants may either be matched by the RCVS or provided with a list of available buddies to contact directly and arrange their own pairing and follow-up.

10. It is suggested that the pilot runs for 12 months and that a short survey is sent to members at the end of the 12 months to evaluate the scheme's effectiveness, gather feedback, and determine its future direction.

11. Once the CPD buddy scheme is established it may be suitable to advertise for CPD buddies who are willing to host quarterly CPD drop-in sessions to answer questions and share their approach to CPD and reflection to a wider group.

CPD buddy scheme

12. Aside from setting up and developing the scheme it should not require any additional resources from the RCVS. If the Education Committee agree to the pilot, the Education Team/VetGDP & CPD engagement group would need to complete some initial work before it could be introduced, such as:
    a) Clarify Roles and Responsibilities: Clearly define what is expected from both buddies and participants to avoid confusion or lack of engagement.
    b) Provide Initial Guidance/Toolkit: Create a short onboarding document or webinar outlining how to get started, communication tips, and how to reflect on CPD effectively.
    c) Diversity of Access: Ensure that the scheme is inclusive by encouraging a range of professionals (e.g., different regions, sectors, and career stages) to participants

13. It is important and should be clearly communicated that CPD buddies are not employed by the RCVS and that the scheme operates independently of RCVS oversight in terms of individual buddy interactions. While the RCVS facilitates the initial contact and provides resources, the development of the relationship and all ongoing communications are the responsibility of the participating individuals.

14. The CPD buddy system would be a voluntary scheme, but the VetGDP and CPD Compliance subcommittee may recommend non-compliant vets and RVNs to consider joining the scheme as a supportive measure to help re-engage with CPD.

Next Steps

15. Education Committee is asked to discuss the CPD buddy pilot and agree next steps.

Summary

Meeting	Education Committee
Date	20 May 2025
Title	Update from the CertAVP subcommittee
Summary	Minutes from the meeting of the CertAVP subcommittee on the 4 March 2025
Decisions required	To note
Attachments	None
Author	Laura Hogg Senior Education Officer L.hogg@rcvs.org.uk / 020 7202 0736

Classifications

Document	Classification[1]	Rationales[2]
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	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	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 4 March 2025

Present:	Stephanie Richardson	
	Zara Kennedy	
	Abbie Calow - Chair	
	Matt Jones	
	Liz Chan	
	Ros Carslake	
	Rachael Gregson	
	Sam Bescoby	
	Amanda Davies*	
In Attendance	Laura Hogg	
	Jenny Soreskog-Turp	

*Absent
The meeting was held remotely by Microsoft Teams.

Apologies for Absence

1. Apologies were received from Amanda Davies.

Declarations of interest

2. There were no new declarations of interest.

Minutes

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2024 were held as a true record.

Matters arising

4. All matters had been actioned or were on the agenda for discussion.

CertAVP Quality assurance (QA)

5. The subcommittee were presented with draft feedback questions for an end of CertAVP survey.

6. It was highlighted that two of the questions were duplicated. It was also highlighted that not all candidates would be able to answer all questions if they had completed their modules through an assessment only route.

7. The subcommittee suggested adding a tick box at the beginning of the survey for candidates to select whether they had completed the CertAVP as a full course participant or through

assessment only and to highlight that not all questions may be applicable to them. There should also be the option to select where they had undertaken their modules.

8. The subcommittee suggested changing the use of 'faculty' to 'course leader', and 'academic stress' to 'academic challenges' and of 'programme' to 'CertAVP'. They also suggested merging and rewording questions 16 and 17.

9. It was suggested to add a question on how candidates felt their overall workload was.

10. As there are no objectives for the overall CertAVP programme the subcommittee queried the target of the survey and whether this would be better as an end of module review. The subcommittee were informed that the survey would be sent to candidates once they had completed their final module, before being issued with their certificate to ensure student feedback is being collected. The subcommittee were also informed the survey was a requirement from Education Committee following the updates to the QA processes.

11. Due to time constraints the subcommittee agreed to look at the updated survey questions via email.

ACTION – an updated survey to be circulated to the subcommittee via email

Equine Behavioural modules

12. Following discussions at the June meeting the subcommittee were presented with final module documents and the module combinations for the equine behavioural modules.

13. The subcommittee also discussed Edinburgh's accreditation application to run these modules and noted the requirement for case logs seemed high at 50 for a module. As candidates were also required to present a reflective case report there was discussion whether the number of case logs could be reduced.

14. Ms Gregson told the subcommittee she would take this back to Edinburgh for discussion. As the course is already being run at Edinburgh, the numbers may be where it was being aligned to also make these into CertAVP modules.

15. The subcommittee were happy to approve the new modules provided the formatting and typos were addressed. Edinburgh's accreditation for these modules would come back to the next meeting.

ACTION – Edinburgh to review accreditation application
ACTION – modules to be amended and proofread before adding to modules available

Requests for third sits of synoptic exam

16. The subcommittee was presented with requests for a third sit of the synoptic exam from three candidates.

17. The subcommittee discussed the first candidate's request taking into consideration the feedback from the examiners. As they felt the candidate appeared to be lacking in some areas of their knowledge, they felt it appropriate that the candidate be asked to present a log of 20 cases that would be reviewed by Liverpool before they could progress to a third sit of the exam. They would also need to wait 12 months in order to gain further knowledge and practice their exam technique before they could sit the exam. The candidate would also be reminded of the format of the exam and sent the candidate guidance so they could further review the marking rubric and what would be expected of them in the exam.

18. The subcommittee were happy to approve the second and third candidate's request for a third sit.
ACTION – secretary to feedback to candidates

Approval of synoptic examiners

19. The subcommittee were presented with names of four potential synoptic examiners for approval, as the potential examiners were not AP's or specialists but do hold relevant postgraduate qualifications and experience in those areas.

20. The subcommittee queried whether one of the potential examiners could act as an examiner if they had retired. The subcommittee were informed that the potential examiner is currently on the practising register. As the requirements to be on the AP/specialist list require those to be on the practising register, should any examiner no longer reside on the practising register they would no longer be able to act as an examiner.

21. The subcommittee were happy to approve the names suggested as synoptic examiners.

QAR report

22. The QA report from Nottingham was noted.

23. The subcommittee observed there was a 50% fail rate for some of the C modules. It was reported that this was often where a candidate had not provided sufficient detail or had used inappropriate/retrospective cases. The subcommittee were informed that the instructions provided to the candidates is being reviewed to make it clearer what is expected of them.

Synoptic examiner reports

24. The examiner reports were noted.

25. The subcommittee asked if the examples on the template could be removed when circulated for future meetings.

Statistics

26. The statistics were noted.

27. The subcommittee highlighted a mistype on the number of A-FAVP.1 module passes.

28. The subcommittee noted that there was a varying pass rate of the synoptic exam for some designations when sat with different providers, it was discussed that this was often due to the low numbers of candidates sitting those designations with some providers, skewing the pass rate.

Any other business

29. Mrs Richardson highlighted a case of self-plagiarism that they had received from a candidate who it had been flagged had previously submitted their case report at another provider and asked if there were any rules on this. The other providers all confirmed their policies stated that you cannot submit the same case more than once.

Date of the next meeting

30. The date of the next meeting is 17th June at 10am.

Laura Hogg
March 2025
l.hogg@rcvs.org.uk