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Apologies

1. The Chairman welcomed the Chairman of the Fellowship Sub-Committee, Dr Lydia Brown.
2. Apologies for absence were received from Professor Gary England and Professor Duncan Maskell.

3. Members wished to convey their good wishes to Mrs Freda Andrews who was unable to attend the meeting owing to a hospital appointment.

Declarations of interest

4. There were no new declarations.

Minutes

5. The minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2012 were received and noted.

Matters arising

Phasing out of RCVS Diplomas

6. Members were reminded of the decision made at the last meeting to phase out the RCVS Diplomas with the last enrolments taking place at 1 November 2012. Copies of correspondence from two Diplomates raising their concerns, which had been received following publication of this decision, were noted and considered.

7. Members were reminded that when a previous proposal had been made to subsume the RCVS Diplomas some years ago, many more objections had been received.

8. It was noted that the main objections arose because of the perceived difficulty in obtaining a Diploma while working in practice.

9. Whilst noting the concerns raised, members were unanimous in standing by the original decision and agreed that interaction with the European Colleges should be encouraged.

Committee structure

10. At the February 2012 meeting, the Committee had expressed its disappointment at not having the chance to discuss the paper on restructuring committees. In the light of the PRC paper for the following day, which appeared to accelerate the restructuring process, concern was again expressed that EPSC had not had an opportunity to discuss proposals in its meeting. It was suggested that EPSC should discuss this at their February 2013 meeting. It was also suggested that the timing of committee meetings needed to be reviewed.

11. The PRC paper proposed the establishment of a Board but that restructuring of other RCVS committees would take place after the appointment of the new Chief Executive as originally envisaged. Officers pointed out PRC and Council would decide whether to implement the Governance Review Group’s suggestion or stick to the original timing. They also gave
assurances that establishing a Board would not impact on the other committees. However, it was noted that the proposal included provision that the Chairman of Education Committee should be a member of the Board. The EPSC Chairman indicated that he would raise the issue of the role of the Chairman on the Board at PRC.

Action: Chairman

12. Heads of Veterinary Schools (HOVS) had discussed this matter at their meeting the previous day and had asked Officers for a meeting.

13. A member in favour of establishing a Board immediately and then reviewing committees and the timing of their meetings as a secondary phase did not think that the importance of Education committee was in any way diminished by the proposals.

Recommendations from the Specialisation Working Party

14. The Committee received a paper prepared by the Head of Education setting out the 26 recommendations of the working party covering the specialist list and level of specialisation, proposals for a list of ‘advanced practitioners’ to be subjected to revalidation, titles and designations, the number of specialists, the referral process, the RCVS Fellowship, and the replacement of the existing RCVS subject boards. It was noted that the responses to the consultation paper had been made available electronically but not in hard copy because the document was over 500 pages in length.

15. The President thanked the Head of Education in her absence, and Education department staff, for their work on this project. He explained that there was still some outstanding work to be completed e.g. the issue of the Fellowship as an alternative route to specialist status for those in niche areas and the working party recommended that another group should take this forward. He reported that some market research would be carried out with members of the public to test clarity and the terminology used to describe specialisation.

16. There followed some discussion on the status of an ‘Acknowledged Veterinarian’ within Europe and possible confusion with the proposed term for a middle tier of ‘Advanced Practitioner’. It was agreed that these terms meant different things and, therefore, it was essential to reach an early agreement on the preferred title of ‘Advanced Practitioner’ in the United Kingdom.

17. In considering the document the following minor amendment was discussed and agreed:
   - Page 17 para. 20 line 3 – to insert the word ‘normally’ before the word ‘includes’.
   - Page 22 para. 1.6 – two members felt there was some confusion in the meaning and suggested that the word ‘arranging’ in brackets would provide clarity i.e. “The initial contact should be made by the referring (arranging) veterinary surgeon....”

18. Referring to the proposal to award the title of RCVS Honorary Fellow (Hon FRCVS) to Specialists who had been on the RCVS list of specialists for a continuous period of 10 years, one member felt those in this category deserved to be acknowledged by award of the full FRCVS. The President reported that this proposal had been made following discussion with the various interested parties.
However, there would be an opportunity for further discussion.

19. The Committee was pleased to note that further work to be undertaken by the RCVS Practice Standards Group on standards for specialist practices had been endorsed by the working party.

20. The Chairman thanked the Committee for the useful discussion and confirmed that the recommendations would be presented to Council.

Action: Recommend to Council

Changes in the structure of the CertAVP\(^1\) modular certificate and byelaw amendment

21. The Chairman of the CertAVP Sub-Committee reported that since its inception the CertAVP structure has been the subject of much debate. A number of potential candidates were deterred by the certificate’s structure, particularly the size and nature of the compulsory A module. Feedback from a limited sample of those taking the certificate, and those who chose not to pursue the qualification, suggested that we could retain much of the original philosophy behind the CertAVP but make it more appealing by re-configuring the foundation elements.

22. The proposed changes would reconfigure the A module by removing the business elements and the clinical key skills would be absorbed by the new “Foundations of Veterinary Practice” (FVP) A module and the original B modules. The new FVP module would be worth 10 credits and candidates would be required to take one or two B modules and 3 or 4 C modules to make up the 60 credits. Designations could remain available through specific combinations of modules as before.

23. Responses to the survey suggested that people who had completed the current A module would not have been dissuaded from taking the CertAVP by the new structure – in fact they might have preferred it - and those who had not yet enrolled found the new structure more attractive.

24. The Committee expressed concern about the removal of business skills from the module and the fact that this element would no longer be compulsory. However, business skills were increasingly covered in the undergraduate curriculum and it was noted that optional business modules would be available as part of the CertAVP. One view was that many veterinary surgeons worked as employees and perhaps did not need or want to study business skills. On the other hand, employers would like their employees to have good business knowledge.

25. There was an understanding that the changes had been stimulated by a variety of factors, including the continued debate in the professional media and commercially-driven concerns. It was acknowledged that the creation of the BSAVA Certificate, set up as a direct response to consumers not wishing to study the original A module had led all involved to want to increase the attraction of the RCVS CertAVP. It was frustrating that the value of the A module could only really be appreciated once it had been completed, and that required individuals to enrol.

\(^1\) CertAVP – Certificate in Advanced Veterinary Practice
26. There was some concern that the relatively large size of the new module meant that the areas it covered were not given sufficient credits to do them justice.

27. The Committee approved the proposal to change the structure of the certificate in Advanced Veterinary Practice by a majority and would recommend to Council the necessary changes to the bye-laws.

Action: Recommend to Council

Social mobility ‘toolkit’

28. The “Social Mobility Toolkit” report, produced by ‘Professions for Good’, a group of professional bodies working together on diversity issues, and endorsed by the coalition government, was received and welcomed.

29. A template questionnaire for collecting data to monitor social mobility was provided in the report. Members recommended that RCVS should not circulate the template as it stood as some of the response options were inappropriate or inapplicable to our respondents. It was also noted that the veterinary schools already collected much of the data that the templates requested from their applicants and would be prepared to provide this.

Action: Veterinary schools

Veterinary student standards for medical fitness to train – HEOPS\(^2\) draft guidance

30. The paper, which had already been discussed at Advisory Committee, set out a proposal by HEOPS for draft standards of medical fitness to train for veterinary students. The Committee was asked to consider the draft standards with a view to providing feedback and a written response to HEOPS. The Committee supported the guidance in principle but had some concerns.

31. HOVS had discussed the draft guidance at their meeting and noted that a meeting had taken place between RCVS and HEOPS and now needed to establish what discussions had taken place locally as not all were aware that their universities had had input. Members from one school queried why this work was being repeated and referred to guidance elsewhere and the reports\(^3\) published by Anne Tynan which were not referenced in this draft guidance. It was reported that the University of Cambridge had to ensure that it applied the same standards to medical and veterinary students so guidance covering only veterinary student standards would pose a problem. HOVS also observed that they consulted with a range of professionals including occupational practitioners but this draft guidance gave the impression that occupational practitioners were the main professionals consulted and had the coordinating role. There was general agreement that there should be a systematic approach on a case by case basis but that decisions would be made

---

\(^2\) HEOPS – Higher Education Occupational Physicians / Practitioners

\(^3\) Time to take stock: disability and professional competence & At the portal of the profession: the veterinary profession and people with disabilities
on the advice of a range of professionals and that the final decision lay with the universities.

32. In summary, the Chairman said that it appeared that a standard approach was to be welcomed but the draft guidance did not cover what was currently being done.

33. HOVS would report the current position in their schools.

Action: HOVS

PQSC and Statutory Membership Examination Board recommendation

34. A paper, classified as ‘Private’, because it contained details of an individual, was received. EPSC was asked to ratify the recommendation from PQSC and the Statutory Membership Examination Board to refuse permission for the individual concerned to have a further attempt at sitting the Statutory Membership Examination.

35. It was noted that the examination regulations set out the maximum number of attempts allowed.

36. The Committee voted unanimously in favour of the Board and PQSC’s decision.

Action: Secretary to write

Professional Development Record (PDR) project update

37. An update on the professional development record project from the Head of Education was received and noted. The Chairman invited comments especially from members of Council who had been involved in testing the CPD recording system which was now live and available for use by RCVS members. It was suggested that a link should be provided on the RCVS website to give more publicity to the system following its launch at BSAVA

RCVS Certificates and Diplomas

38. The Committee received and noted a paper summarising the activities of the RCVS related to Certificates and Diplomas and showing the number of Certificate candidates remaining in the system who are entered for the last examination in 2012 and the number of Diploma candidates currently enrolled and numbers entered for the 2012 round of examinations.

Recommendation to award Diploma of Fellowship

39. A recommendation was received from the Fellowship Sub Committee to award the Diploma of Fellowship, subject to minor amendments being made before it is placed in the RCVS Library, to Candidate No. T/728 – Dr Annamaria Nagy DrMedVet MRCVS for her thesis entitled: ‘High-field and low-field magnetic resonance imaging findings in the carpus and proximal metacarpal region of horses with and without carpal and/or proximal metacarpal regional pain’
40. Draft minutes of the Research Sub-Committee meeting held on 3 April 2012 were received and noted. In the absence of the Sub-Committee Chairman, the EPSC Chairman invited comments. The meeting about the industry and academia and cooperation strategies event had been postponed until late autumn as the sub-committee was still waiting to secure funding.

41. An update was provided to the Committee about the end of the Wellcome Trust CVRT awards. There was some money to fund students who would intercalate next year but this would only result in a short term benefit. The Wellcome Trust was minded to fund joint training schemes and wished to see closer alignment of post graduate medical and veterinary training.

42. This was disappointing as medical students who intercalated received an extra year of funding from the NHS in their clinical years but neither Defra nor Wellcome would fund veterinary students. A way needed to be found to address the issue. It was suggested that the Research Sub-Committee might be able to help and could be tasked with exploring avenues of support.

43. It was pointed out that intercalation could inspire veterinary students to go into research careers but warned that a lot depended on the nature of their intercalation, particularly the research project elements, and the veterinary schools needed to ensure that their programmes were appropriately designed and delivered.

44. The Wellcome Trust CVRT award had provided funds to support mentors for people on the scheme, but this funding was coming to an end. HOVS wished to ask RCVS to provide the shortfall which amounted to £10,000 for 2 further years. It was suggested that a request should be made to the RCVS Trust for this funding.

45. In response to questions about how the Research Sub-Committee raised research related issues with other organisations, for example, with Defra, and about representation on the committee, and how it was ensured that the views of the different veterinary schools were communicated, it was clarified that the Chairman of Research Sub-Committee was also a member of the Heads of Veterinary Schools Meeting (HOVS).

46. EPSC recommended that the name, remit and composition of the Research Sub-Committee should be discussed as part of the wider review of committees.

47. Vice President, Mr Jinman, referred to the Research Sub-Committee’s discussion about the approach from the British Society of Animal Scientists (BSAS) regarding their proposal to establish a regulatory body for animal scientists. He asked that the Research Sub-Committee submit their views to him as soon as possible as these would be relevant to the Legislation Working Group’s discussions with Defra about reviewing the exemption orders.

Action: Chairman to ask Research Sub-Committee Chairman
48. With reference to paragraph 26 to 30 about the AVTRW/BSAS\(^5\) joint conference in Nottingham, the Chairman said that unfortunately the conference had been poorly attended by AVTRW members.

CertAVP Sub-Committee

49. The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2012 were received. It was noted that the Head of Education had given an oral report of the meeting at the February meeting of EPSC.

Heads of Veterinary Schools report

50. In Professor England’s absence, Professor Price reported. HOVS had discussed the Social Mobility Toolkit and the HEOPS guidance and planned for an Away Day to be hosted by Glasgow. It would explore opportunities for cooperation between schools and areas of strategic importance. Heads of teaching, curriculum and research as well as administrators would participate as well as the Heads of School. HOVS would feedback to EPSC.

51. Veterinary Public Health teachers had held a meeting with Professor Frans Smulders to discuss the implications to the curricula of the proposals for up to 15% of the curriculum to relate to veterinary public health. Another meeting would be held to define core, track and postgraduate elements of the veterinary public health proposals. The document drawn up by the UK veterinary schools in 2009 would be used as the basis for the new discussion. An outcome of the meeting was a recommendation to the EAEVE working group that it was inappropriate to single out veterinary public health and develop a standard operating procedure (SOP) for veterinary public health in isolation.

52. EPSC was urged to look at the Veterinary Development Council’s report and submit a response. The Committee was reminded that the report had been funded by Defra and was an initiative aimed at ensuring the engagement of the veterinary profession.

53. An update on the progress of the EAEVE SOP was provided. Mrs Lynne Hill had attended one meeting so far. The new SOPs would be leaner, more structured and in a similar style to the AVMA’s standards. Professor Smulders had discussed the veterinary public health SOP with this group as well.

Items for publication

54. The Chairman summarised the items for publication arising from this meeting as follows:

- Confirmation of the decision to phase out RCVS Diplomas
- RCVS commitment to the concept of social mobility and the collection of relevant data
- To note the meeting with European representatives about veterinary public health

\(^{5}\) AVTRW – Association for Veterinary Teaching and Research Work
55. The Chairman would not be at June Council as he would be in Sydney for the visitation. Vice Chairman, Mr Chris Tufnell, would present the report to Council.

Examination fees and expenses

56. The proposed changes to rates of examination fees and examiners' fees for 2012 to 2013 were received and noted. The paper was classified as 'Confidential' pending approval by PRC. There was an error in the percentage increase column which showed a 0% increase for Fellowship synoptic examiners whereas the amount in the 2013 column represented an increase over 2012.

Other business

57. Sir Kenneth Calman had agreed to present the recommendations of the Specialisation Working Party, which he had chaired, and this was welcomed by the Committee.

58. The Vice President, Mr Peter Jinman, reported that he had been approached by an organiser of leadership courses. He asked members for their views on whether this was something that the Committee could endorse or take forward in some way as a profession or whether they felt that it was a matter for individuals. The expense of such courses was acknowledged. The general view was that such courses were beneficial but should be funded by members or their organisations.

59. The Chairman announced that this was Dr Christopher Chesney's last meeting of EPSC before he retired from Council. Dr Chesney had been a very valuable member of the Committee and in particular he commended him for always taking the trouble to make his point in an erudite and polite way even if he was in a minority. His work as Chairman of the Statutory Membership Examination Board was also to be applauded. Dr Chesney thanked him and recalled that he first sat on Education Committee in 1996 and had had the privilege of being on the committee for 16 years. He was proud of its work which he encouraged members to continue.

Date of next meeting

60. Wednesday 10 October 2012 at 10am.

Anne Jermey
Committee Secretary
May 2012
education@rcvs.org.uk
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Background

1. Council has powers in the Supplemental Charter to make bye-laws for a number of purposes. The General Administration Bye-Laws 2009 currently do the following main jobs:

   (a) they lay down rules for the orderly conduct of College business;

   (b) they constitute committees, the Officers’ Meetings and the Governance Review Group, delegate powers to those bodies and lay down their terms of reference;

   (c) they determine the procedure of the Annual General Meeting (this is a specific requirement of the Charter); and

   (d) they determine the fee to be paid for the issue of a certificate as to whether or not a certain person is on the register (again, this is a requirement of the Charter).

2. The Charter lays down procedural requirements for bye-laws "for the good order and management of the College": 21 days notice of proposals for such bye-laws must be given in writing to all Council members, and they must be approved by a two-thirds majority at a Council meeting. The view has been taken in the past that those requirements should apply to RCVS bye-laws generally.

3. There are arguments for making changes in the 2009 bye-laws in respect of the following matters:

   - the delegation of powers to committees and the Officers;

   - the management structure of the College; and

   - minor deficiencies in the existing provisions.

Delegation of powers

4. The Charter allows Council "to act by committees or sub-committees and to delegate such duties and powers as it thinks fit from time to time to such committees or sub-committees and to any of its own number and to the officers and servants and agents of the College". The Charter does not require any of this to be done through bye-laws, and it would be convenient if Council were able to revise the committee structure from time to time without going through the procedure for amending bye-laws. Revisions of the bye-laws are always liable to lag behind events: thus the 2009 bye-laws still provide for a Public Affairs Committee, even though that Committee no longer meets. Again, Council agreed in June that it would set up a new committee to advise it on the appointment of members of the Preliminary Investigation and Disciplinary Committees (as reconstituted following the proposed legislative reform order), and such a committee needs to be set up in November in order to meet the timetable for recruitment.
5. At their weekend meeting in July the Officers favoured removing the constitution and terms of reference of committees from the GA bye-laws. If this were done, Council would instead need to approve from time to time a paper listing committees and similar bodies and describing their membership and terms of reference.

6. It would similarly be possible to remove from the bye-laws the delegation of powers to the Officers (bye-laws 8, 9 and 11 and Schedule 3). A case can be made for continuing to set out in the bye-laws the arrangements which Council has made for the management of College business, because such arrangements should not be changed every five minutes. If, however, the senior management structure of the College is to be formally promulgated the job needs to be done properly, and on this subject the 2009 bye-laws do not stand up to critical examination. The relevant provisions are discussed below.

Management structure

7. The Act, the Charter and the bye-laws all recognise that the College will have a management structure below the level of the Council, but the structure is not tightly defined. The main provisions are as follows:

- the Act says in section 1(2) that there shall be a President and two Vice-Presidents elected from among themselves by members of the Council. The Act does not say anything about their role, and there is no expectation that one person will progress through the three positions;

- section 9 of the Act requires Council to appoint a registrar to keep the register of veterinary surgeons. Various provisions of the Act give the Registrar specific functions in relation to registration;

- article 9 of the Charter also requires Council to appoint a Registrar and specifies that the Registrar is to be an officer of the College - i.e a senior employee - and not a member of the Council;

- article 11 of the Charter gives Council power to appoint a Secretary, who may be the same person as the Registrar;

- article 6(1) of the Charter provides for the Secretary or Registrar to convene Council meetings, article 7 requires one or other of them to take the minutes of general meetings and Council meetings (though they may depute this task), and article 10 requires the Registrar to issue registration certificates. Otherwise the Charter is silent about the functions of the Secretary and Registrar;

- article 8 of the Charter requires Council to elect a Treasurer each year but says nothing about the Treasurer's role;
- bye-law 8 gives the President power to "take such action in the name of the College and of the Council as may be reasonably necessary", "carry out such other functions as customarily adhere to the office", and convene meetings of Council or of committees, consulting the Vice-Presidents, Treasurer and Registrar when possible;

- bye-law 9 requires the Vice-Presidents to deputise for the President "as may be required in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Bye-Law, but not necessarily undertake specific roles assigned to the President by these or other Bye-Laws or Regulations, unless so provided". The meaning of the words quoted is open to debate;

- bye-law 10 gives various jobs to the "Secretary and Registrar", assuming them to be the same person;

- bye-law 11 defines the Officers as the President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer and Secretary & Registrar, gives them power to meet "to oversee and co-ordinate the despatch of the business of the College", and gives their meetings delegated authority to act in the name of Council and the College on the matters mentioned in the third Schedule to the bye-laws. This authority is conferred on the Officers' meetings, not the Officers as such. The meetings are, however, loosely defined: the bye-law refers to meetings of the Officers "or such of them as shall be available at the time" and does not specify a quorum;

- Schedule 3 to the bye-laws is reasonably clear in relation to workaday functions of the Officers' meetings, such as arranging representation of the College at external events, but vague about the central role: "to oversee the general management of all College business" and "to deal with business not requiring the decision of the Council or of any Committee". The financial responsibilities of the Officers' meetings overlap with the remit of the Planning and Resources Committee, with both having a duty to monitor management accounts and a power to approve expenditure from the contingency fund.

8. The lack of clarity of the bye-laws which confer powers and duties on the Officers of the College perhaps reflects an expectation that they will follow custom and practice and refrain from taking action which might attract criticism within Council. There does not, however, seem to be much point in going through the formality of making bye-laws to specify the roles and powers of the Officers if their responsibilities are left unclear.

Minor changes

9. The present bye-laws could usefully be improved in a number of minor respects:

- bye-law 3 requires the keeping of register of documents to which the Common Seal has been affixed "which shall be available for inspection by any Council member". It is not clear whether it is the register or the documents which have to be available for inspection;
- bye-law 14 mentions the Head of Finance without defining that position;

- Schedule 1 to the bye-laws deals with procedure for general meetings in paragraphs 1, 2, 4 and 5, as required by the Charter, but paragraph 3 specifies the agenda for the AGM. This seems unnecessary;

- paragraph 13 of Schedule 1 says that Council and Committee minutes "shall be taken as read and confirmed at the next succeeding meeting". It is not clear what this means, or how it fits with the practice of circulating minutes for comment before the next meeting.

Timing

10. If it is agreed that the bye-laws should be amended so as to remove the constitution and terms of reference of committees, and perhaps also the provisions which delegate powers to the Officers, Council can be invited to approve this proposition in principle in November. New bye-laws can then be submitted for ratification by Council in March 2013.
Annex

Extract from General Administration Bye-Laws 2009

THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION BYE-LAWS 2009
as amended

Made by the Council on 5 November 2009 under powers conferred by Articles 3, 6(2), 10 and 22 of the 1967 Supplemental Charter

Citation and Commencement

1. These Bye-Laws may be cited as the General Administration Bye-Laws 2009; shall come into immediate effect, and all previous General Administration Bye-Laws, and any amendments to them, shall cease to have effect, but without prejudice to the validity of anything done thereunder.

Interpretation

2. (1) The Interpretation Act 1978 shall apply to these Bye-Laws as it applies to an Act of Parliament and, unless the context requires to the contrary, words and expressions used in these Bye-Laws shall have the same meanings as in the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 (“the Act”) and the Supplemental Charter granted on 19th October 1967 (“the Supplemental Charter”).

(2) A reference to ‘the Council’ means the Council of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

Common Seal

3. (1) The Common Seal of the College shall bear the armorial bearings of the College, as granted by the College of Arms on 1st July 1845.

(2) The Secretary and Registrar shall have custody of the Common Seal, which shall only be affixed as provided in Article 13 of the Supplemental Charter.

(3) The Secretary and Registrar shall keep a register of documents to which the Common Seal has been affixed, which shall be available for inspection by any Council member.

General Meetings

4. The procedure and rules of debate at General Meetings shall, subject to the provisions of the Supplemental Charter, be as set out in Schedule 1 to these Bye-Laws.
Council Meetings

5. The procedure and rules of debate at Council meetings shall, subject to the provisions of the Supplemental Charter, be as set out in Schedule 1 to these Bye-Laws.

Committee Meetings

6. The procedure and rules of debate at Committee meetings shall be as set out in Schedule 1 to these Bye-Laws, and shall also apply where appropriate to meetings of Sub-Committees and Working Parties, at the discretion of the Chairman of the Sub-Committee or Working Party concerned.

7. It shall be permissible for any Committee, Sub-Committee or Working Party to meet by means of telephone conferencing or video-conferencing, at the discretion of the Chairman, and the provisions of Schedule 1 to these Bye-Laws shall be adapted as necessary to any meeting held by either of those means.

President, Senior Vice-President and Junior Vice-President

8. (1) The President may, subject to the provisions of the Act, the Supplemental Charter and these Bye-Laws, take such action in the name of the College and of the Council as may be reasonably necessary. He may carry out such other functions as customarily adhere to the office. He may direct that a meeting of the Council or any Committee or Sub-Committee shall be convened on such date and for such purpose as he thinks fit. In performing his duties under this paragraph the President shall whenever reasonably practicable consult the Senior and Junior Vice-Presidents, the Treasurer and the Registrar.

(2) The Senior Vice-President and the Junior Vice-President shall deputise for the President as may be required in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Bye-Law, but not necessarily undertake specific roles assigned to the President by these or other Bye-Laws or Regulations, unless so provided.

Treasurer

9. (1) The Treasurer shall be responsible for the financial affairs of the College, including the proper maintenance of its accounting records and the preparation of the College’s Accounts for audit and presentation to the Annual General Meeting.

Secretary and Registrar

10. (1) The Secretary and Registrar shall normally attend all General Meetings, Council meetings and Committee meetings (save for the statutory committees). All notices convening General Meetings and agendas for Council and Committee meetings shall be issued over the name of the Secretary and Registrar.

(2) The Secretary and Registrar shall be responsible for the management and administration of the affairs of the College, subject to the provisions of the Act, the Supplemental Charter, these Bye-
Laws and the directions of the Council given from time to time. He shall consult the President (or, in his absence, one or both of the Vice-Presidents) on any matter requiring new policy or a substantive change in existing policy.

(3) The Secretary and Registrar shall be responsible for the safe custody of all documents and property belonging to the College. No confidential document shall be made available other than to members of the Council except by order of the President or of the Council or as required by law.

(4) In the event of a vacancy in the post of Secretary and Registrar, or the prolonged absence of the Secretary and Registrar through illness, the duties of the post shall be carried on by an Acting Secretary and Registrar or otherwise, as the President (or, in his absence the Senior or Junior Vice-President) shall direct, subject to the directions of the Council.

Officers’ Meetings

11. The Officers of the College (namely the President, the Senior Vice-President, the Junior Vice-President, the Treasurer and the Secretary and Registrar), or such of them as shall be available at the time, shall be empowered to meet together to oversee and co-ordinate the despatch of the business of the College, and in particular to deal with the matters set out in Schedule 3 to these Bye-Laws. Any such meeting shall, subject to the provisions of the Act, the Supplemental Charter and these Bye-Laws, have delegated authority under Article 6(1) of the Supplemental Charter to act in the name of the Council and the College on the matters set out in Schedule 3 to these Bye-Laws.

Accounts and Auditors

12. (1) The Accounts of the College as signed by the Auditors shall be presented to the Annual General Meeting. The Accounts shall be circulated to the members of the College in or with the Annual Report of the Council, either in full form or in summary form. If the Accounts are circulated in summary form a copy of the full Accounts shall be available to any member on request and copies of the full Accounts shall be available at the Annual General Meeting. If the Accounts are made available electronically, hard copies shall be available on request.

(2) The Auditor(s) shall be a chartered accountant who is a registered auditor, or a firm of chartered accountants who are registered auditors, appointed by the Council. The duties of the Auditors shall be to examine the accounts and financial records of the College and to state their opinion on the Accounts of the College.

Appointment of Committees and Boards and Delegated Powers

13. (1) There shall continue to be the following Committees of the Council, the members of which shall be appointed by the Council, and which shall report to the Council:-

(a) the Planning and Resources Committee;

(b) the Public Affairs Committee;
(c) the Education Policy and Specialisation Committee;

(d) the Veterinary Nurses’ Council;

(e) the Examination Appeals Committee;

(f) the Specialist Recognition Appeals Committee;

(g) the Registration Appeals Committee;

(h) the Advisory Committee; and

(i) the Nominations Committee.

(2) Unless appointed to fill casual vacancies, or where other terms have been specifically stated, the members of each Committee shall hold office on a yearly basis from the conclusion of the Annual General Meeting until the conclusion of the next ensuing Annual General Meeting, and shall be eligible to be re-appointed. Members appointed to fill casual vacancies shall hold office until the conclusion of the next ensuing Annual General Meeting. The other provisions relating to the membership of Committees and the terms of reference of each Committee and Board shall be as set out in Schedule 2 to these Bye-Laws.

(3) Each of the Committees named in paragraph (1) shall, except where indicated, have delegated authority, in accordance with and subject to, Article 6(2) of the Supplemental Charter, and subject to the Act and these Bye-Laws, to act in the name and on behalf of the College and the Council in relation to the matters set out in its terms of reference to the extent therein specified, subject to any conditions laid down by the Council from time to time.

(4) It is hereby declared that nothing in this Bye-Law shall be taken to prevent the Council from itself exercising any powers or functions delegated in accordance with Article 6(2) of the Supplemental Charter and this Bye-Law. It is further declared that nothing in this Bye-Law shall be taken to preclude any other delegation of functions by virtue of any other enactment or rule of law.

(5) Each of the Committees referred to in paragraph (1) may appoint one or more Sub-Committees, Working Parties or Boards for such general or special purpose as they may think fit and, in accordance with and subject to Article 6(2) of the Supplemental Charter, subject to the Act and these Bye-Laws, and subject to any contrary direction from the Council, may on behalf of the Council delegate to such Sub-Committees, Working Parties or Boards power to act in the name of the College and the Council in relation to the matters set out in its terms of reference.

Payments by the College

14. (1) The authorised signatories for payment of amounts up to £1000 shall be any one of the President, Treasurer, Registrar and Head of Finance. The Council may by resolution approve any other Council member or member of the staff of the College to authorise payment of amounts up to and including £1000 if any of the said signatories are not reasonably available.
(2) The two authorised signatories for payment of amounts exceeding £1000 shall be one of the President or Treasurer, together with one of the Secretary and Registrar or Head of Finance. The Council may by resolution approve any other Council member or member of the staff of the College to authorise payment of amounts exceeding £1000 if any of the said signatories are not reasonably available.

(3) All payments by the College may be made by cheque, direct debit, standing order, BACS (the Bank Automated Clearing System) or any other method approved by the College’s Auditors, and any sum may be paid in Euros or through a Euro Bank Account. Payments below the amount of £100 may also be made from the Petty Cash Account.

Fee for Certificates of Registration

15. The fee to be charged, in accordance with Article 10 (as amended) of the Supplemental Charter, for the Secretary and Registrar to certify under his hand whether a person is registered in any of the registers maintained by the College, shall be £3, together with the value-added tax thereon.

SCHEDULE 1

PROCEDURE AND RULES OF DEBATE FOR GENERAL MEETINGS AND COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Convening of General Meetings

1. Annual and Special General Meetings of the College shall be convened in accordance with Articles 3 and 4 respectively of the Supplemental Charter. The notice of the meeting shall state clearly the business to be transacted at the meeting. No accidental omission to give notice to a member shall invalidate the meeting.

Quorum of General Meetings

2. Subject to the succeeding provisions of this paragraph, the quorum for any general meeting (including any adjournment thereof) of the members of the College shall, in accordance with Articles 3 and 4 of the Supplemental Charter, be twelve members personally present. If the necessary quorum is not present within fifteen minutes after the time fixed for the commencement of the meeting, the meeting shall be adjourned to a date and time fixed by the Chairman, with the agreement of the members present. At the adjourned meeting, if twelve members are not present within fifteen minutes after the time fixed for the commencement of the meeting, then the members present shall be deemed to constitute a quorum in any event. If any general meeting ceases to be quorate during the course of the meeting, the meeting shall be adjourned and the provisions relating to a meeting for which no quorum is present at the commencement of the meeting shall apply to such an adjourned meeting.
Business of the Annual General Meeting

3. Subject to the Chairman’s discretion to vary the order of business as he thinks fit, the business and order of business of the Annual General Meeting shall be as follows:-

(1) The notice of the meeting shall be read by the Registrar, unless the meeting consent to this being taken as read;

(2) The minutes of the immediately preceding general meeting shall be read, or taken as read with the agreement of the meeting, confirmed, and signed by the Chairman of the meeting;

(3) The names shall be announced of those persons appointed to the Council by the Privy Council under Section 1(1)(b) of the Act and by universities in the United Kingdom under Section 1(1)(c) of the Act;

(4) The names shall be announced of those persons elected to the Council under Section 1(1)(a) of, and Schedule 1 to, the Act;

(5) An address shall be given by the President;

(6) Honours and awards shall be presented;

(7) The Annual Report of the Council and the Accounts of the College shall be received;

(8) The President and Vice-Presidents who have been elected to take office at the conclusion of the meeting shall be invested with the Badges of their respective offices; and

(9) Such other business specified in the notice of the meeting shall be taken in the order decided by the Chairman.

Chairmanship of General Meetings

4. The President shall take the Chair at all general meetings but if he be not present the Chair shall be taken by the Senior Vice-President. If both the President and the Senior Vice-President are not present the Chair shall be taken by the Junior Vice-President. If the President and the Senior and Junior Vice-Presidents are not present the members shall choose a Council member present to take the Chair.

Adjournment of General Meetings

5. Each general meeting shall have power to adjourn from time to time, and from place to place, by agreement of the members present. No business shall be transacted at the adjourned meeting other than business left unfinished at the immediately preceding session of the meeting.
Convening of Council Meetings

6. Subject to the provisions of Article 22 of the Supplemental Charter, at least ten days’ notice shall be given of every Council meeting, unless the President shall have directed that a shorter period shall be permissible. The agenda for the meeting shall state clearly the business to be transacted at the meeting. Subject to paragraph 10, no other business shall be transacted other than that so stated, without the leave of the Council as a matter of urgency.

Quorum of Council Meetings

7. The quorum for any Council meeting shall be nine members personally present, in accordance with Article 6(1) of the Supplemental Charter. If no quorum is present within fifteen minutes of the time fixed for the commencement of the meeting the meeting shall stand adjourned to a date and time to be fixed by the Chairman, with the agreement of the members present. If the meeting ceases to be quorate during the course of the meeting it shall be adjourned likewise.

Chairmanship of Council Meetings

8. The Chair at Council meetings shall be taken by the President. If the President be not present the Senior Vice-President shall take the Chair. If both the President and the Senior Vice-President are not present the Junior Vice-President shall take the Chair. If the President and the Senior and Junior Vice-Presidents are not present, the Council members shall choose one of their number to take the Chair.

Adjournment of Council Meetings

9. Each meeting of the Council shall have power to adjourn to a future date and time, by agreement of the members present. No business shall be transacted at the adjourned meeting other than that left unfinished at the adjournment of the immediately preceding session of the meeting, with the exception of urgent business designated as such by the President, and of which notice shall have been given to each Council member.

Council Members’ Motions

10. A Council member who wishes to raise any subject for discussion, or to move a motion, at any Council meeting shall, as soon as possible after receipt of the notice of the meeting, and in any case not later than three days prior to the date of the meeting, give notice thereof to the Secretary and Registrar. That subject or motion, as the case may be, shall then be added to the agenda of the meeting, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 6. No motion which in the opinion of the Chairman is the same in substance as a motion previously rejected by the Council shall be moved within six months of the date of the meeting at which it was previously rejected, except with the agreement of the Council.
Convening of Committee Meetings

11. At least ten days’ notice shall be given of every Committee meeting, save that the Chairman of the Committee may direct that a shorter period is permissible. The agenda for the meeting shall state clearly the business to be transacted at the meeting.

Chairmanship of Committee Meetings

12. The Chairman of the Committee shall take the Chair at every meeting of a Committee. If the Chairman of the Committee be not present, the Vice-Chairman of the Committee shall take the Chair. If both the Chairman of the Committee and the Vice-Chairman of the Committee are not present, the members of the Committee present shall choose one of their number to take the Chair.

Minutes

13. Minutes shall be taken of every meeting of the Council and of its Committees and Sub-Committees. The minutes shall be taken as read and confirmed at the next succeeding meeting of the Council or of the Committee or Sub-Committee concerned.

Rules of Debate

14. Subject to the discretion of the Chairman to regulate the proceedings as he thinks fit, the following rules of debate shall apply to general meetings of the members of the College and to meetings of the Council and, with necessary adaptations, to meetings of Committees and Sub-Committees:

Motions

(1) No motion shall be discussed before it has been seconded, and no member shall speak more than once to any motion, except with the leave of the Chairman. The seconder of a motion may reserve his speech until later in the debate. The mover of the motion shall have the last word in the debate, but shall confine himself to answering points made by previous speakers and shall not introduce new material in the debate. No motion may be withdrawn, except by leave of the Chairman. The withdrawal of a motion shall not preclude it from being moved on a later occasion. Where a Council member presents to a Council meeting a report from a Committee the recommendations contained in that report shall be taken to be the motions before the meeting and in presenting the recommendations the member concerned shall be taken to be moving the reception and adoption thereof. In such circumstances, where the member presenting the recommendations indicates that the Committee wishes to modify the proposals, they shall be deemed to be amended accordingly and the motions presented to the Council in that form.

Speeches

(2) All speeches should be directed to the Chair, and made from a standing position. No member shall speak for more than five minutes on any one occasion, except with the leave of the Chairman.
Voting

(3) Subject to the provisions of the Supplemental Charter, all questions before a general meeting shall be decided by a simple majority of the members present and voting, and all questions before a meeting of the Council shall be decided by a majority of the members present, whether voting or not. Subject to the succeeding provisions of this sub-paragraph, voting shall be by show of hands. Immediately prior to the question being put to the meeting, the Chairman, or the Registrar at his direction, shall read the text of the question to be voted upon, but this shall not be necessary where the text of a motion or of an amendment is printed in the notice or agenda of the meeting or has otherwise been circulated in writing to members. The Council may direct that a secret ballot shall be held for the elections to the offices of President, Senior Vice-President and Junior Vice-President and (if requested by at least 6 members) may also direct that a record be made of votes cast in an open ballot and that this list of names should be published.

Amendments

(4) Amendments to motions must be relevant to the motion and within the scope of the motion. An amendment shall be for one of the following purposes:

(a) to omit words;

(b) to omit words and insert or add others in substitution thereof;

(c) to insert or add words;

(d) in the case of a meeting of the Council, that the subject-matter of the motion be referred to a Committee

No amendment shall be discussed before it has been seconded. Only one amendment may be discussed at any one time, but the Chairman may permit more than one amendment to be discussed at the same time if he considers that this will assist the meeting. If an amendment is carried, the motion as amended shall then become the substantive motion before the meeting, and may be further amended. The mover of an amendment shall have no right of reply to the debate on his amendment, but the seconder of the original motion shall have the right of reply to the debate on the amendment. The seconder of an amendment may reserve his speech to a later stage in the debate on the amendment, but shall have no right of reply to the debate on the amendment.

Closure of Debate

(5) A member who has not spoken in the debate may move the closure of the debate by moving either:

(a) that the question be now put; or

(b) that the meeting do proceed to the next business
A motion to close the debate must be seconded. Neither the proposer or seconder of a closure motion shall speak to the closure motion and there shall be no debate on it. If a proposal that "the question now be put", is carried, the question before the meeting shall then be put to the meeting forthwith, save that the mover of the original motion shall have a right of reply to the debate before the question is put. If it is agreed to proceed to the next business the original debate is closed without any question being put.

Points of Order

(6) A member may raise a point of order at any time during the meeting and shall be heard forthwith. A member wishing to raise a point of explanation in relation to a previous speech of his in the debate shall raise it as a point of order. The ruling of the Chairman on a point of order shall be conclusive and shall not be questioned in any way, except by way of substantive motion.

Chairman’s Casting Vote

(7) The Chairman of the meeting shall have a second, or casting, vote, which he may exercise whether or not he has exercised his personal vote.

SCHEDULE 2

MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMITTEES

Membership

1. Subject to paragraph 2, not less than half of the members of each Committee shall consist of Council members. The Chairman of each Committee shall normally be a Council member. Subject to paragraph 2, each Committee with the exception of the Specialist Recognition Appeals Committee shall have no fewer than six and no more than 16 members, exclusive of ex officio members.

2. The Disciplinary Committee and Preliminary Investigation Committee shall be constituted in accordance with Schedule 2 to the Act. The Registration Appeals Committee shall be constituted in accordance with section 5D of the Act and the Veterinary Surgeons (Registration Appeals) Rules 2008. The Veterinary Nurses' Council and the Governance Review Group shall be constituted as set out in paragraphs 8 and 9 below.

3. The Chairmen of all Committees shall, if not already members of the Committee, be ex officio entitled to attend and speak at meetings of the Planning and Resources Committee, but shall not be entitled to vote thereat or be counted as part of the quorum for any meeting of that committee.

4. The Council may fill any vacancy on any Committee, or subject to paragraph 1 add to the membership of any Committee (with the exception of the Disciplinary and Preliminary Investigation Committees) at any time.
5. The quorum for a meeting of a Committee shall be three, or such higher figure as the Council may decide in any case. Ex officio members of Committees shall not be counted as part of the quorum for that Committee.

6. (1) The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and members of Committees shall be appointed by the Council on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, with the exception of the Veterinary Nurses’ Council and the Governance Review Group.

(2) Where an external panel appointed by the Governance Review Group has found a Council Member to be in breach of the Code of Conduct for Managing Conflicts of Interest the external panel may direct that membership of one or more committees shall be suspended for a period of time.

7. (1) The President, Senior Vice-President and Junior Vice-President shall be ex officio members of all Committees of the Council, with the exception of the Disciplinary Committee, the Advisory Committee, Governance Review Group and the Veterinary Nurses’ Council, save where specifically appointed to serve on the Veterinary Nurses’ Council.

(2) The Treasurer shall be ex officio a member of all Committees and Sub-Committees of the Council, with the exception of the Disciplinary and Preliminary Investigation Committees, Governance Review Group and the Veterinary Nurses’ Council, save where specifically appointed to serve on the Veterinary Nurses’ Council.

8. (1) The Veterinary Nurses’ Council shall consist of the following members . . .


Terms of Reference of Committees

Advisory Committee

10. The terms of reference of the Advisory Committee are . . . [etc]

SCHEDULE 3

POWERS OF OFFICERS’ MEETINGS

1. To oversee the general management of all College business.

2. To deal with business not requiring the decision of the Council or of any Committee.

3. To deal with urgent business and approve expenditure from the contingency fund, arising between Council and Committee meetings, reporting to the Council or the relevant Committee and seeking ratification, as necessary.
4. To monitor the management accounts of the College and to monitor the progress of projects.

5. To meet with the Chairmen of Committees; to co-ordinate Council and Committee business and to discuss matters relating to governance, rules of procedure, terms of reference and composition of committees.

6. To ensure that members of the Council are kept informed of developments.

7. To initiate reviews of the strategy plan and make recommendations to the Council and Committees.

8. To oversee the activities of the Communications Board.

9. To determine the representation of the College on various external organisations, speakers at conferences and similar matters.

10. To arrange meetings with members of the College, veterinary associations and other bodies, as appropriate.

11. To keep under review the role and composition of sub-committees and working parties.
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Background

1. The 1967 Charter gives the RCVS Council power "to act by committees or sub-committees and to delegate such duties and powers as it thinks fit from time to time to such committees or sub-committees and to any of its own number and to the officers and servants and agents of the College". At its meeting on 10 May the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC) agreed that Council should be invited to set up a new committee, the Board, to manage the affairs of the College. The Board would consist of the Officers and the Chairmen of the main committees. It would probably meet every two months, but more often if necessary, with meetings being supplemented by electronic communications.

2. The aim in setting up the Board will be to enable Council to focus on its strategic responsibilities, setting the annual budget and strategy plan, while entrusting delivery to a smaller body meeting more frequently and the executive team, with appropriate oversight (notably from the Audit and Risk Committee).

3. In setting up the Board, Council will need to determine its remit. It is proposed that the Board should supersede the Officers' Meetings and PRC. The powers of the Officers' Meetings and the terms of reference of PRC are set out in the General Administration Bye-Laws 2009.

4. There is a trend for healthcare regulators to be governed by increasingly small Councils or Boards, constituted of members appointed by Government. In September 2011, the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence (which will become the Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care during 2012) issued guidance on "Board size and effectiveness" and considered "whether there is a case for moving to smaller Councils as a way of delivering more Board like and effective governance". The conclusion of the report includes the following:

   We have been asked whether there is a case for moving to smaller councils as a way of delivering more “board like” and effective governance. The size of the councils of the health professional regulators currently ranges from 12 to 24. From the experiences of CHRE and the literature we have come across, it seems reasonable to suggest that smaller boards, in the range of 8 to 12 members, are associated with greater effectiveness. This strongly indicates to us that a move to smaller councils across the health professional regulators would be possible without compromising effectiveness. It appears that smaller sized groups are able to communicate more effectively and reach decisions more quickly than larger ones. In addition, they are less likely to suffer from fragmentation and clique-formation and more likely to develop a culture of inclusiveness than their larger counterparts. Finally, since smaller boards struggle to involve themselves in issues that should be delegated to the executive, a smaller size helps them to focus their efforts on core governance issues.

Charter provisions for delegation

5. The Charter, the 1967 Supplemental Royal Charter, provides that Council may delegate duties and powers as follows:
Save as provided in section 15 of and Part II of Schedule 2 to the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966, the Council shall have power to order its own procedure, to act by committees or sub-committees and to delegate such duties and powers as it thinks fit from time to time to such committees or sub-committees and to any of its own number and to the officers and servants and agents of the College.

Provided that no resolution involving any departure from the previously established policy of the Council which is passed at any meeting of a committee or sub-committee to which the Council has delegated any of its duties or powers shall have any validity or effect unless (a) a majority of the members present at the meeting and entitled to vote are members of the Council or (b) such resolution is confirmed by Council.

Powers of Officers’ Meetings

6. Bye-law 11 says "The Officers of the College (namely the President, the Vice-Presidents, the Treasurer and the Secretary and Registrar), or such of them as shall be available at the time, shall be empowered to meet together to oversee and co-ordinate the despatch of the business of the College, and in particular to deal with the matters set out in Schedule 3 to these Bye-Laws. Any such meeting shall, subject to the provisions of the Act, the Supplemental Charter and these Bye-Laws, have delegated authority under Article 6(1) of the Supplemental Charter to act in the name of the Council and the College on the matters set out in Schedule 3 to these Bye-Laws." The Schedule is reproduced at annex A.

Terms of reference of PRC

7. The remit of PRC, as set out in Schedule 2 to the bye-laws, is at annex B.

Comments

8. The bye-laws are rather vague, perhaps inevitably so, in summarising the roles of the Officers’ Meetings and PRC. The Officers are charged to "oversee the general management of all College business" and "deal with business not requiring the decision of the Council or of any Committee". PRC is to "co-ordinate the activities of the College" and "oversee matters of governance and the management of resources". Broad formulae of this kind serve to give an impression of what is expected but leave the precise extent of delegation unclear.

9. The bye-laws require the Officers to ensure that members of Council are kept informed of developments and provide for PRC to refer certain matters to Council. It must

- present an annual budget to Council and recommend proposed fee changes;

- advise Council on corporate governance matters; and

- present a strategic plan to Council.
10. For the most part, however, the bye-laws give the Officers and PRC jobs to do without saying how far they must consult or report back to Council:

- monitoring management accounts and progress of projects (Officers);

- monitoring income and expenditure through management accounts (PRC);

- receiving reports on matters with major resource implications and overseeing a regular risk assessment and internal audit reviews (PRC);

- meeting with Chairmen of Committees, co-ordinating Council and Committee business and discussing matters relating to governance, rules of procedure, terms of reference and composition of committees (Officers);

- keeping under review the role and composition of sub-committees and working parties (Officers);

- initiating reviews of the strategy plan (Officers), reviewing its implementation (PRC);

- dealing with matters relating to Council elections, keeping under review Schedule 1 to the Act and the Election Scheme (PRC);

11. In respect of other matters the bye-laws give the Officers or PRC reasonably clear power to act on their own authority:

- approving expenditure from the contingency fund, reporting to Council or the relevant Committee and seeking ratification, as necessary (Officers): the implication seems to be that they can act first and explain later;

- dealing with requests for variations from the approved budget or to draw on the contingency fund or the College’s reserves (PRC);

- managing the assets and investments of the College, taking account of advice from any Investment Sub-Committee that may be appointed and from the retained stockbrokers of the College (PRC);

- laying down procedures for budgeting and financial control within the College (PRC);

- approving rates of travelling and subsistence expenses and recompense for loss of earnings (PRC);

- authorising the sealing of documents (PRC);

- adjusting priorities for action as appropriate following review of strategic plan (PRC)

- overseeing appointment of professional advisers to the College (PRC);
- determining external representation and conducting external relations (Officers);
- dealing with all matters relating to registration and membership of the College, overseeing publication of Register and Directory and monitoring composition of profession (PRC); and
- overseeing the activities of the Communications Board.

Possible terms of reference to the Board

12. Annex C outlines a composite of the present powers of the Officers and the terms of reference of PRC. This would not give the Board any wider discretion than the Officers and PRC enjoy under the present arrangements. Committees are invited to consider whether this statement of the Board's responsibilities would be acceptable in principle.

Further steps

13. It is proposed to put recommendations to Council for a revised committee structure in March 2013, so that committee membership can then be considered by Nominations Committee in May. The new committees can then be in place from July 2013, at the same time as the newly constituted Preliminary Investigation and Disciplinary Committees.
Annex A

Schedule 3 to the General Administration Bye-Laws 2009

Powers of Officers’ Meetings

1. To oversee the general management of all College business.

2. To deal with business not requiring the decision of the Council or of any Committee.

3. To deal with urgent business and approve expenditure from the contingency fund, arising between Council and Committee meetings, reporting to the Council or the relevant Committee and seeking ratification, as necessary.

4. To monitor the management accounts of the College and to monitor the progress of projects.

5. To meet with the Chairmen of Committees; to co-ordinate Council and Committee business and to discuss matters relating to governance, rules of procedure, terms of reference and composition of committees.

6. To ensure that members of the Council are kept informed of developments.

7. To initiate reviews of the strategy plan and make recommendations to the Council and Committees.

8. To oversee the activities of the Communications Board.

9. To determine the representation of the College on various external organisations, speakers at conferences and similar matters.

10. To arrange meetings with members of the College, veterinary associations and other bodies, as appropriate.

11. To keep under review the role and composition of sub-committees and working parties.
Annex B

Extract from Schedule 2 to the General Administration Bye-Laws 2009

The terms of reference of the Planning and Resources Committee are to co-ordinate the activities of the College, to oversee matters of governance and the management of resources and, in particular:

(1) To present to the Council at least annually a proposed Budget and to keep that budget under review;

   (i) To recommend proposed fee changes to the Council, having consulted the relevant Committees;

   (ii) To monitor income and expenditure through management accounts and to deal with any requests for variations from the approved budget, or to draw on the contingency fund or the College’s reserves;

   (iii) To manage the assets and investments of the College, taking account of advice from any Investment Sub-Committee that may be appointed and from the retained stockbrokers of the College;

   (iv) To lay down procedures for budgeting and financial control within the College;

   (v) To approve from time to time rates of travelling and subsistence expenses and recompense for loss of earnings for Council and Committee members and lay observers.

(2) To receive reports on matters which have major resource implications, particularly those which are not sufficiently provided for in the budget, whether they relate to the premises, equipment, staff or policy initiatives and to oversee a regular risk assessment and internal audit reviews;

(3) To prepare and present to the Council a strategic plan, drafted in line with budget priorities, and to review the implementation of the plan as necessary, adjusting priorities for action as appropriate;

(4) To oversee the appointment of professional advisers to the College, including auditor(s), legal advisers, stockbrokers, insurance brokers and such other advisers as may be necessary;

(5) To deal with all matters relating to registration of veterinary surgeons and veterinary practitioners and membership of the College (in consultation with the Education Policy and Specialisation Committee, as appropriate), overseeing the publication annually of the Register and Directory of Practices and monitoring of the composition of the profession by surveys and other means, taking into account advice from any relevant Committees or Sub-Committees;

(6) To advise the Council on all corporate governance matters including keeping under review the Act and regulations made thereunder, the Charter and these Bye-Laws and keeping under review the structure of committees and delegation of powers;
(7) To authorise the affixing of the Common Seal of the College, subject to the provisions of the Charter and these Bye-Laws;

(8) To deal with all matters relating to Council elections, keeping under review Schedule 1 to the Act and the Election Scheme; and

(9) To oversee the discharge of duties imposed on the College by other legislation and to receive reports, as necessary.
Outline of possible terms of reference of Board

General

Oversee the management of all College business and oversee matters of governance and the management of resources.

Matters on which the Board is to report to Council

Present an annual budget to Council and recommend proposed fee changes.

Advise Council on corporate governance matters.

Present a strategic plan to Council.

Matters on which the Board is to report to Council as the Board thinks appropriate

Monitor management accounts and progress of projects, receiving reports on matters with major resource implications.

Oversee a regular risk assessment and internal audit reviews.

Co-ordinate Council and Committee business and keep under review governance, rules of procedure, terms of reference and composition of committees, and role and composition of sub-committees and working parties.

Keep strategy plan and its implementation under review.

Keep under review arrangements for Council elections, Schedule 1 to the Act and the Election Scheme.

Matters for decision by the Board

Lay down procedures for budgeting and financial control.

Deal with requests for variations from the approved budget.

Approve expenditure from the contingency fund or the College’s reserves.

Manage the assets and investments of the College.

Oversee appointment of professional advisers to the College.

Approve rates of travelling and subsistence expenses and recompense for loss of earnings.
Authorise the sealing of documents.

Adjust priorities for action as appropriate following review of strategy plan.

Oversee the activities of the Communications Board.

Determine external representation and conduct external relations.

Deal with all matters relating to registration and membership of the College, oversee publication of Register and Directory and monitor composition of profession.
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**Summary**

The paper summarises various actions that will need to be taken to implement the recommendations of the Specialisation Working Party which were approved by Council in June. In particular, it is proposed that two new working parties be set up:

- a) to propose criteria and procedures to implement the new Advanced Practitioner status
- b) to propose ways to widen the scope of the Fellowship

**Decisions required**

The Committee is invited to approve the terms of reference and outline membership for new working parties and advise on what other actions, if any, need to be taken to implement the recommendations

**Attachments**

Annex A, Recommendations approved by Council in June 2012

**Authors**

Freda Andrews
Head of Education
020 7 202 0702
f.andrews@rcvs.org.uk
Background

1. Council approved all the recommendations from the Specialisation Working Party at its meeting in June. Annex A lists those recommendations. EPSC now needs to agree how those recommendations are to be implemented. Some work needs to be taken forward by other committees (Advisory, Practice Standards Group), whereas others are within EPSC’s remit.

2. It is proposed that two new working parties be set up to consider the detailed criteria and procedures that are needed to implement
   a) the new RCVS Advanced Practitioner status, and
   b) widening the scope of the Fellowship.
   Proposed terms of reference and outline of membership are suggested below.

3. The Committee’s attention is also drawn to the need to agree a timescale for phasing out postnominal qualifications in the Register.

The specialist list and level of specialisation - recommendations (a) to (f)

4. It is proposed that the existing Specialist Sub-Committee should take forward these recommendations, and advise EPSC at its next meeting in March 2013 on whether any changes are needed to the existing criteria, guidance and procedures for considering applications to the list of RCVS Specialists. The sub-committee next meets on 10th January 2013 under the chairmanship of Professor Herrtage.

The list of “advanced practitioners” – recommendations (g) – (l)

5. It is proposed that we set up a new working party – the Advanced Practitioner Working Party - under the chairmanship of Professor Stephen May. The working party will report to EPSC on the detailed criteria and procedures needed to implement RCVS Advanced Practitioner status.

6. The working party’s draft terms of reference will be to:

   • report to EPSC on measures needed to take forward the recommendations agreed by Council to set up RCVS Advanced Practitioner status including periodic re-validation of this status
   • define the qualifications, period of experience and any other criteria to be met for admission to the AP list, and for remaining on the list (re-validation).
   • make proposals for a committee structure and timetable to consider AP applications (eg. the form that a credentials committee/advisory panel or other mechanism should take), including proposals for handling appeals
   • propose a charging structure for applications and re-applications
   • membership of the working party to comprise no more than 6 people, the majority being practitioners, including representatives from BVA and SPVS with small animal, production animal and equine practice represented on the group. Members of the working party should themselves be qualified at least at Certificate level.
7. Council has already agreed to drop additional postnominal qualifications from individuals’ entries in the Register. However, a final decision has yet to be taken on precisely when this should happen. At its meeting in October 2011, P&RC proposed that this should take effect in either March or September 2012. This has not been possible due to IT issues and the P&R Committee is to consider this and may wish to take into account when the new status of Advanced Practitioner is available and any changes to eligibility to the Specialist list are to be implemented. The current inclusion of postnominals does not provide an accurate and up to date indication of accredited status and expertise. Historic inclusion of postnominals does not reflect current activity or maintenance of a specialism.

8. The recommendation to cease awarding additional subject/species designations with the Certificate of Advanced Veterinary Practice should perhaps wait until AP status is implemented. We have already received some enquiries from candidates wondering whether synoptic exams for the CertAVP will continue once postnominals are dropped from the Register. The new AP Working Party will need to consider whether inclusion on the list of RCVS Advanced Practitioners with a subject/species designation (eg. “RCVS Advanced Practitioner in Small Animal Surgery”) will require completion of a synoptic exam, or whether having completed a particular combination of modules would suffice.

9. The lists of specialists and advanced practitioners can be promoted to the public as suggested when the new AP and Specialist lists have been implemented.

10. Revisions to the Code of Professional Conduct and association guidance will be taken forward by Advisory Committee.

11. This needs to be taken forward by the practice standards group.

12. It is proposed that we set up a new working party to take forward these recommendations, under the Chairmanship of Professor Gary England. (NB. This working party would be separate from the existing Fellowship sub-committee which, for the time being, needs to continue in its present format as an operational sub-committee running the Fellowship examination as it currently stands, considering enrolments and appointing examiners.)
• report to EPSC and advise on additional routes to the Fellowship that would make it an award that more practising clinicians can achieve as per the recommendations agreed by Council (eg, creating a new route of “meritorious contributions to clinical practice”)
• propose explicit statements on the standards required for all routes for the Fellowship, including guidance for examiners in line with the QAA level 8 qualification descriptor
• propose revised bye-laws to enact the required changes
• membership of the working party to be 5 or 6 members, to include individuals who are themselves qualified at this level
• make proposals for a fee structure for the award.

RCVS Subject Boards (recommendation (z))

14. Some subject boards need to continue to hold annual meetings as long as they have candidates enrolled for the Diploma. A list of the subject boards that need to continue and those which are no longer needed (i.e. where there are no candidates enrolled for the diploma) is provided under agenda item 10, annex C. It will be for the Advanced Practitioner Working Party and the Specialist Sub-Committee to advise EPSC on how we can involve former subject board members on new credentials committees for AP/Specialist status in the future.

Conclusion

15. Some of the recommendations agreed by Council can only be implemented once detailed criteria and procedures have been agreed for RCVS Advanced Practitioner status, new routes to the Fellowship, and possible expansion of the Specialist list. Until the working parties have been set up and started their work, it is difficult to put a precise timescale on this, although we should probably allow at least a year before new byelaws/policies come into effect and the required administrative processes can start. In the meantime, we need to be clear about the strategy for implementing all these recommendations: taken together, they have a significant impact on a wide range of College business, not just the work of the Education Department. Coordinating all the various strands of work will be a challenge that EPSC will need to monitor.

Recommendations

16. The Committee is invited to approve the overall strategy set out above to implement the recommendations of the Specialist Working party and, in particular, to approve

a) the terms of reference for the Advanced Practitioner working party (paras 5-6)

b) the terms of reference for the Fellowship working party (paras 12-13)

c) agree the approach proposed for phasing out reference to postnominals in the Register and Findavet, pending further work to implement AP and specialist status over the next year.
EXTRACT FROM PAPER APPROVED BY COUNCIL, JUNE 2012

Summary of recommendations

A summary of the working party’s recommendations is listed below. These are reproduced from the sections on each of these issues described in the following paper.

1. The working party recommends to Education Policy and Specialisation Committee:

   The specialist list and level of specialisation

   a. RCVS should continue to publish and promote a list of veterinary specialists. The list should include all those who are currently accredited as specialists by RCVS, or by a European speciality College. The purpose of the list is to provide a clear indication to the profession and the public of those veterinary surgeons who have been accredited as specialists by the RCVS, by virtue of having demonstrated achievement at diploma level (doctorate level 8 in the national qualifications framework, FHEQ; Level 12 in the Scottish Credit Qualifications Framework, SCQF)\(^1\), who are currently active as referral specialists and leaders in their specialty.

   b. Those who are on the list should be entitled to call themselves “RCVS specialist in <subject area and/or species>” (the title to be subject to further market research testing with members of the public and may be revised in the light of that feedback).

   c. Entry to the list will require individuals to hold a postgraduate qualification at level 8 (doctorate level) in the national qualifications framework (see Annex 2 below for a full definition of this level) and/or to present evidence to a credentials committee that they have the equivalent specialist experience and training at level 8. Evidence could take the form of a portfolio of work, which would be subject to examination including an oral assessment. Applicants must currently be practising in the specialty and available to provide their specialist service to the public and/or the profession.

   d. Continued inclusion on the list of specialists will require the individual to be periodically revalidated, at least every 5 years (as now). This will require evidence of a commitment to, and strong record of, continuing professional development, continued contribution to the specialty, as well as continued availability to provide their specialist service.

\(^1\) FHEQ = Further and Higher Education Qualifications framework, applying to England, Wales and Northern Ireland; SCQF = Scottish Credit Qualifications framework. The two frameworks are equivalent, but start at different points hence level 8 in the FHEQ equates to level 12 in the Scottish framework; level 7 in the FHEQ equates to level 11 in the Scottish framework. For ease of reference, the FHEQ numbers are used in this paper.
e. Holders of European Specialist status who are practising in the UK should automatically be eligible for inclusion on the RCVS list, provided that they maintain their European Specialist status by being revalidated by their European College. Revalidation by a European College should be accepted as being equivalent to revalidation by RCVS and require no further evaluation by RCVS, apart from administrative checks to confirm continued availability to provide their service to the profession and/or public in the UK, and contact details.

f. There should continue to be an application and revalidation fee payable by those applying to join or remain on the list to cover administrative costs.

The list of “advanced practitioners” – an accredited ‘middle tier’ of expertise

g. RCVS should set up, publish and promote a new list of “advanced practitioners”. The purpose of the list will be to provide a clear indication to the profession and the public of those veterinary surgeons who have been accredited at postgraduate certificate level (Masters level 7) by the RCVS, by virtue of having demonstrated knowledge and experience in a particular area of veterinary practice (including general practice) beyond their initial primary veterinary degree. Inclusion on the list will demonstrate that the individual holds an appropriate qualification and that they have stayed up to date in their field of practice since achieving their certificate level qualification.

h. Those who are on the list should be entitled to describe themselves as “advanced practitioner in <subject area and/or species>” (this title to be subject to further market research testing with the public and may be revised in the light of that feedback).

i. Entry to the list of advanced practitioners will require individuals to hold an appropriate qualification at postgraduate level 7 in the national qualifications framework in their subject/species area (equivalent to level 11 in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications framework). Those on the list must currently be practising in the named subject/species area and demonstrate a commitment to, and strong record of, continuing professional development.

j. Continued inclusion on the list of advanced practitioners will require the individual to be periodically revalidated, at least every 5 years, with evidence provided of ongoing continuous professional development as well as continued involvement in the subject/species area.

k. RCVS should continue to liaise with the appropriate European associations that are developing the concept of the ‘European Acknowledged Veterinarian’, with the aim of establishing equivalence between the two systems in terms of level and purpose. If equivalence is eventually established to the satisfaction of RCVS, then holders of the European status who are practising in the UK should automatically be eligible to join the RCVS list of advanced practitioners, provided that they maintain their European
acknowledged status by a process of revalidation by the appropriate European body. (This parallels the recommendation relating to European Specialist status above, but is dependent on ongoing work and agreement being reached on equivalence.)

I. There should be an application and revalidation fee payable by those applying to join or remain on the list, but this fee should be kept as low as possible so as not to discourage eligible applicants.

Titles and designations

m. Only those who are on the list of specialists should describe themselves as specialists, and veterinary surgeons should not refer to another colleague as a specialist unless that colleague is on the list. Similar considerations should apply to those on the list of advanced practitioners.

n. Veterinary surgeons who cease to be on the lists of either specialists or advanced practitioners should no longer describe themselves as specialists/advanced practitioners, nor describe themselves to clients or other professional colleagues as being specialists or having specialist expertise (or advanced practitioner status, as appropriate) in the subject/species area concerned.

o. RCVS should simplify significantly the listing of postnominal letters for qualifications against Members' names in the published Register and on the RCVS website (Findavet). Official lists should show only the registerable degree (eg. BVMS, or DVM, or BVetMed etc), followed by either MRCVS or FRCVS, and indicating whether the individual is on the list of specialists or the list of advanced practitioners. Thus:
   i. John Brown, BVSc, MRCVS
   ii. Jane Smith, BVM&S, MRCVS, Advanced Practitioner in Small Animal Surgery
   iii. Peter Jones, MVB, FRCVS, RCVS Specialist in Anaesthesia

p. RCVS should cease awarding additional subject/species designations and subject/species specific postnominal letters with the Certificate in Advanced Veterinary Practice. Holders of the CertAVP who have achieved particular combinations of modules, and who are admitted to the list of advanced practitioners, may show the subject area with the advanced practitioner title (eg. advanced practitioner in equine medicine).

The number of specialists

q. RCVS should promote – both to the profession and to the public - the lists of specialists and advanced practitioners, to encourage all veterinary surgeons who are
eligible to join one or other of the lists. With the introduction of a new tier of expertise - the advanced practitioner - the working party does not believe that additional measures, such as ‘grandparenting’, need to be taken to increase the number of veterinary specialists beyond those who may already be eligible, or who are able to present acceptable evidence and be assessed to show that they meet the level descriptor. All those who are currently qualified at level 8 and practising as specialists, or who are qualified at certificate level (level 7) and taking referrals must be encouraged to join one or other of the lists. This will provide better assurance to the public and clearer information that those who are taking referrals at either level are up to date and active in their field.

The referral process

r. It should continue to be a matter of professional judgement for the veterinary surgeon as to whether a case would benefit from being referred to another veterinary surgeon. RCVS should not stipulate that particular types of cases should be referred, nor should it dictate to whom they should be referred. In making such judgements, the veterinary surgeon should take account of their responsibilities set out in the Code of Professional Conduct. In particular, the supporting guidance on referrals and second opinions, and on communication and informed consent will be important in this context. This guidance will need to be revised to reflect the new terminology for veterinary specialists and advanced practitioners, and to make it clear that only those on the lists should be referred to as specialists or advanced practitioners as appropriate. (The guidance with suggested amendments highlighted is reproduced below at Table 1.)

Specialist practices and facilities

s. The working party recommends that further work should be undertaken by the RCVS Practice Standards Group on standards for specialist practices.

RCVS Diploma of Fellowship – FRCVS and Honorary FRCVS

t. RCVS should actively promote – both to the profession and to the public - the Diploma of Fellowship as the highest award issued by the College. Achievement of the Fellowship should continue to be one of the routes for clinicians to gain veterinary specialist status. This is particularly important as RCVS phases out its Diplomas in favour of European Diplomas.
u. Further work should be undertaken by RCVS to develop additional routes to the Fellowship to make it an award that more practising clinicians can achieve. For example, the existing routes of Fellowship by Thesis, and by Meritorious Contributions to Learning, could be supplemented by a new route to recognise “meritorious contributions to clinical practice”. A working group should be formed to develop the criteria for this new route to the Fellowship with a view to producing explicit statements on the standards required for each route and guidance for examiners, in line with the level 8 descriptor. Revised byelaws will also be needed to enact these changes. Periods of clinical training under supervision should be included in the requirements.

v. Veterinary specialists who have been on the RCVS list of specialists for a continuous period of 10 years should be awarded the title of RCVS Honorary Fellow (HonFRCVS), to recognise their longstanding contribution to their specialty. This will require a change to the RCVS byelaws for the Fellowship, which currently restricts the award of Honorary Fellowships to three per year.

Promotion and publicity

w. The RCVS should make the list of specialists and the list of advanced practitioners readily available and searchable through its website, and consider developing some unique branding to set these lists apart from the standard Register of Members. The lists need to be more immediately visible for the public and not just be seen as an internal reference tool for the veterinary profession.

x. The RCVS should publish some simple materials (eg. leaflets, posters) designed for the public explaining in simple terms the various levels of veterinary qualifications and the factors to be taken into account when considering a referral. Such materials should be made readily available for veterinary practices to give to their clients.

y. In order to raise general awareness of the framework for specialisation, the RCVS should promote veterinary specialisation and the existence of the two lists on an ongoing basis, for example through published materials, news stories, press releases, at conferences and by social media as considered appropriate.

The RCVS subject boards

z. Drawing on the membership of the subject boards and other sub-committees within RCVS, a large panel – or pool of specialists and Fellows should be appointed for a rolling fixed term, from which smaller sub-groups can be brought together to advise on subject specific matters when required by the College. Credentials committees should be formed from members of the panel, according to the subject areas under consideration, to evaluate applications for specialist status and advanced practitioner status. Ideally, the panel should comprise a broad range of veterinary surgeons who themselves have been accredited as specialists and/or Fellows.
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Primary Qualification Sub-Committee

1. Following a review of various sub-committees and working parties over the summer, Officers and the Chairman of EPSC agreed to invite Lynne Hill to take over the chairmanship of the Primary Qualifications Sub-Committee (Barry Johnson having moved into Disciplinary Committee). It was also considered time to renew the membership of PQSC. The EPSC Chairman has approved the following revised membership of PQSC following discussion with the incoming PQSC Chairman.

- Mrs Lynne Hill: Chairman; visitor, chairman of visitors, international collaboration. CEO Langford Veterinary Services Bristol
- Prof. Stuart Reid: Existing member of PQSC, originally appointed as Dean of Glasgow. Now RVC; visitor, chairman of visitors, international collaboration
- Mr David Wadsworth: Existing member, small animal practitioner, visitor
- Prof. Susan Dawson: New member of PQSC, Liverpool Dean, visitor
- Dr. Bob Moore: Chairman of Statutory Membership Exam Board, large animal practitioner, visitor
- Prof. Susan Rhind: Director of Veterinary Teaching, Edinburgh; on visitor list.
- Prof. Malcolm Cobb: Prof. of Comparative Medicine, Deputy Head of School at Nottingham; small animal internal medicine/cardiologist

2. PQSC hasn’t met since the last EPSC meeting, hence there is no report to receive this month. The next meeting will be held in December or January (date to be confirmed with members), and the main item on the agenda will be to consider the monitoring reports from the UK veterinary schools. A further meeting is planned for March, when reports from overseas schools will be considered.

3. Mrs Hill is attending EPSC ex-officio as chairman of PQSC, and will provide an outline of her plans for other work that PQSC may need to undertake in the coming year.

Recommendation

4. EPSC is invited to note the revised PQSC membership and the plan of future work to be outlined at the meeting by the chairman.
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Day 1 Competences Review Working Party

Overview
1. It is now 10 years since the Day 1 Competences were first agreed. They have been adopted by accrediting bodies in Australia and New Zealand, South Africa and in Europe by EAEVE. Since that date RCVS has developed the Year 1 Competences which form the basis of the Professional Development Phase (PDP) and is at an advanced stage of developing a student experience log (SEL) based on a consolidated skills lists developed with the universities. Vet Schools have used the RCVS D1Cs as a guideline to develop their own specific ‘Day One Skills’ lists.

Proposed Membership
Chairman: David Catlow
Members: Bob Partridge

Proposed members:
- a veterinary school rep who is strong on veterinary education
- a head of school (nominated by HOVS)
- BVA representative - Chair of Members Services Group? (MSG consists of regional BVA reps, SPVS, AVS, BVHA, VPHA, Assoc of Government vets, RAVC, recent graduate reps)
- AN Other RCVS Council rep from general practice?

Proposed Remit
2. The working party’s task is to review the ‘RCVS Day 1 Competences’ statement to determine whether it is still a valid and current statement of the level to be expected of new veterinary graduates at the point they first qualify.

3. Account should be taken of the views of both veterinary practitioners and teachers in the veterinary schools (for example through the BVA subject divisions and HOVS) to ensure that the D1Cs reflect current and likely future expectations, and that they are realistically deliverable within the framework of the 5 year veterinary degree course.

4. The working party will report back to the Education Policy and Specialisation Committee.

---

1 The skills list for the new Student Experience Log was received by EPSC at its meeting in February 2012
Proposed plan of work

5. To review the D1Cs by consultation with the profession. A consultation exercise can instigate a huge volume of work. It is not envisaged that the consultation should question the fundamental principle of the need for D1Cs but that they be reviewed with a light touch to ensure they remain fit for purpose for an evolving veterinary profession. A small working party would aim to meet in late 2012 to clarify the consultation process and questions to be raised, publicise the consultation and invite responses. To maximise efficiency of RCVS resources it seems sensible to use the existing consultation channels in the profession by requesting responses to be preferably channelled through representative veterinary associations and BVA back to the working group.

6. The working party would meet again in spring 2013 to consider the responses and make their recommendations.

Recommendation

7. EPSC is invited to consider and endorse these proposals and make suggestions for the vacant positions on the working party.
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**Summary**

The paper summarises progress with the PDR development project, provides figures on take-up of the new CPD recording component at Annex A.

Updated figures for PDP take-up and completion are also provided in Annex B.

Notes of the most recent meeting of PDP postgraduate deans are attached for note.

**Decisions required**

To note

**Attachments**

- Annex A – take-up of online CPD recording in the PDR
- Annex B – update on all PDP enrolments and completions, including use of the new PDP component in the PDR.
- Annex C – notes of meeting of PDP postgraduate deans, July 2012
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Professional Development Record Project

CPD online recording

1. The PDR project started in May 2011, following agreement by EPSC and P&RC to proceed. The chosen contractors, Skillwise, began building the system in June 2011 starting with the first of three components, the online CPD recording system. The CPD system was finished in April 2012 and introduced gradually to the profession, first at BSAVA congress and subsequently through items in RCVS News. A parallel VN CPD recording system was implemented at the same time.

2. At the time of writing, 456 Members had signed up to use the CPD section of the PDR, of whom 336 had made entries in their record. (See Annex A for more figures on usage.)

Professional Development Phase - PDP

3. The second phase of the PDR - the new PDP recording system - was in development from April to July 2012. We signed up the first new graduate for the system on 14th August. By 13th September, 212 new graduates and other new registrants had signed up to use the new PDP record. Access to PDP also includes access to the CPD system, but not vice-versa unless requested. Feedback on the new PDP site so far has been positive. The new features on the PDP site make it easier and more intuitive to use, provide a better model for reflection on performance and self-assessment, including a ‘confidence rating’ feature, ability to upload case notes and other documents, and the facility to ‘share a page’ with a third party, eg. employer or practice mentor. As it sits alongside the CPD online record, the user can switch between the two, so that new graduates are encouraged to take responsibility and account for all aspects of their ongoing professional development.

4. Annex B provides detailed information on PDP take-up and completion since 2007. (At a previous meeting, EPSC asked to receive these data once a year.). Take up and completion rates are monitored by the Postgraduate Deans at their periodic meetings. The notes of the last Postgraduate Deans meeting in July are attached at Annex C.

Student Experience Log - SEL

5. The third and final phase of the PDR – the student experience log to be used by undergraduates – is now under development. We have not given a specific date for delivery, as this is a more complex phase. We hope it will be available to the veterinary schools sometime after February 2013, but it is too early to commit to a date.
**Budget**

6. We are currently in line with the figures agreed by P&RC and EPSC for consultants’ fees for software development, hardware purchase and hosting. However, the escrow costs were slightly underestimated in 2011 and an adjustment will be made to the 2013 budget to allow for this. (The source code is lodged with NCC under an escrow agreement.)

**Promotion**

7. Promotion of the Professional Development Record has been included in the Communications Department plans for 2012-13. We wanted to wait until the new PDP system was up and running and appeared to be stable before starting to promote it more actively. It will be promoted at upcoming congresses (London Vet Show, BVNA) and consideration is being given to a webinar, as well as demonstration material and leaflets. A new guidance booklet for PDP has been produced and is sent to new graduates and their employers when they sign up for PDP. The RCVS web pages have been updated with the latest guidance on PDP and CPD, and provide linked access to the PDR.

8. Although it is yet early days for the PDR, we may want to consider whether to undertake some sampling of CPD records in the future. If so, we would need to consider how this would be done, by whom, what feedback would be given to those whose records were sampled and what should be done if/when sampling identifies those who have not been complying with the Code of Professional Conduct.
Professional Development Record Statistics

1. At the time of writing, there were 456 veterinary surgeons registered for the CPD component of the PDR.

2. Council Members were amongst the first to register for the PDR in February 2012. April saw a slight increase in users as the PDR was advertised and displayed on the RCVS stand at the BSAVA World Congress. Since June, up-take has begun to increase steadily and there has been an average of 100 new users per month since then. That average is anticipated to increase due to further publicity and also new graduates signing up for both the PDP and CPD components of the PDR.

3. There is a fair spread in the number of CPD hours recorded in PDR. Below is a table to show the range of hours that have been recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours recorded</th>
<th>0 hours</th>
<th>1-50 hours</th>
<th>51-100 hours</th>
<th>101-150 hours</th>
<th>151-200 hours</th>
<th>201-250 hours</th>
<th>More than 250 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of vets' records</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of users who have yet to record any hours are those who have registered in the last four weeks.

4. A reporting system is currently being developed by Skillwise so that Education Department can extract data as and when required from the PDR. Currently, data is provided by Skillwise at the request of the Education Department. The information that is currently supplied is the date when the user activated their PDR account, the number of hours logged and permission settings (i.e. whether the user has granted RCVS access to further information in their record). It is hoped that details on the amount of hours recorded per year and usage of the ‘notes’ function can be built into the reports in the future. Committee Members are welcome to suggest any further criteria that they would like to see reported.

5. Such reports would become useful in the future should random CPD sampling be introduced. However, as the majority of MRCVS are currently not registered for the PDR, sampling via the PDR would not yet be representative. The Committee may wish to give further thought to whether and how (and by whom) CPD records should be sampled in the future and what the follow-up should be for anyone found not to be complying with RCVS Code of Professional Conduct requirements for CPD.
Professional Development Phase Update

Take-up of PDP

1. As at 5th Sept 28% of the 2012 UK cohort of new veterinary graduates has signed up and been activated, for the PDP component of the PDR. This is the same rate of take up as at the same period last year. However, the data is volatile and the numbers can change significantly at various times of the year. Take-up figures for graduate cohorts from 2007 – 2011 as at mid-September are provided in the table below:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total UK Graduates*</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UK Graduates Activated**</td>
<td>594 (95%)</td>
<td>588 (93%)</td>
<td>667 (91%)</td>
<td>599 (84%)</td>
<td>666 (84%)</td>
<td>221 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Graduates Activated</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Activated</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data on grads taken from RCVS registration figures – ie. UK graduates who have registered with RCVS.
**Activated = the point at which the graduate applies to RCVS for access to use the PDP system.

Completion Rates

2. Completion rates as at 5th Sept 2012: the table below shows the number of participants (by annual graduate cohort) who have completed their PDP. Figures for Jan 2011, April 2011, Sep 2011, Jan 2012, April 2012 and Sep 2012 are provided for comparison.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Work has continued on chasing up those from the 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 cohort who have not yet completed their PDP. For 2007 and 2008 graduates the final two steps of the chase-up protocol have been implemented. After initial chasing e-mails sent from the office and the postgraduate dean, letters are sent by post from the Head of Education, followed by a further letter from the Acting Registrar to those still failing to respond. For both cohorts, out of the 147 Acting Registrar letters sent, there have been 64 responses so far. Those who have not responded
have had their access to their PDP record suspended. Two graduates have come back to the RCVS requesting permission to be re-instated. A small group of graduates who failed to respond have had their PDP records left open to them; as they are ready/nearly ready for sign off, we are chasing these separately to encourage them to see their PDP through. The 2009 cohort will have chase-up letters sent to them mid September 2012. The 2010 cohort will also have e-mail reminders sent to them.

The new PDP site on the PDR

4. August 2012 RCVS launched the PDP component of the PDR. 221 UK graduates have successfully registered and had their accounts activated. A small number of graduates were enrolled on the old PDP database have not yet made any entries on the old system. We are contacting these graduates to offer them the chance of transferring over to the new PDR.

5. Unfortunately, it is not possible to transfer users automatically from the old to the new PDP system, as the skills lists have changed slightly.
Table 3
PDP Cohorts 2007-12: Activation and Completion Data
(Shaded areas show position as at September each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2007</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2009 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2010 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Position of all cohorts (including overseas) as at mid-September each year

Cohorts as at the first September following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 @ 15/09/07</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 @ 15/09/08</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 @ 15/09/09</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 @ 15/09/10</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 @ 15/09/11</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 @ 15/09/12</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. 2011 cohort includes first set of Nottingham graduates

Cohorts as at the second September following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 @ 15/09/08</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 @ 15/09/09</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 @ 15/09/10</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 @ 15/09/11</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 @ 15/09/12</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohorts as at the third September following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 @ 15/09/09</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 @ 15/09/10</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 @ 15/09/11</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 @ 15/09/12</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cohorts as at the fourth September following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 @ 15/09/10</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 @ 15/09/11</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 @ 15/09/12</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cohorts as at the fifth September following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 @ 15/09/11</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 @ 15/09/12</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cohorts as at the sixth September following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 @ 15/09/12</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Position of all cohorts (including overseas) as at January each year

Cohorts as at the first January following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 as at 01/08</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 as at 01/09</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 as at 01/10</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 as at 01/11</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 as at 01/12</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohorts as at the second January following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 as at 01/09</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 as at 01/10</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 as at 01/11</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 as at 01/12</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohorts as at the third January following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 as at 01/10</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 as at 01/11</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 as at 01/12</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cohorts as at the fourth January following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 as at 01/11</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 as at 01/12</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cohorts as at the fifth January following graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of Activated Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 as at 01/12</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Present: Jill Hubbard
        Nicky Paull
        * Julian Wells
        Agnes Winter
        Jacqui Molyneux, RCVS President (present until 12)
        Freda Andrews, Head of Education
        Stephanie Platt, Education Officer

Attended p.m. Graham Wolfson (Skillwise) (from 12)
              Wayne Soutter (Skillwise) (from 12)
              Col. Douglas Mcdonald (from 11.30 am)

*Attended by teleconference

1. Notes from the previous meeting, 21st December 2011, were provided for information. It was noted that letters from the Registrar and Head of Department had been sent to non-compliant graduates. It was disappointing that not everyone had replied to these letters, but a more strongly worded letter that refers to the new Code of Conduct will help in the future. The postgraduate deans (PGDs) recently chased up their participants with an e-mail reminder. These reminders referred to the new Code of Conduct and had received a good response.

2. It was noted a few graduates refused to do PDP. Reasons for this could be lack of practice/practice mentor support. The BVA may be able to do more to help promote PDP within practises, and Jill Hubbard was involved in one of the BVA groups looking at this.

PDP update

3. The current take-up and completion rates for all annual cohorts so far, were noted. The agreed protocol for chasing graduates had been followed for the 2007 and 2008 graduate cohorts and had produced a fair level of response. Any participant who hasn’t responded has had their PDP access removed (although access can be restored when they get back in touch). E-mail reminder’s had been sent to 2009 non-completers, and also produced a fair level of response. Lists for 2010 non-completers have been drawn up and reminder e-mails have been sent out. The response to the various reminders was likely to improve as awareness of the Code of Professional Conduct filtered down.

Review of administrative procedures:

4. When the new PDP website goes live, PGDs and RCVS will have to work with both the old and new PDP system. The summary of the procedure for registering for PDP and for sign-off for both the old and the new system was noted.
5. It was agreed that PGDs will be proactive in checking their participants involvement with the system and do periodic checks of their cohorts to identify those, for example, who were not using the notes facility.

6. Sign off procedures are going well and the PGD are happy with the turnaround time from RCVS admin for declarations. However, rather than send their comments for graduates to RCVS admin to be forwarded on, it was agreed that PGDs will now contact their graduates direct and copy in RCVS with any comments they have re. sign off. The PGD will inform RCVS directly when they are happy with participant’s records and that the certificate of completion can be sent out. RCVS will notify the PGD when the completion certificate has been sent out.

7. It was emphasised that if the PGD contacts a graduate directly to indicate that their records are fit for sign off, the PGD will make it clear to the graduate they have not fully completed their PDP until the RCVS paper work is in order and the graduate’s completion documents have been sent out.

Declaration document
8. A copy of the new PDP declaration that would be used on the new system was noted. The declaration still asks for the area of practice to be specified even though this is not shown on completion certificates. There has been no negative reaction to the removal of the species area from the certificate.

Narrow species area
9. There were a very small number of cases where graduates were working in a specialised practice who reported that it was hard to complete their PDP record, eg. poultry and specialist pig practice. These graduates may wish to proceed to a certificate in the future, and being unable to complete their PDP could hold them back. However, an important principle of PDP was that it covered broad areas of practice and, whilst sympathetic to those who go straight into specialist practice, it was important not to lose sight of this principle.

10. It was agreed that PGDs will be flexible when reviewing these graduates’ records, and that PDP has moved on a lot since it first was introduced. In some cases, whilst the specific skills list may not cover their precise area of practice, nevertheless, the general Year One Competences would and should still apply to them, and they should still be able to record their experiences on the system to show how they have met the Y1Cs.

11. It was agreed that it would be acceptable for a PGD to consult with a colleague in the specialist area concerned if they had any doubts about Y1Cs in that area.

12. The new system will help to overcome this problem, as case reports can be uploaded.

13. It was noted that this was not comparable to the situation faced by interns, as interns were on the whole not responsible for their own cases.
Signing off PDP for locums lacking a regular mentor/senior vet

14. This is an occasional problem. In exceptional cases where a more senior vet cannot be found to countersign the declaration, it was agreed that we could accept counter-signatures from the same cohort year as long as they have completed PDP for some time. There was a problem where some employers were not being supportive of PDP, or where they would not sign off the graduate’s declaration. It was suggested that perhaps the PGD should communicate directly with the employer to help resolve the problem. However, PGDs had concerns about this course of action, as we only heard ‘one side of the story’. A more appropriate course of action would be to offer the graduate the choice as to whether the PGD contacted their employer or not. It was noted that improving communication with employers was important but the problem could be an employment issue and not a PDP issue. It was not for RCVS to get involved in employment problems, although the PGD could direct the graduate to a more appropriate source of advice, such as the BVA.

Improving graduates and employers understanding about PDP

15. Understanding of PDP has improved among graduates and employers. It could be further improved with guidance such as webinars and talks to final year veterinary students. Webinars could be held to demonstrate how to use the PDP and benefits of completing the PDP. A typical webinar would be about 1 hour long followed by discussion and Q&As. PGDs were invited to think about offering a webinar and the Communications Dept may get in touch to discuss further.

16. It was suggested that it would be very helpful for PGDs to take part in the RCVS/President’s talk to final year students, to talk briefly about PDP and be available to answer students’ questions. The President would consider this with Officers.

17. It was suggested that there needs to be more contact with the practice when the new graduate signs up for PDP. When the graduate contacts RCVS to sign up for PDP, RCVS will urge the graduate to provide their practice details. The RCVS will send the PDP Guidance booklet direct to the employer. A list will be produced listing any graduate who has failed to produce contact details. This will be passed to the PGD for them to chase up the graduate. (This could provide a problem for locums.) Graduates will be e-mailed or sent the electronic link that provides examples of self reflective notes on the RCVS website.

PDP and the RAVC

18. Colonel Douglas Macdonald attended the meeting for this discussion. RAVC expects their new graduates to comply with PDP requirements as per all other new UK graduates in practice. Some officers had problems accessing PDP website due to military IT systems, but they were able to access the system from their own personal computers/laptops. It was noted that some new Officers could be deployed without completing their PDP, as the period of military training was changing. However, the RAVC was very supportive of the RCVS PDP requirements. The new PDR system would enable those who wanted to upload case reports if this was appropriate.
Progress with on-line system

19. Graham Wolfson and Wayne Soutter joined the meeting to give a presentation of the new PDP website. Each PG Dean has already had a one-to-one run through the system from Skillwise via webex. All see it as an improvement on the old PDP database.

20. Work is still proceeding to develop and test the PDP component of the PDR, and this is still on schedule to go live from early August.

21. It was suggested that it would be helpful to add further options to the “status” list, so that PGDs could see if a reminder/chase up letter had been sent to the graduate.

22. The possibility of plagiarism was discussed, especially as the new system allowed case reports to be uploaded, and the “share a page” facility could facilitate copying. It was agreed to add a further clause to the completion declaration document for the graduate to sign to confirm that the notes/cases reports were their own work.

Any other business

23. PGDs were reminded to send in their invoices regularly (monthly or two monthly), and to claim for whole days – not fractions thereof.

Date of the next meeting

24. The date of the next PDP meeting is Friday 11th January 2013 at 11am.
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RCVS Certificate and Diploma Examinations 2012

Background

1. A successful examiner training day was held at the College on 31 January 2012. The presenters included:

   Dr Katharine Boursicot - Reader in Medical Education and Head of Assessment at St George's Medical School, University of London
   Dr Matthew Pead - Senior Lecturer and Academic Director of Professional Assessment and Development and Director of Clinical Skills Centre, RVC.
   Professor Susan Rhind - Professor of Veterinary Education, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies.

   There were 40 participants including chief examiners and some less experienced examiners, across a range of both Certificate and Diploma subjects who took part in a number of workshops.

   It has been suggested that this event be repeated for future Diploma examinations which will continue to be run until 2019 until the last remaining enrolled candidate has entered for the examination.

2. During 2012, Diploma examinations were held in 9 subjects for a total of 11 candidates (12 in 2011) of whom 8 (11 in 2011) were successful and Certificate examinations were held in 17 subjects for a total of 72 candidates (135 in 2011) of whom 48 were successful (93 in 2011).

3. All of the written examinations were all held at the Emmanuel Centre due to the possibility of noise at the RCVS during demolition work on the neighbouring site.

Special Arrangements

4. Special arrangements were made this year for one 'special needs' candidate requiring additional time to take the written papers.

5. Examinations for a single candidate were held in 6 Certificate subjects and 7 Diploma subjects.

6. The RCVS again also hosted and carried out the administrative arrangements at an external centre for the Australian College of Veterinary Scientists Examinations for 22 candidates (3 in 2011).

Performance Standards

7. This year, there was an increase in candidates achieving a Good Pass for their submitted work.

8. 3 candidates achieved <45% in the written papers, of whom 2 were advised that compensation was not permissible and that they could not pass the examination overall (see para. 33). As there
was more than 1 candidate entered in the subject, they were given the opportunity to attend the clinical, oral and practical with the knowledge that they would not achieve the Certificate and that there would be no opportunity for a future attempt. Both declined to proceed. (Para. 33 also refers)

9. In the case of those who were unsuccessful, the broad band marking scheme was applied and all failed case reports and question papers were trebled marked.

10. Failed candidates received comprehensive reports on the reasons for the examiners’ decision.

Administration

11. The deadlines for issue of results and examiners’ reports were met well within the published timescale and in some cases by the day following the examination.

12. This year the teams were more proactive in confirming dates for the clinical, oral and practicals which made the process run more smoothly for all concerned.

13. RCVS has confirmed and published dates for the final opportunity to enrol for an RCVS Diploma in November 2012 and for the Diploma examinations to be held in 2013.

14. The old Certificate is no longer available and any candidates remaining in the system who did their 5 year unexpired enrolment to transfer to the CertAVP modular Certificate at a reduced enrolment fee provided they applied by 1 March 2012.

Appeals

15. 6 enquiries were received.

16. 1 of these proceeded to appeal by a candidate who had exceeded the word count in their submitted case books and the appeal was upheld. The candidate was permitted to proceed to the remaining sections of the examination and subsequently passed overall. At the time of press there is one further potential appeal.

Issues arising from some of the examinations

Diploma in Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law

17. 1 candidate entered and withdrew from the written examination and the COP was therefore not held.

Certificate in Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law

18. 1 candidate entered and failed at Section (a).
Diploma in Cattle Health and Production

19. 2 candidates entered and were successful in the examination as a whole. The examination was held within a short time frame and was conducted extremely efficiently by the new team.

Certificate in Cattle Health and Production

20. 1 candidate entered and passed the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Equine Practice

21. 2 candidates entered and were both successful in the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Equine Surgery (Orthopaedics)

22. 3 candidates entered and were all successful in the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Equine Surgery (Soft Tissue)

23. 1 candidate entered and was successful in the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Equine Medicine (Internal Medicine)

24. 1 candidate entered and was successful in the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Equine Medicine (Stud Medicine)

25. 2 candidates entered; 1 failed at the written stage and did not proceed to the clinical, oral and practical. The remaining candidate passed the examination overall.

Certificate in Poultry Medicine and Production

26. 1 candidate entered and was successful in the examination as a whole.

Diploma in Sheep Health and Production

27. 1 candidate entered and was successful in the examination as a whole. The Examiners commented that if it were possible to award a pass with distinction, they would have happily awarded it to the candidate as they were thoroughly impressed with the candidate’s performance.

Certificate in Sheep Health and Production

28. 2 candidates entered and were both successful as a whole.
Diploma in Small Animal Medicine

29. 1 candidate entered and failed the examination as a whole. This was the candidate's 3rd and final
attempt at the examination. They are the only remaining candidate enrolled with the enrolment
due to lapse in November 2012. They have the option of requesting a 4th attempt which would be
granted at the discretion of the Small Animal Medicine Board. Should the request be granted
they would be allowed to extend their enrolment by one year in which to sit the examination. At
the time of press, no such request has been received.

Certificate in Small Animal Medicine

30. 13 candidates entered; 1 candidate failed after section (b); 2 candidates failed after section (c)
and the remaining 10 were successful in the examination as a whole.

Diploma in Small Animal Surgery (Orthopaedics)

31. 1 candidate entered and was successful in the examination as a whole.

Diploma in Small Animal Surgery (Soft Tissue)

32. 2 candidates entered and were successful in the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Small Animal Surgery

33. 19 candidates entered for the examination; 1 candidate was unsuccessful at section (a); 2
candidates withdrew due to illness prior to section (b); 4 candidates failed and 10 were successful
at the examination as a whole.

34. At the Examiners' Meeting after the conclusion of the Certificate in Small Animal Surgery clinical,
oral and practical examination, when the final marks for each section were compiled and checked
it became apparent that 1 candidate had achieved less than 45% in the written papers. They had
not been informed of this prior to the COP examination and had therefore sat the examination
without the knowledge that they had already failed the examination. Examiners are requested to
notify the RCVS of any candidates achieving less than 45% in the written examination as soon as
possible before the COP examination. This was explained to the candidate and an apology
offered for the oversight. The matter is currently being taken up with the Chief Examiner.

Certificate in Veterinary Anaesthesia

35. 1 candidate entered and failed at section (a) of the examination.

Diploma in Veterinary Cardiology

36. 1 candidate entered and was successful in the examination as a whole.
Certificate in Veterinary Cardiology

37. 2 candidates entered; 1 was unsuccessful after section (a) and the remaining candidate was unsuccessful at the examination overall.

Certificate in Veterinary Dermatology

38. 6 candidates entered; 2 failed and 4 were successful in the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Veterinary Diagnostic Imaging

39. 4 candidates entered; 1 candidate failed at section (a); 1 candidate failed and 2 were successful at the examination as a whole.

Diploma in Veterinary Ophthalmology

40. 1 candidate entered and failed at the submitted work stage.

Certificate in Veterinary Ophthalmology

41. 9 candidates entered; three candidates failed at section (a). 1 candidate appealed the result after failing due to exceeding the word count and the fail mark was subsequently upgraded to a pass. 7 candidates therefore sat the remaining sections of the examination and all were successful overall.

Diploma in Zoological Medicine (Reptilian)

42. 1 candidate entered and was successful in the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Zoological Medicine

43. 4 candidates entered; 2 were unsuccessful after section (a); 1 candidate failed and one candidate was successful at the examination as a whole.

Discussion

44. The Sub Committee is invited to comment on the above and make any necessary recommendations.
Annex A

FULL LIST OF RESULTS OF CERTIFICATE AND DIPLOMA EXAMINATIONS HELD IN 2012

APRIL

Certificate in Animal Welfare Science Ethics and Law  
1 candidate entered and failed at Section (a).

Certificate in Laboratory Animal Science  
1 candidate entered and failed at Section (a).

Diploma in Veterinary Ophthalmology  
1 candidate entered and failed at Section (a).

JULY

Diploma in Animal Welfare Science and Law  
1 candidate entered and withdrew from the examination after section (b).

Diploma in Cattle Health and Production (11 July 2012)  
2 candidates entered and were successful at the examination as a whole:

Alastair Ian MACRAE BVM&S CertSHP CertCHP PhD MRCVS  
James Alex WILLSHIRE BVSc CertCHP MRCVS

AUGUST

Diploma in Small Animal Surgery (Orthopaedics) (7th August)  
1 candidate entered and was successful at the examination as a whole:

Mark Alexander BUSH MA VetMB CertSAS MRCVS

Diploma in Small Animal Surgery (Soft Tissue) (10th August)  
2 candidates entered and both were successful at the examination as a whole:

Timothy Michael CHARLESWORTH MA VetMB CertSAS MRCVS  
Alistair Ian FREEMAN BVMS CertSAS PhD MRCVS

Certificate in Veterinary Dermatology (10th August)  
6 candidates entered; 2 were unsuccessful and 4 were successful at the examination as a whole:

Lesley Alice BUCHAN BVM&S MRCVS  
Helena Karoline Mary LANGLEY BVetMed MRCVS  
Welsey Philip POWER MVB MRCVS  
Neil MacRae SMITH BVM&S MRCVS
Certificate in Equine Medicine (Internal Medicine) (21 August 2012)
1 candidate entered and was successful at the examination as whole:

Joanne Elizabeth DYSON BVSc,BSc MRCVS

Certificate in Equine Surgery (Soft Tissue) (21 August 2012)
1 candidate entered and was successful at the examination as whole:

Christopher John PEARCE BVSc CertEM(IntMed) MRCVS

Diploma in Veterinary Cardiology (30 August 2012)
1 candidate entered and was successful at the examination as a whole;

Stephen Alexander COLLINS BVetMed CertVC MRCVS

Certificate in Equine Medicine (Stud Medicine) (30 August 2012)
2 candidates entered; 1 candidate failed at Section (b) and was not permitted to proceed to Section (c); 1 candidate was successful at the examination as a whole:

Graham Stewart FOWKE MA VetMB MRCVS

Certificate in Veterinary Ophthalmology (31 August)
9 candidates entered; 2 candidates failed at Section (a) and the following 7 were successful at the examination as a whole:

Ramanujuan Reuben Coore DVM BSc PhD DipLHP MRCVS
Melanie Fleming MA VetMB MRCVS
Sarah Hane Harrison BVMS MRCVS
Gillian Chien-Li Hung BvetMed BSc
Kasun Vimukthi Kumaratunga BVSc MRCVS
Helen Manson BVM&S MRCVS
Rui Pedro Camanho Rodrigues Oliveira

SEPTEMBER

Certificate in Zoological Medicine (3 September 2012)
4 candidates entered; 2 failed at section (a); 1 candidate failed and 1 candidate passed the examination as a whole:

Mikel Sabater Gonzalez MRCVS

Diploma in Sheep Health and Production (4 September 2012)
1 candidate entered and was successful at the examination as a whole:

Fiona Margaret Lovatt BVSc CertSHP PhD MRCVS
Certificate in Equine Practice (5 September)
2 candidates entered and were successful at the examination as a whole:

Jonathan David GARRATT BVetMed MRCVS
Paul Thomas Staveley SMITH BVM&S MRCVS

Certificate in Equine Surgery (Orthopaedics) (5 September)
3 candidates entered and were successful at the examination as a whole:

Dr Olli Tapio MAKELA MRCVS (CHECK MRCVS)
Maria Jesus RODRIGUEZ VIZCAINO PhD MRCVS
Alice Elizabeth SHELDON BVM&S BSc CertEP MRCVS

Certificate in Small Animal Surgery (5 September)
19 candidates entered; 1 candidate was unsuccessful at section (a); 2 candidates withdrew before section (b) and the following 12 were successful at the examination as a whole:

Michael CANTY MVB MRCVS
Francesca CONNOLLY BVMS MRCVS
Joseph Oliver Sean FOX BVetMed MRCVS
Timothy Richard GARRAN BVSc MRCVS
Stephen Anthony KIRBY BVetMed MRCVS
Gareth Glynne JONES BVSc BSc MRCVS
Ian Andrew McCLIVE MA VetMB MRCVS
Rafael PARDO IBANEZ MRCVS
John RYAN MVB MRCVS
Nigel Reginald SMITH BVetMed MRCVS
Paulus Agust Maria VERSCHUEREN MRCVS
Helena Mary WHITE BVetMed MRCVS

Certificate in Small Animal Medicine (12 September 2012)
13 candidates entered; 1 candidate failed at section (b); 2 candidates failed and the following were successful at the examination as a whole:

Rachel Elisabeth-Joy ALLEN BVetMed MRCVS
Michelle Dawn BACON BVSc MRCVS
Gisela de CARVALHO FONSECA TYNDALL MRCVS
Mary-Anne FRANK BVSc MRCVS
Ceri Nea GRUFFUDD JONES MA VetMB MRCVS
Caroline KISIELEWICZ MVB MRCVS
Dalaya LIVY BVSc MVS CertVA MRCVS
Kevin Francis MURTAGH MVB MRCVS
Katja SCHIRREN MRCVS
Pablo VILA GONZALEZ MRCVS
Certificate in Poultry Medicine and Production (11 September 2012)
1 candidate entered and was successful at the examination as a whole:

Richard James JENNISON BVMS CertLAS CertWEL MRCVS

Certificate in Veterinary Cardiology (13 September 2012)
2 candidates entered; 1 candidate failed at section (a) and 1 candidate was unsuccessful at the examination as a whole.

Certificate in Cattle Health and Production (13 September 2012)
1 candidate entered and was successful at the examination as a whole:

David Arthur TISDALL BVSc MRCVS

Certificate in Sheep Health and Production (13 September 2012)
2 candidates entered and were both successful at the examination as a whole:

David Richard ARMSTRONG BVM&S MRCVS
Kristy Marie SYER BVSc BSc MRCVS

Certificate in Veterinary Diagnostic Imaging (14 September 2012)
4 candidates entered; 1 candidate was unsuccessful at section (a); 1 candidate was unsuccessful after section (c) and the following passed the examination as a whole:

Mark Andrew AMES BVSc CertVOphthal MRCVS
Natalie Samantha SCOTT BVetMed MRCVS

14 September 2012
## Annex B

### 2012 Examination Certificate and Diploma Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certs 2012</th>
<th>No. of cands entered</th>
<th>Non MRCVS</th>
<th>No. of cands failing at Section (a)</th>
<th>No. of cands sitting written exams</th>
<th>No. of cands with special needs</th>
<th>No. of cands sitting COP only</th>
<th>No. of cands who withdrew</th>
<th>No. of cands who failed Sections (b) and/or (c)</th>
<th>No. of cands who passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CertWel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertEM(IM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertEM(SM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertEP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertES(Orth)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertES(ST)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertPM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertPMP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertOphthal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertVD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertVC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertLAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertCHP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertSHP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertSAM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertSAS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertVA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertVPH(FH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertVDI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertVRep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CertZooMed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certs Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RCVS Certs & Dips Exams  
Classification: Unclassified
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dips 2012</th>
<th>No. of cands entered</th>
<th>Non MRCVSs</th>
<th>No. of cands failing at Section (a)</th>
<th>No. of cands sitting written exams</th>
<th>No. of cands with special needs</th>
<th>No. of cands sitting COP only</th>
<th>No. of cands who withdrew</th>
<th>No. of cands who failed Sections (b) and/or (c)</th>
<th>No. of cands who passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DWEL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVOphthal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCHP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSAS(Orth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSAS(ST)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZooMed (Reptilian)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dips Sub Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certs &amp; Dips Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Board Meeting dates for 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>No meeting to be held (Diploma subsumed)</td>
<td>Board not active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>No meeting to be held * (No candidates enrolled on Dip)</td>
<td>Board not active *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>No meeting to be held * (No candidates enrolled on Dip)</td>
<td>D McDowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint State Vet Med &amp; Vet Public Health</td>
<td>No meeting to be held * (No candidates enrolled on Dip)</td>
<td>J M Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet. Anaes</td>
<td>No meeting to be held (Diploma subsumed)</td>
<td>S M Crispin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>No meeting to be held (Diploma subsumed)</td>
<td>C Chesney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Medicine</td>
<td>No meeting to be held (Diploma subsumed)</td>
<td>M Herrtage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Ophthalmology</td>
<td>No meeting to be held (Diploma subsumed)</td>
<td>B Cottrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Imaging</td>
<td>No meeting to be held (Diploma subsumed)</td>
<td>S A May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Animal</td>
<td>No meeting to be held (Diploma subsumed)</td>
<td>S M Crispin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Mon 22 October 2012</td>
<td>A Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>Fri 9 Nov 2012</td>
<td>N P Swayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Fri 9 Nov 2012</td>
<td>N P Swayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Med</td>
<td>Thurs 15 Nov 2012</td>
<td>P Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
<td>Wed 21 Nov 2012</td>
<td>A Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equine</td>
<td>Mon 26th Nov 2012</td>
<td>R Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Surgery</td>
<td>Thurs 6 Dec 2012</td>
<td>A Boag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet. Cardiology</td>
<td>Fri 7 Dec 2012</td>
<td>C Tapsfield Wright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to no further Diploma enrolments before 1 November
Examiners nominations to be confirmed by Boards in Autumn 2012.

Shading indicates no eligible candidates at the time of writing. Examining teams will be appointed if any applications for final approval of experience are received before 1 November 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARM &amp; PRODN. SUBJECTS</th>
<th>C/O/P VENUE</th>
<th>NOMINATED EXAMINERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dip Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law | Chief Examiner: | S Mullan  
Specialist Exr (Law):  
Observer: | S Hepple  
Mr M Radford (non vet)  
D McKeegan |
| Dip Cattle Health and Production | Chief Examiner: | *J Huxley  
Reserves:  
Observers: | J Husband  
C Hudson  
TBC |
| Dip Laboratory Animal Science | Chief Examiner: Glasgow | *J Wilson (U)  
Special Examiner Observer | T Morris (BHR)  
B Mortimer (Tba) if required |
| Dip Pig Medicine | No eligible candidates | |
| Dip Poultry Medicine & Prodn. | No eligible candidates | |
| Dip Sheep Health & Production | Chief Examiner: Edinburgh | *P A Roger (P)  
Observer:  
Local Organiser: | C J Lewis  
N Sargison  
P Scott  
P R Scott (U) |
| Dip Veterinary Public Health (MH) | No eligible candidates | |
| Dip Equine Orthopaedics | | * TBC  
Jo Price  
B Bladon  
I M Wright  
D Platt |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma / Specialization</th>
<th>Chief Examiner:</th>
<th>Observer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dip Equine Soft Tissue Surgery</td>
<td>*T J Phillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J G Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Bladon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T R C Greet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip Equine Internal Medicine</td>
<td>* J D Slater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T S Mair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K Corley (able to act for questions but not submitted work – due to timetable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A E Durham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Equine Stud Medicine</td>
<td>*TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C M Marr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J F Pycock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Small Animal Medicine</td>
<td>*J D Wray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Eastwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip Small Animal Surgery (Orthopaedics)</td>
<td>*T Gemmill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H W Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G Arthurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Small Animal Surgery (Soft Tissue)</td>
<td>*K Pratschke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Doran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip Veterinary Cardiology</td>
<td>A French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Dennnis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip Veterinary Ophthalmology</td>
<td>Team TBC by Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip Zoological Medicine</td>
<td>*S Girling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K Eatwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Redrobe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Meeting</strong></th>
<th>Education Policy and Specialisation Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>10 October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Report of Fellowship Sub Committee 21 August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Report of the annual meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Decisions required** | By the Committee:  
To note. |
| **Attachments** | Report                                      |
| **Author**  | Janet Etheridge  
Specialisation Manager  
j.etheridge@rcvs.org.uk |
Fellowship Sub Committee
Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 21 August 2012

Present: Dr Lydia Brown - Chairman
          Mr A G Greenwood
          Dr A G Matthews
          Mr P W Scott
          Mr J M Williams

In attendance: Miss Janet Etheridge - Committee Secretary

Apologies

1. There were no apologies for absence.

Declarations of interest

2. The only amendment to those already registered was submitted by Dr Lydia Brown as Adviser to Candidate No. T/755.

Minutes of meeting held on Tuesday 16 August 2011

3. The report of the meeting held on Tuesday 16 August 2011 was received as a correct record.

Matters Arising

4. It was noted that the following Diplomas of Fellowship had been approved by Council and awarded at the AGM in July 2012:

   David George Sidney BURCH BVetMed MRCVS
   By Thesis T/728
   In the subject: ‘Examination of the pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic relationships of orally administered antimicrobials and their correlation with the therapy of various bacterial and mycoplasmal infections in pigs’

   Annamaria NAGY DrMedVet MRCVS
   By Thesis T/748
   In the subject: ‘High-field and low-field magnetic resonance imaging findings in the carpus and proximal metacarpal region of horses with and without carpal and/or proximal metacarpal regional pain’

Extracts from EPSC October 2011, February and May 2012

5. The Members received and noted the relevant extracts.
Recommendations of Specialisation Working Party

6. It was noted that a new Working Group was to be established to actively promote – both to the profession and to the public - the Diploma of Fellowship as the highest award issued by the College.

Reports from Registered Candidates/Advisers for Diploma of Fellowship by Thesis

7. The Sub Committee received a list of 17 candidates provisionally registered for examination by Thesis and noted their current status.

8. Reminders had been issued to the candidates to submit further information where appropriate and annual progress reports from candidates and their advisers had been circulated to the Sub Committee for consideration.

9. The Sub Committee took the opportunity to review a previous application where queries had arisen during the year.

Reports on Examinations by Thesis in Progress

10. T/736

The Committee noted that the thesis had been examined and that the examiners’ recommendation had been:

“that certain specified sections of the thesis should be re-written and/or the general presentation improved and a new version based upon the original may be submitted not later than one year from the date of notification from the College of the result of the first examination”

New Applications for Provisional Registration

11. 5 new applications for provisional registration were received and considered.

Applications for Full Registration and Nomination of Examiners

12. 1 new application for full registration was received, considered and approved.

New Applications for Diploma of Fellowship by Meritorious Contributions to Learning (MCL)

13. 3 new applications were received and approved.
Nominations for the Sub Committee for Membership 2013-2014

14. The Sub Committee received and considered the list of past members.

Examination Fees and Examiners’ Honoraria – 2013

15. It was noted that, with effect from 1 January 2013 the fees for the Diploma of Fellowship would be as follows:

**Fellowship by Thesis**

- Preliminary Registration: £395.00
- Submission of Thesis: £1000.00
- Re-Submission: £500.00

**Fellowship by MCL**

- Preliminary Registration: £395.00
- Submission of Papers: £1000.00
- Examiners’ Honoraria: £236.00
- Re-submission: £115.00

Any Other Business

16. Referring to the list of registered candidates, a query was raised as to the number of candidates either failing to achieve the Diploma or withdrawing from their registration and what appeared to be a number of inappropriate submissions. The Members were asked to consider what more advice could be provided in order to prevent inappropriate submissions.

17. The Secretary advised that in recent years, a number of candidates had been required to rewrite certain sections of their thesis and had been successful on a subsequent submission.

18. With regard to inappropriate submissions, it was noted that the information pack and bye-laws required a review and that this should be brought to the attention of the new Working Group.

**ACTION:** Secretary

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 20 August 2013 at 2.00 p.m. (via teleconference)

Janet Etheridge
Specialisation Manager
August 2012
j.etheridge@rcvs.org.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Education Policy and Specialisation Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Wednesday 10 October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Certificate in Advanced Veterinary Practice (CertAVP) Report of meeting held on 15 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

To note the minutes from the CertAVP Sub-committee meeting 15 June 2012. Also to note that Col. David White has taken over chairmanship of the CertAVP sub-committee and Dr Cathy McGowan has been asked to join the sub-committee. Some other changes to the membership are under discussion.

For your information: Letter from Dr Jill Maddison to the Veterinary Times July 16, 2012 explaining the high standard of the CertAVP.

**Decisions required**

By the Committee:

To note.

**Attachments**

Annex A - Letter from J Maddison to the Veterinary Times

**Authors**

Britta Crawford
Education Officer
020 7202 0778
b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk
CertAVP Sub-Committee  
Minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2012

Present:
* Ms Charlotte Boardman
* Dr Mark Holmes
* Dr Chris Little
  Dr Jill Maddison
* Dr Tim Mair
  Professor Stephen May - Chairman
  Dr Robert Moore
  Ms Trudy Musgrove
  Mr Ronnie Soutar
* Professor Sandy Trees
  Colonel David White

In Attendance
Mrs Freda Andrews - Head of Education
Mrs Britta Crawford - Education Officer

* Absent

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Charlie Boardman, Chris Little, Mark Holmes and Tim Mair
Declarations of interest

2. Stephen May declared a direct interest in item 7a of the agenda, the RVC application for accreditation to assess pig and poultry modules, where he is a grant holder for the BBSRC in the Advanced Training Partnership in Intensive Livestock Health and Production.

Minutes

3. The minutes of the Sub-committee meeting held on 19 January 2012 were approved as a record of the meeting subject to a change in paragraph 14 to indicate that the situation regarding B and C modules in veterinary business needed further clarification.

Matters arising

4. A joint statement from the BSAVA/RCVS has been posted on both websites regarding the academic equivalence of the two qualifications.

Principles of Veterinary Management and Leadership

5. David White has developed a “Principles of Veterinary Management and Leadership” C module from the material remaining from the A-PKS module which was not included in the new FAVP module as a response to the proposed B business module by Liverpool that the Committee reviewed at its last meeting.

6. The question was raised as to whether there was too much material included for a 10 credit module but after discussion the sub-committee was assured that it was a broad module that could be assessed in such a way as to make it relevant for the candidate. Meaningful depth was being sought in key themes for the candidate rather than comprehensive coverage. The sub-committee agreed to look closely at the assessment methods suggested by the providers when they applied for accreditation.

7. The sub-committee agreed that the structure of the CertAVP should continue to allow each candidate the opportunity to take a business module. It would be important that three prescribed C modules remained the maximum to achieve a specific designation, and that the CertAVP was not constricted by a move to four clinical modules relevant to a candidate’s desired designation.

8. EPSC would be informed of the new business module and it would be published on the website and circulated to providers.

   ACTION: EPSC to be informed

Key Skills Module Redevelopment
9. The change in structure of the CertAVP including the Foundations of Advanced Veterinary Practice module and resulting changes in the bye-laws had been agreed by Council. Transition arrangements would need to be agreed with each of the providers. Each of the providers would need to apply for accreditation for the new module but this could be agreed by email amongst the sub-committee and the provider would not be charged.

Recommendations from the Specialisation Working Party

10. The Specialisation Working party had submitted its recommendations to Council and they had been approved at the June meeting. The working party’s clear recommendation is to simplify significantly the listing of postnominal letters for qualifications against members’ names in the published Register and on the RCVS website. Official lists should show only the registerable degree, followed by MRCVS or FRCVS and indicating whether the individual is on the list of specialists or the list of advanced practitioners.

11. The criteria for joining the list of RCVS advanced practitioners will be decided by a RCVS working party and EPSC. The sub-committee expressed a desire to make a significant contribution to this working party and wished to pass on its recommendation to the working party taking this forward that professional skills must be part of the criteria for being an advanced practitioner and not just species specific skills.

Structure of the CertAVP Sub-committee

12. The sub-committee were asked to consider its current membership and whether any specific expertise from additional members was needed. The sub-committee agreed that they should be moving towards a monitoring and quality assurance function to ensure the health of the programme and that the membership should reflect this. They considered the type of reports they should require from the providers and the methods by which the providers should be monitored. Freda Andrews was asked to draft a list of data required from the universities based on information which would be asked for at a visitation, for circulation to the sub-committee.

   ACTION: Freda Andrews to draft list of data required from providers for circulation

13. The sub-committee members agreed that whilst some of the members were from specific institutions they were there to represent CertAVP providers not a specific university, but did agree that someone from Liverpool with experience of the CertAVP could be helpful. They also expressed a wish to have more members who had completed the CertAVP. The sub-committee agreed that representatives from each of the providers should be invited to a meeting once a year to share good practice. Closed business could be discussed at the end of the meeting. Sub-committee members were asked to forward any potential names of members to Britta Crawford to pass on for consideration by EPSC and Officers.

   ACTION: Sub-committee members to suggest names for additional members
   ACTION: Britta Crawford to invite providers to meeting in November

RVC Pig and Poultry Accreditation Submission

14. Stephen May passed the chairmanship to Bob Moore for this item as he had a conflict of interest and asked the sub-committee if they would like him and Jill Maddison, to leave the room. The offer
was declined. The application was approved for accreditation providing the headings which had referred to poultry instead of pigs were corrected.

ACTION: Britta Crawford to inform the RVC

**Bristol AWSEL1 Accreditation Submission**

15. The sub-committee was surprised to note that Bristol did not offer an assessment only option and asked them to adapt their submission in order to do so. There was some concern over the assessment methods and the sub-committee asked for further clarification on what would be required from the candidate. The sub-committee asked that they look at the number of case exposures that would be required and suggested a total word count of 5000 – 7500 words.

ACTION: Britta Crawford to ask for further clarification from Bristol

**Dermatology Modules**

16. The sub-committee was concerned with the structure of the dermatology modules which had been revised by Dr Chesney in conjunction with the dermatology board. The sub-committee felt that the modules still needed some revision to make learning objectives clearer and suggested that Liverpool, which had been accredited to assess the modules, would be best placed to revise the modules to a workable format.

ACTION: Britta Crawford to inform Liverpool

**CertAVP(SAM) Synoptic Examination**

17. The sub-committee were delighted with the suggestions and information put forward by the examiners and felt that this was a very sound way to assess a Cert(SAM) synoptic examination. Dan Batchelor is to act as the reserve examiner and David White offered to attend as the Observer from the sub-committee.

**Equivalence**

18. A candidate has applied for equivalence for MSc modules from Liverpool’s MSc in Veterinary Infectious Disease Control against VPH and VEPI modules. The sub-committee agreed that the candidate would need to map each learning outcome to show that she has covered the material through her own study. The sub-committee in principle would be prepared to offer credit for the C modules but not for the B module. They would also require proof that she has achieved these qualifications by seeing the original certificate/university transcript.

ACTION: Britta Crawford to feedback to candidate

**Cardiology Synoptic Report**

19. The sub-committee thanked Dr Chris Little for his synoptic examination report and noted its contents.
Update on enrolments and pass statistics

20. The statistics were noted, together with additional charts prepared by David White, who was thanked for his contribution. The sub-committee agreed that it would be interesting to develop some further analysis of the statistics, although an indication from members of how they would like the figures analysed would be helpful.

Any other business

21. There was no other business

Date of next meeting

Friday 2nd November at 10.30.

Britta Crawford
Education Officer
June 2012
b.crawford@rcvs.org.uk
CertAVP ‘more rigorous’ than its precursors

Dear editor,

I have been following the debate relating to the proposal to introduce a middle tier of veterinary practitioner – now to be known as an advanced practitioner. In the comments sent to the RCVS, and in other discussion forums, there were relatively frequent references to the old certificates and the new Certificate of Advanced Veterinary Practice (CertAVP). The theme of many comments was along the lines of: “I don’t know much about the new CertAVP but I know it is inferior to the old certificates.” The lack of rigour of the assessment process was cited as a reason for this judgement, as well as the perception that because the CertAVP includes assessment of other “soft” skills, the assessment of a candidate in a specific discipline – such as medicine or surgery – must, by definition, be much less.

It may interest Veterinary Times readers to know that if the discipline-specific work required for the old Certificate in Small Animal Medicine is compared with the assessment required for the equivalent C modules (C-SAM-8, C-SAM-9 and C-SAM-10), for the CertAVP, as assessed at the RVC, the level of assessment for the CertAVP is greater than the requirements for the old medicine certificate. The situation is similar for small animal surgery, and if comparisons were made in other disciplines, such as diagnostic imaging and anaesthesia, these, too, would refute this “modern myth” of a dumbed-down certificate.

In addition to their C module work, CertAVP candidates assessed at the RVC must write five case reports of 1,500 words each for Module B in Small Animal Practice (B-SAP), covering the key areas of clinical reasoning in medical cases, principles of surgery and anaesthesia, review of diagnostic imaging in their practice and therapeutic case reports (requiring an understanding of clinically relevant pharmacology at a far deeper level than the drug data sheet), as well as a synoptic essay of 1,500 words reflecting on their learning through the module and how it has impacted on their present and future practice (visit http://cpd.rvc.ac.uk/the-view-from-the-finishing-line for examples of these essays). Of course, also complete the Professional Key Skills A module (A-PKS) and the Clinical Key Skills B module (B-CKS), which are soon to be combined into a new Foundation of Advanced Veterinary Practice module (A-FAVP).

Based on all of this, I fail to see how it can be claimed the CertAVP does not create a practitioner worthy of the status of advanced practitioner, whose knowledge has been just as rigorously – or even more rigorously – assessed than in the old certificates. I also cannot see how anyone could claim the CertAVP is easier to obtain than the old certificate and requires less work. Unlike the old certificates, candidates in all modules assessed at the RVC received detailed feedback on every piece of submitted work, so the assessment is not just of their learning, but for their learning. It is too early to compare the pass rate of the old and new certificates, but the comparison will probably be meaningless because of the very different approach to supporting candidate’s learning during the assessment process.

Neither the old certificate nor the CertAVP is a specialty qualification, but holders of either qualification are worthy of the title advanced practitioner in a specific discipline.

Yours faithfully,

JILL MADDISON, BvSc, DipVetClinStud, PhD, MRCVS,
Director of professional development and EMS,
RVC, Hawkshead Lane,
North Mymms,
Herts AL9 7TA.
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Aiding the Transition from Veterinary School to Practice
Open Educational Resources (OER) to support new graduates

Background

1. The RCVS is a partner organisation in a HEA/JISC funded project led by the RCVS Charitable Trust which will look at the transition from veterinary school to practice. The other partners are Bristol Veterinary School, Royal Veterinary College, The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, Society of Practising Veterinary Surgeons and the Veterinary Benevolent Fund. The project will:

   a. Investigate the challenges new veterinary graduates face as the enter practice
   b. Identify open educational resources (OER) that will help new graduates face these challenges
   c. Suggest ways in which OER can be made available to support new graduates

2. The project is being managed by Clare Boulton, Trust Librarian. A recent graduate, Jennifer McIntyre has been recruited as Project Co-ordinator. The project is due to be completed at the end of November 2012 and is currently running on time and on budget.

Current position

3. The first phase of the project, to identify the needs of new graduates is nearing completion. This has involved researching literature on the subject, analysing data held by project partners and carrying out an online survey which was promoted to new graduates on VetGrad and via the Young Vet Network, via the partner schools emails lists and at SPVS and VDS organised events.

4. Suitable OER held by project partners have been identified and other non partner OER are currently been investigated. These are being matched against the identified needs

5. Ways to evaluate the OER are being finalised: these will include online and at focus groups at the VDS graduate reunions in Bristol and Liverpool at the end of October/beginning of November

Future activities

6. The findings of the project will be made available in a final report which will be publicised in the veterinary press. Dissemination activities will be arranged for congresses and events in 2013.

7. OER will be made available on a webpage on the Trust’s website.

8. We will identify any needs for which there are no suitable OER and investigate funding opportunities for their creation.

Decisions required

9. The Committee is invited to note progress with the project and to make any comments.
Open Educational Resources Explained

1. An ‘Open Educational Resource’ - or OER are digital materials which are freely available online.

2. OER can be anything from a pdf document or powerpoint presentation to a video or image. OER should be able to be used, re-used and repurposed for teaching, learning, research and more.

3. OER are made available through open licenses such as Creative Commons in which a copyrighted work is released for more open use without the need for additional permission.
Project update circulated in August

The project is now well underway – initial data received from project partners has produced a short list of recent graduate concerns, perhaps the most worrying of which is an issue of bullying in practice. These concerns are summarised in the ‘word cloud’.

A new questionnaire has been finalised. Its aim is to assess both the current concerns of recent graduate vets and also to gain an idea of how best to present the OERs we collect.

It will be promoted at the VDS RVC graduate reunion in the beginning of September. In addition we have flyers containing information about the online survey complete with a url link.

We will send these out, alongside project updates, to all organisations and persons who have expressed an interest, asking them to send it to any recent graduates they are in contact with. Finally we will advertise the questionnaire on the RCVS Charitable Trust website and in various publications.

We are hoping to get a reasonable response this way. As an added incentive a prize draw of a years free membership of the RCVS Charitable Trust Library is being offered to five people who complete the survey online by 16th September and one person at the RVC graduate reunion.

Thinking ahead we are organising focus groups at both the Bristol and Liverpool VDS graduate reunions where we will be able to explore the use of OER in greater depth. Flyers have been produced in pdf format which will be kindly sent out alongside the other material for the reunions by the VDS.

A spreadsheet has been started; it contains the broad needs/concerns found thus far and initial ideas of resources and possible OERs to meet them. The needs included are shown in the box on the left. If you have any ideas of suitable OERs (or something which could be made into an OER), or know of anyone that does, please let us know.

We are in the process of contacting other people and organisations we think would be interested in either distributing questionnaires or providing OERs. If you can think of any suggestions please do let us know.

Finally, we have been searching the literature for evidence of new graduates’ concerns or employers’ impressions of their needs in practice. We have uncovered a wealth of research – mainly external to the UK and mostly repeating the same concerns over and over again. It would seem that the new graduates of today have similar problems to those of the past and that many problems remain throughout their career. If you would like to see summaries of the papers or the concerns raised please let us know.
Aiding the Transition from Veterinary School to Practice

The transition from veterinary school to practice is an extremely important one. New vets can base their entire career on their first year in practice, so we want to help make sure is it successful. Your input is crucial to achieving this goal. We are currently carrying out research into the challenges that veterinary graduates face as they start out in the workplace with the aim of identifying what online resources they need to help them meet these challenges. Any suggestions and insights you can give are extremely important.

This is where we need your help. As recent graduates you are best placed to understand the needs of a new graduate in clinical practice within the UK and to suggest ideas to help us gather and evaluate the right types of online educational resources to help both you and others meet these needs.

What will it involve?

You can help us by attending a focus group on the day of the VDS conference. During this you will be able to contribute your ideas to an in-depth discussion with 8-10 other people. This will be held after the VDS talks at the Liverpool graduate reunion on the 20th October from 4:30pm until 6:15pm. We will be finished well before the dinner starts. If you would like to take part in the focus group please email Jennifer McIntyre (j.mcintyre@rcvstrust.org.uk) by Monday the 8th October. Refreshments will be provided.

What do you get?

Everyone who attends the focus group (only 8-10 places available) will receive their choice of either £30 worth of Amazon vouchers or a years free membership of the RCVS Charitable Trust Library (worth £45). In the meantime if you (or your practice) have any comments or suggestions or if you would like to be added to the mailing list for updates on the project please let us know by contacting Clare Boulton, the project manager, via email (c.boulton@rcvstrust.org.uk).

Join a focus group – email Jennifer McIntyre jmcmintyre@rcvstrust.org.uk
Find out more at our website www.rcvstrust.org.uk/graduateoer