

To: The Board of Governors of the American College of Poultry Veterinarians
From: Dr. Kathleen Long, ACPV Credential Review Committee Chair
Date: June 24th, 2024
Subject: Report on Activities of the ACPV Credential Review Committee

Thirteen ACPV applicants for the 2024 examination were promoted by the ACPV Executive Director to the ACPV Credential Review Committee for evaluation. The committee reviewed the applications, academic degrees, veterinary licenses, publications, sponsor evaluations, and letters of program standing for each applicant. Of the thirteen applicants:

- Five applicants were recommended to write the ACPV exam with no conditions.
- Five applicants were recommended to write the ACPV exam pending submission of additional document(s), and in one case, a new sponsor evaluation.
- Two applicants were not recommended for the ACPV exam as the submitted papers were not of publishable quality.
- One application was requested to be reviewed by the Executive Director/ACPV Board of Governors as the committee did not reach consensus on the acceptability of the applicant's publications. All three publications were research papers of high quality and published in peer-reviewed journals; however, all three were based on foundational microbiology research with minimal or no reference to poultry. Subsequent review determined that these publications did not meet the ACPV standard.
- One or more applicants appealed the decision of the Credential Review Committee, which was addressed via the ACPV Appeals Committee.
- One applicant who was not recommended for the ACPV exam on the basis of publication quality requested feedback from the Credential Review Committee on how to improve their submission and what resources to use for next year. Feedback was provided with respect to each publication, and the suggestion made to seek instruction on how to write case reports and scientific studies at a publishable standard.

The Credential Review Committee received an additional inquiry from an applicant for the 2025 ACPV exam regarding the acceptability of white papers as publishable works. A detailed response was provided emphasizing that manuscripts submitted to ACPV must be written objectively and factually and contain all parts of a research manuscript that would be required for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. References to the ACPV Policy on Credentialing were provided.

The committee proposes the following suggestions for consideration by the ACPV Executive Director and Board of Governors based on questions and issues encountered in this year's credential review:

1. Suggestion to specify to applicants that if a paper has been published in a peer reviewed journal, the applicant must upload the published version to demonstrate it has been peer reviewed.
2. Suggestion to incorporate a way for the sponsors to evaluate the applicants' publications as part of their sponsor declaration. For example, instead of rating the applicant's research contact hours, the sponsor could be asked to rate the quality of the publications the applicant is submitting. This would force the sponsor to review the publications and potentially reduce the likelihood of unacceptable publications being submitted.
3. Suggestion to broaden the limitation on nutrition publications to allow papers about nutrition plus health/veterinary outcomes. Currently, applicants may only submit more than one nutrition paper if the subject is a feed toxicity, which is very restrictive.

4. Suggestion to clarify that all sponsors must be ACPV Diplomates in good standing, or to formally recognize any accepted equivalent sponsor certifications. A further suggestion would be to impose some form of system limitation that prevents anyone other than an ACPV Diplomate in good standing from completing a sponsor form.
5. Suggestion to clarify the acceptability of primary/foundational scientific research papers that are not directly related to poultry medicine, e.g., microbiology papers.
6. Several applicants were missing documents, translations, or equivalency certifications in their initial submission. In the case of translations and equivalency certifications, this is unfair to applicants who did provide them. Suggestion to implement more stringent requirements related to the completeness of the initial submitted documents.

Respectfully submitted by:

Dr. Kathleen Long on behalf of the Credential Review Committee (Drs. Rocio Crespo, Erfan Chowdhury, and Kathleen Long)