****

***Five Paragraph Format for review of RVSO reports to ABVS—ACPV (K Campbell, Secondary Reviewer)***

Please prepare your review report using the following five-paragraph format. The report you submit will be included in the February 2015 ABVS agenda book.

1. **Purpose:**

These recommendations are based on review of the ACPV’s five year report.

1. **Discussion:**

This report was very well constructed and presented in an organized manner. The College is to be congratulated for their efforts to provide a complete review of their programs, policies and procedures.

The items the reviewers found particularly noteworthy were the newly constructed examination format based on completion of a Job Task Analysis and an extensive evaluation of the methodology used for determining the pass points for their certification examination. They have developed two versions of each of the three parts of their certification examination with passing scores for each of these based on a combination of a modified bookmark and a modified Angoff method. The College is commended for the proactive manner in which the committee sets the cut points for the examination. They plan to alternate versions of the exam for six years and develop a new exam for use starting in 2021.

An item of minor concern was the omission of how candidates are informed of their deficiencies on areas of the examination that they do not pass. The reviewers are concerned that the examination will not reflect state-of-the-art knowledge expected of a Diplomate due to advancements in diagnostic and preventative methodologies and changes in regulations over a six year period.

The policy for maintenance of certification is well described and provides Diplomates of the college a wide variety of options, both scientifically and geographically to obtain the necessary hours to maintain certification. The move to online submission of CE through the website has undoubtedly lessened the burden of those reviewing the materials submitted for maintenance of certification.

Previous reviewers questioned whether candidates qualifying to sit for the examination via graduate training, residency training or experience have equivalent preparation and success rates. This report states that success rates have been tracked and are similar for candidates from each route. The reviewers appreciate this update.

The ACPV has developed excellent guidelines for appeals processes and has also established a Recertification Committee. The requirements for recertification are well delineated and reasonable.

The ACPV has implemented a web-based dues payment and CE reporting systems and has increased the percentages of Diplomates remaining members of the College through payment of annual dues.

The ACPV is investigating the potential for electronic delivery of their examination and also a possible management alignment with the American Association of Avian Pathologists to provide one voice regarding issues on poultry health and to facilitate website and communication processes.

The ACPV requires three first author publications or reports suitable for publication or that make a significant contribution to the field as part of the credentialing process. The reviewers would like to see more information provided to candidates on this requirement.

The ACPV provides notification of acceptance of credentials after submission of application, however it was not clear whether this is 120 days prior to the date of the examination.

The example letter provided to candidates failing one or more portions of the examination had an error (stated scores would be given for failing portion(s), however scores for passed sections were also given. The letter did not provide any details regarding specific areas of deficiency. The reviewers feel that the candidates should have the opportunity for a more complete critique of deficiencies to help prepare to retake the exam.

1. **Conclusion:**

The ACPV is to be commended for completing a Job Task Analysis and development of a standard setting methodology for their certification examination. They should reconsider whether content of examination will need modification over a six year period. They should continue to monitor how candidates qualifying under the five years of professional experience compare with those completing graduate training as part of an MS and those completing approved residency training. They should also provide candidates with more details on the publication/suitable for publication reports requirement.

1. **Recommendation(s):**

Recommend accepting ACPV Five-Year report and renewal of status as a RVSO by the ABVS

1. **Implementation:**

Approve motion and forward to AVMA Executive Committee