

To: The Board of Governors of the American College of Poultry Veterinarians

From: The Credentialing Committee (Dr. El-Gazzar, Dr. Schlegel and Dr. Long)

Date: November 9, 2021

The Credentialing Committee reviewed the applications, nominations and publications submitted by the applicants to the American College of Poultry Veterinarians. This year's field of applicants is strong and the committee recommends to the Board of Governors all applicants (listed below) be moved forward as having met the qualification requirements to sit for the exam.

- Alix Nelson
- Cameron Ellington
- Katie Burchfield
- Lucas Nickel
- Rachel Thiemann
- Taylor Boyett

The number of this year's applicants is smaller relative to previous years. However, the committee would like to point out that given the quality of the reviewed applications, no applicants were deemed unfit to sit for the exam this year. The Credentialing Committee views this trend of having fewer, but high quality applicants as a positive change that should be encouraged.

Other items discussed by the Credentialing Committee:

The requirement of 3 first authored case, research or technical reports suitable for publication is often a challenging requirement, particularly for the Experience and Training Program applicants. During this year's applications review meeting, the committee discussed, and is putting forward to the Board of Governors, multiple suggestions aiming towards clarifying, facilitating and improving the quality of submitted reports by the applicants.

The Committee agreed the nature of required reports is not well defined, which makes it even more challenging for the applicants and for the credentialing committee. Given the clinical nature of our college and of the exam, the committee thought that clinical reports and manuscripts should be encouraged, but not to the exclusion of basic research or other types of reports. This could encourage Experience and Training Program applicants to engage in intellectual projects that are more relevant to their expertise to produce higher quality publications. We recommend that the following language be added to the instructions for applicants and to the training document for the Credentialing Committee. "Clinical research reports are encouraged more than other types of publications. Examples of clinical research include, but not limited to case studies, vaccine application, diagnostics, treatments, disease transmission and epidemiology, disease prevention, control and eradication."

In past years, the committee did accept in-depth disease review papers. The committee agreed that review papers are acceptable if they summarize recent research or bring up a gap in knowledge to be addressed. Review papers are not specifically addressed in the training document under publications.

The committee agrees that review papers are acceptable but that no more than one of the publications be a review paper. This could also be another venue for Experience and Training Programs applicants to produce high quality publications. We recommend that the following language be added to the instructions for applicants and to the training document for the Credentialing Committee. "A limit of ONE, in depth review paper is acceptable if the review summarizes recent research or brings up a gap in knowledge to be addressed."

The committee agreed that it would be helpful for the applicants if there were examples of publications posted on the ACPV website showing what is to be expected as publications. Posting examples may prevent further applications from not meeting the publication requirements. Current committee members agreed to take on the task of selecting examples of abstracts if the board elects to adopt this suggestion.

Additionally, the committee agrees there is an apparent lack of attention for the quality of writing, readability, punctuation and spelling in some of the submitted reports. We recommend that the following language be added to the instructions for applicants and to the training document for the Credentialing Committee. "Submitted reports should meet acceptable standards of professional writing and readability and should be free of punctuation and spelling errors. Proofreading before submission is highly recommended."

On a different topic, this year was the first year where the primary/secondary sponsors system was adopted. However, in some incidences, on the some of the competency questions, there was an "I don't know" answer from the primary sponsor. This created confusion during the committee attempts to evaluate those applicants. The committee thinks that explanation is warranted whenever a primary sponsor marks "I don't know" or "not Competent" on one of the competency questions listed on the endorsement form. Preferably, secondary sponsors should also provide explanation in such incidences. We recommend that the following language be added to the endorsement form "If the answer is (I don't know) or (not competent), please provide explanation."

In the attached document, committee recommendations and suggestions are included and highlighted.

Respectfully submitted by:

Mohamed El-Gazzar
Ben Schlegel
Kathleen Long