

2020 Continuing Education Committee Report

Continuing Education Committee

Jenny Nicholds, chair
 Kelli Jones, past chair
 Bill Hewat
 Elise Myers
 Megan Lighty
 Jessica Walters

The 2020 ACPV workshop was initially scheduled to occur on March 29, 2020, just prior to the WPDC 2020 meeting in Sacramento California. With the advent of COVID-19, the event was cancelled a little more than 2 weeks prior to launch. Come mid-May, as people began to settle into a new normal, the possibility of a virtual workshop was discussed. Thanks to the hard work of the chair, the committee and Janece and Bob Bevans Kerr, this discussion came to fruition with the launch of a virtual workshop on July 17, 2020. All original speakers, save one, were able to present. The workshop was well attended with 171 registrants, a 54% increase over the previous years' workshop. While sponsorship was down and registration fees were decreased to account for the virtual nature of the event, the workshop contributed a profit of \$17,193.13, which exceeded the previous year face to face meeting. In general, evaluation received from attendees (detailed at the end of the report), was positive and comments were constructive and well intentioned. Overall, this event was a great success.

2020 ACPV Workshop titled, "Clear Communication and A Case Report-a-Palooza."

Virtual Workshop

Recorded presentations available on July 17, 2020

Live Q&A Sessions held July 24, 2020

8 hours total CE credits

13 invited speakers: Charlie Broussard, Martin Smith, Karen Grogan, Natalie Armour, Connie White, Yuko Sato, Nick Dorko, Mark Bland, David French, Joel Cline, Seiche Genger, Jolene Tourville, and Jenny Nicholds.

2020 ACPV Workshop Expenses:

Name	Expense	Amount
Member Clicks	Workshop Platform 1/2 of cost	\$1,500.00
BK Management	Workshop assembly fee	\$1,500.00
Martin Smith	Speaker Stipend	\$500.00
Connie White	Speaker Stipend	\$500.00
	RACE Certification	\$335.00
	Zoom Meeting Webinar Purchase	171.87
Total		4,506.87

Below is a list of projected income received for the 2019 ACPV Workshop:

Name	Income	Amount
Sponsors	10 Sponsorship Donations	\$12,800.00
Registrants	171 Paying Registrants	\$8,900.00
Registrants	15 Free Registrations	\$0.00
Total		\$21,700.00

Break down of registrants

- 45@\$75 non ACPV member fee
- 95@\$50 ACPV member fee
- 31@\$25 student fee

As of July 17, 2020, the ACPV workshop made a profit of **\$17,193.13**.

RACE Certification

The workshop was RACE certified. RACE stands for “Registry of Approved Continuing Education” and is a program administered by the American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB.) The workshop was approved for 8 hours of CE through RACE.

Process

1. Gather program information.
 - a. Each speaker with credentials.
 - b. If the speaker is a student, recommendation letters are required.
 - c. Title of all segments
 - d. Abstracts
 - e. Length of presentation
2. Complete provided spreadsheet
3. Fill out online application including
 - a. Proof of organization authenticity. (Used Secretary of State document.)
 - b. Combined CV’s of all speakers.
 - c. Certification Payment
 - Being a registered organization does not cost anything; only certifying programs
 - Cost of RACE certification varies; it is based on program application fee and CE hours/length of program
4. Submit application for approval
 - a. Approval takes anywhere between 4-8 weeks.
 - b. RACE Certification lasts 2 years after approval
 - c. Each new program or modification to program would need a new certification.

2020 Workshop Survey Results as of July 28, 2020

42 Respondents

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor	
	Responses	Percentage	Responses	Percentage	Responses	Percentage	Responses	Percentage
Workshop Topic	17	52%	14	42%	2	6%	0	0%
Relevance to your work	24	59%	15	37%	2	5%	1	2%
Virtual Meeting Experience Overall	24	57%	15	36%	3	7%	0	0%
Ease of Registration	32	76%	9	21%	1	2%	0	0%
Quality of Recorded Presentations	23	55%	18	43%	1	2%	0	0%
Live Q&A Sessions	16	50%	13	40%	3	9%	0	0%
Clarity of Instructions	22	52%	17	40%	3	7%	0	0%
Presentation Quizzes	15	36%	22	52%	4	10%	1	2%
Communication about Workshop	24	59%	17	41%	0	0%	0	0%
Charlie Broussard	24	62%	13	33%	2	5%	0	0%
Martin Smith	8	20%	10	26%	16	41%	5	13%
Karen Grogan	25	64%	13	33%	1	2%	0	0%
Natalie Armour	23	59%	13	33%	3	8%	0	0%
Connie White	15	39%	12	32%	8	21%	3	8%
Yuko Sato	25	61%	15	37%	1	2%	0	0%
Nick Dorko	27	68%	13	32%	0	0%	0	0%
Mark Bland	26	63%	14	34%	1	2%	0	0%
David French	27	68%	13	32%	0	0%	0	0%
Joel Cline	26	65%	11	28%	2	5%	1	2%
Jolene Tourville	17	43%	18	45%	5	12%	0	0%
Jenny Nicholds	28	70%	12	30%	0	0%	0	0%
Seiche Genger (incomplete data)	4	na	4	na	0	na	0	na

Workshop Evaluation Comments

Excellent workshop, thanks
Thank you all
Topics and case reports were all really well done. Great job!
I cannot find a record of my continuing education credits for this workshop on my AAAP website. Please advise
This workshop covered a topic that I definitely needed to learn more about. I am thankful that it was offered virtually since I would've not been able to make the in-person meeting, regardless of quarantine. I enjoyed the blend of educational talks and case report presentations, as it made me think about the skills discussed earlier when listening to the case reports. The evidence-based topic was a little hard to follow; I would've gained more from this time if it covered how to write case reports specifically (or what to look for when gathering resources) rather than briefly covering what I would consider different research article styles. However, it was an interesting talk and did give me items to consider when performing research. Thank you again for providing this opportunity and I look forward to the AAAP meetings later this week.
Did not listen to Q&A - did not get through lectures before the Q&A (holidays).
Two of the case presentations (Bland, Nicholds) were previously presented within AAAP. They are both great presenters so not a problem for me.
I put clarity of instructions as "Fair". there's no indication how long the CE courses are going to be available on the internet.
The audio clarity of all presentations is excellent. the quizzes are great at 3 per session. and almost all questions are representative of points-of-emphasis of the presentations.

My opinion is that there are 2, too many presentations. all presentations are excellent, but it seems too many for 8 hours of CE; with listening and then quizzes.

Loved the case reports. Several of the first speaker's topics were above my pay grade. But that is not to be negative as I am sure their information that was presented was very helpful to those who write or review scientific papers.

Dr. Smith's presentation was difficult to follow. Too many words/slide. Too many messages.

The first few communication lectures had some good points in them and will certainly be helpful for presentation skills. However, I didn't feel like I learned anything new about communication styles, strategies, and conflict resolution. Maybe I misunderstood what "communication" meant?

Cases are always my favorite things to listen to, but they really weren't focused on communication. It felt like more of a last minute tie-in than a key component to any of the cases.

WELL DONE, ORGANIZERS!!!!

-I'm not sure how to access my CE certificate. I think I did everything right and all quizzes have a checkmark, but it says no certificates are available.

-It would be nice to have more time to view the presentations in advance. I didn't have time on the weekend or during work which meant I had to do them every evening that whole week.

-I would suggest in the future giving any submitted questions to the panel in advance of the Q&A. I had submitted a question but it seemed the presenter was surprised by my question and didn't give a very useful answer, whereas I suspect if she had gotten the question ahead of time, she could have prepared more useful info.

-The Q&A was really productive with good discussion. It might be useful to be able to unmute people to ask questions since the presenter often wanted clarification, but it was really tough to give clarification quickly in the chat (however, I understand that it can be difficult to moderate the discussion if the participants are unmuted, so understand that typed questions may be best).

-While I viewed the presentations ahead of time as intended, I suspect many people did not take full advantage of the opportunity, and may not have benefitted as much from the live Q&A.

-This CE was a steal of a deal - only \$50 or \$75. I passed this on to others in my organization just to view the presentations about communication/writing/presentations since it was affordable and useful.

Overall this was a good workshop, with some interesting presentations. I struggled with virtual meeting format (not a fan). The level of questions for some presentations were very poor. Suggest giving examples of good quality questions and the type of format, which should be used.

I was expecting way more practical examples of good communication and interactions involving different levels of the poultry industry, like the one provided by Dr. Bland.

Recognizing that bringing in speakers from outside the group is a challenge and a bit of a gamble, Dr. Martin Smith read a 30 minute power point, and was a good example of how NOT to present to ANY audience. SNL skit material, actually.

Dr. Connie White lost a great opportunity to bring along a group of vets who obviously want to learn more about data analysis. She seems to know her subject material, but in pointing out the deficiencies of many manuscripts that represented the best efforts the authors AND that passed the peer review process, she provided abundant ammunition for the popular opinion that you can't trust science, period. Question, yes; denigrate, no. Science is an ongoing process and a dialogue. Clarity is often elusive. She could have addressed design and analysis floor pen studies (the standard assessment of our colleagues in nutrition), designing and evaluating field trials of new products based on statistical analysis of production parameters, etc. rather than demonstrating the deficiencies of study after study without clear recommendations for avoiding the

<p>problem. It was a canned talk that showed she didn't understand the needs of her audience.</p>
<p>It is not asking too much for board certified veterinarians to use professional terminology in presentations. It standardizes the message and reduces the need for translation. Sort of, really, kind of, a ton of, etc. don't elevate the profession. Training programs have a responsibility to address this.</p>
<p>Overall I think the virtual meeting went well and the live Q&A sessions were well attended (30-40 attendees). The name of the powerpoint file showed below the video, and sometimes it 'gave away the case'. In hindsight, Q&A sessions could have been back to back. Not sure if there were other options for allowing panelists to participate in the audience, if it was not their time to be on the panel. Thanks for all the hard work!!</p>
<p>A couple of the recorded sessions had a low hum in the background that was annoying. Dr. Martin Smith's presentation had a lot of words on the slides (just the opposite of what Charlie said to do).</p>
<p>Registration was a little hard because my administrative person couldn't just do it. I had to log in and then she could pay. I just paid and got reimbursed because easier to do that and keep social distance perimeters in tack.</p>
<p>During Q&A, I got booted out of the meeting and had to log back in but not sure if that is a me issue or AAAP issue or Zoom issue.</p>
<p>Overall a great symposium and Dr. White's presentation should be required for all graduate students!!!!</p>
<p>I thought that there was too much time between the Live Q&A sessions. The time between sessions could be shorter.</p>
<p>Some talks were boring and too long, i.e evidence based talk. It was a waste of time. The speaker Genger for case report from Indonesia, which is not included in your survey, was very condescending to the people of Indonesia. Maybe she was trying to be humorous but in this day and age, it is totally unacceptable.</p>
<p>The case reports were good, the conceptual ones were a little rough to get through, maybe best to have shorter presentations on those.</p>
<p>The use of videos in the presentations caused me problems with slowing down the presentations. In some cases I could not view them on my PC but could on my Apple.</p>
<p>I had few days difficulties to Log In into the AAAP website</p>