

Council on Education (COE) Listening Session

AVMA Convention – San Antonio, Texas

August 7, 2016

The session was transcribed by an independent company. Filler words such as “uhh” and “umm” are removed to best represent the integrity of the recording.

Dr. John
Scamahorn:

Welcome. This reminds me of church. We all know how that room ... you know sit in the back. Can't get in the front. Little lady of church always complained, you're in my seat, doc. I said you should have gotten here before I did. You know that kind of thing.

Welcome. I'm John Scamahorn. I'm the incoming chair. When this meeting is over I will be chairing COE this next year. I would like to welcome you to the session and thank you for taking your time and listening to our presentation. I'm going to give you the agenda here in just a second and then participate in the listing session for us. If I push the right button this slide will change. What's the purpose? One, we want to keep in contact with the profession. We want your input from what's going on. We want to be open with you about what we have done this past year. We're going to start to reach out to you. Our agenda will be real short. I'm going to give a little overview of accreditation, the role COE and accreditation. I'm going to introduce you to some COE members over here that are at the meeting and will listen and participate in our session.

Then we will present an overview where we were last year and then what we're looking forward to this next year or what we expect with COE.

Then I'll turn it over to Mr. Daniel Stone, our moderator. He will facilitate the actual listening session and then I'll wrap it up.

Many times when talking to individuals, people ask what accreditation is. I guess in a nutshell, it's a voluntary peer-reviewed system based on standards which are developed with the input of the public and the profession which will give us a quality educational program and encourages development of new ideas and new educational techniques. Where does the COE fit in? The COE, the big thing of COE, we're autonomous authority. We can, one, examine the programs and evaluate them. We make our decisions without anybody's input with that and then we assign a classification. Nuts and bolts, that's what accreditation is all about. It's based on standards, once again which we develop with the input of the public and lastly we want to develop solid programs that are reviewed on a regular basis which lead to an entry-level veterinarian.

Membership, how many people are on COE?

20 people are in COE. We have practitioners. We have researchers. We have academic, nonacademic. We have nontraditional individuals. Now that's not their lifestyle or anything like that. Don't get me wrong. They're nontraditional roles in veterinary medicine which is great with that. There are 16 individuals there. We also accredit the Canadian schools. Canadian VMA has a representative on COE and they elect 3 public members. This makes up the Council of Education. We have 3 of the members besides myself here, Billy. Would you guys introduce yourself. Tell us about your role and where you are on the Council year-wise.

- Dr. Billy Martindale: I'm Billy Martindale. I'm a small practitioner in Denison Texas. I represent the Council as a private clinical practitioners in small animal medicine. I'm going into my fifth year on the Council.
- Dr. Garry Adams: My name is Garry Adams. I'm a Professor of veterinary pathology at Texas A&M University. I represent basic science. It's my fifth year on the Council on Education as well.
- Dr. Margie Lee: I'm Margie Lee. I'm a professor at the University Georgia College of Veterinary Medicine. I'm a microbiologist. I run a diagnostic lab. I do research and I teach graduate undergraduate and vet students and I represent research.
- John Scamahorn: We have new members coming up this fall who'll be trained before our meeting in September along with our site visitors. Let's take a look back at our year in review. I'll bring you up to date with some of things the Council has done this past year. First of all, standards 10 and 11.
*10 is research.
* 11 is outcomes.
We did quite an extensive review of these two standards. Sent it out for stakeholder input and got quite extensive information and feedback, which is what we wanted. We revised those last September and the idea is to clarify for the colleges what the Council expects of them in order to meet these two standards. Also the COE has a policy that once we adopt a standard we do not start assessing that college on that standard for a year. Those assessments will be coming up in October. As part of our cyclic review, we looked at standards 3, 4, 5 and 6, that have to do with:
* physical facilities and equipment,
* students ... I'm drawing a blank ...
*clinical resources, thank you. 4 and 5 is libraries and 6 library information ... it's not libraries anymore ... information resources. Number 6 is students.
- We sought the stakeholder input. We revised those in March of 16 and the key part there is we want the colleges to tell us how they're meeting those standards by including that information in outcomes assessment. In other words if you're meeting that standard, you'll show it in outcomes.
- Besides our standards standing committees on the Council, we have a working group which is looking at the guidelines for the interpretation of the distributive

model. That group has worked and will be having a report in September. Once again, any changes that occur will go out for stakeholder input. As a result of input from stakeholders, we have created two other working groups this past year, they will be reporting in September. They are on diversity and student finances and I know the House of Delegates had a resolution addressing the financial situation with students. We were already on that. I think Dr. Brandt made a comment at the House of Delegates that we'd already had a committee out there looking at those. We will see those recommendations come back from those two working groups for our September meeting, but once again before we make any changes, we go out for input from individuals.

Where are we going to go with this next year? Our cyclic review has to do with 7, standard 7 Admissions, standard 8 faculty, and lastly standard 9 curriculum. Again public comment will be sought. We want your input as to what you think we need to do based on what we put out for a comment. That's my short presentation. I'm going to turn the meeting over to Mr. Daniel Stone. Mr. Daniel Stone is a well-recognized facilitator with experience with a lot of groups, from government to not-for-profits to medical to higher education. Mr. Daniel Stone, would you take over, please?

Daniel Stone:

Good afternoon, folks. Nice to see you all here. It's nice to be at AVMA again. I think this is the third listening session I've been with. I think there have been 4 that have been conducted in the past couple of years and we done them at the last couple AVMA sessions. I recognize a few of you, folks. How many of you have been to prior listening sessions? Quite a few of you. Terrific. This is again an ongoing attempt to solicit feedback and input to the Council.

Again, just a word about my own background, I've been consulting for AVMA and AAVMC and a wide variety of other veterinary organizations for nearly 35 years now. I worked at USDA APHIS for 16 years. I've worked at FSIS, worked with a number of state veterinary medical associations, state animal health organizations and worked nationally and internationally. I worked on a lot of One Health issues. It's a pleasure always for me to be back working with veterinarians.

Having said that, just very quickly, going over how this session is going to work is the primary focus here from this point on the session is you folks. This is really your chance to raise questions for these folks to address. You don't have the full Council here, so I don't know that any individual can speak officially for the full Council, but you might be able to get some perspective on some things from them. It's also a chance for you to provide your opinion about the various kinds of areas that the Council has already been addressing or will be addressing.

You're the main event from this point on. The Council here is obviously here to listen. They address any questions that you may raise with any information they can provide you, and again they're gathering information here so they can bring that back to the full Council when they meet again so they can incorporate that into their decision-making, and their deliberations. My role of course is to keep you

folks engaged and keep this session productive, keep it on track. At the end of the session before we're closing here I'll give you my own, what I would call an informal summary of some of the themes that I've heard addressed here, but this whole session is being taped and a transcript of the session is going to be made. It'll be posted on the AVMA website. Can't guarantee exactly when because we don't know exactly when the transcriptions will be completed, but it will be posted there within a reasonable period of time and that will be the official record of this meeting.

With that, just a couple of guidelines for us about how to make the session work. You could see there are a couple of microphones here. If you have any comments you want to make or any questions you want to raise, I do invite you to just stand up, go to the microphones, and we need you at the microphones, not just where you are seated so we can actually have the audios. We can transcribe the session.

It says here be clear, be concise. That's kind of an obvious thing here. We're a pretty small group here. We've actually got up to two hours here so in prior sessions where we have had lots of people, we've put pretty strict time limits on things here. We've got a little bit more space here so if you need to expand your comments a little bit, that's fine. Please again, create space for other folks to jump in with their comments like that. If it's going on longer than I think ... long enough. Let's put it that way. You may see me go like this (cut gesture) saying get to the end of the paragraph and yield the microphone that would be great. That's about it for this session. Any questions about what we're doing, how we're doing it and why we're doing it? Terrific!

From this point on this is again an open forum. I'm assuming you came here because number one you're interested in this topic, it obviously effects everyone in the veterinary profession, some very, very directly. It has a very immediate impact. For some people it has a broader impact. I'm assuming you're here because this matters to you and I'm also assuming that at least some of you are here because you have a you have something you want these folks either to hear from you or there's something you want to hear from them. I will be tracking comments up here. You'll be able to see them projected as we go through. You'll kind of get a sense about whether it's being heard and taken in inaccurately. With that, the microphones are open.

As they say in the carnival, don't be shy. Who would like to go next? I'm judging from the silence here that you folks are all completely happy with the COE. You understand it. You're very satisfied with what they're doing and you've got no questions about it. Is that a fair assumption? Otherwise I would expect to see some folks standing up at the microphones here. This may be a much shorter presentation than we'd expected. Are you all looking to get out on the Riverwalk or something like that? Yes. Sir.

Break the ice for us.

Dr. Clark Fobian: I fear being exposed as being lacking in knowledge here but there was a resolution on the House Floor that was passed concerning a recommendation to the board that they make a recommendation, or to the Council on Education, that they incorporate some verbiage relating to imparting the knowledge of student debt through the curriculum or programs of the college. What I was looking for and why I was reluctant to come forward is I don't have the exact copy of how that was ultimately passed. I believe there was an amendment, but there's probably someone in the room that has that on hand and I don't know if anyone is in a position to comment on that.

Daniel Stone: Can you clarify before you leave there, Clark? Just clarify one thing for me. I'm trying to understand the point. It says about incorporating verbiage about imparting knowledge of student debt to the curriculum programs to the college. What did that mean?

Dr. Clark Fobian: Yeah, I didn't phrase that very well. A request for the Council and Education to adopt a standard on financial literacy.

Daniel Stone: Got it.

Dr. Clark Fobian: That's more succinct.

Daniel Stone: In other words to have some element of the curriculum address financial literacy.

Dr. Clark Fobian: The notes I had here say it was approved and then I was sitting there with Dr. Cox and we didn't have the exact copy of the amendments and how it was ultimately addressed.

Daniel Stone: Got it. What's your question here to the COE? What's the status of that or what do they plan to do with that?

Dr. Clark Fobian: This is interesting that in something like this can be addressed on the House floor and really it does seem one-sided due to the autonomy of the Council. The points brought out on the floor of the House was this was already covered in other aspects of the standards, maybe not as concisely and I think the amendment did relate to that that okay we just want the Council to have an emphasis on how important the Association felt this was.

Daniel Stone: Okay. Can we here you, John?

Dr. John Scamahorn: Let me dress that a little bit. In the PowerPoint there were a couple things. The Council's been aware of these issues. We've heard the stakeholder input and that's why we formed the working group already to address that. It's kind of like we were ahead of the resolution from that standpoint I like to say because we've listened and we know what's going on and try to understand what's going on. We actually have some of that verbiage already in standard under students, standard 6, and under curriculum standard 9, so the working group is looking at that and saying

what we can do. Standard 9 is curriculum and again that comes back to your question about educating. Karen anything else you like to say on that as the staff?

Dr. Karen Brandt: I'm Karen Brandt. I provide staff support to the Council on Education. Just wanted to let everybody know that the Council hasn't really had a chance to do anything with the House of Delegates recommendation because that recommendation was just approved on Friday. There hasn't been any chance for that to get forwarded to the Council on Education but the amendment to that resolution, that was initially proposed, was that the House of Delegates supports a recommendation that the Council add another standard of accreditation to their standards as initiated by the student AVMA. That's where the resolution amendment was. I anticipate that resolution, what comes out of that resolution, will get forwarded to the Council. The Council, because the House of Delegates, as is the Board of Directors, as is the entire profession, as is the public, are stakeholders, will then use that as stakeholder input.

Daniel Stone: Clark, anything you want to respond to with any that or does that satisfy you?

Dr. Clark Fobian: I thought this would be a good forum to bring that up.

Daniel Stone: Terrific. Thanks so much. All right. What else? ... What else can we get out on the table here for our time? Make this time really worthwhile ... Obviously there is no comments coming back. John, here's what I'm tempted to do, but I don't want to put you guys on the spot here is to get some feedback folks about how they feel about this COE in general. How's that? Yeah?

Dr. Clark Fobian: When Dr. Scamahorn was chair of the Executive Board of the AVMA he was always reluctant to call on me because he knows I was ...

Dr. John Scamahorn: Careful Clark, careful.

Dr. Clark Fobian:

Make his job hard. When Dr. Scamahorn gave his earlier report there was one slide there that related to implementation of the distributive model of education. Maybe this would be a good time to elaborate on uncertain considerations there because this is something that, as a practitioner myself, and having the opportunity last three years to go all around, I keep hearing interest in that aspect of it.

Daniel Stone: That's a request to hear something about out of the Council's view on distributed models?

Dr. Clark Fobian: Let me go back. Maybe go back to that slide and then at that time I know I had some questions on what are ...

Daniel Stone: Right there.

Dr. Clark Fobian: Review the COE guidelines for implementation of ... A working group is in order to do that now? It is composed of strictly members of the Council? Okay.

Recommendation will be considered for the Council? I can get ahead of that. Thank you. This is something that our membership should know.

Dr. John Scamahorn: Clark, let me come in and answer that. One, it's bad when you get into this and you want to cite sections and standards and stuff, but 8.1 and 8.2 if you want look at that way, but anyway. There are two sections that deal with distributive sites for colleges. As we all know, the majority of schools do not do everything in-house anymore. Even a hospital, teaching hospital sends students off-site for certain educational opportunities. The goal of this working group is to review those sessions, those sections, and try to standardize and clarify because some people get confused about this system or that system. It's for clarity and whatever the Council decides next month then this will go out for stakeholder input. Once again, make sure everybody understands but the distributing model, teaching model is used in teaching hospital situations and non-teaching hospital situations. We want to make sure there's parity basically across the system.

Daniel Stone: Thanks, Clark. Any other folks brave enough to stand up and give some feedback to the COE and how you feel about how you heard a review of the year and what they're up to and what they got in front of them. Are you satisfied that that's the kind of stuff that you think this COE should be focusing on? Have any particular guidance or wisdom as they go about moving forward? Any retrospective comments for them about how you think they have been doing either in their job or in their communication that they been giving you folks about their job? What you think? Let's take advantage of the kind of expertise and intelligence that's in the room.

Yes, sir. Please come to the mic. If you would please give us your name and where you're from or role you're in.

Dr. Mike Whitehair: Daniel, I haven't seen you in about 15 years. I'm Mike Whitehair. You and I worked on the vision 20/20 commission quite a few years ago.

Daniel S.: Yes, sir. I do remember you. Hi, Mike.

Dr. Mike Whitehair: I'm on the Board of Directors for the AVMA.

Daniel Stone: Great.

Dr. Mike Whitehair: I wanted to ask the Council members where you see standards going in relationship to the Department of Education and how challenging is it to anticipate what those requests will be and how close you think you're coming to achieving meeting their expectations?

Dr. John Scamahorn: Okay. We had a June hearing in front of the U. S. Department of Education's (USDE) National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI), which is the big government committee that makes recommendations to the Secretary of Education. At that hearing we had in June, the NACIQI recommended that we had

met all the standards and therefore the recommendation was for re-authorization. We're just waiting basically on the Secretary of Education to sign off to reauthorize us as an accreditor. Since this process drug on all these years we've got about, Karen, 17 months left? Something like that before we have to start again. It's a 5-year cycle. We had been continuing to meet the criteria and so we have met that and it's now a matter of the waiting for the Secretary of Education to sign off and we'll be starting this process again.

Daniel Stone: John, can you tell us how challenging is it for you folks to anticipate the DOE requirements and to meet their expectations? Is that an easy thing to do or are they mercurial? What's the, you know without adding ...

Dr. John Scamahorn: I think that will get you, Billy.

Dr. Billy Martindale: I continue to get mixed signals from the USDE. It may just be me but it's a little bit difficult to interpret what they're really wanting at times. Some of the things I think that we would not even consider doesn't seem to bother the USDE and then there are those things that we don't consider to be all that important really do bother them. I think it's a matter of ... I'm not a person but a part of the team that goes to Washington in those meetings but just from the reports, it's a little difficult. It's a matter of trying to understand what they want and then trying to put those in place. It's on-going. Maybe I'm by myself here but that's what I've experienced.

Daniel Stone: Can you give us an example Billy of something that seems to be important to the Department of Education that is a little hard to understand from your perspective?

Dr. Billy Martindale: Just recently it was application of standards. They seem to think that we didn't have to have equal application of standards. We feel like its extremely important, and you feel like it's extremely important, that we have equal application of standards at all time. I don't think that I'm reading that with the USDE. They say that you have the choice of applying standards that seem to fit the situation. That's what I'm talking about.

Daniel Stone: That a uniformity versus ... that you would expect more uniform application of standard.

Dr. Billy Martindale: I would think they would demand that. Am I the only one that's recognized that? I think that's an area where application of standards they're a bit more liberal than we would be as the Council.

Daniel Stone: Mike did that give you a response to your question? Were you look at anything more than that?

Dr. Mike Whitehair: What I was trying to do was open up the difficulties and challenges of trying to meet accreditation standards. Doesn't matter what profession it's in. I just wanted to hear it from our COE perspective. I think it must be a bigger issue than that too.

Dr. John
Scamahorn:

Mike. Coming to the hearing in June, I think one of the big things we found is there are many recognized accreditors. One of the issues I think was getting the individuals we worked with to understand our process, understand our profession. I think that was one of the big issues. Once we explained that and they understood how we operated, as Billy said, we apply those standards straight across the board, that type of thing; I think that made a difference in the process. They're reviewing all kinds of accreditors. They've taken a big focus on outcomes assessment. In other words, are these students getting a job? Are they able to do something with their career and again we know our graduates are all, very high percentage, able to get jobs and be successful from that standpoint. We're not like a technical college for example that grinds out a lot of people but then cannot find a job, does not have the skills. Getting them to understand our profession I think was one of the big hurdles.

Daniel Stone:

Yeah. Garry.

Dr. Garry Adams:

One part of that question, Dr., that you ask relates to understanding your question. The other part is our part to provide hard data to answer that question and over the last year or two a lot of hard data has been accumulated to respond specifically to their questions. Once we understood it, we were able to provide hard data to respond to that question, and this year's testimony given by members of the COE has been very successful in providing hard data to respond to the question they have about, for example, the number of students that are employed. That cuts across the board. It also has an impact on the standards, and on the questions that we have in the standards of several categories, of how soon are your students employed, what kind of employment do they have, what's the long-term career development?

All those kind of questions, if we can respond with hard data that makes a response so much more direct rather than anecdotal responses. Not that we've given those, that's the way they have interpreted our responses. They want to see numbers and quality of data and the COE has worked hard to provide that. The communication and dialogue with them can change because reviewers change.

It's like you're having a drug or a vaccine reviewed. After reviewers change, well then, sometimes there's a little different interpretation. Understanding the reviewer, and establishing a dialogue to understand what they are asking has been part of the process. The COE and representatives like Dr. Brandt have been able to establish such a dialogue and a trust. When we understand what they want we then respond accordingly with hard data.

Daniel Stone:

Great. Thank you. Who's next. Again, opportunity to give the COE some feedback. How they're doing. What you like about what they're doing. What think they could do better. What you don't quite understand about what they're doing. A lot of silence out there. Let me ask this question. I'm just curious, why were you interested in coming here today? What were you hoping to get out of the session or learn here or what have you? I want to see if we can do something to make this

as productive and useful for you as possible. Let's have at least one brave soul tell us. I'm seeing you move around. Let's see you.

Mark Cox: I'm Mark Cox. I'm the Texas Delegate to the House of Delegates. We have had time to work through and watch some of the evolution of the COE. The House gave up the election process for the members of the COE a couple of years ago in an effort to achieve greater autonomy. I guess if I have a question at this point in regards autonomy is one about funding. How are you funded? How do you budget? Are you self-funding? Does the accreditation process visiting schools does it pay your bills or do you get funding elsewhere? Two is staffing, you certainly may have covered both those things in an earlier listening session but this is my first opportunity.

Daniel S.: It's fine for us to repeat stuff from earlier listening session system. We treat this is the fresh ground every time we start. Thank you for those question. It sounds like what your saying is that there has been an attempt to give the COE more autonomy, but you're asking some basic questions like where did your funding come from and your second question was staffing. What's your staffing support? John, you want to ...

Dr. John Scamahorn: COE is located in the Division of Education and Research staffed by AVMA staff and a portion of the budget comes from within that division. What was the rest of the part of that question? Schools do contribute to the process of funding site visits.

Daniel S.: What percentage of the total budget for this year is contributed by the schools, John, versus AVMA. Can we get a sense about that?

Dr. John Scamahorn: I going to refer to staff on that. I can't tell you right off the top of my head.

Daniel S.: I'm not trying to put you guys on the spot, I'm just trying to open up this communication here.

Dr. John Scamahorn: Exactly.

Dr. Karen Brandt.: COE's budget or the fees the schools paid is based on if they are a developing school and are not accredited yet. They pay 100% of the cost of accreditation. If they are a non-US or Canadian school they pay 100% of the cost of accreditation. All US and Canadian schools pay 50% of both direct and indirect costs of accreditation.

Daniel S.: Great. It's really useful to use this as an opportunity to get these out on the table because again the goal of this session is to increase transparency. We should really use this uses well and find if there are other questions that you have, Mark, or anybody else about what actually goes on there because it's an autonomous body to create some sense of accountability and transparency. I think that's all to the good. It's certainly in the spirit of the ... Clark?

Dr. Clark Fobian: I want to address the microphone. I'll put Karen in the limelight again. How many

staff members are we talking about? Just for those staff who you think need to service the Council. 1 1/2 full time, 2 full time, what kind of investment is our members making in the Council through that channel?

Dr. Karen Brandt: I don't have my figures right in front of me but I would say it's about a 2.8 FTE equivalent.

Dr. Clark Fobian: Thank you. To that I would cap it off by saying that surveys the AVMA have done of its membership put accreditation high on their list of what they value from AVMA. If we're able to provide that with less than 3 full-time staff, this is okay. I'm impressed with that.

Daniel S.: That's a good investment.

One thing that is interesting about this listening session, just reflecting back on the other ones and some you have been ... I know many of you have been to the other ones. Karen, you've been to all of them I think. At some of the other ones there were really, really strong feelings raised about things like distributive learning models and things like that and that's not here in the room. Maybe it's not in the room because you see it's on their agenda so you're going to wait and see.

Next year you will find out how you really feel about it, but I'm struck with there is not a lot of push-back on the COE in this session so far. No one is saying, somehow the COE is having ... that their concerns about the impact he was having on the professionals. Let's put it that way as a kind of a fair way of putting it. I'm really struck with that which and I want to check this out which speaks to me that one might posit that somehow the work of the COE and its communication efforts have somehow allayed many of the concerns that you folks have about the COE and that right now you're sort of on an even track with them. That seems like they're doing a good job. They're doing it in a good fashion. They've taken into account our point of view, our feedback, our concerns. It's smooth sailing ahead. Is that a fair ... because if nothing else were said here today, that would be an easy assumption to make walking out of this room. Let me test the assumption. Do you think that's fair?

Yes sir.

Sam Miller: I'd like to say something here.

Daniel Stone: Please do. Again, start with your name please.

Sam Miller: My name is Sam Miller and I'm with the Texas Veterinary Medical Association. I appreciate the opportunity to have these listening sessions. I think speaking to what you had just mentioned, the distributive model has been a little bit of an issue amongst the members. Part of it I think we don't understand a lot of it. I think looking forward there are rumors that there or more veterinary schools that are wanting to form, be it public or private schools, and as I understand the rumors of these are going to have a two-year distributive model. I think the distributive

education, we're going to start seeing more and more of that. I learned through something that Ms. Brandt had said this weekend that not absolutely every one of the off-site facilities are always evaluated. It is only associated with the core learning center, so I would like it if y'all could explain a little bit more about that. Also as we consider this moving forward, I would think that having to evaluate these off-site facilities increase the cost of these inspections. If this seems to be a trend are we prepared to budget more money for that off-site evaluation of the distributive sites?

Daniel Stone: Great. thanks so much.

John Scamahorn: Let me start with the record. There is one distributed model used at one college in United States right now. That's Western. It was accredited 8-10 years ago, something like that. I don't have the exact date. There is one in Alberta Canada in CalGarry. There is one developing at LMU. There is not a great influx of distributed models.

Sam Miller: Part of what I said was rumors there may be ...

John Scamahorn: That's rumors. I'm just telling you the facts. That's what's out there. Western, I was on the Western site visit. These schools, colleges must identify their core teaching sites. These are ones where students are required to go to get whatever skill is being taught there with that. The site visit teams go to all the sites, just like other schools have off-campus opportunities for students whether you want to call them externships or preceptor-ships. The COE does not look at those. Those are optional. Those are not part of the core educational process so that may be where you're getting that idea. We don't visit all. For example, Western, we added extra people to the team and we split up into four teams. Dr. Granstrom headed up the site team from staff at that time. We started in Denver, Phoenix, San Francisco and San Diego I believe. We visited all those sites and then came together at the college to do the site visit at the college. That's the lay of the land from that standpoint.

Sam Miller: With those distributive models, how many off-site facilities will you not visit because they're not considered the core sites. Do you have any idea?

Dr. John Scamahorn: I'd hate to give you a figure and be wrong from that standpoint. The core education that the students must do, they are visited.

Daniel Stone: Let me suggest, follow-up and I'll get to you Clark. Based on what you just said, John. Is it a comparable number of off-site facilities that you don't visit for say Western than you might for a college with a veterinary teaching hospital but has externships and preceptor-ships? You made that comparison in some of your earlier comments, would it be comparable to that?

Dr. John Scamahorn: If a school with a teaching hospital has an off-site ... for example large animal that was one of the resolutions here in the House of Delegates. Food animal, a lot of universities with teaching hospitals do not have those resources available to teach

students. Those students go off-site to get that skill. If that happens, those sites will be a visited.

Daniel Stone: Yeah. Clark let's get you in.

Dr. Clark Fobian: Another part of Dr. Miller's question related to do we see ... as we're accrediting possibly up to 3 distributive models that we speculate something around there, can we expect this will increase the cost of accreditation?

Dr. John Scamahorn: Developing schools do pay more.

Daniel Stone: That's all paid for by the schools anyway.

John S.: I'm sorry. Yeah the cost is paid by the school.

Dr. John Scamahorn: Once they're in the pipeline does it cost more? Do we send more individuals to Western for the accreditation visit than we would let's say to Missouri University?

Dr. John Scamahorn: We do and they're charged for it.

Daniel Stone: Dr. Granstrom.

Dr. Granstrom: The colleges now pay for the site visit in its entirety. It costs us nothing.

Dr. John Scamahorn: All right. They're charged more and they pay more.

Daniel Stone: It's all revenue neutral in that sense. Cost neutral.

John Scamahorn: Right.

Daniel Stone: Okay. Did that answer your question adequately?

Dr. Clark Fobian: I guess. I thought that I heard that the existing accredited schools get 50%.

Dr. Granstrom: No. We'll clarify it.

Dr. Karen Brandt: Just to clarify the costs for the running the accreditation process. Staff cost, the cost of running an office, cost of COE meetings, all of those costs, accreditation costs, indirect and direct costs for that, domestic schools pay 50%. All schools cover the cost of their individual site visit. If we go to school A and it costs us \$50 a night for hotel room, school pays for \$50 a night for a hotel room and we had 3 members on the site or 5 members on the site team they pay for 5 members. If it would be a distributed model and wherever they're staying it costs \$200 a night for a hotel room and there are 10 members of the team, the school pays all of those costs. All site visit costs are covered by the school.

Daniel Stone: Okay. It's site neutral as far as AVMA is concerned?

John Scamahorn: Yeah.

Daniel Stone: Does that do it for you? Does that answer the question?

Clark Fobian: Yes it does. How much will cover cost if that increases from a reimbursement standpoint? Unfortunately that may be passed to the students I would think, the tuition costs.

Daniel Stone: It might be a piece of tuition increases if they go that route. Garry?

Garry Adams: It might be. I think important for clarification on visiting off sites where it's a core. It's obligatory that students do that. Every one of those is going to be inspected fully across the board, whether it's a distributive or non-distributive model, must be observed and verified. The information it was reported on the self-study will need to be verified and to see if it meets all 11 standards every time.

Daniel Stone: Can you us an example of 2 or 3 non-core sites that might not be visited, just to get some flavor here to this conversation?

Garry Adams: The present system that A&M uses for large animal teaching would be an example of that.

Daniel Stone: Okay. Great. Yes, Clark.

Clark Fobian: We have time and I think we seek understanding. When I first started on the Executive Board the members of the Council were the ones going and making the cite visit. The Department of Education felt that that would subject them to bias in the decision-making process particularly since some of those same site visitors were ones involved in the vote on accreditation. This has been separated out and my terminology might ... there is this subcommittee or group that is doing your site visits and coming and reporting to the Council members that Dr. Scamahorn mentioned. Could we receive some input on how well that seems to be working. I was concerned about it because it's one more degree of separation between those that actually see the facilities and those that are making the decision on whether to accredit it or not.

I guess I'm looking for some reassurance that that supposed improvement isn't actually removing us a degree from making the best assessment of the qualifications of this institution.

Daniel Stone: Got it. By separating them out you get more objectivity but have you also lost some level of in-depth knowledge in the decision-making process. Is that a fair comment there, anyone, John?

John Scamahorn: Yeah. I'll take that on Clark.

It's been a great process to work through the last several years. Our site visitors are trained. They receive the same training. For example in September we'll have a new group of site visitors coming in, probably 5, 6 again depending on the committee. Doctor Garry's chairing that committee. We haven't met yet to decide how many others these applicants we're going to accept into the pool. They'll come in and get the same training that new members like you had last year, Doctor., and have the same training of what we need to do, here are the standard, here's the process. The big thing that we really focus on is confidentiality and conflict of interest too, which was again a concern the Department of Education had.

In the last three years we've used a system now for three years. It's been very productive. It's been very positive. We've had to educate some of the older COE members that now we don't go on trips and so we rely on that report which is very critical, and that reports have been produced an excellent form.

We have two reviewers that look at the self-study. When the self-study comes to COE, prior to the site visit, there are two reviewers that look at and say maybe I don't understand this or that. Could you delve into that? There are reviewers. Once the, what we call ROE, report of evaluation is produced and that report comes back, those two reviewers, it's their job to look in depth and if they have questions to go back to the chair and say what was this what was that. Help me understand what's going on in the situation and then that ROE, that report is presented by the one or two, depending on how the reviewers as a primary and secondary, want to present it to the Council. We do have, in some cases we will have the chair available in case somebody needs to ask, something just slip completely through, answer this question versus I don't know what happened. That kind of thing. I know my own role as a reviewer is I want to know everything about that document that I was given, the self-study. I have my questions I want to do and then I want to look that the team did they answer my questions. I want to make sure that if the Council asks me, I'm just giving report, I know what that answer might be because I'm going to find out what it is. That kind of thing. It's worked great in my perspective.

Daniel Stone: It's been a big improvement. Is that right?

John Scamahorn: Yes. Yes, Garry.

Garry Adams: One other point I think is that there will be an observer on each site visit who's had experience to first look at the quality of the review and second to see if there's any conflict of interest for partiality bias and especially the quality of review. The rubric will be followed in detail line by line, the entire rubric, and all 11 standards. That's the responsibility of the observer and if it's not followed the observer has the power to return the report with any kind of the issues that occurred during that site visit. Response to the self-study, responsive to site visit, response to the review of the evaluation. The reviewer doesn't participate or vote in the decision but does have the ability to report what happened during the site visit. Was it appropriate above board all standards reviewed every line of the rubric was followed and questions were asked and debate occurred among the site visit? Do not enter into

the discussion, absolutely not, but it listened to the discussion. Was it rigorous? Was it fair? Was there a conflict of interest? That's one of our responsibilities to come back here was the quality of the review process compromised by the separation. I haven't seen it yet, no.

John Scamahorn: Right. Lastly. Quality assurance. We do surveys of all the site chairs. We do surveys of the site team members as well as we survey the observer. Get everybody's input. What's going on? These are all reviewed then by the evaluation committee to make sure everything is working the way we like it to work.

Garry Adams: The site visits being made by COE members was a major concern for USDE. That was one of the things that they didn't like. They felt like we just couldn't be making those so evaluations and not be biased. That's debatable but we were trying to ... we did comply with their instructions and so I think that being said that has been a very positive part, that process has taken a considerable amount of workload off the COE members, which has helped some because I think we all agree the workload has continued to increase on COE members. Logistically it would have been difficult. Just the evaluation itself. The rubric that they take and fill out and then allow the COE to evaluate on the site of recommendations ... not recommendations, just a report, has been very positive for the COE and so there's been ... while they come back with the report, doesn't mean the COE is going to agree with the report. We do follow up and occasionally make those changes when there is not agreement to go along with the site visit team. The downside is that the COE members do not get to go in as observers and not only at the colleges so that takes away some, I think, from our appreciation if not anything else from the being able to visit the colleges as well.

Daniel Stone: Clark.

Clark Fobian: Thank you for the very thorough explanation. Sounds very good. That does answer all the questions I had. One last point though, what size of your group of site visitors and how are they selected? Just for the record.

John Scamahorn: Great. Right now we have 33 evaluators, site team members we call them. They can be assigned. We are looking for a few good men; well we're going to add a few more good men and women. When Garry chairs our committee here to bring that up to speed so were looking anywhere from 6 to 8, 5 to 7 something like that to add. Again, the site teams will vary, the number we need be depending on when we go to a domestic school, whether we go to a Canadian school, whether we go to a foreign school, so the pool gets to put together this fall of who will be going and assigned each one of these site teams. What else on there, Clark?

Clark Fobian: Selection of other from the Council.

John Scamahorn: Selection. Exactly, the call went out for nominees. We have 14 if I remember that list, Garry. People who, again, itself nominations not like you had to go through this organization. It's self-nominating the process. We have all those applications now.

There is a subcommittee of the Council which again, Garry chairs. I've alluded to that several times. It's on his shoulders. We'll be looking at those and making the selections of the candidates that we will add to the teams this fall. They must show up on September 25 for training and that was part of it. If you can't come, don't apply, because we need to get you trained and up to speed and these people also will not go out just as a site member on their own to start with. These people will go as an observer initially so they can see what's going on.

Daniel Stone: Great. Thanks. I'm just curious about one thing because you've talked about the value of this process. You've got some mechanisms in place to ensure quality. You've got mechanisms in place to ensure objectivity. It's taken some work off the Council itself, which has been helpful. Any downsides?

Billy, you said one of the downsides is that this removed the Council members from the colleges so it's a less vivid experience for you folks as Council members. Any other downsides you see to this new system?

Pretty benign system.

Clark Fobian: More training.

John Scamahorn: More training.

Daniel Stone: Yeah. More training. All right. Good. Thanks, Clark.

John Scamahorn: I recognize Mary Beth. I didn't see you sitting back there. Mary Beth Leininger is also a member of the COE. I don't know when you snuck in. I didn't see you.

Dr. Mary Beth Leininger: Yeah. I was next door in another meeting.

John Scamahorn: Next door. Okay. Welcome, Mary Beth.

Daniel Stone: Mary Beth if there is anything you want to add, feel free.

Mary Beth Leininger: I came here in the middle of this. I don't think I should ...

Daniel Stone: Okay. We might put you on the spot later one. All right. Other comments, perspectives about the COE. Again, your chance to find out things that have been in the back of your mind like I wonder how they do this or wonder why they do this or wonder if they are aware of this concern or a chance to give your opinion about how they operate. Whether you think they're doing a good job. It's worth letting them know that if you think be doing a better job, it's worth letting them know that. Anything else you guys want to raise?

John Scamahorn: Doctor Nelson.

Daniel Stone: This is my definition of a quiet group. All right, I think we're not going to drag this

thing out. We're about an hour ... but let me just turn it back to you folks about any final comments you want to make. I'll just say simply that I think there've been a number of areas I've heard raised here, concerns about or questions about the distributive model and what's the future of that and how is that going to get paid for from the accreditation point of view? Some general questions about the accreditation process itself. What is it and what does it cost and what's a AVMA's commitment to that? What's the college's commitment to that? Finally on the efficiency of the review process itself and whether the review process ... how's that really functioning and is it really accomplishing what we wanted it to accomplish?

Those have been the topics here. It's not been a huge wide-ranging discussion but important topics. Let me turn it to you guys, John, maybe you want to lead that off and any kind of response to what you've heard here or any comments.

John Scamahorn: I'm glad you all came. I know you're itching to go to the Big and Rich concert tonight, right? You've got to get your cowboy boots on and everything like that. Anyway, I'm glad everybody came. We had this input, which is great. Hopefully we've helped clarify items. I guess my bottom line would be as we go forward if you have comments or concerns, contact us. Go to the AVMA website. You can send an email to COE@AVMA.org. That's why we have staff. They do this all the time. Give us your input. Tell us your thoughts. Anything we get, gets funneled to the Council. We review it. We look at it. Again as with standard 12, I think it was the way it came to the House Delegates, we already saw it. We already knew about it. Mary Beth you're chairing that committee as I remember, am I right?

Mary Beth Leininger: Yup.

John Scamahorn: Yup. Right there she is. We hear and we want to hear. Funnel that information to us because that's what we need to know. We need your pulse of what's going on in the profession so again we can develop standards that meet the needs of the profession as well society.

Daniel Stone: Great comment, John.

John Scamahorn: That would be my comment.

Daniel Stone: Anything else from any other COE members, staff. All right, folks. Thanks for showing up and enjoy the rest of your afternoon.

John Scamahorn: Thanks. Good job, Doctor.

Great to see you my friend

Daniel Stone: Thanks for the questions.