



Minutes ECVO Residents Meeting
Saturday 25th May 2019, 13.00h – 14.00h
Hilton Hotel Antwerp, Room Tiffany

Attendance list

Residents

Radka Andrysikova, Kevin Arteaga, Amandine Bessonnat, Klaas-Ole Blohm, Francisco Cantero, Christina Casola, Maria Del Prado Cebrian Lopez, Sarah Coall, Jesus Diaz Bujan, Andra-Elena Enache, Savina Gogova, Aure-Eline Grillot, Siv Grosas, Negar Hamzianpour, Arnold Lavaud, Emer Lenihan, Paola Azzurra Massidda, Nina Mustikka, Aleksandra Rawicka, Aurélie Sauvage, Ingle Slenter, Stamatina Giannikaki, Renata Stavinohova, Lena Ström, Katharina Thieme and Eline Vercruyse

Representatives of the Education and Residency Committee

Dr Sabine Wacek: Co-Chair of the Education and Residency Committee (SW)
Dr Franziska Matheis Resident Coordinator (FM)
Dr Antonella Rampazzo (AR)

Opening and introduction

FM introduced herself explaining that she was the right person to contact for all Resident matters and reminded everybody that all queries would be handled confidentially. She also offered Residents to come and see her directly after this meeting to discuss matters in a more private setting.

Residents-without-representatives-meeting

She asked if the Residents were interested in a Residents-without-representatives-meeting in 2020 during the conference week. She asked if the Residents wanted the ECVO to organise this for them. The Residents noted that they were in favour of organising such a meeting.

Savina Gogova noted that a Residents-without-representatives-meeting would be a good idea and added that at her home institution, the Residents had built a group to exchange information which was highly appreciated. SW asked when to best schedule the meeting and it was agreed to schedule it before the Resident and Mentors Meeting.

SW asked if a room should be booked for the new meeting next year. It was noted that the meeting could also be scheduled for the Friday of the Congress week during one of the breaks. It was agreed that no AV equipment was needed.

ACTION POINT 1: SW to contact CSM and ask them to organise a room for this new Residents meeting.

Exam Dates

Referring to the ECVO examinations Renata Stavinohova noted that it was difficult for Residents to know the exact date of the exam so late with regards to work and family commitments.

FM answered that this had been discussed with the Examination Committee and it was explained that it was extremely difficult for the Exam Committee to fix the date earlier with regards to the setup of the exam and the locations. FM explained that the ECVO currently discussed a change in the exam format which might make the early determination of the exam dates easier in the future (at least the month of the examination). She suggested to feedback to the Committee and the EC to reconsider this again.



ACTION POINT 2: FM to feedback to the Exam Committee and the EC that the Residents wish to know the exam date earlier.

Deadline reminders

FM then asked if the Residents would find it helpful to receive regular reminders for form submission deadlines. There was consensus that this would be helpful, and one Resident suggested that reminders should be sent at least to Residents being in their last year. It was suggested by a Resident to implement a little reminder popping up once logged in to the website. He noted that this could easily be done through a little app added to the ECVO webpage. It was agreed to speak to the communication committee about this idea and to investigate costs. SW asked the Resident to send her the name of the programme.

ACTION POINT 3: SW to investigate the app as option to automatic reminders

Literature list

A comment was made by a Resident that the literature list apparently was not up to date as there was an older edition listed than available (Edition 2 instead of 3) and she suggested that the list should be up to date at least 6 months before the examination. FM and SW agreed. AR noted that generally Residents should use the latest addition but agreed that the list should be up to date.

Ingle Senter noted that she had been given a different answer from a member of the exam committee about the book editions and was informed that Candidates should stick to the edition listed in the reading list. FM noted that Residents should contact her for this kind of matters to receive a unique and definite answer which could then be distributed to all Residents e.g. in a mailing.

ACTION POINT 4: FM to remind the Exam Committee to keep the reading list updated.

Publication requirements

SW referred to the publication requirements and explained why changes were made. She summarized the changes and noted that there was no need for the publication to be indexed in PubMed as only Index option anymore – but to be indexed somewhere and published in a peer-reviewed journal. She added that Residents were now allowed to write a paper in a language other than English but must submit an extended English abstract in that case.

Aurélie Sauvage asked if a list of acceptable journals was available or could be provided.

SW answered that there was no specific list of acceptable journals and explained that recommendation was that it should be peer-reviewed and if not written in English, submitted with an extended abstract in English. AR suggested that in case of any doubt regarding the publications or journals to contact the committee beforehand and check if the journal was acceptable for publication.

Pre-approval of publications/journals

Negar Hamzianpour commented that she emailed the Credentials Committee to ask whether her publication was acceptable towards publication requirements and received the answer that the committee could not pre-approve publications before the end of the residency.

FM agreed to review this with the Credentials Committee in order to give Residents a clear information as early as possible if a publication was acceptable or not.

Stamatina Giannikaki asked if this was communicated to the Credentials Committee because each time, she contacted the Committee in the past she was answered that it must be indexed in



PUBMED. SW explained that this had just been changed during the chairs meeting and in agreement with the Credentials Committee.

ACTION POINT 5: FM to check with the CC about pre-approval of publications/journals.

New regulations and IB versions

Arnold Lavaud asked if the recently implemented regulations about in-house presentations applied to all Residents or only to new Residents. SW answered that the new version of the IB was applicable to new Residents only and that it was outlined with each Residents application which IB applied.

Arnold Lavaud added that there was some unclear information about the clinical institution for student and how to count it. He asked if it was meant as “only once per Residency” or “only once per year”? SW answered that it was meant as “once per year”.

ACTION POINT 6: SW to review and rewrite the IB text about clinical institutions.

Eline Verduyck asked if the HED sessions requirements were only applicable for new Residents starting in June or for everybody. SW answered that it was only for new Residents but that it was made available to everyone. SW noted to add an explanatory note on the website about it.

ACTION POINT 7: SW to add an explanatory note to the website about HED session requirements and who this applies to.

AR referred to the HED forms in the Resident section and noted that that even if not everybody had to fill out the HED forms, it was still examination relevant. She noted that Residents should train on HED forms. She added that Marianne Richter from the HED committee would provide the slides and this would make it easier to everybody to understand what exactly is expected.

Presentation requirements

Stamatina Giannikaki asked if in-house seminars for referral veterinarians and if in-house presentations for nurses count towards presentation requirements. SW confirmed that both would count. SW reminded everybody to regularly check the website for new information and courses e.g. Basic Science Course. She asked if everybody was aware about the Ocular Pathology Training Course. The Residents confirmed.

Communication Platform for Residents

Katharina Thieme asked if a communication platform for ECVO mentors had been set up and if a similar thing could be set up for the Residents on the website. SW noted that it was planned but then not implemented. SW commented that the ECVO website might not be the best place for such exchange tool. FM reported that a communication platform for Residents existed some years ago but very few Residents participated. She added that she was not sure if there was a budget for things like this. It was agreed to, in a first step extend the Residents face-to-face meetings at the conference. SW encouraged the Residents to organise a communication platform themselves if they really wanted it.

Negar Hamzianpour suggested to also implement a platform for Residents to share MCQs. She asked if people were interested and the Residents agreed to use drop box for this. SW noted that they would have to organise the email list themselves because the ECVO was not allowed to provide email addresses. It was suggested to also setup a Resident list serve. SW noted that people should bear in mind the potential risk about wrong information being distributed through such exchange platforms.

FM suggested sending an email asking who was interested and asked interested people to contact Negar directly.

Practical Examination and Procedures

Aurélie Sauvage asked if more information could be provided from the exam committee on the practical exam with a list demonstrating how procedures are expected to be done together with an explanation on the marking system of the committee. AR appreciated that there were many ways to do procedures differently and that it was not easy for Residents to identify what is expected. FM feared that the committee would not be able to provide these details. It was noted that the guidelines clearly suggested to give emphasis to what is written in the core literature, but unfortunately the information varied a lot. It was noted that in any case, the Resident should be able to justify why they are doing it in a particular way.

The Residents still wanted FM to ask the Exam Committee for more details on what is expected because to them it was not outlined clearly enough and depending on subjectivity of the examiners. The Residents noted that this was felt to be unfair.

The Residents also asked for more transparency in the allocation of exam questions/cases to candidates. They wanted to know how the committee decides which candidate gets which question. It was suggested that this should be done by drawing the questions for reasons of fairness. It was noted that alternatively, all candidates should get the same question and species as candidates drawing rare species were disadvantaged. A Resident suggested that part A of the exam could be a common animal for everybody and then for in a B-part a rarer animal.

SW, FM and AR noted that they appreciated that there were many questions about the examinations but noted that they could not comment on the questions related to the examination itself as this was in the responsibility of the exam committee. They suggested that FM could compose a catalogue of questions and ask if the committee could answer these.

ACTION POINT 8: FM to write a list of the questions and forward it to the exam committee for consideration.

With regards to guidelines on how Residents are expected to do a surgery, AR noted that it was in the responsibility of the Residents' mentors to train the Residents appropriately and that it was also expected of the Residents to be pro-active and to practice the surgeries as often as possible. SW asked if there was any other comments or questions.

Stamatina Giannikaki asked if there was a reason why they are expected to be trained on very rare procedures whilst others seen every day were not. It was answered that this was due to organisational reasons and costs.

Aurélie Sauvage noted that within the American College a list of procedures existed. FM noted that to her knowledge, this was not an official list from the College, but a list put together from Residents. There were concerns if this was legal as Residents having sat the exam were not allowed to talk about it.

The committee representatives suggested that for the next year a representative of the exam committee should join the meeting for about 15 min and to write down a list of question beforehand for the committee representative to answer. It was agreed by the Residents to do that.

SW reminded that in order to bring some light into the practical part of the examination, a presentation about it had been provided by David Gould some years ago which was considered as being very helpful. It was noted that it was available on the ECVO webpage.

SW reminded everybody to feel free contact Franziska Matheis at any time for questions and noted that her email address was to be found on the website.



SW closed the meeting at 13.55.

List of ACTION POINTS

ACTION POINT 1: SW to contact CSM and ask them to organise a room for this new Residents meeting.

ACTION POINT 2: FM to feedback to the Exam Committee and the EC that the Residents wish to know the exam date earlier.

ACTION POINT 3: SW to investigate the app as option to automatic reminders.

ACTION POINT 4: FM to remind the Exam Committee to keep the reading list updated.

ACTION POINT 5: FM to check with the CC about pre-approval of publications/journals.

ACTION POINT 6: SW to review and rewrite the IB text about clinical institutions.

ACTION POINT 8: FM to write a list of the questions and forward it to the exam committee for consideration.