



College of Veterinarians of British Columbia

COUNCIL MEETING

CVBC Boardroom

210 – 10991 Shellbridge Way, Richmond

Friday, October 12, 2018

1:00 p.m.

Minutes of the Open Meeting

Council Members: Dr. Brendan Matthews (President), Dr. Joanne Weetman (Vice-President), Mr. Jeremy Pierce (Treasurer), Ms. Lori Charvat and Dr. Maarten Hart

Regrets: Dr. Sergije Prostran, Ms. Linda Wong and Mr. Wally Oppal, QC

Staff: Ms. Luisa Hlus (Registrar), Dr. Stacey Thomas (Deputy Registrar), Ms. Ping Li Chen (Controller) and Ms. Nicole Alivojvodic (Communications Coordinator & Administrative Assistant)

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

2. ROUTINE PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

2.1. Approval of the Open Agenda

MOTION: THAT the Open Agenda be approved with the power to add.

MOVED/SECONDED CARRIED

2.2. Approval of the Minutes of the September 28, 2018 Open meeting

MOTION: THAT the Minutes of the September 28, 2018 Open Council meeting be approved as distributed.

MOVED/SECONDED CARRIED

3. REPORTS REQUIRING COUNCIL ACTION/DECISION/DISCUSSION

3.1. Fee Comparisons

In preparation for this year's AGM the office prepared a document comparing the fees of starting and running a practice facility in British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario. These jurisdictions were chosen as they are the largest and there is the most movement of registrants between them. In considering this document, the Registrar noted that B.C. is the most expensive jurisdiction to open a veterinary practice facility, but it is less expensive to be registered in B.C. than it is in Alberta due to no mandatory association membership fees. Ontario was the least expensive in both cases.

3.2. Proposed Schedule C Changes Messaging

At the last meeting, Council directed the Registrar to prepare a messaging piece to accompany the proposed Schedule C Changes when they are circulated for registrant approval. Council was presented with this piece and approved it. A typographical error will be corrected: "...\$850 on a five year cycle,..." (not your).

Council Direction: when the proposed Schedule C changes go out for vote, pre-face it with this piece.

3.3. Registrant Cooperation Standard Messaging

At the last meeting, Council directed the Registrar to prepare a messaging piece to accompany the approved Registrant Cooperation Standard when it is published on the website and distributed in the newsletter. The Registrar included this draft in the agenda, but prior to the meeting, Ms. Charvat submitted an edited version of this messaging piece to the office. It was distributed on table during the meeting. Council discussed and approved Ms. Charvat's edited version as follows:

Over the last ___ years, the CVBC has published several newsletter articles to inform registrants about the complaint investigation process. We understand that an investigation creates stress for registrants, and yet it is a statutory and bylaw requirement that registrants respond. Our new Registrant Cooperation standard is intended to clarify what is expected of registrants when responding to a complaint. Cooperation between the College and registrants will minimize the time it takes to investigate the complaint and consequently lower the costs for both the registrant in question and the entire profession.

We also believe that with greater clarity about the investigation process and the expectations of registrants, the angst that comes with a complaint can be mitigated.

Most registrants who are requested to attend at the CVBC office for an interview comply with the request, however, a minority of registrants under investigation will refuse to attend for an interview when requested. The rationale has been that no particular provision exists in the act or the bylaws to direct registrants to participate in an interview. To remedy this gap, Council passed the Registrant Cooperation Practice Standard.

As a self-regulated profession, we must continually earn the trust of the public whom we serve. Having a robust complaint process, with clear expectations on the process, serves to build trust in the profession of veterinarian medicine.

Registrants wishing to consult with the CVBC before responding to a complaint are welcome to call.

Council Direction: publish/distribute the Registrant Cooperation Standard along with this explanatory message.

3.4. New Practice Standard

The Registrar and Deputy Registrar drafted a practice standard regarding facility advertising, specifically advertising to be “open” when a veterinarian is not present. Council was asked for feedback and to suggest a title for this standard. Council discussed and noted several outlier situations which do not fit into the rules set out in the standard. These situations include: rural practices, lunch time, and directions from a veterinarian to a veterinary technician in emergency situations.

Council Direction: develop FAQs to address these situations and bring back at next meeting.

3.5. Veterinary Dentistry Standard

The Deputy Registrar presented Council with two versions of a draft dental radiography standard as well as support for the need of the standard and rationale for the content of the standard, all written by Dr. Cathy Wilkie, Chair of the Investigation Committee.

Ms. Ping Li Chen left at 2:32 p.m.

Council discussed the drafts at length and opted for version 1 with some modifications.

It is not reasonable to require pre and post extraction x-rays for each patient and procedure. The World Veterinary Health Association considers it desirable but not always necessary. If veterinarians doing dentistry adopt the same level of care of board certified dentists, the resulting increased expense will result in animals getting no care rather than some care, which is not in the public’s interest. There should be room for discretion as to: whether to have x-rays, what type, and whether vet or tech

takes the x-ray. The standard is meant for companion animals (excluding equine), as neither large animals nor companion horses routinely get dental x-rays. However, equine practitioners generally will not do an extraction without access to an x-ray machine (even if not an intra-oral one). Intra-oral x-rays are very expensive (all are digital), so Council does not wish to require those at this time or without adequate lead time to the profession. Requiring “dental radiographs of diagnostic quality” is sufficiently general that it does not require dental machines but will encourage those. Every veterinarian has x-rays machines, even in remote areas. Under the heading “Practice Expectations” of version 1, the Deputy Registrar suggested deleting the word “intraoral”, substituting “appropriate” for “direct” supervision and deleting paragraph 7. The title should be augmented with “excludes equine” in a footnote. The amended version 1 was thought not to require a registrant vote as the controversy was neutralized with the amendments.

MOTION: TO approve the “Veterinary Dentistry Standard (Companion Animals)” as amended.

MOVED/SECONDED **CARRIED**

Council Direction: publish and distribute the Veterinary Dentistry Standard to the profession prior to the AGM and specify that it will take effect January 1, 2019.

3.6. Anesthetic Monitoring Standard

The Deputy Registrar provided Council with two drafts of an Anesthetic Monitoring Standard. The first version was submitted by Dr. Cathy Wilkie and the second version includes the Deputy Registrar’s revisions to make it less stringent with regard to blood pressure, respiratory, cardiac and oxygenation monitoring. Both versions of the standard set requirements for equipment which are greater than the requirements currently set out in the CVBC Bylaws (Schedule D – Accreditation Standards).

Council was asked to consider whether it wishes to pass a standard and how stringent Council wishes the Standard to be with regard to the requirements. Council discussed and determined that both drafts were too prescriptive.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- Requiring a pulse oximeter will get push back because its necessity is not universally accepted; although its audible is a good backup, the requirement for charting is key.
- Doppler is a nuisance, but perhaps there should be a choice between it and the pulse ox
- An ECG and a vigilant surgeon is sufficient, looking at the tissue perfusion rather than a monitor screen

- What does “arterial blood pressure should be monitored” mean? Feeling for it (ex femoral pulse) is ok and monitoring machines should not take the place of physical observations; this can be made clear by stating “monitor” includes look/feel qualitative as well as quantitative reporting
- Consider not requiring arterial blood pressure because it is hard to get an accurate number, although the trend matters
- charting is important, so is a “must”, as it forces manual monitoring (“continuous awareness of TPR and gum colour”) and should be done in 5 minute intervals
- Machines are too prescriptive
- Consider a list of “musts” and refer to “shoulds” in ACVAA guidelines, to trim it up
- during surgery: anesthesia monitoring by tech under direct supervision and by lay person under direct personal supervision; the surgeon is the supervision (which would allow the surgeon to briefly leave the room if a tech is present)
- post-surgical recovery: recovering = direct supervision
- inducing/maintaining = direct personal supervision
- Alberta requires a 2nd person to monitor while the vet is performing surgery

Council Direction: revise and bring forward at a future meeting.

3.7. Guide to VCPR Standard

The Deputy Registrar revised the Guide to the VCPR Standard, as directed at the last meeting, and presented it to Council for approval. Council approved the Guide.

Council Direction: publish and distribute the Guide to the VCPR Standard.

3.8. CCC Policy: Defining the 2-Year CE Cycle

The Deputy Registrar presented Council with a policy written collaboratively with the Continuing Competence Committee. The policy establishes clear rules for the application of the 2-year cycle for all registrants.

MOTION: TO approve the CCC Policy “Defining the 2-Year CE Cycle” as distributed/amended.

MOVED/SECONDED

CARRIED

Council Direction: publish and distribute the policy.

4. REPORTS RECEIVED FOR INFORMATION

- 4.1. President's Report
There was no report.
- 4.2. Registrar's Report
There was no report.
- 4.3. Report on Name Approvals
The report was received for information.
- 4.4. Report on New Registrants
The report was received for information.
- 4.5. Report on Change of Registration Class
The report was received for information.
- 4.6. Task List
The task list was received for information.

5. ADJOURNMENT

- 5.1. Next meeting dates
Friday, November 2, 2018 (AGM);
Friday, December 14, 2018.

The open meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.