

European Association
of Establishments for Veterinary
Education



Association Européenne
des Etablissements d'Enseignement
Vétérinaire

24th General Assembly
VetAgro Sup, Lyon Veterinary Campus,
Marcy l'Etoile, France
11.-12. May 2011

MINUTES

11. May 2011

1. Welcome and Introduction

The President, Prof. László Fodor (LF) gives a brief welcome address and thanks the hosting institution and Prof. Stéphane Martinot (SM) for the organisation.

SM thanks the attendants as well as the sponsors and explains the housekeeping rules.

Green and red voting cards were distributed before the start of the meeting.

Insertion of points 6.4; 6.5; and 7.2. into the agenda is proposed and unanimously approved.

2. Minutes of the 23rd General Assembly (Vienna, Austria)

Annex 1

The minutes are **approved unanimously**.

3. The Presidents' Report 2010

Annex 2

The report was online prior to the GA. Therefore, LF gives only a short summary. There is no discussion and the report is **approved unanimously**.

4. Treasurer's Report 2010

4.1 Financial Report 2010

Annex 3

The treasurer, Joachim Braun (JB), presents the financial report 2010 (for details see annex 3), thanks for the support of the office. He stresses that in order to further professionalize our work, the budget has to be increased.

JB reports that meanwhile (after the financial report was written in March) a bank account was opened in Vienna to replace the one in Switzerland, in order to save costs. As suggested by the auditors, € 100.000 will be put into a reserve to earn some interest.

No questions are raised and the Financial Report is **approved unanimously**.

4.2 Auditors Report

Annex 4

GG presents the auditors report. The auditors had visited the EAEVE Head Office in Vienna in March 2011, verifying of and attesting to the correctness of bookkeeping. (for details see annex 4)

All suggestions made last year had been adhered to:

- Expenditures are itemised and explained in more detail.
- The treasurer worked closely and hand in hand with the EAEVE office.
- A financial report was presented to the ExCom every three months to guarantee transparency and to facilitate forecasts.

This year's financial report contains the following suggestions:

- Membership fee ought to cover fixed costs
- EAEVE should have a separate account holding funds to cover at least annual fixed costs and take provisions for a more stable office "situation" than previously
- ExCom should address the cost structure of fixed vs. variable costs and take provisions
- EAEVE should have accounts at an international bank, allowing e-banking from abroad.

All information was made available to the auditors. The documents are complete and in an excellent order. Funds have been managed correctly. All transactions for 2010 were completed and thoroughly documented.

GG recommends that the General Assembly relieve the Executive Committee of the economic responsibility for 2010, which was unanimously approved of

The Auditors Report is **adopted unanimously**.

LF explains that the auditors Gerhard Greif (GG) and Marina Spinu (MS) were elected two years ago and announces that both auditors are ready to stay in this function for another 2-year term.

The suggestion is **agreed upon unanimously** the GA elected both auditors for an other term of two years.

5. Financial Figures 2011

5.1. Budget 2011 and forecast

JB presents the budget 2011 as well as a forecast, but points out up front that it is extremely difficult to ascertain and project accurate figures because of the unpredictable impact of numerous external factors, such as number of future visitations, numbers of visitations cancelled, resulting in the number of ECOVE meetings necessary, ENQA membership etc.

It is, however, indisputable that certain expenditure will increase, such as the secretariat.

Due to the declining numbers in visitations, the budgeted figures reflect a decrease in projected 2011 revenues as compared to 2010 (€ 303.600 for 2010 and € 204.200,00 for 2011) and simultaneously, a sharp increase in expenditures (€ 208.334,00 in 2010, € 285.450,00 in 2011).

The budget of 2011 was **unanimously accepted** without comments.

5.2. Visitation and Membership Fee Forecast 2012

As explicitly recommended by the auditors, membership fees ought to cover the fixed costs. As a result, it is suggested to raise the annual membership fee to € 1.500 for all members, without any distinction being made according to their status (voting vs. non-voting member). As of 2012, the deadline for payment will be April 1st; if payment is received after April 1st, additional 10% will be billed. Faculties who have not paid by the time the GA takes place are not allowed to vote.

The discussion is opened. Giorgio Poli (dean of Milano) opposed the fact that his Faculty shall pay the full membership fee without having the right to vote. Stuart Reid (dean of the Royal College of London) in replying questioned why two years ago in the GA it was decided by vote that associate members shall pay only 50% of the membership fee.

The motion to raise the membership fee to €1500 is put to vote.

Result: 7 red cards, no abstentions

The suggestion to raise the membership fee to € 1.500 uniformly for all members is therefore accepted.

As a next step, it is suggested to leave the visitation fee unchanged.

Unanimous acceptance.

Followed by three presentations ((see under “Presentations and Publications” on the EAEVE homepage www.eaeve.org).

John Baker, Bain & Company, Inc. London, talks on “**Careers Outside the Clinic**”, whereas **Jan Mattila**, President of IVSA (International Veterinary Students’ Association) gives a talk on “**The Role of Students in the Evaluation Process**”) and **Manuel Sant’Ana**, a PhD student of the Institute of Biomedical Sciences Abel Salazar, University of Porto, Portugal, shares his impressions as student member of a visiting team on two occasions (“**My Personal Experience in EAEVE/FVE On-Site Visitations**”), coupled with recommendations, which could, in their view, upgrade the role and importance of students in the evaluation process. Whereof a discussion ensues; Gert Niebauer (GN), stresses the importance of the involvement of students and promises that EAEVE’s guidelines will be revised, integrating students to a larger extent. However, he also points out, that our present guidelines award students proper rules within the frame of their expertise and experience and that overall the opinion of students are valued highly within the visiting team. GN makes also clear that in the future we will exclusively invite students who are still enrolled in their last year or shortly after graduation.

Hans Henrik Dietz (HHD) compliments the students on their presentations – and hopes that the deans have listened carefully, as it is up to the deans to make sure that in the frame of the EAEVE visitation and evaluation process, students are involved. It is also up to the deans to ensure that both students and staff have understood the importance of an evaluation.

Bernd Hoffmann supports HHDs opinion; every faculty ought to get their students involved. However, during the visitation and the formal meetings with the students, they should not be hand-picked, but randomly selected.

6. Evaluation System

8.1 Evaluation Report 2010

Annex 5

GN, who had taken over as Executive Director after Dr Robin Oakley, who retired last year, welcomes guests, in particular Marguerite Pappaioanou, the Executive Director of the Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges, Ron DeHaven, the Executive Vice President of the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), Dave Granstrom, the Director of the AVMA Education and Research Division, Jim Nave, the AVMA Director of International Affairs, Walter Winding, the president of FVE as well as the Japanese delegation – Yoshiharu Hashimoto and his colleagues from the University of Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan.

He then presents a summary of the visitations 2009/10. He thanks Robin Oakley for his excellent job as his predecessor – and also Uschi Deimel, office manager in the Head Office in Vienna – without her it would not have been possible to handle this considerable number of visitations.

The following on-site visits took place during the calendar year 2010 (in all 19, 2 of which joint visits, 6 revisits, 9 stage I and 2 Stage II visits)

- Eight Full Stage I visitations: Caceres, Padua, Warsaw, Timisoara, Afyon, Turin, Iasi, Toulouse.
- Two stage I joint visits: one in London, UK with the RCVS and one in Dublin, Ireland, with the VCI.
- One combined full Stage I and Stage II in Copenhagen
- One joint visit Stage II with the Swiss National Accrediting Body in Berne and Zurich (Vetsuisse)
- Six revisits in Liege, Wroclaw, Zaragoza, Bursa, Cordoba, Teramo.
- Two planned on-site visits were cancelled for financial reasons: Sofia for lack of Taiex-support and Van, Turkey for non-payment of membership and visitation fee.

For details on the outcome please check the annex.

In addition, the following actions were set by the executive director:

- a new agreement for joint visitations with the RCVS was drafted and negotiations with the RC are still ongoing
- Next step toward ENQA membership was taken (see more details under 6.4.)
- participation at a Taiex-organised workshop in Paris (the presentation is published on our home page (http://www.eaeve.org/fileadmin/downloads/publications/101008_nieb_alfort_eaeve_taiex_10_10.pdf) and the published Taiex summary is copied on the next page.
- visitation to AVMA headquarters; plans for a join-visitiation (AVMA, EAEVE, RCVS, Australian Vet College) in Glasgow (2012 or 2013)
- a new lease with the Österreichische Tierärztekammer was negotiated and signed and the move to the new premises in Wien Hietzing was organised and effectuated at the beginning of 2011
- a SOP working group is about of being established

With respect to visitation preparation, existing auxiliary elements were improved and additional elements created to further professionalize and streamline visitations such as

- Revised report templates for Stage 1 and Stage 2
- Revised Standardized Visitation Schedules for Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stages 1 and 2
- Guide for the Chair of the Visiting Team
- Guide for the Clinical Sciences (Practitioner) Member
- Guide for the Student Member.
- Conflict of interest statements (for experts and Ecove-members)
- Guide for Expert Teams
- Guides and Timetables for Faculties

A Guide for the Expert on Food Hygiene is about to be published – special thanks go to the Food Hygiene Working group under the chairman Frans Smulders, University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna.

We have made lots of other improvements in the process: for instance we try to get the reports ready 2 months after the visitation. The ECOVE procedure has been thoroughly revised

(http://www.eaeve.org/fileadmin/downloads/ecove/110530_ecove_rules.pdf); likewise the list of experts which we “inherited” and which used to comprise more than 250 experts. We have thoroughly scrutinized those experts to make sure that all come from approved schools – and reduced the number to approximately 150 in the process. One goal we have set ourselves is to increase the number of females on this list to mirror the ratio of female-male students at the schools visited. In the past, the team sometimes consisted of males only...

As Bernd Hoffmann will retire at the end of this year and Gert Niebauer cannot cover all visitations himself, three new coordinators have joined the pool: Hans Henrik Dietz, Stefano Romagnoli and John Williams.

6.2. Stage II Evaluations

GN emphasizes the possibility of stage II - either combined with stage I or separate and stresses that we do not mean to push and solicitate, but want to encourage the faculties to take it into consideration. Several faculties on the visitation list in the next couple of years might be ready for stage II.

Following several questions posed by members, GN explains the stage II procedure at some depth. He stresses that nobody can be accredited without being approved; so one of the prerequisites to apply for stage II is to be on the “approved list”. GN does not recommend applying for a combined stage I and II visitation, unless the faculties have already an “approved status”. Stage I and stage II are two separate procedures which are in praxis nearly unlinked processes and form a two-tier system, though, which can be, but need not necessarily be done simultaneously. However, doing is separately, (just like Vetsuisse did in 2010) is rather the exception than the rule. In short, two evaluations are done in parallel, but they are two different processes, following two different protocols (and also require two SERs to be written). Both have a validity of 10 years; after this period of time, there has got to be a new approval for both stages.

If a faculty decides to do it separately, the accreditation is only valid until the expiration of the approval, since accreditation cannot exist on its own.

As far as national accreditation goes, GN stresses that we hope that our stage II will be recognized by the national accreditation systems in the near future, so faculties need not undergo two separate processes (a national quality assessment procedure and an EAEVE accreditation).

Stage II visitations involve 2 experts – they start out (together with the stage I experts) with the tour of the faculty, but after that stage 2 experts work separately according to the stage 2 SOP's, (looking at the procedures, talking to the quality management experts of the faculty, looking at quality assurance documentations....)

The representative of Vetsuisse encourages EAEVE to adapt the validity of approval/accreditation to that of the National accreditation – (for the time being, it is 7 years in Switzerland and Austria).

GN presents a summary of the visitation programme of the next years (*Current updated programmes can be found on the EAEVE Website and are updated bi-weekly*).

6.4. Application for ENQA membership

The GA is informed that at the ENQA Board Meeting held in 2009 on 23. January, the decision had been made not to accept EAEVE as a member. The reasons for this decision had been:

1. ECOVE is currently a joint committee between EAEVE and FVE and since it is the deciding body on establishment status, it must belong to a single legal entity and be entered in the statutes as such.
2. Status of EAEVE was unclear since the organisation is registered under both laws, the French and the Austrian
3. Internal Quality Assurance was not set up and running

All three items have been solved meanwhile and we seem now be conform with all ENQA requirements, so another application for ENQA membership will be effectuated in the fall of this year. In several communications with ENQA headquarters in Helsinki, a basis for a new submission of our application for membership was discussed and strategies for reasonable assurance leading to acceptance of our membership request were negotiated. A personal meeting in Helsinki with the executive director of ENQA for delivery of the application is envisioned.

To provide full transparency of visitations´ outcome, both the SER and the final report have to be published – GN urges the faculties to check if they have adhered to the visitation agreement. A second thorough check will be performed by the EAEVE office to make sure that all required documentation is being publicly accessible.

6.5. New visitation agreement

Annex 6a

To encourage faculties to honour the originally arranged visitation date and not to cancel or postpone at short notice, it had been decided at the GA in Hanover 2009 that a written Visitation Agreement should be signed at the time of setting the date.

Furthermore, it has proven to be a big problem, when in the past verbal visitation agreements have been made between a representative of EAEVE and a faculty. As of now, everything needs to be in writing, since visitations are linked to voting rights (until 2013). As a result, a faculty will only end-up on the visitation list once it has signed the contract with a definite date and paid the deposit.

6.6. Report of CIQA

Annex 7

LF reminds the General Assembly that two years ago CIQA was brought into being to act as a quality management tool since we are convinced that an association involved primarily in evaluating levels of education and assessing teaching quality of its member establishments should submit itself to an Internal Quality Assessment and Assurance Policy Apart from that, internal quality control is one of the prerequisites for ENQA membership.

Hans Henrik Dietz, Copenhagen chaired the constituting and first CIQA meeting, with Marc Gogny and Luca Rossi being the other members. Two members were exchanged for various reasons so as of now Luca Rossi is the new chairman, supported by two other members, Marcel Wanner and Petr Horin. Hans Henrik Dietz presented the CIQA report (for details please see Annex 7) which had been compiled by Luca Rossi and the EAEVE office.

Most frequent Category 1 deficiencies found in 9 visited/revisited Faculties (between GA 2010 and GA 2011):

- Insufficient clinical teaching
- Lack of or inadequate isolation facilities
- Insufficient clinical case load
- Inadequate clinical facilities/equipment
- Insufficient number of necropsies
- Inacceptable hygienic conditions and student security

Reasons for dissatisfaction with the visitation (post-visit feedback of faculties):

- Not all team members able to communicate sufficiently well with staff
- Chairman sometimes stressing too many details
- A feeling of some team members being a priori “suspicious”
- Insufficient knowledge of academic milieu by a team member (practitioner)
- Insufficient knowledge of the organization of the local educational system by some team members

7.Membership

7.1. Application for membership by Faculdade de Medicina Veterinaria, Universidade Lusofona, Lisbon, Portugal

LF points out that according to article 5 of our statutes a faculty wishing to become a member has to present itself at the GA. The faculty of (name) applying for membership had been informed that it is supposed to deliver the GA some information about the structure of the faculty, the number of students, the curriculum, case load in the clinics and other important data in the framework of a short presentation. Laurentina Pedroso, the dean of the Faculty of Lusofona, Lisbon, Portugal presents its application for membership.

After the presentation LF thanks for the nice and informative presentation, and opens the floor for discussion. He then asks the delegation of the faculty to leave the room and votes are taken on the membership of this new faculty.

Unanimous acceptance. LF welcomes the Faculty of Lusofona as new member.

7.2. Exclusion of Members (Article 7 of the statutes)

According to our statutes, **Article 7** – Membership shall cease by exclusion pronounced by the General Assembly under proposal of the Executive Committee as a result of non-payment of Fees for two consecutive years.

At last year's GA in Vienna, the three Ukrainian faculties Lviv, Kiev and Bila Tseвка were already delinquent with their membership fee payment for several years, each having accumulated debts of over €5.000. It had however been decided to extend the deadline for payment till December 31, 2010 –. Since no membership fee was received in spite of additional reminders, those three schools ceased to be members.

The faculty of Tirana was then discussed because of delinquency of membership fee payment. The faculty has, in spite of several reminders, not paid their membership fee for two consecutive years and it is suggested that the same procedure granted to the Ukrainian faculties ought to be applied to this faculty namely giving an extended deadline until December 31, 2011, and exclude without further discussion if payment has not arrived by then.

Bartolomeo Biolatti, the dean of Turin, mentions that he had met a representative of Tirana at a TAIEX workshop and they are still interested in staying members, yet the economical situation is preventing them from paying.

Massimo Castagnaro, the dean of Padua, is in favour of sticking to the rules.

Vote as to whether proceed as suggested:

2 red cards. Thus suggestion accepted.

Action Point: Write another reminder (by certified mail) to Tirana, stating the deadline of Dec. 31, 2011.

12 May 2011

8. The 25th General Assembly in Budapest (Hungary) in 2012

As the University of Budapest will celebrate its 225th birthday in 2012,, Fodor Laszlo, the dean, proposed to let it coincide with the 25th General Assembly of EAEVE at last year's GA in Vienna. The date of this next GA in Budapest was set with 15th/16th May 2012.

9. Proposals for the Organizer of the 26th General Assembly in 2013

Massimo Castagnaro, the dean of Padua, proposes Padua as site for the General Assembly 2013 and shortly presents his Faculty.

The proposal of Padua as the location of the GA 2013 is adopted unanimously.

Followed by five presentations (see under “Presentations and Publications” on the EAEVE homepage www.eaeve.org).

Monica Forni, University of Bologna, EAEVE/FVE Stage II expert, talks on “**Quality Assurance and Quality Management in Veterinary Institutions**”, followed by presentations by **Ron de Haven**, Executive Vice President of the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) and **Gert Niebauer**, EAEVE Executive Director, respectively, dedicated to the comparison between the “**US Accreditation System: Domestic – Foreign and Global Views**” and the “**EU Accreditation System: Domestic – Foreign and Global Views**”.

The presentations trigger discussions as to the differences in the accreditation systems, what the curriculum at a US university is composed of and the relative importance of faculty research in accreditation.

Frans Smulders, Department of Farm Animals and Veterinary Public Health, University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna talks on “**Towards Harmonisation of the Food Hygiene/Public Health Curriculum in Europe**”. The objective of the Working Group was to formulate the minimum standards of undergraduate training in Food Hygiene in Europe.

Stuart Reid, dean of RCV, congratulates the group on their work and regrets that there is not a British expert on the group.

It is stressed that the document is only a start, an initiative to trigger discussions.

The last presentation is by **Yoshiharu Hashimoto, Japan** on „**Reformation Plan in the Japanese Veterinary Medical Education System: Necessity to Develop an Accreditation System**“ The report, including the intentions to approach and to acquire international accreditation is well received by the GA.

10 Amendments to the Statutes Annex 8

69 voting members present/ 2/3rd of members present necessary for quorum

LF gives an overview of the proposed amendments and mentions that they were sent out to the faculties plus put online one month before the GA – no feedback was received neither by the office nor via the regional representatives.

Need for amendment

- minor spelling mistakes, grammatical corrections
- minor changes in wording
- insertion of committees (ECCVT, CIQA)
- need for clarification of the membership
- omitting Annex 2 and 3

Article 4 (old)

The Association shall be composed of Members who shall be the establishments for Higher Education running courses in Veterinary Education, as indicated in Article 3,

leading to the award of a degree permitting application for a professional status as a veterinarian.

Only full members are entitled to vote.

Full members shall be defined as follows:

- 1)
- 2)
- 3) Current member establishments (as at May 2009) which are in the process of evaluation or re-evaluation and will have signed by Dec. 31,2009 an Agreement fixing a date for visitation.

Article 4 (proposed amendment)

The Association shall be composed of members who shall be the establishments for Higher Education in Veterinary Sciences, as indicated in Article 3, which lead to an academic degree, permitting application for a professional status allowing the exercise of veterinary medicine. All members have to pay the annual membership fee.

The right to vote is restricted to establishments:

- 1) Which have paid their annual membership fee before 1st April of each year AND
- 2 have been approved or conditionally approved. Approval or conditional approval is valid from the date of the decision of ECOVE for 10 or 5 years, respectively.

Suggested transition rule:

Article 21

Member establishments which have signed or will sign before December 31st 2011 a visitation contract, made or make timely payments and being visited before January 1st 2013, have and maintain voting rights thereafter until the establishment status is determined by ECOVE.

Article 6 (old)

Qualification for Membership entails:

- Fulfilling the conditions defined in Article 5.
- Requesting admission from the President of the Association.
- Being admitted by the General Assembly after self-presentation.

Article 6 (proposed)

Qualification for membership entails:

- I. Fulfilling the conditions defined in Article 5.
- II. Applying for membership through the Executive Committee and agreeing to undergo a preliminary on-site visit at the discretion of the Committee.
- III. Being admitted by the Executive Committee.

The voting is done of the following levels:

1. **On corrections of spelling mistakes, changes in wording, insertion of committees**

Unanimous approval.

2. Article 4 (Uniform membership, voting rights)

Cristina Queiroga, the dean of Evora, Portugal complains that they will not be able to vote, since they already have arranged a date after Jan. 2013.

Robert Karczmarczyk, representative of the faculty of Wroclaw, Poland, states that a complete exclusion from voting rights of non-approved establishments is unfair. If faculties have no influence, they need not to come to the GA at all.

Bernd Hoffmann thinks that it is illegal to have members without voting rights.

Gerhard Greif, dean of Hanover, thinks that every member should have a voting right.

Stephane Martinot answers that according to French law, it is NOT illegal to have members with no voting rights.

GN urges not to make any modifications and to change the present status of voting rights, (that is to maintain that non-approved establishments shall have no voting rights) .

LF suggests to the faculties that if they want to open a discussion on voting rights, it can be suggested for next year.

Motion: Voting rights shall be granted to approved and to conditionally approved establishments only: Two thirds (48 votes) in favour, no abstentions

Motion: changes to Article 4 as proposed : 55 in favour, no abstentions.

3. Article 6 (Admission)

Over 55: accepted.

4. Article 21 (Transition rules)

Vote on the following modification (Article 21 – transition rule):

*Member establishments which have signed or will sign before December 31st 2011 a visitation contract, made or make timely payments and be visited before **Dec. 31 2013 (instead of Jan. 1, 2013)**, have and maintain voting rights thereafter until the establishment status is determined by ECOVE.*

34 votes in favour, 20 votes against, no abstentions.

Article 21 Accepted.

5. Omission of Annex 2 and 3

55 in favour.

6. Complete statutes

Over 55 in favor. Thus accepted.

11. Amendments to SOP's

Annex 9

LF tells that the following amendments to the SOP's were already presented at last year's GA, however, due to a formal mistake, there was no voting on it.

Need for revisions of SOPs

- Definition of conditional approval
- Introduction of limited approval
- Contracts on clinical work outside the faculty.
- Isolation facilities
- 24 h emergency service
- Instructions to preparation of SER
- Definition of self directed learning

Summary of the most important changes:

(for details please check Annex 9)

Principles and process of evaluation (page 12)

1. Approval:

An Establishment with no Category 1 Deficiency shall be approved

2. Conditional Approval:

In case of 1 or 2 closely linked Category 1 Deficiencies, ECOVE can judge whether these are likely to be able to be resolved within a period agreed between the Establishment and ECOVE, normally 2 or 3 years and, if the judgement is positive, can assign Conditional Approval. The final decision on approval or non-approval must fall within 5 years of the original evaluation visit.

3. Non-Approval:

An Establishment with 2 unrelated or more Category 1 Deficiencies cannot be approved.

4. Non-Eu limited approval (limited accreditation):

A faculty outside the EU with a curriculum differing in one or another area significantly from EU-directives without compromising overall standards of acceptability can get limited approval.

ANNEX III

Chapter 4 CURRICULUM

Self directed learning are faculty controlled, non-supervised, scheduled curricular sessions, making use of defined teaching material provided by the Faculty (eg e-learning, radiographs etc.).

4.1.1.2.2 Supervised, faculty-based practical training

7.1.8.2 OTHER ON-FARM SERVICES AND OUTSIDE TEACHING

If there is no on-duty Ambulatory (Mobile) clinic, a Faculty shall have defined contracts with Large Animal practitioners, farms or other institutions to allow for outside teaching and patient care.

A Faculty should provide herd-health services.

Please indicate if and to what extent this applies to your Faculty. If applicable please provide number of patients seen on outside teaching.

LF thanked the valuable work of Bernd Hoffmann on the modification of the SOP.

All proposed amendments to the SOP's are unanimously accepted.

12. Any other business:

LF stresses that all documentation regarding the GA (Annexes) and the oral presentations are available on the homepage. He asks the faculties to notify the office at their earliest convenience, if there has been a change in deans, address, e-mail address or any other important information. Likewise, faculties are asked to sign with a full name, give the full name of the faculty, phone and fax numbers whenever contacting the office, since it is sometimes very difficult and time-consuming to research and trace back originators of messages if the person in question signs for instance with a first name only and writes the mail from a private e-mail address for example.

LF and SM thank the guests and members for their attendance and close the 24th General Assembly of Lyon on May 12, 2011 at 15.15.

2011-06-08