## **Instructions to Faculty Regarding Pedagogical Merit Review**

Pedagogical merit review of animal-based teaching or training is a mandatory requirement of:

* University Animal Care Policy

<http://www.uvic.ca/shared/shared_usec/docs/policies/RH8110_1260_.pdf>

* CCAC Guidelines

<https://ccac.ca/Documents/Standards/Policies/Pedagogical_merit_of_live_animal-based_teaching.pdf>

The Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC), which oversees animal-based activities in research, teaching, and testing, requires that all animal-based teaching and training projects undergo pedagogical merit review ***prior*** to review by the Animal Care Committee (ACC), ideally by at least two independent experts in pedagogy and/or replacement alternatives.

**For Instructors (Principal Investigators):**

* Successful Pedagogical Merit Review must be obtained ***prior*** to submission of the Teaching AUP to the ACC.
* Submit the following documentation to the Chair, Pedagogical Merit Review Committee ([raad@uvic.ca](mailto:raad@uvic.ca)):

1. Pedagogical Merit Review Form – Instructors (Appendix A)
2. Animal Utilization Protocol (AUP) proposal (teaching)
3. Course Outline

**For the Chair, Pedagogical Merit Review Committee (PMRC):**

* The Chair, PMRC will arrange pedagogical review of the proposal by at least two independent experts in pedagogy.
* The Chair, PMRC will provide confirmation of the successful/unsuccessful pedagogical merit review to the PI and to the Animal Ethics Liaison (to be shared with the ACC), and will forward the completed review forms to the instructor.

**For Reviewers of Pedagogical Merit:**

* In accordance with CCAC Policy, expert opinion must attest to the value of animal-based activities in teaching or training. Evaluate the proposal by reviewing the Course Outline, the AUP and the Pedagogical Merit Review Form – Instructors (the form includes information on learning outcomes, learning assessment methods, learning activities, curriculum alignment, and replacement alternatives).
* Document your review using the Pedagogical Merit Review Form – Reviewer (Appendix B)
* Forward the completed Pedagogical Merit Review Form – Reviewer, to the Chair, Pedagogical Merit Review ([raad@uvic.ca](mailto:raad@uvic.ca)).

Appendix A – Instructor Form

## University of Victoria

## Pedagogical Merit Review Form – Instructors

The Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC), which oversees animal-based activities in research, teaching, and testing, requires that all animal-based teaching and training projects undergo pedagogical merit review ***prior*** to review by the Animal Care Committee (ACC), ideally by at least two independent experts in pedagogy and/or replacement alternatives.

**Instructors –** Prior to submitting your Animal Use Protocol (AUP) Application to the ACC for review, please complete the set of questions below and forward to the senior administrator responsible for pedagogical merit review (Dr. Raad Nashmi; email: [raad@uvic.ca](mailto:raad@uvic.ca)). Please also include the following:

1. Course Outline
2. Animal Use Protocol.

Reviewers will assess if intended learning outcomes align with learning assessment methods, and if both align with learning activities in support of the intended outcomes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course/teaching activity title and number (if any): |  | |
| Instructor(s): |  | |
| INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES | | |
| 1. **Specific**   Clearly describe learning objective(s) or intended outcomes. | |  |
| 1. **Attainable and Realistic**   Describe how intended outcomes are realistically achievable, given the composition, learning level and needs of student group(s), and the teaching activities proposed. | |  |
| What is the student-to-animal ratio and how was it selected? | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Timely**   Explain the potential benefits of involving animals in this course, at this point in time in the academic curriculum, to future study or career paths. |  |
| Does this course serve as a prerequisite for later course(s)? Quote further course number, if known. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LEARNING ASSESSMENT METHODS | |
| Clearly describe how the achievement of intended learning outcomes will be evaluated (e.g., lab reports, multiple choices, essays, demonstration). |  |
| LEARNING ACTIVITIES | |
| Clearly describe all learning activities involving animals. |  |
| What is the student per instructor ratio? Describe how the students will be assisted, instructed, and supervised. |  |
| Explain why chosen learning activities are best suited to the intended learning outcomes and assessment methods. |  |
| REPLACEMENT ALTERNATIVES | |
| Objectively explain why replacement alternatives were not chosen. |  |

**Instructor name**:

**Date**:

*Please forward this form, along with the course outline and the corresponding animal use protocol, to the senior administrator (*[*raad@uvic.ca*](mailto:raad@uvic.ca)*) responsible for pedagogical merit review.*

**Approval:**

The Pedagogical Merit Review Committee has found the proposed lab to be of sufficient pedagogical merit to warrant the use of animals.

Chair of Pedagogical Review Committee

Date:

**Appendix B – Reviewer Form**

**University of Victoria**

**Pedagogical Merit Review Form – Reviewers**

A number of elements factor into deciding if animal-based teaching or training has pedagogical merit. For the purposes of the policy, the goal of this review is to determine if the live animal model proposed by the instructor is the best learning model in support of intended learning outcomes. In other words, is the involvement of live animals essential, or can replacement alternatives, either absolute (non-animal model such as a mannequin or computer model) or relative (such as eggs, cell cultures, tissues, or animals that current expert peer advice and interpretation of scientific evidence indicate have a significantly lower potential for pain perception, such as some invertebrates), be used.

**Reviewers** - Please answer the following questions and document your conclusion. In order to perform the review, learning outcomes, learning assessment methods, and learning activities must be provided by the instructor.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Number  and Name: |  | | |
| Instructor(s): |  | | |
| LEARNING OUTCOMES | | | |
| **Are the learning outcomes:** | | | |
| **a. Specific:** are they clearly described and do they specify the involvement of animals? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| **c. Attainable and Realistic:** are they realistically achievable, given the composition, learning level, and needs of the student group(s), and the teaching activities (what, where) proposed? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| Are the animal/student ratio and instructor/student ratio appropriate to achieve the learning outcomes? | | YES  NO |
| Are there clear benefits to involving animals in this course, at this point in time in the academic curriculum, to future study or career paths? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| Does this course serve as a prerequisite for later courses? | | YES  NO | |
| **LEARNING ASSESSMENT METHODS** | | | |
| Are live animals involved in the assessment? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| Are the learning assessment methods clear? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| **LEARNING ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| Are the learning activities clear? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| **CONSTRUCTIVE CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT PARADIGM (see question 7 in *the CCAC frequently asked questions: Pedagogical merit of live animal-based teaching and training*)** | | | |
| Do learning outcomes strongly align logically with learning assessment methods, and do both align with learning activities in support of the outcomes? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| **REPLACEMENT ALTERNATIVES** | | | |
| Has the instructor made reasonable efforts to identify replacement alternatives or explained convincingly why replacement cannot be done? | | YES  NO | If No, explain: |
| **BEST LEARNING MODEL AND REPLACEMENT ALTERNATIVES** | | | |
| Based on SMART learning outcomes, constructive curriculum alignment, and the necessity for these students to achieve stated learning outcomes at this point in their teaching/training experience, is the live animal proposed in this course a good and appropriate model in support of learning outcomes, or could an equivalent absolute or relative replacement alternatives be used?  GOOD and APPROPRIATE MODEL  ALTERNATIVE  Explain choice: | | | |
| **If a replacement alternative would be more appropriate, provide options below:**  **Absolute** (e.g., computer simulation, model):    **Relative** (e.g., tissue, eggs, invertebrate): | | | |
| **CONCLUSION** | | | |
| With regard to meeting learning outcomes, the proposed live animal model is: | | ESSENTIAL (has pedagogical merit)  NOT ESSENTIAL (no pedagogical merit) | |

**Reviewer name:**

**Date:**

*Please forward this form to the senior administrator responsible for pedagogical merit review (Dr. Raad Nashmi;* [*raad@uvic.ca*](mailto:raad@uvic.ca)*), who will forward it to the instructor and the animal care committee.*