

# GPRC Pedagogical Merit Protocol

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this protocol is to set out the requirements that ensure that all animal-based teaching and training conducted at Grande Prairie Regional Campus undergoes pedagogical merit.

## BACKGROUND

The Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) policy on Pedagogical Merit of Live Animal-based Teaching and Training (May 2016) requires that CCAC certified institutions that conduct animal-based teaching or training must have a formal pedagogical merit review process.

## SCOPE

This protocol applies to all animal-based teaching and training activities at Grande Prairie Regional College that require an Animal Use Protocol (AUP), including teaching in an academic setting, institutional training, as well as non-degree/diploma/certificate credit courses (e.g. professional development or continuing education workshops).

## STATEMENT

1. All teaching and training involving animals must undergo a peer review of pedagogical merit by at least two reviewers who are independent of the ACC.
2. An AUP must be reviewed and approved by the ACC before the animal-based teaching or training can commence. The ACC will not itself review the AUP for pedagogical merit.

## RESPONSIBILITY AND PROCEDURES

Grande Prairie Regional College Vice President, Academics & Research (VPA&R) is responsible for establishing and maintaining a Merit Review Committee and ensuring that pedagogical merit review is conducted in accordance with CCAC policy.

The Merit Review Committee is responsible for reviewing the pedagogical merit of animal use in teaching or training. The Merit Review Committee is composed of reviewers who collectively have the expertise to assess the pedagogy of animal use in teaching and training. To assure that the pedagogical merit review is at arm's length from the course instructor, the course, and the ACC, the following terms and conditions are required:

1. Reviewers must be external to the course/laboratory for which the protocol will be undertaken, and must not be directly or indirectly involved in the course/laboratory design or implementation.
2. Reviewers have appropriate expertise in a relevant field, discipline, or sub-discipline to adequately review the proposal.

**Effective Date:** January 1<sup>st</sup> 2017

**Revision Date:** May 1, 2020

**Reviewed and Approved by ACC:** December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018

3. Reviewers cannot be a member of the ACC or any ACC subcommittee.
4. Reviewers must disclose potential or perceived conflict of interest with a course instructor or course/laboratory to the Vice President Academics of Research.

The course instructor must complete and submit an AUP for the proposed teaching or training activity. As part of the AUP submission, the course instructor will complete the GPRC Instructor Form for Review of Pedagogical Merit (See Appendix 1). This information, along with the AUP, will be provided to the reviewers to facilitate their review.

The GPRC Animal Care Coordinator is responsible for identifying protocols that require Pedagogical Review and directing them to the Vice President of Academics and Research who will select a minimum of two reviewers. Ideally, the two reviewers should have knowledge in pedagogy and replacement alternatives to animal-based teaching or training should be involved in the pedagogical merit review. There is no requirement for the same individual to possess knowledge in both areas as long as both are covered.

The assigned reviewers will evaluate pedagogical merit of the application based upon the information presented on the GPRC Instructor Form for the Review of Pedagogical Merit. Each reviewer will complete a Pedagogical Merit Reviewer Form (See Appendix 2) and states whether the animal-based activity has pedagogical merit or not. Reviewers are free to request additional information from the course instructor, through the Vice President, Academics & Research before rendering a final decision. A third review may be sought if there is a disagreement between the first two reviewers.

Reviewers' comments must be documented and forwarded to the instructor, who will be given the opportunity to make appropriate changes to the protocol and related documents, based on the reviews' comments, before resubmitting the documents to the reviewers, if necessary. Reviews will then send their final comments and conclusion to the VPA&R for pedagogical merit review who, if pedagogical merit is confirmed will submit the following to the animal care committee: the final protocol and the reviewers' comments and conclusions. If based on the comments and conclusions of the reviewers, the VPA&R decides that there is no pedagogical merit, the ACC should not undertake ethical review of the protocol.

The ACC will review the ethics of the AUP as per the GPRC ACC Terms of Reference and render a final decision on the AUP once pedagogical merit is approved.

#### **REFERENCE**

1. CCAC Policy: Pedagogical merit of live animal-based teaching and training
2. CCAC Frequently Asked Questions: Pedagogical merit of live animal-based teaching and training

**Effective Date:** January 1<sup>st</sup> 2017

**Revision Date:** May 1, 2020

**Reviewed and Approved by ACC:** December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018

## Appendix 1

### Instructor Form for Review of Pedagogical Merit

*In accordance with new CCAC guidelines, all animal-based teaching or training courses must have a formal pedagogical merit review to determine if animal-based methods are essential to meeting learning objectives and outcomes. Your request for an animal-based training course at Grande Prairie Regional College will undergo an internal/external review to determine its pedagogical merit regarding its use of animals. Please complete the following questions on this form, and attach course outline this completed document.*

<b>COURSE NAME AND NUMBER:</b>	<b>INSTRUCTOR(S):</b>
<b>LIVE ANIMAL : STUDENT : INSTRUCTOR RATIOS</b>	

<b>DESCRIBE THE LEARNING OUTCOMES and ACTIVITIES</b>
Identify the relevant learning outcomes.
Clearly describe the learning activity and the involvement of live animals.
Specify how well the learned behaviour must be performed (accuracy, speed, quality)
Clearly describe the benefits for involving live animals in this course.

**Effective Date:** January 1<sup>st</sup> 2017

**Revision Date:** May 1, 2020

**Reviewed and Approved by ACC:** December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018



<b>Describe how students will be evaluated on knowledge or skill acquisition involving live animals? Assessment methods could include essays, multiple choice questions, laboratory reports, performance of a task, etc.</b>
<b>REPLACEMENT ALTERNATIVES</b>
<b>Show how you have made efforts to identify reasonable replacement alternatives. (Attach appropriate resource information that was consulted when researching replacement alternatives)</b>

Applicant name:

Date:

*Please forward this completed form to the Animal Care Committee Coordinator.*

**Effective Date:** January 1<sup>st</sup> 2017

**Revision Date:** May 1, 2020

**Reviewed and Approved by ACC:** December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018

## Appendix 2

# Pedagogical Merit Reviewer Form for Animal-Based Teaching and Training Activities

A number of elements factor into deciding if animal-based teaching or training has pedagogical merit. For the purposes of the [CCAC policy: Pedagogical merit of live animal-based teaching and training](#) (CCAC, 2016), 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 (i.e., non-animal model such as a mannequin or computer model) or relative (i.e., eggs, cell cultures, tissues, or animals suggested to have a lower potential for pain perception based on expert interpretation of scientific evidence, such as some invertebrates), be used. **For certain competency-based teaching or training activities where the intended learning outcomes are prescribed or mandated by a third party such as a ministry of education, an institutional researcher/personnel training program or an accreditation or certification body, an expedited review process is available.** For more information on expedited pedagogical merit review, see question 8 of the [CCAC frequently asked questions: Pedagogical merit of live animal-based teaching and training](#).

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

Course number and name, or other identifier:	<input type="text"/>	
Instructor(s):	<input type="text"/>	
Name of organization mandating skills (check box)	<input type="checkbox"/> Canadian Veterinary Medical Association <input type="checkbox"/> Alberta Veterinary Medical Association <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify: <input type="text"/>	
Reference to specific intended learning outcome mandated by prescribing organization or by practical training syllabus in institution	<input type="text"/>	
<b>Learning Activities</b>		
Are the learning activities provided by the instructor clear?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	If No, explain: <input type="text"/>

**Effective Date:** January 1<sup>st</sup> 2017

**Revision Date:** May 1, 2020

**Reviewed and Approved by ACC:** December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Replacement Alternatives		
Has the instructor made reasonable efforts to identify replacement alternatives?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	If No, explain: <div style="background-color: #e6f2ff; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>
Which resources were consulted?	<div style="background-color: #e6f2ff; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	
Best Learning Model and Replacement Alternatives		
Based on the availability and suitability of equivalent absolute or relative replacement alternatives is the live animal proposed in this course the best model in support of learning outcomes? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Explain choice: <div style="background-color: #e6f2ff; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
If a replacement alternative would be more appropriate, provide options below: <b>Absolute</b> (e.g., computer simulation, model): <div style="background-color: #e6f2ff; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <b>Relative</b> (e.g., tissue, eggs, invertebrate): <div style="background-color: #e6f2ff; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
Conclusion		
With regard to meeting prescribed learning outcomes, the proposed live animal model is:	<input type="checkbox"/> ESSENTIAL (has pedagogical merit) <input type="checkbox"/> NOT ESSENTIAL (no pedagogical merit)	

Reviewer name:

Date:

**Effective Date:** January 1<sup>st</sup> 2017

**Revision Date:** May 1, 2020

**Reviewed and Approved by ACC:** December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018