

**Name:** Policy on Pedagogical Merit Review of Animal Use Protocols for Teaching and Training

**Policy Number:** 8-1022

**Approving Authority:** Vice President Academic and Research

**Approved:** 18-NOV-2020

**Responsible Office:** Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, Animal Care Committee

**Responsibility:** Associate Vice President Research

**Revision Date(s):** 3-NOV-2023

**Supersedes:** NA

**Next Required Review:** 2026

---

## 1. Preamble

1.1 As a certified institution of the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) based on the CCAC's standards for teaching and training.

teaching and training.

1.2 The Policy on Pedagogical Merit Review of Animal Use Protocols for Teaching and Training is ultimately the responsibility of the Vice President Academic and Research (VPAR). The VPAR

has designated day-to-day responsibility for the Policy to the Associate Vice President Research (AVPR). The AVPR has authorized the ACC Coordinator to manage administrative aspects of the pedagogical merit review process.

## 2. Purpose

for teaching and training involving animals.

## 3. Jurisdiction/Scope

(for more information, see

[Requirement for submitting an ant23 B p1 \(b\)r.4 \(o\)4toeC](#)).

[CCAC](#)

#### 4. **Definitions**

ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE (ACC)

The local representative of the CCAC responsible for ensuring that all animals used in teaching, research or testing at SMU are treated ethically and in accordance with the Canadian Council on Animal Care's (CCAC) policies and guidelines.

INSTRUCTOR

The faculty member who has submitted an Animal Use Protocol (AUP) and is instructing the associated course or training activities.

ANIMAL USE PROTOCOL (AUP)

A protocol outlining use of animals in research or teaching that has been submitted by an instructor and reviewed and approved by the ACC.

#### 5. **Policy**

5.1 Per

## 5.5 Pedagogical merit reviewer requirements

Two independent pedagogical merit reviews must be conducted by two independent referees with knowledge of (1) pedagogy and/or (2) replacement alternatives to animal-based teaching or training before an associated AUP can undergo ethical review by the ACC. This pedagogical merit review will involve a review of the proposed AUP and supporting documents and completion of the Pedagogical Merit Reviewer Comment Form. Normally\*, reviewers must not be members of the ACC nor be involved with the associated course or training. There is no requirement for reviewers to possess knowledge in both pedagogy and replacement alternatives to animal-based teaching or training, as long as both areas are covered. Reviewers can be from Saint Mary's University or other institutions.

*\*ACC members who have relevant knowledge and experience should share their expertise with the two independent referees who are responsible for completing the pedagogical merit review. Knowledgeable ACC members may participate in pedagogical merit review but must recuse themselves from the ethical review of the associated AUP.*

## 6. Related Policies, Procedures & Documents

### 6.1 Pedagogical Merit Review Process

- a) The AVPR receives support from the ACC Coordinator through the provision of all required documents to conduct the review.
- b) The ACC Coordinator identifies two potential reviewers and the AVPR confirms suitability of the individuals for the review of the proposed training or teaching activities involving animals.
- c) The ACC Coordinator contacts the potential reviewers and requests their assistance in providing a pedagogical merit review. The reviewers will be given only the protocol title, a completion deadline for the review (four week maximum), and must provide confirmation that they have no conflict of interest in conducting the review.
- d) The ACC Coordinator sends each confirmed reviewer the AUP and supporting documents to conduct the pedagogical merit review, along with the Pedagogical Merit Reviewer Comment Form to complete. Supporting documents include associated SOPs, the Pedagogical Merit Review Instructor form, Teaching Appendix, and any other relevant information.
- e) The review must

- f) In the event of conflicting or inconsistent reviews from the two selected reviewers, a third reviewer will be solicited following the same process outlined in Sections 6.1 a-e