

POLICY & PROCEDURE MANUAL

**ANIMAL WELFARE INTERCOLLEGIATE
JUDGING & ASSESSMENT CONTEST**



November 2017

CONTENTS

I.	General Information	Page 2
II.	Contacts	Page 2
III.	Coordinating Committee Chair, Coordinating Committee, Subcommittees, & Host Institution	Page 3
IV.	Advisory Board	Page 5
V.	Judging System	Page 5
VI.	Judges' Guidelines for Evaluating the Contest	Page 6
VII.	Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric	Page 10
VIII.	Guidelines for Partnerships with For-Profit & Not-For-Profit Organizations	Page 12

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Date: November 18-19, 2017

Location: Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa

Divisions Offered: Undergraduate, Graduate, and Veterinary Students

Species to be evaluated for November 2017:

- Farmed Fish
- Meat Rabbits
- Racing Greyhounds
- Live/On-site Assessment: Finisher Pigs on Small Commercial Teaching Farm

Educational Seminar: During the morning of the first day, an educational seminar will be conducted with invited presentations from the Panel of Judges and/or other animal welfare science experts.

Registration Deadline: Entries are due October 9, 2017.

Entry forms are available at <http://www.awjac.org/enter>.

Coaches' meeting: A coaches' meeting will be scheduled during the contest weekend (November 18-19, 2017); most likely in the early afternoon of the November 19, 2017.

II. CONTACTS

Coordinating Committee Chair:

Dr. Cia Johnson, cjohnson@avma.org, 847/285-6696

Coordinating Committee: Dr. Emily Patterson-Kane, AVMA; Ms. Lindsey McKinney, AVMA; Dr. Janice Siegford, Michigan State University; Dr. Anna Johnson, Iowa State University

III. COORDINATING COMMITTEE CHAIR, COORDINATING COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEES, AND HOST INSTITUTION

Coordinating Committee Chair: The Coordinating Committee Chair oversees the preparations for, and the conduct of, the annual judging contest in accord with the rules and regulations set forth by the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board appoints the Coordinating Committee Chair annually. The Coordinating Committee Chair ensures that rules and regulations governing the contest are duly carried out and that the contest is conducted fairly. The Coordinating Committee Chair will consult with the Advisory Board on questions arising from rule interpretation. The Coordinating Committee Chair will announce final decisions regarding such questions.

Coordinating Committee: The Coordinating Committee comprises the Coordinating Committee Chair and at least 3 additional individuals. Coordinating Committee members chair the organizational subcommittees that are responsible for specific activities in preparation for, and during conduct of, the annual contest and report to the Division Coordinators. The subcommittees include (but need not be limited to) the following: Local Arrangements and Accommodations; Publicity, Finance and Awards; Speakers/Judges Invitations; and Scenario Writing. Subcommittee chairs will identify those individuals they wish to serve on their subcommittees.

Subcommittees:

Local Arrangements and Accommodations: Members of this subcommittee are responsible for securing the following:

- Collection of entry forms from competitors;
- Lecture hall and necessary equipment (e.g., computer, projection equipment, microphone, presentation remote, etc.) for educational seminars, scenario presentations, and awards ceremony;
- Minimum of six rooms for presentation of oral reasons and volunteer time/room monitors for each room;
- Break area for students to utilize during lunches and down time;
- Access to and transportation to/from on-site scenario;
- Block of hotel rooms for competitors, speakers and judges (judges generally at a different hotel from competitors);
- Social arrangements with dinner for competitors, speakers and judges on Saturday evening;
- Meal arrangements for both Saturday and Sunday (e.g., breakfast or morning snack, lunch);
- Set-up of meals on both Saturday and Sunday;
- Dinner arrangements for speakers, judges and coordinating committee on Friday evening (includes discussion of judging format, contest rules, etc. and should be coordinated with the Speakers/Judges Invitations subcommittee);
- Expenses incurred by this subcommittee (host institution) should be consistent with the contest budget developed by the Publicity, Finance and Awards subcommittee and approved by the Advisory Board.

Publicity, Finance and Awards: Members of this subcommittee are responsible for securing the following:

- Updates to the contest website for the current year;
- Development of flyers, brochures, ads and letters promoting the contest to students, faculty and deans;
- Funding in the form of grants, donations and partnerships to support continued success of contest;
- Development of contest budget (to be approved by the Advisory Board);
- Ordering contest awards and speaker/judge gifts.

Speakers/Judges Invitations: Members of this subcommittee are responsible for securing the following:

- Identification of appropriate experts for the species included in the current contest year scenarios;
- Submission of recommended slate of speakers and judges to the Advisory Board for approval;
- Issuance of invitations to identified speakers and judges;
- Coordination of travel and hotel arrangements for speakers and judges with the Local Arrangements and Accommodations subcommittee;
- Coordination of dinner and pre-contest judges/speaker meeting with the Local Arrangements and Accommodations subcommittee.

Scenario Writing: Members of the Scenario Writing Subcommittee are not eligible to serve as coaches for any of the three Divisions for the contest for which they develop scenarios. Members of the Scenario Writing Subcommittee are also not eligible to serve as judges for the contest for which they are serving on this subcommittee. Members are responsible for development of detailed presentations of 4 total scenarios (3 electronic presentations and 1 on-site scenario with notes). Subcommittee members should work with the Local Arrangements and Accommodations subcommittee when developing the on-site scenario. Examples of previous scenarios can be found at:

<http://awjac.org/prepare/past-scenarios.html>

Host Institution: The host institution for the contest will be identified from volunteers, preferably one year in advance of the contest.

Expenses and Compensation: Members of the Coordinating Committee and its subcommittees will not be personally compensated for their time and intellectual contributions to the contest.

The host institution for the contest will be reimbursed for reasonable direct costs associated with conducting the contest (upon provision of appropriate receipts to contest account handling within the American Veterinary Medical Association) and for indirect costs in the form of an administrative grant (amount to be determined by the Advisory Board). Reasonable expenses associated with local arrangements; scenario writing; team recruitment; publicity; and speakers/judges invitations, travel and accommodations will be reimbursed from registration and sponsorship income upon

provision of appropriate receipts. A budget shall be developed by the Coordinating Committee, which realistically considers registration and sponsorship income, in advance of expenditures for the contest. Any monies remaining from registration and sponsorship income after expenses have been paid will be retained by the contest for future use.

IV. ADVISORY BOARD

The Advisory Board consists of 5 members representing: the American Veterinary Medical Association; the Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges; the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association; the Federation of Animal Science Societies; and the International Society for Applied Ethology. Members are identified by their respective organizations. Members of the Advisory Board are not eligible to serve as coaches or judges for any of the three Divisions for the contest during their tenure on the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board's responsibilities include:

- Reviewing all contest rule changes;
- Appointing Coordinating Committee Chair;
- Approving the membership of the Coordinating Committee;
- Approving the contest's Committee of Judges;
- Approving sponsorships and ensuring that the Guidelines for Partnerships are upheld;
- Determining the amount of administrative reimbursement to the institution hosting the contest and approving other reimbursable expenses;
- Providing direction regarding the content of the contest; and
- Recommending the subsequent year's host institution, based on expressions of interest.

V. JUDGING SYSTEM

A Committee of Judges selected by the Coordinating Committee, Speakers/Judges Invitations subcommittee, and approved by the Advisory Board will place all assessments, establish the placing cuts (1 to 7 points between pairs), and evaluate all oral reasons. Judges will be selected based on their background in animal welfare science, veterinary medicine, applied ethology and other disciplines specific to the content of the contest. A minimum of 3 judges will make up the Committee of Judges. A Panel of Judges (a minimum of 3 judges) will be selected from the Committee of Judges to evaluate the team assessment class. If the number of teams entered indicates that additional judges are necessary to improve the efficiency of the evaluation of oral presentations, the Advisory Board, or delegate(s) of the Advisory Board, will have the authority to appoint such judges at the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee. Judges will receive guidelines for evaluation of scenarios and oral presentations. Judges may not serve as coaches for any of the Divisions for the contest for which they serve as a judge. Judges also may not serve on the Scenario Writing Committee for the contest for which they serve as Judge.

VI. JUDGES' GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING THE CONTEST

Review of Materials:

Judges will evaluate the scenarios at the same time as the contestants during the contest. Judges will be given a time and place to confer privately about each scenario immediately following viewing. Judges will view live assessment scenarios prior to the first group of contestants and will confer privately.

Determining Placing and Point Cuts for Comparison Scenarios:

Placing points: 50 max / cuts = 1 to 7 point deduction for incorrect placing.

Judges will confer on each scenario and decide, as a group, on a placing and cut(s) for each scenario. Cuts are based on how clearly the managerial situations in the scenarios depict a difference in the welfare of the animals. If the judges believe that one managerial situation is clearly better (or worse) in terms of welfare provided for the animals, the number of points cut for an incorrect placing should be higher (maximum of a 7 point deduction out of 50). If the consensus of the judges is that the depicted situations are very close in terms of animal welfare the number of points cut should be lower (minimum of a 1 point deduction).

Individual Oral Presentation Scoring:

Total points: 75 max / 45 min (recommended)

The contestants' oral defenses of their placings are the most important part of the comparison scenario portion of the contest; therefore, the number of possible points that may be earned for oral reasons is greater than what may be earned for the placings. Presentations should be judged on the following criteria:

- **Organization:** Is the contestant's defense easy to follow? Is it logical?
- **Relevancy:** Is the contestant's argument pertinent to welfare issues, including questions of both science and ethics?
- **Accuracy:** Are the contestant's points accurate as depicted in the scenario? Are the contestant's cited facts accurate in regard to animal welfare, animal behavior, animal science and/or veterinary science?
- **Terminology:** Does the contestant use appropriate terminology relevant to animal welfare, animal behavior, animal science, and/or veterinary science?
- **Grants:** Does the contestant acknowledge the positive points (if applicable) of the management situation that he/she did not place highest?
- **Presentation Style:** Presentation style (e.g., voice level, tone, inflection, posture) should be informative yet conversational, and not overly formal. Is the contestant at ease? Does he/she make eye contact? Does he/she make excessive use of notes (use of one 3" x 5" or 4" x 6" note card for bullet points or to cite references is permissible). Citing relevant references should be valued.

Guideline for assigning points for oral reasons/defense:

Excellent to good:	75-69 points
Good to above average:	68-63 points
Average:	62-57 points
Below average:	56-51 points
Poor:	50-45 points

(No one should receive fewer than 45 points unless they do not participate)

***Judges, please remember that many students will be nervous when presenting. Please try to provide them a positive experience. Thank you.*

Questions:

Contestants have 3 minutes to complete their oral reasons.

- Judges should announce “time up” at the 3 minute limit (A visible time clock will be provided in each presentation room). Contestants may continue presentations up to 30 seconds over the allowed time. Penalties for going over the 3 minute limit are as follows:
 - 3:00 – 3:10 (i.e., up to 10 sec over) 2 pts deducted
 - 3:11 – 3:20 (i.e., 11 to 20 sec over) 4 pts deducted
 - 3:21 – 3:30 (i.e., 21 to 30 sec over) 6 pts deducted
- Judges should stop participants at 3:30 (i.e., 30 sec over the allowed time).
- If time permits, judges should then ask a question of the contestant.
- Total time for presentation and questions/answers cannot exceed 4 minutes per contestant.
- Contestants can earn a maximum of 25 points for their response to the question.
- Questions will preferably be similar or identical from one contestant to the next.
- Questions should be discussed among judges prior to beginning the oral presentations session. If the number of contestants entered is large, the question section may be eliminated to ensure the contest can be completed within the allotted time.

Team Assessment Scoring:

Team assessment scenarios are a live/on-site assessment. One or more facilities may be evaluated.

Judges should view the assessment scenario prior to the contestants and come to consensus regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the facility(ies) and areas of improvement.

Teams must make an assessment of the facility(ies)’ strengths and weaknesses, identify areas of concern and recommend changes.

Team assessments are scored based on a 125 point maximum with 50 possible points for responses to judges' questions.

- Team assessments are judged based on accuracy of interpretation of management strengths and weaknesses, relevance to the welfare of the animal, effectiveness and practicality of recommended changes, and assessment of the urgency of the recommended changes.
- Judges should also consider organization and presentation style during the team assessment.
 - Was the presentation logical and easily followed?
 - Did each team member contribute to the presentation?
- Following the assessment presentation for each team, each judge should be prepared to ask at least 1 pertinent question regarding the assessment scenario. Additional clarifying questions may also be asked.

Contestants judging the live/on-site class as individuals will present their findings to a judge(s) and is dependent on time constraints.

- If time allows, individual presentations will not exceed 5 minutes. The judge may question the contestant for 2 minutes.
- If time does not allow for the presentation of finding for individuals participating in the live/on-site assessment their scores will be based solely on placement.

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION SCORING RUBRIC

Skill area: Description	Score of 10	Score of 9	Score of 8	Score of 7	Score of 6
<p>Relevancy: Is the contestant's argument pertinent to welfare issues, including questions of both science and ethics?</p>	<p>Conveys an <i>in-depth</i> understanding of the scenario and the welfare and ethical issues to be considered;</p>	<p>Conveys a <i>Mostly complete</i> understanding of the scenario and the welfare and issues to be considered;</p>	<p>Conveys a <i>somewhat basic</i> understanding of the scenario and the welfare and ethical issues to be considered;</p>	<p>Conveys a <i>superficial</i> understanding of the scenario and the welfare and ethical issues to be considered;</p>	<p>Conveys a <i>confused</i> understanding of the scenario or provides <i>no</i> evidence of understanding the welfare or ethical issues to be considered</p>
<p>Effectiveness: Does the contestant use appropriate terminology relevant to animal welfare, animal behavior, animal science, and/or veterinary science?</p>	<p><i>Effectively discriminates</i> between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion</p>	<p>Discriminates between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion</p>	<p>Attempts to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion</p>	<p>Info provided was mostly accurate but had some minor misunderstanding of the information provided. (wrong info)</p>	<p>Makes frequent mistakes regarding the information provided in the scenario.</p>
<p>Accuracy: Are the contestant's points accurate as depicted in the scenario? Are the contestant's cited facts accurate in regard to animal welfare, animal behavior, animal science and/or veterinary science?</p>	<p>All examples from the scenario provided are accurate. The student provides accurate and specific data from the scenario to back up their argument.</p>	<p>Uses accurate information to support their argument, however, does not provide specific data from the scenario.</p>	<p>Uses accurate information to support their argument but lacked some key information (missing info)</p>	<p>Info provided was mostly accurate but had some minor misunderstanding of the information provided. (wrong info)</p>	<p>Makes frequent mistakes regarding the information provided in the scenario.</p>
<p>Terminology: Does the contestant use appropriate terminology relevant to animal welfare, animal behavior, animal science, and/or veterinary science?</p>	<p><i>Stylistically sophisticated,</i> uses language that is <i>precise and engaging,</i> with notable awareness of audience and purpose</p>	<p>Uses language that is <i>fluent and original,</i> with evident awareness of audience and purpose</p>	<p>Uses <i>appropriate language,</i> with some awareness of audience and purpose</p>	<p>Relies on <i>basic vocabulary,</i> with little awareness of audience or purpose</p>	<p>Uses language that is <i>imprecise or unsuitable</i> for the audience or purpose; uses language that is <i>incoherent</i> or <i>inappropriate</i></p>
<p>Organization: Is the contestant's defense easy to follow? Is it logical?</p>	<p><i>Skilfully</i> exhibits logical and coherent structure; "a well-crafted argument"</p>	<p><i>Effectively</i> exhibits a logical sequence of ideas</p>	<p>Exhibits a logical sequence of ideas but within sections may be inconsistent</p>	<p>Exhibits a basic structure but is repetitive or lacks order in places</p>	<p>Exhibits an attempt to organize ideas into a structure, but often lacks coherence; complete lack of organization and coherence</p>

<p>Grants: Does the contestant acknowledge the positive points (if applicable) of the management situation that he/she did not place highest?</p>	<p>Student effectively identifies and acknowledges the strengths and weaknesses of both options in the scenario.</p>				<p>Student's argument is one-sided; does not mention the weaknesses of their favoured option and does not acknowledge strengths of their lower placed scenario</p>
<p>Presentation style: Presentation style (e.g., voice level, tone, inflection, posture) should be informative yet conversational, and not overly formal. Is the contestant at ease? Does he/she make eye contact? Does he/she make excessive use of notes (use of one 3"x5" or 4"x6" note card for bullet points or to cite references is permissible).</p>	<p>Uses excellent presentation skills: speaks clearly and confidently, good pace, makes eye contact and minimal use of notes. Uses voice tone to emphasize points.</p>	<p>Good presentation skills; speaks clearly, comfortable pace; acceptable eye contact; does not rely too heavily on the use of their notes.</p>	<p>Adequate or average speaking skills;</p>	<p>Speaking skills need work; monotone voice; nervous, little eye contact; speaking too quickly.</p>	<p>Poor speaking skills; reads reasons from their notes card, minimal eye contact. Difficult to hear or understand.</p>
<p>References: The extent to which existing scientific literature and accepted standards used to support the arguments made.</p>	<p>Effectively integrates evidence and synthesizes information from a variety of sources, e.g., scientific refs + standards docs (?? More than 5 refs??)</p>	<p>Incorporates and explains specific textual evidence from a variety of sources (good but less effective)</p>	<p>Uses some textual evidence but without much elaboration or from limited sources</p>	<p>Textual evidence is vague, repetitive, or unjustified</p>	<p>Does not include textual evidence</p>
<p>Blending of science and ethics: Limitations of the knowledge of science in resolving questions about animal welfare.</p>	<p>Provides an ethical framework for developing their science-based argument.</p>				<p>No acknowledgement of differing perspectives that are used to identify and weight scientific evidence</p>

Maximum 75 points – Minimum 45 points recommended

(cont.)

VIII. GUIDELINES FOR PARTNERSHIPS WITH FOR-PROFIT AND NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Introduction:

The Animal Welfare Intercollegiate Judging and Assessment Contest (AWJAC) takes a proactive approach to identifying and developing opportunities to form mutually beneficial relationships with outside entities, also known as partnerships. These partnerships can take many forms, including strategic alliances and sponsorships, and they may or may not involve the transfer of monies and the exchange of goods or services.

The most common reasons for forming these partnerships are:

- improving or expanding the contest
- strengthening the contest's visibility and expanding its reach, and
- generating revenue for contest activities.

These Guidelines are designed to be a standard policy under which the AWJAC will function and support efforts to maintain good relations with all parties involved.

However, unanticipated, special circumstances outside the bounds of these Guidelines may arise, requiring approval of specific programs or partnerships by the Advisory Board.

Approval Process and Reporting:

The Advisory Board is responsible for review and oversight of any specific arrangements of a for-profit or not-for-profit partnership to ensure congruence with these Guidelines.

Principles:

1. All partnerships will be created to support the mission of the AWJAC and assist AWJAC in achieving its goals of increasing student knowledge of animal welfare by integrating learning and reasoning skills in a competitive environment that enhances the retention of information.
2. No partnership will be formed with entities whose principles, policies or actions are deemed in conflict with the principles and policies of the AWJAC.
3. The terms of any partnership may not create any real or apparent conflicts of interest, nor may the partnership negatively impact the objectivity or credibility of the contest.
4. AWJAC recognizes the for-profit or not-for-profit partner as an overall entity, rather than the individual brands, products and services marketed and sold under the entity's corporate banner.

5. The AWJAC does not endorse products, programs or services of for-profit or not-for-profit entities. Participation in a partnership with a for-profit or not-for-profit entity will not imply AWJAC approval of that entity's general policies, nor does it imply that AWJAC will exert any influence to advance the entity's interests outside the substance of the partnership itself.
6. Any partnership with a for-profit or not-for-profit entity must recognize the full and inherent value that AWJAC brings to the partnership.
7. For-profit and not-for-profit partnerships with AWJAC will not be exclusive in nature to any industry or interest segment. For example, AWJAC may have multiple partnerships with organizations having similar products, business goals, or interests.
8. AWJAC will not guarantee that new programs or initiatives are dedicated to any one partner, prior to or in the process of their development.

Acknowledgement of Partnerships:

1. AWJAC will retain the right and use or approval of the AWJAC logo in any collateral materials or electronic placement in a for-profit or not-for-profit partnership.
2. Recognition of for-profit or not-for-profit partner contributions through collateral materials or electronic placement will be limited to the name and logo of the for-profit or not-for-profit partner. Display of individual product or service names and logos are subject to a separate review and terms are to be included in the designated partnership agreement created for each for-profit or not-for-profit partnership. Where necessary and appropriate, disclaimers and/or other language will be utilized to qualify the relationship between the for-profit or not-for-profit entity and the AWJAC.
3. AWJAC will at all times maintain total control of any collateral materials containing its name or logo, which may not be used by any for-profit or not-for-profit entity without the express written permission of the AWJAC.

Execution of Partnerships:

1. All the parameters of a for-profit or not-for-profit partnership, including the roles, responsibilities and expectations of all partners, will be made clear in the form of a written agreement and require signatures from both the AWJAC and the for-profit or not-for-profit partner to activate the partnership terms.
2. The written agreement between the AWJAC and a for-profit or not-for-profit partner will include appropriate and pertinent terms referencing licensing language, a complete list of specific partnership benefits, option for right of first refusal for events in subsequent years, timing of activation, implementation and evaluation and payment schedule.