Table S1. Pre-interaction survey Likert response data (n=91).

| Category | Likert Scale Question | Median | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|------------|--|--------|------|-----------------------|
| Category 1 | What is the general attitude and experience with CAL educational tools and the IVALA™ program? | | | |
| | I relied heavily on computer based resources during my previous education. | 3 | 3.05 | 1.15 |
| | I enjoy computer based learning. | 4.00 | 3.73 | 0.65 |
| Category 2 | I am interested in using the IVALA™ program. | 5.00 | 4.68 | 0.49 |
| | I believe the IVALA™ "VITAL" program will be helpful to my learning, understanding, and retention of anatomic information. | 5.00 | 4.54 | 0.52 |
| | What is the perceived educational value of CAL tools in relation to other learning resources? | | | |
| | I would rather use computer based learning than paper text. | 3.00 | 3.16 | 0.98 |
| | I would rather use computer based learning than attend live lectures. | 2.00 | 2.48 | 1.03 |
| | I would rather use computer based learning than hands on experience of cadaver dissection. | 2.00 | 1.88 | 0.88 |
| | I would like to have more of my educational resources provided in computerized from, rather than traditional forms like text, live lectures, and laboratory exercises. | 3.00 | 2.54 | 0.91 |
| | I could happily do without computer based learning resources. I prefer traditional forms like text, live lectures, and laboratory exercises. | 3.00 | 3.03 | 1.02 |
| | I wish all of my learning resources were in hard copy text supplemented with hands on experience. | 3.00 | 3.19 | 1.06 |
| | I believe I would benefit from having all of my learning resources computerized. | 2.00 | 2.62 | 1.00 |
| | I think hands on experience through dissection of cadavers can be easily replaced by computerized resources. | 2.00 | 2.02 | 0.80 |
| | I think there is no substitute for hands on experience, no matter how realistic a computerized simulation may be for learning. | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.80 |
| | I think computerized resources should be used as a supplement to traditional learning resources such as text, live lectures and laboratory exercises, but should never replace them. | 4.00 | 4.30 | 0.77 |
| | I would like the IVALA TM program (or a similar program) to completely replace traditional cadaver based learning in the future. | 2.00 | 2.09 | 0.94 |
| | I do not believe the IVALA™ program (or a similar program) could ever completely replace cadaver based anatomy education. | 4.00 | 3.95 | 0.92 |
| | I believe a mixture of traditional cadaver based anatomy lessons parallel and complementary to computer based learning would be the best possible experience for my education. | 5.00 | 4.53 | 0.70 |

Likert Scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

Table S2. Coded responses to the Pre-Interaction open-ended question: Provide any comments about your feelings, expectations or concerns regarding your upcoming use of $IVALA^{TM}$. (n = 28).

| | Number of | Percentage of students providing |
|---|-----------|----------------------------------|
| Comment category | comments | a comment fitting this category |
| I believe there will be educational value in IVALA. | 28 | 82.35 |
| I am doubtful IVALA TM can replace cadaver dissection. | 7 | 20.59 |
| Hands on experience (dissection) is important to me. | 4 | 11.76 |
| I have concern for lack of fidelity or technical issues. | 3 | 8.82 |
| Computerized learning is important to me. | 3 | 8.82 |
| Traditional text is important to me. | 2 | 5.88 |

Table S3. Post interaction survey Likert response data. (n = 56).

| Category | Likert Scale Question | Median | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|------------|---|--------|------|-----------------------|
| Category 1 | What is the general attitude and experience with CAL educational tools | | | |
| Category 1 | and the IVALA™ program? | | | |
| | I enjoyed using the IVALA™ program. | 4 | 3.81 | 1.06 |
| | I would recommend using the IVALA™ program in future RUSVM | 4 | 4.02 | 0.97 |
| | anatomy classes. If there were an application for my mobile device that was similar to the | | | |
| | IVALA™ program, I would use it as a study aid. | 5 | 4.28 | 1.06 |
| o . • | What is the perceived educational value of IVALA TM in relation to other | | | |
| Category 2 | learning resources? | | | |
| | I believe computerized learning tools like IVALA $^{\text{TM}}$ program and other | | | |
| | virtual learning tools will be an essential part of anatomy education for | 4 | 4.05 | 0.77 |
| | future students. | | | |
| | I believe computerized learning models and simulation could completely | 2 | 2.07 | 1.12 |
| | replace the use of canine cadavers for anatomic education in the future. | | | |
| | There are already enough computerized anatomy learning resources | 2 | 2.02 | 0.02 |
| | available for study and I feel that the addition of the IVALA™ program was a burden to my study load. | 2 | 2.02 | 0.92 |
| | I would have preferred to spend more time with the IVALA™ program | | | |
| | rather than some of the other computer based resources provided for the | 3 | 3.30 | 0.84 |
| | veterinary anatomy course. | Ü | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| | I felt that I did not have enough time to spend with the IVALA™ program | | | |
| | because there are so many other anatomy learning resources provided in | 3 | 2.82 | 1.07 |
| | the veterinary anatomy course. | | | |
| Category 3 | What effect did IVALA™ have on laboratory dissection experience? | | | |
| | Use of the IVALA $^{\text{TM}}$ software made me more confident during laboratory | 3 | 3.27 | 1.10 |
| | dissection of the cadaver dog. | 3 | 0.27 | 1.10 |
| | Use of the IVALA™ software made me more efficient during laboratory | 3 | 3.30 | 1.07 |
| | dissection of the cadaver dog | | | |
| | The IVALA TM program made my dissection of the cadaver dog more clear | 4 | 3.56 | 1.05 |
| | and understandable. Was the accuracy, fidelity and content of IVALA™ suitable for this | | | |
| Category 4 | anatomy course? | | | |
| | The IVALA TM Virtual specimen looked realistic enough to learn the | | | |
| | required anatomy effectively. | 4 | 3.74 | 0.95 |
| | The IVALA TM Virtual specimen exhibited accurate anatomy. | 4 | 4.09 | 0.79 |
| | The IVALA™ virtual specimen is suitable for learning the required | 4 | 2.67 | 1.00 |
| | anatomic structures for Gross Anatomy semester 1 course (VMA5113). | 4 | 3.67 | 1.02 |
| | I would like to see the IVALA $^{\mbox{\tiny TM}}$ program brought to a higher level of | 4 | 3.84 | 0.84 |
| | fidelity and accuracy. | - | 5.04 | 0.04 |
| | The IVALA™ program obviously lacks the detail of a cadaver canine | | | |
| | specimen and I found these imperfections to be a significant hindrance to | 2 | 2.42 | 0.86 |
| | my learning. | | | |
| | The current version of IVALA TM software has the accuracy and fidelity I needed to understand and learn the relevant canine anatomy of the | 4 | 3.63 | 0.94 |
| | forelimb and hind limb. | 4 | 3.03 | 0.54 |
| Category 5 | Was the IVALA™ program user friendly? | | | |
| cutegory | The IVALA™ software was easy to use. | 4 | 3.60 | 1.16 |
| | Manipulation of the IVALA TM virtual specimen allowed for adequate | | | |
| | view of each anatomic structure of interest. | 4 | 3.67 | 1.02 |
| | The IVALA $^{\text{TM}}$ virtual specimen was helpful because I could use it | | | |
| | whenever / wherever I wanted (as long as I had internet service and access | 4 | 4.14 | 1.01 |
| | to a computer). | | | |
| Category 6 | Was the IVALA $^{\scriptscriptstyle TM}$ program beneficial to an atomic knowledge? | | | |
| | The IVALA $^{\scriptscriptstyle{\text{TM}}}$ program was beneficial to my knowledge of veterinary | 4 | 3.70 | 1.15 |
| | anatomy. | - | 5.70 | 1.10 |
| | Even though the fidelity and accuracy of the IVALA TM program was not | 4 | 3.93 | 0.82 |
| | perfect, I found its use to be beneficial to my overall knowledge. | | | |

Likert Scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

Table S4. Coded responses to the post interaction open-ended question: Provide any comments about your feelings, expectations or concerns regarding your use of IVALATM. (n = 24).

| Comment category | Number of comments | Percentage of students providing a comment fitting this category |
|---|--------------------|--|
| IVALA™ was benefit to learning of anatomy | 13 | 54.2 |
| I had technical issues with IVALA TM | 8 | 33.3 |
| The accuracy and/or fidelity of IVALA $^{\text{TM}}$ needs to be improved | 4 | 16.7 |
| IVALA TM is not a valid substitute for dissection | 4 | 16.7 |
| I would like this program for the iPad | 3 | 12.5 |
| I found other computerized programs to be more helpful | 2 | 8.3 |
| I would like IVALA™ to have quiz capability | 1 | 4.2 |
| I needed more guidance | 1 | 4.2 |
| I appreciate interaction of IVALA | 1 | 4.2 |