The following Motions and Documents were considered by the GFC Executive Committee at its Monday, September 14, 2015 meeting:

Agenda Title: **Proposed Changes to the Composition of the Council of the Faculty of Public Health**

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, proposed changes to the composition of the Council of the School of Public Health, as set forth in Attachment 1 submitted by the School of Public Health, to take effect upon final approval.

Final Item: 5

Agenda Title: **Proposed Changes to the Composition of the Council of the Faculté Saint-Jean**

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from the General Faculties Council, proposed amendments to the composition and membership of the Council of Faculté Saint-Jean, as submitted by Faculté Saint-Jean and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon final approval.

Final Item: 6

Agenda Title: **Proposed New Course Designation of PLAN in the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Faculty of Science**

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, a new course designation of PLAN (Urban and Regional Planning), Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, as submitted by the Faculties of Science and Graduate Studies and Research, to take effect for Fall Term, 2016.

Final Item: 7

Agenda Title: **Proposal from the Faculty of Nursing to add NURS 201-Introduction to Nursing Theory II to the List of Courses with Consolidated Exams**

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, the addition of NURS 201 - Introduction to Nursing Theory II to the list of course with Consolidated Final Examinations, as submitted by the Faculty of Nursing, to take effect 2016-2017.

Final Item: 8

Agenda Title: **Proposed Amendments to the Composition of the Selection/Review Committee for the Dean of Students**

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from the Board of Governors and General Faculties Council, proposed changes to the composition of the Dean Selection/Review Committee for Dean of Students as submitted by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect immediately.

Final Item: 10

Agenda Title: **Animal Ethics Policy Suite Revisions (in UAPPOL)**

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee recommends endorsement by General Faculties Council of revisions to the Animal Ethics Policy as submitted by the Office of the Vice-President (Research) as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon final approval by the Board of Governors.

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee recommends endorsement by General Faculties Council of rescission of the Animal User Training Policy, to take effect upon final approval by the Board of Governors.

Final Item: 11

Agenda Title: **Draft Agenda for the September 28, 2015 Meeting of General Faculties Council (GFC)**

CARRIED MOTION: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from the General Faculties Council, the Agenda for the September 28, 2015 meeting of General Faculties Council.

OUTLINE OF ISSUE

Agenda Title: **Proposed Changes to the Composition of the Council of the School of Public Health**

Motion: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, proposed changes to the composition of Council of the School of Public Health as set forth in Attachment 1, submitted by the School of Public Health, to take effect upon final approval

Item

Action Requested	**X** Approval ☐ Recommendation ☐ Discussion/Advice ☐ Information
Proposed by	Kue Young, Dean, School of Public Health
Presenter	Kue Young, Dean, School of Public Health
Subject	Proposed changes to the composition of the Council of the School of Public Health

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is	To update the composition of the School of Public Health Council and eliminate representation from external and other organizations
The Impact of the Proposal is	To reflect current reality of lack of participation in Council activities by external and other organizations and streamline functioning of the Council.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	Section 55.5.20 of the GFC Policy Manual re Composition of the School of Public Health Council, last revised May 2008
Timeline/Implementation Date	Upon final approval
Estimated Cost	N/A
Sources of Funding	N/A
Notes	There is no statutory/regulatory/licensing professional body for public health in Alberta or Canada.

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	*Dare to Discover* (Learning, Discovery, and Citizenship; Transformative Organization and Support) and *Dare to Deliver*
Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)	1. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act* (*PSLA*)**: "**Faculty councils** **28**(1) Each faculty of a university must have a faculty council. (2) A faculty council [...] shall consist of (a) the dean of the faculty, who is the chair, (b) the president, (c) all full-time members of the academic staff of the faculty, (d) any representative of a professional association appointed pursuant to subsection (4), and (e) any other persons who are appointed to the faculty council by the general faculties council on the recommendation of the faculty council." "28(4) When by statute a body has regulatory powers in respect of a profession for which a faculty offers a program of study […] a representative of that body nominated by that body." 2. **GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference (*Mandate* 8.a)**: "a. Appointments to Faculty Councils: The Executive Committee of General Faculties Council shall be authorized to make appointments to Faculty Councils on their recommendations.

	With respect to appointments of external members to Faculty Councils, approval of the positions by the Executive Committee, on behalf of GFC, shall suffice."

Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultative Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)	Dean of the School of Public Health – consultation, discussion, feedback – to recommend to the School of Public Health Council
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	School of Public Health Council (Oct 22, 2014) – for recommendation; GFC Executive Committee (Sept 14, 2015) – for final approval
Final Approver	GFC Executive Committee

Attachments:

1. Attachment 1: Comparative Table of Proposed Revisions to the Current Composition of the Council of the School of Public Health

Prepared by: Kue Young, Dean, School of Public Health kue.young@ualberta.ca

Revised: 9/8/2015

Attachment 1: Comparative Table of Proposed Revisions to the Current Composition of the Council of the School of Public Health

Old	Changes	Comment
Ex officio		
Dean		
President		
All full-time members of the academic staff of the faculty		
Additional members		Regarding PSLA 28(4) there is no statutory/regulatory/licensing professional body for public health in Alberta or Canada
~~1 representative Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry (appointed by the Dean)~~	delete	Many FOMD faculty members are already adjunct faculty in SPH and contribute actively to teaching and research
~~1 representative Health Sciences Council (appointed by the Vice-Provost HSC)~~	delete	No need for HSC to be represented in SPH as dean of SPH sits among other health sciences deans in HSC Board; position of Vice-Provost HSC no longer exists;
~~1 representative Capital Health (appointed by the President and CEO)~~	delete	Capital Health no longer exists; close collaboration exists between SPH and Alberta Health Services
~~1 representative Alberta Health and Wellness (appointed by the Deputy Minister)~~	delete	Deputy Minister of Alberta Health sits on SPH External Advisory Council – her input there is more valuable to SPH than her delegate in SPH Faculty Council
~~1 representative Public Health Agency of Canada (appointed by the Regional Director, Alberta/NWT)~~	delete	SPH has had very little interactions with PHAC Alberta/ NWT Region and its involvement in SPH Faculty Council is not needed
Academic staff with joint appointments of 0.2 or greater FTE or equivalent internal secondments to the School (EXEC 01 Oct 2007)		
Three graduate student representatives, one of whom must be a doctoral student, to be selected by the ~~Faculty Student Associations (Public Health Sciences and Health Promotion Studies)~~	School of Public Health Student Association	There is only one student association for the whole School since the School became non-departmental in 2012

OUTLINE OF ISSUE

Agenda Title: **Proposed Changes to the Composition of the Council of the Faculté Saint-Jean**

Motion: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, proposed amendments to the composition and membership of the Council of Faculté Saint-Jean, as submitted by Faculté Saint-Jean and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon final approval.

Item

Action Requested	☑ Approval ☐ Recommendation ☐ Discussion/Advice ☐ Information
Proposed by	Pierre Yves Mocquais, Dean, Faculté Saint-Jean
Presenter	Sheena Wilson, Assistant Professor, Faculté Saint-Jean
Subject	Proposed changes to the Composition of the Council of Faculté Saint-Jean

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To update the composition of the Faculté Saint-Jean Council
The Impact of the Proposal is	See purpose
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	Section 55.5.15 of the GFC Policy Manual re Composition of Faculté Saint-Jean
Timeline/Implementation Date	On final approval
Estimated Cost	N/A
Sources of Funding	N/A
Notes	N/A

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	Dare to Discover, Dare to Deliver, Comprehensive Institutional Plan, Other
Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)	1. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act* (*PSLA*)**: "**Faculty councils** **28**(1) Each faculty of a university must have a faculty council. (2) A faculty council [...] shall consist of (a) the dean of the faculty, who is the chair, (b) the president, (c) all full-time members of the academic staff of the faculty, (d) any representative of a professional association appointed pursuant to subsection (4), and (e) any other persons who are appointed to the faculty council by the general faculties council on the recommendation of the faculty council." **2. *Post-Secondary Learning Act* (PSLA):** "Powers of faculty councils 29(3) A faculty council may delegate any of its powers, duties and functions under this Act as it sees fit and may prescribe conditions governing the exercise or performance of any delegated power, duty or function, including the power of subdelegation." 2. **GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference (*Mandate* 8.a)**: "a.

	Appointments to Faculty Councils: The Executive Committee of General Faculties Council shall be authorized to make appointments to Faculty Councils on their recommendations.

Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultative Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)	
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	Faculté Saint-Jean Executive Committee, on behalf of the Council of Faculté Saint-Jean – August 21, 2015 GFC Executive Committee – September 14, 2015
Final Approver	GFC Executive Committee

Attachments

1. Attachment 1 (page(s) 1 - 2) : FSJ Comparative table Changes to Membership/Composition

Prepared by: Marie Simuong, Governance Coordinator, msimuong@ualberta.ca

CURRENT	PROPOSED
COUNCIL OF FACULTÉ SAINT-JEAN	**COUNCIL OF FACULTÉ SAINT-JEAN**
Ex officio	**Ex officio**
▪ Dean (Chair) ▪ President ▪ All full-time members of the academic staff of the Faculty (category A1.0)	▪ Dean (Chair) ▪ President ▪ All full-time members of the academic staff of the Faculty (category A1.0)
Additional members	**Additional members**
▪ Director of the Canadian Studies Institute ▪ Director of the *Institut pour le patrimoine de la francophonie de l'Ouest canadien* ▪ Assistant Dean, ~~Student Affairs~~ ~~▪ Assistant Dean, Academic Affairs and Governance~~ ~~▪ Assistant Dean, External Affairs~~ ▪ ~~Assistant Dean and~~ Director, *Centre Collégial de l'Alberta* ▪ Director of the *Bibliothèque Saint-Jean* ▪ One student per section appointed by the *Association universitaire de la Faculté Saint-Jean* ▪ One student appointed by the graduate students of the *Faculté Saint-Jean* ▪ Two Sessional Lecturers : one full-time and one part-time ~~(category A2.1 §55 GFC Policy Manual)~~ ▪ Registrar or representative ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Science or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Arts or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Education or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Nursing or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environment Sciences or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Business or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Augustana or designee ▪ One representative of the *Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta* ▪ One representative of the *Alberta Teachers' Association* ▪ One representative (Educator) of Immersion Schools elected by Canadian Parents for French ▪ One representative of the *Fédération des conseils scolaires francophones de l'Alberta* ▪ One representative from *La Société Radio-Canada* ▪ One representative of the *Centre d'accueil et d'établissement d'Edmonton*	▪ Director of the Canadian Studies Institute ▪ Director of the *Institut pour le patrimoine de la francophonie de l'Ouest canadien* ▪ Assistant Dean, Academic Administration ▪ Assistant Dean, Operations and Corporate Support ▪ Director, *Centre Collégial de l'Alberta* ▪ Director of the *Bibliothèque Saint-Jean* ▪ One student per section appointed by the *Association des universitaires de la Faculté Saint-Jean* ▪ One student appointed by the graduate students of the *Faculté Saint-Jean* ▪ Two Sessional Lecturers : one full-time (category A2.1 UAPPOL Recruitment Policy) and one part-time (category A2.2 UAPPOL Recruitment Policy) ▪ Registrar or representative ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Science or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Arts or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Education or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Nursing or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environment Sciences or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Business or designee ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Augustana or designee ▪ One representative of the *Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta* ▪ One representative of the *Alberta Teachers' Association* ▪ One representative (Educator) of Immersion Schools elected by Canadian Parents for French ▪ One representative of the *Fédération des conseils scolaires francophones de l'Alberta* ▪ One representative from *La Société Radio-Canada* ▪ One representative of the *Centre d'accueil et d'établissement d'Edmonton*
Observers (non-voting) ▪ Secretary to the Council, designated by the Dean ▪ All other persons attending a Council meeting	Observers (non-voting) ▪ Secretary to the Council, designated by the Dean ▪ All other persons attending a Council meeting

CURRENT	PROPOSED
CONSEIL DE LA FACULTÉ SAINT-JEAN	**CONSEIL DE LA FACULTÉ SAINT-JEAN**
COMPOSITION	**COMPOSITION**
Ex officio ▪ Doyen (président) ▪ Président de l'Université de l'Alberta ▪ Tous les membres permanents du personnel académique de la Faculté (catégorie A1.0)	**Ex officio** ▪ Doyen (président) ▪ Président de l'Université de l'Alberta ▪ Tous les membres permanents du personnel académique de la Faculté (catégorie A1.0)
Membres additionnels ▪ Directeur de l'Institut d'études canadiennes ▪ Directeur de l'Institut pour le patrimoine de la francophonie de l'Ouest canadien ▪ Doyen adjoint ~~aux affaires~~ ~~étudiantes~~ ~~▪ Doyen adjoint des affaires académiques et de la gouvernance~~ ~~▪ Doyen ou la doyenne adjoint aux affaires externes~~ ▪ ~~Doyen adjoint et~~ directeur du Centre Collégial de l'Alberta ▪ Directeur de la Bibliothèque Saint-Jean ▪ Un représentant étudiant de chacune des sections, nommé par l'Association universitaire de la Faculté Saint-Jean ▪ Un étudiant nommé par les étudiants du 2e cycle de la Faculté Saint-Jean ▪ Deux représentants des chargés de cours : un temps plein et un temps partiel ~~(catégorie A2.1 §55 *GFC Policy Manual*)~~ ▪ Registraire de l'Université ou son représentant ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Science* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Arts* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Education* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Nursing* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Business* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Augustana* ou son délégué ▪ Un représentant de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta ▪ Un représentant de la Alberta Teachers' Association ▪ Un représentant (en éducation) des écoles d'immersion nommé par *Canadian Parents for French* ▪ Un représentant de la Fédération des conseils scolaires francophones de l'Alberta ▪ Un représentant de la Société Radio-Canada ▪ Un représentant du Centre d'accueil et d'établissement d'Edmonton	**Membres additionnels** ▪ Directeur de l'Institut d'études canadiennes ▪ Directeur de l'Institut pour le patrimoine de la francophonie de l'Ouest canadien ▪ Doyen adjoint, administration académique ▪ Doyen adjoint, opérations et soutien corporatif ▪ Directeur du Centre Collégial de l'Alberta ▪ Directeur de la Bibliothèque Saint-Jean ▪ Un représentant étudiant de chacune des sections, nommé par l'Association des universitaires de la Faculté Saint-Jean ▪ Un étudiant nommé par les étudiants du 2e cycle de la Faculté Saint-Jean ▪ Deux représentants des chargés de cours : un temps plein (catégorie A2.1 *UAPPOL Recruitment Policy*) et un temps partiel (catégorie A2.2 *UAPPOL Recruitment Policy*) ▪ Registraire de l'Université ou son représentant ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Science* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Arts* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Education* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Nursing* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Business* ou son délégué ▪ Doyen de la *Faculty of Augustana* ou son délégué ▪ Un représentant de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta ▪ Un représentant de l'*Alberta Teachers' Association* ▪ Un représentant (en éducation) des écoles d'immersion nommé par *Canadian Parents for French* ▪ Un représentant de la Fédération des conseils scolaires francophones de l'Alberta ▪ Un représentant de la Société Radio-Canada ▪ Un représentant du Centre d'accueil et d'établissement d'Edmonton
Observateurs (sans droit de vote) ▪ Secrétaire du conseil, désigné par le doyen ▪ Toute autre personne qui assiste à une réunion du conseil	**Observateurs (sans droit de vote)** ▪ Secrétaire du conseil, désigné par le doyen ▪ Toute autre personne qui assiste à une réunion du conseil

OUTLINE OF ISSUE

Agenda Title: **Proposed New Course Designation of PLAN in the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Faculty of Science**

Motion: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, a new course designation of PLAN (Urban and Regional Planning) (Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences), as submitted by the Faculties of Science and Graduate Studies and Research, to take effect for Fall Term, 2016

Item

Action Requested	☒Approval ☐Recommendation ☐Discussion/Advice ☐Information
Proposed by	Mazi Shirvani, Vice provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research; Sandeep Agrawal, Professor & Inaugural Director Undergraduate Program in Planning, Faculty of Science
Presenter	James C Cahill, Faculty of Science, Sandeep Agrawal and Bob Summers, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences
Subject	Introduction of a new course designation of PLAN in the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To introduce a new course designation, PLAN, as an identifier of courses related to new Master of Science (MSc) in Urban and Regional Planning program, starting in Fall, 2016
The Impact of the Proposal is	The proposed cost-recovery Urban and Regional Planning program has been designed in line with the professional accreditation standards of the Canadian Institute of Planners. It is necessary to distinguish this program which is a professional program in Planning from graduate programs in Human Geography which are thesis based. Also, the proposed PLAN courses are Faculty of Science courses, while the existing HGP courses are Faculty of Arts courses. The new course designator will provide clarity to students and the professional accreditation body regarding the courses that are part of the proposed Urban and Regional Planning Master's degree program.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	This is a new course designation for courses to be offered in the context of a new program.
Timeline/Implementation Date	Fall Term, 2016.
Estimated Cost	The costs for the proposed program are addressed in the separately considered Outline of Issue "Proposal for an MSc in Urban and Regional Planning, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Faculty of Science"
Sources of Funding	See above
Notes	<internal use only>

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	Dare to Discover, Dare to Deliver

Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)	**1. Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA):** GFC is responsible, generally, for the academic affairs of the University and specifically, for programs of study in Faculties (Sections 26(1) and 26(1) (b)). **2. GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference/Mandate of the Committee:** In 1996, GFC delegated its authority to the GFC Executive Committee to ratify new course subject names and their abbreviations (Section 3.14). **3. GFC Policy:** "Course subject names shall designate broad areas of study (often an entire department) and shall not be used to designate numerous specializations. Faculty Councils shall endeavour to keep the number of subject names in the Faculty to an acceptable minimum. Subject names shall not be added or changed except for strong academic reasons." (Section 37.2 of the GFC Policy Manual)

Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultative Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)	Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Department Council, Dean of Arts, Dean of Extension, Dean of Science.
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	EAS Department Council, Dec 2, 2014; Science Chairs Committee, March 29, 2015; Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, Apr 29, 2015; Academic Standards Committee (May 21, 2015); GFC Academic Planning Committee June 10 2015,
Final Approver	<internal use only>

OUTLINE OF ISSUE

Agenda Title: **Proposal from the Faculty of Nursing to add NURS 201 – Introduction to Nursing Theory II to the List of Courses with Consolidated Exam**

Motion: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, the addition of NURS 201 – Introduction to Nursing Theory II to the list of courses with Consolidated Final Examinations, as submitted by the Faculty of Nursing, to take effect 2016-2017.

Item

Action Requested	☒Approval ☐Recommendation ☐Discussion/Advice ☐Information
Proposed by	Faculty of Nursing
Presenter	Carolyn Ross, Associate Dean (Undergraduate Programs), Faculty of Nursing
Subject	Introduction of Consolidated Final Examination for NURS 201- Introduction to Nursing Theory II

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To add NURS 201 to the list of courses for which consolidated final examinations are scheduled.
The Impact of the Proposal is	NURS 201 has multiple sections (four in 2015) of the same course. The course must be delivered on different days and times because of the challenges that nursing has in scheduling clinical courses. The outcome of this is: • Multiple exams are required. Because all sections of the course have the same course content, the exams all test the same important concepts. • According the University Exam Planner, some sections of the course write their exam one week prior to other sections in the course. This means that information about one section of an exam can be shared with students in the remaining sections. This has the potential to give a significant advantage to students who write exams later, even if those students are writing a different version of the exam. • A consolidated final exam for all students is seen as a solution in terms of ensuring fairness and consistency in the examination process. • From a Faculty perspective, a consolidated exam is fiscally responsible in that the professors have only one exam to proctor instead of multiple exams.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	N/A
Timeline/Implementation Date	2016-2017 academic year
Estimated Cost	N/A
Sources of Funding	N/A
Notes	

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	Dare to Discover, Dare to Deliver

Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)	1. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA)****:* Section 26(1)(d) of the *PSLA* gives GFC responsibility over "timetables for examination and for lectures and other instruction." 2. **GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference**: **Mandate of the committee** "7. Examinations b. The Executive Committee approves requests from Faculties which wish to schedule common examinations. (GFC 27 OCT 1980)" 3. **UAPPOL Policy: Assessment and Grading, Consolidated Final Examinations Procedure** "1a. Approval of consolidated examinations Faculties will determine which courses best demonstrate the need for a consolidated final examination on a continuing basis, and request approval by the GFC Executive Committee. Approval must be obtained from the GFC Executive Committee prior to scheduling or conducting a consolidated final examination."

Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultative Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)	Carolyn Ross, Associate Dean (Undergraduate Programs), Faculty of Nursing (June, 2015) Katherine Trepanier, Director (Undergraduate Programs), Faculty of (June, 2015) Anna Vocioni, Assistant Registrar (ETT), Office of the Registrar (June, 2015)
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	GFC Executive September 14, 2015
Final Approver	GFC Executive

Prepared by: Vanessa Kaiser, Faculty of Nursing (vanessa.kaiser@ualberta.ca)

OUTLINE OF ISSUE

Agenda Title: **Proposed Amendments to Composition of Dean Selection/Review Committee for Dean of Students**

Motion: THAT the GFC Executive Committee approve, under delegated authority from the Board of Governors and the General Faculties Council, proposed changes to the composition of the Dean Selection/Review Committee for Dean of Students as submitted by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect immediately.

Item

Action Requested	☒ Approval ☐ Recommendation ☐ Discussion/Advice ☐ Information
Proposed by	Steven Dew, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Presenter	Wendy Rodgers, Deputy-Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Helen Vallianatos, Assistant Dean of Students
Subject	Selection and Review Procedures for Deans and Department Chairs: Composition of the Dean's Selection Committee, Dean of Students

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To amend the UAPPOL Faculty Deans Selection Procedure Appendix A: Dean Selection Committees for Individual Faculties, Dean of Students, as follows: 1) Remove an outdated reference to a staff category. 2) Update the language used in reference to student membership. 3) Addition of two academic staff representatives.
The Impact of the Proposal is	To ensure clarity and more inclusive and better balanced committee representation.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	UAPPOL Faculty Deans Selection Procedure Appendix A: Dean Selection Committees for Individual Faculties, Dean of Students
Timeline/Implementation Date	Upon final approval
Estimated Cost	
Sources of Funding	
Notes	<internal use only>

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	Dare to Discover, Dare to Deliver
Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)	1. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act*** **(PSLA)**: The *PSLA* gives General Faculties Council (GFC) responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, *over academic affairs* (section 26(1)). The *Act* provides that *[a] person shall not be appointed to, promoted to or dismissed from any position on the academic staff at a university except on the recommendation of the president made in accordance with procedures approved by the general faculties council* (section 22(2)). In addition, GFC may recommend to the Board of Governors on *procedures in respect of appointments, promotions, salaries, tenure and*

	dismissals of academic staff (section 26(1)(o)). 2. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act* (*PSLA*)**: The Board of Governors has authority to employ *officers, employees or other persons* and *academic staff members* (sections 83 and 84 of the *Act*) and to appoint the President, Vice-Presidents, Deans and Registrar (sections 81, 82, 21(1) and 20(1) of the *Act*). The Board has delegated certain of these powers. 3. **UAPPOL Policy**: The Faculty Deans Selection and Review Procedures state: "With respect to the procedures for the selection [review] of Faculty Deans, the Board and GFC delegate their approval authority to the GFC Executive Committee for all matters of a routine editorial nature. For matters of a substantive nature, the GFC Executive Committee shall recommend to the Board Human Resources and Compensation Committee (BHRCC). The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will determine what is of a routine/editorial or substantive nature." Note: The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) has determined these proposed amendments to be of a routine/editorial nature.

Routing (Include meeting dates)

Participation: (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) • Those who have been informed • Those who have been consulted • Those who are actively participating	Provost and Vice-President (Academic) Dean of Students Directors Council (Meeting of August 21, 2015; August 26, 2015)
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	GFC Executive (September 14, 2015) for final approval
Final Approver	GFC Executive Committee

Attachments (1)

1. Attachment 1: Comparative Table of Proposed Changes to the Composition of the Selection/Review Committee for the Dean of Students (page 1 - 1)

Prepared by: Kate Peters, Portfolio Initiatives Manager, peters3@ualberta.ca

Recommended Dean of Students Selection Committee Revisions

As proposed by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

CURRENT	PROPOSED	Comments
a) Provost and Vice-President (Academic), or designee, Chair.	a) Provost and Vice-President (Academic), or designee, Chair.	
b) Vice-President (Research), or designee, Vice-Chair.	b) Vice-President (Research), or designee, Vice-Chair.	
c) Vice-Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, or designee.	c) Vice-Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, or designee.	
d) Registrar, or designee.	d) Registrar, or designee.	
e) Three (3) Administrative Professional Officers (Category A1.2) who are from units which report to the Dean of Students, elected by those in Category A1.2 who are in units which report to the Dean. For this purpose the Director of the University Health Service and the Director of Student Counselling Services are considered to be Category A1.2.	e) Three (3) Administrative Professional Officers (Category A1.2) who are from units which report to the Dean of Students, elected by those in Category A1.2 who are in units which report to the Dean. ~~For this purpose the Director of the University Health Service and the Director of Student Counselling Services are considered to be Category A1.2.~~	e) The Directors of the University Wellness Services and Student Counselling Services were SOTS positions when this policy statement was made. They are now APO positions and there is no need for this exception.
f) One (1) member of the Graduate Students' Association executive selected by the Graduate Students' Association executive.	f) One (1) member of the Graduate Students' Association executive selected by the Graduate Students' Association executive.	
g) The President of the Students' Union or that person's designee from the Students' Union executive.	g) One (1) member of the Students' Union executive selected by the Students' Union executive.	g) Language aligns (f) and other Dean Selection Committees.
h) Two (2) undergraduate students, as selected by the Students' Union using whatever method the Union deems suitable.	h) Two (2) undergraduate students to reflect the diversity of the student body as selected by the Students' Union using whatever method the Union deems suitable.	h) To ensure that student representation reflects the diversity of the student body (International students, Aboriginal etc.)
i) Two (2) graduate students, elected by the Graduate Students' Association.	i) Two (2) graduate students~~,~~ ~~elected by~~as selected by the Graduate Students' Association using whatever method the Association deems suitable to reflect the diversity of graduate students.	i)Language aligns with (h)
j) Three (3) academic staff (Categories A1.0 or A2.0) elected by GFC who are not affiliated with a unit that reports to the Dean of Students.	j) Three (3) academic staff (Categories A1.0 or A2.0) elected by GFC who are not affiliated with a unit that reports to the Dean of Students.	
k) One (1) representative of the full-time support staff (Category S1.0 or S2.0) from the units that report to the Dean, elected by the full-time support staff in those units. The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall direct the election.	k) Two (~~1~~2)) representatives of the full-time support staff (Category S1.0 or S2.0) from the units that report to the Dean, elected by the full-time support staff in those units. The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall direct the election.	k) Support staff play an important role in ensuring service delivery. Representation should be representative.
(new)	l) Two (2) academic staff representatives from Category A1.1 or A1.6 who have experience dealing with student and faculty issues (such as Associate Deans) to be selected by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic).	l) The addition is to address the proportionate imbalance of academic staff on the committee and to ensure pertinent experience working with students and faculty.

OUTLINE OF ISSUE

Agenda Title: **Animal Ethics Policy Suite Revisions (in UAPPOL)**

Motion: THAT the GFC Executive Committee recommends endorsement by General Faculties Council of revisions to the Animal Ethics Policy as submitted by the Office of the Vice-President (Research) as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon final approval by the Board of Governors.

Motion: THAT the GFC Executive Committee recommends endorsement by General Faculties Council of rescission Animal User Training Policy, to take effect upon final approval by the Board of Governors.

Item

Action Requested	☐ Approval ☒ Recommendation ☐ Discussion/Advice ☐ Information
Proposed by	Vice-President (Research)
Presenters	Dr Walter Dixon, Associate Vice-President (Research) Ms Susan Babcock, Acting Executive Director, Research Ethics Office
Subject	Animal Ethics Policy Suite

Details

Responsibility	Vice-President (Research)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To recommend • Endorsement of the proposed revisions to the Animal Ethics Policy Suite. • Rescission of the Animal User Training Policy; Animal Euthanasia Procedure; Animal Ethics Review Procedure; and Animal Care and Use Committee Scientific and Pedagogic Merit Review Procedure.
The Impact of the Proposal is to	• Consolidate the Animal User Training Policy with the Animal Ethics Policy; and • Update the Animal Ethics Policy to align with Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) guidelines and policies and to reflect the introduction of new procedures as well as changes in organizational structure and business practices at the University.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	Revises - Animal Ethics Policy (2 June 2005) and its Procedures Rescinds - Animal User Training Policy (2 June 2005) and 3 procedures.
Timeline/Implementation Date	Effective immediately following Board of Governors approval.
Estimated Cost	None
Sources of Funding	N/A
Notes	**Background** • The proposed revisions are to: 1) rescind the Animal User Training Policy as well as the Animal Euthanasia Procedure, the Animal Ethics Review Procedure, the Animal Care and Use Scientific and Pedagogic Merit Review Procedure and the Administration of Animal Research Procedure; 2) update the existing Animal Ethics Policy and incorporate animal user training requirements and authority to euthanize animals within the Animal Ethics Policy; 3) establish new Procedures related to the Animal Ethics Policy and 4) update the remaining Procedures. The intent of the Animal Ethics Policy has not changed. The proposed changes, though extensive, improve the

	University's compliance with the requirements of the Canadian Council on Animal Care and the Tri-Council *Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions* while providing a clearer and more comprehensive policy framework for animal care and use in research, teaching and testing. The University continues to operate according the highest standards of animal use. • The changes proposed include: o Rescinding the Animal User Training Policy and incorporating the animal user training requirement within the Animal Ethics Policy; o Rescinding the Animal Euthanasia Procedure and incorporating the authority to euthanize animals within the Animal Ethics Policy o Rescinding the Animal Ethics Review Procedure and the Animal Care and Use Scientific and Pedagogic Merit Review Procedure, and approving the NEW Animal Care and Use Committee Structure, Application and Review Procedure which incorporates scientific and pedagogic merit review requirements o Rescinding the Administration of Animal Research Procedure and approving the NEW Animal Care and Use Roles and Responsibilities Procedure o Approving changes to the Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedure and the Animal Maintenance Special Requests for Alternate Animal Holding Housing Procedure o Approving the New Post Approval Monitoring Procedure, the New Animal Care and Use Standard Operating Procedures: Definition, Creation, Approval and Management Procedure, and the New Institutional Animal User Training Procedure o Animal Care and Use Committees are now discipline oriented rather than aligned by Faculty; and o Accountability of the University reflects Canadian Council on Animal Care standards and the Russell-Burch "Three Rs" tenet (replacement, reduction and refinement) of animal use. • Consultation has included the Animal Care and Use Committees and UAPWC, membership of which includes researchers, animal facilities staff, veterinarians and Associate/Vice Deans (Research) [FOMD, ALES & Science] and the Associate Vice-President (Research), and was informed by CCAC compliant policy and processes in place at other institutions. • The 2013 CCAC site visit and assessment process at U of A provided additional input and comment on our draft procedures, in particular the new Post Approval Monitoring Procedure, the new Animal; Care and Use Standard Operating Procedures: Definition, Creation, Approval and Management Procedure and the new Institutional Animal User Training Procedure. • Operationally, these proposed revisions will not significantly affect individual researchers and their animal use applications. UAPWC and the Research Ethics Office will advise the Animal Care and Use Committees, researchers and animal facilities of the revisions once they are approved.

	These changes would take effect immediately following final approval of the revisions to the Animal Ethics Policy.

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	Dare to Discover, Dare to Deliver 2011-2015, Comprehensive Institutional Plan
Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)	1. ***Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)*** *policy statements for:* *Senior Administrators Responsible for Animal Care and Use Programs* (2008) *Terms of Reference for Animal Care Committees* *Scientific Merit and Ethical Review of Animal-based Research* *Ethics of Animal Investigation,* *Categories of Invasiveness,* and *Social and Behavioral Requirements of Experimental Animals*. 2. ***Provincial Legislation***: a. Veterinary Profession Act (Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter V-2) 25 March 2010 b. Animal Protection Act (Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter A-41) 01 November 2010 c. Animal Protection Regulation Alberta Regulation 203/2005 with Amendments up to and including Alberta Regulation 210/2008 3. ***National Institutes of Health (US)*** Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW), Public Health Service Statement of Compliance with Standards for Humane Care & Use of Laboratory Animals Animal Welfare Assurance #A5070-01 (Expires 30 November 2015) 4. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act*** **(*PSLA*)**: Alberta's *Post-Secondary Learning Act* (*PSLA*) gives the Board of Governors the authority to "develop, manage and operate, alone or in co-operation with any person or organization, programs, services and facilities for the educational or cultural advancement of the people of Alberta" (Section 60(1)). Further, the Board of Governors "must consider the recommendations of the general faculties council, if any, on matters of academic import prior to providing for […] any other activities the board considers necessary or advantageous" (Section 19(e)). 2. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act*** **(*PSLA*)**: Section 26(1) states that, "[s]ubject to the authority of the board, a general faculties council is responsible for the academic affairs of the university and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, has the authority to […] (o) make recommendations to the board with respect to affiliation with

other institutions, academic planning, campus planning, a building program, the budget, the regulation of residences and dining halls, procedures in respect of appointments, promotions, salaries, tenure and dismissals, and any other matters considered by the general faculties council to be of interest to the university […]."

Further, the *PSLA*, states in Section 31(1) that "[t]he general faculties council has general supervision of student affairs at a university […]."

3. **GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference (Section 3/Mandate of the Committee)**:

"5. **Agendas of General Faculties Council**
GFC has delegated to the Executive Committee the authority to decide which items are placed on a GFC Agenda, and the order in which those agenda items appear on each GFC agenda. […]

With respect to recommendations from other bodies and other GFC committees, […] the role of the Executive Committee shall be to examine and debate the substance of reports or recommendations and to decide if an item is ready to be forwarded to the full governing body. The Executive Committee may decide to refer a proposal back to the originating body, to refer the proposal to another body or individual for study or review, or to take other action in order to ready a proposal for consideration by General Faculties Council. When the GFC Executive Committee forwards a proposal to GFC, it shall make a recommendation that GFC endorse; endorse with suggested amendments; not endorse; or forward the proposal with no comment."

4. ***Post-Secondary Learning Act* (*PSLA*)**: Under the heading *Officers and employees*, the *PSLA* states, as follows:

"83 A board shall
(a) appoint any officers, employees or other persons it considers necessary for the proper conduct of the affairs of the public post-secondary institution and may promote or dismiss the officers and employees,
(b) determine the remuneration of the officers and employees,
(c) prescribe the duties of the officers and employees, and
(d) prescribe the term of employment and the terms and conditions of employment of the officers and employees."

Under the heading *Academic staff*, the *PSLA* states, as follows:

"84(1) In this section […], 'agreement' means an agreement between the board and an academic staff association under section 87. […]

(3) A board shall, subject to any existing agreement,
(a) determine the remuneration of academic staff members,
(b) prescribe the duties of academic staff members, and

	(c) prescribe the term of employment and the terms and conditions of employment of academic staff members." 5. ***Board Learning and Discovery Committee Terms of Reference***: "3. MANDATE OF THE COMMITTEE Except as provided in paragraph 4 hereof and in the Board's General Committee Terms of Reference, the Committee shall, in accordance with the Committee's responsibilities with powers granted under the Post-Secondary Learning Act, monitor, evaluate, advise and make decisions on behalf of the Board with respect to matters concerning the teaching and research affairs of the University, including proposals coming from the administration and from General Faculties Council (the "GFC"), and shall consider future educational expectations and challenges to be faced by the University. The Committee shall also include any other matter delegated to the Committee by the Board. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing the Committee shall: a. review and approve initiatives related to the overall academic mission and related plans and policies of the University; b. review, provide feedback and approve teaching and research policies[.] […]"

Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultative Route	**SUMMARY OF DUE DILIGENCE** Animal Ethics Policy
STAKEHOLDER	**BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY AND OUTCOME**
University Animal Policy & Welfare Committee (UAPWC) Research Ethics Office	**2011-2012** Following the 2010 CCAC site visit and assessment and approval and implementation of the new Human Research Ethics Policy (2011), the Research Ethics Office began work on an online system for Animal Care and Use Committees and reviewed the existing Animal Ethics Policy and Procedures, the bulk of which were developed in 2005, in that context. In developing the online module, REO reviewed policies and procedures in place at other Canadian universities and considered recommendations from the CCAC 2010 Site Visit Assessment and procedure gaps noted by the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee as well as other work under way on new procedures. Based on the foregoing, the Research Ethics Office prepared a series of revisions to the existing policy suite to better align the Animal Ethics Policy with current CCAC guidelines and standards, to mirror the new Human Research Ethics Policy Suite and to generally update the policy with reference to changes in organizational structures and business practices and the introduction of new procedures since 2005, eg Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedure.
University Animal Policy & Welfare Committee	**25 January 2013:** UAPWC met to review the proposed changes to the existing Animal Ethics Policy Suite. Members included: Associate Vice-President

	(Research); Associate/Vice Deans (Research) – ALES, FOMD & Science; Directors of the animal services units (ALES, FOMD & Science), and Chairs of the Animal Care and Use Committees. **UAPWC endorsed and recommended the Vice-President (Research) seek approval for the following changes to the Animal User Training Policy and the Animal Ethics Policy and its Procedures**: 1) That the current Animal User Training Policy be rescinded. [Institutional requirements for animal user training are captured in a proposed addition to the **Animal Ethics Policy**, specifically Section 7.0 and in the NEW Institutional Animal User Training Procedure.] 2) That the proposed revisions to the Animal Ethics Policy be approved, as shown in Attachment 1. 3) That the current Animal Euthanasia Procedure be rescinded. The authority to humanely euthanize animals is contained in a proposed addition to the **Animal Ethics Policy**, specifically Section 8.0 4) That the existing Animal Ethics Review Procedure be rescinded. 5) That the NEW Animal Care and Use Committee Structure, Application and Review Procedure be approved, as shown in Attachment 2. This new procedure describes the structure and authority of the ACUCs as well as the application process, decision making and review requirements for new animal use applications, renewals and amendments. 6) That the current Animal Care and Use Scientific and Pedagogic Merit Review Procedure be rescinded. [It will be replaced with material in the new *ACUC Structure, Application and Review Procedure*, specifically 2.a i-iv.] 7) That the proposed revisions to the Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedures be approved as shown in Attachment 3.
University Animal Policy & Welfare Committee	**7 March 2013** UAPWC met to review the proposed changes to the existing Animal Ethics Policy Suite, specifically the revisions to the Special Request for Alternate Animal Holding/Housing Procedure and the changes associated with the Roles and Responsibilities Procedure. UAPWC endorsed and recommended the Vice-President (Research) approve the following changes to the Animal Ethics Policy and its Procedures: 1) That the proposed revisions to the Animal Maintenance Special Requests for Alternate Animal Holding Housing Procedure be approved, as shown in the Attachment 4. 2) That the current Administration of Animal Research Procedure (Roles and Responsibilities) be rescinded 3) That the NEW Animal Care and Use Roles and Responsibilities Procedure be approved, as shown in Attachment 5. In addition, UAPWC identified the need for three new procedures to address: Post-Approval Monitoring, Institutional Animal User Training (to provide detailed requirements for both theoretical and applied animal

	user training based on nature and scope of animal use) and Institutional Standard Operating Procedures Development and Review Procedure.
University Animal Policy & Welfare Committee	**17 June 2013** At its meeting on 17 June 2013, UAPWC endorsed and recommended that the Vice-President (Research) approve the NEW Post Approval Monitoring Procedure.
Research Ethics Office	**June 2013 to December 2014** The Research Ethics Office worked with UAPWC and the Office of the Vice-President (Research) to prepare for the 2013 CCAC Site Visit and Assessment. This included completion of a detailed self-assessment of the University's animal care and use program for CCAC and the site visit itself (October 2103). The CCAC written assessment report was received February 2014 and included recommendations that affected institutional policy and procedures for animal care and use. REO and UAPWC prepared, on behalf of the Vice President (Research), detailed responses to the recommendations in May, August and December 2014 as well as the relevant policy and process changes.
University Animal Policy & Welfare Committee	**16 June 2014** At its meeting on the 16 June 2014, UAPWC discussed draft versions of the new Animal; Care and Use Standard Operating Procedures: Definition, Creation, Approval and Management Procedure and the new Institutional Animal User Training Procedure and recommended a number of changes. Following the meeting, the draft procedures were approved by email with the recommendation that the Vice-President (Research) seek approval for new Animal; Care and Use Standard Operating Procedures: Definition, Creation, Approval and Management Procedure and the new Institutional Animal User Training Procedure.
University Animal Policy & Welfare Committee	**15 September 2014** At its meeting on 15 September 2014, UAPWC revisited the NEW Animal Care and Use Roles and Responsibilities Procedure that it had endorsed in March 2013 and endorsed the red-line changes for formal approval.
University Research Policy Committee (URPC)	**27 February 2015** URPC is comprised of Associate/Vice Deans (Research) of all faculties, along with senior administrators from RSO and REO. URPC reviewed the final versions of the documents and recommended their approval.
AASUA	**February - April 2015** AASUA received the proposed revisions to the Animal Policy Suite on 25 February 2015, and their comments were received on 7 April. A response to the AASUA comments was prepared by REO, and a meeting to discuss the feedback took place on 17 April; attendees were Ted Allison (Chair, AASUA Research and Scholarly Activity Committee), Brygeda Renke (Executive Director of AASUA), Susan Babcock (Administrative Director, REO), Lynn Penrod (Executive Director, REO), and Katharine Moore (Office of the Vice-President (Research)). Based on this feedback, further revisions were made to the Animal Policy suite. On 20 May 2015, Brygeda Renke advised that the Animal Policy suite was ready to move to governance for approval.
Vice-President (Research)	**4 August 2015** Vice-President (Research) Lorne Babiuk endorsed the revised Animal Ethics Policy Suite moving to governance for approval.

GFC Academic Planning Committee	**9 September 2015** No changes recommended to the Animal Ethics Policy suite.
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	GFC Executive Committee - 14 September 2015 GFC - 28 September 2015 Board Learning and Discovery Committee (BLDC) - 1 October 2015
Final Approver	Board Learning and Discovery Committee Board of Governors (for information) – 16 October 2015

Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)
1. Attachment 1 (page(s) 1 - 5) - Animal Ethics Policy Proposed Revisions
2. Attachment 2 (page(s) 1 - 4) - Animal Care and Use Committee Structure, Application and Review Procedure
3. Attachment 3 (page(s) 1 - 3) - Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedure Proposed Revisions
4. Attachment 4 (page(s) 1 - 4) - Special Requests for Alternate Animal Housing Procedure Proposed Revisions
5. Attachment 5 (page(s) 1 - 6) - Animal Care and Use Roles and Responsibilities Procedure
6. Attachment 6 (page(s) 1 - 3) - Animal Care and Use Post-Approval Monitoring Procedure
7. Attachment 7 (page(s) 1 - 4) - Institutional Animal User Training Program Procedure
8. Attachment 8 (page(s) 1 - 3) - Animal Care and Use Standard Operating Procedures: Definition, Creation, Approval and Management Procedure
9. Attachment 9 (page(s) 1 - 15) - AASUA Feedback on the Animal Policy Suite and the Research Portfolio's Response
10. Attachment 10 (page(s) 1) - Communication and Implementation Plan for Animal Ethics Policy and Procedures
11. Attachment 11 (page(s) 1 - 2) - Animal User Training Policy
12. Attachment 12 (page(s) 1 - 2) - Animal Euthanasia Procedure
13. Attachment 13 (page(s) 1 - 2) - Animal Ethics Review Procedure
14. Attachment 14 (page(s) 1 - 3) - Animal Care and Use Committee Scientific and Pedagogic Merit Review Procedure

Prepared by:

Susan Babcock, Research Ethics Office
susan.babcock@ualberta.ca

Katharine Moore, Office of the Vice-President (Research)
katharine.moore@ualberta.ca

Original Approval Date: June 2, 2005

Most Recent Approval Date:

Animal Ethics Policy

Office of Accountability:	Vice-President (Research)
Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO) ~~– University Veterinarian~~
Approver:	Board of Governors (~~BEAC~~) ~~and General Faculties Council (GFC Executive Committee)~~
Scope:	Compliance with this University policy extends to all members of the University community who use **animals** for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

The University of Alberta holds that scholarly integrity and trust are vital to the responsible conduct of research. It is committed to ensuring the ethical and humane use and responsible care of animals in research, teaching and testing. ~~in accordance with applicable laws, the **Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines**, and Tri-Council requirements *Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards*.~~ The University of Alberta regards the use of animals in research, teaching and testing as a privilege, not a right. Animals are used only for valid scientific studies with a reasonable expectation of obtaining knowledge for the potential benefit of people and/or animals. The University of Alberta is committed to ensuring the highest possible standards in the care, well-being, quality of life and use of its animals in accordance with applicable laws, the **Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)** guidelines and policy statements, and the Tri-Agency *Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions*.

Purpose

~~State the guiding ethical principles for~~ – To promote the highest standards of practice in research, teaching and testing involving animals.

~~**Ensure researchers, scholars and all others using animals for teaching and research purposes know the expectations of the University of Alberta.**~~ – To establish the nature of these standards and address instances when these standards have not been met.

~~Identify non-compliance with this Policy.~~

POLICY

1. ~~Guiding Ethical Principles of Animal Care and Use~~GUIDING ETHICAL PRINCIPLES OF ANIMAL CARE AND USE

   a. Animals used in research, teaching and testing by ~~scientists and educators **(researchers)**~~ University of Alberta staff and trainees must be cared for and maintained in accordance with applicable laws, ~~the Canadian Council on Animal Care (~~CCAC~~)~~ g~~G~~uidelines and policy statements, and the requirements of the Tri-Council ~~MOU requirements~~ *Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions*.

   ~~b. The University of Alberta highly discourages studies resulting in end-stage death as a direct result of the animal use procedures.~~

   ~~c.~~b. The Russell-Burch ~~"3R~~Three Rs~~"~~ ~~tenet of "~~Replacement, Reduction and Refinement~~"~~ principles will be upheld in the design and review of animal use protocols.

2. ~~Animal Care and Use Committees~~ ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEES

   a. The ~~University of Alberta~~ Vice-President (Research) shall ~~create~~ establish an institutional Animal Policy and Welfare Committee [~~the~~ University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee ~~or~~ (UAPWC)] to concern itself with the ethical and responsible use and care of animals in research, teaching and testing.

   b. UAPWC has the authority, on behalf of the Vice-President (Research) ~~of the University~~ to:

      i. stop any ~~objectionable~~ procedure if it considers that unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress is being experienced by the animal;

      ii. ~~terminate~~ stop immediately any use of animals that is not described within an approved protocol or that deviates from the approved protocol;

      iii. direct that any animal be humanely euthanised if it is experiencing unnecessary and/or unanticipated ~~an animal if~~ pain ~~and~~ or distress ~~caused to the animal~~ that cannot be alleviated; and

      iv. order the closure of facilities that do not meet CCAC standards and/or endanger the well-being of animals contained therein.

   c. ~~The~~ UAPWC shall establish ~~applicable~~ such specialized Animal Care and Use Committees (ACUCs) as necessary to review and manage ~~the affairs of~~ animal use applications. All ~~individuals~~ **Principal Investigators (PIs)** using animals must ~~be responsible~~ apply to and be accountable to at least one of the specialized ACUCs ~~following applicable Animal Care and Use Committees~~

~~i. Animal Care and Use Committee: Biosciences~~
~~ii. Animal Care and Use Committee: Health Sciences~~
~~iii. Animal Care and Use Committee: Livestock.~~

   d. UAPWC will serve as the appeal body concerning a negative decision of an ACUC. A PI who disputes an ACUC decision, following reconsideration by ACUC, may appeal that decision to UAPWC. Refer to the *Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedure*.

      i. Because ethics review and the observance of research ethics at the University is premised on collegial relations between ACUCs and researchers, a request for appeal must be a last resort. An appeal may only be made on the grounds that there has been a miscarriage of justice, such as an error in process, procedural irregularity, lack of due process, and exceptions to the precepts of natural justice such as bias.

      ii. If an appeal is upheld, UAPWC will immediately review the animal use protocol in question. Decisions by UAPWC on appeals are final.

3. ~~Ethics Review for Animal Use~~ ETHICS REVIEW OF ANIMAL USE

   a. The University's animal care and use program is premised on collegial relations among its members.

   b. ~~No person~~ University of Alberta staff and trainees shall not use an animal for ~~the purposes of~~ research, teaching, or testing ~~at the University of Alberta before receiving~~ without written approval from one of the ~~appropriate established Animal Care and Use Committee~~ University's ACUCs.

   c. Each ACUC shall have a defined area of expertise and shall be capable of considering a range of research methods and animal models within that area. ACUCs are mandated to approve, reject, propose modifications to or terminate the approval of any proposed or ongoing animal use that is subject to review under this Policy. PIs should apply to ACUC best equipped to review the proposed animal use for which approval is requested.

   d. ACUC has the authority to:

      i. stop any procedure if it considers that unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress is being experienced by the animal;

      ii. stop immediately any use of animals that is not described in an approved protocol or that deviates from an approval protocol; and

      ~~i.~~iii. direct that any animal be humanely euthanized if it is experiencing unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress that cannot be alleviated.

b.e. If the University of Alberta is either the host or home institution for shared animal research protocols a PI is collaborating with researchers at other institutions to conduct animal research, the the CCAC Guideline *Policy Statement* for *Animal-Based Projects Involving Two or More Institutions* shall will apply.

4. Accountability and TransparencyACCOUNTABILITY

a.

b.a. Every effort shall be made to cooperate with the Alberta Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the news media, and the public regarding the use of animals in research, teaching and testingThe University of Alberta aspires to the highest standards of animal care and use and is regularly assessed by CCAC in accordance with its standards of GAP – Good Animal Practice.

5. Procurement of AnimalsPROCUREMENT, USE, HOUSING AND MAINTENANCE OF ANIMALS

a.

a. Typically, Animals animals must be ordered from obtained through one of the University of Alberta approved animal facilities **animal services units**, except animals used in the field.

b. All approved animal use must receive veterinarian oversight from one of the animal services units.

c. Whenever possible, animal procedures should be conducted in facilities managed by one of the animal services units.

d. Animal procedures may be conducted in other locations, provided they are suitable and both the location and procedures, including the transfer of the animals, has been approved by ACUC and the University's Office of Environmental Health and Safety (EHS).

b.e. Animals will normally be housed in facilities managed and maintained by one of the animal services units.

c.f. In certain circumstances, a PI may apply for special permission to house animals in an alternate site. Refer to the *Special Requests for Alternate Animal Housing Procedure*.

6. Maintenance of AnimalsACCESS TO ANIMALS AND FACILITIES

a. All animals maintained at the University of Alberta and the facilities in which they are used or housed are subject to post-approval monitoring and periodic inspection by the University Veterinarian, UAPWC, Animal Care and Use CommitteesACUCs, and Directors of Animal Care Services and staff of the animal services units, EHS and REO staff. These people must have access at all times to all areas where animals are housed or used.

b. Detailed triennial program assessments shall be carried out by CCAC assessment panels.

7. ANIMAL USER TRAINING

To promote the highest standards of animal care and use, all University of Alberta staff and trainees engaged in the care and use of animals must, at a minimum, be trained in the principles and ethics of animal care and use. University of Alberta staff and trainees:

a. associated with an animal use protocol must successfully complete Part 1 Institutional Animal User Training and provide REO with proof of completion.

b. engaged in animal care and use must also complete relevant Part 2 Institutional Animal User Training appropriate to the species of animal and the procedure(s) to be performed. No person shall handle animals or perform any procedures with animals until they have completed appropriate Part 2 training.

8. EUTHANASIA

a. Any veterinarian licensed by the Province of Alberta called upon to attend an animal used in an University ACUC approved protocol is delegated authority to stop any unapproved procedure or any procedure causing unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress to the animal, and to humanely euthanize any animal believed to be in unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress that cannot be alleviated. The veterinarian will consult with the PI and ACUC Chair, if possible, and will salvage research data, if possible. The veterinarian will send a written report to the PI, the ACUC Chair and the veterinarian who reviewed the protocol following any such event.

b. University veterinarian staff may delegate authority to humanely euthanize animals to senior animal services unit staff.

c. PIs are responsible for ensuring approved protocol endpoints are met. Every effort must be made to identify and humanely euthanize morbid animals prior to reaching a moribund state (a state of dying).

~~7.~~9. ~~Non-Compliance~~NON-COMPLIANCE

~~a.~~

~~b.~~a. ~~Conducting animal~~ Animal ~~research~~ use that has not been reviewed and approved by an ~~Animal Care and Use Committee~~ACUC will constitute non-compliance.

~~c.~~b. Animal use that contravenes this ~~policy~~ Policy constitutes non-compliance.

~~d.~~ Non-compliance may represent research misconduct. See the *Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy*.

~~e.~~c.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. **[▲Top]**	
Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, ~~breeding,~~ or testing purposes ~~at the~~ by University of Alberta staff or trainees. ~~Includes animals held within the *bona fide* University of Alberta Facilities, approved special requests for alternative animal housing, and animals used in field studies.~~
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) ~~Guidelines~~	The ~~*Guide to the Care and Use of Experimental Animals*, Volume 1, 2nd Edition, 1993, and Volume 2, 1984, and guidelines and policies, as amended or replaced from time to time, published by the Canadian Council on Animal Care~~national organization responsible for setting and maintaining standards for the ethical use and care of animals used in science (research, teaching and testing) in Canada.
~~Researcher~~Principal Investigator (PI)	~~Includes, but is not limited to faculty members, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, non-academic staff, companies renting space in University animal facilities, and external persons and organizations conducting research in affiliation with the University of Alberta.~~A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as described in an approved animal use protocol.
Animal Services Units	Animal facilities established and operated by the University of Alberta as ongoing administrative units to provide veterinary and animal care staff, infrastructure, training, oversight and other resources to support the use of animals in research, teaching and testing by University staff and trainees. They currently are: Agricultural Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (AFNSAS), Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS) and Science Animal Support Services (SASS).

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. **[▲Top]**

Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (Government of Canada)

Animal-Based Projects Involving Two or More Institutions (CCAC)

~~Animal Care and Use Committee: Biosciences (University of Alberta)~~

~~Animal Care and Use Committee: Health Sciences (University of Alberta)~~

~~Animal Care and Use Committee: Livestock (University of Alberta)~~

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

~~Memorandum of Understanding on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards (NSERC)University of Alberta~~ Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy (~~University of Alberta~~UAPPOL)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

PUBLISHED PROCEDURES OF THIS POLICY

Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedure

Animal Care and Use Committee Structure, Application and Review Procedure

Animal Care and Use Post-Approval Monitoring Procedure

Animal Care and Use Standard Operating Procedures: Definition, Creation, Approval and Management Procedure

~~Administration of~~ Animal ~~Research~~ Care and Use Roles and Responsibilities Procedure ~~(Roles and Responsibilities)~~
~~Animal Care and Use Committee Scientific and Pedagogic Merit Review Procedure~~

~~Animal Ethics Review Procedure~~~~Animal Euthanasia Procedure~~Institutional Animal User Training Procedure

~~Animal Maintenance:~~ Special Requests for ~~Alternative~~Alternate Animal ~~Holding/~~Housing Procedure

Approval Date: September 1, 2015

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

Animal Care and Use Committee Structure, Application and Review Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO)
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with this University procedure extends to all members of the University community who use **animals** in research, teaching or testing.

Overview

Ethics approval must be obtained before any use of animals for research, teaching or testing is undertaken.

Purpose

– Define the structure of Animal Care and Use Committees (ACUCs) at the University of Alberta.

– Define the decision making and review requirements for ethics review of animal use.

– Describe the basic procedures for application for and ethics review of animal use.

PROCEDURE

1. STRUCTURE OF ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEES AND GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

   a. The University of Alberta, through the Vice-President (Research) and the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC), shall establish such number of ACUCs as determined appropriate. ACUCs will be organized around models of animal use and their composition will conform with the requirements outlined in the **Canadian Council for Animal Care** (CCAC) *Policy Statement: Terms of Reference for Animal Care Committees.*

   b. It is the shared responsibility of the **Principal Investigator (PI),** the **animal services unit** providing housing and/or veterinarian oversight and ACUC to ensure the ethical conduct of animal care and use and to promote animal welfare consistent with CCAC requirements. Whether a PI works with animals or not, s/he is responsible for the animal care and use performed by his/her staff and trainees.

   c. ACUCs shall apply the principles adopted in the *Animal Ethics Policy* in review of an animal use application. ACUCs should be aware of, and be willing to consider and suggest, a range of approaches to promote the ethical conduct of animal use. No animal use application will require approval from more than one ACUC. ACUC may request additional veterinarian and facility input if necessary. Each ACUC will accept, and rely on, the reviews of the other ACUCs.

   d. ACUCs shall function impartially, provide a fair and constructive review with respect to an application and provide reasoned and appropriately documented opinions and decisions. ACUCs should make their decisions on the ethical acceptability of animal use in an efficient and timely manner, and shall communicate all decisions in writing, in print or by electronic means. The deliberations of ACUCs are confidential.

   e. Ethics review will be based on fully detailed animal use applications submitted for review through the Research and Ethics Management Online (REMO) system. The animal use applications will include the information defined in the *CCAC Guidelines on: Animal Utilization Protocol Review* and the *CCAC Policy Statement: Terms of Reference for Animal Care Committees.*

f. REO will provide administrative support for ACUCs.

2. DECISION MAKING AND REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

a. ACUC must ensure that each animal use application has been found to have scientific or pedagogical merit through independent peer review before approving the application.

i. In the case of research funded through a competitive peer review process, confirmation of funding or a score in the fundable range will typically be accepted as evidence of peer review. Such merit review will be acceptable for five years from the date of review or such other time as ACUC may decide.

ii. For teaching applications, evidence of *a priori* consultation with, or involvement of, the relevant animal services unit in the development and approval of the course content and methods must accompany evidence of pedagogical review by the academic unit. ACUC may request additional review.

iii. For animal use applications that have not received peer review, the PI will be asked to suggest the names of a minimum of two subject matter experts to review animal use protocols. REO will maintain a bank of reviewers and will consult with the PI's Department Chair and/or Associate/Vice Dean (Research) to select reviewers as required.

iv. REO will coordinate an impartial peer review process, following which the anonymized reviewers' comments will be provided to the PI. If the reviews do not warrant any changes to the animal use application, ACUC will complete its review. If changes are recommended, the application will be returned to the PI for appropriate action and the PI's Department Chair and/or Associate/Vice Dean will be asked to verify that the PI has addressed any concerns before ACUC completes its review.

b. All new animal use protocols and fourth year renewals of ongoing protocols will be reviewed by full ACUC.

c. Annual review of ongoing protocols may be done by a subcommittee of ACUC consisting of the ACUC Chair or designate (a scientific member of ACUC), a veterinarian and one community member for up to three annual reviews. At any time a subcommittee member can stipulate that the protocol go to full ACUC review.

d. While the disposition of any individual review rests solely and exclusively with either ACUC, or in the event of an appeal, with UAPWC, ACUCs are accountable to UAPWC for ensuring their processes are consistent with University of Alberta policy and procedures. In the event of a disagreement about the interpretation or application of policy, procedures or guidelines, the Chair of UAPWC shall have final authority.

e. To change approved animal use, except where necessary to eliminate any unanticipated harmful effects to the animals, the PI must submit, and receive ACUC approval for, an amendment to his/her animal use application.

f. The ACUC Chair may, in exceptional circumstances, review and approve interim animal use on the understanding that a fully detailed animal use application will be reviewed by full ACUC at its next meeting.

3. NEW AND ONGOING ANIMAL USE PROTOCOL REVIEW

a. All applications for animal ethics review at the University of Alberta will be managed through the Research and Ethics Management Online (REMO) system. A PI should choose the ACUC best qualified to review his/her application. The receiving ACUC may redirect an application that would be more suitably reviewed by another ACUC and shall notify the PI as necessary. An animal use application will be checked for operational implications by the animal services unit(s) that will provide veterinarian oversight for the proposed animal use. The animal use application will then be received by an ACUC Coordinator and, following an administrative review and in consultation with the ACUC Chair, be assigned for review by ACUC.

b. Applications for animal ethics review will be distributed to all members of ACUC. They may be reviewed by the committee as a whole and/or by specific assigned reviewers, as well as the ACUC Chair or Associate Chair, the veterinarian and the community member(s).

c. If the ACUC Chair, the veterinarian or one of the primary reviewers determines additional expertise is necessary for appropriate review, *ad hoc* reviewers will be asked to review the animal use application.

d. At the discretion of the ACUC Chair, the PI will be invited to attend the ACUC meeting at which his/her new or fourth year renewal application is being considered, in order to clarify details of the proposed animal use.

e. If ACUC determines that changes are required, those requirements will be communicated in writing to the PI by the ACUC Coordinator. Once the PI has made changes, the ACUC Chair will issue the approval if s/he is satisfied the requirements have been met, or will refer the application to full ACUC or members of the ACUC if not satisfied. ACUC will make decisions by consensus wherever possible. See *Animal Care and Use Roles and Responsibilities Procedure* for additional details.

f. Ethics approval for animal use is issued for twelve (12) months at a time or for such shorter period of time specified in the approval.

   i. Where animal use requires ongoing ACUC approval, it is the responsibility of the PI to ensure that an annual report and application for renewal is made in sufficient time before the expiry date of the approval to permit review and approval.

   ii. A complete renewal, including a fully updated animal use application, must be submitted after three consecutive renewals or when otherwise deemed necessary by ACUC.

   iii. If the PI does not provide an annual report by the approval expiry date, the protocol will be closed and no further animal work will be allowed. ACUC, the animal services unit and REO will work with the PI to find an appropriate resolution to any affected animal care and use.

   iv. To facilitate animal ordering and financial administration, the Research Services Office and the animal services unit(s) will be notified by REO when an application is approved and when approval is renewed or expires or the application is closed.

4. AMENDMENTS TO AN APPROVED ANIMAL USE PROTOCOL

From time to time, approved animal use protocols may need to be amended to incorporate new procedures or design, new animal numbers or strains, changes in personnel and other changes to the animal use. Amendments to an approved animal use protocol must be completed using REMO and must be approved by the same ACUC that provided the original approval before amendments can be implemented. Depending on the scope of the amendment(s) and the implications for animal care and use, the PI may submit an amendment or may be required to submit a new animal use protocol.

a. Administrative amendments, including reduction in number of animals used, change in strain of animal(s), funding changes and personnel/contact information changes can be submitted at any time and will be received by the ACUC Coordinator on behalf of ACUC.

b. Amendments that have little or no impact on the approved animal use may be approved by the ACUC Chair. These include changes in animal procedures or drugs used (where the effects on the animal are equivalent), moderate increases in animal numbers (≤25% of the number previously approved), addition of animal species/strains that are not known to have specific housing/care requirements and changes in the use of hazardous agents, subject to Environmental Health and Safety review. At any time, the ACUC Chair can send the amendment to full ACUC, or a subcommittee thereof, for review. Minor changes in anesthetic or analgesic made on the recommendation of a veterinarian to improve the welfare of an animal can be made without review but must be reported as a refinement in the next annual report.

c. Amendments that have more than minor impact on animal use will be reviewed by a sub-committee of ACUC, including the Chair, the veterinarian and a community member and, at their discretion, approved or referred to full ACUC for review. These include changes in species, sex, breed, strain (with health implications), age and genetic manipulation that will alter the animal procedures, introduce earlier endpoints, or trigger specific housing/care requirements, increase in animal numbers by more than 25%, change in anesthetic agent or use of analgesic agents, changes in method of euthanasia, new procedure or manipulation, particularly ones judged to result in increased potential for pain and distress and change in duration, frequency or number of procedures performed. At any time, either the ACUC Chair or the ACUC veterinarian can send the amendment to full ACUC review.

d. Major changes to the approved animal use protocol will normally require submission of a new animal use application which must be reviewed by full ACUC. Examples of major changes include a change in the main objective of the study or direction of research, a change from non-survival to survival surgery, an increase in the category of invasiveness, addition of category D procedures to a category D protocol and withholding or reducing substantially the use of analgesics or other drugs or procedures which provide comfort or safety for an animal handler.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching or testing by University staff or trainees.
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)	The national organization responsible for setting and maintaining standards for the ethical use and care of animals used in science (research, teaching and testing) in Canada.
Principal Investigator (PI)	A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as describe in an approved animal use protocol.
Animal Services Units	Animal facilities established and operated by the University of Alberta as ongoing administrative units to provide veterinary and animal care staff, infrastructure, training, oversight and other resources to support use of animals in research, teaching and testing by University staff and trainees. They currently are: Agricultural Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (AFNSAS), Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS) and Science Animal Support Services (SASS).

FORMS

No Forms for this Procedure.

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (Government of Canada)

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy (UAPPOL)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Original Approval Date: January 11, 2010

Most Recent Approval Date: September 1, 2015

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO) ~~– University Veterinarian~~
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with this University procedure extends to all members of the University community who use ~~animals~~ **animals** for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

~~In cases where a~~ A **Principal Investigator** (PI) has the right to request, and the Animal Care and use Committee (ACUC) has an obligation to provide reconsideration of a negative decision by ACUC. If the PI and ACUC cannot achieve agreement through reconsideration, the PI may appeal the disputed decision of ACUC to the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC) in accordance with this Procedure. ~~would like to appeal a decision of an **Animal Care and Use Committee** (ACUC), the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) policy statement on: *Terms of Reference for Animal Care Committees* (ACCs) states in Section 3.i that one of the responsibilities of the ACC is to "*define an institutional appeal mechanism that can be used by the author of a protocol in the event that **animal** use is not approved by the ACC. This mechanism should include appropriate expertise and ensure a separate, fair and impartial process. The CCAC may be called upon for information purposes; however, appeals cannot be directed to the CCAC.*"~~

Purpose

To specify the grounds for an appeal of a decision by an ~~Animal Care and Use Committee~~ ACUC and to detail the procedures to be followed in the event of an appeal.

PROCEDURE

1. If a PI, after exhausting all reasonable attempts to resolve disagreements cooperatively, disputes an ACUC decision, the PI (appellant) may appeal that decision to ~~the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (~~UAPWC~~)~~.
2. Only ~~the~~ UAPWC may hear an appeal of a decision of an ACUC of the University of Alberta. An appeal may only be made on the grounds that there has been a miscarriage of justice, such as an error in process, procedural irregularity, lack of due process, and exceptions to precepts of natural justice such as bias.
3. The decisions of ~~the~~ UAPWC are final and binding.
4. ~~The~~ UAPWC shall hear an appeal from the same appellant against the same decision only once.
5. A written appeal of an ACUC decision, outlining the grounds for the appeal and accompanied by supporting documentation, must be submitted by the PI to the Administrative Director of ~~the Research Ethics Office (~~REO~~)~~ within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the written ACUC decision.
6. ~~The~~ UAPWC members will be asked in advance of a hearing to declare any possible bias and, if ~~so~~ bias is declared, will not be called upon to hear the appeal. No UAPWC member will hear an appeal if ~~the said member~~ s/he participated in the ACUC decision being appealed. The appellant may request that any UAPWC member not be part of the appeal process on the grounds that the member's presence would bias and prevent a fair hearing. If the UAPWC Chair is, for any reason, unable to chair the appeal hearing, the Administrative Director of REO will identify another member of ~~the~~ UAPWC to serve as chair for the appeal hearing.
7. The Administrative Director of REO will acknowledge receipt of the appeal in writing to the appellant, and will forward the appeal and current procedures for appeal to the Chair of ~~the~~ UAPWC, and the Chair of ~~the~~ ACUC concerned.

8. The Chair of ~~the~~ ACUC (respondent) must provide a written response to the appeal within ten (10) working days. This written response will include the following information:
   a. All documents available at the ACUC meeting(s) related to the appeal;
   b. All minutes of the ACUC meeting(s) related to the appeal;
   c. A response to the PI's grounds for appeal; and
   d. Any comments on the alleged miscarriage of justice and on the relief requested.
9. For the purposes of an appeal hearing, the Chair of ~~the~~ UAPWC may augment ~~the~~ UAPWC's membership by adding faculty members who serve on University of Alberta ACUCs. These special members will be asked in advance of a hearing to declare any possible bias; if any such bias is present the member will not be called upon to hear the appeal. Both the appellant and the respondent will have the right to challenge these additional members.
10. REO will convene a meeting of ~~the~~ UAPWC, with provisions for presentations by the appellant and the respondent, within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the appeal. The appellant will present the grounds for the appeal and speak to the issues. The respondent will present the reasons for the decision of ~~the~~ ACUC and speak to the issues. Both sides may call witnesses and question the other parties. Both sides may have an advisor present during the hearing; however, the advisors may not be called as witnesses or participate in the presentations and questions.
11. ~~The~~ UAPWC, having heard the oral presentations of both parties and having reviewed the written and supporting documentation, shall be the sole judge of the facts and shall, by majority vote, reach a decision before adjourning the appeal hearing. The Chair of ~~the~~ UAPWC will, within ten (10) days of the appeal hearing, provide a written decision to REO. REO will transmit the decision to the appellant, the respondent and to such other parties as deemed appropriate.
12. If the appeal is upheld, UAPWC will immediately view the animal use application in question.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, ~~breeding,~~ or testing ~~purposes at the~~ by University staff or trainees. ~~Includes animals held within the recognized University of Alberta facilities, approved special requests for alternate animal holding/housing, and animals used in field studies.~~
Principal Investigator (PI)	~~The person on a research proposal, application, agreement, contract or award responsible for the conduct of the research project.~~ A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as describe in an approved animal use protocol.

FORMS

~~There are no~~No forms for this Procedure. [▲Top]

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

~~Animal Care and Use Committee: Biosciences (University of Alberta)~~

~~Animal Care and Use Committee: Health Sciences (University of Alberta)~~

~~Animal Care and Use Committee: Livestock (University of Alberta)~~

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy (UAPPOL)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Original Approval Date: June 2, 2005

Most Recent Approval Date: September 1, 2015

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

~~Animal Maintenance:~~ Special Requests for Alternate Animal ~~Holding/~~Housing Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office~~University Veterinarian~~ (REO)
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with this University procedure extends to all members of the University community who use ~~animals~~ **animals** for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

Animal facilities are expensive and complex to plan, design, build and maintain. Existing and planned facilities must meet **Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)** guidelines. In addition, animal care is best carried out or overseen by animal health professionals whose primary goal is animal health and welfare in the service of high quality science. In cases where a **Principal Investigator (PI)** ~~(PI)~~ has a compelling justification to hold animals for more than 24 hours in an area that is not managed by one of the **animal services units**, the design and use of the alternate animal housing and the care of the animals housed, therefore, must follow CCAC guidelines and will require active collaboration between the PI, the animal services unit and the relevant Animal Care and Use Committee (ACUC). ~~requires **alternate animal holding/housing,** exemplary **animal** care and use practices are required in accordance with applicable laws and the **Canadian Council on Animal Care** (CCAC) **guidelines** as well as the *Tri-Council requirements Memorandum of Understanding on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards*. This procedure outlines the process for application approval and supervision of these facilities.~~

Purpose

Identify the ~~procedure to be followed for special requests for~~process for application, approval and supervision of alternate animal ~~holding/~~housing.

PROCEDURE

Animals obtained by the University of Alberta should be housed in facilities operated by one of the animal services units whenever possible. A PI may apply to house animals in alternate animal housing, provided:

a. The PI has a compelling justification to establish and maintain alternate animal housing.

b. The alternate animal housing is appropriately constructed or renovated for animal care and use.

c. The Committee for Animal Resources (CAR), a subcommittee of the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC), approves the alternate animal housing design and its proposed use.

d. The alternate animal housing is linked to an active, approved animal use application.

e. An ACUC approves the animal use in the alternate animal housing.

f. The PI and/or his/her research personnel have the training necessary to provide animal care on par with care provided by the animal services unit.

g. One of the animal services units provides appropriate veterinarian oversight and services for animal care and use in the alternate animal housing.

~~A request for animal holding/housing is required when there is a compelling **justification** for the need to hold or house animals for more than 12 hours, if the recognized animal facilities are unable to accommodate them. Normally, animal procedures will be conducted in one of the **recognized animal facilities**. The PI must make application to the~~

~~applicable **Animal Care and Use Committee** (ACUC) using the following form, *Alternate Animal Holding/Housing Request*.~~

1. ~~**APPROVAL IS A THREE-PART PROCESS**~~APPROVAL OF THE ALTERNATE ANIMAL HOUSING

   The PI must apply to CAR for approval of construction of a new space to house animals or renovation of any existing space in order to house animals in that space.

   a. As part of its deliberations, CAR will determine if the research needs can be met in existing facilities and will consult with the Chair of the relevant ACUC concerning approval of the animal use. Once CAR has approved the project and the construction or renovation is underway, the PI should provide updates to CAR and confirm when the work is complete~~The appropriate **Director of Animal Care** certifies that the research needs cannot be met in the recognized animal facilities~~.

   ~~b. The Biosafety Officer in collaboration with the Research Ethics Office Animal Policy and Welfare Program, issues a permit for the holding/housing space following a successful audit of the proposed site.~~

   ~~c.~~b. CAR will then conduct a site visit, and pending completion of any deficiencies, provide written approval of the alternate animal housing.~~The ACUC approves the ethics and justification for the request.~~

2. APPROVAL TO HOUSE ANIMALS IN ALTERNATE ANIMAL HOUSING ~~**2. CONDITIONS**~~

   a. Once CAR has approved the alternate ~~Alternate~~ animal ~~holding/~~housing, the PI must apply to ACUC for approval to house animals in that location as part of the regular animal use application process. The application should include the PI's justification for the alternate animal housing and CAR's final approval of the housing, as well as an operations manual for animal care in that location and the contract services agreement with the relevant animal services unit. ~~sites may not be used until a permit is issued.~~

   ~~b.~~ Once ACUC has approved the request to house animals in the alternate animal housing, animals may be housed there. The alternate animal housing will then be subject to annual site assessments by ACUC, as well as any other conditions ACUC may impose.~~The approval for alternate animal holding/housing is valid for one year. The PI must renew the application with the *Annual Report* of an approved protocol.~~

   b.

   c. Animals on other animal use protocols may not be housed in that alternate animal housing unless ACUC has approved a specific application for such an arrangement and the housing will accommodate the additional animals.

~~3. The PI is required to develop a business plan which includes **Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)** for animal care in alternate animal holding/housing sites. The audit will be, in part, to ensure that the alternate housing site has proper containment and ventilation infrastructure in place to prevent undue exposure of neighboring personnel to animal dander and odors.~~

~~4. Approval from the appropriate Director of Animal Care must be provided prior to any animal re-entering a recognized animal facility after being held at an alternate housing site.~~

~~5. Documentation of daily animal care must be maintained and made available for viewing on request, by the University Veterinarian, the Director of Animal Care, or their designate.~~

~~6. The PI must post or have available the permit for alternate holding/housing in the animal room.~~

~~7. The University Veterinarian, all Directors of Animal Care or their designate, shall have unlimited access at any time to all approved locations where animals are being maintained and/or used within the confines of their designated area(s) of responsibility. Alternate animal holding/housing sites may be subject to increased levels of monitoring.~~

~~8. Alternate holding/housing of animals is subject to the source animal facility **per diem** charges and arrangements must be made with the facility administration for necessary services such as cage washing, animal disease surveillance, and shipping and receiving animals at the time of application.~~

~~9. The PI must inform the ACUC, the Director of Animal Care and the University Biosafety Officer when an alternate animal holding/housing site is no longer being used.~~

~~10. The PI must inform the Director of Animal Care and the University Biosafety Officer in the event an animal is reported missing from an alternate animal holding/housing location.~~

3. OPERATION OF ALTERNATE ANIMAL HOUSING

a. Ongoing approval for alternate animal housing is contingent on ongoing requirement for the housing as well as continuing approval for the animal use protocol and maintenance of a contract services agreement with the animal services unit.

b. The PI must inform ACUC, the animal services unit and the University's Environmental Health and Safety Office when alternate animal housing is no longer required.

c. The PI must inform the animal services unit and the University Biosafety Officer within twenty-four (24) hours of learning that an animal is missing from alternate animal housing, or if evidence of insect or rodent pests is found in the alternate animal housing location.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, ~~breeding,~~ or testing purposes ~~at the~~ by University of Alberta staff and trainees. ~~Includes animals held within the recognized University of Alberta facilities, approved special requests for alternate animal holding/housing, and animals used in field studies.~~
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) ~~**Guidelines**~~	The national organization responsible for setting and maintaining standards for the ethical use and care of animals used in science (research, teaching and testing) in Canada. ~~The *Guide to the Care and Use of Experimental Animals*, Volume 1, 2nd Edition, 1993, and Volume 2, 1984, and guidelines and policies, as amended or replaced from time to time, published by the Canadian Council on Animal Care.~~
Principal Investigator (PI)	~~A faculty member of the University of Alberta eligible for membership in AAS:UA which would include Professor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor Emeritus, Faculty Service Officer and or Administrative Professional Officer. Adjunct Professor can be included subject to approval from the Dean or designate.~~ A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as described in an approved animal use protocol.
Animal Services Units	Animal facilities established and operated by the University of Alberta as ongoing administrative units to provide veterinary and animal care staff, infrastructure, training, oversight and other resources to support use of animals in research, teaching and testing by University staff and trainees. They currently are: Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (AFNSAS), Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS) and Science Animal Support Services (SASS).

FORMS

~~Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca~~No Forms for this Procedure. [▲Top]

~~Alternate Animal Holding/Housing Request (University of Alberta)~~

~~Annual Report (University of Alberta)~~

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (Government of Canada)

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

~~Memorandum of Understanding on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, NSERC)~~

Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy (UAPPOL)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Original Approval Date: June 2, 2005

Most Recent Approval Date: September 1, 2015

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

~~Administration of Animal Research Procedure~~ (Animal Care and Use Roles and Responsibilities~~)~~ Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO) ~~– University Veterinarian~~
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with this University ~~policy~~ procedure extends to all members of the University community who use **animals** ~~animals~~ for research, teaching or testing.

~~Overview~~

~~The *Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards* mandates that the University comply with these ***Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines***. All research, teaching and testing using **animals** requires review and approval by an authorized Animal Care and Use Committee before the animal use begins. These procedures state the authority and mandate of these committees.~~

Purpose

~~– Identify the mandate and powers of the major bodies involved in the administration of animal welfare policies at the University of Alberta.~~

Describe the membership, roles and responsibilities of the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC) and its sub-committees.

– Describe the membership, roles and responsibilities of the Animal Care and Use Committees (ACUCs).

– Describe the roles and responsibilities of the **animal services units**.

PROCEDURE

1. UNIVERSITY ANIMAL POLICY AND WELFARE COMMITTEE ~~University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee~~ (UAPWC)

   a. ~~The~~ UAPWC is a standing committee of the Vice-President (Research) and is the institutional animal care and use committee for the University of Alberta. UAPWC oversees all animal care and use performed under the jurisdiction of the University to ensure humane and ethical treatment of animals in compliance with University and **Canadian Council on Animal Care** **(CCAC)** policies, guidelines, standards and procedures. As the institutional animal care and use committee, UAPWC:

      i. recommends to the Vice-President (Research) on policies, procedures and standards for animal care and use at the University;

      ii. oversees and monitors the work of ACUCs to which it has delegated responsibility for reviewing and managing animal use applications and ensures that ACUCs meet or exceed CCAC guidelines on animal care use;

      iii. ensures all animal users are aware of their responsibility to remain in compliance with University standards for animal care and use;

      iv. supports and promotes education and training opportunities for University staff and trainees on the ethics of animal care and use in research, teaching and testing;

v. advises the Vice-President (Research) about significant events in animal care and use and provides an annual report to the Vice-President (Research) on the status of the University's animal care and use program;

vi. directs and promotes the post-approval monitoring program for animal care and use;

vii. recommends to the Vice-President (Research) on the construction, maintenance, or closure of University animal facilities;

viii. supports and promotes communication among and between the animal services units, **Principal Investigators (PIs)** and ACUCs to facilitate integrated and collaborative delivery of a comprehensive University-wide institutional animal care and use program;

ix. reviews regularly (at least every three years) the terms of reference of ACUCs;

x. hears appeals by PIs of negative decisions by an ACUC (see *Animal Care and Use Committee Appeal Procedure*), and

xi. supports a coordinated crisis management program for the animal services units in conjunction with the University's Integrated Emergency Master Plan.~~.~~

b. The Vice-President (Research) will appoint the following members, typically for three-year terms: the UAPWC Chair, two graduate student representatives, a representative of faculty animal users, a faculty member who does not engage in animal care and use, and two community members.

The following are *ex officio* members of UAPWC: the Vice-President (Research) or designate, the University Veterinarian, the Executive Director of REO, the Associate/Vice Deans (Research) of the Faculty of Science, the Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences and the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, the Chairs of ACUCs, the Directors of animal services units, the Biosafety Officer, the Post-Approval Monitoring Coordinator and the Chair of the Cross Cancer Institute Animal Care Committee.

~~b.~~c. UAPWC will meet at least twice per year and as often as necessary to fulfil its responsibilities. Quorum will constitute 50% of the membership plus one, including at least one veterinarian, once ACUC Chair and one community member. REO will serve as the secretariat for UAPWC.

~~c. The UAPWC shall oversee all use of animals at the University of Alberta and assure that they are used according to established Policies and Regulations.~~

~~2. The UAPWC shall be responsible for approving the establishment of any smaller specialized laboratory animal facilities for the use of individual departments or faculties through the appropriate supervisory Dean and the Vice-President (Research).~~

~~3.~~2. COMMITTEE FOR ANIMAL RESOURCES ~~Committee for Animal Resources~~ (CAR)

a. ~~The~~ CAR is ~~an executive advisory committee for the~~a standing committee of UAPWC. CAR concerns itself with evaluation of and planning for University animal facility use and development. It is comprised of the University Veterinarian, the Executive Director of REO, the Directors of the animal services units, the Biosafety Officer, a representative from Facilities and Operations, and the Chair of UAPWC.

b. ~~The Purpose of~~ CAR's specific responsibilities include ~~is~~:

i. ~~to~~ evaluat~~inge~~ and ~~make~~ making recommendations regarding ~~the need to~~ upgrades to existing animal facilities, development of new facilities, and ~~close~~closure of ~~existing~~ facilities that do not meet ~~*CCAC Guidelines*~~ CCAC guidelines;

ii. ~~to~~ review~~ing~~ and approv~~inge~~ all plans for new structures or renovations to existing facilities~~,~~ designed for animals, to ensure that CCAC guidelines for facilities are met or, when possible, exceeded;

iii. ~~to annually~~touring ~~assess~~ all University of Alberta animal facilities, at least every three years, to evaluate operations, maintenance and repair requirements;

iv. ~~to~~ setting priorities/recommendations for any Facility Alteration Request (FAR) ~~approval~~ submitted by UAPWC;

v. ~~to~~ provid~~e~~ing a consultation service to faculty ~~during the~~ recruitment process~~es~~ ~~for the University of Alberta~~when animal use is anticipated;

vi. developing an integrated communication plan to address the needs of the research community and animal users, in particular to assist Facilities and Operations to provide timely and effective support for animal services units and PIs, in particular those operating alternate animal housing sites in the event of emergency, including power or HVAC failure, fire, flood, intrusion or criminal activities;

~~v.~~ identifying research trends involving animal use to facilitate long-term planning for facilities and infrastructure requirements.~~vi. to review Approval in Principle applications submitted to the Research Ethics Office (REO); and;~~

vii. ~~vii. to draft policy/recommendations under the direction of~~

c. CAR shall meet at least quarterly, at the call of the Chair and as often as necessary to fulfil its responsibilities. Quorum will constitute 50% of the membership plus one. REO will serve as the secretariat for CAR.

3. ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEES (ACUCs)

Responsibility

a. Animal Care and Use Committees are established by and report to UAPWC. ACUCs are: ACUC – Biosciences, ACUC – Livestock, ACUC – Health Sciences 1 and ACUC – Health Sciences 2.

b. Each ACUC is mandated to approve, reject, propose modifications to or terminate the approval of any proposed or ongoing animal use that is subject to review under this Policy. ACUCs provides quarterly reports to UAPWC on its activities. Detailed information on the scope of each ACUC and its membership is contained in the ACUCs' Terms of Reference and UAPWC records maintained by REO.

c. ACUCs will review and assess animal use protocols, according to the *Animal Care and Use Committee Structure, Application and Review Procedure*, the *CCAC policy statement on: ethics of animal investigation* and CCAC guidelines on animal use protocol review as well as any other relevant CCAC guidelines and policy statements.

d. ACUCs will work with the staff of the animal services units to ensure compliance with its decisions and with the conditions set out in approved animal use protocols.

e. ACUCs will conduct annual on-site reviews of all the animal care facilities and areas in which animals are used associated with the animal use protocols it reviews. ACUCs will develop alternatives to on-site reviews for research conducted in the field.

f. ~~–~~ACUCs will receive and follow-up unanticipated adverse event reports as required.

g. ACUCs will implement strategies and recommendations arising from post-approval monitoring activities as required.

h. ACUCs will contribute to and participate in CCAC site visits and assessments and other such assessments as required.

Membership

A dynamic and collaborative peer review process is vital to the animal care and use program. Senior administrators at all levels of the institution should acknowledge, support and, wherever possible, recognize the work of current ACUC members and assist with identification and recruitment of new members. Facility veterinarians and staff who serve on ACUCs, like researchers who are also reviewers, must be able to provide support and advocacy for both scientific excellence and ethical and humane use of animals according to CCAC guidelines. ACUCs, the animal services units and the PIs share responsibility for the effectiveness of the university animal care and use program.

i. The ACUC Chair will typically be selected from among the current scientific/faculty membership of ACUC and will be appointed by the Vice-President (Research).

j. Normally, ACUC members will be appointed by REO for terms of no less than two years and no more than four years, renewable to a maximum of eight consecutive years of service. The voting membership will include:

i. faculty/scientific members experienced in animal care and use and representative of the animal use commonly reviewed by ACUC;

ii. a veterinarian experienced in experimental animal care and use;

iii. the Director of the animal services unit, who may also be a veterinarian, most closely aligned with the majority of the animal use reviewed by the ACUC;

iv. an institutional member whose normal activities, past or present, do not depend on or involve animal use for research, teaching or testing;

v. at least one and preferably two or more person(s) representing community interests and concerns, who has (have) had no affiliation with the institution, who has (have) not been significantly involved in animal use for research, teaching or testing;

vi. technical staff representation (either an animal facility or an animal research technician);

vii. graduate student representation;

viii. the Chair of UAPWC or designate, and

ix. the Post-Approval Monitoring Coordinator.

The ACUC Coordinator, although not a voting member of ACUC, will provide advice and recommendations to ACUC on animal use protocols, CCAC requirements and ACUC processes.

Meetings

k. ACUCs will typically meet once a month in person or as required at the call of the Chair.

l. Decisions will, to the extent possible, be made by consensus. If consensus cannot be achieved, decisions must be supported by a simple majority of eligible voting members.

m. Quorum will constitute the Chair, one veterinarian, one community member and at least two additional scientific members, one of whom must be a faculty member.

n. ACUC members shall disclose any potential conflict of interest and recuse themselves from meetings or discussions about animal use protocols on which they are named.

o. ACUC meetings and decisions will be documented in meeting minutes, correspondence and the Research and Ethics Management Online system. ACUC records and discussions are confidential unless otherwise indicated.

p. REO will serve as the secretariat for ACUCs and will compile the annual animal use data form for CCAC.

4. ANIMAL SERVICES UNITS

In order for investigators and teachers to have animals that are healthy subjects for research, teaching or testing and for the University to meet its obligations to protect the health and welfare of the animals, there must be competent veterinary and animal care service providers whose numbers and expertise match the nature and scope of the institutional program.

a. The animal services units provide animal care and services in support of approved animal use at the University of Alberta.

b. The animal services units are responsible for ensuring that animal care is in compliance with CCAC guidelines.

c. All University operated facilities or locations where animals are used or housed must be overseen by and accountable to one of the animal services units.

d. The animal services units report to the Deans of their respective Faculties and are accountable to the Vice-President (Research) or designate for their compliance with CCAC guidelines.

~~c.~~

~~4. The University Veterinarian~~

~~a. Working with the Chair of UAPWC and pursuant to the University of Alberta policies and goals of the UAPWC, the University Veterinarian shall:~~

~~i. Ensure that University policies on the care and use of experimental animals are being implemented appropriately throughout the institution.~~

~~5. Animal Services~~

~~a. Animal Services shall provide support to any member of the University of Alberta academic staff who has the approval of the appropriate Animal Care and Use Committee to use animals for research, teaching and testing.~~

~~b. There are presently three service areas:~~

~~i. Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry).~~

~~ii. Biosciences Animal Service (Faculty of Science).~~

~~iii. Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences).~~

~~c. Animal Services shall be responsible to the Dean of the Faculty for administrative purposes and responsible to the University Veterinarian and UAPWC for all matters related to animal care and welfare.~~

~~d. Responsibility for the day-to-day supervision of all animal facilities must rest with one of the three animal services listed above.~~

~~e. Animal Services shall be responsible for ensuring that animal care is in compliance with the *CCAC Guidelines*.~~

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use.

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, ~~breeding,~~ or testing purposes ~~at the~~by University staff or trainees. ~~Includes animals held within the bona fide University of Alberta Facilities, approved special requests for alternative animal housing, and animals used in field studies.~~
Animal Services Units	Animal facilities established and operated by the University of Alberta as ongoing administrative units to provide veterinary and animal care staff, infrastructure, training, oversight and other resources to support the use of animals in research, teaching and testing by University staff and trainees. They currently are: Agricultural Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (AFNSAS), Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS) and Science Animal Support Services (SASS).~~Means the *Guide to the Care and Use of Experimental Animals*, Volume 1, 2nd Edition, 1993, and Volume 2, 1984, and guidelines and policies, as amended or replaced from time to time, published by the Canadian Council on Animal Care.~~
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) ~~Guidelines~~	The national organization responsible for setting and maintaining standards for the ethical use and care of animals used in science (research, teaching and testing) in Canada.
Principal Investigator (PI)	A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as describe in an approved animal use protocol.

FORMS

~~There are no~~No forms for this Procedure. **[▲Top]**

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

~~Memorandum of Understanding on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards (National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, NSERC)~~

Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (Government of Canada)

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Approval Date: September 1, 2015

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

Animal Care and Use Post-Approval Monitoring Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO)
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with this University procedure extends to all members of the University community who use **animals** for research, teaching and testing.

Overview

Post-approval monitoring enables **Principal Investigators** (**PIs),** animal care and use committees (ACUCs), **animal services units** and the University to assess animal care and use in practice and to close any gaps between those practices and approved animal use applications. Post-approval monitoring involves a wide range of activities, from PI self-assessments and regular animal health monitoring by the veterinarian and animal care staff to lab visits and formal observation of techniques. An effective post-approval monitoring program is based on collaborative and collegial processes relying on information from many sources, including animal use applications, animal health programs, ACUC site visits, veterinary rounds, incident reports, self-assessments, laboratory visits by staff engaged in the University Animal Policy and Welfare Program and other reports.

The **Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)** requires that the University establish and define a post-approval monitoring program to audit approved animal use applications and to provide continuing education to ensure consistency of practices with approved animal use applications and University policy and procedures. Recognizing that University research is built on scholarly integrity and trust, the starting point for post-approval monitoring is that researchers typically adhere to the activities described in their animal use applications. Consequently, post-approval monitoring will most often involve information exchange about procedures that work well, continuing education about areas that are problematic and assessments of novel issues so that best practices inform all animal care and use.

Purpose

– Describe the objectives of the post-approval monitoring program.

– Describe the components of the post-approval monitoring program and its relationship to the overall animal care and use program.

PROCEDURE

1. POST-APPROVAL MONITORING OBJECTIVES

   a. PIs**,** ACUCs, the animal services units, and senior administration share responsibility for ensuring that animal care and use performed by University staff and trainees is consistent with ACUC decisions and institutional and CCAC standards.

   b. Neither University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC) nor ACUC representatives are present when animal use protocols are conducted so they must work with PIs and members of the veterinary and animal care staff to ensure compliance with ACUC decisions and with the conditions set out in the approved animal use application.

   c. The most important partner in post-approval monitoring is the PI**.** S/he agrees to undertake his/her animal care and use in practice as approved in principle by ACUC when s/he signs the final version of the animal use application, and s/he is responsible for the conduct of his/her staff and trainees.

d. The veterinarians and animal care staff are also essential partners in post-approval monitoring as they deliver applied animal user training and provide day-to-day assistance and information with respect to animal care and use and will often be the first to learn of an animal welfare issue.

e. All University staff and students working with animals must work together in a collegial manner and attempt to correct deficiencies collaboratively.

f. Deficiencies may arise for a number of reasons, including knowledge gaps, protocol drift, poor record keeping, communication problems and human error. Deficiencies can be corrected through protocol updates or amendments, improved practice, better training and more rigorous attention to detail.

g. In the rare event there are persistent and/or deliberate breaches of compliance that threaten the health and safety of personnel or animals, these issues must be reported to the Chair of ACUC that approved the protocol and the Chair of UAPWC. Breaches of compliance or non-compliance with University policy and procedures may constitute research misconduct and will be handled according to the *Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy*.

2. POST-APPROVAL MONITORING ACTIVITIES

a. Post-approval monitoring procedures should not be unduly cumbersome or intrusive. They may be a natural extension of many animal care and use activities that are already in place and should leverage existing information and processes wherever possible. These include, for example, day-to-day observation of animal health and application of endpoints, assistance provided by ACUC personnel to animal users with their animal use applications, including processes for amending applications, site visits and discussions of animal use protocols by ACUC members and veterinary assistance and follow-up for new procedures and/or procedures more likely to result in animal pain and distress.

b. The following are examples of how post-approval monitoring activities will be incorporated with existing practices:

i. Self-Assessment – Following approval of a new animal use application, including major amendments and fourth year renewals, REO will provide the PI with a self-assessment form which s/he may complete and append to the animal use application.

ii. Veterinarian reports – A simple form, created in consultation with the animal services units, will be filled out by veterinarians after visiting a lab or attending a procedure. Each report will be appended to the relevant animal use application.

iii. ACUC facility tours – ACUC's observations related to animal procedure and housing space made during its annual visits will be appended to individual animal use applications wherever possible.

iv. Animal care reports – These could take many forms, ranging from copies of records maintained by staff in the animal services units to incident reports and post-mortems and will be appended to the animal use applications.

v. Facility Reports – The animal services units can append information on routine or non-routine events, for example, power outages, disease outbreaks, treatment and resolution, and the like.

c. The Post-Approval Monitoring Program will also involve lab visits, which may be random and unannounced or for cause. For instance, studies involving a higher category of invasiveness, complex or novel procedures, alternate animal housing or identified by ACUC as requiring additional follow-up are more likely to receive for cause visits.

3. POST-APPROVAL MONITORING RESOURCES

a. The Post-Approval Monitoring Coordinator will be housed in REO and will support the Post-Approval Monitoring Reviewers. The Post-Approval Monitoring Reviewers, between 3 and 6 knowledgeable and experienced animal users, will be recruited by the Post-Approval Monitoring Coordinator in consultation with ACUC Chairs and Chair of UAPWC.

b. The Post-Approval Monitoring Coordinator will be an ex officio member of all ACUCs and will attend all ACUC meetings. In addition, the Post-Approval Monitoring Committee members will be ACUC members and will be encouraged to attend meetings, although they will not be required to review protocols.

c. Post-approval monitoring activities and information will be captured at a protocol level in the Research Ethics and Management Online (REMO) system as much as possible.

d. REO will provide administrative support for the Post-Approval Monitoring Program.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching or testing by University staff or trainees.
Principal Investigator (PI)	A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as describe in an approved animal use protocol.
Animal Services Units	Animal facilities established and operated by the University of Alberta as ongoing administrative units to provide veterinary and animal care staff, infrastructure, training, oversight and other resources to support use of animals in research, teaching and testing by University staff and trainees. They currently are: Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (AFNSAS), Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS) and Science Animal Support Services (SASS).
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)	The national organization responsible for setting and maintaining standards for the ethical use and care of animals used in science (research, teaching and testing) in Canada.

FORMS

No Forms for this Procedure.

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (Government of Canada)

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy (UAPPOL)

Original Approval Date: June 2, 2005

Most Recent Approval Date: September 1, 2015

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

Institutional Animal User Training Program Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO)
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with this University procedure extends to all members of the University community who use **animals** for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

Consistent with its commitment to the highest possible standards in animal care and use in research, teaching and testing, the University has established and maintains an institutional animal user training program that meets or exceeds the requirements of the **Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)** and is consistent with CCAC guidelines and standards.

Purpose

- Define the responsibilities of different members of the animal care and use program with respect to animal user training.
- Define the components of the animal user training program.
- Define the training required for animal users.
- Define how animal user training records will be validated and maintained.

PROCEDURE

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

   All staff and trainees involved in the care and use of animals for research, teaching and testing must possess: an appreciation of the ethical issues surrounding the use of animals for scientific or pedagogical purposes in Canada and adequate knowledge and technical skills to humanely carry out approved procedures and to promote quality science based on the appropriate use of animals by skilled individuals.

   a. **Principal Investigators (PIs)** are responsible for ensuring that all personnel working with animals under their supervision are named on an approved animal use protocol and are adequately trained to appropriately and humanely carry out procedures on the animals in their care.

   b. Animal Care and Use Committees (ACUCs) are responsible for verifying that University personnel have the training necessary to carry out animal care and use procedures.

   c. Directors of the **animal services units** are responsible for ensuring delivery of species and technique specific training consistent with CCAC standards, institutional training requirements and approved standard operating procedures and for ensuring staff and trainees are trained for the animal care and use they conduct.

   d. The University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC) is responsible for oversight of the institutional animal user training program.

   e. REO is responsible for maintaining secure, consolidated, online records of animal user training.

   f. The Post-Approval Monitoring program will include assessments of animal users' competence and may include recommendations for additional training.

g. All members of the animal care and use program, including the staff of the animal services units, are responsible for ensuring that research personnel working with animals are humanely carrying out the approved procedures assigned to them.

2. ANIMAL USER TRAINING PROGRAM

The Institutional Animal User Program has two major components: theoretical and practical.

a. Ethics of Animal Use Training

All University staff and trainees involved in the use of animals for research, teaching and testing must complete Ethics of Animal Use training, commonly known as Part 1 training.

i. Part 1 training includes the following core topics: regulations and animal welfare, moral, legal and ethical issues and the concept of the Three Rs (Reduction, Refinement and Replacement).

ii. Part 1 training is based on material developed by CCAC and other CCAC accredited institutions, including the University of Alberta. UAPWC will review the Part 1 training, at minimum every three years. REO will, on behalf of UAPWC, manage and maintain the course content.

iii. Part 1 training is normally delivered online. REO manages access to the online course and maintains secure online records of all users who have successfully completed ethics of animal use training for reference by members of the animal care and use program.

b. Species, Technique and Other Training in Animal Use

All staff and trainees who handle or care for animals used in research, teaching or testing must be knowledgeable about the animals in their care and trained in the appropriate technical skills for the work they will perform.

i. Part 2 training is organized by species. The five core components of Part 2 species training are: basic biology, husbandry, handling and restraint, euthanasia, zoonoses and human safety.

ii. Directors of the animal services units are responsible for ensuring delivery and oversight of Part 2 training for animals regularly used in University research, teaching and testing, consistent with the animal work commonly supported by each unit.

iii. Directors of the animal services units are also responsible for ensuring delivery and oversight of techniques or procedures training relevant to the research, teaching and testing they support, either in conjunction with the Part 2 training or separately.

iv. Training provided by the animal services units will incorporate both approved unit level Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for animal care and use and approved institutional SOPs.

v. If two or more animal services units provide Part 2 training in the same species or the same procedures/techniques, the training should be consistent.

vi. Directors of the animal services units may delegate species and procedure/technique training duties to their staff commensurate with their qualifications. Competent trainers and supervisors are essential to maintaining high standards for animal care and use and trainer designations should be assigned appropriately.

vii. Directors of the animal services units will ensure that all training is supported by relevant, up-to-date resource materials and that the training content is documented.

viii. Directors of the animal services units will maintain teaching/training animal use protocols so that ACUCs review the training programs offered by the animal services units, at minimum every four years.

ix. Directors of the animal services units will ensure appropriate records of the training provided by their staff are maintained. Successful user training results will be transmitted to REO using forms developed by REO for that purpose. REO will maintain these training records in a secure online system for access by members of the animal care and use program in the course of their work.

x. Directors of the animal services units should also ensure research personnel receive orientations to their facilities, equipment and processes, including unit-level operational SOPs.

3. TRAINING REQUIREMENTS AND EXCEPTIONS

a. All University staff and trainees who are involved in the use of animals or who work in facilities where animals are housed or used must complete Part 1 Animal User training provided by the University.

   i. Although CCAC does not require community members serving on ACUCs to complete ethics of animal use training, they may take Part 1 training if they wish.

b. University staff and trainees must complete appropriate species training plus frequently used technique or procedure training before they will be allowed to work with animals.

   i. PIs who do not handle animals are encouraged to complete Part 2 training and relevant techniques and procedures training.

   ii. PIs who do not complete Part 2 training must employ research personnel with the required training and authorize them to enforce appropriate standards and practices in animal care and use. Whether or not they work with or handle animals, PIs are responsible for the care and use of animals performed by their staff and trainees.

   iii. Notwithstanding the foregoing, PIs who wish to house animals in their research areas must complete Part 2 species training and the animal services unit may require additional training for the research personnel providing animal care.

   iv. Personnel who do not participate in hands on experimental procedures or work in areas in which animals are used or housed are not required to complete Part 2 training.

   v. Directors of the animal services units may provide or authorize abbreviated species and procedures or techniques training for staff and trainees who will normally work under the supervision of trained animal users. This will be accepted as protocol specific training only and will not constitute Part 2 training.

c. New University staff and trainees who have been trained in animal care and use at other institutions may present REO with evidence of comparable training.

   i. The Chair of UAPWC may accept external Part 1 training in the ethics of animal use in lieu of the University administered training. REO will maintain records of the external training if it is accepted.

   ii. Directors of the animal services units may accept external species and technique or procedure training in lieu of such training provided by the University. If the external training is accepted, Directors will provide to REO both details of the user's training and confirmation that the user's training meets the University's standards.

d. If an animal services unit does not have the expertise to provide species or specialized procedure or technique training, the Director and the PI are responsible for identifying other sources of expertise and training.

   i. Directors of the animal services units may designate alternate trainers who may be PIs, other University personnel or other individuals not associated with the University. Designation of alternate trainers should include details of their qualifications and expertise as well as how the alternate training will be provided.

   ii. Directors of the animal services units will maintain records of alternate trainers and the animal user training they provide. Successful user training results will be transmitted by the animal services unit to REO following a standard template. REO will maintain these training records online for secure access by members of the animal care and use program in the course of their work.

4. SUPPLEMENTAL TRAINING

a. By providing continuing education opportunities for animal users, the University can promote best practices and an institutional response to new procedures, the three Rs and societal views.

b. As an animal user's responsibilities and activities change, s/he will be required to complete additional species and/or technique or procedure training.

c. Post- Approval Monitoring personnel, veterinarians and animal care staff will meet with PIs and research staff to discuss and observe procedures and make recommendations, as necessary, about ways of addressing possible deficiencies.

d. In cases of sub-optimal or unsuitable animal handling procedures, ACUCs, Directors of the animal services units and the Post-Approval Monitoring Coordinator are all authorized to require additional training.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching or testing purposes by University staff or trainees.
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)	The national organization responsible for setting and maintaining standards for the ethical use and care of animals used in science (research, teaching and testing) in Canada.
Principal Investigator (PI)	A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as describe in an approved animal use protocol.
Animal Services Units	Animal facilities established and operated by the University of Alberta as ongoing administrative units to provide veterinary and animal care staff, infrastructure, training, oversight and other resources to support use of animals in research, teaching and testing by University staff and trainees. They currently are: Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (AFNSAS), Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS) and Science Animal Support Services (SASS).

FORMS

No Forms for this procedure. [▲Top]

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (Government of Canada)

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy (UAPPOL)

Approval Date: September 1, 2015

Parent Policy: Animal Research Ethics

Animal Care and Use Standard Operating Procedures: Definition, Creation, Approval and Management Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO)
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with this University procedure extends to all members of the University community who use **animals** for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

The **Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)** and the University of Alberta encourage the use of formal, written standard operating procedures (SOPs) for commonly used animal procedures wherever possible. In addition to promoting consistent and verifiable processes across the Animal Care and Use Program, SOPs offer **Principal Investigators (PIs)** an alternative to writing detailed procedures each time they prepare a protocol. Similarly, the use of SOPs reduces the review burden for the Animal Care and Use Committees (ACUCs) and simplifies the work of the **animal services units**.

Note: This Procedure addresses only SOPs involving live animals.

Purpose

– Define different types of animal care and use SOPs.

– Define the processes by which SOPs are created, approved and managed.

PROCEDURE

1. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE REQUIREMENTS

   SOPs are sets of fixed instructions or steps to be followed in carrying out a given operation or in a given situation. SOPs may be developed by various members of the animal care and use program for a range of activities, including record keeping, equipment maintenance, use of equipment, emergency management and animal care and use.

   a. Any SOP involving live animals must be reviewed and approved by an ACUC before it can be used. Changes to SOPs must also be approved before they are implemented.

   b. SOPs should follow a standard template and provide sufficient detail so that trained personnel new to the animal care and use program should be able to carry out the procedure.

   c. Animal services units and ACUCs should, as much as possible, encourage PIs and their research personnel to follow common, consistent SOPs for animal care and use procedures.

2. INSTITUTIONAL SOPs

   Institutional SOPs should be established for procedures involving animals that are common across research areas and/or animal services units and to promote best practices for the University's animal care and use program.

   a. Institutional SOPs should, wherever possible, make use of existing approved unit level or PI SOPs. Institutional SOPs may incorporate material from SOPs in use at other CCAC accredited institutions.

b. Institutional SOPs will be reviewed and approved by the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC), which includes Directors of the animal services units and Chairs of ACUCs, or by a sub-committee of UAPWC, created for that purpose. Institutional SOPs will be accepted by all University ACUCs and animal services units.

c. SOPs relevant to the services provided by two or more of the animal services units must be endorsed by all units before they are presented to UAPWC for approval as institutional SOPs.

d. Whether or not institutional SOPs are regularly reviewed by ACUCs in connection with specific animal use protocols, they should be reviewed by UAPWC at least every four years.

e. Any member of the University animal care and use program may recommend development of an institutional SOP to UAPWC. However, UAPWC will give priority to development of SOPs for commonly used procedures.

f. The institutional animal user training program and ACUCs will reinforce the use of SOPs, in particular institutional SOPs or SOPs maintained by the animal services units.

g. Approved institutional SOPs will be maintained in the Research and Ethics Management Online (REMO) system by REO and will be accessible online to REMO animal module users.

3. ANIMAL SERVICES UNIT SOPs

Directors of the Animal Services Units must establish and maintain SOPs for services or activities performed by their staff or in their facilities.

a. Unit level operational SOPs address various functions of an animal services unit in addition to those that involve animal care and use, for instance equipment maintenance, cleaning and record keeping. Operational SOPs that do not involve animals do not require ACUC approval.

b. Unit level animal care and use SOPs involving live animals may or may not be associated with a specific animal use protocol. Unit level SOPs connected to animal use protocols maintained by the Director, for instance, training or breeding protocols should be reviewed in conjunction with the animal use protocol or when these SOPs are amended. Stand-alone SOPs, for rarely used procedures, should be reviewed by ACUC at least every four years.

c. Animal services units should provide species and procedure or technique training consistent with approved institutional and unit level SOPs.

d. The Director must ensure current approved versions of his/her unit's SOPs are available to staff and researchers as needed.

4. INVESTIGATOR SOPs

PIs may create standard operating procedures for specialized activities that they or their research personnel perform regularly.

a. PI level SOPs involving live animals will typically be approved by an ACUC, in connection with the PI's animal use protocol, every four years or in the event of changes. The animal use protocol identifies the animal users and their training, as well as the context in which SOPs will be employed. The more invasive the SOP, the more important it is to verify that the personnel following the SOP have commensurate training.

b. The PI must ensure that current approved versions of his/her SOPs are available to all members of his/her research group on an as needed basis.

c. A PI may also include institutional or unit level SOPs in his/her animal use protocol and make minor modifications to the SOPs, provided those modifications are approved by ACUC.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the

	class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching or testing by University staff or trainees.
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)	The national organization responsible for setting and maintaining standards for the ethical use and care of animals used in science (research, teaching and testing) in Canada.
Principal Investigator (PI)	A member of the academic staff who is responsible for the design, conduct, supervision and oversight of the care and use of animals in research, teaching or testing as describe in an approved animal use protocol.
Animal Services Units	Animal facilities established and operated by the University of Alberta as ongoing administrative units to provide veterinary and animal care staff, infrastructure, training, oversight and other resources to support use of animals in research, teaching and testing by University staff and trainees. They currently are: Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Sciences Animal Services (AFNSAS), Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS) and Science Animal Support Services (SASS).

FORMS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

SOP Template

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (Government of Canada)

Animal Protection Act (Government of Alberta)

Animal Protection Regulation (Government of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy (UAPPOL)

Attachment 9

AASUA Research & Scholarly Activities Committee
Review of Proposed UAPPOL Animal Care Suite
March 6th, 2015

Responses from the Research Portfolio, dated 16 April 2015, are in blue font below. The text highlighted in yellow relates to the priority areas the Research Portfolio representatives suggest be discussed at the meeting with AASUA representatives on 17 April.

Comments

1) Have ACUCs had opportunity to participate in this Policy & Procedure Development? It appears not. This seems to be a very important step in getting this important Policy Suite right. If one imagines an Org Chart, it would be challenging to rationalize why the ACUCs would be circumvented in this process.
UAPWC includes the Chairs of the ACUCs and the Veterinarians/Directors of the Animal Services Units.

2) Someone should be responsible for interacting with CCACA to improve CCAC guidelines when issues are identified. ACUCs should be empowered to do this.
CCAC accreditation is for the entire University Animal Care and Use Program. All formal communication with CCAC is via the Office of the VPR and REO. More broadly, University veterinarians and PIs serve on CCAC assessment teams, different CCAC bodies, including its Board and Standing Committees, and support CCAC initiatives, including development of peer-based guidelines. Researchers, ACUC Chairs and Veterinarians/Directors bring forward issues for discussion at UAPWC (via the ACUC or REO or the VPR) and consultation with CCAC may be pursued in that context. The ACUCs are expected to uphold current CCAC requirements on a day to day basis, functioning effectively as arms of CCAC.

3) Who is responsible for ensuring REMO is useable and has integrity?
This is not a policy issue. However, REO and IST are responsible for the REMO system. Currently there are over 15000 individual system users (<1000 relate to animal care and use), 4300 active REB files and 430 active ACUC files.

4) The revision of this policy suite fails to rationalize policies and procedures with at least one of its field stations, the Bamfield Marine Sciences Centre. Seems like an opportunity lost.
    a. Bamfield Marine Station processes for ACUC are duplicated, contrarian relative to this, and thus impede research – is this Policy Review not an ideal time to rationalize these processes?

Although the UA contributes financially to the Bamfield Marine Station, the BMS is not a UA field station and its operations are entirely outside the University animal care and use program. BMS maintains its own animal care and use program, ACUC and policies and procedures. Per the CCAC policy on animal-based projects involving two or more institutions, ACUC approval by both the home and host institution is required in these

cases. [Note: This is policy requirement is cumbersome and REO has already had several discussions with CCAC on ways of addressing this.]

5) Strongly recommend building **wildlife/field** animal care & use issues into the front of the document, not addressed as an 'exception to the rules' throughout, or put Wildlife issues consolidated into a stand-alone Procedure
    a. Or an annex that lists where to find relevant details throughout the P&P

Wildlife/field animal care and use accounts for less than 20% of all UA research, teaching and testing animal protocols and the Policy and Procedures reflect this. However, REO could compile the wildlife/field research relevant components as a stand-alone reference document once the revised Animal Ethics Policy suite has been approved.

6) **Animal Ethics Policy** Overview text suggested edit – "Animals are used only for valid scientific studies with a reasonable expectation of obtaining knowledge for the potential benefit of people and/or animals."
    AGREED

7) We're confused as to why **Animal Ethics Policy** uses "research, teaching and testing" (throughout); what is "testing", and is it not captured by the word 'Research'? Unlike Research & Teaching, "testing" is not an activity typically covered in other policies.

CCAC requirements extend to all animal use in science in Canada. Testing refers to regulatory testing, eg required by Health Canada. PIs conduct this testing for companies as contract research for companies that do not operate their own animal care and use programs.

GENERAL COMMENT – The Policy is intended to be short and to articulate guiding/governing principle and the institutional position on the subject, in this case ethical use of animals in science. Details on how policy is to be implemented are contained in the Procedures. For instance details on animal user training are contained in the relevant procedure. The policy and procedures should not be read in isolation nor should the Policy and Procedures duplicate one another.

8) **Animal Ethics Policy**
    a. Preamble should include concept of trust in the PIs (and all users), as per preamble to PAM Coordinator Procedure

PROPOSE - The University of Alberta holds that scholarly integrity and trust are vital to the responsible conduct of research. It is committed to ensuring the highest possible standards in the care, well-being, quality of life and use of animals in research, teaching and testing in accordance with applicable laws, the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines and Policy Statements, and the Tri-Agency *Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions*.

    b. Preamble includes Tri-agency Agreement (should this be here?); what if there are differences amongst these agencies? How will we proceed? (similar in 1a).

The Tri-Agency Agreement specifies that if institution uses animals it will maintain CCAC accreditation, that such research will be fully compliant with CCAC standards and that access to funding for such research be permitted only after ethics approval is in place. The agreement compels us to uphold CCAC requirements.

i. Does tri-agency have documents that address animal care? If yes, direct reader to them in a link.

The Tri-Agency agreement points to CCAC requirements. A link to the Agreement is provided at the end of the Policy.

c. Purpose - first line of revision is twice worrisome:
   i. "highest standards" is an empty term, and not accurate, as many would say CCAC could have higher standards, whereas others would argue the most Ethical approach would be for CCAC to reduce its oversight (approximating 'lower' standards, or at least 'different' standards).

The University must meet CCAC standards and those standards are not declining. In a policy document, we should aspire to highest standards that we can achieve.

   ii. This Policy does not 'promote' anything, but ensures the University and it's community (Researchers & Scholars) act to promote the standards.
   iii. Suggested Purpose would then be "To establish the nature of standards of practice in research and teaching [and testing] involving animals, to delineate mechanisms to educate Researchers and Scholars about these standards, and establish mechanisms to address instances when these standards have not been met."

d. 1.c regarding 3 Rs – it's a guideline, not a rule. [e.g. can be a difference of opinion on whether cell culture is feasible, or cell culture may be prohibitively expensive]. This should not be Policy, but as CCAC intends, it should be a guideline.

The Policy does not say that the 3Rs must be upheld at all costs. Nonetheless, they must be addressed in protocol design and review.
PROPOSE - The Russell-Burch "Three Rs Replacement, Reduction and Refinement" principles will be upheld in the design and review of animal use protocols

e. 2.b what is mechanism for UAPWC to collect information and decide [not clear practically] – similar for ACUCS in 3.b.

To be detailed in Procedure (which is under development). Incident reports, PAM activities, mortality reports, annual reports, reports by PIs, research staff and animal services staff all provide information for the committees.

f. 2.b.ii needs grammar help – we're not worried about deviating from a non-approved protocol. Perhaps "stop immediately any use of animals that is not described within an approved procedure or that deviates from an approved procedure."

PROPOSE – ii. Stop immediately any use of animals that is not described within an approved protocol or that deviates from an approved procedure

g. 2.b.iii is awkwardly passive in tense, and could be more than one animal. Perhaps "authorize humane euthanasia of any animal if unnecessary…" or better would be leave it more similar to the original and refer to the new section 8 that deals with this point in detail. E.g. "humanely euthanize any animal(s) if unnecessary…alleviated, as described below in Section 8. Euthanasia.".
    i. it is important that 2.b.iii points to section 8 for many reasons, including that any euthanasia should follow the good principles set out in 8 and in the previous Euthanasia Policy

Sections 2 and 3 are about the authority of the committees of euthanize animals in special circumstances.

PROPOSE – iii. Direct that any animal be humanely euthanized if it is experiencing unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress that cannot be alleviated.

h. 2.c. "PIs using animals must apply and be accountable to at least one of the specialized ACUCs". (consistent with 3.b. if doing moderately diverse science)

AGREED

i. 2.d. "UAPWC will serve as the appeal body concerning ~~a negative~~ decisions of ACUC…"

ACUCS almost never reject an animal use application. Who would bring forward an appeal of a positive decision?

j. 2.d.i. the concept that these P&P are "premised on collegial relations" should go into the new "Animal Care and Use Committee, Structure, Application and Review Procedure", perhaps best in 1.d. Also should go into the pre-amble Overview ("premise") of this Policy. Indeed the lack of acknowledgement to the vast excellent work of PIs and trainees and staff in these documents is an oversight.

PROPOSE NEW 3.a The University animal care and use program is premised on collegial relations among all its members. Renumber remaining items in 3.

k. 3.c. would be better placed as 2.e or 2.c.
l. 3.c.iii. should be made consistent with 2.b.iii, if it is edited above.
m. 3.c.iii. must point to section 8 for many reasons, including that any euthanasia should follow the good principles set out in 8 and set out in the previous Euthanasia ~~Policy~~ Procedure

Section 3 is about the ACUCs. Section 2 is about UAPWC

n. How does one justify reducing transparency and cutting off correspondence with all other groups – what will be said when Media inevitably asks… "no comment"?

This cuts both ways. How should the University respond if animal rights activists want to tour laboratories? If policy is silent, cooperation is not precluded.

i. 4.a could include the concept of Community members participation on ACUC and UAPWC, in accordance with CCAC

Composition of UAPWC and the ACUCs is addressed in the Roles and Responsibilities Procedure.

o. 5. Procurement: only sources provided are far too limited – what about getting animals from pet store distributors

Pet store procurement is specifically prohibited by CCAC. At the UA, the animal services units can, with special permission of the VPR, order animals through pet stores/distributors for PIs when there is no other source of animals. Excluding wildlife/field research, animals must be procured through the animal services units which may order animals from any number of vendors.

p. 5.d. what are the implications of this for wildlife, and the protocol approval process?

Take in context with 5 c. *Whenever possible, animal procedures must be conducted in facilities managed by one of the animal services units.* The ACUC review process considers the invasiveness of the procedure, the setting in which it is conducted and the additional distress for the animal caused by prolonged confinement, transportation etc. The ACUCs can and do approve variations.

q. 5.d. suggest removing ending text '...and EHS' as this Policy is not about EHS, and this point would be covered in policies about EHS. If this point is left in here, information must be provided detailing how one attains 'EHS approval'.

EHS is responsible for biohazard assessment and allergen control as well as chemical safety, all issues regularly associated with animal use and integrated in the review process. EHS representatives sit on CAR (because of the facilities issues) as well as UAPWC. Details on EHS approval are provided in the procedures (Review and Alternate Housing).

r. 6.a. should be expanded to included wildlife biology **Unclear**

s. 6.a. list of folks with access should include UAPWC, consistent with 2.b.

AGREED PROPOSE - All animals maintained at the University of Alberta and the facilities in which they are used or housed are subject to post-approval monitoring and periodic inspection by the University Veterinarian, UAPWC, Animal Care and Use Committees, Directors and staff of the animal services units, EHS and REO staff. These personnel must have access at all times to all areas where animals are housed or used.

t. 6.a. ACUC members do not (and probably should not) have access to all animal locations at all times – it's just too many keys and too much responsibility

The Policy confirms that if any of these people want to see an area in which animals are used or housed, they cannot be denied access.

u. Section 7 replaces current Animal User Training Policy:

i. Current policy allows equivalent training from other Institutions to substitute for UofA training, and this should be retained and delineated here (I think it is appropriately in new Procedure, so this is just asking for consistency)

Details are in the Procedure (3.c.i-ii) not in the Policy.

DISCUSS

ii. Definition of 'Personnel' vs. "Staff & Trainees" unclear – e.g. spin-off companies. Suggest use definition from Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy, i.e. "Researchers and Scholars" = "Includes all members of the University who are involved, directly or indirectly, to any extent whatsoever, in research and other scholarly and creative activities."
    1. Removing the definition of "Researcher" from the policy is ill-advised
    2. Similar for 1.a

iii. Suggest harmonizing the proposed definition of **Principal Investigator** with definition from Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy, which is "The person on a research proposal, application, agreement, contract or award responsible for the conduct of the research project.".

iv. The proposed definition of a Principal Investigator needs improvement, as it would currently capture all "Academic Staff" in any AUP (e.g. a Research Associate working for the PI). The definition given in the existing Animal Ethics Review Procedure (being rescinded) seems quite clear and appropriate.
    1. Similar for definition in Animal Care & Use Committee Appeal Procedure

v. 7.a. what about for out of province studies (e.g. other provinces or territories or international projects)

UA policy applies only to UA staff and trainees. Many people are researchers, the PI definition was chosen specifically to ensure that only faculty members could assume responsibility for animal use protocols or external investigators who have permission to work under UA auspices, eg faculty from other universities or spinoffs.

w. 8.a. "University of Alberta owned animal" is confusing on two fronts – 1) in my research lab, it would've never occurred to me that the University 'owns' the animals [is this true?]; 2) this entirely fails to capture important instances of field work where a wild animal (certainly UofA doesn't own them!) needs to be euthanized.

PROPOSE - Any veterinarian licensed by the Province of Alberta called upon to attend an animal used in an University ACUC approved protocol is delegated the authority to stop any unapproved procedure or any procedure causing unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress to the animal ~~or any non-approved procedure,~~ and to humanely euthanize any animal believed to be in unnecessary and/or unanticipated pain or distress that cannot be alleviated.

x. 8.a. Is there a clear "Animal Services Unit" to receive reports when incidences are in the field? Perhaps report to the PI & University Vet.

PROPOSE - The veterinarian will send a written report to the PI, the ACUC Chair and the animal services unit veterinarian who reviewed the protocol following any such event.

y. 8.a. first sentence – enables any member of the public to call upon most any vet, who may not appreciate that euthanizing the animal(s) without collecting the data may be the least ethical course of action (depending on severity of distress, for example). This should be bracketed somehow – who can 'call upon' such vets? Do the vets need to consider the existing AUP at all?
    i. In this light, can "and will salvage research data, if possible." Be strengthened, e.g. ""and will salvage research data to all extents possible to ensure the best possible data interpretation/Integrity of remaining animal use".
    ii. 8.a also needs to consider research approved for other provinces & territories, and international work. Unclear

Sections 2 & 3 of the policy specifically identify who may order an animal to be euthanized (outside of ACUC approved euthanasia which is conducted by PIs and/or animal services staff). All animals housed in University run facilities are maintained under direct veterinarian care (either UA staff or a UA contracted vet) and such care is understood to be consistent with the approved protocol. The original Euthanasia Procedure balances animal welfare and salvaging research data, as does this.

z. 8.c. The original text in the Euthanasia Policy (being rescinded) was clearer. "ensure endpoints are met" sounds more like meeting grant milestones rather than following approved humane euthanasia.

9) Animal Care and Use Committee, Structure, Application and Review Procedure

a. From parent Animal Ethics Policy 2.d.i. the concept of "collegial relations" should go into this new Animal Care and Use Committee, Structure, Application and Review Procedure, perhaps best in 1.d.

PROPOSE – 1c Relying on collegial, peer-review processes, the ACUCs shall apply the principles adopted in the Policy in review of an animal use application.

b. There is a perceived significant shift and troubling discrepancies in the Responsibility of the PI. The parent Policy 2.c removes PI responsibility (which seems like a really terrible idea) except that in its definition it seems to appoint responsibility solely to the PI. In this Procedure 1.b Animal Care is identified as an ambiguous shared responsibility. UNCLEAR
    i. The concept of shared responsibility seems fraught with danger, especially for something so important as animal ethics & welfare. I strongly advise leaving it as the PI is responsible, and the other groups provide service, support and oversight. Share responsibility leaves ambiguity and debate as to who is expected to ensure animal ethics and welfare, and any incidents will be left to distributed blame amongst the many groups identified as responsible.
    ii. Shared responsibility is not consistent with PAM Procedure 1.c.

iii. **Please change this to *with SUPPORT of other groups*, and do not have others with Shared responsibility**
iv. Similarly, Article 16 discipline is all about the PI
v. Not consistent with proposed Institutional Animal User Training Program Procedure 3.b.ii that says "Whether or not they work with or handle animals, PIs are responsible for the care and use of animals performed by their staff and trainnees".
    1. Indeed this point should be explicitly in every possible place in these P&P.
vi. Not consistent with proposed "Institutional Animal User Training Program Procedure" point 1.a.

c. 1.d advise to include "constructive", e.g. "...provide a fair and constructive review...". ACUCs should more frequently be providing positive feedback and commendations for good work.

Nothing in policy precludes this and good work is often commended but note also the requirement for impartial review.
PROPOSE The ACUCs shall function impartially, provide a fair and constructive review, with respect to an application and provide reasoned and appropriately documented opinions and decisions.

d. 2.a note the lack of definitions for "Scientific & pedagogic merit" from the Procedure being rescinded. This may lead to debate/confusion, though *probably* all healthy and resolvable within ACUCs.

CCAC has specific guidelines on merit review for research protocols and has had different guidelines for merit review for teaching and testing protocols. REO is working on guidelines for pedagogic merit review.

e. 2.c clarity needed – should this include ACUCs from other institutions?

University cannot write policy for other institutions' ACUCs.

f. 2.e is worded very broadly – I suspect it is intended for handling emergencies until a vet can be consulted or similar, but it's current wording seems to permit permanent change to a protocol (in a contentious/important aspect regarding harmful effects) based solely on the PI's judgment. **UNCLEAR**

g. 3.e (last sentence). ACUCs making decisions based on consensus is a disaster. How will a lack of consensus (imagined by this point) be managed by the ACUC Chair? This is important.
    i. I see no rhyme or reason for consensus-based decision making in this process.
    ii. This must be made consistent with 3.k (or 3.l?) of **Animal Care & Use Roles & Responsibilities Procedure** which says a simple majority vote rules when consensus cannot be attained.

The ACUCs have a history of making decisions by consensus whenever possible. This is a desirable process and should be encouraged in collegial, peer review processes. It is not inconsistent with relying on a simple majority vote if consensus cannot be achieved.

h. 4.f.iii. We suggest some qualification of this procedure to allow for flexibility. E.g. better to say "the protocol may (or will normally) be closed and no further animal work will be allowed.". Mitigating factors occur (what if the PI is deathly ill?). This is a dramatic action not consistent with CCAC guidelines or normal ethics or natural justice. Killing animals and throwing out data merely to subserve the paperwork gods and CYA is (not intended and) a revolting notion.

The procedure does not say this and, as the next sentence in the procedure indicates the ACUCS, REO and the animal service unit work with the PI to find an appropriate resolution. Note that during the recent assessment, CCAC indicated that protocols not be extended beyond their anniversary date unless a renewal has been submitted.

i. 4.a. reductions in numbers of animals used is very much not a mere administrative change, and may invalidate approval of a protocol.

j. 4.b suggest "At any time the ACUC Chair can send the amendment to full ACUC, or a subcommittee thereof, for review."

AGREED

k. 4.c suggest "These include, but are not limited to, changes in species..."

10) Special Requests for Alternate Housing Procedure

a. The second sentence "In addition, animal care is best..." is not true in some cases (indeed it contradicts bullet 6 below), so perhaps qualify as "In addition, animal care typically is best..."; or, if you hold to this statement note the expense that would be occurred in hiring such professionals.

This material originated in CCAC policy statements.
PROPOSE In addition, animal care typically is best carried out.....

b. This procedure should have a numbered bullet that actively excludes wildlife / field biology from this procedure.

Alternate animal housing is PI driven. PIs working with wildlife/in the field do not typically house animals, nor do they request AAH nor do we mandate it.

c. Procedure should be enumerated, not with bullets.

AGREED

d. Second bullet should be "the alternate housing is, or will be, appropriately constructed..."

AGREED

e. Last bullet is confusing, perhaps requiring ACUC to approve work for a location that is not yet constructed, and then renewing said approval for years during inevitable construction delays; it is also inconsistent with 2.a, which indicates application for ACUC approval later in the process.

Approval to build an alternate housing facility ≠ approval for any/all animal use in that location.

f. Section 1 only envisions applications coming from a PI, but currently applications come from additional sources Not to our knowledge, can you provide examples?

g. 3.a. some current facilities do not have such contract service agreements, and any such costs are unreasonable to impose upon a PI

Alternate animal housing locations typically require more work by the animal services unit (oversight, supervision, training, cage wash, etc). Documentation of how those services will be provided is relevant for all parties. Alternate housing should not be the same price as housing within the facility (OR free). Resolution of any costing issues, case by case, should be addressed by the PI, the animal services unit and the ADR.

h. should include some University responsibilities on par with their other facilities:
   i. U will prioritize immediately contacting the PI or designate in instances of campus emergency (including but not limited to power failure, loss of building heat or HVAC, intruders, criminal activity) via the Central Call-out Centre
   ii. U will prioritize supply of utilities to alternate housing facilities
   iii. Or maybe such concepts should go in the parent Policy, noting that the concepts apply equally to Animal Service Units and Alternate Housing Sites

This is another reason CCAC and the University works to keep alternate animal housing locations to a minimum. These issues would be addressed as part of the contract for services negotiated with the animal services unit, but it may be useful to touch on them in the AEP and/or via the CAR facility review process.

11) **Animal Care & Use Roles & Responsibilities Procedure**

a. What is the responsibility of the VPR? Central Admin in general?

Executive positions are not defined in Policy. However as the senior institutional official for the University's animal care and use program, the VPR leads systems and processes to deliver humane, ethically conducted animal research, teaching and research that is fully compliant with CCAC requirements and any relevant legislation. The VPR supports CCAC assessments and fees, REO and the work of UAPWC and the ACUCs, and REMO. As well the VPR is involved in the development and operation of specialized units or activities associated with animal care and use, including renovations to animal facilities, institutional biosecurity and interfacing between ethics and grants and such other issues as the VPR deems relevant to good animal use. See also the CCAC policy statement for senior administrators responsible for animal care and use programs.

b. Provide an org chart

c. Suggest renaming to "Animal Care & Use Committees Roles & Responsibilities Procedure"

The Procedure, like the Policy, pertains to all aspects of the University animal care and use program, not just the ACUCs.

d. 1.b Cross Cancer Institute has its own Animal Care Committee? Why does their Chair get special representation at UAPWC?
    i. Is this cancer Animal Care Committee clearly defined as having the same roles & responsibilities as an ACUC? (it's name is different)
        1. Seems not, as it is not listed in the Procedure's 3.a.

Like Bamfield, CCI is a separate institution with its own animal care and use program, policy and procedures. Unlike Bamfield, many CCI staff are also University staff. Rather than require all UA staff working in the CCI vivarium to go through two ethics reviews (as required by CCAC policy), we have negotiated a CCAC approved arrangement that permits UA to accept CCI ACUC approvals. As part of our special relationship, the CCI ACC Chair sits on UAPWC (with all the UA ACUC Chairs) to ensure that their practices are consistent with ours.

e. Key responsibilities of the UAPWC, as detailed in the parent Policy section 2.b and 3.c, seem to be missing from this document defining responsibilities.

Because UAPWC's authorities are defined in the parent Policy, they are not repeated in the Procedure which focuses on responsibilities.

f. 2.b formatting of enumeration points is wonky/duplicated **Unclear**

g. **2.b.ii is unacceptable. There is rarely/never a good reason to exceed CCAC guidelines for paperwork** with respect to paperwork and oversight. CCAC guidelines regarding ethics of animal use are ***vastly*** exceeded every day operationally, but that is not what these policies are about, nor CAR's mandate (note the word '*Ethics*' is indeed absent in 2.b).

CAR must be involved in the construction or renovation of any/all facilities in which animals are used or housed and has operated this way for years.

h. 3.e. wildlife/field protocols need an exception to this. **Unclear**
i. 4. Who is responsible to fund the animal services units? Central or Deans/Faculties? This cannot be ephemeral.
j.

ACUC membership

k. ACUC MEMBERSHIP Preamble should also acknowledge the vital role of Community members **Suggest wording?**
l. 3.j.i should be specific on quantity – i.e. must be >half made up of faculty/scientific members;

Eg. Such members to constitute more than half of the membership of the ACUC?

    i. in 3.m it becomes clear that when 3.j.i refers to "Faculty/Scientific members" it means the member is Faculty *or* Scientific. This is ill-advised – the members here should all be faculty who are scientists. **What about scientific members from Alberta Agriculture, CCI, Alberta Environment, the Zoo who may or may not be adjuncts?**
    ii. Thus 3.j.i should read: "Academic Members who are scientists and may be experienced in animal care and use and representative of animal use

commonly reviewed by the ACUC will comprise more than 50% of the voting members."

m. should not be limited to persons with 'Animal' experience [find other wording for Scientist but not so narrow as current]; e.g. many good eminently-qualified members work on invertebrates etc. Invertebrate research is outside CCAC. It is not reviewed or approved by ACUCs, acquisition, housing, care and disposition are outside the animal care and use program.

n. Define *ex officio* – i.e. they are non-voting, consistent with ACUC Coordinator in last bullet. No, the Director of the animal services unit (often but not always a veterinarian) MUST participate in the ACUC to ensure a well integrated and supported program,

o. 3.j.iv Membership – why would anyone want an institutional member [& what does that mean? Definition?] *without* experience This is a CCAC requirement and points to a different type of community member and would normally be drawn from the academic ranks. Potentially PIs who do invertebrate work could fill this role?

p. 3.j.viii - Why? Only need to be there for adjudicating [high potential for conflict of interest with appeals process]. ACUCs must be at arms-length from Central Admin interference or influence; [indeed we recently approved a protocol in haste that may have otherwise been sent for deeper revision except that it was a pet project of a Dean].

    i. This is not consistent with 1.d stating "ACUCs shall function impartially...". The UAPWC Chair could be there to address policy or process issues independent of review of individual ACUC matters. The ACUCs are delegated authority to act by UAPWC which is responsible for ensuring that the ACUCs apply University policy and procedures with some consistency and uniformity

ACUC meetings –

q. 3.m Quorum should be at least 3 scientific members and at least 50% of voting membership;

r. 4.b. what if we disagree with the CCAC guidlelines – should be communicate with CCAC why we disagree The ACUCs in effect function as extensions of CCAC and are expected to uphold CCAC requirements. If an ACUC wants the University to lobby for changes then that request should be made formally via UAPWC.

s. 4.d VPR designate should be an Academic and a Scientist

t. this Procedure should include similar long details for the new Post-Approval Monitoring Committee See below – old drafting.

Animal Care & Use Post-Approval Monitoring (PAM) – CCAC received and endorsed this draft procedure.

12) ACUCs should be a large part of the PAM process. The ACUCs are best equipped to make the required judgments. E.g. in 1.g. PAM coordinator could suggest a Review, but triggering should be thru ACUCs

The ACUCs are an important part of the PAM process, however they do not control it. Reviews can be and are triggered by PIs, the animal services units, EHS, the PAM coordinator and reviewers (animal users and past ACUC members) as well the ACUCs.

Preamble

13) paragraph two - CCAC *Requires* s/b *Recommends in cases where the research doesn't involve frequent observation of the test animals* – should this be a Procedure? Maybe it is only advisable, doesn't need to be CCAC requires that institutions have post approval monitoring programs. Their implementation is typically proportionate. One Procedure should be sufficient.

14) Education role is the researcher's REO and the animal services units provide the majority of animal user training associated with the ethics of animal use, species and procedure training. Excluding zebrafish and wildlife research, most PI led training relates to unique lab practices and procedures.

15) objectives should clarify that monitoring is conducted by the researcher & trainees

16) 1b false (an unintentionally quite insulting!) – we are *frequently* present

17) 3.a. A new Committee is created – this P&P Suite must somewhere define its Roles & Responsibilities, akin to all the other committees. (Currently the existence of this important & powerful new Committee is buried in the middle of a sub-bullet!).

a. e.g. define at length akin to other Committees in "Animal Care & Use Roles & Responsibilities Procedure"

This is an error arising from an old draft. It should read as follows:
The Post-Approval Monitoring Coordinator will be housed in REO and will support the Post-Approval Monitoring Reviewers. The PAM reviewers, between 3 and 6 knowledgeable and experienced animal users, will be recruited by the PAM Coordinator in consultation with the ACUC Chairs and the Chair of UAPWC.

PAM Coordinator/Committee should produce an Annual Report of PAM, detailing how their activities have improved the ethical & humane treatment of Animals. Report should go to the VPR, ACUCs and IAPWC. PAM Coordinator provides regular reports to CAR and UAPWC, which reports to the VPR. REO encourages the ACUC Chairs to share UAPWC materials with their committees.

Attachment 7: Animal Care & Use Standard operating Procedures …(OPs regarding SOPs)

18) Preamble "*Encourage*" is used appropriately here, as an example of better wording for elsewhere

19) Another use of SOPs is to assist in identifying when staff need to be disciplined

20) 1.a. is nebulous / not practical; scientific procedures are developed first, SOPs are then written based on existing procedures;

21) 1.b is fundamentally flawed and a source of substantial contention. The idea that a written protocol can substitute for proper in-person training is very scary and irresponsible. This must be removed. This section indicates the amount of detail required it does not say that the SOP stands in lieu of training.

a. As a tragic extra problem, holding the drafter of an SOP to this standard means that so much detail needs to be included that the SOP is unwieldy and immediately out of date by the time it is approved. SOPS for animal

manipulations eg, how to do injections, draw blood, net fish, restrain cows, euthanize mice

b. It is not reasonable for an SOP to have sufficient detail as to meet this requirement and also be applicable to more than one room, never mind be applicable across all of campus See above

22) 1.c PIs can encourage this too, as can personnel. PIs can dictate how their labs will be run and what SOPs will be used. The animal services units and the ACUCs may not, except in very special circumstances.

23) 2.a. should incorporate methods in the literature (peer reviewed) AGREED

Institutional Animal User Training Policy

24) should not be trying to exceed CCAC Guidelines. What if the CCAC guidelines are out of date or inadequate or silent?

25) Preamble should include concept of trust, as per preamble to PAM Coordinator Procedure

26) Who is responsible for ensuring all this Training is available and documented in a timely manner? REO delivers and documents Part 1 training as it is required. The animal services units either deliver Part 2 species and technique training or they verify that Part 2 species and technique training delivered in other ways (by PIs, by external experts eg Alberta Fish & Wildlife staff, or by other institutions) is acceptable. All Part 2 training records are uploaded to REMO user profiles by REO to ensure that the PIs, animal services units, ACUCs and PAM reviewers have access to centrally maintained training records.

27) 1. "promote quality science" is a nice concept – it should prominently appear early and often in this Suite of P&P – it is a core of Ethical use of animals.

28) Training for wildlife procedures are broadly unresolved. See Section 3 of the Procedure

a. 2.b.i. not always practical for wildlife
b. 2.b.vi. Delegation of authority is required for wildlife/field research, e.g. also delegate to non-staff in the case of specific wildlife techniques. This has to be included in the policy/procedure - some clear direction that UofA staff do not necessarily have the expertise required for wildlife procedures.
c. PIs are often best-equipped to provide Part 2 training, regardless of in-house or wildlife/field work.

29) 1.e. When a Scholar or Researcher or Student is deemed to have breached the Student Code or Research Ethics & Integrity Policy, this should be annotated in REO's training databases and this individual no longer be considered 'trained' AGREED

30) 1.f. is not consistent with PAM Procedure. (e.g. not listed in that Procedures #2. Why not? [What is PAM Committee *really* going to be doing?] Will add observation of animal procedures as additional detail in PAM Procedure

31) 1.g. is not helpful – there are many more folks also responsible for this, and this group also has many more responsibilities.

32) 2.b should end with "where available"

33) 3. Needs to be changed, as wildlife training uses surrogate species in training (e.g. there is rarely a wolverine at hand upon which to practice euthanasia)

a. 3.b.iii How will this be interpreted for wildlife studies off-campus?

34) 3.c.ii Does this "technique" refer to Part 2 training? - if so, be specific
35) 4.d should include PIs. PIs can require additional training for their staff if that is a requirement for working in his/her lab.

Animal Ethics Policy Suite
Communications and Implementation Plan

The Research Ethics Office (REO) is the central point of contact for all staff and students involved in research, teaching or testing involving animals. Following approval of the revisions to the Animal Ethics Policy Suite, REO will communicate the changes to the University research community as follows:

- notices about the revised policy and procedures and links to UAPPOL will be displayed on the REO website and on the Research Ethics and Management Online (REMO) website
- using REMO, notices will be sent to everyone with access to the Animal Ethics module advising of the changes and providing the relevant links to UAPPOL
- within REMO, we will include links to the revised policy and procedures that are relevant to the online ethics form and user help
- links to the current policy could be included in ethics approval letter and other correspondence associated with the ethics review process
- REO will work with the animal services units to ensure their staff are all familiar with the revised policy and procedures and positioned to disseminate the information to research staff
- REO will also work with all academic and administrative units to ensure that their websites reflect current and accurate requirements for ethics review for human participant research as well as research, teaching and testing involving animals
- REMO training materials and sessions for new users and orientations for new committee members will include references and links to the revised policy and procedures.

Approval Date: June 2, 2005

Animal User Training Policy

Office of Accountability:	Vice-President (Research)
Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO) – University Veterinarian
Approver:	Board of Governors (BEAC) and General Faculties Council (GFC Executive Committee)
Scope:	Compliance with University policy extends to all members of the University community who use animals for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

All personnel involved with the use of **animals** in research, teaching and testing must be adequately trained in the principles of animal care and use and the ethical issues involved in animal use. Appropriate training is therefore a mandatory requirement for compliance with **Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines**.

Purpose

Identify the University of Alberta's policy on the training requirement of individuals who are involved in the care and/or use of animals.

POLICY

1. All persons involved in the care and/or use of animals at the University of Alberta shall either:
    a. Complete the University of Alberta Institutional Animal User Training Program (IAUTP) or
    b. Furnish evidence that they have received formal training through a **National Institutional Animal User Training (NIAUT) Program**, or equivalent. Equivalent courses are reviewed by the Committee for Animal Resources and are subject to being brought forward to the University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC).
2. Additional training may be required in certain circumstances (*e.g.*, biosafety training).
3. No person shall attempt procedures with animals until they have completed appropriate training on the species of animal relevant to the procedure to be performed.
4. Failure to obtain approved training constitutes non-compliance with this Policy.
5. Non-compliance may represent research misconduct.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. **[▲Top]**

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, breeding, or testing purposes at the University. Includes animals held within the *bona fide* University of Alberta Facilities, approved special requests for alternative animal housing, and animals used in field studies.
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines	The *Guide to the Care and Use of Experimental Animals,* Volume 1, 2nd Edition, 1993, and Volume 2, 1984, and guidelines and policies, as amended or replaced from time to time, published by the Canadian Council on Animal Care.

National Institutional Animal User Training (NIAUT) Program	An approved program created and mandated by the Canadian Council on Animal Care for the training of individuals who are involved in the care and/or use of animals.

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. **[▲Top]**

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

Institutional Animal User Training (CCAC Guideline)

Recommended Syllabus for an Institutional Animal User Training Program (CCAC Guideline)

PUBLISHED PROCEDURES OFTHIS POLICY

There are no published procedures of this policy.

Approval Date: June 2, 2005

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

Animal Euthanasia Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO) – University Veterinarian
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with University policy extends to all members of the University community who use animals for research, teaching and testing.

Overview

In accordance with University of Alberta policies regarding the humane treatment of animals, when it is deemed necessary to euthanize an **animal** being used in research, teaching or testing, these procedures shall be followed.

Purpose

Ensure the humane euthanasia of animals when it is deemed necessary.

PROCEDURE

1. In the event that a designated veterinarian licensed by the Province of Alberta deems it necessary to euthanize an animal associated with an approved protocol, the authority to do so is granted by the Animal Care and Use Committee.

a. In these circumstances, every attempt will be made to contact the researcher or designate prior to performing the euthanasia to allow for consultation; but, in the event that a situation is deemed to be an emergency, the veterinarian will exercise professional judgment in the interests of the well-being of the animal.

b. The euthanasia procedure performed under these circumstances will be conducted according to the instructions from the protocol to salvage data collection when possible and practical.

2. **Researchers** shall be responsible for ensuring the appropriate endpoints for the protocol are met, as described in the protocol applications approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee. Every effort must be made to identify and humanely euthanize morbid animals prior to reaching a moribund state (a state of dying).

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]

Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, breeding, or testing purposes at the University. Includes animals held within the bona fide University of Alberta Facilities, approved special requests for alternative animal housing, and animals used in field studies.
Researcher	Includes, but is not limited to faculty members, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, non-academic staff, companies renting space in University animal facilities, and external persons and organizations conducting research in affiliation with the University of Alberta.

FORMS

There are no forms for this Procedure. **[▲Top]**

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca **[▲Top]**

American Veterinary Medical Association Guidelines on Euthanasia (AVMA)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

Approval Date: June 2, 2005

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

Animal Ethics Review Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office (REO) – University Veterinarian
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with University policy extends to all members of the University community who use animals for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

In accordance with ***Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines***, *Tri-Council Policy Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards*, and University of Alberta policy, ethics approval must be obtained before any use of **animals** in research, teaching or testing is undertaken. These procedures discuss the steps that must be taken to obtain this approval.

Purpose

Identify the procedure for obtaining ethics approval for the use of animals in research, teaching and testing.

PROCEDURE

1. Applications for Ethics Review
    a. **Principal Investigators** associated with Health Sciences will normally apply to the *Animal Care and Use Committee: Health Sciences*.
    b. Principal Investigators associated with the Faculty of Science will normally apply to the *Animal Care and Use Committee: Biosciences*.
    c. Principal Investigators associated with Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences will normally apply to the *Animal Care and Use Committee: Livestock*
    d. All other Principal Investigators will submit their applications to the applicable Animal Care and Use Committee that can best assess their procedures, the level of invasiveness, the housing location, husbandry, scientific merit and non-disclosure agreements.
    e. Those individuals who do not meet the definition of Principal Investigator shall submit their applications to the *University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (UAPWC)* for consideration.
    f. Applications for animal use must be submitted and approved prior to beginning animal procedures and annually thereafter to remain current for the duration of the funding period.
2. Release of Research Funds by the Research Services Office (RSO)
    a. When ethics approval for the use of animals has been obtained from the Animal Care and Use Committee, evidence of approval must be submitted to RSO for the release of research funds. Approvals will expire one year from the date of issue and must be reviewed annually.
    b. In the event that funds need to be accessed for preliminary research activities not using animals, prior to obtaining the Ethics Approval from the Animal Care and Use Committee, the Principal Investigator shall submit an Approval in Principle application to the Research Ethics Office (REO).
        i. The Committee for Animal Resources (CAR), the Executive Advisory Committee for UAPWC will review the proposals for an Approval in Principle.
        ii. The Approval in Principle can be used by RSO to release funds in advance of submission of the complete application to the appropriate Animal Care and Use Committee for review and possible approval. However, no animals may be purchased or used prior to receiving formal approval from the Animal Care and Use Committee.
        iii. CAR shall then inform the appropriate Animal Care and Use Committee of the Approval in Principle.

3. Appeals

    a. Appeals will be directed to the Vice-President (Research).

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use.

Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines	The *Guide to the Care and Use of Experimental Animals,* Volume 1, 2nd Edition, 1993, and Volume 2, 1984, and guidelines and policies, as amended or replaced from time to time, published by the Canadian Council on Animal Care.
Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, breeding, or testing purposes at the University. Includes animals held within the *bona fide* University of Alberta Facilities, approved special requests for alternative animal housing, and animals used in field studies.
Principal Investigator	A faculty member of the University of Alberta eligible for membership in AAS:UA which would include Professor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor Emeritus, Faculty Service Officer and/or Administrative Professional Officer. Adjunct Professor can be included subject to approval from the Dean or designate.

FORMS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Approval in Principle Application

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Animal Care and Use Committee: Biosciences (University of Alberta)

Animal Care and Use Committee: Health Sciences (University of Alberta)

Animal Care and Use Committee: Livestock (University of Alberta)

Canadian Council on Animal Care Guidelines (CCAC)

Memorandum of Understanding on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, NSERC)

University Animal Policy and Welfare Committee (University of Alberta)

Approval Date: January 11, 2010

Parent Policy: Animal Ethics Policy

Animal Care and Use Committee
Scientific and Pedagogic Merit Review Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Research Ethics Office – University Veterinarian
Approver:	Vice-President (Research)
Scope:	Compliance with University procedure extends to all members of the University community who use animals for research, teaching or testing.

Overview

The *Tri-Council Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards* mandates that the University comply *with* ***Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines***. The CCAC policy statement on: *Terms of Reference for* ***Animal*** *Care Committees (*2006) and the CCAC policy statement on: *The Importance of Independent Peer Review of the Scientific Merit of Animal-Based Research Projects* (2000) state that it is the responsibility of the animal care committees to ensure that each project has been found to have **scientific merit** or **pedagogic merit** through independent peer review before approving the project. Each **Principal Investigator** (PI) must include in his/her animal use application clear evidence of independent peer review. The institution must implement a mechanism through which non-peer-reviewed projects are reviewed for merit.

Purpose

To identify the institutional mechanism for obtaining independent scientific and pedagogic merit review for animal use protocols prior to consideration by the **Animal Care and Use Committee** (ACUC).

PROCEDURE

1. IDENTIFYING THE REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW
    a. Scientific Merit

    In the case of research funded by Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and other agencies as identified that rely on a competitive peer reviewed funding process, confirmation of funding will typically be accepted as evidence of peer review.

    b. Pedagogic Merit

    For teaching applications, evidence of formal evaluation of the course content and methods, by the academic unit will be accepted.

2. IDENTIFYING REVIEWERS

    a. For research projects funded through processes that have not explicitly considered the scientific merit of the proposed animal use or teaching applications that have not been assessed by the academic unit, the PI shall provide with his/her Animal Use Protocol (AUP) application the names of three subject matter experts (at the University of Alberta or elsewhere) who can review the proposed animal use.

b. These applications will not advance to the ACUC for review until the merit review has been completed.
c. The ACUC Coordinator will forward these applications to the Research Ethics Office (University Veterinarian) for processing.
d. If a named reviewer is unable to provide a review (due to conflict of interest or any other reason), the Research Ethics Office (University Veterinarian), in consultation with the **Director of Animal Services** of one of the **established animal facilities** and the Department Chair (or Associate Dean [Research] in the case of non-departmentalized Faculties) as needed, will secure a replacement.

3. PROCESSING THE REVIEW

e. If there is no conflict of interest, the reviewers will complete assessments and return their written reviews to the Research Ethics Office (University Veterinarian).
f. Anonymous reviewers' comments will be made available to the PI. If the reviews do not warrant any changes to the AUP the PI will advance his/her application to the ACUC for review.
g. If changes are recommended, the Research Ethics Office (University Veterinarian) will return the application to the PI for appropriate action.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]	
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Guidelines	The *Guide to the Care and Use of Experimental Animals,* Volume 1, 2nd Edition, 1993, and Volume 2, 1984, and guidelines and policies, as amended or replaced from time to time, published by the Canadian Council on Animal Care.
Animal	Any living non-human vertebrate and any living invertebrate of the class of cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, teaching, breeding, or testing purposes at the University. Includes animals held within the recognized University of Alberta facilities, approved special requests for alternate animal holding/housing, and animals used in field studies.
Scientific Merit	The use of animals in research and testing is acceptable only if it promises to contribute to understanding of fundamental biological principles, or to the development of knowledge that can reasonably be expected to benefit humans or animals. Expert opinion must attest to the potential value of studies with animals.
Pedagogic Merit	The use of animals in teaching is acceptable only if it promises to contribute to understanding of fundamental biological principles, or to the development of knowledge that can reasonably be expected to benefit humans or animals. Expert opinion must attest to the potential value of instruction with animals used for teaching purposes.
Principal Investigator	The person on a research proposal, application, agreement, contract or award responsible for the conduct of the research project.
Animal Care and Use Committee	Animal Care and Use Committee: Biosciences, Animal Care and Use Committee: Health Sciences, and Animal Care and Use Committee: Livestock.
Director of Animal Services	Director of Animal Care, Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science Animal Services (AFNSAS); Director of Biosciences Animal Service (BSAS); and Director of Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS).
Established Animal Facility	Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science Animal Services (AFNSAS); Biosciences Animal Service (BSAS); and Health Sciences Laboratory Animal Services (HSLAS).

FORMS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Animal Use Protocol (AUP) application

RELATED LINKS

Should a link fail, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca. [▲Top]

Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)

CCAC Policy on The Importance of Independent Peer Review of the Scientific Merit of Animal-Based Research Projects (CCAC)

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards (Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council of Canada, NSERC)

Terms of Reference for Animal Care Committees (CCAC)