

INSTITUTIONAL ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE (IACUC)
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
9001 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, CA 93311-1099

MINUTES OF MEETING, Friday, November 18th, 2016
DDH A-108

Members Present:

Scientific Concerns: Amy Gancarz-Kausch, David Germano

Non-Scientific Concerns: Steve Gamboa, Andrew Troup

Safety and Risk Management: Tim Ridley

Community Concerns: Laramie Lyda-Craft, Larry Saslaw

Consulting Veterinarian: Mylon Filkins

Ex Officio: Imeh Ebong [GRaSP]

Members Absent:

Scientific Concerns: Matt Leon

Others Present: Gwen Parnell, GRaSP

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Steve Gamboa at 1:00 PM.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Imeh Ebong, Associate Vice-President, GRaSP, and *ex officio* member of the IACUC was in attendance. There was a round of introductions.
- b. Four webinar-type presentations are impending over the next couple of weeks for possible software packages to handle integrated processing of grants, IRB, and IACUC activities at CSUB. IACUC members are invited to attend and provide input as are “consumer” faculty, such as Amber Stokes, who submit protocols.
- c. There are slots available for a workshop later today involving grant writing. Registration is required.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous IACUC meeting on Friday, 09 September 2016 were approved. Germano moved/Troup seconded, 8-0.

4. OLD BUSINESS

CITI HCUAS Training. At the previous IACUC meeting, members had been tasked with taking the CITI HCUAS training. Several members had explored the modules or already had experience with them. There appeared to be a consensus that these materials were useful and well done although a few questions involved tedious procedural details that could better be looked up rather than memorized. There was concern about the time involved, which may be significantly greater as compared to the existing “home grown” HCUAS training. A critical issue is identifying and specifying to users which modules should be taken by persons in various roles, such as IACUC members, PI’s, and students who will be working with animals as research or teaching assistants. A working group made up of Gwen, Amy, and Laramie will draft recommendations on which modules X persons in different roles should be required to complete. Perhaps it will be useful to have a core set of modules and then others provided depending upon roles. It would be useful if CITI could be customized so that links would take persons in different roles to those particular modules they are assigned to take for certification.

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. **Tradition vs. Policy.** The transition from the old RERC to the new RERC made it clear that quite a few actions of the IACUC are driven by tradition rather than written policy. This can present problems if not all are aware of those IACUC traditions; it can be awkward explaining such actions to others. Also, IACUC record keeping should be more systematic in case of external audit and to ensure that proper policies and procedures are being followed. Therefore, the following agenda items for consideration of the IACUC members.
- b. **Selection of Alternate IACUC Members.** IRB tradition was to invite departing members to become “alternate members” via the same nomination/appointment procedure used to select regular members: RERC nominates to Academic Senate, which advises the Academic Provost, who appoints. The main purpose is to have additional members available if needed to reach a meeting quorum, but also to consult if needed. This was made a formal policy at the IRB meeting in the morning. There was a motion to do the same for IACUC. Saslaw moved/Ridley seconded, 8-0.
- c. **RERC Email Protocol Approvals.** There is a tradition that RERC gives “go ahead” for protocol activities when the PI has met the requirements of the protocol review in advance of the formal authorization letter, which can lag by

several days. This is done when there is time urgency, for example for intramural research funding decisions. There was discussion of how often this happens, whether it is needed, and if this action creates any compliance issues. There was a motion that this tradition be continued but that it will be made explicit in the revised policy and procedure document. Filkins moved/Germano seconded, 8-0.

- d. **PI Meeting Attendance.** PI's are required to attend to discuss their protocols, but this is tradition, not formal policy. If there were a student PI on an IACUC protocol, faculty mentor would be required to attend. It was noted that faculty mentor presence when students are questioned is important. There was a motion to make this formal IACUC policy by placing appropriate language in the revised IACUC policy and procedure document. Germano moved/Filkins seconded, 8-0.
- e. **Late IACUC Protocol Renewals.** Both IRB and IACUC have allowed "renewals" during a "grace period" after a protocol has closed. This has the potential for IACUC allowing use of animals outside of an authorization period that is in between the closure of authorization and the authorization of renewal. This is not acceptable. IRB has added a "final closure" letter to follow up on the "impending closure" letter, and the IRB policy will be to strictly enforce closure dates. PI's who run late will have to re-submit. There was a motion to do the same for IACUC and to make this part of the revised policy and procedure document. Germano moved/Troup seconded, 8-0.
- f. **IACUC PRF in Qualtrics.** The PRF has not been previously available in Qualtrics. A link would be sent to IACUC members with new protocols to be reviewed. Focus of discussion was the purpose of the review form. Is the purpose to be a vehicle to organize reviewers' thoughts about a protocol? Should the forms be brought to the meeting by the committee members? If the form is turned in before the meeting, what about changes in views following meeting discussion? There was a consensus that the final question [Q50] about "Disposition of the Protocol" should be removed, because that ends up being a group decision and is reflected in the meeting minutes. There was a consensus that the protocol review form, with the suggested revisions was useful and that they should be filed in Qualtrics, but there was no position taken on before vs. after the meeting. Given the use of the form, the title should be changed to "Protocol Initial Assessment Form." Multiple choice options should be added to several yes/no questions. There was a motion to incorporate the above and add words, as needed, to the revised policy and procedure document. Germano moved/Gancarz-Kausch seconded, 7-0. It was suggested that the new PRF be used as a discussion guide at the next meeting in which a new protocol is reviewed.
- g. **Add Link to "The Guide"?** Should there be a link on the IACUC homepage to the latest [8th] edition of the "*Guide to the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*"? It was noted that this document is often available as a resource at other institutions. Previously a new edition was reviewed by a CSUB IACUC working

group for possible updates in policies and procedures. There was a consensus that this should be done.

- h. Selection of “Outstanding IACUC Protocol” 2015-2016.** There was a consensus that protocols within the designated period be sent out to IACUC members for a vote. There was a brief discussion of what the criteria should be. For the present period, there is only one protocol. There was a consensus that the vote this time should include the option of stating that the protocol is not “outstanding” and hence is not recommended for such an award.
- i. Required HCUAS Modules X Roles.** Depending upon their roles in the research, different personnel need to get certified for particular modules, for example, surgery or euthanasia. This is the practice, but not formal policy. Specific roles of personnel should be added to protocol that would define which HCUAS certifications are needed. There was a motion to implement the above and incorporate appropriate language into the IACUC policy and procedure document. Filkins moved/Gancarz-Kausch seconded, 7-0.

6. AREAS OF CONCERN

- a. Rat Carcasses.** Gancarz-Kausch noted a problem with disposition of rat carcasses insofar as Biology Stockroom personnel were reluctant to accept and dispose of them. There does not appear to be a policy. Ridley and Gancarz-Kausch will work together to establish a general policy and provisions for instances in which the carcasses have known exposure to particular drugs and chemicals.
- b. Logs of Scheduled Drugs.** Filkins noted that there should be logs tracking incoming and outgoing amounts of each scheduled drug. Gancarz-Kausch noted that this was the case for the scheduled drugs used in her research.

7. ADJOURNMENT

When there was no more business the meeting was adjourned at 2:48 PM by Chair Gamboa. 7-0. Ridley moved/Filkins seconded, 7-0.

Inspection of Animal Facilities

Consulting veterinarian was present for all inspections.

DDH H-116 [Amy Gancarz-Kausch, Psychology]

Surgery is carried out in this facility; equipment and procedures were not reviewed. The PI reviewed use of the experimental chambers. A red bio-waste container was present. Rat carcasses were stored in a freezer awaiting disposition. The log of scheduled drugs was well-kept with everything carefully logged in and out. There were some expired drugs used by another investigator that should be discarded.

Animal Colony DDH H-100

The log was up to date as was the emergency call out sheet. There were about 20 rats in residence in the colony room at this time.

Science I 212 [Amber Stokes, Biology]

Newts were housed in tubs of water in temperature-controlled environments. There were no unanticipated adverse reactions. Several newts had stopped eating and were euthanized using a species-appropriate approved procedure. Dead newts are being stored in a freezer. PI will be advised when a carcass disposal policy is in place. Some can be sent to collectors. The log was up to date.