

Meeting Date: June 30, 2008

Members Present:	J. Angelosante	V. Batterson	T. Brabb
	D. Fitts	G. McLean	D. Newsom
	D. Lee	R. Murnane	N. Phillips
	T. Reh		

Members Absent:	J. Cashman	S. Cunningham	W. Dickhoff
	S. Kelley	S. Skerrett	M. Slosberg
	I. Washington		

Opening Business:

Dr. Fitts called the meeting to order at 2:35pm.

Approval of the Minutes:

Dr. Fitts called for the approval of the May 22, 2008 IACUC meeting minutes. Dr. Phillips moved to approve the minutes and Mr. McLean seconded the motion.

Vote on the Motion: The minutes were approved with 8 members voting in favor and 2 abstentions.

Dr. Fitts introduced a new Committee member, Dr. Tom Reh, from the Department of Biological Structure.

Attending Veterinarian's Report:

Dr. Brabb reported that she had nothing to report this month.

Protocol monitoring:

Dr. Brabb mentioned that there was one protocol on Veterinary Monitoring and that it had just started.

Executive Secretary's Report:

Report on packets sent:

Dr. Phillips reported that 3 packets were sent to the Committee since the meeting on May 22, 2008. These packets included 11 new protocols. There were 19 renewals, of which 13 were three-year renewals requiring a complete Project Review Form. There were also 96 Significant and Minor Changes. The IACUC has completed its approval process for many of these items, though some are awaiting final approval due to holds for items such as EH&S approval, OH review or signatures, or revisions from PIs.

Update on a previously reported anonymous concern sent to the IACUC c/o Dr. Phillips:

Dr. Phillips reminded the Committee that she had received a letter of concern regarding an animal experiment. The letter indicated that a specific experiment was performed prior to approval of the Significant Change to the IACUC protocol. The letter further alleged that the experiment was published. The publication and specific portion of the publication were noted. Dr. Phillips previously reported that based on timing of submission, revision and re-submission listed in the publication it could not be definitively determined that the work was conducted prior to IACUC approval.

The Director of Compliance of the University's School of Medicine looked into the allegation by meeting with researchers and reviewing the experiment. She was able, with help of the research group, to determine that the experiment was conducted after IACUC approval. With regards to the publication, the foreign collaborator of the UW researcher had already published the article and then found that the UW researcher had an experiment that would enhance the article. In an unusual move, the researchers were able to convince the journal editor to pull the publication off the web, allow addition of the UW experiment, and then re-post the publication. As a result, sequence of events was:

- the original paper was submitted to the journal 7/12/07
- it was returned for modifications 8/17/07
- UW researchers received IACUC approval for a Significant Change on 7/27/07
- UW researchers conducted the experiment reported in the publication on 10/22/07 and 10/28/07
- the paper was accepted by the journal 12/19/07
- paper available on-line on 1/22/08
- paper retracted and UW data added 2/6/08
- final version of paper published 3/08

Dr. Phillips concluded by saying that the experiment noted in the journal article and in the anonymous concern was conducted after IACUC approval.

Protocol Review:

- ❖ Shadlen, IACUC No. 2896-01 "1. Neural Coding Vision 2. Neural Mechanism of Visual Perception 3. Neural Basis of Bayesian Influence 4. Bayesian Decision Making 5. Howard Hughes Medical Institute" – Significant Change, Version 35

Dr. Brabb reported that she did not think the Significant Change met the requirements for Significant Changes adding additional surgeries as stated in the UW IACUC policy "Guidelines for Non-human Primate Neuroscience Studies". She pointed out that the request did not include the reason these additional surgeries were needed for the particular animals listed in the Significant Change request. Dr. Brabb let the Committee know that this information had been requested. The Post-approval Monitor for this research group had met with the technician and explained what was needed. However, a revision of this request was not submitted.

Motion: Dr. Brabb moved to table the Significant Change until the request is complete. Dr. Batterson seconded the motion.

Discussion of the Motion: Dr. Brabb pointed out that the negative side of tabling the request is that if something needed to be done this might put the research group behind. Mr. McLean asked if this could be turned over to the Designated Review process. Dr. Phillips reminded everyone that the policy states that the Significant Change requests for additional surgeries need to be discussed at a convened meeting of the IACUC.

Vote: The vote was unanimous with all 10 members present voting in favor.

❖ Rosenfeld, IACUC No. 2650-08 “C. pneumoniae and Atherosclerotic Plaque Destabilization” – Significant Change, Version 25

Dr. Phillips reported that the PI and a colleague both study experimental mice exposed to diesel. They work together and their IACUC protocols are very similar in procedures approved. The two protocols are approved for different specific experiments that are part of their collaborative work. The PI's colleague has been delayed in submitting his IACUC 3-year renewal and there are mice in an on-going experiment. The PI is therefore requesting that the experiment be transferred to his approved protocol. In order to do so he needs to add the experimental group to his protocol. As such he has described the specific mice and the aims of this particular experiment. The procedures per se and the personnel are already on his protocol.

Motion: Dr. Phillips moved to approve the Significant Change. Dr. Brabb seconded the motion.

Discussion of the motion: Dr. Phillips explained that the two protocols could be combined but historically they have been separate with the collaborative work that they do and the different grants over the years. Mr. McLean asked if there were any other animals on the protocol that is about to expire. Dr. Phillips replied that this group of animals and this experiment were the only animals still on the protocol.

Vote: The vote was unanimous with all 10 members present voting in favor.

The meeting was brought to a close at 2:55pm.

The floor was opened to public comment.