

## ROLL CALL

Finance- Senators DeVivo and Neill excused

Student Activities- Senators Chaouch and Allston excused

COLA- Senators Nenopoulos and Lederer-Plaskett excused

Academic Affairs- Chair Caster and Senator Campbell excused

CODEEE- Senator Talbot excused

Student Action- All present

Public Relations- All present?

## PUBLIC FORUM (00:01:37)

Bill Falls and Dr. Ruth- I have been teaching at UVM for 20 years and that is the first time I have gotten applause. There is Dr. Ruth right on cue, that is okay, I planned to do most of the talking so Dr. Ruth will be my safe net if I get into trouble. First thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak, I really appreciate the invitation and the work that you and your colleagues are doing around this very important issue. What I have thought I would do is take my ten minutes and describe what Institutional animal care and use committee (IACUC) is about. Please I know I have five minutes for questions but don't hesitate to stop me and ask questions if you have some. You all know that one of UVM's major missions is to carry out research. I know that many of you are involved in research here at UVM. A lot of the research that is done here involved federally funded or internally funded projects that they use humans, may use animals, may use infectious agents, and may use radioisotopes, a bunch of different things. There are federal regulations and guidelines that tell us how we should and should not be using humans, animals, radioisotopes and infectious agents and those mandates that are given by the federal government usually trickle down to UVM in terms of committees that are established, and are given authority by the government to regulate here on campus. So if you were going to do a human research project you would need to submit a protocol to the human (??) review board. They would need to make sure that what you proposed to do with humans conforms to all standard practices, federal regulations and guidelines and then they would give you approval to do your work. Similarly with infectious agents and we have a committee called the IBC that oversees the use of hazardous materials such as infectious agents but there is also the IACUC which is the institutional animal care and use committee which is given by the federal government as a mandate for us to oversee all of the research on campus with animals. The IACUC was established as part of the animal welfare act passed by congress in 1985. So it established that every institution that is going to receive federal funding with work, be it private

or public, have an IACUC. To establish who the members of IACUC are going to be they have to be members of the community that is doing the research, so here at UVM we have IACUC members that are animal researchers themselves. We are also required to have scientists who are not animal researchers. We are also required to have members of the public. We are blessed with some excellent members of the public who serve on IACUC. What does the IACUC do? Well the IACUC is in charge of reviewing all of the animal use, be it research or teaching here on campus. We conform to the federal regulation given by the animal care act, given by the US department of agriculture which oversees our committees, given by the OLOC and also by an organization called ALAC, an international organization that UVM belongs to voluntarily and it sets a higher bar as to the activities of the IACUC and as to what can and cannot be done with animals and what those standards are. So if you were a researcher and you had an idea that involved animals, what you would first do is get funding for that project, good luck in today's economy. Only about 3-5% is funded from what is submitted. If you were lucky enough to get funding, and what is funding? It means that you sent a grant to the agency, the agency has looked at your proposal and says one, it has scientific merit, so the quality of your work is good enough to warrant funding and two, the work is justifiable in that it is going to advance human knowledge or advance our understanding of human health related issues like work that I do, which generally goes to the national institute of health. So the grant justifies the use of the money and certifies the scientific quality of the work. But before you can begin the work and indeed before you can get the money, you have to get IACUC to approve you. There is a 30 page document that we require researchers to fill out which asks nitty gritty details about the use of animals. Details that go well beyond what are present in the grant which nowadays are only about six pages. Very very detailed procedures about what is done. So you would write this protocol, fill out these 30 pages and you would first go to doctor Ruth, the university veterinarian. She reviews the protocol. She then goes back to the researcher and tells them whether their protocol is acceptable. The principal investigator then makes revisions in the protocol and submits it to the IACUC. That then lands in front of me and I assign two principal reviews selected from our committee, who are going to be responsible for unpacking that protocol, looking at it in terms of what we accept as best practices with animals and make sure there is proper justification for the use of animals, making sure the animal numbers are justified. Making sure that what is done with these animals is what we expect to be done with the animals. Those two people will present that protocol to the committee, the entire committee reads the protocol. The entire committee has an obligation to review the protocol but the two primary reviewers are the ones who are going to lead the discussion around that protocol. During the committee meeting we discuss the protocol. The first thing I do is ask the two committee members for comments, then I turn to Dr. Ruth, then to the statistician and I ask if they have any comments, especially around the animal numbers. We are required to ensure that only the proper number of animals are used, no more, no less. All of these comments are then summarized for revision of the protocol. Now we have a few choices, we can either accept the protocol as it is which I can tell you is rare. Probably only 2 or 3 which we have approved outright. Most of the

time we have what are called stipulations and clarifications. A stipulation is when we go back to the researcher and say, you must do this. A clarification is something we say, hey you know what, we are not sure what you are going here, you need to give us more detail, you need to explain it. On occasion we outright deny a protocol. Now that generally happens with protocols that have not been read by external reviewers. That is why we often don't reject protocols. Typically we review these protocols and give them a long list of things to change. If they satisfy the committee in making those changes they get approved. I want to remind you that that doesn't mean they are free to go off and do whatever they want. We try very hard to do protocol follow up. To make sure that things are going well. Dr. Ruth keeps a very close eye on research that is being done. We also re-review each protocol annually. This is the procedure that we go through. I know the question you have been grappling with the last few senate meetings is whether or not our meetings should be open or not. I will tell you right now we have an exemption to the open meeting law while discussing the protocols. The reason for that, and I am sure your senators have said to you are many. The principle reason is to protect intellectual property. When you get a grant that means your idea is in its infancy. You then get a protocol approved, that idea is still in its infancy. You have not been able to collect any data or run any analysis because you need approval to do that. Once you get approval you begin to collect data and you move towards publication of your results. As scientists we strive to publish our results because science is progressive and self-correcting, science is public, so we publish our results. So in order to maintain intellectual property we feel in the IACUC we need to control make sure we are controlling the dissemination of that information to make sure that we are protecting what the researcher has put their heart and soul into. The other reason is, in the context of the protocol, 30 pages, lots of information, we are revealing the location of animals on campus, controlled substances, hazardous materials, radioisotopes, things of that nature. We don't want that to be part of the public record. We need to protect that because these are dangerous things if they were fallen into the wrong hands. Thirdly there are people who feel passionately against the use of animals, I don't want to argue about that, I respect people's individual beliefs. But there are people who would want to do something terrible to the people working with animals. So we want to maintain the integrity of the process to ensure the safety of the students, faculty and families. Those are the principle reasons why we have this exemption, But, I want to reiterate, we are not sort of operating in a situation where there is no oversight in what we do. Indeed the USDA makes unannounced inspections. The inspector goes through our protocols, through our meeting minutes and everything to make sure everything is up and up. We have to report to (?) OLOC and we voluntarily report and are overseen by ALAC. We are conforming to some stringent standards that we are voluntarily doing and I think we are doing really well. I know that it is still a closed door meeting and there is some concern about what goes on behind closed doors. The best I can tell you is that we need to be behind those closed doors and we are doing our best to ensure the proper care of those animals.

QUESTIONS (15:41)

Chair Rifken- What would you see as some of the implications if this did pass in the state legislature?

Bill Falls- This is just speculation because I have only operated under the current law. I worry, I sit around this table with my colleagues and we are very respectful of each other and the people whose work we are evaluating. We speak very candid, very frankly about the work. I have had personal experiences when we review protocols of my colleagues in the Department of Psychology and have said, you know, this is not good, we need to have them change this. And I feel comfortable speaking openly because I know that while comments are going to be reported back to the principal investigator, there is going to be no attribution. The problem we have to imagine is that if it is public, do we have to be worried that members of the committee are going to inhibit their comments because they are talking about their colleagues. Imagine yourself an assistant professor who is reviewing the protocol of a senior professor. Someone who is going to determine whether or not they are going to get tenure, whether or not they are going to stay as a faculty at UVM. Wouldn't you be inhibited a little bit about what you do or what you say. You might not want to be because you recognize the importance and integrity of the process but you want to still be that way. So that is my biggest fear if it is somehow still open. And I fear that to protect intellectual property we would have to shrink the 30 page protocols to leave out information because we are still worried about certain issues. And I know I have told you before I have read protocols from other IACUCs and they are very different than ours. I have had investigators come to UVM and say I cannot believe the protocol, it is so long. That is because we are very thorough and very thoughtful. I know that is not what you all want and what the legislature would want but that is just reality.

Senator Talbot- Aside from all of the acronyms, from the time that a project is in its early infancy to the point where the results are actually published and the work is done. Is there an avenue for someone like me who is not associated with another committee, for me to access the health of the animals involved in the testing.

Bill Falls- Presently no because again all of that info is all contained within executive session when we discuss those protocols. Even when the protocol is approved there is no avenue in making it public. That would be in violation of the first principal if we want to protect intellectual property.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES (00:21:36)

Gerard Williams- After we spoke I went through the IACUC protocol the 30 pages, I encourage everyone to look at it. I totally sympathize with the idea that the intellectual property is really important and I sympathize with that. It seemed to me that looking through the protocol that there was maybe two or three sub sections that would compromise that information. For most organizations that are subject to the public records act, information like that is redacted, research

information could be redacted. So, my question is really why is it incompatible considering that you can still redact the info necessary.

Bill Falls- Surely, I guess I would encourage you to look at the protocol and if you want I would sit down with you to go through it. I can see that maybe taking a good hard look at it like you did would give you the impression that there are some sections that would exclusively contain info that we would say needs to be protected, but unfortunately it is not so simple because we probably have about 200 protocols active written in 200 different ways. One of the frustrations we have as an IACUC is that each researcher tends to write it differently. Even if you had a section that you could look at and have nothing to do with the hypothesis or methods, we can't guarantee that it always would not. It wouldn't be a simple task to go through and redact these things. The other point is that I fear that while there are sections that may say, what analgesics are you using? And it will say we are going to use buprenorphine and we are going to use 0.5mg/kg and we are going to give it intraperitoneally, that is okay I guess but it is taken out of context and it wouldn't really makes sense.

Gerard Williams- Why you think IACUC in VT is not transparent but in other states it is. Why is Vermont an exception?

Bill Falls- If I am allowed to sort of speculate on that, I have seen other protocols and they are mere shadows of what we do. I haven't done the research but I would wonder where the protocols coming from these institutions in the research triangle are more the type with very limited information where they are effectively redacted themselves. They are not asking they same depth and quality of info that we ask. Whether that preceded the openness of the IACUC or was a reaction to it, I do not know. How can they maintain the integrity and meet the requirements for maintaining the quality of the protocol and intellectual property.

Senator Osef- Does any of the money for as far as what you do come from student money?

Bill Falls- First, none of us are paid to do this work, all of the members of IACUC are volunteers. I don't know the revenue source, I am assuming, UVM keeps one big pot and the grant money goes into that pot, the tuition money goes into that pot. We have the best staff I have ever worked with working on IACUC.

Senator Talbot- Is there any leeway of perhaps making a second protocol, that protocol with the intent to release to the public.

Bill Falls- Anything is possible, I hate to say that, but I would respond by saying, but Oh my God that would be a nightmare. Largely because the researchers we interact with are excellent people, incredibly smart and they do some amazing things. But it is sometimes really struggle to get them to really write a good protocol. I think if we asked them to write a parallel protocol that sort of redacts things to be made public would be made very difficult.

Dr. Ruth- I did want to point out that we have been working to improve the transparency of our process as good as we can without jeopardizing the work. Right now we have an animal research website. <http://www.uvm.edu/~animrsch/> You can get to it from the animal care management website, the IACUC website. It talks in a general way about a number of research areas that are ongoing here at the university. So it is not going to get into the very specific details of a procedure or process but it will tell you in general how animals are used in that process and there again we haven't attributed the work to anyone by name, we haven't named any places. You could get a very good idea of the flavor of the work done here from that website and were are working to expand it, it's a slow process because I try to get a lot of people to review it to make sure I am not divulging any information.

Senator Talbot- on estimate how long does it take to fill out a protocol

Bill Falls- I can tell you I had that experience this weekend. I spent four hours on Saturday and another six on Sunday filling out the protocol.

Senator Mansfield- Do you think that making things more transparent would change how the animals are treated in the lab work?

Bill Falls- I really admire the work my colleagues and researchers do, I admire the work that Dr. Ruth does. I don't think the way the animals are treated would change because they do a masterful job ensuring the health and wellbeing of the animals involved. I think it would change the way IACUC can oversee the way they are treated. I don't think the animals would suffer, I think the process would suffer.

Senator Daley- Is there a second vet on the committee IACUC

Dr. Ruth- We have a second veterinarian who serves as my alternate. She is always at a meeting if I can't be there. There are some meetings when we are both there, there is always a vet at the meetings.

Senator Daley- In the protocol are there certain segments that address animal welfare and how animals are treated during the research?

Dr. Ruth- The emphasis of the protocol is to minimize any pain or distress that the animals would feel during the study. That is the reason for my preliminary review of the protocol. I advise the primary researchers on techniques to minimize that. The thread of animal welfare runs through the entire protocol.

Senator Kasnetz- It sounds as far as the concerns are legit, why did the Vermont supreme court vote the other way?

Bill Falls- It is my understanding that the law was passed, a challenge was made regarding whether or not IACUC was covered under the law, the court system looked at the law as it was written. The court said as it is written, IACUC is covered. The legislature then said they didn't want them to be covered along with 199 other entities so we need to go back and change the law with these exceptions.

RULES ARE INSTATED (00:37:18)

Lance Polya- First of all, I was part of the supreme court ruling. When the supreme court voted, they voted specifically for this IACUC. What happened was that four years later UVM went to legislature and specifically asked them to be exempt from it. The ruling was very specific about this IACUC and that their records were made to be public. In 42 of the 50 states, at public universities, the protocols are public. There has not been since the time, that we know, a major challenge for intellectual property compromise. So it is successful in other universities and other situations.

Kayla Tepper- Benner, where is your sweater vest. The first thing I just wanted to say is that I don't really like this system of time limits on forum. Unfortunately this is the first time I have been able to come back since I have not been on senate and it really makes me stressed out, if you are going to put time limits on anything, put it on committee reports, or executive reports or anything else. You have a list serve, it should be used a lot more. I don't know how to angry birds, if I did I know I would be very distracted but you could probably use your phone also to check stuff on the list serve. Think about it, just a suggestion from a humble student who was once a senator.

OLD BUSINESS (00:40:49)

Resolution Encouraging the Expansion of the Arabic Program at the University of Vermont

- Friendly amendment to change stands behind to supports
- Suggestion to add asking for a tenure for Professor Jonathan- declined
- Confusing on be it resolved section
- Suggestion to add a section about supporting Professor Jonathan, not necessarily tenure-declined
- Friendly amendment to remove significant from the fourth whereas- declined
- Resolution Passes

EMERGENCY BUSINESS (00:52:59)

NEW BUSINESS (00:53:23)

Resolution in support of barefoot student rights

Bill allocating funds to women's ice hockey

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS (00:54:02)

President Golfarini- Mural committee is good to go, email tomorrow asking about chairs. The South African students will be here from Jan 14<sup>th</sup> to the 28<sup>th</sup>?

SENATOR OF THE WEEK- Sean Keenan! Did a ride along,

The United way had a benefit dinner, all of the senior admin of waterman was there, really good food, a lot of lovely people, I realized that I got a plus one! What I am going to do with senator of the week now is if you are going to be put in a raffle to be my plus one.

QUESTION #1 finalizing the capital campaign proposal committee

Vice President Vitagliano- This Thursday will be attending a dinner with the UVM foundation. I do get a plus one but that seat is already taken. Right after that I will be at the BOT orientation on Friday. As with appoints, I have a new appointment with the campus master advisory committee; still looking for two students on the advisory committee. The appointment application of Samantha Holland will be this Sunday at 4. There are still 3 off campus positions available on the lynx.

Question #1 Continuing to review and confirm the BOT application and meeting with Erin St. John to get outreach to the secretary of trustees.

Chair Monteforte- Emailed Constitution committee with the form you need for changes, due next Monday.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS (01:02:50)

Finance- 9 supp tonight

Student Activities- I am going to email most of my report, encourage people to apply for appointments.

COLA- Tomorrow there is a Ward 1 Smanska park(?), on Brookes street. Working on PSAs for being loud in the neighborhoods and such. Ward 6 meeting, not too many people there, concerns brought up; bike safety, trying to change the traffic of South Willard St.

Academic Affairs- will email report on the list serve

CODEEEE- Email report

Student Action- Email report



Public Relations- Email report

SENATORIAL FORUM (01:07:37)

Senator Lederer-Plaskett- Holding a debate for the mayoral candidates of Burlington. It would be really great if SGA wanted to supply questions to ask them.

Senator Campbell- Remember you are representing SGA here, all of the good work PR does can be undone when people come to public forum. Respect the people who come to speak to us and each other.

Senator Keenan- Have been volunteering for the past few weekends (Irene Relief), want to urge people to volunteer now, there is a need.

Senator Pasterkiewicz- Thanks for voting for my bill

Senator Osef- Sent out an email talking about the course credit to our club leaders, I think it would be something really worth looking into.

Senator Chaouch- I am elections committee chair, we will be having meetings soon. Anyone interested in joining, let me know

Chair Benner- In relation to what Senator Campbell brought up, someone came up to me last week, upset about the rude conduct we displayed during public forum

Senator Matthews- Just got an email about an organ tissue donor list, the biggest group gets a \$1000 party, will be bringing this up again.

President Golfarini- did everyone get the email I sent out? It had some videos in it about the fun theory.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett- Cola is looking to install a Gondola from Church to the top of Waterman

Senator Goodnow- Do you think having an SGA presence at the Occupy the BH beach?

Senator Talbot- Hesitant of SGA support, there are a lot of messages being thrown out by the occupiers. It's a movement to take note of though, if you feel inclined, go to it!

President Golfarini- Ben and Jerry's was the first company to publically support it.

Chair Goodnow- I know we could all definitely go, but we could establish a new student role on campus, student activist. I understand there are dangers, I appreciate all responses

SENATORIAL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS (01:20:40)

Senator Osef- Happy National coming out day!

Senator Campbell- If you are looking for something to de-stress, the UVM Top Cats, and other acapella groups are putting on a show this Saturday

Senator Lederer-Plaskett- UVM Throw back help by the Class Council

Chair Dougherty- sorry for my absence over the past couple of meetings

ROLL CALL

Finance- Senator Neill excused

Student Activites- Senator Allston excused

COLA- Senator Nenopoulos

Academic Activities- Senator Daley excused

CODEEE- All present

Student Action- All present

Public Relations-All present

8:23