

Procedures of the University Animal Care Committee (UACC)

1. Procedures for the Use of Animals

1.1) All research and teaching at Queen's University involving animals that are housed in University facilities, on private farms, collected in the wild, or held in facilities other than those of the University (institutions not necessarily assessed by the Canadian Council on Animal Care) requires prior approval of the University Animal Care Committee (UACC). The UACC is responsible for overseeing the work carried out by all members of Queen's University who use animals for research, teaching or testing.

a) Therefore, a Queen's Principal Investigator (PI) who wishes to carry out animal-based work within a host institution's facilities must also submit an animal use protocol to the UACC. Both institutions must approve the protocol before commencement. Researchers from other institutions who apply to use the Queen's University Biological Station (QUBS) or another Queen's animal care facility must provide the UACC with copies of their home approved protocols for UACC approval. All home approved protocols will be reviewed by the UACC Subcommittee for approval. See the <u>UACC Policy on Animal Based Projects Involving Two or More Institutions</u>.

b) New Animal Use Protocols (AUPs) should be submitted to the UACC Coordinator at least two months in advance of the anticipated start date of the project or course. Because the UACC can request clarification of any missing or incorrect information, submitting an incomplete application can add a month or more to the approval process. Please be advised that research funding cannot be released until all applicable approvals are in place (including scientific merit when applicable).

1.2) In order to achieve the objective of ensuring that the use of vertebrate animals at Queen's University meets or exceeds the standards of animal welfare established by the Animals for Research Act (Ontario), and the Canadian Council on Animal Care, the UACC reviews all Queen's University sanctioned activities involving live animals whether they are to occur on Queen's property or otherwise. In order to facilitate this process, the UACC requires advance notice of any proposed evestion Arithand the ampropriot doug protocol and the transfer of the use and distribution of animals as compared to that which was previously approved. A justification for the number of animals being requested must be provided regardless of any changes.

1.6) Full Resubmission protocols must include an update on the previous approval period outcomes as they relate to complications, adequacy of humane/study endpoints, and a description of the use and distribution of animals as compared to that which was approved will be required.

1.7) A protocol closure report collecting information on why the study is no longer being pursued is required upon completion of a protocol (or when a PI chooses not to renew or to abandon a protocol). An update on outcomes as they relate to complications, adequacy of humane/study endpoints, and a description of the use and distribution of animals as compared to that which was approved will be sought and PI's will be encouraged to explain if/ how the research objectives were reached and to indicate any publications or additional research opportunities that arose out of the research.





breaches of compliance develop. See the UACC Policy on the Oversight of Animals in Science.

2.6) The UACC shall establish procedures for post approval monitoring of animal use protocols and define the roles and responsibilities of the members of the animal care and use program in the monitoring process.

To facilitate compliance as dictated by the Animals for Research Act (ARA), Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) guidelines and policies, and institutional policies and standard operating procedures (SOPs), a Quality Assurance Program (QAP) has been implemented. This program provides support to the research community while ensuring the protection of animal subjects by confirming accurate and consistent UACC approved protocol performance of animal-based research in a collegial and unobtrusive manner.

2.6a) QAP assessments are managed by the QAP Coordinator who serves as the eyes and ears of the UACC, without voting privileges, but with obligations to advocate on behalf of the UACC when interacting with researchers and research (er)3.7 uo2.6 (e13.6 (ov)10(e1)]o(i)-Tw 0 -1.n.015 aTw 0 61.3 (t)2 ((o)13.4g w 0.28 0)1 (((c)-2.7 (h)137 (ear)17 (c)-2.n (t)2 (oc, (t)2 (c) + 1.0 +



also choose to delegate certain responsibilities to one or more senior animal care staff member(s).

2.8) The UACC will maintain an active dialog with senior administration through communications with the UACC Chair and the University Veterinarian. Senior administration will be sent a summary document quantifying all annual activities of the UACC (protocol reviews, facility assnn



3.5) After UACC members have completed their reviews, they shall discuss the proposal at a full UACC meeting and, taking account of the members' evaluations, either **a** approve (with or without comments), **b** return for modification (for subsequent review by the UACC Subcommittee), or **c** decline the proposal, requiring it be revised and resubmitted to the next full UACC meeting for subsequent review.

If the members of the UACC reviewing the proposal so indicate, they shall be given an opportunity to see any clarifications/revisions that may be provided by the PI. Reviewers shall also have access to the PI's grant application(s) and/or other appropriate documents in order to satisfy themselves concerning the nature of the experimental procedures to be utilized. The UACC Coord-21.013 -04 Tw [(C)6 (oo Tw [(r)-c,3.3 (i))6 (ooe)13.3 (d(t913.fd.)2 ((at)2 (i3.3 (t))]TJ 0.004 TC3 (d(t913.fd.)2 (t))]T



review successfully completed before the protocol is approved. A reviewer pool will be maintained by the UACC Coordinator with suitable reviewers from this pool being selected by staff within the Office of the Vice Principal (Research). The UACC Coordinator will approach the selected reviewers to provide written assessment of the proposed research. A scientific summary of the research protocol is sent for review, along with a reviewer comment form which includes a statement requesting declaration of the relationship between the reviewer and the PI to ensure an arm's-length review. In addition, the reviewer must declare whether they are qualified to review the proposal. As a minimum, one reviewer must be external to the UACC. In addition, regardless of the funding source, peer-review for scientific merit may be sought for any protocol where, in the judgement of the UACC, the specifics of animal use have not been adequately justified or explained. Reviews are documented and must contain sufficient information to support reviewer conclusions.

4. Pilot Projects

The UACC encourages the use of pilot studies with few animals when new approaches, methods, or products are being tried. Animal users must report on the results of pilot studies, regardless of whether they wish to pursue the study immediately or not, in order to preserve important data on various approaches to animal-based studies, whether they work well or not.

Submitting a pilot project for review entails the same process as submitting a new protocol. When completing the protocol, it must be labelled as a pilot project. At time of renewal, regardless of whether the study is to continue, a pilot progress report must be completed. If the study is to continue, a full resubmission must be submitted. Pilot extensions of up to 1 year are available if nothing is changing within the application and little or no progress was made during the initial 1-year period.

5. Interim Approval

In the event that interim approval (approval prior to the next meeting of the UACC) is required, the PI should submit the protocol following the regular process however communicating approval needs to the UACC Coordinator including clear justification for this request. The UACC delegates the responsibility of interim approvals to the UACC Subcommittee. Interim approvals are subject to discussion and final approval at a full UACC meeting.

6. shppea(eM3ch40.is/te)14CC3UAne(b)227(at)2h(d)1h(at)40025)8cSth0.illegat)15.84(ep)227(3i)p7(on7)5.07(1)4(16)21(i)40.598a0