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Dedication

This history is dedicated to the memory of Nathan Brewer. His vision, patience and dedication brought to fruition what are today The American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ACLAM) and The American Association for Laboratory Science (AALAS), originally the Animal Care Panel (ACP). The Proceedings of the Animal Care Panel were the forerunner of the Journal of Laboratory Animal Science. Dr. Nathan Brewer died at the age of 105 and was still of sound mind and interested in the College. It is remarkable that what Dr. Brewer envisioned and worked tirelessly to achieve, with the help of the other founders and early members, was accomplished in its entirety.
Dr. Charles “Bud” Middleton (1930-2010) earned his DVM degree at the University of Missouri in 1958. In 1962, he completed a Master’s degree in surgery at Michigan State University and entered the laboratory animal training program at Bowman Gray School of Medicine. In 1966, he became Director of Sinclair Research Farm at the University of Missouri. He became an ACLAM Diplomate that same year. He was also Chairman of the University of Missouri Area Program in Laboratory Animal Medicine. After 18 years at the University of Missouri he served as Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans Administration. In 1985, he took the position of Director of the Division of Laboratory Animal Resources at the University of New York Stony Brook. He remained there until he retired in 1995.

He was one of ACLAM’s strongest and most dedicated supporters. He was Newsletter editor from 1975 to 1976, Chair of the Exam Committee from 1982 to 1983, and President of the College from 1985 to 1986. He Chaired the Nominations Committee from 1987 to 1988, and served as ACLAM’s Historian from 1992 to 1999.

I knew Bud personally. He was one of my mentors at the University of Missouri’s Laboratory Animal Training Program. We were friends and colleagues throughout my career. Bud somehow managed to combine great self confidence with great humility. One day he would be arguing “toe to toe” with a high ranking University official, and the next day he would be in coveralls building primate cages with his staff. He valued hard work, honesty and integrity in any human being no matter their race, creed or color. He had a high regard for both research and clinical medicine. He had strong opinions and was not shy about giving them, but he always had his “ducks in a row” (i.e., the data to back them up). The first draft of this history was peppered with his observations, reflections and witticisms, which made for some enjoyable reading but were removed in the final version as this was not meant as an annotated history. I hope, however, that some of Bud’s spirit appears between the lines of the following pages. If this sounds more like a tribute than a biography, it is, and I can think of no better way to end it than with the complimentary close of the Secretary/Treasurer.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie La Regina
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List of Frequently Used Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACLAM – American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine
AFC – ACLAM Foundation Committee
BOD – Board of Directors
CC – Credentials Committee
CE – Continuing Education
COC – Certification Oversight Committee
CPC – Career Pathways Committee
CTOC – Careers and Training Oversight Committee
EC – Examination Committee
ERC – Examination Review Committee
GC – Governance Committee
GRAC – Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee
LABSG – Laboratory Animal Boards Study Group
RTOC – Recruitment and Training Oversight Committee
RDD – Role Delineation Document
SPC – Strategic Planning Committee
TPOC – Training Program Oversight Committee
TPRC – Training Program Recognition Committee

AAALAC – Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care
AAAS – American Association for the Advancement of Science
AALAS – American Association for Laboratory Animal Science
AAVMC – Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges
ABVS – American Board of Veterinary Specialties
ACP – Animal Care Panel
ASLAP – American Society of Laboratory Animal Practitioners
AVMA – American Veterinary Medical Association
ECFVG – Educational Commission for Foreign Veterinary Students
EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
FASEB – Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology
FDA – Food and Drug Administration
FELASA – Federation of European Laboratory Animal Science Association
IACUC – Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
IATA – International Air Transport Association
ICLAS – International Council for Laboratory Animal Science
ILAR – Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources
NAL – National Agriculture Library
NAS – National Academy of Science
NCRR – National Council of Research Resources
NIH – National Institutes of Health
NLM – National Library of Medicine
NRC – National Research Council
NSMR – National Society for Medical Research
OLAW – Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
OPRR – Office of Protection from Research Risks
PHS – Public Health Service
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture
USUHS – Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences
Status of Animal Care, Use and Facilities prior to a Board Specialty

Facets of animal care and use before the initiation of centralized programs with a veterinarian in charge are beyond the scope of this publication. Prior to 1957, veterinary management of research animal facilities and programs of care was rare in medical schools and commercial research institutions. There were exceptions, but the majority of facilities and care were far from ideal. Before World War II, there were few research projects using animal models. Many of the research facilities were not designed, or were poorly designed, for housing animals. Most rooms in buildings that housed animals for teaching or research were primitive by today’s standards. At some institutions, there were a plethora of rooms in buildings scattered through various divisions and departments. Frequently, they were autonomous and controlled by the investigator funding the animal project. Investigators bought their own cages and equipment, and graduate students or research technicians were assigned the care of the animals. Vendors of feed, bedding and caging exhibited at annual scientific meetings of the biomedical community, such as the Federated Societies, reflecting the management and care of animals by individual investigators and their students. Even when veterinarians became a part of the animal program, they came from private practice backgrounds and were self-taught. In the late 50’s this pattern began to change.

The late 40s and early 50s saw increased funding of extramural biomedical research from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and other government agencies. These new funds to medical schools and research institutions, together with matching grants for animal facility expansion or new facilities, increased the use of animals. Medical institutions soon moved to centralize animal care and use programs, employed veterinarians to oversee them, and created a demand for veterinarians trained in laboratory animal care. Thus, the veterinary specialty of Laboratory Animal Medicine is unique, being conceived and nurtured within the institution of human medicine, not within veterinary medicine per se.

The Genesis of Organized Laboratory Animal Medicine
(Edited from the notes of Dr. Nathan Brewer)

The Animal Care Panel was the first organization to bring together veterinarians and others interested in the care, diseases and use of laboratory animals. What started as informal meetings of the few veterinarians managing research animal colonies grew into a vital organization within a decade.

In 1946, Dr. Arthur Rosenberg joined the staff of Northwestern University. Dr. Rosenberg and Dr. N.R. Brewer of the University of Chicago met at frequent intervals to discuss problems related to laboratory animal care. One of their activities was the presentation of scientific exhibits concerning the use and care of animals. This activity helped to promote a favorable climate for the organization of the Animal Care Panel (ACP). What may have been the first exhibit on the subject of laboratory animal medicine was presented at the AVMA meeting in Boston in 1946. The exhibit featured problems related to the pre- and post-operative care in gastrointestinal surgery of the dog. Enough interest was generated by the exhibit that Dr. Brewer and Dr. Rosenberg presented another exhibit the following year at the AVMA meeting. That exhibit demonstrated bronchoscopy in the dog.

The art work for the 1947 exhibit was done by Dr. Robert Litt, who collaborated in its
preparation. These exhibits were a medium for visits with such men as the late Dr. Charles A. Griffin of the New York State Department of Public Health and with Dr. Benjamin D. Fremming, then at the University of Texas. The visits gave recognition and encouragement to the development of this important new specialty.

Dr. Robert Litt was named head of the experimental surgical facilities at the University of Illinois Medical School in 1948. In the spring of 1948, a meeting of researchers, laboratory technicians, veterinarians and supervisors of animal quarters in the Chicago area was held at the University of Illinois. Problems related to the care and management of laboratory animals were discussed. The highlight of the meeting was a demonstration of intestinal anastomosis in the dog by the host Dr. Litt. This was followed by a discussion of pre- and postoperative management. In 1948 Dr. Elihu Bond, after working with Dr. Brewer at the University of Chicago, followed Dr. Litt as head of the experimental surgical facilities at the University of Illinois. In 1949 he became Director of the animal facilities at that institution.

Dr. Robert J. Flynn was made the supervisor of the Argonne National Laboratory Animal Facilities also in 1948. In 1949, Hektoen Institute became the fifth Chicago institution to add a veterinarian, Dr. William F. Schroeder, to its staff to direct the management of its animal facilities. These five Chicago institutions, in the realization that animal facilities were becoming increasingly the responsibility of each institution rather than of each researcher, made professional appointments to cope with that responsibility. It was believed that a veterinarian, because of his knowledge of the husbandry and diseases of domestic animals and pets, and his interest in the well-being of animals, would be best qualified for these appointments. Dr. Lester Fisher followed Dr. Rosenberg at Northwestern University. Dr. Fisher was followed by Dr. Bennett J. Cohen in July 1949. Starting in the fall of 1949 Drs. Bond, Brewer, Cohen, Flynn and Schroeder met once a month to discuss animal care problems. Additional meetings were held on special occasions, such as when the late Dr. Carl Schlotthauer of the Mayo Foundation or Dr. W.T.S. Thorp, then Chief of the Laboratory Aids Branch of the National Institutes of Health, came to Chicago. All of these men recognized the need for more information about their work. There were large areas where no information was available or where it was scattered and diffused. For this reason it was believed that other institutions and individuals would be interested in meeting to exchange information pertaining to the care of laboratory animals.

A forum was planned, a panel, to bring together interested people. In deliberations about the form and program of the forum an early decision was made: invitations to participate would not depend on whether or not the individual was a veterinarian. Drs. Thorp and Schlotthauer were participants in the early planning. The late Dr. Charles A. Slanetz of Columbia University Medical School, the late Mr. Harry Herrlein of Rockland Farms and Mr. C.M.W. Cumming of Carworth also participated.

Plans and dates for a meeting that would include interested participants in the United States and Canada were set for the fall of 1950. Dr. Cohen agreed to act as Secretary for the Program Committee and Dr. Brewer was chosen Chairman. On 12 May 1950 the first letter announcing the formation of the panel was distributed. It was signed by the five Chicago veterinarians: Drs. Bond, Brewer, Cohen, Flynn and Schroeder. On Tuesday, November 28 1950, a group of 75 workers interested in the care and management of laboratory animals assembled in Dora Lee Hall of the University of Chicago. The ensuing discussions brought to the fore many challenging problems relating to the operation of laboratory animal facilities. A business meeting was held after the program was completed and the Animal Care Panel (ACP) was born. In 1953, the ACP
became a not for profit educational association, and in 1967 the name was changed to the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science.

**The American Board of Laboratory Animal Medicine**

It took over ten years from the first communication between Dr. Brewer and various individuals to the formation of the American Board of Laboratory Medicine as a reality. This Board was incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois as a not-for-profit organization February 18, 1957. Following incorporation, approval was sought and obtained from the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) for a new specialty board. Once the incorporation and approval from the AVMA was achieved, the advancement of laboratory animal medicine was rapid. Those individuals who followed made additional changes, improvements and refinements. However, the goals of ACLAM today remain the same as those first stated in 1958: To encourage education, training and research in laboratory animal medicine; to establish standards of training and experience for qualification of specialists in laboratory animal medicine; and to further the recognition of such qualified specialists by suitable certification and other means.

In 1958, Charter Fellows were veterinarians of established reputations who were engaged in laboratory animal medicine and who had joined together to establish the organization at its organizational meeting, plus others elected for Fellowship by unanimous vote of the original group. A candidate for Charter Fellowship was a graduate of a veterinary school recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association; a member in good standing of the American Veterinary Medical Association; had an MS degree or equivalent training from a recognized institution of learning and 5 or more years of experience in laboratory animal medicine or 8 years of experience in laboratory animal medicine without the advanced degree. Said Charter Fellows must have applied for Fellowship within 12 months following incorporation of the Board (2/12/57).

Fellows were veterinarians of good moral character who had met the training and experience requirements, satisfactorily completed the Certifying Examination, and were elected by a majority vote of all Council members.

The first set of prerequisites, approved by the Council, for a candidate to become eligible to take the Certifying Examination was as follows:

a) Be a graduate of a veterinary school recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association.

b) Be a member in good standing of the American Veterinary Medical Association.

c) Have an MS or equivalent degree from a recognized institution of learning and at least 5 years of experience in laboratory animal medicine and have made a distinct contribution to the advancement of laboratory animal medicine. It was possible to substitute 3 years of additional experience along with recognized accomplishments in laboratory animal medicine for the advanced degree.

d) Submit to the Council, with the application, a written statement containing all pertinent information necessary to enable the Council members to judge the suitability of the candidate's abilities, training and experience to undertake the Certifying Examination.

Associate membership was open to veterinarians who had at least three (3) years of postgraduate experience in laboratory animal medicine and who met all the prerequisites for the Certifying Examination except the advanced training and experience requirements.

Applications for certification and detailed information on requirements were available from the
Secretary/Treasurer. Application forms had to be completed in full and be accompanied by an examination fee of $15.00.
The Certifying Exam was given at a time and place determined by the Council, and was announced to eligible candidates. In the event that the applicant's credentials were not accepted by the Council, the examination fee was returned. In the event that a candidate failed to pass the examination, he might be permitted, at the discretion of the Council, to take a subsequent examination, contingent on payment of an additional examination fee. Such applicants were expected to furnish additional information concerning their subsequent training and thereby justify re-examination.

An ACLAM Brochure containing the above information on fellowship and certification was published in 1960 and sent to interested individuals.

**ACLAM 1960-1969**

In the 1960s, the American Board of Laboratory Animal Medicine became the American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ACLAM). Board Certification remained the cornerstone of the organization. The title of those qualifying for full membership was changed from “Fellow” to “Diplomate” and the Council became the Board of Directors (BOD).

ACLAM entered rapidly into new educational endeavors for both members and the scientific community in general. Starting in 1968, the Symposia on Animal Models for Biomedical Research, textbooks on a variety of laboratory animal species and stand alone educational forums made the College unique among Veterinary Specialty Boards. When the Animal Care Panel was formed, it was opened to anyone with an interest in the care and use of laboratory animals. However, as the field grew, those with more specialized interests added new organizations such as the Association of Primate Veterinarians (APV). Many Diplomates were actively involved in these other organizations, including the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science (AALAS) and the American Society of Laboratory Animal Practitioners (ASLAP). Diplomates often served as officers of these organizations. The influence and contributions of laboratory animal veterinarians were growing, as Nathan Brewer had envisioned.

The number of Diplomates was small in the 1960s and did not reach 50 until 1966. About twenty of these were charter members. Despite the small numbers, efforts to lay the foundation of a growing professional organization continued. Mr. Harvey Sarner was retained as the ACLAM attorney. He rendered his first legal opinion for the College stating that the President could legally appoint two Diplomates to audit ACLAM accounts. In 1964, letterhead stationery was used for the first time.

In 1961, Dr. Brewer received a plaque acknowledging his outstanding services as co-founder and first president of ACLAM. Dr. Leo K. Bustad became the first honorary member in 1962. In subsequent years, honorary and emeritus status was discussed. It was pointed out that the provision for retired Diplomates was filling that need.

In 1961, Dr. Brewer expressed concern that a one year presidential term was insufficient to provide program continuity to the

The first two presidents each served a 3 year term. The term of office for each officer was changed to one year beginning in the late 60s. The offices would begin at the conclusion of the annual ACLAM business meeting and extend through the succeeding ACLAM business meeting the next calendar year. The By-Laws were changed to accommodate this change. Dr. Robert Flynn was the first one year president in 1963. Dr. Bennett Cohen, President in 1964, expressed concern that a one year presidential term was insufficient to provide program continuity to the
College. His rationale "To allow the President to carry through a long range development program which ACLAM needs," reflected his concern that a new president who was not aware of, or did not agree with, the plans of the previous president could be problematic. This potential problem was addressed in the 70s with the addition of the President Elect and Past President as BOD members.

Dr. Cohen also urged attention to three items specific to the founding principles of the College. They were:
1) More defined procedures for certification of Diplomates.
2) An effective mechanism for approval of training programs,
3) Promotion of scientific development of laboratory animal medicine.

In addressing the first two items, ACLAM committed itself to site visit the five institutions that were conducting training programs in laboratory animal medicine, and considered the use of a professional examination service for the first time. More funds would be necessary to cover the costs of such visits, as well as the examination service. It was also agreed, at this time, that the Program Director for any ACLAM approved training program must be an ACLAM Diplomate. As simple as it is to list these 3 areas which needed improvement or fine tuning, the actual development was more complicated. The exam, certification requirements, and training program approval proved a lengthy and sometimes controversial process.

The 60s also saw the elimination of Associate Membership within ACLAM. A constitutional amendment was initiated to effect this change. After 1966, no further Associate applications were processed. Current Associate Members were encouraged to take the certifying examination and become Diplomates of the specialty. The decision was not made lightly, there was much discussion, legal council was approached, and the final decision could not help but leave some Associates disappointed. However, the decision was a stimulus to the formation and growth of ASLAP which, with AALAS, became major organizations for education and training within the profession and the greater biomedical community. The original Animal Care Panel was indeed evolving into more diverse groups addressing more specific needs.

ACLAM’s commitment to continuing education, at this time, resulted in a combined effort with the Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources (ILAR) of the National Research Council: The Animal Models for Biomedical Research Symposia held in 1968. The intent was to sponsor a 5 day course patterned after those offered by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology (AFIP). Each of the four Symposia (I, II, III, IV), was chaired by an ACLAM Diplomate, who selected the speakers and models to be presented. All four were published under the general title “Animal Models for Biomedical Research” by the Printing and Publishing Office of the National Academy of Science. Symposium I was chaired by Dr. Charles McPherson and published in 1968. Symposia II and III were chaired by Dr. Russell Lindsey and Dr Charles Middleton respectively. Symposium IV was chaired by Dr. Norman Wolf and published in 1971. These were the first of many ACLAM publications.

In 1968, the AVMA proposed the establishment of a separate section on Laboratory Animal Medicine at its annual meeting. ACLAM sent a letter offering assistance in planning the program, but the AVMA denied the request, stating that it could not be co-sponsored by any special interest group.

**ACLAM Credentials and Training Programs in the 1960s**

The criteria for Diplomate status put forth at the August 24, 1961 BOD meeting were as follows:
1) Membership in the AVMA
2) Masters degree and 3 years of approved experience, or 2 years training in an approved program and 3 years approved experience, or 5 years approved experience
3) Pass the written examination
4) Presentation of an approved written dissertation on some phase of laboratory animal medicine
5) Pass an oral examination.

A letter was sent by Dr. Flynn in 1962 to Associate Members of ACLAM, Deans of Veterinary Colleges, Directors of Training Programs, Veterinary Journals and others interested in ACLAM certification.

In 1965, the By-Laws were reworded to accommodate new BOD requirements for taking the exam:

A. The experience requirement in the By-Laws must include the type of experience and institution where experience took place. Experience could include 3 years with one common species of laboratory animal and one year of general experience with at least two of the three following species: rodent, carnivore, subhuman primate. The institutional experience must include number of animals held and used by species, space devoted to the animal care unit, the training and number of personnel employed in the unit and the size, sources of support and type of research programs conducted.

B. The dissertation did not need to be basic biological research, and need not have been published. It must have been a scholarly contribution to the understanding of laboratory animal medicine, the biology of laboratory animals or laboratory animal science, technology and medicine. It must demonstrate ability to solve problems in a scientific manner, use the library and write clearly. It could be a comprehensive review of the literature, review of case histories or a paper resulting from a research project.

C. Approval of the candidate for certification would require a three forths majority of the BOD.

The Membership/Credentials Committee was charged with evaluating a candidate’s application. All members of the committee would get a copy of applications. References were to be contacted, and queried about the applicant. If there was unanimous agreement to approve an applicant they would be notified and given the time and place of examination. If there was not unanimous agreement, the application will be forwarded to the BOD for a decision. A majority affirmative vote would be necessary to approve an applicant. On completion of the examination, the Committee would review all results and, if there was unanimous agreement, the applicant would be certified as a Diplomate. In the event of disagreement the entire BOD would be polled.

Dr. Thomas B. Clarkson directed the first academic training program in laboratory animal medicine at the Bowman Gray School of Medicine in 1960. His first trainee was John Le May. In that same year, a second program at the UCLA Medical School was started by Dr. Bennett Cohen. Dr. Cohen’s first trainee was Sigmund Rich. The Air Force also supported a training program at this time. The programs included both professional and research training. However, there were no established guidelines for training programs in laboratory animal medicine.

Drs. Clarkson and Cohen encouraged ACLAM to develop a mechanism for program approval. They believed that a graduate program in laboratory animal medicine should include both professional and research training. Professional training should include instruction in such areas as methods and techniques of laboratory animal care and experiments, comparative anatomy, pathology, and diseases of laboratory animals, necropsy techniques, genetic concepts and the administration of research animal facilities. Research training should include didactic and research
in some phase of laboratory animal medicine. Training programs would likely increase in number in the next few years, and thus it was extremely important to have ACLAM members express what they believe should be the content of the training.

Dr. Robert Hummer, Director of the Air Force Laboratory Animal Training Program, agreed with Drs. Cohen and Clarkson regarding what should constitute training. Additionally he felt that laboratory animal veterinarians should be research oriented and have an adequate background in statistics and research methodology. He hoped that members of the specialty would put forth published minimum curriculum standards to be used as a guide for constructing a curriculum and as a yardstick for evaluation.

Although there was general agreement with the Clarkson-Cohen proposal, the area of research was controversial. Some, such as Dr. Clarkson, considered laboratory animal medicine as that part of general medicine which focuses its primary attention on laboratory animal species. Therefore, research in any basic or clinical science was of equal value, and a training program was successful if the research contributed to knowledge in any area of biology or medicine. However, others, including Dr. Robert Flynn, argued that only research dealing with a specific aspect of laboratory animal medicine was appropriate for the training programs.

In 1964, a Workshop sponsored by the Institute for Laboratory Animal Resources addressed the need for educational guidelines to be used by all training programs. The first guidelines were published in 1967 as "A Guide to Post Doctoral Training in Laboratory Medicine" No. 1483 NAS-ILAR. Subsequently, it was adopted as the Guide to Post Doctoral Training by ACLAM.

Dr. Orland Soave first mentioned that a "core" of knowledge should be considered which encompassed the specialty. In 1968, he questioned the adequacy and completeness of the "Guide for Postdoctoral Training in Laboratory Animal Medicine." He had received several letters complaining about the 1968 examination, and believed that the body of knowledge was not properly or adequately defined. The question of what constitutes "core" knowledge would generate discussion and fine tuning efforts for many years.

During this decade, NIH funding for training programs increased. Originally, funding for programs in laboratory animal medicine was provided by the Physiology Training Committee of the NIH General Medical Sciences. By the mid-60s, training grants for these programs were under the authority of the Animal Resources Branch of the NIH. In 1965, the listed training programs in laboratory animal medicine were Bowman Gray School of Medicine (Thomas B. Clarkson, DVM); Tulane University (Kenneth Burns, DVM); University of Michigan (Bennett Cohen, DVM, PhD); New York University (L.R. Christensen, PhD); Ohio State University (Robert Henthorne DVM); Brooks Air Force Base (Robert Hummer DVM); University of California, Davis (Director not given, but not a veterinarian); University of Florida (Alvin Moreland, DVM); and Stanford University (Orland Soave, DVM). It became increasingly clear that ACLAM did not have the funds to send site visitors to evaluate programs for approval. It was decided that a letter giving tentative approval would be sent until actual site visits could be made. The Credentials Committee was given the responsibility to accept or reject the training that the applicant submitted in order to take the exam. In 1966, the BOD approved a By-Law change regarding training programs. The phrase “approved by the College” was deleted and replaced with “whose director is an ACLAM Diplomate.” Thus, ACLAM required that the program director of any approved post doctoral training program in laboratory animal medicine be a Diplomate of ACLAM. The change was to take place as soon as approved by legal counsel, Harry Sarner.
ACLAM Examination in the 1960s

The first written exam was formulated by Dr. William Dolowy in 1962. Dr. Dolowy was Secretary/Treasurer from 1962-64 and chairman of the Examination Committee. The written examination could be taken at any time, preferably after an approved curriculum of post graduate study had been completed. The applicant need not wait until the experience requirement had been fulfilled. William Dolowy's article published in 1963 about the ACLAM Certifying Exam included an actual exam that was used until 1964. After the first year, a reference was required for each question.

Approximately 60% of the written examination was based on infectious, parasitic, metabolic, nutritional, genetic and reproductive aspects of mice, rats, dogs, rabbits and Rhesus monkeys. Approximately 20% was based on the same topics for cats, guinea pigs, poultry and hamsters and 20% on specific topics of nutrition, immunology, sterilization, physiology, virology, mycology, germ free technology, anatomy, bacteriology, genetics, anesthesia, surgery, laboratory technology, radioactive isotopes, tumors, atherosclerosis, biostatistics, appropriate use of specific animals, and organizations relating to the specialty. The questions were all multiple choice. Many were taken from the Proceedings of the Animal Care Panel starting with its inception, including references listed therein. Questions were also taken from animal disease reports in such journals as Cancer Research, Circulation Research, JAVMA, AJVR, Veterinary Bulletin, Carworth Quarterly Letter, Transplantable and Transmissible Tumors of Animals and current veterinary texts.

In the early 60s, a Diplomate took the written exam at the same time as the candidates. A passing score for certification was 70% of that Diplomate’s score. The first listed results of the exam were in 1962. There were 6 applicants and 2 passed.

In 1964, it was decided to hold the written exam once a year, either in conjunction with the AVMA or the Animal Care Panel (ACP) depending on which meeting would be more centrally located. The oral exam was given at both the AVMA and ACP meeting, depending on availability of examinees. However, by 1967 the entire examination was given at the AVMA and continued there for many years.

Also in 1964, Dr. Cohen suggested ways to improve the exam procedure. He pointed out that oral exams can be problematic, especially if procedures were not uniform among the examiners. Differences in interpretation between examiners might lead to different pass/fail outcomes although candidates performed equally well. He pointed out that these problems must be overcome if the oral exam was to remain creditable. There was also dissatisfaction with the written exam, and the BOD sent a memo detailing these concerns to Diplomates and Associate members. The written was criticized as being insufficiently comprehensive, with poorly worded or ambiguous questions.

An attempt was made to completely revise the exam in 1965. The written exam would consist of true/false questions, fill-in-the-blank or short answer questions as well as multiple choice. An oral examination was still required, but a practical exam was offered for the first time. The practical consisted of slides of lesions of laboratory animal diseases and demonstration of examination techniques used in laboratory animal medicine. It also included questions to evaluate problem solving ability, poise, response and over all knowledge. However, under the By-Laws existing at the time, the 1965 practical did not count toward certification.
The first practical exam required for certification was given in 1966. It consisted of projected slides illustrating techniques, gross and microscopic lesions of laboratory animal diseases, parasitic ova, species and strains of laboratory animals, radiographs and electrocardiographic tracings. It was considered part B of the written. Part A was given in the morning, the practical or Part B in the afternoon, with the oral exam following on the same or the next day. The written component included questions on laboratory animal biology and care, diseases of laboratory animals, experimental pathology, surgery and post surgical care, biostatistics, genetics and techniques of animal experimentation. In 1967, approximately half of written and oral questions were new with the remainder coming from previous exams. The oral was administered by a committee of at least four Diplomates as examiners with concurrence of three to pass.

By this time, passing scores for the exam were no longer determined using a Diplomate’s score as a control. Often the passing grades were selected at what was called “the natural break point.” This was the score where a clear break occurred between candidates. For example, a number of candidates may have scored above 70%. If the next highest score was significantly below 70 (say 58), then 70 became the “break point.” Passing grades ranged from 57% to 70%. A separate passing grade was determined for the written and the practical. The method generated some controversy. Grading on a curve was proposed but not adopted, and a professional exam service was again suggested but still deemed too expensive.

In 1969, the practice of taking away points for wrong answers was dropped, and correct answers were given one point each. The issue of continuing the oral exam was again raised. It was decided to keep the oral exam as an opportunity for more membership participation, for investigating the thinking and philosophy of the candidates, and for newcomers to express themselves and their points of view. However, it continued to be controversial.

In the late 60s the BOD approved a policy that allowed a candidate to take the examination 3 times in a 26 month period for one fee. Candidates were informed of results within 30 days of taking the exam. Records on a candidate were kept until all three parts of the exam were passed, and slides for the practical were maintained by the Secretary/Treasurer for 3 years, and then placed in the repository.

**ACLAM 1970-1979**

Membership was growing, as were ACLAM’s responsibilities and influence. There was an increase in the number of appointments to other organizations. The first mention of an ACLAM representative to the AALAS BOD (Dr. Gerald Van Hoosier) was in 1970. The College also was involved heavily in the scientific program at the annual AALAS conventions. More committees were appointed by the presidents, and more BOD meetings were held in the same year with committee reports received at each meeting. The first official listing of committees was in 1969-1970, when only 3 were listed. In the 1990s, as many as twenty committees were listed. The number of committees varied considerably. As membership grew and needs changed, some were discontinued and others were added. However, the committees of greatest importance were and continued to be the Credentials, Examination and Training committees.

**ACLAM Credentials and Training Programs in the 1970s**

In the early 70s, the Committee on Curriculum and Training, chaired by Dr. Charles Middleton,
was charged with reviewing and approving candidates’ applications and it became clear that the credentials required to take the examination needed clarification. Was the training a candidate received adequate? Could a candidate take the exam before full completion of the training and experience requirements? What constituted qualified authorship of the required scientific article? Was 14th author adequate? Adding to the difficulty was ACLAM approval of training programs. Legal Counsel, Harvey Sarner, had recommended deleting the requirement that an approved training program be directed only by an ACLAM diplomate, and this was approved by the BOD. Dr. Clarkson believed the time was appropriate for site visits to training programs and to determine ACLAM approval by this method. However, the hosting program would have to pay the site visitor’s expenses as ACLAM’s funds were insufficient to site visit all programs thoroughly. Dr. James Pick reported that the AVMA was considering a proposal to evaluate all specialty training programs. The evaluation would be performed by a three person committee consisting of a member of the AVMA Specialty Board, an AVMA Council member and one member of the specific specialty. However, Dr. Edward Melby pointed out that the AVMA Specialty Board was opposed to this proposal. He felt that ACLAM should take a more general stance toward evaluating training programs, because becoming Board Certified was, by one standard, an evaluation of the adequacy of a candidate’s training. Dr. Middleton stated that his committee on Curriculum and Training was interested in setting guidelines on training programs, and that the College should aspire to some uniformity of training experience. However, Dr. Melby countered with the argument that uniformity of training programs might eventually be achieved through funding mechanisms. Dr. Henry Baker felt some blanket approval of all training programs should be enacted or else the requirement should be deleted as a pre-requisite to take the exam. The BOD requested the Curriculum and Training Committee to assemble recommendations for a training program approval mechanism and provide guidelines for training programs. Dr. Middleton also agreed to draft and submit application changes to the BOD, some of which would require a By-Laws change.

However in 1973, before such recommendations were finalized, the Curriculum and Training Committee was restructured. It no longer reviewed a candidate’s application. This responsibility was given to the new Credentials Committee (CC), and there was discussion as to whether this review would be an acceptable method of determining approved training. The committee was asked to address this issue and make a recommendation to the BOD. Both committees, Credentials and Curriculum and Training, were frustrated and felt a lack of clear direction from the BOD. Given the strong feelings of both committees and BOD members on the subject of training, as well as clear differences in training programs with some lasting 24 months and others only 16, it was perhaps understandable that clear, concise directives were lacking, especially when the goal was to be selective without being restrictive and remain within legal boundaries.

In 1975, Dr. Dale Boyd reported several concerns of the Credentials Committee:

1) Lack of uniform criteria to evaluate approved training
2) Little guidance from the College on what constitutes an approved training program.
3) Should the last year of a 3 year program be allowed as experience?
4) What constitutes an acceptable publication?
5) Time frame from receipt of application to deadline for final recommendation to the BOD was very short.

In 1976, Dr. Jack Hessler reported for the CC and stated that the Committee had many concerns in evaluating applicants. They urged more specific guidelines for training, experience, publication
and possibly accreditation of formal training programs. There was much discussion of the report by the BOD, but no decisions. Since the Committee had not presented specifics, the report was referred back to them for further consideration.

The BOD was asked to clarify the responsibility of the CC regarding recommendations on training programs. The BOD felt this was a part of the charge of the Recruitment and Training Committee. In the meantime the Credential Committee would do the best it could with present criteria (Recall that a previous BOD had asked the CC to consider the possibility that its review of a candidate was an acceptable method of determining approved training). As yet no Policy and Procedure Manual existed which would have helped avoid contradicting directives.

In 1977, Dr. David Valerio presented the Credential Committee Report. The Committee proposed changes in the examination application form and in the ACLAM Constitution and By-Laws. Modification of the form would include a check-off list for candidates and more complete description of responsibilities and experience with a letter of recommendation from recent supervisors. These recommendations were approved. In addition, a revision of the Certification Section of the By-Laws Article II Section 1 was presented for action. It stated that an applicant must have completed a minimum of 4 years of combined training and experience in Laboratory Animal Medicine after the veterinary degree, to be interpreted as follows:

a) Applicants from formal training programs of 2 or more years must have an additional 2 years of experience beyond the training period.

b) Candidates with the MS/PhD but no training must have 5 years of full time laboratory animal experience, 2 years of which must follow receipt of the degree(s).

c) Applicants with neither advanced degrees nor training program backgrounds must have 6 years of full time experience. One year of experience would be allowed for clinical practice on the basis of one month for each 6 months of practice.

This was approved except that the minimal period of training would be 4 rather than 5 years.

It was recommended further that the candidate must have had major input in an article on some phase of Laboratory Animal Medicine, and that the article had been accepted for publication in a referred journal (revision of paragraph Section 1 Article II). This was approved unanimously.

In 1977, The Recruitment and Training Committee was to provide input into areas of future manpower needs and development of criteria for training programs. In response to a survey, the Committee had defined three categories of post doctoral training programs.

(a) Non-NIH Governmental agencies

(b) NIH sponsored

(c) Preceptor-ships and residencies

In 1978, Dr. Valerio reminded the BOD that the proposed Constitution and By-Laws changes were not approved by the membership. He submitted a revision based on the written criticism received from the members. The changes were:

1) One and not 2 years of approved full time experience was needed after completion of a 3 year training program
2) Four years experience for the PhD and 5 years experience for the MS degreed individuals should be required.

The Recruitment and Training Committee Report recommended two criteria for approval of formal training programs:

1) Program must be directed by an ACLAM Diplomate. (There was no reference to the earlier BOD decision, based on legal counsel, that this would not be a requirement for approval)
2) The institution should be AAALAC accredited.

The impetus for trying to certify training programs had been based primarily on the need of the Credentials Committee to evaluate what constituted approved training. Also, there were inquiries on the subject by American Board of Veterinary Specialists (ABVS). Dr. Albert E. New noted that the AVMA Council on Education had dissolved its Committee on Internships and Residency Accreditation. The issue of acceptable training would continue to be pursued, and the ILAR publication Laboratory Animal Medicine, Guidelines for Education and Training would continue to be used. The CC was charged to use the list of training programs proposed by the 1978 Recruitment and Training Committee, professional judgment and current reports from appropriate committees in evaluating backgrounds of candidates the coming year.

In 1979, Dr. New stated that the Recruitment and Training Committee had made commendable progress on tracking training programs and on a means of assessment. No specifics were mentioned. In the same year, the Credentials Committee recommended the senior author on the paper be consulted regarding the role of the applicant using that publication as part of the requirements for sitting for the exam.

We cannot leave this section without relating one incident in 1978, in which the BOD had attempted to give specific direction to the Credentials Committee on a workable definition of the phrase “approved experience” for evaluating 1978 candidates. The definition was to be incorporated into a Constitution and By-Laws revision, but the BOD was criticized for seeming to endorse a policy contrary to the existing Constitution and By-Laws.

For the Training and Credentials Committees of this relatively young specialty it was a difficult decade, still progress was made, and many well qualified candidates were added to the rolls of ACLAM Diplomates.

**ACLAM Examination in the 1970s**

In 1970, the examination fee was increased from $50 to $75. There were three chances to take the exam in 26 months for one fee. If all parts were not passed in that time the applicant must pay another fee and retake the entire exam. Ohio State was paid $200 for evaluating the exam for that year. Orland Soave again raised a concern regarding the oral exam and the possibility of law suits from those who failed. In an attempt to address this concern, it was agreed that:
1) The oral exam be held on a day other than one on which the written or practical are given.
2) 45 minutes be scheduled for each oral exam.
3) CVs be mailed to oral exam team members.

In 1971, 18 out of 38 passed the exam. Diplomates were again solicited for examination questions and slides. A good response was received for written questions but not slides for the practical.
The use of an examination service was again explored. Drs. Donald Clifford, Robert Yeager and Richard Wescott visited the NY offices of Professional Examination Services. The cost for such a service was in excess of $4,000 per year. There would be delays in transporting and compilation services and no provision for discussion type questions, the practical or oral parts of the exam. It was decided not to pursue these services.

Drs. Donald Clifford, Robert Yeager and Richard Wescott visited the NY offices of Professional Examination Services. The cost for such a service was in excess of $4,000 per year. There would be delays in transporting and compilation services and no provision for discussion type questions, the practical or oral parts of the exam. It was decided not to pursue these services.

Dr Clifford stated that the Examination Committee felt the oral portion of the examination should be eliminated. The validation for using the oral examination as an attempt to evaluate the competence of an individual was questioned. It was agreed that the oral was fraught with many problems, but the value of bringing the membership into a more active participation was considered of great benefit to the College. It was felt that the advantages of giving Diplomates the opportunity to express their views, and meet prospective candidates, far outweighed the difficulties of its preparation and interpretation. The issue was tabled. Dr. Clifford requested a poll of recent Diplomates regarding their feeling about the examination as a whole and the oral in particular, but no action was taken by the BOD.

In 1972, Dr Clifford, stated that scheduling the oral exam on a day by itself seemed beneficial both to examiners and examinees. A question was again raised about the grading system but no action was taken. Fifteen out of 24 passed the written exam, 19 out of 22 passed the oral, and 16 out of 25 passed the practical. The merit of the oral exam again was discussed. A vote followed, and continuation of the oral was approved 10-2. It was also the consensus of the BOD that individuals who failed should be advised of their areas of weakness.

In 1973, Dr. Baker reminded the BOD that, for the past 4 years, a debate had raged in the Examination Committee regarding the oral. The reasons given in the past for keeping an oral exam were:
A. It provided an opportunity for a large segment of the College to participate in the examination process.
B. With few exceptions (2 in 3 years) the results of the oral correlated well with the written and practical.
C. In the past, much emphasis was placed on the oral as a "safety" mechanism to exclude undesirable but intellectually competent individuals. The “undesirable” included individuals showing serious personality deficits, social incompatibility or moral turpitude.

Members of the Examination Committee who favored elimination of the oral argued that:
A. Participation in the annual exam review and the opportunity to submit questions and slides were adequate venues for member participation. Although it was admitted that members were not submitting questions and slides as requested and needed.
B. The written and practical adequately evaluate competence.

Dr. Baker recommended deletion of the oral exam which would require a By-Law change. He requested a consensus of opinion, but a consensus could not be reached. The BOD asked Dr. Baker to submit a proposal with recommendations for a By-Law change. At the next BOD meeting, Dr. Baker’s report and By-Laws change to eliminate the oral exam was passed by a vote of 9:0. It was noted that the Credentials Committee had recommended elimination of the oral exam for several years.

In 1974, there were 21 individuals who passed all parts of the exam. Scores on the written were 63-77%. The range on the practical was 35-92%. Scores accepted as passing were not stated. It was decided that, in lieu of an oral, at least one letter of recommendation must be from a current
employer. The criteria for such a letter were deferred to the Credential Committee for appropriate action.

In 1975, The Examination Committee Report stated that 12 candidates out of 18 passed all parts and were certified as Diplomates. Scores on the written ranged from 56-80.5%. The practical range was 29.6-90.3%. Mailgrams were sent advising candidates as to whether or not they had been certified as Diplomates. After a self critique, the Examination Committee incorporated the suggestions into the exam. The exam was not markedly changed, but the practical was lengthened and more basic material was included on both parts of the exam.

In 1976, Dr. Noel Lehner reporting for the Examination Committee stated that 35 Diplomates contributed material for the exam, which was an increase but still low. Eleven out of 22 who took the exam were certified as Diplomates. After receiving comments on the exam from members at the retreat, attempts were made to eliminate questions that were regarded as too shallow. Exam Analysis Chair, Dr. Daniel Ringler, reported that the exam analysis by a professional group had been performed for the past 7 years.

In 1977, The Examinations Committee report stated that five Diplomates submitted slides for the practical and 25 questions for the written. The format for the written was changed with short answer and two kinds of true false questions added. There was much discussion about the exam review process but no changes were made. Dr. Lindsey expressed concern about the 1977 examination. He felt it suffered from inclusion of invalid questions and that closer review by knowledgeable Diplomates not serving on the Examination Committee should be encouraged by the Committee. Dr. Ringler suggested that BOD members sit for the 1978 exam for the purpose of evaluating it for relevancy and validity.

In 1978, Dr. David Small reported that an updated list of references for dissemination to exam candidates had been completed. It included references from the yet to be published ILAR Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, as well as additional selected references. Permission was being sought from ILAR to release the references. The response for written questions from the membership was poor but some excellent slides had been received. Dr. Small suggested that Diplomates be required to submit a question to gain admittance to the exam review but this did not come to a vote. No action was taken on the Examination Committee recommendations of:

1) $100 fee for repeat takes.
2) Retention of short answer format and establishment of an 80% pass mark on this portion of the exam.
3) Exam relevance should not be the purview of the Examination Committee.

It was agreed that all exam candidates would again be invited to the ACLAM banquet as paid guests. Dr. Ringler reported that the University of Michigan center that analyzed the 1977 exam reported the written was less difficult than in previous years and that candidates in general were less well prepared.

In 1979, Dr Jerold Rehg reported that the examination was comprehensive and of high quality. All but one person completed it in less than 5 hours. He recommended it continue as a 5 hour written exam. Thirty five sat for the written and 31 for the practical. Fourteen passed to become Diplomates. There was discussion regarding the break point. A motion was made and approved to set the break point lower which resulted in passing two more for the practical.
ACLAM Examination Review in the 1970s

The first mention of the exam review by Diplomates was in 1970. Dr. Russell Lindsey pointed out that ACLAM’s exam review was important to prevent a small group guidance mentality that could weaken the College.

The exam review was usually held at the AVMA meeting. Diplomates were invited to review the entire exam and critique the questions. The Exam Review Committee would forward the criticisms and comments to the Examination Committee. The review was helpful in pointing out additional acceptable answers to a particular question as well as increasing relevancy and accuracy of the questions.

In 1979, a suggestion was made to hold an additional exam review at the Forum or National AALAS meeting. Several reasons opposing an additional review were voiced, i.e., extra security needed at AALAS, possible interference with the Forum, extra burden for the Exam Review Committee; and the need for an annual exam review by Diplomates. It was decided to send a questionnaire on the topic to the membership with the next Newsletter.

ACLAM Continuing Education in the 1970s

The ACLAM Texts

The ACLAM’s text book endeavor began in 1970. There was much discussion regarding the Symposium - "The Rabbit in Biomedical Research." This effort was chaired by Dr Steven Weisbroth. Dr. A. Lanny Kraus and Dr. Ronald Flatt were members. It was decided to work toward a program to present at the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB) and to publish a text. The Symposium was successful and the rabbit text progressed at a good rate.

Dr Robert Yeager proposed that the College undertake a similar series of symposiums with a published text as the end point, the next one being the guinea pig. This was agreed to, and a committee consisting of Dr. Joseph E. Wagner and Dr. Patrick Manning was appointed.

Work on the Guinea Pig Symposium progressed and Academic Press expressed interest in the publication as a follow up to the rabbit text. Dr. Donald Clifford recommended that ACLAM look into the possibility of sponsoring and publishing a text on The Practice of Laboratory Animal Medicine. Some felt that much of this was the responsibility of the Institute for Laboratory Animal Research (ILAR). Also, the scope was considered too broad and not a suitable undertaking for the College.

The Biology of the Laboratory Rabbit text was scheduled for completion in September 1974 with three thousand copies to be printed and priced at $49.50. Dr. Weisbroth indicated that royalties were computed as 12.5% of net sales. For the year ending December 31, 1974, 733 copies were sold with net sales of $26,178.64, and a royalty check of $3,272.33 had been received. Discount sales, etc. reduced net sales to about 75% of theoretical maximum. By June 26, 1975, 1,323 books were sold. The first printing was 1,000 copies. This was followed by a second printing of an additional 1,000 copies and a third printing was anticipated.

Dr. Baker recommended that ACLAM build on the success of the rabbit and guinea pig texts and that the rat was the next logical subject. He requested and was granted approval to proceed on a
rat text. Dr. Baker also asked that he develop a comprehensive guideline to aid the College in future publications.

Dr. Manning led a discussion about future topics for texts. The cat, mouse, ungulates, non-human primates and a combined text on lesser used laboratory animals were presented. A proposed text on Spontaneous Animal Models of Human Disease was discussed by Dr. Edwin Andrews. He stressed the need to consolidate the information which was widely scattered. It was also the intent to expose those models which were not true analogues to human disease but for years had been proffered as such in the literature. Dr. Henry Foster expressed concern that the effort might dilute the momentum of the species series. The BOD agreed that it was an ambitious project. It was proposed that Dr. Norman Altman and Dr. William Ward form an editorial committee to be chaired by Dr. Andrews. Dr. Andrews was given a commitment on the proposed text to be considered a part of the existing series with the stipulation that the text conform to previous and current proposed guidelines. Further, the membership was to be given the opportunity to respond to the final product in scope and input. Dr. Andrews was directed to prepare such a package for the membership.

Dr. Lanny Kraus reported for the Publications Committee and recommended that the mouse be the subject of the next text. It was approved. In the Publication Committee Report of 1977, Dr. Kraus presented recommendations for Editor-in-Chief and four Co-Editors for the ACLAM Text, Biology of the Laboratory Mouse. There was much discussion and the matter was tabled temporarily. Dr. Kraus was asked to present names of candidates for the editorial staff along with appropriate background summaries of proposed individuals at the next BOD meeting.

Dr. Albert E. New reported that royalty income from the rabbit and guinea pig texts totaled $12,755. Dr. Kraus reported that the ACLAM logo would appear on the reprinted Rabbit Text. Dr. Andrews, Chair of The Ad Hoc Sub-Committee on the Animal Models Text indicated that it was in the early stages. Two hundred authors were anticipated for a two volume work.

In 1978, Dr. Kraus reported that the Mouse Text Subcommittee had added 20 chapters bringing the total to 85. It was anticipated that it would be a three volume text.

The Spontaneous Animal Models of Human Disease Volume I was scheduled for release in September 1979 and Volume II in October of ’79. Volume I of the Laboratory Rat would be published in December 1979 and Volume II in January 1980.

**ACLAM Audio-tutorial**

In 1971, Dr. Gerald Van Hoosier, who was working on audio-tutorial materials, stated he would like ACLAM to co-sponsor the project with Washington State University. Co-sponsorship of the audio-tutorial efforts of the Washington State group was approved. By 1975, Dr. Van Hoosier reported that storage of bulky carrousels with slides was a problem. Eventually, the University of Washington, where he was currently employed, duplicated and distributed the series in regular form and microfiche.

In 1976, two of the top three awards of the Student AVMA Audio-tutorial Excellence Award Program went to ACLAM. Dr. Ames of the AVMA expressed his appreciation to ACLAM and said that ACLAM demonstrated how a specialty group could serve the whole profession.

Dr. Darrell Clark stated in his 1977 report for the Educational Resources Committee that sales
of audio-tutorial materials had reached about $50,000. Ten veterinary schools participated in evaluations with 2,800 individual evaluations completed. The Committee was working with veterinary pathologists who were also producing audio-tutorial (A-T) lessons. The goal was a joint effort among certification programs for A-T materials used in veterinary schools.

In 1979, Dr. Van Hoosier reported requests from Europe for the University of Washington ACLAM A-T materials. They were interested in copying, translating and otherwise modifying the materials for use in their countries. Dr. Van Hoosier expressed a desire to assist but not at the expense of copyright violation or commercial gain. Any profit should be returned to the University of Washington for development of more A-T materials. It was decided that while ACLAM did not hold a copyright and was not financially involved, the BOD concurred with the recommendation of approving the European request so long as copyright laws were respected and commercial companies could make no financial gain.

The Beginning of the ACLAM Forum

In 1974, Dr. Norman Altman led a discussion on a proposal for ACLAM members to meet or retreat at times other than in conjunction with AALAS and the AVMA. During the same year there was a discussion on methods to promote ACLAM meetings other than those routinely scheduled. Retreats, continuing education symposia and other general interest subjects were discussed. Money for travel was expected to be the limiting factor associated with stand alone meetings. An ACLAM meeting before the AALAS meeting in Boston was suggested and planned, and that session became first Forum.

At the BOD meeting in Boston (1975), Dr. George Pucak of the Continuing Education Committee reported that the retreat was well attended and recommended additional retreats. As a continuing education program retreats were considered a good idea. The BOD discussed the need for a survey of continuing education experience in the College. Dr. Henry Baker pointed out that this would also provide background information before formulating recertification policies.

In 1977, Dr. Van Hoosier (Continuing Education Committee) reported that the primary action of the Committee had been the Forum held in conjunction with the 1976 AALAS meeting. As a result of the Forum, the Committee recommended four actions, which the BOD subsequently approved:

1) Development of a Laboratory Animal Specialty Award to encourage voluntary continuing education efforts by Diplomates.

2) Development of non-threatening self-assessment programs.

3) Notification of 1978 applicants for certification that recertifying examinations may be required of them in the future.

4) The topic of recertification would be tabled for 5 years.

Dr. Baker moved to accept the first three items and to amend item 4 to read that recertification would not be attempted for at least 5 years, but would continue to be discussed by the BOD. The motion was passed.
It was reiterated, and again agreed to, that the 1978 Forum was open to Diplomates only except for speakers, who could be non-ACLAM Diplomates. The Forum, on Quality Assurance Programs, was held at Brookhaven Laboratories, Long Island, New York. The concept of the Forum was twofold: education and camaraderie. Both aspects were realized. Seventy Diplomates and five non-Diplomates (speakers) were in attendance. Many positive comments were received. The drawbacks were considered to be inadequate time allowed for discussion and few conclusions reached, possibly an excessive number of topics presented, and failure to meet timetables such as meals. The problems of conducting the Forum on a weekend and the extra out of office time required when the Forum was on the front end of an AALAS meeting were discussed. The presentations were taped for preparation of a proceedings document, which was available by July of 1979. A motion that those attending the Forum could have one free copy and Diplomates not attending would be charged $25 was approved.

Dr. Altman made five recommendations for future Forums:

1) The BOD should endorse the concept of the Forum

2) It should be a full 2 day session patterned after the Gordon Conferences. [Note: The Gordon Conference (later to be multiple conferences) started on Long Island during the days of rail transportation. The conferences lasted at least a week in a retreat setting. Over time, several were held each year on various topics, usually in the summer, in relatively remote locations. There were afternoon breaks for such activities as hiking, followed by evening sessions.]

3) The BOD should re-examine the time for scheduling a Forum, i.e., a separate Forum or one held at the conclusion of the AALAS meeting

4) The 1979 Forum Sub-Committee should consider mainline evaluation programs for Diplomates in advance of the Forum. It should be non-threatening and in the mode of continuing education

5) The 1979 Forum Sub-Committee should prepare a definitive post-Forum position paper.

There was no BOD action taken on the recommendations.

Topics for future Forums in the continuing education series were discussed. Dr. Altman suggested focus on the sub-specialty of laboratory animal medicine i.e. aquatic medicine.

The 1979 Forum, Biohazards, concentrated on three areas: pathogenic microorganisms, chemical carcinogens and recombinant DNA. The theme was the definition and containment of each class of biohazard, with some attention directed to personal health programs for each class. The number registered for the Forum was 102, a 50% increase over the 1978 Forum. The Forum budget was approximately $7,700. It was noted that a $1,000 subsidy from the College (royalty income budget) would probably be needed to cover all expenses. Attendees received notebooks consisting of manuscripts and references from the presentations. The proceedings were not taped. A motion was made and passed that extra notebooks would go to Diplomates on a first come basis at cost.

Dr. McPherson reported on the Animal Production Forum held prior to the 1980 AALAS meeting. The format was similar to the 1979 Forum. Notebooks were available. The question of spouses attending was discussed as they were actively discouraged from attending the 1979 Forum. The BOD consensus was to neither encourage nor discourage wives and husbands from attending the 1980 Forum.
The topic of the 1981 Forum would be immunology. Dr. Ringler indicated that Dr. Steven Pakes, Chairman of the 1981 Forum, was desirous of having the Forum separate from the AALAS and AVMA meeting, and perhaps held in the spring. After discussion the BOD decided if 80% of the membership did not oppose a separate meeting, the College should proceed with a separate meeting on a trial basis.

Additional Publications and Seminars

The first mention of an ACLAM sponsored journal was in 1974, when Dr. Henry Baker proposed the concept to the BOD. He favored a journal dealing with comparative medicine and selected animal models. Dr. Baker was asked to chair an ad hoc study to evaluate the feasibility of such a project. At the next BOD meeting, Dr. Baker reported that a prospectus was prepared and presented to Academic Press and University Park Press. However, neither was interested in pursuing a project of this type at the current time, and the project was tabled.

ACLAM’s Program Committee was active in the 70’s. In 1975, a program on "Environmental Factors Influencing Biomedical Research" was presented at the American Society of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics (ASPET). It was co-sponsored by ACLAM, ASPET and ILAR, and had been coordinated by Dr. C. Max Lang. In the same year, the BOD approved a new Symposium Prize Competition developed by Drs. Steven Weisbroth and Patrick Manning. The purpose was to stimulate contributions to laboratory animal medicine and to encourage scientific investigators during the formative period of training.

Five papers were presented at the AVMA Adequate Veterinary Care Session in 1975 and recorded for editing. Using the papers as a spring board, ACLAM hoped to publish a position paper on Adequate Veterinary Care.

In 1978, a one half day joint ACLAM-ASLAP program was held at the AVMA meeting, and the College Scientific Program at the AALAS meeting focused on current veterinary therapy for laboratory animal diseases.

The 1978 Program Committee recommended a reintroduction of the ACLAM prize competition using new guidelines. Presenters would not be required to have participated in training programs. Competition would be open to any veterinarian with six or fewer years of training or experience in a discipline, and papers would consist of original research or deal with a series of case reports with a comprehensive literature survey. The intent was to have the competition at the AALAS meeting on a one year trial basis, but the motion failed 2:7. The principal arguments against it were that it offered nothing new, would require additional effort for the Program Committee, and adequate opportunity already existed for young people.

In the same year, Dr. Ronald Flatt agreed to present a program on the specialty of Laboratory Animal Medicine at a Symposium to be held at Iowa State University in the spring of 1979.

The American Animal Hospital Association (AAHA) made a request to the College for a program at its 1979 meeting in New Orleans. However, the program was poorly attended. A motion was unanimously approved that ACLAM not present a program at AAHA in 1980 due to limited interest. However, The Inter-Mountain Veterinary Medical Association request for a laboratory animal medicine program was approved, and would be a joint effort with ASLAP.
ACLAM and ASLAP in the 1970s

In 1976, Dr. John Mulder, President of ASLAP, was invited by Dr. Henry Foster to discuss ways of bringing ACLAM and ASLAP closer together. There were approximately 400 people in both organizations with about 88% dual membership. Based on the recommendation of Drs. Mulder and Foster a liaison committee was appointed with the charge of seeking cooperation of common goals.

In 1978, ASLAP Liaison Representative Dr. Douglas McKelvie reported that a joint ASLAP-ACLAM Program was planned for the AALAS meeting in September. The program was to consist of presentations by Dr. Van Hoosier and Dr. Steel Mattingly on ACLAM and ASLAP philosophies and activities, and a talk on anesthesia by Dr. Charles Short of Cornell Veterinary School. Attendance of 100 was desired at $25 per person. ASLAP agreed to underwrite any cost overrun. The BOD expressed the following concerns about the proposed functions:

1) Excessive cost
2) Potential conflict with vendor hospitality affairs
3) Overall planning
4) High risk of failure

The need for a first joint venture to be successful was considered of paramount importance. Dr. McKelvie stated that he would report these concerns to ASLAP.

Later that year, Dr. Nephi Patton, representing the ASLAP Liaison Committee, made two requests of the BOD:

1) Consideration should be given by ACLAM to conducting a workshop on continuing education programs for the purpose of preparing non Diplomates, in particular ASLAP members, for the ACLAM exam.

2) Thought be given by ACLAM to the presentation of a series of workshops on the subspecialties in which Diplomates might have expertise, such as primatology.

Much discussion ensued concerning the objectives and activities, similarities and differences of the two organizations. It was decided that ACLAM and ASLAP would continue to cooperate in programs of mutual interest such as joint sponsorship of scientific programs at national meetings, and that open workshops on specific specialties be explored further, but ACLAM could not sponsor training sessions for the expressed purpose of preparing individuals for its certifying exams. However, Diplomates, as individuals, could participate in such educational programs. Dr. Patton indicated that he would relay this back to ASLAP. He also reported that both liaison committees wished to promote the idea of a joint social function at the National AALAS meeting.

Dr. Lanny Kraus moved that the Secretary/Treasurer prepare a draft paper summarizing the discussion on inter-organizational relationships in particular the proposed workshops. The
motion was approved. The paper was included as an addendum to the minutes, and is summarized below. In conclusion, Dr. Albert New reiterated that one of the roles of the ASLAP Liaison Committee was to continue to explore potential areas of collaboration but it should not necessarily feel compelled to implement recommendations.

ACLAM-ASLAP RELATIONSHIPS

The American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ACLAM) and the American Society of Laboratory Animal Practitioners (ASLAP) are organizations of veterinarians engaged in the various activities of the specialty of laboratory animal medicine. ACLAM was incorporated in 1957 and ASLAP in 1967. ACLAM is a specialty Board recognized by the AVMA; ASLAP is recognized by the AVMA as an auxiliary organization of the AVMA. Membership of both organizations totals nearly 500 individuals; an overwhelming majority of the veterinary members are engaged in or associated in some manner with the specialty. Duplicate memberships were held by 112 veterinarians. Approximately 42% of ACLAM Diplomates are ASLAP members while 32% of the ASLAP membership holds ACLAM Diplomate status.

Objectives of both organizations include the promotion and dissemination of information on educational and research programs in laboratory animal or comparative medicine for their respective members and for the scientific community at large. Significant joint efforts have been made in the past, the co-sponsored scientific sessions at the annual AVMA and AALAS meetings being prime examples. A great majority of members of both organizations have agreed that joint sponsorships of scientific programs and educational activities should continue in the future. Although ACLAM and ASLAP will continue to cooperate on such programs, each group should maintain its individuality.

The principle difference between the two organizations is the testing and certification by ACLAM of qualified veterinarians in the specialty. Since one of the primary functions of ACLAM is the certification of Diplomates, dissolution of ACLAM and formation of a new, all encompassing organization of veterinarians in laboratory animal medicine is not a realistic proposal and should not be considered further. Certification should remain as the principle differentiating feature between the two organizations. Other distinguishing features are 1) ASLAP has representation in the AVMA House of Delegates and, thus, a vote for organized laboratory animal medicine and 2) ASLAP provides a forum for participation and sharing for all laboratory animal veterinarians.

The issue of sponsorship of training sessions for individuals interested in sitting for the ACLAM Certifying Examinations was raised by the ASLAP Liaison Committee at the September 1978 ACLAM Board of Directors Meeting. After considerable debate the ACLAM Board decided that:

1) ACLAM could not sponsor or co-sponsor with ASLAP training sessions geared specifically for the preparation of individuals for the ACLAM Certifying Examination. ACLAM cannot be involved in both the training (as such preparation sessions must be considered) and examination of individuals for obvious conflict of interest reasons. ACLAM according to its Constitution and By-Laws does not have as one of its objectives the formal education or training of laboratory animal specialists; however, it does examine and certify qualified individuals. Thus, training and examination activities must be considered separate and independent functions.

2) Workshops or continuing educational sessions must be identified clearly as either educational programs open to any and all veterinarians or specifically as ACLAM examination preparation sessions.
3) Participants or instructors in any ACLAM exam preparation session could be ASLAP members or any ACLAM Diplomate(s) who wish to participate. ACLAM Diplomates, who participate, however, would do so as individuals and not as representatives of ACLAM.

4) ASLAP leadership was encouraged to sponsor short courses and workshops for its members.

5) Open workshops in specific areas of laboratory animal medicine, e.g., genetics, would probably receive widespread acceptance and attendance by both ACLAM and ASLAP members. Possibilities for such workshops in the future should be explored.

ACLAM and the AVMA in the 1970s

In the 70s, joint ACLAM/ASLAP programs were presented at the AVMA, and Diplomates were often appointed to serve or chair the Laboratory Animal Section of the AVMA Committee for Scientific programs.

In 1975, Dr. Steven Weisbroth, ACLAM’s representative to the AVMA Advisory Board on Veterinary Specialists (ABVS) stated that the AVMA was becoming concerned about the need for recertification, and whether specialty boards felt liable for their members. Dr. Baker advised the BOD that the Education and Training Committee and the ad hoc Subcommittee on Continuing Education would be requested to study these questions. The BOD also felt that the subject should be further discussed by the general membership. Dr. Melby believed that these matters would probably be handled best by continued discussion and that the College should not consider recertification hastily. He suggested that the review session be strengthened and points be awarded for attendance at these and regional programs.

The Professional Standards Sub-Committee generated a report on recertification in 1979. This included a section on self-evaluation, a continuing education achievement award, and recommendations on recertification.

A recommendation in the self evaluation section was discussed. Dr. Ringler informed the BOD that a straw vote taken at the 1979 Forum regarding a non-threatening self assessment program proposed in conjunction with the 1980 Forum was acceptable to the membership. Dr. New suggested a failsafe approach making it optional. Other mechanisms proposed for self assessment included a take home test with or without answers and a mailing of questions to Diplomates for use as they see fit. The BOD agreed that implementation of such a plan should not be a charge to the 1980 Forum Sub-committee. Dr. Ringler moved that the recommendations in the self assessment section of the yearend report to "implement a self assessment program at the next Forum" be accepted and that its implementation be delegated to Dr. Pierre Conti, member of the 1979-80 Continuing Education Committee and Dr. Charles McPherson Chairman of the 1980 Forum. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Continuing Education Achievement Award, first proposed by Dr Van Hoosier, and recommended by the subcommittee in the yearend report was discussed and debated. It was suggested that ACLAM share the idea with ASLAP for any veterinarian in laboratory animal medicine. It was referred to the joint ACLAM-ASLAP Committee to further its implementation.
The sub-committee recommendations on recertification were considered. Dr. New reminded the BOD that it had voted to table the issue for 5 years. The BOD agreed to adhere to this and reconsider mandating recertification after the 5 year period.

Also in 1979, Dr Richard Wescott discussed the upcoming ACLAM review by the ABVS. He indicated ACLAM was one of the more sound and progressive specialties. There was a concern that the pass rate on the certifying exam was lower than that of other specialty boards. He also reported on sub specialization. He indicated that the ABVS advised the Zoo Veterinary Group to contact ACLAM and the American College of Veterinary Practitioners regarding affiliation. Regarding sub-specialties within ACLAM, it was agreed that it was not appropriate due to the small size of the College. There was also opposition expressed to accepting existing groups as a body such as zoo veterinarians.

Legislation and Public Relations in the 1970s

During this decade, legislation was proposed to regulate the care and use of laboratory animals. ACLAM responded with educational initiatives and committees concerned with outreach to those outside the profession. One such endeavor was the creation of the External Affairs Committee. The Committee was chaired by Dr. Bennett Cohen. He saw the committee as a liaison between ACLAM and our colleagues both inside and outside the profession. The committee was later called the Public Relations and External Affairs Committee. It was responsible for the publication of various Newsletters and news releases relating to new Diplomates and upcoming Symposia. It also published “The Bulletin” patterned after the Comparative Pathology Bulletin, which was distributed to all Diplomates and selected individuals and institutions. Another area of concern was the lack of information about the specialty within veterinary schools, and steps were taken to improve student education and interest in laboratory animal medicine. In 1973, the ACLAM Summer Fellowship recipient was Mr. William R. Gann III, a first year veterinary medical student at Auburn.

In addition to these activities, many members felt that ACLAM should take a stand on legislation affecting animal research because of the Diplomates’ expertise in caring for them. However, to lobby congress directly would jeopardize ACLAM’s standing with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) as a “not-for-profit organization.” Therefore, it was agreed to make ACLAM’s position known to appropriate individuals within the AVMA and AALAS, but to refrain from lobbying.

The General Business of ACLAM in the 1970s

Finance

With the success of the rabbit and guinea pig texts, the BOD became concerned that income from the texts be used to perpetuate the series, and further the specialty of laboratory animal medicine in general. An ad hoc Committee to Study the Use of Royalty Income was created. The recommendations of the committee as given by Dr. Edward Melby were that royalty funds be used in the following ways:
1) Provide general support for continuing education programs for ACLAM Diplomates.
2) Promote additional publication endeavors in the College.
3) Support actions of the Executive Committee

In 1973, legal counsel Harvey Sarner responded to ACLAM's letter addressing the question of,
"What legal limits of income and bank balance the College could maintain and still remain in a tax free status?" He indicated that projected royalty income would be consistent with the original purposes of the College and would have no effect. He further responded that there were no set limits, but when accumulations started to rise the College should institute additional programs to spend or earmark this income.

In the late 70s, the duties of the Secretary/Treasurer had increased to the point where more assistance was needed. The possibility of hiring at least a part time Executive-Secretary was discussed, but it was pointed out that annual expenses already consumed dues income each year. It was agreed that if dues were increased it should be substantial to cover several years of forecasted needs. In lieu of hiring an Executive-Secretary, it was recommended and approved to authorize $13,000 to enable the Secretary/Treasurer to hire part time help. A motion to increase dues to $30 annually was made and passed.

In 1978, the effective utilization of accumulating College fiscal assets was discussed, and an ad hoc Audit Committee was established. Dr. Van Hoosier pointed out that this would require a Constitution and By-Laws charge.

Secretary/Treasurer Dr. William Webster reported that the estimated budget showed a slight operating deficit. Increasing dues in the near future was rejected as a means of offsetting increasing expenses. Because of the tight 1978-79 operating budget the College needed to determine expenditures which appropriately could be made from royalty income, i.e., what expenditures qualify as continuing education or examination activities. Other suggestions included cutting Directory costs by 1) using a corrected address list as an insert and 2) listing new Diplomates en bloc. The BOD also agreed that the College financial contributions to affiliated groups should be re-evaluated on an annual basis. Dr. Lanny Kraus moved adoption of the estimated 1978-79 budget with item categorization by purpose, and separation of core operating expenditures from royalty income expenditure, which was unanimously approved. The Secretary/Treasurer was directed to seek out the best possible interest rate and re-invest appropriate saving account monies due to our growing passbook savings account balance.

In 1978, the usual contributions of $300 to AAALAC, AALAS and a belated donation of $200 to the National Society for Medical Research (NSMR) were made. However, concern was expressed about some aspects of NSMR philosophy and activities. Some of their positions appeared extreme, and their political actions and surveillance efforts were questioned. It was agreed to contribute $200, and to send a letter to NSMR indicating ACLAM’s desire to be informed of and involved in the decision making process. Dr. New encouraged BOD members to inform Michael Grafton, Executive Secretary of NSMR, of any negative criticism they may have of NSMR activities and policies. The Student Chapter of the AVMA (SCAVMA) requested financial support and $200 were authorized.

Later that year, Dr. Webster reviewed the 1978 interim financial report, which included the agreed to separate accounts of income and expenses. The Secretary/Treasurer was directed to explore the possibility of depositing $15,000 in short term Certificates of Deposit or Money Market Certificates when the current $10,000 CD matured in March 1979. A decision on best investment of money funds was left to the discretion of the Secretary/Treasurer. Dr. Webster also reported a deficit of $900 for the 1978 ACLAM Banquet, $400 of which was attributed to non-paying unidentified guests. He recommended that the local Arrangements Committee for future banquets be charged with assuring tighter control for paid attendance.
In 1979, the examination fee was increased to $150 to avert the projected $1,000 deficit in exam related costs. Fifty dollars of the application fee was non-refundable.

The ad hoc Audit Committee recommended, and the BOD agreed, that travel expenses should be:

1) For an individual essential to a College committee function who has no other source of travel funds.
2) Projected travel cost to be incorporated into the 1979-80 budget. Committee chairmen were expected to operate within BOD approved budgets. There was general agreement by the BOD that the Audit Committee should become a standing committee.

Directory

An ACLAM Membership Directory similar to that of the American College of Veterinary Pathologists was proposed in 1970. A pictorial-biographical directory was suggested but the response to a request for photographs was poor. By 1977, only 40% of member photos were available. However, photos continued to be collected with the goal of publishing a photo directory by 1978. The Directory was updated every 2-3 years. In lieu of reprinting the entire directory each year, inserts of address changes were sent to all Diplomates. The “ACLAM Brochure” was revised and included in the directory.

ACLAM Logo

The concept of an ACLAM logo had been discussed in the 1960s. In 1970, Dr. Henry Foster, president of Charles River Laboratories volunteered to have his staff work on a logo for the College. He presented the concepts of his veterinary group in 1971. A facsimile of the logo was included in the BOD minutes. He suggested the College should consider producing membership pins with the logo. In 1972, Dr. Foster presented sample copies of the logo on letterhead stationery, membership cards, etc. He was given the go ahead to prepare these materials. He then presented samples of lapel pins. They were considered extremely well done. Dr. C. Max Lang moved to purchase 250 lapel pins and Dr. Altman moved to set the price at $10. Both motions passed. The logo lapel pins were manufactured by O.C. Tanner of Salt Lake City at a cost of $8.68 each. At the next BOD meeting, Dr Foster produced a $10 bill and paid for the first pin. He also reported that ACLAM stationery and membership cards had been printed at a cost of $800, $200 of which was for design involving the logo. The initial annual fee for new Diplomates was increased to $25 to allow the College to include a logo pin and the ACLAM plaque. Thereafter dues would revert to $15. In 1979, the sale price of logo pins was approved to be increased to $25 as new pins cost $24.

Honorary Members

In the 1970s, a recommendation was made to recognize contributions to laboratory animal medicine by both veterinarians and non-veterinarians. The BOD approved and an Honorary Membership Committee was appointed. The committee would forward the name and credentials of their selection to the BOD for final approval. Mr. Bert Hill became ACLAM's first non DVM member in 1973. He was the Executive Secretary of ILAR at the time, and a geneticist by training.
In 1978, it was decided that new BOD members would be invited to attend the Sunday BOD meeting as observers prior to their first official BOD meeting later in the week.

In 1979, an additional College business meeting was proposed to provide opportunity for interaction in College affairs. This meeting would be held before the BOD meeting at the AVMA. This would give the BOD an opportunity to discuss and review any new ideas suggested and take appropriate action. No action was taken on the proposal for a mid-year BOD meeting to distribute BOD activity and avoid close proximity of AVMA and AALAS.

**ACLAM 1980-1989**

During the 1980s ACLAM’s issues reflected the increasing maturity of the organization. Indeed, it was in 1982 that ACLAM celebrated its 25th anniversary. Finances became more organized and sophisticated. The credentialing process became more complex as candidates from different backgrounds, experience, and training programs raised new questions as to interpretation of the constitution, By-Laws and guidelines. Time commitment of members on these committees increased steadily. Seeing this, the BOD appointed task forces to deal with some of the larger issues. Unfortunately, some of the task force recommendations overlapped or contradicted those of the committees, causing confusion and not a little frustration. Despite the continued growing pains, progress was made. A Policy and Procedure Manual was developed which greatly helped to organize the rules and guidelines into a coherent form. An endowment fund was established to fund ACLAM’s educational endeavors and three more texts were published including the four volume set The Mouse in Biomedical Research.

**ACLAM Credentials and Training Programs in the 1980s**

The major issues facing the credentialing process in the 1980s were the publication requirement and experience of the candidates. The issue of training programs and their evaluation while still a concern was not the burning issue it had been in the 1970s.

In 1980, The BOD had stated that the College would neither approve nor disapprove training programs. The BOD also agreed that criteria set forth in the ILAR document on training should be used in judging programs. For purposes of evaluating training programs, the BOD decided that "formal" meant "structured."

In 1982, a position paper was distributed in the agenda book on residency training. In essence, it reaffirmed the training recommendations by ABVS. Despite the continued stance that the College did not approve training programs, the issue continued to re-surface. A Director of a training program requested a review of his training program by the Credentials Committee. The BOD responded that ACLAM did not approve or disapprove these programs. Rather, the CC and the BOD evaluated applicants applying under the training option according to the guidelines set forth in the document: Laboratory Animal Medicine Guidelines for Education and Training; *ILAR News* Vol XXII, No 2, Winter 1979. It was noted also that practice exams were not endorsed by, or in any way associated with, the College. Dr. C. Max Lang recommended that any Diplomate involved in such an endeavor emphasize that ACLAM was in no way involved.

In 1980, The BOD discussed the value and importance of the publication requirement and decided that it demonstrated some credibility in research and should be retained. It was decided that
graduates of schools not approved nor accredited by the AVMA must submit an ECFVG Certificate (Educational Commission for Foreign Veterinary Students) or clear evidence of its equivalent.

The BOD overruled the Credentials Committee recommendation that an article reporting the toxicity of a chemical in animals not to be accepted for publication.

A proposal submitted to require individuals who had failed the exam in three attempts under a single application to wait or to gain 2 or more years of training or experience before sitting for the exam under a new application was disapproved. The BOD agreed the idea had merit, but the inability to define the 2 year interim period and to avoid a "closed shop" image with the AVMA precluded approval.

The interpretation as to what was meant by “full time experience” was debated. Sections of the CC Guidelines were modified to read "Teaching microbiology exclusively and conducting virology or toxicology research exclusively" were not considered experience. Also "performing pathology services to a lab animal unit exclusively" would not be considered experience. Additionally, a researcher taking care of his or her own animals would not qualify as experience. A graduate degree from any university would not be considered the equivalent of the ECFVG certificate. Dr. David Small was to write the final version of the Credentials Committee Document to be given to the BOD and distributed to the 1980-81 CC.

In 1981, there was a lengthy CC report dealing with the current mechanism of applicant review. The basis of the discussion was the recent BOD approval of a candidate that had been disapproved by the CC. A proposal was made that either the BOD review applications disapproved by the Committee, or that the President, President-Elect and Secretary/Treasurer review all applications. No action was taken.

“Equivalency” in eligibility requirements was discussed. The concept of equivalency gave ACLAM some leeway in evaluating the 1 year required clinical experience for the ECFVG Program, and to admit foreigners who worked in the US before the ECFVG program existed or for some other reason could not sit for the exams.

The requirement that candidates have a state license was debated. The BOD voted 6:4 against requiring licensure as part of the eligibility requirement. The committee recommendations to provide better documentation of training, experience and veterinary medical qualifications, and to reduce applicant confusion regarding private practice credit and graduate degree training were approved.

A recommendation to delete the publication requirement was discussed. It was the BOD’s consensus to keep the requirement. There was discussion regarding evaluation of the publication, but no decision was reached other than it must be published or accepted for publication by the deadline of receipt of application. The BOD agreed with the committee’s recommendation to provide a more complete and consistent means of dealing with the publication requirement.

Adherence to the closing date for application receipt by Secretary/Treasurer and notification of an applicant’s status in a timely manner were emphasized.

In 1982, the Credentials Committee recommended and the BOD approved the establishment of an ad hoc committee to further develop guidelines for training, residency and experience requirements. The ad hoc Committee was to provide additional information on the criteria for
acceptable training and experience, routes of eligibility, authorship requirements and the waiting period for reapplication to take the exam. One of the Committee’s recommendations was that the Training Program Director should send a letter indicating that the program complied with the ILAR publication on training. The intent was to assure that the training was appropriate, but not put ACLAM in the position of approving or disapproving training programs. The BOD felt this wasn't adequate assurance and sent it back to the Committee for rework.

In 1983, the application receipt date was moved to October 1 with assurance of notification by January 1. It also was proposed that ACLAM not accept foreign training or experience. However, this was disapproved 1:8. The CC recommended that acceptable experience be listed rather than what was not acceptable. This was approved, and a substantial list of approved documented experience was compiled. Twenty eight people were approved to sit for the exam and

In 1984, the Credentials Committee report stated that a standard form had been used to insure equity. If essential information were missing, the Chair of the Committee was to call the individual to obtain the information. The procedure was reported to work well and was recommended to be used in subsequent years.

In the same year, the ad hoc Admissions Review Committee had been asked to review several aspects of the credentials process. They made recommendations on criteria for acceptable training and routes to eligibility. Both recommendations were approved. The recommendations on training had two dissenting votes based on the concern that ILAR, not ACLAM, was setting the standards.

The Committee recommended that the candidate be first author. However, the ad hoc Committee on the Constitution and By-Laws disagreed and recommended the applicant be co-author of a research paper but first author of case reports. Neither recommendation was accepted, leaving it unchanged. The issue continued to be controversial with more discussion and a task force appointed to develop criteria for review by the BOD. Reapplication policy also had two ad hoc committees making different recommendations on the same issue.

In July of 1984, the Admission Review ad hoc Committee recommendations were referred to the Constitution and By-Laws Committee. An ad hoc Committee had been appointed to consider how to evaluate the publication requirement more objectively. A motion was made and passed that the numeric rating for publication be replaced with a qualitative “yes” or “no” and comments.

It was suggested that the CC seek clarification from the AVMA as to status of individuals licensed in a state, but who were foreign graduates without passing the ECFVG for specialty board qualification.

The 1985 Credentials Committee asked the BOD for clarification of two items:

1) There was discussion as to whether or not the applicant must be the first author. If a change were made, making the authorship requirement more restrictive, a 2-3 year lead time should be given before implementation. As training and experience were preparatory to becoming board eligible, and if the individual was engaged in all aspects of the process, first authorship may not be a primary issue. Further, it was pointed out that the AVMA/ABVS would soon be issuing new guidelines on board eligibility. It was agreed to withhold any action until these guidelines were issued but continue to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of first authorship.
2) The second item the Committee sought for clarification was the ECFVG certification or equivalent. The BOD agreed that the current CC guidelines provided sufficient guidance and latitude to deal with the question.

One candidate was recommended to take the 1986 examination by the CC on a split vote. The BOD mail ballot was indecisive in that five voted for approval, one for disapproval, three to postpone for BOD discussion and one abstention. A motion was made and passed that the applicant be turned down. There was a general consensus that insufficient information was available regarding the applicant’s training as set forth by ILAR/NAS/NRC documents.

The 1986, the Credentials Committee recommended that candidates had to be first author of the publication submitted with the application. Dr. John Harkness noted that publication requirements had been discussed in 1975, 1979, and 1981 but with varying or inconclusive recommendations. It was noted that the BOD consistently supported a publication requirement but had not agreed on authorship. Dr. Middleton moved to drop the publication requirement. Dr Harkness pointed out that this would require a change of the Constitution and By-Laws. Dr Middleton then moved that a biomedical research publication of which the candidate was first author, published or accepted for publication; or a copy of a committee acceptance of a master’s thesis or PhD dissertation be accepted as evidence of meeting the publication requirement. The motion failed for lack of a second. Dr. Max Lang moved that the guideline be changed to read that a case report not be accepted, that the candidate must have made a major contribution to the work and the preparation of the article, and that the candidate must be first or second author. The vote was 5:1 in favor. Dr. Lang moved that the BOD not approve the recommendation that the publication be accepted by a referred journal before submission of application. The motion passed unanimously. At this time a letter of acceptance of the publication by a referred journal by May was recommended.

It was the general impression that the application for certification was confusing. Therefore, it was approved that incomplete applications not be returned, that the signature of a Diplomate on the application form was sufficient and a letter was not required, and the candidate need not specify under which option they were applying. It was later agreed that the Diplomate signing a candidate's application should review it for completeness and accuracy before signing it.

The recommendation of the CC to clarify the appeals process in the application material was approved. The recommendation to require a state license was again voted down.

By 1987, Guidelines for the Credentials Committee were established in the ACLAM Policy and Procedure Manual. The BOD agreed that the interpretation of these guidelines should be flexible and left to the Committee.

It was recommended that a Vice-Chair be appointed to assist the Chair. The Vice-Chair may assume the Chair the following year, but it was emphasized that this would not be automatic.

In 1987, the CC asked for clarification of the publication requirement. Both President Patrick Manning and Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang responded. The BOD agreed with the written responses. There was general concern that the BOD allow discretionary power to the Committee for interpretation on a case by case basis. The stated intent was to give flexibility and to ensure fairness. The Committee was urged to make a recommendation to the BOD for changes in the Policy and Procedures when it was evident that such changes would enhance clarity and equality
The 1988, the Credentials Committee submitted a report noting several problems with current guidelines and recommendations for correction. They also noted that five applicants appealed negative decisions on their board eligibility. The problems this year appeared due to errors of interpretation by applicants. It was noted that some information is in the Constitution and By-Laws and BOD minutes, but not in the CC Guidelines. This was, in part, by design. The Constitution was the basic covenant and was restricted to minimal essential elements and required a major change in mission to justify changes. The By-Laws were the basic interpretation of the Constitution and may need to be changed occasionally. The Guidelines were the "regulations" of both the Constitution and By-Laws. It was anticipated that the Guidelines would be reviewed annually, and revised according to natural evolutionary changes. There should not be the same information in the Constitution, By-Laws and Guidelines but there should be a step-by-step progression of interpretation.

It was also stated that the CC Guidelines should not only reflect the progressive interpretation of our purpose and goals but also reflect correct and future needs.

The Committee recommended that the experience requirement follow the training program. A motion was made to accept the recommendation but it failed on a 2:7 vote leaving it that the candidate must have completed a minimum of 4 years of combined training and experience. Thus experience could precede or be interspersed in the training program.

It was recommended that under the graduate degree option, the graduate degree would have to be earned after the veterinary degree. A motion was made and passed to eliminate the graduate degree option which would require a change in the By-Laws. Thus it could not be in effect until 1989 for those applying for 1990.

The Committee expressed concern that some applicants had part time laboratory animal experience, and that there were no specific guidelines to equate this to full time experience. The BOD made no changes.

The Committee expressed concern that some applicants applying under the training program option did not appear to meet all the criteria set forth in the ILAR publication "Guidelines for Education and Training." It was re-stated that the College did not approve or disapprove training programs nor did it insist on complete uniformity in meeting the requirements. Some programs were strictly residency; some were complimented with graduate courses (with and without graduate credit); and others offered a graduate degree as a part of the program. All were deemed acceptable, if they met the majority of the ILAR published requirements. It was left to the Credentials Committee to figure out if requirements had been met.

The publication requirement posed the greatest problem for the Committee. Concerns were:
1) Definition of a publication, e.g., original research, review articles or case reports.
2) Actual contributions of author in relationship to other listed authors.
3) The form used to address applicants contributions to the paper.

It was noted that these issues had been debated repeatedly by the BOD. It was suggested that a part of the problem was that the BOD had tried to clarify with positive and negative examples. A motion was made and passed that examples be deleted. The Committee suggested that 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th authorship be accepted because the contribution could be meaningful. A motion that the applicant had to be first or second author of a publication on some phase of laboratory animal
medicine in a peer reviewed journal beginning in 1992 was defeated on a 2:7 vote. The reasons
given were that few applicants have achieved the stature of being principal investigators thus first
author may reflect institution policy.

The validity of requiring a form documenting the applicant’s contribution when second author,
resulted in a successful motion to delete the requirement. Because of all of these problems, the CC
was unable to adhere to the timetable for making decisions on eligibility. A unanimous vote
reduced the time for making the decision from March 5 to February 20.

In 1989, it was moved and passed to delete the statement regarding the MS or PhD degrees with
experience as an option for qualifying for the certifying examination. It had been 8 years since the
option had been exercised. It was noted that this would be in accord with ABVS/AVMA
recommendation of one preferred and one alternate route to certification, i.e., training and
experience, or experience alone.

In the same year, the CC expressed ongoing concern as to what constituted a "training program."
Dr. Noel Lehner was to request Training program directors to submit a written report detailing how
their program complied with the ILAR publication.

**ACLAM Examination in the 1980s**
The Certifying Exam now consisted of a written exam given in the morning and a practical given
in the afternoon. There was some concern about the length of the exam, and a 2 day exam was
proposed but this was not approved. In 1981, the written consisted of 650 questions. In 1984,
the total number of questions was reduced to 500 (150 true false/350 short answer). In 1985, the
number of true/false questions was reduced to 100, based on Examination Committee
recommendations. The Committee felt such questions did not adequately evaluate a candidate’s
understanding of the field. Analysis of the 1986 exam revealed a good correlation between
multiple choice and short answer questions in discriminating the candidate’s knowledge.

At this point, the exam was still hand-graded by the Examination Committee. Dr. William Britz,
Chair of Exam Development, and Dr. Terrie Cunliffe-Beamer were assigned the task of
investigating the computerization of the exam. The objective was to store all questions, permit
rapid print out of all sorted questions for committee review and selection, selective printing of
the exam and the analysis, and the addition, deletion and modification of questions.

Dr. Van Hoosier had requested that slides from the practical be incorporated into the University of
Washington slide bank. It was moved and passed that the slides could not be shared with any
organization. When no longer useful for the exam they were sent to the Secretary/Treasurer for
destruction.

Several issues of exam security were raised during this decade. In 1980, concern was expressed
by the Examination Committee that some candidates had obtained copies of the college 5 year
report that contained statistical information on exam categories and exam analysis results over the
past 10 years. It was moved and approved that the 5 year report would be mailed to all applicants
for the next 5 years. The Committee was concerned about Diplomates conducting post mortem
discussion of the exam with examinees, as some might be retaking the exam, and thus have an
unfair advantage.

The 1983 exam was held in New York, where “Sunshine Laws” might have required examinees
to provide answers to questions after taking the exam. However, further investigation showed
that these laws did not pertain to the ACLAM exam.

In the same year, there was a report that some of the names of those who passed the 1982 exam were leaked before all the candidates were notified. It was moved and passed therefore that the candidate’s identity would be restricted to the Executive Committee until the entire membership was notified. In addition, it was reported that notes were taken from one candidate at the end of the exam. There was no evidence of intent of wrong doing by this candidate, but the BOD felt it might be an unfair advantage. At the beginning of both the written and practical sessions, all candidates had been asked to place personal items on a table at the rear of the room. This candidate’s grade was not considered, and the candidate was board eligible; but the exam was declared null and void. Later, in a closed session, the BOD received a report from the Executive Committee concerning the informal appeal from this candidate. The Executive Committee recommended that the candidate’s exam results be declared valid. To avoid such an issue in the future the Chair of the Examination Committee was instructed to prepare a written statement concerning personal effects during the examination. The statement was to be included in the letter of instruction sent to candidates, and read during the exam.

Exam analysis and quality were reviewed during the 1980s. In 1984, President Charles Middleton expressed concern about the examination analysis. The analysis was often completed too late to be of value to the Examination Committee preparing the exam. He questioned whether questions were evaluated for relevance to our specialty. He appointed three people to work with Dr. Daniel Ringler on evaluating the analysis.

In the same year, a Task Force was appointed to update the exam policy. Its primary purpose was to summarize previous BOD decisions into a single policy statement, enhance the efficiency of preparing the exams and maintain exam security. There appeared to be some confusion as to the intent of the policy.

Later the same year, several members of the BOD reviewed the draft document "Certifying Examination Policy." Concern was expressed that the Policy was unworkable, too complex to follow realistically, and too restrictive. It was moved and approved to redraft the policy. Dr. McPherson noted that the ACLAM Policy on Examinee Misconduct did not mention the situation in which knowledge that the exam is compromised comes to BOD attention just before or after an examination. The examination would have to be declared null and void, which would disturb greatly those innocent of wrong doing. It was decided to address this point and seek legal counsel, if needed.

On another issue, it was moved that an individual serving on the Examination Committee not be nominated for office while on the Committee. The concern was that it left the Committee short-handed during the exam process. There was general consensus that it was a valid point, but should not be a fixed policy.

In 1985, the BOD approved the new draft of the Certifying Examination Policy report in principle, and directed that it continue to be developed and fine tuned including identification of sources of professional guidance and cost.

President John Harkness recommended hiring a professional consultant, to insure that the examination process was of the highest quality. President Harkness advocated the use of standard scores not percentile ranking, comparing results from year to year, and development of a better mechanism for using the results.
Dr. William White, Chair of the 1985/86 Examinations Committee, had reviewed the examination development process with a testing expert who made several recommendations. Dr. William Britz suggested that if we were trying to analyze a process that was not formally defined, we should first define goals then analyze success in achieving them. He moved that the BOD employ professional expertise in developing a task assessment. The motion failed.

In 1986, President Joseph E. Wagner stated that he had appointed a Task Force on Certifying Examination Policy and Specifications and asked Dr. White to serve as Chair. The charge was to develop a comprehensive description of a certified specialist in Laboratory Animal Medicine, examination specification, specific operating procedures, administering and development of the examination and exam analysis to develop/refine examination procedures. By 1988, Dr. White and his task force had prepared a questionnaire which was reviewed by the Penn State testing service. The goal was to determine what defined a Diplomate, to profile the professional activities of Diplomates, and to define the degree and scope of their involvement. The findings were to be used in exam development.

During the 1980s the reporting of exam statistics and grading changed. The word “breakpoint” was not used, or if so was not recorded in the minutes. In 1980, twenty nine people sat for both parts of the exam, two for written only and one for practical only. No questions were discarded but several additional answers were accepted. The range for the written was 43.8-86%. The Committee recommended the top 19 candidates on the written pass, which was approved. The range on the practical was 20%-78.6%. It was moved and passed that the top 20 candidates for the practical be passed.

For the first time in 1981, the scores were presented as mean and standard deviations. The mean for the written was 387.1 ± 61.1 (654 total possible points). It was moved that a raw score of 383 be accepted as passing for the written which passed on a 7:2 vote. A mean score of 92.2 ± 16.7 out of 140 total possible points was reported for the practical. It was moved and passed that 92 (65.7 percentile) be the passing score for the practical and passed 9:0. Twelve people passed both parts of the examination. Four passed the written and three the practical only.

In 1982, twenty four of 28 approved took the written and 23 of 28 approved took the practical. Fourteen of 24 passed the written and 14 of 23 passed the practical. It was moved and passed that a score of 59.7% was passing for the written and 58.2% for the practical.

Twenty of 28 approved took the 1983 written and 22 took the practical. Ten candidates passed the written with a score of 60% or higher and 12 passed the practical with scores of 60% or higher.

By 1984, the numbers of candidates passing the written and practical were no longer reported in the minutes. The results of the 1984 exam were reported by a number assigned to each candidate so that the identity of each remained unknown. The Examination Committee recommended that the mean score for each part of the exam be used as the passing grade, and this motion was approved.

In 1985, twenty seven of thirty three who were approved to take one or both parts of the exam did so. Twenty seven took the written and twenty four the practical. The results were presented to the BOD without the candidate’s name or number and whether or not they were taking it for the first time. The Committee recommended 60% and above as passing, which was approved.
In 1986, the Examination Committee strongly favored establishing minimal passing standards for both portions of the examination. The recommendation was that 66% be the passing score for both portions of the examination. A motion was made and passed unanimously to have 66% as the minimal passing score. A second motion to have a minimum passing percentage for each major section of the written exam was defeated unanimously. The Committee reported that no candidate with an overall passing score had less than 33% correct answers on any section of the written examination. Another motion empowering the BOD to make adjustments in the minimum passing percentage was passed. To do this a comparison of score distribution between sections of the examination in the current year compared to the preceding 3 years would have to be done. This information was to be passed to the BOD at the time that the Chair of the Examination presents the scores. The option if exercised could only be used to increase the number passing the exam. It was decided to collect data on the scores on each major section of the written to present to the Board for evaluation, and that guidelines for the examination would be mailed to candidates 30 days before the examination.

The passing score remained at 66% for the 1987 exam with both Examination Committee and BOD approval.

The 1988 Examination Committee recommended accepting 63% as the passing score for the written. It was moved, seconded and passed that the score be accepted.

The 1989 Examination Committee presented raw scores and percentages for both parts of the exam. The Chair stated that difficulty, fatigue and consistency of responses were the basis of recommending 59% as passing for the written. A motion was made and passed 8:1 to accept 59%. A passing score of 63% was recommended for the practical, this too was approved. While not in the minutes it appeared that (for humane reasons) the natural breakpoint superseded the minimum passing standard approved in 1986.

**ACLAM Examination Review in the 1980s**

In 1980, Dr. Lanny Kraus reiterated the membership’s desire to hold a second Diplomate Exam Review Session in conjunction with the AALAS meeting. A year later, the Examination Committee expressed concern that conducting the review pulled them away from the grading process for most of a day, and that it was more difficult to maintain security of the questions. Dr. Max Lang, Secretary/Treasurer, then moved that there be two levels of review. For those participants using the review for continuing education, 10% of the written exam from the previous year’s examination would be used as well as the entire practical. Those Diplomates wanting to review the entire current exam would have to make application to the Secretary/Treasurer, pay a modest fee, and take it with the candidates. Enrollment would be limited. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. However, in 1983, since no request for the latter option had been made, the BOD decided to reverse their position and provide a full review of the current exam at the AVMA meeting and a 10% review at the AALAS meeting. By 1988, a full exam review was held at both the AVMA and AALAS meetings.

**ACLAM Continuing Education in the 1980s**

In 1980, the Publications Committee received several suggestions, including establishment of a laboratory animal journal, preparation of a monograph on animal facility biohazards, and
translation of the Rabbit Text into Spanish.

The ACLAM Texts

Also in 1980, Dr. Patrick Manning reported progress on the Laboratory Animal Medicine text with Dr. James Fox as Senior Editor. Problems arose in the selection of a publisher. The legality of an original contract between Elsevier Press and Dr. Fox (purportedly voided by Elsevier when the text was to become an ACLAM sponsored text) was discussed. The question of ACLAM involvement in the Elsevier contract also was debated. It was moved that ACLAM seek legal counsel on the relationship of ACLAM to the Elsevier contract and text editorship and any other future action(s) ACLAM might consider in selection of a publisher. Dr. Manning was instructed to seek legal counsel from an expert in publication and copyright law. After receiving counsel, he reported that ACLAM was free to pursue publication as desired. Dr. Fox then recommended that ACLAM proceed with Academic Press as the publisher. Dr. Fox was to be senior editor of the text with Drs. Cohen and Loew as co-editors.

The Committee did not address the charge of defining criteria by which text editors were chosen. Dr. Manning suggested the President-Elect deal with the issue of establishing the criteria. No action was taken.

Dr. Manning reported the results of the Diplomate survey on preferred topics for the next College publication. In order of decreasing popularity, the topics were: non-human primates, the hamster, facility design and animal usage. The Committee was perplexed because much had been published on these species, albeit in numerous separate publications. He indicated the Committee felt facility design and animal usage would be covered in the text on Laboratory Animal Medicine. Thus, the hamster and gerbil perhaps could be the next publication.

There was discussion as to whether all authors of the mouse text, regardless of which volume their chapters appeared, should receive a free complete set. The BOD agreed that the formal contract of the mouse text should be re-examined. However, it was eventually decided that all authors would receive a copy of each volume. To avoid a price increase as a result of this decision, ACLAM would bear the additional cost out of royalty income. This was in keeping with what was done for the rat and models texts. However, later that same year, the issue of numbers of complimentary copies of the mouse text to authors was again brought up. There was a long discussion and the final decision was that each author should receive volume(s) containing his/her contribution and another volume of his/her choice. The motion was approved unanimously.

Dr. Kraus reported that the Publication Committee supported the hamster as the subject for the next text. A recent College survey pointed to non-human primates as the first choice. It was suggested that the 1981-82 Publication Committee would deal with the selection.

In 1981, there was a discussion about non-ACLAM Diplomates serving as editors or co-editors of ACLAM Texts. This was in response to an inquiry from the Publication Committee. It was decided that ACLAM Diplomates would continue to serve in that capacity.

In 1982, The Publication Committee submitted a draft of Standard Operations Procedures for ACLAM text preparation. After a few modifications, it was moved for adoption and approved. The 1980 Spanish translation request for the Biology of the Laboratory Rabbit was brought up again, but the BOD decided to do nothing until a meaningful request was received from
Academic Press. The BOD approved the Publication Committee’s recommendation that the next species text be the hamster.

By 1983, all 4 volumes of the *Mouse in Biomedical Research* had been published. *Laboratory Animal Medicine* was published in 1984 and *Laboratory Hamsters* in 1987.

In 1987, The Primate Text Committee report, given by Dr. B. Taylor Bennett, stated that progress was slow. He expressed concern that the proposed USDA changes might reduce the number of primates used. He thought the text should be put on hold and the need for such a text reassessed. However, Dr. Roy Henrickson pointed out that ACLAM should press forward while the expertise was still available. The BOD requested the Committee reassess its plans and report back to the BOD. The primate text was to be published in 2 volumes.

**ACLAM Audio-tutorial**

In 1987, Dr. John Harkness reported that Ms. Lynn Dahm had contacted him concerning the audio-tutorial materials prepared and distributed by Washington State University. The University would like ACLAM’s help in updating them. It was noted that ACLAM had never received any fiscal benefit, and that they were never formally reviewed or approved by ACLAM. It was recommended that the Secretary/Treasurer correspond with her to see if an equitable agreement could be reached, and that it be made clear that the University did not have the authority to imply joint sponsorship or use the ACLAM logo. The questions posed in a letter to Ms. Dahm were answered by Dr. Van Hoosier of the University of Washington. On the basis of information he provided, it was agreed to continue with an update.

In 1988, a coordinating task force to collaborate with the University of Washington was established. The task force would work on behalf of the BOD, keep them fully informed, and request official action on all appropriate issues. There were two conditions necessary for the success of the project:

1) A written agreement between ACLAM/UW regarding responsibility rights and privileges and
2) An annual budget of $5000 for travel. All were approved except the travel request which was deferred until the 1989 budget was formulated.

In 1989, the report of the Task Force on the Revision of the Audio-Tutorial Series was accepted. It was BOD consensus that the Task Force seek financial support from NIH, National Agriculture Library (NAL) and the National Library of Medicine (NLM). Later that same year, Dr. McPherson reported that through his efforts and the efforts of Dr. Taylor Bennett, the College received a grant for $72,900 from the NAL to revise the Audio-Tutorial Series over a period from 9/15/89-9/14/92. The programs prepared under the grant could not be copyrighted. Three copies must be given to NAL and the College could sell others. The grant restricted the AT Series to species covered by the Animal Welfare Act.

**The ACLAM Forum**

The 1980 Forum, “Animal Production,” was held in October in conjunction with the AALAS meeting. A self examination program was conducted by Dr. Pierre Conti. In the same year, 73 Diplomates responded to a questionnaire sent by the Continuing Education Committee, favoring the topic of environmental and disease complications in biomedical research for the 1983 Forum.
During this time, there was continued concern about the timing and site of the Forum. Dr. Steven Pakes urged that the Forum be held at a separate time and place from other annual meetings. His Forum Committee felt that the location should be close to the center of Diplomate population. Dr. Sheldon Biven suggested that the Forum be held every 2 years. It was decided that the Immunology Forum, originally scheduled for 1981, under Dr. Pakes, would be held between January and May 1982, at a site to be chosen.

The 1982 Forum, Immunology, was held in Gatlinburg, TN. All but three presenters were ACLAM Diplomates. The text of presenters was sent to registrants in advance. There were 93 paid registrants. A follow up questionnaire revealed that 39% felt the Forum should be a stand-alone meeting, 32% felt it should precede the AALAS meeting, 24% were neutral and 3% wanted it in conjunction with the AVMA.

The 1983 Forum title was "Biomedical Research - the Tools for Success." Topics for the 1984 Forum were discussed. Dr. Norman Altman moved that it be "Emerging Biotechnology in Laboratory Animal Medicine." The motion passed.

Forum expenses were increasing. It was pointed out that poor attendance could have severe budget consequences. Dr. Thomas Hamm moved that for all future forums:
1) A mechanism be established for cancellation not to exceed the budgeted amount in the event of poor response and
2) The amount budgeted would be the maximum amount available. No vote on these recommendations was recorded. However, the Secretary/Treasurer was to draft a letter to Dr. Clarkson, Chairman of the "83" Forum, informing him of this new policy.

In 1984, the issue of the Forum as a special meeting again was discussed. It was noted that location and time were becoming increasingly important as travel funds diminished. It was the general consensus of the BOD that ACLAM experiment with time and location. There was also general consensus that the Forum did not have to be an annual event. The 1984 Forum was successful both financially and scientifically.

A request was made to honor the memory of Dr. Ronald Flatt by dedicating the next Forum to his memory. Concern was expressed that to do so could establish a precedent that would be difficult to maintain. Although the feeling was positive it was decided not to approve the request.

President-Elect Charles Middleton discussed his plan for the 1986 Forum. The topic proposed was the legal, moral and ethical use of animals in research. It would be in the Washington, DC area for ease of attendees to contact their senators and representatives while there and at a location easily accessible to the majority of the membership.

The question was raised as to whether or not the Forum should be opened to non-Diplomates. Lessening the fears of fiscal deficit was one advantage presented. A potential disadvantage was that it could lose its significance to Diplomates and become "just another meeting." It was suggested that registration might be opened to non-Diplomates, if not enough Diplomates registered, but would that give the appearance that the College was only interested in costs? It was agreed that opening the Forum to non-Diplomates would remain an option for the future.

The topic of the 1985 Forum was genetics. It was held on Martha’s Vineyard.

There were 49 registrants for the 1985 Forum. If a member canceled his registration on the first day of the Forum, it was a unanimous decision of the BOD not to make a refund, as costs had already been incurred. The Forum was successful but had low attendance. A Charles River
subsidy prevented a deficit. The issue of including non-Diplomates was raised. It was suggested that perhaps the topics were becoming too specialized.

In 1985, President John Harkness decided not to have a Forum in 1987. The time would be used to explore the issue of topics, frequency, location and attendance. There was general agreement.

The topic of the 1986 Forum was Animal Welfare, and was held in Columbia, Maryland. There was more discussion about non-ACLAM members attending Forums and holding them in conjunction with national meetings.

The 1988 Forum, was open to non-Diplomates. Total attendance was limited to about 150. There would be a cut-off date for Diplomates to register after which non-Diplomate applications would be accepted. There would be a different registration fee for Diplomates ($150) and non-Diplomates ($250). Commercial support would be necessary and sought. However, the BOD voted against corporate sponsors. Because of this action, registration for Diplomates was increased to $175 and $250 for non-Diplomates. It was suggested that registration fees might not be adequate to cover costs. It was moved and passed that the Diplomate fee be raised to $200. It was moved and approved to reaffirm not to accept corporate donations for the Forum.

Additional Publications and Seminars

In 1980, The Educational Resources Committee Report indicated progress on the syllabus for teaching laboratory animal science to life science students. The syllabus was prepared by Drs. Gerald Van Hoosier, Farol Tomson, Darrell Clark, Howard Rush and John Harkness. It consisted of 98 lessons. There followed a discussion of funding, and the possible hiring of additional educational experts to assist in the review and revision. The BOD decided to withhold funding of the syllabus project until a mechanism of review and revision along with costs was established. Later that same year, the Publication Committee became concerned regarding the syllabus. There was a lot of discussion and debate, most of it revolving around money and credit. The BOD consensus was that because the College would have contributed up to $1,000, the final document should be copyrighted under the name ACLAM. It was not copyrighted at the time. No further discussion or action was taken. In late 1980, the proposed syllabus revision provided by Dr. Van Hoosier was distributed. A binder would be added containing the editor’s names, the ACLAM logo and mailed to all ACLAM and ASLAP members. Copyright was to be in ACLAM's name.

In the same year, Dr. Dale Brooks, Chair of the Recruitment and Training Committee, proposed the production of an Introductory Laboratory Animal Medicine Syllabus for veterinary students. Potential overlap with the upcoming text Laboratory Animal Medicine was discussed and no action was taken. A second proposal for providing educational assistance for veterinarians interested in ACLAM certification was presented. These training sessions were proposed to be held at AALAS meetings. Dr Webster, Secretary/Treasurer referred to ACLAM’s standing rules document approved by the BOD in 1978, stating that the College would not sponsor such programs. No BOD action was taken.

Also in 1980, members of the Subcommittee on Therapeutics reviewed ACLAM's position paper on anesthetics, analgesics and tranquilizers and forwarded comments to Dr. Albert E. New, who was preparing the final manuscript.
The Publication Committee reported that no Bulletin was published that year. The purpose for the Bulletin was to serve as a public relations instrument to deans, administrators and others perhaps not familiar with our specialty. There was a problem with lack of feedback for evaluation of the publication. Dr. C. Max Lang moved to discontinue the ACLAM Bulletin. The motion passed unanimously.

In the early 1980s the charge to the Educational Training Committee Report was to:

1) Review and update the ACLAM brochure,
2) Develop and maintain liaison with US veterinary schools
3) Explore the possibility of private funds for fellowship
4) Develop criteria for the summer fellowships.

However, in 1982, the Committee indicated little interest in the summer fellowship program which was approved in 1981 for three fellowships at $1,800 each. It was moved by Dr. Lanny Kraus that the BOD rescind its decision to support the program and eliminate the announcement of the program. The motion was approved.

In 1982, The ACLAM brochure was discussed again. It was decided that the ILAR publication "Laboratory Animal Medicine: Guidelines for Education and Training" contained much of the information appropriate for an ACLAM brochure. Thus, it was recommended that this publication, with a cover letter, be made available upon request in lieu of a brochure.

In 1989, the report of Guidelines for Training and Certification for Persons involved in Experimental Surgery chaired by Dr. Michael Swindle had been submitted. It was suggested that it be endorsed in principle. It was agreed that it should be a set of guidelines and not intended to certify individuals.

**ACLAM Journal**

In 1980, discussion continued on the issue of an ACLAM sponsored Journal. BOD consensus was that ACLAM should continue to explore possibilities of an ACLAM journal noting that at present strong support for such a journal was not evident.

In 1987, President Joseph E. Wagner suggested that the College publish a scientific journal because the subject matter for texts in the near future was limited, and the College risked becoming stagnant. The BOD expressed concern about cost and whether this was the appropriate mechanism to enhance scientific communication. It was generally agreed that the College was not in a position to publish a high quality journal, but the College should consider the possibility of producing monographs and publishing them through established channels. However a task force on ACLAM sponsored journals was eventually appointed.

In 1988, Dr. J. Russell Lindsey gave a report from the Task Force on ACLAM sponsored journal. He distributed a preliminary report and letters of differing opinions. He noted that ACLAM did not have its own journal although it is informally linked with Laboratory Animal Science (LAS). LAS had a long backlog, and there was a growing resentment about veterinarians dominating AALAS. He also stated that he believed the amount of advertising in LAS detracted from its quality.

Concern was expressed by BOD members about the potential adverse impact on LAS. Also, could ACLAM establish an international journal? It was stated that to generate the suggested
subsidy, the Endowment Fund would have to triple, and dues would have to be increased substantially to cover subscription costs. It was noted that such an endeavor would be dependent on non-member subscription to have the necessary critical mass. Dr. Lindsey responded to the concerns and acknowledged that additional information had to be obtained.

Later that same year, a final Journal Task Force Report was given, a motion was made that the BOD support the concept of an ACLAM sponsored journal, and direct its senior officers to proceed with options for financing. The vote was unanimous in favor. The full report was to be submitted to the membership for a vote. President Dennis Johnsen asked Dr. Lindsey to consider certain editorial suggestions before proceeding with financial options. He replied that after consultation with the Task Force members, they considered their report final, and that anything additional should be the responsibility of others. Dr. Johnsen then appointed Drs. VanHoosier and Manning to continue the task. They were to be assisted by Drs. George Irving, David K. Johnson, John Donovan, Ronald McLaughlin and Steven Pakes. Their task was to discuss if a journal was financially feasible, not if such a journal was needed.

In 1989, The Journal Planning Committee recommended that a conjoint effort with AALAS to develop a first class journal be pursued. The Task Force would investigate potential conflicts, since the AVMA had two journals; and a joint effort with a non-AVMA organization might be problematic. Also would such a venture jeopardize ACLAM's tax exempt status?

**ACLAM and ASLAP in the 1980s**

Little was recorded in the 1980s regarding ACLAM/ASLAP relations. Seminars were co-sponsored between the two groups at national meetings, and both participated in economic surveys of the profession.

**ACLAM and the AVMA in the 1980s**

In 1980, the ACLAM 5 year report to the Advisory Board on Veterinary Specialties (ABVS) was accepted by the AVMA. The ACLAM appointed representative to the ABVS was Dr. Steven Pakes. It was moved and passed that the Secretary/Treasurer be appointed as the alternate representative. Also in 1980, successful law suits against the American College of Veterinary Ophthalmology sparked discussion of liability for other specialties, including the possibility of an AVMA umbrella insurance policy. The matter was tabled for future discussion. A year later, it was determined that the AVMA's professional insurance policy does not cover specialty organizations. The AVMA recommended each group obtain its own insurance.

In 1981, the BOD discussed the AVMA proposed changes in the guidelines for the establishment and recognition of veterinary specialty organization. The salient point was that the ABVS considered ACLAM’s experience requirement following training to be a "waiting period" before taking the examination. The response was that ACLAM required no waiting period, but rather a period of approved training and experience as part of the credential prerequisite for approval to take the exam.

There was also discussion concerning the 1979 AVMA requirement for specialty assistance for veterinary practitioners. No BOD action was taken.

In 1982, the ABVS passed a proposal that each College/Board determine the minimum education
and training under optimal supervision that would qualify the candidate for examination. The program was to specify the most time efficient route to qualification for examination and be termed standard/residency route. Other routes as specified by a Board/College were alternate qualifying routes. Dr. Steven Pakes, now on the ABVS Executive Board, recommended that an Ad hoc Committee be appointed to review ACLAM’s requirements.

In 1983, Dr. Paul Hildebrandt a member of the AVMA Executive Board, recommended that all specialty groups have an appeal procedure and liability insurance. He indicated that ACLAM appeared to be in compliance with the recommendations. Later that year a request was received from the AVMA asking for specific information on procedures for the certifying examination appeals process and liability insurance. ACLAM’s response was drafted by Drs. Pakes and C. Max Lang and was approved by the BOD.

Also in 1983, the issue of continuing activities in conjunction with the AVMA was questioned again. It was noted that this was discussed by the BOD in 1966, 1974, 1977 and 1981. No action was taken.

In 1985, ACLAM’s 5 year review by ABVS again received full recognition with some accolades. The ABVS was to release new guidelines in August 1985.

Concern about AVMA annual meeting attendance continued and in 1985, Dr. Conrad Richter pointed out that attendance at the AVMA was flat even with a growing membership, and ACLAM sessions were often poorly attended. However, the AVMA did provide funding for the Section on Laboratory Animal Medicine.

In 1986 the subject of restricted licenses was an ABVS concern. Dr. Middleton moved that a possible need for such license be recognized, but that ACLAM's representative to the ABVS provide detailed information to the BOD for review before proceeding as our spokesperson on the matter. The motion was approved.

Also in 1986, President Wagner recommended Drs. Norman Altman and Daniel Ringler to the AVMA for appointments to the Animal Welfare Advisory Panel. It was moved and passed that these individuals be informed that they are to serve on behalf of the College, must keep the BOD fully informed including regular reports of all correspondence and action, and must seek BOD approval before speaking on behalf of the College.

In 1987, there was correspondence from the AVMA announcing plans to form the American Society of Veterinary Executives. ACLAM would not be eligible because it is not represented in the AVMA House of Delegates.

In 1989, the AVMA planned to convene a panel on research animal surgery. ACLAM would recommend three individuals to serve after consultation with ASLAP on recommendations. In the same year, Dr. William Britz, now ACLAM’s representative to the ABVS, reported that the ABVS proposed three designations of sub-specialties, and that Laboratory Animal Medicine was included for species specific licensure. He stated further that ACLAM’s 5 year report was due by December 15, 1989.
ACLAM and AAALAC in the 1980s

There had been a representative to the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) for a number of years. Dr. Henry Baker was the first representative in 1977-1978. However, in 1987, it was noted that ACLAM had not received a report from its representative for several years. It was suggested that either the representative keep the BOD informed or the appointment of a representative to AAALAC should be discontinued.

Later that year, the report of the AAALAC representative was presented to the BOD. Questions were raised about the lack of feedback from AAALAC Council, and a perceived change in AAALAC philosophy, i.e., that AAALAC was becoming overly restrictive. There was no action taken.

Legislation and Public Relations in the 1980s

In 1980, Dr. Franklin Lowe was appointed chair of an ad hoc committee on Adequate Veterinary Care. He briefed the BOD on a congressional bill (HR4805) – The Research Modernization Act. The Act proposed to direct 30-50% of animal research money for all federal agencies using animals to a National Center to promote the use of alternatives to animal research. It was decided that ACLAM would not comment officially on pending legislation. Dr Albert E. New distributed a position paper draft entitled “Analgesics, Tranquilizers and Anesthetics—Consideration and Recommendations for Animals in Biomedical Research” for BOD review.

In 1981, there were four committees dealing with animal care issues. Dr. Lowe became chairman of Animal Care and Use, Dr. Christian Abee chaired Experimental Techniques, Dr. Charles Leather – Adequate Veterinary Care, and Dr. Albert New chaired the sub-committee Anesthesia and Analgesia. In 1982, the last three committees all operated as subcommittees of the Animal Care and Use Committee. The Adequate Veterinary Care subcommittee was to define adequate veterinary care, define the role of the attending veterinarian in the animal facility, and explore channels of communication with investigators. Although recommended by the committee, the BOD did not endorse the development of criteria for evaluating pain and distress, as the Analgesia and Anesthesia subcommittee had already drafted a paper on working definitions of pain and distress to be reviewed by the BOD and eventually published. The Experimental Techniques subcommittee recommended a survey of institutions offering graduate degrees in the biological sciences to assess the availability of formal/informal training in the use of animals. The BOD recommended this be done for medical and veterinary schools with a Diplomate on staff.

In 1983, there was discussion on the development of a list of speakers from ACLAM on the topic of Laboratory Animal Medicine for the general public. This effort would be headed by Dr. Alvin Moreland, chair of the Public Relations Committee.

In the same year, the Adequate Veterinary Care Committee was to prepare a final report based on their survey “Techniques Using Animals.” They were to consider ACLAM’s position on commonly used experimental procedures, review administrative procedures for identifying veterinary care problems in animal facilities, and act as a liaison with other groups concerned with animal welfare. The committee also recommended the establishment of an award for
outstanding contributions in research using laboratory animals. However, this had been tried in the past without success, and the award was not approved.

The Executive Committee approved a letter to the Veterans Administration expressing concern over the delay in appointing a committee to fill the open position of Chief Veterinary Medical Officer.

In 1984, The Public Relations Committee had contacted the AVMA to request that a film be prepared on the laboratory animal veterinarian and research. The AVMA agreed and would speak to some Diplomates to develop the concept.

In the same year, the Adequate Veterinary Care Committee prepared a document on Adequate Veterinary Care. The Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR) was aware of the document and much interested in it. It was decided that ACLAM would release the document after it had been approved by the membership. It was noted that professional editing would be necessary, and a preliminary statement would be added to ensure professional judgment and flexibility. There was some concern that a simple majority vote by the membership was proper procedure for a document of such importance. It was also pointed out that the NIH guide for the Care and Use of Animals contained a general definition of adequate veterinary care but that the ACLAM document would be more detailed.

A Task Force on Animals in Research was appointed by Dr. Charles Middleton. Drs. Thomas Clarkson and Christian Abee served as members. Their report recommended that ACLAM should be more active and visible in the area, by taking a position that was well thought out and succinct, endorsing standards for assurance of responsible use, increasing educational programs and becoming more engaged in political activities. The recommendations within the document were consolidated into the College’s position on the use of animals in research, teaching and testing, and a strategy for public and political activities. The document was approved.

In 1985, the position paper on Adequate Veterinary Care was approved by the general membership 173 to 14.

In 1986, Dr. Dennis Johnson presented the final edited position paper: Report of the American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine on Adequate Veterinary Care which incorporated the changes recommended by the BOD. The revised paper was approved and would be distributed to the membership, corresponding societies, OPRR/NIH, AALAC, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and others requesting it.

In 1987, Dr. William Britz gave the legal report and expressed concern about responsibilities, liabilities and levels of authority that Diplomates face in the area of animal care and use in research and teaching. He felt a sound review and legal opinion was needed. It was suggested that this could be done in conjunction with ASLAP and/or NABR, particularly NABR as they retained lawyers familiar with the issues. The idea was endorsed in concept by the BOD and Dr. Britz was asked to return a firm recommendation later in the year.

The General Business of ACLAM in the 1980s

Finances

This was the major topic of ACLAM business in the 1980s. The 1979-80 Audit Committee
Report recommended reimbursement of the Secretary-Treasurer office of $500 for unrecorded office expense and $3,800 for secretarial assistance for 1980-81. It was decided that up to $4,300 be authorized for the Secretary-Treasurer to use at his discretion for the office. The BOD agreed to pay the Secretary-Treasurer expenses to all organized ACLAM functions, i.e., AVMA, AALAS and Forum. The cost of travel expenses for some BOD members who had no travel support was discussed and caution regarding travel cost to the College was urged.

In accordance with the 1981 Audit Committee's recommendation, a portion of royalty income was transferred from saving certificates to a money market fund to maximize return. The Secretary/Treasurer was authorized to open a check option for such funds on deposit to minimize funds in the substantially lower interest bearing checking account. Financial resources of ACLAM were divided clearly into:
1) General operating budget supported by dues income and
2) Text Royalty income.

Unfortunately, the General Operating Budget had suffered from deficit spending for several years and reserves were depleted. Operational expenses had increased due to 1) additional services to the membership and 2) significantly increased travel costs for Exam Committee and BOD members. In contrast, the text royalty income contained a moderate reserve during this period. However, these were restricted funds and could not be used for general operating procedures. They could only be used for the purposes specified in the original agreement. Although these commitments had been established, the BOD never instituted the financial policies required to ensure that such commitments would be met in the future.

The following recommendations and decisions were made in 1981.
1) Fulfill the accounting requirements of ACLAM's financial operations
2) Establish budget policies
3) Develop and implement cost control procedures.

In addition, three ideas were presented and debated for using royalty income:
1) subsidize the Continuing Education Forum
2) provide summer fellowships
3) transfer a lump sum to the operating budget.

Dr. Daniel Ringler moved that as many as three summer fellowships be funded from royalty income up to $1,800 each and that a committee be established to recommend an award mechanism. It was approved.

It was moved that a permanent endowment fund from royalty income be established and that the income derived from this fund be used in accordance with the June 17, 1977 Report of the ad hoc Committee to study the use of royalty income from ACLAM texts. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. The initial installment was to be $40,000 with the possibility of more based on BOD action.

Currently identified expenditures that could be charged to income earned from the endowment included:
1) Costs incurred by the Editorial Committee(s) to the external budget and approved by the BOD,
2) Costs incurred for Diplomate Examinations Review, e.g., audiovisual equipment rental, reproduction and non-alcoholic refreshments,
3) Donations to other organizations for the purpose of education in some aspect of veterinary medicine or laboratory animal science,
4) Certain expenses of the Certifying Examination
5) Designated Forum expenses approved by the BOD.

A Travel Policy had never been defined clearly. Recent changes in IRS regulations (Revenue Procedure 80-53) required that certain types of travel reimbursement (e.g., meals on overnight travel) be reported as taxable income to the recipient. A formal travel policy was adopted defining the procedure for handling such requests for reimbursement and limits for same. The policy spelled out procedures for approval for reimbursement. Meals and lodging were not to exceed the rate established for that geographical locality by the NIH. It stated that all committees/groups involved in expenditures of more than $200 per year would submit a budget to the BOD for action before any financial commitments were made. Specific guidelines for committees with annual budgets were presented for the Text Committee, Examination Committee and the Local Arrangements Committee.

During the 1980s, ACLAM continued to contribute monetarily to the work of other organizations including AAALAC, NSMR, Student AVMA and AAALAS. In 1980, the BOD wrote to NSMR expressing modest dissatisfaction with them. In the same year, it was reported that a fund had been set up in the name of the late Dr. Mark Friedman, through the NY Metropolitan Branch of AALAS. The fund would be used to train veterinary students in laboratory animal medicine. A motion was made and passed that ACLAM contribute $100 to the fund. It was noted that other Diplomates had died recently and had similar, in-memoriam funds for education purposes established. If contributions to such funds were proposed, ACLAM would give due consideration to the request. In 1980, the total amount of donations was $1,200 or 14.9% of dues income. In 1981, it was decided that funds only be donated for the purpose of education in some phase of veterinary medicine or laboratory animal science. Such requests must be in writing to the BOD.

Donations to the AALAS Awards and Education Fund had been $500 in previous years. The same amount was proposed, but because AALAS had not provided the requested information there was considerable differences of opinion regarding the donation. It was moved that the donation be made and the motion passed 4 to 3. The request from the Association for Biomedical Research for a $250 donation was discussed. Because ACLAM had a deficit, and donations made from the General Operating Fund were not in keeping with the new policy, it was decided that $100 be given along with a letter informing them of the new policy.

In 1981, Budgets for the Mouse Text, Laboratory Animal Medicine Text, Credentials Committee, Examination Committee, and Forum were approved. In the case of the Texts and the Forum there would be income to offset or exceed the approved budget. The Education and Training Committee requested $2,500 for the purpose of meeting at the Forum to prepare a new brochure and to develop promotional and application forms for the proposed summer fellowships. This was to encourage Committee member participation, which to date had been poor. An additional $50 was requested to develop the brochure revision. Both of these were approved.

Late in 1981, The Secretary/Treasurer reported that dues income would not meet the general operating costs. Dues was increased to $50 beginning January 1, 1982. The 1982 budget was approved with $23,250 for General Operations and $17,145 for Continuing Education.

In 1982 Dr. C. Max Lang, Secretary/Treasurer, reported that ACLAM was solvent due in large part to the policies adopted by the BOD in 1981. Most funds had been deposited in a money market fund. IRS changes affecting tax exempt organizations put the emphasis on expending funds primarily on program service activities. Therefore, ACLAM had to differentiate between
program service activity and general management. To this end, the financial statement was restructured as general management and program service to be consistent with IRS reporting requirements.

Later that year, Dr. Lang reported that the IRS continued to make changes concerning tax exempt organizations. Of particular interest to ACLAM were the following:

a) Income and expenses must be designated as restricted or unrestricted.
b) There must be a distinct separation of income and expenses for general management versus program service activities.
c) BOD legal and liability insurance were interpreted as general management expenses.
d) Any one receiving $1,000 or more must be reported to the IRS even for reimbursement.
e) Any change in the constitution or program service activities must be reported.
f) Any political activity or support of an organization involved in political activities must be reported.

Program services were primarily those that formed the basis of an organization being tax exempt. The BOD formally approved the following as program services:

1. Awards banquet
2. Certification of Diplomates
3. Continuing education
4. Newsletter
5. Publication of texts

It was then decided that funds received from the following sources be designated as restricted funds for the purpose of assuring program services:

1. Awards banquet
2. Certifying examination fees
3. Forum fees
4. Gifts
5. Royalty income

Also in 1982, it was decided that all funds from royalties in excess of that budgeted for Program Service activities be automatically transferred to the restricted fund at the end of each fiscal year. General Management Funds in excess of 20% of receipts for the year, and not expended during the year, would be transferred automatically to the Restricted Fund at the end of the fiscal year; that the Restricted Fund be indexed to the CPI and interest received over and above this be available for Program Service budget subsidies.

The By-Laws stated that all monies in the name of the College be deposited in FDIC banks approved by the BOD. However, the BOD approved that the Secretary/Treasurer determine the "best" institution for savings deposit. It was decided that the BOD reaffirm the standing rules and that they be used as a guide when the By-Laws are revised. Also, the BOD would be informed on an annual basis where such funds were deposited.

It was noted that several members had made private gifts to the College to be used for program service activities. It was moved and passed that the funds be accepted. Professional liability insurance for ACLAM in the amount of $500,000 would be effective January 1, 1983.

The problem of dues payment being received later than 2 months continued. To resolve the problem it was decided that dues be increased to $75 per year with a $25 discount if postmarked
by February 15.

In the early 1980s the examination fees were increased. A qualification fee of $50 was submitted upon application and was non refundable. Failure to pass all parts of the exam within 30 months would require an additional payment to reapply. There was a fee of $125, which was not refundable except in emergency situations as determined by the Executive Committee. A registration fee of $50 was to be paid by those passing the examination and on being voted the status of Diplomate by the BOD. This fee was to offset the cost of the plaque and logo pin. This fee schedule would apply for those making application for 1982; previously approved candidates would be assessed the fee in effect at the time, and all future applicant packets would clearly state that such fees were subject to change. By 1989, it was again necessary to increase fees. The exam fee was increased $250 beginning with those applying to take the exam in 1990.

The Examination Committee asked that their committee members’ travel expenses associated with the exam be paid by the College. It was agreed that committee members should pay their own expenses, but if they couldn't, they could request travel expenses.

It was decided that all committees and special appointees be informed in their letter of appointment of the College's policy on reimbursement, and whether funds were budgeted for that purpose.

There was discussion about Awards Banquet speaker costs in the event there was no Honorary Member selected who would be the speaker. It was decided that in the event another speaker had to be engaged, the maximum budgeted would be $500, and the talk must be educational in nature to assure compliance with the program service request.

In 1983, it was reported that the $25 discount on dues paid by February 15 had a significant positive effect regarding collection. It was decided that Diplomates who had not paid their 1983 dues by December 31, 1983, would be dropped as a member.

In the same year, President Dennis Kohn appointed a Task Force on the Endowment to be chaired by Dr. C. Max Lang. The report of the Task Force included the following:

The purpose of the endowment was to ensure continuity of program service activities established by BOD in 1981.

Anticipated source of funds for the Endowment would be
1) Donations and royalty income
2) Budgeted funds which were not required for general management and program service activities
3) Interest earned on the principal from the endowment fund.

Expenditures would consist of:
1) Fund indexing
2) Certifying exam (anticipated to be self supporting soon).
3) Text preparation
4) Newsletter
5) Continuing education
6) Awards banquet (limited to plaques and educational speakers).

In 1984, The Audit Committee reported that it was unable to complete a formal audit without a
CPA. Dr. Henry Foster the ad hoc Financial Advisor, arranged for up to 5 days of gratis auditing services by Arthur Anderson Company. The first formal audit was performed at the close of the 1984 fiscal year. The Audit Committee reported that the acceptance of donations that were anonymous at the donor’s request was a cause of concern. It was decided that all donations be reviewed by the Executive Committee before formal acceptance by the BOD.

In 1985, Dr. Orland Soave was asked to prepare a recommendation for bequests to the College. President-Elect John Harkness would put it in a format to match other Policy and Procedure. It was agreed that reminders regarding bequeaths to the College would be published in the Newsletter at regular intervals.

The BOD agreed with Dr. Lang’s recommendation that the endowment fund should be at least 3 to 5 times the annual operating budget. Dr. Lang also presented the revised travel policy which allowed and encouraged advance ticket purchase as a cost savings, permitted pre travel reimbursement for tickets, and stated the requirement for providing a social security number for reporting to the IRS.

In 1986, C. Max Lang reported that the number of Diplomates delinquent in dues had decreased from 32 to 2. It was moved that the College accept the Gift Fund contributions. A list of contributors had been reviewed by President John Harkness. Dr. Middleton asked why the entire BOD was not provided with the list. Dr. Lang replied that some donors requested anonymity, and all were active members of the College. It was decided that the BOD would be given a complete list with the amounts in the future, and the BOD would keep donors anonymous, if requested.

Dr. Lang requested a change in the College Investment Policy. He would explore investing half of the endowment in equities and the other half in money instruments. It was so moved and approved. Dr. William Cole noted that some Diplomates were questioning the size of the endowment. Dr. Lang responded that the Endowment was established in 1981, and criteria for its use clarified in 1982 and reaffirmed in 1986 with a goal of 3-5 times in the Endowment what was in the operating budget.

In 1988, thirty nine Diplomates had privately contributed $1,320 to the Endowment Fund. A motion to increase dues by $25 to $125 with a $25 discount if paid by February 15 was made and passed.

In 1989, twenty seven Diplomates privately contributed $1,570 to the Endowment Fund.

**Executive Secretary Position**

The possible creation of a paid Executive-Secretary position was discussed again in 1980. It was last proposed in 1976, but deemed too expensive. President-Elect Altman stated that a Committee on Administrative Procedures comprised of Drs C. Max Lang, Albert New and William Webster would explore it further.

In 1982, a review of the administrative activities suggested 25-40% could be handled by an Executive-Secretary. These activities included collection of dues, arranging for meetings and Forums, and mailing and updating the Directory. All other activities required input from a knowledgeable member of the College. It was moved by C. Max Lang not to proceed with hiring an Executive Secretary but to continue paying for part time help, which would be determined at the discretion of the Secretary/Treasurer. The motion was approved.
Policy and Procedure Manual

In 1984, one of the major goals of President Charles Middleton was to develop a Policy and Procedure Manual. He asked President Elect John Harkness to review all BOD minutes as the basis for formulating the manual, and indicated that the Policy and Procedure manual, once developed, should have one third reviewed annually to assure appropriate deletions, additions and modifications.

By 1985, Dr. Harkness had reviewed the BOD minutes, and summarized previous actions into an ACLAM Policy and Procedure Manual consisting of:
1. Guidelines for the Awards Banquet
2. Officer and Committee Selection Criteria
3. Officer Responsibilities
4. Officer Plaques
5. Guidelines for the Program Committee
6. Membership Guidelines
7. Refunds
8. Visiting Scholar Program Guidelines
9. Directory Guidelines
10. Newsletter Guidelines
11. Miscellaneous
12. Timetable
The BOD adopted these as working documents.

Later that year Dr. Harkness developed additional Policy and Procedure for:
1. Certifying Exam
2. Credentials
3. Wills/Bequests
4. Replacement of Officers/BOD Members
These were all approved.

The original agreement was for 1/3 of the manual to be reviewed each year to assess the need for revision, and that the President-Elect would review all BOD actions during the previous year. The person to do the update on an annual basis was to be the President Elect. In 1985, it was again agreed that this should be a continuing responsibility of the President-Elect. However, this did not take place, and in 1988, Drs. Charles Raflo and Clayton Hadick were given the responsibility of revising the Policy and Procedure Manual. The final revision of the Manual was presented to the BOD in 1989.

Also in 1989, action was taken on the following By-Laws changes:

Article II Section 1b2 had the statement regarding the Masters or PhD with experience as an option for qualifying for the certifying examination deleted.
Article IV Section 2 changed the term for BOD members from 2 to 3 years.
Article IV Section 5e - Voting reports would be included as an addendum to the minutes and approved by Board of Directors at its next regular meeting.
Article IV Section 7 dealt with vacancies on the BOD.
The changes were approved unanimously by the BOD and were submitted to the membership for final approval.

25th anniversary

In 1980, Dr. Franklin Loew reminded the BOD that 1982 would be the 25th anniversary of ACLAM and that the College should commemorate the occasion. The BOD agreed and in 1981 decided that all official ACLAM stationery used in 1982 would have an overlay of silver script noting the event. Also, it was decided to develop plans in conjunction with the annual banquet. The banquet was held at the 1982 AALAS meeting in Washington, DC rather than at the AVMA meeting in Salt Lake City, because of geographical considerations and the desire to involve as many Diplomates as possible in the event.

Diplomate Status

In 1980, the subject of ACLAM's Diplomates serving as USDA inspectors was introduced. Some BOD members stated that such service by Diplomates had been well received in their geographic areas. The BOD's opinion was that such service would not be detrimental to ACLAM, that no conflict of interest could be claimed, and in fact perhaps such participation might be encouraged.

In 1981, Dr. Lanny Kraus introduced John Bleby, Chair of the Specialty Board in Laboratory Animal Science of the Royal Veterinary College of the University of London. He sought Board opinion on his proposal for reciprocity between their MS program in laboratory animal science and ACLAM certification. He indicated the basis of his request was veterinary oversight on US contract operations in the UK. His concern was that the FDA or EPA might someday require veterinarians who work on these contracts to be ACLAM certified. BOD opinion was that the MS program might meet ACLAM criteria for an approved program however; reciprocity was clearly not possible.

In the same year, President Altman reported that a Diplomate had lodged a complaint against another Diplomate for unethical conduct. Article 1 Section 2 of the By-Laws provided for such action, but did not specify how the BOD was to determine when such complaints were in the jurisdiction of ACLAM (i.e., alleged conduct was in conjunction with activities as an ACLAM Diplomate), or in the broader fields of veterinary medicine or the scientific community. The Secretary/Treasurer was directed to find out what other specialty colleges and the AVMA policies were for handling charges of unethical conduct. The Secretary/Treasurer would then draft a set of guidelines for approval by the Executive Committee of the BOD. They would refer it to legal counsel for an opinion. In 1982, the complaint of unethical conduct made by the Diplomate against another was dropped. It was moved by C. Max Lang that ACLAM adopt, in principle, the Rules of Disciplinary Procedures of the AVMA and that they be considered for incorporation in the Constitution and By-Laws. The motion passed.

Diplomate status was discussed in 1981. At issue was remaining ACLAM certified without membership. A recent request was received from a Diplomate who desired retaining certification, but was not interested in paying dues, receiving mailings, etc. A letter from legal counsel was discussed briefly. No action was taken.

In 1982, four Diplomates requested retired status. Article IV Section 2 of the Constitution permitted this for those who had retired from the practice of laboratory animal medicine, and the requests were approved. That same year, a Diplomate asked to become inactive with the option
of later becoming active on payment of dues. The BOD denied the request since it was not provided for under the Constitution/By-Laws.

It was suggested in 1983 that ACLAM consider a policy of requiring each member to publish at least one article per year in a referred journal to remain in good standing. The BOD was supportive of the intent of this recommendation, but felt it was not appropriate to mandate such action.

In 1984, action on requests for retirement status was delayed because of lack of clarity of guidelines regarding retired members who later re-entered the field. Retired members receive all benefits except voting. It was agreed that more definite guidelines needed to be developed. Later that year, Dr. Charles McPherson, after reviewing five solicited letters from retired members, moved that the Policy on Retired Status read: The member seeking retired status shall be an ACLAM Diplomate in good standing. Eligibility for retired status normally begins at age 62 and upon retirement from the practice of laboratory animal medicine.

**Honorary Members**

In 1980, the nomination process and selection criteria were discussed. It was BOD consensus that an Honorary Member need not be nominated and elected each year and specific objective criteria for candidate nomination would be exceedingly difficult to establish.

The BOD then decided to omit attempts to define further the "Outstanding Contributions to Laboratory Animal Medicine" criteria stated in the Constitution and By-Laws. Also, any nomination would be accompanied by letters of support from at least five Diplomates, one or more of whom may be members of the Honorary Member Committee. A suggestion was made that reasons for nomination rejection be forwarded to succeeding committees for purposes of awareness of precedent and consistency in committee deliberations.

The Honorary Membership Committee guidelines were discussed once more in 1981. The debate centered on whether or not such members should be non-veterinarians. In 1981, Dr. Philip C Trexler was inducted as an Honorary Member.

In 1988, a Diplomate questioned the Honorary Membership process. In a general discussion it stated that:
1) The emphasis is on the honor of the award
2) Nominees must have demonstrated clearly a history of significant contributions to the field of laboratory animal science
3) Such nominees would not have been eligible for, or expected to have sought, Diplomate status during such activities
4) Those who are awarded this honor can be expected to continue such contributions and enhance the prestige of the College. It was agreed that no change was warranted but some clarification to the membership was needed.

Dr. Lars Wass was invited to become an Honorary Member in 1989.

**Additional Business**

In 1980, President Lanny Kraus proposed a mid-year BOD meeting to be held on an experimental basis and in conjunction with the January AAALAC Council meeting in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. The advantages presented were
1) Most BOD members were AAALAC Council Members.
2) Progress on College committee activities and programs could be assessed more appropriately than at the AALAS BOD meetings.

BOD consensus was that
1) All BOD members should attend the January BOD meeting,
2) ACLAM would pay expenses for members lacking travel funds
3) The meeting would be held after the AAALAC Council meeting adjourns. There was no further discussion.

This was the first and last BOD meeting that was not held at a national meeting.

In 1981, President Norman Altman reminded the group that the BOD was responsible for the affairs of the College. To this end, he established an Executive Committee consisting of the President, President-Elect, Past President and Secretary/Treasurer to make emergency decisions and/or review committee activities before presentation to the BOD.

In 1982, it was decided that, in general, requests for a copy of the ACLAM mailing list would be denied. However, one copy of each new Directory (or mailing list if requested) would be available at no charge to the AVMA, AALAS, ASLAP and ILAR and would be available to other selected organizations for a fee. It was noted that requests were occasionally received to be placed on the Newsletter mailing list. At the time, the newsletter (published quarterly) was sent only to members and institutions listing an employment opportunity. It was decided that distribution of the Newsletter be limited to members, the AVMA and organizations having an official liaison, i.e., AALAS and ILAR.

In 1983, A Constitution and By-Laws Revision ad hoc Committee was given the following charge:
1) Review and assess the constitution, By-Laws and standing rules with particular attention to standing vs. ad hoc committees.
2) Officers, terms of office, general duties and fiscal management responsibilities of the Secretary/Treasurer.
3) Internal and external College communication.
4) Membership - criteria, certification stipulation, retirement and emeritus status.
5) Standing rules and rules of disciplinary procedure.

In 1985, The EPA requested ACLAM’s assistance in distributing a brochure describing new requirements placed on small quantity generators of hazardous waste. Concern was expressed by the BOD that ACLAM was not the appropriate audience, rather institutional safety officers were more suitable. A motion to assist in distribution failed.

In 1987, Dr. William Britz expressed concern regarding the individual responsibilities, liabilities, and level of authority facing Diplomates in the area of animal care and use in research and teaching. The BOD agreed in principal that a review of the issues and sound legal opinion of laws and regulations affecting members would be beneficial. Dr. Britz was asked to investigate further and report back to the BOD. Drs. Britz and Gale Taylor discussed the matter with a professor emeritus at the University of Illinois. He was familiar with the matter and agreed to present his findings at the AVMA meeting. The BOD approved in principle the proposal of a legal review and appointed an ad hoc committee to formalize a survey questionnaire, focus the issues, consult the AVMA on these and related issues, and collect information on existing institutional policies. It was understood that ASLAP would be considering a similar proposal and this might be a joint venture.
In 1989, Dr William White reported that Dr. Henry and Lois Foster wanted to establish an endowed award (Foster Award) to recognize excellence in laboratory animal medicine, and particularly to young Diplomates. It was decided that this would be achieved best by giving the award to the individual(s) receiving the highest grade on the written or practical exam. This was stated as avoiding bias, emphasizing knowledge, and would serve as a general stimulant to younger members. The endowment would provide $1000 per year.

**ACLAM 1990-1999**

The decade of the 1990s saw the development and implementation of ACLAM’s first Strategic Plan. Although described near the end of this section, it permeated almost every phase of ACLAM activities, from the certifying examination to the establishment of the Executive Director position. The Role Delineation Document (RDD), one direct result of the Strategic Plan, collated data on the knowledge base and skills necessary for the practice of laboratory animal medicine. From these data, and with the assistance of a professional examination service, the certifying exam was refined and modernized. Still, old struggles continued, most notably around the publication requirement for candidates and the appeals process.

During this period, recertification became a reality, and the ACLAM Foundation was created to fund research specifically in the area of laboratory animal medicine. ACLAM widened its influence with legislative bodies and the international community, extended its outreach programs to veterinary students and practitioners, and created a web site. To paraphrase Dr. Gale Taylor, ACLAM had evolved into a complex, sophisticated organization.

**ACLAM Credentials and Training Programs in the 1990s**

In 1991, The Credentials Committee recommended a letter be sent from the first author and the candidate describing the candidate’s role in both the research and manuscript preparation. This had been tried previously, was found ineffective, and was voted down. A recommendation was made to delete the requirement that the papers must involve laboratory animal medicine only. The BOD rejected this and told the Committee to "interpret laboratory animal medicine in the broadest possible sense."

It was recommended that the BOD clarify total time requirements for experience, and training in particular. Could the allowance of up to 3 months in a training program count toward the total experience time? The BOD stated that the guidelines were clear, and recommended that the Committee broaden its interpretation of the guidelines on a case by case basis.

The issue of publications in the Laboratory Animal Science Bulletin was discussed. It was decided that the Credentials Committee would not accept a publication from that source as meeting the publication criteria.

In 1992, a Task Force on Experience and Training Programs was appointed. The experience alone option was discussed as an alternative route for Board eligibility. A motion was made and passed to accept "the concept" of the experience alone option, with specific details to be developed. Further discussion on the report of the Task Force led to agreement that ACLAM should recognize training programs. The BOD directed that there would be no routine site visits but the right to
site visit would be preserved. A Training Program Recognition Committee was appointed with Dr. George Irving as Chairman.

The Credentials Committee reported that 17 of 42 applications were incomplete. Diplomates would be reminded to be diligent in reviewing their candidate’s application for completeness before signing it.

Dr. C. Max Lang suggested that the Board consider a motion to allow an applicant who completed a training program and met the publication requirement to apply to sit for the examination. Thus, the additional year of experience would not be required. A motion was made but failed on a 3-5 vote.

Later that year, Dr. George Irving reported for the Training Program Recognition Committee. Six objectives were established:

1) Identify stakeholders in training programs
2) Characterize elements of existing training programs
3) Establish a voluntary program registry through self assessment
4) Identify elements of an ideal training program
5) Establish a forum for communication on matters that affect training program stakeholders
6) Provide BOD an outline of a suggested training program accreditation process.

For the experience only route, it was proposed to give one month credit of experience for each 2 months of a graduate or post doctoral research program that included use of animals, up to a maximum of 24 months credit. This was approved.

It was agreed that those in the training program route must have completed a formal training program and have a minimum of 4 years of combined training and experience. It was re-affirmed that an applicant who received an MS or PhD that utilized animals before starting a formal training program, or who engaged in a degree or non-degree post doctoral program immediately after completion of their formal training program, would be given 1 month credit for each 2 months of research training, up to 24 months credit. This would become effective in June 1993.

In 1990, twenty one institutions submitted a training program description. In 1993, minimum standards for training programs were established. Following publication of these standards, Training program directors would submit a voluntary self-assessment. Letters would be sent to Training program directors with suggestions for improvement if needed. The Training program directors would then submit their revision to ACLAM. Annual updates would be required by December annually. Non-compliant programs would be removed from the preferred track in August 1997.

In the same year, permission was granted to the Secretary/Treasurer to destroy records of unsuccessful candidates before 1987, as well as a file box of exam questions used before 1987. A list of unsuccessful candidates would be maintained, as well as a sample of each examination, provided the files were organized so it was feasible.
In 1994, the BOD did not concur with the Credentials Committee’s recommendation to disapprove three candidates. All three were allowed to sit for the exam on 5-4 votes. It was stated that the rationale for BOD changes to Committee recommendations should be communicated to the Committee.

In the same year, the need to improve the quality and relevance of the certification process was discussed. A task force was created to try to alleviate the ongoing problems that the Credentials Committee faced because of lack of clear, concise guidelines from the BOD. President John Donovan appointed Dr. William White Chair of the Certification Process Task Force. It was suggested that the Credentials Committee, Exam Committee and Exam Review Committee reports should be reviewed by the Certification Process Task Force before BOD action. The BOD noted that they had overturned several recommendations from the Credentials Committee.

Also in 1994, a candidate’s application to take the Certifying Exam was not approved because his training program was not directed by an ACLAM Diplomate. It was noted that he had over 72 months of experience. His publication was pending. A motion was made and passed to approve his application, if the publication was accepted before May 31, 1994.

Dr. Irving reported that 30 self assessments had been reviewed and that four more were pending. Letters would be sent to the Training program directors with comments.

In 1995, Dr. White reported for the Certification Process Task Force. It was recommended that the College:

1) Establish a committee to develop, gather, administer, collate and analyze data to determine average knowledge and skills, ranked by species and emphasis that the average Diplomate required.

2) Prepare a set of minimum training program standards including details of subject matter, species coverage, contact hours, instructional approach and types of practical experience.

3) Form an Oversight Committee made up of former members of the Examination, Examination Review or Credentials Committees. At least one member must have served on the Exam Committee.

4) Hire a professional consultant to evaluate the certification process and train Diplomates in question preparation and provide analysis on testing.

5) Require one first author publication of original scientific research as evidence of a candidate's mastery of scientific methodology.

6) Redesign the present application format to provide more useful information to judge a candidate. More detailed information on training and experience should be required. A firm application deadline should be set and adhered to. The College should accept applications from accredited US or Canadian veterinary schools or approved foreign schools, or applicants who have a license to practice in the US or Canada.

7) The exam should be held several weeks before AALAS at a neutral site based upon various considerations.
8) Tighten exam security, review the exam computer system, including a selection of appropriate software, question development, exam length, discrimination power of the exam and a legal review of the process.

The Training Program Task Force reported that the National Council of Research Resources (NCRR) of NIH had been reorganized from seven to four programs. Resource Improvement Grants (G20) were moved from Comparative Medicine to the Infrastructure Program. The Comparative Medicine Review Committee was composed of 16 members that included 5 veterinarians, one of whom was an ACLAM Diplomate. Dr. John Strandberg was the new committee chair. A survey was being developed to assess the productivity of former NIH trainees in laboratory animal medicine in the area of grants, contracts and publications.

The Training Program Task Force reported further that the minimum standards were considered a starting point but should be expanded to include more detail. Of the 38 programs that responded to requests for information, four did not meet minimum standards. It was suggested that training program standards might have to be reassessed in light of recent changes at NCRR. Only programs that were from AAALAC accredited institutions were sent the training program approval application package. Other issues that arose included the status of programs that were not directed by an ACLAM Diplomat but had ACLAM Diplomates on staff, and those which did not have AAALAC accreditation, but met the standards of OPRR.

In 1996, the Training Program Task Force met at NIH to discuss the importance of the laboratory animal medicine specialist in the biological and medical sciences, the need to appropriately train veterinarians in laboratory animal/comparative medicine, and to introduce a revised draft of the T32 Program Description and Guidelines.

In the same year, several applicants for the exam appealed the denial by the Credentials Committee. Applicants had 90 days to appeal the BOD decision, which followed the receipt of recommendation from the Credentials Committee. Appeal of the BOD decision was to the American Board of Veterinary Specialties (ABVS). About two thirds of the appeals were based on the publication requirement. Some suggested there was confusion over what constituted an appropriate publication. It was noted that the guidelines were still nebulous and that acceptance of the publication tended to be subjective. Furthermore, it was pointed out that the publication requirements had changed at least three times in the last several years.

Later that year, the publication requirement was discussed once again. It was stated that present guideline interpretation was very subjective. Concerns over the 1987 publication requirement versus what the Certification Oversight Committee recommended were discussed. It was suggested that the publication requirement be defined more clearly in writing. There was much discussion of the publication requirement in light of the 4 year (training and experience) vs. the 6 year experience route. Concern was expressed that opportunities for research had declined and that the requirement, as originally set forth by the Committee, would impair those applying by the experience route as there was a lack of funds for independent research. The point was made that the publication requirement was not as strict as that of many other specialty groups. It was argued that if we were going to have research in laboratory animal medicine it was going to come from the College. Thus original research needed to be emphasized, despite the funding climate. Case reports might be appropriate, but it may take two or three to be equivalent to an original research paper. The discussion continued but there was little data to back up any point of view. Thus no
formal action was taken as to the Certification Oversight Committee's publication recommendation.

In 1997, the Training Program Recognition Committee was considering an alternative to AAALAC accreditation that would be similar to the Public Health Services (PHS) Policy. Eventually, it was decided that no good alternative existed to measure the adequacy of the animal care program. Even the alternative OPRR assurance would not be enough. The BOD agreed. However, in light of the global efforts of ACLAM Diplomates, including the establishment of training programs in other countries, the BOD requested that the Committee consider other methods by which a program could be judged adequate. There was continued concern that ACLAM was making a voluntary program mandatory.

All training programs had until August 15, 1997, to update their programs. A motion was made and passed that in the event a recognized program no longer met the standards, any candidate who had completed 2 years would still qualify for certification via the training route. Failure to meet minimum standards within a defined period of time would impact future trainees. Another successful motion was that training program assessment would be every 3 years.

Dr. Christian Newcomer expressed concern that a draft document of PHS funded trainees required 40 hrs/week of bench work in research for all trainees. This was in conflict with ACLAM’s minimal standard #3 which stated that trainees must have completed at least 24 months of formal training in laboratory animal medicine. NIH required 12 months of laboratory animal training prior to receiving the award, but on receiving the award up to 3 year funding must be based on 40 hrs/week of research only. It was decided to table the issue and to pass the concerns on to the Training Program Recognition Committee.

Later that year the BOD received more appeals regarding denial to sit for the exam. A total of 11 appeals were received. Four candidates were approved to take the exam, five were denied and two were left pending.

Dr. Judith Davis reported on issues of concern to the 1997 Credentials Committee in reviewing applications. The first concern was that the membership did not understand what the credentialing process entailed. Secondly, there was confusion concerning training program recognition, and it was not clear that all Training program directors knew the consequences if their program was not approved. The same concern had been expressed by Dr Robert Jackson, Chair of the Training Program Recognition Committee. The application materials sent to candidates in 1997 stated that, if applying by the training and experience route, only those from ACLAM recognized training programs would be allowed to sit for the exam. Another concern was that letters of reference for those applying by the experience route often merely stated dates of employment. It was pointed out that many employers were reluctant to send letters of recommendation for legal reasons. Also what constituted experience was not defined adequately. The BOD suggested that the Committee draft recommendations for addressing these problems.

It was noted by the Committee that those who failed to become certified after 3 years did not update their applications to reflect their most current employment history. Also, the Committee was concerned about the necessity of the publication requirement, and the use of the term “board eligible” on candidate’s resumes. One was board eligible only after the Credentials Committee or the BOD confirmed that they were eligible to sit for the exam.
The BOD was provided a list of training programs which appeared to be on track for meeting all requirements for 1997. A motion was made and passed that the Training Program Recognition Committee provide a list of approved and unapproved training programs, which included the reason why unrecognized programs did not meet the standards. The list was to be submitted to the BOD for final approval. A motion was made and passed to pursue changing the By-Laws to make the Certification Oversight Committee a standing committee.

Later that year, the Credentials Committee reported two items of major concern and continuing frustration: the appeals process and the publication requirements. The major problem with the appeals process was a lack of communication between the Committee and BOD. The Committee never knew who appealed or why the decision was accepted. The Committee pointed out that during the appeals process the BOD received additional information that was not available to the Committee. The publication concern had to do with the ambiguity of the publication requirement itself. The BOD stated that the Certification Oversight Committee was working on that issue so they would wait until they heard from that Committee.

A motion was passed to clarify the appeals process. The appeal would go to the Executive Director who would send the appeal and the Committee's comments to the BOD for a vote. A friendly amendment was added to communicate BOD final action and reasons for decision to the Committee.

In the same year, the BOD confirmed to the Credentials Committee that if the Training Program Recognition Committee said the program was recognized by ACLAM, the Credentials Committee needed to go no further in evaluating the program.

The Credentials Committee (CC) noted that not all ISI (Institute for Scientific Information) indices journals were peer-reviewed. Therefore, they recommended that the Committee screen all journals for their peer review process and maintain a list of the journals that met the reference requirements. They also proposed that the questionnaire sent to journals not listed as peer-reviewed in ISI be accompanied by the acceptance criterion that the article was reviewed by a minimum of two experts who had the option to reject the paper or require changes prior to acceptance. Although the BOD approved this action, it encouraged the CC to contact ISI to find out which journals were not peer-reviewed. There was concern expressed that this was a great deal of work for the Credentials Committee. The BOD also was concerned with the wording of the section of the Candidate Evaluation Questionnaire, specifically asking references to consider adequacy of training experience, personal integrity, professionalism, communication and interpersonal skills, commitment, and professional growth and development. It was noted that many supervisors were not allowed to write subjective comments. At some institutions this type of question was automatically referred to the Human Resources Department. It was decided that this wording be withdrawn and replaced by wording asking for further information which the reference felt was pertinent to the application. It was confirmed that one of the letters of recommendation must come from an ACLAM Diplomate.

In 1998, the Certification Oversight Committee (COC) addressed the publication requirement for certification. It was considered a "moving target" in the past. The Committee recommended that the publication requirement be closely defined and not open to interpretation. It was the consensus of the committee and the BOD that the original purpose of the publication requirement was to ensure that the candidate understood and was capable of applying scientific methodology to research problems. The ultimate judge of this ability was the peer review.
A proposed By-Laws wording for the publication requirement was presented: "The candidate must have been the first author of an original article which demonstrates application of scientific method in the biological sciences (or in the physical sciences or other scientific area, if relevant to laboratory animal medicine). The article must have been published or accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal."

The ballot would explain that, if approved, the policy would define an original scientific article as containing the following elements, but formal headings for each element would not be required:

1) An introduction that contains information that provides support and serves as a basis for the study.
2) A statement of the hypothesis or question under study.
3) A materials and methods section that delineates how the study was conducted.
4) A section containing results of the study.
5) A section that analyzes the results of the study.
6) A conclusion, summary or abstract that states concisely the findings of the study and places them in perspective.

It was felt that the policy change removed subjectivity of the previous language of the policy that referred to “a significant contribution to laboratory animal medicine.” If the ballot were approved, the 6 areas would be part of the policy and proceedings of the Credentials Committee.

In 1999, the proposed By-Law change was sent to the membership and passed 299 to 93.

In the same year, the BOD received two appeals from candidates who disagreed with the decision of the Credentials Committee. One concerned experience gained through a laboratory animal training program. In examining the training program, the Committee decided that time spent in this training program would count as specific laboratory animal medicine experience. Therefore, the candidate still required an additional 6 months of laboratory animal experience to sit for the examination in the year 2000. The BOD upheld this decision.

The second appeal concerned a candidate's publication requirement. However, after re-examining the article in light of the new publication requirement, the Credentials Committee found that the publication did meet all of the requirements. The BOD confirmed that this candidate would be qualified to sit for the 1999 examination.

Within the Credentials Committee there was ongoing discussion of three items during 1999.
1) Applicants who failed the exam after three attempts were required to reapply. Debate continued on whether some form of continuing education requirement was needed with the reapplication. The American College of Veterinary Pathology (ACVP) did require some continuing education in similar circumstances.
2) Experience should be recent. The intent was not to penalize candidates who, for example, had taken personal leave, but rather to avoid a situation where the experience to be evaluated was 20 years in the past.
3) How was character to be determined? Little could be done to assess this. The candidate could be asked if his/her license had ever been suspended or revoked, and what were the circumstances and the resolution. It was suggested to ask Dr. William Britz, representative to the ABVS, for his advice on the issue.
Also in 1999, the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) wrote to ACLAM asking if their accreditation could serve in lieu of AAALAC accreditation for ACLAM recognized training programs in Canada. There was some discussion as to whether this was appropriate, as AAALAC was an international program. Some felt that if a country had a formal accreditation group similar to AAALAC, it should be considered equivalent. A recommendation from the Training Program Recognition Committee that institutions compliant with the Canadian Council on Animal Care be exempt from the requirement for AAALAC accreditation for the purpose of providing an ACLAM recognized training program was approved.

**ACLAM Examination in the 1990s**

In 1990, The Examination consisted of 400 written and 160 practical questions. There were 62 Board eligible candidates. Fifty one took the written and 43 the practical.

Although ACLAM's standing policy required passing scores of at least 66% on both parts of the exam, the Committee recommended 59% on the written and 64% on the practical. A motion was made to accept the recommendation, which passed unanimously.

Later that year, the BOD reviewed a letter of complaint from an individual who did not pass the 1990 exam. After discussing the grading process and considering that the candidate’s scores were well below passing grade, the appeal was denied.

In 1991, Dr. Hugh Harroff presented a progress report on the computerized database of test questions. Concerns were expressed about security as information was being transferred on disks among committee members. It was suggested that a duplicate of the final master examination be filed separately for safe keeping and that the Committee study and recommend to the BOD measures to address security concerns.

For the 1991 examination, the Committee recommended 64% as the passing score for the written and 66% for the practical. A motion was made and passed that these scores be accepted. A decision was also made that the Exam Committee would be instructed not to use any non-referred journals or bulletins as references for questions on the exam.

In 1992, Dr. Samuel Adams expressed concern that the exam always had some questions that were unclear or ambiguous. A motion was made and passed that the written exam would be evaluated by a testing service and the results reported back to the Exam Committee before the final exam was presented. It was decided that the 1992 exam would be evaluated by the Pennsylvania State University Examination Service.

The Examination Committee recommended a passing score of 65.8% for the written and 66.6% for the practical. A motion was made to accept the recommendation which passed on a 5 to 4 vote. Fifty eight took the written and 42 the practical. At the approved passing score, 22 of 58 passed the written and 21 of 42 the practical.

In 1993, Dr. Diane Gaertner, Chair of the Exam Committee, sent a letter recommending a passing score of 65% with the provision that the BOD was empowered to lower it in extraordinary circumstances. There was discussion about establishing a firmly fixed passing score for the exam. A motion was made to reaffirm the current policy on passing scores. It passed on a 5-3 vote.
It was also moved that if the Examination Committee deleted a question during the grading process, all candidates were to receive credit regardless of their response. The motion passed.

There were three appeals from people not passing the exam. The appeals were reviewed by the BOD, which found that written policy and guidelines were followed in grading and determining the passing score.

Sixty six candidates took the 1993 written exam and 59 the practical. There were no known breaks in security. Six questions were removed as a result of the Diplomate review and all candidates received credit for these questions. The Examination Committee recommended a passing grade of 65.5% for both parts. The motion passed 7:1. This resulted in 22 passing the written and 47 the practical. It was also agreed to round to the nearest whole number the percentage scores in the future.

In 1994, examination security was revisited. It was pointed out that neither the application packet nor the examination security statement signed by candidates contained anything about obtaining prior knowledge of exam material as being inappropriate and grounds for disqualification. The BOD by consensus agreed that a statement to the effect that gaining or attempting to gain prior unauthorized knowledge of the exam content was a breach of security and grounds for disqualification.

Fifty-five percent of the 1994 exam questions were regarded as core knowledge. No known breaches of security occurred. Dr. Lynn Keller, Exam Committee Chair, also reported that 51.9% had a score of 66% or better on the written and 58.5% had a score of 66% or higher on the practical. The BOD accepted the recommendation for passing 41 people.

The 1995 examination contained 384 written and 130 practical questions. Core knowledge percentages were reported as 60% on the practical and 57% on the written. The high score was 82% on the written and 90% on the practical.

The BOD agreed that a standardized location and time for the exam in relation to a BOD meeting was paramount, and that the well being of candidates would be given high priority.

Dr. Britz reported that he had been approached by an ACLAM Diplomate for information regarding a formal request for mediation on the basis of an exam score that was one point below passing. The BOD had reviewed the request and denied it. Dr. Britz raised the issue because he was approached in his capacity as a member of the ABVS/AVMA. He explained that it was ABVS's responsibility to make sure that due process followed in cases of mediation.

It was decided that exams of candidates close to a passing score (within 2 points of passing) be re-graded and not just re-added. It was also agreed that if scores of candidates close to passing had not been re-graded but simply re-added, a subset of the exam Committee would re-grade in terms of appropriate answers as well as recalculating the scores.

A Certification Process Oversight Committee was appointed in 1995. This Committee was to have two charges:
1. To develop and conduct a survey to determine the base knowledge and skills required in laboratory animal medicine from which further discussion of the Committee will emanate.
2. To evaluate the question of proper site and location of the exam.
To develop a knowledge base of an average ACLAM Diplomate, the Committee recommended a professional examination consultant to define a framework for the role of the laboratory animal veterinarian, including subject matter. The cost was estimated to be $10,000 to $15,000. It was decided to employ a consultant to produce an initial report on the base of knowledge of ACLAM Diplomates.

In 1996, a motion was made and passed to hold the ACLAM Examination 2 weeks before the AVMA meeting. The motion passed 7:3. The Certification Oversight Committee developed criteria for an exam site and published a request for bids based on the criteria. Institutions willing to host the examination would make application to the BOD.

Dr. Gerald Rosen was hired as a consultant to address the knowledge base of ACLAM Diplomates. From this information an exam would be created. The consultant would meet with an ACLAM focus group of approximately 22 to 25 Diplomates. This was to be a diverse group including different demographics, gender, experience, location, types of institutions, and representation from ACLAM Committees such as Exam Review and the BOD. Future exams and training program guidelines would flow from this base. The entire membership would have a vote in the final document.

Dr. William White reported that the exam site selection had been finalized. Out of five applications, the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences in Bethesda, Maryland, was selected as best meeting the established criteria.

The 1996 Examination Committee reported that 76 candidates sat for the written and 59 for the practical. No questions were eliminated and there was no known breach of security. Eight written and nine practical exams were re-graded for those scoring 63 to 65% as well as those near to the high score. There was a poorer showing on the practical than in the past. Of particular concern was that very few people recognized the ACLAM logo slide. Answers for the logo included ASLAP, AALAS, PETA and others. Although the BOD policy was a score of 66% minimum for passing, The Committee stated that a more natural break would be 62%. Scores of 65.5% or higher were raised to 66%. Concern was raised that rounding from 65.5% to 66% may have caused some candidates to miss passing by one question. It was pointed out that this was a change in scoring guidelines and could potentially complicate scoring of previous exams. A motion was made to round up to any fraction of 65% but was withdrawn when told it would change no passing score.

It should be noted that although 66% had been established as the passing score, the concept of a natural break point on any given exam was still a consideration, and the passing grade recommended by the Examination Committee and approved by the BOD invariably worked in the candidate’s favor.

In 1997, the Examination Review Committee expressed concern that the exam review would not impact the outcome of the 1997 exam. A motion was made and passed that the BOD hold a meeting at the AVMA for the express purpose of reviewing the exam and including exam review Diplomate input. The meeting would be held after the exam review at the AVMA to receive Diplomate comments, break the code and approve the pass-fail grade.

The Examination Committee wanted to ask for slides of specific diseases, species and other topics in the Newsletter. The BOD feared this would telegraph test material, and suggested that the Committee contact Diplomates personally. Concern was also expressed that slides on the practical often don’t have a reference.
The 1997 exam was held at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in Bethesda, Maryland. The ability to machine grade the multiple choice questions on site was very valuable, and the statistics generated were helpful in establishing which questions were discriminatory and which should be discarded. Digitizing the slide file to CD-ROM format as a backup to the actual slides was expected to be completed by 1998. In response to concern of the impact of the Role Delineation Document, it was stated that it would not be difficult to assign primary, secondary or tertiary species or task numbers to the questions. Despite the number of quality checks the Committee performed in making the exam there were still some questions which were dropped during and after the exam. Therefore both the Examination Committee and the Examination Review Committee felt a pre-review of the exam by the Exam Review Committee would increase the quality. The major concern was the security risk. The preferred site would be at the Forum as a separate site would likely increase the cost.

At least 20 people were not able to finish the 1997 exam. The Committee would attempt to shorten the exam by limiting multiple choice answers to a word or phrase. Short answers questions posed some difficulty. Each answer must be discussed and additional time was required to determine if the question was a good one. Short answer questions were the most likely to be misgraded and were the ones that caused the most dissent at Diplomate exam review. The Committee would like to make one or two sections totally multiple-choice to avoid the problems caused by short answer questions, and make the exam more objective. The Committee felt strongly that they should have the option to convert the exam to multiple-choice if they could adequately assess knowledge objectively with this format. Proposed changes to their guidelines would allow the Examination Committee to reduce or eliminate short answer questions in the written examination. The guidelines were approved.

By the end of 1997, the Role Delineation Document which had been prepared by the Certification Oversight Committee from data compiled by Dr. Rosen and the focus group was complete and was sent to the membership for a final vote. It divided the typical duties of laboratory animal veterinarians into specific tasks and ranked species of laboratory animals from most common (primary) to least common (tertiary).

Later that year, it was reported that the exam was continuing to progress to an all multiple choice format. The Exam Review Committee previewed the 1998 exam. Serious concerns were raised on three written and four practical questions. Suggestions for improvement were taken on 22 written and 11 practical questions. The Committee requested and the BOD approved the position of Vice Chairperson. It was clarified that although the Vice Chair was likely to become the Chair, the appointment was not automatic. It was also requested and approved that two new members serve for 3 years beginning in July of 1998. These additions would increase the consistency of the exam. The BOD also approved the plan for revising the examination to follow the Role Delineation Document more closely. The task numbers and species designations would be coded for the 1998 and 1999 examinations to collect data on which to base future decisions. Coding by task was difficult because some tasks didn't have any questions that related to them, and some questions related to two or three different tasks. Organizing the entire exam by task was not practical. By the 2000 examination, the questions concerning a particular species would be balanced to comply with these general guidelines: primary species-65 to 75%; secondary species-20 to 30 percent; tertiary species -10%. This last percentage was increased from the original 3 to 6% as many of the tertiary species were considered important and unique animal models.

The written examination would be reorganized into four sections by the 2000 examination:
The Role Delineation Document would be reviewed to estimate the relative contribution of each knowledge statement and task to each of the four written sections of the examination. If past examination analysis revealed that one or more of the written sections contributed less than 20%, or more than 30%, of the emphasis assigned in the Role Delineation Document, the number of questions in each section would be adjusted to mimic the relative percentage of activity a candidate was expected to spend performing tasks or using knowledge in each of the sections. This activity would begin with the examination of 2001. Using historical and current information about practical examination contents, the information that would be tested best using Kodachrome slides (disease diagnosis and treatment, biology, or instrumentation) might be over weighted in the practical. If judged necessary, after evaluation of several examinations, attempts would be made to balance the content of the written and practical examinations to reflect the Role Delineation Document more faithfully. Re-evaluation of the recommended distribution of examination questions would be performed at least as often as the Role Delineation Document was revised. The BOD was concerned that candidates be alerted to the changes in the exam, particularly the deletion of pathology as a standalone section. It was pointed out that the number of questions related to pathology would not change. The BOD approved the plan for incorporation of the Role Delineation Document into the examination.

It was also decided that the following changes would be made to guidelines for exam question submission:
1) Only multiple-choice questions would be accepted
2) Each question must have four or five possible answers
3) Combinations of questions (e.g. A and C) were not acceptable
4) Asking which statement was true or false was not acceptable
5) Answers would be one or a few words, not complete sentences
6) Short answer questions submitted with Kodachrome slides for the practical examination would remain acceptable and were encouraged.

The site for the 1999 exam was discussed. The Exam Committee felt that site selection should weigh heavily in favor of good audiovisual conditions, security and ease of on-site administration. The audiovisual conditions at USUHS were excellent. The Committee believed that the presence of a laboratory animal training program should not automatically disqualify a site. They felt that any psychological advantage was a manageable issue.

It was confirmed that the pre-review of the 1998 exam was very constructive. In addition, those members who were concerned about exam security were reassured that security was not at risk. It was pointed out that this pre-review did not take the place of the Diplomate Exam Review at the AVMA. Members of both the Exam and Exam Review Committees were present at the review.

Following the 1998 exam, it was reported that there were no suspected breaches in exam security. The Exam Committee encouraged the BOD to continue using USUHS as the exam site. The 1998 exam contained an increased number of multiple-choice questions. The machine grading of the exam went so well that an entire day of grading was eliminated. Based on the statistics, several questions were reevaluated. Questions were deleted based on poor distracters, fairness or relevance. The written consisted of approximately 322 to 324 questions, which were considerably fewer than in past years. When a question was eliminated, all candidates received credit. The Diplomate Exam Review resulted in four questions being reevaluated. As a result, two questions were evaluated as to credit, and two questions were evaluated as to other acceptable answers. Exams that were borderline passing and those near the high score for the Foster Award were re-
graded. The re-graded questions resulted in no substantive grade changes.

A candidate petitioned the BOD to grant an extension to take the exam, citing illness and stress as a reason for failing the first two attempts. It was pointed out that in the past, if a candidate failed to show up for the exam due to illness or other personal problems the BOD had extended the time to an extra year. In this case however, it appeared that the candidate did sit for all three examinations. Only after failing the third time was an extension requested. The request was not granted. The candidate, after taking all three exams and failing, would have to resubmit credentials and pay the fee.

Concern was expressed by several Diplomates concerning the Exam Committee's recommendation to drop "Pathology" as a separate section of the exam. The Exam Committee clarified that the content of pathology within the exam would remain the same. However, they recommended a new wording: Clinical Laboratory Animal Medicine and Pathology. The new section heading was approved by the BOD. Some Diplomates also questioned the content and multiple choice format of the examination. It was the BOD's decision to support the Exam Committee's recommendation to move toward a multiple choice format. The change in format was based on a studied decision as to which type of questions were the best discriminators.

The final year for the contract with USUHS was 1999. According to the original bid, the BOD could not automatically renew the site every 3 years. However, this option would be a part of the new bid. The original bid excluded sites that also had training programs. Originally, the training program issue was one of security. It was suggested that the new bid include a section stating that the exam facility would not be associated with the training program, if a training program existed, and that the facility could be secured. The bidding process was considered necessary to avoid the perception of unfairness. The Examination Committee suggested several requirements for future examination sites. There should be rapid and convenient computerized grading services. There should be a quiet examination room that could be secured and would seat up to 130 to 150 people. This would allow leaving empty seats between candidates. There should be excellent slide projection facilities. A duplicate slide projector, electronic or laser pointer, and microphone system should be available. There should also be an immediately accessible area for candidates and committee members to eat breakfast and lunch and for registration. The room should be capable of being securely locked, and Examination Committee members should have the key during grading to facilitate after-hours grading. There should be restrooms near the examination room, preferably within sight of the door to the examination room. There should be convenient access to a hotel, and proximity to a major airport. The cost of holding the exam at the site should be acceptable to the College.

In 1999, of two proposals were received for the RFP for the exam site, the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS) was again chosen. The Exam Committee had been pleased with the site. As previously approved, the exam site would remain at USUHS for the next 5 years.

Sixty-four candidates out of a total of 67 eligible sat for the exam in 1999. Forty-four percent of the candidates passed the written exam, and 76% passed the practical. The percentage of candidates passing the written was similar in 1997 and 1998. It was slightly higher in 1995 (55%) and 1996 (59%). The percentage of candidates passing practical exam was similar for years 1995, 1997 and 1998. In 1996, only 49% passed the practical. A total of 28 candidates received a passing grade of 66%. It was also reported that the exam was moving more and more to a multiple choice format. This had greatly improved the grading process. The practical was still approximately 50% short...
answer because of the nature of that section.

There was a problem in generating exam questions from Diplomates. The Exam Committee felt it was time to reevaluate soliciting questions from the College. It was suggested that perhaps diplomats should be required to submit questions. However, there was concern that this would generate too many useless questions. The possibility of soliciting questions from authors who had published in laboratory animal media was suggested. Another suggestion was to solicit questions from training program directors. In the past, for reasons of security, no questions were solicited from training programs, and the exam committee was asked not to solicit questions in specific areas. Because submission of questions for the exam became part of recertification, the number of submissions had actually decreased. It was assumed that this was due to the fact that recertification could be obtained by simply attending meetings, which was easier than developing questions. Adjuncts had not been helpful in developing questions. A suggestion to develop an incentive, such as $10 off annual dues, was dropped as being a logistical nightmare. Because the database had expanded, the need for addition questions was discussed. The general rule for the Exam Committee was that no question from the previous year would be used. It was suggested that they should reconsider these limitations and perhaps make them less restrictive. It was the consensus of the BOD that the President would write the training program directors asking for exam questions from their faculty. In the letter, it would be mentioned that the questions would be reworded for the exam.

**ACLAM Examination Review in the 1990s**

The Exam Review Committee reported complaints about the 1991 exam. Problems stemmed from the format of multiple choice, double negative type questions and the time factor relating to them, as well as the quality of slides. There was no discussion or questions.

In 1996, the Exam Committee expressed concern regarding a request by the Exam Review Committee to preview the exam. There was considerable discussion but action was tabled until later in the year. Eventually, both Committees agreed that a preview of the exam would be beneficial in eliminating poor quality questions, and a preview of the 1998 exam was scheduled.

In 1998, it was suggested that the Exam Review Committee look at some cost-saving measures such as using non-committee members to check Diplomates into the review session, and the use of computers and CD-ROM in place of overheads and transportation of the exam slide set.

The Exam Review Committee requested guidance to determine if general veterinary questions were appropriate for the examination and in compliance with the ABVS. It was the consensus of the BOD that the Role Delineation Document needed to be used as the guide. Questions should be relevant to the safe and effective practice of Laboratory Animal Medicine. With this general guide, it was difficult to think of veterinary questions that would not apply to Laboratory Animal Medicine in some form. In any case, the Committee should feel free to contact either the Certification Oversight Committee or the ABVS for direction. They need not go through the BOD.

During the 1998 AVMA Exam Review, Diplomates were instructed to make concerns about specific questions known to the ERC during the review. The Chair would ask for a show of hands for a majority vote to recommend accepting additional answers or discarding the question. The concern was expressed from one BOD member about the voting procedure. What if an
expert said that the question should be deleted, but the majority of attendees disagreed? It was pointed out that the Examination Committee was not necessarily bound by the votes or the lack thereof. The vote was an indication of the seriousness of concern of the membership.

The Committee also asked for clarification of the charge of the Recertifying Examination Question Review Subcommittee. Was the primary mission to give recertification credits for exam questions, or to produce quality exam material from submitted questions? Should the subcommittee be under the Exam Review Committee or under Recertification? It was decided to ask the subcommittee if they felt strongly on one directive or the other before the BOD made a decision.

It was decided that the Exam Review Committee would evaluate computer-based presentation technology for improving the quality and operational efficiency of the exam reviews.

At the 1999 AVMA meeting, 37 Diplomates attended the written examination review, whereas 21 attended the practical portion. As a comparison, 40 Diplomates attended the general business meeting. Although both the Examination Committee and the Examination Review Committee felt that their members worked extremely hard for so few Diplomates to review the examination, the BOD stated that Diplomate review was still needed, as it was the only opportunity for the membership to have direct input into the examination.

ACLAM Recertification in the 1990s

In 1991, Dr. C. Max Lang stated that recertification had become a real issue. Dr. William Britz suggested that ACLAM develop a pro-active plan before the AVMA imposed recertification measures. One concept was a 5 year recertification based on continuing education points. Points would be given for attending the Forum, participating in the exam review and for attending scientific meetings. It was agreed that ACLAM would develop a plan for recertification ready for the next ABVS meeting. It was recommended that the Credentials Committee be charged with developing a plan with Dr. Britz as an ad hoc member.

In 1992, recertification was discussed again. Dr. Lang indicated that discussions dated back to 1972 when recertification was first addressed as a potential requirement in the applicant's packet. He proposed recertification every 8 years. A motion was made and passed to adopt "in principle" a recertification plan to go into effect in 1993 subject to BOD acceptance of a final plan later in the year. Concern was expressed about requiring recertification for those who became Diplomates before 1972. The consensus was that the recertification plan would not include re-examination. A motion was made and passed as follows: "It is the intent of the BOD that officers, members of the BOD and Committee members be participants in the recertification process." The BOD appointed a Task Force to recommend how best to implement recertification. Dr. Charles Montgomery agreed to serve as Chair. Drs. Max Lang, Gale Taylor and Dale Martin served as members.

Later that year, Dr. Montgomery presented a report on recertification and experience requirements. The accrual of points during an 8 year period would be the basic mechanism. The periods would be staggered so that 1/8 of the membership would come up each year. Activities for which points would be awarded were: 1) Scholarly activities such as a publication, presentation, teaching.
2) Professional development such as attendance at meetings, ACLAM Forums and continuing education sessions.
3) Service activities such as exam questions accepted, service on ACLAM committees and as elected officers, holding office in other laboratory animal medicine and science organizations, and membership on national or international committees.

The recommended procedure was approved and the plan would be submitted to the ABVS at its December meeting. By-Law changes would have to be made before final adoption.

In 1993, recertification had generated more comments than any other BOD action. Concerns of the membership were taken into account, but the BOD reaffirmed that the recertification process would proceed.

In 1994, Dr. Dale Martin gave the Recertification Committee's report. He reviewed the timetable and background for recertification. He said the plan must be viewed by the Diplomates as "value added" rather than punitive. Recertification credits were to be given for scholarly activities, professional development, continuing education and service activities. Dr. Diane Gaertner made the point that the Examination Committee should not be responsible for evaluating acceptability of questions submitted for the exam in terms of credit. A draft of the plan would be published in the Newsletter for review and comment. After BOD approval, there would be a vote by the general membership.

In 1995, Dr. Martin reported that comments received from the members addressed three areas of concern or clarification. First, the number of credits awarded in the service area for ACLAM vs. non-ACLAM but related functions. Some felt extra credit for ACLAM functions would be viewed as coercive or self-serving. Second, a credible mechanism for awarding credits for ACLAM exam questions that would not place an extra burden on the Exam Committee should be developed. Thirdly, it was suggested there be a plan for early recertification should a Diplomate desire such.

A motion was made and passed (8-2) to give equivalent credit for ACLAM and non-ACLAM (but related) activities. Also, it was approved unanimously that the Exam Committee assess and assign credit for exam questions submitted for recertification. The BOD also agreed to re-certify every 8 years as described in the plan, and that the early recertification option could be requested anytime. There was discussion about Diplomates who failed to meet the requirements of recertification. Currently the Constitution and By-Laws state that failure to be re-certified would result in being listed as an inactive member. Concern was raised as to how recertification status should be listed in the directory. No decision was reached.

Recertification was implemented in 1996.

By 1997, approximately 270 Diplomates submitted recertification credit reports. The Recertification Committee Chair, Dr. Christine Parks, reported concern about the types of credits people were claiming. The Committee wished to set some guidelines for reviewers and then re-review the applicants in light of the guidelines. Contact hours claimed were also a concern since only the Forum could be verified.

In the same year, it was decided each Diplomate would receive a formal letter indicating the number of credits approved in each category. The form would be changed to provide brief instructions for credit allowances. A computerized database would be maintained to assure
uniform tracking. To keep paperwork to a minimum, once a Diplomate was formally notified of
allowed credits, there would be no retroactive decisions. New Diplomates start their
recertification in the year following their certification.

In 1998, it was approved that each member of the ACLAM Exam Committee would receive 90
recertification credits for each year served on the committee. It was expected that a member
would formulate a minimum of 30 exam questions a year. Committee members could claim
service activity credit for time spent on other efforts related to Exam Committee work.

A motion was made to accept the recommendation of the Recertification Committee that
Diplomates receive more recertification credits for submitting practical slides than for written
questions. The motion died for lack of a second. It was felt that getting extra credit as an
incentive to submit practical slides rather than written questions was not justifiable, and was not
a precedent that the BOD wanted to set.

It was reported that 274 Diplomates earned recertification credits in 1996.

In 1999, the membership was reminded that there were no advantages to be gained by reporting
more than a total of 400 credits in eight years. President Abee added that recertification credits
were not really frequent-flier miles.

In the same year, the Recertification Committee reported that there remained some confusion
regarding recertification, particularly early recertification. The Committee’s clarifications would
be highlighted in the upcoming Newsletter, as well as a reminder that guidelines for
recertification were printed in the latest ACLAM Directory. Specific problems included a
perception that the Committee would automatically recertify Diplomates early. At present, a
Diplomate must request early recertification. It was clarified that diplomates who do not become
recertified in the allotted time are dropped from the Directory. The Directory lists only active
members, or those who are not yet due for recertification. It was decided that if recertification
forms submitted by Diplomates were difficult to interpret, they would be returned to the
Diplomate to be filled out properly.

ACLAM Continuing Education in the 1990s

ACLAM Texts

In 1990, The Drug Formulary for Laboratory Animals prepared by Drs. Steven Leary and Terry
Hawk was offered to ACLAM, and was approved for publication in 1991.

In 1992, the ACLAM text Anesthesia and Analgesia in Laboratory Animals was approved for
publication.

In 1994, the second edition of the Biology of the Laboratory Rabbit was published, and the first
volume of the primate text – Non-human Primates in Biomedical Research: Biology and
Management was published the following year (1995).

In 1995, the BOD endorsed a plan to seek a Chairman for the Publications Committee, to
formalize a job description and charge to the Chairman, and to establish the Committee as a
revenue generating agency to explore publishing opportunities beyond textbooks. Dr. Robert
Whitney was to chair the search committee.
Dr. Henry Baker was chosen as chairman of the Publications Committee in 1996. Dr. Baker discussed moving into electronic publications and solidifying a relationship with Academic Press to explore their willingness to publish texts on the internet. No new ACLAM texts were planned. However, Dr. Baker and Academic Press were examining the need for text revisions.

In 1997, Dr. Baker reported that the CD-ROM program prepared for the Publication Committee was felt to be insufficient for Committee approval. There were questions as to the intended audience, cost recovery, and so forth. It was decided to delay further work on it at present. The ACLAM Laboratory Animal Medicine text would be the next in line for revision. The co-editors selected were Drs. James Fox, Frank Lowe and Fred Quimby. Lynn Anderson was added as a fourth editor in 1998.

After exploring several options, including various publishers, the Publication Committee’s recommendation that the 1998 Bioethics Forum be published as a text by ACLAM was approved. Dr. Lanny Kraus and Dr. David Rehnquist were selected as editors for the text.

In 1999 the second edition of the Formulary for Laboratory animals by doctors Steven Leary and Terri Hawk was published. ACLAM participation in the publication was acknowledged by the authors.

ACLAM Audio-tutorial

By 1992, the audio-tutorial project was progressing well, with 13 of 38 programs completed. Dr. C. Max Lang asked for clarification on three items of concern:

1) ACLAM's financial obligation for the project.

2) Could ACLAM avoid paying the University of Washington the 16-18% overhead they were charging on funds raised for the project?

3) Request for additional funds for the project would need to be postponed until the fall meeting as outlined in the Policy and Procedures Manual.

Dr. Charles McPherson asked for BOD approval to solicit additional funds from various sources. Following a brief discussion, he was given authority to pursue funds outside ACLAM. It was noted that Dr. McPherson had already obtained $10,000 from the National Agriculture Library.

In 1994, Dr. McPherson reported that progress was slow but steady for the audio-tutorial programs. The programs on viral, parasitic and noninfectious diseases of hamsters and use of primates in research were nearly complete. Good progress was made on laws, guidelines and regulations. An interactive computer based version of the use of rabbits was reviewed by the Committee and was received favorably.

Later that year, Dr. McPherson reported that an additional six programs were completed and six more were in production. Thirty to 70 copies of each program had been sold with receipts in excess of $100,000. Most of this goes back into production of additional sets with a small amount set aside for future production. The BOD requested additional information on financial arrangements for this activity.
In 1999, Dr. Henry Baker informed the BOD that the University of Washington Educational Resources Center would convert 27 of the ACLAM audio-tutorial slide sets to CD-ROM format. The creation of the master copy would take about 6 months. Several items were excluded from the agreement. These were: the production of compact discs for distribution and sale; a mechanism for product distribution and sale; pricing and expected return on sales, software support, review and securing permissions for use of images; access of ACLAM members and possibly nonmembers to the programs on the ACLAM Internet site; licensing of this product to others for translation into other languages; and responsibility for future development of this product, including updating the contents and additional of new modules. The BOD asked the Publications Committee how best to accomplish these items.

ACLAM Forum

In 1990, the topic of corporate donations for the ACLAM Forum was revisited and discussed in great detail. The BOD agreed to allow solicitations for corporate donations but only to be used to support the scientific program and perhaps publication of the proceedings. Dr. David Johnson moved that the BOD rescind the previous policy as stated on page 173 of the Policy and Procedure Manual and change the policy to allow corporate donations for educational purposes only. The motion passed on a 5-3 vote. President Fox appointed Drs. David Johnson, Kim Waggie and Donald Holmes as an ad hoc Committee to prepare the new policy statement.

The following year (1991), the BOD reviewed each proposed By-Laws change. The By-Law regarding corporate donations was changed by deleting "corporate." It would read "ACLAM will accept donations in support of the Forum with the stipulation that any such funds may be used only to enhance the educational components of the program.”

In 1992, Dr. Gale Taylor asked the BOD to reconsider its decision to delete the word "corporate" in the Forum Policy as approved 7/28/91. He indicated that the deletion of "corporate" changed the BOD’s original intent, and was confusing and misleading. A motion was made and passed to reinser the word "corporate."

The topic of the 1992 Forum held in Lake Tahoe was "The Molecular Pathogenesis of Viral Infections." It was decided to name the 1992 Forum after Bennett Cohen. In future years, events may be named for other distinguished Diplomates, but none will be in perpetuity. It was agreed that Diplomates registering by January 15 would pay $200 and $300 after that date. The Forum would be opened to College sponsored guests. A limit of 250 registrants with registration closing March 1, 1992 was approved. Later that year, it was reported that the 1992 Forum was an intellectual and fiscal success.

The 1994 Forum was held at the Evergreen Conference Center in Stone Mountain, Georgia, and had a net profit of $14,612. The net gain was due to lower than expected conference center costs, higher number of registrants at the $325 vs. $275 fee, and the contributions of ILAR. A motion was made and passed to make a $5,000 contribution to ILAR.

Also in 1994, a motion was made to have the first annual ACLAM meeting in the Spring of 1996 incorporate the exam review, continuing educations programs, science programs, committee meetings, business meeting, social events, a banquet and awards. The motion died for lack of a second. In the same year, there was discussion and approval to have an annual Forum and to hold it in conjunction with the AVMA in 1996. Although several sites in the area were investigated, and the combined Forum/AVMA would be less than 7 days, the concept never
The 1996 Forum was held in Annapolis, Maryland. The topics were transgenics, gene therapy and IACUC issues. It was moved and passed that non-ACLAM Diplomates could attend. There would be a discount for early registration. Registration fees were $325 for Diplomates and $140 for spouses. Later that year, the reported profit from the 1996 Forum was $15,000. This was due to large registration, expenses lower than anticipated, and $4,000 from corporate sponsors.

The 1997 Forum site was Perdido Beach resort in Alabama. There was discussion on seeking contributions from corporations. Names of contributors would appear on a placard outside the meeting hall and on the program. The general theme was Critical Management Issues. It was noted that the Forum was timed to coincide with revision of the NIH Guide, the Guide for Agricultural Animals and the Guide for Cost Accounting in Animal Facilities. The program would be focused on labor law, regulatory compliance, human resource issues, clinical management, management and facility design. The 1997 Forum netted $41,000.

The 1998 Forum on Bioethics was held at Pheasant Run in the Chicago area and netted $15,000. Topics included "Philosophical and Ethical Underpinnings," "Ethical Principles in Human Bioethics," "Principles in Animal Ethics," religious and Eastern viewpoints, rights-based views and Moral Pluralism. Emerging bioethical issues included genetic engineering and end of life decisions. A total of 231 registered for the Forum. Of those attending, 58% rated the site and arrangements satisfactory, 32% rated them as excellent. The Forum Program was rated as satisfactory by 42% and excellent by 54%. By way of comparison the 1997 Forum site was rated as excellent by 67%. However, the 1997 program was rated satisfactory by 56% and excellent by 40%. A monograph from the Forum would be published in 1999.

It was suggested that some type of formula might be developed in which every third or fourth Forum was held in the Western states. Another suggestion was that every third or fourth Forum be held in conjunction with the AVMA.

The 1999 Forum was held in San Antonio, TX. There were some problems with meeting sites in the area. A motion was made and passed to rent the Villita Assembly Hall ($700 per day) for the sessions and identify a cluster of 4-6 hotels in the adjacent area for housing. A total of 261 people registered for the Forum; this was the third-largest Forum attendance. There was a net gain of $41,000. The program centered on the subject matter found within the Role Delineation Document, which described the tasks and knowledge statements for the safe and effective practice of the specialty of laboratory animal medicine. Specific topics included anesthesia and analgesia (physiological effects of pharmacologic agents, delivery systems and monitoring systems), clinical pathology, imaging technology and molecular diagnostic techniques. Breakout sessions emphasized the practical aspects of these areas.

**ACLAM Journal**

In 1990, Dr. Gerald Van Hoosier, Chair of the Journal Planning Committee for ACLAM summarized the Report of the Joint ACLAM/AALAS Committee dealing with the development of a conjoint journal. The essence of the report was that issues raised previously were unresolved, although further dialogue continued between AALAS and ACLAM. A question was raised as to how much longer it would be discussed. Dr. Fox suggested continuing the dialogue in deference to the Planning Committee. It was pointed out that an independent journal for ACLAM might not be realistic.
In 1991, President Fox summarized the report of the ACLAM Journal Planning Committee. Due to initiatives by AALAS, and the announcement of a new journal in Comparative Medicine to be edited by Henry Baker and published by Academic Press, it was recommended to continue to monitor developments. It was decided to keep the Journal Committee in place for another year. The Committee was to present the BOD with specific recommendations to continue for an additional year or to terminate the activity.

By 1992, the Journal Planning Committee, in its final report, recommended forgoing plans for a journal and to concentrate on new texts and timely updating of existing texts. This was approved by the BOD.

**Continuing Education Committee**

The Continuing Education Committee was appointed in 1995 to establish an ACLAM presence at other scientific, professional and associated meetings and to identify and develop continuing education courses and materials for ACLAM members. There was a question as to the recommendation by the Committee that no fewer than half of the presenters at an ACLAM sponsored program be ACLAM Diplomates, unless specific approval was requested and received from the BOD. It was suggested that the College should maintain some flexibility to bring in other expertise. The guidelines of the Committee should state that ACLAM was to receive some formal recognition for sponsoring a program at various meetings.

In 1998, the Continuing Education Committee announced that Drs. William Masters and Kerry Taylor coordinated a session to be presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Anaheim in January 1999. The presentation was entitled "All Creatures Weird and Wonderful." Dr. Michael Swindle and others organized a program at the American Heart Association. Both the American Heart Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science recognized ACLAM sponsorship. Both programs were well attended. At the American Heart Association there was standing room only.

One of the charges to this committee was to review and approve supplemental (alternative) educational materials that could be used for continuing education credit. In 1999, it was suggested that a list of such approved continuing education materials be sent to the Recertification Committee for credit assignment.

The Continuing Education Committee and the Recertification Committee approved procedures for establishing alternative methods of and materials for continuing education (CE). The following criteria were proposed and approved:

1) Format for CE would include but not be limited to video tapes, CD-ROMs, audio tapes, and proceedings/syllabi from professional meetings
2) There would be no distribution restrictions. The CE did not have to be distributed exclusively by any one organization (such as AALAS) after acceptance of the CE.
3) There would be no date restrictions. The CE Committee would decide whether material submitted was out of date or not. Each accepted item would be reviewed by the Committee every 3 years.
4) Submission for CE credit may be by an individual or organization.
5) Submissions would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
6) Once a particular item was approved by the Continuing Education Committee the information would be published in the next ACLAM Newsletter.
Additional Publications and Seminars

In 1990, a symposium on aging was co-sponsored by ACLAM/ASLAP.

In 1995, the ACLAM Exhibit was discussed. The brochure, Partners in Biomedical Research, would be part of it. Three companies had submitted proposals to produce the exhibit. Dr. McPherson mentioned that the Holt Group would give ACLAM more assistance with design than the others, and the BOD approved its selection. Drs. Christian Newcomer, Marylyn Brown, Charles McPherson and William Stokes were appointed as a sub-committee to provide data and ideas to the Holt Group in production of the exhibit.

In 1996, the ACLAM exhibit was shown for the first time at the Forum. Sites for displaying the exhibit were discussed.

ACLAM and ASLAP in the 1990s

In 1991, the ACLAM/ASLAP Salary Survey had not been received. Concern was expressed that for over 2 years no survey was available and the data would be outdated when published. Dr. Richard Simmonds stated that the delay was due to changes that resulted in loss of the data base program, which now had to be reconstructed from scratch. A new committee was appointed and charged to complete the task using the same questionnaire.

The BOD considered a request from Dr. Kenneth Boschert on behalf of ASLAP for approximately $1,000 per year to fund a brochure to be developed and sent to roughly 2,000 sophomore veterinary students. Dr. Gale Taylor was instructed to request more information and a proposed budget.

In 1992, Dr. Simmonds reported that 975 salary surveys were sent out with 45% returned. This was sufficient information for analysis.

By 1994, the economic survey was complete.

The joint ACLAM/ASLAP Liaison Committee consisted of Drs. William Britz and Ronald McLaughlin for ASLAP and Drs. Lucy Senter and B. Taylor Bennett for ACLAM. Presidents Donovan and Stein of ACLAM and ASLAP respectively would work on a charge to the Committee involving the economic survey and laboratory animal medicine’s relationship to the AVMA.

In 1995, the following recommendations of the ACLAM/ASLAP Liaison Committee were approved: that ACLAM and ASLAP would define their expectations to the AVMA and the two organizations would formalize their interactions for developing programs for the AVMA and AALAS meetings. The BOD would adopt a routine interval of 3 years for economic surveys, and a joint committee would be appointed to establish guidelines, conduct the surveys, computerize and code them.

In 1996, the AVMA was contacted and was willing to assist in the ACLAM/ASLAP survey. The cost for data analysis would range from $5000 - $6200, depending on whether ACLAM gave the AVMA the use of the data a year after the survey and analysis were complete. In terms of cost
the AVMA was the only tangible proposal of the consultants contacted. It was pointed out that even if a joint committee of ACLAM/ASLAP were to do the entire survey and data analysis, the cost would probably reach $2000-3000 in any event. Also there were better uses of our members’ expertise than to crunch numbers. However, it was agreed that a joint committee was necessary to oversee the survey. It was also agreed that ACLAM and ASLAP would be equal partners in development of the oversight of the survey. It was decided to use the AVMA, establish a survey committee with ASLAP as an equal partner, and that the AVMA would own the data one year from completion. No one could see a specific downside, considering ACLAM would have exclusive use of the data for one year. The only proviso would be to publish the data in our respective newsletters before it was in any way published by the AVMA.

Later that year, the ACLAM/ASLAP Mutual Benefits Committee replaced the Liaison Committee. The actions of the committee were to rebut the notion that laboratory animal medicine was not being recognized adequately by the AVMA, and that the criticisms from our community about space and time at the AVMA were unjustified. It was recommended that ACLAM and ASLAP should work on ways of enhancing influence with the AVMA. The committee recommended stronger ACLAM/ASLAP interactions and suggested a fusion of the two organizations, as there are models of this in various specialties. There was a feeling from the Committee that continuing education, especially in the area of computers and interactions with the AVMA, would be enhanced if there was a fusion of our efforts and planning. The Committee would formulate reasons as to the advantages of such a fusion and pass their recommendations on to the two BOD's further action.

In 1997, no recommendations were received from the ACLAM/ASLAP Mutual Benefits Committee. The suggestion to merge ACLAM/ASLAP into one group was so controversial that it was dropped. There was a preliminary report on data from the salary survey. One thousand surveys had been sent out, and approximately 600 responses were returned. The AVMA stated that this was an extremely good response to a survey, better than for any other specialty. The salary survey would be published in the AVMA Journal. A formula for salary was developed from survey responses so that each person could plug in his or her particular variables. A summary of the report would appear in both the ASLAP and ACLAM newsletters.

In 1998, the ACLAM/ASLAP Mutual Benefits Committee presented several action items for the BOD to approve in concept. Pending approval of the same items by ASLAP's BOD, a process for moving forward with the issues would be developed.
1) Economic Survey Committee: formalize a plan for the appointment and budget of the future committee. It was decided that the most recent experience be summarized and used as a template for future work.
2) Communication between the Chairs of the Continuing Education Committee of ACLAM and the Continuing Educational Seminar Committee of ASLAP should occur at least annually. Cross posting of programs on the two homepages would also facilitate communication. This item was approved by the BOD.
3) The BOD also approved increased member participation in the activities of the Veterinary Student Liaison committee.
5) The Continuing Education Awards Committee of ASLAP and the Recertification Committee of ACLAM should work toward a single form that could be used by both committees to fulfill their requirements. Both ACLAM and ASLAP Committees would need to determine the feasibility of using a single form.
6) It was decided that the person appointed by the AVMA as the AVMA Convention Management Representative would serve as an ex-officio member of the program committee.
In 1998 new guidelines were approved for the ACLAM/ASLAP Program Committee. There was concern expressed that two co-chair arrangement mentioned in the guidelines would not work in practicality, and neither ACLAM nor the ASLAP president was in a position to appoint a single chairperson. It was suggested that the Committee be asked to appoint a single chairperson itself. It was noted that the Committee should not be micromanaged, but problems should be handled as they arose.

The Economic Salary- Survey Committee developed standard operating procedures from the recommendations of the ACLAM/ASLAP Mutual Benefits Committee. These standard operating procedures (SOP) were presented to both BODs. The SOPs were approved by ACLAM, and would be incorporated into the ACLAM Policy and Procedures Manual once they were approved by the ASLAP BOD.

In the same year, the current ASLAP/ACLAM Mutual Benefits Committee was appointed for a one-year term. Consideration to continue the committee was recommended if BODs of the two organizations determine that additional issues needed to be addressed. President-elect Christian Abee proposed not to reappoint the Mutual Benefits Committee. Dr. Patricia Brown would serve as BOD liaison to ASLAP, helping to coordinate some of the unfinished items.

In 1999, the BOD approved the use of the Center for Information Management of the AVMA to collect and collate the economic survey information. It was recommended by the ACLAM/ASLAP Program Committee that the future Laboratory Animal Medicine Program Coordinator to the AVMA be a committee co-chair rather than an ad hoc committee member. However, this was an AVMA appointment. The College could propose a member, and the BOD supported the Committee's recommendation, but it was the AVMA's final decision. A question was raised as to whether this person should be a member of both ACLAM and ASLAP. It was the consensus of the BOD that there was no need for this, as we have ACLAM members on the committee as well as the BOD liaison. The committee also reported that costs for speaker reimbursements for the 1998 AVMA and AALAS meetings were split between ACLAM and ASLAP.

The ACLAM/ASLAP Mutual Benefits Committee reported that an article using the salary survey as an in-depth evaluation of the use of regression analysis to predict professional income of laboratory animal veterinarians was submitted to the Journal of the AVMA in June of 1999. ASLAP requested ACLAM to reconsider associating the annual ACLAM Forum with the AVMA annual meeting each July. An announcement was placed in the ACLAM Newsletter soliciting comments from the membership for this idea. However, only 25 responses were received. It was decided that a survey would be published in the Newsletter asking the membership for their opinion on holding the Forum with the AVMA. It was pointed out that in the Strategic Plan, the ACLAM Forum was proposed as a stand-alone meeting. However, it was countered that we should have a formal presence at the AVMA to speak with our colleagues about laboratory animal medicine. It also was pointed out that attendance at the ACLAM/ASLAP programs at the AVMA was low, and that attendance at Diplomate review was so low as to bring into question the value of the review to candidate’s scores. The possibility of using the AVMA site in alternate years was raised. This could be difficult because of the time differences. Meetings would be separated by as much as 15 months. It was suggested that ACLAM and ASLAP integrate programs with other specialties, and sponsor a topic of mutual interest such as anesthesia/analgesia in rabbits and rodents. These topics were being addressed at this year's AVMA without input from laboratory animal community. It was also suggested that
the Continuing Education Committee might consider sponsoring programs at other veterinary meetings, as well as mainstream biomedical meetings.

Later that year, the ACLAM/ASLAP Mutual Benefits Committee was replaced by single liaison for both BODs.

**ACLAM and AVMA in the 1990s**

In 1990, the American Board of Veterinary Specialties (ABVS) of the AVMA recommended that the Constitution and By-Laws be changed so that the BOD did not have the authority to bypass the provision of the ABVS Policy and Procedure Manual, i.e., waive the examination. The BOD agreed that Section IV of Article II of the By-Laws be eliminated. The ABVS again questioned the experience requirement as to whether or not it was just a waiting period.

A letter was prepared for submission to AVMA/ABVS addressing these two issues:

1) The BOD would submit the following By-Laws amendment to the membership for ratification in accordance with Article 11 to read... Section 3. Certification of successful candidates shall require a majority affirmation vote by the BOD. Delete Section 4 of Article 11 which now reads... “The Board may by unanimous vote waive either the practical or written examination or both in unusual circumstances.”

2) Dr. Noel Lehner's written response to the BOD (containing recommendations based largely on the ILAR document "Laboratory Animal Medicine: Guidelines for Education and Training") would be used to respond to concerns to clarify the 1 or 2 year "experience requirement" to sit for the exam.

In 1991, Dr. Michael Swindle reported on the issue being considered by the AVMA as to whether non-veterinarians be allowed to perform surgery. He noted that the veterinary surgeons in the early 1980s recommended to the AVMA that only veterinarians be allowed to perform surgery. This had been approved and was still a standing rule. The issue would be debated again at the 1991 AVMA meeting.

The ABVS Committee report was presented by Dr. Britz. He stated that the ABVS overwhelmingly agreed that recertification was needed. He indicated that recertification could be accomplished in various ways including examination or continuing education and should be a topic for BOD consideration during the next year.

Certification of training programs was another issue at the AVMA/ABVS. Dr. Britz recommended that a "third party" such as AAALAC be invited to establish an accreditation process for approving training programs.

Dr. William Cole requested evaluation and response to the AVMA regarding their publication policy relative to the American Journal of Veterinary Research (AJVR). The three points raised in the AJVR policy were as follows:

1) The author must demonstrate convincingly that knowledge gained was of sufficient scientific value to animals and humans to justify the adverse conditions or treatment imposed on the animals.
2) The level of pain needed to be assessed on the basis of the animal’s deviation from normal behavior. Outcome of the assessment must be included in the paper.

3) If the study was a model of human disease the author must be able to justify the use of the species from the standpoint of future benefits to the species used. The basis of this was that the AJVR had veterinary not human medical research as its target.

It was decided to write to the AVMA regarding their publication policy, and to express concern for its implications in publishing the results of biomedical research.

In 1992, Dr. Britz reported on changes taking place at the ABVS. He warned there was a good deal of talk about "due process" pertaining to credentials, especially pertaining to approval or disapproval of referred journals. Alternate routes for certification continued to be an on-going discussion. Dr. Britz re-emphasized the importance of defining good objectives for "experience time" to assure it was not viewed as a waiting period.

In 1994, the ABVS 5 year report was due and was prepared by Dr. Britz, ACLAM's representative to the ABVS.

In 1995, the issue of AVMA/ACLAM relationship in all its aspects was again discussed with no action taken. It was suggested that the Public Policy Committee also work toward improving relationships with the AVMA.

The ACLAM 5 year review by AVMA/ABVS was approved with a comment by the lead reviewer that ACLAM was the specialty to emulate.

In 1997, Dr. Britz reported that ACLAM received continued full recognition by the ABVS/AVMA.

In the 1998 annual AVMA Specialty Organization Report it was noted that 301 ACLAM Diplomates were employed in academia, 145 in industry, 94 in government and 61 in practice. There were 37 training programs with 92 individuals in these programs. It was pointed out that we were the fourth largest specialty in the AVMA at that time.

It was decided to support the AVMA Animal Welfare Forum at a level of $500. The topic for that year was marine mammals.

In 1999, after much discussion concerning the use of the word "specialist," the AVMA decided to retain the current definition, which stated that only those veterinarians who were board certified by an AVMA recognized specialty could refer to themselves as "specialist."

**ACLAM and AALAS in the 1990s**

During the 1990s, AALAS worked with ACLAM to establish a system of communication with the ACLAM membership. The ACLAM/ASLAP Program Committee sponsored numerous topics at AALAS throughout the 1990s. These included ascites production, USDA animal welfare policies and rodent health quality assurance.
ACLAM and AAALAC in the 90’s

In 1990 AAALAC assessed ACLAM dues of $250 for 1990 as a Group I AAALAC member organization. The BOD approved payment of the dues.

In 1995, staff changes at the AAALAC office were reported. Dr. Albert New was on administrative leave, and Dr. Katherine Bayne was acting Executive Director until September, when Dr. John Mulder would become Interim Executive Director through June 1996. All were ACLAM Diplomates. By June 1996 a new Executive Director was expected to be in place.

Legislation and Public Relations in the 1990s

In 1990, The Association of Public Health and Regulatory Veterinarians invited ACLAM to participate in the organization and development of the association. There was some discussion but the BOD did not accept the invitation.

In 1994, Dr. Harry Rozmiarek reported that ASLAP sponsored a 6 week training program for two USDA inspectors that year. The ACLAM/ASLAP Coordinating committee might consider ACLAM’s involvement in this. Dr Steven Niemi suggested that ACLAM could sponsor training in USDA animal welfare programs and management/supervisory/cost accounting topics.

In 1995, It was recommended that the latest Adequate Veterinary Care document be sent to AAALAC, OPRR, ILAR and ASLAP and possibly to a representative of the AVMA for input and review. The document would then go to the membership.

Dr. Vaitakaitis, Director of the National Center for research Resources (NCRR) planned a spring workshop with ILAR dealing with animal models in gene therapy. Although the direction of NCRR had changed in terms of laboratory animal medicine, Dr. Vaitakaitis expressed an interest in forming a working group with ACLAM.

The unaffiliated member of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) was an issue. Dr. Niemi suggested ACLAM could take an active role in providing guidance to the unaffiliated member, i.e., course or materials on adequate veterinary care. Dr. Dale Martin stated that the Department of Defense had reviewed the issue and required 8 hours of training for unaffiliated members, with 4 hours in ethics and 4 in veterinary and husbandry issues. It was suggested that the Public Policy Committee pursue the issue. Dr. William White indicated that he had been approached by several laboratory animal veterinarians in other countries about help in forming an organization similar to ACLAM. Dr. Marilyn Brown had discussed this with Dr. White and suggested a Forum, held in Canada, on international issues, to include an “Organization Day” where ACLAM members would meet with representatives from other countries. The BOD requested that Dr. White obtain a written request from interested parties detailing their needs and expectations.

In 1996, ACLAM’s document on Adequate Veterinary Care was published. The Office of Protection from Research Risk (OPRR) ordered 5,000 copies, a few other institutions also asked for copies.

The Public Policy Committee was charged with two new items:
1) The nature of ACLAM’s interaction with NIH/OPRR and the USDA and how to establish a
A motion was made and passed to appoint a Public Relations Committee with the charge to enhance the public relations of ACLAM. It was pointed out that this new committee should not conflict with the Public Policy Committee. The purpose and charge of the new committee were discussed. A question was raised as to whether or not the College was becoming too complex with the number of committees being appointed. It was pointed out however, that this committee filled a niche, that people were needed to do the footwork and market our profession, and that this was indeed an ad hoc committee which did not need to continue to exist indefinitely. This committee would not be limited to simply shutting the ACLAM exhibit around. It would have free reign to think of any way to put ACLAM in the marketplace and to advise ACLAM as to the benefits of the various forms of public relations. There was continued concern that no confusion exist between the Public Policy Committee and the Public Relations Committee.

In 1997, the ACLAM exhibit was displayed at the Society of Toxicology. There were only a few contacts.

There was concern over what appeared to be extensive overlap between the Public Policy Committee and the new Public Relations Committee, but no further action was taken.

In early 1998, a survey was sent to members asking for their input on three options for position papers by the Public Policy Committee. Only 72 members responded to the survey. However, a variety of individual topics were generated by the respondents. The BOD expressed concern that this Committee had not moved further along in its mission. It was suggested that the three options presented in the survey were too general to excite much interest. After much discussion it was decided that the primary problem was a lack of a mechanism to build a consensus of the College and produce a statement in a timely fashion. To make an impact in public policy, ACLAM must keep issues timely, move with appropriate speed, and find a way to achieve consensus (not necessarily unanimous agreement). The Committee was encouraged to design a mechanism for achieving consensus by the members. It was considered important to have a strategy in place to get ACLAM's position to the agencies involved. Specifically, the BOD directed the Committee to develop short and long-term mechanisms for arriving at consensus, to develop a plan to get the consensus to the groups most affected, and to choose one or two items from its list as a test case. Later that year, the BOD commended the Committee in their efforts to develop both long and short-term mechanisms to deal with public policy issues. The BOD approved a statement on the value of AAALAC accreditation which was the product of these initial efforts by the Committee.

Dr. Cynthia Gillette proposed that the BOD draft a response to the USDA concerning the inclusion of rats and mice in the regulations. Points to consider were that ACLAM supported humane care of rats and mice, and that the cost/benefit of regulation be carefully considered given that rats and mice were included under other regulatory or accrediting agencies. ACLAM should offer assistance to the USDA in considering this issue.

The Public Relations Committee would assess the feasibility of a website to reach the general public as well as the biomedical research community. The Committee was responsible for the ACLAM display booth that was taken to AALAS, AVMA, FASEB and the American
Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). An ACLAM speakers slide set would be developed. The BOD noted that several other laboratory animal groups addressed young people and students. Therefore, it was felt that ACLAM efforts in this area should be focused on adult audiences and professional societies.

In 1998, there was much discussion concerning the frustration of both the BOD and the Public Policy Committee regarding Committee activities. The Committee was uncertain how to proceed with its charge and requested BOD direction. The BOD wanted the Committee to develop the process of responding to its charge, and come to the Board with specific recommendations. It was pointed out that the original intent of this Committee was to take a leadership role in areas outside the ACLAM membership. It was suggested that the BOD needed to provide more guidance to the Committee. Independent of any specific topic the Committee was currently addressing, it should develop a standard operating procedure of how the Committee would work. The Board liaison would work with the Committee to provide more guidance, keeping in mind that ACLAM wished to lead, not just react. The BOD discussed the Committee's draft policy statement on testing of consumer products. It was the general feeling that the original draft could be more concise. No action was taken pending the Committee response to suggestions.

In the same year, ILAR had pre-published a document on the well-being of non-human primates. The document was sponsored in part by the USDA. Meanwhile, inspectors groups had put together an operating plan for how to evaluate compliance with enrichment and well-being of non-human primates. The USDA often used "must," whereas the ILAR document used "should." So there was concern that there were two documents with somewhat different interpretations. The Public Policy Committee did not need to take action on this. However, it was suggested that a letter be sent to the USDA expressing ACLAM's concern that a professional document was being used as an engineering standard rather than as a performance standard.

In 1999, it was confirmed that the Public Policy Committee was responsible for developing position statements for ACLAM. The following procedure was passed: a draft position statement by the Public Policy Committee would be submitted to the BOD which would then review and approve the statement for publication in the ACLAM Newsletter. After publication, Diplomates would have a 30 day comment period. Comments would be collated and summarized by the Public Policy Committee and a final draft resubmitted to the BOD for approval.

In the same year, President Abee reminded the membership that the public comment period for the inclusion of rats, mice and birds in the Animal Welfare Act regulations ended May 28, 1999. In 1998, a letter prepared by then-President Harry Rozmiarek was published in the ACLAM Newsletter. That letter stated that ACLAM saw no reason why rats, mice and birds should not be included. The BOD would update this letter and send it to the USDA during the public comment period. The BOD also approved letters of endorsement for the new Agricultural Animals in Agricultural Research and Teaching Guide, as well as the ILAR document on physical well-being of nonhuman primates. Letters were sent to the USDA and to the National Academy of Sciences.

It was approved that ACLAM would be a signatory on a letter in support of the ILAR recommendations for approaches to cost recovery for animal research, i.e. that animal research facilities should be treated as laboratories and not as specialized service facilities.

In 1999, the Public Policy Committee presented a topic list that was generated by survey of
ACLAM members and participants in CompMed (an e-mail list). There were 20 topics dealing with appropriate use and care of laboratory animals. A question was raised as to which audience ACLAM was trying to reach. Some topics were more pertinent to the regulatory agencies, whereas others were more relevant for researchers. The topics that generated the most interest were animal surgery training and qualifications, animal wastage, class B versus class A dealers, food/water deprivation, postoperative analgesia in rodents and other species, appropriate asepsis for rodent surgery, lethality studies/alternatives to death as an endpoint, pain and distress, and tumor burden studies. It was decided to select two topics as the initial undertaking for the Committee: appropriate asepsis for rodent surgery, and postoperative analgesia in rodents and other species. These two topics were considered the most timely as the USDA had proposed inclusion of rats, mice and birds under the Animal Welfare regulations. In addition, both of these topics had been ongoing concerns for AAALAC.

The Committee also presented an initial list of suggested areas of expertise to be covered by an “expert tree” program. This was essentially a chart of experts in various areas of laboratory animal medicine. It was clarified that the expert tree was meant to assist the College leadership in the formation of a rapid response. It would serve two purposes:
1) The BOD could contact experts for facts before responding with an official ACLAM statement.
2) The President or a BOD member could refer a request for information to an "expert" with the provision that the opinion did not necessarily reflect that of ACLAM.

The Public Relations Committee requested more direction from the BOD as to the interpretation of their charge. Drs. Melvin Balk, Margaret Landi and Steven Leary would talk with the Committee about potential directions, how to deal with the media, and how to present the College to the public. The committee was responsible for coverage of the ACLAM display booth at various meetings. They suggested that some small ACLAM mementos could be passed out at the booth. Dr. Balk suggested that many things could be designed with the ACLAM logo including mugs, shirts and so forth. The committee also reported that there was little response to the idea of developing a speaker slide set.

In that same year, the USDA was developing a database to address the freedom of information issue. Drs. Michael Kastello, Hilton Kline and Lynn Anderson met with Dr. Goldentyer, the Director for USDA APHIS animal care (Eastern Regional Office). They raised questions concerning how the database would be operated, and what would be the time interval between an inspection and posting. Would the responses from regulated institutions be displayed? They suggested that some small ACLAM mementos could be passed out at the booth. Dr. Goldentyer was responsive to the group’s concern. Drs. Christian Newcomer, William White and Michael Kastello would make up a USDA interface group. The primary goal would be to discuss the electronic database of the USDA, in particular the operation of the database, including lag time, posting of reports, and reporting corrective actions in response to deficiencies noted during site inspections. This was seen as an opportunity for ACLAM to take a leadership role in terms of animal welfare regulation.

ACLAM International Activities

In 1991, Dr. Max Lang presented a request from The Federation of European Laboratory Animal Science Association (FELASA) for reciprocation of registration fees to attend meetings. The request was approved.
Dr. Lang also received a request from the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) for reciprocating between RCVS and ACLAM. It was agreed there were major differences between the two groups, and a letter was sent explaining this and declining the offer.

In 1998, the BOD was advised that there was an initiative in Europe to establish a European College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ECLAM). The organizers were looking for guidance and support that could come through the ACLAM International Committee.

The International Council for Laboratory Animal Science (ICLAS) invited Dr. Harry Rozmiarek to speak on behalf of ACLAM. ICLAS saw its role in the international community as a coordinator between countries in such areas as creating comparable guidelines. ACLAM was invited to join as a scientific member for $350 per year. Although many of the BOD members expressed interest, questions arose as to what the exact expectations were for scientific members, and what costs were involved. The general feeling of the BOD was that the world was shrinking, and ACLAM needed to be a player. Expense was a consideration but the long-term gain in terms of global partners was important. Therefore the BOD elected to become a scientific member of ICLAS.

In 1999, Dr. Abee was invited to speak at the European Society of Laboratory Animal Veterinarians meeting held in conjunction with FELASA. The development of the European College of Laboratory Animal Medicine was announced at this meeting. President Abee emphasized that the College was interested in developing collegial bridges, and he saw many opportunities for the College to provide support for our European colleagues. A Japanese College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (JCLAM) was formed recently as well. Dr. Abee invited the leadership of both organizations to attend the next BOD meeting at AALAS, and give a brief presentation on their Colleges.

In the same year, Dr. John Donovan reported to the BOD on the ACLAM International Committee. The Committee’s charge was to coordinate ACLAM international activities, to keep informed of trends and initiatives in the international community impacting on the specialty of laboratory animal medicine, to reach out to the evolving laboratory animal medicine specialization programs and offer assistance in development, to facilitate an academic information exchange between ACLAM and evolving programs, to interact with sister organizations to coordinate activities of common interest, and to participate directly in ICLAS as a scientific member. The committee would initially be structured as appointed, but with the addition of a member from Canada and ad hoc members from within the College with specific international experience in a variety of countries or regions. The intent would be to broaden representation and delegate responsibility for regional/national input to individual members. Initial objectives would include conducting informal surveys to identify evolving laboratory animal specialization/certification programs, exploring the feasibility/interest of ACLAM recognized laboratory animal medicine training programs, and participating in short term training exchanges, developing contacts and exploring potential interactions with the international activities of AALAS, ILAR and other organizations, and considering the use of reciprocity with other laboratory animal medicine specialty boards. The Committee recommended that the Chair of the International Committee serve as the scientific member to ICLAS. Dr. Abee suggested making this a standing committee because of the need for international contacts.
The General Business of ACLAM in the 1990s

Finances

In 1992, Dr Gale Taylor, Secretary/Treasurer, reported the net worth of the College was $448,968. Dr Taylor stated how heavily the University of Illinois had subsidized his efforts. He reminded the BOD that unless Dr. Charles McPherson, the new Secretary/Treasurer, had similar support, the budget would reflect it.

A review of how ACLAM funds were being invested was presented by Dr. McPherson. Investments were somewhat diversified in well known entities. The investment approach was approved.

In 1993, there was discussion of ACLAM's investments and the poor performance of same. A motion was made and passed for the Secretary/Treasurer to seek professional guidance on investments.

In 1994, Dr. McPherson presented three options for investment advice. Someone brought up the option of a committee as advisory. A motion was made and passed to establish such a committee to assist in making investments.

Later that year, Dr. McPherson stated that ACLAM’s accountant had recommended that:

1) ACLAM establish separate accounts for the Endowment Fund.
2) Income to the Fund be limited to investment income, donations and monies transferred to it on direction of the BOD.
3) Expenses of the Fund be limited to investment expenses and monies transferred from it to operating funds on the direction of the BOD.

A motion was made and passed to accomplish the recommendations.

In 1995, the accountant suggested that a committee be appointed to examine fiscal records, document changes to policy and review any other fiscal matters. Drs. William Stokes and Christian Newcomer were appointed as an Audit Committee. The proposed budget for 1995 included a recommendation for increasing the initial application and credentialing fee from $250 to $325 effective 1996. A motion was made and passed to approve.

In 1996, a sub-committee of the BOD consisting of Drs. Harry Rozmiarek, Margaret Landi and Marie La Regina was created to examine the issue of travel expenses and reimbursement and make a recommendation to the BOD.

By 1997, ACLAM's market value was $862,692 with a book value of $679,956. It was recommended to take approximately $40,000 of profit to add to and balance the 1997 budget. The policy on the Endowment Fund was clarified as to being 50% equities and 50% CD's or money market accounts. Both book and market value of the funds were to be kept. In response to a Diplomate who proposed capping the current endowment fund and using remaining funds for the Foundation, the BOD confirmed that the ACLAM Endowment Guidelines called for the endowment fund to be 3 to 5 times the annual operating budget. The book value in November of 1997 was 2.6 times 1996 expenditures.
In 1998, the market value for all accounts was $969,673. Accounts were invested in mutual funds, CDs and a checking account. The program services account was valued at $796,396. The operating account included a certificate of deposit and a checking account totaling $58,072. The Foundation account was valued at $115,205. By 1999, the total market value for all accounts was $1,134,498. The financial statement from the accountant had a few changes in the method of reporting. Securities would now be reported only at their market value. However, the report from the Executive Director would show both cost and market value. Also, pledges to the Foundation would be listed as assets even though that money was not currently available. Thus, in the accountant's report, ACLAM appears to have more money than is actually available. In addition, the accountant recommended establishing the Foundation as a separate account. It was suggested that having two ACLAM endowments (one for the Foundation and one for ACLAM's educational programs) was confusing and that the College no longer should solicit for the original ACLAM endowment. After much discussion it was decided to remove active solicitation for the original ACLAM endowment from the Newsletter. Secretary-Treasurer Marie La Regina expressed concern that ACLAM had given the Foundation $75,000 in ACLAM funds over the past two years. In addition it was the interest from the Original Endowment, as well as income from royalties and the Forum, which helped to fund program services. It appeared that the Foundation would continue to expect this size contribution from the BOD at least for the next few years. Therefore, Dr. La Regina asked the BOD to consider not closing contributions to the Original Endowment. In addition, it was felt that Diplomates should have the option of contributing to either restricted fund. It was decided to list both restricted funds, the original ACLAM endowment (possibly renamed the ACLAM Education Endowment) and the Foundation Endowment on the dues notice with a short explanation of the goals of each one. Dr. La Regina would bring a proposal to the BOD regarding names and descriptions of these two funds. Although the BOD had approved an endowment fund for the Foundation, no such fund had been activated.

Later that year, the BOD approved Dr. McPherson’s and Dr. La Regina’s suggestion that the ACLAM Endowment be renamed the Program Services Fund and that no solicitation for the Foundation Endowment be included on the dues notice.

The audit committee consisted of Secretary/Treasurer Marie La Regina and Dr. Stephen Niemi. The committee visited Executive Director Charles McPherson at the ACLAM office in August of 1998. Receipts and expenditures were matched with amounts budgeted for 1997. Each month’s expenditures were examined, totaled and compared with the amounts of the financial report. All was found to be in order.

The Committee recommended the following:
1) A professional audit due to the size of the College financial holdings
2) A continuing conservative approach to investing
3) Due to the volume of mailings, the Committee recommended a postage meter for the Executive Director.

Another initiative that year was to evaluate the need for a financial manager. The Audit Committee recommended that a financial planner was not necessary, if the college decided to stay on a narrow conservative approach. It was decided to appoint an ad hoc Financial Committee to assess the financial management needs of the College and make recommendations to the Board of Directors.
In 1999, budget requests of several committees were questioned. For certain committees it was suggested that Policy and Procedure needed to be in place to predict future budget needs. For other committees, a review of cost saving measures was suggested to decrease their budget request.

The total market value of all accounts was $1,134,498. The cost value was $838,239. Program Services savings accounts totaled $347,412. Program Services securities totaled $504,359. The operating accounts totaled $152,759. The Foundation account totaled $129,968. Total royalty income for 1998 from ACLAM texts was $14,554.72.

Dr. Balk presented a graph of the expense and income for the College from 1996 to 1999. It showed that income met, or slightly exceeded, expenses for those 4 years. He pointed out that this was due to our committee members who were very careful with their budgets. However the budgets had increased by $100,000 over those 4 years and the College was under increased pressure for more money. It was pointed out that the biggest increase was due to the Foundation. Other large expenses in the near future would include the website development cost of approximately $50,000. The new Strategic Plan would also cost approximately $50,000. Generally, the College would need reserves of 2 to 3 times the annual budget ($1 million). It was suggested that the Finance Committee contact a financial advisor familiar with not-for-profit organizations to help manage the College finances, and that a CPA identify precisely what funds were restricted. It was pointed out that an amount tagged for a specific purpose does not have to be reported as reserves. If certain monies were tagged for specific purposes, the College could maintain its not-for-profit status and still hold more than three times the annual budget.

**The Strategic Plan**

In 1990 President-Elect James Fox reported that he was appointing a Task Force on Future Goals. It was to be chaired by Dr. John Harkness. The stated objectives were to bring issues to the attention of the BOD and to formulate goals for the College. Dr. Gale Taylor expressed concern that the College had evolved into a complex, sophisticated organization with too much reliance on volunteers.

Later that year, Dr. Harkness stated that the Task Force would stress the need for a long range strategic plan emphasizing "planning and accountability" as key factors in the process. The Task Force would strive to identify strengths and weaknesses, threats and opportunities and set priorities. A major priority would be to overcome the polarization of different groups within ACLAM.

In 1991, Dr. Harkness, reviewed the process of soliciting opinions from twenty members by mail or personally. He indicated that most surveyed felt a recognized, unbiased, professional strategic planner was needed. He recommended either James Dunlop or Westat Corporation. He further recommended that the President appoint an ACLAM planning group of eight to work with the planner. Financing would include travel expenses for all eight ACLAM members for four meetings a year. Additionally, the initial consultant fee would be $27,000. There was discussion about obtaining corporate donations from the Ford or Pew Foundation. The idea of member contributions to fund the plan was also discussed. It was agreed to invite the James Dunlop Company to the next BOD meeting, and to pay their expenses and a professional fee if required.
A committee would be established for each facet of the Plan with a BOD member serving on one, and offering additional members from the general membership.

In 1992, at the invitation of President Lang, James Dunlop, the independent management consultant, presented a proposal to create a Strategic Plan for ACLAM. It was stated by several BOD members that the plan submitted by Mr. James Dunlop would better serve the College than the one originally presented by Dr. Harkness, Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee.

In accord with action taken at the August 2, 1992 BOD meeting, an agreement was signed with James Dunlop & Company for consultant services for the long range strategic planning.

In 1993, by mail ballot of the membership, the Strategic Plan and Constitutional and By-law amendments were passed. A number of Diplomates had noted with their ballots their thoughts and concerns on Recertification, a meeting separate from the AVMA (not the Forum), increased dues as a result of having a paid Executive Director and staff, and the line of succession in case the President and President-Elect were unable to serve. The BOD reviewed Sections 4 and 5 of Article III of the By-Laws, and confirmed that, in such a case, the immediate Past-President would serve as President and the Vice President as President-Elect.

In 1994, President Gale Taylor reviewed the Strategic Plan. He stated that not everything called for in the Plan could be implemented immediately, and that priorities for completion should be set. He then reviewed the ten Strategic Plan Directions:

A. Increase member recognition and value as research partners by the research community.
B. Improve the quality and relevance of the certification process.
C. Increase ACLAM’s influence in the formulation of laboratory animal welfare policy and standards.
D. Continue the development of a workable accepted Recertification program.
E. Improve the continuity of programs, decision making and governance of the College.
F. Strengthen the College's continuing education programs.
G. Strengthen ACLAM’s publication activity.
H. Establish minimum criteria for laboratory animal medicine training programs, provide standardized descriptions and outcome measures, and recognize programs which fulfill ACLAM standards.
I. Increase member participation in ACLAM activities.
J. Increase the body of knowledge by identifying and supporting research in laboratory animal science and medicine.

The annual ACLAM meeting was discussed. The Strategic Plan called for a separate meeting in March, April or May. Some felt that annual Forums were too frequent for good participation. Others stated that because of recertification requirements there was a need for more continuing education opportunities.

One of the strategies in the Strategic Plan was to restructure the business meeting to allow decision making, member participation and consensus by having an agenda. The point was made that only 1/3 of the members attend a given meeting, thus it would be inappropriate for major decisions to be made at the meeting. It was agreed that members could voice positions and concerns at the business meeting. Dr. Melvin Balk was appointed to Chair the Committee to monitor the Strategic Plan.
By 1995, much of the Strategic Plan had been implemented.

In 1996, Dr. Balk, Chair of the Strategic Plan Oversight Committee, reported progress on all directives from start to completion. He also suggested that the BOD should set some objective criteria to judge when Strategic Plan goals had been achieved. He noted that the next Strategic Planning process could start as early as 1997-98 with input from the current Strategic Plan Oversight Committee.

A questionnaire was sent to all committee chairs regarding their progress in implementing areas of the Strategic Plan relevant to their committees. Comments on the survey from the BOD were requested. Input from past presidents involved with formulating or implementing the Strategic Plan was requested. This would serve as the beginning of the re-planning process before engaging a consultant.

In 1998, the Strategic Planning Committee presented to the BOD a recommendation to reconsider the method in which ACLAM does it strategic planning. It proposed a scheduled survey cycle as an evaluation process which could best meet the ongoing needs of ACLAM Diplomates.

By late 1998, not all of the committees had responded to the progress evaluation. Neither had the BOD. Dr. Cynthia Gillette responded to the progress evaluation on behalf of the BOD. The Chairs of committees which had not responded would be contacted by Drs. Christian Abee and Melvin Balk. Once completed, a one-day retreat would be arranged where the issues raised by the evaluations could be discussed by a focus group. An outside consultant, experienced in this area, would most likely attend and lead the focus group.

In 1999, three directions were targeted for increased focus by the Strategic Planning Committee. These were: increased member recognition and value as research partners, increase ACLAM's influence in the formulation of laboratory animal welfare policy and standards, and strengthen ACLAM's publication activity. A question was raised as to the real need to increase focus in these areas. It was pointed out that increased member recognition was an ongoing effort. The Continuing Education Committee, Public Relations Committee and Public Policy Committee were all very active in areas of member recognition. In addition, the Public Policy Committee was getting more active in issues of animal welfare. It was also pointed out that the Publications Committee had been very successful in strengthening ACLAM's activity in the area publications. It was decided that the BOD should provide feedback to the new Chair as to expectations, especially as to the development of a new strategic plan and a budget to come which this.

Dr. Gillette's response to the Planning Committee was approved with the addition of the following goals: to work on institutional memory regarding ongoing issues such as the publication requirement, the location and timing of the Forum, structure of training programs and so forth, oversight of the implementation of the Role Delineation Document, reviewing changes in legislation policies and so forth. In order to achieve these goals a better understanding of the international laboratory community was needed, as well as better dialogue with ASLAP and the AVMA, and a constant review of the Role Delineation Document.
Executive Director

In 1993, as part of the Strategic Plan, a draft of a position description for the Executive Director was distributed to the BOD, which would review and submit suggestions and comments to Secretary/Treasurer McPherson. He would then revise the description for later board action.

In 1994, it was decided that the Executive Director position would be a part-time paid position. A job description and position announcement were drafted. Dr. Taylor appointed a search committee which would refine the job description and position announcement. The Committee would also do the preliminary candidate screening. The goal was to have an Executive Director in place January 1, 1995.

Later that year, Dr. Charles Raflo of the Executive Director Search Committee reported that two applications had been received for the position and there had been several more inquiries.

By the end of the year, Dr. Charles McPherson was chosen as the Executive Director.

In 1995, Dr. McPherson as Executive Director gave his report. He had been in the position for 6 months. He indicated that the shift from the Secretary/Treasurer position had gone smoothly. He reported the investment assets of the College at $604,055.40. An office had been established for ACLAM by the Executive Director. Further plans for the Executive Director were the Forum, and guidelines for the new committees.

Later that year, Dr. McPherson suggested that an individual be appointed as back up to the Executive Director. This individual would be ready to serve the College should the Executive Director be unable to perform his duties for a temporary period of time. It was suggested that a one-page policy statement covering this emergency situation, and how it would be handled, would be issued as part of the guidelines for the Executive Director. Dr. McPherson nominated Dr. William Stokes for the position. Revisions of officers' guidelines were approved by the BOD. It was noted that many of the items deleted from the Secretary/Treasurer duties were in the area of records retention policy, and that this was picked up by the office of the Executive Director. This would also include a copy of each year's exam with the correct answers.

In 1997 activities of the Executive Director included: registration materials for the 1998 Forum and mailing of dues notices, recording and reporting of Recertification credits for 1997, development of new forms for recertification credit, and distribution of the exam applications and serving as an interface in the credentials review process.

Later that year, Dr. McPherson formally submitted his letter of resignation. He stated that the position requires a halftime Executive Director and halftime secretary. It was mentioned that some organizations contract these functions out to businesses that specialized in administration. However, it was argued that the By-Law changes delegating much of the Secretary/Treasurer responsibility to the Executive Director were passed because the members believed the position would remain with an ACLAM Diplomate.

A year-end bonus was recommended and approved for the Executive Director. A bonus had been awarded for the last 3 years. There was discussion that the salary should reflect job duties and time spent. Rather than awarding a bonus every year, perhaps the base salary should be increased.
In 1998, a new Executive Director, Dr. Melvin Balk was appointed. All active files were packed, loaded and transported personally by Dr. Balk to the New Hampshire office.

Dr. Balk would make recommendations to the BOD concerning the frequency of professional audit costs. ACLAM had not had a professional audit for several years. It was pointed out that the auditor needed to understand not-for-profit organizations.

Dr. William White was selected as the Executive Director backup. He is located close to the ACLAM office in New Hampshire.

In 1999, the position of Executive Director was changed from a direct employee of ACLAM to a consultant position. This would decrease the administrative load on the BOD and would also decrease expenses, e.g., retirement funds and a health plan could be eliminated.

**Policy and Procedure Manual**
The Policy and Procedure Manual was sent to the BOD. Each chairperson would review sections pertaining to their committee activities and make recommendations to the BOD.

**Diplomate Status**

In 1992, there were 431 active Diplomates, 11 honorary and 59 retired.

In 1994, Dr. Marlyn Brown expressed concern that there may be confusion on the part of the membership as to when officers or BOD members are speaking in an official capacity and when they are expressing a personal opinion. She noted that what an officer says can reflect poorly on the organization. Of particular concern was that the ACLAM Newsletter was available on the homepage and was not restricted to Diplomates. Several options were suggested including elimination of the President's Message from the homepage version of the Newsletter. Another option discussed was a disclaimer. It was suggested that when expressing a personal opinion on a controversial issue one should state that it was a personal opinion. There was considerable discussion pro and con with the net result of urging officers and BOD members to use good judgment.

In 1996, a Diplomate published comments which were contrary to ACLAM's position on pain relief and surgical and post surgical care. In 1997, the same Diplomate wrote a letter criticizing AAALAC policies. The letter was judged highly inflammatory. This resulted in two BOD actions. An official letter was sent to the individual with the warning that such behavior and tactics in addressing issues were considered unprofessional. The BOD felt that it had a responsibility to all members, most especially the younger Diplomates, to show that this type of behavior was neither acceptable nor approved by ACLAM. The BOD placed a statement in the ACLAM Newsletter stating that the Diplomate’s opinions were not endorsed by the College. The official position of ACLAM on pain relief and surgical and post surgical care and the benefits of AAALAC accreditation had been published earlier. The second action was to place a disclaimer in the Newsletter just above "letters to the editor." This would be an interim measure until the Publications Committee decided on a “letters to the editor” policy. In the meantime, the editor of the Newsletter would review and edit letters as per the disclaimer; however, he was encouraged to ask the Publications Committee for guidance on any letters of questionable content.
In 1997, a Diplomate's request for approval to use the ACLAM logo on his letterhead was approved 6:4. Use of the ACLAM logo was discussed for use on business cards and stationery. The logo was copyrighted. A motion was made and passed that Diplomates may use the logo on business cards, but any other use was to be on a case by case basis. Before this was announced the BOD would explore legal implication and take further action in July pending legal counsel. Later that year, Dr McPherson reported regarding the use of the logo from AVMA's liability insurance representative. Generally, if the logo indicates membership only, its use in that context was considered appropriate. If members identified themselves as officers or BOD members, the use of the logo would not be acceptable. It was decided that the motion made by the BOD earlier could now be implemented and publicized in the Newsletter.

In 1999, total membership for the College stood at 677. There were 597 active Diplomates, 69 retired and 11 honorary members.

**New Committees, Task Forces and Advisory Panels**

In 1990, Dr. C. Max Lang stated that the current standing committees (Program, Forum, Credentials and Certifying Examination) would be asked to formulate a series of questions and issues that needed to be addressed. One or more BOD members would be asked to serve as liaison for each committee. Appointments were to be made by 1991. The committees were to submit a preliminary report to the BOD by February 1992 and the report would be submitted to the membership.

In 1993, appointments to new committees as per the Strategic Plan were discussed. The new committees were Continuing Education, Public Policy, Recertification, Training Program Recognition, Planning, Publication and Foundation. The Foundation Committee would eventually fund research in laboratory animal medicine (directive J of the Plan). Additionally, a Task Force on certification was to be appointed. Publication and Foundation Chairs would receive a stipend. Appointments would be delayed until position descriptions were developed. It was suggested that committee appointments would probably be for 2, 3 or 4 year terms to provide for phase-in of staggered appointments. A notice would be in the next Newsletter so Diplomates could volunteer for committees.

In 1994, Dr Cynthia Gillett was asked to develop a list of advisory panels for ACLAM committees as recommended in the Strategic Plan. She at first recommended 25 people per committee. It was suggested that 6-10 would be a more manageable number. Committees would be contacted first to discuss how advisory panels would work. Some committees might not need advisory panels. Later that year, she reported that 64 people had been appointed to advisory panels. By 1999, adjunct committee members were appointed for one year, but could be reappointed by the incoming president. The Publications Committee and the Training Program Recognition Committee both used adjuncts successfully. Other committees did not find adjunct members helpful.

In 1996, guidelines for the new committees- Foundation, Publication, Public Policy, Planning, Training Program Recognition - were approved. The BOD liaison duties were clarified stating that the liaisons were to function as a conduit, not a committee member, regarding concerns of BOD to committees and vice-versa.

In 1997, an Electronic Media Task Force, chaired by Dr. Kenneth Boschert, was appointed. The following year, the Task Force made the following recommendations:
1) Most of the elements on the current ACLAM web page would be retained and expanded with future versions. The new website should be searchable and more secure. An online directory, area for job postings and announcements, member only electronic discussion, an area to list ACLAM Policy and Procedure, and a current list of committees and membership should be added.

2) The College should obtain a third-party Internet Service Provider (ISP) to host the ACLAM website. Consider negotiating with AALAS for ISP services. Develop a list of website criteria and requirements.

3) Contract with a third party professional website design service. This was strongly suggested by the Task Force as superior to relying on volunteer efforts.

4) A standing committee on information resources should be established that would deal with electronic communications issues. This would include general oversight of the ACLAM homepage including planning, development, maintenance and updates, and provide a means of editorial oversight of any new materials which would exist only on the website, and for information that was produced for public consumption.

Dr. Boschert pointed out that the College needed to develop a website management strategy and philosophy. The design of the new website would include built-in management capability to provide automatic updates, templates and assure consistency. If this were not done, the website would have to be redesigned with every significant change. The total cost for the project was estimated at $52,400. A professional designer would interview key people and produce a proposal to redesign the website. There would be an annual expense for the maintenance of the website on the third-party server (about $1200 per year). A third expense would be to hire a manager to update the website. It was suggested that it should be a paid position, and that a minimum of 10 to 20 hours per week would be required. It was decided to form a Website Development Committee that would be an ad hoc committee for one year.

Then in 1999, after discussions with Dr. Henry Baker, the ad hoc ACLAM Website Development Committee was dissolved. ACLAM would hire a website manager under the auspices of the Publication Committee. The BOD was concerned about security of the website. Whatever server was chosen, matters of security, tampering and access to information needed to be addressed. The BOD approved the job description for the website manager. It was decided that the manager could outsource some of the website maintenance and updating rather than performing those duties personally.

In 1998, President Abee proposed the formation of a Task Force on the Role of Academics in Research. He was concerned that we nurture the research component of our College, realizing that research was not the sole pursuit of the majority of our members. Some Diplomates had expressed concern that research was being deemphasized. Others pointed out that ACLAM was actually reemphasizing the importance of research through the establishment of the ACLAM Foundation, and refining the publication requirement as a reflection of a candidate's understanding and implementation of the scientific method. The question was raised as to whether this was a real problem or a reaction to some Diplomate’s opinions. There was concern among many of the BOD that this issue not divide the membership into opposite camps of researchers versus clinicians. It was suggested that this task force was an outgrowth of Directive A in the Strategic Plan, and that the College should not only nurture research among our members, but also outside our profession. This suggestion was countered with the argument that Directive A was meant to gain recognition for all of ACLAM’s activities, not just research. Although the majority of the BOD agreed with the concept of the Task Force, it was clear that
even supporters were aware of the potentially contentious atmosphere that could be generated. Caution was advised as to how to word the charge to this Task Force.

Dr. Abee proposed a new ad hoc International Committee composed of College members with knowledge of different countries. This committee would keep the BOD informed of international issues affecting laboratory animal medicine and recommend potential action items either for the BOD or specific committees. The new committee was approved.

**ACLAM Foundation**

In 1994, the BOD endorsed a plan for the ACLAM Foundation Committee (AFC) to pursue nominations to select a chairman for that committee and to develop a mechanism for soliciting projects and finalizing funding sources. The ACLAM Foundation put forth a proposal by Dr. Steven Niemi that the type of research funded by the Foundation should focus on animal welfare. It was suggested that clinical research be a second focus.

In 1995, Dr. Niemi reported that the only candidate for the position of Chair of the ACLAM Foundation was Dr Martin Morin. It was decided to offer the position to him pending a final position description. It was suggested that the element of fund raising may have contributed to the lack of candidates.

In 1996, Dr. Morin was officially appointed as Chair of the ACLAM Foundation. He posed several questions as to what type of research would be funded and suggested that there would be a lot of synergies between NCRR and USDA on types of research funded. Funding sources in general were discussed.

Dr. Niemi stated that the ACLAM Foundation needed $30,000–40,000 to "prime the pump" so that the Foundation could begin to fund research without waiting for outside funding. A second recommendation was to allow Dr. Morin to explore the possibility of planned giving to build an endowment for the Foundation. The BOD needed more information before taking action.

In 1997, Dr. Morin reported for the Foundation Committee. He said they had no plans for a publication beyond a brochure. The Foundation would keep the Executive Director and President informed, and would depend on them to defer difficult decisions to the BOD for review. A separate endowment for the Foundation was requested and it was so approved. Dr. Morin emphasized that he would be targeting large gifts specifically through estate planning and bequests. It was intended that estate planning sessions, headed by a lawyer or an accountant, would be offered perhaps at the Forum. A motion was made and passed to authorize distribution of the Request for proposal (RFP) for the Foundation.

Later that year the Committee received 26 scientific proposals, which they narrowed to six. The Committee requested $40,000 ($30,000 to fund two grants received in 1997 and $10,000 for operating expenses) an additional $15,000 to fund a third grant submitted in 1997 was also requested. It was noted that we did not make a commitment to fund the Foundation at $40,000 or more each year. There was also concern that by funding three grants the first year, there would be greater pressure to fund more in the coming years. The growth of the Foundation should be gauged carefully so as not to overrun funding. It was suggested that we should expect to provide the Foundation with consistent modest support. The quicker ACLAM showed results, the more donations the Foundation would likely receive. The Foundation could well need $40,000 a year from ACLAM for the next 5 years. Their Endowment would have to reach approximately
In 1998, the Foundation Committee found five grants worthy of funding. However, due to budget constraints only three proposals were funded. They were: "Evaluation of Environmental Testing Techniques for Detection of Pathogens of Laboratory Animals", Dr. Lela Riley; "Testing and Comparison of Analgesic Drug Action in Amphibians", Dr. Craig W. Stevens; and "Development of Molecular Assays for Detection of Adventitial Murine Pathogens in Cell Lines, Transplantable Tumors, and Other Biological Materials Derived from Rodents", Dr. Stanford H Feldman. To date, the Foundation had raised over $50,000. The Foundation Committee set three fundraising goals for 1998: 75% repeat gifts from donors; donations from 20% of ACLAM members; and raising $65,000 without including the BOD allocation for 1998. Policy and procedures for the Foundation Endowment needed to be formulated. Dr. Morin reported that grantees must submit a summary of the results to get final payment. These reports would be placed in the ACLAM Newsletter and used to solicit funds. A question was raised as to how the AALAS Foundation may affect solicitations. Dr. Morin did not feel that the AALAS Foundation would affect the ACLAM Foundation. The AALAS approach was different. ACLAM was moving cautiously and building credibility and acquiring data. Once there were data, the Foundation could range into other donor areas. The solicitations, at this point, were based on goodwill as there was not a product to sell. So requesting donations beyond the laboratory animal community was not expected at this time. A brochure would be available at the AVMA and AALAS. ASLAP members and the Allied Trade Organizations had been solicited for donations. A special grant was received from Henry and Lois Foster. Also, Dr. Morin agreed to encourage poster presentations by the grantees at the Forum, as the Foundation could not make this requirement as no travel funds were provided.

Language changes in the Policy and Procedure Manual for the Foundation Committee investment guidelines were approved as follows:
"With preservation of the principal as the overriding goal, a conservative investment style will be followed. The majority of the endowment fund will be invested in money instruments, with little risk of devaluation. The accounts will be established with a maximum of 40% of the account invested in equities. If, through incoming capital gain increases, the equity portion of the accounts were to grow to 50%, the total account would be rebalanced to establish a maximum 40% equity position."

Further language changes were approved to established procedures. Since the BOD and the ACLAM Foundation Committee (AFC) have a fiduciary responsibility to the Foundation Endowment donors to use their gifts as the donor specified, changing the established procedures in this document would be made only following careful deliberation. The procedures would be reviewed every four years. Changes or short-term deviations to established procedures would only be made following recommendations from, or consultation with, the AFC and approval of the BOD with a two thirds majority in favor of the change/deviation. There was a comment that the Foundation Committee wished a solid majority necessary to change the long-term commitment as to how money was to be spent.

A final language change concerned the audit of the Foundation Endowment account. The audit would be made annually according to procedures established by the BOD and in consultation with the AFC. The audit report would be reviewed by the AFC and approved by the BOD at the next meeting following the release of the audit results. It was pointed out concerning the audit that in addition to putting this language in the Policy and Procedures Manual there needed to be a
There was concern as to whether ACLAM's contribution would decrease or continue at the same rate in the future. It was pointed out that there was not a long-term financial commitment of the College to contribute to the Foundation. It is the long-term goal of the Foundation to be financially independent. There were some on the BOD who felt the College should always support the Foundation at some level. There was some concern that anonymous givers should be told that their names, and the amounts they gave, would be known to the Foundation chairman, Executive Director and President, although they would be anonymous to the general membership and public. Some such wording would be placed into the Policy and Procedure manual for the Foundation. A budget of $40,000 for two grants was approved.

Some BOD members expressed concern that in his report, Dr. Morin had stated that the BOD shares the task of fund raising. His description was interpreted as active soliciting. It was decided to send Dr. Morin a letter thanking him for his efforts, but explaining that the BOD was not comfortable in participating in active solicitation.

At the 1999 Forum, three poster presentations were given by individuals who had received Foundation awards in 1997. Five proposals had been funded for 1998. In 1999, 24 research proposals were received. Dr. Morin reported that some research proposals would have received higher scores had the research team been constituted properly. Applicants were encouraged to contact the Foundation for further information. At that time $102,000 were committed for research grants. Any published articles based on these grants would be announced in the Newsletter. It was confirmed that the publication should credit the support of the ACLAM Foundation.

It was suggested that the ACLAM Foundation be moved from Committee status to a separate Board. There was concern that few members were contributing to the Foundation. It was suggested that Dr. Morin speak about methods of giving at the next Forum.

**Honorary and Retired Members**

In 1991, the honorary membership of Dr. Pravin N. Bhatt was approved.

Retired status was discussed at some length. The primary concern was that those with retired status pay no dues but still get the Newsletter, Directory and other ACLAM announcements. It was agreed that the BOD should authorize a fee to cover costs. However, because fee structure was a part of ACLAM's Constitution, the BOD could not arbitrarily assign fees or change policy. The issue was tabled.

In 1993, a motion was made and passed to invite Dr. Abigail Smith to become an Honorary Member.

A motion was made and passed (8-1) that transportation and per diem for new honorary members to attend the event would be paid by the College.

In 1995, Dr. Leo Whitehair was elected as an Honorary Member to ACLAM. There was some discussion regarding veterinary eligibility as an Honorary Member. It was suggested the
guidelines be changed to read that nominees would not be expected to pursue a career as a laboratory animal veterinarian in most instances.

In 1999, Dr. Lela Riley was inducted as honorary member.

Elections

In 1990, President David Johnson asked for re-clarification of the recommendations by the BOD dealing with the change in term of office for BOD members. The BOD reaffirmed the intent to elect two people for 3 year terms not three people for 3 year terms.

Nominations for elected positions were to be expanded to five or six for each position rather than the traditional two.

In 1992, it was decided that the two individuals receiving the highest number of votes for BOD would have 3 year terms and the individual receiving the third highest number of votes would have a two year term.

In 1993, President-Elect Donovan read a letter from Dr. William Webster Chair of the Nominating Committee, suggesting that ACLAM seek to involve more actively its ethnic and racial minority members so that they can become qualified for leadership roles. The BOD agreed with the recommendation.

A By-Law amendment on nomination and election was approved by the membership 298 to 26 in 1994.

In 1998, Dr. Christian Newcomer of the Nominations Committee reported that committee members had reviewed the past 10 years of membership on the BOD as well as committee membership in its search for potential candidates for executive and BOD positions. He suggested that future committees might want to open nominations to individuals with little or no previous service activities. Although traditionally candidates for officers had previous ACLAM BOD experience, this was not in the Policy and Procedure Manual as a requirement.

Additional Business

In 1990, Dr. Lynn S.F. Keller was the first recipient of the Henry and Lois Foster Award scoring highest on both sections.

Dr. James Fox requested $500, half the cost of the ACLAM/ASLAP Symposium on Aging, for Roger Broderson who had agreed to step in due to the death of Bennett Cohen. This was approved, and led to a discussion as to how to recognize Dr. Cohen's contribution. It was pointed out that a precedent should not be set because others had contributed as well. Dr. Daniel Ringler was asked to submit an article on Dr. Cohen for the ACLAM Newsletter.

Dr. C. Max Lang asked the BOD to consider the concept and precedent being established when honoring Dr. Cohen for his contributions. A motion was made and passed to have named lectureships for deceased members who made outstanding contributions to the field of laboratory animal medicine, but no permanently named lectureship would be established. Following discussion, a motion was made and passed to dedicate the 1992 Forum to Dr. Bennett Cohen.

Dr. Steven Leary requested that ACLAM become a member of NABR. It was pointed out by Dr.
Max Lang that they lobby and thus ACLAM membership might jeopardize its tax free status. A motion was made and passed not to contribute.

In 1991, Dr. Glen Otto scored highest on both parts of the ACLAM Exam and was the recipient of the Foster Award.

The Scientist Center for Animal Welfare (SCAW) requested that ACLAM request membership in the organization. A motion was made and passed not to join at this time.

In 1992, Drs. Diane Forsythe (practical) and Daniel Morton (written) attained the highest exam scores and received the Foster Award.

It was noted that the Newsletter was sent by bulk mail. It would cost $1,500 more per year to send it first class. It was agreed to put a note in the next Newsletter to indicate the delivery time and to ask if this detracted from the Newsletter.

Dr. Charles Middleton was appointed as ACLAM Historian. A motion was made and passed as follows: The ACLAM Historian would be appointed by the President. The Historian may be reappointed without limitation. When a new Historian was appointed, that person would be confirmed by a majority vote of the BOD. The duty of the Historian was to write a narrative history of ACLAM. The Historian was to start with antecedents to the founding of ACLAM and go up to within 5 years of current time. Annually this history shall be revised and kept up to date to within 5 years of the current time.

In 1993, Drs. Sanford Feldman (written) and Kathryn Bayne (practical) received the highest grades on the ACLAM Exam and were eligible for the Foster awards.

Newsletter Editor Charles Raflo proposed to increase issues from 4 to 5 times per year at a cost of about $1,200 per annum. This was approved. He also reported that the $50 fee for position announcements does not seem to have deterred announcements.

A new Directory for the fall of 1994 was discussed. E-mail addresses would be included. It was suggested that spouse’s names and a section for deceased members be included. Spouses’ names were not approved but approval was granted for a section for deceased members.

In 1994, Dr. Michael Blanco received the highest score on both parts of the ACLAM exam and received the Foster Award.

ACLAM received a letter from the AVMA’s Secretariat for SNOMED International inviting ACLAM to name an individual to serve. It was agreed to request volunteers via the Newsletter.

In 1995, Dr. Middleton completed the history of the first 40 years of ACLAM. He indicated that it was organized to include the early organization, using minutes of BOD meetings from 1957-1997, and the credentialing and examination process. The document was 175 pages in length and showed that many of the present issues had been problem areas for many years. The BOD and Publications Committee would review and edit document. Action was deferred until comments were received.

The BOD decided that "situation wanted" ads should be charged $50 per ad as "position available" ads presently are.
An ACLAM recognition award was proposed to honor individuals who demonstrated a commitment and significant contributions to laboratory animal medicine but were not otherwise eligible for Honorary Membership. It was moved and passed to accept the concept but to defer the vote. It was noted that originally the ACLAM Recognition Award was proposed on the death of a trainee in laboratory animal medicine. It had been decided that a letter of condolence was more appropriate, and this was accepted by the sponsors of the award. However, the idea of an ACLAM Recognition Award was considered good. Dr. Steven Niemi would develop a scheme and description for the award for BOD consideration.

Dr. Brian Ogden won the Foster award for highest grade on the practical exam. Drs. Tracy Peace and Nanette Kleinman tied for high score on the written and would receive the award for the written.

The new ACLAM Directory would be formatted to paste changes of address labels over old addresses.

There was discussion regarding BOD Teleconference Guidelines. The BOD reviewed the draft and decided that the President could have an absent member of the BOD participate via this mechanism. This would have to be a special circumstance and it would be paid by ACLAM. Someone said that telephone votes were not acceptable in the past at regularly scheduled BOD meetings. The motion was withdrawn pending review of the Guidelines.

In 1998, there was a strong feeling that the history of ACLAM as it currently stood should be abbreviated and reformatted, so that members could use it as a resource on the evolution and development of the College. Specifically, it should be reorganized and indexed such that the specifics about programs and policies (e.g. the Forum and Certification requirements) are summarized in individual sections. There was concern that the history was basically one person's interpretation of BOD minutes and not a true history. It was suggested that the publication committee might be asked to develop it as a search vehicle rather than as a compilation of raw data. Dr. Middleton, however, felt that the history should be published with minimal changes.

In that same year, Dr. Balk requested permission to investigate a new type of directory that would be printed in a three ring binder. With this format, pages with changes in addresses would be sent with the Newsletter. Also, he would investigate the possibility of a pocket directory. The BOD approved both suggestions. The BOD also approved Dr. Balk's membership in the American Society of Association Executives. This was an active and diverse group with good publications and software.

Dr. James O'Malley scored highest on the 1998 practical exam and Dr. Susan D Goodwin scored highest on the written exam. Both received the Foster award.

Dr. David Small had been appointed official ACLAM photographer for the last Forum. As compensation, his registration to the Forum and cost of film were paid by ACLAM. The question was raised as to the need for an official photographer. As the AVMA had its own official photographer, it was suggested that Dr. Small's efforts be limited to the Forum and the ACLAM banquet. The BOD approved the formation of a subcommittee of the Publications Committee to establish the need for a professional photographer. For the interim, ACLAM would use the services of Dr. Small on a case-by-case basis.

It was suggested that all committees be requested to provide a summary page of action items,
followed by background information if necessary. This format would make it easier for the BOD to identify major items that require approval.

A new Directory was shipped to all Diplomates in 1999. This included a desk copy and a travel version. Comments were generally positive. With this format, Diplomates were able to add photographs at any time.

In the same year, the ACLAM history document, completed by Dr. Charles Middleton, was made available to Diplomates. Forty-two copies were requested.

A sunshine fund was established to send an appropriate memento, such as a card or flowers, to a Diplomate who suffered from an illness or to the spouse of a Diplomate who had died.

The topic of Chimp Haven was discussed. The organization had started a sanctuary for retired chimpanzees. Dr. Michael Kastello reported that the organization had 200 acres in Shreveport, Louisiana, and over 100 animals were to be resettled there. The organization sought support of the concept and funding. It was decided to applaud the initiative in a letter to Chimp Haven, Inc., with the inclusion that the BOD desires to be kept informed about the progress of the project.

In 1999 there was a three-way tie for the Foster award on the practical-Drs. Andrew Wilkinson, Lisa Forman, and Samuel Cartner. Dr. Wilkinson also had the highest score on the written portion.

**ACLAM 2000-2007**

From 2000-2007, the emphasis was on recruitment and training. There were too few qualified laboratory animal veterinarians for the number of open positions. One of the most active committees was the Career Pathways Committee, which visited veterinary schools, attended the meetings of the Student Chapter of the AVMA, and awarded externships in laboratory animal medicine. A mentoring system was developed to assist veterinarians who wished to become certified through the experience route. Then there was the un-qualified success of Camp ACLAM, first held at the AVMA and then at the Charles River Short Course. It consisted of 16 courses aligned with the Role Delineation Document, with practice exams and seminars on how to prepare for exams.

Research in laboratory animal medicine was not neglected. By 2006, the ACLAM Foundation had awarded 57 grants for nearly $1 million. On the public policy front, ACLAM published several position statements, including pain assessment and management in rodents and rabbits, euthanasia of poikilotherms and rats and mice, and medical records for animals used in research, teaching and testing.

There were other accomplishments but the road was not always smooth. Again the publication requirement was a point of contention. Finances too were a concern, since for several years the College had withdrawn $60,000 to $80,000 per year from the reserve funds to balance the operating budget. Still, on the whole, the pluses of these last 8 years far outweighed the minuses.

**ACLAM Credentials and Training Programs 2000-2007**

In 2000, the Credentials Committee brought several action items to the BOD. They suggested
that the list of acceptable peer reviewed journals be expanded with current information placed on the website. If the question arose as to whether or not a journal was refereed, a separate form would be completed by the editor of the particular journal to state that the journal was refereed. This was approved. A second recommendation, which was approved, was that the website must be updated to contain the most current requirements about the publication article. A third recommendation was that credit for research experience should be the same, whether it was gained during a training program or outside of a training program, because the ultimate goal was to be familiar with the research process and scientific methodology. This issue would be sent back to the Credentials Committee and Certification Oversight Committee for coordination. The BOD did not approve a request for documentation of additional training for applicants reapplying for the examination, asking applicants whether their license had ever been revoked or suspended and requiring that training, experience and references be obtained within 8 years of the application date. It was stated that the examination should be the deciding factor. The BOD did accept the suggestion that the application packet be made available in electronic format.

In that same year, the revised “ACLAM Training Program Standards” were sent to all training program directors for final comment, and responses were reviewed and summarized for the BOD. It was decided to accept 2000 hours as the required length of the supervised clinical and administrative portion of a recognized training program as suggested by the Training Program Recognition Committee. It was acknowledged that it might be difficult for some of the 2 year programs to meet the new standards.

In 2001, the Training Program Recognition Committee (TPRC) was renamed the Training Program Oversight Committee (TPOC). They presented a timetable for the committee to review the 37 currently approved training programs based on the revised Training Program Standards. A suggested triennial review format by the entire TPOC and an abbreviated annual review process were submitted for BOD review. Specific information would be requested for the annual review consisting of significant changes that could potentially impact the quality of the program. A letter requesting this information, as well as deadlines for submission and implications for the program if no response was received, would be sent from the Executive Director to the training program directors. If problems were found, they would be noted by the TPOC and sent to the BOD for a decision on whether or not the specific program should remain approved by ACLAM. The recommendations of the TPOC were approved. The new standards would take effect with the candidates applying for the 2003 examination.

By late 2001 five programs had received their renewed recognition utilizing the new training standards.

It was decided, on the recommendation of the Credentials Committee, to update the list of approved journals acceptable without further proof of being a refereed journal. The list would be updated annually and submitted to the BOD before it was posted on the ACLAM website. The question to the BOD addressing the issue of foreign licensure as a qualifying credential for ACLAM certification was referred back to the Committee since the ACLAM Constitution appeared to be very clear on this point. The issue of whether the license was current should be asked by the Committee of the candidate.

The Certification Oversight Committee (COC) proposed a list of Diplomates to review the Role Delineation Document. The group would represent all ages, subspecialties and both sexes as outlined in the Policy and Procedure Manual. Dr. Richard Fish would chair the review. Gerald Rosen was the consultant for the project.
Data about success on the certifying examination for 1 year and 3 years were presented. Additional data were required to compare ACLAM's results with similar groups. The COC requested and the BOD approved that the Executive Director develop the examination performance database. The data were needed before considering changes to the pass point. The COC proposed hiring a professional examination service to look at the statistics and philosophy behind the examination. ABVS had questioned ACLAM about the pass point for its examination. ACLAM had grown at 3.1% per year versus an average of 4% for the other members of ABVS. The BOD requested the COC to develop a more detailed proposal.

References used by the Examination Committee were examined by the COC. Guidelines were developed on how the candidates should use the reference list in preparation for the exam and how the Examination Committee should use the list in writing the examination.

In the same year, the Training Program Task Force reported that too few veterinarians were being trained in the clinical area. It was suggested that some institutions might be willing to provide clinical training opportunities, if the didactic training were provided by ACLAM. It was proposed that approximately 160 of the 200 required hours be provided by an ACLAM course, whereas the remaining 40 hours could be provided by training institutions. One method for providing this training would be to hold two 10 day long training symposia on a 2 year rotation. Other methods suggested included intensive short courses, or streaming video conferences. A poll of members present at the general business meeting of October 23, 2001 showed that approximately 20 members were interested, although several people expressed concern that such a program might undermine existing training programs. The need to attract more people into the existing programs was also noted.

However, in 2002, the Task Force felt it did not have enough data for a full didactic training program for candidates, and that the program would probably not help the pass rate. Despite this, the primary objective of the Task Force remained: exploring ways to provide didactic training for those preparing for the certifying examination. The Task Force decided to concentrate on a website for training with links to workshops, training program materials, study groups and so forth; developing mentoring teams for candidates; and providing an ACLAM workshop of core material to be presented at AVMA and AALAS meetings to provide didactic training or continuing education.

The Task Force issued its report on enhancing training opportunities for candidates while not competing with the recognized training programs. A website listing training resources would be posted on the ACLAM website. A mentoring program for candidates studying for the certifying examination would be established. Diplomates would be matched with candidates to give them any assistance they might need. A method of supplying review material to trainees would be established, possibly by presenting full-day programs/workshops at both the AVMA and AALAS meetings. These would be repeated on a 3 year cycle. These recommendations would be given to the appropriate ACLAM committees for implementation.

In 2002, a proposed By-Laws change was signed by three active Diplomates and submitted to the BOD. The proposal requested that the 1997 and 1999 By-Laws changes that would become effective in January of 2003 be rescinded, and proposed alternative criteria for the publication requirement. The BOD had much discussion on the history and purpose of the publication requirement which was mainly to assure that candidates understood the research process. It was decided not to support the proposed By-Laws change and to permit the current By-Laws change
to become effective. However, because the process for making a By-Laws change had been followed, the requested change must be sent to the membership for a vote. A letter about the BOD decision, with the pros and cons of the proposal, was sent as background information. The letter included information about the vagueness of the rewording of the requirement, the history of the issue, concerns about the perception of the stability of the BOD's decision, pipeline issues, and the fact that some credentials packets for the 2003 examination had been mailed already, that described the first author research publication requirement. The Diplomates’ petition was also mailed with the ballot. The BOD was willing to revisit the issue, if it determined that the publication change scheduled to take effect in January of 2003 caused a significant decrease in credentials applications. The By-Laws change was defeated by a vote of 283 to 95.

In the same year, five more training programs were approved for continuing ACLAM recognition. It was decided that training programs would submit annual updates that included names of trainees who had started the program and those who had completed the program since the last report. The Committee was on schedule to review one third of the recognized programs each year.

In 2003, it was decided that the DVM/MS laboratory animal medicine program at Tufts could not be recognized as a formal training program in laboratory animal medicine, and graduates would not be eligible to sit for the certifying examination. However it was hoped that through this program, veterinary students would be exposed to laboratory animal medicine. The Training Program Oversight Committee (TPOC) approved two programs for ACLAM recognition. Most programs were on schedule for their annual or triennial reviews, but there were a few that had not completed their reviews. Some programs were inactive or had chosen to withdraw.

The Certification Oversight Committee updated its reference list that could be used to formulate the test. The list was on the website and sent to the examination applicants. It was not considered all-inclusive nor did the candidate have to read everything on the list to pass the test. Some additional items that the BOD suggested should be on the list were the ILAR Redbook II on neuroscience, behavioral methodology, recombinant DNA guidelines, chemical hygiene and standards by OSHA.

The Committee reported on the charge of mentoring candidates applying through the experience route. Some members who entered the College via the experience route had already volunteered, and some criteria for mentors and the process had been developed. The BOD approved an ad hoc 3 to 5 member committee to develop materials, a webpage and methods with the COC and the Publications Committee providing support.

The Credentials Committee recommended revising the publication criteria. The BOD thought that the By-Laws were very clear regarding the publication requirement, and that the Committee was too rigid in its interpretation. It was emphasized by the BOD that the liaison was to be included in all deliberations.

By 2004, the Certification Oversight Committee heard all appeals within the College. The Committee heard five appeals from candidates that were not credentialed by the Credentials Committee. All five appeals were approved, due to inconsistencies in ACLAM’s paperwork. One of the problems was that the COC was not kept up to date on all correspondence of the Credentials, Examination and Examination Review committees and the BOD. It was decided that the COC chair would be copied on all certification related communications between the
constituent committees and the BOD. The Credentials Committee reported confusion between the old and new rules for the publication requirement, the time of acceptance of the publication, and the words “should” versus “must.” The BOD accepted the recommendation of the COC that the CC perform a comprehensive evaluation of all materials associated with the credentialing process for consistency with the ACLAM By-Laws, Policy and Procedures Manual, and ABVS materials. The CC would make recommendations for streamlining the forms and instructions. They would work with the COC and legal counsel to identify discrepancies and review final revised materials for consistency, and make recommendations to bring ACLAM By-Laws and corresponding credentialing materials into compliance with the ABVS Policy and Procedure. It was also approved to add in the Policy and Procedure Manual an annual evaluation by the Credentials Committee of all materials associated with the credentialing process. Many inconsistencies were identified, as well as areas in which conflicts were less apparent. The Credentials Committee’s suggested corrections, additions and deletions would be submitted to the BOD for review.

In 2004, the Training Program Oversight Committee reported that two programs were delinquent in submitting their annual report. The programs would be informed of their delinquent status. In future, if any programs were delinquent or approaching that status, the Committee Chair would call the Program Directors and inform them of their impending status. The BOD liaison to the TPOC would also call the delinquent programs.

In 2005, the Credentials Committee presented a modified credentialing application form for the 2006 exam. It was decided that all applications must be received by the Executive Director by December 15 for the following year's examination. This date change was necessary, because the ABVS required that all specialty organizations notify candidates of approval to take the examination at least 120 days in advance of the exam.

The responsibility of the Credentials Committee to confirm that a submitted journal article was peer-reviewed had caused problems in the past. The BOD decided that the Committee should abandon the "Approved ACLAM List" and accept articles published in journals listed in Pub Med. However, the Credentials Committee must continue to determine that the submitted publication was a scientific article that included Introduction, Methods and Materials, Results, Discussion and References. As a footnote, ACLAM would retain the list of approved journals and add that two other options (journal referee form or instructions to authors) could apply to verifying that an article was indeed peer-reviewed.

Currently, ACLAM recognized training programs were supposed to issue a certificate when the Training Program was completed. The BOD decided that a letter from the Training Program Director was acceptable as proof of completion of the Training Program. The BOD confirmed that candidates applying via the experience route must have completed their 6 years of experience before applying to take the Certifying Examination. This requirement (having completed all training/experience) would now be the same for both routes of applying for certification. It was decided to drop the request for additional references on the application form, as they had never been used. In order to avoid rejections with subsequent reversals on appeal, the Executive Director should provide the CC with the list of clarifications he sent to the applicants.

It was decided that the Role Delineation Document would be renewed on its normal 5 year cycle. A committee was formed and would meet at the 2007 Forum. The facilitator could be Castle International or similar professional.
In response to the ABVS recommendation to mentor candidates applying for certification through the experience route, ACLAM established a Mentoring Committee. The Committee submitted a plan for evaluation of the mentor and mentee, and solicited volunteers. In addition, the Committee developed a guide for mentors. However, late in 2006, the Committee was assimilated into the Career Pathways Committee.

In 2007, the CC denied five applications for ACLAM Board eligibility. Three candidates appealed. One appeal was approved by the Certification Oversight Committee, and the other two denied because their manuscripts were method descriptions and not original scientific articles. The Committee also recommended an earlier application date (August 15) in addition to the current date of December 15. The rationale for an earlier date was that it allowed candidates whose manuscript was not accepted in August the opportunity to submit another in December. In addition, the earlier date allowed candidates the option to know many months in advance if they were Board eligible. The BOD approved the recommendation. Later that year, the Credentials Committee reported that seven applications for the 2008 ACLAM exam were received by the August 15 early application date. Three were approved out right, one required additional journal information, and one would complete the experience route by the December 15 deadline. Two applications were not approved because their publication did not meet requirements for approval.

The Mentoring Subcommittee of the Career Pathways Committee drafted mentor and mentee readiness assessment surveys. The following recommendations were made: the target mentor pool should be volunteers from ASLAP and ACLAM; volunteers should be requested through newsletters, websites and mass e-mails; and the target mentee pool should be veterinary students, private practitioners, veterinarians in a training program and laboratory animal veterinarians. Mentee applicants should be requested through ASLAP veterinary school liaisons, state VMA newsletters, AVMA/ASLAP websites and laboratory animal study groups. Career Pathway Committee members would match mentees to mentors, and the BOD should establish a separate Mentoring Committee, if response becomes high. Guidance should be given to the Committee on ACLAM's relationship with the Laboratory Animal Board Study Group (LABSG), which approached ACLAM for support.

**ACLAM Examination 2000-2007**

In 2000, the examination contained four sections instead of five. The Role Delineation Document was reviewed for the ranked species. It was emphasized that the goals set forth in that document as to percentages of questions for each species were goals, not absolute numbers. The RDD was to be reevaluated in 2002 and changes might be made at that time. It was decided to appoint members to the Examination Committee at the AALAS meeting so that they would be ready to become members on January 1, and take part in the process earlier. It was noted that relevancy scores had not been done for the last few years. Dr. Robert Dysco volunteered to bring the database up to date. He was given special permission to receive the 1998 and 1999 examinations in order to complete this task. It was emphasized that forms used to transfer materials between members of the Committee must be completed. It was decided that a confidentiality form should be developed which states that members would not divulge examination contents. The Chair of the Practical Examination should be in charge of transporting the slides to the examination review. When the slides were no longer needed in exam format, they would be passed on to the next Chair. No questions had been received from the Question Review Subcommittee.
Later that year, Drs. Gaye Ruble and Helen Diggs of the Examination Committee presented the results of the certifying examination given on July 16, 2000 at USHUS. There were no security problems at the examination. The exam was copied locally so multiple copies did not have to be transported. Additional arrangements would need to be made for copying in the future. There were no changes to the pass/fail statistics. Sixty-three candidates were credentialed to take the exam. Fifty-nine sat for the written portion and 41 for the practical. Nineteen passed the exam for a passing percentage of 32%.

A confidentiality statement was reviewed. This statement would be signed by all on the Examination Committee certifying that they would not divulge, or retain in any manner, information about the examination on which they have privileged information. It was noted that, of the 19 candidates who passed the 2000 examination, 13 went through the training program route and 12 of these passed on the first attempt.

A workshop on examination question writing was suggested. The BOD decided that the Question Review Subcommittee would look into getting a tutorial on the website, or give a workshop at the end of the examination review.

The COC expressed concern about the examination pass rate and wanted to conduct a brief (10 min.) written survey of the exam candidates immediately following the exam. The survey would ask the candidates if they felt prepared for the examination and, if not, why not. They would also ask if the candidates believed the exam was fair. The BOD approved this concept, for both the written and practical examinations on a voluntary basis. The Board also supported the concept of developing a database of trainees to facilitate direct communication, and to help identify trends that enhance success. The infrastructure for developing such a database was not yet available. It was suggested that residents should be encouraged to submit exam questions through their training program directors. This concept would be discussed with training program directors before a decision was made by the BOD. It was also recommended to survey the Diplomates as to why they do not submit questions. Other ABVS specialties would be canvassed to determine whether or not candidates write questions for their certifying examination.

Based on the discussion from the previous BOD meeting, research experience credit for credentialing candidates would be given on a one-to-one basis effective December 2001. The Certification Committee and the Certification Oversight Committee would coordinate the implementation of this position. (Note: credit for any type of experience post training would become a moot point with the elimination of the post training experience requirement.)

In 2001, the Question Review Subcommittee reported that only 36 of 52 questions submitted in the previous year were forwarded to the Examination Committee. Three Diplomates submitted questions for continuing education credit in 2000. Only one individual submitted four questions for 2001. The Subcommittee suggested that it be discontinued. The BOD agreed and replaced it with a Question Writing Subcommittee of the Examination Committee. The Subcommittee and the Examination Committee would work together to create questions for the Certifying Exam, and develop a web-based training module for question writing for future Committee members and adjuncts; all exam committee adjuncts were to submit at least 10 questions each year. Those Diplomates who submitted material to this new subcommittee would have their names placed in a lottery with the prize being a free registration to a future Forum. The winner would be drawn at the AALAS meeting. Between the years 2000 and 2007 as few as two and as many as eight Diplomates submitted questions each year.
The Examination Resources Committee eventually replaced the Question Writing Subcommittee of the Examination Committee. In late 2001, the new committee suggested that older Diplomates with extensive slide collections be encouraged to donate the slides with comments for examination and teaching material when they retire.

There was some concern voiced that the only statistic heard by members of the College and candidates was the one-year pass rate which was sometimes very low, and could be discouraging to the candidates. It would be very helpful to give a three-year success rate which approaches 75% and was a very favorable pass rate.

In 2001, 22 of 66 candidates passed the written examination. Forty-six took the practical and 21 passed. Twenty-one candidates passed the certifying examination and were eligible to become Diplomates. Although no questions were eliminated based on the examination review, four questions were eliminated after the examination. The species distribution as outlined in the Role Delineation Document was met. A printed list of definitions for morphologic diagnosis, etiologic diagnosis etiology and so forth would be provided to the candidates taking the examination. The three-year exam pass rate remains near 75%. It was recommended that the Certification Oversight Committee review the pass rate and possibility of lowering the percentage to pass to 60%, or taking an average of the written and practical scores to determine a final grade.

Previously, the Examination and Examination Review Committees had met at the Forum to preview the exam that would be given that year. Because of moving dates for the Forum it was decided that the two Committees would meet at the exam location, which allowed better timing for this activity and permitted the Committees to view the slides as they would actually be projected during the examination.

The 2002 Certifying Examination had an instruction sheet attached, whereas previously candidates were given oral instructions. Seventy-one candidates sat for one or both parts of the exam. Thirty-six candidates received scores of 65.51% or higher.

The Examination Resource Committee submitted a number of questions for the 2002 examination. Many were accepted. The quality and formatting of the questions facilitated the review and use of the materials by the Examination Committee.

On the recommendation of the COC, it was decided that an examination consultant would be hired to review the entire examination process.

In 2003, it was restated that the BOD could lower the pass point on the examination, but could not raise it above 66%. This was done by the BOD after the Committee had presented its report of scores to the BOD at the AVMA meeting. What was needed was a mechanism for lowering the pass point, and the rationale for the lowering. Some organizations had a panel of experts review and rate the examination, which might mean a panel of experts was needed for each section of the examination. The input from this panel dictated how the pass point would move up or down. The COC would look at this along with mentoring and discuss it with the examination consultant.

The Examination Committee reported difficulty in assigning examination questions to the tasks in the Role Delineation Document (RDD), which resulted in a difference between the task percentages in the RDD when compared with percentages in the examination. The committee suggested that the ranges be broadened or eliminated. The problem was that a question could
meet multiple tasks. The suggested solution was to eliminate generic tasks such as consulting and education.

Forty candidates took the 2003 examination. Twenty three passed. The breakdown of the questions and the statistics of the exam were reviewed. The BOD desired non-rounded percentages around the cutoff point of 65.51% for future reports.

It was decided to hire Castle Worldwide, Inc., as the examination consultant. This was a one-time proposal to perform a comprehensive look at all aspects of the ACLAM examination and its processes. The examination review process was not included. The consultant would examine all written materials and compare the ACLAM process with other organizations. The total cost would be $10,000 or more if other items were added to the request. A task force of the Certification Oversight Committee met with the consultant to compare ACLAM’s examination and its associated processes with other professional organizations. This included the legal aspects, current testing practice and associated procedures.

In 2004, the examination used digital images for the first time. It was likely that all images would be upgraded to the digital format. Forty-six candidates sat for the certifying examination, and 17 received a passing score and became Diplomates. Fifteen of 44 passed the written portion, and 35 of 41 passed the practical portion. An anonymous survey on whether or not candidates felt they were prepared was administered after the examination, and 27 of 29 surveys were returned. Only two individuals in a non-residency program thought they were adequately prepared, while 13 from a residency program felt they were prepared. All 13 passed on the first attempt at the certifying examination. All questions fell within established guidelines for species. If all tasks were assigned to each question according to the RDD, the only task which did not meet its suggested goal was the education task.

The BOD received a draft report from the examination consultant in 2005. The BOD approved the report in concept, and also approved the formation of an ad hoc task force to oversee the process of implementation. A committee of 3 to 5 Diplomates was suggested for a period of 2-3 years. In addition to implementation of the plan, the Committee would oversee and evaluate progress of the plan, and work closely with both the Examination Committee and the Examination Review Committee.

In 2005, 55 candidates took the certifying examination. Twenty-five passed either one or both sections of the exam to become new Diplomates. The possibility of lowering the passing score to 65.30% was discussed. This would positively affect one candidate. At the request of the ABVS, and by vote of the ACLAM BOD approximately 2 years ago, the BOD had the ability to lower the score after the exam was given. It was initially decided to lower the passing score of the 2005 exam from 65.51% to 65.30% with the caveat that the BOD would contact legal counsel for affirmation. However, counsel recommended not to make this change, hence the original 25 candidates recommended by the Exam Committee remained.

Twelve proposals were suggested by the examination consultant. The BOD selected two as their focus. The first was to align the exam with the Role Delineation Document and its tasks. It was decided to charge the Examination Committee, the Examination Review Committee and the consultant with this responsibility. The second proposal that was approved was a Standard Setting Study (SSS) to set the passing score of the Exam. The Study would use 10 to 14 Diplomates at the 2006 Forum to set the passing score by reviewing the exam and deciding what percentage of minimum competency was needed for a laboratory animal veterinarian to pass the
The composition of this Pass Point Setting Panel would be primarily newer Diplomates from all aspects of employment and route of entry into ACLAM (both the training program and experience routes). The Angoff Modified Technique would be used to set the passing score. These Diplomates would meet with the exam consultant and decide on the minimum competency required for a laboratory animal veterinarian just entering the field to pass the exam. A full report would be submitted to the BOD describing the methodology followed, rationale, recommended score, confidence level of the score, consequences of implementation of the score, and a set of options to consider to possibly adjust the suggested score up or down. It was decided to have a passing score information letter sent to ACLAM’s counsel for review. An article explaining the Angoff Modified Technique was put on the ACLAM website.

In 2006, a group of 14 Diplomates meeting the criteria set forth in the consultant’s report were reviewed by the Certification Oversight Committee and approved by the BOD. The Pass Point Setting Panel met at the Forum to set the cut score for the 2006 exam. The panel members were well-qualified, represented a broad range of employment, had entered the College through both the training program and the experience routes, and represented a broad sample of Diplomates passing the examination at various times (heavier on the more recently passed). The panelists were to examine each question on both the written and practical portions of the exam to determine what a minimally competent, entry-level laboratory animal veterinarian must know to perform his or her job. Each panel member actually took the practical exam. When the statistics for the individual questions were examined, a tight consensus of opinions (standard deviations) was observed. The panel was given feedback about their consensus. On the second day, they did a second evaluation round on both practical and the written portions. When the results were given to the panel, they were comfortable with the pass point, but were uncomfortable with the number of candidates who would pass. The consensus of the panel was that they did not think that a third round of evaluation would change anything. Mr. James Henderson, the examination consultant, acknowledged that the panel had reached a rational conclusion given that they understood the concepts of setting the pass point, received instructions on how the process would work using the Angoff Modified Technique, and understood the difference between the importance of knowing the fact and estimating the number of candidates who would answer the question correctly (difficulty of the question). The choices before the BOD were to accept the panel’s pass score as set, accept the score with modification, or reject the panel’s score (which would be hard to defend). If the BOD accepted the panel score, 43.9% of the candidates would have passed having correctly answered 94 out of the 135 questions on the practical exam. However only 10.17% of the candidates would have passed the written having correctly answered 169/240 questions. It was decided by the BOD to adjust the panel score to minus 3 standard errors of the mean (SEM) of the panelists’ estimate on both the written and practical portions of the examination. By doing this, the respective numbers would be 89/135 for a 54% pass rate on the practical and 160/240 for a 22.03% pass rate on the written using the Angoff Modified Technique.

It was noted that ACLAM was ahead of other veterinary specialties in evaluating their examination processes. An examination disclosure policy would be developed. The Examination Resources Committee would continue to write questions and develop training on how to write exam questions.

Fifty-nine candidates sat for the 2006 written examination, and 41 candidates took the practical exam. Candidates were given 5 hours to complete the written portion. The quality of the exam was comparable to previous year’s exams. The exam met the RDD within one half of a percent. 14% were new questions. The species diversification was within 2% of the requirements of the...
Scoring of the exam took 2 hours. Five questions on the written portion were deleted. The candidates were given 3 hours to complete the practical portion. Forty Five seconds were allotted for each slide. The practical did not match the RDD requirements as some tasks had no questions testing that particular task. 38% of the questions on the practical were new. Three questions were deleted. Candidates were given credit for the questions which were deleted, resulting in three more people passing the practical and four more passing the written, for a total of 17 new Diplomates. Examinee's who did not pass the exam received letters advising in general terms how they did on groups of RDD sections.

According to the Examination Consultant, the 2007 examination should be equated with the 2006 exam. This would be accomplished through a statistical method comparing the difficulty of the 2006 exam with 2007 exam. It was also approved that the Examination Committee would assemble the 2007 certifying examination, and future examinations, balanced across the entire examination (written and practical) according to the tasks identified in the RDD and not require that each part cover the full RDD. Effective with the 2010 examination the written and practical portions would be combined such that the College would have one pass score to become a Diplomate.

It was decided that no further Standard Setting Study would need to be done unless there were major changes to the exam or RDD.

The BOD decided that to avoid the perception of conflict of interest, no Training Program Director or member of the Laboratory Animal Board Study Group would be a member of any committee dealing with the exam.

In 2007, exam security was discussed in light of the experience of the American College of Veterinary Pathologists (ACVP) with the perception of conflict of interest in the assimilation of the exam. The current exam security statement given to candidates was updated, reflecting current technology and legal review. It was agreed that all Program Directors would receive a copy of the new Security Statement.

In the same year, three changes were made to the exam: the practical slides which had previously been projected were printed in color in the exam booklet, the practical and the written were combined for comparison to the RDD, and exam results were sent to Castle for equating with the 2006 exam. There were 375 questions on the combined exam, which had at least a 64.5% difficulty index. Eighty candidates took the written, and 63 took the practical exam. Fourteen candidates were from non-residency programs, while 41 were from residency programs. Some suggestions were made for the 2008 exam. With 240 questions on the written exam, the time for the exam might be shortened from 4.5 hours. The printed practical pictures should be printed one to a page, and on paper that produced less glare. Nineteen candidates passed the written portion (24%) and 34 passed the practical (54%). There was a great deal of discussion about the low number of candidates that pass the exam and why. The emphasis on, and importance of, the RDD should be stressed to the Training program directors and those candidates entering by the experience route. The 2007 exam had excellent correlation with the 2006 examination. The BOD asked the Certification Oversight Committee to evaluate the certification process to determine why such a small percentage of candidates passed the exam. It was unclear how many Training Programs were using the RDD.

In late 2007, the COC gave a presentation to the membership on changes to the exam. It consisted of the history of the examination, the standard setting process, and what had changed
in the exam and the exam procedure. The material was placed on the website. The membership was informed that in 2010, the exam would be one exam, and not separate practical and written parts.

The charges to the COC in 2007 were to review the Role Delineation Document and make suggestions for revisions and improvements. A meeting of a demographically balanced cross-section of the College was recommended to construct a survey that would gather data from Diplomates on professional activities of laboratory animal veterinarians. The Committee recommended, and the BOD approved, a reevaluation of the definition of "minimal competence" for an ACLAM Board Certified Specialist in Laboratory Animal Medicine. The definition of minimal competence would be used to perform a second Standard Setting Study in 2008. It was suggested to reevaluate the exam site because of the limitations in technology currently available at USUHS which limited the ability of the Exam Committee to give additional information to the candidates. The COC was asked to explore alternatives to the exam site. It was decided to charge the COC with updating website items dealing with exam issues. It was also approved that the Recruitment and Training Oversight Committee (RTOC), formally the Career and Training Oversight Committee, would establish a mechanism to review annually and update the list of recommended references used on the exam.

**ACLAM Examination Review 2000-2007**

At the 2000 AVMA meeting, 21 Diplomates attended the review in the morning and 22 in the afternoon. The results of the review were that no changes were needed in the grading of the examination. Comments were favorable. The examination was very close to the Role Delineation Document. In contrast to the AVMA, at the 2000 AALAS meeting 67 Diplomates reviewed the written examination and 48 reviewed the practical.

The BOD discussed the use of the Option Finder equipment at the examination reviews. This was an interactive Audience Response System that would allow Diplomates to respond to questions and input their opinions electronically. The BOD needed details on how the equipment would enhance the examination review, who would be responsible for the equipment, the advantages of owning versus renting the equipment, maintaining examination security, how this equipment might enhance the validity and reliability of the examination, and the cost estimate for the additional keypads.

In 2002, the audiovisual contractor who could supply the system at the Forum presented the BOD with a proposal for lease of the equipment, including technician time, shipping and travel expenses. The system would be donated for this demonstration. The company wanted a copy of the exam so they could input the information into the system before the Forum. Security of the examination was of great concern to the BOD even though it was a previous year's exam. After further discussion about security concerns, it was decided to permit the lease of the audience response system for the Forum, if the data could be loaded under the supervision of a member of the Examination Committee. Approximately 70 Diplomates attended the examination review at the 2002 Forum, and participated in the audience response system. There were no leaks in the security of the exam as it was loaded onto and then deleted from the response system.

There was some discussion about moving the examination closer to the AALAS meeting so that more Diplomates could have some input into the review of the examination. Diplomate concerns about questions could have a direct impact on the examination scoring as some questions could be eliminated or additional answers accepted. This again was discussed in 2001, the BOD
consensus was that there was no good reason to change the timing of the exam.

In 2001, the Examination Review Committee (ERC) became a standing committee. Twenty-one Diplomates reviewed the 2001 examination. No questions were deleted as a result of the review.

In 2002, the Examination Committee and the ERC again suggested moving the certifying examination from 1 to 2 weeks before the AVMA meeting to just before the AALAS meeting. The Diplomate review was one opportunity members had to make an impact on the grading of the test. Attendance at the AVMA meeting had been declining over the past few years, which meant that fewer Diplomates had a larger impact on the examination. Attendance at the AALAS meeting had always been greater, and if the exam were reviewed at the AALAS meeting, more Diplomates would have an impact on the examination. It was decided to refer this item to the Certification Oversight Committee, which would review the pros and cons of moving the examination nearer to AALAS and its effect on the committees involved. Eventually, the COC was not supportive of changing the date of the examination if the main reason for moving the date was to increase the impact of the Diplomate review on the results of the exam.

In 2003, the ERC asked to be involved in evaluating the continuing education experience and audience response system if the examination consultant were hired. The audience response system was considered a valuable tool, and was used one or two times a year. The Committee wished to continue this.

In 2004, it was emphasized that the pre-review of the examination by the ERC was critical to examination development, and would be continued.

In 2005, during discussion of the examination consultant's report, a question arose as to the possible future role of the ERC since part of the report would set the pass point of the examination via a different method, and Diplomates would no longer have a role in deleting examination questions during the review session at the AVMA meeting.

Based on the examination consultant recommendations, it was required that the test contain a number of previously used questions in exactly the same position as they were on the previous exam. Therefore, the traditional exam review, where Diplomates could review and make comments on each question, would no longer occur in the future for security reasons. It was decided that the examination review as a continuing education experience (with only a portion of the exam reviewed) would take place at the Forum and AALAS meeting, but not at the AVMA meeting.

In 2006, it was decided that the Exam Review Committee would no longer conduct reviews at meetings as was done in the past. Instead their main function would be to assist in putting together the annual exam. A recommendation of the Certification Oversight Committee involved new responsibilities of the ERC. It would provide a review of the exam prior to administration, present informational sessions to help Diplomates understand examination content and correlation with the RDD, and develop fact gathering sessions at the Forum and AALAS meetings to ensure College input into examination development. Except for reviewing the exam before it was given, the remaining responsibilities were aimed at Training program directors. The BOD approved this recommendation in concept but wanted more specifics. It was decided, that the ERC would generate detailed data for the COC on source of exam questions, and provide guidance on using the data for exam preparation. Concern was expressed about loss of the review process and security of the questions used in the exam. Because of the need for this
security, the exam review session as previously known, would not occur in 2006 nor any time in the future.

**ACLAM Recertification 2000-2007**

In 2000, it was decided that letters to the editor and book reviews would be awarded credits. It was clarified further that only questions written for the ACLAM examination would be accepted for credit. Questions submitted for other certifying examinations would not. There was a question about the number of service activities credit hours given for AAALAC site visits. It was decided that only the time for the actual site visit would be awarded credit. This would average 8 hours per day. It was not to include preparation time before and writing time after the site visit. Also, it was decided that only time spent at the AAALAC Council meeting would count for credit. The membership was reminded that there was no extra credit for accumulating more than 400 points. When a Diplomate reached 400 points, he or she was to request to be recertified, and the clock for the next 400 points in 8 years would be started.

In 2001, the BOD made clear that Continuing Education (CE) credit should not be given for activities associated with routine employment unless the activity had been specifically mentioned in the recertification process (e.g., teaching). Also, Diplomates could receive credit for paid speaking engagements at for-profit events. Credit for teaching would be based on the time spent in contact with students; it should not include preparation time. Diplomates must list specific materials that were used for self-study credit. A tips/recommendations list was created by the Recertification Committee and approved by the BOD. It would be included with recertification forms. The list included the maximum CE credit available for various commonly attended meetings, classifying in-house seminars, and service credits for AAALAC. The list would be sent along with recertification forms to Diplomates each year.

In 2002, two Diplomates did not fulfill their recertification requirements. The "certification current" statement was dropped from under their name in the Directory.

The Committee decided and the BOD approved that the definition of the scientific meeting did not include in-house seminar series. Such seminar series were considered academic course work for recertification purposes and should be listed as such, not under credit for scientific meetings. The instructions that accompany the recertification credit form would be clarified to reflect this.

The Committee requested that complete information be sent on scholarly activities, or the Committee might have to deny credit. Also, if a Diplomate were submitting credits for multiple years, separate recertification records should be submitted for each year. The Committee was concerned about the definition of laboratory animal medicine focused publications, other publications and authorship. The BOD directed the Committee to use journals listed as study references for the certifying examination to determine whether they were laboratory animal medicine focused or not, and whether or not they were peer-reviewed.

**ACLAM Continuing Education 2000-2007**

**ACLAM Texts**

In 2000 the BOD approved the revision of *Flynn's Parasites of Laboratory Animals*, and the second edition of *The Laboratory Rat*. *Flynn's Parasites of Laboratory Animals* would be published by Iowa State University Press. Dr. Flynn would lend only his name to this volume.
Dr. Henry Baker announced his retirement as of July 2001 as Chair of the Publications Committee. An advertisement for a new Chairperson was placed in the Newsletter. There would be a modest stipend, open to negotiation.

It was decided that the Publications Chair would be responsible for all publications within the College, both external and internal, printed and electronic. The position would be called Chair, ACLAM Publications.

In 2001, Dr. Mark Suckow was appointed chair of ACLAM publications. He would also be chief editor for the revised Laboratory Rat text. Dr. Steven Wisebroth and Dr. Craig Franklin would be coeditors.

Dr. David Baker would be chief editor for the revision of Flynn's Parasites of Laboratory Animals. Dr. Baker selected an advisory group of four Diplomates and for non-Diplomate parasitologists. They reviewed the format and discussed the matter with Iowa State University Press.

The suggestion of an experimental surgery text as a new publication endeavor was approved. The BOD also suggested developing a text about animal facility design and recommendations for housing. They requested the committee to investigate the feasibility of self publication by ACLAM, which may be in a CD-ROM format.

It was suggested that Dr. Suckow explore the possibility of revising the mouse texts, foreign translations for some or all ACLAM texts, and website enhancement.

In 2002, the revised Laboratory Animal Medicine text was published. Dr. Jack Hessler was selected as editor-in-chief with Drs. Clifford Roberts and Noel Lehner as co-editors for a facility design and renovation text. A text on experimental surgery will require more thought since a very large volume on the same subject was recently published.

Dr. James Fox was selected chief editor for the new edition of the Mouse in Biomedical Research text. If non-Diplomates became coeditors, a concept the BOD welcomed, they must agree that the royalties from the sale of the text became the property of ACLAM.

By 2003, the second edition of the text Laboratory Animal Medicine had sold 1000 copies which brought in approximately $23,000 to ACLAM.

In the same year, Drs. Fred Quimby, Christian Newcomer, Abigail Smith, Stephen Barthold and Muriel Davison were selected as coeditors for the revision of the Mouse in Biomedical Research.

There were many advantages to having a major publishing house manage the whole process of text publication, particularly when it came to marketing. However, if ACLAM published the facilities design text it would realize more of the profits generated.

In 2004, Dr. Suckow resigned as chair of the Publications Committee. Dr. Gerald Van Hoosier was selected to replace him. The textbooks: Design of Animal Facilities, second editions of the Laboratory Rat, Mouse in Biomedical Research, Flynn's Parasites of Laboratory Animals and Laboratory Animal Medicine involved approximately 100 Diplomates. Many other texts were
deemed “old” by the publisher and would be considered for revision. New titles were also needed, and Diplomates were called upon to submit suggestions. Dr. Van Hoosier reported that ACLAM's public statements were being put into a standard format.

In 2006, new ideas for texts included Clinical Chemistry of Laboratory Animals, and Iatrogenic Lesions in Laboratory Animals. Dr. William White was developing a Transportation of Laboratory Animals text. By late 2006, 15 texts were in various stages of completion.

Because the selection of a text editor was a time sensitive effort, the BOD gave the Chair of the Publications Committee the authority to select the editor and inform the Board, rather than having the BOD vote approval of the selection.

Dr. Van Hoosier announced his intention to resign as chair. Names of volunteers and nominations for the position were solicited. Previous editing experience was desired.

Dr. James Fox was selected as the new publications chair in 2006.

In 2007, the Parasite text was published. Additional texts being considered in 2007 were a combined rabbit/guinea pig/other rodents text, and a revision of Harkness and Wagner’s Biology and Medicine of Rabbits and Rodents. It was decided to provide $1000 to each editor of an ACLAM text in the future in addition to the recognition plaques.

**ACLAM Audio-tutorial**

By 2000, the audio-tutorial CD-ROM was completed and available for purchase.

A web-based tutorial on laboratory animal medicine for veterinary schools was suggested. This could be a cooperative effort with AALAS or the AVMA using their resources and ACLAM expertise. Dr. Cynthia Gillett would explore this idea further.

In 2005 the usefulness of the audio-tutorials was questioned since the pictures were still good but the information was out of date. The Publications Committee would address this concern.

**ACLAM Forum**

The past, present and future Forum program chairs met in 2000. They listed specific duties for certain personnel running a Forum so nothing would be forgotten. They also made suggestions on how the Forum might generate additional income. Registration fees were already at the high-end. They recommended that vendors not be present other than as participants in the program or in the audience. Sponsors would continue to be recognized. Proceedings could be sold but might not generate much additional income. ACLAM merchandise should not be sold, but could be used at the auction. Sponsor levels were changed to $1000, $2000 and $3000. This entitled each donor to one, two, or three free registrations respectively. It was suggested that ACLAM look for a major donor as a sponsor for multiple years. The suggestions would be incorporated into the Forum Guidelines in the Policy and Procedures Manual.

The 2000 Forum was held in Fort Meyers Florida. The topic was "Laboratory Animal Medicine: Advancing Science and Animal Welfare in the 21st century". Speakers concentrated on current best practices for establishing more humane and earlier endpoints in cancer research, vaccine testing, acute toxicity testing and infectious disease research. New technologies that could
support refinement and reduction of animals were discussed also.

The 2001 Forum was held in Point Clear, Alabama. The theme was “Diagnosis and Control of Disease.” There were 300 registrants and 37 were registered for the Forum for Life. The Forum for Life was a social and learning event for retirees and spouses of Diplomates. Proceedings were not published, but meeting notes were made available to each registrant. Selected poster authors were present during the scheduled breaks in the formal program. A grantsmanship writing workshop was added as well as a workshop given by the COC on writing questions for the ACLAM examination. The Elizabeth Griffin Foundation, an organization interested in bio-safety and bio-security, was permitted to be present at the 2001 Forum and distribute information about their organization. The Forum had a net gain of $12,500.

The theme for the 2002 ACLAM Forum, held in Savannah Georgia, was “Genetics, Genomics and Gene Therapy: Applications in Biomedical Research.” The price for early registration was $550, for late registration $595, and $650 for non-ACLAM Diplomates registration. There were 258 registrants for the scientific sessions, and 37 for the Forum for Life. The Forum was an educational and financial success despite registrants being a few less than expected. There was a net income of slightly over $38,000.

The title for the 2003 Forum held in Fort Myers, Florida was: “Induced Animal Models in Human Disease (Before, Beyond, and Besides Transgenics).” Presentations focused on models that cause IACUC protocol review and management difficulties. Speakers presented overviews of the current state of knowledge about specific human health problems, general synopsis of unanswered research problems, justification for the use of animal models, and reviews of the animal models currently available. There was a discussion of experimental endpoints and pain and distress assessment and management. Three key areas covered were neuroscience models, infection and inflammation models, and surgery models. The Forum had 310 registrants with 24 registered for the Forum for Life.

The 2004 Forum had 265 registrants. This was lower than the typical 300. It was held in Tucson Arizona, and had a town meeting format. Four topics were covered: Balancing ideal conditions in animal facilities with the reality of fiscal constraint, the role of animal enrichment in biomedical research, euthanasia, animal housing and environment. Attendees met in discussion groups after the talks. The Option Finder system was used to poll the attendees during the discussion. After expenses, the net gain for the Forum was $47,154. This was mostly due to $42,500 donated by corporate sponsors.

The theme of the 2005 Forum was Pathways for Success for the Laboratory Animal Veterinarian. It included topics on the laboratory animal veterinarian’s role with occupational health and safety, the IACUC, physical plant issues, and providing adequate veterinary care. The Forum was held in Asheville North Carolina. An evening program on agricultural animals was held as well. The Forum for Life included topics about the people of the South Appalachian Highlands, a storyteller, singer and arts and crafts of the region. The Forum had 307 registrants, and netted $25,000.

The BOD would not meet at the AVMA in Hawaii in 2006 as it was considered too far. Therefore, the 2006 Forum was held in late June in St. Petersburg Beach Florida. There were 225 registrants. Sponsors contributed $42,000. Because the Forum was advertised as a family event, it was lengthened to 4 days to allow one morning and one afternoon off for recreational activities. The title of the program was “Education in Laboratory Animal Medicine.” The Forum
had a net gain of $12,200 due to fewer attendees, a longer meeting and higher fixed costs, but it was successful based on comments of attendees in the Forum evaluation.

The 2007 Forum was held in Tucson Arizona. The title of the program was “Fifty Years of Support to Biomedical Research.” Sessions included pain and distress, euthanasia, aquatic husbandry and new technologies in genetically modified animals. The CL Davis course on Pathology of Laboratory Animals was incorporated into the program on the Saturday before the Forum. Over 300 were present for the event, including 225 Diplomates, 25 non-Diplomates, 30 attendees for the Forum for Life and numerous guests. Corporate support totaled $39,500. Financially, the Forum broke even. This was explained because the meeting also hosted the 50th anniversary of ACLAM and some extra open full bars, meals, gifts and awards were given. There were numerous problems with the CL Davis pathology seminar before the Forum. ACLAM did not lose any money on this venture. However, CL Davis was planning additional meetings in conjunction with the Forum, with better planning and follow-up.

Continuing Education Committee

In 2000, Dr. Michael Swindle, Chair of the Continuing Education Committee (CEC), proposed a one-day workshop to be held in various locations around the country. The workshop would be open to all, not necessarily just ACLAM Diplomates. This could be a good source of income. He outlined the regional meetings, which would start in the fall of 2001 at USHUS in DC, move to the Palo Alto California in February 2002 and Chicago in the fall of 2002. All these meetings would have the same program topic of Genetically Engineered Rodents: The Challenge of Phenotyping. All speakers would be ACLAM Diplomates. The meetings would be held on a Saturday from 9:30 AM until 4:30 PM and cost approximately $100 per participant.

Unfortunately, the first regional seminar to be held at USHUS in September was canceled due to the events of September 11 and the small preregistration. The site for the second seminar in California declined to permit use of its facilities. It was decided to cancel all future seminars.

Electronic formats of publication were being considered for training and recertification to include diagnostic exercises, possibly with radiographs, clinical pathology and ultrasound using video streaming.

In 2002, the Committee was charged to plan seminars for continuing education at the AVMA and/or AALAS meetings. It was to plan and coordinate the seminar series with the Program Committee. The first 6 hour workshop was accepted for the 2003 AALAS meeting and covered pigs, amphibians and zebra fish. The program was set up for continuing education for Diplomates, and training sessions for candidates in training programs, as well as those desiring to enter the College via the experience route.

AALAS had accepted the ACLAM Continuing Education Program as a workshop in 2003. Some questions were raised. As AALAS charged a fee for its workshops, could ACLAM receive part of the funds collected? Was there a long-term commitment on the part of AALAS to continue to have the program as a workshop? Should the program be held in the normal AALAS/AVMA meeting time, or should it be a stand-alone meeting? Could the material be put on the ACLAM website with a charge for viewing it?

Later that year, it was reported that the first ACLAM Training Session was a success. Twenty-
eight people had registered for the workshop on pigs, amphibians and zebra fish. The AALAS Executive Committee would discuss sharing the workshop fees with ACLAM.

In 2004, Dr. Helen Diggs of the CEC reported on Camp ACLAM activities at the AVMA meeting. This was a new educational endeavor to assist veterinarians applying for certification by the experience route. Laboratory animal related workshops were presented, but a major seminar was not on the program. Regarding wet labs using animals, the AVMA had become a registered USDA research facility with its own IACUC. Protocols involving wet labs for the 2005 AVMA meeting were to be received and reviewed by the AVMA IACUC by March of 2005. ACLAM needed personnel both for seminars and wet labs in order to make Camp ACLAM a success. It was strongly advised that the CEC and the Program Committee coordinate plans to make sure that Camp ACLAM was on the AVMA or AALAS program schedule. Some thoughts were expressed pertaining to adding Camp ACLAM to the Charles River Short Course as a separate track.

In 2005, it was decided to hold Camp ACLAM in conjunction with the Charles River Short Course. A three person special task force was set up to assist the CEC in coordinating with Charles River Laboratories, or any other group desiring to have Camp ACLAM in association with their meeting. The program was to be both a continuing education experience and a training experience especially for those preparing for the certifying examination by the experience route. The program consisted of 16 courses which were aligned closely with the RDD. There were practice examinations with limited questions to give those attending the opportunity to participate in the type of exam which ACLAM administers. There were also topics covering how to take examinations, how to prepare for examinations, and what resources might be used. The program was so successful that it would continue to be held at the Charles River Laboratories Short Course. The Camp ACLAM committee was increased to six members and their service terms increased from 1 to 3 years. The BOD also approved the request to complete further metrics by new Diplomates approximately 4 to 6 months after they passed the examination. It would cover the usefulness of the ACLAM exam website and the ACLAM mentoring program in assisting them to pass the examination.

In late 2006, the Continuing Education Committee was disbanded as it was no longer required. However, the college would continue to participate in planning Camp ACLAM and assist with the Charles River Short course. Suggested topics and speakers were always needed.

Additional Publications and Seminars

In late 2000, the Program Committee announced that due to a poor response to requests for posters for the AVMA in 2001, the poster session was canceled. The topics for the posters would be rolled into a session on Contemporary Topics, which would include case reports, poster topics and a “What’s Your Diagnosis?” session. There would be further efforts made to revive the poster session at future AVMA meetings.

In the same year, work began on the revision of the Partners in Biomedical Research brochure. Suggestions were received from the Research and Academics Task Force. It was to be targeted toward researchers, university officials and others in light of the new technologies currently being used. The updated document should be given the widest distribution possible. In 2001, the "Your Partners in Biomedical Science" brochure was published and distributed to all Diplomates, institutional officials, IACUC chairs and others in the scientific community. Brochures also were given to the Career Pathways Committee for distribution to veterinary
students. Brochures would be available at the General Business Meetings and at the ACLAM booth.

ACLAM/ASLAP programs at the 2001 AALAS included pocket pets, cloning and cryopreservation, and eradication of *Helicobacter*. Programs at 2002 AVMA meeting would include laboratory animal medicine and space, cloning, and career pathways in laboratory animal medicine. There would also be wet labs on anesthesia, critical care, and surgical procedures on rabbits, guinea pigs and other rodents. Because so few posters were submitted for the 2002 AVMA, the poster session for that meeting was canceled.

In 2002, the BOD was asked to consider co-sponsorship of the training program seminar series for the Scripps Research Institute, so veterinarians licensed in California could receive continuing education credit for attendance. The BOD did not support the request for two reasons: there was concern that ACLAM sponsorship of a local seminar series would set an undesirable precedent, and, secondly, an alternative mechanism for establishing continuing education status was available through the registry of Approved Continuing Education of the American Association of Veterinary State Boards.

The BOD reviewed a sensitivity training videotape developed by Proctor and Gamble. The tape, which dealt with some of the emotional aspects of using animals in research, had been offered to ACLAM to duplicate and distribute with all proceeds being the property of ACLAM. The BOD accepted the proposal. The module would sell for $149 to Diplomates and ASLAP members and $179 to others.

In 2003, there were some questions about the nature of the laboratory animal program at the AVMA meeting and the charge to the Program Committee. The BOD wanted a program that would appeal to all attendees-laboratory animal specialists and general practitioners alike. Previously, the BOD decided that it was up to the Program Committee to determine the focus of the program at the AVMA. The Committee felt that it had failed in its mission, as the attendance at the AVMA meeting was poor. The BOD emphasized that the Committee was to maintain a laboratory animal presence at the AVMA meeting, and the success or failure should not be measured by a headcount. Some ideas to improve attendance were to move the program off its scheduled day of Monday as it conflicted with the BOD meeting, have repeat workshops if they prove to be very popular, change the program to take up one day with improved quality, and consider what could be done to move the program presentations to days other than those when ASLAP and ACLAM activities were scheduled.

The Program committee with ASLAP would offer a Career Option seminar every other year at the AVMA meeting. Some of the programs given at the AVMA were written in the Journal of the AVMA.

**ACLAM Website**

In 2001, it was decided to close the "Members Only" section of the website since very few had registered to use it. A copy of the BOD minutes could be obtained by clicking an e-mail link to the Executive Director directly with a request. The General Business Meeting Minutes would be posted in the public section. The BOD minutes would be sent to Committee Chairs on a routine basis.
In 2002, the Career Pathways Committee announced that information about training programs and internship opportunities would be placed on the ACLAM website.

The Publications Committee was forming a training material subcommittee (the Training Connections Subcommittee) to develop a website dedicated to training materials that would be useful for those studying for the examination. New Diplomates were encouraged to contribute sites they found helpful in studying for the certifying examination.

In 2005, a members only section of the website was discussed once more. It had not been used, and was removed in 2001. However, the Policy and Procedure Manual was to have been placed there. The BOD decided to repeal a previously passed motion to place the Manual on the website as it was not up to date. In addition, the BOD decided to have the webmaster, Dr. Steven Fisk, develop a members only section. Some items to be placed on the members only area would be the Strategic Plan, Policy and Procedure Manual, and various task force reports. Later that year it was announced that the website would be upgraded utilizing the professional service of the University of Washington. Dr. Fisk would be retained as the webmaster. By late 2006 the upgrade of the webpage was nearly complete, and viewed by some in a beta version.

In 2007, the new website was up and running and hosted by Worldspice. The usefulness of a "members only section" was questioned again. Dr. Fisk would discuss a "members only section" with ASLAP, AALAS and AAALAC and look at the cost/benefits to ACLAM. Later that year, the "members only section" on the ACLAM website was approved. Dr. Fisk would manage the members only area. Suggestions for what it would contain included the Policy and Procedure Manual, and the Directory with a method to personally update information. The estimated annual cost was $3000 for 400 users.

Laboratory Animal Study Groups

By 2007, there were several organized study groups around the country established for preparation for the ACLAM exam. One group, the Laboratory Animal Boards Study Group (LABSG), forwarded a proposal for indirect support from ACLAM. The BOD discussed what, if any, relationship ACLAM should have with the organization. The LABSG had submitted an explanatory letter to the BOD about the role of the mock board exams, and the Group’s efforts to minimize any security issues the BOD might have relative to the ACLAM certifying exam. Several questions arose, including ACLAM's liability, involvement of the ABVS and legal counsel, and the role of the newly created Careers and Training Oversight Committee (CTOC). It was decided to provide up to $2500 from the disbanded Career Pathways Committee budget for software, web training and administrative and server support. The LABSG would meet at the AALAS meeting with the BOD to discuss integration, present a budget on how funds would be used, and meet with the CTOC. They would be encouraged to discuss integration of their files on the ACLAM website with Dr. Fisk.

Recruitment and Education 2007

In 2007, the Recruitment and Education Oversight Committee (REOC) was created which brought together several committees under one umbrella. These included the Training Program Oversight, Recertification, Career Pathways, Publication, and Program Committees for the AVMA, AALAS, Forum and Camp ACLAM. Its charge included analysis of the current status of recruitment and training for careers in laboratory animal medicine; analysis of the present
methods for funding post doctoral education and training in laboratory animal medicine; explore mechanisms by which external as well as internal funding for education and training activities could be developed; analyze present ACLAM educational activities as well as assess the needs of Diplomates and candidates for ACLAM certification; analyze the content and availability of printed and electronic resources for continuing education and training; meet regularly with constituent committees to coordinate activities of same; and develop Policy and Procedure.

**ACLAM and ASLAP 2000-2007**

In 2000, the Economic Survey (Salary Survey) was published on the ACLAM and ASLAP websites. It was decided to have a combined business meeting between the two organizations at the next AVMA meeting. ASLAP would be first, then ACLAM, with each organization being limited to one hour. In the future, the organizations would rotate being first to have their business meeting at the AVMA.

ACLAM and ASLAP were sharing booth space at the AVMA meeting. The BOD agreed to share ACLAM's regulatory responses and position statements with the ASLAP BOD. The ACLAM CD-ROM was advertised in the ASLAP Newsletter. A new header for the booth would be made to inform everyone that the booth was about laboratory animal medicine and not just ACLAM and ASLAP. Contact would be through the ASLAP liaison at each veterinary school to determine if an information packet about laboratory animal medicine as a career could be distributed to each first-year student. ACLAM was present along with ASLAP at the 2002 student AVMA meeting.

The International Committee would cooperate with the ASLAP International Committee to develop a list of international contacts for laboratory animal medicine and science questions. The contact list would be placed on both organizations’ websites. These contacts would be especially useful when shipping animals between countries. It was decided that the International Committee would be a joint committee with ASLAP.

In 2001, ASLAP and ACLAM wrote a letter to the USDA questioning the use of policies in lieu of the federally mandated rule-making process. The letter was presented to the USDA at and AAALAC Board of Trustees meeting and published in the ACLAM Newsletter.

In 2002, it was decided that the Career Pathways Committee would work through the ASLAP veterinary liaisons already established at veterinary colleges. ASLAP would be involved with an official ACLAM liaison from this committee to ASLAP. Three summer internships were funded.

ACLAM and ASLAP cosigned a letter to the AVMA to encourage the organization to form a panel to study the assessment and alleviation of pain and distress. The panel would be modeled after the Euthanasia Panel. This not only involved laboratory animal medicine/science groups but many other species groups as well. A letter was written to other species groups requesting that they support this concept and develop guidelines for their particular species.

The ACLAM/ASLAP Economic Survey would be mailed out in January of 2003. The cost of the survey was split with ASLAP. By May 2003 the survey was completed. An additional table was added to the final report that showed total income from primary job by employer, region and board certification. Publication of the data was discussed. The completed survey would be included in a mailing with the ACLAM Newsletter.
The 2005 ACLAM/ASLA economic survey was sent to all members. In addition to e-mail reminders, follow-up reminder postcards were sent to encourage maximum participation.

ACLAM and AVMA 2000-2007

In 2001, the ABVS questioned again the waiting period required for candidates who had completed 2 and 3 year training programs before they were eligible to sit for the exam. ACLAM did not have any specific requirements that must be fulfilled during this time (two years and one year respectively). Those completing 4 year training programs did not have a waiting period as they were eligible immediately to sit for the certifying examination. It was decided to respond to the ABVS that ACLAM would phase out the experience requirement. Also included would be the requirement that, at the time of application, a candidate applying through the training program route must have documented evidence that he or she had completed the training program. This change would be phased in over a 5 year period so as not to affect current candidates.

Effective in 2003, candidates who had completed a training program would not be required to have up to 2 years experience post training. The ABVS appreciated ACLAM's response to their concerns regarding the perceived 2 year waiting period. They also suggested that ACLAM develop a specific appeal process for candidates who failed the examination, but the ABVS did not require such an appeal response at this time. The COC was asked to review the appeals process for application to individuals who did not pass the certifying examination.

The draft report of the AVMA Euthanasia Panel stated that euthanasia by carbon dioxide was still acceptable, but the gas must come from the cylinder and not dry ice. There were comments as well about ether and methoxyflurane being unacceptable. Induction was too long with methoxyflurane, and ether was explosive. Dr. B Taylor Bennett reported that the draft report was put on a website where it was considered a confidential document. The AVMA House of Delegates questioned the short response time given for comments to the report.

In 2002, Dr. William Britz updated the BOD about the ABVS and its relationship with the AVMA. The ABVS was now well recognized by the AVMA and was receiving additional funds that would permit it to have a 3 day meeting in 2003. The ACLAM President and Executive Director were invited to attend. An ABVS requirement that all candidates be given their examination results not later than 45 days after taking the certifying examination did not affect ACLAM, but a statement to this effect was placed in the Policy and Procedure Manual. There was low AVMA membership in the specialties, especially among the younger members. Dr. Britz asked that Diplomates support the AVMA because of their increased support of veterinary specialties. All veterinary specialties were under the umbrella of the AVMA.

It was reiterated that there should be an appeals process for both credentialing and examination of candidates. The documents distributed to candidates should be checked to make sure they indicate clearly how to initiate the credentials or examination appeal. The ABVS stated that the appeals body reviewing appeals in ACLAM should be distinct from the Executive Committee, BOD or examination or credentialing process. The BOD had decided to use the Certification Oversight Committee as this independent body with the ABVS representative being an ad hoc member. The ABVS also wanted some kind of mentoring for those desiring credentialing via the experience route.
In 2003 the ABVS changed the wording regarding mentoring from "shall" to "may." It was unclear if the mentoring should be for the entire 6 years of the experience route, or only 2 years as in the training program scenario. Requirements and characteristics of the mentor were reviewed, as were the requirements of the person being mentored. All this would be done with the proviso that if one were mentored, there would be no guarantee of passing the examination. Volunteers were requested as mentors.

In the same year, Drs. B Taylor Bennett and Susan Stein (ASLAP AVMA Delegates) presented a resolution to the AVMA House of Delegates calling on the AVMA to help prevent the imposition of needless regulatory burdens that have no clear benefit for animal care. With a roll call vote, the House of Delegates approved the resolution even though the AVMA Executive Board and House Advisory Committee had both recommended disapproval.

Also in 2003, By-Laws changes were required to eliminate the experience requirement for candidates applying via the training program route, and to designate the Certification Oversight Committee as the entity to which a candidate could appeal on credentialing or examination results. Both changes were passed on a vote by the membership 292 to 3. The changes would take effect in 2004.

Dr. Lynn Anderson took the position as ACLAM representative on the ABVS starting after the AVMA meeting in July of 2004. Dr. William Britz was stepping down.

In 2005, ACLAM was notified that it had received continued recognition as a specialty organization by the AVMA for the next 5 years.

The AVMA held a meeting on the subject of minor use, minor species (MUMS) to encourage development of new animal drugs for minor species, and for minor uses in major species. The FDA was to set up an Office for Minor Use and Minor Species. The AVMA focused on indexing, which was the legal marketing of animal drugs that were unable to demonstrate safety and effectiveness sufficient to get regular FDA approval. There would be expert panels involved to evaluate early, non-food life stages of food producing minor species such as rabbits.

At the ABVS annual meeting in 2006, Dr. Lynn Anderson represented ACLAM. Two items of interest at the meeting were liability insurance for the BOD and reporting conflict of interest disclaimers. It was decided to share information with ABVS on the cost of ACLAM’s insurance for its BOD members, and how ACLAM handled conflict of interest.

The AVMA Animal Welfare Advisory Committee would meet twice before it was disbanded. The objective was to formulate overarching guidelines and principles that would apply to the entire AVMA membership. These guiding principles would be used by the Animal Welfare Division in the AVMA and the Animal Welfare Committee to develop positions within the AVMA, to respond to questions, and to write white papers. Some parts of the profession were having trouble with refinement. Refinement should apply to all use of animals as should reduction of the numbers of animals used. Guidelines from the Committee had been drafted by late 2006. These guidelines were sent to the AVMA Executive Board which could adopt them unchanged, modify them or reject them.

Also, in 2006, the ACLAM/AVMA Relations committee was charged to decide how best to
spend the $28,000 gift from Glaxo Smith Kline to ACLAM, which was to be dedicated to fostering better relations with ACLAM and the AVMA. Their action plan included: sending the President and President-Elect to the AVMA Leadership Conference for 5 years; funding a speaker to the AVMA Leadership Conference for 5 years; funding a private practitioner or veterinary student to attend the AVMA meeting for one year; funding an AVMA representative to attend the ACLAM Forum for 2 years; contributing once to the AVMA Fellowship program; and providing campaign funds to ACLAM Diplomates running for AVMA Council position for 3 years. All items in the plan were approved by the BOD.

The ABVS invited three ACLAM Diplomates to attend its Job Analysis Workshop.

**ACLAM and AALAS 2000-2007**

In 2001, it was suggested that a letter be written to AALAS requesting that they waive the registration fee for AALAS members invited to speak in the ACLAM/ASLAP sponsored programs. Currently, the fee was waived only for non-AALAS members. After some revision, the letter was endorsed by several other professional associations. If the effort were not successful, AALAS would be asked to consider a discounted one-day registration.

In 2002, AALAS responded that according to their current policy, the Program Committee could request financial support for speakers in its budget.

**ACLAM and AAALAC 2000-2007**

ACLAM continued to maintain a representative to AAALAC throughout this period.

**Legislation and Public Relations 2000-2007**

Dr. Christian Newcomer presented at the ILAR meeting in 2000 on pain and distress, as did Dr. B Taylor Bennett, who was on the AVMA Euthanasia Panel. The proceedings would be published by ILAR. The USDA was also present and listening.

In the same year, ACLAM's statement on the 3Rs (reduction, refinement and replacement) was finalized. The statement and background information was placed in the Newsletter and on the website.

Also in 2000, the USDA Interface Committee presented three actions for BOD approval. It was suggested that a comment should be prepared to the USDA in response to its proposed definitions for reporting of Pain and Distress. Any official comment would be distributed to the ACLAM membership and scientific and professional groups with encouragement for individuals to submit comments to the USDA. A draft comment was approved with minor modifications that supported the adoption of the 1992 NRC/ILAR Pain and Distress Report. The BOD decided that the Public Policy Committee and the USDA Interface Committee as well as a subcommittee of the BOD should answer any specific questions that the USDA asked. The USDA Interface Committee would draft a letter on the USDA coverage of rats, mice and birds.

The National Association for Biomedical Research (NABR), the Federation of American
Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB) and other members of the scientific community were forming a coalition to address the incorporation of rats, mice and birds into the USDA inspection standards. These organizations believed that if standards were adopted for rats, mice and birds, they should make sense and not create more documentation requirements. The BOD believed that it should be part of a coalition of these organizations. Later that year a letter by Drs. Katherine Bayne and Michael Kastello was written in response to the pain and distress issue, sent to the USDA, and placed on the ACLAM website.

Comments on the draft document "Methods and Welfare Considerations in Behavior Research in Animals" by Adrian Morrison were reviewed by Drs. Helen Diggs and Peggy Danneman. There was no revised document as yet. The Society for Neuroscience was updating its document and ACLAM would review it. Dr. Danneman, also a member of the Society for Neuroscience, would monitor progress of updating.

FASEB had proposed a closer cooperation with ACLAM by inviting ACLAM representation on its Science Policy Committee. Dr. J. R. Haywood of FASEB spoke to the BOD about the FASEB workshop on pain and distress, which was co-chaired by Drs. Kastello and Haywood. He pointed out that FASEB and ACLAM had common challenges and opportunities to cooperate, especially on regulatory issues. A coalition of groups was needed to develop a common strategy and action plan to educate leaders of all scientific organizations. It was suggested that a FASEB ad hoc member be placed on the ACLAM committee that dealt with regulatory issues or position statements.

In early 2001, the BOD asked the Public Policy Committee to revise its statement on Pain and Distress. The BOD suggested that the role of professional judgment in clinical assessment should be inserted as to continuation or discontinuation of analgesia programs.

In the same year, it was decided that the Public Policy and USDA Interface Committees would be combined into the Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee. It would contain the ACLAM, FASEB and AAALAC representatives as ex officio members. Non-Diplomates could be invited to serve on this committee. Those representatives could be from FASEB, OLAW (Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare), USDA, neuroscience, the CDC (Centers for Disease Control), or the Fish and Wildlife Service, to name a few. The chair of the committee should be someone who was very aware of regulatory issues and could be a more senior member of the College.

The College established an NIH initiative as there were many more opportunities for laboratory animal veterinarians then there were trained specialists. A conference call was held about strategies for increasing funding for training of laboratory animal veterinarians by the NIH. Some NIH funded positions for research training for veterinarians on training grants were unfilled.

The BOD approved $5,000 to help fund the ILAR veterinary manpower study.

In late 2001, the pain and distress statement was approved. It was placed on the website and sent for information to groups such as FASEB, AALAS, AVMA, ILAR, ASLAP, USDA, OLAW, AAALAC and others.
In late 2001, Dr. Michael Kastello reported on his attendance at a USDA animal care meeting, which included representatives from various organizations from the animal care and use regulated community. The USDA budget had increased over the last few years, and the number of inspectors had increased to 81. The goal was to maximize the number of no violation inspections, and to increase the quantity and quality of inspections. Inspections would be reported online, 2 to 4 weeks after the inspection. The appeals process had not been established. The annual report form would also be available online. ACLAM was recognized for helping with training inspectors.

Dr. Kastello reported also that members of Congress were asked to extend the moratorium on USDA funding to write regulations for rats, mice and birds. This would allow more time for the regulated community to address issues of regulatory burden. Dr. Kastello suggested that the regulated community develop and recommend regulations to the USDA that would minimize regulatory burden and preserve the veterinarian’s ability to use professional judgment. The Committee would also work with Dr. Taylor Bennett (ASLAP) and the AVMA on this issue. A letter was sent to the American Physiological Society to thank them for including ACLAM in the Congressional visits.

The National Institute of Mental Health requested ACLAM’s endorsement of “Methods and Welfare Considerations in Behavioral Research.” Although many ACLAM Diplomates authored sections of this authoritative report, the request was respectfully denied as ACLAM did not officially endorse such documents.

In 2002, the Governmental and Regulatory Affairs Committee (GRAC) was made a standing committee.

After incorporating comments from selected experts and the membership, the revised statement on Rodent Surgery was approved by the BOD.

In the same year, the BOD approved the concept of the development of “Reference Documents”. Members and leaders would suggest the topics. The object was to develop a detailed document on a specific topic that could be used as a working reference by veterinarians, IACUC’s, Institutional Officials and so forth. Working groups would be composed of five Diplomates, and be given 6 months to compose a 20 page document including references. The first two topics were euthanasia of poikilotherms (especially zebra fish and xenopus), and euthanasia of rats and mice including neonates. These reference documents were intended to elaborate further on the AVMA Euthanasia Panel report. In 2003, it was admitted that information on carbon dioxide euthanasia was in such flux that it was difficult to summarize at the present time. The Committee suggested that it continue to collect data and summarize at a later date. The BOD felt it would be permissible to publish the report in sections. The BOD gave the GRAC approval to hold a 2 day meeting to develop position statements on oversight mechanisms for the use of animals in research, and the value and necessity of the use of animals in research and threats posed to individuals and institutions by anti-research animal activists.

ACLAM had supported revision of the ILAR report Recognition and Alleviation of Pain and Distress in Laboratory Animals. However, in 2003, the GRAC requested the BOD to re-review its support of the ILAR revision. The Committee was divided in its opinion. The discussion centered around the fact that the AVMA was going to examine the same subject and that the ILAR panel probably would have to incorporate a broad range of views and opinions. ACLAM
also planned to write a paper on the same subject. The BOD decided to table the request to support ILAR to revise its report on pain and distress.

In 2004, the Committee reported that the AVMA document might take as much of as 3 years to produce, and would have various categories of expertise incorporated. Fourteen people had been proposed to compose a task force to write the AVMA document on pain and distress. Each specialty group, such as ACLAM, would develop its own guidelines as they were responsible within their own fields. The guidelines would then be brought to the task force and overarching recommendations would be made to tie the document together referencing each specific group’s document. A USDA Veterinary Medical Officer was proposed to serve as an ex officio member on the task force. The plan was currently under review by the AVMA Executive Board. Although the ILAR proposal required more development before ACLAM committed funds, it was decided to encourage ILAR to proceed with revision of the 1992 report Recognition and Alleviation of Pain and Distress in Laboratory Animals, and that ACLAM would like to participate.

By 2003, the development of a plan to notify ACLAM members rapidly was complete. This was an e-mail notification system run through the webmaster. The GRAC recommended the appointment of an ad hoc committee to develop an ACLAM standard on medical records in response to the USDA suggesting stringent requirements on medical records. It was decided to form the committee with volunteers requested over a mass ACLAM e-mail. The resulting standards would also state when medical records were not required.

Also in 2003, the BOD appointed a Task Force to develop a position statement on Recommendations on Pain Assessment and Pain Management in Experimental Animals. This would be considered a "Reference Document" and would be 20 pages long. The document would contain best practices to be used as guidelines. It was decided that the document should be more narrow in focus (rodents and rabbits) than was presented originally, and should be developed by species.

It was approved that the Career Pathways Committee would remain an ad hoc, nine-member committee with the staggered 3 year term structure.

In 2003, the Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee developed a mechanism to track legislative and regulatory issues through action and watch lists, and to develop position papers and responses for the College. An e-mail list was developed to contact Diplomates for their input on issues requiring rapid responses. Some of the issues that had been handled were: a letter to the Department of Transportation about airline/pet issues; a position paper on the use of animals in research; comparing foreign country oversight systems on a matrix; attending meetings with the USDA about its pending regulation on animal medical records and other items; and working with the IATA (International Air Transport Association) about regulating transportation of laboratory animals.

In the same year, the Career Pathways Committee reviewed its goal of outreach to veterinary students and practitioners interested in laboratory animal medicine as a career. Nine summer externship programs were awarded. Veterinary students were contacted through the student chapter of the AVMA. A speaker pool was developed and resources, including a PowerPoint presentation and fact sheet about laboratory animal medicine, were available for speaker use. Practicing veterinarians were contacted through a display at the Western States Veterinary Conference and the AVMA meeting. Veterinary leadership was contacted and updated through
The Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC). The Jules Cass Clerkship in laboratory animal medicine was set up at The Ohio State University.

The GRAC submitted a position statement on animal experimentation, which was approved with minor changes by the BOD. The final version would appear in the Newsletter and on the website. Some additional methods of marketing the position statements were suggested: Contemporary Topics, Lab Animal and Journal of the AVMA (JAVMA). It was suggested that a mechanism for press release and a list of recipients should be developed by the Committee. It was felt that the best approach would be to publish each statement in the JAVMA without the background section included. There would be a reference to the ACLAM website for additional information. A suggestion to have the AVMA adopt each statement was dismissed as too complicated, since this statement would have to go through and be presented by ASLAP, as it was the organization within the AVMA that represents laboratory animal practitioners. If the Animal Welfare Committee adopted the statement it would have to go through the AVMA Executive Board which could accept it as written, but could also modify or reject the statement. The statement could be put on the AAALAC website and published in the American Journal of Veterinary Research.

A white paper was being developed on oversight mechanisms for animal care and use, looking at the differences between USDA, NIH and how this compares with other countries.

In the same year, Dr. Howard Rush (comparative medicine representative to the Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges) reported on its recent activities. The mission of the AAVMC was to coordinate the affairs of the 27 US veterinary medical colleges, four Canadian Veterinary Medical Colleges, Departments of Veterinary Science and Comparative Medicine, animal medical centers and two international veterinary schools. Comparative Medicine was the only specialty group represented on the AAVMC. Veterinary colleges were having a difficult time recruiting students into areas other than private practice. There was a need to change veterinary education to interest more people in public practice, and the selection of veterinary students interested in areas other than private practice. Numerous white papers had highlighted these shortcomings. The AAVMC was seeking more federal funding for veterinary colleges to train students in veterinary public practice.

In 2004, Dr Rush reported that congressional sponsors were being sought for funding to increase the size of classes in veterinary schools with emphasis on interest in public practice. It had also been requested that the laboratory animal questions on the national Certifying Examination be re-examined and that the AVMA collect demographics on public practitioners. Another project of the Association was the development of a model curriculum on laboratory animals for use at veterinary colleges with input from both ACLAM and ASLAP. The Association would hold a symposium in 2006 to examine the use of animals, and alternatives to animals, in veterinary medical education.

In the same year, the ACLAM statement on medical records in response to the USDA proposed requirements on medical records was reviewed by the BOD. The BOD added some comments, such as requirements for record-keeping for behavioral problems, documenting exercise exemptions for dogs, tracking IACUC exceptions and medical record availability to internal and external audiences. The revised draft document was published in the Newsletter for comment by the membership, and re-submitted to the BOD for approval. The final document "American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine Public Statement: Medical Records for Animals Used in Research, Teaching and Testing" was approved by the BOD and forwarded to the Publications
Committee for final formatting and publication. When published, it would be made available to the USDA, AVMA, IACUCs and other interested groups.

The Chair of the Publications Committee was made an ex officio member of all task forces formed to write statements so that the Publications Committee could be involved early and in the entire process.

In the same year, it was reported that the document on rodent euthanasia would contain three sections: Euthanasia of fetal and neonatal rodents, euthanasia of rodents using carbon dioxide, and the influence of euthanasia technique on scientific investigation. These would expand on the report of the AVMA panel on euthanasia. The Committee had reviewed the literature and best practices on the first and last issues. As carbon dioxide euthanasia was a Forum topic, the task force would wait until after the Forum to expand this section. In addition, a document was being developed on surgical standards by the Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee. Topics would include which individuals actually performed the surgery. It was suggested that assistance from the Academy of Surgical Research be sought. The BOD also encouraged the Committee to pursue their endeavors to establish a formal alliance between other organizations and ACLAM.

In response to the retirement of Nelson Garnett at OLAW, the Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee wrote a letter in support of placing a veterinarian in the position. The effort was coordinated with both ASLAP and the AVMA.

Also in 2004, the Career Pathways Committee (CPC) received 36 applications for externships and made 16 awards. The Committee enhanced the visibility of the profession to veterinary students by visiting the student AVMA meeting, nine veterinary schools, four Canadian veterinary schools, and the Merck-Merial Symposium with the ASLAP veterinary school liaisons. It was decided that the Careers Pathways Committee in association with ASLAP should develop and coordinate the AAVMC request to produce a model laboratory animal medicine curriculum for veterinary schools.

In 2005, the CPC had awarded 14 individuals $1000 each to attend a summer training and experience program. Follow-up metrics were planned to see if exposure to laboratory animal medicine at meetings was beneficial.

In the same year, it was decided that the euthanasia report would not be sent to the College at large for comments because it had been in progress for so long, and the report needed to be published recognizing that there may be additional new information. The Publications Committee published the report. It was sent to the standing list of ACLAM professional organization contacts such as AAALAC, ILAR and FASEB, and placed on the ACLAM website.

Dr. William White discussed an opportunity for ACLAM to work with the IATA in developing training materials. It was so approved by the Board with the proviso that the Publications Committee would be involved.

It was noted also that ACLAM's position statements/reports were now listed as a link on the International Veterinary Information Services (IVIS) website.

In the same year, the NABR was taking the lead to keep rats, mice, and birds out of the Farm Bill. ACLAM was asked to support the effort. It was decided to charge the Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee with the development of a questionnaire to acquire data on any
burden that the rats, mice, and birds addition might mandate and to determine if NABR had data on the subject. It was decided also to encourage the membership to send written opinions to the BOD on the inclusion of rats, mice and birds in the Farm Bill and to give their rationale as to pro or con. The BOD would read these and formulate a policy on how to proceed. ACLAM also sent a letter to the USDA on proposed regulations of ferrets.

As there was a great deal of confusion about the purpose of the Public Relations Committee and its lack of direction, the Committee was disbanded in 2005.

In 2006, the GRAC recommended that ACLAM join the Animal Enterprise Protection Coalition that was established by the NABR to support legislation and public policy and helped to protect animal enterprises. In addition, the Committee recommended that the BOD notify Diplomates of pending legislation and encourage them to write letters to members of Congress. Discussion ensued, and being assured by the President that this did not jeopardize the tax exempt status of ACLAM, the BOD passed the recommendations as written.

In the same year, because of budget limitations, the CPC cut the amount awarded to fund each externship. Twenty-one applications were received and funded. Decreasing the amount awarded to each recipient to $800 was the only way to fund all the awardees and still remain within the budget. The Committee presented a model Laboratory Animal Medicine curriculum, a list of resources, and assessment metrics for North American Veterinary Schools to introduce laboratory animal medicine to veterinary students. The curriculum would be forwarded to the AAVMC for their comments. Afterwards, it would be sent to the AVMA for endorsement, then onto veterinary schools for implementation. The Committee considered publishing the curriculum in the Journal of Veterinary Medical Education. Core lectures could be placed on the ACLAM website that would be combined with sets of images so presentations could be customized. A list of texts, journals and diseases could be posted as well. The BOD approved the Committee's actions to pursue development of the curriculum with the AAVMC and AVMA.

Later that year ACLAM responded to a proposed rule of the USDA that non-nonhuman primates and other animals moved between cages should be moved using a transfer cage for safety reasons.

The “Medical Records Statement” was approved for publication in 2007.

ACLAM in conjunction with the IATA developed an electronic publication on air transportation of rats and mice. Drs. Leslie Colby and Sonja Chou prepared the publication. It was submitted to the IATA for final review and distribution.

Also in 2007, a link to AVMA advocacy was added to the ACLAM website. It was decided to support the revision of the ILAR guide with a $5,000 donation from the 2007 budget, provided that there would be no restriction on any ACLAM Diplomates participating in the revision process. A letter to the USDA was sent stating that ACLAM endorses NABR’s position on the revision of the USDA Policy Manual.

**ACLAM International Activities 2000-2007**

In 2001, the International Committee made four recommendations to the BOD that were approved. The first was the establishment of a joint International Committee with ASLAP. The
second was to establish formal liaison links with other laboratory animal medicine organizations, the European and Japanese Colleges of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ECLAM/JCLAM), the European Society of Laboratory Animal Medicine, the Japanese Association of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ESLAM/JALAS) and ICLAS. Thirdly, Academic Press should be approached about the translation of ACLAM texts into various languages other than English. And finally ACLAM should endorse and encourage ACLAM training programs to offer short term, 1 to 3 month low-cost training exchanges. The development of an international formulary in conjunction with ECLAM and JCLAM was discussed. This endeavor would have to be coordinated with ACLAM Publications which would have oversight. The authors had agreed to the idea. The BOD had no objection, but would like to see US and international drugs listed and indexed separately.

In 2002, it was reported that the latest version of the International Committee guidelines raised some conflicts. As it was a joint committee with ASLAP, the status of the BOD liaison was suspected of trying to add an additional ACLAM person to the evenly divided committee. It was clarified that the BOD Committee Liaison was just that, and not a voting member of the Committee. It was decided that the vice chair requested by ACLAM for continuity matters would be an informal appointment because ASLAP did not see the need for a vice chair. Although ad hoc committee members were appointed to ACLAM committees at the request of the Chairperson, ASLAP committees did not have such members. The solutions to these conflicts between the two organizations would be clarified in the final version of the Committee Procedures Document. It was felt that the mutual benefits outweighed the struggle to coordinate the effort, so every attempt would be made to resolve individual organization issues.

In 2003, it was uncertain if ASLAP would reappoint its International Committee. After much discussion with ASLAP it was recommended that ACLAM have an international committee with a liaison to ASLAP. There was difficulty getting the combined committee coordinated and their procedures cleared through two Boards of Directors. ASLAP decided to suspend its committee with the possibility of bringing it back at a later time. ASLAP would appoint a liaison to the ACLAM committee. It was approved therefore to have an ad hoc independent ACLAM international committee with a liaison to ASLAP. The arrangement would be reevaluated in 2004.

In 2004, Dr. Timothy Morris, President of the European College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ECLAM), and Anne-Dominique Degryse, President of the European Society of Laboratory Animal Veterinarians, were guests of the ACLAM Board, where they reported on the history of the two European organizations and the agendas of each. The issues emphasized in Europe were presented. An international contact list, limited to Diplomates and maintained by AAALAC international, was developed. The list would give laboratory animal veterinarians around the world specific contacts in various countries for questions dealing with animals. The BOD approved a Diplomate registration rate at the Forum for any Diplomates of any College of Laboratory Animal Medicine.

An international formulary was published.

In 2005, Dr. William White reported that the College was in the process of establishing a joint affiliation with JCLAM and ECLAM for an International Association of Laboratory Animal Veterinarians to participate with global regulating bodies that could make rules affecting everyone.
The International Committee had developed an "Ask the Lab Animal Vet" website. It had not had much use so it was decided to abandon the website. The International Committee was dismantled since international focus would be enhanced in the College through other activities.

In 2006, representatives from JCLAM, ECLAM and ACLAM met by teleconference and discussed a draft constitution and By-Laws to govern the International Association of Colleges of Laboratory Animal Medicine (IACLAM). Each organization’s Board of Directors would meet to decide whether or not to adopt the document. The BOD agreed that ACLAM would accept the Constitution and By-Laws of the Association. It was decided that ACLAM would pay its $500 membership to the Association and $150 for the IACLAM to become a member of the World Veterinary Association. Korea had also formed the Korean College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (KCLAM), which would be invited to join IACLAM. Representatives from the various organizations would receive guidance and direction from their respective organizations.

In 2007, Dr. Steven Leary sent out a short ACLAM demographic survey. The information was needed because ACLAM's growing international relationships required experts be named for various topics. Any information collected in the survey would aid in the selection of the proper personnel.

In the same year Dr. Rafael González from Mexico City briefed the BOD on the activities of the Mexican College of Laboratory Animal Medicine in its efforts to organize into a formal group. The BOD told Dr. González that any of ACLAM's documents in the public domain such as the Constitution and By-Laws were available for their use. Later that year, the Mexican College of Laboratory Animal Medicine invited Dr. Balk to speak at its biannual meeting in Mexico. He presented facts on how ACLAM was formed and how it operated. ACLAM was represented also at the annual meeting of the Mexican Association of Laboratory Animal Medicine.


Finances

In 2000, the fee charged for the certifying examination was reviewed. After much discussion, including comparisons of the total cost for the Examination Committee and certifying examination fees charged by other AVMA specialty groups, the BOD decided to increase the fee from the current $325 to $550. There would be a refund of $400 to those who were not credentialed. Those candidates currently in the credentialed pipeline would be grandfathered at the current price. The new prices would take effect with the credentialing process for the 2002 examination. Those candidates who did not pass both parts of the examination, and must repeat one or both parts, would be charged $400 instead of the current $250. When one passed both parts of the examination and was approved by the BOD as a new Diplomate, they would be charged $125 starting with the July 2001 examination. This charge covered the cost of the pin, plaque and Directory. It would replace the current fee of $75. The fees could be paid by credit card effective with the 2002 exam cycle.

There was a discussion of an increase in the dues for the college, which was $125 with $25 waived if paid before March 1. The College was withdrawing $60,000-$80,000 per year from the reserve funds to balance the operating budget. An increase in dues would result in a balanced budget for the College. It was approved to phase in a dues increase with the following schedule: the dues would be $175 with a $25 late fee effective in January 2002. In 2003, the dues would
increase to $250 with a late fee of $50 if not paid by March 1. There would be no more early payment discount. However, following the meeting, a review of other specialty organizations’ dues structure showed that the intended increase would make ACLAM dues much higher than similar organizations. By an e-mail vote in February of 2001, the BOD approved an increase in the dues to $150 in 2002, and $200 in 2003. There would be an additional charge of $25 if paid late in 2002 and $50 if paid late in 2003.

The BOD decided to continue to pay for travel expenses to the ACLAM Forum BOD meeting with a limit of $800 for each BOD member, if they had attended both the AVMA and AALAS BOD meetings preceding the Forum BOD meeting. Another change approved was that officers and BOD members would now have to pay the Forum registration fee where previously they had not been charged for attending the Forum. This would begin with the 2002 Forum.

It was decided to charge more for the College’s mailing labels. Educational and not-for-profit organizations would be charged $500 for each set and commercial organizations and professional recruiters would be charged $1000.

It was decided also to charge more for position advertisements in the Newsletter and on the website. There would be no fee charged for educational meetings or training opportunity advertisements. Nonprofit organizations would be charged $250 for each ad and for-profit organizations would be charged $500. The ads would be placed both in the Newsletter and on the website. They would remain on the website for three months.

In 2001, the Financial Oversight Committee was disbanded. The Secretary/Treasurer and Executive Director would meet with a financial advisor who consults for other nonprofits to develop investment strategies for ACLAM and the Foundation. They also performed an audit of the ACLAM accounts and records held at the Executive Director's office. Everything was found to be in order.

Discussions with the investment advisor raised some questions. These included the amount of risk that ACLAM was willing to accept; whether the investments should be income or growth oriented; the amount of day-to-day involvement by the BOD or representatives; and if investment in any companies or industries would be unacceptable. The BOD directed the Secretary/Treasurer and the Executive Director to ask the advisor for different investment scenarios.

The Career Pathways Committee asked for an additional $14,000 to cover the costs of a core group of Diplomates to speak to veterinary students about careers in laboratory animal medicine. The Committee would develop a standard presentation and reach out to all veterinary schools by the 2002 AALAS meeting. In addition, the CPC requested $10,000 to fund summer internships or externships for veterinary students under the guidance of a Diplomate who would apply for the funds. The Committee also requested $5,600 to place two ads in the Journal of the AVMA to promote laboratory animal medicine to practitioners. The BOD suggested placing ads in DVM Magazine instead and reduced the advertising cost to $1,500. The net increase to the Career Pathways budget was $25,500, for a total of $33,100. Sources of income to fund these additional expenses, other than withdrawing from ACLAM investments, were explored. It was decided to increase registration fees for the Forum.

In 2002, the ACLAM Program Services Fund investment account was opened with the financial advisor. Present accounts were moved into the new accounts. Certificates of deposit were moved
as they matured. Over the past few years the amount transferred from the Program Services Fund was growing. ACLAM was actually drawing on principle not just the interest of the fund. The only way to draw less funds would be to decrease spending or increase income. The question was raised as to whether ACLAM needed four BOD meetings a year, and did the Foundation continue to need funding from the BOD. New sources of income were expected from text royalties.

The BOD established an Investment Committee to work with the advisor on investment decisions. The decisions would include the ACLAM Foundation as well as the Program Services Fund. The Investment Committee would formulate a strategy to implement methods to reach the goal of 3 to 5 times the annual operating budget. The Committee vote must be unanimous among the three members or the question would be brought before the BOD. The committee would consist of the President, Secretary-Treasurer, and Executive Director, with the President-Elect as an ad hoc member.

It was approved that the Program Service Fund should be used to fund new initiatives; develop and update educational materials such as books and audiovisual media; and support nonrecurring expenses. Selected equities should have proven records, favorable prospects and sound financial positions.” The approved Policy was placed into the Policy and Procedure Manual. The status of ACLAM’s accounts could be tracked on the advisor’s website. Paperwork for opening the investment account for the Foundation was signed.

Following discussions with the financial advisor, it was decided that assets would be allocated as 60% equities, 30% fixed income and 10% cash. Investments would be re-examined every year. The objective was to conserve principle over time, and add to it by having a balanced budget and not draw out more than 5% from the ACLAM Program Services Fund. The advisor would provide quarterly reports to the BOD.

It was decided to form an ad hoc committee to develop ideas to raise funds for the Program Services Fund.

In 2003, it was decided that historical and year-to-year financial data would be presented at every BOD meeting.

After some discussion, the BOD decided that gifts of stock to ACLAM or the Foundation would be evaluated on an individual basis as to whether they would be kept for dividends and growth, or sold, and the cash invested otherwise. The decision would be made by the Finance Committee based on advice from the financial advisor.

In October 2003, the Secretary-Treasurer and Executive Director audited the files and accounts, and everything was found to be in order. However, the 2003 budget called for withdrawing $17,000 from the Program Services Fund. The amount was down from previous years, but the fund was still losing principle because of the withdrawals. Expenses were still more than income from all sources. The 2004 budget called for withdrawal of $47,000.

The year 2005 included expenses of several critical initiatives, and the upcoming year would have several significant expenses including the examination consultant and the strategic plan session. It was suggested that the BOD should reevaluate the fees charged for credentialing and the examination. Because of the ability of the Treasurer and Executive Director to review expenses and investments electronically on at least a monthly basis, it was decided that the
annual audit trip was an unnecessary expense to the college. However, the accountant advised that in the state of New Hampshire, where ACLAM was registered as a nonprofit, a new law required all organizations with a net worth of more than $500,000 to be audited each year.

It was suggested that dues be raised to match the dues of the AVMA ($250). An increase in dues including future increases was approved. This would include a sliding scale of financial penalties for the late payment of dues depending on the payment date. Based on information from other veterinary specialty organizations as to their examination fee structure, it was approved to charge $200 for credentialing (nonrefundable), $500 for the examination with no refund, and $500 each year for reapplying for the second and third attempt to pass the examination after being credentialed. The fees became effective for the 2007 examination.

By 2006, ACLAM was well within its budget. The College had a net worth of almost $1.5 million with approximately $600,000 in investments for ACLAM at a 5% return, and another $30,000 available to cover any budget shortfall. There was discussion on how the BOD would advise the College on the health of ACLAM's finances in light of the recent dues increase and continuing discussion about budget challenges. Part of the issue was the timing of income versus expenditures, and the fact that some dues payments arrived in December, which added revenue to the College in the 12th month, whereas the preceding 11 months may have appeared to have shortfalls. It was suggested that the timing of mailing dues notices be reconsidered in light of the operational year of the college.

Dr. Margaret Landi had arranged for Glaxo Smith Kline to donate funds to ACLAM and the Foundation with certain stipulations placed on the funds. To date, no additional information on the allocation of the funds was available. Of the $63,000 donated, about $25,000 would go to the Foundation for funding a research grant. An RFP on the effect of rodent density and caging was released, and the submitted projects were evaluated. When funded, proper credit would be given to the donor. The ACLAM Forum would receive $10,000, and $28,000 was to be used to strengthen ACLAM's ties with the AVMA. An ad hoc committee consisting of people who were well known to the AVMA would brainstorm the idea and report back to the BOD.

It was decided to donate $1000 to ILAR toward the publication of the March 2007 issue of the ILAR Journal. The issue entitled "Education and Training for Laboratory Animal Care and Use Programs" included several articles from the 2006 Forum.

In 2007, royalties received from Elsevier were $48,551. Investments were $800,000 for ACLAM at a 5% return, with another $40,000 available to cover any budget shortfall. With approximately $400,000 for the Foundation, there were over $1.2 million in the professionally managed funds with Smith Barney.

In late 2007, ACLAM had a value of $924,503 while the Foundation was worth $440,384.

**Strategic Plan**

A survey was mailed to all Diplomates in 2000. The information received would be used by the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) to revise the strategic plan. A planning meeting was scheduled with a facilitator. Sixty one percent of the surveys were completed and returned. Most Diplomates were satisfied with ACLAM. Suggestions from Diplomates included enhancing opportunities for volunteering, the College's presence to the scientific world and public and
better communication with members.

The Research and Academics Task Force suggested that the hiring of a professional and permanent liaison to advance the cause of basic research to other organizations be considered by the SPC.

A new mission statement was formulated. It read: “the American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ACLAM) advances the humane care and responsible use of laboratory animals through certification of veterinary specialists, professional development, education and research.” From that mission statement, four goals were developed: ACLAM would be the laboratory animal veterinary specialist’s primary resource for continuing education and professional development. ACLAM certification would be recognized universally for its excellence and value. ACLAM would be a recognized source of information on the responsible use of laboratory animals and the authority on their veterinary care. ACLAM would be an advocate for promoting and supporting research relevant to laboratory animal science and medicine. Each of the goals was then broken down into strategies and milestones by which the goals could be measured.

In 2001 it was decided that the SPC would continue. It would report to the BOD three times year (at the Forum, AVMA and AALAS) on progress in implementing the Strategic Plan. It would also facilitate a new plan when necessary (Approximately every 5 years). It would define BOD liaison roles, standardize forms and formats for reports, and explain the roles of adjuncts on committees.

The BOD selected five strategies from the strategic plan to implement in the coming year.
1) Develop outreach programs for veterinary school students.
2) Enhance the website to become the primary source of knowledge, information and communication within the College.
3) Improve interactions with national and worldwide veterinary and scientific groups and governmental regulatory agencies.
4) Develop a process to update ACLAM’s publications to include all types of media.
5) Develop a document that identified areas requiring further research (e.g., biology, behavior, diseases, the need for new animal models and so forth.). This last strategy would be tasked to the Research and Academics Committee.

It was clarified that the SPC was to monitor the progress made against the Strategic Plan, suggest changes to the plan and make a recommendation to the BOD when another plan was needed. The Committee would be expanded when a new plan was being developed. It was decided that the Committee would report to the BOD twice a year. The committee would prepare a written progress report on the comparison of the selected goals of strategic plan and how well they were met over the past 2 years. This report would be placed in the Newsletter.

In 2004, ACLAM had made sufficient progress on the current strategic plan, and formulation of a new plan was approved. The main issues of globalization of laboratory animal medicine and science and the pipeline issue would be included in the new plan.

In 2005, the SPC held a one-day meeting with the BOD and a facilitator, Marcia Holston. Members of the Committee represented various demographics of the College. Six directions were identified: to increase the number of veterinarians entering the specialty of laboratory animal medicine; to review and implement the recommendations of the "Report on the Certifying
Examination and Examination Process” from the Castle Worldwide Inc.; to offer exam
preparation resources and enhanced educational resources branded by ACLAM; to standardize
the quality/content of training programs and ensure that the programs were grounded in the Role
Delineation Document; to establish and promote practice standards for the animal research
environment; and to maintain current and expand future Foundation activities. Prime movers
identified in the plan were the following committees: Examination, Examination Review,
Certification Oversight, Continuing Education, Camp ACLAM, Mentoring, Publications,
Training Program Oversight, and Foundation as well as the Executive Director and the
Webmaster. These committees and individuals would inform the BOD about methods of
implementation for the plan.

In 2007, the SPC was asked to find a way to generate funds for training laboratory animal
specialists. The ACVP plan that used outside funds for training might be adapted for ACLAM
use. It was suggested that ACLAM consider gathering quantitative information on the shortage
of laboratory animal veterinarians similar to the information gathered by ACVP. The BOD
agreed and sent it to the REOC for consideration.

Executive Director

The Executive Director set up two searchable databases as suggested by the Certification
Oversight Committee. The first included membership data about a Diplomate’s expertise,
committee assignments, training program involvement and other information. The second
concerned examination performance.

A database template was formulated for the purpose of cataloging offices held, committee
assignments and training program attended. The data were collected on a separate sheet that was
sent to Diplomates with their dues notice. This information was to be used for committee
assignments and nominations for office. The BOD discussed the utility of a database that would
contain information submitted by the training program directors about their past and current
trainees.

In 2004, after discussions with Dr. Balk, the BOD decided to accept the proposed contract
extension as information only. The annual performance evaluation paragraph would be rewritten
to include a more thorough annual performance evaluation. It was approved to compare
Executive Director positions of other organizations as to whether they were filled by a single
person within the organization or by a professional person outside the organization.

Later that year, the original contract was modified to include an annual performance evaluation
to be accomplished by the President along with the Executive Committee. The replacement
of the Executive Director would be placed in the new strategic plan or deliberated by an ad hoc
committee. With these additions, the BOD approved extension of the contract for the Executive
Director until 2008.

In 2006, the Executive Director and the webmaster formulated a document management system.

Dr. Balk requested additional administrative support. He suggested that Dr. Steven Fisk, who
was already doing some supportive work in addition to being webmaster, be hired as a part-time
employee for the position. It was approved to write a job description for administrative support
for the Executive Director, and a contract with the cost not to exceed $20,000 for a one-year
period. This was in addition to the $10,000 that Dr. Fisk received as webmaster. The contract would include a clause that it would be evaluated after one year.

In 2007, the Executive Director’s contract was renewed starting in 2009. Again there was discussion as to whether or not to keep the office within the College or hire an outside professional Executive Director. It was pointed out that the College should be made aware of the real cost of hiring such an outside professional, and not what Dr. Balk was being paid.

Policy and Procedure Manual

In 2000, a consultant was identified to update and reformat the Policy and Procedure Manual. A cost proposal was submitted. The BOD desired to know the number of hours estimated for the job, when the finished product would be delivered, and whether both printed and electronic versions would be included as finished products. Also, was there a mechanism for updating the finished product? It was decided to proceed with the contract as there was $6000 in the budget for this purpose. If the cost estimate came in over 20% of the budget, the Board would be notified.

In 2001, under the guidance of the Governance Task Force, the Policy and Procedure Manual was revised and reformatted. It was divided into a policy section and procedure section. Committee Chairs were responsible for updating their own sections.

In 2004, the Manual was updated for the ABVS 5 year report. The Policy and Procedure Manual was divided into sections for an immediate and continuing review. The COC cross checked all procedures and materials leading from credentialing to certification. Committee liaisons were copied on all correspondence between the committee chairs and members and the BOD.

The Policy and Procedure Manual would be placed on the website for the entire College and the public to view as it showed how the College was managed. It would be the responsibility of the newly appointed Governance Committee (GC) to update the Policy and Procedure Manual, the By-Laws and the Constitution. The Committee would also ensure that all new committee chairs were trained and educated so that they understood the requirements. They would also oversee the development of a record management system for the College, which would include a strategy for document retention, data integrity and other records management topics. The Governance Committee would consist of senior Diplomates, with the ACLAM counsel as an ex officio member.

It was realized that there was no single person or committee appointed to assure that actions taken by one committee but affecting other committees were coordinated and placed in the Policy and Procedure Manual. It was decided that the GC would determine who should be the coordination point and how the coordination should be accomplished.

In 2006, the GC developed a form to update the Policy and Procedure Manual on an annual basis so that the Manual matched exactly what the committees were actually doing and how they were doing it. The form was accepted by the BOD with minor changes. This form would be used as part of the committees’ annual report to the BOD. Updating of the Policy and Procedure Manual was included as one of the charges to every committee. The webmaster was added to the GC. Legal counsel continued as an ex officio member. The webmaster was responsible for keeping the Policy and Procedures Manual and the Constitution and By-Laws up to date in the master documents and on the website.
Following updating of the Constitution and By-Laws, the current Governance Committee would be disbanded and replaced with a new Committee chaired by the immediate Past President and including the Vice President and President Elect.

In 2007, Dr. Steven Fisk sent out the appropriate Policy and Procedure Manual sections to Committee Chairs and BOD liaisons with the request to update or modify their sections during the year. It was decided that each Committee should indicate if changes to their procedures had any impact on the By-Laws or on other committees, and involvement of the BOD liaison in the proposed change. The BOD liaison should be copied on all correspondence and conference calls.

**Diplomate Status**

In 2002, a letter was received and forwarded to the BOD requesting sanctions to be taken against a Diplomate. The BOD discussed the matter and decided the request was out of the jurisdiction on which the action could be taken.

In 2003, it was clarified that the proper nomenclature for Diplomate status on business cards, letterhead and other business stationery was DACLAM or Diplomate, ACLAM. This would be placed in the next Directory and printed in the Newsletter.

The Governance Committee developed language concerning censorship of a member, the appeals process and terms related to ACLAM membership. This was approved by the BOD.

By the end of 2007, ACLAM had a total of 837 total members, 686 active, 134 retired and 17 honorary members

**New Committees, Task Forces and Advisory Panels**

In 2001, it was decided to establish an ad hoc Governance Task Force. This committee would give guidance and oversight to the revision of the Policy and Procedure Manual (updating and reworking the guidelines there in) and proceeding with By-Laws changes brought about by any approved revisions. In 2005, the task force was replaced with an ad hoc Governance Committee.

In the same year, as per the Strategic Plan, it was decided to establish a veterinary student outreach committee (Career Pathways Committee), which would be formed as an ad hoc committee. One goal of the committee, beyond the shared goal to recruit good students into the field of laboratory animal medicine, would be to emphasize the benefits of becoming board certified. It would work with the ASLAP student liaison committee to avoid duplication of effort.

The Public Policy Committee and the USDA Interface Committee were combined into the Government and Regulatory Affairs Committee, which would help to assure animal welfare while addressing concerns regarding regulatory burden.

The Question Review Subcommittee of the Examination Committee was disbanded and replaced with the Examination Resource Subcommittee. The new subcommittee of the Examination Committee would write questions for the exam.

Following a survey of committee chairs, it was found that adjuncts serve an extremely useful
purpose for some committees such as the Foundation, and should continue to be appointed where their involvement was meaningful.

A suggestion was received from the Griffin Foundation in 2004 that ACLAM present additional awards other than the Forster and Poster Awards. The proposed Griffin Foundation Award would carry a $1000 gift. The BOD approved the establishment of an Awards Committee that would deliberate the suggestion and set up procedures similar to the AALAS Awards Committee. In addition, the Committee would review the qualifications for Honorary Diplomates, and provide another layer of review for these applications. The first award of this Committee was the Lifetime Achievement Award.

In late 2006, the following committees were disbanded as they were no longer required: Continuing Education, ACLAM/AVMA Relations and the Mentoring Committee. The Mentoring Committee would be made part of the Career Pathways Committee.

In 2007, the Careers and Training Oversight Committee was formed as an ad hoc committee and would function similar to the Certification Oversight Committee. It would coordinate all activities (recruitment, training, and education) of the Career Pathways, ACLAM/ASLAP Program, Camp ACLAM and possibly the Training Program Oversight Committee. Charges to the new Committee included funding and training materials. Later that year the name was changed to the Recruitment and Education Oversight Committee and the committees to be coordinated were expanded to include the Training Program Oversight, Recertification, Career Pathways, Publication, and Program Committees for the AVMA, AALAS, Forum and Camp ACLAM.

**ACLAM Foundation**

An anonymous donor to the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) wished to fund an award for $25,000 that would recognize an IACUC or institution that had made significant progress in minimizing or preventing pain and distress in laboratory animals within their institution. Dr. Andrew Rowan from the HSUS contacted President Lynn Anderson to inquire if ACLAM would be interested in cosponsoring such an award. Dr. Anderson and Dr. Rowan discussed the potential for an HSUS donation to the ACLAM foundation to fund research on the minimization and prevention of pain and distress, provided there were no strings attached. Drs. Anderson and Martin Morin would discuss this further with HSUS.

Later that year, following the meeting with HSUS, no commitment was made by that organization to contribute to the ACLAM Foundation. It was stated that the award program proposed by HSUS would require site visits of institutions by representatives of HSUS and ACLAM. Dr. Anderson requested HSUS to outline its proposal detailing ACLAM's role. However, she suggested that making site visits and participating in this type of recognition program was not consistent with ACLAM's mission. The BOD agreed not to pursue this opportunity to participate in the HSUS award program. The HSUS also suggested cosponsoring regional educational workshops with ACLAM on current topics. The BOD agreed that this could be considered, and that the dialogue should be kept open between the two organizations.

The Foundation awarded seven grants totaling $99,000 for the 2000 cycle. Two of these were funded jointly by ACLAM and AAALAC. Two additional grants were being considered for later in the year. The Foundation presented a method of recognizing donors to the President Circle for Sustained Giving. The auction at the Forum had been successful. A larger percentage of
Diplomates donating to the Foundation were needed before outside funding agencies could be contacted for funds.

The Foundation Committee was asked to consider if funds could be set aside for grants to trainees or those with less experience, so that they were not competing with a very experienced researcher for the same funds. This had been a recommendation by the Research in Academics Task Force. The Task Force also recommended that a formal document listing areas requiring further research in various topics be developed by the Foundation. Implementation of this recommendation was referred to the Task Force in cooperation with the Foundation. The information on the Foundation final report would be shared with the American Association of Veterinary Medical Colleges. Research in the veterinary profession was not strong for a variety of reasons. USDA funding for research in land-grant colleges was decreasing. ILAR and NCRR were also looking at this problem.

Later that year, specific funds targeted for trainee research projects were discussed further. Mechanisms were currently in place, but the experience section required the trainee to seek out a mentor. The science was most important, not necessarily the experience. The Association of Primate Veterinarians informed the Foundation that they would be interested in cosponsoring a research grant depending on the topic. This would be considered on a case-by-case basis and interest. The level of involvement had not been determined.

Later that year, one more grant was approved bringing the total to eight grants at $15,000 each. The grant funding level was raised to $20,000 each for the 2001 cycle. At this time, there were funds sufficient for approximately four grants in the 2001 cycle. The Foundation would have a live and silent auction at the 2001 Forum. Ideas and donations were being sought to reach the target of $7500. A raffle would be added.

In 2001, Dr. Morin reported that the 1997 and 1998 grants were completed. One 1999 grant was not completed and all the funds were returned. Five new grants were awarded. Two posters which originated from grants were presented at the Forum. Partnering of the Foundation with other organizations was discussed and encouraged. Brochures on estate planning were available to the membership.

In the same year, the ACLAM Foundation Committee became a standing committee.

The Foundation received the Jules Cass donation as an endowment to administer a laboratory animal medicine clerkship at The Ohio State University. The awarding of the funds would be through the ACLAM Foundation whereas the selection process could be assigned to the Career Pathways Committee or to the ACLAM Foundation through its grant review function. The training would have to be performed at an ACLAM recognized training program.

The Research and Academics Committee developed a list of research needs that could be used to help the Foundation prioritize the funding of grants.

Later that year, Dr. Morin reported that a sixth grant with assistance from AAALAC International was awarded. A total of $93,000 was awarded in 2001. It was confirmed that the Elizabeth R. Griffin Foundation was working with the ACLAM Foundation to award grants on the themes of zoonoses or laboratory safety. Dr. Morin reported that 30% of the membership was donating, but he hoped for 100% involvement of Diplomates. Training program directors were asked to encourage their trainees to submit research proposals. Dr. David Besselson won the
AALAS Young Investigator Award. He recognized the Foundation for funding his first grant.

In 2002, Dr. Morin reported that fundraising for 2001 was excellent and raised $130,000 for the 2002 grant cycle. However, funding was lagging for the 2003 grant awards. Eight new grants were funded. Six grants included Diplomates or post-doctoral trainees as principal or co-investigators. One award was funded by the Foster Foundation, one by the Griffin Foundation, and one was co-funded by ACLAM and the Griffin Foundation. Twenty-three grants were in review. A record number joined the Presidents Circle in 2001. With the formation of the Investment Committee, and the drawing down of the principal in the Program Services fund in the recent past, there might come a time when the Foundation would need to become self sufficient and not rely on an annual input of ACLAM funds.

In late 2002 Dr. Morin reported that in its 6 years existence, the ACLAM Foundation had funded 34 grants worth $500,000 and had $1 million on hand or pledged.

The 2003 donation from ACLAM to the Foundation was made in memory of all those Diplomates who died in 2002. Six new grants were awarded. Approximately $80,000 were available for the 2004 grant cycle.

Dr. Morin reported that 18 full proposals were reviewed for the 2004 cycle. He suggested that it was time to consider hiring a scientific director to direct the grant making and marketing while he directed the fundraising. He also appealed to ACLAM to fund a grant. It was suggested that a zero donation from ACLAM gives the wrong impression to other donors. However this was countered by the argument that ACLAM did pay all the Foundation’s expenses ($16,000 annually), which means all donations go entirely to grants. However, depending on the College’s financial condition, ACLAM might donate funds for a partial or entire grant.

In the same year, the Foundation awarded six grants totaling $132,000. It was decided to seek a Scientific Director for the Foundation. This individual would manage and coordinate research proposal solicitation, grants management, and dissemination of research results. However, the BOD would not fund a paid Scientific Director at this time and a volunteer would be sought.

In 2005, another 18 full proposals were reviewed, and five were funded. Dr. Gregory Boivin was appointed the Scientific Director of the Foundation. He would also be an ad hoc member of all Forum Program Committees and coordinate the poster sessions.

In 2006, the special RFP on cage density was funded at $34,000. From its inception, the Foundation had funded almost $1 million in 57 grants, and received pledges and actual funds amounting to almost $2 million. More grant applications were needed especially from postdoctoral students.

In 2007, it was asked if the mission of the Foundation could be changed to include funding for educational opportunities, or could the Foundation model be used to develop another foundation to fund education? It was also asked if donations could be earmarked specifically for research or education. It was decided to establish a Careers and Training Oversight Committee to develop recommendations for determining what educational components should be supported and the funding required for the support. The BOD also felt that the Foundation should fund research to fill in the gaps such as cage density and enrichment.
ACLAM Awards Committee

In 2006, the BOD considered an outline of awards with information about each award. Concerns were raised about the overlap of ACLAM's awards with those of ASLAP and AALAS. Three awards were recommended: the Nathan Brewer Lifetime Achievement Award; the Comparative Medicine Scientists Award; and the Distinguished Service Award. The BOD approved the general framework, but additional details were needed with emphasis on recognition of colleagues. It was suggested that the ACLAM awards should be adopted gradually so that not all suggested awards were initiated in one year. A target date for the first award was the 2007 Forum, which would be ACLAM's 50th anniversary. Later that year, it was decided that the first award would be the Mentor Award.

By early 2007, the Committee had contacted the membership for nominations for the Mentor award. However, only about 25% of the College membership voted and the BOD decided not to award any Mentor Awards at the 2007 forum, as originally planned. The Awards Committee would develop criteria for the receipt of a Mentor Award other than a popularity vote. Later that year the Committee further defined the criteria for selection of candidates for the Mentor Award. There would be a nominating letter and five letters of support. The supporting letters would comment in substantial detail on the criteria for selection for the award. It was emphasized that this could be an annual award for up to three awardees. The criteria and procedures were finalized and approved by the BOD.

It was suggested that the Awards Committee become a standing committee. This would require a By-Laws change.

Honorary and Retired Members

It was approved unanimously that Dr. John VandeBerg, Southwest Foundation for Biomedical Research, would be given Honorary Diplomate status at the 2001 Forum.

Dr. Stephen Barthold was presented Honorary Diplomate status at the 2003 Forum.

It was decided that, if an individual suggested for Honorary Membership did not meet all the prerequisites, a special recognition award could be given for that person’s contributions to laboratory animal medicine and science.

Dr. Anne-Dominique Degryse was presented Honorary Diplomate status in 2004.

In 2006, the Awards Committee was asked to develop a list of criteria for consideration of a candidate as an Honorary Diplomate. They were asked to define what was meant by “significant contribution” and bringing “high honor to ACLAM.” It was suggested that previous Honorary Diplomates could be asked to suggest criteria, and that recent and past résumés be evaluated to find common threads that make the selected candidates outstanding. Supporting letters should address the criteria. Later that year, there was much discussion about what it should take to become an Honorary Diplomate. Review of previous winners showed that they were a diverse group, selected for various reasons. It was agreed that letters of support needed to be more detailed, as some had been lacking in the past. The BOD approved the criteria detailed by the Committee for a person to be nominated as an Honorary Member.

Some young Diplomates had requested to be placed on the retired list because of life changes,
and they did not expect to practice of laboratory animal medicine any longer. It was decided that if they chose to become active in the future, they must pay all back dues at the normal rate and have their certification current.

**Elections**

In 2000, the College decided to align the fiscal year with officer and BOD members’ terms of office. This would require a By-Laws change. The elections committee would have to develop its slate of candidates in the spring. Nominations would be announced at the AVMA meeting, and the election would occur in August or September. It was decided that newly elected officers and BOD members would take office officially in January of the following year, but start their terms after the AALAS general business meeting. A ceremonial change of office would occur at the AALAS general business meeting. Current committee chairs would be asked to serve longer or newly appointed chairs would have to be willing to take office earlier and serve longer for the first cycle. Committee budget requests and annual reports would be due at the AALAS meeting. It was approved to make the AALAS meeting the annual meeting referred to in the By-Laws. Incoming members of the BOD would be invited to the AALAS meeting as guests so they would be familiar with BOD business when they actually took office. Because the terms of office now began at the AALAS meeting, the nominations process would begin in January/February.

In 2005, it was confirmed that there was no requirement for previous service on the Board of Directors of ACLAM before being nominated for the position of vice president.

**Additional Business**

The Task Force on Research and Academics had made several recommendations to various committees which were approved by the BOD. It was decided to reconstitute the Task Force as an ad hoc committee charged with monitoring the progress on recommendations made in its report.

The BOD decided that BOD minutes would be published on the website in the members only section. The minutes were also available by request from the Executive Director. The question of how long to archive them would be left to the webmaster, and depend on available space on the server.

The publication schedule of the Newsletter was changed from five times a year to four times a year (March, June, September and December). This schedule would coincide better with the BOD and general business meetings. Members were able to opt out of receiving the hard copy of the Newsletter and could receive an electronic edition instead. It could also be printed from the website.

Only the small Directory would be published in August of 2000, after the new Diplomates were admitted to the College. The Executive Director would investigate the possibility of placing it in a small notebook so it could be upgraded.

The winners of the 2000 Foster Award for the highest grades received on the written and practical examinations were Dr. Lisa Halliday for the written and Dr. Jon Rueter for the practical.

In 2001, the BOD approved the Certification Oversight Committee’s recommendation that all
ACLAM committees be charged with maintaining records for their committee for 6 years. The Chair of each committee would update those records during his or her tenure, and discard records over 6 years old unless they were of historical value. Historical records would be forwarded to the Executive Director for storage, but the 6 years of committee records would be passed on to the next Chair.

The 2001 August issue of the Directory was sent to all Diplomates, while the 2002 February issue was only sent to active Diplomates.

ACLAM logo items by Shirts Happen were placed on its website and on the ACLAM website. ACLAM receives 15% of the sales, which will go to the Foundation.

Following a Diplomate’s suggestion a charm that could be worn on a bracelet or necklace was approved as an alternative to the logo pin. New Diplomates would be given a choice between the pin and the charm.

In the same year, Dr. Jeffrey Lynn suggested that ACLAM serve as a clearinghouse for investigating and disseminating information on disease outbreaks in animal colonies. The BOD acknowledged that this was important information, but that ACLAM did not have the resources to carry it out. It was suggested that Dr. Lynn might submit a proposal for this idea to the ACLAM Foundation. He also could discuss the development of the investigative process with other Diplomates, especially those who were epidemiologists. No BOD action was taken.

The 2001 winners of the Foster Award were Dr. Monica Schroder for high score on the written and practical, and Dr. Mary Martin who tied with her for high score on the practical.

In 2002, the BOD decided to retain an attorney. The College had legal vulnerability with credentialing, examination and recertification. For litigation purposes, a multi-city legal firm would have to be hired. This would be expensive. However, an internal attorney or legal counsel could possibly foresee legal hassles and avoid them entirely or lessen their impact. Dr. Francis Doepel, an ACLAM Diplomate and an attorney, could serve in this capacity. It was decided to hire Dr. Doepel as an in-house counsel.

The winners of the Foster Award for highest exam score in 2002 were Dr. Jennifer Pullium (Written) and Dr. Andrew Burich (Practical).

325 Diplomates had elected to receive their Newsletter electronically. An electronic version of the Directory would be investigated. All Diplomates would receive an e-mail with the Newsletter as an attachment. Those Diplomates desiring a hard copy or those without an e-mail address would have to inform the Executive Director and request a hardcopy.

The winners of the Foster Award for highest exam score in 2003, were Dr. Patricia Stewart (Written) and Dr. Leanne Alworth (Practical). They will each receive a plaque and a $500 check.

An ACLAM personal highlight of 2004 was that Dr. Nathan Brewer turned 100 years old. He received an engraved pewter tray at his birthday gala at the National Zoo, on July 17, 2004. This was the first Lifetime Achievement Award presented by ACLAM.

Winners of the 2004 Foster Awards were Dr. George DeMarco for highest score on the written. He also tied for highest score on the practical with Dr. Ann Schiavetta. Each would receive a
plaque and $1000 and $500 respectively.

In 2005, the Newsletter, as requested by a survey of the members, became shorter with topic changes. Many documents would be placed in full on the website with an executive summary placed in the Newsletter. The Newsletter would be published in a new format which included pictures, hot topics and regulatory affairs. Some hard copies were still being mailed, but most Diplomates received an e-mail with the Newsletter as an attachment.

The 2005 Foster award winners were Dr. Kenneth Jacobsen for highest score on the written and the practical, and Dr. Nina Woodford who tied for highest score on the practical.

The winners of the 2006 Foster award were Dr. Lawrence Carbone for highest score on the written and Dr. Douglas Taylor for highest score on the practical.

It was approved to present the Foster Awards to Dr. Robert Rose and Dr. Jeremy Smedley. They tied with the highest score on both the written and practical in 2007.

ACLAM -To Be Continued

It is safe to say that by 2007 the members of ACLAM had formed a well organized, influential and respected College. ACLAM had become, as President Landi said in 1999, “…a people knowledgeable in the care, techniques, models and laws involving research animals. We bridge the knowledge between human and non-human animals not only for scientists, but for regulators, other professional groups and the general public.” Throughout ACLAM’s existence, knowledge has been a primary goal. Knowledge demanded of our Diplomates, certified through the exam. Knowledge spread through textbooks, seminars, workshops and position papers. Knowledge obtained through research. Knowledge shared with others nationally and internationally. And all this knowledge, first and foremost, now and in the future, dedicated to the care and well being of laboratory animals.
Appendix 1

Officers and Honorary Members of the American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine
1957-2007

President and Secretary/Treasurer are identified by name and year. In 1970, Officer’s terms started in July, and remained so through 2007.

Jan-Dec 1957  President-Nathan Brewer  
Secretary/Treasurer- Robert Flynn  
Jan-Dec 1958  President- Nathan Brewer  
Secretary/Treasurer- Robert Flynn  
Jan-Dec 1959  President Nate- Brewer  
Secretary/Treasurer Robert Flynn  
Jan-Dec 1960  President Benjamin Fremming  
Secretary/Treasurer- Robert Flynn  
Jan-Dec 1961  President Benjamin Fremming  
Secretary/Treasurer- Robert Flynn  
Jan-Dec 1962  President Benjamin Fremming  
Secretary/Treasurer Robert Flynn  
Jan-Dec 1963  President- Robert Flynn  
Secretary/Treasurer- William Dolowy  
BOD- Bennett Cohen, Nathan Brewer, Melvin Rabstein  
Jan-Dec 1964  President- Bennett Cohen  
Secretary/Treasurer William Dolowy, William Gay (Nov. 1964)  
Jan-Dec 1965  President- Melvin Rabstein  
Secretary/Treasurer- William Gay  
Jan-Dec 1966  President -Lisbeth Kraft  
Secretary/Treasurer- Robert Yeager  
Jan-Dec 1967  President- Thomas Clarkson  
Secretary/Treasurer- Robert Yeager  
Jan-Dec 1968  President -Alvin Moreland  
Secretary/Treasurer Robert Yeager  
Jan-Oct 1969  President- Orland Soave  
Secretary/Treasurer- Robert Yeager  
Oct 1969-70  President-Charles Mcpherson  
Secretary/Treasurer Robert Yeager  
July 1970-71  President- J. Russell Lindsey  
Secretary/Treasurer- James Pick  
1971-72  President- Robert Yeager  
Secretary/Treasurer- James Pick  
1972-73  President- Richard Wescott  
Secretary/Treasurer- Albert New  
1973-74  President- Steven Pakes  
Secretary/Treasurer- Albert New  
1974-75  President-Edward Melby  
Secretary/Treasurer -Albert New  
1975-76  President- Henry Baker  
Secretary/Treasurer Albert New
1976-77  President- Henry Foster  
Secretary/Treasurer Albert New

1977-78  President Gerald VanHoosier  
Secretary/Treasurer William Webster

1978-79  President Albert New  
Secretary/Treasurer -William Webster

1979-80  President Daniel Ringler  
Secretary/Treasurer-William Webster

1980-81  President Lanny Kraus  
Secretary/Treasurer -William Webster

1981-82  President- Norman Altman  
Secretary/Treasurer- Max Lang

1982-83  President William Webster  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1983-84  President Dennis Kohn  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1984-85  President Charles “Bud” Middleton  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1985-86  President John Harkness  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1986-87  President Joseph E. Wagner  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1987-88  President Patrick Manning  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1988-89  President Dennis Johnsen  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1989-90  President David Johnson  
Secretary/Treasurer Max Lang

1990-91  President James Fox  
Secretary/Treasurer Gale Taylor

1991-92  President Max Lang  
Secretary/Treasurer Gale Taylor

1992-93  President Robert Whitney  
Secretary/Treasurer Charles McPherson

1993-94  President Gale Taylor  
Secretary/Treasurer Charles McPherson

1994-95  President John C. Donovan  
Secretary/Treasurer Marie LaRegina

1995-96  President Samuel Adams, Jr.  
Secretary/Treasurer Marie LaRegina

1996-97  President Christian Newcomer  
Secretary/Treasurer Marie LaRegina

1997-98  President Harry Rozmiarek  
Secretary/Treasurer Marie LaRegina

1998-99  President Christian Abee  
Secretary/Treasurer Marie LaRegina

1999-2000  President Margaret Landi  
Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo

2000-01  President Cynthia Gillett  
Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo
2001-02  President Lynn Anderson
          Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo
2002-03  President Diane Gaertner
          Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo
2003-04  President Dale Martin
          Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo
2004-05  President Kathryn Bayne
          Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo
2005-06  President Michael Kastello
          Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo
2006-07  President William White
          Secretary/Treasurer Charles Raflo

**Honorary Diplomates**
1962 -- Leo Bustad
1971 -- T.C. Jones
1973 -- Bert Hill
1974 -- George Harrell
1978 -- Joe Held
1979 -- Harry Rowsell
1981 -- Phil Trexler
1989 -- Lars Vass
1992 -- Pravin Bhatt
1994 -- Abigail Smith
1995 -- Julia Hillard
1996 -- Leo Whitehair
1999 -- Lela Riley
2000 -- Michael Festing
2001 -- John Vandebergh
2002 -- Hans Hedrich
2003 -- Stephen Barthold
2004 -- Ann-Dominique Degryse
2007 -- Judy MacArthur Clark
2007 -- Ralph Dell
### Appendix 2

**American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine Forums**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Continuing Education Retreat</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Continuing Education and Recertification</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Programs</td>
<td>Brookhaven NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Biohazard Control</td>
<td>Lake Lanier, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Animal Production</td>
<td>McCormick Park, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Immunology</td>
<td>Gatlinburg, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Biomedical Research</td>
<td>Howey-in-the-Hills, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Emerging Technology in Laboratory Animal Medicine</td>
<td>Olive Branch, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>Martha’s Vineyard, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
<td>Columbia, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Current Concepts in Laboratory Animal Medicine</td>
<td>Columbia, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Anesthesia and Analgesia</td>
<td>Columbia, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Molecular Pathogenesis of Viral Infections</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Occupational Health and Safety</td>
<td>Stone Mountain, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Transgenic Animals, Gene Therapy, and IACUC Issues</td>
<td>Annapolis, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Human Resource Management and Facility Design</td>
<td>Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Ethics and the Use of Laboratory Animals</td>
<td>St. Charles, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Clinical Medicine in a Research Setting</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Advancing Science and Animal Welfare</td>
<td>Fort Meyers, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Diagnosis and Control of Diseases</td>
<td>Point Clear, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Genetics, Genomics and Gene Therapy</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Induced Animal Models – Human Disease</td>
<td>Fort Meyers, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ACLAM Town Meeting – Current Issues</td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Pathways to Success for Laboratory Animal Veterinarians</td>
<td>Asheville, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>New Frontiers in Education and Training</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Contemporary Topics in Laboratory Animal Medicine</td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine Text Book Series

*The Biology of the Laboratory Rabbit*, 1974. Steven H. Weisbroth, Ronald E. Flatt, Alan L. Kraus, eds


*The Laboratory Rat*, second edition, 2006. Mark A. Suckow, Steven H. Weisbroth, and Craig L. Franklin, eds.

Christian E. Newcomer, Fred W. Quimby, and Abigail L. Smith, eds.

*Flynn's Parasites of Laboratory Animals*, 2nd ed. 2007. DG Baker, ed.
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