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• Integrating social work expertise into HAI
  – Animals in clinical interventions
  – Animal welfare as a social justice issue

• Ethical framework for HAI
  – Teaching, practice, research and advocacy

• ~500 MSW students have received an Animal-Assisted Social Work certificate
Social Science-Informed Animal Welfare (SSIAW)

• SSIAW as a framework for IHAC
  – Enhancing animal welfare by emphasizing the role of human behavior
  – Focus on the human change mechanisms at the individual, organizational, and global level to achieve sustainable outcomes for all animals
IHAC Research

• Therapeutic Human-Animal Interactions
  – Youth residential setting (Green Chimneys, NY)
  – Prison dog training programs (WA, CO, Israel)
  – Families in crisis (CO)

• Animals in Communities
  – Shelter operations (CO, TX)
  – HSUS Pets for Life as a One Health intervention (national)
  – Economic impacts of animal welfare policies (national)
Why economic impact studies?
Economic Impact Studies of Animal Welfare Policies

• Multidisciplinary team
  – Economists, MBAs, Social Workers, Lawyers
  – Strong research backgrounds

• Social-environmental-economic impact methodology
  – Dr. Frank Vanclay (University of Groningen)
  – International Association of Impact Assessment (IAIA)

• Standard microeconomic and macroeconomic analyses
  – IMPLAN and other modeling
Socioeconomic Impacts

Systems approach to economic impact modelling

**Inputs**
What does the policy cost?

**D/I Outputs**
Direct purchasing
Indirect purchasing
Induced purchasing

**Broader Indirect Effects**

**Social and Public Health Effects**
Example 1: OK Humane’s Compassion Center

• New shelter concept funded by OK Humane
• Downtown Oklahoma City as part of “Core to Shore”
• Integrate humane activities into the urban core
  – Lunch hour dog walking
  – Humane education programs
  – Pet-centric amenities
Socioeconomic Impacts in Oklahoma City, OK

Inputs
Construction  ($20m)
Operations   ($4.5m/y)
5 Year total  ($42.5m)

D/I Outputs
Construction  $35m
Operations   $16.7m/y
5 Year total  $118.5m

Urban Amenity Complex
“Core to Shore” strategic plan

Social
Physical health
Workplace productivity
Mental health
Example 2: Austin’s “No Kill” Resolution

- City of Austin Resolution passed in 2009
- Mandates a 90% Live Release Rate
- Formal partnership with Austin Pets Alive!
- Substantial community engagement
- 2015 audit
- Component of Austin as a Humane City
Sheltering Impacts

Trends in Austin Shelter Outcomes

- Adoption
- RTO
- Transfer
- Shelter Euthanasia
- Other Outcome
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Socioeconomic Impacts in Austin, TX

Inputs (2010-2016)
Premium  ($30.4m)

D/I Outputs (2010-2016)
Operations  $40.9m
Vet/Pet Care  $49.3m
Pet Retail  $25.3m

Brand Equity  $72m

6-Year Total Output  $157.5m

Social
Public health
Social capital
Community engagement
Future Studies

• Breed-specific legislation in Denver
• Community-based animal sheltering
• Pet policies in rental housing
• Low cost veterinary clinics
• Equine rescue operations
Conclusions

• Animal welfare policies have broad economic and social impacts that need to be factored into animal welfare policy making

• Need to ramp up sustainable resources for smooth implementation

• Need to engage community support for sustainability
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