

ACNP Summer Council Meeting Minutes
Sunday, July 12, 2015
8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. EST
Loews Chicago Hotel, Burnham A&B

Attendees:

Raquel Gur, Presiding
Anissa Abi-Dargham
Alan Frazer
Suzanne Haber
David Kupfer
Jim Meador-Woodruff
David Rubinow
Marina Wolf
Joe Coyle, Secretary-elect
Rita Valentino, Council-elect
Ronnie Wilkins, staff
Sarah Timm, staff
Laura Hill, staff
Jacque Loftus, staff

Minutes:

- 1. Program Committee Report*** – Bitu Moghaddam and Carlos Zarate joined the meeting and reported that the process for this year was very smooth and efficient.
 - The committee paid attention to diversity and accepted no panels where all participants were males with no diversity.
 - This year the committee will not allow scheduling changes. If someone cannot attend on the date they are scheduled, then the full panel, mini-panel or study group will be replaced.
 - There will be no night sessions this year. We will add an eighth concurrent session.
 - Confidentiality continues to be an issue on the committee. One new suggestion from the Program Committee Chairs is to ask all members to sign a confidentiality agreement. This can be considered further by Council.
 - B. Moghaddam recommended that we change the scoring system next year. Rather than a 1-9 scale, the scale would be Accept Strong, Accept, Discuss, Reject, and Reject Strong. There was some concern this will tighten the scores too much. This will be discussed further by the Program Committee.
 - Fewer than half of the panels and mini-panels were accepted. Seventy-five percent of study groups were accepted.
 - URM participation was about the same as last year. The number of women on panels was slightly higher than in past years.
- 2. Treasurer's Report*** – D. Kupfer gave the report. Investments for ACNP are healthy and continue to do well. Total cash and investments is almost \$10M. Total assets when you

take into consideration the Executive Office building is just over \$12M. Council also reviewed the sources of revenue. The amount of corporate funding has again dropped since last year from 24% to 21%. The highest sources of revenue are PMG and the Annual Meeting.

The FY2015 budget was also reviewed by Council. The auditors sent a copy to the Audit Committee for review.

3. ***Hoch Award*** – No nominations have been received to date. Award specifications were reviewed. This is an award for service to the College. Council would like to have more quantitative data about nominees. Council decided for 2015 to draft a list of Program Committee Chairs, Membership Committee Chairs, Council and NPP Editorial Board participants over the past 15 to 20 years. The information will be discussed on an upcoming teleconference and used to select this year's awardee.

4. ***Strategic Planning Task Force Report***

a. **Membership Workgroup/Industry Advisory Workgroup**

- ***CHARGE:*** *How do we engage and incorporate industry scientists into the College? What is the current percentage of industry members and what should metrics for growth be in the future?*

Presently, there are 7% of members from industry. The percent of applicants from industry over the last five years who were accepted to membership is 0% to 100% for Associate members and 25% to 50% for Full members.

Council agreed it is difficult for the Membership Committee to understand the contributions of industry applicants to the field since the metrics are very different from those used for academic nominees for membership. Council should clearly articulate to the Membership Committee the value of applicants from industry and the need for the development of contextually appropriate metrics.

ACTION ITEMS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Rework the 'Role in Industry Projects' questions used by the Membership Committee to better capture the information necessary to accurately evaluate industry applicants.
Council approved the forms for use for 2015. One addition to the instructions for nominators' form will be a request for the nominator to rank the nominee in comparison to other members in their companies. It will be important for the nominator to convey those qualities and accomplishments that identify the applicant as outstanding.
- Council should articulate why having industry members is important and how they benefit the College.
Council decided to empanel a task force to examine these issues. Participants on the task force could be Hussein Manji, Steve Paul, Mike Ehlers, Patricio O'Donnell, and Jeff Conn as well as members from the Industry Workgroup who worked on the current recommendations. Those recommendations will be sent to the task force for consideration.

- R. Wilkins reminded Council that many years ago we received industry funding for a travel award in honor of G. Sepinwall. We could apply those funds to a travel award just for a young investigator in industry.
- **CHARGE:** *Determine what ACNP should expect 5 years from now in terms of percent female and URM members, associate members and nominations for each group, as well as for ACNP travel awardees. The Membership Workgroup should also discuss ways to increase the visibility of the aforementioned groups in the College.*

ACTION ITEMS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

- R. Gur will write a letter to past URM travel awardees and have discussions with them to determine their concerns/issues, specifically those that led them to not pursue membership. From the feedback, she will develop a survey to get data on why they do not return to the meeting or apply for membership. Council will discuss this feedback from the survey.

b. Annual Meeting Workgroup

- **CHARGE:** *This group should address the size of the meeting. S. Timm can get a listing of hotels that can handle a meeting size of more than 1500. One question is what would we need to create (policy-wise) that might stabilize attendance.*

ACTION ITEMS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

The meeting workgroup reported that the ideal, maximum size of the meeting is around 2000 attendees. The group discussed ways to constrain the meeting but still have a variety of levels of people included. They discussed capping percentages within registration categories. The final recommendation was to set a cap on the number of invited guests each year based on a projection of how many invited guests we can have and still stay below 2,000 total attendees.

The Strategic Planning workgroup recommended that the Executive Office would like to know more details about “who” those invited guests are; what are their credentials, are they industry, academia, area of interest, etc. The workgroup recommends that we gather this data (in a survey) and make recommendations to present to the membership. We will find out how many invited guests from past years presented a poster at the meeting. We will also send a survey to the past three years of Invited Guests asking for demographic information, if they are academics, clinicians or industry, if they have applied for membership in the past, how many times they have applied for membership, etc. The survey will be reviewed by the Executive Committee.

- **CHARGE:** *Clinical/Pre-Clinical Balance and how do we bring in the latest, greatest science.*

ACTION ITEMS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

All agreed the balance between clinical and basic science over the past 5 years has been acceptable and does not need action. However, it is important to share these statistics with Program Chairs so that they can keep watch over these numbers.

c. Publications Workgroup

- **CHARGE:** *This group should develop a vision with metrics on where NPP, NPPR and the website should be in 5 to 10 years.*

ACTION ITEMS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

NPP and NPPR are in good health. Nonetheless, the impact factor for NPP has fallen. The reason for the fall in impact factor is in part a product of variability in the impact factor for NPPR, which is substantially higher than that of NPP. This year's fall was due to the fact that the NPPR impact factor was much lower than in past years. Impact factor can be artificially inflated in a number of ways. One way is to delay print publication, for example, by publishing online and reaping the benefit of the citations thereby accumulated prior to publication. Although the artificial inflation of impact factors is a regrettable practice, the importance of impact factor for promotion clearly influences authors' decisions about where to submit their best work. Bill Carlezon is planning to meet with his editorial board for further discussion. Council would like to learn more about their findings. Council agreed this issue that will need further discussion on a future EC call and in December.

d. Advocacy/Outreach Workgroup

- **CHARGE:** *What is the appropriate level of advocacy outreach to other organizations and on "the hill" and how do we assess the outcomes of our efforts?*

ACTION ITEMS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

- All agreed that we should be involved in advocacy efforts, however, we are not an organization that should be doing this ourselves, but should be part of a coalition. We have done so by participating in the American Brain Coalition.
- Our goal should be to influence larger (partner) advocacy organizations to promote the importance of research and research funding (specifically for psychiatric disorders) to those on the hill and their constituents.
- The focus of our efforts should be translational research and increasing new investigators in research careers.
- Budgeting for this initiative will be based on activities of the Advocacy Subcommittee on the hill and support for other organizations by way of dues or in response to specific requests for project funding.
- The measurement of success in the use of our funds and the time and effort of our members will be:

- When groups like SfN, APA and ABC look to the College for the expertise to help them address issues specifically related to the interface between research and patient care.
- When members of Congress, their senior staff, and other relevant policymakers on the national or state level reach out to the College to help them better understand the complex issues surrounding the needs for research and research scientists.
- Additionally, the College should reach out to the membership to see who has existing relationships with Congressional members and learn how they are leveraging those relationships to support research.
- We should reach out to College members, asking them to report interactions with Congress to the Liaison Committee in order to keep a record of these indications of our influence on policy issues.
- Finally, we need to make a long-term commitment to this endeavor. A short-term effort is futile.

Additionally, Council would like to reach out to our current advocacy affiliates and offer those who wish to attend our annual meeting a chance to meet with the leadership.

e. **Financial Workgroup**

- **CHARGE:** *This group will establish the funds available to fulfill the action plans from the strategic plan. The idea would be to support operations from our annual revenue, which will allow earnings from investments to be used for other mission-driven goals.*

INFORMATION/RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Our corporate revenues continue to fall. As they have fallen, the College has had the foresight to diversify. That diversification was done in purchasing the Executive Office building and the journal and in developing the Parthenon Management Group.
- As we have added more and more food and beverage functions at the meeting and as costs of those items continue to increase, the bottom line of the meeting is more and more fragile. As we are discussing other aspects of the meeting in our long term planning, we also may need to consider the option of moving the meeting to a more economical location in the future. Hotels in Orlando and other cities are willing to offer a much better financial package that we can get on the beach in South Florida. Alternatively, we may need to consider cutting back on those food and beverage functions.
- Overall, though, we are protected by a strong portfolio of investments, and the earnings from those investments should keep us in a profitable position in the near future. Should this task force's recommendations move forward, Council will have the flexibility to use the earnings from investments or the investments themselves to support new initiatives.

5. ***Accompanying Person Registrations*** - The current charge for an Accompanying Other is \$150. This fee is not covering the cost of food and beverage per person. Below is the cost per person for the last three years.

2012– \$336.50

2013– \$334.50

2014- \$311.19

Council reviewed these rates and agreed to increase the accompanying person charge to \$200 starting in 2016. We will add an option for people to purchase a ticket for \$50 to the reception only.

6. ***Minority Invitations*** – In 2014, at the request of the Minority Task Force, Council agreed to invite the 25 URM travel award applicants who were not award recipients. In 2015, there are 33 applicants who did not receive awards. Council agreed to extend invitations to these 33 people. These attendees will register at the trainee rate of \$200.

7. ***2020 Meeting Location*** – Council reviewed the options and agreed that Hawaii is not a viable option for the College due to the loss of attendance and the inadequacy of the space for posters. The JW Dessert Ridge was voted as the 2020 meeting location. Ronnie Wilkins also brought up the issue of challenging negotiations with the Diplomat. Council expressed interest in looking at properties in Orlando as possible meeting sites and to provide alternatives for purposes of negotiating with the Diplomat.

8. ***Summer Meeting Locations*** – Council agreed Chicago is a good location for the summer meeting. The meeting dates next year will be moved to July 16-17, 2016.

9. ***Career Development Institute for Psychiatry Trainee Class*** – Council approved the request to offer invitations to the meeting for these trainees at the trainee registration rate.

10. Committee & Task Force Reports -

- a. ***Constitution & Rules Committee Report on Bylaws Change*** – In response to a charge from Council to add Associate Members to Council, the Constitution & Rules Committee has recommended a new Associate Member Representative Delegate position. There was discussion that having only one person as a liaison rather than two may be better. After the ensuing discussion, Council decided that the Constitution and Rules Committee recommendation requires additional data, thought and discussion. Council will obtain data from the Associate Membership about their impression of the College. The survey from the Associate Members done by the Membership Advisory Task Force will be sent to Council for review.
- b. ***Membership Advisory Task Force Progress & Accomplishments*** - Council charged the 2015 task force with drafting a list of the group's accomplishments over its 4-year tenure. Council reviewed the report and agreed the task force has made great progress and implemented a number of great ideas.. Council decided

that the task force should continue one additional year. The Executive Committee will discuss on a future call the areas of focus for the Advisory Task Force.

- c. ***Publications Subcommittee Report on Open Access Journal*** – The subcommittee reviewed the risks and benefits associated with launching an Open Access (OA) NPP spinoff journal, concluded that a spinoff journal is not advantageous for the College, and have recommended not to move forward with this initiative. The Executive Committee reviewed the report in March and agreed it should be reviewed by full Council. Council agreed with this decision.
- 11. NPP Proposal for Process Changes*** – Editor-in-Chief Bill Carlezon has proposed eliminating the Author Disclosure/Signature Forms used by the journal as they are redundant and cumbersome for both staff and authors. The Publications Committee has endorsed the reduction in paperwork. Council approved the changes.
- 12. Committee Updates*** – Reports from other committees without action items were reviewed.
- 13. Executive Office Report*** – Ronnie Wilkins updated the group that the budget for this year may be off this year due to reductions in corporate revenue and increases in our F&B costs. Overall, though, we are protected by a strong portfolio of investments, and the earnings from those investments should keep us in a profitable position in the near future. He also reported on the evaluations of the Executive Office from Council and Committee Chairs. The feedback was excellent.
PMG continues to grow and is now the highest source of revenue for the College. PMG has finished the accreditation process from ACCME. We will learn if we become accredited in December or January. We recently signed a contract to manage the Society of Biological Psychiatry and anticipate another contract soon from the International Congress of Schizophrenia Research.
- 14. Timeline to Assess Readiness for Membership in the College*** – Marina Wolf drafted a document that offers guidance to those considering application for membership in the College. The document will be emailed to Council for review, and we will discuss this on an upcoming Executive Committee call.
- 15. Executive Session*** – Raquel Gur presented the transition plan proposal from the Parthenon Management Group Board of Directors. As of March 31, 2016, Ronnie Wilkins will step down as President/CEO of Parthenon Management Group but remain as ACNP Executive Director through April 1, 2018. Sarah Timm will take the position as President/CEO of Parthenon Management Group beginning April 1, 2016 and will assume the position of ACNP Executive Director on April 1, 2018.

The meeting concluded at 1:12 p.m.