

**ACNP Summer Council Meeting Minutes**  
**Saturday, July 17, 2021**  
**11:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. EST**

*Linda Brady, Presiding*

Carlos Zarate  
Kerry Ressler  
David Rubinow  
Rita Valentino  
Marina Wolf  
Helen Mayberg  
Trevor Robbins  
Mary Phillips  
Diego Pizzagalli  
Carrie Bearden  
Ellen Leibenluft  
David Kupfer

Executive Director: Sarah Timm  
Staff: Erin Shaw

Elect: William Carlezon, Council-Elect (Elect have voice but no vote)  
Marina Picciotto, Council-Elect

Apologies: Maria Oquendo

***Conflict of Interest Forms were reviewed prior to the start of the meeting by Linda Brady, President, Rita Valentino, Secretary, and Sarah Timm, Executive Director, per the Conflict of Interest Policy for Council.***

L. Brady thanked Council for their continued engagement over the past year with all the virtual meetings.

- 1. *Treasurer's Report*** – D. Rubinow presented the Treasurer's Report to Council. He encouraged Council members to review the FY21 Audit Report that was linked in the agenda and reminded Council that the fiscal year for ACNP runs April 1<sup>st</sup> to March 31<sup>st</sup>. As of March 2020, the overall value of our investments which include Olimpio Neu, Wells Fargo and Vanguard had decreased. However, our investments increased dramatically over the past year ending in \$14 Million and have gone up to \$15 Million from March 2021 to June 2021. He advised that the funds in the cash and cash equivalents will continue to move up and down based on moving cash to investments. With total cash and investments, the bottom line was at \$18 Million at the end of June which had increased from \$11 Million in March of 2020 totaling a 38% increase. The total

net assets which include our fixed assets as well as the office building, furniture, etc., and our investments also increased by 37% to \$20 Million. D. Rubinow advised that our total assets represent a very conservative evaluation of assets with includes Parthenon Management Group with \$1.2 Million in the bank. S. Timm advised that if the College were to sell PMG, it would sell anywhere from \$4 to \$5 Million which is not reflected on the total assets chart. D. Kupfer advised that PMG's management income is bringing in the bulk of the revenue for the College at 66% as our main source of revenue. Other sources of revenue include the journal at 14%, annual meeting registration at 7%, corporate fees at 7% and membership dues at 4%. S. Timm advised that the corporate fees are the funds received from our participating corporations. These funds used to represent closer to 50% of the revenue the College received when S. Timm started with ACNP. On the June 2021 Income Statement, the total income equals \$1,248,302 with the total expenses of \$396,440. The net income is \$851,862. The June 2021 Balance Sheet lists PMG under the investments with the total investments as \$16,987,824 compared to \$12,305,762 in June 2020. D. Rubinow advised a lot of the changes in the comparisons were due to prepayments to the annual meeting or deferred revenue. The total liabilities and equity are \$20 Million. D. Rubinow reminded Council that our use of funds shows that our income generated from the dividends and interest from the previous fiscal year's investments are used for special mission driven projects. Council is able to use our financial success to fund projects and initiatives that align with the mission of the organization. It was questioned if the College was under any legal obligations to spend any of our funds as the College is a non-profit. D. Rubinow and S. Timm advised that the College is not under any legal obligation and can use the funds to determine the long-term financial success of the College and fund projects and initiatives that align with our mission and membership fields. S. Timm advised that the College has been using the funds from the cash earned from dividends and interest from the previous fiscal year which has been the most conservative way of funding these special projects.

L. Brady provided an overview of the ACNP Near-Peer Mentorship Program that was created from the URM Mentoring Task Force who met in parallel with the URM Mini Retreats. This near-peer mentorship program was designed to provide targeted programming to help shape the scientific identity of the College as one that is diverse in their membership and is a welcome place for individuals that represent excellence in the area of neuropsychopharmacology research. This program would provide mentorship support to trainees in navigating ACNP membership from travel award to full membership of the College. The goal is to establish a pipeline of underrepresented minorities in our field and increase the URM representation within the College. This first group of mentees would become a cohort of future mentors by building skillsets for mentorship. The Near-Peer Mentorship Program was developed based on two existing programs which were the Career Development Institute (CDI) and the Center for the Improvement of Mentored Experiences in Research (CIMER). The inaugural near-peer mentorship program would occur over a 12-month period with 8-12 mentor/mentee pairs. The initial class of mentees would be chosen based on applications from URMs that were not selected for a travel award or suggested by the membership to apply. The call for mentors will be from our existing membership and mentor-mentee matches will be based on a set of matching criteria and the scientific area of research. The program would work with the Center for

the Improvement of Mentored Experiences in Research (CIMER) that provides resources for organizations and institutions to improve research mentoring relationships. CIMER would provide specific URM mentorship training for our mentors and training to our mentees. Marisa Spann and Anne Andrews have participated in the CIMER program and recommended them as a resource for the near peer mentorship program. The program would start with a workshop in November of 2021 preparing the mentors for their role in the program. In December of 2021, there would be training for the mentees and a meet and greet opportunity for the mentor/mentee pairs. In January through March 2022, there would be skills assessments, virtual receptions, program overview of goals and objectives and one-on-one meet and greets. In April of 2022 through September of 2022, there would be scheduled long distance mentorship sessions, a virtual career workshop and peer activities. In October 2022 through December 2022, there would be preparation for the annual meeting in-person workshop, a completed evaluation of the program and a discussion of future program enhancements. The near peer program was also designed with aspects of the Career Development Institute (CDI) program but limited to URM mentees. L. Brady advised that many of the opportunities can be leveraged for long-term sustainability for developing URM engagement and membership in the College. The vision would be for the mentees to become mentors of the program. She also advised that an additional ACNP staff person will be needed for this effort that would be responsible for facilitating this program and offering contact points with the mentors and mentees throughout the program. The estimated cost for CIMER's training and consulting, workshops, and the additional FTE would range from \$40K to \$50K. S. Timm advised that after the first few years, this program will be developed, and the College would not need the training from CIMER so long term this estimated cost could go down. Council agreed this is a terrific idea and were supportive. It was suggested to change the name of the program to the URM Near Peer Mentorship Program as it is geared for URMs. It was questioned if the URM mentorship training could be available as general mentorship training for our other mentors during the annual meetings. S. Timm stated that it was originally discussed with CIMER to provide training through the Career Development Session at this year's annual meeting. However, because the Career Development Committee decided on a different topic for this year's Career Development Session this would have to be considered for the 2022 meeting. It was stated that the College needs to be clear regarding the time commitment for the mentors because the junior members might not have the bandwidth to dedicate to this program. It suggested to provide stipends or support to the ACNP mentors such as waived registration to the annual meeting, etc. Council motioned, seconded and all were in favor of approving the funding for this request. S. Timm stated they will provide this feedback to the URM Mentoring Task Force for them to discuss the suggestion of stipends for the mentors and will come back to Council should they request additional funding. It was suggested for the task force to consider flexibility for our younger trainees that may need to attend meetings virtually.

## **2. *Follow-up Discussion from URM Mini Retreats –***

- a.** L. Brady reminded Council that in May, they agreed to add the following verbiage to the ACNP website regarding the Diversity Invitation Bank.

*The Diversity Invitation Bank allows members to offer two invitations to a scientist from an underrepresented minority group. These groups include an individual who identifies as African American, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, LGBTQ+ or a scientist with a disability. Members who request the invitation should vouch for the minority status of the scientist they are inviting. Guests from this bank may present a poster.* \*Should more than two invitations be needed, please contact the Executive Office at [acnp@acnp.org](mailto:acnp@acnp.org) for assistance.

However, based on feedback from the last URM mini retreat with the Diversity Invitation Bank not being capped on the number of invitations, it was suggested to change the language to the below:

*The Diversity Invitation Bank allows members to offer invitations to scientists from an underrepresented minority group. These groups include an individual who identifies as African American, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, LGBTQ+ or a scientist with a disability. Members who request the invitation should vouch for the minority status of the scientist they are inviting. Guests from this bank may present a poster.*

Council was in favor of the updated verbiage, and it was approved.

- b. Membership Committee Suggested Changes** – L. Brady reviewed the suggested changes raised from the Membership Committee chair, Anne Andrews, based on “hot-button” issues that were raised on the mini retreats. The first suggestion was adding a question to the membership application to address diversity. The suggested language below was adapted from UCLA.

*“Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) are core values of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology and key components of the ACNP’s mission and commitment to excellence. Contributions to teaching, scholarship, leadership, and/or service that promote DEI are encouraged and will be given due recognition during the membership evaluation process. The aim is to ensure that contributions to DEI are recognized as important elements in professional development and achievement and are not treated as “invisible labor.”*

The following are examples of efforts that candidates might provide evidence for to advance DEI. These examples are by no means exhaustive:

- efforts to advance equitable access to education
- public service that addresses the needs of diverse populations
- research and scholarship in areas of expertise that highlight inequalities
- mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations
- encouraging diversity of thought; acknowledging that innovative ideas come from dissimilar teams, cultures, and sources

- pedagogical practices and learning theories that create inclusive learning environments and communities
- curriculum development that enhances equity, diversity, and inclusion

Council approved of the language and additional bullet points. They agreed it was an active response from the discussion in the mini retreats.

The second suggestion was reviewing the grant information listed on the ACNP website and in the membership applications.

Membership Application: Here is how the question is currently worded in the application.

**NIH Grants on which you are PI: \***

List: grant names, issuing agency, grant amount, type of grant (e.g. R01, R21, K), award dates, your role and funding source.

***Consider changing to the following:***

List grants from which you and/or your research group currently derive support. Grants can be from U.S. federal agencies, international funding agencies, and/or private foundations. Delineate your role(s), e.g., PI, co-PI, co-I, site-PI, core director, etc. If funding is pending and has been previously reviewed, provide previous score if available.

List: grant names, issuing agency, grant amount, type of grant (e.g. R01, R21, K), award dates, your role and funding source.

ACNP Website: Here is how the website currently reads in the FAQ's:

Q: Do I have to have my own funded R01 Grant to be eligible for ACNP membership?

A: Being PI of an NIH R01 is not a requirement for membership, but independent peer-reviewed federal funding is generally considered necessary to be in the top candidate pool. Thus, high quality applications without an active RO1 or similar grant can be acceptable. This is usually from individuals with one or more of the following characteristics: significant high impact publications, significant past NIH funding, or significant funding from other sources, including NSF, VA, DoD or major foundations. Also, expectations of NIH funding does not apply to individuals working in government or in pharmaceutical research and development, for whom active NIH funding might not be feasible or appropriate.

***Consider changing to the following:***

Evidence of an independent, sustainable research program is generally considered to be necessary to be in the top candidate pool for ACNP membership.

Applications regarded as being in the top pool of candidates often show evidence for one or more of the following: significant high impact publications, significant

current NIH funding, significant pending NIH funding, or significant funding from other sources, including NSF, VA, DoD, or major foundations. Expectations for grant funding does not apply to individuals working in government or pharmaceutical research and development. Here, other types of evidence of programmatic leadership and support, as feasible or appropriate, are regarded favorably.

It was suggested to add in international agencies in the statement on the website FAQ's. It was stated that expanding from being a PI to other roles is important in being more accessible; however, it states "*evidence of an independent, sustainable research program*" falls more under a PI. It was stated that the committee should also recognize people who have fundamental roles on teams, not necessarily PIs, but some kind of independent or fundamental role on team science. It was advised that team science discussion in most academic centers is now being recognized in promotion. It was also suggested that we should add back the first original sentence in answering the question to state, "*Being PI of an NIH ROI is not a requirement for membership.*" Council agreed with adding this statement. It was also stated that it would be disingenuous if we were to say that anyone that participates in research would be a competitive applicant for membership. It was reminded that we are a College and not an open membership and we do not want to change the nature of the College in an effort to be more inclusive. It was reminded that our founders used 'College' in the name which reflects the long-standing strategy and structure of being an honorific organization. It was clarified that these changes related to Full Member applications. It was suggested to rephrase the question and ask the applicant to list their role on a grant in the application and modify the wording in the FAQ on the website to lead with the fact that the Membership Committee considers multiple criteria when reviewing applications and list those. It was also suggested to state that none of these are an absolute requirement; however, historically applicants with independent funding have been at the top of the applicant pool in the past. It was also noted that some of the discontent expressed at the URM mini retreat was directed at the problem that there is an apparent systematic bias against URM PIs for funding, yet the ACNP language suggests that NIH funding is a requirement for membership. Council agreed the change in the language proposed is good and a step in the right direction. It was suggested to ask the Membership Committee to develop a series of criteria that would address the point and ask the ways in which an applicant can demonstrate, if not their independence, the extent of their contribution to team science. Council agreed to go back to the Membership Committee chairs to request this language including the consideration of contribution to team science. Once the updates are made, Council suggested informing membership of the changes and sending a special email to everyone who applied within the last three years, but were not successful, to consider applying again and list the changes.

The last suggestion was to include a non-voting minority representative at the December Membership Committee meeting where the membership applications

are being discussed. It was noted that there are current URM members on the Membership Committee; however, this non-voting person would be more of an advocate for URM members to eliminate the concept that this is a special “closed, secretive meeting”. It was also stated that the Membership Committee currently reviews the URM applications for both Associate Member and Member first before the other non-URM applications during the meeting.

**c. Discussion on how to change the perception of Exclusivity vs. Inclusion.** M. Phillips presented the following suggestions to increase diversity in College membership, in committee membership and in senior-level voting Members and Fellows:

- Bylaw change that Members or Fellows who are no longer active in research (if not doing 10% or more active research or research equivalent) cannot vote or participate on a committee. 10% or more (% to be set) of research can include being involved in teaching in academia or being involved in mentoring in their own institution. These Members and Fellows will be encouraged to move to emeritus status if eligible.
- Bylaw change that Emeritus Members and Emeritus Fellows cannot vote or participate on committees/Council. Emeritus Members and Fellows can revert back to being regular Members and Fellows if they wish to still vote and participate on committees/Council, etc. and they are above the % threshold of research.
- These members (either Emeritus or the members doing less than 10% or more of research) can only bring one invited guest to the annual meeting if they are also attending the meeting. This invited guest must be a woman or URM.
- Membership requirements – change the membership verbiage from suggesting having an R01 or having an independent peer-reviewed federal funding being generally considered necessary to being in the top candidate pool regarding R01 or equivalent accolade, as there are attendees in other areas of work who would be highly qualified to apply for membership.
- If the membership requirements to become a Member are lessened, then increase the requirements to become a Fellow and make this more honorific.
- Fellows should be considered the top honorific members and be allowed to invite two guests to the meeting if one of them is a woman or URM.

It was mentioned that eligible Members and Fellows were previously encouraged to move to emeritus status as a strategy to increase the number of new members accepted into the College. Taking away voting and service privileges for emeritus members would reverse this strategy by encouraging those emeritus members to revert back to full Member or Fellow which would decrease the number of new members that the College can accept that year based on the bylaws. It was stated that emeritus members in other organizations do not have the same rights as active members as ACNP does. It was suggested to consider promoting junior members of the College into more committee service and leadership roles on committees instead. It was also suggested to encourage the Nominating Committee to place younger Fellows on the slate for Council. Council thanked

M. Phillips for her suggestions but decided to encourage the Diversity & Inclusion Task Force and other members in the College to encourage URM members to apply for fellowship, so they are able to serve in more leadership positions within the College. L. Brady stated that the Program Committee did a great job with balancing submissions with URM members and junior members when accepting proposals for the program.

3. ***Follow-up Discussion from April Council Call*** – During the April call, Council discussed how to get better URM representation in leadership positions in the College. It was stated that in the past, Council discussed inviting two Associate Members to join Council as non-voting ad members to learn the process. Council discussed considering this idea again and inviting a URM Member and/or an Associate Member to participate as a non-voting ad hoc member of Council. S. Timm reviewed the previous discussions by Council when this was originally discussed in 2013-2015. S. Timm advised that after discussion and review by the Constitution and Rules Committee, Membership Committee, and the Membership Advisory Task Force, it was voted against moving forward and remained that only Fellows could serve on Council. It was stated that even though the decision was five or six years ago, it is a different world now and this was brought up during the URM mini retreats. It was stated that this would help with the transparency of the Council meetings and show that decisions are made by a thoughtful process. It was noted that SOBP elects junior members to their Council that have voting rights. If this was approved for ACNP, it was questioned if these younger members would be able to have a vote or only a voice on Council. S. Timm advised that the original proposal in 2013 was for the younger members to have voting rights, but then it changed to only having a voice for Council. It was suggested to have two additional spots on Council with an Associate Member and a URM. It was suggested that these ad hoc members could report on the Council meeting process to other Associate Members and past travel awardees. As this would be a bylaw change, it was recommended for the Constitution and Rules Committee and the Career Development Committee to review this proposal for further discussion. M. Wolf advised that in her presidency year, she wrote blogs for the ACNP website and Bulletin with one devoted to Council meetings and the process in making decisions. There was a suggestion to allow members to listen in on Council discussions such as the summer meeting or having a town hall for members at the Business Meeting. S. Timm reminded Council that all Council meeting minutes are placed on the ACNP website in the member's only section and noted that membership elected them as Council members and trust they will do what is best for the College. Council decided to bring the proposal of additional members on Council to the Constitution and Rules Committee and Career Development Committee for consideration and requested for the Council minutes to be emailed to membership once posted on the website.
4. ***Nominating Committee Process*** – L. Brady reminded Council of the process for selecting the Nominating Committee from the bylaws and policy manual. L. Brady suggested to remove the word "secret" in secret ballot since it is just a ballot. S. Timm advised that the Executive Office will update the Policy Manual as the person with the most votes are elected as chair of the Nominating Committee, not the first person to accept the appointment. It was questioned how the College could make the Nominating Committee

more merit based and choose people for the ballot that have experience to make smart decisions on the slate and understand the time it takes to serve on Council. As the list of eligible Fellows and Fellow Emeritus is very large, it is hard for Council to research the service to the College for each eligible person for the Nominating Committee ballot. It was requested for the Executive Office to resend the list of eligible Fellows and Fellow Emeritus with highlighting the names of individuals who have served on Council or the Nominating committee during the past five years. It was suggested to ask the eligible Fellows and Fellow Emeritus if they are interested in serving on the Nominating Committee to self-nominate themselves for the Nominating Committee ballot instead of having Council members choose between 15 and 20 names. S. Timm advised that this requires a bylaw change. There was also a suggestion to request the Nominating Committee to choose the ballot for the next Nominating Committee which would also be a bylaw change. S. Timm will provide the discussion captured in the minutes to the Constitution and Rules Committee for consideration for next year.

5. ***NIH-OSTP Listening Session on ARPA-H*** – S. Timm advised Council that the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Health (ARPA-H) within NIH is inviting ACNP as an important stakeholder to participate in a listening session on August 2<sup>nd</sup>. Each invited participant will be asked to provide no more than four minutes of prepared remarks on ARPA-H. This will be followed by a short, moderated discussion between all participants. L. Brady asked if anyone on Council would like to volunteer to attend on behalf of the College or provide information to S. Timm to report on the College's behalf. M. Wolf and R. Valentino were suggested to attend. As the Institute Directors will be there, R. Valentino was unsure if it would be appropriate for her to attend as a NIH employee. M. Wolf will review this in more detail and advise S. Timm if she is able to attend.
6. ***NPP EIC Search Committee*** – M. Wolf updated Council that the Search Committee, consisting of Nii Addy, John Krystal, Marina Picciotto, Mary Kay Lobo, Julie Licinio, Leanne Williams, and Bill Carlezon as ex officio, received five applications for NPP Editor-in-Chief. The committee reviewed all five applications and agreed to move forward with interviewing three candidates. The committee is now developing a set of questions now for the interviews that will be scheduled in September. Council questioned if there was representative diversity within the selected candidates. M. Wolf stated the committee is interviewing one woman and two men with good representation of basic/clinical and substantial editorial experience. M. Wolf advised that three weeks before the application deadline, there was a big push to invite applications from URM scientists. As the position requires a substantial time commitment and some editorial board experience, the candidate pool was not extremely large. However, the members M. Wolf contacted were very appreciative that the committee reached out and would consider it for the future. M. Wolf was hopeful that this exchange will encourage URMs to view leadership positions in the College as being more viable in the future. She also indicated that the committee would have the candidates address the role of the Editor-in-Chief in promoting diversity in journal initiatives during the interviews.
7. ***2021 ACNP Annual Meeting Updates*** – S. Timm provided an update to Council on the hybrid annual meeting. She advised that registration has opened, and we have received 288 registrations with only 38 planning to attend virtually. As the notifications for panel,

mini-panel, and study group acceptances were emailed on Thursday, she expects the registration number to grow next week. Prior to the Program Committee meeting, the Executive Office polled all chairs of proposals to ask if they would have at least two individuals presenting in person to facilitate the session successfully and all sessions came back stating that a minimum of two participants would be in-person with some stating that all presenters plan to attend in person. S. Timm reported there is enthusiasm to attend the meeting in person and will try to keep as many of the meetings in the convention center, so attendees do not have to travel as much between sites. S. Timm reported that since we are requiring all attendees and accompanying others to be vaccinated, the Executive Office applied to the Ministries of Health, and we were approved to not require social distancing, so we did not have to limit the number of in-person registrations. S. Timm also advised that since we are a closed meeting, legally we can require vaccinations whereas other open meetings could have issues with ADA with requiring vaccinations. S. Timm advised that currently if you are traveling from the US, attendees can upload their vaccination card to the Puerto Rico travel site and be allowed to enter Puerto Rico. If you are traveling outside the US, you currently still have to provide a negative PCR covid test within 72 hours prior to arrival; however, that restriction could be lifted closer to the meeting. S. Timm advised that as COVID is changing day to day, the Executive Office will determine the safety protocols closer to the meeting and work with Council in the fall. S. Timm also advised that attendees may change their registration to in-person from virtual or vice versa.

8. ***NIH Institute Director's Session*** – Council discussed the format for this year's NIH Institute Director's Session at the 2021 Annual Meeting. L. Brady reminded Council that the format for the 2020 session included an update on the institutes' diversity and inclusion efforts and an update on COVID with Q&A following. S. Timm noted that the feedback from this session was positive last year, and attendees appreciated the discussion of the two topics instead of the general overview of the institutes. Suggestions for this year's session included asking the institutes to report on what's new at their institute, review changes on funding opportunities and diversity that would be of interest to applicants, following up on diversity issues that were raised at last year's session, discussion of the BRAIN Initiative, changes in President Biden's budget, the UNITE Initiative, etc. It was suggested to ask our younger investigators what they would like to learn from the session or poll membership for topics that Council could narrow down. It was also suggested to ask the Institute Director's what they think would be helpful for the junior and mid-level investigators. As the session is time-limited and there needs to be time for Q&A, the Director's might only have time to present on their updates with diversity and the priorities of the institutes. Further discussion will be held on a future call.
9. ***Membership Committee Application Reviews Proposal*** – The Membership Committee chairs are requesting to change the application reviews from a 1-5 review scoring (1 = Outstanding, top 5% and 5 = Poor) to the NIH 1-9 scale that is currently used by the Program Committee for their reviews. This was approved by Council.

**10. PMG Update** – S. Timm reported to Council that things are going considerably well with Parthenon Management Group. 2020 was an exceptional year with the addition of a large client and virtual meeting business. As a few of our clients were already planning to move to virtual meetings, PMG was able to shift to virtual meetings quickly during COVID. This year, PMG completed the transition of our largest client, the Case Management Society of America, which consists of 7,000 members and added 8 FTE to staff to make 63 PMG employees. S. Timm stated that PMG has a Marketing Manager and Website Developer so now we are able to bring those services in-house instead of outsourcing. S. Timm advised that PMG has designed our third strategic plan which will take us through 2025. The goals in the new plan are:

- Increase revenue to \$7M while maintaining the core values of PMG
- Recruit and retain a diverse workforce of key talent to meet the needs of PMG and the organizations we serve.
- Strategically analyze current and new business to ensure a mutually beneficial partnership.
- Develop new lines of business in our ever-changing technology focused world.

S. Timm reported that PMG now has 18 association management clients and an additional six meetings-only clients. PMG has also expanded our services to grant management and consulting. S. Timm advised that we manage a \$1.2 Million per year HRSA grant for the Organization of Teratology Information Specialists and now manage a new HRSA grant for the development of the Center on Rural Addiction at the University of Vermont (CORA). Also, S. Timm has been working with several new start-up organizations that have significant growth potential to help with developing a governing structure, a strategic plan, website/marketing, and membership technology. S. Timm reported that FY2021 was an exceptional year for PMG with over \$1M in profit. FY2022 is shaping up to be another healthy year for PMG but does not anticipate another \$1M pre-tax profit year. S. Timm advised that PMG absorbs a significant amount of expense for ACNP with paying rent of the building back to the College and paying for a portion of the executive level staff salaries. S. Timm advised that C. Neill Epperson and Guy Goodwin was added to the PMG Board and the Board will be presented with the new strategic plan at their meeting in July. It was questioned if ACNP should apply for any grants to help provide for diversity related projects. S. Timm could not think of any specific grants at this time but will advise if any she comes across will translate well to the College. It was questioned if all of PMG clients are still medically health care organizations. S. Timm advised that our niche is research and medical health care and that a lot of other association management companies do not have niches as PMG does. Council thanked S. Timm and her team for the spectacular job and productivity in leading many associations.

**11. Strategic Plan Update** – L. Brady encouraged all of Council to read through the strategic plan updates. S. Timm noted that staff is reviewing the strategic plan several times per year and the updates provided to Council note which objectives are complete, in progress or not started based on color coordination. L. Brady advised that Goal #1 is the Standards of Excellence for College Membership, Goal #2 the Annual Meeting, Goal #3 Publications, Goal #4 the Effective Source of Scientific Information and Collaborative Relationships, and Goal #5 the Financial Stability and Criteria for the use of ACNP

Financial Reserves. It was noted that asking Springer Nature for a proposal for a spinoff open access journal was created during the 2019 summer Council meeting, and that the consensus was there were too many negatives that had not been considered at that time. This has dissolved with the new designation of the journal.

**Information Items:**

**12. 2025 ACNP Annual Meeting** – The Executive Office staff are planning site visits for properties in Tampa and Orlando for the 2025 Annual Meeting. This will be further discussed in December.

**13. Committee & Task Force Reports** – Council was encouraged to read the committee and task force reports. L. Brady stated that all committees and task forces are making great progress.

*a. Women’s Task Force* – The Women’s Task Force agreed to cancel the Women’s Reception during the 2021 Annual Meeting. E. Leibenluft advised Council that the task force members agreed since the Women’s Luncheon was a huge event and there is already networking during the open lunch period, that the reception seemed redundant. She advised that attendance had not been great the past few years and the task force decided it made sense to not continue the reception this year.

*b. Education & Training Committee* – Council reviewed the NNCI Project update on the *BRAIN 2021: a 16-session modern learning experience that brings contemporary neuroscience content to life*. As a reminder, Council approved to provide \$35,000 each year for three years to support the NNCI from the use of funds. Council agreed this project looks fabulous and thanked the Education and Training Committee for all their work. It was stated that NNCI is helping us move in the direction of increasing the pipeline.

**14. NPP Pricing Letter** – Council reviewed the 2022 prices for *Neuropsychopharmacology*.

L. Brady thanked Council for their great feedback and discussions today.

The meeting concluded at 2:25 p.m.