

**ACNP Council Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday, December 8, 2021**  
**7:00pm – 9:00pm Atlantic Standard Time**  
**Puerto Rico Convention Center - 204**

*Carlos Zarate, Presiding*

Carrie Bearden  
Linda Brady  
William Carlezon  
Ellen Leibenluft  
Mary Phillips  
Maria Oquendo  
Marina Picciotto  
Diego Pizzagalli  
Kerry Ressler  
David Rubinow  
Rita Valentino

Executive Director: Sarah Timm  
Staff: Erin Shaw

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

***1. Future Annual Meeting Discussion***

- a. Feedback from the 2021 Hybrid Meeting*** – Council and staff heard very good comments regarding the annual meeting and the new hybrid format. S. Timm advised that there were some challenges with live-streaming for virtual attendees but noted that every session was recorded (with presenter approval) for attendees to view 30 days post meeting. S. Timm noted the technology challenges were quickly fixed and that attendees were very understanding. It was noted that staff in the convention center and hotel were great, and attendees felt safe and welcome in San Juan. It was suggested to reconsider the shuttles and hotels in the future, but the attendees really liked the Convention Center. S. Timm advised that a survey will be sent to all presenters (both in-person and virtual) after the meeting requesting feedback as well as the annual meeting evaluation that will be sent to all meeting attendees.
- b. Future Hybrid Meetings*** – C. Zarate advised that societies, such as ECNP, are moving to hybrid meetings in the future. It was noted that one way to be mindful of the diversity effort and the cap of 2,000 attendees is with a hybrid meeting format; however, noting that it will be more expensive. The Annual Meeting Task Force, chaired by Judy Ford, will research future meetings, and discuss the

feedback from this year's hybrid meeting. S. Timm advised that we had almost 2,100 in attendance with 42% being virtual. She also noted that it would be less expensive if we required all presenters to be in-person in future meetings. The Annual Meeting Task Force will update Council on their discussions in April 2022 on what aspects of hybrid should continue after reviewing the evaluations.

- c. *Cap Annual Meeting Attendance at 2,000*** – Council was reminded that in the past, it was agreed to cap 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. It was stated that having the virtual option will help with capping the attendance numbers; however, noting that this option works right now as we are still in a pandemic. S. Timm advised that the hybrid option will work temporarily for the cap of attendance for the next few years. It was stated that diversity and inclusion need to be considered for the future with capping attendance, as we need to have a plan for continuing to keep URMs coming to the meeting and being involved in the College. It was suggested a hybrid model would assist in engaging scientists from other countries such as Africa. It was advised that only one person from Africa has attended the ACNP Annual Meeting in the past five years. It was also noted that parents with young children appreciated the hybrid option as it is harder to attend in-person with school obligations or childcare challenges. The issue of the meeting attendance requirement for members by the bylaws was discussed. The bylaws state that Members and Fellows who have three successive absences from the annual meetings will be referred by the Secretary to the Membership Committee. The Membership Committee shall be empowered to recommend to Council that non-participating Members and Fellows be terminated as members. The bylaws also state that Associate Members may not miss more than two Annual Meetings during their seven-year tenure as an Associate Member unless excused by Council. Council agreed that virtual attendance should count in the hybrid meeting format. It was suggested to continue inviting the attendees from the University of Puerto Rico to attend future meetings virtually to keep them in the pipeline. It was also suggested to not have a cap of attendees for virtual attendance. With a meeting cap, it was questioned who would receive priority in attending in-person such as travel awardees and diverse attendees. It was suggested to add a question in this year's meeting evaluation, if the meetings continue in a hybrid meeting format, would you continue attending in-person or would you want to attend virtually. The Annual Meeting Task Force will be charged to propose a plan to Council by their April call. The Annual Meeting Task Force includes Judy Ford, E. Leibenluft, Marina Wolf, L. Brady, C. Zarate, K. Ressler, G. Horga, R. Sinha and incoming Program Chair, Victoria Risbrough.
- d. *Annual Meeting Invitation Categories*** – S. Timm reviewed the current annual meeting invitation categories in consideration of capping annual meeting attendance at 2,000 for future annual meetings. Council suggested for the Annual Meeting Task Force to review this in tandem to the hybrid platform. It was also suggested for the task force to consider an alternate way for virtual networking among virtual attendees.

*e. Carbon Off-Setting for 2022 Annual Meeting* – S. Timm advised that the Executive Office has investigated carbon off-setting options for the ACNP Annual Meetings. The College could add an additional \$7.15 - \$10 to annual meeting registration fees to carbon off-set the 2022 Annual Meeting. S. Timm advised that PMG is working with a company, South Pole, who reviews the past three years of attendance at the annual meetings, the number of attendees, air travel, and meals to create a carbon footprint per attendee that the organization could sponsor a project in the world. S. Timm advised that either the College could pay the additional fee per attendee, or it could be added to the registration fee. It was noted that attendees would not be able to “opt-out” as then the meeting would never be carbon neutral. Council agreed this is a good thing to support and suggested using the money in our use of funds. S. Timm advised this would cost the College around \$10-\$15K per year. Council agreed this is a great public relations move and requested to ensure all members and attendees are made aware of it. B. Carlezon advised that NPP published an article on the carbon footprint of the College and those authors could update those details to include this. Another suggestion to address the issue of the carbon footprint related to the temperature inside meeting rooms. It was stated that the Executive Office could report the temperature inside the meeting venue as another suggestion to help the carbon footprint. S. Timm advised that they request the venues to be set for 73 degrees and not to touch it; however, in these large venues it is difficult to maintain temperature.

2. *2025 ACNP Annual Meeting Location Discussion* – S. Timm provided an overview of the 2025 annual meeting location proposals. Council was reminded that the 2024 meeting will be in Phoenix, Arizona as the 2020 meeting went virtual and the contract had to be renegotiated. S. Timm advised that the College typically books the annual meeting five years in advance so Council could also decide the 2026 location during this time as well. S. Timm advised that the 2022 meeting will be in Phoenix, Arizona, the 2023 meeting in Tampa, Florida, and the 2024 meeting in Phoenix, Arizona. As S. Timm reviewed the proposals, she noted that the Executive Office did not look at San Juan as the meeting had not happened yet, and there were some challenges in the preplanning. The proposals were the JW Marriott and Tampa Marriott Water Street in Tampa, Florida which is where the 2023 meeting will take place. The two properties are connected by a skybridge and together have 175,000 square feet of meeting space and close to 1300 guest rooms. The proposals in Orlando, Florida consist of the Gaylord Palms Resort and Convention Center which would accommodate all attendees under one roof but would not have as many affordable restaurant options and would require shuttles to other options for dining. The JW Marriott Grande Lakes and Ritz Carlton are two hotels combined into one complex, similar to the 2019 meeting. The Loews Complex at Universal which consists of the Loews Royal Pacific, Sapphire Falls, and Aventura would provide meeting space that is connected by a breezeway between the Royal Pacific and Sapphire Falls with Aventura across the street with overflow. These properties are connected to City Walk, which is a large entertainment district with many restaurant options. Council was interested in the Loews Complex as it provides more affordable hotel and dining options for attendees. Council also requested a

proposal for San Juan, Puerto Rico and will take into account the attendees' perspectives once the meeting evaluation results are in. Council will make a final decision on 2025 and 2026 in April.

- 3. *Review current list of participating corporations and the companies the Liaison Committee has suggested contacting*** – It was questioned if Council should create a subcommittee from the Liaison Committee and other members familiar with industry and biotechs in 2022. It was suggested to contact digital technology companies. S. Timm requested for Council members to send the companies and contacts for digital technology to the Executive Office. It was questioned if a Council member is in conflict with a company, should they promote it to the ACNP. S. Timm advised that the members writing the supporting letters for the companies applying for participation corporation lists the conflicts and disclosures in their letters. S. Timm also advised that if a Council member is in conflict, then they should recuse themselves from the vote on the participating corporation application. Council agreed to charge the Liaison Committee to consider if they need additional expertise for contacting potential companies, then they should recruit others in the College. It was also suggested to send a survey to membership in the future to suggest names of potential companies to the Liaison Committee.
- 4. *Final Decisions on Use of Funds*** – S. Timm reminded Council that in Saturday's meeting, they approved to provide \$20K to the APA Research Colloquium through 2024, \$15K to the American Brain Coalition for 2022, and \$6K to the FBR "Love Animals? Support Animal Research" campaign. It was noted that the College is spending around \$250K on past travel awards and the URM Near Peer Mentorship program. S. Timm explained that the College has been using the previous year's investment interest and dividends to fund these "Use of Funds" project. The estimated amount of interest and dividends for spending in 2022 is \$189K. S. Timm reminded Council that the College did not spend all the funds in 2020 due to the pandemic. D. Rubinow noted that if the Council would like to fund additional projects, the College could easily manage the current initiatives and new initiatives as we are in good shape financially but noting that Council should always be mindful on how we are spending the College's money. M. Oquendo reminded Council that as a non-profit organization, having a deficit as well as having a surplus in funds without using those on your mission is not advisable. With this in mind, the College should be investing in initiatives to support our mission. It was questioned what financial impact the College will have with hybrid meetings in the future. S. Timm advised that the biggest expense will be the audio visual. It was stated that Council is supportive of any equipment PMG will need to continue with hybrid meetings. S. Timm advised that the PMG Board is discussing if PMG should invest in the technology company that PMG is working with to develop things further.

The potential of a spin-off journal was discussed. B. Carlezon advised that the premise of a spin-off journal would likely mean additional revenue for the College with little investment. The publisher is evaluating the spin-off journal proposal, and B. Carlezon should have something more formal to present to Council in January or February. It was suggested for a future Bulletin article, such as the Director's Notes by S. Timm, to advise

membership how we are using the College's funds in 2022 and how it correlates to our strategic plan.

5. ***Future of Psychiatry Session*** – Council reviewed the proposal from C. Neill Epperson, 2022 Membership Committee co-chair, on the Future of Psychiatry group and a Zoom session in February of 2022. After review and discussion, Council suggested that the best way to proceed would be for N. Epperson to submit a study group proposal to the 2022 Annual Meeting first to see interest from the Program Committee and if approved, meeting attendees. As this proposal is not well aligned with our mission, it was suggested that it might be better done in partnerships with other organizations that are more dedicated to ensuring more equitable and comprehensive care. It was suggested to provide feedback to N. Epperson to submit a study group proposal to the Program Committee for the 2022 meeting. It was questioned if there would be interest in having ongoing interest groups moving forward, such as ongoing discussion from the study groups at the annual meetings. It was noted that this would need to be reviewed by the Program Committee.
6. ***Renaming the NPP EIC Position*** – B. Carlezon proposed to take a closer look at the use of language in the College such as Fellow, Fellowship, Chairman, and Editor-in-Chief. He has been made aware by colleagues that the term “chief” can bother some people. B. Carlezon suggested to instead call the EIC position “Principal Editor”. Also, the definition of fellow is a man or boy. It was advised that the American Psychological Association released a 25-page document about the use of language that can be used as a reference. Council agreed to create a task force to review the language and nomenclature, and B. Carlezon volunteered to chair. C. Zarate, E. Leibenluft, and M. Oquendo also volunteered. It was suggested to include the neuroscience-based nomenclature (NbN) in the discussions. The paper in NPP, *Choosing appropriate language to reduce the stigma around mental illness and substance use disorders*, can also be used as a reference.
7. ***Presidential Initiatives for 2022*** – C. Zarate shared the following presidential initiatives for 2022, which were also shared in the Business Meeting.
  - The future of ACNP Annual Meetings in a new hybrid ‘meeting’ world
  - Bring more clinical translational research to the College and Annual Meeting by outreach to key clinical research societies
  - The 2021/2022 URM Near Peer Mentorship Program
  - Expand global outreach and engagement of international societies

The Annual Meeting Task Force will be reinstated to consider a hybrid meeting for 2022 and the future. With a hybrid meeting format, this will allow the Council to expand our outreach globally and increase engagement with international societies. It is hoped that speakers at the annual meeting who are not currently members of the College will become future members and leaders of the College.

Another topic of consideration is how should the field work to have clinical translational scientists work with basic scientists. It was noted that Kafui Dzirasa's Distinguished

Lecture talk discussed this and was well received. This could also include engaging AsCNP, CINP and ECNP. One suggestion was to request at least one clinical or one basic scientist in the proposals of mostly clinical or basic to provide the other perspective; however, noted that the program should be balanced, and the proposals should not be forced. It was also suggested to schedule a meeting with leaders of other organizations such as ASCP and CPDD to share initiatives, like the mini retreats in 2021. The theme for these 2022 mini retreats could be on clinical translation of basic science.

The other initiative for 2022 will be to continue to invest in the URM Near Peer Mentorship program. We want to assure that the mentees in this program stay involved in the College and annual meeting. A suggestion was to charge the Education and Training Committee with developing a mentor program after the mentees complete the URM Near Peer program to connect with mentors in their field that can help the mentees get jobs in labs. In the past, the College worked with Eli Lilly on a sponsored grant where trainees were placed in ACNP member labs for a summer internship program. This was a great program and initiative; however, there were challenges in implementation. It was suggested to create a task force or charge a current committee such as the Education and Training Committee on maintaining trainees in the pipeline by continuing to invite them to the annual meetings such as the URM Near Peer mentees, University of Puerto Rico invitees, and HBCU's. It was suggested to add an evaluation question at the end of the URM Near Peer Mentorship program on what the mentee was looking for out of this program and if it was successful.

The Diversity and Inclusion Task Force planned a symposium today with presenter, Ruth Shim. There were members of the task force who also submitted their own proposals to the Program Committee, and one was a study group that was accepted. This study group had over 100 people in the session, but only around ten senior members. Council requested for more senior leaders to attend these sessions in 2022.

***Information Items:***

8. ***2022 Summer Council and Program Committee Meetings*** – The summer Council meeting will be held virtually on Sunday, July 17, 2022, from 10:00am – 2:00pm Eastern. The Program Committee will meet virtually on Saturday, July 16, 2022.
9. ***2022 EC/Council Call/Meeting Schedule*** – Council was provided the 2022 EC and Council call schedule.

The meeting concluded at 9:00 PM Atlantic Standard Time.