

Council Minutes
Monday, March 6, 2023
11:00am - 12:00pm Eastern

Participants:

Kerry Ressler
Rita Valentino
Cynthia Crawford
Carlos Zarate
Linda Brady
Ellen Leibenluft

Bill Carlezon
Colleen McClung
Deanna Barch
Sarah Timm, staff
Erin Shaw, staff

Minutes:

K. Ressler thanked E. Leibenluft, C. Zarate, L. Brady, David Rubinow, R. Valentino, Maria Oquendo, and S. Timm for their guidance and review of the recent President's Blog.

- 1. ACNP Panel, Mini-Panel and Study Group Sessions*** – K. Ressler advised that the Program Committee suggested shortening the scientific sessions during their December committee meeting. Council reviewed the proposed new schedule with the panel and study group sessions decreased from 2.5 hours to 2 hours. The mini-panels will be decreased from 75 minutes to 50 minutes. The proposed new schedule has sessions starting 30 minutes later at 9:00 am and moves the poster sessions up by 30 minutes to be from 5:00 pm – 7:00 pm instead of 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm. The Executive Committee reviewed the request and the newly proposed schedule during their Executive Committee call on February 28th. They presented the new schedule to Council who unanimously approved the proposed new shortened schedule.
- 2. Future Annual Meetings*** – Council discussed future annual meetings. S. Timm questioned if the Council needs more data on the following items before making decisions, and if a task force should be formed.
 - a. Future Meeting Locations*** – With the Supreme Court ruling on Dobbs v Jackson, overturning Roe v Wade, and changing reproductive rights in some states, there has been concern from members about holding the meetings in more conservative states. There has also been concern raised by the LGBTQ+ community regarding their safety in more conservative states. During the December Council meeting, Council discussed the implications of future meeting locations and how to make everyone feel comfortable at the ACNP Annual Meetings. S. Timm advised that the College is very limited to properties that are not in convention centers and that there are only two locations that are not in conservative states or cold locations that could host the meeting. During the October Council meeting, Council discussed sourcing D.C., Puerto Rico, Honolulu, and Colorado for the 2027 Annual Meeting location.
 - b. Future Meeting Dates*** – There has been a request to Council to revisit the dates of the annual meetings as the current dates in December fall right after the Society for Neuroscience (SfN) Annual Meeting and the holidays. S. Timm advised that this has been a recurring discussion with Council over the years and there was a

survey to membership around ten years ago; however, the majority voted to keep the meeting in December. C. McClung stated that December is a challenging time both professionally and personally during the holidays to host a meeting, and suggested January as an alternative month. It was also noted that a lot of things have changed socially and politically in the last 10 years and another survey might provide different results. It was noted that the predictability of always hosting the annual meeting the first weekend in December helps members plan around the dates professionally and personally. Meetings such as the Society for Neuroscience (SfN) change each year and could be in October one year and November the next. It was stated that predictability is important and should be built in the survey.

It was discussed that a survey to membership could inform on both meeting location and dates more broadly which would help Council consider a change in policy. The survey could have questions such as, “do we want to stay in warm locations”, “do we want to change the dates of the annual meeting”, “do we want to refrain from holding the meeting in states that could impact our members feeling of safety”. It was brought up that rather than boycotting particular locations, the College could take the opportunity to increase outreach and education in those locations and that could assist with changing policy. It was noted that surveys to membership in the past have not provided a good response rate such as the recent Roe v Wade survey. B. Carlezon suggested keeping the survey as brief as possible and advise members of the importance of the survey and time it will take to complete which has always worked well for the journal in the past. It was suggested to be very specific in the survey on what our members prioritize such as location, size of the meeting, dates of the meeting, cost of the meeting, and social/political issues. It was advised that hosting a meeting in January is more expensive than hosting a meeting in December and therefore a date change could increase registration as well as hotel costs in warmer locations. A task force would address these questions. Another suggested question would be to ask if membership wants to continue with hybrid meetings long after the pandemic has passed. The Executive Office will draft the survey questions for this task force to review. The task force should include members that are passionate on both sides of the issues. It was suggested for the task force to consist of volunteers from Council and chairs and co-chairs of the committees and task forces. The Executive Office will send invitations to the committee chairs this week to see if they have interest joining the task force. D. Barch, B. Carlezon, E. Leibenluft, and C. McClung all volunteered to be on the task force. Once the survey is completed, the task force will review and provide a recommendation to Council for future annual meetings during the summer Council meeting.

It was questioned if the Executive Office is still considering California as a meeting location. S. Timm advised that they are still trying to negotiate the 2026 contract at LA Live; however, are struggling as food and beverage costs have gone up 100%. It will cost the College around \$1M in food and beverage costs to have the meeting in Los Angeles. S. Timm advised that restricting locations will also constrain the College in negotiating lower costs.

3. ***Meeting Attendance Requirement for Members*** – Council discussed the current meeting attendance requirement for members from the bylaws.

- a. The Status of Fellows and Members 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 Fellows and Members be terminated.
- b. Council shall be empowered to determine final action to be taken in case of an Associate Member having more than two unexcused absences from an annual meeting.

The 2020 and 2021 Annual Meeting member attendance requirement was waived due to COVID. Attendance was required for the 2022 Annual Meeting according to the bylaws; however, members were able to choose between in-person and virtual attendance. It was stated that continuing to allow hybrid meetings to count allows for more flexibility for our members and a way to expand the size of the meeting. Council agreed to continue to allow members to choose between in-person and virtual attendance. It was noted to continue to allow this flexibility until a change is made to hybrid meetings and this will be reviewed again.

C. Zarate requested for Council to have a future discussion on the process for membership applications to the College. He noted that very senior members of organizations have stated that they would like to join the College; however, the membership process is arduous and that they might not be able to attend the meeting as frequently. This will be discussed on a future call.

4. *Recent Updates* –

- a. ***NPP-Digital Psychiatry and Neuroscience*** – B. Carlezon reminded Council that the College started the contracting process with Springer Nature back in July 2022 and the contract was not finalized until February 2023. He advised that he has an unofficial Senior Editor team in place based on portfolio areas; however, will need the budget to be approved to send the official invitations. The portfolios currently consist of studies in humans, devices and apps, computational, molecular, and studies in animals. Other Deputy Editors will focus on social media, special features, and there will be an Editorial Intern. The Editorial Board stipends total \$56K which includes B. Carlezon's stipend as Principal Editor. B. Carlezon is also requesting an additional \$3K for miscellaneous support such as podcast training. The total budget request of \$59K does not include the portion of editorial staff assistance and the invitations and waived registration for the annual meeting for the non-ACNP members on the Editorial Board. B. Carlezon advised that he might request additional support in future years if there is a need for additional portfolios. The Senior Editors will be asked to write an article for the new journal. The Executive Office will send a formal vote to Council via email on the budget approval this week. Council requested to revisit the budget during the December Council meeting to pre-plan for the second year.
- b. ***Technology in Psychiatry Summit (TIPS) Satellite Meeting*** – K. Ressler reminded Council of the request from TIPS to host a satellite meeting prior to the ACNP Annual Meeting. K. Ressler advised that TIPS will not ask for funding from ACNP as this meeting will be funded by The Institute for Technology in Psychiatry (of McLean Hospital) and soliciting funding from industry and non-profit. The TIPS satellite meeting will be associated as a pre-meeting to the

ACNP Annual Meeting and will highlight the new journal, *NPP-Digital Psychiatry and Neuroscience*. The satellite meeting will be scheduled the Friday and Saturday before the ACNP Annual Meeting at another hotel close to the ACNP conference hotels as there was not enough meeting space and hotel rooms at the ACNP conference hotels. To finalize the planning for this meeting, they will need Council approval. The Executive Office will send an email vote to Council this week.

- c. ***Global Outreach Discussion*** – C. Zarate advised the first task force call of the Global Outreach Task Force discussed two proposals. The first discussion was to make a formal proposal to Council on a needs-based scholarship for prospective members and annual meeting attendees based on the World Bank low-income countries. The task force agreed to prioritize lower middle income and low-income countries and then adopt a case-by-case review for upper-middle income countries as some of those in Latin America such as Argentina and Brazil have seen 100% inflation in the last eight months. The task force is requesting 50 virtual meeting invitations for those World Bank categories. This will be discussed on a future Council meeting. The 2nd discussion was a proposal from Peter Kalivas and Lukoye Atwoli, African College of Neuropsychopharmacology (AfCNP), for ACNP/AfCNP sponsored neuropsychopharmacology schools in Africa to grow a community of neuropsychopharmacology collaborators. This has been funded by IBRO and ISN. The task force requested additional information on the IBRO-ISN program trainees' long-term outcomes and will discuss again on their next task force call. The task force was also advised of the travel award program and to distribute the travel award flyer to potential candidates.
- d. ***Potential Speakers for Plenary and Special Sessions*** – K. Ressler provided an update on potential speakers for the President's Plenary, Meet the Expert and Teaching Day sessions. K. Ressler advised the theme of the President's Plenary session will further the theme of translation, *Translational Success in Neuropsychiatry Treatment from Bench to Bedside*. K. Ressler is requesting five presenters for this session with shorter talks instead of the previous sessions of only 4 presenters. The potential speakers are Reisa Sperling, Harvard, Samantha Meltzer-Brody, UNC, John Krystal, Yale, Tony Coles, Cerevel, and Linda Brady, NIMH. K. Ressler suggested that L. Brady could either present or moderate a panel discussion with the other presenters. The Teaching Day session potential speaker is Elena Koustova, NIDA, who is a leader in the "how to's" of how to teach academic researchers to innovate/work with industry to develop successful translational programs. The Meet the Expert potential speakers are Steve Marder and Michael Green on the topic of how MATRICS was built with the FDA. K. Ressler advised that the potential topics and speakers have been discussed with the Program Committee chairs, Victoria Risbrough and Tracy Bale, and Helen Mayberg. It was stated that the suggestions were good topics and speakers. L. Brady questioned if information on the NIH programs, HEAL Initiative, Blueprint for Neuroscience Research, and National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) should also be included. It was suggested those could also be submitted for discussion as a study group proposal. K. Ressler advised that he has a list of backup speakers as well if any of the potential speakers are not available.

The Executive Office will send the proposed list of topics and speakers to Council for any additional suggestions before formal invitations are sent.