

**Minutes Board Meeting MultiPark
2011-04-12 kl 12.00-14.00**

Present: Hjalmar Bjartmarz
Anders Björklund
Patrik Brundin
Ingemar Carlstedt (until §15)
Martha Escobar
Susanne Iwarsson
Elisabet Londos
Cecilia Lundberg
Per Odin (via phone from §5)
Roger Olsson
Steven Schmidt
Jens Schouenborg

Absent: Deniz Kirik (his comments to the agenda, distributed to all board members previous to the meeting, are enclosed at the end of this document as Appendix 1)
Andreas Puschmann

§1. Opening of the Meeting

Patrik Brundin welcomed everybody and opened the meeting. Patrik Brundin chaired the meeting unless otherwise stated.

§2. Election of "Justeringsperson"

Roger Olsson was assigned as "Justeringsperson"

§3. Approval of the agenda

The order of the points in the agenda was modified since Hjalmar Bjartmarz requested to move §17 before starting with the decision points (§17 was discussed before §7: using the numbering of the agenda). In addition Susanne Iwarsson wanted to include a report of the progress of the initiative to reinforce educational efforts at the Faculty of Medicine with the support of the strategic areas. It was also pointed out that the term guest researchers should be used instead of guest teachers, since the latter type of employment is no longer available according to the legislation that took force on Jan 1, 2011. In order to allow that Ingemar Carlstedt could participate in the discussions regarding decision points, §16 (innovation) was moved prior to §14 (information about S Pålhagen's application).

§4. Introduction of Steven Schmidt

Patrik Brundin introduced Steven Schmidt as the new grant manager (25% position).

§5. Information

- **High Content Screening system**

Martha Escobar informed that the system was installed during the 1st week of April and that the first training session for 5 participants has also been carried out. Further adjustments of the apotome are required and this requires a 2nd visit of the

engineer that has been planned for the last week in April. These adjustments do not affect the function of the instrument for applications related to cultured cells.

- **Procurement of the cell-sorter**

Martha Escobar informed that the procurement for cell-sorter has been initiated jointly with STEM THERAPY. The invitation to tender was published on April the 7th and will be opened until the 2011-05-17. A delivery of the instrument should be possible during the late summer.

- **New working groups**

Patrik Brundin summarized the composition of the current working groups (published on the website, under "Management").

- **New rules for employment of postdoctoral fellows**

Martha Escobar informed about the new rules regarding the employment of individuals that have been active at Lund University at postdoctoral level with the support of scholarships. These rules apply from 2011-04-01 and might have repercussions on the applicability of "third-year postdoc".

§6. Delegated decisions

Eunju Shin has been awarded a travel grant of 15 100 SEK for his upcoming participation in the 11th international neural transplantation and repair (INTR-11) meeting in Clearwater, Florida, USA, in May 2011.

§7. Report on the establishment of the clinical node

Per Odin informed the members of the board that the clinical node will hold an additional meeting with a large group of clinical investigators in MultiPark before the next board meeting (June 15th). Ongoing work has focused on the definition of a draft by the working group (composed by Per Odin, Lena Brundin, Christer Nilsson, Lennart Minthon and Sven Pålhagen). Hjalmar Bjartmarz commented on the lack of transparency of the process since no one in the large assembly was asked about who should be included in the working group, although he agreed that the composition of the group is not questionable, he pointed out the lack of information as a major problem.

In addition, it was also reported that Paola Piccini has been in Lund and discussions regarding the recruitment of a post-doctoral fellow for PET projects are ongoing. The postdoctoral fellow would be required to work in London.

§8. Decision regarding the acceptance of Gunnar Gouras as Associated Partner of MultiPark

It was *decided* to include Gunnar Gouras as associated partner of MultiPark.

§9. Decision regarding handling of postdoc/guest researchers applications

It was *decided* to include in the evaluation forms for these applications the possibility to make the decisions *per capsulam* in the case that both referees agree. If any doubts decisions will be made at the next board meeting.

§10. Decision regarding the recruitment support staff to run the technical platforms

It was *decided* to delegate to the coordinator and administrative staff to perform the recruitment the technical staff to take care of the technical platforms in accordance with the budget for 2011. A policy document where the kind of help and the level of support that



the technical staff should must be produced and be accessible in order to define the work assignment for this person. This document will be prepared by Martha Escobar and Patrik Brundin, for approval at the next board meeting.

§11. Decision regarding the purchase of a 30 % statistics resource from RSKC

It was *decided* to delegate to the coordinator to sign a contract with RSKC to buy 30% consult services in statistics to be used by the members of MultiPark. The starting date should be as soon as possible ending by 2012-12-31. After this period an evaluation will be carried out to define the level of usage and the usefulness of this kind of resource.

§12. Decision regarding the appointment of Junior Group Leaders – number of positions and definition of their start-up package

Susanne Iwarsson chaired the meeting at this point. Patrik Brundin, Anders Björklund and Cecilia Lundberg left the meeting due to conflict of interest. There was still enough *quorum* to made this decision.

It was *decided* to approve the appointment according to the recommendations of the working group. It was also *decided* to define the start-up package as 500 000 SEK per year/person. This sum can then be used to cover any kind of costs except for scholarships. Due to the limitations that MultiPark's funding represents in terms of its use ("periodisering" is not allowed) periodic reports need be submitted to the MultiPark management in order to guarantee the usage of the allocated resources prior to the payment of a new period. Further, it was also *decided* to include all appointed junior group leaders as associated partners of MultiPark.

§13. Decision regarding application for guest-researcher months by Maud Hårleman

It was *decided* to support the application by Maud Hårleman with 4 months (FTE) for 2011. Hårleman will be employed at the Department of Health Sciences, with Susanne Iwarsson as the responsible group leader. Elisabet Londos will be engaged to support the clinical aspects of Hårleman's project.

As a side note, the working group responsible for the evaluation of guest researcher applications stated that the application form used was not optimal from the evaluation point of view. For forthcoming applications, it has to be revised.

§14. Decision regarding application for funding of a postdoctoral fellow in connection with the guest professorship of Paola Piccini

Susanne Iwarsson led the discussion. Patrik Brundin left the room due to conflict of interest. It was *decided* to support the application by Ruben Smith/Per Odin with 50% clinical post-doc position (to be invoiced by SUS) plus support for increased living costs (travel, rent) during stays in London (20 000 SEK/month: 120 000 SEK). It was also decided that this effort *must* be followed of a long-term plan since this competence should be used in conjunction with efforts to establish a PET-facility in Lund as a joint effort with Region Skåne. The definition of a working group on this area is therefore necessary and should be started as soon as possible, jointly with LBIC. Since this post has not been previously included in the budget it was noted that this kind of costs are part of the budget of the clinical node.



§15. Decision regarding handling of resources allocated for "MultiPark Innovation Support"

It was *decided* to announce a call for proposals to be finalized by the innovation group; it was also *decided* to establish a procedure for evaluation of the proposals as follows:

1. Announcement (without defined deadlines)
2. Evaluation by the innovation group
3. Selection of proposals and decision by the innovation group (to be able to provide confidentiality).

§16. Information regarding application for guest-teacher appointment by Sven Pålhagen


Regarding the recruitment of Sven Pålhagen, as stated also under §13, the application form used for the evaluation was not optimal. The working group nevertheless supported Pålhagen's application, although it could not be evaluated as a research project. Formalities regarding the appointment are still not solved and will be handled by Per Odin and Susanne Iwarsson.


§17. Report on the progress of the establishment of the "Chemical Biology and Therapeutics Development Platform" and decision regarding site visits


It was *decided* to delegate the final decision regarding the funding of site visits proposed by the CBT group to the coordinator. The group has identified visits to St Jude's Children hospital and Vanderbilt University. The visits will be made by at least two members of the working group.

§18. Other matters discussed


Susanne Iwarsson informed about the progress of work on how to encourage and support closer cooperation between the Strategic Research Areas and education. During the last meeting it was discussed the possibility to implement a pilot project that would help to elucidate better ways to promote education at research level among young medical and health science students, with the financial support of the strategic areas. Next meeting is planned for June 2011.


Patrik Brundin


Susanne Iwarsson
(Chair §12 and §14)


Martha Escobar

Justeras


Roger Olsson

8/7/2011

Appendix 1:

Comments to the agenda by Deniz Kirik; communication by email on 2011-04-11

Comments and decision points from Deniz Kirik for the MultiPark board meeting scheduled to take place on April 12, 2011

§5c -- Information on new working groups

Several of us have been involved in the development of plans to establish a clinical NeuroPET imaging and the associated platforms. Our intention is to lift up the quality of clinical research that can be carried out within the core priority areas of MultiPark. I would like to point to the fact that this will be an involved process by many parties and have a potential opening for co-financing in the autumn through major infrastructure investments we could get in as external financing. I think it is now the right time to establish this core group so that within the next 2-3 months a concrete plan can be put forward. It is important that this plan is headed by MultiPark, engages LBIC as a partner and involves the hospital leadership in the planning. I would like to suggest that the board appoints a member to be the leading person for this project.

§5e -- New rules for employment of postdoctoral fellows

The modification suggested is in principle fine and I would to vote for approval. I do, however, have a concern to note. So far the approved post-docs have been for people from within the groups of the board members or their immediate associates. I think this is not a good situation and suggests that these positions have so far been used as a mechanism to transfer money from MultiPark budget to a few closely linked investigators rather than providing a means to leverage the Neuroscience communities needs more broadly. I think this weakness should be corrected as soon as possible. I suggest that information on these positions should be more widely distributed to a large group of investigators and promote applications from others than ourselves...

§7 -- Decision regarding the acceptance of Gunnar Gouras as Associated Partner of MultiPark

It would be natural to bring a new professor into the organization that promoted its recruitment. I support this decision and approve it. What remains rather unclear is what role will he play as a member of MultiPark. The list of associate members have so far been exactly what it sounds - a list of names. A number of associate members are completely unaware of what happens in MultiPark. I was surprised by one commenting that he/she was hoping that we would start working soon and was unaware that the board has actually spent much of its resources not only for this year but even for the coming years. Thus many if not all of MultiPark's operations happen ignoring its member basis. Even more embarrassingly some of the key Neuroscience experts are not even members. It seems that the list of associates currently listed is biased and not well justified. I think that this should be discussed carefully and we need to see an improvement in the utility of the associate members and an explanation on what basis they have been listed as such.

§9 -- Decision regarding the recruitment support staff to run MultiPark apparatus technical platforms

The decision on the infrastructure investments to technical platforms established as part of MultiPark initiatives have been controversial. I do not think that they actually fulfill the criteria to be named as MultiPark platforms and consider the investments made into the equipment inappropriate for the goals of the program as a whole. Thus I do not agree to the proposal to delegate the recruitment of staff to these positions at this point.

§10 -- Decision regarding the purchase of a 30 % statistics resource from RSKC

This is an important point as it represents an area that is lacking in our knowledge basis. I would very much support this initiative but would like to make the remark that the resource should be possible to utilize as a consultancy at all levels of our work from experimental design to data analysis. I am sure that this will be very appreciated in our environment.

§11 -- Appointment of Junior Group Leaders – number of positions and definition of their start-up package

I would like to refrain from participating in the decision of these position as I can see that I have a conflict of

interest. Actually this is true not only for myself but many others in the board have conflicts of interest for various reasons. It appears that the working group is also formed by very closely linked investigators that makes this entire process and its motivations questionable. I would have preferred to see that this process was lifted out of MultiPark's sphere of influence and carried out by an external group that should have no conflict of interest in the matter and therefore would have the credibility to claim fairness and an unbiased decision process that it deserves.

§12 -- Decision regarding application for guest teacher months by Maud Hårleman

I cannot evaluate this application as I could not find the motivation for accepting this application from the host, which is presumably one of the clinical departments. Is there a contact person in Lund for this project? Has this person provided a letter of support for the request? The two reference persons listed in the attached document are external references. I guess this was not the intention of the information requested in the template (as judged by other applications I read below). In addition, if we are bringing in a guest researcher who should be an expert in the field, why does the period include time for literature search. If specific information is needed, this is something that can as well be acquired in parallel to work in other aspects of the project. I think this item in the agenda is not ready for approval.

§13 --

Decision regarding application for funding of a postdoctoral fellow in connection with the guest professorship of Paola Piccini

This application is in line with the working group process I suggested to initiate above and fits well with the needs in the area. The proposal is well described and motivated by the hosting investigator (Per Odin). I support this and would vote to approve the proposal. I would like to suggest that the initial 1 year period ends with a report by the applicant and the host that summarizes the achievements during this term and a detailed description of the proposed steps forward in Lund. This would then come very close in time with the concrete development plans for the infrastructure investments we would propose from within MultiPark as well as strategies for co-financing, collectively giving a very good view of the process we will embark.

§14 -- Information regarding application for guest-teacher appointment by Sven Pålhagen

It seems that this opportunity arose upon retirement of the applicant from his full time post. I think the information provided is overall very good. What I think is rather cryptic and poorly described is the 3rd aim. As my own work yields to such clinical translation, I felt this part was unsatisfactory. Could we please ask the applicant and the two hosts (Per Odin and Håkan Widner) to provide an expansion of this 3rd aim prior to making a decision.

§15 --

Report on the progress of the establishment of the "Chemical Biology and Therapeutics Development Platform" and decision regarding site visits

There is no information distributed on this point. I am sorry I will not be able to hear more about it. I am very interested to follow the developments under this item. I do hope that the meeting notes will contain all relevant information about this program for me to read. In addition, I would try and find a time to talk with Roger in person to understand his suggested strategy better and find out how I might be able to contribute to it.

§16 -- Decision regarding handling of resources allocated for "MultiPark Innovation Support"

I think that the selection of the innovation board then becomes a critical one. If I recall correctly these are again people around our own environment. Although Olle Lindvall is one of the few persons we can trust in this work, it is still important that this is handled without causing problems between investigators in Lund. I can foresee this becoming a serious issue when some proposals are supported others are turned down. The reasons for the decisions would become a controversial issue.

I do not have any issues with the board having the second voting rights to this. Although, I think it may be preferable that it did not come to the board again as many of us would apply ourselves and would end up in the same conflict of interest issues. Could we make the entire decision process independent of the board. The board could decide how much money it would allocate and approve the innovation group (then must

be external to MultiPark) and ask them to make the decisions.
