

## Imaging Advisory Group (IAG)

23.04.24  
Minutes

Present:

Ambalika Batra-Penny	ABP	Head of enterprise and innovation
Ariel Poliandri	AP	Director of Research Operations
Aurora Campagna	AC	PhD Student Forum Representative
Carly Lightfoot	CL	Library and Learning Technology Services
Daniel Osborn	DO	Senior Lecturer in Genetics - MCS
Deborah Chong	DC	Lecturer in Infection and Immunity - I&I
Emily Woodcock	EW	Light Microscopy Manager – IRF (Chair)
Florencia Cavodeassi	FC	Senior Lecturer in Development Biology
Kazim Ogmen	KO	Postdoctoral Research assistant
Nikita Demchenko	ND	Cell Biology Manager – IRF
Tom Carter	TC	Professor of endothelial cell biology

Apologies received from:

### Item 1

#### a). Previous Minutes and Action Points

To receive and approve: The minutes of the meeting held on 26.01.2024 were approved.

#### **Actions from Previous IAG Meeting (26.01.24):**

**Action Point 1 from 26.01.24 meeting:** *“EW to update the terms of reference to reflect the new institutes”*  
Status: Closed

EW has updated the terms of reference to show the two new institutes rather than MCS. We have representatives from these two new institutes.

**Action Point 2 from 26.01.24 meeting:** *“EW to look into potential slide scanners with fluorescence”*.  
Status: Complete

EW organised the demo of the Nanozoomer S60 slide scanner with fluorescence – discussed in this meeting.

**Action Point 3 from 26.01.24 meeting:** *“EW to send AP capital equipment bid for high throughput slide scanner”*.

Status: Complete

EW sent the capital equipment bid to AP but this was not awarded to the IRF.

### Item 2: Updates on research, teaching /student support, strategic or commercial activities

#### a. Lecturers

I&I: DC did not have any updates.

#### **Cardiovascular and Genomics:**

Representatives from the cardiovascular and genomics institute include DO, FC and DM.

No new updates.

#### **Neuroscience and Cell Biology:**

Representatives include TC and AC.

No new updates

**IMBE:**

FC gave the IAG a heads up on the emails that will come through asking for research undergraduate research projects. The IRF may get researchers coming down to use the facility in these research projects.

**b. Post-Doctoral Scientists**

KO noted that the ImageXpress Pico was not available to book on the PPMS system. DC explained that a user needs to book training before they can book the equipment.

**c. PhD students**

AC has no new updates from PhD students.

**d. i. Professional Services –Library**

JS was unable to attend but sent through some library updates. The library has recently renewed their read and open access publishing agreements with Taylor and Francis, OUP and Wiley. If you wish to know more about eligibility, you can go to their website or give them an email. The library will be sending out newsletters via the institute next month.

**ii. Professional Services – JRES**

ABP said that Neophore, the startup company who have been working with the IRF have now moved into their new lab space on the ground floor.

JRES is refurbishing some space in Hunter to be a collaboration space to work with industry – hoping to be open at the end of June.

ABP said that it would be good for the IRF to have a presence at the opening of the room as there will be industry and local partners in attendance.

Lousie Phillips is not on maternity leave. The new head of research funding is Brad Robinson so if anyone would like an introduction, please let ABP know.

Howard Duffy is leaving at the end of May and JRES are in the process of recruiting someone new to replace him.

AP asked if IRF images could be included on the walls of the new Nexus space.

AP also asked if Neophore were going to continue using the IRF in the same way they have been. AP also questioned how the money is paid to the IRF as at the moment it is paid via internal recharges which do not count as income for the IRF as it is just internal money being moved around. AP suggested that it could come through enterprise income so that the IRF could show off commercial income.

**iii. Professional Services – Outreach and widening participation**

KA was not present to provide updates.

**e. Academic Lead**

DO explained that EW and himself have been working with Howard Duffy to use a platform called Beauhurst to look for potential commercial partners. We are still quite early in this process but will hopefully be able to replicate the relationship the IRF has with Neophore.

AMB said that she has a clinical pharmacology student starting to work with them and they have a biomed one year placement starting in the summer. These students will be able to help out with IRF commercial partners.

### Item 3: Report from IRF staff

To receive and consider:

#### a). Equipment Failures/ misuse

#### b) Active/ ongoing projects that require update

Histology & flow cytometry – ND said that the IRF is starting to use new histology cassettes which will allow smaller samples to be automatically processed – saving time on manual processing.

Light microscopy – EW said that she is currently in talks with estates to re-lay the floor in both microscope rooms. She has been assured that it is a one day job. During this time, all microscopy will be unavailable. EW has asked Nikon and Phase focus for quotes to remove the equipment and place it back.

The IRF held an SEM demo day. Unfortunately, EW was ill for the demo but Nikita ran the session and has shown some amazing photos.

DO explained that SEM is not what he needs for research and that he would need TEM.

FC said that the system was amazing but it is not the type of system that she needs for her research.

EW said that thinking about the city merger in the future, there may be more scope to have an EM for the engineering department to use.

EW also updated on the latest round of the IRF REF awards. There were four applications and all four were awarded. During the panel discussions, there was discussion about changing the scoring system for the awards. When an applicant applies, the scores are used to determine a ranking and then the maximum amount of time for each system is awarded based on the score up to the maximum.

**Action Point 1: EW to update scoring of IRF REF**

#### c). Spending requirements

### Item 4 Discussion

#### a). IRF SEM Demo day

See above for discussion

#### b). IRF Equipment management policy

EW has put together an IRF equipment management policy. The ImageXpress pico is a good example of this as another researcher got a grant for some equipment and it is now housed in the IRF but there was not a policy in place. Going forward, a policy would be good to say that the IRF will keep it for X amount of years and will the IRF pay for the service contract? This aims to make it clearer for both the IRF and researchers.

AP added some more background for this. The funding body asks how the capital equipment is going to be managed on the clear expectation that it will be professionally managed to ensure it is utilised to the maximum of its capacity. So in the case of the IRF and the MRI, you're getting equipment that is £500,000 and it will be costly to maintain and you need space for it. You also need to know how long you're going to maintain it? How are you going to give the people who wrote the grant access to it?

DC said that the policy was a good idea. It adds transparency between the IRF and the person who got the grant.

FC said that giving preferential use to the group that got the grant may not be good. It may also be hard to charge the group who got the funding for equipment use as they are asking for the funds to acquire it and not asking for funds to use it.

ND and DO agreed with the above statements.

EW thanked the IAG for their useful comments and that they are useful for putting a draft together. The draft will be sent out at the next IAG.

**Action point 2: EW to draft IRF equipment management policy and sent to IAG for next meeting**

**Action point 3: DO to look at potential funding streams for new equipment in IRF**

**c) IRF LinkedIn page**

EW has set up an IRF LinkedIn page where staff would post weekly about the research that takes place in the IRF and some of the pretty images we get from the microscopes. There is concern that, as the image would be published online, the image would not be able to be used in research publications in the future.

AP said that there could be issues with IP as researchers could publish two very similar images.

ABP said that it is how you describe the images rather than the actual image itself. For example, if the image shows that something interacts with something else, that is potentially novel knowledge. So if that knowledge was out there, it would be classed as already being published.

FC said that unpublished data may cause issues when publishing on LinkedIn but for data already published, this may not be an issue. FC also explained that images are used on lab websites and do not invalidate them for publication.

ABP also said to think about the copy-right of the image. Who took the image. EW said that she spoke to Beth about putting together a document that they sign that says they agree for the image to be used by the IRF on LinkedIn.

**d) Potential name change of IRF**

Just before Sandra Ashton left, she was trying to transition the name from Image Resource Facility to Imaging Research Facility. This was discussed briefly at the last meeting that if we were going to change the name, should we change the name completely.

ABP suggested asking ChatGPT for potential facility names.

ND asked if flowcytometry and histology could be incorporated into the name. There is potential to come up with some names using an Acronym.

DO said that he prefers Imaging Research Facility as resource sounds like somewhere you can get a stock image from.

**Item 5: Any other business**

**Meeting Closed**

**Dates of Meetings for 2024**

**To be confirmed**