

Imaging Advisory Group (IAG)

27.03.23

Minutes

Present:

Alice Eseola	AE	Imaging Manger – IRF
Anna Dulic-Sills	ADS	Director of Research Operations
Atticus Hainsworth	AH	Reader in Cerebrovascular Disease - MCS
Aurora Campagna	AC	PhD Student Forum Representative
Angeliki Asimaki	AA	Senior Lecture in Cardiac Morphology
Carly Lightfoot	CL	Library and Learning Technology Services
Christopher Carroll	CC	
Daniel Meijles	DM	Senior Lecturer in Cardiovascular Biology - MCS
Daniel Osborn	DO	Senior Lecturer in Genetics - MCS
Deborah Chong	DC	Lecturer in Infection and Immunity - I&I
Nikita Demchenko	ND	
Paris Ataliotis	PA	Reader in Developmental Genetics - IMBE
Sandra Ashton	SA	Head of Facility - IRF (Chair)
Jenay Thomas	JT	Minute Taker

Apologies received from:

Jennifer Smith	JS	Research Publications Librarian
Guy Whitley	GW	Professor of Cell Biology – MCS
Tom Carter	TC	Professor of Endothelial Cell Biology

Item 1a: Previous Minutes & Actions

To receive and approve: The minutes of the meeting held on 23.01.2023 were approved with following amendments:

Item 2, Page 2 – *There are a few negotiations with publishers. CL to share in the chat what this will mean researchers intending to publish in their journals.*

This should read:

*There are a few negotiations with publishers **still outstanding**. CL to share in the chat what this will mean **for** researchers intending to publish in their journals.*

Item 2 Page 2 FC had discussions with AE regarding teaching to make use better use of resources at the facility.

Also, JS posted links to both the [Paying open access fees \(sgul.ac.uk\)](http://sgul.ac.uk) web page and [Open Access Publishing FAQs \(sgul.ac.uk\)](http://sgul.ac.uk) which hold the main updates on OA publishing for members of the Group in the chat during the meeting.

Previous Actions:

AP 1 - 23.01.23 : FC to connect with DO to structure what support is required for teachers – Completed.

DO informed that discussed with FC regarding structured research projects. They have generated some ideas around how the IRF can support the SRP projects, discussed further in Item 4b.

AP 2 - 23.01.23: JSF to connect with Nikita also to discuss teaching support - Ongoing

1b. Introductions and Apologies

The group welcomed Nikita Demchenko, the new IRF cell biology manager, to the group. ND will take charge of the Flow facility and IHC (Immunohistochemistry) work.

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

a. Lecturers

MCS: DM has a piece of equipment (C6 flow cytometer that can do four channels) given to him by his PhD supervisor. It needs required funding to be repaired but he has donated this to the University and the IRF as a replacement for the previous one that was lost. JSF is dealing with this.

I&I: DC informed the group that she did not receive the Rose society grant but will look into grant applications to provide the other 50% of the funding for the microscope. DM then shared in response that he is putting a grant together that has some potential budget allowance for equipment (for BHF high throughput microscopy). DM and DC to discuss further the possibility of including this in the grant outside of this meeting.

DO noted there are opportunities for to receive more equipment within the IRF. In line with this, SA & himself intend to create a form they will circulate to identify specific details about equipment the group would like (including who would require it, why it would be useful for the IRF and cost) to be stored on a database to refer to for equipment bids or as and when funds become available. He encouraged the group to think about the type of equipment they need.

IMBE

PA – No current updates

Population Health

No representation currently.

b. Post-Doctoral Scientists

No representation at this meeting

c. PhD students

AC- No updates or complaints from the students as the ones using the facility are quite happy with it. There may be potential opportunity for some short-term work with the IRF but to be discussed further in next meeting.

d. i. Professional Services –Library

CL – The paying Open Access fee's webpages (contain details regarding the Library's read and publish deals and applying for open access fee funding) has been updated in response to researcher feedback. Please see [link](#) for details regarding this and negotiations with Sage and Spring of Nature for a new read and publish agreement.

SA, JS & CL are collating a poster to share digitally with IRF users to inform them of how to acknowledge the IRF and as a way to measure the effectiveness of facility via publications output.

When it is time to publish, researchers usually need to inform the library. However, as it is not always clear how many people are publishing things from the IRF at times, DM suggested including a statement in the document currently used by the Library with a tickbox, asking whether or not the IRF was used.

CL believes it may not be feasible for publications going through read and publish deals but could easily be done for applications for internal St George's funds.

Action Point 1: SA, CL & JS to bring something back to July meeting to finalise the question around publications.

ii. Professional Services – Finance

MM not in attendance

iii. Professional Services – OWP (ERCM)

Currently no one in post to represent. To reach out to OWP once someone has been recruited.

iiii. Professional Services – JRES

Representation needed to replace AA.

e. Academic Lead

DO shared an idea which entails running some structured research projects with 6 students who will have the opportunity to use some of the IRF equipment. An example could be a tissue sample which technical staff will wax process while student's complete microtome sectioning and H&E staining. Others with similar projects (more specifically equipment that is underused) can help technical staff hone their skills, creating more teaching hours for the IRF, potentially producing additional funds for facility and kick-starting a project that someone may want to begin.

The group were all advised put to submit any projects they are interested in with a trial run being started around October. PA also confirmed that money for consumables is likely to be available.

SA is in support of this idea but queried how it would be operationalised from IRF standpoint. DO believes the academic supervisors will still have a large responsibility e.g. research project marking, discussing rationale of experiment etc.

PA highlighted that the key role for IRF would be to provide technical support to the students. It is a 12-week semester – first round in mid-November – Dec and 2nd from late Feb – March. Antibodies or tissues samples could be given to these students to be tested.

SA clarified with DO and PA that anyone can submit a project for SRP purposes including the IRF or academic supervisors. The idea of a form to specify potential projects and whether they require support from IRF was suggested, considering this will need to be limited. ADS also reiterated the need for a selection process as there is only a finite number of hours IRF can provide.

It has also come to light that there is a small research interest within the IRF itself which require some to work on. These could be offered as potential projects which provides some work for students and simultaneously benefits the facility.

Action Point 2: DO, FC/PA & SA to discuss how to operationalise this idea and communicate via the RIM's and IAG. To also consider how IRF can link in with the pre-established process for SRP's, to ensure there is a fair selection system within the IRF.

Item 3: Report from IRF staff

To receive and consider:

ND has had inductions and the Flo facility is now fully operational and can now carry out sorting and inductions for users. ND will be working on redeveloping the charging policy for Flow. The old FACS Calibur has been removed and the Acura should be put in there soon enough. Also working on getting the contract sorted, ensuring its ready to use. ND hasn't witnessed any poor behaviour or activities within the Flow room.

a). Equipment Failures/ misuse

AE relayed some poor behaviour and habits that she had observed taking place:

Flow room - some are using the facility without booking under PPMS (70% not being reported on the PPMS of as shown on the Flow instrumental log activity). It is important to report full usage of facility to apply for grants.

Light Microscopy department - it well used and most visits are pre-booked however the use of Livecyte is an issue. Some do not return after completing their experiment to collect their plate & the CO2 is left running. To combat this, AE will now turn off the CO2 once experiment is complete, regardless of whether they return to collect their plate.

Cancellations of instruments - especially the microscope. The confocal is heavily used but some cancel on the morning of their experiment causing delays and inconvenience for others. Possibly will introduce a cancellation charge but still to be discussed.

Florescence lamp -It should be switched off before logging out of software but some forget to do this

Also, a reminder for researchers and lecturers to communicate to the IRF *before* bringing students to the facility (sometimes students are brought without notifying the team) to ensure names can be documented, especially for health and safety reasons.

AC queried the potential cancellation charge policy, namely at what point the charge would be applied. She believes most try to avoid cancelling on same day but agreed this is not ideal. SA & AE highlighted that while it is still being drafted, it is likely to charge for short-term cancellations i.e. less than 24 hours before or morning of but assured group it will be thought out sensibly. ADS also expressed disappointment in lack of care for equipment and questioned how to combat this issue. DM suggested having 1st, 2nd and 3rd offenses (for research fellows or students) with lab heads being penalised as and when the behaviour is repeated or including in PDR discussion.

SA mentioned the increasing cost of items. DM proposed idea to have a standardised fee for grants, known as core facilities cost which generates a different stream of income for the facility. ADS raised that this relates to having access charges which involves being classed as a major core facility instead of part of overheads which triggers other questions.

Good news- the auto-scratch wound maker tool has been installed for the facility and safety cabinet has been commissioned with an email to invite users to use it, free of charge for the next 2 months.

b).Active/ ongoing projects that require update

None discussed

c). Spending requirements

AE also encouraged group to be proactive & submit any requests for equipment they would like to purchase in anticipation of any grants/money becoming available in the future.

Item 4 Discussion

a) Equipment request form – IRF

Form was circulated prior to the meeting. Accepted by the group with no comments. SA will send to group with instructions on how to complete after the meeting.

b) IRF Research Excellence Fund 2022 – update on outcomes

No comments or questions regarding the Research Paper. Will be circulated Research Committee. Most have interacted well but some have not. SA inquired if there are concerns with IMBE researchers having time to conduct research and progress it. SA emphasised these rewards are competitive and those awarded the fund should use it with any complications to be addressed quickly. There are a number of publications that have been generated as a result of fund and grant success as well, as proof that the fund works. SA will circulate as a new round of applications.

Item 5: Any other business

None discussed

Meeting Closed

Item 6 Dates of Meetings in 2023

Monday 26th June

Monday 25th September

All meetings commence at 11:00 am in Microsoft Teams unless otherwise specified.