
ISRHML – Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation

trainee expansion program

Minute – Science Review Board

Meeting		
Date	Monday, August 14, 2017	
Members	Shannon L. Kelleher, Chair	Present
	Christina (Tina) Chambers	Present
	Evette van Niekerk	Excused
	Kim F. Michaelsen	Present
	Nathan Nickel	Excused
	Teresa da Costa	Present
	Valérie Verhasselt	Present
Secretary	Kathrin Litwan	Present

Agenda	
1.	Welcome
2.	Quorum
3.	Review of TBF applications
4.	Review of TTF applications
5.	Decisions

Agenda topic		
N°	Topic	Status/Comment
1.	Welcome	Shannon Kelleher welcomes the attendees.
2.	Quorum	As of Annex 4 in the Sponsorship Agreement for the Trainee Expansion Program (TEP) the SRB is quorate with 5 out of 7 members present. With 5 of the 7 members present on the call (see above) the board is quorate.
3.	Review of TBF applications	<p>Hereinafter, every single application is presented: First by the primary reviewer followed by the secondary reviewer. In case the primary reviewer is not on the call, Shannon Kelleher reads the comments from the primary reviewer.</p> <p>a. Chen LI</p> <p>Evette van Niekerk as first reviewer is not on the call. Shannon Kelleher reads Evette van Niekerk's comments to the applications. Evette van Niekerk scored the application as a 4 (very good). Valérie Verhasselt comments on the application as a secondary reviewer. Valérie Verhasselt sees the expertise of the applicant as excellent. She has no concerns about the application. Teresa da Costa asked about the quality of the chosen host institution. Valérie Verhasselt rates the quality of the host institution as excellent. Kim Michaelsen sees the application as a strong application. But he has concerns about the fact that there are two applications about microbiota. Due to the fact, that Valérie Verhasselt is primary reviewer on the second application about microbiota (the application from James Butcher), Valérie Verhasselt comments on this application as well. Valérie Verhasselt sees James Butcher as more senior than Chen Li. Valérie Verhasselt sees the application of James Butcher as superior to the application of Chen Li. If only one microbiota project can be moved forward Valérie Verhasselt would prefer to move forward the application of James Butcher. The members then discuss the application of James Butcher. Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 3 (excellent) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 3 (excellent) • Kim Michaelsen: 4 (very good) • Teresa da Costa: 3 (excellent) • Valérie Verhasselt: 3 (excellent) • Average score: 3.2 <p>b. James BUTCHER</p> <p>Valérie Verhasselt as primary reviewer gives comments on the application and applicant. As mentioned she rates this application superior to the application of Chen Li. The applicant is seen as more senior to Chen Li. Shannon Kelleher reads the comments from Evette van Nierkerk who was secondary reviewer of this application. Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 2 (outstanding) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 3 (excellent) • Kim Michaelsen: 3 (excellent) • Teresa da Costa: 2 (outstanding) • Valérie Verhasselt: 2 (outstanding) • Average score: 2.4 <p>c. Emily LITTLE</p> <p>Tina Chambers as primary reviewer gives a short summary of the application and the applicant. Tina Chambers rates the project as very ambitious especially time wise. It is unclear to Tina Chamber whether or not it is possible to complete the project within one year. She highlights</p>

		<p>the terrific skill set of the applicant as well as the applicant's very good grades. Tina Chambers names the small number of publication by the applicant but relativizes this with the rather junior career stage (the applicant just finished her PhD). Tina Chambers also points out that four more publications are in press. Tina Chambers mentioned that the proposed project fits well to the applicant's CV. Besides the ambitious timeline, Tina Chambers also mentions the junior stage of the mentor which can be negative as the mentor has not enough time to supervise the applicant. All in all, the applicant seems to be very enthusiastic and if the project would be accomplished within one year, it would also give interesting results to the field.</p> <p>Teresa da Costa as secondary reviewers follows the comments from Tina Chambers. Teresa da Costa also rates the project as too ambitious to be completed in one year.</p> <p>Both reviewers have their concerns about the RCT and if it can be completed within a year.</p> <p>Valérie Verhasselt would like to support and encourage an applicant who is ambitious and enthusiastic.</p> <p>Kim Michaelsen sees the chosen area of research as very interesting.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 4 (very good) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 3 (excellent) • Kim Michaelsen: 3 (excellent) • Teresa da Costa: 3 (excellent) • Valérie Verhasselt: 2-3 (outstanding – excellent) • Average score: 3.1 <p>d. Eva NANINCK</p> <p>Kim Michaelsen as primary reviewer presents the project. The project is seen as very ambitious. It includes murine as well as human studies. Kim Michaelsen assesses the research question as very specific and the study design as very good. Kim Michaelsen is fascinated by the ambitiousness of the applicant. The broad expertise of the supervisors reflects the broad characteristics of the project itself. Furthermore, the supervisors were felt to be encouraging.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher as secondary reviewer agrees on the comments from Kim Michaelsen. The project seems to her as very fundable. Shannon Kelleher underlines the ambitiousness. Shannon Kelleher questions the role of the applicant within the project. It is also unclear what the applicant will do with the enormous amount of information the applicant will collect in the course of the project. Shannon Kelleher rates the project itself as very exciting. Nevertheless, Shannon Kelleher scored the application rather as a 3 (excellent) as a 2 (outstanding) because of before mentioned question about the fate of the collected information.</p> <p>Other members have no questions to the application.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final score for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 3 (excellent) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 3 (excellent) • Kim Michaelsen: 2 (outstanding) • Teresa da Costa: 3 (excellent) • Valérie Verhasselt: 3 (excellent) • Average score: 2.8 <p>e. Kassandra HARDING</p> <p>Nathan Nickel was allocated as primary reviewer. As he was not capable of reviewer applications Shannon Kelleher took over.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher gives a summary on the application and applicant. The project is seen as very innovative and highly helpful to promote breastfeeding in the chosen area. Shannon Kelleher rates the application as excellent and believes that the project will help to bridge the applicant's knowledge and skills to reach her career goals. Shannon Kelleher mentions the very diverse qualifications of the applicant. Shannon Kelleher highlights that the project not only looks at the implementation of two tools (platforms) but also on the measurements.</p> <p>Kim Michaelsen as secondary reviewer is fascinated by the project. He points out that the supervisor (Rafael Pérez-Escamilla) seems to be very supportive for the project. Kim Michaelsen also sees the project as a good bridge for the applicant.</p> <p>Tina Chambers likes the proposed project and has no further questions.</p> <p>One more time the members point out the novelty of the project.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final score for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 2 (outstanding) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 2 (outstanding) • Kim Michaelsen: 2-3 (outstanding – excellent)
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teresa da Costa: 2 (outstanding) • Valérie Verhasselt: 3 (excellent) • Average score: 2.3 <p>f. Stephanie MARTIN</p> <p>Kim Michaelsen as primary reviewer presents the project and the applicant. He misses strategies for the project. Kim Michaelsen points out to the other members that the proposed project is out of his research area. But he believes that the proposed project will give different aspects of a group which is not breastfeeding so well.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher took over the position as secondary reviewer from Nathan Nickel. She rates the proposal as a true bridge. The applicant presented the application very structured. But the research itself is seen as not very innovative. Shannon Kelleher misses the information about the fate of the information which is collected during the time of the project.</p> <p>Valérie Verhasselt misses a real intervention in the project. Kim Michaelsen and Shannon Kelleher mention that the project aims to come up with a recommendation for the best intervention in the studied population rather than to test a specific intervention.</p> <p>The board members are less enthusiastic about this application than about the application from Cassandra Harding.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 3 (excellent) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 3 (excellent) • Kim Michaelsen: 3 (excellent) • Teresa da Costa: 3 (excellent) • Valérie Verhasselt: 4 (very good) • Average score: 3.2 <p>g. Tanya CASSIDY</p> <p>Teresa da Costa as the primary reviewer rates the project itself as interesting. Nevertheless, Teresa da Costa points out that the application was not well structured. It seemed to Teresa da Costa that someone else wrote the application for Tanya Cassidy. Teresa da Costa mentions difficulties to really extract the real purpose of the project. But she mentions once more that the overall subject of the project seems very interesting. Teresa da Costa mentions her concerns: The objective to re-enter to research is not seen as the main goal of TEP. Further, the timeline is also not very well thought through. Teresa da Costa also comments on the budget. The costs that were budgeted are mainly used to pay the applicant's salary and travel costs during the time of the project. Moreover, the supervisor is not in the area of the proposed project. This fact was also mentioned by the supervisor himself in his supporting letter. As last comment, Teresa da Costa highlights that the application also raises ethical questions that were not discussed in the application.</p> <p>Tina Chambers as a secondary reviewer agrees to Teresa da Costa's comments. Tina Chambers rates the application as a follow-on project to an outrunning fellowship. For her this is not the goal of TEP. Tina Chambers also comments on the missing expertise of the supervisor. She points out that the mentor even states that he will not be able to help the applicant much. For Tina Chambers the application is not an appropriate funding opportunity for TEP.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 7 (fair) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 7 (fair) • Kim Michaelsen: 7 (fair) • Teresa da Costa: 7 (fair) • Valérie Verhasselt: 7 (fair) • Average score: 7
4.	Review of TTF applications	<p>Shannon Kelleher proposes to follow the same scheme in presenting the application as for the TBF. Therefore, primary reviewers present the application followed by the secondary reviewer. Afterwards the discussion will be opened.</p> <p>a. Ifeyinwa ASIODU</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher as primary reviewer presents the application and the applicant. The proposed project will help to continue a long-lasting collaboration between the applicant and the chosen host institution/supervisor. Shannon Kelleher feels that the applicant will directly benefit from the project and the collaboration. She sees the applicant as a strong applicant and the project is well in-line with the applicant's research focus.</p>

		<p>Valérie Verhasselt as secondary reviewer adds her comments to the application. She feels that the applicant herself struggled to make clear what she wants to do during the proposed project. But, this missing information was caught up by the supervisor in her supporting letter. Valérie Verhasselt questions the fact that the applicant splits the visit to the host institution to four visit rather than to one longer visit. Shannon Kelleher guesses that this is due to the applicant's position as newly assigned assistant professor.</p> <p>The budget mainly request to cover travel costs.</p> <p>As no further questions arise, Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 3 (excellent) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 3 (excellent) • Kim Michaelsen: 3 (excellent) • Teresa da Costa: 3 (excellent) • Valérie Verhasselt: 3 (excellent) • Average score: 3 <p>b. Kyly WHITFIELD</p> <p>Tina Chambers as primary reviewer presents the application and the applicant. She mentions that the applicant comes from an institution without a very strong focus on research. The chosen mentor is a researcher herself who is successful at an institution that also does not have a strong research focus and would therefore be a good role model for the applicant. The application defines the training well.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher summarizes Evette van Niekerk's comments as she is not on the call. For Evette van Niekerk the project will help the applicant to move forward. Evette van Niekerk mentioned no concerns in her comments.</p> <p>The SRB sees the project as a good chance for the applicant to move to stay in science especially given that the applicant is located at an institution that is not very research-focused. Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 2 (outstanding) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 2 (outstanding) • Kim Michaelsen: 3 (excellent) • Teresa da Costa: 2 (outstanding) • Valérie Verhasselt: 4 (very good) • Average score: 2.6 <p>c. Yimin CHEN</p> <p>Teresa da Costa as primary reviewer presents the applicant and application. The applicant would really profit from the TTF. The home and host institutions are of high quality. As negative comment, Teresa da Costa points out the short duration of the stay. It is felt that the applicant would benefit more from a longer stay at the host institution. Teresa da Costa's rate is based on the opportunity the TTF will give to the applicant.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher as secondary reviewer scored the application with a 5 (good). The score reflects the applicant rather than the well-structured project. Shannon Kelleher misses the real opportunity for the applicant to learn real new skills. The first objective seems context-less to Shannon Kelleher. The project itself is seen as very important. But the need for the applicant is not seen.</p> <p>For Teresa da Costa, the applicant will profit from the analysis and the feeling of how the analysis is done. For her, the main objective would be to learn how the statistical method is used.</p> <p>Teresa da Costa rates the project itself as not very innovative.</p> <p>Shannon Kelleher asks the members for their final scores for the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: 4 (very good) • Christina (Tina) Chambers: 4 (very good) • Kim Michaelsen: 4 (very good) • Teresa da Costa: 2 (outstanding) • Valérie Verhasselt: 4 (very good) • Average score: 3.6
5.	Decisions	<p>The SRB unanimously decides to calculate the average scores for each application and to use an average score of 3.0 as a cut-off to propose to the CB.</p> <p>The decisions and recommendations to the CB are outlined in the following sections. The SRB</p>



ISRHML
The International Society
for Research in Human
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY
LARSSON  **ROSENQUIST**
FOUNDATION
dedicated to human milk

		unanimously recommends three TBF and two TTF applications to the CB.
--	--	--

For the TEP Science Review Board:

Zug, August 14, 2017

Place and Date



Kathrin Litwan
TEP Coordinator

ISRHML – Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation

trainee expansion program

Decision Note – Science Review Board

Meeting		
Date	Monday, August 14, 2017	
Members	Shannon L. Kelleher, Chair	Present
	Christina (Tina) Chambers	Present
	Evette van Niekerk	Excused
	Kim F. Michaelsen	Present
	Nathan Nickel	Excused
	Teresa da Costa	Present
	Valérie Verhasselt	Present
Secretary	Kathrin Litwan	Present

The TEP Science Review Board decides on Monday, August 14, 2017 the following:

Decisions taken		
N°	Topic	Decision
1.	Shannon Kelleher proposes to use an average score of 3.0 as a cut-off for TBF and TTF application to propose to the Counsel Board.	The Scientific Review Board unanimously agrees to use an average score of 3.0 as a cut-off for the TBF applications.
2.	According to the before agreed-on cut-off of 3.0, following TBF applications are proposed to the Counsel Board (alphabetic listing): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eva Naninck (average score 2.8) • James Butcher (average score 2.4) • Kassandra Harding (average score (2.3) 	The Scientific Review Board unanimously agrees on the mentioned three TBF application to proceed to the Counsel Board for final decision.
3.	According to the before agreed-on cut-off of 3.0, following TTF applications are proposed to the Counsel Board (alphabetic listing): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ifeyinwa Asiodu (average score 3.0) • Kyly Whitfield (average score 2.6) 	The Scientific Review Board unanimously agrees on the mentioned two TTF applications to be proceeded to the Counsel Board for final decision.

For the TEP Science Review Board:

Place and Date

Place and Date

Shannon L. Kelleher
Chair of the TEP Science Review Board

Yz
Member of the TEP Science Review Board