

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEETING

JANUARY 17, 2012

1:06 P.M.

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS
865 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CT 06067-3444

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of the
2 Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee meeting,
3 held at Connecticut Innovations, 865 Brook Street, Rocky
4 Hill, Connecticut, on January 17, 2012 at 1:06 p.m. . . .

5

6

7

8 CHAIRPERSON MARIANNE HORN: This is
9 Marianne Horn. I am the Commissioner's designee today, so
10 I'll be chairing the meeting. The Commissioner sends her
11 regrets. She had to be at another meeting, or she would
12 certainly be here.

13 Happy New Year, everybody. We've had a
14 little changing of the guard here. For those of you who
15 have not met Emily Smith, Emily is -- what is your
16 position, Emily?

17 MS. EMILY SMITH: They call me Managing
18 Director of External Relations. That just means I get to
19 do stem cell. Government Relations, I do all of the
20 marketing and media and public relations for Connecticut
21 Innovations.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All right and you were
23 Chelsea's boss?

24 MS. SMITH: Yes, I was. Yes.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And Sarah Donofrio is --
2 oh, we have Dr. Genel joining us. Also from CI is going
3 to be helping us get organized. If this meeting is any
4 indication of how things will happen in the future, we're
5 off to a great start, so we very much appreciate their
6 assistance.

7 MS. SMITH: We're learning the ropes, so if
8 anyone has any advice for us, just let us know, please.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And if anybody thinks
10 that we are not doing things the way we had done before,
11 please speak up.

12 Okay. In terms of the minutes, the last
13 official meeting we had was November 2, 2011. We had a
14 Bidder's Conference after that, which Milt will talk about
15 a little bit later.

16 Have you all had a chance to take a look at
17 the minutes? Do we have a motion?

18 DR. MILTON WALLACK: Move.

19 DR. GERRY FISHBONE: Second.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any discussion? Okay.
21 All in favor?

22 VOICES: Aye.

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. We'll move into
24 the agenda. Much of this does not require a vote. It's

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 really information for your information as these -- some
2 of the 2006, 2008 and 2009 grants come to a close, but
3 certainly an opportunity to raise any questions that you
4 might have as we go through the final report.

5 So the first one is a receipt of 2006 final
6 report, 06 SCB 08, Carmichael. I'll ask CI whether they
7 had any comments.

8 MS. SMITH: We didn't have any comments. I
9 looked through this. I reviewed it with some folks here
10 on staff, who have been involved in this program in the
11 past, so they could guide me a little bit, and nothing
12 jumped out at us.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Any further
14 comment on Carmichael?

15 DR. FISHBONE: One thing that was
16 interesting he submitted a final report for the '06 grant
17 and, also, for the '09 grant, and the overall progress
18 summary was almost identical. I think he added one
19 sentence. They're sort of word-for-word the same.

20 MS. SMITH: '09?

21 DR. FISHBONE: This is not to say there's
22 anything wrong with that, but it was kind of -- I thought
23 I was reading the same report.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So his first, the SCB,

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 was an established investigator grant, and the '09 grant
2 was a seed grant.

3 DR. FISHBONE: They are different. It's
4 just a lot of the wording. I guess that's sort of
5 probably basic wording that people use in reports.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Anything further
7 on the '06 Carmichael? Item number four, receipt of 2008
8 final report, 08 SCB Yale, 013, Zaccarino(phonetic).

9 MS. SMITH: Again, nothing looked out of
10 the ordinary. It was a lot of documentation here, but it
11 looked fine to us.

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: One of the issues we've
13 had in the past has been with the level at which the lay
14 summaries are written, and against that comment I want to
15 point out that at DPH our staff has been reduced
16 significantly, and we're going to have some difficulty
17 getting the lay summaries posted on the DPH website with
18 regularity, so we will attempt to.

19 We did file the annual report, which is no
20 longer required with the legislature. We did file that,
21 so there is some overview of the whole program.

22 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: Do we have any idea
23 how many --

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don't know, and I

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 don't know if they count on each individual. I can ask
2 that question.

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Just for curiosity.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I certainly go there a
5 lot.

6 MS. SMITH: They can tell if it's all
7 coming from you, or if it's coming from someone else.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Any comments on
9 Zaccarino? Number five, receipt of 2009 final report, 09
10 SCA UCHC 16, Carmichael. So this is the report that we
11 were just discussing.

12 MS. SMITH: This looked fine.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: 09 SCA Yale 11,
15 Masine(phonetic).

16 MS. SMITH: We reviewed this. There was
17 nothing in this one either that seemed out of the
18 ordinary. The lay summaries, does that get posted on the
19 DPH website?

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Up to this year we were
21 able to post them. We've had staff to cut and paste and
22 post them with the individual grants. 09 SCA Yale 45,
23 Garcia Castro.

24 MS. SMITH: There was nothing out of the

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 ordinary from our perspective on this one either.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any further comments on
3 the 2009 final reports? Okay, moving on, number six is
4 the receipt of six-month fiscal reports, and, again, my
5 understanding is that these are for your information.
6 These are reviewed by CI financial and the DPH financial,
7 and they reconcile their reports with one another.

8 MS. SMITH: Yes, and I did have a couple of
9 these that I would be going back to get additional
10 information. For instance, one here from Yale for Zhang
11 Xu(phonetic). There was some information missing, and the
12 other person that we had didn't name who the graduate
13 student was, and there seemed to be a large budget
14 variance that we were going to look for additional
15 information on.

16 On Laura Grabel(phonetic), this is the
17 Wesleyan piece of the UConn/Wesleyan stem cell core, there
18 was some formatting issues with the columns, so that the
19 dollar amounts didn't show up, so we're just going back
20 and asking for some clarity there, and that's the same
21 issue on Alexander Richter(phonetic) at the University of
22 Connecticut Health Center. There were some formatting
23 issues that prevented us from seeing the budget variance,
24 so we would go back and ask for some -- just asked them to

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 kind of reprint that with the column wider.

2 Other than that, there were two of these
3 that we did not receive that we should have, and that was
4 for the 09 SCB UConn 18, Rasmussen(phonetic), and 09 SCB,
5 these are the established grants, Wesleyan.

6 We did not receive these six-month reports
7 for these two projects, and we'll be going back and asking
8 them to make sure that they send those. And that's all I
9 have to report on.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I didn't see Grabel
11 listed here under number six.

12 MS. SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry. It's actually
13 listed as 09 SCD UCHC 01, Xu, X-U, because it's the
14 UConn/Wesleyan core, and it's listed under the UConn name,
15 but that's the one that it is. I'm sorry.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you.

17 DR. WALLACK: Marianne, where is Ted
18 Rasmussen?

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And Rasmussen we don't
20 have.

21 MS. SMITH: I did not receive Rasmussen.
22 That's one of the ones. The other one was Nagal(phonetic)
23 from Wesleyan. Those were the two I did not receive, so I
24 will be contacting them following this meeting and asking

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 them to submit them.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So those would appear on
3 a subsequent --

4 MS. SMITH: Agenda, yeah.

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Again, if the committee
6 has any questions, concerns, comments, feel free to raise
7 them, even though we're not voting on these.

8 Okay. Hearing none, we'll move on to
9 number seven. It's a carryover request, 08 SCB UTH 011,
10 Vecovich(phonetic), and this is a UConn grant, so I would
11 ask anybody with a conflict with UConn not to vote on
12 this.

13 MS. SMITH: And I believe we included this
14 carryover request in the board packet, and, basically, it
15 says that the carryover in other personnel is due to Dr.
16 Xu leaving the position at the University.

17 The PI is in the process of reassigning a
18 technician to work on the project, and the remaining funds
19 here will be used for that, and then there were some other
20 variances in the other direct costs. As the project moves
21 into the final project, your cost we'll anticipate to
22 increase for research-related material, supplies and
23 service-related expenses.

24 I did review these with actually with Dan

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 Wagner, who has some experience looking at these from when
2 he used to work on the program, and he didn't seem to feel
3 that any of this was out of the ordinary.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: One of the concerns the
5 committee has had in the past is whether any reallocation
6 carryover is indicative of any issues with getting the
7 goals met or work the done.

8 MS. SMITH: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So no concerns there.

10 DR. FISHBONE: It's a very large carryover,
11 isn't it?

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: It is.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Fifty percent of the grant.
14 It does make you wonder what was achieved.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And what was the
16 rationale for the carryover?

17 MS. SMITH: A lot of it was that Dr. Xu
18 left her position at the University, and the PI is in the
19 process of reassigning a technician to work on the
20 project. We could follow-up in six months.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We do have a
22 representative here from UConn, who would be interested in
23 shedding some light on that, if the committee is
24 interested.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 DR. MYRON GENEL: Sure.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Isolde? Come up
3 to a microphone.

4 MS. ISOLDE BATES: Just to clarify, Dr.
5 (indiscernible) is in process of sending the final report,
6 and the carryover in personnel is actually after she
7 reassigned the technician, Ms. Glispin(phonetic) or
8 Maya(phonetic).

9 It's really only going to be \$5,000. It
10 was such at the time, then we had to sending the carryover
11 request. Those were the numbers we had to use, but, as
12 you see, at the end of the month, when the annual report
13 is due, you will see that the amount is very, very low.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you. Okay. Do we
15 have a motion on number seven?

16 DR. FISHBONE: We accept the report. So
17 moved.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

19 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Second.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

21 VOICES: Aye.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: The motion passes.

23 Number eight, the reallocation request, 08 SCB UCH 021,
24 Rosenberg, and, again, a UCHC grant.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 MS. SMITH: So, again, we included this in
2 your packet. There was a cover letter here that indicated
3 that they would like to reallocate \$27,000, \$10,000 from
4 other expenses and \$17,000 from supplies, and, basically,
5 the reallocation is needed, because they're hoping to
6 accelerate their efforts to, you know, move the project
7 forward.

8 And, again, I've reviewed this with Dan
9 Wagner, and he seemed to think that the reallocation was
10 not anything out of the ordinary, is appropriate and so
11 on.

12 DR. WALLACK: Move acceptance of the
13 request.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Second? Any further
16 discussion? Okay. All in favor?

17 VOICES: Aye.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Receipt of Storrs and
19 UCHC final audit report. These were included in the
20 packet.

21 MS. SMITH: So those were included in your
22 packet, and, let's see, Storrs? Well I'll pull it out of
23 here. What was unclear to me was whether these audit
24 reports needed to be voted on.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 I didn't think that they did, but I wasn't
2 sure, so we included these in your packet. I went through
3 these. There was a comment in one of them about
4 continuously monitoring the budget allocations for all of
5 these projects.

6 There seems to be a little bit of a
7 discrepancy, but nothing major, and I think, overall, the
8 auditors were satisfied with the program and the way it's
9 being managed on behalf of UConn.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don't think these need
11 to be voted on. They're just here for your information.

12 MS. SMITH: Okay.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Sounds like they made
14 recommendations and management responded.

15 MS. SMITH: Responded, yeah. Yeah.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Similarly, the receipt
17 of the 2011 Yale audit report.

18 MS. SMITH: Right, and it was the opinion
19 of the auditor in that one that Yale is in compliance with
20 all the terms and conditions of the program.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Have you received
22 anything from Wesleyan?

23 MS. SMITH: No, I have not. I did not
24 receive anything from Wesleyan.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Could I ask you if you'd
2 follow-up on that?

3 MS. SMITH: Sure.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: They have a different
5 kind of audit system. I'm not quite sure where that ended
6 up.

7 MS. SMITH: Okay. And then I would put
8 that on the agenda for the next meeting, whatever we
9 receive from them.

10 DR. WALLACK: The nature of the two reports
11 is a little different. I mean is that a problem or not?

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think just go by what
13 the institution does. These are institutional audits, and
14 Wesleyan does not have the capacity to do an institutional
15 project, so they were getting outside audits.

16 DR. WALLACK: So there's three different
17 approaches, is what you're saying happened. Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: But if there are any
19 recommendations that the committee has for a different
20 method of auditing --

21 DR. WALLACK: No. I personally like the
22 UConn audit. I mean it's very, very clear and very
23 complete. I'm just wondering if there wasn't the ability,
24 even though the University, Yale University has their own

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 approach to it, if there could be consistency on it.

2 Anyway, that's my question.

3 CHAIRPERSON HORN: You can ask Yale and
4 UConn to look into perhaps providing a similar audit form,
5 whether that's a possibility. The recommendation would be
6 to look at UConn's audit report, as it seems to give more
7 information than the Yale.

8 Thank you. That message has been conveyed
9 to all in the audience.

10 DR. WALLACK: Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Milt, you want to
12 update us on the 2011 Bidder's Conference?

13 DR. WALLACK: Sure. First of all, it
14 should be noted, especially with the CI people here, that
15 we were very, very happy that Chelsea was able to arrange
16 her schedule to stay on an extra I think three days, or
17 something like that, in order to do this.

18 I think that the conference went well. The
19 attendance was not what we had anticipated, but I think
20 the goals of the conference were achieved. We basically
21 wanted to try to create, as, Marianne, you put it, a level
22 playing field for all aspirants, all people, who wanted to
23 be involved in stem cell research, the motivating factor
24 being that we had heard in the past there were a few

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 motivating factors.

2 One of them was that we had heard in the
3 past from some Universities and some Institutions, in
4 general, that it wasn't a level playing field, and, so,
5 the purpose of the meeting was to give them a format, if
6 you will, an updated format about how they should approach
7 applying for State funding.

8 The other aspect of it is that, and this
9 came to light in the last distribution of funds in July,
10 that there were some issues having to do with how the
11 applications were really being put together and whether or
12 not they were following the guidelines, specifically, of
13 what we had hoped to see, so we thought that a conference,
14 such as this, would enable us to get the message out, and
15 getting the message out also identifies not only the
16 opportunities, but the obligations that the various
17 constituency had going forward, one of the things being,
18 for example, the lay reports.

19 It may not be a big thing to the
20 scientists, but for those of us, who are trying to discern
21 what's going on, it becomes an important, I think,
22 component to it.

23 There's actually a third component, and
24 that is that we wanted to see -- we had heard in the past

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 through the years that the business and industry community
2 have had a difficult time identifying with how they can
3 enter the process. Just getting ESCRO approvals, for
4 example, there have been issues in the past, so we felt
5 that that would enable us to get the message out to them.

6 I think that was the overall goal to open
7 up the process. Other side issues had to do with the fact
8 that we wanted to get the message out to the legislators,
9 that we were trying to be as open and transparent in the
10 process as we possibly could, and to send that kind of
11 message we felt that it was important.

12 We did not have any legislators there, but
13 it was held in the LOB, the meeting, and, certainly, the
14 fact that the meeting was going on was posted.

15 So I think that on all of those levels we
16 achieved our goals, but it was only achieved, because of
17 some excellent reports that were shared with those in
18 attendance that day.

19 Marianne, your report, Chelsea's report,
20 and I have to say, most specifically, and I gave an
21 update, most specifically, and the Commissioner opened the
22 meeting with remarks and welcoming, but, most
23 specifically, David Goldhammer, I think it should be noted
24 for the minutes, made a really excellent PowerPoint

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 presentation, which I think was very, very meaningful to
2 those who were there.

3 And even for those who weren't there, and
4 this is the point I'm getting to, I think that, unless you
5 have already taken care of this, or have another idea how
6 you want to manage this point, I think it would be
7 worthwhile to take the printed deliberations,
8 specifically, the PowerPoint that David Goldhammer
9 created, and somehow be able to post it as part of the
10 minutes of maybe the report from this meeting about the
11 meeting on November 18th, so we can enter David's
12 presentation into these minutes, unless you have a better
13 idea what to do with it.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: No. It is on the
15 website somewhere, but I have to track it down, whether it
16 got into a special presentation section, or whether it was
17 noted on the November 17th date of the meeting, which was
18 posted.

19 DR. WALLACK: I don't know.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So I'll double check.
21 It is there, but we'll post it in a couple of different
22 places.

23 DR. WALLACK: Would it be a problem to also
24 have it as an attachment to these minutes, since the

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 report is being made at this meeting?

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Not at all. I will
3 forward those on.

4 DR. WALLACK: And, Marianne, the things you
5 talked about, if you wanted to have that included, could
6 be included, as well, in that.

7 Chelsea had a more informal presentation,
8 so I don't think that we'd want to go there. One of the
9 other results was that I had an article published in the
10 New Haven Register, a forum article, that was basically
11 Mike's suggestion, frankly, that addressed many of the
12 subjects that we tried to talk about from our agenda of
13 the program, now getting into the whole biomedical life
14 science whole thing, so these are all the results, so I
15 think it was very positive.

16 The attendance should have been, could have
17 been better, so that's my report.

18 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good. Any
19 questions?

20 DR. GENEL: Just a comment. Judging by the
21 submissions for this year's grant, I think it's a good
22 idea we did this, since the usual suspects are back.

23 DR. FISHBONE: There's a lot of new names,
24 as well. A lot of new names.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 DR. GENEL: Yeah, but the institutions are
2 the same.

3 DR. WALLACK: And Mike's point is really
4 the crux of the matter, and that is that the two major
5 institutions are maintaining the intensity of their
6 interest, I think on a par with where we were, and I'm
7 sure you'll get into this, in the past.

8 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, very good. Well
9 thank you for organizing that, Milt. I think it was a
10 worthwhile effort, and I think that the key players from
11 the institutions were there, and it was, I think, great to
12 get everybody on one page and very clear presentations
13 about what the expectations were.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Can I ask a question of
15 David?

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Sure.

17 DR. FISHBONE: What's happening on the NIH,
18 you know, what's happening with the NIH now, in terms of
19 funding? Are they funding embryonic stem cell research at
20 similar levels? Are they cutting back?

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I haven't specifically
22 looked at funding to embryonic stem cell research.
23 They're certainly funding it. I don't know the precise
24 levels.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 I do know that, overall, NIH funding across
2 the board is trouble, you know, it's troubling. It's low.
3 The cutoff for funding is extremely competitive, so it's
4 a challenge for researchers right now and has been.

5 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. The Dickey-Wicker
6 Amendment is coming up again in the courts, which,
7 depending on how that works out, that may affect even more
8 funding of stem cells.

9 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Do you know the timeline
10 for that?

11 DR. WALLACK: It's there now.

12 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

13 DR. FISHBONE: It's going on now. It's the
14 same two people, who have been suing somebody for --

15 DR. WALLACK: Well it's really the church
16 that is acting on behalf of Sherley and Deisher.

17 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Is there any new dates,
18 Milt?

19 DR. WALLACK: I have that. No, I don't
20 have it with me. Yeah. I think they -- do you remember
21 the dates? I think they're posting the appeals now, as
22 we're speaking. I don't know if that means this week or
23 next week, but it's right at this point.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: Without a specific date.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, we'll send
3 something around when we see it.

4 DR. WALLACK: I'll forward you not the
5 whole thing on Dickey-Wicker, but one page.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That would be great.
7 And we'll send it out to everybody.

8 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. The next item is
10 an update on 2012 grant applications and timeline for
11 review process, and I'll turn that over to Emily.

12 MS. SMITH: Sure. So the grant
13 applications were due 4:30 Friday, and, so, Friday was a
14 busy day here. We received 87 proposals, totaling
15 \$38,631,019.

16 We received two core applications, two
17 disease directed, 29 established investigator
18 applications, one group, and 53 seed proposals.

19 By school, we received 36 from UConn Health
20 Center, one was a UConn Health Center/Wesleyan
21 combination, that's in addition to the 36 from UConn
22 Health Center, five from UConn, one from Wesleyan, 32 from
23 Yale, and 12 from the Yale School of Medicine.

24 We have them all ready to be reviewed by

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 Marianne and her folks, and we'll get right on that. My
2 understanding is the grant review meeting we're hoping to
3 have that in June.

4 I think the next presenter is going to go
5 over the peer review timeline and process, and I think
6 what we have to do is get the reviewers assigned, so we'll
7 be working on that, and I think there's a June --hopefully
8 at the June meeting or sometime soon. Around that time is
9 when we'll actually make a decision on these.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, great. Thank you so
11 much for getting those on so quickly.

12 MS. SMITH: You're welcome.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So what I will do, in
14 conjunction with CI, is just to go through these grants
15 and make sure that all the pieces are there, make sure
16 that they're actually talking about something related to
17 stem cell research that we could actually fund, make sure
18 that the research is going on in Connecticut, and that
19 nothing else would overtly take them out of the running.

20 DR. FISHBONE: What's our current status
21 with the wording? We are funding now induced pluripotent
22 stem cell grants. Is there some sort of ratio or anything
23 that we should be looking at or thinking about? Do you
24 know?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don't think we
2 established any ratio, just excellent science.

3 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah, but we are going
4 beyond embryonic stem cell, and that's within the wording
5 of the legislation.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

7 DR. WALLACK: Gerry brings up an
8 interesting point, though, and that is that a lot of the
9 work that's being done, at least at some institutions, in
10 the area of IPS is clearly an acknowledgement or nod
11 towards what David was saying before, and that is that
12 it's been very, very difficult to access funds for
13 embryonic stem cell research, and how our RFP specifically
14 talks about the issue, and we've historically taken this
15 position, that we supposedly are interested in funding
16 research in the area of embryonic/adult stem cell research
17 that could not otherwise be easily funded or funded by the
18 federal government, so that what, Gerry, you bring up is
19 certainly, you know, it shouldn't not allow the IPS
20 applications to come in, but I think that we're still a
21 bastion.

22 Unless we change our vision or our mission
23 statement, we're still a bastion of embryonic, I think.

24 DR. GENEL: Yeah. How would you implement

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 that, Milt? I'm thinking that if there were two competing
2 applications, one of which was embryonic and one of which
3 was induced pluripotent, we would lean to the embryonic,
4 but would you dip down into a priority score in order to
5 preferentially fund an embryonic?

6 DR. WALLACK: No, and we specifically have
7 always stated that we would never do that. And even with
8 the disease directed, when we put that on, we specifically
9 said there's not a certain amount of dollars that we're
10 going to put aside for disease directed. We're going to
11 do the best science, and if no disease directed qualified,
12 we wouldn't fund it.

13 We can do, I think, a couple of things.
14 Number one, we could reemphasize that in the RFP, if we
15 chose to do that. I think the institutions, the
16 Universities, understand that the only place they can get
17 the embryonic funding at least more easily is from us. We
18 can restate that.

19 The other thing, from what I've been told,
20 is that part of the problem is that the cores need support
21 for -- if they're going to continue to do the embryonic,
22 so while we've had huge discussions over the last two
23 years having to do with do we fund cores, or do we not
24 fund it, and how much and so forth, and there were two

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 marvelous presentations, you know, a few months back from
2 (indiscernible) and from Mark Laronde(phonetic), and we
3 decided that we would put aside a million dollars on a
4 competitive basis for the cores, we may have to be
5 cognizant of, as we go forward, not in this cycle, as we
6 go forward, do we want to do something with the cores, as
7 far as funding goes, in a more positive way, so as to help
8 them to sustain the ability to do embryonic stem cell
9 research.

10 DR. GENEL: I agree.

11 DR. WALLACK: So I think, and I've been
12 sort of always on the side of maybe, you know, trying to
13 see if they can cut back, cut back on the core funding,
14 but this awareness, because of, Gerry, what you're
15 bringing up at the IPS and, David, what you're saying
16 about the federal, may put a different component into how
17 we address that, so it may be something we want to
18 consider on a future agenda item area. I don't know.
19 Does that answer it, Mike?

20 DR. GENEL: Well I think -- yes. I think
21 at both levels. I think probably the most important level
22 is the second one, and that is that if this is something
23 we want to call attention to, then we need to make sure
24 that that's in the next RFP in some fashion.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 The issue with the stem cell, with cores I
2 think is a valid one.

3 DR. WALLACK: You know it may be that we
4 might, and this is a recommendation now, we might want to
5 have the institutions make an updated -- create an updated
6 discussion, have an updated discussion with us relative to
7 if we were to consider increased funding for the cores, if
8 it would and how it would affect their work in the area of
9 embryonic stem cell research, they can tell us, as part of
10 our discussion, if, in fact, it would have a meaningful
11 impact.

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So look at after we
13 regroup after our next round?

14 DR. WALLACK: Right.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: So probably September or
16 so next year.

17 DR. GENEL: I suspect we'll have a better
18 idea of this when we actually see the applications,
19 because it's not entirely clear from the titles to what
20 extent IPS cells are being used and embryonic or both. I
21 think we'll have a better sense of that.

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And even if there's a
23 shift of ES cells to IPS cells, the cores are still
24 invaluable. They're needed in the same ways for IPS work

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 as they are for ES cell work, so I think the cores are
2 really needed in either case.

3 I think, in the RFP, did we not change the
4 language to take out the language about priority for
5 funding projects that cannot be funded federally? I
6 thought we took that out, because there are so many more
7 ES cell lines that can now be funded federally, that that
8 raises an interesting point.

9 You can get money for IPS cells, adult stem
10 cells, and most embryonic stem cell lines federally now.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We did leave that
12 language in. I think we had some discussion about --

13 DR. WALLACK: That was still in?

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: It is.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. My desire to take it
16 out, given the fact that there are so many lines --

17 DR. WALLACK: I think you were going to
18 work with Chelsea with some wording.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: He did, and I think we
20 just deferred it to this next year.

21 DR. WALLACK: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: It was going to require
23 another committee meeting to discuss the language of the
24 RFP, and we were coming up against the deadline.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: But I think this will sort
2 itself out, in terms of how the grants score. If someone
3 makes a strong case for why using IPS cells was preferable
4 to ES cells, then I think that will be reflected in a good
5 priority score, which then has a better chance of funding,
6 so I don't know that we have to kind of our priority, you
7 know, have in our minds a bias towards the embryonic cells
8 versus the IPS cells, because, clearly, IPS cells have a
9 number of unknowns, but, also, some advantages, clear
10 advantages.

11 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. I think our goal is
12 to fund the best research out there to achieve the
13 disease-oriented results, and my own feeling would be that
14 we should fund the best of whatever is out there, since,
15 as you say, more embryonic stem cell lines are now
16 available to people.

17 When this all started, there were,
18 basically, there was nothing out there, so it's very
19 important to stress embryonic stem cells, but it seems to
20 me like the field is moving a lot into the induced
21 pluripotent stem cells. I think, if there are good
22 applications, we should, you know --

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. I agree.

24 DR. WALLACK: But just to push back on what

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 you just said a little bit, some of the discussions,
2 again, in a very ad hoc basis, anecdotal way, that I've
3 had with some of the scientists, it sounds like part of
4 that movement to IPS, and you and I were discussing this
5 before, relative to Europe, for example, is that there's
6 been an increasing wall being put up on the embryonic
7 side, so it may be an issue of convenience for the
8 scientist and a greater certainty, if you will, that they
9 can get funding than they could for embryonic.

10 The feds aren't doing it, and we're, like I
11 said, the only place right now, I don't know what Maryland
12 is doing, or California, that is still doing this.

13 DR. RON HART: Can I speak? This is Ron
14 Hart on the phone.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Please.

16 DR. HART: I still have funding for both
17 ESCs and IPS, and, to me, there are many reasons to think
18 about going to IPS. Some of them are practical. It
19 requires oversight regulations work with IPS and ESC, but
20 that's relatively minor.

21 The great, huge advantage, of course, is
22 the variety of disease and genetic backgrounds that are
23 easily obtained from sources to make into IPS to solve
24 problems of human disease. That's something that really

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 (coughing) can't be done with embryonic stem cells, and,
2 yet, you're doing what seems like the exact same culture
3 and the exact same method, so it just doesn't seem to be
4 an evolution of the field.

5 I'm sure there will still be projects
6 reliant upon ESCs, but I think those will be few.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes, and I think there
8 will be even fewer. It will probably be a very rare
9 application we get that uses ESCs that are not eligible
10 for NIH funding, so I think almost everything we get is
11 going to be eligible for NIH funding, so, again, it comes
12 down to the best rationale for the experiments, the best
13 science that we should be looking at.

14 DR. HART: Unless you're creating a new
15 embryonic stem cell line, which is not supported by
16 federal dollars, or wanting to use a line that can't be
17 approved by federal regulations, and that's very, very,
18 very rare.

19 We're not going to see things that can't be
20 funded federally.

21 DR. FISHBONE: We were just discussing
22 before, Milt and I, that some of the big supporters, like
23 Ian Wilmont(phonetic) of embryonic stem cell, are now
24 talking about moving to IPS. For whatever reasons, I

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 don't know, but they're satisfied with the results of IPS,
2 in terms of where it's leading.

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Let me make one other
4 comment. Even, you know, yes, initially, we were one of
5 the few states that would fund research on ES cells that
6 could not be funded federally, and this is extremely
7 important.

8 Now things have evolved, and IPS is here,
9 and more ES cell lines can be funded federally. This, in
10 my mind, though, doesn't minimize at all the impact of
11 this program.

12 The fact that we're getting 80 plus
13 applications year in and year out tells us how important
14 this program is, and what it's allowing is for Connecticut
15 scientists to become more competitive for next steps for
16 federal dollars, and we know that this, you know, we have
17 a number of cases, where this is exactly what has
18 happened, so we're still growing the stem cell enterprise
19 in Connecticut and sustaining it by this program, even if
20 that kind of that initial intent is not as important as it
21 once was.

22 DR. WALLACK: Well put.

23 DR. GENEL: Marianne, if I may make a
24 comment?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

2 DR. GENEL: I suspect your division into
3 Yale University and Yale School of Medicine is very
4 artificial. Looking at the titles, they are just
5 coincidences to whether or not somebody designated their
6 grant as coming from the School of Medicine or from the
7 University. I would suggest you lump them together.

8 MS. SMITH: All right.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. I was hoping the
10 other two might join us for the peer review process, but I
11 think we'll go ahead with that anyway.

12 I think most of you know Rick Strauss from
13 Connecticut Association of Science and Engineering, and we
14 mentioned at an earlier meeting that Rick is going to be
15 helping the Department to perform the peer review process
16 this year with some of the administrative funds that the
17 Department receives to do stem cell work.

18 And I think it's going to lead to a process
19 that is very considered and very thorough, and that we
20 will have much more assurance that a seed is ranked
21 comparably to the other seeds within that category, and
22 the same with the established, and the same the core and
23 the group.

24 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please, for a

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 tape change.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, so, Rick, why
3 don't you take it away?

4 MR. RICK STRAUSS: Okay, well, it's great
5 to be here. Rick Strauss from the Connecticut Academy of
6 Science and Engineering, and, also, Terry Clark, our
7 Associate Director, is here. Ann Bertini(phonetic) will
8 also be assisting. She's our Assistant Program Director,
9 so we have a team working on the project.

10 We actually had some additional meetings
11 and development of our proposal for consideration by DPH
12 back in November. I think we are under contract as of
13 sometime in early January and got that go ahead to get
14 started, so what we've done so far is have an initial
15 meeting with Marianne to have her explain what the process
16 was.

17 That got followed up with a meeting I think
18 on January 5th with Gary Stein and his assistant,
19 Priscilla, by phone with Marianne, going over some initial
20 ideas that we had for this year's review process.

21 We, then, followed up with development of
22 materials, draft materials, and then went up to meet with
23 Gary and Priscilla at UMass last Tuesday, followed that up
24 with revisions and back and forth discussion on documents

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 and process, and I'll go over the results of all of that
2 now.

3 So, first of all, from a timeline
4 perspective, thanks to CI we're a little ahead of
5 schedule. As you know, the proposals were submitted last
6 Friday. They're now posted, so Marianne can get going on
7 her work for the compliance review, and we have a date for
8 that to be completed by around January 27th, so get
9 started.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: It will be done by the
11 20th.

12 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, good. But, at the same
13 time, now that we have the, you know, the summary of the
14 proposals that are in and they're available for Gary Stein
15 to start looking at, he'll be able to start thinking about
16 the reviewer assignments, so we hope to complete the
17 reviewer assignments by February 8th.

18 And we're also in the process now of
19 selecting the reviewers, and I'll go over that in a
20 minute.

21 So the proposal review period will
22 essentially be as soon as possible through April 4th, and
23 between April 4th and April 11th we'll complete the
24 reconciliation process, which I'll describe in greater

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 detail, by April 11th, and then we anticipate conducting
2 study sections for the various types of grants between
3 April 16th and April 20th and transmitting the final
4 results of the review process to you and DPH by the end of
5 April, April 27th, or thereabouts, so that will give you
6 time to get your June meeting scheduled.

7 So, first of all, we'll talk about
8 selection of peer reviewers, so our first job is we need
9 reviewers. Last year, I think you had a total of 10, so
10 the first step was, with Marianne's assistance, to go out
11 and see how many of those reviewers that were eligible to
12 come back that Gary wanted to re-invite would agree to
13 come back, so eight of the 10 have accepted the invite to
14 come back. One has a medical issue and can only do a
15 partial number of reviews, so she's on the bench in case
16 we need her.

17 MS. SMITH: Is she part of the eight?

18 MR. STRAUSS: No.

19 MS. SMITH: No, so, it's like eight and a
20 half?

21 MR. STRAUSS: So that's the status of last
22 year. Now what we looked at was, in the review process
23 and discussed this with Marianne and Gary, is getting more
24 support for the Chair, because what we want to do is to

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 really get prepared for the study sections for developing
2 questions on the proposals for the reviewers, so we've
3 come up with the idea to have four co-Chairs, so there
4 will be the Chair, four co-Chairs, and 10 reviewers, a
5 total of 15.

6 So that means, with the eight coming back,
7 we need seven additional reviewers. Now, you know, we
8 have the Academy staff that can go out and identify
9 potential reviewers, but we wanted to develop a process
10 that would provide the Commissioner with candidates that
11 have been reviewed, so what we did was to think about
12 creating a Peer Reviewer Screening Committee, so a
13 committee that will review the candidates that we
14 identified through a variety of processes, and they will
15 essentially provide their consent for the submittal of
16 candidates to the Commissioner for her approval.

17 Generally, we go to our Academy members.
18 That's a great idea, except for 99.9 percent of them are
19 from Yale and UConn that have stem cell experience, so
20 that created a little bit of a problem.

21 We do have -- well let me back up. We have
22 been doing a peer review process for the Department's
23 Biomedical Research Grant Program. A little bit smaller.
24 This last year was about a million dollars instead of 10

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 million dollars, and, in that process, we get somewhere
2 between -- well it varies by year.

3 I mean there's been up to like 30 or 40
4 proposals, but, generally, less than 20 proposals. The
5 peer reviewers serve on a pro bono basis, so we need many
6 more reviewers, because we can't have them do so many
7 reviews, so we have about 20 or so reviewers to review,
8 like last year, you know, 14 proposals, with a two-level
9 process.

10 So, in that process, one of our members is
11 a retired scientist from Bristol-Myers Squibb, Dr.
12 Dias(phonetic), so he's agreed to serve on the committee,
13 and we reached out to others, but we weren't able to find
14 anybody, and I thought, okay, well, let's see who are the
15 stakeholders here?

16 Well it would be good to have Gary on the
17 committee, because, you know, he's going to be working
18 with these people as the Chairperson, so Gary Stein
19 accepted, and then I said, well, maybe we need somebody
20 from the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee, so
21 Marianne and I talked over a couple of names, and Milt
22 Wallack has graciously agreed to serve as a member of that
23 screening committee, so we have a three-member team that
24 will receive the bios, bio sketches, you know, CVs, web

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 information on the candidates that we identify, and then
2 they will essentially provide their consent, or ask
3 questions of each other to review the candidates.

4 And then whoever they pass, if you will,
5 will go to the Commissioner for approval. This may
6 actually be more than the number that we need, so we'll
7 have a bench that if something happens in the period, we
8 can always draw on somebody else to fill in, or use them
9 as candidates for next year to fill in for others.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Or fill in for the
11 Advisory Committee. I've got my eyes on them today.

12 MR. STRAUSS: Well there may be a fee
13 associated with --

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah, okay.

15 MR. STRAUSS: But, anyway, so the process
16 we used to start with was to go out to all prior and
17 current peer reviewers for their recommendations on who
18 they might suggest for additional reviewers, and then,
19 also, go through those responses, and if somebody said no,
20 then we would ask them, so that kind of leads us away.

21 And then we also had submitted a request to
22 members of this Advisory Committee that are essentially
23 not from Connecticut, because you guys are all sort of
24 like involved here, so we've gotten some additional names

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 from those people, and then we also have our Biomedical
2 Peer Reviewers that we've used, and there's a lot of UConn
3 and Yale people there, so we're not going to be going to
4 those. We'll just be going to the people that are out of
5 state.

6 So that process has resulted so far in 14
7 possible candidates. Four have said that they are
8 interested in serving, five, not at this time, two,
9 considering, and we're waiting for three responses, so the
10 Screening Committee is now, right now, reviewing, well,
11 except for Milt, he's here, four candidates, so that would
12 bring us to a total of 12, meaning three more.

13 The end of this week, whatever that number
14 is that we have will get submitted to Marianne, that the
15 committee provides their consent for, will get submitted
16 to Marianne for her to forward to the Commissioner for her
17 approval, so we can get started with contracting and those
18 kind of things.

19 So that's pretty much the peer reviewer
20 selection piece of work, so that's moving along pretty
21 good. Yeah?

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Can you say a few words
23 about what criteria are being used for selection,
24 obviously, not only qualifications, but we also need peer

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 reviewers, who cover all of the major areas of stem cell
2 research, not just IPS and ES cells, but adult stem cells,
3 animal models and so forth, so are you looking for a mix
4 of people, in order to cover?

5 MR. STRAUSS: Well we had a discussion
6 about that with Gary, and that's one of the key roles
7 he'll be playing in looking at who he needs to maybe fill
8 in in certain areas, although he felt fairly comfortable
9 with what happened in last year's process, that based upon
10 his review of the letters of intent, that he's fairly
11 comfortable with the group that had already been there, so
12 we don't think that that's really going to be an issue,
13 although he's got his eye out for that, and that will be a
14 consideration of his and feeding into his comments in the
15 selection process.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

17 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, so, next is the
18 process. This involves the utilization of the co-Chairs,
19 as well as the primary and secondary reviewer, so the
20 primary and secondary reviewer, like last year, will go
21 through the proposals, and then independently submit them
22 through us, and we will get them, and then provide the
23 reviews to Gary and to the co-Chair that he's assigned to
24 oversee that particular proposal.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 So what he plans to do is to divide up
2 whatever number of proposals equally among the co-Chairs,
3 so that they all have an equal load.

4 If there's a strong difference of greater
5 than one point, or one point or greater, I'm not sure
6 exactly that fine line, but let's say one point or
7 greater, then the primary and secondary reviewer would be
8 asked to chat with each other, communicate to reconcile
9 their proposal to bring it closer, and the co-Chair will
10 be informed about what's happening.

11 The reconciliation, if they are able to do
12 it, would go to the co-Chair for the co-Chair's review,
13 the co-Chair may make comments, but that would be the
14 reconciled score.

15 If it's not reconciled, then the co-Chair
16 would review the proposal, produce a reconciliation
17 statement and a proposal score that Gary, as Chair, would
18 review, and that's the proposal that would go to the study
19 section level two.

20 In addition, the co-Chairs, and we have to
21 see if this really works out, or how Gary plans to utilize
22 them, would be involved with Gary in reviewing the core
23 and the group proposals, so, you know, if you will, the 10
24 primary and secondary reviewers would be doing the seed

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 and the established, Gary and the co-Chairs would be doing
2 the cores and the groups, just as a way to divide it, but,
3 you know, he may look at it a little differently.

4 The point is that we have these four co-
5 Chairs that are assisting in the process, so now we get
6 to, for the level two review, the co-Chair responsible for
7 that particular proposal would have reviewed it,
8 identified questions to ask during the study section for
9 that type of grant, because we would do it, do the study
10 section by type of grant, and, as we move from the lowest
11 ranked proposals to those highest ranked, meaning the
12 lowest score, the questioning would probably get a little
13 more intense, in terms of whether a proposal should be re-
14 ranked for whatever reason.

15 If there's any re-ranking done at the study
16 section level, there will be a study section
17 reconciliation statement and a new proposal score, so
18 that's pretty much the process.

19 The package that you would get would
20 include, at the bottom, the secondary review, the primary
21 review, and then a cover sheet that would start with the
22 initial primary, secondary reviewer scores and their
23 proposal average score, and then you would see the co-
24 Chair reconciliation statement, if any, with the co-Chair

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 score.

2 Well I'm sorry. You would see the primary,
3 secondary reviewer reconciliation statement with the
4 revised scores and revised proposal score, and then, if
5 not reconciled, you would see the co-Chair's
6 reconciliation statement with the co-Chair's proposal
7 score, and then the top item would be the study section
8 final score, and the study section reconciliation
9 statement, so they would say, basically, why did they
10 change the ranking?

11 And these are all statements that are 150
12 words or less, so you would have the whole history of the
13 review, original, any revisions, and, so, that's pretty
14 much the process, so, at a glance, you can see here's the
15 final score.

16 Now the final study section score might be
17 the same as the original score, with nothing else on the
18 page, because that would be the way it would work.

19 So, in order to implement this, what we've
20 developed is a process outline for the reviewers,
21 instructions for the reviewers, the timeline for the
22 reviewers, as well as forms that they'll be using that are
23 fillable and all that stuff with strengths and weaknesses
24 identified in bullets, along with the overall narrative

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 for the overall statement.

2 I think that's about it. Any questions?

3 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Sounds terrific.

4 MS. ANNE HISKES: Hello. This is Anne
5 Hiskes calling in.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Hi, Anne. It's
7 Marianne. We're just in the middle of Rick Strauss from
8 CASE outlining the peer review process, so I think it's
9 going to be very thorough and transparent, and it sounds
10 like it will be very fair.

11 MR. STRAUSS: Yeah. What's interesting is,
12 when we started the biomedical review, we had a one-level
13 process, and, you know, the proposers, the reviewers
14 ranked the proposals, and we had a Chair, and then we
15 evolved from that into this two-level process that we've
16 been using, and one of the comments initially was, well,
17 you know, don't do it like NIH does it, because, you know,
18 we have much more ability in the way we were handling the
19 biomedical for the reviewers to really go through an
20 analysis and then make modifications in the rankings, so
21 that they really felt that they were coming up with a
22 product that would rank the top proposals the top.

23 And then, in the last year, they said you
24 really need to adopt the NIH criteria, but keep your

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 process the same, so, you know, what we've used is that
2 experience and brought into your process, and Gary thought
3 it was going to work pretty good, especially the part
4 where he gets four Chairs to work with to help.

5 And our job is to make sure he's not
6 dealing with any of the administrative tasks, that he's
7 focusing on the proposal work and the assigning of the
8 reviewers and the consistency in the reviews, along with
9 the co-Chairs.

10 DR. FISHBONE: Are the co-Chairs stem cell
11 researchers?

12 MR. STRAUSS: What he did was to go back
13 into the -- it's all part of the reviewers, but, you know,
14 what we said is do you want to go through the current
15 reviewers to see if any of those, if you would like any of
16 those people to be co-Chairs, or do you want to reach out
17 to some of the new ones, so he said, okay, and he looked
18 at them, and he says, okay, here's the four co-Chairs I'd
19 like.

20 Now we haven't been in touch with them yet.
21 That's pending authorization for how much we're going to
22 pay him, so we have to get that approval, and, once we get
23 that, then we'll go back and say, okay.

24 The proposal is that the primary and

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 secondary reviewers are paid 3,000 and the Chair and co-
2 Chairs are paid 4,000, so that should work out pretty
3 good. So we have four co-Chairs identified, and they
4 become the bench for, you know, moving into the Chair
5 position.

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Are there any guidelines
7 for the approximate length that a review should be?

8 MR. STRAUSS: The narratives are 150 words,
9 and then the strengths and weaknesses for the categories
10 are bullets. These are all like draft, so for each of the
11 categories as part of the review, and the secondary
12 reviewers are doing a partial on the total, but they're
13 looking at the overall proposal, and they're not ranking
14 the various criteria, but like the significant approach
15 investigators, they are bulleting their strengths and
16 weaknesses, so the narrative is a statement not to exceed
17 150 words, and the others should just be hopefully, you
18 know, sentences, or, you know, bullets to say this is the
19 strength or weakness.

20 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I'd say, in past years,
21 there's been a lot of variability in how much was written,
22 and there's quite often the case, where the narrative was
23 short and not very informative, and then the scientist
24 gets a score, and it's really hard to know how that score

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 correlates with the few sentences that are on the page.

2 I think the NIH has also gone to much
3 shorter reviews, apparently because it's hard to attract
4 reviewers if you expect multi-page kinds of narratives.

5 I'm hoping that's enough detailed
6 description of the strengths and limitations to really
7 allow the scientist to see that what the reviewer thinks
8 about the proposal is accurately reflected in the priority
9 score. That's one area that some scientists have been a
10 little bit upset with, and the other, which I think is
11 being dealt with beautifully, is the spread, so you have
12 two reviews, and maybe one of them seems really positive,
13 and then the other may not so much, but then you end up
14 with a score, one score, and you're not sure, you know,
15 one of the reviews might have glowing remarks to make,
16 but, yet, it's a score of a four, you know, and it's not
17 clear how that score of a four was arrived at, so I think
18 this process that you're bringing to the review system
19 will really be a nice improvement.

20 MR. STRAUSS: One thing I didn't mention is
21 that one of the things that we would like to do, and I
22 know that the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee looks
23 at the scores provided by the Peer Review Committee, and
24 then applies, you know, certain other criteria, in terms

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 of the funding decision, but it would be valuable to share
2 with the Peer Review Committee and the Chair what the
3 final Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee rankings are,
4 so that they can see whether or not there are things that
5 they were doing in their rankings that were confusing, or,
6 you know, whatever it was.

7 How many proposals were re-ranked or re-
8 ordered, plus it makes it basically re-ordered by the
9 Advisory Committee. Right now, there's no feedback that's
10 going back to them, especially to the Chair, because, you
11 know, I know that they're looking at the best science, and
12 you're making decisions based on, you know, funding
13 criteria that includes the best science, so not so much
14 dealing with why you re-rank on the basis of funding, but
15 if you're re-ranking, because there's a disagreement in a
16 proposal being the best science, then that would be good
17 for the especially for the Chair to know.

18 I don't know how much the other 15
19 reviewers are going to look at it.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any --

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think we tried to stay
22 away from re-reviewing on a scientific basis. I think
23 that's not really what we should be doing, and it really
24 hasn't been what we --

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 DR. FISHBONE: Right.

2 MR. STRAUSS: So it would just be
3 interesting to see what happens in the process.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Thank you.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That's really great.

6 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

7 DR. FISHBONE: Could I just ask one
8 question?

9 MR. STRAUSS: Yes.

10 DR. FISHBONE: In previous years, if the
11 scores by the two reviewers were very different, a third
12 reviewer was brought in.

13 MR. STRAUSS: Right.

14 DR. FISHBONE: And what you're suggesting
15 one of the Chairs --

16 MR. STRAUSS: One of the co-Chairs.

17 DR. FISHBONE: Co-Chairs becomes that third
18 reviewer.

19 MR. STRAUSS: Right, the co-Chair assigned
20 to that proposal, and what's nice is that with 80 some-odd
21 reviews, each of the primary and secondary reviewers will
22 have a total of about accommodation of 20 reviews, be it
23 primary or secondary.

24 The co-Chairs will have the responsibility

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 for familiarizing themselves with 20 proposals, and
2 they're looking at it from a slightly different
3 perspective, but, you know, all the reviewers are
4 essentially, you know, have about the same number of
5 proposals that they're working on, so it should help,
6 especially with the co-Chair looking at 20, you know, so
7 we'd have, well, and they may be assigned, you know, each
8 co-Chair might be assigned one-fourth of the, you know,
9 about let's say, if it was perfectly divided, you know,
10 they're going to have a combination of seed and
11 established, although it depends on how Gary handles it.

12 Maybe he'll have two reviewers do the
13 established. I'm sorry, co-Chairs, be the co-Chairs for
14 the established, so, you know, they may have some other
15 discussions for the purposes of consistency.

16 They might each have about 20 or whatever
17 it is.

18 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It is good to spread out
19 the different types of grants among as broad a group of
20 the peer reviewers as possible. If you don't, you run the
21 risk, for instance, if there's two or three people doing
22 all of the group grants, or all of one particular funding
23 method, and they happen to be easier or harder scores than
24 the average, then you bias in fair or against that

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 particular funding mechanism, so it is good when possible.

2 I understand there's limitations on so many
3 people and lots of grants, but it is good, when possible,
4 to try to spread out.

5 MR. STRAUSS: So, anyway, we'll see how it
6 works.

7 DR. FISHBONE: Sounds good.

8 MR. STRAUSS: Interesting. And we'll be
9 coming to each of your meetings to give you a progress
10 report on how we're doing.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's great. Thank
12 you, Rick. It's such a relief to have you working on
13 this.

14 MR. STRAUSS: Well, thanks, and you'll get
15 some names for the Commissioner's approval by Friday.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's terrific. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. STRAUSS: I hope.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Are there any questions
20 from anybody on the phone before Rick takes off?

21 MR. STRAUSS: Or sits over here.

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Or sits over here.

23 DR. WALLACK: That was probably the most
24 comprehensive overview of how the process is going to work

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 that we have ever had.

2 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. Absolutely.

3 MR. STRAUSS: Well, thanks.

4 DR. WALLACK: Great.

5 MR. STRAUSS: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you, Rick. Okay,
7 just one other item, quickly, an update on the California
8 Collaborative Funding Initiative. This began when I went
9 out to California in October, and a couple of folks out
10 there asked to talk to me, as a representative of
11 Connecticut, about working on some collaborative funding
12 arrangements with them.

13 Paul Pescatello has been helping me out to
14 do that, and I've been working with the Attorney General's
15 Office to find out whether we could do a Memorandum of
16 Understanding, or how we would do that, so that we can
17 actually sign something with California to indicate that
18 we were interested in collaborative efforts, however that
19 may take place, given the restrictions of California's
20 grant process and restrictions of Connecticut's grant
21 process.

22 They kind of realized that the research
23 would continue to go on in both states. We would still
24 both fund research here. We're both bound by RFPs, or

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 RFAs, or whatever they call them, but, somehow, there
2 would be an understanding, that collaborations would be
3 fostered, and that the research monies would be leveraged,
4 and the research would be enriched by the collaboration,
5 whatever shape it takes, so we're moving forward with the
6 possibility of getting legislation that would authorize a
7 Memorandum of Understanding, that we have to have
8 authorization to do that one state to another, so that is
9 going forward.

10 And Paul is also working with the
11 scientists to see if, at the next stem cell retreat -- I
12 believe Yale is hosting?

13 DR. WALLACK: Wesleyan.

14 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Oh, Wesleyan, okay.

15 DR. WALLACK: April, I think.

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: That we could do some
17 kind of a video connection, or some way of connecting the
18 scientists. And I think the purpose of the MOU from
19 California's perspective is that they then sense that
20 we're serious about doing this, and they, then, are
21 willing to invest some funds to bring scientists into the
22 state at their expense and begin the dialogue in person
23 here.

24 So we've missed a couple of funding

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 opportunities that California has that we might have been
2 able to vote on funding, as they call it. Maryland has
3 actually done that to some extent. The next one coming up
4 from California is an early translational set of
5 applications, so I'll keep you posted on this.

6 Paul and I have another phone conversation
7 with California in another couple of weeks. I think it's
8 just good to keep talking, keep the scientists talking,
9 and build on the connections that are already there. Any
10 questions on that?

11 DR. WALLACK: You just briefly touched on
12 Maryland.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum.

14 DR. WALLACK: Did you ever want to create
15 the triangle?

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We certainly could try
17 to do that, yeah. Maryland's program is very similar to
18 ours. When I talked to Dan, it's really all the same
19 issues that we've run into here may run into, so I'll
20 certainly pick his brain a little bit more about how they
21 have worked with California.

22 DR. WALLACK: So the legislation would then
23 empower us to go not just to California, but to go to
24 Maryland, or wherever else we wanted to go.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Any other country or
2 state.

3 DR. WALLACK: That's great.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yeah, because Canada has
5 some collaborations with California right now.

6 DR. WALLACK: Right.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Looking at going beyond
8 2015. And is there any public comment?

9 DR. WALLACK: Before you do, you mentioned,
10 when Rick was speaking, about the need to have some
11 spillover into the Advisory Committee?

12 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Correct. Good. Yes, we
13 are down to 11 members on the Advisory Committee, so I
14 think we're down five, five members.

15 I did receive a couple of names. Milt, I
16 think you tried to strong arm somebody. Dr. Genel, you
17 tried to strong arm somebody, who, unfortunately, was
18 committed elsewhere.

19 DR. GENEL: He refused to be strong armed.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: But I do have a name of
21 somebody from the University of Hartford, who had
22 expressed some interest, and I will follow-up on that. So
23 if people have other ideas, we'll look to Rick to hand
24 some people over.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 We need a business person, and I know Milt
2 had some idea. Perhaps Paul would have some, as well.

3 DR. WALLACK: You know, Paul would probably
4 be very, very good for that, because he would have the
5 corporate types that are involved with the health care
6 industry.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

8 DR. WALLACK: So they may know a little bit
9 of the language.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum. So that is
11 definitely on my list, so that you folks don't have to,
12 and to get them on very quickly, so you don't have to
13 review so many grants.

14 Coming back, then, to the timeline, June
15 17th and 18th were the dates we had tentatively.

16 MS. SMITH: I think 18th and 19th.

17 CHAIRPERSON HORN: 18th and 19th.

18 MS. SMITH: The 18th is a Monday, the 19th
19 was Tuesday.

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And we have been able to
21 get it done in one day most of the time. People seem to
22 like to come in on a -- have the option to come in on a
23 Sunday evening, and then spend the day, and then go home,
24 but I understand there are a few people, who might not be

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 able to do that.

2 DR. WALLACK: Could you do it the week
3 before, possibly?

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think we'll have to
5 take a poll and kind of go with that. It's very hard,
6 when somebody is not going to be around. We just don't
7 have enough people. So June -- what would that be, 11th?

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: 11th and 12th.

9 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And that will give us
10 enough clearance there. Rick, we have May and the
11 beginning of June for stem cell reviews?

12 MR. STRAUSS: Sitting here right now.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: There will be no
14 slippage.

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So you're talking about
16 June 11th?

17 CHAIRPERSON HORN: June 11th, and then we
18 always have the possibility of going over to the 12th.
19 How does that work for people on the phone?

20 DR. HART: Fine. Ron Hart.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Treena, did you
22 have to go? I think I heard her hang up awhile back.

23 DR. FISHBONE: Yeah. She said 2:30.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Anne? Sorry? Anne?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 MS. HISKES: Anne Hiskes is on the phone.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. Does June 11th,
3 with the potential for the 12th, work for you for our
4 reviews?

5 MS. HISKES: Yeah, that would be good.

6 CHAIRPERSON HORN: You're not going to be
7 anywhere exotic this year?

8 MS. HISKES: I usually go to Michigan for
9 the month of July. June is good.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. And, David, does
11 that work for you?

12 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It works for me.

13 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Milt and Gerry?

14 DR. WALLACK: Yup.

15 CHAIRPERSON HORN: And, Dr. Genel, you said
16 okay?

17 DR. GENEL: Well Monday is my regular-
18 scheduled patient day, so I have to make a change.
19 Whether it's the 11th or the 18th, I have to make a
20 change.

21 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

22 DR. GENEL: One is as bad as the other.

23 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

24 DR. GENEL: Just don't change it at the

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 last minute.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

3 DR. WALLACK: One other date that's
4 projected is Tuesday, the 18th, September 18th, Tuesday,
5 September 18th. We may not be meeting that day anyway,
6 but it's the second day of Rosh Hashanah.

7 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Oh, okay. And we will
8 attempt to keep the meetings between now and the grant
9 meeting to those that are necessary, and, at this point,
10 it doesn't look like we're going have an awful lot on the
11 agenda for next month.

12 We'll send out the review of hearings, and
13 you'll get conflict of interest forms and all the usual
14 things that go along with that.

15 If we need to meet, we'll let you know,
16 but, otherwise, I think we'll just carry on and save it
17 for June. Yes, Rick?

18 MR. STRAUSS: Did you go back to public
19 comment?

20 CHAIRPERSON HORN: We are back in public
21 comment. Yeah.

22 MR. STRAUSS: Yeah. This is just in regard
23 to the workshop that was held. I believe CTN covered
24 that. They didn't? I thought it was recorded.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: It was supposed to be.

2 CHAIRPERSON HORN: No.

3 MR. STRAUSS: Okay, no problem.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Cancelled.

5 DR. WALLACK: But you know what, though,
6 Rick, we have a report.

7 MR. STRAUSS: Yeah. No, I just thought, if
8 it was covered, CTN only keeps it up on their website for
9 so long, so you'd want to grab it from them.

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Archive it.

11 MR. STRAUSS: And then you could post it,
12 but you don't have to worry about that.

13 DR. WALLACK: So would you want anything
14 done with the verbatim report? Have we done anything with
15 it?

16 CHAIRPERSON HORN: It will be posted, if it
17 hasn't already been posted. I think all of that was
18 posted. Okay, so, does the Marriott in Farmington work,
19 if they'll have us back, since we paid the bill so late
20 last time?

21 DR. WALLACK: One thing on the committee,
22 just so you know. I know there's a question you had about
23 Ann Kiessling.

24 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um-hum.

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: She e-mailed earlier today
2 that she wasn't going to be attending today, but it's only
3 because she is in Greece.

4 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Oh.

5 DR. WALLACK: And that she also
6 complimented CI for being very, very well-organized
7 leading up to today's meeting, and she wanted to be sure
8 to be kept in the loop about this meeting and going
9 forward, so it seems as though she's --

10 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Good. That's very good
11 news. Okay, so, we'll let people know as soon as possible
12 after this meeting. If you could send out the June 11th
13 and 12th are the dates that we're looking for for a grant
14 meeting.

15 Let us know as soon as possible if that
16 will not work, and at the Farmington we can make
17 arrangements for overnight for them. I think most people
18 have contracts, so people who need them. David, yours is
19 probably still sitting on somebody's desk out at UConn,
20 but --

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Start --

22 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, we could do that.

23 DR. FISHBONE: We don't have a March
24 meeting?

RE: CONN. STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2012

1 CHAIRPERSON HORN: At this point, we don't
2 have a February meeting.

3 DR. FISHBONE: February, but we do have a
4 March?

5 CHAIRPERSON HORN: I don't know. We'll
6 have to reassess. I'm thinking, unless we get an awful
7 lot of stuff in, but we don't know. We may end up having
8 a lot of things that we need to go over. If it's really
9 just paperwork stuff, we can do it over the phone.

10 DR. FISHBONE: Sure.

11 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Rather than having
12 everybody come in. Okay. The next meeting date will be
13 determined, but, certainly, I would say February, not
14 February. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

15 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

16 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

18 VOICES: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON HORN: Thank you, everybody.

20 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 2:30
21 p.m.)