

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MARIANNE HORN, ACTING CHAIRPERSON

APRIL 17, 2012

CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS
865 BROOK STREET
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT 06067

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

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 . . .Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of
2 the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee held on April
3 17, 2012 at 1:04 p.m. at Connecticut Innovations, 865
4 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut. . .

5
6
7
8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIANNE HORN: This is
9 Marianne Horn. I am the Commissioner's designee today. The
10 Commissioner was not able to attend. So welcome to
11 everybody on the line and in the room. And we'll just go
12 around and say who is here in the room.

13 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: Gerry Fishbone.

14 DR. MILTON WALLACK: Milt Wallack.

15 DR. DIANE KRAUSE: Diane Krause.

16 MS. EMILY SMITH: Emily Smith.

17 MS. SARA DONOFRIO: Sara Donofrio.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And Marianne
19 Horn. And Rick Strauss is also here in the audience, he's
20 going to be presenting.

21 I did want to take a minute and introduce
22 Diane Krause. Most of you will probably know her. She is
23 a new member of the Advisory Committee appointed just a
24 couple of weeks ago. We're delighted to have her, a

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 professor of laboratory medicine, pathology, and cell
2 biology at the Yale School of Medicine in New Haven,
3 Connecticut and we are delighted to have her with us.
4 She's been a tremendous help to the program throughout and
5 so you all know an excellent scientist. So, conflicted
6 unfortunately on the Yale grants, but we're very happy to
7 have you aboard. So welcome.

8 DR. KRAUSE: Thank you. I'm happy to be
9 here.

10 DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: Hi, Diane.

11 DR. KRAUSE: Hi, David.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And, David, where
13 are you?

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I'm in Canada.

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: What part of
16 Canada?

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: In Toronto.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: In Toronto, oh,
19 that's my hometown, say hello. So, we might need to do a
20 little rearranging. We promised David that since he's on
21 vacation with his children that we might try to get him on
22 and off as quickly as possible. Do we have a quorum if
23 David leaves? Not yet. We'll need to hold you hostage,
24 David, until one more person comes.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That's fine. And after
2 three days on vacation a two-hours reprieve might not be
3 bad.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- okay. They're
5 all set for now.

6 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I have the time allotted
7 so I should be okay.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, very good.

9 Well, I have no other opening remarks. I
10 think we can just plunge into the agenda. I just want to
11 acknowledge the stem cell retreat that took place at
12 Wesleyan last week and I understand was very successful,
13 and exciting. And certainly reflecting back on seven years
14 since the program started, it's been a tremendous growth
15 and you all should really be very proud of how far the
16 program has come.

17 DR. WALLACK: The organizer did an amazing
18 job, Laura Grabel.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, Laura
20 Grabel.

21 DR. WALLACK: And her university, Wesleyan
22 University, they were all great.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's terrific.
24 And where is the next one going to be and when?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: It's at Yale and, Paula, help
2 me, which date is it?

3 DR. PAULA WILSON: November 5th.

4 DR. KRAUSE: November 5th.

5 DR. WALLACK: November 5?

6 DR. KRAUSE: Um, hmm.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. We should
8 talk off the record. I have been speaking with California
9 about the possibility of having some scientists come and
10 talk to some folks here about some research collaborations
11 at our next retreat, so that would be a good target date,
12 and it wouldn't cost us anything.

13 So the minutes of March 30, 2012, other
14 than the correction to the spelling of my name at one
15 point, does anybody else have any comments? Can I have a
16 motion, please?

17 DR. WALLACK: Are all the names here, is
18 Sally here? Do we have all the names of the people that
19 were here on the attendees?

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I didn't check
21 that out.

22 MS. SMITH: We'd have to go back and have
23 the attendance sheet. I mean it looks to me like they're
24 all here.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MS. DONOFRIO: I usually don't list the two
2 of us.

3 DR. WALLACK: Oh, they don't list you,
4 okay.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Can I have
6 a motion for approval?

7 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

8 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

10 ALL VOICES: Aye.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Opposed?

12 Recused? The minutes pass.

13 I'm going to -- if you're okay with us
14 proceeding, David, in the order of the agenda we'll just
15 go ahead with Item No. 3 and I'll turn it over to CI.

16 MS. SMITH: Okay. Item No. 3 on the six
17 month fiscal reports there are seven of them listed here.
18 They were included in your packet. They're included as an
19 FYI basis. There is no approval needed, but if anybody has
20 any discussion about them or comments.

21 DR. KRAUSE: It's the first time I had
22 looked at these kinds of things because it's my first time
23 I'm meeting here and just remarking on the fact that
24 through almost everybody's grant about 65 to 70 percent of

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 the direct costs go to personnel. It's just something to
2 realize when we're talking about the job creation. This
3 money is mostly going to hiring people.

4 DR. WALLACK: That's a good point.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So these are the
6 '08 grants that were awarded in the fiscal year '09. They
7 look like established in core -- they don't --

8 MS. SMITH: -- those are in '08, right?

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: '08, so they're
10 coming to the end of their --

11 MS. SMITH: -- yes. For instance, this
12 first one is, the end date is August 31, 2012, it's this
13 year.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So we've got one
15 more final --

16 MS. SMITH: -- final report.

17 All right. Moving on, Item No. 4, there is
18 an interim progress report here. From what I understand
19 this was requested by the Committee at the November 2nd
20 meeting, which I did not attend, but looking back in the
21 minutes there was a discussion of this project. And the
22 Committee requested interim progress reports and that's
23 what's included in your packet here. Is there any
24 comments about it?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. FISHBONE: Well, basically the first
2 year was sort of rough.

3 MS. SMITH: Yes, that's correct.

4 DR. FISHBONE: So how should that be
5 handled?

6 MS. SMITH: I guess I don't know the answer
7 to that because we've never really had a situation like
8 that before.

9 DR. WALLACK: So, this grant was originally
10 awarded in 2010.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

12 DR. WALLACK: And its completion date was,
13 I think, September of 2012? Yes, September of 2012.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Rihgt. It's a
15 seed grant. It would be for two years.

16 DR. WALLACK: Rihgt. And there is really -
17 - there hasn't been anything done with this grant and I'm
18 not so sure that I feel comfortable, personally, with the
19 continuation, frankly, of the grant. Certainly the work
20 it's impossible for it to be done in the time that's left.

21 And, I guess, also what is in my mind is the torturous
22 debates that we have because of the quality of people that
23 we can't award grants to.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. WALLACK: And we probably -- I know we
2 keep a bullpen of people available that some of us felt
3 very badly that we couldn't award grants to. And I would
4 think that maybe with the lack of performance here I'm
5 still not convinced that even with this report that the
6 person involved with this is going to be able to show any
7 positive conclusion. I don't know if I wouldn't want to
8 see, again, like I say the grant taken away and awarded to
9 one of those people who we otherwise would have hoped to
10 have awarded a grant to.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, I think
12 let's that in a couple of steps. The first one is to
13 decide what you want to do with this grant. It is
14 actually, would be up for completion this fall.

15 DR. WALLACK: Right.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, I think we'd
17 need to have a clear understanding of where this person is
18 and if she's going to be requesting to have the grant
19 extended and the funds carried over so that she can indeed
20 accomplish the goals of the grant. If she is trying to
21 finish it by the end and the Committee has concerns about
22 spending the money that way, I think that is something we
23 might want to call her in and have that discussion with
24 her unless you have enough information here to make the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 decision.

2 DR. WALLACK: I don't see any information -
3 - I'm sorry --

4 DR. DEES: -- this is Richard Dees. I think
5 did we give her -- she's having a hard time -- she finally
6 got through all the junk that she had to do in order to
7 get this off the ground and now they're actually starting
8 from where she's hired the people she needs to hire. I
9 guess I'm inclined to give her some time with this rather
10 than sort of waste what she has done so far -- I mean I
11 assume she's going to ask for an extension of the grant.
12 It's a little hard for me to tell from this how much she
13 already spent -- of year one that's she's spent already.
14 Does anyone have an idea what she has allocated this year.
15 Anyway, I'm inclined to give her a chance to see what she
16 can do now that's she (inaudible) --

17 DR. WALLACK: -- Richard, the reason I said
18 what I said is that we've given her enormous opportunity.
19 We've discussed her progress a few times. And like I say
20 there were other people on the seed grant list that some
21 of us felt very strongly about that they should be funded.
22 Unfortunately, we can't fund everybody. And I'm not
23 impressed with the idea that things will change. And if
24 you recall she also had some difficulties even

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 administratively in her own university. So, I don't know.
2 I'm not comfortable with her proceeding.

3 DR. HART: It's Ron Hart on the phone. Can
4 I jump in here?

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Please.

6 DR. HART: The -- it's been clear that much
7 of the delay has been outside of her control both from her
8 own university's point of view and from these agencies
9 getting her the cells. And if -- you can complain about
10 how long it takes to go through some of those human
11 subjects' approval, but she has not completed that work
12 and is ready to start on the cells. In my mind, it's
13 quite unfair to talk about terminating any projects at
14 this stage of the game without giving the opportunity to
15 actually start some science with those cells. When she
16 comes back for a request for a no-cost extension in the
17 fall I would definitely want to see a progress report at
18 that point, but at this point I think it's very premature
19 to talk about dismissal.

20 DR. WALLACK: Ron, I think you make a good
21 point and if we were to give her even additional time, and
22 yes there is a clear expectation that she'll have to ask
23 for an extension, then I think that we -- it's a lot of
24 money. I mean 200,000, and I think that we have to be

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 very, very cognizant of where she's been, what's been
2 going on with it, and be, therefore, be very careful of
3 how we proceed with her in the future. And ask for updates
4 from her on a more periodic basis than we ask otherwise.
5 So, I hear what you're saying, Ron and Rich, but the -- my
6 only caveat would be that if we then do extend her time
7 let's not do so without at least getting maybe three or
8 four month reports from her on her progress.

9 DR. HART: I don't disagree that she
10 deserves more critical review of her experience. I think
11 that is justified. Asking for a special round of review
12 based on this behavior I think is a little unnecessary
13 given that she needs to come back for a no-cost extension
14 very soon. And I think we can put the onerous on her to
15 prove to us that she is justified in asking for any
16 extension of time to spend the money that has been given
17 to her, but that's -- that's a normal course of events
18 right now.

19 What's more important, in my mind, is this
20 is, I believe, the only one of our grants, to my
21 recollection, on Huntington. It was reviewed
22 scientifically favorably. It's a difficult disease to
23 attack. It's difficult to obtain -- and I think it
24 deserves, for the type of grant that was awarded, a seed

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 grant this is perfectly appropriate and deserves to be
2 followed through to the originally awarded period.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Gerry.

4 DR. FISHBONE: I would tend to agree with
5 Ron that I think she is finally gotten her ducks in order
6 from what she's describing and I would agree that most of
7 the problems that she had were outside her control. And
8 it almost seems like she had -- was given a very hard time
9 for reasons I'm not sure of. So I would agree with
10 allowing her to continue. She's also hired a Ph.D. who
11 will start in this month, I think, and that's going to be
12 hard on that person too if we stop it. And I think perhaps
13 we should just keep a close eye on what happens. It's very
14 unlikely she'll be able to finish the grant in the time
15 that's allotted and I think, as people have said, we
16 should see how her progress is going. And I would like to
17 see her be given an opportunity to see what she can
18 achieve with the grant with all due respect.

19 DR. WALLACK: Well, it's very clear that
20 the consensus here is that we want to see her, we as a
21 group, want to see her continue at this point.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

23 DR. WALLACK: Again, I think that we have
24 to respond, I think, to her resubmission. And I would be

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 very uncomfortable if in that response we did not pay
2 attention to the history of -- and, Ron, with all due
3 respect I understand totally what you're saying, but there
4 has also been a performance flaw here. And I think we
5 ought to, in that response, identify the fact that we have
6 certain expectations and we expect that there will be
7 periodic reporting back to us. Now maybe the next one,
8 Ron, coincides with what you're saying when she sends the
9 resubmission, but even after that I'm not sure I'll be
10 comfortable if we don't have a more closely looked at
11 project.

12 DR. DEES: When she resubmits then we can
13 evaluate what she needs to do next.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, Milt, what
15 you're saying is in the response to this interim progress
16 report you would want to give her some indication that
17 when she does another submission the Committee expects to
18 see significant progress.

19 DR. WALLACK: Rihgt.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And may impose
21 additional reporting as needed, something like that.

22 DR. WALLACK: Exactly. And I think that
23 it's only fair from our perspective and maybe it does her
24 a favor also in that there is an indication to her that we

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 don't just give out these 200,000 dollar grants ad hoc
2 without some expectations, and that we've very serious
3 about the researchers performing at a certain level and
4 according to an expectation. That's all I'm saying. I
5 think that we have to send a message to her in some regard
6 and to not do so, I think, isn't fair to the other people
7 who we didn't give grants to. It's not fair to us, I don't
8 think. And also I think, again, it may be doing a favor to
9 her.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And I think we've
11 done that in the past where we've had people who have had
12 issues getting their grants up and started whether it was
13 they couldn't get the right machinery or equipment, or
14 whatever, and it seems to have worked to get their
15 administration's attention and their attention to the fact
16 that we're really watching this grant more closely. And
17 there may be ramifications if it doesn't get in line.

18 So are people comfortable with something
19 like that? If we approve this interim progress report,
20 but send out a cover letter to the effect of that this
21 next report will be closely monitored and there may be
22 additional reporting requirements, and we expect to see
23 significant progress.

24 DR. WALLACK: I will move what you just

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 said, Marianne, and yes.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Is
3 everybody okay with that? Okay.

4 DR. MYRON GENEL: I'm going to abstain. I
5 really didn't hear the discussion.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Dr. Genel
7 has arrived, but midway. Did somebody else just join us?

8 DR. ANN KIESSLING: Hi, Ann Kiessling, I'm
9 late.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Hi, Ann, how are
11 you. And Paul Pescatello just arrived as well, great.

12 DR. KRAUSE: So I have a question now that
13 the discussion is over if it were decided for a grant that
14 the funding would end, I guess, at the designated end.
15 There can be no carry over of funds. Where does that
16 money go? That's money from the 2010 budget or something
17 and you were talking about, Milt, the fact that there is
18 so many grants that we'd like to fund that we can't. Is
19 there actually a mechanism that --

20 DR. WALLACK: -- yes.

21 DR. KRAUSE: That that funding could be
22 recycled back into our fund even though it's from a
23 different year?

24 DR. WALLACK: We retain a list of

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 applicants that were very close in consideration for
2 granting. And we put the names into the bullpen and those
3 people, yes, are available.

4 DR. KRAUSE: And the funds are available to
5 be released to those people even though they came from a
6 different fiscal year.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We'd have to look
8 at all of that because we are some significant ways down
9 the road from where we had the bullpen, but Milt is right
10 we always do have a few grants -- I think we typically
11 look at that as if there is a failure of an escrow
12 approval or the PI leaves for some reason and the grant is
13 not approvable or they can't sign a contract and that we
14 would have somebody else waiting in line. A year down the
15 road I'm not sure what would happen, but certainly the
16 funding would come back.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: We have the flexibility to
18 use the funds as we see fit and not necessarily to go back
19 to the grants in 2010, I would imagine.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean this is a premature
22 discussion since there is no action needed right now, but
23 I'm worried about funding a grant two years, you know,
24 that the field has moved on and the grant may not be of

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 the same sort of importance or quality today that it was
2 two years ago.

3 DR. WALLACK: That's true.

4 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So if that's the case then
5 the money could be used for the bullpen for this year, or
6 2011, or any way that we --

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- yes, my sense
8 is that we'd go back into the pool and then we could make
9 it, as we do with any unexpended money that goes back into
10 the pool, and we keep a running total going forward.

11 DR. KRAUSE: Thank you.

12 MS. BATES: It's Isolde Bates, UCONN Stem
13 Cell Institute, I just want, need a clarification on
14 Carolyn's report in regards to the money. So we've been
15 operating on Year 1 funds. Now that you have extended it,
16 she hired a post-doc, will I be able to get Year 2 funds?
17 Will I be able to get partial of Year 2 funds with -- I do
18 -- we do need now some money to pay payroll, etcetera.

19 DR. KRAUSE: Are the Year 1 funds spent?

20 MS. BATES: No, they're not fully spent,
21 but it's not sufficient enough to pay for her effort and
22 put on the post-doc.

23 DR. FISHBONE: There is 52,885.

24 MS. BATES: right. And the post-doc's

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 salary, between salary and fringe, I believe, comes up to
2 about 60 and then her effort. And I don't remember right
3 now what it is, her class, the money that she needs for
4 supplies, etcetera.

5 DR. KRAUSE: I completely understand the
6 budget concerns. I wasn't really part of this discussion
7 of this grant previously so I'm not -- it sounds to me
8 like the second year funds need to be released in order
9 for her to progress with the work at all.

10 MS. BATES: At least 50 percent.

11 DR. KRAUSE: It's really only 80K a year
12 once you pay the indirect, and 80K when you're paying
13 salaries really doesn't get you that far.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So in November
15 when the initial report was submitted and was deemed not
16 to be sufficient and she submitted -- in November she was
17 looking for, already, her second year.

18 MS. BATES: Yes, and we did not get it.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. So now
20 she's brought this report back. My understanding is with
21 the approval of this report, even though we are giving a
22 cover letter saying we will be watching closely, that
23 those funds would be released as part of that approval.

24 MS. SMITH: And I think Isolde is

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 suggesting that perhaps 50 percent of it could be released
2 until the, you know, October or --

3 MS. BATES: -- we are coming forth with a
4 no-cost extension, you guys already looked at that. So I
5 just kind of, from managing the budget, I need to have an
6 idea what I can or cannot do.

7 DR. WALLACK: So, but, Isolde this person,
8 the salary, the total responsibility is 62,000 dollars,
9 correct?

10 MS. BATES: In, I don't have -- I believe
11 the post-doc was hired around 40,000 something plus
12 fringe. I don't have the exact number yet.

13 DR. WALLACK: So, it's between 50 and
14 60,000.

15 MS. BATES: Yes.

16 DR. WALLACK: But that person is not going
17 to be paid that amount of money on day one anyway.

18 MS. BATES: No, no, it's over the year.

19 DR. WALLACK: Rihgt. So, it's not like we
20 need to put aside that total sum at this point.

21 MS. BATES: No. That's why I was at least
22 if we could get a portion of it.

23 DR. WALLACK: Well, you already have 50
24 some odd left.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MS. BATES: But what is left is the money
2 mostly in supplies because she barely -- the only supply
3 item she used or the only other expense was she went to
4 the Stem Conn a year ago, other than that the only other
5 money used was to pay her effort, her salary on the grant.

6 So I would have to take money now from the supplies and
7 move it into --

8 DR. FISHBONE: -- well, we have to assume
9 that if she was expecting to get 100,000 in the second
10 year she's got 50. We can give her the other 50. And then
11 there would be 50 left over when she applies for --

12 MS. BATES: -- the no-cost extension.

13 DR. FISHBONE: Would it be a no-cost
14 extension or just an extension?

15 MS. BATES: It would be an extension with
16 the -- if there is any remaining money to be paid we would
17 request that if not it would be just a no-cost.

18 DR. WALLACK: It would have to be a no-cost
19 because there is no other funds that we have allocated to
20 her.

21 DR. HART: Can I just jump in real quickly
22 here? My understanding what we were just discussing
23 before this is we're approving her annual report, which
24 should be released in the second year of the budget. And

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 then if she's gone and spent it all before, between now
2 and the end of August she'll have to ask for a no-cost
3 extension. Isn't that right?

4 MS. BATES: Yes.

5 DR. HART: So by approving this we are
6 releasing the second year.

7 MS. BATES: Oh, okay.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's my
9 understanding unless you want to place some restriction on
10 that and only release 50 percent, but that's not how we've
11 typically done it when they come back.

12 DR. HART: If the budget, other than what's
13 been proposed here, if it were to have some major change
14 from this to spend more money at that time would require a
15 major modification. I think we should release the second
16 year. And, again, evaluate this critically when it comes
17 up for the no-cost extension.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Is that
19 acceptable? Okay.

20 MS. BATES: Thank you.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: The Year 2 funds
22 are released.

23 MS. SMITH: Okay. So, moving onto Item No.
24 5 there is a request to change a PI. The request comes

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 from Yale University, Dr. Pascale Draine, at Yale
2 University and would like to, they would like to switch
3 the PI to Dr. Patell. The packet -- included in your
4 packet is the biographical sketch and the revisions to the
5 budget to account for the fact that Dr. Patell is a post
6 doctorate associate, so that the --

7 DR. FISHBONE: -- what does that mean?

8 DR. KRAUSE: It's post doc.

9 DR. FISHBONE: I mean different from a
10 fellow?

11 DR. KRAUSE: It's the source of funding
12 gives you the title of associate versus fellow. If you
13 have your own funding then you're a fellow because you
14 have a fellowship. Other than that you're an associate.

15 DR. FISHBONE: You're an associate.

16 MS. SMITH: Yes. And this would require an
17 approval by the Committee.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And we had
19 required and have language both in the RFP and in the
20 assistant's agreement that when there is a change in PI
21 that the Committee approve that and that the PI's CV be
22 attached, that there be representation that this will not
23 impact -- or what the impact of the change will be on the
24 research and that the -- that he is well qualified for the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 research. So I think this letter covers all the bases.

2 MS. SMITH: It covers all of that, yes.

3 DR. PAUL PESCATELLO: So moved.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So moved? Second?

5

6 DR. WALLACK: Second.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor? No

8 Yale votes, please.

9 ALL VOICES: Aye.

10 DR. FISHBONE: I just one question about
11 the responsibilities of somebody when they accept the two-
12 year application. It would seem to me you have a
13 responsibility to stay in your institution for two years
14 and perform what you've signed up for, but there is no way
15 that we can enforce that.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: The only hold we
17 have over them is the money and whether we would approve
18 that money being moved with the PI to a different
19 institution. Otherwise it stays with the institution and
20 they have to figure out how to replace that person who is
21 leaving. But we don't have anything that says I will stay
22 and finish the research at this university. Diane, have
23 you ever heard of anything like that?

24 DR. GENEL: It's really unfeasible at this

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 level.

2 DR. KRAUSE: At the NIH both occur, some
3 people take their NIH grants with them and generally when
4 they retire they give their NIH grant to somebody else who
5 is continuing that work at their same institution. So
6 there is precedent for this at the NIH. Certainly within
7 Connecticut we're not letting the funding leave
8 Connecticut. So I guess there would be a different issue
9 if this person were moving to another institution in
10 Connecticut to continue this same work, but that's not
11 even an issue here. Plus, it's different since it's a post
12 doc under a sponsor and it's the sponsor who is really
13 overseeing the work.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No. 6?

15 MS. SMITH: No. 6, so these are the final
16 reports. At the March meeting the Committee requested
17 revised lay summaries for these three projects. Basically
18 the Committee felt that the original lay summaries were
19 not simplified enough, they were not in plain English.
20 They did not include any description of how the research
21 is connected to treatments -- and they asked that three
22 different, these three different projects revise their lay
23 summaries. So they're included in your packet.

24 In March these were approved with the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 request for the revised lay summaries, so I don't believe
2 we need another approval. I included them in the packages
3 just so you could see that we did request them and we had
4 received them. I have not yet sent out an email to all of
5 the PI's giving them guidance on what the expectations are
6 with regard to the lay summaries. To be honest with you, I
7 just haven't had time to do that yet, but I do that on my
8 list of things to do. So that will occur.

9 DR. DEES: Richard Dees, one comment about
10 -- (inaudible) -- these are better, but I would say only a
11 third really took it to heart (inaudible) --

12 MS. SMITH: -- okay. Moving onto to Item
13 No. 7, I would like to actually make a motion to remove
14 this item from the agenda seeing that I put it on here in
15 error. This was actually approved at the last meeting. So
16 that was my fault that it ended up on here, so I would
17 recommend that we take it off.

18 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Second. All in
20 favor?

21 ALL VOICES: Aye.

22 MS. SMITH: Thank you. No. 8, we have a
23 carry over request for the Yale project. It's -- it looks
24 -- it looks appropriate to me and I did recommend

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 approval, but we're open to discussion here.

2 DR. DEES: Richard Dees, again, there is
3 not any explanation for the carry over. I mean I'm not
4 worried about it, I was just wondering if we have any
5 explanation of what's going on.

6 MS. SMITH: I did not receive an
7 explanation with this particular request.

8 DR. DEES: Do we have one? (Inaudible) --

9 MS. SMITH: -- yes, usually we get
10 something either in an email or in a letter. I could go
11 back and ask for one. Paula, do you have any information
12 on this, this particular project?

13 DR. WILSON: Hold on just one second.

14 MS. SMITH: Okay.

15 DR. WILSON: Yes, do you have the
16 justification page for Dr. Wang's report?

17 MS. SMITH: No, we just received the budget
18 carry-over request.

19 DR. WILSON: There wasn't a revised budget
20 and -- page attached? If she sent it.

21 MS. SMITH: No, we just have one page. It's
22 the budget carry-over request.

23 DR. WILSON: I'll give that to you now,
24 unless it's too late. The funds shall be allocated to CI

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 effort and prior budget modification request after
2 regrouping. TBA increase in effort did not begin until
3 approval of adjusted budget. She had put in a request to
4 do a rebudgeting in year 3 and she has not hired the Ph.D.
5 yet so that's why there are funds remaining for the PI's
6 effort.

7 MS. SMITH: Okay.

8 DR. WALLACK: I move the extension.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I second. All in
10 favor?

11 ALL VOICES: Aye.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Opposed? Motion
13 carries.

14 MS. SMITH: Item No. 8 is the request for a
15 no-cost extension request and they're also asking to
16 reallocate some money from supplies to salaries. This is
17 a UCONN Health Center request. It's a two-sided document
18 that was in your packet. And I'd recommend approval of
19 this.

20 DR. KRAUSE: I make a motion.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So Diane the
22 motion. Second?

23 DR. WALLACK: Second.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Milt Wallack

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 seconded. Any further discussion? Any discussion? Okay.
2 All in favor?

3 ALL VOICES: Aye.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Opposed? The
5 motion carries.

6 MS. SMITH: Thank you. I leave it back to
7 you.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. At the last
9 meeting Milt and David and I agreed that we would get
10 together and discuss some modifications for the RFP. This
11 does not mean that there can't be other modifications to
12 the RFP before it goes out in the fall, but this is just
13 taking a look at sort of the scope of the RFP and whether
14 it could be reworded to be clearer to let people know that
15 all kinds of stem cell research really could be
16 encompassed within our, of our scope. The limits in the
17 statute talk about embryonic stem cell, which -- research,
18 which is defined as human embryonic stem cell research or
19 human adult stem cell research.

20 And interesting this week, the cord blood
21 group called and wanted to amend the statute to make clear
22 that research on cord blood could be done under this
23 program. And I said, well, I think, that I'd check with
24 one of the scientists at the retreat and I said, aren't

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 those already considered to be adult stem cells. So I
2 think there was a little confusion about we do have a
3 fairly broad scope for this, but I don't know that it can
4 be stretched as far as the certain members of the
5 Committee would like it to go without having to have a
6 legislative amendment, but good try, Milt.

7 So, David very kindly drafted two versions.
8 One is labeled minor and one is labeled major. The minor
9 really does -- makes the current wording clearer. And the
10 second one, I think, would be the one that would require
11 to have a legislative change. But I open it up for
12 discussion.

13 DR. WALLACK: I think that David did an
14 amazing job in capturing the discussion that we had. And
15 as usual he's to be applauded for that. And from my
16 perspective, I said this at the meeting and I'll say it
17 again, and Marianne knows that I was going to say it
18 today, and I certainly understand, as I always do,
19 Marianne's concern legislatively. And I think the major
20 change would speak more to where we are now and to our
21 future, but if Marianne, as she is, is uncomfortable with
22 that then I certainly think that what David did to bring
23 additional clarity, with his minor change which reflects
24 our conversation that we had, would be beneficial. But I

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 think it doesn't preclude us from then working towards the
2 major change area in the future.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, absolutely
4 not.

5 DR. KRAUSE: I think that the minor change
6 is fine and within the minor change I like the first
7 wording rather than the alternative after the "or". And
8 just, Milt, in general I think that even though a lot of
9 specifics are discussed in the major proposal, the
10 proposal for the major change, it's all really present in
11 the minor one. I mean IPS, genomics, tissues with stem
12 cells they are all within --

13 DR. WALLACK: -- right.

14 DR. KRAUSE: Human adult stem cell research
15 and studies, you know, human stem cell research and
16 studies with their potential to human health was all
17 included in that.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And one of the
19 reasons we wanted to have that discussion here on the
20 record today and reflected in the minutes was just to make
21 it clear that it is already fairly broad and does include
22 a lot of research such as IPS and if there are genomic
23 studies that utilizing stem cells that David certainly, we
24 have funded studies like that.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 Paul, you look like you have something.

2 DR. PESCATELLO: I guess I'd be interested
3 in the academic talks because I guess I hear all the time
4 from founders of biotech companies, the scientific
5 founders, the importance of basic research and I think
6 we've done really amazing basic research with this
7 funding. And I guess I hear all the time from founding
8 scientists you really can't jump start, you can't bypass
9 that kind of hard work that has to be done to get to
10 translational research if that's what this is getting at.

11

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think this was
13 actually looking at expanding it into non-Ameolian models.

14

15 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Let me jump in just for a
16 minute, this is David Goldhammer. And the intent was to
17 put other kind of non-human research on a little more than
18 even footing with the understanding that some of the major
19 breakthroughs are going to come from -- studies and other
20 even non-ameolian studies. And restricting the research
21 or the emphasis on humans, I think, does -- that is little
22 bit disturbing, but I completely understand the
23 constraints that we're under and I am fully on board with
24 that. But -- so that was really the intention is to try

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 to kind of focus the emphasis on human health relative to
2 the human health rather than human cells.

3 And I agree that the second one, the minor
4 one gets at that. I think at the time what I didn't like
5 about what we had originally is I thought that to me there
6 was a few redundancies in the wording of it. And I know
7 for a fact that the last sentence on animal models kind
8 of, it almost read as if animal models were held to a
9 higher standard than other types of stem cell research in
10 what they had to accomplish in order to be considered. And
11 there were other little inconsistencies between the
12 sentences. The second sentence says, other types of stem
13 cell research will also be eligible, but then the last
14 sentence talks about animal models, which will also be
15 considered when, in fact, animal models fall under the
16 category of other stem cell research. So there is kinds
17 of little redundancies.

18 But my biggest concern was that animal
19 models, which are heavily funded and are really important
20 to continue funding, seem to be deemphasized or held to a
21 higher standard. So in terms of the minor change that was
22 one thing I was trying to avoid.

23 DR. WALLACK: Marianne, for the discussion
24 purposes, I would move acceptance of the changes to

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 overview of minor variety that David Goldhammer submitted
2 to us.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Do we have
4 a second?

5 DR. KRAUSE: I second.

6 DR. HART: Can I clarify with or without
7 the "or" part?

8 DR. KRAUSE: My recommendation was as
9 written stopping prior to the word, "or".

10 DR. HART: Okay. Is that the motion?

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, Milt, your
12 motion is that the minor changes to the overview up to but
13 not including anything after "or".

14 DR. WALLACK: Through the check and I ask
15 David if he's comfortable with that?

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: My preference was the one
17 before the, the ending before the "or" as well, but I
18 didn't know if that went too far in terms of not getting
19 back around to mentioning human stem cells, but I prefer
20 the one before the "or".

21 DR. WALLACK: So you're -- you agree with
22 Diane.

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes.

24 DR. WALLACK: Okay. I'm absolutely fine

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 with it.

2 DR. DEES: Richard Dees, just a question,
3 may I just clarify why exactly the major change would go
4 beyond our statutory --

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- okay. So I was
6 looking at the legislation which was drafted at a time
7 when we were looking at embryonic stem cell research
8 primarily. And looking at funding methods of embryonic
9 stem cell that weren't fundable by the federal government
10 since there was such restricted funding. So that was our
11 starting point.

12 We have moved from there to the language of
13 the statute that still reads embryonic stem cell research
14 and adult stem cell research. And those are -- that's
15 what money is to be used for. So, we have, I think, by
16 including animal models in there that are directly related
17 to human disease is an acceptable extension of the
18 language. It's right on the edge there, but I think to
19 extend it out further to all -- I think it just takes it
20 and blows a hole in the intent of the legislation. I'd
21 rather have this Committee go back to the legislature and
22 clarify and explain why we need to go in a slightly
23 different direction given the passage of time rather than
24 just assume that they intend to use this state funding to

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 do all kinds of stem cell research whether it's on fruit
2 flies or whatever.

3 And I understand once you open it up to
4 anything other than humans that you've opened it. And so
5 having opened it to animals why don't we open it to other
6 kinds of research and I understand that as, that is a
7 difficulty in the reasoning. But my recommendation is that
8 we keep it fairly tight.

9 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Marianne?

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: This is David Goldhammer.
12 So just one question, so in the 2012 RFP we do say any
13 form of stem cell research which would, of course, include
14 fruit flies. The difference, I think, and the major
15 revision is that it's more explicitly -- there is -- it's
16 more -- in the first one, is that -- but you agree that
17 they're not that different in terms of describing -- or
18 describing what is allowed -- just one is more specific
19 than the other.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, I think
21 they're both fine.

22 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And before we -- there is
23 a motion or a vote, can I just ask that -- there is three
24 words that bother me in the minor change.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

2 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And that is in the first
3 sentence I had written, "But priority will be given to
4 human stem cell research and to studies with a clear
5 potential relevance to human health." There is some
6 ambiguity in that, I think. And so maybe because the
7 question is some research has clear relevancy and how this
8 -- does that bother anyone but me?

9 DR. WALLACK: Yes, we discussed this at our
10 meeting and I think that it's important, not just for us
11 to leave it the way you wrote it, but I think it's
12 important for legislators, other interested parties
13 because they don't have the same sense that we do that
14 you're talking to about why maybe it's okay without the
15 last four or five words in that sentence. So, I think for
16 the general population --

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- the words "and to" as
18 if there is a distinction between human stem cell research
19 and other types of research with potential relevance to
20 human health. It's like I'm creating this dichotomy
21 between the two as if human stem cell research is not
22 necessarily relevant to human health.

23 DR. HART: You're absolutely right, this is
24 Ron Hart. I think I'd like to suggest putting the word

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 also in that sentence and also to studies with clear
2 potential relevance. And that way it just establishes a
3 clear hierarchy --

4 DR. KRAUSE: -- no, I don't think that does
5 it. I think, and to other studies with clear potential
6 relevance to human health because then it's inclusive of
7 both.

8 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So if we include the word,
9 "other" that would solve, that would solve that problem, I
10 think.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

12 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I wanted to point out too
13 that fruit flies are animals.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm sorry. That
15 shows you why I became a lawyer.

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: It's part of the
17 discussion time.

18 DR. WALLACK: So it's now modified to apply
19 to other studies, is that what you're saying, Diane?

20 DR. KRAUSE: Yes.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. Okay, so in the
22 animal models sentence I say, animal models of human
23 disease, regeneration repair and aging also will be
24 considered. Again, as if that is somehow distinct from

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 the sentence before that concerns research with a clear
2 potential relevance to human health. Is that word also --

3 DR. KRAUSE: -- this is Diane. The first
4 time I read this and was just editing it scribbling, I put
5 the word, including, so it was all one sentence. So, with
6 clear potential relevance to human health including animal
7 models of human disease, blah, blah. So, I agree it's not
8 a separate thing it's --

9 DR. WALLACK: -- yes, I like that, that's
10 good.

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That's good.

12 MS. SMITH: All one sentence.

13 DR. KRAUSE: Apparently.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

15 DR. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessling. I
16 need a little clarification. Are we talking about the
17 minor changes here or the major changes?

18 DR. WALLACK: Yes, minor.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Major is off the
21 table for this year.

22 DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

23 MS. SMITH: So actually we're making this
24 whole paragraph one big giant sentence?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: Yes. Is that too big?

2 MS. SMITH: "It is the intent of the
3 Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee to
4 consider funding any form of stem cell research, but
5 priority will be given to human stem cell research and to
6 other studies of pure potential relevance to human health
7 including animal models of human disease, regeneration
8 repair, and aging" --

9 DR. KRAUSE: -- period.

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Period.

11 MS. SMITH: Okay. I'm okay with that.

12 DR. GENEL: If I'm correct, I recall
13 somebody wrote a book in one sentence. I can't remember
14 who the author was.

15 (Multiple Voices)

16 DR. DEES: This is Richard Dees. You could
17 put a period after stem cell research, period. And say
18 priority will be given.

19 DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That's good.

21 DR. GOLDHAMMER: That's actually good
22 because it actually makes more of an impact, I like that.

23 MS. SMITH: Can you just say that again?
24 I'm sorry.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. DEES: The first sentence -- (multiple
2 voices) priority will be given to (indiscernible) funding
3 any form of stem cell research -- period --

4 MS. SMITH: -- I got it, okay, thank you.

5 DR. WALLACK: So, David, one other question
6 and, Diane, you modified this so to you too, animal models
7 -- are we saying of human disease or should it be
8 pertaining to human diseases?

9 DR. KRAUSE: They mean the same thing to
10 me.

11 DR. WALLACK: It's okay? Okay.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Milt, so
13 would you like to make your motion again?

14 DR. WALLACK: I move the amended motion as
15 -- I move the motion as amended.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And do we have a
17 second?

18 DR. KRAUSE: I'll second.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Diane second.

20 All in favor?

21 ALL VOICES: Aye.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good, the
23 motion passes. This will be inserted into the 2013 RFP. We
24 will have another go round of the entire RFP, top to

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 bottom, after we've done the grants when we regroup
2 probably in September. So, please, have a look at it over
3 the summer if you can. And I know that there were some
4 thoughts about changing certain things that I think Dr.
5 Dees you might have had some changes that you wanted
6 happen that were just a little bit late for last year. So,
7 we'll give everybody a second bite at the apple, but we
8 wanted to get this out in the public domain.

9 Okay, the process for the stem cell grant
10 review meeting, so we're proceeding with arrangements much
11 as they were for last year's meeting over at the
12 Farmington Marriott on June 11th starting at 8:30 and
13 going hopefully until we finish, but we have also reserved
14 a spot for the next morning in case we don't get through
15 the 85 some grants that we have to review in one day. I
16 sent information out to those out-of-state folks about
17 making reservations. So, please, let me know if you've
18 having any difficulty with hotel reservations. And I
19 think for the in-state people meals will be provided
20 throughout the day. And hopefully all the technical --
21 your needs will be met there in terms of Internet and
22 places to plug in your computers.

23 Rick Strauss from C.A.S.E. is going to be
24 assisting CI with the processing of the applications

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 during the day. And Rick will go over his snazzy new form
2 at the end of the meeting.

3 So I was looking through a couple of things
4 that we had put together for the advisory committee to do
5 their reviews last year and I don't know whether these
6 were helpful. I'd be happy to send them out again and I've
7 revised them a little bit to reflect the, this year's RFP.

8 It was a checklist that just went through the criteria to
9 use in evaluating the stem cell proposals. So in addition
10 to the scientific and ethical reviews that are done by
11 peer review there are some specific items identified in
12 the RFP that you folks have used in terms of a Connecticut
13 specific review.

14 Benefits including benefits to the State of
15 Connecticut align with funding priorities as determined by
16 the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee.
17 Looking at the ability to perform the proposed research,
18 commitment to the host institution, hospital or company.
19 And collaborators the proposed project including cost
20 sharing, potential for collaboration across disciplines.
21 So it will go through some of the priorities and some of
22 the things that are not priorities for this year.

23 So I don't know if that's helpful to have
24 in front of you when you do your reviews. I'm getting

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 some nods. I'll send that out.

2 And I think there was another document that
3 was the framework, which essentially cut and pasted from
4 the RFP and gives more detail about things that may come
5 up during the meeting and we say, wait a minute, did we
6 say we could fund junior people? Or did we say we could
7 fund senior people? So it kind of breaks out the nitty
8 gritty of the RFP so I will send that out as well. You
9 can use them if they're helpful and don't feel compelled
10 if they're not.

11 DR. GENEL: You're going to circulate that,
12 Marianne?

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I'm sorry?

14 DR. GENEL: You're going to circulate that?

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, I'll send
16 that out to everybody. So one is called checklist and one
17 is called framework.

18 And then last year I don't know if you want
19 to go through the same process that we used last year
20 where we -- I think we basically looked at different
21 funding levels and broke the grants off at -- ranked them
22 and broke them at funding levels of 13.8 million, 15.5
23 million, and 16.7 million. And I can't remember whether we
24 did it within categories or whether we did it from start

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 to finish. I think we did it within categories, the top
2 ranked grants. And we took the peer review score -- is
3 this ringing a bell? No, people are looking puzzled.
4 Okay.

5 DR. GENEL: I don't recall that.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Maybe that
7 was more of an internal thing. We -- I think we reviewed
8 only proposals that were over, under -- scored better than
9 4.5 So, had lower scores than 4.5 and any Committee
10 member could suggest that they'd like to have a higher
11 scored grant brought in to that pool. Let's see. And we
12 reviewed the grants in this order, established
13 investigator and then group and disease specific, seed,
14 and finally core. Does that seem like a reasonable way to
15 proceed this year? Okay, so we didn't go within each,
16 within each category and looked at those grants 4.5 and
17 better.

18 DR. GENEL: I don't know that we should
19 necessarily -- that is simply the way we elected to split
20 the discussion based on what was in front of us. It may
21 be different this year. I mean it depends on the number of
22 group grants that are there and established investigators.
23 I think that's something that can probably best be decided
24 at the time when we start.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

2 DR. GENEL: I think it's a good idea to
3 have some sort of strategy for doing that, but I don't
4 think the strategy we use one year necessarily binds us to
5 do it the same way the next year.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. And I think
7 that's what we did. These are notes taken from that
8 transcript of the meeting, so I think we did sit down at
9 the beginning of the meeting in July last year and say
10 this is how it's all shaped up, and these are the peer
11 review scores. And then deciding the order can be shifted
12 around.

13 DR. GENEL: Well, this year, for example,
14 don't we have a floor on the stem cell, on the cores.

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

16 DR. GENEL: We've allocated a maximum of a
17 million.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

19 DR. GENEL: Well, we might take that right
20 off -- we might take that off the table right away if we
21 did that.

22 DR. FISHBONE: I just have a question about
23 the seeds.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. FISHBONE: Over the last six years
2 we've always kind of leaned towards the seeds saying that
3 we would give a specific amount to the seeds, it was like
4 two million or whatever to the seeds.

5 DR. WALLACK: 10 percent, yes.

6 DR. FISHBONE: Yes. I'm wondering whether
7 the --

8 DR. WALLACK: -- 20 percent.

9 DR. FISHBONE: 20 percent. What the
10 advancement in the field and more and more people working
11 towards translational kinds of things whether we should
12 accentuate the core as much as we have, accentuate the
13 seeds as much as we have. It's like seven years into the
14 process.

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We don't have any
16 percentage for the seeds this year. We took that out last
17 year. We had --

18 DR. FISHBONE: -- oh, we did.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: They can be up to
20 200,000 and what we have not modified those much. In
21 established we sometimes would reduce the amount that is
22 funded. We sort of stuck with the 200,000 just being that
23 amount that's given to every grant.

24 DR. FISHBONE: But we had like two million.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 I'm just wondering if, you know, when we started out it
2 was important to encourage people to come into the field
3 and so we were pushing seed grants. And I'm just
4 wondering if that left us enough for the established
5 investigators and disease orientated research. In other
6 words, after a period of time should we be looking at a
7 slightly different emphasis?

8 DR. GENEL: Oh, I don't think there is any
9 question that there isn't enough. I don't think there is
10 enough when you had 9.8 million dollars to allocate to
11 fund all of the meritorious grants period. I think we've
12 gotten a lot of bang for our buck from the seeds
13 considering, all things considered. I mean I don't -- I
14 agree I don't think we necessarily need to have a fixed
15 number, but all things being equal I'm very supportive of
16 I think what's come out of the seed grants.

17 DR. GOLDHAMMER: This is David Goldhammer.
18 I think at this stage of the process we should -- the
19 process should be driven by the quality of the science.
20 And if we feel, as a Committee, that we want to make some
21 kind of a shift than that should be reflected in the RFP
22 and up front rather than at this stage deciding to
23 emphasis a particular category.

24 DR. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessling. Is

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 there anyway that we can actually track progress from seed
2 grants into established investigator grants in the last
3 three years? If the seed grants that were funded led to
4 the more advanced and bigger programs.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Doing that
6 through the PI would that be an accurate way to do that?

7 DR. GENEL: That's an interesting idea.
8 That's a very good idea.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

10 DR. KIESSLING: I don't know how much that
11 would -- how much time that would take somebody, but if
12 there is a way that that can just be, I think, somebody is
13 right if we just went from PI's it might work.

14 DR. GENEL: Well, the only problem with
15 that, Ann, is that the seed grant may not have led to
16 funding, the larger funding by the state fund, but it
17 might have led to an NIH grant.

18 DR. KRAUSE: Well, that's why you would ask
19 the PI.

20 DR. GENEL: Yes. Well, right, I don't think
21 our internal data would be able to capture that. You'd
22 really have to go out and send a survey out.

23 DR. KRAUSE: But it would be nice because
24 you could say what publications did you get from this

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 grant and what additional grant funding did it lead to.
2 And then we'd have statistics that would look really good
3 for the program.

4 DR. WALLACK: That would be great.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think that
6 would be really useful as the program goes back to the
7 legislature and the legislature begins to say, well, what
8 is going to happen to you folks. You've got three years
9 left and where are you going to be.

10 DR. WALLACK: Right.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And what do we
12 want to do with you?

13 DR. KRAUSE: But that is work, that's a
14 project.

15 DR. KIESSLING: The original intent of the
16 legislature was to fund work that could not be funded by
17 NIH.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

19 DR. KIESSLING: And that, obviously, has
20 changed now. But I think it would be very useful to know
21 whether our seed grants have -- in terms of overall
22 research dollars for Connecticut.

23 DR. GENEL: Right. Would you limit it to
24 seeds?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. KRAUSE: No.

2 DR. KIESSLING: Not necessarily, but
3 established investigator grants are fewer or it would
4 probably be easier to do that. I don't know. I mean I
5 think that this would be -- this would be our fifth year
6 of doing this, 6th year?

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: 6th year.

8 DR. WALLACK: I think, Marianne, your
9 response --

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- the information we have
11 we shouldn't restrict it to the seeds, but the seeds are
12 for the purpose of leveraging --

13 DR. KIESSLING: -- right.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- (inaudible) -- so that
15 would be great to know.

16 DR. WALLACK: Marianne, I think your point
17 is really very well taken and I know there is always
18 questions from the legislators about what are we really
19 getting for our investment. And to do it for all of the
20 grants, not just the seed, even though there is more
21 limited number of established investigator, I think it can
22 be a very compelling story that may need to be told within
23 the next two years. So, Diane and Marianne, both of you I
24 would --

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. KIESSLING: -- some of that information
2 is in the annual reports, I think.

3 DR. WALLACK: You're right, but I think
4 it's harder to fish through that.

5 DR. KIESSLING: Right.

6 DR. WALLACK: Then if we were to be able to
7 just have that available. I think, Diane, that's probably
8 why you brought that up and your comment, Marianne, is
9 reflective of what --

10 DR. KRAUSE: -- what might work, since
11 we're talking about a huge amount of work.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

13 DR. KRAUSE: Is that the institutions
14 provide you with that information. So maybe Yale could do
15 it for Yale and UCONN could do it for UCONN.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

17 DR. KRAUSE: As long as we decided exactly
18 what would go in. Maybe that's not going to be finalized
19 right now, but you want their name and then the -- how
20 many publications --

21 DR. WALLACK: -- that's right.

22 DR. KRAUSE: Or the publications that came
23 from it and what grant funding came from it, and if there
24 is anything else we absolutely want. But it would just be

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 a table that we would then provide to CI and you could add
2 it up.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That would be
4 terrific if you could get an intern or somebody over the
5 summer who could work on that kind of a project that would
6 be --

7 DR. WALLACK: -- that would be great.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Terrific.

9 DR. KIESSLING: The management of the
10 institutions probably already has that data. Not the
11 publication, but the dollars to the PI.

12 DR. WALLACK: So even if they have some
13 inkling I think that would be probably a good idea to have
14 a separate person in charge of doing all of that for each
15 of the institutions. I don't see the problem with that.
16 They can access any kind of backed up information that's
17 available, but someone needs the responsibility.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Great, Diane has
19 signed up for her first project. We'll work with you on
20 that to --

21 DR. WALLACK: -- so Diane is going to do
22 that? Who is going to do that at UCONN and the Health
23 Center?

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We have another

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 volunteer, Isolde. Thank you.

2 DR. WALLACK: Isolde did volunteer?

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, she did.

4 DR. WALLACK: Great, great.

5 MS. BATES: CI will provide guidelines.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: CI is going to
7 provide guidelines and I'm all set.

8 DR. WALLACK: Fantastic.

9 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Did we agree this has to
10 include a questionnaire to the PI's? Sponsored program
11 won't be able to -- they'll have a listing of all the
12 grants, but they don't know the relationship between the
13 grants and whether one led to another.

14 DR. KRAUSE: I agree, David. I think that
15 grants and contracts has some information, but that's not
16 quite what we're looking for here because we want the
17 grants that were obtained based on the work that was
18 funded from Connecticut.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. So, David,
20 we might loop you back into the survey and make sure that
21 we're hitting all the buttons we need. We won't work you
22 too hard.

23 DR. WALLACK: It was interesting at the
24 retreat there -- I remember at least one of the

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 researchers, who stated that their funding came from our
2 funding, and then that morphed into the NIH funding. So
3 to have an idea, and to the legislators to understand, how
4 we can attract and I think we've already attracted 45, 50
5 million dollars of NIH funding from what we started here
6 becomes a very powerful statement.

7 MS. SMITH: I think it's just good for
8 those players to know that besides just the legislators.

9 DR. WALLACK: You're absolutely right.

10 MS. SMITH: Because regular old people in
11 Connecticut would like to know that this program had
12 leveraged all these other things.

13 DR. WALLACK: You're absolutely right.

14 MS. SMITH: I just think that it's good
15 advertisement.

16 DR. GENEL: You might consider putting out
17 a release.

18 MS. SMITH: Yes.

19 DR. WALLACK: That would be great.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Good.

21 DR. FISHBONE: I know one funding agency
22 has attempted to write to each of the people who have been
23 funded and ask them what are they doing now? How many of
24 them stay in research? How many of them drop out and go

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 into other things? I mean that maybe not what we're after
2 in terms of you want a product to show, but it's
3 interesting to know how many of the people we've funded
4 with seed grants are -- I mean most of them are post
5 doctoral fellow and how many of them go onto become
6 professors and continue to work in the field. Again, this
7 is all work.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Well, if
9 people are comfortable then with a very limited script for
10 the meeting we will go with that. And if you have any
11 thoughts or ideas about how to improve the process from
12 last year before the June meeting, please, let me know. We
13 are not planning to meet in May. So this will be it until
14 we get together. You certainly will be getting pairings
15 for your review from CI and instructions about how to
16 access the protocols. Maybe just the best time to turn the
17 meeting over to an update on the peer review process with
18 Rick Strauss, who is attempting to make up the whole
19 process kind of seamless and make your review easier with
20 one form. Rick, you're up.

21 MR. RICK STRAUSS: Okay. Okay, Rick
22 Strauss from the Connecticut Academy of Science and
23 Engineering. Hi.

24 MS. SMITH: Hi, Rick.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: So we're going to do an
2 update on the peer review process for you. Our reviewers
3 had until last Thursday to complete their reviews. Of
4 course that was -- was it last Thursday? No, it was a
5 week ago Thursday. Well, so anyway, all the reviews have
6 been done and this is how it shook out. So for the seed
7 grants there were a total of 54 proposals. 26 of the 54
8 or 48 percent required reconciliation by the primary and
9 secondary reviewers. So that's if the primary reviewer
10 and secondary's scores were more than 1 point apart on the
11 scale of 1 to 9. So if there was a two and a four that
12 means they had to reconcile.

13 DR. KRAUSE: So it's almost 50 percent
14 needed that.

15 MR. STRAUSS: Yes, of the seeds. And then
16 of the -- then we had 22 of the 26 proposals that required
17 reconciliation were reconciled by the primary and
18 secondary reviewers. And four of the proposals needed to
19 go to the co-chair that was assigned to that proposal for
20 reconciliation.

21 On the established grants, we had 29
22 proposals. 14 required reconciliation or 48 percent.
23 These numbers are kind of amazing if you think about it.

24 DR. WALLACK: What percent is that?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: 48, the same as the seed. 13
2 of the 14 proposals were reconciled by the primary and
3 secondary reviewers with one still out -- so, yes, with
4 one still outstanding that we're waiting on. So, we don't
5 -- and actually that's just a clarification, so none will
6 need to go to the co-chairs for reconciliation on the
7 established.

8 On the cores there were two. And one
9 requires reconciliation that's in process by the primary
10 and secondary reviewer. We have one group and that was
11 reconciled -- actually that did not require
12 reconciliation. They just -- that made it on the first
13 pass. And on the disease directed collaborative group,
14 two proposals were reviewed. One required reconciliation
15 and that proposal was reconciled by the primary and
16 secondary reviewer.

17 So, you know, it's -- and the co-chairs are
18 reviewing all the proposals that were assigned to them for
19 questions at the study section that will be held next
20 Friday from 2:00 till 6:00, but my guess is it's going to
21 be a little shorter than that. A week from next Friday,
22 sorry, the 27th of April.

23 DR. PESCATELLO: So was there any common
24 theme about how they were reconciling? They were far apart

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 and how they came together and reconciled?

2 MR. STRAUSS: Yes, I imagine they're all
3 different. A of them were just like two to four, more than
4 one, but just not like one and seven, although there were
5 some with a larger disparity. And, you know, most of them
6 were able to work out the differences. There was one
7 proposal with a specific issue that we'll work through at
8 the study section or at least discuss, but we don't have
9 to get into the details on that now.

10 DR. PESCATELLO: I mean could you say, was
11 sort of a misunderstanding on one person's part, but then
12 they were, from the discussion they understood something
13 they hadn't understood or is it too hard --

14 MR. STRAUSS: -- maybe, but we haven't
15 asked them specifically. I mean, Terri, do you have
16 anything?

17 MS. TERRI CLARK: Each one was asked to
18 write a reconciliation statement describing how they came
19 together. So, there is a record for each of the proposals,
20 which includes that reconciliation statement, so you'll be
21 able to see that. But generally, one might have had more
22 knowledge in a particular area and was able to persuade
23 the other reviewer. That's generally -- and typically
24 they were close. It was only -- I can't count them, but

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 not a huge number that had huge disparities.

2 DR. PESCATELLO: Um, hmm.

3 MR. STRAUSS: But we haven't really -- I
4 mean we've had some conversations with a couple of people
5 that had some questions. There were a couple of questions
6 that came up that we were able to resolve without, you
7 know, just within our team by checking documentation
8 without having to get legal advice.

9 So the study section will be interesting.
10 And then we'll ask for feedback from them on the process.
11 We did have to go back and forth with a couple of the
12 reviewers to get information in and in some cases
13 reviewers left sections of their review -- they didn't
14 make any comment like on budget. It was blank. So we went
15 back and said, you really have to fill out all the lines,
16 even if it is no comment we don't want to leave a blank
17 there.

18 So, most of the -- you know, the review
19 record that you will see will probably be no more than two
20 or three pages, but that's mostly in a form so it's not a
21 lot of writing, it just covers, you know, it goes from the
22 -- and that includes the primary and secondary review. So
23 you'll have a cover sheet, which we distributed before.
24 The cover sheet takes you from the final peer review score

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 back through the initial peer review. And then also has
2 the two full reviews, the primary and the secondary
3 reviews in it.

4 So, we, thanks to Sara, emailed you about
5 ten versions of the cover sheet, but the good news is here
6 is the latest.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And just for the
8 record, the fact that UCHC is listed four times and Yale
9 only once means nothing. This is just a draft and we'll
10 be a little bit more ecumenical next time.

11 MR. STRAUSS: So I'll walk through this.
12 And actually one of the things that was mentioned here is
13 that you assign reviewers -- you know, the -- from the
14 Committee you put them in pairs to review a proposal and
15 that's something we can add to the form for, either we add
16 it or we put the columns in for CI to then throw in so
17 that you have all of that information right on this one
18 form and you can see how those reviewers are.

19 But let's just walk -- so this is just --
20 they're all the same, but this one just happens to be for
21 the established. So, what we thought would be helpful is
22 on the left -- and the previous one said, you know, it was
23 the Committee final score, but in talking to Mike he said,
24 well you really don't score it, you just say fund it,

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 maybe, or no. So, we changed this so that it would be the
2 Committee action and in walking through the session if the
3 Committee said, well, let's put in the fund column then a
4 one would get added in here, or a two for maybe, or a
5 three for no. So that this document can then be sorted at
6 the meeting at any time pretty easily. You just hit
7 Control A, and F9 and boom the whole table gets resorted.

8 So, we're starting on the left and that can
9 change, you know, whenever things happen. We will put the
10 final peer review score in here. You'll see whether there
11 is a co-chair reconciliation score. And if there was a
12 reconciliation by the initial scoring team or the primary
13 and secondary reviewers that would be added in. The
14 proposal score based on the primary and secondary review
15 is in the next column to the right there. And then the
16 primary and secondary review scores. So you'll have the
17 full record of the scoring so that you'll see whether
18 there was initial disparity so that might let you say,
19 well, let me go take a look at the primary, secondary
20 reviews to see what the differences were, to see how they
21 reconciled especially if it was let's say a one and a
22 seven and they ended up at a one and a half.

23 DR. KRAUSE: I'm not understanding what the
24 prop score is.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: That's the proposal score. We
2 just don't have enough room to --

3 DR. KRAUSE: -- but the primary person
4 gives it a score.

5 MR. STRAUSS: And then the secondary.
6 Those are averaged and that's the proposal score.

7 DR. KRAUSE: If they're just one apart
8 those are averaged and that's the proposal score.

9 MR. STRAUSS: They're always averaged
10 together to get the proposal score.

11 DR. KRAUSE: Okay. But if they were more
12 than one apart then that's not the final score, the final
13 score is whatever happens with the recon.

14 MR. STRAUSS: If they're more than one
15 apart the proposal score is still averaged.

16 DR. KRAUSE: I see.

17 MR. STRAUSS: And then -- but you would see
18 the next score as a reconciliation score and then if they
19 were -- or the read score means that they revised their
20 score, but it's a read score if you see a co-chair
21 reconciliation score.

22 DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

23 MR. STRAUSS: So if there is no co-chair
24 reconciliation score that means that the score under

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 initial scoring is a reconciliation score. We just don't
2 have enough room to throw all the --

3 DR. KRAUSE: I don't have to remember this
4 until June, right?

5 MR. STRAUSS: No, you don't have to
6 remember this until June and it will be clearer with all
7 the other numbers to the left there because you'll see the
8 last score is the -- what we're going to do is you're
9 going to be looking at the final, at the peer review final
10 score. Every proposal will have one of those.

11 DR. KRAUSE: Yes.

12 MR. STRAUSS: And there might be changes
13 from the last score, based on wherever that was in the
14 process, whether that was just from the primary and
15 secondary reviewer, their reconciliation, or the co-chair
16 reconciliation could still be revised at the study
17 section.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: But if they just
19 wanted to know what the bottom line --

20 MR. STRAUSS: -- bottom line --

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- the first --

22 MS. SMITH: And that could come from the
23 prop score, or the recon, or read score, or the co-chair -
24 - that could come from any of those columns, but that is

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 the final score.

2 MR. STRAUSS: Rihgt.

3 MS. SMITH: Okay.

4 MR. STRAUSS: Well, but at the study
5 section they're going to discuss it and they may revise it
6 even though it was reconciled or even though there was a -
7 -

8 MS. SMITH: -- if they revise it that's
9 going to be --

10 MR. STRAUSS: -- in the final review score.

11 MS. SMITH: Rihgt. Because that's the
12 bottom line.

13 MR. STRAUSS: Rihgt, that's the bottom
14 line, but this gives you the history of what happened with
15 the scoring. In the initial version of this that we sent
16 out, you know, that we provided last time we only had the
17 final peer review score and then thought, well, maybe it
18 would be -- on the proposal summary sheet that you will
19 get it will have a record of all the scores, but the nice
20 part about this, assuming it's helpful, is that you see it
21 at a glance for each proposal and you can -- and that
22 might let you say, I really want to make sure I check --
23 make a note and check X, Y, Z and the other thing.

24 DR. WALLACK: Rick, so basically all you're

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 doing is you're reading from right to left and you have
2 all the background stuff on the right side.

3 MR. STRAUSS: Yes, right. Okay. So then
4 the grant number and then peer review record will be
5 embedded here. So that you will be able to click right
6 there to get the full peer review record. And then in the
7 next column there will be a link to the CI website for the
8 proposal so that you can automatically just pull that
9 right up.

10 And then we added in the amount of each of
11 the grants. And then this last column, if it's helpful,
12 if you say, you know, during the meeting well let's put
13 that in the funding column then we add the amount of the
14 grant into the cumulative column on the right. And then,
15 at some point, somebody would say well, could we take a
16 look at how much we have committed to. So we just -- just
17 click this Control A, F9 and the number will automatically
18 update so you'll be able to see how many dollars you've
19 committed to in that. And then if you start moving maybes
20 in, you know, then to the funding, we'll just rehit the
21 button again and then it will give you a new number.

22 So what we could do, if you want, is on the
23 template add in the Committee members that are going to be
24 reviewing that grant, put their names in here.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

2 MR. STRAUSS: If that would be helpful so
3 that you can see who is going to be doing what. And then
4 we don't need the spreadsheets. I mean this will suffice
5 for, I think, the whole review unless there is other --
6 the link to the proposal because the way you've -- the way
7 CI has put the proposals in that has the PI name at the
8 end of the -- so, you essentially have the PI name on the
9 link.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So we would just
11 need the reviewer, any conflict that they have listed, and
12 whether there is any proprietary information in the grant.
13 I think those are the other things that we had in our
14 spreadsheet. I don't know if it could all fit on one
15 sheet.

16 MR. STRAUSS: Yes, so is that like --

17 DR. KRAUSE: -- which reviewers on the peer
18 committee, peer review may have had conflicts or --

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- no. When we
20 add your names in here with the pairs besides the grant.

21 DR. KRAUSE: Then any grant that says,
22 Yale, will also have my name listed as somebody who has
23 conflicts.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Correct. So that

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 when it comes up for a vote we do that. We can do it
2 separately. I don't know if that will make this too
3 complicated.

4 MS. SMITH: We could just have a master
5 sheet with Yale and the conflict people and UCONN instead
6 of putting it on each --

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- right, because
8 you don't get assigned a grant to which you have a
9 conflict. It's just for voting.

10 MR. STRAUSS: Is it mostly just the two
11 universities that have the conflict?

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

13 MR. STRAUSS: So anything that's --
14 therefore any -- so any Yale member of the Committee would
15 not vote on any of the Yale proposals. So you could just
16 -- so there wouldn't be any other conflicts.

17 MR. STRAUSS: No, I don't think this year
18 there --

19 DR. KRAUSE: -- there could be, but --

20 MR. STRAUSS: -- yes, there could be.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We don't have any
22 this year.

23 MR. STRAUSS: We could add that in, but it
24 seems like you might be able to have that just a separate

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 list.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

3 MR. STRAUSS: So the only thing we would
4 have to do is put the pairs in. So -- and is there a need
5 to list them separately so that they can be sorted
6 separately or can they just be in the same column which
7 means you'll have it, but you can't sort by last name.

8 DR. KRAUSE: I would put them in separate
9 columns.

10 MR. STRAUSS: Is there a primary and a
11 secondary or are they both equal?

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: They're both
13 equal.

14 DR. KRAUSE: If somebody isn't there for
15 some reason at the last minute, you know, then we --

16 MR. STRAUSS: -- so I'll put two columns
17 in.

18 MS. SMITH: Is there anyway you could
19 combine the grant ID number with the proposal information
20 to collapse that a little bit to make room for this other
21 stuff you have to put in?

22 MR. STRAUSS: You mean the proposal link?

23 MS. SMITH: Yes.

24 MR. STRAUSS: Well then I -- unless that

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 had the grant ID number in it. But we'll all play around
2 with it.

3 MS. SMITH: All right.

4 MR. STRAUSS: So, the intent would be that
5 once we go through the study section we update the peer
6 review record and that will all be in one document. Then
7 we have to imbed it and then we'll sort it by peer review
8 final score. And there is a separate sheet for each --
9 well, there is a separate one for established and for
10 seed. And then we put all the others on one sheet. So,
11 there is three different files. So, I think the best thing
12 to do at that point would be would provide that to CI,
13 load it up on the website, and they're good to go.
14 Interestingly you can -- once we load the link you can get
15 into the proposals without --

16 DR. FISHBONE: -- would the grants be
17 listed --

18 MS. SMITH: -- we'd have to secure --

19 DR. GENEL: -- it will still be a secured
20 site.

21 MR. STRAUSS: Yes, right, it will be on
22 your secure site. It's pretty big, but as long as you're
23 accessing it from the CI site then you can download it.
24 Or maybe there is a way if members needs sticks maybe

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 memory sticks maybe that could be provided that way.

2 MS. DONOFRIO: It's an Excel document?

3 MR. STRAUSS: No, this is a Word document.
4 It's a Word document with a table, with the documents,
5 with our peer review record embedded in it.

6 MS. DONOFRIO: Okay.

7 DR. KRAUSE: Where are the pdf's?

8 MR. STRAUSS: The pdf's of the proposal are
9 on the CI website. The pdf's of the peer review record
10 are embedded in the document. Now, they're not big. I
11 mean they might be 300 kb or something, but when there is
12 50 of them it is big, and we've tried to downsize it and
13 we can't get them smaller. So, we're working on that
14 technically. But we'll be able to -- we'll bring a stick
15 over here. They'll load it up and then you'll be able to
16 download it. So, we can't email it. It's too big.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: But people
18 accessing it from home on the CI website shouldn't have
19 any problems loading up.

20 MR. STRAUSS: Right.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All of these
22 different things regardless if you have an old computer or
23 a regular memory.

24 MR. STRAUSS: Rihgt.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, that will
2 be helpful.

3 MS. SMITH: We will have to have a
4 conversation with you, Rick, off line about the format we
5 receive this document and the purpose of posting it on our
6 server, which is our --

7 MR. STRAUSS: -- right, yes.

8 MS. SMITH: Because we can't post every
9 kind of document up there.

10 MR. STRAUSS: Yes, it's just a Word doc.

11 MS. SMITH: That's the problem.

12 MR. STRAUSS: Oh, you can't post the Word
13 document.

14 MS. SMITH: But we can have a conversation
15 with you off line about that and figure out what to do
16 about it.

17 MR. STRAUSS: Then we can just use -- we're
18 going to post it on our website for --

19 MS. SMITH: -- will it be secure?

20 MR. STRAUSS: No, it's secure. It will be
21 password protected.

22 MS. SMITH: What were you telling me some
23 people can't access whatever you use? You use something,
24 Brownbox, Bigbox --

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: -- oh, no. What we were
2 thinking of using Box.net, but that requires like
3 invitations and --

4 MS. SMITH: -- okay.

5 MR. STRAUSS: And all of that stuff, so
6 this is easier. We would just put it on our website in a
7 secure directory and put up a password and then people can
8 get into it. So if there is a problem with the CI site we
9 can just do it on our site.

10 MS. SMITH: All right.

11 MR. STRAUSS: So we can talk about that.
12 So, also, you know, once we get the glitches out of this
13 and everything it would really be good for next year to
14 use this document for instead of entering everything into
15 the Excel spreadsheet enter the stuff in here, you load
16 your stuff up on the -- you know, the proposals on the
17 website, put the link in here, put the dollars in here,
18 and then we're ready to go.

19 So that's it. Hopefully this thing will
20 work and won't bog you down during your review meeting.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, thank you.
22 So as I mentioned we will not be having a meeting in May,
23 but you will be receiving correspondence from CI with the
24 pairings for the grants once we have the peer review down

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 and begin that process. And, obviously, reminders of the
2 meeting and the logistics of that. If anybody has any
3 trouble making a hotel reservation, the people who are
4 coming in overnight, please, let me know.

5 DR. GENEL: Marianne, how are we doing in
6 terms of completing the membership of the Committee?

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, we have
8 Diane, as you can see.

9 DR. GENEL: I see Diane, yes.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes. And I am
11 going to enlist the help of Emily Smith to push these
12 along. We have sent letters of recommendation to five
13 different members of the legislature, including the
14 Governor. And requesting to have some more people
15 appointed and I have not heard on anyone other than Diane.

16

17 DR. PESCATELLO: Do you need more names or
18 do you have enough names?

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think I have
20 enough names now unless I get word back from the
21 legislators that they're not comfortable with the people
22 we submitted. But, we have business people, an ethicist
23 from Trinity, and some scientists who I think are good and
24 not conflicted. And so we just need to move that along.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 The other thing is that we need to get almost all of the
2 rest of the Committee reappointed in terms of expired and
3 need reappointing. So, Emily, tells me she has magical
4 powers up there that I don't have.

5 MS. SMITH: Not really, but that's okay.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That they respond
7 to her so I'm certainly going to take her up on that.

8 DR. GENEL: That means the membership of
9 the advisory committee for June will be what 12?

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: 12. But I have
11 to say I don't believe the commissioner is intending to
12 review. I don't imagine the Commissioner is intending to
13 review any grants, but I think that still puts you even
14 with last year. Paul was away last year and we had Bob
15 leave during the year, but we have Diane now. So I think
16 it's skinny, but -- and I think we have a few more grants
17 this year. But if we can possibly get more people on and
18 up and running before June we certainly will. But it
19 would have to happen in the next couple of weeks.

20 DR. GENEL: Yes, right, because you can't -
21 -

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: As Gerry and I
23 were talking before the meeting he came along four days
24 before our grant review one year when we had somebody

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 conflicted out and we didn't have a quorum. So, it works.

2 It can work.

3 Public comment, I just wanted to remind
4 anybody who hasn't sent in their SFI, the statement of
5 financial interest, to be sure to do that. It has to be
6 received by them before May 1st, it can't be postmarked
7 May 1st, and there is the electronic version. So, if
8 anybody is having problems with that, please, let me know.
9 The next meeting date is June 11th.

10 Is there any other public comment?

11 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Can I make one comment
12 before the public?

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Absolutely.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Since we have -- since
15 we're short members and there is a lot of grants to review
16 I'm wondering if it's possible outside of the formal
17 meeting to agree on a priority score cutoff below which we
18 won't discuss. It takes quite a bit of work to prepare a
19 presentation. Of course -- but that's a different level
20 of work than preparing to present the grant to the group.

21

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

23 DR. GOLDHAMMER: So for instance, if I had
24 an idea of what the cutoff was I would spend less time on

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 that lower two thirds or half of grants. Is there a way
2 to do that or is that not going to be --

3 DR. WALLACK: -- can we agree to not --
4 unless as you said before, unless requested by a Committee
5 member, put on the table for consideration on the 11th
6 anything worse than 4.0.

7 DR. KRAUSE: Let me respond to Milt first.
8 I think it's premature to figure out what that cutoff will
9 be before we know what the scores are. So, I think it's a
10 good idea to have a cutoff and if we find out that 50
11 percent of the grants have a score higher than five then
12 five would be a great cutoff, or four or whatever. But I
13 think before we know the range and who ends the
14 distribution it might be hard to come up with that number.
15 David, what were you thinking?

16 DR. GOLDHAMMER: You're right.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

18 DR. GENEL: I think you could do that if
19 you would say that for the large numbers, we know the
20 numbers, the large numbers are the seed grants and the
21 established investigators. If there are only five other
22 applications, as I recall, or something to begin with. If
23 one set an arbitrary limit that we will not seriously look
24 at the lower 50 percent in each category, and we can

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 decide that, then it's independent of the scores.

2 DR. KRAUSE: That's good except if they all
3 have twos and threes --

4 DR. GENEL: -- yeah.

5 DR. KRAUSE: It's not fair because you're
6 cutting something right in the middle of it.

7 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Based on history that
8 would work out.

9 DR. KRAUSE: Based on history that would be
10 fine.

11 DR. GENEL: Well, somebody from the
12 Committee ought to really look at it to determine whether
13 it's 50 percent, or 55 percent, or 45 percent. In other
14 words, I hear what you're saying there is a large cluster
15 at four you don't want to arbitrarily cut off at 50
16 percent.

17 DR. KRAUSE: Yes.

18 DR. GENEL: But I think it would be good
19 for somebody from the Committee to look at that and to
20 help make that decision.

21 MS. SMITH: Well, how about 50 percent
22 rounded down to the --

23 DR. GENEL: -- rounded down to the next --

24 MS. SMITH: -- something like that.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 DR. GENEL: To the next score.

2 MS. SMITH: So it's 50 percent in the
3 middle of four then we'd take four and above.

4 DR. GENEL: Yes, or it could be 4.1, or it
5 could be 4.2, or it could be something along that line.
6 It's a judgment call.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

8 DR. WALLACK: I think that's good. And it
9 still speaks to what David brought up and why I made the
10 recommendation because it seems historically that that
11 range is what we're not going to want to consider above
12 that.

13 DR. GENEL: So, somewhere around the top 50
14 percent is what we would look at seriously and --

15 DR. KRAUSE: -- should we recommend that
16 CI, for example, make that decision because you'll --
17 somebody is going to have access to these scores before
18 the assignments are made.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, we believe
20 the beginning of May we will have access to them.

21 DR. KRAUSE: So, how should the decision be
22 made which is considered the bottom 50 percent if there is
23 anything other than a clear cut off?

24 MS. SMITH: I don't think it's the place of

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 the Committee administrator, which is what CI is.

2 DR. KRAUSE: I understand.

3 MS. SMITH: To make that determination. I
4 mean if there is something we can do to help obviously we
5 will, but I don't think that type of a final decision
6 should be made by us.

7 DR. KRAUSE: So, David, when you made the
8 recommendation or asked about it who were you thinking
9 might make the decision?

10 DR. GOLDHAMMER: Well, last year the
11 Committee made the decision, but we made it in session on
12 the day of the review.

13 DR. KRAUSE: Right.

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: And I was wondering if
15 that, if it's possible to make the decision at the
16 Committee, but not have a formal Committee meeting. And I
17 know there is restrictions on what we can do by email.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We can always set
19 up a very quick phone conference at some time that's
20 convenient. Maybe the end of the first week of May,
21 beginning of the second week of May on a Tuesday afternoon
22 at 1:00 and just --

23 DR. GENEL: -- will the scores be posted by
24 that time?

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MR. STRAUSS: We hope so. We have
2 reconciliation statements that we might have to do. So,
3 we'll know pretty clear on Monday April 30th where we
4 stand in terms of whether we're going to need to wait for
5 somebody or whether we have everything in. But we hope by
6 the end of that week or the following Monday, May 6th,
7 that we would be done.

8 DR. GENEL: The worst possible scenario we
9 can't --

10 MR. STRAUSS: -- so that's pretty good, I
11 think.

12 DR. HART: Can you appoint a subcommittee
13 of two people that can set that threshold?

14 DR. GOLDHAMMER: I think we might want the
15 whole Committee. There was some disagreement last year
16 about what that threshold should be and it required the --
17 a significant amount of discussion.

18 DR. HART: Okay.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Why don't we set
20 something up in the first week of May, the beginning of
21 the second week, maybe? I know I cut you guys short of
22 review time. So the first is on a Tuesday. If we look to
23 meet -- so, Rick, you think you'll have scores by Tuesday?

24

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 MS. SMITH: Did you say the 6th?

2 MR. STRAUSS: I meant the 7th because the
3 6th is Sunday.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. So why
5 don't we set up a meeting for May 8th, if that's not too
6 far down the road. And --

7 DR. PESCATELLO: -- just keep the same
8 meeting date we had.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That would be on
10 the 15th. I'm just worried about you won't have your
11 assignments then until after that.

12 DR. GENEL: There is plenty of time, that's
13 three weeks.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

15 DR. DEES: Can I make an alternative
16 suggestion?

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Absolutely.

18 DR. DEES: Can we -- would this work
19 (inaudible) a 50 percent cut off (inaudible) and then go
20 up to the nearest whole number after that? I mean we can
21 modify that later, I believe. That would address David's
22 point, which is trying not to have to prepare something
23 for (inaudible) --

24 DR. WALLACK: I would endorse what you're -

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 - Rich, I think you make sense and I would endorse your
2 idea.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So 50 percent and
4 then round down to the next --

5 DR. WALLACK: -- which is basically, Emily,
6 what you said.

7 DR. DEES: To the next highest number.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: The next highest
9 number. So if --

10 DR. DEES: (inaudible)

11 DR. FISHBONE: You have to round up.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

13 DR. DEES: Last year, if it was like last
14 year there is a lot of scores of three that will not get
15 funded.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

17 DR. DEES: If it's anything like that just
18 to note that there will be a lot of grants that are --
19 we're putting that additional time into that won't get --

20 DR. GOLDHAMMER: (Inaudible)

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Richard and David
22 having a discussion.

23 DR. GENEL: David, Richard, do you think a
24 50 percent is too high? Would 40 percent be a better

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 number? I mean we're talking about 90 applications.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: 85.

3 DR. DEES: I mean I think 40 percent I'd be
4 happy with too.

5 DR. GOLDHAMMER: 40 percent, I think, would
6 work well as well.

7 DR. GENEL: 40 percent then.

8 DR. WALLACK: So let's do 40 percent.

9 DR. GENEL: 40 percent round it up to the
10 highest number.

11 DR. DEES: You want to round to the nearest
12 half point then?

13 DR. GENEL: Yes.

14 DR. WALLACK: Half point.

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. And if we
16 run into any peculiarities we'll let the Committee know
17 what we run into. And I just want to clarify so every
18 grant does get a review by two members of the Advisory
19 Committee, but the more detailed reviews are going to be
20 saved for the, for this 40 percent of the ones that we are
21 considering fundable.

22 DR. GENEL: Rihgt.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We're not just
24 drawing a line and saying we're not even going to look at

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 those because I think always we represented that all of
2 the grants get a review by both the peer review and two
3 members of the Advisory Committee. They may not be
4 discussed by the entire Committee if they're above a
5 certain score, but they do, at least get reviewed, and
6 then there is a possibility they would be brought into the
7 larger discussion.

8 DR. GENEL: And we're agreed that if any of
9 us feel that one of those that are below that arbitrary
10 line deserves --

11 DR. WALLACK: -- we'll bring it in.

12 DR. GENEL: Review with consideration by
13 the full Committee we'll bring it up.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Great.

15 DR. FISHBONE: You mean above the line?

16 DR. WALLACK: Yes.

17 DR. FISHBONE: Above the line. Anyone that
18 would not be reviewed, Gerry, we can bring in.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, just one
20 final point, in earlier years we used to set time limits
21 in terms of the discussion for particular grants. I don't
22 know that we did that last year and I think it worked out
23 okay. But I just wanted to see whether people wanted to
24 limit the discussion of seed grants to five minutes or to

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 -- I think there is --

2 DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- I think we did that in
3 part because we don't have this other system in place. I
4 think when we now are going to review, or I should say
5 discuss all of the grants, that really frees up a lot of
6 time and I don't think we have to be restricted to a
7 particular time limit per grant. It tends to work out
8 anyway.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good.

10 DR. WALLACK: Before you close, the --
11 since we're not going to be having a meeting probably
12 until late summer or early September, whenever, do you
13 want to bring us up to date on the collaboration outside
14 of the state?

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, the
16 legislation was proposed and passed the House. I don't
17 know the Senate is in session today that would authorize
18 Connecticut to enter into an interstate compact with
19 another state, another country in order to do
20 collaborative funding. So, once we do that I think
21 California will be very interested in signing such an
22 agreement with us. We may be a little far down the road in
23 terms of where their grants and where their interest in
24 collaborative funding is, but I think it will certainly

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 result in their willingness to have their scientists come
2 to Connecticut and perhaps participate in our next retreat
3 and begin some dialogues face to face or at least over
4 video to bring the scientific programs that are together
5 in alignment and perhaps get us to be able to leverage our
6 money more. And they are interested in collaborating with
7 us.

8 DR. WALLACK: So, to that point, would you
9 have a problem if we also began exploring the possibility
10 of a similar collaborative partnership with Maryland?

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, the
12 legislation is open.

13 DR. WALLACK: And I'm making specific
14 reference about the same ability for those folks to be
15 able to come to the November 5th retreat as well if there
16 is an interest on their part. I'm only raising that point
17 because of the similarity in our two programs.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Our programs are
19 very similar and they have done a collaborative agreement
20 with California.

21 DR. WALLACK: Rihgt.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So I think it
23 would be really helpful to have them come.

24 DR. WALLACK: Great.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 17, 2012

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, we'll see you
2 all and we're going to start at 8:30 on June 11th. There
3 will be breakfast served, Farmington Marriott.

4 DR. GENEL: 8:30?

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: It starts at
6 8:30, but the food will be available earlier than that.
7 So, thank you all again so much for your time. Any other
8 comments before we leave? Thank you.

9 Motion to adjourn.

10 ALL VOICES: Aye.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay. Thank you,
12 have fun, David. That motion passed.

13 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
14 2:53 p.m.)