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

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

DR. GERALD FISHBONE: Gerry Fishbone.

DR. MILTON WALLACK: Milt Wallack.

DR. DIANE KRAUSE: Diane Krause.

MS. EMILY SMITH: Emily Smith.

MS. SARA DONOFRIO: Sara Donofrio.

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

I did want to take a minute and introduce Diane Krause. Most of you will probably know her. She is a new member of the Advisory Committee appointed just a couple of weeks ago. We’re delighted to have her, a
professor of laboratory medicine, pathology, and cell biology at the Yale School of Medicine in New Haven, Connecticut and we are delighted to have her with us. She’s been a tremendous help to the program throughout and so you all know an excellent scientist. So, conflicted unfortunately on the Yale grants, but we’re very happy to have you aboard. So welcome.

DR. KRAUSE: Thank you. I’m happy to be here.

DR. DAVID GOLDHAMMER: Hi, Diane.

DR. KRAUSE: Hi, David.

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

DR. GOLDHAMMER: I’m in Canada.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: What part of Canada?

DR. GOLDHAMMER: In Toronto.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: In Toronto, oh, that’s my hometown, say hello. So, we might need to do a little rearranging. We promised David that since he’s on vacation with his children that we might try to get him on and off as quickly as possible. Do we have a quorum if David leaves? Not yet. We’ll need to hold you hostage, David, until one more person comes.
DR. GOLDBAM: That’s fine. And after three days on vacation a two-hours reprieve might not be bad.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- okay. They’re all set for now.
DR. GOLDBAM: I have the time allotted so I should be okay.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, very good. Well, I have no other opening remarks. I think we can just plunge into the agenda. I just want to acknowledge the stem cell retreat that took place at Wesleyan last week and I understand was very successful, and exciting. And certainly reflecting back on seven years since the program started, it’s been a tremendous growth and you all should really be very proud of how far the program has come.
DR. WALLACK: The organizer did an amazing job, Laura Grabel.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, Laura Grabel.
DR. WALLACK: And her university, Wesleyan University, they were all great.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That’s terrific.
And where is the next one going to be and when?
DR. KRAUSE: It’s at Yale and, Paula, help me, which date is it?

DR. PAULA WILSON: November 5th.

DR. KRAUSE: November 5th.

DR. WALLACK: November 5?

DR. KRAUSE: Um, hmm.

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I didn’t check that out.

MS. SMITH: We’d have to go back and have the attendance sheet. I mean it looks to me like they’re all here.
MS. DONOFRIO: I usually don’t list the two of us.

DR. WALLACK: Oh, they don’t list you, okay.

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

DR. WALLACK: So moved.

DR. FISHBONE: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor?

ALL VOICES: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Opposed?

Recused? The minutes pass.

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

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

DR. KRAUSE: It’s the first time I had looked at these kinds of things because it’s my first time I’m meeting here and just remarking on the fact that through almost everybody’s grant about 65 to 70 percent of
the direct costs go to personnel. It’s just something to realize when we’re talking about the job creation. This money is mostly going to hiring people.

DR. WALLACK: That’s a good point.

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

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So we’ve got one more final --

MS. SMITH: -- final report.

All right. Moving on, Item No. 4, there is an interim progress report here. From what I understand this was requested by the Committee at the November 2nd meeting, which I did not attend, but looking back in the minutes there was a discussion of this project. And the Committee requested interim progress reports and that’s what’s included in your packet here. Is there any comments about it?
DR. FISHBONE: Well, basically the first year was sort of rough.

MS. SMITH: Yes, that’s correct.

DR. FISHBONE: So how should that be handled?

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right. It’s a seed grant. It would be for two years.

DR. WALLACK: Right. And there is really - there hasn’t been anything done with this grant and I’m not so sure that I feel comfortable, personally, with the continuation, frankly, of the grant. Certainly the work it’s impossible for it to be done in the time that’s left. And, I guess, also what is in my mind is the torturous debates that we have because of the quality of people that we can’t award grants to.

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

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

DR. WALLACK: Right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, I think we’d need to have a clear understanding of where this person is and if she’s going to be requesting to have the grant extended and the funds carried over so that she can indeed accomplish the goals of the grant. If she is trying to finish it by the end and the Committee has concerns about spending the money that way, I think that is something we might want to call her in and have that discussion with her unless you have enough information here to make the
DR. WALLACK: I don’t see any information -
- I’m sorry --

DR. DEES: -- this is Richard Dees. I think

did we give her -- she’s having a hard time -- she finally
got through all the junk that she had to do in order to
get this off the ground and now they’re actually starting
from where she’s hired the people she needs to hire. I
guess I’m inclined to give her some time with this rather
than sort of waste what she has done so far -- I mean I
assume she’s going to ask for an extension of the grant.
It’s a little hard for me to tell from this how much she
already spent -- of year one that’s she’s spent already.

Does anyone have an idea what she has allocated this year.

Anyway, I’m inclined to give her a chance to see what she
can do now that’s she (inaudible) --

DR. WALLACK: -- Richard, the reason I said

what I said is that we’ve given her enormous opportunity.
We’ve discussed her progress a few times. And like I say
there were other people on the seed grant list that some
of us felt very strongly about that they should be funded.
Unfortunately, we can’t fund everybody. And I’m not
impressed with the idea that things will change. And if

you recall she also had some difficulties even
administratively in her own university. So, I don’t know. I’m not comfortable with her proceeding.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Please.

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

DR. WALLACK: Ron, I think you make a good point and if we were to give her even additional time, and yes there is a clear expectation that she’ll have to ask for an extension, then I think that we -- it’s a lot of money. I mean 200,000, and I think that we have to be
very, very cognizant of where she’s been, what’s been going on with it, and be, therefore, be very careful of how we proceed with her in the future. And ask for updates from her on a more periodic basis than we ask otherwise. So, I hear what you’re saying, Ron and Rich, but the -- my only caveat would be that if we then do extend her time let’s not do so without at least getting maybe three or four month reports from her on her progress.

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

What’s more important, in my mind, is this is, I believe, the only one of our grants, to my recollection, on Huntington. It was reviewed scientifically favorably. It’s a difficult disease to attack. It’s difficult to obtain -- and I think it deserves, for the type of grant that was awarded, a seed
grant this is perfectly appropriate and deserves to be followed through to the originally awarded period.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Gerry.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

DR. WALLACK: Again, I think that we have to respond, I think, to her resubmission. And I would be
very uncomfortable if in that response we did not pay
attention to the history of -- and, Ron, with all due
respect I understand totally what you’re saying, but there
has also been a performance flaw here. And I think we
ought to, in that response, identify the fact that we have
certain expectations and we expect that there will be
periodic reporting back to us. Now maybe the next one,
Ron, coincides with what you’re saying when she sends the
resubmission, but even after that I’m not sure I’ll be
comfortable if we don’t have a more closely looked at
project.

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

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

DR. WALLACK: Right.

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

DR. WALLACK: Exactly. And I think that
it’s only fair from our perspective and maybe it does her
a favor also in that there is an indication to her that we
don't just give out these 200,000 dollar grants ad hoc without some expectations, and that we’ve very serious about the researchers performing at a certain level and according to an expectation. That’s all I’m saying. I think that we have to send a message to her in some regard and to not do so, I think, isn’t fair to the other people who we didn’t give grants to. It’s not fair to us, I don’t think. And also I think, again, it may be doing a favor to her.

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

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

DR. WALLACK: I will move what you just
said, Marianne, and yes.


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

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

    DR. ANN KIESSLING: Hi, Ann Kiessling, I’m late.

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

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

    DR. WALLACK: -- yes.

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

    DR. WALLACK: We retain a list of
applicants that were very close in consideration for granting. And we put the names into the bullpen and those people, yes, are available.

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: I mean this is a premature discussion since there is no action needed right now, but I’m worried about funding a grant two years, you know, that the field has moved on and the grant may not be of
the same sort of importance or quality today that it was
two years ago.

DR. WALLACK: That’s true.

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

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

DR. KRAUSE: Thank you.

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

DR. KRAUSE: Are the Year 1 funds spent?

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

DR. FISHBONE: There is 52,885.

MS. BATES: right. And the post-doc’s
salary, between salary and fringe, I believe, comes up to about 60 and then her effort. And I don’t remember right now what it is, her class, the money that she needs for supplies, etcetera.

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

MS. BATES: At least 50 percent.

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

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

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

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

MS. SMITH: And I think Isolde is
suggesting that perhaps 50 percent of it could be released
until the, you know, October or --

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

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

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

DR. WALLACK: So, it’s between 50 and
60,000.

MS. BATES: Yes.

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

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

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

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

DR. WALLACK: Well, you already have 50
some odd left.
MS. BATES: But what is left is the money mostly in supplies because she barely -- the only supply item she used or the only other expense was she went to the Stem Conn a year ago, other than that the only other money used was to pay her effort, her salary on the grant. So I would have to take money now from the supplies and move it into --

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

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

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

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

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

DR. HART: Can I just jump in real quickly here? My understanding what we were just discussing before this is we’re approving her annual report, which should be released in the second year of the budget. And
then if she’s gone and spent it all before, between now
and the end of August she’ll have to ask for a no-cost
extension. Isn’t that right?

MS. BATES: Yes.

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

MS. BATES: Oh, okay.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Is that
acceptable? Okay.

MS. BATES: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: The Year 2 funds
are released.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So, moving onto Item No.
5 there is a request to change a PI. The request comes
from Yale University, Dr. Pascale Draine, at Yale
University and would like to, they would like to switch
the PI to Dr. Patell. The packet -- included in your
packet is the biographical sketch and the revisions to the
budget to account for the fact that Dr. Patell is a post
doctorate associate, so that the --

DR. FISHBONE: -- what does that mean?
DR. KRAUSE: It’s post doc.
DR. FISHBONE: I mean different from a
fellow?
DR. KRAUSE: It’s the source of funding
gives you the title of associate versus fellow. If you
have your own funding then you’re a fellow because you
have a fellowship. Other than that you’re an associate.
DR. FISHBONE: You’re an associate.
MS. SMITH: Yes. And this would require an
approval by the Committee.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And we had
required and have language both in the RFP and in the
assistant’s agreement that when there is a change in PI
that the Committee approve that and that the PI’s CV be
attached, that there be representation that this will not
impact -- or what the impact of the change will be on the
research and that the -- that he is well qualified for the
research. So I think this letter covers all the bases.

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

DR. PAUL PESCATELLO: So moved.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So moved? Second?

DR. WALLACK: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: All in favor? No Yale votes, please.

ALL VOICES: Aye.

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

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

DR. GENEL: It’s really unfeasible at this
level.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No. 6?

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

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

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

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

  DR. WALLACK: So moved.

  ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Second. All in favor?

  ALL VOICES: Aye.

  MS. SMITH: Thank you. No. 8, we have a carry over request for the Yale project. It’s -- it looks -- it looks appropriate to me and I did recommend
approval, but we’re open to discussion here.

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

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

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

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

DR. WILSON: Hold on just one second.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

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

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

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

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

DR. WILSON: I’ll give that to you now, unless it’s too late. The funds shall be allocated to CI
effort and prior budget modification request after regrouping. TBA increase in effort did not begin until approval of adjusted budget. She had put in a request to do a rebudgeting in year 3 and she has not hired the Ph.D. yet so that’s why there are funds remaining for the PI’s effort.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

DR. WALLACK: I move the extension.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I second. All in favor?

ALL VOICES: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

DR. KRAUSE: I make a motion.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So Diane the motion. Second?

DR. WALLACK: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Milt Wallack
seconded. Any further discussion? Any discussion? Okay. All in favor?

    ALL VOICES: Aye.

    ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Opposed? The motion carries.

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

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

    And interesting this week, the cord blood group called and wanted to amend the statute to make clear that research on cord blood could be done under this program. And I said, well, I think, that I’d check with one of the scientists at the retreat and I said, aren’t
those already considered to be adult stem cells. So I think there was a little confusion about we do have a fairly broad scope for this, but I don’t know that it can be stretched as far as the certain members of the Committee would like it to go without having to have a legislative amendment, but good try, Milt.

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

DR. WALLACK: I think that David did an amazing job in capturing the discussion that we had. And as usual he’s to be applauded for that. And from my perspective, I said this at the meeting and I’ll say it again, and Marianne knows that I was going to say it today, and I certainly understand, as I always do, Marianne’s concern legislatively. And I think the major change would speak more to where we are now and to our future, but if Marianne, as she is, is uncomfortable with that then I certainly think that what David did to bring additional clarity, with his minor change which reflects our conversation that we had, would be beneficial. But I
think it doesn’t preclude us from then working towards the
major change area in the future.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, absolutely
not.

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

DR. WALLACK: -- right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DR. WALLACK: Marianne, for the discussion purposes, I would move acceptance of the changes to
overview of minor variety that David Goldhammer submitted
to us.

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

DR. KRAUSE: I second.

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

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

DR. HART: Okay. Is that the motion?

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

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

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

DR. WALLACK: So you’re -- you agree with
Diane.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes.

DR. WALLACK: Okay. I’m absolutely fine
with it.

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

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

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

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

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Marianne?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: This is David Goldhammer.

So just one question, so in the 2012 RFP we do say any
form of stem cell research which would, of course, include
fruit flies. The difference, I think, and the major
revision is that it’s more explicitly -- there is -- it’s
more -- in the first one, is that -- but you agree that
they’re not that different in terms of describing -- or
describing what is allowed -- just one is more specific
than the other.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, I think
they’re both fine.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: And before we -- there is
a motion or a vote, can I just ask that -- there is three
words that bother me in the minor change.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

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

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

DR. GOLDHAMMER: -- the words “and to” as if there is a distinction between human stem cell research and other types of research with potential relevance to human health. It’s like I’m creating this dichotomy between the two as if human stem cell research is not necessarily relevant to human health.

DR. HART: You’re absolutely right, this is Ron Hart. I think I’d like to suggest putting the word
also in that sentence and also to studies with clear potential relevance. And that way it just establishes a clear hierarchy --

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

DR. GOLDHAMMER: So if we include the word, “other” that would solve, that would solve that problem, I think.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I’m sorry. That shows you why I became a lawyer.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: It’s part of the discussion time.

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

DR. KRAUSE: Yes.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Yes. Okay, so in the animal models sentence I say, animal models of human disease, regeneration repair and aging also will be considered. Again, as if that is somehow distinct from
the sentence before that concerns research with a clear
potential relevance to human health. Is that word also --

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

DR. WALLACK: -- yes, I like that, that’s
good.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: That’s good.

MS. SMITH: All one sentence.

DR. KRAUSE: Apparently.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

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

DR. WALLACK: Yes, minor.

DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

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

DR. KIESSLING: Okay.

MS. SMITH: So actually we’re making this
whole paragraph one big giant sentence?
DR. KRAUSE: Yes. Is that too big?

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

DR. KRAUSE: -- period.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: Period.

MS. SMITH: Okay. I’m okay with that.

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

(Multiple Voices)

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

DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: That’s good.

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

MS. SMITH: Can you just say that again?

I’m sorry.
DR. DEES: The first sentence -- (multiple voices) priority will be given to (indiscernible) funding any form of stem cell research -- period --

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

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

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

DR. WALLACK: It’s okay? Okay.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: And do we have a second?

DR. KRAUSE: I’ll second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Diane second.

All in favor?

ALL VOICES: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good, the motion passes. This will be inserted into the 2013 RFP. We will have another go round of the entire RFP, top to
bottom, after we’ve done the grants when we regroup
probably in September. So, please, have a look at it over
the summer if you can. And I know that there were some
thoughts about changing certain things that I think Dr.
Dees you might have had some changes that you wanted
happen that were just a little bit late for last year. So, we’ll give everybody a second bite at the apple, but we
wanted to get this out in the public domain.

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

Rick Strauss from C.A.S.E. is going to be
assisting CI with the processing of the applications
during the day. And Rick will go over his snazzy new form at the end of the meeting.

So I was looking through a couple of things that we had put together for the advisory committee to do their reviews last year and I don’t know whether these were helpful. I’d be happy to send them out again and I’ve revised them a little bit to reflect the, this year’s RFP. It was a checklist that just went through the criteria to use in evaluating the stem cell proposals. So in addition to the scientific and ethical reviews that are done by peer review there are some specific items identified in the RFP that you folks have used in terms of a Connecticut specific review.

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

So I don’t know if that’s helpful to have in front of you when you do your reviews. I’m getting
some nods. I’ll send that out.

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

DR. GENEL: You’re going to circulate that, Marianne?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I’m sorry?

DR. GENEL: You’re going to circulate that?

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

And then last year I don’t know if you want to go through the same process that we used last year where we -- I think we basically looked at different funding levels and broke the grants off at -- ranked them and broke them at funding levels of 13.8 million, 15.5 million, and 16.7 million. And I can’t remember whether we did it within categories or whether we did it from start
to finish. I think we did it within categories, the top
ranked grants. And we took the peer review score -- is
this ringing a bell? No, people are looking puzzled.
Okay.

DR. GENEL: I don’t recall that.

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

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

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

DR. GENEL: We’ve allocated a maximum of a million.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.
DR. FISHBONE: Over the last six years we’ve always kind of leaned towards the seeds saying that we would give a specific amount to the seeds, it was like two million or whatever to the seeds.

DR. WALLACK: 10 percent, yes.

DR. FISHBONE: Yes. I’m wondering whether the --

DR. WALLACK: -- 20 percent.

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

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

DR. FISHBONE: -- oh, we did.

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

DR. FISHBONE: But we had like two million.
I’m just wondering if, you know, when we started out it was important to encourage people to come into the field and so we were pushing seed grants. And I’m just wondering if that left us enough for the established investigators and disease orientated research. In other words, after a period of time should we be looking at a slightly different emphasis?

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

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

DR. KIESSLING: This is Ann Kiessling. Is
there anyway that we can actually track progress from seed
grants into established investigator grants in the last
two years? If the seed grants that were funded led to
the more advanced and bigger programs.

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

    DR. GENEL: That's an interesting idea.

    That's a very good idea.

    ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

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

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

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

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

    DR. KRAUSE: But it would be nice because
you could say what publications did you get from this
grant and what additional grant funding did it lead to. And then we’d have statistics that would look really good for the program.

DR. WALLACK: That would be great.

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

DR. WALLACK: Right.

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

DR. KRAUSE: But that is work, that’s a project.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

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

DR. GENEL: Right. Would you limit it to seeds?
DR. KRAUSE: No.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: 6th year.

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

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

DR. KIESSLING: -- right.

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

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

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

DR. KIESSLING: Righgt.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Right.

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

DR. WALLACK: -- that’s right.

DR. KRAUSE: Or the publications that came from it and what grant funding came from it, and if there is anything else we absolutely want. But it would just be
a table that we would then provide to CI and you could add it up.

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

DR. WALLACK: -- that would be great.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Terrific.

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

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We have another
volunteer, Isolde. Thank you.

DR. WALLACK: Isolde did volunteer?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes, she did.

DR. WALLACK: Great, great.

MS. BATES: CI will provide guidelines.

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

DR. WALLACK: Fantastic.

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

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

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

DR. WALLACK: It was interesting at the retreat there -- I remember at least one of the
researchers, who stated that their funding came from our
funding, and then that morphed into the NIH funding. So
to have an idea, and to the legislators to understand, how
we can attract and I think we’ve already attracted 45, 50
million dollars of NIH funding from what we started here
becomes a very powerful statement.

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

DR. WALLACK: You’re absolutely right.

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

DR. WALLACK: You’re absolutely right.

MS. SMITH: I just think that it’s good
advertisement.

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

MS. SMITH: Yes.

DR. WALLACK: That would be great.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Good.

DR. FISHBONE: I know one funding agency
has attempted to write to each of the people who have been
funded and ask them what are they doing now? How many of
them stay in research? How many of them drop out and go
into other things? I mean that maybe not what we’re after in terms of you want a product to show, but it’s interesting to know how many of the people we’ve funded with seed grants are -- I mean most of them are post doctoral fellow and how many of them go onto become professors and continue to work in the field. Again, this is all work.

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


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

DR. KRAUSE: So it’s almost 50 percent needed that.

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

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

DR. WALLACK: What percent is that?
MR. STRAUSS: 48, the same as the seed. 13 of the 14 proposals were reconciled by the primary and secondary reviewers with one still out -- so, yes, with one still outstanding that we’re waiting on. So, we don't -- and actually that’s just a clarification, so none will need to go to the co-chairs for reconciliation on the established.

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

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

DR. PESCATELLO: So was there any common theme about how they were reconciling? They were far apart
and how they came together and reconciled?

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

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

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

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

DR. PESCATELLO: Um, hmm.

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

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

So, most of the -- you know, the review record that you will see will probably be no more than two or three pages, but that’s mostly in a form so it’s not a lot of writing, it just covers, you know, it goes from the -- and that includes the primary and secondary review. So you’ll have a cover sheet, which we distributed before. The cover sheet takes you from the final peer review score
back through the initial peer review. And then also has the two full reviews, the primary and the secondary reviews in it.

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

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

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

But let’s just walk -- so this is just -- they’re all the same, but this one just happens to be for the established. So, what we thought would be helpful is on the left -- and the previous one said, you know, it was the Committee final score, but in talking to Mike he said, well you really don’t score it, you just say fund it,
maybe, or no. So, we changed this so that it would be the Committee action and in walking through the session if the Committee said, well, let’s put in the fund column then a one would get added in here, or a two for maybe, or a three for no. So that this document can then be sorted at the meeting at any time pretty easily. You just hit Control A, and F9 and boom the whole table gets resorted.

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

DR. KRAUSE: I’m not understanding what the prop score is.
MR. STRAUSS: That’s the proposal score. We just don’t have enough room to --

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

MR. STRAUSS: And then the secondary.

Those are averaged and that’s the proposal score.

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

MR. STRAUSS: They’re always averaged together to the get the proposal score.

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

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

DR. KRAUSE: I see.

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

DR. KRAUSE: Okay.

MR. STRAUSS: So if there is no co-chair reconciliation score that means that the score under
initial scoring is a reconciliation score. We just don’t have enough room to throw all the --

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

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

DR. KRAUSE: Yes.

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

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

MR. STRAUSS: -- bottom line --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: -- the first --

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

MR. STRAUSS: Right.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

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

MS. SMITH: -- if they revise it that’s going to be --

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

MS. SMITH: Right. Because that’s the bottom line.

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

DR. WALLACK: Rick, so basically all you're
doing is you’re reading from right to left and you have
all the background stuff on the right side.

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

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

So what we could do, if you want, is on the
template add in the Committee members that are going to be
reviewing that grant, put their names in here.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Correct. So that
when it comes up for a vote we do that. We can do it separately. I don’t know if that will make this too complicated.

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

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

MR. STRAUSS: No, I don’t think this year there --

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We don’t have any this year.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: They're both equal.

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

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

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

MR. STRAUSS: You mean the proposal link?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. STRAUSS: Well then I -- unless that
had the grant ID number in it. But we’ll all play around with it.

MS. SMITH: All right.

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

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

MS. SMITH: -- we’d have to secure --

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

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

MS. DONOFRIO: It’s an Excel document?

MR. STRAUSS: No, this is a Word document.

It’s a Word document with a table, with the documents, with our peer review record embedded in it.

MS. DONOFRIO: Okay.

DR. KRAUSE: Where are the pdf’s?

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

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

MR. STRAUSS: Right.

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

MR. STRAUSS: Right.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, that will be helpful.

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

MR. STRAUSS: -- right, yes.

MS. SMITH: Because we can’t post every kind of document up there.

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

MS. SMITH: That’s the problem.

MR. STRAUSS: Oh, you can’t post the Word document.

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

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

MS. SMITH: -- will it be secure?

MR. STRAUSS: No, it’s secure. It will be password protected.

MS. SMITH: What were you telling me some people can’t access whatever you use? You use something, Brownbox, Bigbox --
MR. STRAUSS: -- oh, no. What we were thinking of using Box.net, but that requires like invitations and --

MS. SMITH: -- okay.

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

MS. SMITH: All right.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay, thank you. So as I mentioned we will not be having a meeting in May, but you will be receiving correspondence from CI with the pairings for the grants once we have the peer review down.
and begin that process. And, obviously, reminders of the
meeting and the logistics of that. If anybody has any
trouble making a hotel reservation, the people who are
coming in overnight, please, let me know.

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

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

DR. GENEL: I see Diane, yes.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: I think I have
enough names now unless I get word back from the
legislators that they’re not comfortable with the people
we submitted. But, we have business people, an ethicist
from Trinity, and some scientists who I think are good and
not conflicted. And so we just need to move that along.
The other thing is that we need to get almost all of the
rest of the Committee reappointed in terms of expired and
need reappointing. So, Emily, tells me she has magical
powers up there that I don’t have.

MS. SMITH: Not really, but that’s okay.

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

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

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

DR. GENEL: Yes, right, because you can’t -

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: As Gerry and I
were talking before the meeting he came along four days
before our grant review one year when we had somebody
conflicted out and we didn’t have a quorum. So, it works. It can work.

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

Is there any other public comment?

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Absolutely.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

DR. GOLDHAMMER: So for instance, if I had an idea of what the cutoff was I would spend less time on...
that lower two thirds or half of grants. Is there a way
to do that or is that not going to be --

DR. WALLACK: -- can we agree to not --

unless as you said before, unless requested by a Committee
member, put on the table for consideration on the 11th
anything worse than 4.0.

DR. KRAUSE: Let me respond to Milt first.

I think it’s premature to figure out what that cutoff will
be before we know what the scores are. So, I think it’s a
good idea to have a cutoff and if we find out that 50
percent of the grants have a score higher than five then
five would be a great cutoff, or four or whatever. But I
think before we know the range and who ends the
distribution it might be hard to come up with that number.

David, what were you thinking?

DR. GOLDHAMMER: You're right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

DR. GENEL: I think you could do that if
you would say that for the large numbers, we know the
numbers, the large numbers are the seed grants and the
established investigators. If there are only five other
applications, as I recall, or something to begin with. If
one set an arbitrary limit that we will not seriously look
at the lower 50 percent in each category, and we can
decide that, then it’s independent of the scores.

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

   DR. GENEL: -- yeah.

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

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

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

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

   DR. KRAUSE: Yes.

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

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

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

   MS. SMITH: -- something like that.
DR. GENEL: To the next score.

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. SMITH: I don’t think it’s the place of
the Committee administrator, which is what CI is.

DR. KRAUSE: I understand.

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

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

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

DR. KRAUSE: Right.

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

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

DR. GENEL: -- will the scores be posted by that time?
MR. STRAUSS: We hope so. We have reconciliation statements that we might have to do. So, we’ll know pretty clear on Monday April 30th where we stand in terms of whether we’re going to need to wait for somebody or whether we have everything in. But we hope by the end of that week or the following Monday, May 6th, that we would be done.

DR. GENEL: The worst possible scenario we can’t --

MR. STRAUSS: -- so that’s pretty good, I think.

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

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

DR. HART: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Why don’t we set something up in the first week of May, the beginning of the second week, maybe? I know I cut you guys short of review time. So the first is on a Tuesday. If we look to meet -- so, Rick, you think you’ll have scores by Tuesday?
MS. SMITH: Did you say the 6th?

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

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

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

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

DR. GENEL: There is plenty of time, that’s three weeks.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Okay.

DR. DEES: Can I make an alternative suggestion?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Absolutely.

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

DR. WALLACK: I would endorse what you’re -
- Rich, I think you make sense and I would endorse your idea.

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

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

   DR. DEES: To the next highest number.

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

   DR. DEES: (inaudible)

   DR. FISHBONE: You have to round up.

   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Yes.

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

   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Um, hmm.

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

   DR. GOLDBAMMER: (Inaudible)

   ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Richard and David having a discussion.

   DR. GENEL: David, Richard, do you think a 50 percent is too high? Would 40 percent be a better
number? I mean we're talking about 90 applications.

    ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: 85.

    DR. DEES: I mean I think 40 percent I’d be
    happy with too.

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

    DR. GENEL: 40 percent then.

    DR. WALLACK: So let’s do 40 percent.

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

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

    DR. GENEL: Yes.

    DR. WALLACK: Half point.

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

    DR. GENEL: Right.

    ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: We’re not just
    drawing a line and saying we’re not even going to look at
those because I think always we represented that all of the grants get a review by both the peer review and two members of the Advisory Committee. They may not be discussed by the entire Committee if they're above a certain score, but they do, at least get reviewed, and then there is a possibility they would be brought into the larger discussion.

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

DR. WALLACK: -- we’ll bring it in.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Great.

DR. FISHBONE: You mean above the line?

DR. WALLACK: Yes.

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

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

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Very good.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: Well, the legislation was proposed and passed the House. I don't know the Senate is in session today that would authorize Connecticut to enter into an interstate compact with another state, another country in order to do collaborative funding. So, once we do that I think California will be very interested in signing such an agreement with us. We may be a little far down the road in terms of where their grants and where their interest in collaborative funding is, but I think it will certainly
result in their willingness to have their scientists come
to Connecticut and perhaps participate in our next retreat
and begin some dialogues face to face or at least over
video to bring the scientific programs that are together
in alignment and perhaps get us to be able to leverage our
money more. And they are interested in collaborating with
us.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: No, the
legislation is open.

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

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

DR. WALLACK: Right.

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

DR. WALLACK: Great.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON HORN: So, we’ll see you all and we’re going to start at 8:30 on June 11th. There will be breakfast served, Farmington Marriott.

DR. GENEL: 8:30?

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

Motion to adjourn.

ALL VOICES: Aye.

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

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