

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes – Regular Meeting
Tuesday, January 17, 2012

A regular meeting of the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee “Advisory Committee” was held on Tuesday, January 17, 2012, at the offices of Connecticut Innovations, 865 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut.

Call to Order: Noting the presence of a quorum, Marianne Horn called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. Members present: Treena Livingston Arinzeh, Ph.D. (by phone); Gerald Fishbone, M.D; Anne Hiskes, Ph.D. (by phone); Marianne Horn, J.D. representing Jewel Mullen, M.D., M.P.H., M.P.A; Myron Genel, M.D; David Goldhamer, Ph.D; Ronald Hart, Ph.D. (by phone); and Milton B. Wallack, D.D.S.

Advisory Committee Members Absent: Richard H. Dees, Ph.D.; Ann Kiessling, Ph.D. and Paul Pescatello, J.D., Ph.D.

Other Attendees: Isolde Bates (UCONN); Terri Clark (CASE), Sara Donofrio (CI); Emily Smith (CI); Rick Strauss (CASE); and Paula Wilson (Yale).

Opening Remarks:

Attorney Horn indicated that she has been appointed by Dr. Mullen to represent her for the meeting. Attorney Horn introduced Emily Smith and Sara Donofrio who will be handling the administration of the Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee on behalf of CI.

Approval of Minutes – November 2, 2011 Meeting

The Advisory Committee members were asked to consider the minutes from the November 2, 2011 meeting.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Wallack, seconded by Dr. Fishbone, the Advisory Committee members voted in favor of adopting the minutes from the November 2, 2011 meeting as presented. VOTE: 7-0-0 (Dr. Hiskes was not present for the vote).

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Receipt of 2006 Final Report:

The Advisory Committee members reviewed the 2006 final report for grant 06-SCB-08, Dr. Carmichael, Principal Investigator. Ms. Smith indicated that the report was reviewed by CI, and there is nothing unusual to mention. Attorney Horn stated that final reports are provided for informational purposes, and no action is required by the Advisory Committee.

Receipt of 2008 Final Report:

The Advisory Committee members discussed the 2008 final report for grant 08-SCB-Yale-013, Dr. Vaccarino, Principal Investigator. Ms. Smith stated that the report was reviewed by CI, and there is nothing unusual to report. Attorney Horn stated that one of the issues of concern raised in the past was with respect to the complexities of the lay summaries. She noted that because staffing at the Department of Public Health (“DPH”) has been significantly reduced, it may be difficult to post the lay summaries on the DPH Website with regularity. Attorney Horn was asked to find out how many hits are received on the DPH Website for the lay summaries.

Receipt of 2009 Final Reports:

The Advisory Committee received the 2009 final reports for grant 09-SCA-UCHC-16, Dr. Carmichael, Principal Investigator; grant 09-SCA-Yale-11 Dr. Massaro, Principal Investigator; and grant 09-SCA-Yale-45, Dr. Garcia-Castro, Principal Investigator. Ms. Smith indicated that there is nothing unusual to report with the grants.

Receipt of 2009 Six-Month Fiscal Reports:

The Advisory Committee received the six-month fiscal reports for the following grants:

- 09-SCB-Yale-21, Dr. Xu, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-Yale-14, Dr. Huang, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-Yale-06, Dr. Kocsis, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-Yale-27, Dr. Lu, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCA-Yale-35, Dr. Herold, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCD-UCHC-01, Dr. Xu, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-Yale-13, Dr. Sutton Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-UCHC-17, Dr. Srivastava, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-UCHC-01, Dr. Bayarsaihan, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-UCHC-09, Dr. Shapiro, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-UCHC-20, Dr. Lichtler, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCA-UCON-02, Dr. Wang, Principal Investigator

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Ms. Smith stated that the six-month fiscal reports have been reviewed and reconciled by both CI and DPH. Additional information has been requested for the following three reports because some of information was missing.

- 09-SCB-Yale-21, Dr. Xu, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCD-UCHC-01, Dr. Xu, Principal Investigator
- 09-SCB-UCHC-20, Dr. Lichtler, Principal Investigator

Ms. Smith indicated that the six-month reports have not yet been received from grant 09SCBUCON18, Dr. Rasmussen, Principal Investigator, and grant 09SCBWESL26, Dr. Naegele, principal investigator. CI will be contacting the universities to try to obtain the reports.

Carryover Request for Grant 08-SCB-UCHC-011, Dr. Zecevic:

Attorney Horn reminded the members who have conflicts of interest not to participate in any of the discussions or vote on the projects for which they have a conflict.

Ms. Smith reviewed the request for a carryover of funding for grant 08-SCB-UCHC-011, Dr. Zecevic, Principal Investigator. Attorney Horn noted that in the past, the Advisory Committee has considered whether these types of requests affect the goals of the grant. A question arose regarding the large amount being carried over. Isolde Bates from UCONN was asked to respond to the question. Ms. Bates clarified that the principal investigator is in the process of preparing the annual report, and the carryover after reassigning the technician will only be about \$5,000.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Fishbone, seconded by Dr. Wallack, the eligible Advisory Committee members voted in favor of authorizing the carryover of funding for grant 08-SCB-UCHC-011, Dr. Zecevic, Principal Investigator. VOTE: 6-0-1 (Dr. Goldhamer abstained from the vote, and Dr. Hiskes was not present for the vote).

Reallocation Request for Grant 08-SCB-UCHC-021 Rosenberg:

Ms. Smith discussed the request for a reallocation of funding for grant 08-SCB-UCHC-021, Dr. Rosenberg, Principal Investigator. She noted that the request has been reviewed by CI, and CI feels that the reallocation is acceptable.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Wallack, seconded by Dr. Fishbone, the eligible Advisory Committee members voted in favor of accepting the request for a reallocation of funding for grant 08-SCB-UCHC-021, Dr. Rosenberg, Principal Investigator. VOTE: 6-0-1 (Dr. Goldhamer abstained from the vote and Dr. Hiskes was not present for the vote).

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Receipt of Final Audit Reports from UCONN, UCHC and Yale:

Ms. Smith stated that the final audit reports have been received from UCONN, UCHC and Yale. She summarized that the auditors are satisfied that the universities are in compliance with the terms and conditions of the program. The reports are being provided to the Advisory Committee members for informational purposes, and no action is required by the Advisory Committee. Ms. Smith noted that an audit report has not yet been received from Wesleyan, and she will follow up on the issue.

The Advisory Committee members discussed the formats of the audit reports and asked if the universities could use the same format. The Advisory Committee members liked the format of the audit report received from UCONN, and the representatives from the universities in attendance at today's meeting were asked to relay this message to the appropriate staff.

Report on 2011 Bidders' Conference:

Dr. Wallack reported on the bidders' conference held at the Legislative Office Building on November 17, 2011. He indicated that the goals of the conference were achieved. Briefly, Dr. Wallack stated that the goals of the conference were to: 1) try to create a level playing field for everyone who wants to be involved in stem cell research, 2) try to provide guidelines for applicants to appropriately put together applications, 3) provide information on the obligations for grant recipients (i.e. reporting requirements) and 4) to provide information to the public and industry about entering the open process. Dr. Wallack indicated that the Advisory Committee wanted everyone to be aware of the open and transparent process. He acknowledged the excellent presentations made by Dr. Jewel, Dr. Goldhamer, Attorney Horn, Ms. Sarnecky and himself. It was noted that the presentations are on the DPH Website. A copy of Dr. Goldhamer's presentation will be included as an attachment to these minutes.

In response to a question about the National Institutes of Health ("NIH") funding, Dr. Goldhamer noted that overall NIH funding is being reduced, and grant funding is becoming extremely competitive and challenging for researchers.

Update on 2012 Grant Applications and Timeline for Review Process:

Ms. Smith provided an update on the 2012 grant applications. The deadline for receipt of responses to the Request for Proposals ("RFP") was Friday, January 13, 2012, at 4:30 p.m. CI received 87 applications, consisting of 2 core proposals, 2 disease directed proposals, 29 established investigator proposals, 1 group project proposal and

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

53 seed proposals. Ms. Smith provided an overview of the break down between the universities. She was asked to group the Yale proposals together rather than break them out between Yale University and the Yale School of Medicine. Attorney Horn indicated that DPH in conjunction with CI will go through the grant applications to determine the completeness of the application and whether there is something overtly wrong with the application.

A question arose as to whether there is a certain amount of funding available in this round of grant funding for induced pluripotent stem (“iPS”) cells. Attorney Horn noted that there is no specific amount for iPS. The Advisory Committee members discussed the funding of human embryonic stem cells (“hESC”) versus iPS. It was noted that the priority of the Connecticut Stem Cell Research program is to fund the best science regardless of whether iPS cells or hESC are used. A discussion ensued on the financial commitment to core facilities in Connecticut, and it was noted that future funding of core facilities needs to be discussed again before the next round of funding, especially in light of the reduction of federal funding and the need to sustain core facilities in Connecticut.

A discussion ensued on the language in the RFP which states that “A priority for the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Grants Program is to support research on hESC that is not currently eligible for federal funding.” It was noted that this language may not be necessary any longer and should be revisited before the next round of funding.

Peer Review Process:

Attorney Horn introduced Mr. Strauss and Ms. Clark from the Connecticut Academy of Science and Engineering (“CASE”), who will be assisting DPH and CI with organizing the peer review process for the grant applications for the 2012 round of funding. Mr. Strauss explained that preliminary discussions have been held about the peer review process. He reviewed the proposed timeline that will ultimately lead to consideration for grant funding by the Advisory Committee in June. Mr. Strauss indicated that the compliance review by CI and DPH will be completed by January 27, 2012, reviewer assignments will be made by February 8, 2012, proposals will be reviewed by the peer reviewers by April 4, 2012, reconciliations of scores and reviews will occur between April 4, 2012 and April 11, 2012, section reviews will occur between April 16, 2012 and April 20, 2012, and the final results will be provided to DPH and CI by April 27, 2012.

Mr. Strauss talked about the selection of 15 peer reviewers, which is an increase of 5 from last year’s 10 reviewers. He mentioned that 8 of the 10 reviewers from the 2011 grant funding round would like to continue on as peer reviewers. In order to provide more support for the peer review chairperson, four co-chairs will be added. Mr. Strauss explained the process for soliciting and recommending 7 additional members for a total of 15 members for approval by the Commissioner Mullen. In response to a question, Mr.

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Strauss indicated that the chairperson of the peer review committee will assist with assuring that there is an appropriate range of expertise on the peer review committee.

Mr. Strauss explained the process for reviewing the applications, noting that there will be a primary and secondary reviewer for each of the applications. The applications will be divided equally among the co-chairs, who will oversee the review of his/her respective proposals. Mr. Strauss discussed the process for reconciling scores for proposals where there is a significant difference in the scores between the primary and secondary reviewers. He briefly reviewed the forms that will be used by the peer reviewers during the process. The Advisory Committee members suggested that different types of grants be spread as broadly as possible among the reviewers. It was noted that the goal of the process is to be thorough, transparent and fair. The Advisory Committee members thanked Mr. Strauss for explaining in detail the comprehensive process. Mr. Strauss asked the Advisory Committee members to provide the results of the grant review meeting to the peer review committee. He indicated that he will provide periodic updates to the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee members will be polled to determine the best dates in June to schedule the grant review meeting. The suggested dates were Monday, June 11, 2012, and Tuesday, June 12, 2012. If possible, the grant review meeting will be held at the Farmington Marriott.

Update on California Collaborative Funding Initiative:

Attorney Horn provided an update on the proposed California collaborative funding initiative. Attorney Horn and Dr. Pescatello have been working with the attorney general's office to determine the appropriate documentation needed to collaborate with California. Efforts are also being made to move forward with legislation authorizing collaborative efforts with other states and countries. A suggestion was made to also look into collaborative efforts with Maryland.

Public Comment:

Mr. Strauss questioned whether the November Bidders' Conference was recorded by CT-N. Attorney Horn responded that the conference was not videotaped, but the verbatim transcript is available on the DPH Website.

Next Meeting Date:

The regularly scheduled February 21, 2012 meeting will be canceled. The next meeting date will be determined based on the need for discussion and/or action by the Advisory Committee.

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Adjournment

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Fishbone, seconded by Dr. Pescatello, the Advisory Committee members voted unanimously in favor of adjourning the meeting at 2:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Dr. Jewel Mullen, Chair

[Attachment: Dr. Goldhamer's November 17, 2011 Presentation](#)

Formatted: Font: Arial