

Minnesota Regenerative Medicine Board Meeting

March 19, 2015, 7:00 AM – 8:00 AM, Conference Call

Attending:

Board:

Margaret Anderson Kelliher

Roberta King

Ven Manda

André Terzic

Jakub Tolar

Guests:

Nancy Morgan

Mike Pfenning

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 AM with all members and two guests in attendance.

The response to the RFPs and the review process were described. It was noted that, although the RFPs had been for individual scholars, there was an enthusiastic response for education programs. It was suggested that, although the RFPs listed a grant period of two years, the response had been different than expected and all proposals be funded for one year, with the opportunity to demonstrate progress and apply for the second year. This would have the benefits of spreading the funding farther, as well as keeping the focus on the RMM's goals. The members of the Board were polled and agreed to award one year of funding at this time.

Criteria for the Biotechnology/Biobusiness proposals were read. Funding was available for 7 grants of \$100,000 each. There were 12 proposals submitted, with 6 proposals receiving excellent scores and 2 additional strong proposals that tied for the seventh place. The question was asked whether to fund one of the seventh place proposals at 100% or to fund both of them at \$55,000 each (there being some additional funds available due to some requesters asking for less than the full \$100,000). It was the consensus that both proposals had equal potential. The members of the Board were polled and unanimously agreed to fund both of the seventh-place proposals at \$55,000, and the first six proposals for their requested amounts.

Next the review criteria were read for the Grades 3-12 programs. It was noted that of eight proposals submitted, there were five outstanding proposals, each for \$10,000. The Board was polled and unanimously agreed to fund these five proposals at \$10,000.

There were seven proposals submitted in the Undergraduate Program category; three programs had received excellent rankings. The proposals ranged from two to four years in length. It was proposed that

they each receive one year of funding at their requested rate. The concern was raised that continuity was important to programs to maximize impact on students. It was noted that one year of funding would encourage the awardees to possibly seek other sources of funding. There was a brief discussion, and the Board unanimously agreed to fund the top three proposals for the equivalent of one year of their request.

Eight proposals were submitted for Undergraduate Scholarships, of these, two were standout. It was recommended that they be funded for \$10,000 each. The Board was polled and unanimously agreed to fund these two proposals.

At the Graduate Scholarship level, there were 17 proposals submitted, 3 of which tied for the highest ranking. It was proposed that these three be funded at \$45,000. It was noted that the fourth-ranked proposal received very high marks from three reviewers, but a very low mark from the fourth. There was a brief discussion about how to address this kind of score with a significant discrepancy. The consensus was that it was most straightforward to accept the rankings as is. The Board was polled and unanimously agreed to fund three proposals at \$45,000.

Fourteen Post-Doctoral proposals were submitted. Of these, three tied with the highest score. The Board was polled and unanimously agreed to fund three proposals at \$75,000.

There was one proposal received in the Patient Care category, from Mayo Clinic, to fund a regenerative medicine patient education video. The Board was polled and agreed to fund this proposal at \$25,000.

VM asked if other schools in the state were represented in the education categories besides the University of Minnesota. JT noted that most scholars were from Mayo Clinic and the University of Minnesota. The level of competition was high, therefore these awards would be expected to cluster at the locations with the greatest resources. VM requested that in the next round of proposals, there be more emphasis on the undergraduate scholars. JT agreed that additional outreach around the state would be done.

The issue of renaming Minnesota Regenerative Medicine was brought forth. It was asked if there were any naming constraints given in the bill. It was noted that there were not. The suggested names were put before the Board, and it was unanimously decided to change the name to Regenerative Medicine Minnesota (RMM). The Board recommended getting design assistance in creating a logo.

It was moved that the Board vote to accept the funding proposal as described and the new name. The motion was seconded, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the proposal and name.

The business of the meeting have been accomplished, the meeting was adjourned at 7:42 AM.