



## **Regenerative Medicine Minnesota Board Meeting**

**January 20, 2016 | 400 S 4<sup>th</sup> St #416, Minneapolis, MN 55455**

*Board members attending: Margaret Anderson Kelliher, Roberta King, Jakub Tolar*

*Absent: Andre Terzic*

*Guests: Michael Pfenning, Ronald Dixon, Nancy Morgan*

At 8:07 AM, the meeting was called to order.

The research proposals received (81) were described. Roughly same number of grants, but different types of submissions based on restructuring that came from the Board.

Change in the review system. Went from field-based to type of science-based with stages along the pipeline. Basis science: can't treat what we can't understand (Discovery Science new knowledge relevant to human biology); Translational Research – steps toward clinical trial; Clinical Trial, actually treating patients with regenerative medicine.

11 reviewers from US, 4 international. Three or more reviewers per proposal. Reviewers were polled to ascertain no conflict of interest, required to maintain the absolute confidentiality of ideas, and advised to prioritize the quality of the science.

Board discussion of additional ideas and improvements as follows:

What has risen to the top due to the review? Is there cross-pollinating? Is the RMM connecting people?

RMM is the catalyst as MP said. Helping connectivity across the silos. Eventually they will be together in one place (annual meeting) and have further discussion and see the connections.

The annual meeting should be intentional in creating the cross conversations. The learning curve from last year is good. Good that we have been flexible with the process. Formalize the gathering.

Invite all awardees: last year's will present data, this year's will receive award. Showcase of accomplishment.

Ability to adapt needs to be the motif of this project. We have the means to restructure. Note that younger investigators are underrepresented. Need to capture these younger investigators. Next meeting will address the way to define this by age, title, etc. Proportional impact less on these established investigators, the money can be a significant catalyst on an early-stage investigator. Suggest not using

age for criteria, but the length of time since they graduated from medical school or PhD, within 12 years of last degree. This would provide encouragement for young PIs.

Have the meeting in June (after legislature is out of session). Build the stories and the outcomes, show the progress.

What part of the meeting is for researchers and what is for legislators? Two goals: researchers to talk to each other (scale and in-depth); policy-maker side – invite to entire thing, part vision, part progress. Could have stations/poster session, first person talks, reception. For example, research focus, 2-3 PM; then public side, reception and be done by 6:00 PM.

Meeting should alternate locations between UMN and Mayo. The Board agreed that this is a good idea.

It was moved to accept the recommendation of the reviewers and award grants to the three highest-scored grants in each category (9 grants total). The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

The business of the meeting being completed, the meeting adjourned at 9:08 AM.