MINUTES OF THE MARYLAND STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMISSION

Monday, May 1, 2023 TEDCO, 7021 Columbia Gateway Drive, Columbia, MD 21046 Columbia, MD

Members:

Scott Bailey, Co-Vice Chair Rachel Brewster, Co-Vice Chair Margaret Conn Himelfarb Diane Hoffmann, Chair Debra Mathews David Mosser Linda Powers Avram Reisner Ira Schwartz Curt Van Tassell

Staff:

Ruchika Nijhara, MSCRF Ben Antebi, MSCRF Sabrina Spinner, MSCRF

The Commission meeting was called to order at 9:13 a.m.

I. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Commission reviewed the meeting minutes from the April 11, 2023, Commission meeting. A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Statement for Closing the Meeting

A motion was made and seconded that the Commission go into closed session. The motion stated the following:

STATUTORY AUTHORITY TO CLOSE SESSION

General Provisions Article §3-103(a)(1)(i):

This subtitle does not apply to ... a public body when it is carrying out ... an administrative function.

General Provisions Article §3-108(a)(5):

A public body may meet in closed session ... to consider the investment of public funds.

General Provisions Article §3-108(a)(13):

A public body may meet in closed session ... to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory, or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter.

TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED:

The discussion will concern the implementation of the Commission's previously adopted criteria for grant funding. The Commission will discuss which applications to fund, given the scientific rankings

and other relevant factors. The discussion will likely also relate to the characteristics of specific applications.

REASONS FOR CLOSING:

Paralleling the NIH process for considering funding of grant applications (as contemplated by its enabling legislation), the Commission believes that confidentiality is essential to protect the sensitive information about plans and processes that applicants divulge, to avoid a chilling effect on future submissions, and to enable the most candid Commission discussion of how best to invest limited resources.

The motion passed unanimously. The Commission went into a closed session at 9:18 a.m. In the closed session, the Commission reviewed the scientific peer review ranking of, and key information about, the applications recommended for funding in five of the seven current categories of grant funding (Manufacturing Assistance, Launch, Discovery, Commercialization, and Post-Doctoral Fellowship Applications). All applicant names and affiliated institutions had been redacted. The Commission considered all applications but gave priority to applications that received competitive, meritorious scientific scores and included collaborations, regenerative medicine, translational research, and underfunded areas of research.

RFA Type	Recommended Awards	<u>Total</u>
Manufacturing Assistance	4	\$3,866,550
Launch	6 + 1*	\$2,098,743
Discovery	18 + 1*	\$6,206,748
Post-Doctoral Fellowship	9 + 2*	\$1,170,000
Commercialization	2	\$773,657
Total	39 Awards	<u>\$14,115,698</u>

^{*}Additional applications that are recommended if an award is declined. These applicants will not be notified of their "waiting list" status.

III. Opening the Meeting

A motion was made and seconded that the Commission return to open session to discuss the next steps surrounding a duplicate postdoctoral grant application.

The motion passed unanimously. The Commission went back into open session at 3:58 pm.

During the open session, the duplicate post-doctoral application was discussed. The decision was made to send a letter to the Office of Research Integrity letting them know about the potential research misconduct, and with a request to be notified of the outcome of their investigation.

To avoid issues like duplicate applications in the future, the Commission agreed that it would be best going forward to include a checkbox in the applicant portal whereby the applicant certifies that they have adhered to the research integrity policy like that of the NIH.

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 pm.

MARYLAND STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMISSION

STATEMENT FOR CLOSING A MEETING

Location: 7021 Columbia Gateway Drive,

Columbia, MD 21046

Date: May 1, 2023 Time: ____ am

Motion By: Ira Schwartz

Seconded By: Debra Mathens

Vote to Close Session:

	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Armanios	[],	[]	[]	M
Bailey	ĬΫ/	įί	Ϊĺ	ii
Brewster	N/	Ϊĺ	Ϊĺ	ii
Hoffmann	įv/	ÌÌ	ĬĬ	įį
Himelfarb	iv/	ĨĨ	ĬĬ	Ϊĺ
Mathews	ij//	ĬĬ	Ĭĺ	ĬĬ
Mosser	[4]	Ĺĺ	ĨĨ	
Nsiah	[]/	ĹĴ	Ĺĺ	M
Powers	[4]/	ĹĴ	ΪĨ	
Reisner	M	ΪÌ	ĨĨ	
Schwartz	M/	Ĺĺ	Ϊĺ	ĬĬ
Van Tassell	[4]	[]	ĨÌ	

STATUTORY AUTHORITY TO CLOSE SESSION

General Provisions Article §3-108(a)(5):

A public body may meet in closed session ... to consider the investment of public funds.

General Provisions Article §3-108(a)(13):

A public body may meet in closed session ... to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory, or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter.

TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED:

The discussion will concern the implementation of the Commission's previously adopted criteria for grant funding. The Commission will discuss which applications to fund, given the scientific rankings and other relevant factors. The discussion will likely also relate to the characteristics of specific applications.

REASONS FOR CLOSING:

Paralleling the NIH process for considering funding of grant applications (as contemplated by its enabling legislation), the Commission believes that confidentiality is essential to protect the sensitive information about plans and processes that applicants divulge, to avoid a chilling effect on future submissions, and to enable the most candid Commission discussion of how best to invest limited resources.

Diane Hoffmann MSCRC Chair