

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

BEFORE THE
EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: NOVEMBER 13, 2018
4 P.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR 7152

FILE NO.: 2018-16

I N D E X

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | PAGE NO. |
|---|----------|
| OPEN SESSION | |
| 1. CALL TO ORDER. | 3 |
| 2. ROLL CALL. | 3 |
| 3. CONSIDERATION OF CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR EVALUATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND CEO OF CIRM | 4 |
| CLOSED SESSION | NONE |
| 4. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEMS "4" AND "5" ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)). | |
| 5. PUBLIC COMMENT. | NONE |
| 6. ADJOURNMENT. | 41 |

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NOVEMBER 13, 2018; 4 P.M.

CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: SO I'D LIKE TO CALL THIS MEETING OF THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TO ORDER. MARIA, IF YOU COULD PROCEED WITH ROLL CALL PLEASE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.

DR. DEAS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.

DR. GASSON: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.

CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: SHERRY LANSING. JEFF SHEEHY.

MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

MR. TORRES: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

DR. VUORI: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: THANKS, EVERYBODY.

SO THE PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING IS TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DISCUSS THE PROCESS AND PROCEDURE BY WHICH WE'RE
2 GOING TO DO DR. MILLAN'S ANNUAL REVIEW AS PRESIDENT
3 OF CIRM. AND JUDY GASSON AND I SERVE AS CO-CHAIRMEN
4 OF THIS PARTICULAR COMMITTEE.

5 WHAT WE WANT TO DO, MORE SPECIFICALLY, AND
6 OBVIOUSLY OTHER ISSUES OR CONCERNS OR QUESTIONS THE
7 REST OF YOU HAVE PLEASE BRING THEM UP DURING THE
8 MEETING, BUT IN PARTICULAR IS TO DISCUSS THE
9 APPROACH THAT WE'RE GOING TO USE IN TERMS OF A
10 PARTICULAR FORMAT THAT WAS PROVIDED TO YOU. IT'S ON
11 THE WEBSITE AND WAS PROVIDED TO YOU IN ADVANCE IN
12 THE FORM OF WHAT I CALL WORKSHEETS THAT ARE TO BE
13 COMPLETED. THERE'S ONE SET OF WORKSHEETS TO BE
14 COMPLETED BY MEMBERS OF THE ICOC TO ADDRESS MARIA'S
15 PERFORMANCE IN HER ROLE AS PRESIDENT OF THE COMPANY
16 REPORTING ULTIMATELY TO THE BOARD.

17 AND THEN THE OTHER WORKSHEET REVOLVES
18 AROUND HER ROLE AS A MANAGER OF HER DIRECT REPORTS.
19 SO THERE'RE REALLY TWO DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE
20 EVALUATIONS THAT WOULD BE DONE FOR THOSE TWO
21 DIFFERENT ROLES THAT SHE SERVES AS PRESIDENT OF
22 CIRM.

23 AND SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO DURING THE
24 COURSE OF THIS IS JUST TAKE A LOOK AT THOSE TWO
25 FORMS THAT HAVE BEEN PROVIDED TO YOU, GET YOUR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FEEDBACK, RECOMMENDATIONS, THOUGHTS, ETC., SO WE CAN
2 MAKE ANY MODIFICATIONS THAT SEEM APPROPRIATE AND
3 THEN FINALIZE THESE SO THEY CAN BE SENT OUT AT THE
4 BEGINNING OF NEXT WEEK AND GIVE PEOPLE ABOUT TWO
5 WEEKS TO COMPLETE THEM.

6 LET ME JUST TALK ABOUT THE PROCESS GOING
7 FORWARD AND THEN WE CAN TURN BACK TO THESE. THE
8 IDEA IS WE WOULD GIVE BOTH MEMBERS OF THE ICOC AS
9 WELL AS HER DIRECT REPORTS ABOUT A TWO-WEEK PERIOD
10 TO COMPLETE THE REVIEWS AND RETURN THEM. THEY WOULD
11 GO TO JAMES HARRISON. I'M SURE YOU ALL REMEMBER HIM
12 FONDLY. JAMES, ARE YOU ON THE CALL?

13 MR. HARRISON: I AM, STEVE.

14 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: GREAT. WELCOME,
15 JAMES. IT'S NICE TO HEAR YOUR VOICE.

16 MR. HARRISON: THANK YOU.

17 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: JAMES, THEN, WOULD
18 COLLECT THESE. HE WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR
19 INTEGRATING ALL THE COMMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE, ALL
20 THE CRITIQUING THAT THEY'VE DONE, AND THEN
21 ULTIMATELY INVOLVED IN THE PRESENTATION OF THESE
22 RESULTS TO THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE AND TO THE
23 MEMBERS OF THE ICOC AT OUR MEETING IN DECEMBER.

24 SO JAMES WAS IN THIS ROLE ONCE BEFORE WHEN
25 WE CONDUCTED AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF ALAN TROUNSON. FOR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THOSE OF YOU THAT WERE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC AT THE
2 TIME LIKELY REMEMBER THAT. SO WE'RE USING A
3 SIMILAR, VERY SIMILAR PROCESS TO THE ONE WE USED
4 LAST TIME.

5 THE MAIN DIFFERENCE IS, AT LEAST SO FAR,
6 IS THE FORM OF THE TWO DIFFERENT WORKSHEETS WHICH
7 HAVE BEEN MODIFIED A BIT. AND I'VE BEEN THE ONE TO
8 TAKE THE LABORING CORE ON THIS. SO IF THERE ARE ANY
9 CONCERNS PEOPLE HAVE, I'M VERY WILLING TO MAKE
10 THOSE.

11 MY CHANGES REALLY REFLECT MY EXPERIENCE
12 WITH PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS IN THE YEARS THAT I WAS
13 AT GENENTECH AND HAD THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
14 REPORT TO ME. AND SO THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE
15 EVALUATION IS OBVIOUSLY A VERY IMPORTANT PART OF
16 WHAT WE DID EVERY YEAR, AND SO THIS SORT OF REFLECTS
17 SOME OF WHAT I LEARNED THROUGH THOSE PROCESSES AT
18 THAT TIME.

19 IN ANY EVENT, AT THE END OF THE DISCUSSION
20 OF THE FORMS AND ANY CONCERNS, CHANGES, ETC., I
21 WOULD LIKE TO GO TO A CLOSED SESSION TO UPDATE YOU
22 ON CONVERSATIONS THAT I'VE HAD WITH DR. MILLAN ABOUT
23 THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS AND TO LET YOU
24 KNOW WHAT WE HAVE DISCUSSED IN THAT REGARD.

25 SO THERE'S BEEN -- THERE'S AN E-MAIL WITH

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 A SEPARATE PHONE NUMBER TO CALL INTO TO BE ABLE TO
2 HAVE THAT DISCUSSION WITH ONLY THE MEMBERS OF THE
3 EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE INVOLVED.

4 I SHOULD ASK AT THIS TIME ARE THERE ANY
5 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AT ANY OF THE VARIOUS SITES
6 THAT ARE ON BOARD HERE?

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: NONE HERE IN OAKLAND,
8 STEVE.

9 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: SOUNDS LIKE WE DON'T
10 HAVE ANY AT ANY OF THE SITES. NONETHELESS, WE USE
11 THE SECOND LINE FOR MY RECOUNTING OF POSITIVE
12 DISCUSSIONS WITH DR. MILLAN.

13 SO LET ME JUST PAUSE THERE AND ASK IF
14 ANYBODY HAS ANYTHING THEY WANT TO RAISE BEFORE WE
15 KIND OF DIVE INTO SOME OF THE SPECIFICS ON THE TWO
16 DIFFERENT FORMS THAT WERE PROVIDED TO YOU BEFORE THE
17 BEGINNING OF THIS MEETING. ANY BIG-PICTURE ITEMS
18 FROM ANYBODY?

19 DR. VUORI: QUICK QUESTION. DO I
20 UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY THAT THIS IS ANNUAL PERFORMANCE
21 REVIEW NOT SECURED BY ANYTHING ELSE IN PARTICULAR,
22 AND THEN SORT OF A CLARIFICATION THAT YOU MENTIONED
23 ALAN'S REVIEW IN THE PAST. HAVE WE NOT HAD
24 PRESIDENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW SINCE ALAN WAS ON
25 BOARD?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LET ME TAKE THAT ONE.
2 YOU MAY REMEMBER WE HAD ALAN'S REVIEWS, THEN WE
3 HAD -- RANDY PREFERRED A BIT OF A DIFFERENT
4 TECHNIQUE WHERE HE ACTUALLY CAME TO THE BOARD
5 MEETINGS, AND WE HAD TWO CLOSED-SESSION DISCUSSIONS
6 WITH HIM EVALUATING WHAT HE DID AND COMMENTING ON IT
7 DURING THOSE MEETINGS. SO IT WAS A LITTLE BIT OF A
8 DIFFERENT FORM, AND WE THOUGHT THAT WE'D GET BACK,
9 NOW THAT MARIA HAS BEEN HERE FOR A LITTLE OVER A
10 YEAR, WE'D GET BACK TO THE MORE TRADITIONAL WAY OF
11 DOING IT, WHICH IS WHAT WE'VE PUT IN PLACE HERE.

12 DR. VUORI: THANKS.

13 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: AND YOU HAVE A
14 COMMENT, J.T., APART FROM THAT?

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JUST A VERY BRIEF
16 SUGGESTION, STEVE. I KNOW THAT ONE OF THE THINGS
17 MARIA HAS BEEN VERY FOCUSED ON IS SORT OF MAXIMIZING
18 ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH, IF YOU WILL. SO I THINK --
19 WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT'S BEST EVALUATED BY MEMBERS
20 OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM IN THEIR PARTICULAR
21 QUESTIONNAIRE. SO I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE THAT POINT
22 COVERED FOR MARIA'S BENEFIT. WE OUGHT TO ADD
23 ANOTHER SECTION, WE CAN WORK ON THE LANGUAGE, WON'T
24 BE VERY INVOLVED, ON THE TOPIC OF ORGANIZATIONAL
25 HEALTH AND HOW SHE'S DONE IN PROMOTING THAT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. GASSON: THAT'S A GOOD IDEA.

2 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: JUST SO AT LEAST I'M
3 CLEAR ABOUT WHAT SPECIFICALLY YOU'RE REFERRING TO,
4 CAN YOU BE A LITTLE BIT MORE EXPLICIT ABOUT THE
5 WORDS "ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH" AND WHAT THOSE
6 ENCOMPASS?

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IT WOULD REFERENCE HOW
8 THE TEAMS WORK TOGETHER, HOW SORT OF THE SENTIMENT
9 IS OF ALL TEAM MEMBERS HERE ABOUT HOW SHE'S
10 FOSTERING INTERNAL COOPERATION AND RAPPORT, AND ALL
11 THAT SORT OF THING, AND ACCOMPLISHMENT. AS I SAY,
12 WE'LL WORK TO FLESH OUT A LITTLE BIT MORE. WE'LL
13 GET SOME LANGUAGE WITH HER AS TO THE SPECIFIC
14 TOPICS, BUT SHE HAD MENTIONED GENERALLY THAT AS AN
15 OVERVIEW TOPIC SHE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE COVERED.

16 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OKAY. GREAT. I
17 THINK THAT'S WONDERFUL. I APPRECIATE A LITTLE BIT
18 WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT. WE SHOULD DEFINITELY ADD
19 THAT. IF WE CAN GET PUT THAT TOGETHER ON THAT FRONT
20 VERY SOON HERE, THAT WOULD BE EXTREMELY HELPFUL.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YEAH.

22 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: ARE THERE ANY OTHER
23 QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, CONCERNS, ETC., AGAIN BEFORE WE
24 KIND OF TURN TO THE DOCUMENTS THAT I'VE BEEN
25 REFERRING TO? IF NOT THEN, AS I SAID, THIS IS MEANT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TO BE DONE BY TWO DIFFERENT GROUPS. AND SO THE
2 FIRST ONE IS TO TURN TO THE FORM THAT'S GOING TO BE
3 SENT TO THE ICOC. I WOULD NOTE THAT IN THESE FORMS,
4 AND WE HAVEN'T PROVIDED THE LINK YET, BUT THAT
5 RESPONDERS WILL BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY EITHER TO
6 DO THIS IN WRITTEN FORM OR ABLE TO DO IT BY A SURVEY
7 MONKEY. SO THERE WILL BE THAT OPPORTUNITY TO DO IT
8 ONLINE AS OPPOSED TO DOING IT SITTING DOWN AND
9 CHECKING BOXES AND WRITING COMMENTS.

10 SO LET'S TURN TO THE ONE THAT DEALS WITH
11 THE ICOC. SO I'M JUST GOING TO OPEN IT UP FOR
12 COMMENTS GENERALLY BOTH AS TO THE WAY IT'S BEEN PUT
13 TOGETHER HERE BUT FORMATTED, SO TO SPEAK, AND ANY OF
14 THE SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTES THAT ARE LISTED, WHETHER YOU
15 THINK THEY'RE NOT NECESSARILY APPROPRIATE OR WHETHER
16 WE NEED TO FOCUS ON ADDITIONAL THINGS, AS J.T. JUST
17 HAS INDICATED WITH ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH, OR
18 ANYTHING ELSE THAT MIGHT HAVE STRUCK YOU AS YOU HAD
19 A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THIS.

20 DR. DEAS: HOPEFULLY I'M NOT TAKING US
21 KIND OF BACK TO WHAT WE'VE PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED, BUT
22 I WAS JUST THINKING THAT WITH BOTH OF THESE
23 EVALUATIONS, FOR INSTANCE, THE EVALUATION BY THE
24 DIRECT REPORTS, THE USEFULNESS AS WELL AS THE DIRECT
25 PURPOSE OF THE DIRECT REPORTS. AND WHAT I'M MEANING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BY THIS IS THAT WHEN I THINK ABOUT THE DIRECT
2 REPORTS DOING AN EVALUATION OF THEIR LEADER, I
3 USUALLY THINK ABOUT IT IN THE CONTEXT OF PERHAPS A
4 THREE SIXTY THAT OFFERS THE LEADER INFORMATION THAT
5 MIGHT BE ABLE TO ASSIST THE LEADER WITH LOOKING AT
6 THINGS, PERCEPTIONS, THAT HE OR SHE MAY NOT HAVE
7 BEEN AWARE OF. AND RATHER THAN THE DIRECT REPORTS
8 ACTUALLY EVALUATING THE LEADER ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, I
9 WOULD THINK THAT MAYBE THE DIRECT REPORTS MAY GIVE
10 INPUT, BUT NOT NECESSARILY -- I'VE NEVER BEEN IN A
11 SITUATION WHERE MY DIRECT REPORTS GOT TO BE A PART
12 OF MY ANNUAL EVALUATION.

13 AND SO I BRING THIS UP. I DON'T THINK
14 THAT MARIA WOULD HAVE ANY PROBLEMS; HOWEVER, I BRING
15 IT UP SO THAT WE MAY BE ABLE TO DISCUSS ON THE FRONT
16 END HOW WE WILL USE THE FEEDBACK FROM THE DIRECT
17 REPORTS VERSUS THE FEEDBACK FROM THE BOARD.

18 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: SURE. SO WHY DON'T
19 I RESPOND TO THAT? SO, AS I SAID, MARIA SERVES TWO
20 ROLES IN HER ROLE AS PRESIDENT. AND THE DIRECT
21 REPORT ROLE IS HER ROLE AS A MANAGER. SO SHE HAS A
22 MANAGEMENT STYLE THAT GOES WITH THE WAY SHE MANAGES
23 THAT IS IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND HOW IT'S WORKING
24 VIS-A-VIS THE PEOPLE THAT SHE MANAGES BECAUSE IF
25 SHE'S A GREAT MANAGER, WE NEED TO RECOGNIZE THAT;

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BUT IF SHE'S OTHER THAN A GREAT MANAGER, THEN THERE
2 ARE PERHAPS THINGS THAT NEED TO BE IMPROVED, AREAS
3 FOR IMPROVEMENT, WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT, IN OUR
4 ROLE AS THE ICOC, TO HAVE A PLAN FOR HER TO IMPROVE
5 THOSE SORTS OF THINGS, PARTICULARLY IF THEY'RE
6 IMPORTANT, AND TRY TO ASSURE THAT THAT HAPPENS IN
7 ORDER FOR AN ORGANIZATION TO RUN SMOOTHLY.

8 I DON'T WANT TO REPEAT KIND OF WHAT
9 HAPPENED WITH ALAN TROUNSON, BUT I THINK FOR US, THE
10 ICOC, TO GET A GOOD VIEW OF HOW SHE WORKS DIRECTLY
11 FROM THE PEOPLE WHO WORK FOR HER IS AN IMPORTANT
12 PART OF THIS WHOLE PROCESS FROM MY POINT OF VIEW.

13 DR. DEAS: I THINK IT'S AN IMPORTANT PART
14 OF THE PROCESS. HOWEVER, AT THE SAME TIME, FOR
15 INSTANCE, THERE ARE DIRECT REPORTS THAT A MANAGER
16 MIGHT BE STRATEGIC AND PRECISE AND FISCALLY
17 ACCOUNTABLE, AND YOU MAY HAVE A DIRECT REPORT THAT
18 FEELS THAT THAT IS JUST TOO HARD AND, THEREFORE,
19 THEY GIVE YOU SATISFACTORY. HOWEVER, THE PERSON
20 THAT MARIA IS REPORTING TO IN HER ROLE, WHEN SHE HAS
21 THOSE ONE-ON-ONE AND TALKS ABOUT WHAT SHE'S DOING IN
22 TERMS OF BRINGING ACCOUNTABILITY, THEY MAY FEEL
23 THAT, OH, SHE'S ON THE RIGHT TRACK AND SHE'S DOING
24 AN EXCELLENT JOB. AND THAT'S WHY I BROUGHT IT UP AS
25 TO HOW WE MIGHT USE IT AND HAVING THOSE DISCUSSIONS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PRIOR BEFORE GETTING THE RESULTS.

2 AND THEN, FOR INSTANCE, IF YOU GOT A
3 RESULT THAT ALL IS SATISFACTORY, IT MAY NOT MEAN
4 THAT SHE IS NOT -- HER EVALUATION IS NOT ABOVE
5 EXPECTATION BECAUSE SHE MAY BE ABOVE EXPECTATION TO
6 THE PERSON THAT SHE REPORTS TO.

7 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: COMMENTS FROM
8 ANYBODY ELSE?

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DEBORAH, I APPRECIATE
10 THAT PERSPECTIVE. I AGREE WITH STEVE HERE. I THINK
11 IT'S APPROPRIATE. THE LEADERSHIP TEAM WORKS
12 EXTREMELY CLOSELY WITH MARIA. THEY MEET ON A WEEKLY
13 BASIS. THEY HAVE RETREATS TOGETHER. THEY'RE VERY
14 CLOSELY TIED. AND I THINK TO PROPERLY INFORM THE
15 EVALUATION, THAT IT WOULD BE THE RIGHT THING TO DO,
16 TO HAVE THEM PUT IN THEIR QUESTIONNAIRE AS WELL.

17 DR. VUORI: I AGREE THAT IT'S VERY
18 IMPORTANT TO GET THEIR FEEDBACK ON HOW THINGS ARE
19 WORKING AT CIRM WITH MARIA AS THE LEADER AND TEAM
20 LEVEL. I'M JUST A LITTLE BIT HESITANT IN USING THE
21 WORD OF "ANNUAL REVIEW." YOU KNOW, THESE PEOPLE DID
22 NOT SELECT THEIR BOSS, NOR WOULD WE EVER ASK THEM TO
23 DO THAT. AND I DON'T THINK IT'S COMMON, AT LEAST
24 I'VE NEVER RUN INTO A SITUATION WHERE DIRECT REPORTS
25 ARE ASKED TO PERFORM A PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THEIR SUPERIOR PERSON.

2 SO I DO AGREE THAT IT'S GREAT TO SEEK THAT
3 IMPORTANT FEEDBACK, BUT I JUST PROBABLY WOULD NOT
4 CALL IT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. JUST MY OPINION.

5 DR. DEAS: THAT'S WHAT I WAS TRYING TO --
6 THAT WAS THE POINT I WAS TRYING TO RAISE.

7 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: I GUESS I COME FROM
8 A VERY DIFFERENT SCHOOL, AND THAT IS THE PUBLIC --
9 WELL, THE COMPANY WORLD. AND THIS IS ABSOLUTELY THE
10 THING THAT HAPPENS EVERY YEAR TO EVERYBODY IN AN
11 ORGANIZATION LIKE THE ONE THAT I WAS IN. AND ONE'S
12 REPORTS DO REVIEW THE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR MANAGER
13 IN THAT PERSON'S ROLE AS A MANAGER BECAUSE NOT ALL
14 MANAGERS TEND TO MAKE GREAT MANAGERS AND SOME NEED
15 TO IMPROVE IN AREAS IN ORDER FOR AN ORGANIZATION TO
16 RUN SMOOTHLY AND SUCCESSFULLY.

17 AND SO THE PERSON TO WHOM THAT PERSON
18 WHO'S BEING REVIEWED REPORTS, SO THE MANAGER OF THE
19 PERSON WHO'S BEING REVIEWED GETS TO SEE THESE
20 REPORTS. IT'S TO REVIEW THEM WITH THE PERSON --
21 REVIEWS SOME OF THE REPORTS WITH THE PERSON FOR WHOM
22 THE REPORTS WERE WRITTEN IN ORDER TO HAVE THAT
23 PERSON UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY'RE DOING WELL AND WHAT
24 THEY MAY NOT BE DOING SO WELL AND WHAT MIGHT BE
25 NEEDED FOR THEM TO IMPROVE IF THAT'S THE CASE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO THAT'S THE WORLD THAT I'M VERY FAMILIAR
2 WITH AND THAT I COME FROM, AND THAT'S ALSO KIND OF
3 HOW I THOUGHT ABOUT THIS AND FASHIONED IT. THIS
4 REALLY REFLECTS, I GUESS, THAT EXPERIENCE. IF WE
5 WANT TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT, THAT'S FINE, BUT I'M
6 NOT FAMILIAR WITH A DIFFERENT APPROACH AT THIS
7 POINT.

8 DR. DEAS: WELL, THE ONLY THING I WOULD
9 ADD TO THAT IS THAT WE ARE, BY VIRTUE OF OUR
10 FUNDING, A STATE ENTITY FROM THE STATE OF
11 CALIFORNIA. AND IF WE'RE GOING TO BASE IT BASED ON
12 EXPERIENCE, WE SHOULD THINK ABOUT HOW THE STATE
13 ENTITIES EVALUATE. AND FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, I DON'T
14 KNOW OF ANY STATE ENTITY THAT HAD THE DIRECT REPORTS
15 DO A PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND, THEREFORE -- WAS IT
16 JUDY WHO SPOKE? I CAN'T REMEMBER.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: IT WAS KRISTINA.

18 DR. DEAS: THEREFORE, WHAT KRISTINA SAID,
19 TO SIMPLIFY IT AND TO BRING IT IN LINE, LET'S NOT
20 CALL IT A PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REVIEW BEING DONE
21 BY DIRECT REPORTS. WE MIGHT CALL IT DIRECT REPORT
22 FEEDBACK OR SOMETHING ELSE BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO
23 GIVE THE DIRECT REPORTS THE IMPRESSION THAT THEY'RE
24 DOING A PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF THEIR LEADER. AND
25 I THINK THAT WOULD BE IN ALIGNMENT WITH HOW THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 STATE AGENCIES OPERATE WHEN IT COMES TO PERFORMANCE
2 EVALUATION.

3 DR. JUELSGAARD: JAMES, ARE YOU ON THE
4 PHONE?

5 MR. HARRISON: I AM, STEVE.

6 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: LET ME ASK YOU A
7 QUESTION BECAUSE I WANT TO GO BACK TO ALAN TROUNSON,
8 THE FORMER PRESIDENT, AND WE DID EVALUATIONS BACK
9 THEN. REMIND ME OF -- I GUESS I CAN PULL IT UP. I
10 THOUGHT WE'D HAVE IT IN THE FILES HERE. SO WE DID
11 THE SAME SORT OF THING WITH ALAN. WE HAD BOTH THE
12 ICOC REVIEWS, BUT WE HAD, I THINK, HIS STAFF REVIEWS
13 AS WELL; IS THAT RIGHT?

14 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT. THE BOARD
15 CONDUCTED TWO REVIEWS OF ALAN AND SOUGHT INPUT
16 OBVIOUSLY FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS AS WELL AS STAFF
17 MEMBERS AT CIRM AND EVEN STAKEHOLDERS. SO MEMBERS
18 OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, GRANTEES, AND IN THIS
19 FIRST REVIEW EVEN A COUPLE OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

20 TO BE CLEAR, THAT WAS INPUT THAT WAS
21 PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE WHICH ITSELF
22 CONDUCTED THE EVALUATION OF DR. TROUNSON.

23 DR. GASSON: I THINK THE INFORMATION IS
24 IMPORTANT, AND I THINK THAT IT WILL BE HELPFUL TO US
25 ON THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE TO HAVE THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INFORMATION. IF WE WANT TO CHANGE THE NAME TO
2 SOMETHING ELSE, I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT.
3 BUT I DO FEEL -- AND WE'VE HAD PREVIOUS
4 CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THIS, STEVE AND MARIA AND J.T.
5 AND I, AND I THINK IT'S AN IMPORTANT SOURCE OF
6 INFORMATION FOR US ON THE BOARD HOW SHE'S PERFORMING
7 AS A MANAGER.

8 ALSO, THESE PEOPLE WILL HAVE MUCH MORE
9 DETAILED KNOWLEDGE OF THE SORT OF DAY-TO-DAY
10 ACTIVITIES, WHICH WE ON THE BOARD AND EVEN ON THE
11 EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE DON'T NECESSARILY HAVE. SO
12 I'M IN FAVOR OF COLLECTING THE INFORMATION. WHAT WE
13 DO WITH IT AS A SUBCOMMITTEE, WE CAN DECIDE AS WE GO
14 FORWARD.

15 DR. DEAS: I THINK WE'RE ON THE SAME PAGE,
16 THAT IT'S IMPORTANT TO COLLECT THE INFORMATION, IT'S
17 IMPORTANT TO GET THE FEEDBACK FROM THE DIRECT
18 REPORTS, BUT WE'RE NOT ON THE SAME PAGE THAT THE
19 DIRECT REPORT IS DOING A PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
20 REVIEW. AND SO I THINK THAT'S WHERE THE HANG-UP IS.
21 THE DIRECT REPORTS, THEY'RE GIVING FEEDBACK JUST
22 LIKE THE GENTLEMAN WHO JUST SPOKE SAID, EVEN THE
23 PUBLIC AT LARGE, THEY GAVE FEEDBACK, BUT THEY DIDN'T
24 DO A PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REVIEW.

25 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: I'VE NOW MANAGED TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PULL UP ALAN'S REVIEW DONE -- THAT WAS COMPLETED BY
2 APRIL 15TH, 2013. AND SO THERE ARE TWO OF THEM, BUT
3 FOR THE WHAT I CALL DIRECT REPORTS, IT'S ENTITLED
4 "PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REVIEW PRESIDENT CIRM BY
5 CIRM STAFF." SO AT LEAST IN A PREVIOUS ITERATION OF
6 THIS WITH THE PRESIDENT AT THE TIME, WE DID CALL IT
7 A PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

8 I THINK -- I GUESS THE MOST IMPORTANT
9 THING IS GOING TO BE THE INFORMATION THAT THEY
10 PROVIDE. I REALLY -- FOR ME THIS IS ALL A BUNCH OF
11 SEMANTICS BECAUSE IF YOU ASK FOR THE SAME
12 INFORMATION, IT WINDS UP BEING LIKE WHEN THEY DO A
13 REVIEW. SO, DEBORAH, WHAT IS YOUR PREFERENCE AS
14 OPPOSED TO CALLING IT A PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
15 REVIEW? YOU WOULD JUST CALL IT PERFORMANCE
16 FEEDBACK? I'M NOT SURE.

17 DR. DEAS: YEAH. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
18 FEEDBACK OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. AND AS I WAS
19 SAYING TOO, I DON'T THINK MARIA WOULD HAVE ANY
20 PROBLEMS WITH HER DIRECT REPORTS OR ANYTHING; BUT
21 WHAT I'M LOOKING AT GOING FORWARD, LET'S JUST SAY
22 THAT THERE WAS A BIG PROBLEM. THEN WE HAVE ON OUR
23 HANDS THE PRESIDENT FEELING THAT WE SHOULD HAVE
24 NEVER ASKED DIRECT REPORTS TO DO A PERFORMANCE
25 EVALUATION REVIEW. AND THIS IS ATYPICAL IN A STATE

1 ORGANIZATION.

2 SO THAT'S WHAT I'M THINKING, THAT IT'S
3 UNLIKE WHAT WE WOULD DO; AND, THEREFORE, JUST CHANGE
4 THE NAME AND JUST SAY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SAY
5 FEEDBACK.

6 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE AN ISSUE
7 WITH THAT BECAUSE I DO FEEL THAT DIRECT REPORTS,
8 PATIENT ADVOCATES, OTHER GRANT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS
9 SHOULD HAVE A REVIEW OF MARIA'S PERFORMANCE, NOT
10 FEEDBACK. THAT SORT OF DIMINISHES THEIR OPINION. I
11 THINK, AS WE'VE DONE IN THE PAST, WHETHER IT WAS
12 ALAN OR A DIFFERENT ITERATION WITH RANDY, BUT ALL OF
13 THESE FOLKS OUGHT TO BE GIVEN EQUAL STATUS IN TERMS
14 OF THEIR OPINION SO THAT WE HAVE A VERY TRANSPARENT
15 PROCESS, THAT ULTIMATELY WE MAKE THE FINAL DECISION,
16 BUT WE TREAT THEIR INFORMATION AND THEIR OPINIONS
17 WITH DUE RESPECT.

18 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: WE'VE GOT ANOTHER
19 ISSUE THAT'S COME UP IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF
20 AUDIENCES TO WHOM THIS IS GOING TO BE DIRECTED, SO
21 WE NEED TO CIRCLE BACK TO THAT. SO WE GOT A BIT OF
22 A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION. I GUESS ONE WAY TO DEAL
23 WITH THIS IS JUST TO TAKE A QUICK VOTE ON THE TWO
24 WORDS "REVIEW VERSUS FEEDBACK" AND SEE WHERE WE COME
25 OUT. SO --

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. TORRES: WAIT A MINUTE. ON THAT
2 ISSUE, MR. CHAIRMAN, ARE YOU SAYING THAT IF WE VOTE
3 FOR FEEDBACK, THAT APPLIES TO BOARD MEMBERS AS WELL?

4 DR. DEAS: NO. NO.

5 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: NO. WE'RE JUST
6 TALKING ABOUT THAT RIGHT NOW FOR THE DIRECT REPORTS,
7 YES.

8 MR. TORRES: PATIENT ADVOCATES AND WORKING
9 GROUP REVIEW MEMBERS?

10 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: LET'S COME BACK TO
11 THAT BECAUSE RIGHT NOW THEY'RE NOT ON THE CALENDAR
12 FOR DOING A REVIEW. WE OUGHT TO HAVE A DISCUSSION
13 ABOUT THAT BECAUSE I THINK THERE'S, AT LEAST FOR ME,
14 A BIG QUESTION ABOUT THE NEED OR EVEN ADVISABILITY
15 OF THEIR REVIEW. BUT I'M GOING TO HAVE A MUCH
16 LARGER DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT ONCE WE GET THIS ISSUE
17 BEHIND US.

18 DR. VUORI: SO ONE WAY TO MAYBE THINK
19 ABOUT THIS -- YOU SAID IT WAS SORT OF SEMANTICS. IN
20 MY MIND THERE IS AN ENTITY THAT DETERMINES MARIA'S
21 ANNUAL COMPENSATION. IT CAN'T BE ALL THESE PEOPLE.
22 WE ARE NOT ALL VOTING, ALL HER DIRECT REPORTS,
23 PATIENT ADVOCATES, ETC., ETC. IT'S THE BOARD THAT
24 DETERMINES HER ANNUAL COMPENSATION. AND IN MY MIND
25 THAT IS THE ENTITY THAT ALSO REVIEWS HER PERFORMANCE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FULL STOP. THAT IS MY VIEWPOINT.

2 NOW, EVERYBODY ELSE, WE CAN CALL IT
3 REVIEW. I DON'T CARE WHAT IT IS, BUT MAYBE SORT OF
4 CLARIFY THAT DIRECT REPORTS REVIEW THE PERFORMANCE,
5 THEN IT'S FEEDBACK TO THE BOARD WHEN THEY ASSESS ON
6 HER COMPENSATION. SO THAT TO ME IS SORT OF THE
7 DISTINCTION WHAT I'M SORT OF SEMANTICALLY TRYING TO
8 COMMUNICATE, THAT IN MY MIND PERFORMANCE REVIEW IS
9 DONE BY A PERSON OR ENTITY THAT DETERMINES
10 SOMEBODY'S RAISE, COMPENSATION, ETC. THEY CAN SEEK
11 FEEDBACK, REVIEWS, OPINIONS, COMMENTS, WHATEVER THEY
12 WANT FROM WHOEVER THEY WANT TO HELP THEM IN THAT
13 ASSESSMENT, BUT THAT'S SORT OF A DISTINCTION THAT I
14 HAVE HERE FOR BOARD ASSESSMENT VERSUS EVERYBODY
15 ELSE'S.

16 DR. DEAS: I AGREE WITH YOU.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S TOTALLY FINE.
18 THIS ISN'T OBVIOUSLY, OF COURSE, ABOUT HER
19 COMPENSATION. THIS IS JUST ABOUT HER PERFORMANCE.
20 BUT I THINK KRISTINA'S POINT AND DEBORAH'S POINT ARE
21 WELL TAKEN. IT IS REALLY, JUST AS YOU SAID EARLIER,
22 A SEMANTIC THING HERE. I'M TOTALLY GOOD WITH
23 CALLING IT -- ANYTHING COMING FROM A SOURCE OTHER
24 THAN BOARD MEMBERS' FEEDBACK TO INFORM THE BOARD
25 MEMBERS' OPINION.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. DEAS: YES.

2 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: JEFF, DO YOU HAVE AN
3 OPINION ON THIS?

4 MR. SHEEHY: NO, I DON'T ACTUALLY.

5 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OKAY.

6 MR. SHEEHY: I DO TAKE YOUR POINT, THOUGH,
7 ABOUT HOW VALUABLE THAT INFORMATION WAS IN THE PAST.
8 SO I DO THINK THAT'S WHAT PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE
9 COGNIZANT OF.

10 DR. VUORI: MAYBE WE CAN CALL IT
11 ASSESSMENT, DIRECT REPORTS, THEIR PERFORMANCE
12 ASSESSMENT.

13 DR. DEAS: THAT'S A GOOD ONE.

14 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: YEAH. I'M FINE WITH
15 THAT. ART, ARE YOU OKAY WITH THAT?

16 MR. TORRES: SO IN TERMS OF KRISTINA IS
17 CHANGING THE WORDS TO ASSESSMENT AS OPPOSED TO
18 FEEDBACK FROM OPINION LEADERS AND DIRECT REPORTS?

19 DR. DEAS: YES.

20 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: ASSESSMENT FROM
21 DIRECT REPORTS, YEAH.

22 MR. TORRES: YEAH, THAT'S FINE.

23 I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE GIVE DUE
24 RESPECT TO THOSE PEOPLE THAT ARE IN THERE ON A
25 DAY-TO-DAY BASIS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. VUORI: AGREED.

2 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: JUDY, ARE YOU OKAY
3 WITH THAT?

4 DR. GASSON: TOTALLY.

5 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: SO WE'LL CHANGE
6 REVIEW TO ASSESSMENT AS FAR AS DIRECT REPORTS GOES.

7 NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT THE ISSUE THAT ART
8 RAISED BECAUSE I SORT OF NARROWED THE GROUPS TO
9 WHICH THIS IS AIMED TO THE DIRECT REPORTS AND THEN
10 TO THE ICOC ITSELF, BUT I'VE NOT ASKED FOR OTHER
11 OUTSIDERS TO PROVIDE ANY INPUT. AND ART'S
12 SUGGESTION, PATIENT ADVOCATES, ALTHOUGH I WOULD SAY
13 THAT WE HAVE TEN BOARD MEMBERS WHO REPRESENT THE
14 PATIENT ADVOCACY GROUPS ALREADY INVOLVED IN THIS
15 REVIEW PROCESS. AND I DON'T KNOW -- YOU MENTIONED
16 GWG MEMBERS OR SOMEBODY ELSE, ART. I FORGET.

17 MR. TORRES: WHAT HAPPENED WAS THAT JAMES
18 WENT OVER THE PEOPLE THAT WE PREVIOUSLY SOUGHT
19 INFORMATION FROM.

20 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: I KNOW THAT. I KNOW
21 THAT, BUT THAT WAS THEN AND THIS IS NOW. AND SO
22 WE'RE TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHAT'S GOING TO GIVE US
23 THE BEST INFORMATION FOR WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO
24 HERE. AND SO LET'S HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT
25 ORGANIZATIONS OF PEOPLE OTHER THAN THE TWO THAT ARE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALREADY ON THE TABLE, WHICH ARE THE ICOC AND DIRECT
2 REPORTS. ARE YOU SUGGESTING THAT THERE ARE OTHERS
3 THAT OUGHT TO WEIGH IN, AND WHO MIGHT THEY BE AND
4 WHY?

5 MR. TORRES: YOU ARE CORRECT. WE DO HAVE
6 PATIENT ADVOCATES ON THE BOARD, BUT THERE ARE OTHER
7 PATIENT ADVOCATES OUT THERE THAT ARE ADVOCATING
8 APART FROM OUR BOARD. THE REVIEWERS THAT COME IN TO
9 OUR OPERATION ARE A GOOD THERMOMETER, I THINK, TO
10 ASSESS FROM THEIR ASSESSMENTS AS TO HOW THEY FEEL
11 OUR PRESIDENT IS DOING. I THINK THE STAKEHOLDERS
12 THAT WE USED THE LAST TIME WERE APPROPRIATE. IF YOU
13 WANT TO REDUCE THE NATURE AND THE CHARACTERIZATION
14 AND NUMBER, THAT'S ANOTHER MATTER THAT I THINK
15 REQUIRES A LITTLE MORE DISCUSSION.

16 DR. GASSON: I WOULD PROPOSE THAT THE
17 BOARD AND THE DIRECT REPORTS DO AN ASSESSMENT OR
18 REVIEW ANNUALLY, AND THAT WE WOULD INVITE THESE
19 OTHER GROUPS WHO ARE IMPORTANT, BUT I DON'T KNOW
20 THAT WE WANT TO ASK THEM ANNUALLY TO WEIGH IN. SO
21 PERHAPS WE WOULD ASK THEM EVERY OTHER YEAR, EVERY
22 THREE YEARS, WHATEVER PEOPLE THOUGHT WAS APPROPRIATE
23 JUST TO KEEP THE PROCESS --

24 MR. TORRES: I'M FINE WITH THAT, JUDY.
25 I'M PERFECTLY FINE WITH THAT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. GASSON: OKAY.

2 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: WELL, THE OTHER
3 POSSIBILITY WOULD BE TO MAKE IT A LESS FORMAL PART
4 OF OUR PROCESS. AND THAT IS TO PUBLICIZE THROUGH
5 OUR WEBSITE THE FACT THAT WE'RE DOING AN ANNUAL
6 EVALUATION AND ASK THAT ANY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
7 WHO FEEL THAT THEY WANT TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK JUST
8 PROVIDE A WRITTEN LETTER WITH WHATEVER THEIR
9 FEEDBACK IS AS OPPOSED TO PROVIDING THEM WITH A FORM
10 THAT'S LAID OUT THE WAY THESE ARE AND MAKE IT A LOT
11 MORE INFORMAL. ANY THOUGHTS ON THAT?

12 MR. TORRES: I WOULD RESERVE MY COMMENTS
13 FOR THE EXECUTIVE SESSION.

14 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK IF WE DO WANT THAT
15 FEEDBACK, WE SHOULD ACTUALLY PROVIDE A STRUCTURE FOR
16 PEOPLE TO DO IT. IT'S JUST WE'RE NOT GOING TO GET
17 THE KINDS OF COMMENTS THAT WE MIGHT WANT. I'M
18 AGNOSTIC ON THE ISSUE. IT DEPENDS ON HOW WE
19 PERCEIVE THE PRESIDENT'S -- HOW WE WANT THE
20 PRESIDENT'S ROLE TO BE PERCEIVED IN THE LARGER
21 ENVIRONMENT, GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOLKS, PEOPLE FROM
22 ADVOCACY GROUPS AROUND THE STATE, OTHER SCIENTISTS.
23 DO WE WANT TO GET FEEDBACK ON HOW OUR LEADER IS
24 PERCEIVED BY THOSE GROUPS, TO ME, REALLY IS THE
25 QUESTION.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 LIKE I SAID, I'M AGNOSTIC, BUT I DON'T
2 THINK WE DID IT THE LAST TIME WITH ALAN, BUT I COULD
3 BE WRONG, BUT I KNOW THAT WE HAVE DONE IT IN THE
4 PAST. IT DOES GIVE YOU A SENSE OF THE TEMPERATURE
5 OF THE LARGER COMMUNITY, BUT TO WHAT DEGREE THOSE
6 STAKEHOLDERS ARE IMPORTANT IN THIS PROCESS AT THIS
7 POINT IN OUR HISTORY IS REALLY AN OPEN QUESTION.

8 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: A MUCH MORE
9 FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION, WHICH IS HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY
10 WHO YOU'RE GOING TO SEND THESE TO GIVEN THE GROUPS
11 YOU'VE JUST NAMED, JEFF? SO IF YOU HAVE GRANTS
12 WORKING GROUP, WE HAVE, WHAT, SOMETHING LIKE 350
13 PEOPLE THAT ARE MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
14 WOULD WE PICK A GROUP, A SUBSET OF THOSE? THE SAME
15 THING IS TRUE OF THE ADVOCACY COMMUNITY. APART FROM
16 OUR PATIENT ADVOCATES THAT ARE BOARD MEMBERS, HOW DO
17 WE KNOW WHO WE WOULD WANT TO SEND A FORM TO TO
18 PROVIDE FEEDBACK? THAT'S WHY I WAS SUGGESTING THE
19 MORE INFORMAL APPROACH BECAUSE THEN ANYBODY WHO
20 WANTED TO COULD SEND SOMETHING BACK. BUT I JUST
21 DON'T KNOW HOW YOU CAN FIGURE OUT WHO YOU'D PROVIDE
22 THOSE FORMS TO AND MAKE SURE YOU GOT THE RIGHT
23 PEOPLE IN AND NOT LEAVE PEOPLE OUT OUGHT TO HAVE A
24 ROLE AT THE TABLE TOO.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WITH RESPECT TO THE GWG,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE WAY IT'S BEEN RUNNING IN RECENT YEARS, THERE'S A
2 SMALL CORE GROUP THAT BASICALLY IS THERE, AND THIS
3 IS AT THE CLINICAL TRIAL GWG LEVEL, AND YOU HAVE
4 DIFFERENT GWG'S FOR EACH OF THE OTHER LEVELS, BUT
5 WITH RESPECT TO THE CLINICAL, A SMALL GROUP, AND I
6 WOULD SAY THAT THAT WOULD BE THE APPROPRIATE GROUP
7 TO SEEK RESPONSES FROM AS FAR AS THAT BODY. I THINK
8 WHEN YOU START GETTING INTO THE BASIC RESEARCH AND
9 THE TRAN REVIEWS, YOU HAVE A LARGER GROUP, AND THAT
10 GROUP SORT OF SHIFTS SOMEWHAT ACCORDING TO SUBJECT
11 MATTER, PARTICULAR APPLICATION CYCLES, ETC. THAT'S
12 A LITTLE TRICKIER. I THINK YOU COULD GET A GOOD
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLING OF GWG INPUT FROM THAT CORE
14 GROUP IN THE CLIN REVIEWS.

15 DR. JUELSGAARD: SINCE I DON'T GO TO GWG
16 MEETINGS, CAN YOU GIVE ME A LITTLE BIT OF A SENSE OF
17 THEIR INTERACTION WITH MARIA AT THESE MEETINGS?

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THERE REALLY IS NOT A
19 LOT. MARIA IS AT ALL THE MEETINGS, BUT SPECIFICALLY
20 THE GWG MEETINGS ARE DESIGNED, OTHER THAN WITH
21 PRESENTATIONS OR WHATEVER, THE TEAM REALLY DOES NOT,
22 OR ANSWERING QUESTIONS, THE TEAM DOES NOT REALLY
23 SPEAK A WHOLE LOT BECAUSE YOU DON'T WANT TO BIAS THE
24 DISCUSSION OF THE REVIEWERS BY HAVING ANYBODY AT ANY
25 LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT SAY ANYTHING. SO NOT A LOT OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INTERACTION IN THE MEETING ITSELF.

2 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: SO WHAT INFORMATION
3 WOULD WE HOPE TO GAIN -- I MEAN GIVEN THAT LEVEL OF
4 INTERACTION, WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION ABOUT MARIA
5 MIGHT WE HOPE TO GAIN BY ASKING CLINICAL TRIAL GWG
6 MEMBERS? I'M A LITTLE UNCERTAIN AT THIS POINT.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: NOT A LOT OTHER THAN
8 SORT OF INDIRECTLY BY HOW THE TEAM ITSELF HAS
9 PERFORMED IN GETTING ALL OF THE APPLICATIONS, ETC.
10 TO THE POINT WHERE THEY'RE READY FOR REVIEW AND THE
11 EFFICIENCY OF THAT AND THE PROFESSIONALISM OF THE
12 TEAM'S WORK LEADING UP TO THAT; BUT IN TERMS OF
13 SPECIFIC INTERACTION WITH MARIA HERSELF, NOT A LOT.

14 ART, DO YOU HAVE A DIFFERENT VIEW OF THAT?
15 YOU'RE IN ALL THE MEETINGS AND JEFF AS WELL.

16 MR. TORRES: I THINK THEY HAVE
17 INTERACTION, NOT NECESSARILY BACK AND FORTH AT THE
18 ACTUAL MEETING, BUT CLEARLY BEFORE AND AFTERWARDS.
19 I KNOW THERE'S BEEN INTERACTIONS AND CONVERSATIONS
20 THAT THEY MAY HAVE ON A NUMBER OF MATTERS NOT
21 RELATED TO POTENTIAL AWARDS THAT ARE GOING TO BE
22 CONSIDERED BY THE GROUP AS A WHOLE. AND I THINK THE
23 AMOUNT OF RESPECT THAT I SEE FROM MANY OF THEM
24 TOWARD MARIA IS INSPIRING IN TERMS OF THEIR
25 PARTICIPATION AND THEIR CONTINUED COMMITMENT TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PARTICIPATION AND, MOST IMPORTANTLY, THEIR
2 COMMITMENT TO OUR MISSION.

3 MR. SHEEHY: FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, I KIND
4 OF LUMP ALL THESE TOGETHER. THE QUESTION IS THE
5 ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT, WHICH HAS VARIED OVER THE
6 YEARS, TO WHAT DEGREE IS IT IMPORTANT FOR US TO
7 EVALUATE HOW EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS VIEW THE
8 PRESIDENT. DO WE CONSIDER THAT PART OF THE
9 PRESIDENT'S ROLE? THE GWG MEMBERS GIVE A SENSE OF
10 HOW THE PRESIDENT AND THE AGENCY IS GENERALLY HELD
11 WITHIN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY. OTHER STAKEHOLDERS
12 KIND OF TAKE THE TEMPERATURE ON HOW THE AGENCY AND
13 ITS LEADERSHIP IS VIEWED EXTERNALLY.

14 AND, AGAIN, THAT HAS BEEN AT TIMES
15 SOMETHING THAT WE FELT WAS IMPORTANT. I DON'T KNOW
16 AT THIS TIME IN OUR HISTORY IF THAT'S SOMETHING THAT
17 IS IMPORTANT, WHICH IS WHY TO ME IT'S A 30,000 FEET
18 QUESTION WHETHER WE NEED TO DO THAT OR NOT. AGAIN,
19 I'M AGNOSTIC ON IT, BUT JUST TO PUT THAT OUT THERE.
20 THAT'S WHY WE DID IT THEN, BUT IT MAY NOT BE
21 NECESSARY TO DO IT NOW.

22 MR. TORRES: I TEND TO AGREE WITH JEFF ON
23 THAT.

24 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: I'M IN AGREEMENT
25 WITH JEFF AS WELL. IF WE WANT TO REVIEW THE GWG

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROCESS AND HAVE THE GWG MEMBERS TELL US HOW THEY
2 MAKE THE PROCESS WORK, THAT MIGHT BE A WORTHWHILE
3 THING, BUT THAT'S A DIFFERENT THING THAN ASKING THEM
4 TO REVIEW DR. MILLAN IN PARTICULAR. AND SO MAYBE AT
5 SOME POINT WE SHOULD, OR MAYBE WE SHOULD HAVE DONE
6 THIS IN THE PAST, HEAR FROM GWG MEMBERS ABOUT HOW
7 THEY SEE OUR PROCESS AND HOW EFFECTIVE THEY THINK IT
8 IS OR ISN'T. ANYWAY, THAT'S SORT OF BESIDE THE
9 POINT RIGHT NOW.

10 I'M GETTING A SENSE THAT WE'RE PREPARED TO
11 JUST HAVE HER DIRECT REPORTS DO THEIR ASSESSMENT AND
12 HAVE THE ICOC MEMBERS DO THE REVIEW, AND THOSE ARE
13 THE TWO GROUPS THAT WE WANT TO FOCUS ON. IS THAT
14 FAIR?

15 DR. GASSON: I THINK IT'S FAIR, AND WE CAN
16 RESERVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE ADDITIONAL REVIEW AT SOME
17 FUTURE TIME IF WE CAN SEE THAT THAT WOULD BE A
18 BENEFIT TO THE PROCESS.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WORKS FOR ME, STEVE.

20 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OKAY.

21 DR. DEAS: I AGREE WITH THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: HAVING SORT OF
23 CIRCLED THE MAIN ISSUES, ARE THERE ANY PARTICULAR
24 COMMENTS ON THE FORMS THEMSELVES, ANYTHING THAT
25 ANYBODY SEES THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO ADD TO, TAKE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AWAY FROM, MODIFY, ETC., IF YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO
2 LOOK THROUGH THEM?

3 DR. VUORI: I THOUGHT BOTH OF THE FORMS
4 WERE EXCELLENT. THANKS FOR ALL THE WORK. OTHER
5 THAN THE COMMENT ABOUT THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, I
6 THINK FOR DIRECT REPORTS, I THINK, THEY LOOK VERY
7 GOOD TO ME.

8 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: THANKS, KRISTINA.
9 ANYBODY ELSE?

10 LET ME JUST SAY THIS, THERE'S NOTHING NOW,
11 BUT SOMETHING OCCURS TO YOU AFTER THE MEETING OR
12 WHATEVER, MAYBE YOU COULD JUST SEND YOUR THOUGHTS TO
13 ME OR TO MYSELF AND JUDY AND INCLUDE J.T. ON THOSE,
14 AND WE'LL TAKE THEM UNDER ADVISEMENT.

15 DR. GASSON: YOU HAVE TO DO IT QUICKLY.

16 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: I KNOW WE'RE TRYING
17 TO MOTOR ALONG WITH THIS THING. SO I GUESS WE COULD
18 DO THIS FORMALLY AND ASK FOR A MOTION, BUT LET ME
19 ASK J.T., SINCE HE'S MUCH MORE FAMILIAR WITH THE
20 FORMALITY THAN I AM AT LEAST, DO WE NEED TO DO
21 SOMETHING FORMAL IN TERMS OF ADOPTING THESE OR WHAT
22 SHOULD WE DO? JAMES, MAYBE YOU KNOW.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I DON'T THINK SO.
24 JAMES, DO YOU DISAGREE WITH THAT?

25 MR. HARRISON: NO. I THINK THIS IS A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROCESS THAT THE BOARD HAS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED. SO
2 ALL YOU ARE DOING IS MAKING SOME MINOR MODIFICATIONS
3 TO THE WAY YOU GATHER THE INFORMATION. SO I DON'T
4 THINK A FORMAL VOTE IS NECESSARY.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JUST A QUICK PROCESS
6 QUESTION. DO YOU ENVISION A REGROUPING OF THE
7 EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE PRIOR TO THE DECEMBER BOARD
8 MEETING AT WHICH WE WILL HAVE THE CLOSED SESSION
9 WITH MARIA TO DISCUSS THE EVALUATION, OR DO YOU
10 PROPOSE TO HAVE THE RESPONSES COLLATED, NOT HAVE A
11 SEPARATE MEETING, AND ROLL INTO THAT DECEMBER BOARD
12 MEETING AND HAVE MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION
13 SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE BOARD HEARING THIS AS A MATTER
14 OF FIRST INSTANCE AT THE CLOSED SESSION ITSELF?

15 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: J.T., YOU'RE A MIND
16 READER. THAT WAS ACTUALLY SORT OF MY NEXT TOPIC,
17 THE SECOND TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION. SO LET'S MOVE THAT
18 TO THE TOP, AND THEN I WANT TO COME BACK TO
19 PERFORMANCE AGAINST GOALS BEFORE WE GET OFF THESE
20 TOPICS.

21 SO WE COULD DO THIS EITHER WAY. AND I
22 HINTED AT THAT A LITTLE EARLIER IN THE CONVERSATION
23 BECAUSE I'M NOT EXACTLY SURE WHAT THE PREFERENCE
24 WOULD BE OF THIS GROUP. SO EITHER WAY IS ALL THE
25 INFORMATION COMES BACK, GOES TO JAMES, HE PUTS IT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALL TOGETHER, AND THEN WE CAN EITHER REVIEW IT WITH
2 THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE A FEW DAYS PRIOR TO THE
3 BOARD OR WE CAN BRING IT TO THE BOARD WITHOUT A
4 REVIEW OF THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE. AND SO I'D
5 LIKE TO HEAR PEOPLE'S THOUGHTS ON THAT AND WHICH
6 THEY PREFER BECAUSE I'M UNCERTAIN MYSELF. SO
7 ANYBODY HAVE ANY IDEAS ON WHAT THEY THINK A BETTER
8 WAY TO DO THIS IS?

9 MR. SHEEHY: THE WAY WE DID IT IN THE PAST
10 IS THAT IT CAME BACK TO THE COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE
11 LOOKED AT IT, AND THEN I THINK WE SENT IT TO THE
12 PRESIDENT TO RESPOND TO. I THINK WITHIN THE
13 COMMITTEE, AGAIN MY MEMORY MAY BE FAULTY, I THINK WE
14 KIND OF FLAGGED THINGS THAT WE THOUGHT THAT THEY
15 WERE -- IF THEY WERE THINGS THAT NEEDED TO BE
16 ADDRESSED SO THAT THERE WAS AN OPPORTUNITY -- THERE
17 WAS AN EXTRA STEP IN THERE BEFORE JUST LIKE KIND OF
18 GIVING IT TO THE BOARD AND THEN HAVING THE PRESIDENT
19 RESPOND. THERE WAS A STEP WHERE THERE WAS A LITTLE
20 BIT OF ANALYSIS OF WHAT WE HAD GOTTEN BACK AND THEN
21 THE OPPORTUNITY FOR RESPONSE BEFORE WE TOOK IT TO
22 THE FULL BOARD.

23 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: IN THIS CASE THE
24 EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD REVIEW IT, AND THEN WE
25 WOULD DISCUSS WHAT WE LEARNED WITH DR. MILLAN AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GIVE HER A CHANCE TO RESPOND BEFORE THE WHOLE BOARD.

2 JEFF, IS THAT WHAT YOU WERE SAYING?

3 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, IF THERE WERE ISSUES
4 THAT WERE FLAGGED. JUST COLLATING THE DATA, BUT IF
5 IT ALL RUNS TO ONE DIRECTION, OBVIOUSLY, ESPECIALLY
6 IF IT'S A POSITIVE DIRECTION, YOU CAN ATTENUATE
7 THAT.

8 TALKING IN TERMS OF PURE PROCESS, NOT THAT
9 I'M ANTICIPATING THAT, BUT IT DOES GIVE YOU A LITTLE
10 BIT -- IT SEEMS A LITTLE BIT BETTER TO HAVE THAT
11 SECOND LOOK. AGAIN, IT COULD BE JUST VERY
12 STRAIGHTFORWARD, EVERYTHING IS GREAT, AND THEN WE
13 PASS IT ON AND HAVE THE FULL BOARD LOOK AT IT. IN
14 THE EVENT, HIGHLY UNLIKELY, I HOPE, AT LEAST FROM MY
15 EXPERIENCE, IF THERE WAS SOMETHING, IT MIGHT BE
16 BETTER TO HAVE AN ADDITIONAL STEP SO THAT IT DOESN'T
17 JUST ALL END UP AT THE BOARD.

18 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OTHER THOUGHTS?

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AS JEFF WAS SPEAKING --
20 JAMES, STEP IN HERE IF YOU WOULD -- I BELIEVE THAT
21 IS THE PROCESS THAT WE FOLLOWED WITH ALAN. I DO
22 REMEMBER THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE DID MEET WITH
23 ALAN TO DISCUSS THE REVIEW IN ADVANCE OF IT GOING TO
24 THE BOARD. SO, JAMES, IS THAT HOW WE'VE DONE IT?
25 ARE JEFF AND I REMEMBERING THAT CORRECTLY?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. HARRISON: YOU ARE. SO WE PRESENTED A
2 SUMMARY OF THE RAW DATA TO THE EVALUATION
3 SUBCOMMITTEE, WHICH THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE THEN
4 DISCUSSED. AND BASED ON ITS OWN EVALUATION AND
5 IMPRESSIONS FROM THAT DATA, THE EVALUATION
6 SUBCOMMITTEE PREPARED A REPORT, A DRAFT REPORT
7 EVALUATING THE PRESIDENT'S PERFORMANCE, WHICH WAS
8 PROVIDED TO THE PRESIDENT, WHO AND HAD AN
9 OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND. AND THEN THE DRAFT REPORT
10 AND PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE WERE PRESENTED TO THE
11 BOARD.

12 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OKAY. WELL, THAT
13 SEEMS A REASONABLE APPROACH TO ME. UNLESS SOMEBODY
14 DISAGREES, LET'S PROCEED THAT WAY. AND THEN WE JUST
15 NEED TO FIGURE OUT HOW FAR IN ADVANCE OF THE BOARD
16 MEETING. THE BOARD MEETING IS THE 13TH, MARIA
17 BONNEVILLE?

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES, IT IS. DECEMBER
19 13TH.

20 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: SO HOW FAR IN
21 ADVANCE OF THAT? WE HAVE TO GIVE JAMES ENOUGH TIME
22 TO COLLECT AND COLLATE THE INFORMATION, SO I DON'T
23 WANT TO SHORT-CIRCUIT HIM, BUT WE'LL NEED A LITTLE
24 BIT -- OR IF WE GET THE KIND OF FEEDBACK THAT WE GOT
25 WITH ALAN, FOR EXAMPLE, WE MIGHT JUST HAVE TO DELAY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PRESENTING THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW. I DON'T EXPECT
2 THAT. LET'S SEE IF WE CAN FIGURE OUT A WAY TO
3 SCHEDULE THAT THAT SEEMS A REASONABLE COMPROMISE
4 BETWEEN JAMES DOING WHAT YOU NEED TO DO AND GIVING
5 THIS GROUP ENOUGH TIME TO SEE THE RESULTS IN ADVANCE
6 AND PUT TOGETHER, IF NEED BE, A REPORT THAT WE WOULD
7 SHARE WITH DR. MILLAN AND GET HER TO RESPOND TO IN
8 TIME FOR THE BOARD MEETING.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES, IF WE HAVE ALL
10 THOSE STEPS, REGARDLESS OF HOW ROSY THE REVIEW MIGHT
11 BE, THAT IS A NUMBER OF STEPS THERE. IN YOUR
12 OPINION IS THIS REASONABLY DOABLE BY DECEMBER 13TH,
13 OR IS IT SOMETHING THAT SHOULD BE CALENDARED FOR THE
14 NEXT IN-PERSON MEETING, WHICH I'M NOT ADVOCATING
15 FOR, WHICH IS MARCH FOR EVERYBODY ON THE PHONE.
16 JUST ASKED BECAUSE THAT IS A NUMBER OF STEPS, AND
17 THERE'S NOT A LOT OF TIME BETWEEN NOW AND THEN.

18 MR. HARRISON: WHAT I'D RECOMMEND IS THAT
19 YOU TRY TO SCHEDULE AN EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE
20 MEETING IN ADVANCE OF THE BOARD MEETING. AND IF ALL
21 GOES SMOOTHLY AND WE HAVE THE TIME AND THE
22 EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE FEELS THAT IT'S HAD ENOUGH
23 TIME TO DIGEST THE INFORMATION, INCLUDING A DRAFT
24 REPORT, BEFORE THE BOARD MEETING, THEN YOU CAN
25 PROCEED WITH THE DECEMBER MEETING. IF NOT, YOU CAN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALWAYS PUT IT OVER UNTIL MARCH, BUT YOU WOULD AT
2 LEAST HAVE PRESERVED THE OPPORTUNITY TO GET IT DONE
3 IN DECEMBER.

4 DR. GASSON: THAT SOUNDS VERY REASONABLE.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OKAY. GREAT. SO,
7 MARIA BONNEVILLE, LET'S FIGURE OUT -- WE'LL START
8 WORKING ON PLANNING DATES FOR THAT EVALUATION
9 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING IN ADVANCE OF THE BOARD.

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: I WOULD SUGGEST THE WEEK
11 OF DECEMBER 3D, WHICH DOESN'T GIVE JAMES A WHOLE LOT
12 OF TIME. IF EVERYTHING GETS TURNED IN ON NOVEMBER
13 30TH, IT DOESN'T GIVE HIM A WHOLE LOT OF TIME TO
14 TURN THAT AROUND, BUT THEN THE BOARD MEETING IS THE
15 FOLLOWING WEEK. SO, AGAIN, JUST BECAUSE, LOOKING AT
16 A CALENDAR, I WANTED TO MAKE SURE EVERYBODY SORT OF
17 UNDERSTOOD THAT.

18 MR. TORRES: THERE'S NO PROHIBITION OF A
19 TELEPHONIC BOARD MEETING IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: THAT'S TRUE.

21 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OKAY. LET'S SEE IF
22 WE CAN SCHEDULE ONE MAYBE FOR THE LATTER PART OF THE
23 WEEK OF DECEMBER THE 3D. AND, JAMES, I DON'T WANT
24 TO UNDULY BURDEN YOU. SO WE'LL JUST HAVE TO KEEP IN
25 TOUCH --

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK WE CAN.

2 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: -- AND SEE HOW YOU
3 ARE DOING.

4 MR. HARRISON: STEVE, THAT SOUNDS FINE.

5 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: OKAY. GREAT. I
6 APPRECIATE THAT.

7 THE OTHER THING THAT'S ON THE AGENDA HERE,
8 AND THIS IS PART OF THE BOARD'S REVIEW OF MARIA,
9 SOMEBODY HAS TO OWN OUR STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS. THERE
10 ARE SIX OF THEM. AND GENERALLY IT'S THE LEADER OF
11 THE ORGANIZATION, IN THIS CASE, MARIA, DR. MILLAN.
12 IN THE REVIEW FORMAT THAT I SENT AROUND, I HADN'T
13 PLUGGED THOSE RESULTS IN, AND I ASKED HER TO PROVIDE
14 US WITH AN UPDATE OF THEM. SO THERE'S A SINGLE PAGE
15 THAT'S PART OF THIS AGENDA THAT SHOWS THE PROGRESS
16 ON THOSE GOALS, REMEMBERING THAT THESE ARE GOALS FOR
17 2020.

18 AND SO IF ANYBODY -- SO WHEN YOU DO THIS
19 REVIEW, AS A BOARD MEMBER, YOU WILL SEE THE GOALS
20 AND THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE GOALS, AND THEN YOU CAN
21 PROVIDE ANY COMMENTS THAT YOU'D LIKE ABOUT HOW WE'RE
22 DOING. WE'RE DOING VERY WELL, BUT EVERYBODY WILL
23 HAVE THEIR OWN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR OPINION.

24 ALL RIGHT? AS I SAID, I'D LIKE TO, WHEN
25 WE'RE FINISHED HERE, MOVE INTO A CLOSED SESSION AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 JUST BRIEFLY DISCUSS A COUPLE OF CONVERSATIONS,
2 PHONE CONVERSATIONS, THAT I'VE HAD WITH MARIA ON HER
3 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT. ARE THERE
4 ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS ABOUT ANY OF THIS
5 FROM ANY COMMITTEE MEMBERS?

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE, JUST A QUICK
7 PROCEDURAL STATEMENT. WE CAN GO INTO CLOSED
8 SESSION, BUT THEN WE HAVE TO RECONVENE IN OPEN
9 SESSION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. SO I WILL LEAVE
10 THIS LINE OPEN, AND THEN I WILL START THE CLOSED
11 SESSION IN ANOTHER ROOM; AND THEN WHEN YOU ARE ALL
12 DONE, I WILL STILL BE HERE, AND THEN WE CAN WRAP UP
13 THE MEETING.

14 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: OKAY. IF I COULD
15 ASK EVERYBODY JUST TO KIND OF COME BACK TO THIS
16 SESSION. THE CLOSED SESSION IS NOT GOING TO TAKE
17 LONG AT ALL. IT SHOULD BE FAIRLY SHORT. EVERYTHING
18 IS GOING WELL, BUT I JUST THOUGHT IT BEST TO KIND OF
19 ADVISE YOU ON WHAT MARIA AND I HAD DISCUSSED ABOUT
20 THIS WHOLE PROCESS.

21 DR. DEAS: JUST SO I'M CLEAR, THE CLOSED
22 SESSION, WHAT DO WE DO? ARE WE GOING DIRECTLY INTO
23 CLOSED SESSION ON THIS SAME LINE?

24 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: WHY DON'T YOU,
25 MARIA, GIVE THE PHONE NUMBER, CLOSED SESSION PHONE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 NUMBER -- I GUESS NOT.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: I SENT IT VIA E-MAIL A
3 BIT AGO, AND I CAN RESEND SO THAT EVERYBODY HAS IT
4 AGAIN. AND SO, DEBORAH, YOU WOULD END THIS CALL,
5 YOU WOULD CALL INTO THE NEW CLOSED SESSION NUMBER.
6 AND AFTER THAT WAS DONE --

7 DR. DEAS: SO YOU'RE GOING TO SEND THAT
8 BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THEY PUT THAT ON MY CALENDAR.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. YOU WILL BE
10 RECEIVING AN E-MAIL RIGHT NOW FROM DOUG GUILLEN. HE
11 WILL RESEND THAT TO YOU.

12 DR. DEAS: OKAY. THANK YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: SO WE'RE GOING TO
14 TEMPORARILY PUT THIS MEETING ON HOLD, GO INTO CLOSED
15 SESSION, AND THEN WE'LL COME BACK TO THIS MEETING
16 ONCE THAT'S FINISHED.

17 DR. GASSON: ALL RIGHT.

18 (THE COMMITTEE THEN WENT INTO CLOSED
19 SESSION AT 5:04 P.M. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE
20 CLOSED SESSION, THE FOLLOWING WAS HEARD IN OPEN
21 SESSION:)

22 CHAIRMAN JUELSGAARD: I'M BACK. MARIA,
23 CAN YOU TELL WHO'S JOINED US AND WHO HASN'T YET --

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: LET'S SEE. WE HAVE
25 JAMES, STEVE, JUDY, ART. THAT'S IT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ME.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: WELL, J.T.

3 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: DO WE HAVE A QUORUM?

4 MS. BONNEVILLE: WE CAN ADJOURN WITHOUT A
5 QUORUM IF YOU'D LIKE TO. IT'S NOT A PROBLEM.

6 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: I SHOULD JUST ASK, I
7 KNOW THE ANSWER IN ADVANCE.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF IS ON AS WELL.

9 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: OKAY. GREAT. SO IS
10 THERE ANYTHING ELSE -- NOW THAT WE'RE BACK IN OPEN
11 SESSION AGAIN, IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT ANY
12 MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE WOULD LIKE TO RAISE AT
13 THIS POINT?

14 HEARING NONE, IF THERE ARE ANY MEMBERS OF
15 THE PUBLIC THAT ARE ON THIS PHONE CALL, IS THERE ANY
16 COMMENT FROM ANY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? I HEAR
17 NONE. IN THAT EVENT, WITH NO FURTHER ADO, THE
18 MEETING IS ADJOURNED.

19 MR. HARRISON: JUST TO BE CLEAR FOR THE
20 RECORD, NOTHING TO REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION.

21 CHAIRMAN JUELGAARD: NOTHING TO REPORT
22 OUT OF CLOSED SESSION. THANK YOU, JAMES.

23 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT
24 5:15 P.M.)

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 13, 2018, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR 7152
133 HENNA COURT
SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864
208-255-5453

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

.