

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

BEFORE THE
APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

DATE: AUGUST 30, 2022
9 A.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR
CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2022-32

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
ACTION ITEMS	
3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO COMPASS TRAINING PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (EDUC 5)	5
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 ITEM 3 (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C))	
DISCUSSION ITEMS	
5. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
6. ADJOURNMENT	50

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

AUGUST 30, 2022; 9 A.M.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. GOOD MORNING,
EVERYBODY. WELCOME TO THE AUGUST 2022 ICOC AND
APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING. MARIA,
WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. DAN BERNAL.

MR. BERNAL: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE. YSABEL DURON.

MS. DURON: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: (INAUDIBLE. NODS.)

MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.

DR. FISHER: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

DR. HIGGINS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD. RICH
LAJARA.

MR. LAJARA: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.

DR. MIASKOWSKI: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.

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

ADRIANA PADILLA.

DR. PADILLA: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.

ME. PANETTA: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT. MARVIN

SOUTHARD.

DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

MR. TORRES: PRESENT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.

2 DR. WATSON: HERE.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., WE HAVE QUORUM.

4 MR. TORRES: I'M HERE, MARIA. I HAD TO
5 UNMUTE MYSELF. SORRY.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: NO PROBLEM. THANKS A
7 LOT.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.

9 WE'RE GOING TO GO RIGHT INTO THE
10 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING. WE HAVE
11 ONE ACTION ITEM TODAY, CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS
12 SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO COMPASS TRAINING PROGRAM
13 ANNOUNCEMENT SO-CALLED EDUC 5. PRESENTATION BY DR.
14 SAMBRANO. GIL.

15 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

16 GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. LET ME JUST
17 FINISH PUTTING THIS IN PRESENTATION.

18 GOOD MORNING. AND TODAY WE START OUR
19 MEETING AS WE USUALLY DO WITH A STATEMENT OF OUR
20 MISSION, WHICH IS TO ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE
21 TO DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
22 TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE
23 CALIFORNIA AND WORLD.

24 AND SO PART OF GETTING TO THAT MISSION IS
25 OUR CONTINUED EFFORTS TO CREATE FUNDING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OPPORTUNITIES ACROSS WHAT WE CALL PILLARS, AND WE
2 HAVE FIVE OF THOSE. THE ONES THAT YOU OFTEN HEAR
3 ABOUT, WHICH ARE THE DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND
4 CLINICAL PILLARS WHICH HAVE RECURRING OPPORTUNITIES,
5 BUT ALSO OUR INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS AND WHAT WE ARE
6 TALKING ABOUT TODAY, WHICH IS OUR EDUCATION PILLAR.

7 AND SO EDUCATION ITSELF IS QUITE CORE TO
8 CIRM'S MISSION. IT IS REFLECTED IN OUR STRATEGIC
9 PLAN ACROSS THE THREE DIFFERENT THEMES THAT MAKE UP
10 THE STRATEGIC PLAN IN THAT TRAINEES CONTRIBUTE IN A
11 VARIETY OF WAYS TO WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE BY BEING THE
12 ENGINE, IF YOU WILL, THAT DRIVES MUCH OF THE
13 RESEARCH AND PROGRESS THAT HAPPENS, PARTICULARLY IN
14 ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS, DELIVERING REAL WORLD
15 SOLUTIONS BY ADAPTING AND LEARNING SKILLS TO MEET
16 THE CHALLENGES OF TOMORROW, AND PROVIDING AN
17 OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL BY HAVING OUR PROGRAMS CREATE A
18 DIVERSE WORKFORCE THAT WILL BE ABLE TO IMPACT ON
19 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.

20 AND SO FROM A BROAD PERSPECTIVE, WE HAVE
21 SUPPORTED EDUCATION PROGRAMS UNDER PROP 71 AND
22 CONTINUE TO DO SO UNDER PROP 14. WE HAVE PROGRAMS
23 THAT SPAN THE SPECTRUM FROM TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL
24 STUDENTS THROUGH UNDERGRADUATE AND MASTERS, AND PRE
25 AND POSTDOCTORAL LEVELS. AND WE RESTARTED MANY OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THOSE PROGRAMS THAT HAD ENDED OR WERE ENDING IN
2 2020. SO IN 2021 WE APPROVED THE SPARK PROGRAM, THE
3 BRIDGES PROGRAM, AND THE RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM
4 THAT WE BROUGHT BACK AFTER A HIATUS OF ABOUT SIX TO
5 SEVEN YEARS.

6 AND SO TODAY WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT A
7 NEW PROGRAM. THIS IS ONE WE HAVEN'T DONE IN THE
8 PAST. WE THOUGHT THERE WAS, DESPITE OUR SPECTRUM OF
9 EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AN IMPORTANT GAP THAT THIS COULD
10 FILL. SO THE GOALS OF THIS PARTICULAR PROGRAM ARE
11 TO PREPARE A DIVERSE CADRE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS
12 FOR CAREERS IN REGENERATIVE MEDICINE, CREATE NOVEL
13 RECRUITMENT AND RE-SUPPORT MECHANISMS, AND, THIS IS
14 KEY, TO IDENTIFY AND FOSTER UNTAPPED TALENT,
15 PARTICULARLY WITHIN POPULATIONS THAT ARE
16 HISTORICALLY UNDERREPRESENTED IN THE BIOMEDICAL
17 SCIENCES. WE WANTED TO COMBINE HANDS-ON RESEARCH
18 OPPORTUNITY WITH A STRATEGIC AND STRUCTURED
19 MENTORSHIP EXPERIENCE TO ENHANCE THAT TRANSITION OF
20 STUDENTS TO A SUCCESSFUL CAREER AND TO FOSTER
21 AWARENESS AND APPRECIATION OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
22 INCLUSION ACROSS THE TRAINEES, THE MENTORS, AND
23 OTHERS WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM.

24 AND SO THE RATIONALE BEHIND THIS IS THAT
25 WE KNOW THAT MOST UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING PROGRAMS,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INCLUDING MANY THAT TARGET UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES,
2 TEND TO TARGET INDIVIDUALS THAT HAVE A PREDEFINED
3 ACADEMIC SET OF CREDENTIALS. SO GRADE POINT
4 AVERAGE, THEY HAVE SOME RECORD OF SHOWING ACADEMIC
5 EXCELLENCE IN SOME WAY THAT MANY INSTITUTIONS LOOK
6 TO TO RECRUIT THESE STUDENTS. SO WHAT WE WANTED TO
7 DEVELOP WAS SOMETHING THAT LOOKED AT STUDENTS FROM A
8 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE, THAT WE WOULD SUPPORT
9 PROGRAMS THAT WOULD COME UP WITH NOVEL STRATEGIES TO
10 RECOGNIZE AND FOSTER UNTAPPED TALENT THAT COULD LEAD
11 TO NEW AND VALUABLE PERSPECTIVES IN REGENERATIVE
12 MEDICINE.

13 THE OTHER THING WE WANTED TO PROVIDE,
14 BECAUSE MANY EXISTING PROGRAMS ALSO TEND TO TARGET
15 STUDENTS THAT ARE HEADED TOWARDS GRADUATE SCHOOL,
16 MEDICAL SCHOOL, OR TRADITIONAL PATHS, WAS TO PROVIDE
17 STUDENTS WITH OPTIONS AND MAKE THEM AWARE OF THE
18 SPECTRUM OF CAREERS THAT EXIST AND THAT THEY MAY NOT
19 HAVE CONSIDERED. AND SO THAT WAS ANOTHER IMPORTANT
20 PART OF THIS PROGRAM.

21 THE COMPASS PROGRAM IS INTENDED, BECAUSE
22 IT IS AN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM, TO COMPLEMENT AND
23 NOT COMPETE WITH OUR OTHER UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS
24 WHICH IS THE BRIDGES PROGRAM. WE THINK THAT IT
25 SERVES A DIFFERENT SUBSET OF TRAINEES AND ALSO THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IT WILL NOT COMPETE WITH OTHER UNDERGRADUATE
2 TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT ARE SPONSORED BY NIH, SUCH AS
3 THE MARC OR RISE PROGRAMS GIVEN THESE FEATURES.

4 SO THE COMPASS PROGRAM HAS THREE MAIN
5 ELEMENTS. IT HAS AN OUTREACH AND RECRUITMENT
6 ELEMENT IN WHICH THE PROGRAMS ARE EXPECTED TO
7 DEVELOP STRATEGIES FOR IDENTIFYING STUDENTS AND
8 RECRUITING THEM THAT, AS MENTIONED, USE
9 NONTRADITIONAL APPROACHES TO RECOGNIZE THE UNTAPPED
10 TALENT, TO DO AND CONDUCT ADAPTIVE OUTREACH, MEANING
11 THAT THEY SHOULD ASSESS WHERE THEY HAVE GAPS IN
12 BRINGING IN STUDENTS OR WHAT THEIR STUDENT
13 POPULATION LOOKS LIKE AND HAVE A STRATEGY FOR
14 FILLING THOSE GAPS. AND ALSO, AS THEY DEVELOP THESE
15 STRATEGIES, TO ALSO CONDUCT SELF-ASSESSMENT ON HOW
16 WELL THEY ARE WORKING AND TO CHANGE AS THEY NEED TO
17 IN ORDER TO SUCCEED.

18 THE SECOND ELEMENT IS THE TRAINEE
19 EXPERIENCE ITSELF. THE GOAL IS TO SUPPORT STUDENTS
20 FOR TWO TO THREE YEARS. IT'S UP TO THE PROGRAM TO
21 DETERMINE WHAT IS BEST AND WHAT ALIGNS BEST WITH
22 THEIR ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT. THEY PROVIDE
23 FOUNDATIONAL COURSES WHICH MAY PROVIDE COURSES IN
24 THE FAIR DATA SHARING PRINCIPLE, TRANSLATIONAL
25 RESEARCH, INTRODUCTION TO STEM CELL AND REGENERATIVE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MEDICINE, THINGS LIKE THAT.

2 THERE 'S THE RESEARCH INTERNSHIP ITSELF,
3 WHICH CAN HAPPEN OVER A SUMMER OR ANOTHER QUARTER OR
4 SEMESTER PERIOD OR MORE DEPENDING, AGAIN, ON HOW THE
5 INSTITUTION BUILDS THE PROGRAM.

6 THE MENTORSHIP PROGRAM IS THE THIRD
7 COMPONENT AND ONE WE FEEL IS PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT.
8 WE WANTED TO CREATE MENTOR TRAINING, SO NOT JUST
9 TRAINING THE TRAINEES, BUT TRAINING THE MENTORS AS
10 WELL IN HOW TO BEST MENTOR THE STUDENTS. WE WANTED
11 TO BRING AND CREATE A COHORT OF ACTIVITIES THAT
12 BRING ALL THE MENTORS AND THE STUDENTS TOGETHER AS
13 WELL AS CREATING DIFFERENT TYPES OF MENTORS. OFTEN
14 THERE IS THE FACULTY MENTOR WHO MAY BE RESPONSIBLE
15 FOR ACTIVITIES IN THE LABORATORY ENVIRONMENT, BUT
16 THE OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE PEERS AS MENTORS AS WELL AS
17 MENTORS THAT CAN GUIDE THEIR CAREER PATH IS
18 SOMETHING THAT WE WERE LOOKING AT AS A POSSIBILITY
19 OF SOMETHING THAT COULD BE DEVELOPED.

20 AND, IN ADDITION, AS THESE PROGRAMS
21 DEVELOP, THESE MENTORING PROGRAMS, THAT THEY WOULD
22 SHARE WITH OTHERS THEIR PRACTICES ON WHAT WORKS,
23 WHAT DOESN'T WORK. AND THROUGH THAT WE CAN DEVELOP
24 A SET OF BEST PRACTICES FOR THE EDUCATION PROGRAM.

25 SO THOSE THREE MAJOR ELEMENTS ARE CORE TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE COMPASS PROGRAM. AND AS SUCH, WE ALSO FELT IT
2 WAS IMPORTANT TO HAVE THREE REQUIRED ROLES WITHIN
3 THE PROGRAM.

4 THERE'S THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR, WHICH IS THE
5 EQUIVALENT OF THE PI WHO OVERSEES ALL THE
6 ACTIVITIES, BUT ALSO A MENTORSHIP FACILITATOR WHO
7 DESIGNS AND EXECUTES THE MENTORSHIP PROGRAM TO
8 ENSURE THAT ALL THE TRAINEES HAVE CUSTOMIZED,
9 APPROPRIATE, AND MEANINGFUL MENTORSHIP THROUGHOUT
10 THEIR APPOINTMENT PERIOD.

11 A DIVERSITY AND OUTREACH COORDINATOR WHO
12 DEVELOPS THE STRATEGIES AND EVALUATES EFFORTS TO
13 RECRUIT A DIVERSE AND QUALIFIED SET OF STUDENTS FROM
14 UNDERREPRESENTED AND DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS.

15 AND THEN, LASTLY, AS A REMINDER, WHEN THIS
16 CONCEPT WAS APPROVED IN JANUARY BY THE BOARD, THIS
17 IS A SNAPSHOT OF THE BUDGET THAT WAS APPROVED. SO
18 AS MENTIONED BEFORE, THERE WAS AN INVESTMENT OF
19 ABOUT 20 AWARDS THAT WOULD BE COVERED BY 58.22
20 MILLION. THE MAXIMUM AWARD AMOUNT IS 2.91 MILLION
21 FOR EACH ONE. AND THIS WOULD COVER APPROXIMATELY 25
22 STUDENTS, ASSUMING THE APPLICANTS PUT FORTH ALL THE
23 DIFFERENT OPPORTUNITIES THAT ARE AVAILABLE AND WOULD
24 USE UP THE 2.9 MILLION. THE TRAINING DURATION IS
25 TWO TO THREE YEARS, AND THE APPROXIMATE COST PER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 STUDENT IN TERMS OF THEIR STIPENDS, COURSE FEES, AND
2 SUCH IS ABOUT 30,800, AND THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION
3 COSTS ARE 27,000. SO THAT BRINGS A TOTAL OF ABOUT
4 JUST UNDER 60,000 PER YEAR PER APPOINTMENT FOR A
5 STUDENT.

6 ALL RIGHT. SO THAT'S THE COMPASS PROGRAM.
7 AND THIS PROGRAM WENT THROUGH THE TYPICAL REVIEW
8 PROCESS, OUR THREE STAGES OF APPLICATION,
9 SUBMISSION, AND ASSESSMENT OF ELIGIBILITY, THAT WE
10 DO INTERNALLY AT CIRM, THE REVIEW BY THE GRANTS
11 WORKING GROUP TO ASSESS MERIT, AND THOSE
12 RECOMMENDATIONS ARE WHAT WE ARE BRINGING TO YOU FOR
13 A FINAL FUNDING DECISION ON THOSE PROGRAMS.

14 APPLICATIONS WERE SCORED ON A SCALE OF ONE
15 TO A HUNDRED WITH 85 TO A HUNDRED BEING RECOMMENDED
16 FOR FUNDING IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE. ANYTHING THAT
17 SCORED BELOW 85 IS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.

18 THE CRITERIA THAT WERE UTILIZED TO COME UP
19 WITH THOSE SCORES ARE THESE FOUR KEY QUESTIONS. DID
20 THE PROPOSED PROGRAM HOLD THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE
21 AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? IS THE TRAINING PROGRAM
22 WELL PLANNED AND DESIGNED? IS IT PRACTICAL AND
23 ACHIEVABLE? AND DOES THE PROGRAM THOUGHTFULLY
24 INCORPORATE STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT DIVERSITY, EQUITY,
25 AND INCLUSION?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HERE IS A SUMMARY OF THE GRANTS WORKING
2 GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE APPLICATIONS THAT
3 WERE RECEIVED. WE RECEIVED 20 APPLICATIONS, AND 16
4 WERE RECOMMENDED. THEY RECEIVED A SCORE OF 85 OR
5 HIGHER. AND THE TOTAL APPLICANT REQUEST FROM THOSE
6 16 APPLICATIONS IS JUST OVER 46 MILLION. AND THE
7 FUNDS AVAILABLE, AS MENTIONED, IS 58.22.

8 ALL RIGHT. AND THEN JUST A REMINDER, AS
9 MENTIONED EARLIER, MANY OF YOU HAVE A CONFLICT OF
10 INTEREST WITH A GIVEN APPLICATION. SO IS THIS JUST
11 A REMINDER THAT YOU SHOULD LOOK. IF YOUR NAME IS UP
12 HERE, IT MEANS YOU MAY HAVE A CONFLICT WITH ONE OF
13 THE APPLICATIONS. SO JUST BE MINDFUL OF THAT.

14 AND LET ME STOP HERE FOR A SECOND AND PUT
15 UP THE RANK ORDER OF THE APPLICATIONS, WHICH IS ALSO
16 THE COVER SHEET THAT YOU HAVE. IF YOU WANT TO
17 REFERENCE IT, YOU MAY HAVE THAT AVAILABLE THERE AS
18 WELL.

19 SO THE APPLICATIONS BEGIN AT THE VERY TOP
20 HERE WITH 13840. THE TOP 16 RANKED IN SCORE FROM 85
21 UP TO A 95. AND THEN THERE ARE FOUR APPLICATIONS
22 THAT ARE NOT RECOMMENDED THAT RANGE IN SCORE FROM 80
23 TO 68.

24 SO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS MY PRESENTATION.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GIL.

2 OKAY. THE WAY WE'RE GOING TO DO THIS IS
3 IN FOUR PARTS. THE FIRST QUESTION I WILL ASK IS
4 DOES ANYBODY WANT TO MOVE ANY OF THE APPLICATIONS
5 FROM THE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING CATEGORY UP TO
6 THE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING CATEGORY?

7 THE SECOND QUESTION WILL BE ANYBODY WANT
8 TO TAKE OUT ANY OF THOSE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AND
9 PUT THEM INTO THE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
10 CATEGORY?

11 THE THIRD QUESTION WILL BE DO WE HAVE A
12 MOTION TO APPROVE THOSE IN THE RECOMMENDED FOR
13 FUNDING CATEGORY AS AN OMNIBUS MOTION?

14 AND THE LAST WILL BE DO WE HAVE A MOTION
15 TO NOT FUND THOSE IN THE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
16 CATEGORY. SO A LITTLE COMPLICATED, BUT LET'S TAKE
17 THOSE ONE AT A TIME.

18 SO THE FIRST QUESTION IS ARE THERE ANY
19 APPLICATIONS THAT ANY MEMBERS OF THE APPLICATION
20 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE WANT TO ELEVATE FROM THE NOT
21 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING TO THE RECOMMENDED FOR
22 FUNDING CATEGORY?

23 OKAY. HEARING NONE, SECOND QUESTION. ANY
24 APPLICATIONS CURRENTLY IN THE RECOMMENDED FOR
25 FUNDING CATEGORY THAT ANY MEMBERS OF THE APPLICATION

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE WANT TO PULL OUT AND PUT IN THE
2 NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING CATEGORY?

3 HEARING NONE, DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO
4 APPROVE THOSE APPLICATIONS IN THE RECOMMENDED FOR
5 FUNDING CATEGORY?

6 DR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.

7 DR. SOUTHARD: SECOND.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY DAVID, SECONDED
9 BY MARV. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE
10 BOARD? HEARING NONE, IS THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: IF YOU HAVE A COMMENT,
12 PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND. I SEE EVAN SNYDER HAS A
13 PUBLIC COMMENT. SO YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES, EVAN.
14 THANK YOU.

15 DR. SNYDER: JUST BEFORE YOU START THE
16 TIMER, RALPH FEUER, WHO IS THE PI ON THE SDSU GRANT,
17 WANTED TO MAKE A COMMENT FIRST. I'M NOT SURE
18 WHETHER HE WAS ABLE TO MAKE IT ONTO THE CALL.

19 DR. FEUER: I'M HERE. I DON'T KNOW IF YOU
20 CAN HEAR ME.

21 DR. SNYDER: RALPH WOULD LIKE TO GO FIRST
22 IF THAT'S OKAY, MARIA.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. THAT'S FINE.
24 RALPH, YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES.

25 DR. FEUER: THANK YOU FOR THE TIME. I'M A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROFESSOR AT SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY, AND I'VE
2 BEEN RUNNING THE BRIDGES PROGRAM AT SDSU FOR THE
3 PAST 14 YEARS.

4 I'D JUST LIKE TO SAY THAT OUR APPLICATION
5 MAY HAVE HAD SOME LOWER SCORES, BUT I THINK BASED ON
6 SOME MISUNDERSTANDINGS OF THE APPLICATION. DESPITE
7 THE LOWER SCORES, AT LEAST FIVE OF THE REVIEWERS
8 THOUGHT THAT OUR APPLICATION WAS WORTHY TO BE
9 FUNDED. AND I THINK I JUST WANT THE BOARD TO
10 RECOGNIZE THAT SDSU, AS PART OF THE CSU SYSTEM OF
11 UNIVERSITIES, HAS A LOT TO OFFER, ESPECIALLY IN
12 TERMS OF THE GOALS OF CIRM AND TRAINING THE NEXT
13 GENERATION BASED ON A DIVERSE POPULATION REPRESENTED
14 BY THE STUDENT BODY THAT EXISTS AT SDSU.

15 SO I JUST WANT TO MAKE THAT KNOWN. WE
16 HAVE AN EXPERIENCED TEAM, THAT WE PUT TOGETHER A
17 PROGRAM THAT I KNOW WILL SET FORTH THE GOALS OF
18 CIRM. AND IT WOULD BE A SHAME, BASED ON WHAT I KNOW
19 ABOUT THE DIVERSITY AT SDSU, IF WE DIDN'T HAVE A
20 PROGRAM HERE IN SAN DIEGO TO SUPPORT THE DIVERSE,
21 TALENTED STUDENTS THAT WE HAVE AT SDSU.

22 WITH THAT, I'LL LET DR. SNYDER MAKE HIS
23 POINTS TO THE BOARD. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: EVAN, YOU HAVE THREE
25 MINUTES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. SNYDER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
2 I THINK THAT THIS APPLICATION IS VERY
3 UNIQUE IN MANY WAYS. MOST IMPORTANTLY, IT'S
4 HIGHLIGHTED BY ITS TITLE. WE HAVE A LASER FOCUS ON
5 THE UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY COMMUNITY AND THE
6 DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY. IN FACT, EVEN THOUGH SBP
7 DOES NOT HAVE AN UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL, WE'VE HAD A
8 LONG, LONG COMMITMENT TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION.
9 AND THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN SBP AND SDSU IS ACTUALLY
10 ONE ENCOURAGED BY CIRM LEADERSHIP BECAUSE OF ITS
11 SYNERGY.

12 SDSU AND SBP HAVE PARTNERED TOGETHER IN
13 MULTIPLE TRAINING PROGRAMS, INCLUDING THOSE
14 SUPPORTED BY CIRM, FOR OVER 15 YEARS. THEY'RE PART
15 OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM THAT WE NOW HAVE. WE'VE
16 BEEN A LONG PART OF THE BRIDGES PROGRAM, PART OF THE
17 SPARK PROGRAM. AND THE SPARK PROGRAM, I THINK, IS A
18 RECENT EXAMPLE OF ITS GREAT SUCCESS. THE SPARK
19 PROGRAM THROUGH SBP, OF WHICH SDSU IS A MEMBER,
20 TRAINED 12 UNDERREPRESENTED HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
21 FROM SAN DIEGO AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES. WE WON
22 SEVERAL PRIZES AT THE RECENT SYMPOSIUM. FOR
23 EXAMPLE, WE TIED FOR FIRST PLACE IN ORAL
24 PRESENTATION, POSTER PRESENTATION, AND CIRM
25 BLOGGING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SBP FOR 45 YEARS HAS HAD A HUGE COMMITMENT
2 TO TRAINING AND PARTICULARLY TO THE UNDERREPRESENTED
3 COMMUNITY. WE HAVE A LONG HISTORY OF TRAINING IN
4 THE STEM CELL FIELD. WE WERE ONE OF THE FIRST -- WE
5 WERE ONE OF THE FIRST FIVE NIH HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM
6 CELL TRAINING PROGRAMS, ONE OF THE FIRST SIX
7 RESEARCH CENTERS IN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
8 RESEARCH. WE PARTICIPATED IN NUMEROUS BRIDGES
9 PROGRAMS FROM CIRM. THE ALUMNI FROM OUR EDUCATION
10 PROGRAM HAVE GONE ON TO DO STELLAR THINGS.

11 THE UNIQUE WAY WE TRAIN, AND IT STEMS FROM
12 OUR GRAD PROGRAM, IT IS IMMEDIATE RESEARCH
13 IMMERSION, VERY INDIVIDUALIZED TRAINING THROUGH
14 TUTORIAL-BASED TRAINING, AND HEAVILY LIAISON WITH
15 THE CLINICAL COMMUNITY, THE INDUSTRIAL COMMUNITY.
16 WE THINK THAT AT A PIVOTAL TIME IN THE TRAINING OF
17 UNDERREPRESENTED UNDERGRADS, WHEN THEY'RE TRYING TO
18 MAKE CRITICAL CAREER DECISIONS, WE, COMBINING OUR
19 STRENGTH WITH SDSU, HAVE AN UNMET OPPORTUNITY,
20 UNRIVALED BY ANY OTHER UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL IN
21 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA THAT HAS THIS KIND OF FOCUS TO
22 TRAIN THIS POPULATION OF KIDS.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, EVAN.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, ARE THERE ANY
25 OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. JENNIFER HAS HER
2 HAND RAISED. JENNIFER, YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES.

3 DR. MANILAY: MY NAME IS JENNIFER MANILAY,
4 AND I'M A PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
5 MERCED. DR. KARA MCCLOSKEY AND I ARE HERE TODAY AS
6 THE CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS ON OUR CIRM COMPASS
7 GRANT. WE'RE VERY EXCITED TO RECEIVE A SCORE OF 86,
8 PLACING OUR PROPOSAL IN THE CATEGORY OF RECOMMENDED
9 FOR FUNDING. AND WE APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO
10 ADDRESS SOME OF THE REVIEWERS' CONCERNS TODAY.

11 UC MERCED IS THE NEWEST CAMPUS OF THE
12 WORLD RENOWN UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEM. AND
13 UC MERCED'S EXISTENCE WAS CATALYZED BY STRONG STATE
14 AND LOCAL COMMUNITY SUPPORT TO PROVIDE A WORLD-CLASS
15 PUBLIC EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA'S CENTRAL VALLEY. UC
16 MERCED'S RESEARCH AND TEACHING MISSION CENTERS
17 AROUND EMBRACING DIVERSITY AND FOSTERING
18 INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES. CIRM HAS ALREADY
19 INVESTED IN UC MERCED CAMPUS VIA SIX AWARDS,
20 INCLUDING A CIRM MAJOR FACILITIES GRANT FOR OUR STEM
21 CELL INSTRUMENTATION FOUNDRY, ABBREVIATED SCIF.

22 WE WISH TO AMPLIFY THAT OUR UC MERCED
23 COMPASS SCHOLARS WILL UTILIZE THE SCIF AS PART OF
24 THEIR TRAINING. MANY FACULTY ON OUR CAMPUS UTILIZE
25 THE SCIF AS PART OF THEIR RESEARCH PROGRAMS,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INCLUDING THE CELL CULTURE ROOMS, FLOW
2 SPECTROMETERS, AND CLEAN ROOM.

3 THE HUMAN STEM CELL TRAINING MODULE WILL
4 PROVIDE HANDS-ON TRAINING IN FLOW SPECTROMETRY, AND
5 THE ENGINEERING MULTICELLULAR LIVING SYSTEMS
6 LABORATORY COURSE WILL DEVELOP SKILLS FOCUSED ON
7 SELF-PATTERNING MATERIALS, DESIGN, AND FABRICATION,
8 AND ON-CHIP DIAGNOSTIC PLATFORMS.

9 CIRM'S EMPHASIS ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION
10 IN THE COMPASS PROGRAM ALIGNS WITH UC MERCED'S CORE
11 VALUES. AT THE TIME OF SUBMISSION, WE WERE UNABLE
12 TO IDENTIFY THE BEST PERSON TO LEAD OUR DEI
13 RECRUITMENT. BUT TODAY HAPPY TO DESIGNATE VALERIE
14 ANDERSON AS THE UC MERCED/CIRM COMPASS DIVERSITY AND
15 OUTREACH COORDINATOR. VALERIE IS THE ASSISTANT
16 DIRECTOR FOR OUR UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY
17 CENTER AND HAS MANY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE PROVIDING
18 RECRUITMENT AND OUTREACH FOR UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH
19 PROGRAMS AT UC MERCED. SHE HAS A SPECIFIC PASSION
20 FOR SUPPORTING DIVERSE STUDENTS' ACCESS TO RESEARCH
21 AND SUPPORTS THEM FROM THEIR INITIAL APPLICATION
22 THROUGH THEIR PROGRAMS AND AFTERWARDS.

23 WITH VALERIE AND COMPASS PARTNERS AND THE
24 UC MERCED DIVISION OF EQUITY, JUSTICE, AND INCLUSIVE
25 EXCELLENCE, WE LOOK FORWARD TO IMPROVING THE COMPASS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RECRUITMENT PLAN FOR THE BENEFIT OF OUR STUDENTS.

2 WE'VE ALSO SECURED TWO STEM CELL
3 SCIENTISTS AS NEW ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS AND ARE
4 SEEKING ADDITIONAL ONES, BEING INTENTIONAL IN
5 RECRUITING A DIVERSE BOARD TO ENGAGE WITH OUR
6 STUDENTS AND OUR PROGRAM. PLEASE REFER TO THE
7 WRITTEN STATEMENT WE SUBMITTED FOR ADDITIONAL
8 INFORMATION.

9 WE LOOK FORWARD TO TRAINING THE FUTURE
10 GENERATION OF THE STEM CELL WORKFORCE AT UC MERCED.
11 THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. J.T., WE HAVE
13 ANOTHER HAND RAISED, BIANCA ROMINA.

14 MS. ROMINA: GOOD MORNING. MY NAME IS
15 BIANCA ROMINA MOTHE. AND I AM THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR
16 OF OUR SUBMITTED COMPASS GRANT FOR CALIFORNIA STATE
17 UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS.

18 SO FOR THOSE OF YOU THAT DON'T KNOW WHERE
19 CSUSM IS, IT'S IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY, SO IN SOUTHERN
20 CALIFORNIA. AND I KNOW WE CAN'T DISCLOSE ANY OF
21 THAT INFORMATION IN THE TITLE OF THE PROPOSAL OR IN
22 THE PUBLIC ABSTRACT. SO I JUST WANTED TO THANK
23 CIRM. IN MY 13 YEARS OF BEING FUNDED BY CIRM WITH
24 THE BRIDGES PROGRAM, THIS COMPASS GRANT MECHANISM IS
25 THE MECHANISM THAT WE HAVE ALL BEEN WAITING FOR.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THIS IS GOING TO PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR SCUSM TO
2 GO AND RECRUIT BIOTECHNOLOGY MAJORS BECAUSE WE HAVE
3 A BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM ON OUR CAMPUS. WE ARE GOING
4 TO GO TO OUR LOCAL HIGH SCHOOLS AND BRING IN
5 STUDENTS TO CSUSM, BE ABLE TO PREPARE THEM TO APPLY
6 TO THE COMPASS PROGRAM, AND AS JUNIORS OR SENIORS OR
7 SOPHOMORES, JUNIORS, AND SENIORS REALLY BE ABLE TO
8 ENGAGE IN THE COMPASS PROGRAM AND BE TRAINED IN LIFE
9 SCIENCES AND STEM CELL RESEARCH.

10 THIS IS ALSO PROVIDING AN OPPORTUNITY FOR
11 FACULTY TO BE ABLE TO ACCESS STUDENTS AT A MORE
12 JUNIOR LEVEL, WHICH THEY HAVE NEVER BEEN REALLY ABLE
13 TO SUPPORT FINANCIALLY. SO I JUST WANTED TO GO
14 AHEAD AND THANK YOU, CIRM. THESE HAVE BEEN
15 CONVERSATIONS THAT I HAVE HAD WITH CIRM STAFF SINCE
16 MICHAEL YAFFE WAS AROUND A FEW YEARS AGO. AND GIL
17 SAMBRANO, WE'VE HAD THESE CONVERSATIONS IN THE PAST
18 ABOUT HOW TO RECRUIT THE MOST DIVERSE STUDENTS IN
19 THE STATE AND GET THEM INVOLVED IN RESEARCH BECAUSE
20 IT'S SUCH A HIGH IMPACT PRACTICE. ON OUR CAMPUS
21 STUDENTS THAT ENGAGE IN RESEARCH GRADUATE IN FOUR
22 YEARS AND HAVE JOBS WHEN THEY'RE DONE. SO THIS WILL
23 CREATE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR AN ADDITIONAL 30 STUDENTS
24 TO ENGAGE IN RESEARCH THAT PROBABLY NEVER WOULD HAVE
25 BEFORE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THANK YOU SO MUCH, AND WE APPRECIATE THE
2 VOTE OF CONFIDENCE HERE AT SCSUSM.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THERE ARE NO
4 OTHER HANDS RAISED THAT I CAN SEE, J.T.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU.
6 YSABEL.

7 MS. DURON: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR. I'M NOT
8 SURE IF I'M SPEAKING OUT OF TURN HERE, BUT I WAS
9 MOVED BY MR. SYNDER'S COMMENTS. MY PROBLEM WAS
10 WHETHER OR NOT I ACTUALLY HAD AN ABILITY OR A RIGHT
11 TO SPEAK ON THIS.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: YOU CAN.

13 MS. DURON: I CAN?

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: YOU DO NOT HAVE A
15 CONFLICT WITH THIS AWARD.

16 MS. DURON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

17 BUT ALSO I WASN'T EVEN SURE ON WHICH GRANT
18 HE WAS REFERRING TO. DID I MISS THE NUMBER? AND
19 WAS IT ONE OF THOSE THAT WAS LEFT BELOW THE 85
20 PERCENT? AND IF HE IS SPEAKING TO US ABOUT
21 RESUSCITATING IT AND MOVING IT FORWARD, I CAN'T MAKE
22 A REALLY GOOD DECISION BASED ON THAT LACK OF
23 KNOWLEDGE. CAN THAT BE CLARIFIED FOR US?

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. GIL.

25 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THAT APPLICATION IS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 13652. AND SO THAT ONE RECEIVED A SCORE OF 80. SO
2 IT IS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.

3 MS. DURON: OKAY. IS THAT THE LAST ONE IN
4 THE BUNCH? I'M TRYING TO MANIPULATE MY --

5 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THERE ARE FOUR THAT ARE
6 NOT RECOMMENDED. SO IT'S THE TOP ONE OF THE FOUR
7 THAT ARE NOT. I CAN SHOW THE RANK ORDER AGAIN.
8 GIVE ME A SECOND.

9 MS. DURON: IF YOU COULD JUST SHOW US THAT
10 ONE. THANK YOU. I WAS INTERESTED -- I MEAN ONE OF
11 THE THINGS THAT I LIKED VERY MUCH ABOUT THE SCORING
12 WAS THAT IT WAS VERY THOROUGH IN BOTH THE POSITIVES
13 AS WELL AS THOSE NEGATIVES. I WONDERED IF, IN TERMS
14 OF THE NEGATIVES, THAT THOSE WERE SO HIGH OR IF, IN
15 FACT, THOSE CAN BE REVISITED TO SEE WHAT ARE THE
16 WEAKNESSES AND CAN THEY BE NURTURED AND GIVEN NEW
17 LIFE; OR SINCE WE ALREADY TOOK A VOTE ON NOT MOVING
18 ANYTHING, WHETHER OR NOT WE WANT TO RECONSIDER
19 WHETHER OR NOT THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO MOVE
20 FORWARD.

21 I JUST -- I HAVE A LOT OF -- I LOVE TO
22 SUPPORT PEOPLE WHO ARE PASSIONATE ABOUT WHAT THEY
23 DO. SOMETIMES IT'S NOT ALWAYS RECOGNIZED.
24 SOMETIMES IT'S NOT ALWAYS STATED WELL, BUT I DO
25 APPRECIATE THEIR DESIRE TO LET US KNOW THAT THEY ARE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 VERY PASSIONATE ABOUT CONTINUING THIS PROGRAM. AND
2 I WOULD JUST LIKE TO LOOK ONCE AGAIN.

3 I APPRECIATE THE REVIEWERS REALLY BEING
4 THOROUGH IN THEIR COMMENTS, AND I'M TRYING TO GET
5 DOWN HERE, GIL, TO SEE WHAT WERE THE OVERRIDING AND
6 OVERARCHING CONCERNS THAT ENDED UP WITH THE FINAL
7 SCORE IN THE NEGATIVE AND WHETHER OR NOT THERE'S
8 OPPORTUNITY TO SEND IT BACK FOR SOME NURTURING AND
9 ADDRESSING SOME OF THE CONCERNS SO THAT IT COULD BE
10 BROUGHT BACK.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, WOULD YOU PLEASE
12 ADDRESS THOSE ISSUES FOR YSABEL AND THE REST OF THE
13 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE'S BENEFIT? THANK
14 YOU.

15 DR. SAMBRANO: ABSOLUTELY. SO LET ME JUST
16 BEGIN BY SAYING THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, WHEN
17 THEY REVIEW EDUCATION PROGRAMS LIKE THIS, THEY ALSO
18 FEEL QUITE COMPELLED TO BE SUPPORTIVE WHERE THEY
19 CAN. AND FROM CIRM'S PERSPECTIVE, WE ADVISE THE
20 GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT WE ARE WILLING TO WORK
21 WITH APPLICANTS TO IMPROVE THEIR PROGRAMS. SO
22 DESPITE THE FACT THAT SOME PROGRAMS MAY NOT HAVE
23 ARTICULATED EVERYTHING WELL OR PRESENTED THEMSELVES
24 IN THE BEST LIGHT, WE DID LOOK AT THESE WITH AN EYE
25 TOWARDS CIRM BEING HELPFUL AND BASICALLY GIVING THEM

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT OPPORTUNITY. AND THAT WAS JUST IN GENERAL.

2 FOR THE APPLICATION THAT WE ARE TALKING
3 ABOUT HERE FROM SAN DIEGO STATE, THE CONCERNS WERE
4 RELATED TO A COUPLE OF MAJOR POINTS. ONE OF THEM
5 WAS IN THEIR RECRUITMENT OF STUDENTS.

6 SO THE APPROACH THEY'RE TAKING IS
7 IDENTIFYING STUDENTS THAT HAVE, QUOTE, A SPARK
8 DURING THEIR CLASS AND LAB SESSIONS. AND SO THIS
9 WAS A POINT OF DISCUSSION BY THE WORKING GROUP AND
10 WAS BROUGHT UP AS A SERIOUS CONCERN IN THAT IT IS
11 INHERENTLY BIASED AND MAY NOT BE INCLUSIVE IN ALL
12 THE WAYS THAT PEOPLE MAY SHOW INTEREST OR ENGAGE
13 WITH THE CLASSES. SO THAT WAS ONE KEY ELEMENT.

14 ANOTHER IS THE MENTOR TRAINING. THOSE
15 WERE CITED BY REVIEWERS AS A CONCERN. THERE WAS A
16 LOT OF DETAIL WITHIN THE PROPOSAL ABOUT THE
17 MENTORSHIP -- ABOUT THE TRAINING OF MENTORS AND HOW
18 THEY WOULD BE IDENTIFIED AS GOOD MENTORS; WHEREAS,
19 INTERESTINGLY, THEY DID OFFER COURSEWORK ON THE DEI
20 TO THE STUDENTS, BUT NOT SO MUCH TO THE FACULTY.

21 OTHER THINGS WERE THAT THE PROGRAM ITSELF
22 WAS NOT WELL WRITTEN AND WELL ORGANIZED, AND THERE
23 WERE SEVERAL MISSING ELEMENTS WITHIN THE
24 APPLICATION.

25 SO THOSE ARE JUST I THINK MAJOR DRIVERS OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE SCORE. THERE WERE OTHER ELEMENTS, BUT I THINK
2 THOSE ARE THE ONES THAT WERE MOST SIGNIFICANT.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL.

4 YSABEL, DO YOU HAVE -- DO YOU WANT TO HAVE
5 FURTHER COMMENT IN RESPONSE, OR SHALL WE MOVE ON TO
6 I BELIEVE MARV HAD HIS HAND UP?

7 MS. DURON: LET'S HEAR FROM OTHERS AND
8 THEN I'LL COME BACK, J.T. THANK YOU.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. LET'S SEE. I
10 CAN'T SEE THE SCREEN.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN IS NEXT.

12 DR. SOUTHARD: SO THIS IS MORE OF A
13 QUESTION ON THE DEI MATTER. I WAS WONDERING IF, AS
14 WE CONSIDER DEI EXPERIENCES, WE HAVE INCLUDED PEOPLE
15 WITH LIVED EXPERIENCE OF MENTAL ILLNESS AS A
16 CATEGORY THAT WE WOULD RESOLVE -- I MEAN INCLUDE.
17 AND SO THIS IS BROADER THAN THIS PARTICULAR
18 APPLICATION. IT'S JUST A QUESTION I HAD AND WANTED
19 TO SPEAK WITH YOU ABOUT THAT.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: GO AHEAD. NEXT IS JOE.

21 MR. PANETTA: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I JUST
22 WANT TO ADD TO THE CONCERN THAT YSABEL RAISED, THAT
23 WE DON'T VOTE ON THESE COMPASS GRANTS A LOT. SO I'M
24 NOT AS FAMILIAR WITH THE PROCESS OF GOING BACK AND
25 WORKING WITH THE APPLICANTS TO ENSURE THAT THERE'S

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AN OPPORTUNITY TO REAPPLY. BUT MY FRIEND EVAN MADE
2 A VERY COMPELLING ARGUMENT FOR THE VALIDITY OF THEIR
3 APPLICATION.

4 AND, GIL, THANK YOU FOR THE EXPLANATION OF
5 THE DEFICIENCIES. THAT WAS VERY CLEAR. BUT I'VE
6 GOT A LOT OF RESPECT FOR BOTH INSTITUTIONS, AND I
7 JUST WANT TO BE SURE THAT THE OPPORTUNITY IS THERE
8 AND UNDERSTAND WHAT THE OPPORTUNITY IS. I DON'T
9 KNOW WHAT THE TIMING IS ON THESE GRANTS IN TERMS OF
10 PROGRAMS BEGINNING, BUT TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S AN
11 OPPORTUNITY TO CORRECT THESE DEFICIENCIES PRETTY
12 QUICKLY. AND IF WE'RE NOT GOING TO APPROVE IT, GIVE
13 THE APPLICANTS A CHANCE TO COME BACK IN. THANK YOU.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: NEXT IS FRED.

15 DR. FISHER: THANKS. I THINK ONE OF THE
16 DATA POINTS THAT I FELT -- I FEEL IS COMPELLING IS,
17 WHEN I LOOKED AT THE FINAL SCORES PAGE OF THIS,
18 THERE WERE 15 REVIEWERS, ONLY FIVE OF WHICH VOTED
19 FOR THE PROPOSAL TO MOVE FORWARD. SO TWO-THIRDS OF
20 THE REVIEWERS FELT THAT THE PROPOSAL, AS GOOD AS IT
21 MAY BE, AS CREDIBLE AS THE INSTITUTION MAY BE, AS
22 COMMITTED AS THE PEOPLE SUBMITTING THEIR PROPOSAL
23 AND REPRESENTING THE UNIVERSITY MAY BE, WHEN
24 TWO-THIRDS OF THE PEOPLE THAT WE CHARGE WITH DOING
25 THE DEEP REVIEW AND SCORING THESE PROPOSALS SO THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TO INFORM OUR DECISIONS, I DON'T THINK WE CAN JUST
2 DISMISS THAT.

3 AND SO I'M IN AGREEMENT WITH OTHERS ABOUT
4 WONDERING WHAT THE OPPORTUNITY IS, HOW THE FEEDBACK
5 WAS SHARED BECAUSE I DON'T THINK I HEARD IN THE
6 COMMENTS A PARTICULAR REBUTTAL OR DISAGREEMENT WITH
7 THE ASSESSMENT OF THE REVIEWERS, PARTICULARLY
8 WHENEVER WEAKNESSES WERE IDENTIFIED. SO IT SEEMS
9 THAT THE REVIEW WAS THOROUGH. TWO-THIRDS OF THE
10 REVIEWERS AGREED THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE SCORED AT THE
11 LEVEL THAT TRIGGERED FUNDING. THE HIGHEST SCORE WAS
12 AN 87; THE LOWEST WAS A 70. SO CLEARLY THERE ARE
13 DEFICIENCIES THAT TEMPERED THE REVIEWERS' ENTHUSIASM
14 FOR THE PROPOSAL. AND SO I THINK WHETHER OR NOT
15 THIS PROPOSAL SHOULD BE MOVED OR HOW THAT GETS
16 ADDRESSED, IT IS REALLY SECONDARY TO SHOULD IT BE
17 APPROVED TODAY. AND THEN MAYBE WE ADDRESS HOW
18 PEOPLE ARE INVITED TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS THAT THE
19 REVIEWERS FOUND AND RESUBMIT. SO...

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, FRED.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, FRED. ALL
22 RIGHT.

23 EVAN, I SEE YOU HAVE YOUR HAND UP. THIS
24 IS A LITTLE OUT OF NORMAL PROCEDURE; BUT SINCE A LOT
25 OF THESE COMMENTS HAVE GONE TO WHAT YOU SAID, I

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WANTED TO GIVE YOU ANOTHER MINUTE TO RESPOND PLEASE.

2 DR. SNYDER: I DID WANT TO JUST QUICKLY
3 ANSWER SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT WERE RAISED. AND
4 MAYBE IT DOES GO TO THE POINT THAT GIL MENTIONED,
5 THAT THE APPLICATION ITSELF MAY NOT HAVE
6 REFLECTED -- MAY NOT HAVE HIGHLIGHTED THE ANSWERS TO
7 THE VARIOUS QUESTIONS. AND I THINK THAT MAY BE PART
8 OF THE LEGACY OF COVID AND PREPARING THINGS DURING
9 THE PANDEMIC.

10 FIRST OF ALL, SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT WERE
11 FLAGGED AS NEGATIVE WERE ACTUALLY MISREAD, WHICH
12 INFLUENCED A LOWER SCORE. ONE OF THE REVIEWERS, FOR
13 EXAMPLE, SAID THAT STUDENTS WOULD BE CHOSEN BASED ON
14 WHETHER THEY COULD WRITE A GRANT COMING INTO THE
15 PROGRAM. WELL, THAT'S WRONG. IN FACT, THEY ARE
16 TAUGHT PRECISELY HOW TO WRITE A GRANT.

17 IN TERMS OF MENTORING MENTORS, THAT IS ONE
18 OF THE ENORMOUS STRENGTHS OF THE SBP PROGRAM. WE
19 HAVE A LONG TRAINING HISTORY IN T32S AND ALL OF CIRM
20 TRAINING PROGRAMS. AND TRAINING EDUCATORS, TRAINING
21 STUDENTS, TRAINING ETHICISTS, JOURNALISTS,
22 POLICYMAKERS IS ONE OF THE PILLARS OF WHAT WE DO.
23 SO THE FACT THAT THAT DID NOT EMERGE PROBABLY WAS AN
24 ERROR IN OUR WRITING.

25 I THINK YOU CAN SEE FROM THE STANDARD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DEVIATION THAT, DESPITE FRED'S MENTION, THE STANDARD
2 DEVIATION REALLY PUT US IN THE MEAN JUST BELOW
3 ESSENTIALLY THE FUNDING LINE. AND SIMPLY WHAT WE
4 ARE ASKING IS EITHER TO BE ELEVATED NOW BECAUSE I
5 THINK WE WILL BE HIGHLY IMPACTFUL OR AT LEAST TO
6 ADDRESS WITH REBUTTAL SOME OF THE COMMENTS THAT WERE
7 RAISED AND THEN HAVE THE ICOC PERHAPS RECONSIDER OUR
8 APPLICATION.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM
10 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

11 MS. DURON: J.T., TO ME THIS BECOMES A
12 PROCESS QUESTION, AND I THINK FRED RAISED THAT AS
13 WELL. WHAT OPTIONS DO WE NOW HAVE GIVEN THAT WE
14 JUST A BIT AGO DID NOT RAISE ANY OF THESE
15 UNDERSCORED UP TO THE LEVEL OF POTENTIAL PASS. DO
16 WE HAVE TO REVISIT THAT MOTION OR DECISION AND THEN
17 DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT WE WANT TO GIVE THIS
18 OPPORTUNITY TO GO BACK TO THE PROPOSED GROUP, LET
19 THEM REWORK IT, AND THEN SEND IT BACK FOR REVIEW,
20 MUCH LIKE WE DO OUR OTHER GRANTS? I DON'T KNOW.
21 CLARIFY THE PROCESS FOR ME PLEASE.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL.

23 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
24 SO JUST TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT BOARD
25 MEMBERS BROUGHT UP, OUR INTENT WITH THE COMPASS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROGRAM IS THAT THIS IS A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM. AND SO
2 WE DID NOT SPECIFICALLY HAVE AN INTENTION TO HAVE A
3 REVISION OF APPLICATIONS OR NECESSARILY HAVE ANOTHER
4 OPPORTUNITY POTENTIALLY FOR ANOTHER FIVE YEARS. SO
5 THAT'S JUST AN IMPORTANT THING TO KNOW.

6 HOWEVER, IF THERE IS AN INTEREST IN HAVING
7 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TAKE A LOOK AGAIN AT SOME
8 APPLICATIONS, WE CAN DO THAT, BUT THAT IS NOT
9 SOMETHING WE HAD PLANNED AS PART OF THE PROCESS. I
10 THINK ONCE WE GOT HERE, IT WAS A FUND OR DON'T FUND.

11 I THINK THAT FOR THOSE THAT -- IF YOU
12 CHOOSE TO FUND A PROGRAM THAT IS NOT RECOMMENDED, AS
13 I MENTIONED EARLIER, WE ARE RULING INTERNALLY TO
14 WORK WITH THE APPLICANTS TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO MAKE
15 AN APPLICATION APPROPRIATE AND ADDRESS CONCERNS THAT
16 WERE BROUGHT UP. SO I THINK THAT'S TO THE EXTENT
17 THE COMFORT LEVEL YOU HAVE IN ALLOWING US TO DO THAT
18 OR WHETHER YOU WOULD PREFER THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
19 TO TAKE ANOTHER LOOK. BUT I THINK THAT WOULD BE AN
20 OPTION AS WELL.

21 AND THEN I THINK ANOTHER QUESTION THAT I
22 WANTED TO CLARIFY. SO EVAN BROUGHT UP THE SCORING
23 JUST TO POINT OUT THAT THE SCORES ARE BASED ON THE
24 MEDIAN. SO THE STANDARD DEVIATION DOESN'T REALLY
25 AFFECT WHAT THE MEDIAN SCORE IS. IT IS LARGELY A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 VOTE BETWEEN THOSE THAT SCORED ABOVE 85 VERSUS NOT,
2 WHICH, AS MENTIONED EARLIER, IS A TWO-THIRDS VERSUS
3 ONE-THIRD.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL.
5 ADRIANA.

6 DR. PADILLA: YES, THANK YOU. JUST A
7 QUESTION FOR GIL. WHAT WAS THE FUNDING AMOUNT? IS
8 THERE DOLLARS TO FUND THIS PROJECT AS WELL, OR IS
9 THAT A CONCERN? AND OBVIOUSLY I THINK DEFICIENCIES
10 NEED TO BE CORRECTED; BUT IF THE OPPORTUNITY IS
11 THERE TO IMPROVE AN APPLICATION AND THE FUNDING IS
12 THERE AND THIS IS THE ONE AND ONLY OPPORTUNITY THEY
13 HAVE FOR A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM, THEN PERHAPS SOMETHING
14 SHOULD BE DEVELOPED FOR THAT TO HAPPEN.

15 DR. SAMBRANO: CERTAINLY. SO THE AMOUNT
16 OF FUNDS THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE IS 58.22 MILLION.
17 SO THERE ARE ENOUGH FUNDS BASICALLY TO FUND ALL
18 FOUR, IF YOU DECIDED THAT, THAT ARE NOT RECOMMENDED.
19 SO THE AMOUNT OF BUDGET AVAILABLE IS NOT A CONCERN.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FRED.

21 DR. FISHER: JUST TO FOLLOW UP ON
22 SOMETHING GIL SAID. IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING ON THE
23 SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS THE FUNDING IS SORT OF
24 BENCHMARKED, OR MAYBE I'M WRONG ABOUT THAT. I GUESS
25 MY CONCERN ABOUT APPROVING A PROPOSAL THAT WAS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 REJECTED PRETTY HANDILY AND THEN HAVING STAFF WORK
2 WITH THE APPLICANT TO IMPROVE THE PROPOSAL AND, IN
3 EFFECT, IMPROVE THEIR APPROACH, HOW MUCH CONTROL DO
4 WE HAVE IN TERMS OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF THAT FUNDING
5 IF THE APPLICANT JUST DOESN'T, FOR EXAMPLE? AGAIN,
6 THIS IS MORE -- THIS IS NOT ABOUT SAN DIEGO STATE
7 UNIVERSITY AT THIS POINT. THIS IS JUST MORE ABOUT
8 PROCESS AND HYPOTHETICALLY.

9 WHAT LEVERAGE DO WE HAVE TO ENSURE THAT
10 THE IMPROVEMENTS THAT NEED TO BE MADE ARE ACTUALLY
11 ADDRESSED SUFFICIENTLY TO WARRANT FUNDING AND
12 CONTINUATION OF THE PROGRAM?

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LET ME MAKE A COMMENT
14 HERE. SO THIS IS AN APPLICATION FROM AN APPLICANT
15 THAT HAS HAD A VERY SUCCESSFUL BRIDGES AND SPARK
16 EXPERIENCE. THIS PARTICULAR APPLICATION WAS VIEWED
17 BY A FAIRLY LARGE MAJORITY OF THE GWG AS NOT WORTHY
18 OF FUNDING. AND I AGREE WITH FRED. WE HAVE TO TAKE
19 A LOOK AT THAT. AND THIS NOTION OF GOING BACK AND
20 REWRITING APPLICATIONS TO BRING THEM WITHIN THE FOUR
21 CORNERS OF WHAT THE GWG MAY BE LOOKING FOR IS
22 SOMETHING THAT WE HAVE NOT DONE IN THE PAST WITH
23 SCIENTIFIC APPLICATIONS.

24 COMMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO THAT EFFECT
25 REPEATEDLY BECAUSE THAT IS TO ME NOT GOOD POLICY TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DO. IT COMES IN, IT IS WHAT IT IS NOTWITHSTANDING
2 THE STRENGTH OF THE ENTITY, THE STRENGTH OF THE
3 TEAM, EVERYTHING ELSE. THE APPLICATION HAS TO
4 STAND, IN MY OPINION, ON ITS OWN TWO FEET. AND HERE
5 IT HAS BEEN JUDGED NOT TO BE ONE THAT WAS
6 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY A LARGE MAJORITY.

7 SO I DO THINK WE HAVE TO PAY CLOSE
8 ATTENTION TO THAT. AND I THINK PRECEDENTIALLY, THE
9 IDEA, AS MUCH AS I LIKE THE INSTITUTION AND THE
10 PLAYERS, ET CETERA, PRECEDENTIALLY THE NOTION OF
11 GOING BACK AND REWRITING AN APPLICATION TO BRING IT
12 TO WITHIN WHAT WE THINK ARE THE APPROPRIATE
13 CRITERIA, IN MY OPINION, IS NOT A GOOD IDEA.

14 OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

15 MS. DURON: MR. CHAIR -- JOE, YOU GO
16 AHEAD. YOUR HAND IS UP.

17 MR. PANETTA: THANKS. MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK
18 YOU FOR THE EXPLANATION. THIS IS A LITTLE BIT
19 DIFFERENT FROM THE PROCESS THAT WE GO THROUGH WITH
20 THE SCIENTIFIC APPLICATIONS, AND I APPRECIATE YOUR
21 PERSPECTIVE ON THIS AND I TEND TO AGREE.

22 MY ONLY CONCERN IS THAT I'M NOT SURE THAT
23 WE UNDERSTAND WHAT THE PROCESS IS GOING FORWARD FOR
24 THIS APPLICANT. I GOT THE IMPRESSION FROM WHAT DR.
25 SAMBRANO SAID THAT THIS IS DO OR DIE NOW, AND I

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DON'T KNOW WHEN THE NEXT OPPORTUNITY IS. MAYBE THAT
2 WAS CLARIFIED, BUT I DIDN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND WHERE
3 WE GO FROM HERE. IF WE'RE GOING TO GO WITH THE
4 POLICY THAT WE DON'T GO BACK AND REWORK GRANTS AND
5 REWRITE THEM, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO HAVE SOME
6 CONFIDENCE THAT THE APPLICANT WILL HAVE THE
7 OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK IN SOMETIME IN THE NEAR
8 FUTURE, BUT I DON'T REALLY KNOW WHEN THAT IS. THANK
9 YOU.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, WOULD YOU LIKE TO
11 RESPOND TO THAT PLEASE.

12 DR. SAMBRANO: SO WE DON'T KNOW. WE
13 INTEND TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY LIKELY AGAIN AFTER
14 FIVE YEARS ONCE THIS PROGRAM REACHES THAT STAGE AND
15 WE WOULD RENEW AND MAYBE BRING NEW PROGRAMS IN. WE
16 HAVE NOT DISCUSSED YET THE POSSIBILITY OF EXPANDING
17 THE COMPASS PROGRAM ANY TIME SOONER. SO AT THE
18 MOMENT IT WOULD BE FIVE YEARS FROM NOW.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. YSABEL. WHAT,
20 MARIA?

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: NOTHING.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YSABEL.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL, YOU'RE ON MUTE.

24 MS. DURON: SO, MR. CHAIR, COUPLE OF
25 THINGS. FIRST OF ALL, I'D LIKE THAT MAYBE WE SHOULD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CONSIDER REVIEWING THE PROCESS AND PUTTING THAT --
2 NOT DECIDING TODAY, BUT PUTTING THAT PROCESS INTO A
3 BUCKET OF THINGS WE NEED TO ADDRESS SO WE ARE ALL
4 VERY CLEAR GOING FORWARD.

5 SECOND OF ALL, INSTITUTIONS TOO MUST
6 LEARN, AND THEY SOMETIMES HAVE TO BE NIMBLE IN THAT
7 LEARNING. SO SIMPLY SAYING THAT WE ESTABLISHED A
8 PROCESS AND THEY DIDN'T MEET IT AND THEY SHOULD HAVE
9 KNOWN BETTER, I MEAN THE WHOLE POINT OF PRESSING DEI
10 OVER ALL OF THESE YEARS THAT I'VE BEEN ENGAGED IN
11 DEI WAS PUSHING AGAINST INSTITUTIONS WHO DIDN'T SHOW
12 THAT THEY WERE LEARNING. AND SO IF THIS IS A
13 LEARNING OPPORTUNITY FOR THIS INSTITUTION TO
14 RECOGNIZE THEY THINK THEY KNEW WHAT THE HELL THEY
15 WERE DOING -- EXCUSE MY FRENCH -- BUT IN FACT THERE
16 ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEM TO LEARN TO BE BETTER,
17 THEN I'M NOT ABOUT NEGATING THAT. WE'RE ALWAYS
18 GIVING INDUSTRY AND EVERYBODY ELSE OPPORTUNITIES TO
19 BE BETTER BECAUSE WE WANT THEM TO RISE TO THE TOP
20 AND BE THE BEST, ET CETERA, ET CETERA.

21 SO YOU'VE TALKED ABOUT THE SDSU AND ALL OF
22 ITS PARTNERS AS BEING REALLY GOOD PLAYERS WITH US IN
23 THE BRIDGES AND SPARKS PROGRAMS, SO THEY MUST BE
24 DOING SOMETHING RIGHT. SO TO JUST ASSUME -- AND I'M
25 SORRY, MR. SNYDER, BUT I GUESS SOMETIMES EVEN WHEN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 YOU FALL ASLEEP, SOMEONE HAS GOT TO STAY AWAKE AT
2 THE WHEEL AND REALLY MAKE SURE THAT WHEN SOMETHING
3 GOES OUT THE DOOR, IT IS -- IT MEANS WHAT YOU SAY
4 AND IT SAYS WHAT YOU MEAN. SO SOMEBODY FELL ASLEEP,
5 BUT THAT'S NOT TO SAY THAT YOU DON'T HAVE ALL THE
6 INGREDIENTS THAT ARE NECESSARY TO MOVE FORWARD BOTH
7 THE SCIENCE AND THE SCIENTISTS AND PARTICULARLY
8 THOSE YOUNG SCIENTISTS THAT WE ARE LOOKING TO BUILD
9 AND NURTURE AND GROW WITHIN COMMUNITIES OF COLOR AND
10 UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.

11 SO WHEN I WAS ON TELEVISION NEWS, I MADE
12 MY OWN MISTAKES, AND PEOPLE FORGAVE ME, AND I WAS
13 ALLOWED TO COME AND TO TRY AGAIN. AND SO,
14 THEREFORE, I THINK WE SHOULD FIND -- EVEN IF I
15 SHOULD MOTION, AND THIS WOULD BE NEW, I GUESS THAT
16 WE SEND IT --

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: EXCUSE ME, YSABEL. WE
18 HAVE A MOTION ON THE TABLE. JUST SO EVERYBODY IS
19 CLEAR, IF ANYTHING WAS GOING TO CHANGE, WE'D HAVE
20 TO --

21 MS. DURON: THAT WAS WHAT I HAD ASKED
22 EARLIER, MARIA. IS THERE SOMETHING WE HAVE TO GO
23 BACK AGAINST? SO THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO CLARIFY,
24 WHETHER THE PROTOCOL OR THE PROCESS OR WHATEVER WE
25 WANT TO SAY, I MEAN I MAY BE THE ONLY ONE VOTING ON

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE SECOND CHANCE, BUT I AT LEAST WANT US TO FIND
2 OUT WHAT IS THAT PROCESS. AND THEN WE NEED TO GO
3 BACK AND REVIEW THIS BECAUSE I THINK IF CIRM IS
4 ABOUT ANYTHING, IT IS REALLY ABOUT MAKING SURE THAT
5 EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ARE THERE FOR OUR YOUNGEST
6 SCIENTISTS AND NOT JUST WORRY ABOUT THE SCIENCE OF
7 THE SCIENTISTS.

8 SO YOU TELL ME, J.T. OR GIL, WHAT IS OUR
9 NEXT -- I GUESS IT WOULD BE YOU, MR. CHAIR, TO TELL
10 US.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IF THE QUESTION, YSABEL,
12 JUST TO CLARIFY FOR YOU, IS WERE YOU TO WANT TO
13 SOMEHOW HAVE THIS AMENDED, LET'S ASK KEVIN MARKS TO
14 WEIGH IN ON THIS QUESTION BECAUSE IT'S A MULTISTEP
15 PROCESS. KEVIN.

16 MR. MARKS: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. WE
17 HAVE TWO OPTIONS BEFORE US SINCE THERE'S A PENDING
18 MOTION. SO EITHER THE MOVANT OF THE MOTION, WHICH
19 WAS DAVID HIGGINS, AND WITH THE APPROVAL OF MARVIN
20 SOUTHARD, COULD WITHDRAW THE MOTION, AND WE CAN
21 ENTERTAIN A NEW MOTION. OR THE PENDING MOTION CAN
22 BE AMENDED UPON WHICH WE WOULD NEED TO VOTE ON THE
23 PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND THEN HAVE A SECOND VOTE ON
24 THE AMENDED MOTION THAT WAS MADE BY DAVID.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. YSABEL, DID YOU

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GET THAT?

2 MS. DURON: I'M SO SORRY. MY BRAIN KIND
3 OF WHEN LIKE THIS. I WAS TRYING TO FOLLOW. NO.
4 SORRY, KEVIN.

5 DR. MARKS: OKAY. SO LET ME SEE IF I CAN
6 PUT THIS IN MORE PLAIN ENGLISH AND NOT SO MUCH THE
7 OFFICIAL ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER.

8 SO IF THE MOVANT OF THIS PARTICULAR
9 MOTION, WHICH WAS DAVID HIGGINS, I BELIEVE, AND THEN
10 SECONDED BY MARVIN SOUTHARD, WISH TO WITHDRAW THE
11 MOTION, THEN WE WOULD GO BACK TO CHAIRMAN THOMAS'
12 QUESTION, WHICH IS IS ANYBODY LOOKING TO MOVE THINGS
13 FROM THE UNFUNDED CATEGORY TO THE FUNDED CATEGORY.
14 AND IN THAT CASE WE WOULD HAVE A MOTION ON THAT.
15 AND WE WOULD THEN SUBSEQUENTLY ENTERTAIN ANOTHER
16 MOTION WHICH WOULD BE TO FUND EVERYTHING IN THE
17 FUNDED CATEGORY.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT ASSUMES FIRST WE'D,
19 OF COURSE, VOTE ON THAT MOTION AND SEE WHETHER THAT
20 PASSED OR DID NOT PASS. AND THEN WE WOULD MOVE TO
21 THE NEXT STAGE OF VOTING ON THE FULL BODY OF THOSE
22 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, CORRECT, KEVIN?

23 DR. MARKS: YSABEL, YOU HAVE A QUESTION?

24 MS. DURON: YES. WE DON'T -- WE DON'T
25 HAVE ANY ESTABLISHED PROTOCOL FOR SENDING IT BACK

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WITH REQUIREMENT OR WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRY TO
2 ADDRESS THE ISSUES AND FIX IT AND THEN BE REVIEWED.
3 WE DON'T HAVE ANYTHING IN OUR PROCESS TO DO THAT
4 FROM WHAT I'M HEARING.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S CORRECT BECAUSE,
6 A, WE DON'T; AND, B, THAT WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO THE
7 OTHERS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING THAT AREN'T ON
8 THIS CALL. SO, NO, WE DON'T.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: REALLY QUICKLY, FRED HAS
10 HIS HAND RAISED SO I WAS GOING TO ADDRESS FRED'S
11 COMMENTS AND ASK FRED FOR HIS COMMENT.

12 DR. FISHER: I THINK YSABEL IS ON THE
13 RIGHT TRACK AT THE BEGINNING OF HER COMMENTS, BUT
14 THEN WE LOST OUR WAY BACK INTO UNDOING MOTIONS THAT
15 ARE CURRENTLY ON THE TABLE AND THE REST.

16 THE GWG HAS A PROCESS IN PLACE FOR
17 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW WHERE AT THE GWG LEVEL, IF A
18 PROPOSAL FALLS INTO A CERTAIN CATEGORY, A CERTAIN
19 SCORE RANGE, AUTOMATICALLY THE APPLICANT HAS AN
20 OPPORTUNITY TO GO BACK WITHIN SIX MONTHS, I THINK,
21 AND REAPPLY. FIX THE PROBLEMS, TAKE THE COMMENTS
22 FROM THE REVIEWERS AND THE STAFF, ADDRESS IT, AND
23 THEN IT COMES BACK. THAT PROCESS DOES NOT EXIST
24 WITH THESE GRANTS.

25 AND I DON'T KNOW WHY, BUT I THINK YSABEL'S

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FIRST SUGGESTION IS THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE COULD
2 TAKE UP AT SOME POINT SO THAT THESE APPLICANTS LIKE
3 THIS ONE WHO ARE MOTIVATED TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS
4 OR MOTIVATED TO IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAM WOULD HAVE THE
5 OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE THE CORRECTIVE ACTION. SINCE
6 THAT DOES NOT EXIST, WE ARE LEFT WITH TWO CHOICES.
7 ADDRESS THAT PROBLEM DOWN THE ROAD OUTSIDE OF THIS
8 PROCESS AND MAINTAIN THE INTEGRITY OF THIS PROCESS.

9 MY RECOMMENDATION IS WE MAINTAIN THE
10 INTEGRITY OF THIS PROCESS AND THEN ADDRESS THE
11 PROBLEM THAT HAS NOW BEEN EXPOSED, PRESUMABLY FOR
12 THE FIRST TIME, WHERE WE NEED TO HAVE A PATHWAY FOR
13 APPLICANTS TO COME BACK IF THEIR SCORE FALLS IN A
14 CERTAIN RANGE AND THEY WISH TO TAKE THE CORRECTIVE
15 STEPS POSSIBLE. SO I'D LIKE US TO KEEP THE
16 INTEGRITY OF THIS PROCESS AND ADDRESS THE PROBLEM
17 THAT WE ARE CONFRONTED WITH. WHILE THIS IS THE
18 EXAMPLE OF THE PROBLEM, IT'S NOT ABOUT ADDRESSING
19 SDSU'S PROBLEM. IT'S ABOUT ADDRESSING A PROCESS
20 ISSUE. AND WE CAN DO THAT AT A DIFFERENT TIME, BUT
21 I RESPECT THE WORK OF THE REVIEWERS, RESPECT THE
22 INTEGRITY OF THIS PROCESS, AND NOT CONTORT OURSELVES
23 AROUND THE FACT THAT WE DON'T HAVE A PROCESS SO WE
24 GOT TO UNWIND EVERYTHING ELSE AND ALL THE WORK
25 THAT'S ALREADY BEEN DONE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO HOPEFULLY, YSABEL, THAT MAKES IT CLEAR.
2 AND I SUPPORT YOUR FIRST RECOMMENDATION. I WOULD
3 PREFER THAT WE NOT GO BACK AND BREAK WITH THE
4 PRECEDENT THAT WE'VE HEARD THE CHAIRMAN DESCRIBE, A
5 BREAK WITH THE INTEGRITY OF THE GRANT WORKING GROUP
6 AND THE VAST MAJORITY OF PEOPLE WHO THOUGHT THIS
7 PARTICULAR PROPOSAL SHOULD NOT BE FUNDED, AND
8 ADDRESS THE PROBLEM EXPEDITIOUSLY SO THAT THIS
9 APPLICANT AND OTHERS WHO WOULD CHOOSE TO TAKE THE
10 CORRECTIVE ACTIONS DON'T HAVE TO WAIT FIVE YEARS TO
11 DO SO.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, FRED. I
13 THINK THAT WAS VERY WELL SAID. AND THE ANOMALY HERE
14 IS THAT SIX MONTHS ISN'T AVAILABLE JUST BY VIRTUE OF
15 THE FACT THAT THIS IS A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM SORT OF
16 ONE AND DONE. SO THERE IS NO PROCESS TO ADDRESS.
17 IF THE BOARD CHOOSES TO AMEND THE WAY WE VIEW
18 APPLICATIONS THAT FIT INTO THIS UNUSUAL SET OF
19 FACTS, THEN WE CAN HAVE DISCUSSION ON THAT AT A
20 FUTURE TIME. I WOULD AGREE WITH FRED ENTIRELY.

21 AND FURTHER TO MY EARLIER COMMENT, I DO
22 NOT THINK THAT MAKING BAD POLICY HERE, AS MUCH AS WE
23 WOULD LIKE THE APPLICANT, THE PROGRAM, WHAT THEY'VE
24 DONE IN THE PAST, ET CETERA, IS A GOOD IDEA. SO I
25 WOULD NOT BE IN FAVOR OF AMENDING ANYTHING THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WOULD CHANGE THAT PROCESS.

2 OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

3 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN YOU HEAR
4 ME?

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE'S A LOT OF
6 FEEDBACK, ART, BUT WE CAN HEAR YOU NOW.

7 MR. TORRES: OKAY. GREAT. I AGREE WITH
8 THE TENOR AND THE DIRECTION IN WHICH WE ARE GOING.
9 HOWEVER, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER MERELY MOVING THIS
10 ITEM TO THE FUNDING SECTION SOLVES OUR PROBLEM. I
11 THINK WE HAVE TO BE FLEXIBLE WITH THESE TYPES OF
12 GRANTS TO REVIEW THE PROCESSES THAT MANY OF OUR
13 BOARD MEMBERS HAVE INDICATED AND PUT IT INTO THE
14 PLACE FOR A REAFFIRMATION OR REOPENING OF THE
15 PROCESS AND NOT BE SO RIGID THAT WE CAN'T DO IT FOR
16 ANOTHER FIVE YEARS. I THINK WE'RE FLEXIBLE ENOUGH
17 TO LOOK BACK AT THE PROCESS THAT WE'VE ESTABLISHED
18 AND FIX OUR PROBLEM AT THE SAME TIME AND ALLOW THESE
19 OTHER PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED THIS TIME TO HAVE A
20 SECOND BITE OF THE APPLE AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME.

21 BUT IF THE MOTION IS TO MOVE THIS
22 PARTICULAR PROJECT TO THE FUNDING CATEGORY, THAT
23 DOESN'T SOLVE THE PROBLEM THAT WAS RAISED BY
24 TWO-THIRDS OF THE REVIEWERS.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ART. OTHER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 COMMENTS, QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH HAS HIS HAND RAISED.

3 MR. LAJARA: GENERAL COMMENT. IT MIGHT
4 HELP IN THE FUTURE, BEFORE WE HAVE MOTIONS AND WE'RE
5 GOING TO TAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS, MAYBE DO IT IN THE
6 REVERSE ORDER. MAYBE TAKE THOSE PUBLIC COMMENTS
7 FIRST; AND THEN IF WE'RE GOING TO MOVE ANYTHING,
8 HAVE THOSE MOTIONS SO WE ARE NOT STUCK IN THE
9 POSITION WHERE POTENTIALLY WE'RE GOING TO REVERSE A
10 MOTION. BECAUSE WE TOOK PUBLIC COMMENTS AFTERWARDS,
11 THAT MAY HAVE CHANGED OUR PERCEPTION ON SOMETHING.
12 SO THAT WAS IT.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU, RICH.

14 OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
15 OF THE BOARD?

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE ARE NO OTHER HANDS
17 RAISED.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THAT WAS A
19 ROBUST DISCUSSION. THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR ALL OF
20 YOUR POINTS. THIS IS AN UNUSUAL SITUATION HERE. AT
21 THE END OF THE DAY, WE FIND OURSELVES NOW WITH THE
22 MOTION THAT WAS ORIGINALLY PUT ON THE TABLE TO VOTE
23 YES OR NO ON FUNDING THOSE PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR
24 FUNDING. SO, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: IF YOU COULD PLEASE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RESPOND YES OR NO EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE
2 A CONFLICT. THAT'S IMPORTANT. THANK YOU.

3 DAN BERNAL.

4 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
6 ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE. YSABEL DURON.

7 MS. DURON: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

10 DR. FLOWERS: YES, EXCEPT THOSE FOR WHICH
11 I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

13 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
14 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.

16 DR. FISHER: YES.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

18 DR. HIGGINS: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE I HAVE
19 A CONFLICT.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD. RICH
21 LAJARA.

22 MR. LAJARA: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.

24 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE
25 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

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

MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
ADRIANA PADILLA.
DR. PADILLA: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
MR. PANETTA: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT. MARVIN
SOUTHARD.
DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
MR. TORRES: AYE, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. KAROL WATSON.
2 THE MOTION CARRIES. WE JUST HAVE QUORUM SO THAT WAS
3 A GOOD THING. THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. THANK
5 YOU, EVERYBODY, AGAIN. THAT CONCLUDES THE ITEMS.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: WE NEED TO CLOSE OUT.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OH, YES. SORRY. I
8 FORGOT STEP FOUR, WHICH IS DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO
9 NOT APPROVE THOSE APPLICATIONS IN THE NOT
10 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING CATEGORY?

11 DR. FISHER: SO MOVED.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY FRED. SECOND?
13 I'LL SECOND. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF
14 THE BOARD? ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE'S NO PUBLIC
16 COMMENT.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. HEARING NONE,
18 MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

20 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
22 ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE. YSABEL DURON.

23 MS. DURON: YES.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

25 DR. FLOWERS: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
2 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
4 DR. FISHER: YES.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
6 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
8 MR. LAJARA: YES.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
10 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
12 DR. PADILLA: YES.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
14 MR. PANETTA: YES.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
16 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18 MR. TORRES: AYE, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
20
21
22
23
24
25

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. AND JONATHAN
2 THOMAS.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

4 THANK YOU, EVERYBODY. OKAY. THAT
5 CONCLUDES THE ACTION ITEMS FOR THE APPLICATION
6 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE.

7 WE ARE NOW INTO PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY
8 TOPICS OF ANY INTEREST. DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC
9 COMMENT? HEARING NONE, I BELIEVE THAT CONCLUDES
10 TODAY'S AGENDA. MARIA, OUR NEXT BOARD MEETING IS?

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: SO WE HAVE AN ARS MEETING
12 SEPTEMBER 20TH, AND THAT'S FOR THE APPLICATION
13 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. AND THAT WILL BE TO REVIEW
14 SOME DISCOVERY APPLICATIONS AS WELL AS CLIN. AND
15 THEN WE HAVE A FULL BOARD MEETING ON THE 29TH. SO
16 THAT'S SORT OF ACTIVE FOR SEPTEMBER. SO TWO
17 MEETINGS AND WE'LL SEE YOU THEN.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. THANKS
19 VERY MUCH. HAVE A GREAT END OF SUMMER, AND WE WILL
20 SEE YOU NEXT MONTH.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.

22 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 10:14 A.M.)
23
24
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 VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON AUGUST 30, 2022, 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
(208) 920-3543