

**MINUTES OF THE  
MARYLAND STEM CELL RESEARCH COMMISSION**

Wednesday, February 21, 2007  
techcenter@UMBC  
Catonsville, MD

**Members in attendance:**

Joseph Capizzi  
Brenda Crabbs  
Gloria Marrow  
Linda Powers, Chair  
Karen Rothenberg  
Jack Schwartz  
Jeremy Sugarman

**Members absent:**

Diane Griffin  
John Kellermann  
Suzanne Ostrand-Rosenberg  
Murray Sachs  
Steven Salzberg  
Bowen Weisheit  
Joel Zaiman

**Others in attendance:**

Jacqueline Du Bois, TEDCO  
Linda Saffer, TEDCO  
Renee Winsky, TEDCO

The Commission meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

The Commission considered the minutes of October 10, 2006, November 13, 2006, and January 16, 2007. All agreed they preferred the format be consistent with the manner presented in the January 16, 2007 draft. A motion was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved as suggested. A quorum was not present for the vote.

**II. Administrative Matters**

When the Commission meets to make funding recommendations, the meeting will begin as an open meeting and then go into closed session, which will be limited to matters that are permissibly discussed in closed session under the Maryland Open Meetings Act.

### **III. Status Report on Scientific Peer Review Process**

TEDCO staff reported that the 45 Exploratory Research applications were reviewed by the independent Scientific Peer Review Committee members in an NIH-style study section on February 8 and 9; the 41 Investigator-Initiated Research applications were reviewed on February 15 and 16. Over 30 reviewers participated in these sessions and they came from California, Florida, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

The Scientific Peer Review Committee reviewed and ranked each application based on scientific merit, provided summary comments on each, and provided suggestions for the Commission to consider in the future. The Scientific Review Administrator (SRA) is preparing summary statements for each application.

TEDCO is preparing lists dictated in the draft procedures document and tentatively include: the TEDCO Funds identification number, score, ranking, cell type, disease or condition targeted for study, amount of funding sought, and whether or not the proposed research is basic or translational.

Commissioners discussed whether scores and other summary information regarding the applications should be disseminated to applicants.

### **IV. Discussion of Draft Decision Making Procedures**

The Chairman went over the draft with the Commission. There was considerable discussion of how the procedures would work. The Commissioners commented favorably on the procedures, indicating that the procedures were well developed and thorough. The question arose as to how the Commission would know if an ethical issue was raised by the proposed research. TEDCO staff indicated that the applicants were required to comment, if necessary, on any research with human and animal subjects. In addition, prior to funding any research, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval must be established. There was concern that some IRBs have no experience with this sort of research. Due to this possible circumstance, will individual Commissioners be able to review entire applications? It was determined that Commissioners will be able to review applications, but that guidelines on recusal and conflict of interest pending Commission approval will need to be adhered to.

The next meeting of the Commission will take place on March 7, 2007. If a quorum is present, the Commission will adopt the minutes, procedures, and recusal and

conflict of interest guidelines. The Scientific Peer Review Working Group will meet after the Commission to take some of the preparatory steps outlined in the draft decision making procedures in order to facilitate the Commission's work at its grants decision-making meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.