

ICR Governing Board Meeting Minutes

November 13, 2020 12:00 – 1:00 pm

Virtual Meeting

<https://csupueblo.zoom.us/j/510564566>

ATTENDEES: Dr. Cinnamon Bidwell, Dr. Chad Kinney, Nicole Quartiero, Dr. Malik Hasan, Dr. Sue Sisley, Dr. Maureen Leehey, John Lord, President Mottet, Scott McWhorter, Dr. Jon Reuter, Sherard Rogers

Meeting Minutes:

- I. Welcome (12:00-12:03pm) Dr. Bidwell
 - i. Sal out on international travel; his assistant joined in his place.

- II. Approve minutes from 10/09/20 (12:03-12:05pm) Dr. Bidwell
 - i. Motion – Dr. Hasan; Second – Dr. Leehey; all voted to approve (7)
 - ii. Discussion regarding considering a different meeting structure moving forward. This will be considered in the future, but at this point the monthly meetings are the most effective as we are establishing operational structure. Dr. Hasan suggested forming an executive committee that meets more frequently with the rest of the board joining every few months. Dr. Bidwell responded that this recommendation has been shared in the past, but there is value in the diversity of the members as the details of the various processes being developed.

- III. RFA Scientific Review Procedures (12:05pm – 12:30pm) Dr. Kinney
 - i. Review of draft document; Dr. Kinney is requesting feedback and then he will distribute the document to the Board.
 - b. LOI
 - i. Key Purpose – identify topic area to recruit review panels; also to confirm proposers meet eligibility requirements.
 - c. Review Panel
 - i. Based on NIH model; discussion regarding the first and second level of review model and discussion regarding how the ICR review process will parallel that model and who would comprise the various groups. Nicole Quartiero and John Williamson will be the ICR PD. Dr. Leehey suggested that we incentivize reviewers. Dr. Reuter suggested that the incentive to be a waived registration fee to the ICR Conference.
 - d. Addressing Potential COIs – Best Practices
 - i. Dr. Bidwell asked the Board to comment on how to balance the representation of researchers on the board and their participation or recusal based on their submissions. Dr. Hasan commented that there is a need to balance the appearance of being fair while maintaining the ability to lean on the expertise of board researchers with the main goal of ensuring there is no favoritism or appearance of favoritism.
 - ii. Dr. Leehey asked for clarification regarding levels of review to which Dr. Kinney responded.
 - iii. Dr. Kinney commented that a level of common sense when determining who with a research background from the Board would/should participate in the second level of review.
 - iv. Dr. Kinney will distribute this document for feedback and the board will vote on the adoption of the document/process at the December meeting.
 - v. Dr. Reuter asked about reviewers signing a form related to conflict of interest to which Dr. Kinney responded that it is included in the draft.
 - e. Project Slate
 - f. Progress Reports

- IV. Curriculum Review Process (12:30 – 12:35) Dr. Kinney
 - a. Updated related to CCD - Responded to comments from the Board.

- b. Secondary Review?
 - i. Dr. Kinney shared that he received a response to reviews of the Community College of Denver. They were under the impression that the subcommittee would provide a secondary review of the curriculum plan submitted.
 - ii. Dr. Bidwell responded that the single review is consistent with our process therefore, we do not need to implement a secondary review into the established process.

V. Fundraising Updates (12:35pm – 12:55p) Dr. Kinney

- a. Updates - OSBP
 - i. Response from OSBP
 - ii. Developing a Proposal for consistent research funding
 - 1. Dr. Bidwell, Dr. Kinney and Sal participated in a meeting with the OSBP. The response was that we were too late in the process for next fiscal year, but encouraged us to start the process earlier to be considered for FY23.
 - 2. Dr. Hasan shared that he intends to support a legislation to help support the ICR in the future.
- b. JBC – Strategies for engagement?
- c. Updates – CSU Pueblo Foundation
 - 1. There is now a ‘donate now’ button on the ICR website. There are some restrictions on donors, but this is a positive step forward.
- d. Pueblo County Funding
 - i. Sponsored Program
 - ii. Targeted Priorities
 - 1. Pueblo County provided \$150k to support research at CSU-Pueblo. They have provided priority areas and it will be treated as a sponsored programs.
 - 2. Proposals will be submitted and reviewed scientifically to maintain the merit of projects funded.
 - 3. Questions regarding what board’s role is regarding the review and approval of projects funded.
- e. Governing Board – Nonprofit
 - i. Viability? - Staff limited in their ability to participate in the management of a nonprofit.
 - ii. Approach?
 - 1. Legalization could affect this as it would negate the need to have a separate funding management component.
 - 2. This is an option, but would require a complete and separate operation.
 - 3. There are other efforts in progress that could help address the barriers to accept funding from companies that derive revenue from marijuana as well as support high THC research.
- f. Other Action Items

VI. Public Comment (12:55-1:00pm)

- i. Dr. Sievers shared he commends what the Board and the ICR are working on and accomplishing.

VII. Adjourn