

Consent Agenda – November 15, 2023 Board Meeting

Agenda Item II.a

ICR Governing Board Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023 1:00 – 2:00 pm

Meeting By Zoom: <https://csupueblo.zoom.us/j/91807976090>

In Attendance: Dr. Chad Kinney, Dr. Jeff Smith, Ms. Wendy Fairchild, Dr. Cinnamon Bidwell, Dr. Melissa Reynolds, Dr. Joanna Zeiger, Mr. Dieter Raemdonck, Ms. Amber Valdez, Ms. Elyse Contreras, Dr. John Williamson, Dr. John Harloe, Mr. Scott McWhorter, and Mr. Ean Seeb

Absent: Dr. Malik Hasan, Mr. Sal Pace, Mr. Sherard Roberts, and Dr. Jon Reuter

***Note – Action Items are highlighted with blue text.**

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Welcome (1:00-1:02pm) Dr. Bidwell
- II. Consent Agenda (1:02-1:05pm) Dr. Bidwell
 - No questions/comments – Dr. Zeiger makes the motion and John Harloe seconds – 5 approve, Ms. Contreras abstains.
 - a. Minutes from Sept 20, 2023.
 - b. Dr. Jon Reuter appointed the second Chair of the Governing Board
 - c. Summary – Marketing and Communication, and Cannabis Curriculum
 - i. **Decision item** – Marketing and Communication Extension
 - d. Annual Board Training – December 20th Board Meeting (about 30 min)
 - e. Updated Key Benchmarks
- III. Thank you to Dr. Cinnamon Bidwell (1:05 – 1:07pm) Dr. Kinney
 - Dr. Bidwell leaving post as Chair – Dr. Kinney offers his thanks to her since 2019 – Bidwell spent much time and effort to make this process work – discusses award to be presented – Dr. Jon Reuter will replace her.
- IV. Government Relations – Brief Check in (1:07-1:12pm) Amber Valdez and Dieter Raemdonck
 - Mr. Raemdonck –distributed the Annual Report to Membership of JBC and Education Committees in both houses, Leadership in both houses, and Pueblo Delegation – received “thanks for the update” and he will follow up with folks – lots of hearings and meetings focused on budget items, so nothing in the weeds yet
 - Has not seen the CDOT report related to impaired driving yet – reached out to CDOT liaison – still being wrapped up
 - Dr. Williamson asks for results of this study when available – **Dieter will continue to follow up with CDOT legislative liaison.**
 - Legislators will begin thinking about what to move on for next year – will watch for items of interest to the ICR; he will ask to see this once available and knows this is a priority
 - Ms. Valdez and Mr. Raemdonck left at 1:13
- V. CRC 2023 Debrief and Discussion (1:12-1:35pm) Drs. Bidwell, Kinney, and Williamson

- a. Report from D. Plump Consulting
 - Dr. Kinney discusses report – questions?
- b. Response to Recommendations
 - Dr. Bidwell stressed that this was a success with the move to Denver and etc.,
 - Room sizes were a concern – conference increased by 10% after the conference started and the institution didn't release rooms until the conference started. Space was a concern.
 - Lack of signage – difficult to find where rooms were located.
 - Reception didn't feel like a typical reception, lack of networking opportunities and adult beverages.
 - Dr. Bidwell inquires about better networking opportunities at the conference to engage all desired stakeholders.
 - Dr. Zeiger – Ean Seeb and other dignitaries appreciate receiving the invitation - we really need to branch out of Colorado to have more representation from other scientific academic institutions – hope we can get more next year
 - Dr. Harloe – suggests creating more email lists that target the folks we are trying to reach, offer networking events, get critical mass, then governor/legislators may be able to attend/speak, etc. – he is working on this.
 - Dr. Kinney agrees with Dr. Zeiger - 54% from Colorado-there are many conferences offered that don't have the quality of content that we have – our strength is content – How do we draw a broader audience (question posed to Daphne) – we are looking to contact other campuses that have similar programs or research - Can reach out to these organizations (mostly higher education) to invite and create partnerships – sees as a benefit to our conference.
 - Ms. Contreras – invite other federal agencies and have more days or opportunities for keynote speakers – noticed international attendees. More support for presenters to make smoother and more professional.
 - Dr. Reynolds - Can we do some [Save the Date announcements \(Chad to work with Wendy to get it out soon\)](#) because for academics, summer schedules are filling up?
 - Dr. Bidwell – mentioned NIDA reps were at the conference.
 - Dr. Harloe -Dominique is incoming chair for CANNRA, maybe she'd email their group.
 - Dr. Kinney – strong network of partners with good quality organizations will make the conference better.
 - Dr. Zeiger – conference planning committee – wonders if we should have subcommittee from GB for the conference to discuss conference related things other than discussing abstracts – discuss potential partnerships, etc. – could help with larger issues – Daphne may not be the right person.
 - Dr. Bidwell suggests this would add additional support for the ICR (Dr. Kinney)
 - Dr. Kinney supports this especially when reaching out to organizations that GB members may have contacts. [He is to initiate.](#)
 - Dr. Zeiger - Tulsa University is starting a program and they would likely want to be a partner or at least be involved in some way.
 - Ms. Contreras – attendance on each day wasn't provided in the report -thinks Saturday may have been poorly attended.

- c. Updates on CRC 2024
 - Dates – CSU Ft Collins August 7-9th, student center, ballroom, and many breakout rooms – Dr. Punya Nachappa will chair – she will be point of contact and is a benefit from the cost perspective.
 - **Dr. Kinney will begin forming the committee.**
 - Dr. Bidwell feels optimistic and confident about the next conference.
 - Dr. Kinney - **Dr. Park collaborating with Dr. Williamson on a conference grant to bolster conference - will provide updates.**
- d. Steps to becoming Premier Cannabis Research Conference
- e. Conference Grant

VI. Advancement Plan (1:35-1:45pm) Dr. Smith and Dr. Harloe

Pre-read: Summary from Dr. Smith

- a. Discuss Recommendation for Professional Development and Development of an Advancement Plan for the ICR.
 - i. **Decision item** – Recommendation outlined in **Pre-read**
 - Strategic Partnerships – organization that Dr. Smith is working with - \$57,500 for 5 months - maybe risk with unknown benefit – based out of Washington, DC
 - Gem Consulting, Mike Gem, more training and would teach us to make the ask - \$30,000 to learn to make the asks ourselves – we don't have the staff.
 - Advancement Resources in Iowa – provide online learning series - \$5150.00 – training for Dr. Smith and Dr. Kinney – they will not participate in the ask – most likely to produce results in Dr. Smith's opinion.
 - Dr. Smith recommends AR and would be involved with this task – we allocated \$5000 at last year's board meeting.
 - Dr. Kinney says a few places where this additional money could be available – some resources committed to grant writing could be used - there are options.
 - Dr. Harloe – maybe appropriate for break-out group for fundraising –unless commission, you may not get the work product hoped for
 - Dr. Smith says time of the essence.
 - Ms. Contreras – now and last retreat, Dr. Mottet has an existing contract – can we piggy back on this? Likes Advancement Resources but what is succession plan?
 - Dr. Smith – SA has limited scope that can be provided – strongly encouraged interaction with FFAR for support of hemp research – mostly interested in agencies like traditional government rather than individual donors.
 - Dr. Bidwell – recommendation from Dr. Smith and Dr. Kinney – concerns about succession, engage larger strategic planning around this - Dr. Bidwell asks for support to move forward, and make motion to allocate \$ for advancement training – Ms. Contreras makes the motion, Dr. Harloe seconds, no from Mr. McWhorter
- b. Updates on Potential Donation – Hydroponics Facility in Colorado City
 - Dr. Kinney – He and Dr. Harloe met with Foundation, owner of facility interested in donating facility, acre of grow space indoors – owner has vision for educational purposes – ICR not really able to carry out vision

the owner has – however, offered as an unrestricted gift, could sell and reinvest, but need to disclose – no resources to prop this up – now passed back to the Foundation to discuss with owner.

- Wants this done by end of year for tax purposes – inspect for material defects, last thing we want is to carry on \$10,000 cost per month – walk away?
- Dr. Bidwell – feels challenging for GB to weigh-in at this time – she appreciates the due diligence and hopes to discuss again at a later time.

c. Potential fundraising event

VII. Potential Collaboration with MED (1:45-1:50pm) Drs. Harloe, Kinney, and Smith Statutory Feasibility Study ([Senate Bill 23-271](#))

- Dr. Kinney – met with MED to discuss above – It was not immediately clear what they were looking for from the ICR – followed up with Dr. Smith and Dr. Harloe
- Dr. Harloe – portion of bill requires MED to prepare a feasibility study – feasibility of a standby committee to determine safety of minor cannabinoids, and intoxication potential.
- Looking for experts in the field – up our alley and fulfills our mission – more ammo if funds at risk – we won't have time for writing but resource for asking questions – they may go to CU and others as well.
- Dr. Kinney - not just ICR staff involved, but also GB members – joint effort.
- Dr. Bidwell supports, it's the work we should be doing.
- Ms. Contreras – suggests expanding to the Lambert Center
- Consensus to support – **Dr. Kinney to gather information to share with MED**

VIII. Research Subcommittee Updates-Met 10/6/23 (1:50-1:55pm) Dr. Kinney

- a. LOI – use to trim down applicants – invite full applications
- b. Potential R15/RUI Program
- c. Process improvement
 - i. Research Contract Amendment - prior to July 1st for continuing projects
 - ii. Roll Forward – separate contract amendment after July 1st

IX. Public Comment (1:55-2:00pm) Dr. Bidwell

- None (Ms. Contreras – please thank the person for considering us for the gift)
- Adjourn - 2:03

Agenda Item II.b.

In an effort to provide an opportunity for Colorado Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs) to gain an equitable opportunity to secure research funding through the ICR granting program by focusing on these institutions' researcher's strengths and needs, coupled with meritorious and innovative research, the Research Subcommittee explored the creation of a funding program specific to PUIs and loosely modeled after the [NIH R15 AREA](#) opportunities. This effort will promote the development of future researchers (students) in the cannabis field and serve as a pipeline to cannabis researchers for graduate and professional programs.

Research Subcommittee Motion Approved for the 2024 RFA:

The 2024 RFA will incorporate a new process to stimulate cannabis related research at predominantly undergraduate institutions (PUIs) by supporting an opportunity similar to the [NIH R15 AREA](#) program. This will be through the normal RFA process using the same review criteria (and reviewer base) as the regular RFA with any final decisions to fund a proposal from a PUI by moving one proposal up in ranking being made at an administrative level by the Board in collaboration with the Director. At an upcoming meeting of the Research Subcommittee a decision will be made on minimum criteria for an application from a PUI to be considered for funding, as well as a decision on an appropriate definition for a PUI. This process will be piloted as part of the 2024 RFA with a goal of funding one high quality application from a PUI, and the success of the program evaluated by the subcommittee prior to future RFAs.

The Research Subcommittee Revised its Summary of ICR Grant-Proposal Review Process for 2024. These additions have been highlighted in blue texts below. The appendices that for this document have not been included with this summary as the revisions do not pertain to the appendices.

ICR Board of Governors summary of the ICR grant-proposal review process, 2024.

The ICR has developed a review process for evaluating its research proposals which follows national best practices developed by federal agencies such as the NIH and USDA. The process provides transparency to the board and to the public, implements unbiased and objective evaluation of the scientific merit of each proposal, and utilizes the expertise of the board to ensure that funded proposals match the mission of the ICR; to serve the scientific cannabis-research needs of the citizens of Colorado. The ICR review process also takes steps to minimize conflicts of interest (COI) that might arise with board member involvement in the process (see appendix I).

The review process involves the following steps as outlined below:

- 1) The Governing Board Research Subcommittee evaluates and refines the Request for Applications (RFA) in the October – December timeframe during the year prior to the release of the RFA. [The RFA will include an explanation of the criteria that the ICR will use for letters of intent \(LOI\) screening prior to extending invitations for full applications. It will also include a description of the ICR review process for the scientific panel to NOT discuss full applications that are scored in the lower 50 percentile.](#)

- 2) The RFA is presented to the entire Board for review at the December meeting.
- 3) The RFA is posted in January on the ICR website and advertised using the ICR list-services and “word-of mouth” facilitated by board members and ICR staff.
- 4) Letters of intent are received in *InfoReady* at the end of February and evaluated by the ICR staff for appropriateness with respect to the ICR mission. Authors of all letters receive written feedback indicating either a. that the intended application is acceptable for submission, or b. that the application is not fundable by the ICR.
- 5) Each LOI will be screened by the Grants Manager and, if needed the Director, using the following criteria to:
 1. Ensure that applicants/organizations are eligible for the funding opportunity.
 2. Ensure that the proposed research project fits within the funding opportunity.
 3. To identify the maximum number of full applications that are expected to be received.
 4. To understand the topic areas of the applications that will be received so that the ICR can recruit review panel members with the appropriate expertise.
- 6) Applications are received in April and assigned to an appropriate scientific review panel a. Biology, Agronomy, Chemistry and Physiology, b. Medical, clinical, public health and societal impacts, or c., other, as needed. The panels are comprised of subject matter experts in the field.
- 7) Each application is assigned a primary reviewer and is reviewed by that person and a secondary reviewer. Reviewers enter their scores and comments for each proposal into the *ICR Scientific Review Rubric* located in *InfoReady*. Note: The Evaluation rubric is available for download as a pdf in *InfoReady* (**see also Appendix I**).
- 8) Each review panel meets virtually to discuss each proposal. All members of each panel are required to be knowledgeable of the content of all proposals assigned to the panel. The primary reviewer for each proposal leads the discussion for the panel about the proposal. Reviewers have an opportunity to adjust their feedback in *InfoReady*. **Only proposals with an initial score in the top 50% will be discussed as a part of the review panel meeting. Proposals not reaching this threshold will be triaged with the PIs receiving only the feedback from the primary and secondary reviewers. A review panel member can recall any triaged proposal that they feel strongly warrants a review and discussion by the full panel.** ICR staff (not the director) moderates the discussion with the scientific review panel during the panel meeting to identify the proposals that are of sufficient quality to go forward for funding consideration. The selected proposals will go forward to the board for board review.
- 9) Applications that are deemed to be of sufficient quality to move forward will be redacted to de-identify them, including: project title, project abstract, budget overview, summary of scores, written feedback from the scientific review panel, and project abstracts.
- 10) Board members are provided a Board Member COI rubric (**Appendix II**) to complete prior to reviewing proposals that have moved forward from the scientific review process. Board members with identified COI will be recused from reviewing the application(s) for which they cited a COI.
- 11) Applications will be reviewed by ICR Governing Board members (who do not declare a COI) using the *Governing Board Grant Application Scoring Rubric* (**see appendix III**). This level of review evaluates the alignment of each proposal with the stated mission of the ICR and does *NOT* attempt to re-evaluate the scientific merit of any proposal.
- 12) The ICR Director receives all of the data from the scientific and board reviews and makes final funding decisions in consideration of the review data and ICR-finances.
- 13) The Director will file a short summary justifying any funding decision that is not consistent with scientific and board review selection of the numerically top ranked proposals.

14) Award and rejection letters with feedback showing the review comments and justification for the final funding decision are sent in July and funded research projects begin in October. **Appendix I.**

ICR FY24 Scientific Review Matrix DC.PDF

Appendix II.

Board member Conflict of Interest Rubric

Appendix III.

Governing Board Grant Application Scoring Rubric.pdf

Agenda Item II.c.

Mr. Michael McMaster from the Attorney General's Office will provide State Board Training at the December 20th Board Meeting. This is a regularly scheduled Board Meeting for the month of December. The training will take about 30 min.