



**American Brain Foundation
Research Advisory Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 17, 2017
Held via Conference Call**

Call to order: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 at 10:02 a.m. CST by Robert Griggs, MD, Chair.

In attendance: Robert Griggs, MD, Chair; Eugene Scharf, MD; Ralph Sacco, MD; Shafali Jeste, MD; Raymond Roos, MD; John Morris, MD; Ira Shoulson, MD

Staff: Jane Ransom; Kristi Benson; Suzi Sherman

Excused: Christy Phelps; Lisa DeAngelis, MD; Carsten Bonneman, MD; Merit Cudkowicz, MD

1. **Welcome and introduction of attendees:** Dr. Griggs shared the 2017 meeting calendar and called attention to the in-person committee meeting in April during the Annual Meeting.
2. **Report from Science Committee Meeting of 1/12/2017:** Dr. Jeste shared an update from the Science Committee meeting that took place in Arizona last week. She and Jane presented the crowdfunding idea to the Science Committee along with the plan for proposal reviews. We would like their support and help in variety of areas within the crowdfunding platform. There were two main areas of discussion:
 - i. Ensuring the science that ends up being accepted to be on the crowdfunding platform is message properly so it is clear what the goals of the research are. Review process – what the criteria would be to evaluate the proposals. They all agreed that we need concrete guidelines regarding what is appropriate for this platform
 - ii. How do we figure out who we should connect this opportunity to? Possibly those who do not receive awards from the AAN and those that the committee feels would be appropriate for the ABF crowdfunding.
3. **Forms for Letters of Inquiry and Applications on Crowdfunding Site:** Dr. Scharf shared the draft LOI and Application documents.
 - **LOI**
 - i. Do we need to include what type of institutional support the researcher has? We can sub specify under 3A if they have existing funds or in-kind support. In the follow up we can get the hard letter from their department chair.
 - ii. There should be a CV for the PI to be included with the LOI so that the LOI reviewer can see their credibility.

- **Application**

- i. There should be a word or page limit for each section.
- ii. Under “Outcomes” – need to revise what we mean by “specific criteria”
- iii. We should try to follow the NIH layout for the application form to make it easier for the reviewers to follow.
- iv. Add a “feasibility” rationale under the Methods section.
- v. How do we handle other funding that may be given to the applicant? Will there be overlap with our funding? In general, there is never enough money to do the projects that are proposed. Any existing funding or grants shouldn’t limit one’s ability to apply for our funds. The applicant should be very clear about the funding they already have. They can explain their overlap under the budget section.

4. **Promoting Diversity in the ABF’s Crowdfunding Initiative:** Dr. Morris shared the hope for the crowdfunding review committee to select proposals that have merit and are scientifically worthy and at the same time try to support groups of individuals that may have more difficulty than established investigators of getting research funding (i.e. early investigators, women, and under-represented groups). We do not have concrete ideas of how we balance those proposals as of yet. Dr. Morris is willing to canvas a number of funding entities to get their procedures on how to come up with the fairest method that also allows us to launch careers for those who may have more difficulty in this area. How do we handle certain minority groups who may come from a lower institution who may not be able to get an IRB from their institution? How do we provide help to them? Do we want to have people identify themselves as a disadvantaged group? Dr. Morris will look into how other institutions handle these situations. We may also need to determine if there is a need for mentoring.

Meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m. CST.