

Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2006: Council Meeting
San Francisco, CA

Members present: Moon Chen, Jim Ford, Amy Kyle, John Morgan, Angela Padilla, Gordon Parry, Mark Pegram, Kathy Walters, Lisa Wanzor, Maria Wetzel, Christine White

Members absent: Felicia Hodge, Anuja Mendiratta, Kim Pierce, Kurt Snipes

Staff: Natalie Collins, Janna Cordeiro, Lyn Dunagan, Larry Fitzgerald, Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, Katherine McKenzie, Walter Price, Roslyn Roberts, Sylvia Santana

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:20a.m.

“Meet a Council Member”: Jim Ford and Moon Chen

II. Minutes

MOTION: Lisa Wanzor moved (Gordon Parry seconded) that the May 12, 2006, minutes be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business

A. Funding Update and Data Analysis: Larry Fitzgerald presented a funding update, including the pre-funding status, funding data, and an analysis of the programmatic review. All administrative work is underway for the newly funded grants. Council members discussed the timing of the IDEA-competitive renewal grant applications. The staff will evaluate the timing and criteria for these awards to see if any changes need to be made.

Larry Fitzgerald then presented an analysis of the impact of scientific merit (from the peer review process) on the programmatic review. In summary, the programmatic review process is balanced and consistent; there were no examples of outstanding grants that were not offered funding. At the council’s request, the staff will apply the same analysis to the last few cycles. The council discussed setting the programmatic review cutoff at 50 percent instead of at the lowest one-third, weighing the council’s reduced workload against the value to the “middle-ground” applicants of receiving helpful feedback from the Program. No decision was reached at this time. Staff will conduct further analysis, looking more closely at the “upper 25%” and the outliers of the funded cycle 12 grants.

B. Programmatic Review Debriefing: The council discussed their experiences during the programmatic review process, including the general improvement in the applications, criteria, and Program’s portfolio balance. Portfolio balance is reviewed over a range of years, as well as individual years, and incorporates the historical mandates (such as focusing on the underserved) established during the Program’s founding. In the event that the Program’s available funding increases significantly, the council may reconsider how it apportions the funds between the priority areas.

Council members discussed having both a lay title and a scientific title for grants. Some members believe that alternative titles would help spotlight certain grants and improve overall lay-friendliness; other members were concerned that two titles would be confusing and would damage the Program's credibility. Additionally, there are administrative and logistical costs to including a lay title in any greater scope than on the lay abstract. The staff will discuss the issue and bring its recommendations back to the council.

Action items for the staff that arose from the programmatic review debriefing discussion:

1. Add titles of the grants to the lay abstract form
2. Analyze more data to take a second look at the possible outliers
3. Explore the idea of having a lay title for each grant
4. Eliminate the committee names

C. Joining Forces Conference Award: Walter Price presented a new application. The council discussed the merits of the application and the potential conflict with UC guidelines.

MOTION: Lisa Wanzor moved (Gordon Parry seconded) that the application be funded in the amount of \$24,700 on condition that the participants are paid equally. The motion carried, with eight votes for, two abstentions, and none against.

The council asked the staff to include UC cost criteria to the guidelines for future Joining Forces awards.

D. Cycle 13 Call for Applications: Larry Fitzgerald reviewed the next cycle's *Call for Applications*, with the addition of the new Translation award. Council members discussed the document and suggested slight editorial changes.

MOTION: Lisa Wanzor moved (Maria Wetzel seconded) that cycle 13 *Call for Applications* be approved, with minor changes as discussed by the council. The motion carried unanimously.

The previously-approved final text of the translation award was submitted for the council's information.

E. Committee Reports

1. Translation Committee: The Translation committee is no longer active.

2. Evaluation Committee: Lisa Wanzor reported on the committee's progress of building a logic model for evaluation the new translation award. Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch reported that the Department of Defense has shared information about a new database system for evaluation and outcome tracking, which may be useful and available to us in

the future. Lisa further reported that the committee has developed a plan for the process of evaluating the council's effectiveness.

3. Outreach Committee: Angela Padilla presented an update of the committee's progress in planning the 2007 symposium. The committee is identifying possible plenary speakers and ranking them into four categories. The council discussed the current list and suggested ranking options as well as other possible speakers.

F. Council Chair and Vice-chair Elections: The council voted to name Lisa Wanzor as Chair and Amy Kyle as Vice-chair of the 2006-2007 advisory Breast Cancer Research Council.

IV. Director's Report

A. Special Research Initiatives: Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch presented an update of the SRI's progress. The first steering committee is June 19; the *State of the Science* research is underway; and a final draft of the development plan is ready for the steering committee to see. We are still recruiting for the research analyst position.

B. "Inside Health" video: The Learning Channel's program, "Inside Health with Peggy Fleming" has aired a segment that features the CBCRP. The segment was presented to the council for their enjoyment.

V. New Business

A. Feedback from Advocate Observers and Reviewers: Larry Fitzgerald presented the results of the reviewer surveys and advocate observer surveys, which took place after the peer review process. The feedback will inform any changes for the next cycle.

VI. Announcements

The November council meeting was set for November 16-17, tentatively in the Los Angeles area.

The meeting ADJOURNED at 4:28p.m.