

Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes
February 1, 2002
Santa Barbara, CA

Members Present: Sue Blalock, Teresa Burgess, Diana Chingos, Lauren John, Irene Linayao-Putman, Ellen Mahoney, Tammy Tengs, Sandy Walsh, Anna Wu

Members Absent: Hoda Anton-Culver, Elaine Ashby, Robert Carlson, Craig Henderson, Akua Jithadi, Florita Maiki, Georjean Stoodt

Staff Present: Janna Cordeiro, Laurence Fitzgerald, Charles Gruder, Marion Kavanaugh-Lynch, Katherine McKenzie, Walter Price, Roslyn Roberts,.

I. Call to Order and Introduction

Chair Terri Burgess called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

II. Approval of October 19, 2001 Minutes

Corrections were made to the minutes as follows: The second sentence of the first paragraph on page 4 reads “and knowing how to others to reach more providers” and was corrected to read “and Know-How to others to reach more providers”. The first sentence of the second paragraph of page 4 initially read “for breast and cervical to develop” was corrected to read “for breast and cervical patients to develop”. In the first sentence of the second to last paragraph on Page 5, change “compliment” to “complement”.

Motion: It was M/S/P to approve the minutes with the noted corrections.

III. Director’s Report

A. Cycle VIII Update (Attachment 2)

Mhel began her report with an update of the Cycle VIII Call for Applications. BCRP received 198 applications, an increase of 20% from last year. Each RA reported on applications received in their respective areas.

Larry Fitzgerald reported that because there were so many applications on pathogenesis, he created an additional committee, Tumor Progression, to evaluate applications on hormone receptors, cell cycle, and earlier progression of breast cancer.

Walter Price stated that he was encouraged by the number of dissertation and psychosocial applications received. The portfolio has grown from epidemiologic risk factors and case control studies to molecular epidemiology.

Katie McKenzie is primarily responsible for applications in basic breast biology and shares with the responsibility for those on innovative treatments. She presented a proposal to change the scientific review procedure. Each application has been read by five reviewers – three scientific reviewers, an advocate reviewer, and a

reader. She explained that the staff proposed to eliminate the reader because this would save considerable time and money (approximately \$20,000), without any loss of quality.

Action: Terri determined that there were no objections to this proposed change and the council endorsed it.

Mhel briefly discussed changes in the council's programmatic review process. She reported the distribution of applications among the primary and complementary priority issues and award types. She proposed that council members first recommend funding of applications on the primary issues and types before considering the complementary issues and types.

Mhel presented the tentative schedule for scientific review committee meetings encouraged council members to attend a meeting as an observer, particularly if they had not done so in a previous year. She explained two conditions of attendance that are designed to keep the scientific and programmatic review processes independent. Members who attend a scientific review committee should choose one that is different from their council programmatic review committee. Council members attend scientific review committees strictly as observers, that is, they do not participate in the scientific review process or the committee's discussion.

B. 2002 Advances in Breast Cancer

Mhel reviewed the status of the Annual Report to the Legislature for 2001 and the 2002 Advances in Breast Cancer Research. Changes suggested by council members have been incorporated along with the scientific progress sections written by the RAs. The annual report will be forwarded to UC officials for approval by mid-February. The text for the 2002 Advances is due from the consultant on February 15th and, unfortunately, will not be available for the March symposium. Mhel suggested that the Advances be sent to symposium attendees.

C. Governor's Budget (Attachment 3)

Mhel reviewed relevant sections of the Governor's proposed 2002-03 budget, which was released in mid-January. The budget projects that \$24,400,000 will be collected in cigarette tax revenue from the two-cent breast cancer tax, and that the Breast Cancer Fund will accumulate \$200,000 in interest. The projections are slightly lower than for 2001-02.

The budget proposes allocating \$14,729,000 to BCRP and \$1,600,000 to the California Cancer Registry. Mhel reported that state cigarette tax revenue has declined over the past few years, in part due to a 50-cent-per-pack price increase instituted by the tobacco companies. The Governor's budget projects revenues of \$500,000 from the income tax check-off for breast cancer research in 2002-03, the same as in 2001-02.

D. State Income Tax Check-off (Attachment 4)

Mhel reported that the State Board of Equalization's year-end report for 2000-01 showed that \$624,000 was collected from the tax check-off, which is a significant increase from previous years. Contributions via the breast cancer research tax check-off were surpassed last year only by the endangered species check-off, and only by \$4,000. Interestingly, there were 5,000 more donors to BCRP, but their average donation was less than for endangered species.

The enabling legislation for the tax check-off program sunsets January 1, 2003 and is therefore up for another 5-year renewal this year. Senator Speier has written a bill to renew the breast cancer research tax check-off. She decided not to pursue adding a corporate tax check-off. The bill would renew the current program with one change. It would permit the expenditure of a maximum of five percent of the annual allocation for administrative costs, which is the same as the provision for the tobacco tax allocation.

E. Other Ongoing Projects

The Common Scientific Outline (CSO) group is scheduled to meet in San Francisco in April. BCRP is collaborating in the CSO group with the Komen Foundation, CAPCure, California Cancer Research Program, NCI, DOD, and others.

The steering committee for the conference on breast cancer and the environment is progressing well. The industry relations committee, which was scheduled to meet tomorrow is cancelled and will be rescheduled at a later date.

Presentation of Fundraising/Marketing/Public Education Plan

Laura Talmus of Laura Talmus Associates, and Betsy Krugliak of The Pacific Group, presented a proposed one-year fundraising, marketing and public awareness campaign for BCRP.

IV. Committee Reports and Discussion**A. Collaboration with BCEDP Committee**

Walter Price reported on the Collaboration with the BCEDP Committee. The CDS section of DHS will do a presentation at the symposium emphasizing their BCEDP database which would position researchers to apply for our primary priority issues in health policy and health care issues. Dr. Stoodt will do a presentation to the council on the States' plan to prevent and control breast and cervical cancer. This presentation will serve as background on what role the council could play in information gaps which need to be filled for that plan to be translated and implemented. The Council should consider what role, if any, it would take in the dilemma about mammography screening, policy implications, etc. Finally, the

committee felt that they had successfully developed eight points which would serve as the framework for planning for the next year.

B. Outreach Committee

Terri Burgess gave a brief overview of the instructions to council members for the Cornelius L. Hopper Awards which recognizes posters that are exceptional in three areas: Innovation of Research, Potential Impact on Breast Cancer and Best Presentation for a lay audience. Each council member signed up for one of the committee poster judging committees.

Katie reported that most of the articles for the upcoming BCRP Newsletter had been submitted. She asked the council members to review the article that described them and give their edits back to her. The newsletter would be released at the symposium.

Katie announced that Susan Honig had to drop out of the plenary session of the symposium, so Patricia Keegan, the Deputy Director of the FDA Division of Clinical Trial Design and Analysis, agreed to take her place.

C. Evaluation and Priority Setting Committee

Evaluation

Anna began her discussion with an update of the ongoing evaluation projects. Alex, the newly recruited intern, is responsible for an evaluation of the New Investigator grants. She will include approximately 24 PIs who have received New Investigator awards from BCRP. This evaluation is largely based on the postdoc evaluation conducted last year. Janna has begun an evaluation of our IDEA I awards. The committee has reviewed the draft survey and has agreed that Janna should conduct 8 exploratory interviews before implementing a final survey with approximately 40 PIs. She'll do telephone and email interviews. Janna has sketched out a timeline and the study should be completed no later than August 1st.

Priority Setting

Mhel presented an overview of the priority setting framework developed by the committee. She reiterated the committee's decision to make two major changes which (1) incorporated a new proposed priority setting process every three years and (2) assigns the majority of the workload to the committee and BCRP staff with the committee presenting summaries to the full council. The proposed three year timeline would allow potential applicants an opportunity to apply more than once if the Program has set a particular priority issue and afford a sense of continuity in the process from year to year.

At the Councils' request, Mhel developed a timeline which provided an overview of the process over three full council years incorporating other council responsibilities

within the cycle and clarifying the roles of the staff, committee and council members. She proposed that the annual and tri-annual priority setting assessment would be parallel to reviewing the mission statement and reaffirming the list of long-term outcomes. The criteria would be reviewed and prioritized, taking into account the data questions already developed and presenting the data through various sources including evaluation studies, quantitative data, case studies which would be collected by consultants or contractors.

The tri-annual priority setting process would span over five to seven council meetings designating two hour sessions where data is presented to the council, generating discussion on how to apply and/or implement it in the priority setting process. The BCRP staff will be responsible for collecting the material for those presentations, providing a summary of the presentations along with the council's discussions and maintaining a collective data base to draw from when formulating a plan in making decisions for June, 2004.

Ellen Mahoney suggested a designated council website which would allow council members to access data at any given time. The Council agreed that spreading the process out over three years was a huge improvement and the collection and presentation of data could also be conceived as an educational tool for council members.

Mhel stated the importance of obtaining a formal vote on the adoption of the proposed priority setting process since the council makeup in June 04, at the conclusion of the process, would include all new members.

Action: There were no objections to the proposed change in the priority setting framework and the council endorsed it.

V. Stakeholder's Input Process

Posters - Janna reported the concept of having posters at the symposium which reflect current priority issues along with a blank poster where symposium attendees could write ideas and comments about those priority issues. She discussed devising a way to vote on which priority issues which make the most impact on breast cancer.

BCRP Listens – Mhel will provide a brief overview followed by a moderated open mike forum involving audience participation. Attendees would be given a card to write out questions and/or comments with Council members available to answer questions.

BCRP Website - Larry Fitzgerald gave a presentation of the proposed layout and timeline for the BCRP Listens web site Feedback Pages. The structure was in the form of a descriptive intro page, which is then linked to a submission page patterned after the Symposium registration, and with another link to a 'What Others Are Saying' page to view submitted

comments. The Council discussion was positive and input was given on the style (more lay-friendly) and content of the questions to be addressed. The plan was to have BCRP staff generate the preliminary pages. We would then send the Council and BCRP Staff a 'hidden link' so that final comments on the layout and structure could be obtained in late February. The launch was planned for the BCRP Symposium on mid-March to coincide with the Friday evening session "BCRP Listens." Larry plans to collect the feedback comments and provide them in an unedited form prior to each Council meeting.

VI. Finalization of Proposed New Award Supplements

A. Diversity Award

Janna provided an update on the Diversity Award. The UC General Counsel has approved the language and staff is now in the process of finalizing grant administration details before it is actually distributed in February. Copies of the Award will be available at the symposium with the first applications due in April.

B. CRCAS

The CRCAS Award is similar to the diversity award in that it is a supplement of ongoing grants acting as a training opportunity to get new people involved in a project and trained. This award supplement targets people who have current full CRC awards and affords them the opportunity to apply for supplemental funds to recruit a junior investigator which would allow a post doc, graduate student, or a new investigator to join the project and learn how to participate in community research collaborations and research, or the team can bring in another community group that has interest in getting involved in community/ collaboration research, and bring them into the project and train them on how to get involved in this process.

VII. Preparation for Council's Programmatic Review

A. Description of Process

The programmatic review process purpose is to ensure that the Program is funding grants that fit in the established priorities. The Council made the decision for the current funding cycle that the primary priority issues and primary award types would receive primary consideration and funding. Based on this decision, the programmatic review process was revised.

Each Council member will receive one fifth of the applications to review and score based on the established criteria.

The Cycle VIII Programmatic Review Committees are as follows:

Basic Breast:

Sandy Walsh

Etiology & Prevention - CRC/Socio-Cultural:

Terri Burgess, Irene Linayao-Putman, Tammy Tengs

Innovative Treatments:

Diana Chingos, Sue Blalock, Anna Wu

Pathogenesis:

Ellen Mahoney, Lauren John

VIII. Adjournment

Motion: The meeting was adjourned at 3:45.