

**Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes  
December 10, 2015: Council Meeting  
1111 Franklin St. Room 5320 Oakland, CA**

**Members Present:** Dave Hoon, Jon Greif, Marjorie Kagawa-Singer, K. Alice Leung, Janice Mathurin, Sharima Rasanayagam, Eileen Schmitger, Joan Venticinque, Kristiina Vuori, Jeffrey Wasserman (by phone), and David Wellisch

**Members Absent:** Rose Marie Colbert, Marjorie Green, Dick Jackson, Lori Marx-Rubiner

**Staff:** Mary Croughan, Lyn Dunagan, Carmela Lomonaco, Senaida Poole, Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, Katie McKenzie, Lisa Minniefield

**Guests:** none

**I. Call to Order:** Sharima Rasanayagam called the Council meeting to order at 8:36am and initiated introductions.

**II. Approval of Minutes:** The Council reviewed the minutes from the October meeting.

**MOTION:** Jon moved (Alice seconded) that the Council approve the October 16<sup>th</sup> minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

**III. LOI Recommendations:** Katie briefly overviewed the review process and told the group to focus on the LOIs that they don't want to fund, then the Council broke into committees to determine LOI recommendations. After the Council reconvened, the representatives of the LOI committees presented summaries of their meetings. Members discussed the scoring scales and how they determined the recommendations.

Dave Hoon reported out on behalf of Group A. 16 out of the 19 LOIs submitted were recommended to submit full applications.

Janice reported out on behalf of Group B. 17 out of the 20 LOIs were recommended to submit full applications.

Jon reported out for the Translational Committee. Of the seven LOIs submitted, two of them were recommended to submit as IDEA awards, three were recommended to submit full applications and two others were not invited to submit a full application.

**MOTION:** Kristiina moved (Janice seconded) that the Council accept all of the LOI recommendations. The motion passed unanimously.

**IV. Core Funding Update:** Katie gave an overview of the next steps with Cycle 22 which includes receiving the applications, putting together the programmatic review committees and the council selecting a review committee to be on. The scientific reviews are scheduled for May 10-12th and the council is invited to audit a committee they are not reviewing applications in. All applications except for the CRCs are triaged by one-third during the scientific review process. She added that the PI-3 reviews will overlap the core funding reviews. She also detailed the programmatic review process.

Katie reported on the trend in the reduction of LOI submissions. Some of the causes for the decline might be the advocacy involvement requirement, the filter for relevance is working, missed outreach opportunities, or researchers are receiving funding elsewhere. Some ideas for investigating the trend would be contacting researchers who were previous grantees but haven't submitted a CBCRP proposal recently or contacting researchers who have been funded by other organizations. The group discussed possible theories for the decline. The staff will devise a plan for how to investigate the decline and bring it to the council in April.

**V. Community Initiatives Update:** Senaida updated the group on the optional CRC Pre-Application Research Plan Review and technical assistance webinars. She also updated the group on the outreach efforts made for the QuickStart Training Program, noting the focus of the training is cultivating applications and teaching teams how to apply. Teams will submit applications in mid-February and the training will get started in April, hoping for a cohort of ten teams. She overviewed the schedule of activities including the webinars, face-to-face meetings, technical assistance, and application submissions.

**VI. Council Exit Interviews:** Sharima reported on the interviews she and Margie Kagawa-Singer conducted with six former council members. The summarized results included: they all enjoyed and valued their time on the council and working with the diverse members. They all appreciated the support of the hard working staff. They had some ideas for improving New Member Orientation, some of which have already been implemented since they were new members. They expressed that they could've been more prepared for the reviews as some felt that the review process was difficult but was able to grasp it by the second or third review and again appreciated the staff for their support. They felt that the program could market the program better and more widely; however did not have any marketing ideas. There was some frustration with what the Council can and can't do with the program due to what's written into the legislation. Southern California members made a plea for one day meetings as two day meetings are more difficult to fit in their busy schedules. They would also like the 'important' information highlighted in the binder so they know what to prepare for the meeting. Mhel added that all of the items are important or they wouldn't be in the binder.

**VII. CBCPI Update:** Carmela presented an overview of the implementation of CBCPI. There were 15 initiatives approved with four funded or in the prefunding stage and three initiatives that were approved for release at the October council meeting. She presented the timeline for the three initiatives to include application due dates, funding decision dates and planned project start dates to begin in the summer of 2016. The next initiative to be rolled out will be the *California's Comprehensive Breast Cancer Primary Prevention Plan* RFQ. Mhel asked the council to help find people to promote and apply for the RFQ and the group offered some suggestions for whom to contact. Carmela also briefly presented implementation summary and next steps, including the remaining initiatives that were approved in March 2015, the approved solicitations, and the next two funding solicitations that will be presented to the council at the April meeting.

MOTION: David moved (Eileen seconded) to approve the *California's Comprehensive Breast Cancer Primary Prevention Plan* RFQ. The motion passed unanimously.

Kristiina presented her Meet-a-Member Presentation during lunch.

**VIII. PI-3 Update:** Carmela updated the council on the next strategic planning process for the PI-3, slated to begin in 2016-2021. The council approved PI-3 in March with 50% set aside devoted to

special initiatives in the areas of environmental contributors, health disparities and population-level interventions intended to prevent BC. The council was given the Science Convener RFQ and they discussed the position and the roll that person would have. A clarification was requested to be made prior to approving the RFQ to include revising the first sentence on page 3 of the RFQ with clear sentence of what the project is.

**MOTION:** Jon moved (Alice seconded) to approve the Science Convener RFQ as amended by the council. The motion passed unanimously.

**IX. Discussion of Disparities Definition and Vulnerable Populations Focus:** Carmela summarized the three topics for PI-3, the pre-planning phase that includes defining and applying vulnerable populations and uncovering the problems with the use of the term ‘vulnerable populations’. She also gave a summary on the history and application as well as the potential pitfalls with using the term. The staff recommended that the language be changed to delete reference to ‘vulnerable populations’ from the third topic of PI-3 and change it to: *Development and testing of population-level prevention interventions that incorporate approaches that address the needs of the underserved and/or populations experiencing disparities in the burden of breast cancer.*

**MOTION:** Eileen moved (Margie seconded) to approve rewording the language in the third topic of PI-3. The motion passed unanimously.

Senaida provided a brief background on the council’s recommendation to revisit the existing Disparities definition. At the June 2015 meeting, the council asked the staff to refine the definition so that it becomes ‘actionable’. The group had a lengthy discussion on the characteristics of other disparities’ definitions and brainstormed ideas and gave feedback for how CBCRP could incorporate ‘actionable’ language to the definition without changing the current definition.

**X. Conference Awards:** David presented an overview of the one conference award application, *Breast Cancer Care: Pilot Forum for Mental Health Providers*. The committee felt it was a good proposal but found areas where the plan could be improved. There were some mandated contingencies and then some areas of improvement the applicants could consider. The contingencies were to make their approach multi-cultural by bringing in a conference planning member with experience with working with a variety of communities and adding a talk on incorporating the scientific basis of cultural equivalence in psycho-therapeutic efforts. Another contingency would incorporate a discussion of psychological effects of the medical topics covered in each session. They also need to include an advocate presenter or moderator in each session as well as adding a discussion of “Chemo Brain” under the topic of chemo therapy treatment. Lastly, they need to explain the discrepancy in the budget between 30-40 covered for lunch but a target of 120 attendees. The areas of improvement: the committee thought they need to explain their outreach strategy to contact the mental health professionals. The committee also wants them to consider engaging, David Spiegel in the conference planning as well as consider incorporating treating mental ill breast cancer patients into a session discussion. They also would like for them to describe the psychological and emotional issues with patients diagnosed with breast cancer.

**MOTION:** David moved (Kristiina seconded) to accept the conference award application with contingencies that is recommended by the committee for funding. The motion passed unanimously.

## **IX. Committee Reports**

- A. Outreach:** David presented an update on the planning process for the upcoming conference including an integral part of the meeting, the breakout sessions. The committee met with the World Café group, who are experts in facilitating the interactions the Program is looking to have at the conference. Along with the World Café, there will also be a graphic artist there to map out the ideas that are emerged from the discussions. Katie further described the theme and what types of attendees the Program wants to invite.
- B. Evaluation:** Alice presented three potential dates for the next Priority-Setting process. She also provided some background leading up to the 2015 Retreat, an overview of the process (five major steps), questions to consider when planning for the timing of the process, and the pros and cons for each date. The committee proposed holding its next retreat in seven years (2022).

MOTION: David moved to approve the committee's recommendation to have the next Priority-Setting Retreat in 2022. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. Development:** Jon presented an update on the committee's teleconference held in November. Jon brought up the proposed \$2 tobacco tax with hopes the Program could get a portion of those funds but unfortunately the proposition had already been written so CBCRP could not benefit if it passed. The committee discussed promoting the tax check off, participating in Amazon Smile, getting a fundraising consultant, and promoting fundraising at the upcoming conference. Sharima recommended that we approach UC donors to ear mark their donations for breast cancer research. She also recommended that we join forces with other funders to fund projects so we can expand partnerships to have more funds for research. The group discussed different fundraising options and ways to promote the tax check off. Dave Hoon joined the committee.

**XII. Director's Report:** Mhel reported that CBCRP is set up with Amazon Smile. She also reported on the scandal of tax check off funds. After providing data to the state showing that the program was appropriately using the tax check off funds, she was invited to testify at a legislative hearing. At the hearing, it was noted that CBCRP was seen as having "Model Funds: best practices". At the hearing, she took the opportunity to suggest that there not be an ever increasing minimum contribution amount, keeping the minimum at 250K and asked that the Program be exempt from having to request sponsorship to legislature every five years. She also announced that interviews for the position Steven Beckwith held (which was renamed to Vice President for Research Strategies and Graduate Studies) will be happening soon.

**XIII. Announcements:** none

Sharima adjourned the meeting at 3:50pm.