

Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2006: Council Meeting
San Francisco, CA

Members present: Moon Chen, Felicia Hodges Amy Kyle, Anuja Mendiratta, John Morgan, Angela Padilla, Mark Pegram, Kurt Snipes, Kathy Walters, Lisa Wanzor, and Christine White.

Members not present: Jim Ford, Kim Pierce, Maria Wetzel

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

Guest: Marj Plumb (consultant)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:08a.m.

II. Minutes

Council members corrected the labeling of Marj Plumb and Carol D’Onofrio as consultants.

MOTION: Lisa Wanzor moved (John Morgan seconded) that the November 18, 2005, minutes be approved, with the amendment that attendees Marj Plumb and Carol D’Onofrio each be identified as consultants. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Meet a Council Member

Lisa Wanzor presented information about her work at Breast Cancer Action in the “Meet a Council Member” feature. Council members introduced themselves.

IV. Old Business

A. CRC Outcome Evaluation: Marj Plumb presented the second half of her qualitative study evaluating the Community Research Collaborative awards. She identified several issues faced by community-based participatory research groups, such as the high turnover at community organizations, like the death of the community co-PI or the departure of the executive director; balancing power; and overcoming communication issues. As a result of the CRC evaluation study, this year we have implemented additional requirements to secure board-level approval at the community agencies.

Council members discussed the issues and suggestions that arose from the study, the outcome conclusions and recommendations, and offered additional suggestions for further studies of the CRC awards, such as evaluating whether priority scores can predict outcome. Council members further discussed other mechanisms for studying community questions, like the “science shops” in Europe.

Marj outlined several subjects on which she will study further and report back to the council.

V. Director's Report

A. Special Research Initiatives: Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch presented an update on the SRI project and a draft of the development strategy document, a draft invitation letter, and draft brochure, all of which will go out to the steering committee invitees, who will all be from outside of California. The SRI team has identified their top three choices for the science members, but has had difficulty in selecting advocate members. She shared the list with the council for discussion and recommendations.

B. Cigarette Tax Proposition: Following an overview of the proposition's current status, the council discussed the impact of the proposition on tobacco consumption and sales and future CBCRP revenue, as well as a timeline of when we might expect the increase. Mhel presented a draft analysis based on cycle 11 and advised the council to plan ahead for the increased revenue. Options included considering different splits between core funding and special research initiatives, pre-spending some of the funding for cycle 12 grants, etc.

C. Governor's Proposed Budget: Mhel provided an overview of the governor's budget.

VI. New Business

A. Cycle 12: Larry Fitzgerald updated council members on details of the applications received—the change from a paper to an electronic application receipt process showed little net change from last year in the number and type of grants received, both in topic and award type. He outlined the next steps in the review process, including the changes implemented with the electronic process. Council members are invited to attend one of the scientific review committees, provided that it does not correspond to their programmatic committee assignments.

B. CRC Dissemination Concept Papers: Natalie Collins presented an overview of the five concept papers received.

C. Programmatic Review: Larry Fitzgerald reviewed the goals, principles, timeline, review manual, criteria, and scoring for the programmatic review, and presented an analysis of the 2005 review process. Council members discussed improvements in layout and criteria details, as well as the tertiary cutoff. Committee members signed up for their committees. Staff will compile edits to the programmatic review manual, and all ballots and materials will be handed out at the March meeting.

VII. Committee Reports

A. Translation: Christine White reported on the committee's progress and called for a new chair to replace Jackie Papkoff, who cycled off the council last year, but remained on the translation committee as an ad-hoc member. Christine presented an overview of the consensus- and definition-building process. The committee has decided to

recommend a Letters-of-Intent (LOI) process, to begin in cycle 13. Applicants would submit a modified application along with their CV, funding, and basic information about the study; then next year's translation committee and ad-hoc members would review the LOI for translational criteria, PI involvement, and funding overlap, then invite qualifying applicants to submit a full application, which would then go through the standard peer review/programmatic review process. With the change in the tobacco tax funding, we hope to fund more than one application. Larry Fitzgerald will draft the more formal steps, including the full award and critical path definitions.

B. Outreach: Katherine McKenzie asked for more committee members; the committee is starting to plan the 2007 symposium. Several possible sites in the southern California area are under discussion; a decision should be reached by March. The committee is also discussing themes for the plenary session.

C. Evaluation: Christine White presented a summary of the feedback received by exiting council members, who were interviewed over the phone within one month of leaving the council. One of the suggestions that arose from the discussion was to add the council mandate to the roster.

VIII. 2006 Meeting Schedule

The next council meeting is March 2-3 in the Los Angeles area; the May 12 funding meeting is in Oakland, and the June 8-9 meeting location is to be determined. The council discussed possible locations—Bay Area vs. San Diego—and the staff will take their suggestions under advisement.

The meeting ADJOURNED at 3:48 p.m.