

**Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting
Minutes
February 4, 2000
San Diego**

Members Present: Susan Blalock, Vicki Boriack, Barbara Brenner, Teresa Burgess, Floretta Chisom, Hoda Anton-Culver, Bobbie Head, Felicia Hodge, Akua Jitahadi, Mary Anne Jordan, Michele Rakoff, Judith Luce, Tammy Tengs, and Anne Wallace

Members Absent: Liana Lianov

I. Call to Order and Introduction

Ellen Goldstein, the Priority-Setting Committee facilitator was introduced to the Breast Cancer Research Council.

II. Approval of February 4, 2000 Minutes (attachment 2)

Motion: A motion that the minutes be approved was made by Vicki Boriack and seconded by Barbara Brenner. Minutes were approved as submitted.

After the minutes were approved, Barbara Brenner asked if the council could take a moment to pay tribute in memory of Susan Claymon who passed away on January 18, 2000 after battling with breast cancer. Barbara explained that there would be a service celebrating Susan's life. Anne asked the council to take 10 seconds in silence to remember Susan.

III. Committee Reports and Discussion

Anne Wallace instructed the committees to meet and to be prepared to report to the entire council their committees' progress.

A. Priority-Setting Committee

Ellen Goldstein (facilitator) reported for the Priority-Setting committee. She explained that there were three current areas the committee is working on.

1. Determining the values and assumptions underlying BCRP's current funding priorities, and the values and assumptions that the Council current holds,
2. Determining potential data to be used in the Priority-Setting process, and
3. Collecting and analyzing the data

Ms. Goldstein explained that values + data = priorities. The committee had brainstormed a list of their values, which she summarized. The council was asked for input on this list. The council discussed the following values:

- Enhancing social support
- Collaborating with advocates and activists
- Etiology (leading to primary, secondary and tertiary prevention)
- Ethnic disparities in breast cancer incidence and mortality
- Basic -vs- applied research
- Innovation (conducting research in new areas)

Ms. Goldstein highlighted that the topic of innovation particularly increased the heat of the discussion. Mary Ann Jordan stated one reason is because people see innovation so different ways. Barbara Brenner said that is why this program should continue funding projects that other funding agencies are not willing to fund. Lastly, Ms. Goldstein explained that for BCRC to continue funding innovative ideas as well as increasing success, the council's niche must be defined.

One approach towards defining BCRP's niche is for the council to determine what outcomes are desired at the end of a grant cycle. Brenner explained that BCRC must programmatically and legislatively choose the direction it wishes to go. Brenner stated that although the Call reflects what BCRP is doing, it is not clear that we should not be doing something different.

The discussion then moved into discussing specific priority issues, rather than values.

Bobbie Head addressed her thoughts on this question through describing what she meant by more innovative. She stated that she would like for oncologists to better understand what characteristics of tumors are being observed. Thus, allowing for better diagnosis and a more accurate prognosis.

Hoda Anton-Culver suggested that the Council consider funding a feasibility study of the collection of new data items through the Cancer Registry. Significant discussion ensued without reaching any conclusions or recommendations.

Ms. Goldstein concluded with the observation that this topic requires more discussion in the future.

B. Evaluation Committee

Judy Luce reported on the progress of the Evaluation Committee, including the development of an Evaluation Matrix and a draft Project Outcomes Survey. She pointed out that the survey lacked a question about the ultimate impact of the research project. There was a consensus that this question is needed and brought a lot of value. Anne Wallace shared that the results from this question can begin the dialogue about clinical translation concerns.

Tammy Tengs suggested that specific questions could be asked to frame the steps towards ultimate outcomes, such as asking if the PI has discussed the work with a

clinician. She further suggested that the Call could be used to emphasize BCRP's interest in clinical translation.

Ann Wallace stated that BCRP needs to push the relationship between Scientists and Clinicians. This will begin the translation process. Vicki Boriack and Barbara Brenner encouraged the council to continue involving the advocacy community throughout the research process.

C. Dissemination Committee

Terry Burgess reported that the committee had been working on public service announcements PSAs to disseminate information about Line 52 tax check-off. Vicki Boriack read the 10-second sample PSA and asked the council for feedback. The Council approved the PSA.

Hoda Anton-Culver asked if all university employees would have access to receiving line 52 information. Mhel responded that attempts are being made to find a vehicle for this, and that the website also advertised the tax check-off. Council members raised the issue that finding the website is an obstacle because of its awkward address. Vickie shared that her program at UC Santa Cruz was recently allowed to change their address into one separate from UC. Mhel agreed to pursue this option. Barbara Brenner noted that search engines now require websites to register in order to be listed in searches. Staff will also pursue this.

Terry Burgess reported progress in the Symposium 2001 planning. She explained that they are generating a possible keynote speaker's list. She asked the Council for suggestions. Names that were brought up were Dorothy Allison, writer and Terry Tempest Williams, writer.

Terry Burgess also asked the group if they had any other suggestions to consider during the planning phase. Some of the ideas conveyed were that the poster sessions needed more time; poster sessions could be organized by themes; poster locations should not change; there should be better networking periods; and more competing sessions.

D. Collaboration with BCEDP Committee

Akua Jitahadi reported the committee's previous conference call. Gene Takahashi, the representative for DHS shared that there is a database for the Federal and State funded breast and cervical cancer early detection programs, and that these could be used for research. Currently, one Principal Investigator is using the public use files. The data that has been collected will be available in the year 2001. Access to these databases for BCRP-funded researchers is still being investigated.

Judy Luce shared that one of her concerns was to effectively track patients for research purposes because this is an exceptionally mobile population. Vicki Boriak agreed that this a dilemma because she has experienced the same obstacle during re-screening with her agency.

Lastly, Akua reported that the State and BCEDP partnerships are having a face-to-face meeting in Berkeley in March. She explained that the committee is planning a Focus Group to solicit their input on collaboration. Also at the face-to-face meeting, individuals will be invited to participate in organizing BCRP's 2001 Symposium.

Review of Council's Programmatic Review Materials

Mhel summarized the Council Programmatic Review Process, adopted by the Council last year. Mhel said that the Council will be divided into five committees that will meet simultaneously at the June Council meeting. Council members are to review their assigned grant applications and assign Programmatic scores to each one. The committees will then meet and will receive the average scientific scores, individual component scores, and dollar amounts, and use this information to arrive at funding recommendations. Rough drafts of the reviewers' comments will be available at the meeting. Finally, the full council will meet and develop their final funding recommendations.

Mhel and other BCRC members gave advice for the Programmatic Review process. Judy Luce explained that you must remove yourself if there is a real or perceived conflict of interest. Mhel suggested that if there are any concerns about what might be considered a conflict of interest, the council members should refer to their orientation manuals.

Mhel further expressed the importance of the confidentiality of the individual(s), the institution, and the content of the grants. It is important for the council members to return all distributed review materials. The materials are to be turned in at the June funding meeting.

Mhel continued the discussion by giving general information and an overview of the programmatic review process. She referred members to the Call for descriptions of each award type and priority issue. A sample-scoring sheet was distributed and reviewed.

Mhel concluded by instructing council members to bring their completed scoring sheets with them to the funding meeting. Floretta further explained that if members wanted to change their individual scores after discussion, they would have an opportunity at the funding meeting. A staff member will have a blank scoring sheet that will be completed at the meeting representing the committee's consensus.

IV. Director's Report

A. Reviewer Survey and Focus Group

Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch reviewed the questionnaire that is being given to each of the external scientific reviewers, and the focus group process that will be used at the Review Committee Meetings

B. Governor's Proposed Budget for 2000-2001

Mhel reviewed the information in the Governor's January budget. The trend in the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax revenues from 1989 through 2000 demonstrates a consistent decrease. The Governor's proposed Budget suggests that our budget will continue decreasing and shows that the reserve in the Breast Cancer Research Fund is decreasing, although the proposed allocation for 2000-2001 remains the same as previous years' allocations. An eventual decrease in allocations is expected.

C. Fundraising

Mhel shared with council the Proposal to the California Endowment. She explained that conversations with them would continue.

D. Request for Interns

Mhel Kavanaugh –Lynch presented the applications that were sent to UC Berkeley to advertise openings for interns. The council proposed that these applications be distributed to all UC campuses.

V. New Business

A. Nominations for Council Chair and Vice Chair

Anne Wallace opened the floor to nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair of the Council in 2000-2001.

Barbara Brenner nominated Tammy Tengs for Chair, who declined.
Floretta Chisom nominated Michele Rakoff for Vice-Chair, who accepted.
Anne Wallace nominated Mary Ann Jordan for Chair, who accepted.
Anne Wallace nominated Barbara Brenner for Vice-Chair, who accepted.
Hoda Anton-Culver nominated Terry Burgess for Chair, who declined.

Nominees were asked to submit a paragraph explaining why they thought they would be appropriate for the position. These will be included in the packet for the next Council meeting, when the election will be held.

B. Review of Conference Award Application

In closed session, the Council reviewed an application submitted for a Conference Award.

Motion: A motion was made by Barbara Brenner and seconded by Mary Ann Jordan that the submitted application for the Joining Forces Conference Award be funded with stipulations. The motion passed unanimously.

C. BCRP Newsletter

Katie McKenzie circulated a draft of the up-coming newsletter. Katie asked the council members to review their biographies because they would be printed in the newsletter. She explained that the layout will be completed by the end of February. Terry Burgess asked the council to think about submitting articles for future issues.

Anne Wallace shared with the group that she has a one page Breast Cancer Review Journal list that possibly could be submitted into the newsletter. She stated that she would forward it to BCRP.

VI. Announcements

There were no announcements.

VII. Adjournment

Motion: A motion for adjournment was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Barbara Brenner. The motion was passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.