

Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes
January 30, 2004
Santa Monica, CA

Members Present: Debra Oto-Kent, Elaine Ashby, Janet Howard-Espinoza, Carol D’Onofrio, Jacqueline Papkoff, Kathy Walters, Georjean Stoodt, Kim Pierce, Christine White, James Ford, Vicki Boriak

Members Absent: John Morgan, Diana Chingos, Dorothy Bainton, Kathryn Phillips, Michael Figueroa

Staff Present: Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, Katherine McKenzie, Walter Price, Charles Gruder, Roslyn Roberts, Janna Cordeiro, Lyn Dunagan

Guests: Marj Plumb, Morton Lieberman, Chloe Martin, Roland Newman, Anna Wu, Bob Erwin, Laura Talmus

I. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:16 a.m. by Chair Debbie Oto-Kent.

II. Approval of 11/20/03 Minutes

The November 20 minutes were unanimously approved as written.

III. Priority-Setting Presentations

- **Introduction:** The council is considering presentations about translational research (criteria 5).
- **Bob Erwin: “Translation, Research, and Translational Research – Dilemmas and Opportunities”** With the big funding gap between research and development, an actual product requires years of research, but academic and industrial collaboration (and passion) is vital.
- **Anna Wu: “Translational Research: A Perspective from Academia”** Anna introduced a personal story to reinforce the challenges between a research idea and a drug discovery. Translational research requires a multidisciplinary team and extensive funding; its challenges include expense, lack of academic/granting agency support, market size, and regulatory and legal issues.
- **Roland Newman: “How to Identify Translational Research Opportunities – An Industry Perspective”** Roland reviewed a new drug’s discovery and development process, with its many layers of technology and varied research expertise requirements, and the bottleneck between data translation and actionable knowledge. He concludes that academia and industry must work together more closely to reinforce each other’s strengths.

- **Morton Lieberman: “Overview of Projects”** Morton discussed translational research in social sciences and the challenges faced by academic and community collaborators.
- **Chloe Martin: “Translational Research in a Community-based Organization”** Chloe described translational research from the community organization’s perspective, and how her organization overcame the challenges of introducing research into their practice.
- **Panel discussion:** Translational research is resource-intensive, funding falls off as the research becomes more oriented to the practical, and requires facilitation at each step. Some suggestions:
 - Expand the grant duration to 5 years
 - Require budgets to reflect translational objectives
 - Change the criteria: “translational” and “innovative” criteria are incompatible for TRCs – translational is downstream from innovative
 - Replace the NIH study section model
 - Modify the definition of research
 - Package patents/licenses and recycle research funding through licensing agreements
 - Eliminate “translation” as a word
 - Let industry research large-scale biology; let academia research innovative exploration of new pathways and drug action mechanisms
 - Conduct a one-year test of funding only TRCs
 - Promote effective collaborations
 - Fund dissemination and implementation objectives
 - Identify a company/industry to jointly develop/fund a project
- **Staff presentation:** Walter Price presented “Collaborative Awards: Past Funding, Lessons from the Field, and Recommendations,” with an overview of what the Program has funded, PI feedback, and barriers. The four main problems were time, money, culture clash, and communication. Staff recommendations include: increase outreach, increase funding caps, consider requiring concept papers for TRC and SPRC awards (as already done for CRC awards), assist in developing partnerships, and increase grant durations. Janna asked Council members for additional recommendations.

IV. Director’s Report

Mhel asked Council members to review her written report, and the group discussed the state’s budget issues as they relate to the Program.

V. Programmatic Review Preparation

Mhel reviewed the programmatic review process. The council discussed and recommended the following changes to the process:

- The CBCRP staff will send the preliminary list of lowest tertile scores to Council members by May 1. The final, auditor-approved list will be forwarded when it is available.
- Council members will review all of the applications in the top two-thirds; they will peruse the bottom third and pull hot ideas for discussion.
- Council members will turn in preliminary scores by May 17.
- On May 18, the CBCRP staff will forward committee scores to members; the committee's chair will be responsible for pursuing missing/late scores.

VI. Fundraising Presentation & Discussion

Laura Talmus presented the objectives and achievements of the two-year fundraising/awareness program.

VII. Old Business

Committee reports:

Outreach: Two locations were discussed for the 2005 Symposium; the Council voted for Sacramento. Kathy asked the staff to invite Maria Shriver.

Collaborative: The minutes from last night's meeting will be in the next packet. Kathy recommended reading the NIH's plan for the next 15 years. The CBCRP staff will order copies.

Priority-Setting: Please dress casually at the March retreat, which will begin at 3:00pm on Friday, March 5. The retreat should conclude at 3:00pm on Sunday, March 7.

VIII. New Business

Council members were asked to review the attached council election procedure for discussion and nominations at the May meeting. There will be two vacancies on the Council in June; letters for nomination go out in March. Mhel requested input on the expertise and characteristics needed for the opening positions.

IX. Announcements

There were no announcements.

X. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.