

Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes

June 5, 2015: Council Meeting

The California Endowment 1111 Broadway Oakland, CA

Members Present: Marjorie Green, Jon Greif, Karuna Jaggar, Marjorie Kagawa-Singer, Janice Mathurin, Melanie Marty, Marta Nichols, Ted Schettler, Naz Sykes, Kristiina Vuori, David Wellisch

Members Absent: Maria Caprio, Alice Leung, Arash Naeim, Sharima Rasanayagam

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

Guests: Karren Ganstwig (by phone)

Programmatic Review Committees Meet: Katie briefly reviewed the programmatic review process and the committees met to discuss funding recommendations.

I. Call to Order: After the Programmatic Review sub-committees concluded, the council reconvened and Jon Greif called the council to order at 10:55am.

II. Cycle 21 Funding: Katie reminded the group about the new formal step that was added to the programmatic review to ensure the Program is not passing up funding strong proposals. Each committee will conduct a final review examining the grants with the highest overall score for each award type. The committees will also fill out critique forms to provide feedback to unfunded applicants that received high scientific scores but low programmatic scores. Mhel presented the resource allocation and reviewed the available funding. The group discussed the option of reviewing all of the IDEA awards in one group. It was decided that when IDEA awards are reviewed in separate committees that there will be time allotted for the groups to review them together.

A spokesperson from each committee reported on their committee's funding recommendations. Council members also designated the Faith Fancher, Buzbee, and Tax Check-Off awards.

MOTION: Jon moved (Melanie seconded) to approve all of the committees' funding recommendations. The motion passed unanimously.

A. Approval of Minutes: The council reviewed the minutes from the December 2014 and March 19-20, 2015 meetings.

MOTION: Jon moved (Melanie seconded) that the council approve the December and March minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Policy Presentation

A. Carmela presented the programmatic and scientific review scores, comments and recommendations for the Policy teams. The peer review panel recommended two of

the three teams be put in the pool and suggest that the other team reapply if openings come up in the future. The group discussed the details for accepting or not accepting a team.

MOTION: Marta moved (Kristiina seconded) to put the Ponce and Reynolds teams in in the pool of policy teams. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Karren Ganstwig briefly reviewed the initiative and presented the selection process of the potential topics. The group discussed the topics and requested clarification on the language to the Policy definition. Mhel clarified that the PRAG will wordsmith the other topics when they decide to recommend them to the council for approval. She also detailed the next steps in the project.

MOTION: Melanie moved (Jon seconded) that the council accept the PRAG recommendation for the Policy topic as edited with the additional bullet. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Cycle 22 Call for Applications: Katie briefly presented the review committee and advocate reviewer surveys from Cycle 21. She also presented the draft Call for Applications for Cycle 22 and asked the council for feedback.

V. Transdisciplinary Collaborations Discussion: Mhel briefly summarized the objective of transdisciplinary partnerships, the purpose for the discussion, and the group discussed the different approaches to collaborations. She informed the group that the program has already attempted to enhance collaborations across disciplines in a variety of different ways, including offering specific award types and establishing programmatic review criterion for transdisciplinary collaborations. The council also discussed identifying projects that have had these types of partnerships, getting feedback from the researchers, and then forming a council committee to add recommendations to grant application materials.

The group also suggested different approaches to informing new council members of the program's concepts, priorities, and values. Other ideas discussed included pairing new members with former members; and to create an orientation video or slide deck to show the history the program, how the science and priorities have changed and how the program has evolved over the last two decades. They also discussed the question of what aspects of the Program do we want new council members to know. The staff will seriously consider creating a slide deck for the upcoming orientation.

VI. CBCPI Implementation:

A. **Update:** Carmela updated the council on the current and upcoming activities. She also reported on the initiatives that were approved at the retreat in March. She also presented the next initiatives to be rolled out. The group discussed outreach approaches for the Primary Prevention Plan RFQ.

B. **Disparities Definition:** Senaida provided the group with background on the initial disparities recommendation, the need for clarification, and what action the committee

took to modify the definition. In Senaida's memo, an excerpt from the Gaps document on the disparities definition was provided. The group had a lengthy discussion about the language in the definition, and discussed whether to keep it as is or to make it more specific. She then requested feedback on the clarity and whether the disparities definition in the document addressed the recommendation from the Council at the retreat. The council directed staff to look at refining the definition for the next initiative so that it becomes actionable.

VII. Community Initiatives Update: Senaida gave a brief update on the activities scheduled for the upcoming 2015-16 cycle to include phone, email and webinar-based technical assistance for potential applicants who might be interested in applying for a grant. She also updated the Council on the CBPR QuickStart training program. Due to the low amount of strong applications received for the 2015 training, in-person outreach will take place in the fall with the anticipation of receiving stronger applications for trainings resume in 2016.

VIII. Committee Reports:

A. Outreach: David presented a summary of the upcoming one day symposium planning schedule for February 2016 to take place in San Francisco. The committee worked on reducing meeting costs to \$400 per attendee. The goal of the conference is multi-disciplinary research with the target audience of investigators, advocates, and major donors all of whom are interested in supporting this type of research. The committee will search for panelists who can speak in basic concepts yet in sophisticated terms about the statistical analysis of this kind of research. The meeting will also highlight the Program's funded research in the form of posters, short videos and session presentations. Melanie provided a list of potential speakers, the group discussed the different types of ideal presenters to invite, and Katie encouraged them to send her additional recommendations. David also provided the next steps in the planning process.

B. PS/Evaluation: Ted briefly summarized the edits made to add Public Health Outcomes language to the Call for Applications, Scientific and Lay Abstract forms and instructions.

IX. Director's Report: Mhel reviewed the each item from the Action Items list from the Priority-Setting Retreat and the group discussed some of the items. She also gave a brief update on the governor's budget noting that there weren't any changes to the preliminary budget. She also asked for additional recommendations for new council members.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:29pm.