

**BREAST CANCER RESEARCH COUNCIL
SEPTEMBER 17, 1997
SACRAMENTO, CA
MEETING MINUTES
PART A – OPEN SESSION**

ATTENDEES

Members Present: Shelly Adler, Floretta Chisom, Arlyne Draper, Bob Erwin, Marco Gottardis, Liana Lianov, Susan Love, Judy Luce, Carol MacLeod, Carol Pulskamp, Ann Wallace, Suzette Wright, Carol Voelker

Members Absent: Bobbie Head, Maria Pellegrini, Beverly Rhine

Staff Present: Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, Walter Price, Katie McKenzie, Larry Fitzgerald, Larry Gruder, Mary Kreger, Ailene Ford, Brenda Dixon-Coby, Garland Giles

Guests: Mary Ann Swisler, Journalist, Polly Strand, Janice Pemberton, Breast Cancer Early Detection Program

I. Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM.

All Council members and staff introduced themselves.

II. Approval of 06/30/97 BCRC minutes:

Carol Macleod asked for clarification about inclusion of the confidential portion of the May meeting in those minutes. Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch responded that this, if included, would consist of the list of funded grants, which is now published.

Motion: *Carol MacLeod moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded by Judy Luce and was passed unanimously.*

III. Debriefing of Symposium

What was done well:

- Excellent organization.
- Well constructed evaluation sheets in packet.
- The keynote sessions and poster sessions were excellent.
- Some participants liked Bella Abzug and some didn't.
- The format forced interaction between scientists from different fields, which is a rare occurrence. Having presentations from different fields in the same session was good -- it kept people in the room for presentations from all different fields.
- Press packets were very well done.

Specifics to change/improve/add next time:

- Mention the evaluation sheets at multiple times throughout the event.
- Add address to evaluation sheets so people can mail them in.
- Not enough time was provided to look at posters
- Emphasize that scientists and community members can get together as partners in their own communities.
- Ask if there are any legislators or legislative staff present at the symposium and allow them to introduce themselves.
- Have more oral talks.
- Leave several of the slots for speakers open for “late-breaking news,” which can be filled a week or so before the event.
- Consider having one set of poster sessions in the morning and another in the afternoon, instead of having all of them in the afternoon.
- Send notices to legislators earlier.
- Send second notifications to some people that we want to receive targeted invitations (legislators, former Council members).
- Provide more detail to potential exhibitors about available resources.
- Ask for 5013C status on Exhibitor form.
- Low attendance by press despite wide distribution of very goods packets, community-specific press releases, personal outreach by UC Public Information Office, etc. – unclear how to increase presence.

IV. Directors Report:

A. SB602

SB602 was signed on August 20 by the Governor. The bill renews the Breast Cancer Tax Checkoff program and redirects the funds from DHS to BCRP. The legislature states that if, in any single year, revenue falls below \$250,000, the program will sunset. Therefore, it is important to maintain and increase public awareness of the program so that we can collect enough money to keep it alive.

B. Cycle III Audit

As requested by the legislature in AB 2915, the Program’s Cycle III process is being audited by the State auditor. At BCRP staff suggestion, the auditor has been following the process and observing it in an ongoing fashion, including observing receipt and processing of applications, observing Research Administrators forming Review Committees, observing Review Committees and the Council’s funding meeting. The auditor is now in the process of writing the report. We have been informed of some concerns, all of which in our view are process questions that lie in gray areas, as opposed to findings of misconduct, unfairness, bias, etc.

V. Old Business

A. Council Roles and Responsibilities

Carol Macleod introduced the discussion of the need to clarify what the Council’s job is and what the staff’s job is, referring to the “partnership” that Larry Gruder discussed at the last meeting. She discussed that the two most important responsibilities of the Council are establishing the priorities for funding and recommending the grants to be funded.

She presented a document (attached) prepared by herself and Carol Voelker that listed the word-for-word roles and responsibilities of the Council and the University from the enabling legislation for the Program. She briefly discussed each of the items on this list, highlighting some of the ambiguities. She identified one area that she felt important to discuss – developing guidelines for operation of the Council’s funding decision meeting.

Considerable discussion ensued. Issues included:

- Role of staff at Council meetings.
- Seating arrangement at Council meetings.
- Special arrangements with particular Council members.
- Council members’ point of communication.
- Program financial review.
- Review of Application Evaluations.
- Council involvement in Review Committees.

Floretta Chisom suggested creating a matrix of activities/responsibilities and assignment of aspects of these activities/responsibilities to the appropriate entity (Council, University, both). She volunteered to create a draft of such a document together with the Council Chair and the Director. Marco Gottardis also volunteered to participate in this endeavor.

Action: A committee was formed to create a matrix of Program activities/responsibilities and assign aspects of these activities/responsibilities to the appropriate entity (Council, University, both). Committee members are Floretta Chisom, Bob Erwin, Marco Gottardis, Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch. A draft will be completed and sent to all Council members prior to the next meeting (target date 3rd week in October).

THE COUNCIL THEN ENTERED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

RESUMPTION OF OPEN SESSION

VI. 1997-98 Council Work Plan

Bob Erwin initiated the discussion on possible priorities for the Council and introduced the following options:

- A Council committee could address a systematic approach to cataloging research endeavors in breast cancer research by other agencies, especially using emerging information technology.

Ideas generated in the discussion include:

1. A Council subcommittee couldn’t possibly perform this task in a comprehensive fashion;
2. This is partly the role of the reviewers – to know what is being underfunded and what is being overfunded; counter argument – reviewers only review what has been received – we need to influence the beginning stage – what we ask for;
3. Such an effort will not identify areas that are NOT being targeted, and thus may not be helpful in identifying directions for the Program;
4. Another approach is to identify and provide access to emerging new technologies;

5. Could poll reviewers to help identify cutting edge, exciting or underfunded areas;

Action: A committee was formed to start exploring some of these issues in preparation for setting the priorities for Cycle V. Members are: Ann Wallace, Arlyne Draper, Carol MacLeod, Judy Luce, staff.

- Facilitate the translation of work funded by BCRP, by, for example, having an Advisory meeting (rather than doing the Symposium again this year) targeted at industry and other translational entities.

Action: Committee formed to examine methods to translate work funded by BCRP. Members are: Bob Erwin, Marco Gottardis, Arlyne Draper, Carol MacLeod, Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch.

Carol Voelker suggested developing additional methods to disseminate research results. The frequency of the Symposium was discussed, but no decision was made. Other methods were discussed, including posting progress reports on the WWW Home Page, UC-based television programs, monthly investigator reports via video conferencing.

Action: A Committee was formed to explore additional methods to disseminate research results. Members: Carol Voelker, who will also approach members who are absent from the meeting (Beverly Rhine, Maria Pellegrini, Bobbie Head).

VII. Other Council Business

Bob Erwin reported that a request had been made to move the November 7 meeting from Los Angeles to the Bay Area.

Motion: Bob Erwin moved that the November 7 Council meeting be moved to Oakland/San Francisco and the June 6 meeting be moved to Los Angeles to accommodate an organizational meeting of the California Breast Cancer Coalition. Motion was seconded by Floretta Chisom. Vote: 2 Ayes, 4 Nays. Motion was not carried.

Bob Erwin recommended that future meetings will allow time for committees to get together before or after the Council meeting.

Marco Gottardis proposed that the staff look into the idea of stretching the dollars of grantees by making arrangements with scientific suppliers (media, plastics) to provide discounts for BCRP-funded investigators.

Action: Bob Erwin will ask his company buyer to work with Marco Gottardis to explore making arrangements with scientific suppliers (media, plastics) to provide discounts for BCRP-funded investigators. Marco Gottardis will get information on existing agreements for NIH-funded investigators.

VIII Announcements

The new Compendium of Awards is now available. Council members will be sent these, along with new Council rosters and other materials distributed at the Symposium.

Suzette Wright congratulated the staff for the wonderful job they did in organizing the Symposium and the number of hours she knows they spent on it.

Carol Voelker congratulated Suzette for her work organizing the art exhibits.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25.