

BREAST CANCER RESEARCH COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes

October 16, 1999

San Francisco

Members Present: Susan Blalock, Vicki Boriack, Teresa Burgess, Floretta Chisom, Bobbie Head, Akua Jitahadi, Liana Lianov, Judith Luce, Michele Rakoff, Tammy Tengs, Anne Wallace

Members Absent: Barbara Brenner, Hoda Anton-Culver, Felicia Hodge, Mary Ann Jordan, Kevin Scanlon

Staff Present: Pattie DiLauro, Larry Gruder, Larry Fitzgerald, Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, and Kim Landry

I. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 A.M.

II. Approval of 06/26/99 Minutes

Motion: A motion that the minutes be approved was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Floretta Chisom. The minutes were approved as submitted.

III. Director's Report

A. Cycle VI Timeline

The issues discussed were:

Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch explained that we are currently going through the Application Submission Process. The application deadlines are approaching and the staff's efforts are being spent managing this process. The Concept Papers for the CRC Award are due on October 19th. Mhel reported the need to increase interest and awareness to potential applicants through direct outreach. She explained that she is considering hiring a consultant to disseminate CRC grant information to community groups.

The funding meeting scheduled for May 18-20, 2000 has been rescheduled to June 2-3. This meeting will replace the June 20th meeting as well. The Council will receive programmatic review materials in April.

The start date for Cycle VI grants is July 1, 2000. In response to a question, Mhel explained that the Research Administrators prepare summaries of the reviewers' evaluations by August. They start with funded grants, allowing the PIs to incorporate reviewers' feedback as they begin their projects.

It was suggested that the Council continuously plan for Cycle VII throughout the year, instead of setting aside a particular meeting for planning.

IV. Old Business

A. Symposium De-Briefing

There were 200 evaluations received from the 500 attendees.

Technical Session – 90% of the participants were impressed with this session, particularly the scientists and advocates.

General Session- There was an improvement in communicating the research to the lay audience. It was evident that the scientists put forth an effort to close the communication gap.

Other suggestions and comments:

- The Symposium was a success
- The sessions needed more time
- Some moderators needed better time management skills
- Separate poster sessions for odd-and even-numbered posters
- More presenters needed to be available during poster sessions
- Organize a core session to highlight all sessions being offered during Symposium
- The hotel's set-up was difficult to effectively use
- Determine and incorporate an effective system for Council members to vote and rate posters, i.e., have the session moderators nominate posters first and then have the Council members vote on these nominations
- Advocate Guides were unclear of their responsibility
- Determine if we can avoid overlapping similar sessions
- The Council members should be involved in selecting the next Symposium video
- A thorough introduction is needed before showing a video
- The video panel discussion was too long
- The video misrepresented some topics, i.e., radiation and mammography
- Videos are a good catalyst to stimulate conversation
- Discuss the public policy process
- The Technical Session should be a full day
- Moderators who are members of the Council should be neutral or they should state that they are expressing a personal viewpoint

B. Breast and Cervical Cancer Master Plan

Liana Lianov presented a short introduction to the draft DHS Breast and Cervical Cancer Master Plan. The Council was asked to comment on the Master Plan, especially on those objectives and strategies related to breast cancer research.

The Council suggested removing the reference to BCRP in the Detection section of the document. It was suggested that research objectives should be broad in their definition, giving

latitude for future amendments.

C. 1999-2000 Workplan

Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch described each committee and gave examples of previous accomplishments. Council members were encouraged to sign up for committees.

1. Program Evaluation

The Council suggested that BCRP implement a formal program evaluation. A number of tools are being considered to measure BCRP's success.

2. Priority-Setting Process

The Council has no formal process to ensure that priority setting is done in a thorough fashion, appropriately informed by data. The committee will attempt to develop a process that incorporates these elements.

3. Dissemination

BCRP is currently using the Symposium and the Website to get information to the public. It was suggested that underserved individuals might not have access to the Web, so BCRP should develop dissemination strategies to reach them.

In the past, having a mini-symposium was tried as an option for information dissemination; however, it was not particularly successful or cost/labor effective. It was suggested the committees first discuss goals for disseminating information, and then develop a plan (i.e., audiences, media, and messages).

4. Collaboration with BCEDP

Liana Lianov provided an introduction to the BCEDP and its activities. Vicki Boriack discussed a new program that her agency has begun to extend follow-up care to individuals who have used up the available philanthropic and governmental assistance for treatment and care. The funds are raised by private philanthropic donations.

Strategic Priorities for Cycle VII

Ann Wallace suggested that every member thoroughly read the Call for Applications and be prepared to discuss it at length at the next meeting. Mhel discussed some of the changes that were made for the Cycle VI Call for Applications, such as **SPRC Award** and the **Joining Forces Conference Award**. She explained that the new direction was to include and increase the interest of disciplines are not engaged in breast cancer research. She also mentioned that the award amounts were raised for Pilot Awards from \$75,000 to \$100,000 annually and for Postdoctoral Awards from \$35,000 to \$40,000 annually.

V. New Business

A. 1999 Annual Report

Mhel explained that the Annual Report must include a discussion of the relationship between State and Federal funding for breast cancer research, and asked for guidance in developing this section. Suggestions included:

- Relate anecdotes from funded investigators describing the benefits of BCRP funding in leveraging Federal funds;
- Note that BCRP goals are different from other funding agencies' goals; for example, BCRP has funded projects that other agencies did not fund;
- Address gaps in funding that are mentioned in the NCI report on breast cancer priorities for the future
- Discuss the uniqueness of the source of funds.

The Council discussed the role they would like to take in writing the Annual Report.

MOTION: A motion that the staff write the 1999 Annual Report was made by Bobbie Head and seconded by Judy Luce. The motion passed.

B. Review of 1999-2000 Calendar

The schedule was discussed and calendars were coordinated for the best meeting dates. The results are as follows: **December 13th in San Francisco, February 4th in San Diego, and June 2nd and 3rd in Oakland.** Kim was asked to fax a copy of the final schedule to each member on Monday, October 18, 1999.

VI. Announcements

The next meeting will be held December 13, 1999 in San Francisco.

VII. Adjournment

MOTION: A motion for adjournment was made by Floretta Chisom and seconded by Bobbie Head. The motion passed, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.