

**Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting**  
**Minutes**  
**December 13, 1999**  
**Millbrae**

**Members Present:** Susan Blalock, Vicki Boriack, Barbara Brenner, Teresa Burgess, Floretta Chisom, Hoda Anton-Culver, Felicia Hodge, Akua Jitahadi, Liana Lianov, Judith Luce, Tammy Tengs, Anne Wallace

**Members Absent:** Bobbie Head, Michele Rakoff, Mary Ann Jordan, Kevin Scanlon

**Staff Present:** April Brown, DeShawn Boyd, Brenda Dixon-Coby, Pattie DiLauro, Larry Fitzgerald, Larry Gruder, Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, Kim Landry, Walter Price

**I. Call to Order and Introduction**

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M.

**II. Approval of the 10/16/99 Minutes**

**Motion: A motion that the minutes be approved was made by Vickie Boriack and seconded by Teresa Burgess.** Minutes were approved as submitted.

**III Committee Reports**

**A. Priority-Setting Committee:**

Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch reported that her committee's goal was to develop a procedure for the priority setting process making the process more systematic and thorough. The areas of concern are how and where to obtain data, how to define the process, and how to advance and stimulate innovative ideas. As a starting point, the committee developed a list of implied assumptions that they felt underlie current program activities. The list of assumptions was reviewed and modified by the full council, which reached agreement that the revised list of assumptions underlie current activities. (See Priority-Setting Process Committee Attachment 3) The next step will be to decide which assumptions to revise for the future and prioritize them. In addition, Hoda Anton-Culver signed-up to be a member of this committee.

**B. Program Evaluation Committee:**

Judith Luce, the committee leader, reported that the committee is developing a project outcome survey to be used as an evaluation tool. She stated that the draft of the survey would be disseminated to the other council members for proofing. Katie McKenzie suggested that this survey should capture clinical applications, such as is anyone healthier due to their research. Another suggestion was to

modify the survey to be sure it captures outcomes in all fields and all award types. Hoda Anton-Culver stressed that through this type of survey, BCRP should be able to recognize program success.

Mhel Kavanaugh –Lynch discussed the reviewer feedback form. She explained that the program assumptions were incorporated into the Reviewer Feedback questionnaire. Hoda Anton –Culver asserted that she really likes this notion and practice of asking our expert reviewers for their input. Larry Fitzgerald stated that he would email the form to the council members for their proofing and the council could email their edits back to him. Also, Hoda Anton –Culver signed-up to be member on this committee.

### **C. Dissemination Committee:**

Teresa Burgess, the committee leader, reported that the committee suggests focusing on the legislature and advocacy groups as targets for dissemination this year.. The mode of dissemination will primarily be through BCRP's newsletter and web site. However, the committee is investigating purchasing an email list to reach more scientists. Anne Wallace suggested that BCRP translate and disseminate scientific data into lay practice.

The committee's long term goal is to have information published in different languages, allowing BCRP to reach a more diverse population. Teresa reported that the committee is determining the practicality of sponsoring a legislative breakfast. And if they have one, how to make it successful. Vicki Boriack agreed to query her contacts to determine the legislatures' perception and their view on the benefit of BCRP hosting a breakfast.

The committee recommended holding the 2001 Symposium in San Francisco on September 14 and September 15. The committee suggested advertising much earlier than they did for the 1999 Symposium. Barbara Brenner proposed that we make physicians not specializing in breast cancer (such as gynecologist and primary care physicians) aware of the Symposium. Hoda Anton-Culver offered to research the possibility of BCRP obtaining a physician's list. Vicki Boriack suggested that an intern could assist with dissemination responsibilities.

Tammy Tengs suggested that the committee prioritize its many ideas for dissemination. Dr. Gruder argued that it is important for the committee to clarify the intended audience and the type of information BCRP wants to communicate before choosing the vehicle..

### **D. Collaboration with BCEDP Committee:**

Akua Jitahadi, committee leader, reported that the committee must arrange a conference call to begin prioritizing their goals and objectives. She reported that

a primary goal is to establish a method and a procedure to link the researchers with the BCEDP partnerships.

In addition, Walter proposed that the partnerships be involved in planning future Symposiums, allowing a perfect opportunity to link them to BCRP

Consequently, Walter also raised the question of how the committee would be able to accomplish their goals with their current (limited) human resources. Any projects need to consider the timeline in which they can realistically be accomplished and what additional resources might be needed. The BCEDP Committee suggested that the Program recruit an intern if this was a viable possibility. One project for an intern would be to disseminate mammography-screening information, such as current and relevant data regarding outreach and education methods.

The suggestion was made to look into the possibility of having a link to the BCEDP on the BCRP Home Page.

#### **IV. Directors Report**

##### **A. Cycle VI Timeline**

Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch explained that the CRC review process was completed via telephone. Feedback has been provided to applicants. The review committees for the rest of the Cycle VI applications have not yet been determined, but the committee chairpersons have been selected. Mhel encouraged any council members who have not participated in the review process to observe one meeting.

Mhel explained the current funding process. She explained that the council members would receive all Programmatic Review materials at the February 4, 2000 meeting, prior to the Review Committees. Review Committee scores are then distributed after the committees have met, at which time the lowest-scoring applications are removed from consideration. The Council discussed whether their Programmatic review should occur before or after seeing the scientific merit scores. It was suggested that the Programmatic review would be more effective if it were done before the scientific merit scores were known.

**Motion: Anne Wallace moved that the scientific merit scores be given to the Council at the June funding meeting (and not sooner). The motion was seconded by Hoda Anton-Culver, and was approved unanimously.**

Mhel reiterated that the Council input on applications that do not receive funding, but appeared innovative, is passed on to applicants in the Application Evaluations. Thus, applicants whose grants rate highly on Programmatic review, but are not funded, receive this information..

##### **B. Status of tobacco tax revenue for BCRP**

Mhel reported on a memorandum distributed by the State Board of Equalization dated November 4, 1999 discussing the breakdown of cigarette and tobacco products taxes. According to the memo, It is estimated that tobacco tax revenues declined 8.4% in 1998-1999. The portion of the decline in the breast cancer tax revenue that is due to Proposition 10 has been estimated by the Board to be \$2.9 million, and this amount will be replaced with Prop.10 funds. It is likely that BCRP will continue to be appropriated the same amount as in past years, in part from \$10 million in reserve in the research account. However, due to decreasing revenue, Mhel suggested that BCRP should begin looking at alternative sources of revenue.

### **C. Fundraising**

Mhel presented one fundraising idea, which is for a donation envelope to be inserted inside BCRP's newsletter. A draft advertisement and envelope design was discussed. Judith Luce questioned if this fundraising approach is in conflict with the law. Mhel stated that this is under review of legal counsel.

Barbara Brenner suggested changes in the draft Ad. She would like to change the part of the sentence stating "you and your daughter". Barbara suggests that "you and" be removed from the text.

Also, Mhel encouraged the council to let people know the importance of checking-off *line 52* on their California Income Tax Return.

Mhel reported that she is having conversations with The California Endowment and that they are interested in partnering with the Program, especially with the CRC grants. The Council encouraged her to pursue this.

## **V. New Business**

### **A. Cycle VI Call for Applications**

Anne Wallace began the discussion by asking for ideas and suggestions to begin preparing to write next Call for Applications. Ann stated that the last Call appeared cumbersome and she suggests that one way to prevent this is for BCRP to try to be more specific and emphasize one topic per year.

Tammy Tengs suggested that we actively recruit and involve other scholastic disciplines during our quest for researchers/scientists; for example, mathematicians and statisticians as well as social-cultural and psychological researchers. Tammy suggested that we present the existing Cycle VI 2000 call to scientists of targeted disciplines and asked them for their input – this could be one way to generate interest and expand breast cancer research from non-traditional scientists.

Other suggestions were: keep the Call as is, but add more innovative ideas in addition to sending a cover letter targeting the groups we are trying to attract, continue to fund “known “ research because it allows BCRP to meet its mission, find creative ways to advertise, and send a letter to the presidents of targeted organizations and have them edit the drafted letter recruiting potentially new researchers.

No specific changes to priority issues or award types were made.

## **VI. Announcements**

There were no announcements.

## **VII. Adjournment**

**Motion: A motion for adjournment was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Floretta Chisom.** The motion passed, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.