

**Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes
December 15, 2000
Oakland, California**

Members Present: Susan Blalock, Teresa Burgess, Akua Jitahadi, M. Ellen Mahoney, Irene Linayao-Putman, Tammy Tengs, Anna Wu, I. Craig Henderson, Robert Carlson, Mary Ann Jordan, Georjean Stoodt, Akua Jitahadi, Sandy Walsh

Members Absent: Vicki Boraick, Michele Rakoff, Hoda Anton-Culver, Barbara Brenner

Staff Present: Charles Gruder, Marion Kavanaugh-Lynch, Katherine McKenzie, Walter Price, Laurence Fitzgerald, Roslyn Roberts, Sharon Simms, Ben Freeman, Mary Daughtry

I. Call to Order and Introduction

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am. Staff and Council Members introduced themselves.

II. Approval of September 19, 2000 Minutes

Tammy noted Section III, subsection F reads “she would half time.” The minutes were corrected to reflect “she would reduce her schedule to half time.” Terri pointed out Section IV, subsection A reads “Council Committee and 2000 - 20001.” The minutes were corrected to read “Council Committee and 2000 – 2001. Section V, third paragraph, the minutes read “to have the Ecember meeting.” The minutes were corrected to read “ to have the December meeting.” She also pointed out that her name should be spelled “Terri.” Akua stated her title should be Chairwoman in place of Chairman. Section IV Subsection A-1 was corrected to read “Chairwoman, Akua Jitahadi”; Mary Ann questioned section IV, subsection 2. The minutes read “we will continue to award the Principal Investigators.” The Sentence should be corrected to state “we will continue to have awards to Principal Investigators”. Section V reads” researchers are encouraged.” The sentence was corrected to read “ researchers are encouraged to share their profits”.

Motion: A motion to approve the minutes as corrected was made and seconded.

III. Director’s Report

A. Update on Cycle VII (Attachment 2)

Mhel began with a brief update of the application process for Cycle VII.

Council members will assign themselves to programmatic review committees at the February council meeting. A schedule and RSVP form to attend the Review Committees will be distributed shortly. Mhel encouraged council members to attend one of the review committee meetings to get a sense of the process.

Terri pointed out that last year, the council voted to have the scientific review score and reviews available only at the funding meeting (and not prior to that meeting) so programmatic scores would be calculated in the absence of the scientific scores.

Mhel gave an overview of the criteria and selection process for reviewers. Reviewers are solicited from out of state by word of mouth, Medline searches and by utilizing the BCRP database, consisting of several thousand potential reviewers.

Advocate reviewers are experienced or trained through Project Lead. Project Lead, a four day intensive course of basic science, epidemiology, clinical trials and some role play activity is offered by the National Breast Cancer Coalition. It is an extremely vibrant program that benefits BCRP tremendously.

When the decision was made that all voting members be from outside California, California advocates who had created the program were excluded from participating in the process. It was decided that one California advocate would be invited to sit on each committee as a non-voting member. Mhel conducts a telephone interview conference with all California advocate observers after the meetings to get their opinions of the process. By doing so, an advocate bears witness to the process, gains education and provides feedback to BCRP.

B: 1999 and 2000 Annual Reports

Mhel reported that the 1999 Annual Report has been approved by the UC Budget office and the UC Legislative Affairs Office.

We engaged the services of a science writer to assist in the writing of the 2000 Annual Report. The draft of the first section of the 2000 annual report has been received with enthusiasm.

Terri reported that the Dissemination committee was requested to make a recommendation to the full council on whether we should stick to the two report model which we were forced to adopt last year. The committee agreed to have both reports, the Advances as well as the official legislative report. The official

report would be sent to the Legislator's Sacramento office and the Advances report to the Legislator's home offices.

Motion: A motion was made by Craig Henderson and seconded by Ellen Mahoney to continue publishing both versions of the Annual Report. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Staff Changes (Attachment 3)

Mhel communicated the success in recruiting new employees and made brief introductions of new staff members to the Council.

D. Line 52 Tax Check Off (Attachment 4)

Mhel gave a brief explanation of the State Income Tax Line 52 Check-off. Until recently, there was no information on how much money was being collected. The Franchise Tax Board generates a status report on voluntary contribution funds, which is now being provided to BCRP. According to this report, revenues are increasing. The legislation requires that \$250,000 must be collected each year to keep this item on the tax form.

In an effort to create more publicity regarding Line 52, BCRP is contracting with a public relations firm, Communication Works, to advise on strategies.

IV. OLD & NEW BUSINESS

A. Dissemination Committee Report (Attachment 5)

Chair, Terri introduced Katie who gave an update on the proposed state legislative event. The committee had worked on developing a message to deliver to the legislature. It was suggested that in order to make an independent event a success, we would need to have an action item in our message; however the dissemination committee couldn't come up with one beyond informing legislators and their staff about the presence and importance of BCRP. The options for hosting an event include: getting on the agenda for the legislative retreat (Larry will investigate); connecting with an event concerned with upcoming legislation; and designing an independent event without specific action items that will inform legislators and staff about BCRP (Vicki is checking on the expected interest level by staffers).

Terri described the structure of the Symposium and intent of the symposium as determined at previous council meetings for the benefit of new council members. She reported that Patty DeLaney and Zora Brown had accepted two of the speaking slots in the plenary session, but that Joyce O'Shaughnessy had declined the third. She also reported that Faith Fancher, an Oakland newscaster and breast cancer survivor who has been invited to give the keynote address, is

interested but is unable to commit because she is undergoing treatment. The discussion for alternatives for Faith Fancher's keynote address was tabled until we receive a conclusive answer from her. Terri also reported that a BCEDP representative has volunteered to help us plan the symposium and make it sure it addresses issues that are important to BCEDP.

The council approved the suggested topics for the breakout sessions, but had some additional suggestions. Craig suggested that ideas for some of the topics and session speakers for the breakout sessions could be taken from the upcoming "Developing Technology For Early Detection of Breast Cancer" (IOM) Report. Georjean expressed interest in a session addressing policy, application and dissemination of proven research results. There was also interest expressed in designing training sessions for fostering collaborations and skill development. Irene was particularly interested in building CRC collaborations. Mhel stated that there was a CRC training session in last year's symposium that was poorly attended, so the council may want to suggest ways to improve interest in the session. Irene was also interested in how the symposium could inform an information base for California Health Interpreters.

Candidates for the two remaining speaking slots in the plenary session were chosen. Nora Disis of the University of Washington was suggested based on her excellent personal presentation to Project Lead and her experience in translational research. The top candidates for the speaker to fill the media slot are: Robert Bazell, NBC Chief Health and Science Correspondent and author of *Her-2: The Making of Herceptin, a Revolutionary Treatment for Breast Cancer*; Ellen Levine, Editor-in-Chief of Good Housekeeping magazine; and Gwen Darien, Editor-in-Chief of MAMM magazine.

The council discussed how to handle the poster award process. The council decided it unwieldy for all of the council members to view all of the posters, so a system will be designed whereby council members are assigned specific groups of posters to judge. The specific details have still to be worked out.

After extensive discussion the council decided that poster discussion sessions could be run one of three ways:

1. A discussant summarizes the posters in the session and then leads the discussion with poster presenters.
2. A discussant gives the background and overview of the posters in the session and identifies a few poster presenters to give detailed information about their poster.
3. Each poster presenter gives a short summary of his/her poster.

The council voted to accept the second option. A discussant will be asked to give an overview of the session and highlight the summary by asking 3 – 4 poster presenters to present their data.

The Committee decided to name the Symposium. Terri moved to accept the name “From Research to Action”. The motion was carried.

B. Brainstorming Activity for Cycle VIII Planning (Attachment 6)

The activity was introduced by Mary Ann stating that one of the most important contributions a council member can make is to give input on the research priorities set each year for the BCRP. Mhel gave an overview of the assumptions underlying BCRP’s current practices and requested the council to list five things BCRP could do which would have the most impact in funding.

At the end of the exercise Mhel presented pie charts and schedules that reflected funding by award type and priority issues over the past six cycles. The Breast Cancer Research Program has tried to identify and fill gaps across the entire spectrum of breast cancer research.

The Council discussed the issue of recruiting clinicians into research careers. The challenge is that institutions use an academic reward system based on publication and grant support and do not offer sufficient time and funds to allow appropriate combined clinical-research careers.

Another suggestion is to fund MD’s and Ph.D’s interested in breast cancer research requiring them, as a result of funding their education, to spend at least one – two years in breast cancer clinical research after obtaining their degrees. One issue is that MD’s and Ph.D’s are paid for their education and are very competitive. California institutions cannot afford to have physicians doing clinical research who would otherwise generate income from treating patients. Thus, even if more physicians were induced to enter into clinical research, they might not continue or their institutions would not allow it due to loss of revenue.

Mary Ann stated the council would revisit the issue of whether this is a priority issue along with all the other points raised at the February retreat.

C. Profits Derived From BCRP Funded Research (Attachment 7)

Walter Price presented the issues to be considered in requiring sharing of revenue generated from BCRP sponsored research. Ultimately, it was determined that because of the various sources of funds that go into any disclosure, license or patent, there could be no expectations for a return on investment. What is actually being funded by BCRP is the advancement of science, knowledge and progress against the disease.

The council decided unanimously that it was not worth the effort to pursue the action any further. Larry G. is encouraged to look at other funding sources for BCRP through the University of California.

D. Other Committee Reports

1. COLLABORATION WITH BCEDP (Attachment 8)

Chairwoman Jihati began by introducing the members of the Committee. She asked how information regarding BCRP was reported to the state BCEDP Council. Secondly, the committee asked what efforts were being made by BCEDP to collaborate with the BCRC. She suggested that perhaps communication should be made at the state level as opposed to locally.

Mhel stated she is a member of the State BCEDP Council and reports on BCRP activities, funding, call for applications, etc. Lack of knowledge about BCRP within the partnership is partly due to lack of continuity of staff at the partnership level. The relationship between BCRP and BCEDP has been enhanced by BCRP's participation in the state-wide BCEDP Partnership meeting. The generation of the early detection document (Attachment 8) was one of the efforts made informing the state-wide council on research progress in early detection. Akua stated that the BCEDP council agreeing to BCRP presence at statewide meeting on a regular basis would prove beneficial and help to develop a better relationship so that there are no lost opportunities and they know that the resources are there.

With Georjean serving as an Ex-Officio member of the BCRC, Akua inquired about a format for reporting information to BCRP regarding BCEDP.

The committee decided to table any future steps or actions pending new council members joining the committee.

Irene serves on the Asian Pacific Islander Advisory Committee for BCEDP. She stated the committee was interested in whether BCRP would fund an evaluation for an 800 line which includes a capacity for Asian languages.

2. Evaluation

The evaluation committee is working on program evaluation. Under the direction of Janna, the committee is expected to finalize the existing draft of the Evaluation Plan.

3. Priority Setting

This committee is developed to establish a process for priority setting (as opposed to actually setting priorities). A retreat is planned for February with an emphasis on priority setting.

V. Announcements

Mary Ann announced the next meeting is in Santa Barbara on February 2nd and 3rd.

The April Council meeting was rescheduled to April 6, 2001

VI. Adjournment

Motion: A motion for adjournment was made and seconded.

The motion was passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 3:03 p.m.