

Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes
September 10, 2004: Council Meeting
San Francisco, CA

Members present: Kim Pierce, Moon Chen, John Morgan, Lisa Wanzor, Amy Kyle, Carol D'Onofrio, Christine White, Deb Oto-Kent, Kathy Walters, Jackie Papkoff, Dee Bainton, Jim Ford, Elaine Ashby, Diana Chingos

Members not present: Vicki Boriack, Janet Howard-Espinoza, Georjean Stoodt, Michael Figueroa

Staff: Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, Charles L. Gruder, Walter Price, Larry Fitzgerald, Janna Cordeiro, Katie McKenzie, Lyn Dunagan, Jill Stark, Cathyn Fan, Roslyn Roberts

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:08am and introductions were exchanged.

II. Minutes

Corrections to June 18 minutes:

- In the Outreach Committee report, it should be specified that the next Symposium is scheduled for 2005.
- Vicki Boriack's name is spelled inconsistently

MOTION: John Morgan moved (Christine White seconded) that the minutes from June 18, 2004, be approved with the above changes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business

A. Cycle 11 Application Information Packet

Larry Fitzgerald presented an overview of the application packet and the application process, the programmatic review's relevance to the application process and its difference from the peer review process.

The Council discussed and approved continuing the use of the lowest tertile as a method of weeding out applications lacking scientific merit. Dropping the lowest third scores (opposed to the lowest half) encourages creative ideas and avoids inadvertent reviewer bias.

1. Finalizing Programmatic Review Criteria

Larry continued with an overview of the previous programmatic review process and last year's scores, then introduced the proposed changes for 2005.

- Revise the total number of review criteria, including one separate scoring criteria specific to each award type
- Revise or reduce the number of advocacy items (sensitivity AND inclusion)

- Use more of a tertile system (scoring in 0, 1, 2 instead of 0, 1)
- Define the extra point for scientific merit

The Council discussed the recommendations, offered several editorial suggestions, and refined the following conclusions:

- Add a new Form 5 (Form 5A) for Postdoctoral applicants to answer the question of advocacy involvement and sensitivity.
- Modify Form 2 to add a question relating to the advocacy issues/needs described in the instructions.
- The advocacy criteria will score for both sensitivity and inclusion
- The significant scientific merit scoring criteria (for the extra one point) break down by award type as follows:
 - IDEAs: innovation
 - Career development awards: career development
 - CRCs: community benefit
- Add language encouraging multidisciplinary research throughout the general application packet

MOTION: Carol D’Onofrio moved (Lisa Wanzor seconded) that the Council approve the proposed changes to the programmatic review criteria as set forth in staff recommendations and as detailed in the Council recommendations above. The motion passed unanimously.

Council members were invited to send further editorial suggestions directly to Larry after the meeting.

The following issues were tabled for discussion at a later meeting:

- Fine-tune the scoring details, including:
 - How to rate the component score
 - How to score the advocacy criteria

The ad-hoc committee that worked on the initial programmatic review changes will discuss the remaining issues and bring suggestions to a future meeting.

2. IDEA Awards:

Competitive Renewals

Larry Fitzgerald outlined the staff’s recommendations for previously-unresolved issues in the competitive renewal process:

- Increase the extension-grant’s duration to two years (compared to one year for the original IDEA) and increase the budget to \$200,000-\$250,000 (higher amount reflects use of human/animal subjects)
- Restrict the applicants to one renewal application per IDEA grant, and prohibit revised renewal applications
- Merit scoring criteria will focus on the progress made, instead of the innovativeness of the proposal
- Funding decisions will be based on the prior programmatic review and the new scientific merit scores

- The application submission date will be delayed to allow investigators more time to prepare their applications (applications will be due on the same date as the CRC applications); however, a letter of intent is due at the time of the regular application deadline

The Council discussed these recommendations and would like to include a required statement addressing the inclusion of advocacy involvement as a part of the information that informs the funding decision.

MOTION: Amy Kyle moved (Kim Pierce seconded) that the IDEA competitive renewals will keep original programmatic review score; applicants are required to submit a statement of progress in advocacy involvement, which will be reviewed by staff. Staff will give input on the funding decision. The motion passed unanimously.

Details that still need to be worked out:

- Programmatic score: use a relative ranking (upper quarter or third) and determine the scoring criteria for the scientific merit
- How to balance funding decisions between new IDEAs and competitive renewals

Critical Path and Milestones

Larry Fitzgerald solicited feedback on the proposed Form 5 for critical path/milestones. Council offered significant suggestions and revisions. Members were asked to send their edits to Larry by early next week. Edits will be included in this year's application packet, and the Council will have the opportunity to revisit the critical path issue for the next cycle.

Mentor Profile and Training Plan

The Council offered general language suggestions for Form 5B, which will become part of the scientific review process only (removed from programmatic review). Members will forward edits to Larry.

Junior Investigators

The Council confirmed that, per previous discussion, junior investigators are strongly encouraged to apply, and will be scored under special criteria during the peer-review process, but will not receive special consideration during the programmatic review process.

B. Priority-Setting Process Evaluation (folded into the priority-setting committee report)

IV. Director's Report

Program Initiatives: Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch summarized her progress with the interviews she has made to date and the findings and ideas those conversations have

generated. Feedback suggests structuring the task force as a small group with a defined, achievable task and narrowly-defined goals given plenty of appropriate materials—very contrary to having a task force define their own process and structure. Council members suggested additional contact names.

Program reorganization: Mhel presented an overview and conceptual model for the final proposed reorganization plan. She will be meeting with HR staff this month. Money for the new program initiatives staff will come from the program initiatives funding.

General: Mhel reviewed the list of current publications, the grant funding timeline, the budget, and the tax check-off income.

Annual report to the Legislature and *Advances in Breast Cancer Research*: The Council was presented with the legislative requirements; Mhel requested Council input on changing the yearly *Advances* publishing schedule to every other year, alternating with the Symposium.

MOTION: John Morgan moved (Amy Kyle seconded) that the Program release *Advances in Breast Cancer Research* every other year, alternating with the Symposium abstract booklet. The motion passed unanimously.

New Publications and Events:

- Staff is planning a Decade of Funding publication that will summarize the Program's last ten years of funded projects
- Breast Art Project: Katie McKenzie reports that the Program will exhibit the breast art collection, in collaboration with the UC Davis Design Museum, from October 17 through November 19. The opening evening includes a panel discussion and reception. The project interweaves science and art, intended to attract the public, specifically art-focused people who are interested in breast cancer. Staff is working with Kate Collie, a CBCRP-funded PI, and the Design Museum to develop a brochure and postcard invitation.

Joining Forces Award: Larry Fitzgerald reported that the Susan Love MD Foundation has submitted a letter of intent as a precursor to applying for a Joining Forces award for the Intraductal Conference. The Program previously funded this successful, well-run conference in 2003. There is a lot of demand for and interest in this unique event; they are requesting funds to cover approximately one quarter of their costs. Larry recommends that if the Council is interested in funding this event again, then the Program should ask Dr. Love to add an advocate presence, similar to another Joining Forces award (IABCR meeting) for Dr. Cardiff.

The Council discussed the event and agreed that they are interested in seeing an application from the Susan Love MD Foundation regarding this event, with the inclusion of advocate involvement. Larry will follow up with the organization.

V. New Business

A. Work plan and goals for the year: Deb Oto-Kent briefly outlined the year's goals: working on the Program Initiatives, getting feedback on the priority-setting process and modifying the next priority-setting process, defining translation, etc. Committees were described, and the issue of meeting overlap was discussed—committee members were encouraged to keep their meetings focused in order to finish on time. The Council discussed the format of the meeting dates and agreed that the Thursday night-Friday day meetings still work well.

An ad-hoc committee was formed to define “Translation” and how the Program may best support it. The end goal is to bring back a TRC-style award type and to sprinkle translation throughout what we do. Members of the Translation ad-hoc committee are: Jackie Papkoff, Kim Pierce, Amy Kyle, Lisa Wanzor, and Larry Fitzgerald. Additional staff member(s) will be determined later.

B. Committee Reports

Collaboration: no oral report; see minutes

Outreach: The committee reported on plans for the Symposium. The theme of the plenary session is the unequal burden of breast cancer. The committee requests help in contacting keynote speaker candidates; three possibilities arose. The committee outlined the structure of the meeting, including the restructuring of the poster discussion sessions into technical panels, and reviewed their goals moving forward.

Priority-Setting: The committee reviewed the outcome of its discussion about the priority-setting process and is preparing a survey for the retreat participants. The committee then opened discussion to the full Council. Despite the challenges of the long and complicated process, the Council and staff are generally pleased with the outcome of the process, the depth and breadth of the process, and the due diligence made throughout the process. Several ideas for improvements to the process will be explored in the coming year; involvement by the full Council in the survey will be important to that exchange.

C. Meeting Schedule

The Council discussed the meeting schedule and determined that tentative dates should remain as scheduled. Locations will remain within the general area as set out on the schedule, but may vary slightly. Meeting dates beyond the initial schedule will be set at the next meeting.

The meeting ADJOURNED at 4:22p.m.