HEALTH RESEARCH SCIENCE BOARD
Committee on Program Needs and Effectiveness
Monday, May 5, 2014
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
DRAFT MINUTES

Location
NYS DOH David Axelrod Institute, Executive Conference Room,
120 New Scotland Avenue, Albany

Committee Members Present
Douglas Conklin, PhD (Chair)
Bonnie Jo Brautigam
Beverly Canin
Mary Rogers
Neeta Shah, MD
Lakia Rucker
M. Suzanne Hicks

NYS DOH Staff Present
Bonnie Jo Brautigam
Mary Rogers
Lakia Rucker

Committee Members Absent
Gary Morrow, PhD
Robert Riter

Call to Order and Opening Remarks of the Chair
A quorum was established and Douglas Conklin, PhD called the meeting to order at 1:04 PM.

Consideration of Minutes of the November 29, 2012 Meeting
Dr. Conklin asked if there were any comments on Exhibit 1, the minutes from the November 29, 2012 regular business meeting. No comments or corrections were offered.

ACTION
Beverly Canin made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 29, 2012 meeting (Exhibit 1) without further changes. Neeta Shah, MD seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion was unanimously approved (4-0).

Overview of Current Scientific and Education research Funding Priorities
Bonnie Brautigam reviewed the status of funding for Health Research Science Board (HRSB) and recapped the Board’s previous plan to issue Rowley Scientific Research RFAs every other year (10 awards/cycle anticipated), and also to issue the Brown Risk Reduction Education Research RFA (4 awards/cycle anticipated) and Healthcare Practitioner RFA in alternating years (3 awards/cycle anticipated). Ms. Brautigam asked if these plans should be reconsidered, and asked the committee to develop recommendations to bring to the full Board at its next meeting.

Consideration of Future Education Research RFA Issuances
The committee discussed various possibilities for developing and issuing education research RFAs.

ACTION
A motion was made by Ms. Canin, seconded by M. Suzanne Hicks, to recommend to the Health Research Science Board that the Board issue a Patricia S. Brown Risk Reduction Education Research RFA as follows:

- Issue the RFA as it is currently written
- Issue the RFA in the summer of 2015, for contracts to start in the summer of 2016
- There should be a maximum of four awards, each at a maximum direct cost of $75,000/year, with a maximum of 20% F&A costs
• Implement a new scoring scale of 1 (highest) to 9 (lowest), with a Board-
  consideration cut-off at 3.9
• Allow at least three months between RFA issuance and application due date
• Applications with tied scores will be ranked based on their scores for the Approach
  section of the RFA’s review criteria. If still tied, the scores for the Team Composition
  review criteria will be used to rank tied applications.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously (4-0).

Consideration of Future Scientific Research RFA Issuances
Ms. Brautigam reminded the committee that plans for RFA issuances are predicated on being
able to execute a contract for peer review services from the bids that are due May 6, 2014.

There was a brief discussion about the types of administrative scoring penalties assessed
against applications, the reasons for each and the penalty points assessed for each variance
from the application instructions. For his own edification, Dr. Conklin requested that staff
prepare a report on the types of penalties assessed against each application in the last round of
the Rowley RFA.

The committee discussed various possibilities for developing and issuing scientific research
RFAs.

ACTION
A motion was made by Ms. Hicks, seconded by Ms. Canin, to recommend to the Health
Research Science Board that the Board issue a Peter Rowley Scientific Research RFA as
follows:

• Keep the same language as the prior issuance of this RFA, except remove the
  requirement for hypothesis-driven research
• Contracts are for two year terms, with a maximum of ten awards with direct costs
capped at $150,000/year
• Implement a new scoring scale of 1 (highest) to 9 (lowest), with a Board-
  consideration cut-off at 3.9
• Penalties to be assessed at a maximum of 0.1 per application

Next Steps
Ms. Brautigam stated that staff would try to convene a Board meeting sooner than October in
order to move the committee’s recommendations forward. She noted that the committee’s next
task should be to focus on program evaluation. The committee discussed that issue briefly.

Ms. Canin made a request for staff to look back at funded Rowley contractors within the last four
years to examine their publication history, subsequent funding success, and any intellectual
property development made by the investigators. All committee members were in agreement
with this request asking staff to research those items and report results back to the committee.
Ms. Brautigam agreed.
Ms. Hicks asked for draft minutes of committee and Board meetings to be made available to members sooner than they have been distributed in the past (as subsequent meeting exhibits). Ms. Brautigam stated that staff would try to do so.

**Meeting Adjourned**
The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.