



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)
Beverly Canin
Neeta Shah, MD
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.