

**Florida Biomedical Research Advisory  
Council (BRAC) Subcommittee  
Meeting Minutes**

**November 2, 2006  
10:00am – 11:00am EST  
Web Conference Call**

**Council Members Present:**

Dr. Myra Hurt  
Dr. Mary Lou Sole  
Dr. Herbert Weissbach

**Program Staff Members Present:**

Ms. Mary Bernard – Lytmos Group  
Ms. Eburn Grimes - DOH  
Dr. Susan Phillips - DOH  
Ms. Kerri Poirier – Lytmos Group  
Ms. Peggy Shults – Lytmos Group  
Ms. Judy Taylor-Fischer – DOH  
Mr. Chuck Wells - DOH

During the September 25, 2006 meeting, the BRAC agreed to convene a subcommittee to work with Program staff to prepare a method of ranking and presenting the Bankhead-Coley Bridge Grant applications for funding consideration during its November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. These minutes report the outcome of the Web conference call held for this purpose.

**Plan for Ranking FY2006-07 Bankhead-Coley Bridge Grants by Scientific Merit:** Ms. Shults proposed a scheme for integrating and ranking proposals from different federal competitions by calculating a common ratio between each application's peer review score and its associated federal competition pay line, using fictitious data for an example. Dr. Hurt pointed out that the pay line is a function of the budget more than scientific merit, and using this approach would penalize higher rated proposals in competitions with smaller budgets. Instead, the consensus of the subcommittee was that Bridge Grant applications should be presented to the BRAC sorted by mechanism (e.g. R-01, R-15, etc.) and ranked by federal peer review score or percentile. The BRAC will then consider the relative scientific merits of each application across all mechanisms using the federal peer review score or percentile.

**Plan for Incorporating Other Factors in Determining the Bankhead-Coley Bridge Grant Awards:** After discussion regarding other available information, members of the subcommittee advised including the average Lytmos reviewer ratings of cancer relationship and Bridge Grant budget reasonableness in the BRAC funding worksheet. Because new investigators trying to establish independence will not be expected to seek collaboration and also because there was evidence of different interpretations of the term "collaboration" among reviewer comments, BRAC members recommended that Lytmos reviewer ratings for collaboration should be excluded. Furthermore, rather than relying on reviewer ratings of proposed PI proposed effort, Council members preferred listing the actual PI percent effort in the funding worksheet.

Ms. Bernard noted that certain Lytmos and federal peer review comments pointed out other aspects regarding certain proposals that may be relevant to the BRAC during the funding discussion. To be fair to all applicants, it was agreed that Program staff would present generic cases involving major policy decisions to the BRAC prior to sharing the funding worksheet, so that BRAC consensus could be reached without bias due to a view of any one application's scientific merit.

**Public Comment:** No members of the public responded to the published meeting notice offering to share call-in information.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m. EST.