

# A NEW APPROACH TO P30 CANCER CENTER SUPPORT GRANT FUNDING

---

BSA/NCAB Joint meeting June 23, 2014

From a report of the National Cancer Advisory Board *Ad Hoc* Cancer Centers Working Group

Originally presented to NCAB February 27, 2014

Bill Hait, M.D., Ph.D.  
Global Head, Research and Development  
Janssen, Pharmaceutical Companies of Johnson and Johnson

# National Cancer Advisory Board Cancer Centers Working Group

<p><b><u>Chair</u></b> William N. Hait, M.D., Ph.D., Chair Global Head Pharmaceutical Research &amp; Development Johnson &amp; Johnson Raritan, NJ</p>	
<p><b><u>Members</u></b> Frederick Appelbaum, M.D. Executive Vice President and Deputy Director Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center Seattle, WA</p>	<p>Craig B. Thompson, M.D. President and Chief Executive Officer Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center New York, NY</p>
<p>Mary C. Beckerle, Ph.D. Chief Executive Officer Huntsman Cancer Institute University of Utah Salt Lake City, UT</p>	<p>Kristiina Vuori, M.D., Ph.D. Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute President and Interim Chief Executive Officer and Director La Jolla, CA</p>
<p>Kevin J. Cullen, M.D. Director Greenebaum Cancer Center University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD</p>	<p>George Weiner, M.D. Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center Director University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa</p>
<p>Chi Dang, M.D., Ph.D. Director Abramson Cancer Center University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA</p>	<p><b><u>Executive Secretary</u></b> Linda K. Weiss, Ph.D. Director Office of Cancer Centers National Cancer Institute, NIH Bethesda, MD</p>
<p>Stanton L. Gerson, M.D. Director Case Comprehensive Cancer Center Case Western University Cleveland, OH</p>	<p><b><u>Committee Management Officer</u></b> Ms. Grace Tato Division of Extramural Activities National Cancer Institute, NIH Bethesda, MD</p>
<p>Michelle Le Beau, Ph.D. Director University of Chicago Comprehensive Cancer Center Chicago, IL</p>	

# NCAB Charge to the Cancer Centers *Ad Hoc* Working Group (WG)

- Assess whether current funding guidelines for NCI-designated Cancer Centers (“Centers”) are appropriate and sufficient
  - if not, what aspects might be changed?
- Provide appropriate guidance on policies and metrics relevant to allocation of funds to Centers in a time of fiscal stringency

# 2013 Guideline Amendments

- CCSG awards  $\geq$ \$6 million capped at current direct costs
- CCSG awards of  $<$ \$6 million can request increase of 10% or \$1,000,000, whichever is greater
- New centers can request awards  $\leq$ \$1 million

# Questions from Dr. Varmus to WG

- Are the 2012 interim funding guidelines appropriate and sufficient to counter concerns about current distribution?
- Should we
  - change the 'cap'?
  - launch new centers with larger or smaller budgets?
  - change allowable rate of increase?
- Are there better methods for making funding decisions?
  - if so, what metrics should be used and how much consideration should be given to ways in which core funds are used?
- Are there ways to make budgeting more flexible, without increasing base budget?
  - through supplements or cooperative agreements?
  - appropriate use of these alternative resources?

# Methods

- WG included ten members from diverse cancer centers and from private sector
- Met six times over one year, heard presentations from NCI leadership, and reviewed historical and current funding policies and approaches
- Drew several major conclusions
- Discussed multiple possible approaches, including various funding models
- Aligned on recommendations

# Conclusions

- Significant disparities exist in size of CCSG awards, often due to factors other than merit
  - Longevity, size of NCI budget and competitors in year of application, prior performance
- Interim funding approach in 2012 CCSG Guidelines manages award expectations and retains a flat budget
  - but perpetuates disparities
- Centers differ in type, organizational structure, and environmental factors that affect importance of specific CCSG components
- Centers should be evaluated on what they do and how well they do it
  - impact of science emerging from the center and how that was enabled by CCSG should be paramount
- Components of CCSG process could be optimized to decrease administrative burden, increase flexible use of funds, and stress most significant science
- Underperforming Centers should be carefully reviewed; cessation of funding should be considered

# We Reached Consensus

- The Working Group then discussed approaches to address disparities in funding.
- After review of several example models, a consensus emerged on the following recommendations:



# Recommendations

1. CCSG funding should be comprised of three components
  - base award
  - multipliers of the base predicated on merit and size
  - possible supplement
2. Center Administrators should be involved in planning for implementation of new approach
3. Proposed changes should be framed in context of NCI and Centers' mission.
  - timeline and mode of communicating changes will help determine acceptability