Scope

- 69 NCI-designated cancer centers:
  - 7 basic
  - 13 clinical
  - 49 comprehensive

- 80 CCSG Research Programs in population sciences at 59 centers
  - 40 1 Program
  - 17 2 Programs
  - 2 3 Programs
Research Program Areas By Title

- Cancer Control 36
- Prevention 29
- Epidemiology 14
- Population Science 13
- Disparities 7
- Survivorship 3
- Tobacco 2
Research Program Parameters
(41 RPs analyzed)

- Average membership: 33 (15/66)
- Average NCI funding (Direct Costs): $4.6M ($0.61/22.2)
- Number of themes/specific aims: 3 (2/5)
- Inter-programmatic pubs: 21% (10/55)
- Intra-programmatic pubs: 24% (10/44)
## Scores of Research Programs in CCSG Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional to Outstanding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding to Exceptional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding to Excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent to Outstanding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent to Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good to Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = Outstanding to Excellent

Total: 41
CCSG Review Comments

- Research with important impact on the field and the community as demonstrated by moving evidence-based interventions to translation and dissemination
- Program Leaders with peer-review funding and complementary expertise
- Access to large cohorts, biospecimens, and SEER registries
- Responsive to previous criticism
- Used multiple cores
- Instrumental in developing cores specific to population sciences research – and used them
- High-impact publications
- Number of publications/funding/members increased since last review
CCSG Review Comments con’t

- Clear cancer focus
- Culled membership to increase cancer focus/funding
- Formal training mechanisms (T32, R25) and/or structured mentoring (esp. junior faculty)
- Multiple PI grants
- Structured mechanisms to promote collaboration: seminars, retreats, meetings, collaborative pilot projects
- Clear future plans, particularly recruitment
CCSG Review Comments con’t

- Missed opportunities: esp. if catchment area contains a particular cancer or health problem (disparity, tobacco use, etc.) not addressed
- Lack of synergy across research foci
- Lack of collaboration with basic science programs
- High proportion of members without research funding (>25% of members)
- Attempts to cover too much scientific ground
- Suboptimal depth of faculty expertise
- Lack of institutional commitment to meet programmatic needs