

Revised 8/8/2008

Meeting Record

Meeting Group: NH Cancer Fund Oversight Board

Date of Meeting: March 17, 2008

P. Ames, Representative Bridgham, L. Butterly (Chair), R. Bye, P. Davies, M. Dumond, J. Gersten, N. Kane, S. LaFrance, L. Mendham, J. Miranda-Smith, Laurie Ota, J. Proctor, P. Santos, J. Sias

Not present: Senator Martha Fuller Clark, Y. Corbeil, Representative Emerton, Senator Odell, B. Walker

Guests: Donna Fleming

Length of meeting: 1.75 hrs.

Respectfully submitted by: Judy Proctor

Topic	Discussion	Committee Recommendations	Committee Actions
<p>Statement from the Breast Cancer Screening RFP Committee</p> <p>Palmira Santos</p>	<p>RFP rescinded and the RFP development team met to consider the issue about the NH Medicaid law (see meeting record of 2/4/08).</p> <p>Statement distributed to membership prior to this meeting.</p>	<p>RFP Development Committee to meet with representatives of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Program to determine the feasibility of implementing the recommendations and requests.</p>	<p>RFP Development Team to report back to the Board.</p> <p>Contact Becky Bukowski or Palmira Santos with any additional suggestions or concerns.</p>
<p>Cost Allocation for Administering Funds</p> <p>Mike Dumond</p>	<p>Sub-Committee met as requested at 2/4/08 mtg. Recommended that Mike Dumond propose what percent of the Cancer Fund DPHS would need to cover contract management expenses within DHHS.</p> <p>Challenge: to clearly define the role and responsibilities of DPHS in administering the Fund so costs can be configured to the workload.</p> <p>Who will manage and monitor the contracts.</p>	<p>Small sub-group meeting planned for 3/25 to help clarify roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Once roles clarified, Mike can re-approach the Board.</p>	
<p>Contractors and NH CCC workgroups</p> <p>Joanne Gersten</p>	<p>Can contractors be required to become members of NH CCC workgroup to which their project relates since they are working on Cancer Plan objectives and this would prevent duplication of efforts and grow the Collaboration?</p>		<p>Mike will check with J. Ascheim.</p>
<p>Process Review Session</p> <p>Mike Dumond</p>	<p>Mike and Dr. B are faced with daily challenges in the RFP and contract process. Mike has urgent issues to resolve today to move forward with the process and has been asked by Director Cooney to present these to the full Board since he and Dr.</p>		

	<p>Butterly have not agreed on them. Concerned about additional delays in the process that might impact time-line for award of contracts. Challenge: what is administration vs. allocation of the money as directed by the RSA 126A-63?</p> <p>1. Use of facilitator at a review meeting Can a facilitator of a Proposal Review Meeting be another DPHS member who is not already a member of the review team? Dr. B: No, since the presence of another DPHS person doesn't maintain the team balance as specified in the original agreement for structuring the teams with 2 DPHS, 2 CCC and 1 external expert.</p> <p>Mike: Yes. This person doesn't read or score proposals and is there to keep the meeting moving. Original discussion didn't address the role of a facilitator, but one is commonly used at DPHS, especially with large groups.</p> <p>Donna Fleming of NH Tobacco Program indicates this practice has been helpful in the past so that staff who are functioning as reviewers can focus on the proposals and discussion itself and not have to keep the meeting running.</p> <p>2. Standard DPHS reviewer guidance/instructions Mike received edits from Dr. B last week. Mike submitted them to DPHS Administrators. Reviewers have already received the standard DPHS template version. Dr. B offered to withdraw the edits since reviewers had already received the standard DPHS version.</p> <p>3. Review meeting schedules Mike reports that the designated experts are not able to attend 2 of the tobacco review meetings as scheduled. (Tobacco Media and Coalitions). Meetings have already been rescheduled once (after the budget cuts changed the rapid timeline as outlined in the initial RFP) in order to allow time for reviewers to receive and review all the proposals for their group. Best to capitalize on the use of national experts, but not always available.</p>	<p>Board Vote: Should review team meetings be facilitated by a proposal reviewer who is already a part of the review team rather than by an additional person who is not a reviewer?</p> <p>Yes: 11 votes No: 1 vote</p> <p>Consider edits for the future so DPHS document reflects a joint effort with the CCC, which the current reviewer instructions that were sent out do not.</p> <p>Balance good quality process with potential for additional delays.</p> <p>Dr. Cummings should submit comments and scores, but doesn't have to be present since this meeting is already scheduled.</p>	<p>Board supports having a note taker in the room and offers to provide this assistance to DPHS upon request.</p>
--	---	--	---

Revised 8/8/2008

		Dr. Halperin is willing to meet 1 hr later than the proposed time if this doesn't affect too many of the other reviewers, since the current meeting is scheduled at 6 AM her time.	
Targeted Funding Options Peter Ames	FY'08 and potential FY'09 budget cuts could reduce the effectiveness of contracts. RSA 126-A:65 targets the Fund by percentages in 7 different areas and doesn't allow the OSB to target the funds to maximize the use of limited resources. If additional cuts are made, a new law would be needed to give the OSB authority to target effective programming (in larger blocks of money) rather than use monies in 7 smaller initiatives that would be less effective. Uncertain if there will be enough time to amend the law. More progress could be demonstrated by targeting the funds as needed.	Favors re-targeting the funds if the legislative timeline will allow this to happen.	Peter Ames will discuss with the Finance Committees of the House and Senate to determine the feasibility and course of action.
Next Meeting			April 21 4:00 PM conference call NOTE: Cancel previously scheduled OSB meetings on 4/3 and May 1.