**Florida Cancer Plan 2030 Planning Meeting
Subgroup on Collaboration, Data, Research/Technology
July 21, 2025 at 10:00 AM**

**Quick recap**

The meeting began with introductions from various cancer research organizations and discussions about their roles in the CCRAB subgroup, including data analysis and tracking initiatives. The team reviewed and refined goal language for their plan, focusing on partnerships and measurable objectives, while also discussing challenges with cancer research objectives related to funding and legislation. The conversation ended with discussions about Florida's research capacity and funding, emphasizing the importance of collaboration between institutions and outlining next steps for future meetings.

**Summary**

**Cancer Research Collaboration Meeting**

The meeting began with introductions from participants, including representatives from various organizations such as Moffitt Cancer Center, Florida Cancer Data System, Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center, and the University of Miami. Participants discussed their roles and contributions to the CCRAB subgroup, focusing on research goals, collaboration, and data analysis. Paul noted that Danny and he would align on research goals, and Till mentioned their involvement in providing data analytical skills and creating a tracking dashboard for the Florida Cancer Plan 2025. The conversation ended with an acknowledgment of progress made in the first two steps of the process.

**Goal Language Refinement Workshop**

The group discussed their progress on reviewing and refining goal language for their plan. Bobbie provided a recap of previous assignments, noting that participants should review their assigned goal areas and prepare proposed language for goals and objectives. The team agreed to workshop verbiage in the current session, with plans to circulate and refine it further. Tiffany shared a document with suggested changes to the first goal, which the group planned to review and discuss. Karin emphasized that this was an iterative process and encouraged the team to focus on gathering ideas before finalizing details.

**Expanding Partnerships for Cancer Control**

The group discussed broadening the language around partnerships to include nontraditional partners like rural clinics and FQHCs, with Kenisha suggesting the need for a process to exchange information between collaboratives to maximize cancer control resources. Bill emphasized the importance of creating intentional procedures for forming partnerships, while Bobbie highlighted the progress made in building relationships with regional collaboratives over the years. The group also considered measurable objectives for growing collaboratives and discussed the need for better integration of pediatric programs into the state plan. Paul noted the need to clarify the term "campaigns" in objective 1.2, with Bill suggesting that marketing and message spreading could be key areas for improvement.

**Campaign Objectives and Data Priorities**

The team discussed revising the campaign objectives, with Bobbie suggesting they scrap the current goal and reword it to focus on process improvements rather than assuming leadership roles. They agreed to continue working on objectives offline before their next meeting. The group also reviewed data collection goals, with Gary reporting on a meeting with Monique and Dr. Lee that resulted in a list of priorities including expanding into HIE and Medicaid data, adding recurrence data collection, and maintaining existing goals like cancer biology and lung cancer screening.

**Cancer Research Funding Challenges**

The group discussed challenges with their cancer research objectives, particularly regarding funding and legislation. Gary highlighted that lack of funding and legislation, especially for molecular data and screening data, had led to a standstill in several initiatives, including cancer biology research and data collection projects. Monique noted that while the overall goal remained appropriate, specific objectives needed editing for better clarity and achievability, particularly regarding cervical cancer objectives. The team also discussed successful initiatives like lung cancer screening, which received funding for a second year, and a manual data tool developed to connect researchers with cancer data specialists, though this system was unsustainable in its current form.

**State Data Work Group Objectives**

The group discussed objectives and goals, with Monique noting that many initiatives are already being led by the Department of Health and may not require a new state data work group. Gary emphasized the need to move objectives forward rather than just listing them, while Bobbie highlighted the broad language of the goals. The team agreed to draft specific language for objectives and potentially meet with Dr. Kobetz and others to refine ideas. Paul encouraged continued collaboration and suggested having an offline meeting with Danny to discuss research and technology development.

**Florida Research Funding Strategy**

Paul and Danny discussed Florida's research capacity and funding, noting its national reputation and the introduction of the Casey DeSantis Innovation Fund, a $60 million annual commitment for research projects. They considered whether their objectives should focus on money or outcomes, such as improving the quality of applications and increasing follow-on federal funding. Paul suggested closing the merit gap by funding a higher percentage of qualified applications and improving accrual rates in clinical trials, while Danny emphasized the need for advocacy to secure more funding from the Legislature.

**Institutional Collaboration and Strategic Planning**

The group discussed the importance of collaboration between institutions, noting that the concept was a key focus of the Bankhead-Coley Act, which is now almost 20 years old. They reviewed the Florida state strategic plan, which requires at least two Florida institutions to collaborate on infrastructure grants and large clinical trials for funding. Paul and Danny agreed to have an offline meeting to further discuss objectives and goals, with others invited to join if they email Bobbie or Paul. Bobbie outlined the next steps, including preparing documents for discussion at the next meeting in two weeks, and Monique highlighted the need for advocacy to enable the collection of both positive and negative screening and molecular data, which FCDS currently lack the capacity to pursue.

**Next steps**

* Tiffany to forward the collaboration goal language suggestions to Bobbie.
* Collaboration subgroup to refine goal language to include nontraditional partners and process for information exchange.
* Data subgroup (Gary, Monique, Dr. Lee) to draft revised objectives for the data goal, considering funding and legislative needs.
* Research subgroup (Paul, Danny) to have an offline meeting to discuss and refine research objectives.
* Research subgroup to consider including measurable outcomes related to funding quality, follow-on federal funding, and collaboration between institutions in their objectives.
* All subgroups to prepare draft language for objectives following the workbook steps for discussion at the next meeting.
* Bobbie is to send a follow-up email with instructions for preparing objectives for the next meeting.