

Memorandum for the Record

From: John W. Yarbrow, M.D.

Subject: Department of Oncology Development Grants

It is becoming increasingly apparent that there are only two approaches to developing cancer centers which offer the potential for long-range stability which is desirable in such a center. The first approach is typified by the Sidney Farber Cancer Center affiliated with Harvard University and can be described as that of a free-standing institute with independent sources of support which has affiliated with a medical school. The second pattern can be illustrated by the University of Wisconsin or the University of Miami in which a multidisciplinary department is established within the medical school which is able to have tenured faculty and other departmental prerogatives. No other device ^{guarantees} ~~guarantees~~ a long-term stable cancer center in spite of the fact that we have identified centers ^A which ~~are now well without either~~ ^{have neither} of these two approaches and in spite of the fact that directors and consultants from these centers will argue to the contrary. There is simply nothing, repeat nothing, which has the stability of a department of a medical school. For a more detailed description of this situation I would refer you to a paper entitled "^Cancer ^Centers; ^Their ^Relation-ship to the ^Academic ^Scommunity". Clearly, therefore, it is desirable to develop departments of oncology which are multidisciplinary and relate to historical departments in a matrix. There will be at least six such departments by the end of 1975 and a seventh is seriously under consideration. Thus, a precedent clearly exists. It would be very much in the interests of the cancer centers program as well as the National Cancer Institute to consider developing a new and short-term grants program entitled "Department of Oncology Development Grants." The purpose of this program should be to provide short-term support contingent upon an institution providing hard money budgets for the development of departments of oncology. What we would hope to accomplish would be to set a pattern or trend in medical education, or more precisely to consolidate a trend which has already been established. A goal should be set, for example 20 new departments over the next five years. Approval or disapproval should be based upon peer review mechanisms by a committee charged with this responsibility but the size of the budget should be an established constant for reasons which will become apparent as I discuss

Continuation, Department of Oncology Development Grants

the concept. I would suggest the following budget for the development of such a department:

<u>Year</u>	<u>NCI Contribution</u>	<u>Institutional Hard-money Guarantee</u>
1	400,000	
2	350,000	50,000
3	300,000	100,000
4	250,000	150,000
5	200,000	200,000

From the above it is apparent that by the end of 5 years a hard-money commitment of \$200,000 per year would have been made to the Department of Oncology by the institution. There should be the provision that this commitment should be for a minimum of 10 years. There should be a complete flexibility in spending the NCI funds with exception that the institution is required to appoint to tenured status a minimum of, for example, five faculty members in different disciplines both clinical and basic. By the end of the five year period, therefore, we could be assured that the institution would have given tenure to, for example, at least one medical oncologist, at least one radiation oncologist, at least one surgical oncologist, and at least two laboratory investigators in the newly established Department of Oncology.

There could be a optional opportunity to apply for an additional five years of support at say \$200,000 per year from the NCI which would be awarded if rereview demonstrated the success of the department and would be contingent upon additional hard-money commitments and specify types of faculty appointment.

If this program were established with the idea of awarding four such grants each year for five years we would have established 20 new departments of oncology. It is highly likely that a number of institutions would develop such departments in competition for these grants and it seems quite probable that by the end of a five year period we would have a sufficient number of departments of oncology in the medical schools of the country to maintain the momentum.

Memorandum for the Record

From: John W. Yarbrow, M.D.

Subject: Department of Oncology Development Grants

It is becoming increasingly apparent that there are only two approaches to developing cancer centers which offer the potential for long-range stability which is desirable in such a center. The first approach is typified by the Sidney Farber Cancer Center affiliated with Harvard University and can be described as that of a free-standing institute with independent sources of support which has affiliated with a medical school. The second pattern can be illustrated by the University of Wisconsin or the University of Miami in which a multidisciplinary department is established within the medical school which is able to have tenured faculty and other departmental prerogatives. No other device ^{guarantees} ~~guarantees~~ a long-term stable cancer center in spite of the fact that we have identified centers ^A which ~~are now well without either~~ ^{have neither} of these two approaches and in spite of the fact that directors and consultants from these centers will argue to the contrary. There is simply nothing, repeat nothing, which has the stability of a department of a medical school. For a more detailed description of this situation I would refer you to a paper entitled "^Cancer ^Centers; ^Their ^Relation-ship to the ^Academic ^Scommunity". Clearly, therefore, it is desirable to develop departments of oncology which are multidisciplinary and relate to historical departments in a matrix. There will be at least six such departments by the end of 1975 and a seventh is seriously under consideration. Thus, a precedent clearly exists. It would be very much in the interests of the cancer centers program as well as the National Cancer Institute to consider developing a new and short-term grants program entitled "Department of Oncology Development Grants." The purpose of this program should be to provide short-term support contingent upon an institution providing hard money budgets for the development of departments of oncology. What we would hope to accomplish would be to set a pattern or trend in medical education, or more precisely to consolidate a trend which has already been established. A goal should be set, for example 20 new departments over the next five years. Approval or disapproval should be based upon peer review mechanisms by a committee charged with this responsibility but the size of the budget should be an established constant for reasons which will become apparent as I discuss

The total cost to establish 20 such departments would be only 30 million dollars ~~and this would be~~ spread over a ~~5~~⁹ year period. In the event that some of these departments qualified for additional support for five more years the additional funds ~~would~~ spread over a further 5 year period^d would be 20 million dollars. The cost is modest in comparison with the potential gain. The NCI would gain major resources in universities across the land for the conduct of this programs. CCCs and other cancer centers would be base^d in stable situations guaranteeing their long-term success. The core grant, at least as far as academic institutions are concerned, would then become unnecessary and could be phased out or diverted towards the support of free-standing institutes.

In summary, therefore, long-term stability of cancer centers within academic institutions is best guaranteed by establishment of departments of oncology. The concept of a multidisciplinary department interacting on a matrix with other historical departments is a concept which applies not only to cancer but to many other academic affinity groups as well and is one which can be expected to develop increasing in the new few years. A number of such departments have already been established. It would be highly desirable both from the standpoint of the NCI and from the standpoint of the Cancer Centers Program to develop a program entitled "Department^d of Oncology Development Grants which should be a program with a formula grant based upon local commitment of hard mondy support and appointment to tenure rank of a multidisciplinary faculty in a newly established department of oncology. Such a program would be modest in cost in comparison to its long-range benefits and would in large part obviate the necessity for the core grant except for free-standing institutes. A serious consideration should be given to this possibility.