

Minutes

UW Medical School Oversight and Advisory Committee 12:00 noon April 30, 2003 – Fluno Center

Members Present:

Margaret MacLeod Brahm	Patrick McBride
Philip Farrell	Gregory Nycz
Patricia Kokotailo	Patrick Remington
Mary Lauby	
Nancy Miller-Korth	

Guests:

Patrick Boyle	Linda Dietrich
Paul DeLuca	Richard Reynolds

Staff:

Tracy Cabot
Carla Eakins
Eileen Smith

The meeting was called to order by Phil Farrell at 12:20 PM.

1. Approval of Minutes of April 10, 2003 meeting

Farrell asked if there were any changes to the draft minutes which had been distributed. There being no changes, Miller-Korth moved to approve the minutes as distributed. The motion was seconded by Brahm and passed by unanimous vote.

2. Announcements

Farrell announced that the WUHF Board meeting scheduled on May 1 was cancelled because not enough members were able to attend. It is hoped that the meeting will be rescheduled during the week of May 19 and OAC members were encouraged to attend. An update on the WUHF meeting will be presented at the May 14 OAC meeting. Lauby asked about the responsibilities of the WUHF Board and Farrell responded that it is their responsibility to ensure that the Plans are in compliance with the Insurance Commissioner's Order and to approve the Agreement to Accept Gifts. Smith added that they also decide when to sell the stock and hold the proceeds of sales until the Plans are approved. In addition, they will receive annual reports on use of the funds from the two medical schools as long as WUHF is in existence.

Farrell indicated that the next meeting of the OAC is scheduled for May 14, and no meetings have been scheduled after that. Efforts will be made to schedule one meeting per month through September.

Farrell announced that a request had been received from the Division of Health asking that funds be contributed to help cover costs of printing the implementation plan for the State Health Plan. Farrell reminded the committee that printing the implementation plan for the State Health Plan, Healthiest Wisconsin, was not designated as an expenditure in the 5 year plan. Also, the UW System has a projected budget cut in state funding of approximately \$250 million, and the administration has specifically requested that efforts be made to reduce printing costs regardless of the source of funding. Given the length of the implementation plan, (approximately 700 – 1000 pages), Remington suggested that it would be more appropriate to make the document available on the internet rather than printing numerous copies.

Farrell announced that several opportunities have become available for public presentation of the plan. He will make presentations to the Medical School academic staff on May 1 and 5. Miller-Korth will make a presentation at the “Covering Our Kids” conference in Stevens Point on May 2, and Farrell will present at the Wisconsin Public Health Association meeting in Milwaukee on May 20.

Farrell introduced Dick Reynolds, a health systems management engineer, who will begin working with Smith on developing the many aspects related to implementation of the plan, including the structure, technical assistance, and training that will be necessary to effect the community-academic contracts, as well as tracking, reporting and evaluation processes that need to be established. In addition, Smith will soon be hiring an administrative assistant.

Farrell invited committee members to make additional announcements or comments. Remington expressed concern about the public’s perception of the committee following the revision of the plan to eliminate the proposed use of a portion of the 65% component for the IRC construction. There seems to be a perception that the committee did not exercise due diligence. Boyle indicated that he had heard similar comments. He stated that he reported to the Board of Regents that the OAC is one of the most effective committees he has ever seen, and he knows that the Regents concur. He indicated that he also emphasized the OAC’s effectiveness and commitment to improving public health when he recently met with Governor Doyle. After discussion by several committee members expressing concern about the misinterpretation and misunderstanding of their action regarding the IRC and what can be learned from this situation, it was agreed that it was time to move on to the significant issues facing the OAC regarding the implementation of the plan.

Smith emphasized the need to make information easily available to community organizations and to both the UW faculty and the academic staff to ensure that the RFP process is well understood and executed. She suggested that training sessions on the process should be offered outside of Madison. Farrell agreed and suggested that training sessions in collaboration with MCW should be considered.

3. Discussion of Request for Proposal Process

Brahm stated that the RFP which was distributed to the committee reflects comments from an earlier meeting but is still a work in progress and should be considered a rough draft.

Lauby confirmed with the OAC that community organizations would be considered the primary partner. She commented that the most substantive change in the draft RFP is the differentiation between planning grants and implementation grants. Planning grants would be up to \$10,000 and ideally would lead to full implementation proposals. Remington described the CDC's use of planning and implementation grants. McBride commented that NIH prefers to use "feasibility" grants rather than "pilot" grants. Lauby expressed concern about requiring faculty letters of support for planning grants; she suggested encouraging but not requiring them. Miller-Korth concurred, commenting that time might be needed to develop a supportive relationship with a faculty member. Nycz suggested that successful planning grants could lead to funding from other sources. Brahm commented that two key elements in the evaluation process would be where they are in developing partnerships and possible leveraging of funds. Miller-Korth suggested limiting documentation requirements because small organizations have limited staff and little time for paperwork.

In discussing section C (Eligible Applicants), questions were raised about the eligibility of volunteer faculty as partners. Smith indicated that a legal opinion will be sought. Miller-Korth asked about eligibility of faculty in other schools such as Nursing and Pharmacy. Farrell commented that he had already met with the Dean of the School of Nursing and described the plan to her and the availability of joint appointments.

In reviewing section D (Funding), Smith referred to the minutes of the February 27 OAC meeting where it was suggested that \$10,000 be used as the lower limit for capital equipment instead of \$5,000; she will check University requirements on amount and ownership requirements. After discussion about indirect costs, it was decided that the language needs to be expanded. Remington commented on the differences between contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements. Nycz believes that grant is most appropriate. After discussion of the appropriate time period for awards, Farrell suggested two-year awards with one possible renewal. The letter of intent was discussed. Lauby suggested that it could be used to determine whether the organization is eligible and whether the proposed project fits into the plan. Smith commented that staff in her office would do the technical review and report to the OAC. Remington suggested that eligibility criteria be added to this section.

During discussion of the Project Information section, Remington inquired about Principal Investigator (PI) status for academic staff. Smith responded that some academic staff have permanent PI status and others are considered on a project-by-project basis. In response to Remington's question as to whether PI status would be a requirement, Smith stated that it probably would be under certain circumstances. McBride suggested that the PI status requirement be emphasized during the training sessions. Boyle commented that the responsible PI would not only be a signature authority, but would also have accountability for the project. McBride commented that volunteer faculty would need to apply for PI status. There will be further exploration of the need for PI status.

Farrell suggested adding "specific aims" to the discussion section (F.2.d). DeLuca suggested that applicants be instructed to download a transmittal form from the website instead of F.2.a. Nycz commented that community people might not be comfortable with the typical language used in a research proposal, such as PI; perhaps project director would

be preferable. Farrell indicated that the RFP will need to be reviewed by University authorities before distribution.

Smith emphasized the requirement of “no supplanting” and indicated that every proposal will be reviewed to make sure there is no supplanting. Farrell pointed out that the University has a provision for overload payments which could be considered in lieu of paying a percentage of faculty/staff salary from grants. A legal opinion will be sought regarding whether salary contributions would be considered supplanting and will be presented at the next OAC meeting.

Brahm reviewed the sections of the RFP which remain to be completed. Smith commented on human subjects, HIPPA and intellectual property requirements. DeLuca suggested circulating the Medical School Research Committee application form to committee members for their review; Cabot agreed to do that. Nycz expressed concern that the 12-page limit is too restrictive; Remington agreed and suggested 20-25 pages would be more reasonable. Lauby agreed to change the page limit to 25 pages.

Farrell reported that UW is further along in this process than MCW. He reported that in a telephone conversation with Dean Michael Dunn, they discussed the advantages of having similar processes and procedures and joint training sessions, since some organizations might apply to both schools. Smith reported that Cheryl Maurana told her that MCW will be soliciting public input before developing their RFP. Farrell commented that UW has had considerable experience with effecting community partnerships and that it might be helpful to MCW to work with UW on designing similar procedures in their respective RFPs. Farrell indicated that the draft RFP will be shared with MCW and he and Smith will have a discussion with Maurana and Dunn and report results at the next OAC meeting.

4. Discussion of development of Technical Assistance and Training Program for Partners

Farrell reported that he and Smith believe that the training programs should be held outside of Madison and suggested that the first one be held in Stevens Point. Nycz suggested seeking help from AHEC, but Farrell cautioned that it is important to carefully explore an appropriate role for AHEC before any decisions are made. In discussing the timing of the first training session, Lauby suggested beginning in June; however, Smith suggested it would be better to wait on establishing a timetable for implementation until WUHF approval of the plan has been secured, which may not occur until early summer to mid summer.

Farrell reminded the committee that the next meeting will be held at the Fluno Center at 1:00 PM on May 14. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 PM.

Recorder: Carla Eakins for Doug Mormann, Secretary