

## Minutes

### **UW School of Medicine and Public Health Medical Education and Research Committee 5:00 PM July 9, 2007 – Room 4201 Health Sciences Learning Center**

Members Present: Sanjay Asthana, Bill Busse, Molly Carnes, Paul DeLuca, Norm Drinkwater, Jeff Grossman, Susan Goelzer, Javier Nieto, Greg Nycz, Mary Beth Plane, Patrick Remington, Gordon Ridley, Rod Welch, George Wilding

Members Absent: Cindy Czajkowski, Tom Grist, Cindy Haq, Rick Moss, Susan Skochelak, Jeff Stearns

Guests: Kevin Wymore, Dick Reynolds, Byron Crouse, Howard Bailey, Ann Schensky

Staff: Tracy Cabot, Cathy Frey, Ken Mount, Tonya Paulson, Karla Thompson, Eileen Smith

The Committee was called to order by Chair Paul DeLuca at 5:05 p.m. The first order of business was a surprise tour of the newly-delivered SHOW van.

1. The draft minutes from the June 11, 2007 MERC meeting were presented and approved unanimously without modification.
- 2a. Dean DeLuca announced the appointment of Cindy Haq (who was elected by the faculty as their representative with population health expertise) and Rod Welch (who was selected to represent the basic sciences chairs). Eileen Smith added that Bill Busse had been re-elected to represent the clinical department chairs, and Sanjay Asthana had been re-elected by the faculty to the “at-large” position. Smith noted that each of these members serves a two-year term. Furthermore, Dean Golden has re-appointed George Wilding, Javier Nieto, and Rick Moss to focus leader positions for the remainder of the current 5 Year Plan.
- 2b. Smith reported that a Strategic Planning Retreat has been scheduled for MERC on September 25, from 9:00 to 1:00 at the Madison Club. Mark Covaleski, a professor in the UW School of Business, will facilitate the meeting. Dr. Covaleski has expertise in health care accounting and health services management.
- 2c. Smith announced that an additional MERC Executive Sub-Committee meeting is being planned for August. She added that plans are underway for a joint OAC-MERC meeting in mid-October. The MERC meeting schedule and current membership list were circulated.
- 2d. DeLuca circulated a list of members of the sub-committee charged with developing a Conflict of Interest policy for MERC. The document outlining the charge to this sub-committee was also circulated.

Smith reported on the meeting with WUHF to review the WPP 2006 Annual Report. The meeting went well. WUHF had questions about current spending, coordination with MCW, targeted initiatives, and our plans for the future. WUHF members were very interested in the creation of ICTR and the receipt of the CTSA grant. Insurance Commissioner Sean Dilweg also spoke briefly about the decision-making process related to the future status of WUHF. And WUHF's lawyer, Charles Henderson, presented a legal analysis of the future status of WUHF.

3. Susan Goelzer reported that because there was no quorum in June, OAC did not hold a meeting.

4. Goelzer presented the final version of the WPP Evaluation Plan. She reminded MERC members that this document is the result of an all-day retreat last summer attended by four OAC and four MERC members along with David Kindig, Pat Boyle, and a facilitator. This group identified many items to evaluate, which have since been refined to the five focus areas listed on page 12. Goelzer explained that there is a very tight timetable to complete this evaluation in order to provide information for the development of the next 5 Year Plan. As such, program staff have started to work on the governance and stewardship questions, which is also informed by Dick Reynolds' report (see below). OAC approved the evaluation plan on June 28. The implementation sub-committee will likely include Goelzer, Norm Drinkwater, Doug Mormann, and three or four additional people such as David Chestnut, Maureen Smith, Helene Nelson, and an evaluation expert.

Molly Carnes observed that it is important to evaluate the changes we wish to see, and she asked if we would be evaluating diversity, especially with regards to committee membership, applicants, and awardees. Cathy Frey noted that this issue is embedded in the governance and accountability section of the evaluation plan.

Busse moved that MERC approve the evaluation plan, and Mary Beth Plane seconded the motion. A number of MERC members expressed a desire to read the plan more carefully prior to voting. Goelzer reiterated the concern about the timeline. Drinkwater noted that even if we delay approval, there are still actions that could be initiated before the next MERC meeting in September. He suggested that it would be useful to finalize the membership of the implementation sub-committee before the vote. Therefore, the motion was tabled until the September MERC meeting.

5. Javier Nieto presented a progress report on the SHOW program. As MERC members saw earlier in the evening, two mobile exam centers complete with the new SHOW logo and by-line (Taking the pulse of Wisconsin) have arrived. The program headquarters are on University Avenue in Middleton, and a site for the Milwaukee exam center has been identified.

Nieto reported that the following positions have been filled: program manager, administrative assistant, an associate director for Milwaukee, a community relations coordinator, and a programmer. Recruiting for 10 field team positions is ongoing. Funding will be available through ICTR for follow-up interviewers (annual calls).

Two committees with broad representation have been working to develop the SHOW protocol and Exam Instruments. These cover 37 topics, and will be submitted to the IRB for review in July. Nieto noted that outreach efforts have included a number of SHOW presentations around the state to Milwaukee leaders, PHS Advisory Board, GLITC tribal health directors, among others.

Nieto explained that SHOW uses a random selection of census blocks, and then selection of individual households. There is the opportunity to do a mini-SHOW in a particular community given separate funding. Such a mini-SHOW could be used to compare values before and after an intervention or to compare a given community with trends in the state. Nieto gave an example of using this type of survey to look at upstream determinants of health, such as the number and location of fast food restaurants and the correlation with race, ethnicity, and income. SHOW could link community characteristics to behaviors or physical measurements of participants.

Ongoing activities for SHOW include the development of procedures for application, funding, and cost-recovery for ancillary studies. Other issues include biorepositories and governance. Nieto concluded by outlining a timeline for SHOW, which would have survey recruitment beginning in October or November 2007.

Drinkwater asked about the community response to SHOW, and Nieto said that it has been extremely enthusiastic. Drinkwater asked about the expectations for the human subjects approval process, and Nieto said that he has been working with the IRB and hopes that the process will go smoothly. Busse asked if study participants will be compensated, and Nieto said they will receive \$50 per person, and they can also obtain some general health information. Plane wondered if SHOW is matched to the goals and objectives of the State Health Plan 2010, and Nieto answered that there is a very good match. Remington added that this is a great opportunity to begin to collect baseline data regarding trends and variations to inform the development of the State Health Plan for 2020.

6. Byron Crouse presented a proposal for continued funding for the Wisconsin Academy for Rural Medicine (WARM). He reminded the group that the goal of WARM is to gradually increase the medical school class size from 150 to 175 to enroll students who plan to practice in rural areas of the state. This program received a Planning Grant from OAC in 2004, and received a Dean's Strategic Initiatives grant in 2005. Five students have been admitted for Fall 2007. Crouse requested nearly \$670,000 over 3 years to continue to grow the program up to 25 students. WARM will become self-sustaining at full enrollment by capturing tuition funds. Gunderson Lutheran, Marshfield Clinic, and Aurora Bay Care-Green Bay will serve as the regional learning environments for training medical students in their third and fourth years.

George Wilding asked for an explanation of the "in kind" budget. Crouse explained that it contains estimates from the three regional campuses for teaching the students full time. Grossman asked if there are any ties to residency training opportunities in the state, and Crouse said that there are no ties currently, but he hopes to expand to that in the future. Crouse added that rural medicine programs in other states focus on primary care and family medicine, but WARM includes training in all specialties.

Jeff Grossman asked why the first students will be placed in Marshfield, rather than in Madison or with other UW Health faculty at Appleton, Beaver dam, etc. Crouse explained that the funds were requested to work with existing partners to develop these major health care system sites as “hubs” and rural community clinics as “spokes.”

Carnes asked how many current students plan to work in rural areas, and Crouse said that roughly 4-5% of graduates in the past five or six years. Carnes asked what is the goal of this program, and Crouse explained that while there is no contractual obligation, they are hoping that 70-80% of WARM students will practice in rural areas. Carnes urged Crouse to make an effort to ensure that WARM students are receptive to participating in Type 2 translational research.

Busse asked if potential WARM students are aware of their obligations, and asked about the admissions process. Crouse stated that students must go through the regular medical admissions process, and then are screened by a separate WARM admissions sub-committee. The students are told of the expectations, however, they will be allowed to choose from all residencies at graduation. WARM students will be integrated with all other medical students in years 1 and 2, and go to the regional campuses for years 3 and 4. Carnes asked if there have been discussions with the sub-specialty residency directors about accepting WARM students, and Crouse said they are working on that communication. Remington added that this could have implications for other programs—students coming into WARM may want to get into the MPH program as well.

7. Howard Bailey presented a request for implementation funding for WiNHR. Bailey reminded the group that the Wisconsin Network for Health Research (WiNHR) has received MERC funding for a planning grant in 2005, and received additional funding for an extended planning grant in 2006. WiNHR is a multi-site research network that covers 80% of Wisconsin residents, and offers many benefits to healthcare practitioners and researchers as well as patients. This network served as a model in the CTSA application of what UW is able to achieve. Bailey noted that the group has met all the goals and objectives outlined in their planning grant application, including such items as contracts, regulatory clearances, and initiation of pilot studies.

WiNHR is continuing to expand to additional sites and is working with each institution’s IRB to improve efficiency. Bailey said that there are opportunities for the pilot project data to be used for larger, federally funded studies, which will make WiNHR more self-supporting. On-going efforts include linking all the study sites to one data collection system, and broadening the scope of studies to make WiNHR more multi-disciplinary. They also hope to attract a larger pool of researchers in non-traditional settings, such as community clinics.

Bailey explained that MERC funds for each of the WiNHR sites are matched by in-kind funds from the participating institution. Also, support for biostatistics and informatics, as well as some other expenses, are shared with ICTR. Bailey outlined a two-year budget for administration, support of partner sites, and informatics. The total request to MERC is \$1.3M per year. Bailey explained that the initial cost is high because they are building a multi-disciplinary cooperative clinical research group from the ground up, and they are still in the investment stage.

Nieto asked about the deliverables for WiNHR, and the evaluation of this program in the future. Bailey said that the evaluation should be based on the numbers, such as how many studies are

done, what is the accrual to each study, and what outside grants are received based on the ability to enroll larger numbers of patients than would be available at only one location. Drinkwater observed that in the planning phase, funding for pilot projects was necessary in order to create and test the infrastructure. He asked what portion of the implementation budget would be used for pilot projects. Bailey answered that 75% of the funds are needed to create the infrastructure and 25% are needed to maintain it. Greg Nycz expressed concern that results of the studies be translated to all the partners, and that the partner institutions agree to adopt these results in their practices. Bailey said that ICTR will help with the dissemination of best practices.

Wilding listed a number of issues with the proposed budget, including the cost of information technology support, the investments at each site, and the costs for ongoing pilot studies. Bailey replied that the IT costs cover the expansion of the ONCORE software to include projects studying issues other than cancer, and that this software has to be available to all the sites. For each site, the budget is an estimate of what studies will be done, and what each study will cost.

Plane asked if there are any carryover funds from the current award, and Bailey said there was a small carryover that will be expended by the end of the summer. Sanjay Asthana asked about the contribution from the CTSA grant to the site budgets, and Bailey explained that it is about \$100,000 per year, divided between the four sites. Plane asked how an investigator would learn about WinHR, and Bailey said that they have asked each site to recruit researchers and promote this opportunity.

There being no further questions, it was decided to table this request pending further revisions.

8. Dick Reynolds presented his findings from a review of the Wisconsin Partnership Program. He reviewed processes and protocols to ensure statutory compliance, documented the workflow for the various grant-making processes, assessed program staffing levels, and reviewed existing technology used by WPP staff. The report includes an executive summary, 40 findings and recommendations, and lists 54 auditable items.

Reynolds summarized the significant messages of the report by saying that the WPP is carry out responsibilities well with some areas needing improvement, such as staffing levels, data organization, and OAC-MERC collaborations. Reynolds also observed that MERC needs a Conflict of Interest policy (which is under development) and that many awardees find the non-supplanting requirement difficult to understand and more education is required.

9: DeLuca suggested that the election of Executive Sub-Committee members be deferred to the September meeting, due to time pressures. He asked for a motion on WARM. Drinkwater moved that MERC approve the WARM proposal, with the funding to be split 65% MERC, 35% Dean's Strategic Initiatives fund. Wilding seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

10. Drinkwater moved that MERC adjourn into closed session, pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes 19.85(1)(c), (e) and (f), to determine the faculty recipients for the competitive New Investigator Program. Remington seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The final rankings of the NIP proposals were discussed.

Goelzer moved that MERC reconvene into open session, and Grossman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Remington moved that MERC fund the six top-ranked NIP proposals. This motion was seconded by Busse, and passed unanimously.

Regarding the earlier discussion on the WiNHR proposal, DeLuca asked for a sub-committee to work with Bailey to revise the proposal, especially with regards to clarifying the budget. DeLuca, Busse, Wilding, Mount, and Plane volunteered to serve on this sub-committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:  
Tracy L. Cabot,  
Recorder