

Minutes

UW Medical School Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) 1:30 PM January 13, 2003 – Fluno Center

Members Present:

Philip Farrell	Nancy Miller-Korth
Patricia Kokotailo	Doug Mormann
Mary Lauby	Greg Nycz
Margaret MacLeod Brahm	Patrick Remington (conference call)
Patrick McBride	

Guests:

Patrick Boyle	Linda Dietrich
Mark Lefebvre	John Chapin

Staff:

Eileen Smith
Carla Eakins
Tracy Cabot

Dr. Farrell called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes of December 11, 2002 meeting.

Farrell asked if there were any changes to the draft minutes. Since Lauby had to leave the meeting before the discussion of the proposed format and content outline for the five-year expenditure plan for population health was completed, it was suggested that the minutes should be amended to read by “consensus of those present.” Nycz moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mormann and passed by unanimous vote.

2. Announcements

Farrell commented on a meeting he attended with Vice Dean Paul DeLuca, Eileen Smith, and Medical College of Wisconsin counterparts to share information on the progress of revising the five year expenditure plan. MCW is focusing on those initiatives of the State Health Plan 2010 that are their strengths. Their research and education goals continue to follow those outlined in the 1999 Plan. MCW’s emphasis on Cardiovascular Disease (including hypertension and vascular disease), Cancer, and Genetics/Genomics are very complementary to UW Medical School research strengths. MCW is interested in collaborating with UWMS on a Public Health Leadership Program. Collaboration on a MPH program is problematic.

Farrell mentioned that the Wisconsin United for Health Foundation has extended their registration for a stock sale. He reminded the committee that the schools cannot receive proceeds until the revised Plans have been approved. Therefore, the OAC must maintain momentum with the goal of presenting the revised plan to the Board of Regents at their April 10-11 meeting.

Mormann noted that he has received input from the Public Health Advisory Council regarding the use of the BC/BS funds. The suggestions parallel the discussions of the OAC. It was agreed that the best way to continue to communicate with outside groups is to direct them to the Medical School's BC/BS web site.

3. Presentation by John Chapin, Healthiest Wisconsin 2010.

Farrell introduced John Chapin, Director of the Bureau of Health Information, DHFS. Chapin began his presentation by stating that the public perception is that the UW Medical School has nearly unlimited resources as a result of the BC/BS gift, while at the same time funding availability in the public health arena has been decreasing. In order to manage expectations, the OAC must focus on a message that will establish initial trust. Chapin spoke on five key issues: Dewey, Death, Dharma, Deliverables, and Decade.

Chapin noted a number of dualities in the order allowing the conversion of BC/BS to a for-profit entity, such as two medical schools, public/private, two committees and two endowments, public health and research/education. He quoted John Dewey who once stated that "America's genius is in the ability to transform any duality by turning it 90 degrees." Chapin urged the OAC to use the State Health Plan as a blueprint to transform the dualities.

The OAC should look to use the BC/BS funds as a way to start new projects in areas where there are no current funding sources, rather than giving to programs which have suffered from funding "death." Chapin also stated that the primary goal should not be to enhance the stature of the Medical School, but rather to build partnerships and focus on leadership.

The public will be looking for accountability and deliverables in the use of these funds. The OAC should consider products, benefits and outcomes when making awards. Finally, Chapin noted that the State Health Plan 2010 was designed for a decade, at which time it will be revised.

In response to McBride's question about how to address dualities, Chapin suggested that the funds be used for bridging products that transcend both ends of the duality and also to focus on creating the methodology to bring about change. In order to avoid focusing solely on initiatives with known outcomes, it might be best to "pick the winners" first; then, use funds in the future to support programs with more uncertain outcomes. Finally, it is important to remember that while the state is a partner in terms of implementing the Health Plan 2010, the communities are the more significant partners.

4. Discussion and approval of Mission, Vision, Goal, Guiding Principles, and Assets

Nycz lead a discussion of the revised mission statement approved at the last meeting. The concern is that the statement may have become too concise without conveying how the mission will be achieved. Three versions were discussed: the original version, the shorter version resulting from the previous OAC meeting, and a revised version.

Farrell suggested changing “enabling” to “supporting” in version 3. Lauby questioned the use of “influencing public policy” which could imply a lobbying role for the OAC. She suggested changing “and by influencing” to “thereby influencing” in version 3. Mormann moved to accept the revised version with the above-mentioned changes. Lauby seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Discussion of the revised Guiding Principles and Assets was limited. McBride moved to accept the changes, Lauby seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously. The introductory paragraph remains to be discussed, but that is considered more a part of the text of the revised plan. The approved document will now be posted to the web site.

5. Review of detailed 5 year plan outline

Smith asked for feedback on the general topics, the order of the outline, the chapter headings, and any items missing from the Plan Outline. Section II regarding the background and history of the program will be written by Linda Dietrich, drawing on source documents. Section IIIA, the Mission/Vision section, has been discussed and approved by the committee. Nycz will write the introduction to this section.

The section of the plan dealing with funding for population health initiatives, Section IIIB, was discussed later in the meeting. The section dealing with the Medical School’s plans for Research and Education has changed slightly, with a new direction on funding for infrastructure items called “Centers of Excellence.” Remington noted that these Centers were developed directly from faculty input.

The portion of the five-year plan detailing the fund distribution process, Section IIID, will have two subsections dealing with the 35% public health and 65% research and education endowments, respectively. Lauby noted that at this time it is important to allow for change—our method of calling for partnerships and reviewing proposals may well change after gaining experience the first year or two. Nycz stated that it would be important to remind applicants of the necessity of leveraging these funds, and to look for other funding opportunities to match the BC/BS monies or to continue their programs after exhausting their BC/BS funds. Mormann noted that it will be important to include questions about outcomes as part of the fund application process.

Mark Lefebvre of the UW Foundation will be responsible for drafting much of Section IIIE, Stewardship Principles. McBride questioned how to get applicants to look for other sources of funding to create sustainability for their programs. Lefebvre noted that the UW Foundation is excited about the opportunity to work with communities in grassroots efforts to

discover untapped local resources. Nycz asked about the possibility of spending part of the fund principal. Farrell suggested that this question be discussed at the next OAC meeting.

Sections III F and G, regarding annual and 5-year reporting requirements, are elaborations of the Insurance Commissioner's order. Smith noted that an OAC Conflict of Interest policy is listed as one of the appendices to the 5 year plan. That policy is still under development, and she hopes to have a draft available for discussion soon.

Farrell mentioned that Medical School has been covering the costs of the start-up of the BC/BS program, including program administration and the formation of the OAC. As permitted by the Insurance Commissioner's Order, program administration and OAC expenses will be charged, effective January 1, 2003, to the BC/BS proceeds when they are available. The Committee indicated that this was reasonable.

6. Continuation of Discussion of Population Health Priorities

Lauby questioned whether the group had reached consensus on eliminating bullets under item IA. Miller Korth stated that "eliminate health disparities" covers most of the bullets. Instead, it may be necessary to list the 11 Health Priorities and the 5 System Priorities of the State Health Plan 2010 under this topic heading. Mormann commented that we can't possibly do all 16 items, but Nycz countered that if we prioritize, people will write grants to address those topics only. McBride suggested that we remain broad and flexible now, and become more focused later. MacLeod-Brahm suggested that priorities and methods of accomplishment could be spelled out annually in the application guidelines and training documents.

Nycz questioned the items listed as II and III on the outline as well as allocation of the funds. The population health initiatives and public health academic programs are not described in a way which links them with communities. McBride stated that clarification of II and III was necessary and it was suggested that the outline be re-written to emphasize partnerships. The outline would then mention Community/Academic Partnerships, New Population Health Initiatives, and Public Health Academic Programs, all of which are community-linked or community-based.

Lauby requested further discussion at the next meeting of III, Public Health Academic Programs. She is seeking clarification about the funding source for education priorities and the decision-making process for identification of priorities for the plan.

Farrell closed the meeting with a brief discussion of agenda items for the next OAC meeting. These include a revised outline for the Plan, a discussion of start-up funds, including use of principal, and a discussion of education priorities and funding source.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Douglas Mormann
Secretary