

## Minutes

### **UW Medical School Medical Education and Research Committee 5:00 PM November 16, 2005 – Room H6/215 Clinical Sciences Center**

Members Present: Lynn Allen-Hoffmann, Sanjay Asthana, Paul DeLuca, John Frey, Susan Goelzer, Jeff Grossman, Debra Hullett, Rick Moss, Greg Nycz, Gordon Ridley, Layton Ridders, Susan Skochelak, Doug Smith, Jeff Stearns

Members Absent: Dave DeMets, Norm Drinkwater, Maureen Durkin, Javier Nieto, Joan Schiller, George Wilding

Guests: Philip Farrell, Patrick Boyle

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

The Committee was called to order by Vice Dean DeLuca at 5:07 p.m. He reviewed the agenda.

1. The draft minutes from the October MERC meeting were approved unanimously.
2. Announcements: DeLuca announced that the request to change the school's name to the School of Medicine and Public Health has been approved by Board of Regents. Eileen Smith added that this action occurred subsequent to the submission of a report to the Board of Regents detailing our efforts to increase collaborations in Milwaukee. Examples of collaborations include the site development for SHOW and WiNHR, as well as working with the city of Milwaukee Health Department and the Center for Urban Population Health on public health challenges in Milwaukee. The Board of Regents has required annual updates on these collaborations.

John Frey asked who will be involved in the process for implementing the new collaborations with Milwaukee. Smith indicated that there will be working groups established to begin discussions on the parameters of the commitments to increase collaboration. Frey suggested asking interested faculty at the MCC to participate.

Greg Nycz asked about the OAC funding support for CUPH, and questioned if CUPH is not successful in their competition for OAC funding in the future, will this agreement require the MERC to fund CUPH. Mount replied no.

Nycz also mentioned a report from the Institute of Medicine, titled "Who will keep the Public Healthy?" which surveys expenditures of Schools of Public Health. He suggested that given the recent approval of the name change, it might be useful to do a baseline survey now, and review the results after one year.

Smith reported that the second round of the New Investigator Program has resulted in 41 applications, with one applicant not eligible and 11 repeat applications. The Application Review Subcommittee meets on December 5, and will submit their results prior to the December 21 MERC meeting. MERC can make final decisions on the awards at that meeting. DeLuca added that it would be useful for MERC members to read the critiques of each application. A summary list of applicants is on the restricted website, and the critiques will be placed there as well. DeLuca emphasized that if the MERC decides to debate the rank order determined by the Application Review Subcommittee, it will be necessary to read the applications and critiques before December 21.

3. Mount presented the usual financial report showing spending for the past month. He noted that all the New Investigator accounts are up and running.

4. DeLuca reported on the activities of the Executive Subcommittee meeting held on November 9. The group agreed on a schedule for the MERC meetings for the next six months of the second Monday of each month; Tonya Paulson will circulate the dates.

The Executive Subcommittee heard a request from Susan Skochelak for an extension of the time for the use of the funds for the Medical Education grant. Because the grant implementation was delayed, there will be approximately \$750,000 in carryover funds this year. The Executive Subcommittee recommended the extension of the grant period for one year. Mount explained that this would have a small financial impact of adding \$250,000 to the budget in the fourth year. Ridders moved to approve a one-year extension with the necessary additional funding; Nycz seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Another major discussion item for the Executive Subcommittee was the eligibility of Milwaukee Clinical Campus faculty for MERC grants. Ridley explained that the status of those faculty has not been finalized. We currently have roughly 55 people in three disciplines employed by UW at the Milwaukee Clinical Campus. Those faculty will be employed by Aurora, but they will hold zero-dollar CHS appointments with the UW Medical School. Skochelak moved that we indicate our support for zero-dollar CHS and Clinician-Teacher appointments held by the MCC faculty by allowing them to compete for MERC funds. This provision does not extend to volunteer faculty or visiting professors. Goelzer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Frey asked that Stearns communicate this vote to the Milwaukee Clinical Campus faculty immediately.

5. Rick Moss presented the revisions to the Proteomics proposals suggested by the MERC. The revised proposal includes a modified budget consistent with MERC goals. This budget shows reduction of MERC funds to zero beyond Year 3. The income calculations include an outline of the funds flow into the facility based on full utilization of the instruments, and using current campus rates. This calculation results in a theoretical maximum income potential of \$520,000 per year based on two instruments. However, the facility cannot operate at full capacity at all times, due to servicing needs, as well as “no cost” training for investigators. Therefore, the potential income is less than the theoretical maximum. The chart shows that by Year 4, income from fee for

services will cover about half of the operating expenses. Other income sources include core grant funding, and possible Medical School support, including the recovery of indirect costs on grants. The Advisory Committee is already discussing the possibility that members of the committee will provide support for the facility from their own research grants. Moss noted that he had recently received information regarding the funding of a program project grant that has included support for a mass spectrometry core.

Wilding expressed concern about coordination among the various proteomics efforts on campus. Moss agreed, but emphasized that this program does not have the ability to enforce a policy for all the mass spec facilities. Instead, he will make a proposal to the BioDeans, which does have the power to make such decisions related to coordination and integration of the proteomics program.

DeLuca noted that the funds requested from MERC include one-time expenditures from “cash” for instrument purchases as well as repeating costs for personnel.

Allen-Hoffmann asked if there would be an assessment of need regarding the purchase of the second machine, and whether that should happen in the second year or third year. Moss responded that the field is evolving rapidly, even with respect to the instrument to be purchased in first year (new version). It is likely that a second instrument will be purchased in second year due to lack of capacity in proteomics in the Medical School, but it will be discussed as to which one to buy at the time. He added that it would be useful to acquire a third instrument in Year 3, but that will be grant dependent.

Nycz remarked that this facility has clear advantages to the Medical School, but it appears that the advantages to the people of state relies upon the discovery and implementation of biomarkers. He asked if funds will be needed in the future to implement this knowledge in the field. Moss responded that there are presently biomarkers that can be detected using this technology. Our intention is to build a partnership with the clinical pathology lab to implement what we learn. Allen-Hoffmann made reference to an article in the New York Times magazine in early November that described how physicians are getting involved in genetic medicine—and they make use of similar facilities for diagnosis of disease. Farrell echoed that thought, and said that he is not concerned about getting this application out to the people in Wisconsin because this is such a hot field.

Skochelak asked for a summary of all the budgetary commitments. Mount explained that he has met with all three groups, and given each of them a target budget for a revised proposal. SHOW and WiNHR were given target budgets of \$1M per year for recurring expenses. Assuming that they meet those targets, and we fund the revised Proteomics request as presented today, and we continue the New Investigator Program, we will have \$600,000 in annual income that is not committed to any program. This takes into account all our current commitments to existing programs.

Moss left the meeting.

Skochelak expressed concern about making a decision about the Proteomics proposal before hearing the revised presentations from SHOW and WiNHR. She mentioned that there had been a motion to consider all three proposals at once. Frey asked if we could wait to vote on this until next month, when we hear from the other two. There was some discussion about the pros and cons of delaying a vote. Finally, Ridders moved that we vote on the Proteomics proposal as presented, and Allen-Hoffmann seconded the motion.

DeLuca and Mount elaborated on the MERC budgetary commitments, which at this time allow reasonable funding for WiNHR and SHOW and allow growth of the overall program. Mount explained that we are able to gain flexibility in the annual budget by paying for one-time equipment purchases from our cash reserves.

Frey was concerned about the Proteomics' program ability to get grant funding. He cautioned that if they are not successful, the Medical School Dean's Office might be approached to cover the budget shortfall. Allen-Hoffmann said that such a situation is not without precedent, because the Biotech Center facility is subsidized by the Grad School. Nycz asked what would be the "worst case" scenario; in other words, would the Dean's Office be pressured to support the program, or would there be layoffs. DeLuca said that for the short term, the responsibility would likely fall to the Dean's Office, since we're already spending money to do some of this work elsewhere because we don't have the capacity.

There being no further discussion, DeLuca called the question, and the motion passed unanimously.

6. DeLuca suggested that we delay discussion of the next item on the agenda, consideration of a competitive process for established investigators, to the next MERC meeting when we revisit the budget. He mentioned that there is very high enthusiasm for the New Investigator Program, and he expects to see the same level of enthusiasm from established investigators.

Frey asked when we would hear more about the evaluation of the programs we've funded. DeLuca said that because many of the programs are just getting up and running, not a lot of money has been spent. Smith added that we do require program reports every six months, and some of those are just becoming due. We'll bring that information to MERC as soon as it becomes available. Frey suggested having award recipients give presentations to MERC.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Tracy Cabot, Recorder