

Minutes

UW Medical School Medical Education and Research Committee 5:00 PM July 10, 2006 – Room 4201 Health Sciences Learning Center

Members Present: Sanjay Asthana, Paul DeLuca, Dave DeMets, Norm Drinkwater, Maureen Durkin, Jeff Grossman, Rick Moss, Javier Nieto, Greg Nycz, Mary Beth Plane, Patrick Remington (phone), Gordon Ridley, Susan Skochelak, Jeff Stearns, George Wilding

Members Absent: Lynn Allen-Hoffmann, Bill Busse, Molly Carnes, Susan Goelzer, Tom Grist

Guests: Robert Golden, Kevin Wymore, David Wahlberg

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

The Committee was called to order by Vice Dean Paul DeLuca at 5:01 p.m.

1. The draft minutes from the June MERC meeting were approved unanimously.
2. DeLuca introduced Robert Golden, new Dean of the School of Medicine and Public Health, as well as new MERC members Pat Remington (faculty with population health experience), and Mary Beth Plane (academic staff). He also mentioned that Molly Carnes (faculty at large representative) and Tom Grist (clinical chair representative) would be joining MERC at the next meeting.
3. Eileen Smith reported on the presentation of the 2005 Wisconsin Partnership Program Annual Report to WUHF on June 26. The general themes were:
 1. Achieving Impact, in terms of the OAC's Community Academic Partnership Fund programs. WUHF was interested in how we would export successful initiatives statewide by leveraging funding, questioned the impact of small grants, and suggested the use of targeted initiatives. WUHF asked if we had plans to integrate or connect HIP with other funded programs.
 2. Formation of Partnerships with DHFS and MCW. WUHF indicated that they view public health in Wisconsin as a three-legged stool of the state, UW-Madison, and MCW. They suggested the need for a structure for coordination and leveraging of impact. .
 3. Rate of spending of the \$30M "startup" account. There was considerable discussion about the connection between this spendable account and the full endowment model. WUHF sought assurances that the \$30M would be spent by the end of the current Five Year Plan. WUHF is also concerned about achieving balance between awards and expenditures. Although they understood that some

- ramp-up time is to be expected, they hope that a steady state level of spending will be reached as soon as possible.
4. Transformation to a school of medicine and public health. WUHF is supportive of an integrated model, but asked for benchmarks for ensuring progress and asked about the level of participation of OAC and MERC in supporting the integration.
 5. WUHF emphasized the OAC's authority and unique status, responsibilities to the public and to assess and vote on the 35/65 allocation.

Smith commented that the meeting with WUHF went well. WUHF has until the end of July to respond.

4. Mount presented the financial status report, highlighting projects that are closed out, and explaining that negative expenditures represent charges that exceeded the budget and had to be transferred to other funding sources. Most of the projects are operational. Mount commented on some accounts that have not started spending; those include three of the awardees from the 2005 New Investigator Program, (two of whom had lengthy IRB delays), the Ebling Library award from the Strategic Allocation, (which is delayed in spending because they are awaiting their annual purchasing cycle), and the Imaging Core of the Regenerative Medicine program (which had to get other pieces in place first). Mount also noted that the Proteomics group is getting equipment specifications, and the SHOW mobile unit demo was on view recently. WinHR has been debating contract language with their partners.

5. Nycz reported on OAC's annual joint meeting with MCW's Consortium. Overviews of both programs were presented. Additional UW reports included an overview of the Public Health Leadership Institute by Pat Remington and a report on evaluation efforts by Cathy Frey. Nycz noted that both groups have differing evaluation processes: UW will evaluate the total Wisconsin Partnership Program, while MCW will use two separate processes to evaluate their program. Both schools are interested in finding new ways to engage faculty, and new ways to share information with stakeholders.

6. DeLuca gave an update on the New Investigator Program. Because of the changes to the RfP, it is necessary to make some changes to the Application Review Subcommittee. In addition, some ARS members have stepped down. We will need to add at least two new members to the ARS—one in the area of medical education, and one in basic science. The Executive Subcommittee has already suggested a number of faculty; DeLuca asked the group for any additional nominees. A number of names were suggested by the group. Program staff will contact each nominee to learn if they are willing to serve on the ARS.

Smith announced that program staff will hold two information sessions for potential applicants on July 18 and 19. ARS Co-chairs Howard Bailey and Ruth Benca will be present at these sessions. The grant application deadline is August 18.

7. DeLuca circulated a draft proposal for an Established Investigator RfP which would be a highly competitive process generating creativity in new directions. DeLuca

explained that senior faculty and senior academic staff in the scientist series may be better able to focus on “outside the box” creative activities because they are not trying to get tenure, and they have experience. Funds for faculty salaries on the grant would be allowed since the proposed activities would be outside normal duties.

DeLuca suggested building on the MERC funded cores, such as WiNHR and SHOW. Drinkwater observed that the criteria for the Established Investigators are not very different from those in the New Investigator RfP. He suggested requiring some form of collaboration, for example, between at least two of the three types of faculty (tenure, CHS, clinician-teacher). This would promote the creation of an integrated school of medicine and public health. Susan Skochelak expanded on the idea of requiring collaboration by suggesting that a team approach would be achieved by allowing for co-PIs. It was agreed that collaborators could come from outside the SMPH.

Remington supported collaboration, adding that some community health, intervention research, or policy research programs may not be located in the SMPH, and this program could emphasize building bridges across campus at the senior level. Jeff Grossman asked if this program would be open to all faculty across campus, and DeLuca replied that the PI must be in the SMPH, but that collaborators and co-PIs can be anywhere on campus. Javier Nieto reminded the group of the possibility of joint appointments. Grossman suggested adding health care delivery into the criteria, and Drinkwater added that intervention should be included as well. George Wilding commented that if we are requiring collaboration, we should change the title of the program to reflect that.

Skochelak suggested changing some of the draft language to reflect the broadness of the program. For example, proposal evaluation should be based on merit, proposal design, evaluation, and qualifications of the PI to carry out the proposal. Also, under eligibility, change the wording to reflect an established record of independent scholarship or experience developing, administering, or evaluating academic programs.

Maureen Durkin asked if the amount of the budget allowed for PI and co-PI salaries is sufficient. Drinkwater said that it is a reasonable level to get people to the table to collaborate.

DeLuca asked for a motion for acceptance of this program concept in principle. A revised document reflecting the current discussion would be brought back to MERC. Nieto made the motion, which was seconded by Plane and passed unanimously.

8. Smith circulated a draft policy for handling unsolicited proposals not covered by an RfP. The policy would require the submission of a standardized letter of intent, which would give the Executive Subcommittee information about the purpose of the project. The Executive Subcommittee would then make recommendations for either MERC, Strategic Allocation, RfPs, or reject the proposal. The use of a Letter of Intent would create a process and a single point of contact for proposals. DeLuca added that we are

not trying to create another RfP; we're trying to create a policy to handle unsolicited applications.

Jeff Stearns commented that this formalizes the mechanism, and could be a broad invitation for proposals. Plane asked about the source of funds for such proposals, and DeLuca explained that it could be MERC, the Strategic Allocation, or a combination.

Grossman asked how this mechanism of support would differ from the New Investigator Program or the proposed Established Investigator program. DeLuca said that proposals could be bigger in scope, such as core resources, or take advantage of unusual funding sources (such as the cancer control project). Nieto gave the example of the Health Improvement Program, which wouldn't fit into either New Investigator nor Established Investigator programs.

Nycz suggested that impact and partnership with communities should be used as criteria in evaluating letters of intent, and Drinkwater said that those concepts should be included in the outline of what items to include in the letter of intent. DeLuca said that other standard information would be included as well.

A revised Letter of Intent will be brought back to the MERC for consideration.

9: MERC agreed to cancel the August 14 MERC meeting. DeLuca reminded MERC to submit nominations for the Application Review Subcommittee, and said a revised Established Investigator Program proposal will be discussed at the September 11 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Tracy Cabot, Recorder