Minutes
UW School of Medicine and Public Health (UW SMPH)
Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) and
Medical Education and Research Committee (MERC)
November 17, 2010 Strategic Planning Meeting

Members Present: Betty Chewning, Byron Crouse, Marc Drezner, Norm Drinkwater, Philip Farrell, Meg Gaines, Susan Goelzer, Cindy Haq, Christine Holmes, Craig Kent, Paul Moberg, Doug Mormann, Rick Moss, Greg Nycz, Tom Oliver, Pat Remington, Rod Welch

Members Absent: Rob Lemanske, Katherine Marks

Staff: Cathy Frey, Mary Jo Knobloch, Lorraine Lathen, Tonya Mathison, Mike Mirer, Ken Mount, Eileen Smith

Invited Guests: Jennifer Dekrey, David Golden, Robert Golden, Mark Lefebvre, Tom Olson

Guests: Jenna Gretzel (ABC for Health)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dean Golden welcomed participants to the 2010 joint strategic planning meeting of the Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) and the Medical Education and Research Committee (MERC). He asked participants to introduce themselves.

Dean Golden gave an overview of the agenda and meeting goals. The purpose of the meeting is to review the status of the Wisconsin Partnership Program’s (WPP) implementation of the 2009-2014 Five-Year Plan within the context of the WPP’s financial resources, to identify progress, future directions and opportunities, and to assess the impact of the WPP’s vision to make Wisconsin a healthier state for all.

2. WPP Financial Status

Overview of Financial Projections 2009-2014

Mount presented the endowment value and cash balance for the WPP through October 31, 2010. The projected value of the endowment is $297 million, 5% above the historical value, with a related cash balance of $31.7 million. WPP leadership and staff continue to carefully monitor the value of the endowment.

Mount also presented an overview of the potential awards and spending for OAC and MERC in 2011, detailing the major grant categories for each committee. Mount assumed a 4.25% rate of distribution from the endowment in 2011. He clarified that based on these projections, the OAC and the MERC will both likely face slight budget
shortfalls in 2011, which are manageable with existing cash balances in the short-term. Neither committee is expected to have adequate funds to initiate new programs or expand existing programs. If new programs or initiatives are desired, both OAC and MERC will need to establish strategic priorities for the future and, based on those priorities, make specific programmatic decisions.

**Investment Portfolio and Projected Income**

Tom Olson, Chief Investment Officer for the UW Foundation (UWF), presented an overview of the UWF’s investment pool and endowment guiding principles, including an update on the UWF’s latest strategies in allocating its assets.

**Questions**

Mount and Olson opened the meeting for discussion and questions related to their presentations. Farrell asked why in 2009 the UWF’s portfolio did not perform as well as the S&P 500. Olson clarified that the UWF typically performs better than the financial markets overall, with some exceptions. The lag in 2009 was likely due to investments by the UWF in alternative assets, which often come back slower than equity investments.

Oliver questioned on what the UWF spends its earnings. Mark Lefevbre replied that the UWF’s budget is focused on advancing the goals of the constituents it represents by developing partnerships with foundations and individual donors. He highlighted recent efforts by the UWF to leverage additional funding for the Lifecourse Initiative for Healthy Families.

Drinkwater asked for more information on OAC and MERC’s policy on cash balances. Mount referred to the WPP’s policy on General Principles for Endowment Growth and Distributions, approved by OAC and MERC in 2009. Each year the OAC and MERC review the stipulated endowment rate for the upcoming year. In December, both the OAC and MERC will discuss the distribution rate for 2011. The policy also requires OAC and MERC to maintain reserves in the WPP cash accounts, including at least one-year of budgeted administrative expenditures and one-year of budgeted expenditures on existing awards.

3. **Status of Implementation of 2009-2014 Five-Year Plan**

Goelzer, Remington, and Moss presented a status update on initiatives outlined in the 2009-2014 Five-Year Plan. Since 2004, the OAC and MERC have made 206 awards for over $92 million. Discussion leaders provided a summary of the Five-Year Plan goals by program, and asked participants to grade each program goal using a scale of A (good) to F (poor) and list additional comments or concerns.

Goelzer introduced discussion of the OAC’s Community-Academic Partnership Fund (CAPF). She provided an overview of the goals and related accomplishments for this program, including: improving balanced portfolio, strengthening community-academic
partnerships, facilitating learning and sharing, and increasing community capacity. Discussion focused on: (1) Tension between the CAPF’s goal of a balanced portfolio and OAC’s new focus on targeted initiatives, (2) Goals may have to be adapted due to realities of financial markets, (3) Important role of communication plan to disseminate results of successful projects, (4) Develop and distribute shared resources in the UW School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH) to build capacity within Wisconsin communities, for example by sharing the “What Works” report.

Farrell and Lathen gave an overview of the following goals and accomplishments for the Lifecourse Initiative for Healthy Families (LIHF): improved health status of African-American women over the lifespan, improved African-American infant survival and health, and elimination of racial and ethnic disparities in birth outcomes. Discussion focused on: (1) LIHF is a “marathon” not a “sprint” and it will need time to prove its success through the development of Community Action Plans and the implementation of those plans; (2) Synergies among collaborative partners is vitally important to LIHF’s success.

Remington provided an overview of the OAC’s public health service learning program goals and accomplishments, including: extending statewide reach and applicant pool, embedding public health competencies into training, retaining trainees in Wisconsin, and developing training partnerships. Discuss focused on: (1) New grant to SMPH to create a Center for Public Health Education and Training (CPHET) which will enable expansion of Population Health Fellowship Program, with most likely two additional fellows each year, (2) Efforts to continue increasing interest in the Fellowship Program.

Remington introduced discussion of the following goals and accomplishments of MERC’s public health education programs: assess need for distance MPH or public health certificate, redesign medical curriculum to include public health, develop scholarly concentrations for medical students, establish professional training programs for graduate students, and create multidisciplinary student team learning opportunities. Discussion focused on: (1) Interest by participants in development of a distance MPH program which is now to be developed among partnering institutions as part of CPHET grant, (2) Acknowledged important role of the WPP supported Wisconsin Academy for Rural Medicine (WARM), and the SMPH supported Training in Urban Medicine and Public Health (TRIUMPH) and Rural and Urban Scholars in Public Community Health (RUSCH).

Moss gave an overview of the goals and accomplishments of MERC’s current grant programs: Targeted RFA Programs, New Investigator Program, and Collaborative Health Sciences Program. Discussion focused on: (1) MERC’s important role of orienting the School’s faculty, staff and students to public health to advance the transformation to a school of medicine and public health, (2) Leverage as a key success, (3) Focus on dissemination of successes and how those will benefit the people of Wisconsin.
Moss introduced MERC’s goals related to community engagement, including: expand community-based research capacity through faculty development and recruitment, partner with UW centers and link with external organizations to improve the health of communities, build program planning and evaluation support services, and engage students in addressing community health needs.

4. Break

5. How can we determine the WPP’s impact?

Remington introduced discussion of the WPP’s impact and asked participants to consider: (1) How do we judge, (2) Who are our stakeholders, (3) Should we include reporting on health outcomes in the WPP’s Annual Reports, (4) What activities and efforts have been effective, and (5) What are our expectations for the future. Participants each shared their vision for anticipated accomplishments and outcomes of the WPP by the end of the current Five-Year Plan in 2014, as summarized below.

Role of WPP and SMPH in Wisconsin Communities:

- The people of Wisconsin will see the SMPH as an asset to the state; an organization that helps communities address high priority health needs.
- The WPP will be embedded within communities with UW SMPH faculty and staff working side-by-side with community members, like Johns Hopkins in Baltimore.
- Increased capacity of community organizations to conduct research supported programs.
- A clear and well-understood definition of “translation” will be developed, and translational work by those in the SMPH will be disseminated in a meaningful exchange with communities.
- WPP’s role within SMPH enhances the likelihood of mutually beneficial partnerships between academics and communities.
- The resources and programs of the SMPH will be made available to communities through a UW Extension model.
- The WPP as a “force of change” convening key players to address the state’s priority health needs to make a targeted and long-lasting impact.
- The public will have a better understanding of the value and accomplishments of the WPP as the result of strategic communications efforts.
- SMPH to highly value community input with people of the state as committed partners in their own health and the health of the community.
- Build strong capacity of communities across the state, especially in rural and underserved communities.
- New “Chambers of Health” throughout the state responsible for health in the community, also strongly engaged with the WPP and UW SMPH.
SMPH and Role of Faculty, Staff and Students:

- The culture of the SMPH will change to a community- and translational science-orientation given ongoing infrastructure changes resulting from the establishment of the WPP and the Institute for Clinical and Translational Research.
- More junior faculty in the SMPH focused on population health and doing community-engaged research, along with more MD/MPH graduates.
- Expanded number of service learning opportunities for students through the WARM and TRIUMPH.
- SMPH faculty, staff, and students to be seen as resources for community engagement and enhancement statewide.
- The SMPH will be tracking its progress in transforming to a school of medicine and public health by developing SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-delimited) objectives in service, education, and research, and by enhancing integration of the School’s efforts in those domains.
- SMPH physicians will be focused on creating healthy communities rather than on treating disease.

Programs, Projects and Policies:

- Emphasis will be placed by the WPP on supporting evidence-based programs ensuring significant impact on population health, health and health care related research.
- Ensure far reaching and long-term health improvement through policy change. An example is the statewide ban on smoking.
- More joint initiatives supported by OAC and MERC.
- Support a continuum from basic to clinical to applied research. Cancer research is an example of a discipline that successfully works along the entire continuum.
- More and long-lasting research collaborations involving basic, clinical and population health researchers.
- WPP to have implemented a portfolio of strategies for change through policies and strategic partnerships with a goal of encouraging individuals, organizations, and leaders to take ownership of their health.

UW Foundation:

- UW Foundation will have a strong relationship with WPP, crafting strategic partnerships with other funding agencies and individuals to leverage WPP investments.

6. Future Directions and Opportunities

Goelzer and Moss introduced discussion of future directions and opportunities of the WPP. They focused the discussion around: (1) OAC/MERC synergy, (2) special
initiatives, (3) community engagement, and the SMPH transformation implementation plan. Participants shared the following ideas:

- Identify a targeted health issue with a parallel investment by both OAC and MERC, although with different orientations.
  - MERC to support a research component of an intervention funded by OAC, for example.
  - MERC to seek proposals targeting the identified health issue in the New Investigator Program and Collaborative Health Sciences Program RFPs. In addition, OAC to target the issue in the CAPF RfP.
  - Maintain commitment to eliminating health disparities in birth outcomes through LIHF. Also, role for MERC in supporting LIHF. Consider lessons learned from LIHF when developing future targeted initiatives. Possible to reorient these communities to address multiple health priorities.
  - Consider a targeted initiative in rural communities; listen to needs of those communities.
  - Many community health assessments have revealed obesity as one of the top priorities. Noted 25% of Community-Academic Partnership Fund grant applications focused on obesity, nutrition, and/or physical activity. Evidence-base has been developed for effective obesity prevention initiatives. Also, health care is primed on this issue.

- Expand capabilities in areas of expertise not present or not well represented in the SMPH.
  - Initiate faculty development and recruitment in targeted area, as necessary.
  - Facilitate collaboration with faculty across campus with needed expertise.

- Develop a shared-service model for OAC and MERC with training opportunities.
- Support development of CDC-funded Prevention Research Center.
- Strengthen communication efforts covering the School’s collective public health portfolio. Use this as a way to reduce focus on the 35/65 split, rather look at OAC and MERC’s collective accomplishments.
- Focus on translating research findings into communities, not just creating new knowledge.
- Establish robust evaluation process for all WPP programs and projects.
  - Consider Alex Adams’ 5-step community engagement evaluation cycle with aim of building strong collaborations in communities.
  - Training for applicants and grantees on evaluation research as part of shared-service model.

7. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

Dean Golden thanked participants for a thoughtful and provocative exchange. Golden noted one important accomplishment of the WPP to aim for over the next five years is
to see an improvement in the health of the people of Wisconsin. Although he acknowledged the complex and multiple determinants of health, he anticipates that health in the state can improve when the WPP and the SMPH are embedded in communities with programs that last long after our funding concludes. Golden warned against focusing too much on public opinion as it is likely to change, and highlighted the important role of communication and outreach by the WPP so the public understands our mission, vision and goals. Golden also stressed the importance of continually rethinking and revamping our evaluation efforts. He added that project and program outcomes, both successes and failures, must be shared with the public. The public must better understand that less than a 100% success rate is expected in testing research hypotheses. Golden concluded by warning of tough budget cuts ahead for the state, county, city and SMPH. During these times there is risk of vulnerabilities, so he encouraged OAC and MERC members to pull together as one program to defend these resources and the associated mission, vision and values of the WPP. He noted that participants all “share a common burden” to protect these resources from supplanting, and ensure thoughtful stewardship of the funds focused on improving health in Wisconsin.

Dean Golden adjourned the meeting at 4:05pm.

Recorder, Tonya Mathison