Minutes

UW School of Medicine and Public Health
Medical Education and Research Committee
5:00 PM February 11, 2008 – Room 4201 Health Sciences Learning Center

Members Present: Sanjay Asthana, Molly Carnes, Cindy Czajkowski, Paul DeLuca, Norm Drinkwater, Susan Goelzer, Jeff Grossman, Tom Grist, Rick Moss, Javier Nieto, Patrick Remington, Gordon Ridley, Susan Skochelak, Rod Welch, George Wilding

Members Absent: Bill Busse, Cindy Haq, Greg Nycz, Mary Beth Plane, Jeff Stearns

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

The Committee was called to order by Chair Paul DeLuca at 5:14 p.m.

1. The draft minutes from the January 14, 2008 meeting were approved unanimously without modification.

2. Announcements: a. DeLuca urged the members to send in their conflict of interest documentation as soon as possible.

b. DeLuca reminded the group of the importance of regular attendance at MERC meetings, and suggested that members strive to miss no more than 25% of the regularly scheduled meetings. He indicated that staff are maintaining attendance records.

c. Eileen Smith reported that 49 preliminary applications were received for the Collaborative Health Sciences Program. An ad hoc subcommittee of DeLuca, Drinkwater, Haq, Moss, Nieto, and Skochelak will be joined by Marsha Seltzer and Betty Craig on March 3 to discuss the applications and make decisions about which to invite for full proposals. The resulting list will be presented as a recommendation to MERC on March 10. All of the preliminary applications are available to all MERC members for review prior to the March 10 meeting. Any member can ask for further discussion of an application that has been triaged; however, including such an application on the list for full proposals will be dependent upon a majority vote of the full MERC.

The ad hoc subcommittee will be joined by Marc Drezner and George Wilding to assign two non-MERC faculty experts to review each full proposal. Full proposals are due April 18.

d. Smith announced that Roger Axtell is the Wisconsin Partnership Program’s new liaison to the Board of Regents. Axtell is a Regent Emeritus, and a member of the UWHC Authority Board. Smith will be providing an orientation for Axtell, who will
attend a MERC meeting in the future. Axtell will play an important role during the process of approval of the next Five-Year Plan as well as during the review of the results of the LAB audit.

e. Smith reported that she, Mount, and Dean Golden will be meeting with the insurance commissioner to discuss the upcoming LAB audit and replacing the School’s two representatives on WUHF (George Steil and Robert Froehlke).

f. Smith announced that a public survey will soon be posted on our website. This survey is a part of the WPP’s program evaluation.

3. OAC report: Susan Goelzer reported that Patrick Remington presented to OAC the progress report that David Kindig made to MERC last month on “Making Wisconsin the Healthiest State” grant. OAC is working on the birth outcomes project, and should be receiving the consultant’s report soon. This will be the topic of a meeting at the Wingspread Conference center, on May 22 and 23. The conference is sponsored by the Johnson Foundation, and will bring together approximately 40 people, including local and national experts, state and local leaders, community representatives, and health care provider organizations.

Goelzer also announced that the OAC Strategic Planning discussion on the next five year plan is scheduled for next week.

4. WPP Evaluation: Goelzer reported that the Evaluation Implementation Committee held its second meeting in January. One of the issues is an evaluation of how the WPP is impacting transformation to an integrated School of Medicine and Public Health. The committee has worked with the UW Survey Center to develop a survey, and has identified approximately 50 stakeholders for personal interviews. Carnes asked if the interviews will follow a script with choice of answers, or will it be more open-ended and require interpretation, and Goelzer responded that the UW Survey Center will be making a qualitative interpretation of the answers.

The Evaluation Implementation Committee also heard a report from Dick Reynolds on the pre-audit of the WPP and from Mount on the financial monitoring, which pertains to the evaluation of Governance and Stewardship of the WPP.

5. IME progress report: Susan Skochelak presented an update on the Innovations in Medical Education project. This project has three goals: Curriculum innovation, Expansion of the Clinical Skills Teaching and Assessment Center (CTAC) services, and Statewide Distance Education. Skochelak noted that the IME funds have been used to create a margin of excellence, allowing the SMPH to make curriculum changes we otherwise couldn’t afford to make. Most of the funds have been used for staff salaries: For curriculum innovation, that includes support for faculty leaders, curriculum coordinators, evaluators and administrators; for CTAC funds to support a director, recruiter, and technician; and for Distance Education to support a faculty leader, outreach manager, and IT staff.
Skochelak provided highlights of the progress towards each of the three goals, beginning with Distance Education. This goal has been addressed through the creation of a Statewide Learning Technology, embodied in the HSLC digital video library. A digital video capture and distribution system was developed to record high-profile speakers or series of events, and make them available to a wide audience through a web interface.

Skochelak provided some statistics about the efforts: since the launch of this technology in January 2007, they have created 288 videos with over 417 speakers. The website currently receives over 800 hits per day, and they have received much positive feedback about this project. Skochelak noted that some of these videos will be used to provide content on the new WPT-Education Station.

The goal of CTAC Service Expansion has included an expansion of the Standardized Patient Program. There is now a pool of 180 trained standardized patients, and diversity of those patients has increased from 13 to 30%. Additionally, the CTAC is now being used in all years of medical student education. Skochelak noted that the Community Advisory Committee has provided input regarding curriculum transformation, and members have acted as liaisons to the communities they represent.

Skochelak reported that CTAC has also developed a number of new partnerships with several residency programs, continuing education, and other campus groups who use the facilities to evaluate their learners.

The goal of Curriculum Innovation has three themes: professionalism, cultural competence, and public health, that are well aligned with the transformation of the SMPH. Skochelak described the work process needed to find ways to add new content to our existing curriculum. For example, the theme of professionalism has been addressed through ethics training during all group activities, as well as an ethics core in the PDS 2 course. The theme of public health has lead to the development of a new curriculum, which will be implemented for first and second year students in Fall 2008. This includes an expanded public health course, as well as more public health content in all courses.

Skochelak concluded that IME is a work in progress, but these changes to the curriculum have set a good foundation for the transformation to an integrated school of medicine and public health.

Pat Remington asked if IME had encountered any barriers or challenges, and Skochelak replied that most of the challenges were faced early on, with the delays in getting up and running. Also, they modified their initial plan of having a curriculum coordinator for each year to instead work to each person’s strength over the four years.

Jeff Grossman touched on the concept of “margin of excellence,” and asked what are the needs into the future. Skochelak said that some of those answers will come from MERC’s Strategic Planning Education Subcommittee. We will need to define what is a school of medicine and public health. In terms of medical education, this will likely
include an even richer public health core for all students; plus areas of emphasis or tracks. Another possibility is operationalized community service.

Cindy Czajkowski commented that it is good to see that CTAC is used broadly on campus, and asked if it can it be used by others. Skochelak said yes, and explained that CTAC has brochures and an outreach plan. They have received inquiries from the off-campus entities such as the pharmacy licensing board and the Madison Patient Safety Collaborative. In addition, they’ve also talked with the Office of Continuing Professional Development about using CTAC for licensing and remediating physicians. The Veterinary School has also inquired about using CTAC.

Grossman asked where we stand as an educational institution, and has this investment changed our rankings. Skochelak noted that we have been consistently highly ranked, and gave examples from the US News and World Reports rankings and NIH demonstration grant support.

There being no further questions, Skochelak left the room.

DeLuca began the discussion by observing that some of the innovations have been completed, and asked about the long-term outcomes and support of those initiatives. Grossman said that it is necessary to evaluate what portion is true innovation at the margin of medical education, and what portion is obvious growth and change necessary for any school. Carnes noted that in her experience, innovation gets soft money first, before it gets hard money from campus. She added that IME is likely approaching the point where campus funds should be sought. Gordon Ridley asked if that question should be deferred to the end of our Five-Year Plan. He suggested that each of the three goals should be evaluated independently to determine next steps; for example, the need to develop a business model to sustain the video library.

Wilding concurred that some aspects of IME may need sustained funding, but added that MERC may not be the right source for that funding. Wilding expressed his support for the development of cost-centers with charge-backs. Grossman said that we need to decide as a school what investment do we want to make in education. Can we make incremental investments outside of MERC to make us the best in the United States. DeLuca agreed, but asked about the means to measure improvement. Wilding asked what are the educational goals of this committee, and does IME meet those goals. Remington stated that the impact on our curriculum can be evaluated, but we need to wait for the Strategic Planning Education subcommittee to learn about the needs for the future. There are several items on their agenda that are innovative, and that plan has not yet been implemented. That may be the next phase of IME. Mount noted that we are going to have similar discussion about all of the large MERC initiatives as we prepare for the next Five-Year Plan—meaning we need to consider how long we can provide some level of support for existing projects versus using that money to start new projects.

Remington suggested that we accept the report, with a note that progress is satisfactory based on stated goals.
6/7. Executive Subcommittee Report / NIP Final Reports: DeLuca suggested combining agenda items 6 and 7, because much of the Executive Subcommittee meeting has already been discussed. DeLuca noted that in general, the four NIP reports were very good and demonstrate very impressive output for new young investigators. DeLuca added that he would like each of these investigators to translate these results into public language that we could put on the WPP website.

a. Scott Kennedy’s report was not discussed because the assigned reviewers were not at the MERC meeting.

b. Wilding reported that Luigi Puglieli’s award resulted in a publication in the Journal of Biological Chemistry, and that he also received an R01 around the time he did this work, reflecting high quality productivity.

c. Grossman noted that Stacey Schultz-Cherry had produced a great piece of work, even though she faced some limitations due to technical problems and infrastructure issues. He added that the work resulted in a paper in the Journal of Virology and should be a platform for extramural funding

d. Wilding commented that Rob Striker’s results could have implications for screening for transplant patients. The results were reported in Hepatology, and were the basis for a four-year grant from the American Cancer Society.

DeLuca stated that the Executive Subcommittee also spent some time discussing ways to emphasize in our RfPs that we want a balanced portfolio, which means supporting a complete breadth of proposals. New investigators may be discouraged by the language regarding collaborations, because their departments have told them that their primary focus should be to get established, obtain funding, and achieve tenure. DeLuca will review the RfP announcements and review criteria, and draft suggestions for changes that meet our needs. Remington suggested that we also look for ways to provide encouragement to the public health faculty for the CHSP, in order to maintain balance on that end of the spectrum.

8. Strategic Plan Subcommittees: DeLuca circulated the draft minutes from the Research and Service/Outreach groups, and asked members to read the minutes from each group in preparation for developing the Five-Year Plan. Moss expressed support for the faculty development ideas in the Research group’s minutes, because strategic hires represent a great opportunity to shape the direction of the school, and we don’t have many resources to do this. Moss also spoke in favor of expansion of the CHSP.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Tracy L. Cabot,
Recorder