Minutes
UW School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH)
Wisconsin Partnership Program
Oversight and Advisory Committee
December 17, 2014, Noon-4 pm
Fluno Center, Room 201, 601 University Avenue, Madison, WI 53715

Members Present: Philip Farrell, Cindy Haq, Sue Kunferman, Katherine Marks, Rick Moss, Greg Nycz, Pat Remington (chair), Ken Taylor and Barbara Zabawa

WPP Staff: Quinton Cotton, Andrea Dearlove, Lisa Hildebrand, Jim Krueger, Tonya Mathison, Ken Mount, Eileen Smith, Amanda Price and Richard Reynolds

Guests: Deborah Ehrenthal (Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, LIHF Faculty Leader), Paul Moberg (Department of Population Health Sciences), Chris Wodicka (Legislative Audit Bureau) and Pat Alea (Alea and Associates)

Business Meeting

1. Call meeting to order

Remington called the meeting to order at 12:10 pm.

2. Announcements

a. 2015 Meeting Schedule

A copy of the 2015 OAC meeting schedule was included in the meeting handouts.

b. Video on Collaborative Center for Health Equity

Smith and Remington informed the committee that a video about the Collaborative Center for Health Equity was produced for the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association. The Wisconsin Partnership Program contributed funds to support the creation of this video. A link to the video was provided in the meeting materials.

c. Other Announcements

Smith welcomed Andrea Dearlove to her first official OAC Meeting. Dearlove is the Wisconsin Partnership Program’s new program officer.

3. Decision on draft Minutes

a. November 20, 2014 OAC minutes

Taylor seconded a motion by Nycz to approve the November 20th OAC minutes. The motion passed by unanimous vote.
4. **Monthly Reports:**

   a. **Partnership Education and Research Committee**

   Moss updated the committee on the December 8\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} PERC meetings. At the December 8\textsuperscript{th} meeting, PERC interviewed nine finalists for the New Investigator Program. Then, at the December 11\textsuperscript{th} meeting, PERC decided to fund five of the proposals. The proposals that received New Investigator Program awards are as follows:

   - Dr. Aparna Lakkaraju, assistant professor of ophthalmology and visual sciences – *Repurposing FDA-Approved Drugs as Therapeutics for Age-Related Macular Degeneration*
   - Dr. Caitlin Pepperell, assistant professor of medicine and medical microbiology and immunology – *Understanding M. tuberculosis Evolution Within and Between Hosts*
   - Dr. John-Demain Sauer, assistant professor of medical microbiology and immunology – *Characterization of the Role of PASTA Kinases in Beta-Lactam Resistance*
   - Dr. Miriam Shelef, assistant professor of rheumatology – *Genetic Variants, Immune Dysregulation, & Rheumatoid Arthritis*
   - Dr. Ryan Westergaard, assistant professor of infectious disease – *Implementing Combination Behavioral and Biomedical HIP Prevention Strategies Through High Risk Sexual Networks*

   A description of each project was included in the meeting materials and posted on the Wisconsin Partnership Program website.

5. **Discussion and decision on 2015 Administrative Budget**

   Smith presented the 2015 administrative budget to the committee. In this budget, the staffing level decreased because of the anticipated transition of LIHF evaluation expenses from the administrative budget to a program expense. The LIHF evaluation renewal proposal was presented later in the meeting. Also, in the 2015 budget, funds for the associate director position will be used for an evaluation specialist. Other expenses increased because of the continued support for a communication specialist through a contract with UW Health Marketing Public Affairs, funds set aside for a contract with a convening expert, a WPP-sponsored conference and a joint conference with the Medical College of Wisconsin. Nycz made a motion to approve OAC’s portion (35 percent) of the administrative budget. The motion was second by Zabawa.

   Discussion of the motion included the following questions. Farrell asked what percentage of WPP expenditures the administrative budget took up; Mount responded that it is just below five percent. Marks asked how salaries in the 2015 budget compared to those in the 2014 budget. Smith responded that the 2015 budget shows a two percent increase for all personnel effective July 1\textsuperscript{st}. The increase will depend on the University’s decision on salary increases for the upcoming year but is not expected to exceed two percent. Marks followed up by asking how salary increases are determined for staff. Mount responded that the WPP follows University policy for this matter. If the funds available for salary increases are less than a two-percent, the increase is given across the
board. If funds available for salary increases are more than two-percent, an increase is based on merit. Smith added that all staff members are evaluated annually, regardless of increases in salary. Following the discussion, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

6. **Presentation of LIHF Evaluation Renewal Proposal**

   a. **Discussion and decision on LIHF Evaluation Renewal Proposal**

Deborah Ehrenthal and Paul Moberg presented the LIHF evaluation renewal proposal. The presentation covered interim evaluation activities as well as proposed evaluation aims, changes, and budget. Discussion on the presentation included the following questions. Farrell asked why the PhD level Evaluator position included in the proposal was listed at 90% FTE instead of 100%. Ehrenthal responded that a 90% appointment is a compromise that allows the population health institute to also have access to an expert on maternal and child health. Farrell also asked what type of person Ehrenthal had in mind to fill this position. Ehrenthal responded the ideal candidate would have maternal and child health and evaluation expertise.

Nycz emphasized the importance of having testimonials to determine if the work is making a difference for individuals, especially when trying to convince policy makers that data is meaningful. Ehrenthal agreed and commented that by using mixed methods, the evaluation efforts will be able to capture both qualitative and quantitative data. Haq asked if an additional graduate student could benefit the work of the evaluation team and if there would be other ways this effort could engage students. Ehrenthal responded that this was a great suggestion and there have already been discussions with the population WI Population Health Service Fellowship Program. Remington commented that considering opportunities for synergy with other programs should be a more explicit aim of grant proposals. Again Ehrenthal agreed, adding that it will be important to relate with the Obesity Prevention Initiative because there is overlap between the issues of obesity and infant mortality.

Taylor asked how the LIHF collaboratives are working on policy and systems change and at what level they are working. Ehrenthal responded that this is a very important question and that she is working to better understand the priorities of each collaborative and their decision making process. Nycz asked if there were opportunities for the LIHF program to work with Medicaid since successful outcomes of LIHF could lower costs for Medicaid. Ehrenthal responded that she is currently working with Medicaid through the OB medical home program. Marks commented that it will be important to look at participation in the collaboratives over time. Ehrenthal noted that evaluation of the collaboratives was one objective of the proposal. Ehrenthal added that she intends to provide regular LIHF evaluation updates to the committee. Remington asked if there were plans to apply for other research funding from sources such as the NIH or CDC. Ehrenthal responded that she is considering applying to PCORI for funding to evaluate statewide interventions and programs. Following the discussion, the committee voted to approve the proposal. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

7. **Update on Beloit LIHF Collaborative**

Smith reminded committee that the OAC funded Community Health Systems (the Beloit LIHF Collaborative) was established as the convening agency for one-year, instead of five, due to organizational difficulties. Unfortunately, difficulties within the organization have increased with the
exit of its executive director and recent audits uncovering management and business practice problems. The WPP staff are scheduled to meet with the remaining leadership after the New Year. Smith will be in touch with the committee regarding the future of Community Health Systems and the status of the Beloit LIHF grant. The Regional Program Office provided an assessment of the work done so far by the Beloit LIHF Collaborative (included in the meeting materials). This report indicated that the collaborative has made progress toward some of their year-one aims but future work is uncertain.

Smith shared that the collaborative reports some current activity but future activity is uncertain and that some expenses have been reimbursed and others are pending; stating that if the grant is terminated, outstanding expenses will be paid. Mount added that as stated in the contract, the organization will be reimbursed for appropriate costs, such as staff actively working on the project. The committee will be updated on this matter as more information became available. Moss stepped out of the meeting during the discussion.

**Strategic Planning Discussion**

1. **Current Financial Status and Financial Planning Information**

   Mount provided a presentation on the current financial status of the endowment and existing financial commitments of OAC through the 2014-2109 strategic plan. The presentation sets the stage for OAC’s forthcoming discussion on identifying a spending target for future investments and ensuring a balanced portfolio.

   The current value of the endowment and assets is $395 million, resulting in about $6.3 million dollars of income made available to OAC each year. However, due to accumulated distributions that have not been spent, OAC has about $17.9 million dollars available to spend, which is 2.8 times the annual income. Mount explained that the value of unspent distributions should come down to approximately 1.5 times the annual income, which is a reasonable amount as it allows the committee to fund future commitments if the endowment’s income decreases. In order to reach this target, OAC should aim to spend $7.75 million per year for the next five years. Graphs were presented to visually show OAC’s current commitments through 2019. OAC members were encouraged to think about OAC’s allocation of resources among its different grant approaches and programs to bring spending to approximately $7.75 million per year.

2. **Strategic Planning Discussion**

   a. **Discussion on Grant Programs**

      Remington began the discussion by defining roles of the chair, OAC members, and WPP staff for the strategic planning discussion. Pat Alea provided brief summary comments as she concludes her work with the WPP. Alea reviewed the core values and guiding principles that came out of the April 2014 strategic planning retreat and her thoughts on the committee’s strategic planning progress. Alea is working to prepare a final summary report that will be shared with the committee. One recommendation Alea will be making is to develop a marketing and communications plan for the WPP. Smith responded that a WPP strategic communications and marketing retreat has been planned and the results of this will be shared with the committee as soon as possible.
The discussion on grant programs continued, with a review of investment approaches and their respective programs. OAC’s grant approaches include responsiveness, strategic and capacity building grant-making. Members noted that grant approaches overlap, as most of OAC work involves responding to a need, is prioritized and builds capacity.

i. Discussion and Decision on Community Opportunity Grants Request for Partnerships

Cotton reviewed the Community Opportunity Grants program including new aspects of the program, (1) a simplified notice of intent, (2) a required discussion with a WPP program officer, and (3) the option to apply to be community coach and provide support to the cohort of grantees through the announcement. Members liked the idea of having a community coach to assist grantees but felt the idea needed to be further defined. Specifically, Nycz asked how the coaches would be selected since the proposals will cover such a range of content areas. Haq asked if leaders from successful previous projects could work as coaches. Nycz suggested incorporating Haq’s idea of using successful past projects with a database such as the one created by Karen Timberlake, to help connect applicants with people who have been successful working on similar topics. Kunferman added that many organizations also have a need for technical assistance with evaluation. Remington concluded that the committee would like the mechanism for providing technical assistance to be further refined and discussed at the next meeting.

In addition, Cotton outlined the feedback that was received on the draft RFP. One suggestion was to allow applications from local plans other than community health improvement plans (CHIP) and community health needs assessment (CHNA) implementation plans. Kunferman thought this was a good idea because CHIP or CHNA plans may not include issues addressed by other local plans. Feedback also included an interest in supporting programmatic interventions that have a strong sustainability component. Remington noted that one way to address sustainability may be weighted criterion for sustainability and systems change during the grant review process. Nycz added that it would helpful to provide applicants with examples of programs that focus on sustainability. No vote occurred on the community opportunity grants RFP. The draft RFP will be revised based on committee feedback and discussed at the January meeting.

ii. Community Academic Partnership Grants

Cotton explained how the community academic partnership grant category will change for 2014-2019. There will be larger, fewer, multi-year grants with approximately 3-4 annual awards. These awards will include large dissemination and implementation grants, up to $750,000 over five years and pilot grants, up to $350,000 over three years. In addition, the grant review process will incorporate a brief presentation, where grantees come to OAC and explain why their project should be considered. Farrell liked the idea of the presentation because it would allow OAC to interact with the applicants face to face. Nycz agreed, noting that, as a member of PERC, he knows how helpful it is to hear from applicants in-person. Following a question from Haq, Remington clarified that the brief presentation would come after a short pre-proposal but before completing a full application. Zabawa asked how this additional component would impact the ranking from the external reviewers, specifically, what would happen if applicants the OAC ranked favorably did not end up highly ranked.
after the external review? Nycz responded that PERC uses a process similar to this and that PERC does not always conform to the review ranking when making funding decisions. Remington asked the staff to come back with additional details on the review process for the community academic partnership grants, specifically the sequence of the review process and responsibilities of staff, committee members, and external reviewers in this process.

iii. Strategic Initiatives

Remington continued the discussion on grant programs by focusing on OAC’s strategic initiatives. Currently there are two initiatives, LIHF and Obesity. OAC could consider adding a third initiative. He asked the committee what criteria should be used for guiding the selection of a strategic initiative. Suggestions included:

- (Nycz) Action in an area and community priorities
- (Taylor) Policy change
- (Marks) Education and awareness of an issue, for example helping people learn how to access the Affordable Care Act
- (Haq) Increasing the capacity of the primary care healthcare workforce, especially with additional people gaining coverage through the Affordable Care Act.
- (Remington) Aligning the WPP’s strategic initiatives with state needs.

Haq asked if each strategic initiative has an end point beyond the existing five-year plan. Farrell expressed that the committee should assume the initiatives will go on indefinitely because the efforts work to address such large issues. Smith added that in the future, effort would be made to explore other funding options that would allow the WPP to step down its funding. Haq suggested a review in year 4 of each 5 year initiative before funding is renewed and Remington agreed.

iv. Population Health Service Fellowship and Healthy Wisconsin Leadership Institute

The next discussion topic was the grant programs focused on workforce development. Marks asked if the WPP has been encouraging applicants and grantees to use the Healthy Wisconsin Leadership Institute for technical assistance. Cotton responded that the HWLI has contributed to WPP-sponsored technical assistance activities in the past and that providing additional technical assistance to WPP applicants and grantees was part of HWLI’s most recent grant approved by the OAC.

Kunferman commented on the Population Health Service Fellowship, noting that the program should give more consideration to assigning fellows to other geographic areas of the state, specifically rural areas. Remington agreed and said this feedback should be shared with the program. Farrell asked about the current size of the Wisconsin Public Health Workforce. Kunferman responded that data is available. Remington added that the issue is not in training enough people to work on public health but rather the availability of employment opportunities for graduates. He also said that a discussion on developing the public health and primary care workforce should be a broader discussion for the entire Wisconsin Partnership Program. Haq suggested that the OAC invest funds to engage medical students in service over the summer, similar to the Farrell Scholars program. Remington agreed that all work, especially in communities, should encourage service learning opportunities for medical students. Moss agreed and added that this should be a
partnership program-wide effort. Remington concluded that the topic will be discussed in the within the overall WPP.

v. Convening

The OAC Lead Team for strategic planning recommended that WPP staff gather input and develop a concept paper that explores the benefits and limitations of convening. Farrell asked the committee if the majority of members were in favor of investing in convening. Members responded that they were interested but wanted to learn more details about convening before making a funding commitment.

b. Review Grant Policies

This item will be discussed at a later meeting.

c. Discussion on Next Steps

Remington directed the discussion back to a discussion on OAC’s funding through 2019 and asked members for their thoughts on how OAC should balance its portfolio between the different categories of investments. Remington also asked members to think about an appropriate amount of funding for strategic initiatives. After a brief discussion, it was decided that members would consider this question and share their responses via a survey initiated by WPP staff. The comments would be summarized and discussed at the next meeting.

3. Adjourn-Next meeting Wednesday January 21, 1-4 pm

Remington adjourned the meeting at 4 pm.

Recorder, Amanda Price
Secretary, Ken Taylor
List of Acronyms

CDC       Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CHNA      Community Health Needs Assessment
CHIP      Community Health Improvement Plan
HWLI      Healthy Wisconsin Leadership Institute
LIHF      Lifecourse Initiative for Healthy Families
MCW       Medical College of Wisconsin
NIH       National Institutes of Health
OAC       Oversight and Advisory Committee
OB        Obstetrics
PCORI     Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute
PERC      Partnership Education and Research Committee
WPP       Wisconsin Partnership Program