

Date: May 16, 2013
Time: 12:00 – 1:00 pm
Location: T-269

Name	✓	School
Dave Anderson	✓	HS Administration
Christene James	✓	Pharmacy
Jean Garber	✓	Dentistry
Brenda Zierler	✓	Nursing
Eric Hausman	✓	Nursing
Ellen Cosgrove	✓	Medicine
Dave Green		Medicine (<i>unable to attend</i>)
Vicki Anderson-Ellis	✓	Social Work
Paula Nurius	✓	Social Work
Lawrie Robertson	✓	Public Health
Susan Allan	✓	Public Health

Discussion:

- **Health Sciences Board of Deans Update**

- The Board of Deans asked for an update for the June meeting, the major topics I'll be presenting to the Board of Deans include timeline, split of Phase One into two components, an overview of the governance model, and an outline of future plans including significant, unresolved issues. Another topic will be to provide them with an overview of the communications plans, including outlining a set of communications resources designed to support the initiative at all levels within and external to the University.
- Input on other components to present to the Board of Deans:
 - Dean Frumkin, of the School of Public Health feels "Less is more" and favors visual communications as opposed to text heavy, also needs a message that this is larger than just a clinical focus and that Phase 1A will incorporate all of the schools. There are ways to make links to bring in Public Health and Social Work, for example with curriculum around Infectious Disease. There are opportunities to expand the scope within the current Shared Learning activities with additional opportunities as new curricula components are developed in later phases.
 - It may also be beneficial to show the deans the wide scope of existing IPE activities, including memberships which extend beyond the Health Sciences schools. Our plan is to selectively tap into these activities and members as they support the HSBoD initiative.
 - Curricular illustrations can really help, showing the strength of the collaborative curriculum, how to change programs to fit the needs of all the schools, and also take into account that the School of Social work has interprofessional relationships that transcend the Health Sciences Schools, for example with psychology
 - It's constraining if we limit the model to scenarios that fit all the schools equally well, our current philosophy is to define Health Sciences IPE as any activity involving two or more of the HS schools. We recognize that participation in IPE will vary schools in both scope and content, reflecting the unique character of each school.
 - There is a need to have IPE given more of a priority for room scheduling. There are problems with logistics of freeing up classrooms for larger scale IPE activities, and we need to carve out time for this. While this may be addressed more fully following

renovation of IPE-dedicated facilities, in the near term we will adjust the scheduling model to provide additional support and flexibility for IPE activities.

- A question exists regarding the scope of the Health Sciences Board of Deans IPE initiative. Specifically, should this initiative seek to broadly interact if not integrate with other existing IPE initiatives on campus? It's probably appropriate to specifically address this question to the Deans since it represents a change in scope from the original charge. In the presentation, we would probably best support the discussion by presenting a bullet point list of concrete benefits to broadening this initiative, as well as potential challenges.
 - Keep in mind in this first phase and the committee members are on a volunteer basis on top of our regular tasks with a limited administrative support infrastructure, all of which limits the scope of what we can accomplish.
 - If the broader approach is pursued it could be part of the second phase, for which we'll already be making a request to the Deans and the Provost.
- The Affordable Care Act is going to have an impact on training as well, although there is little certainty as to what that will look like. The impacts of the ACA will be a source of common ground for all 6 schools, as will be meeting the triple aim.
- We need to name this initiative, for many reasons factors to consider include:
 - Some communications subcommittee members relate that "IPE" may be either poorly understood or already burdened with alternative associations by the general public.
 - Focus needs to be on the 6 schools working in concert, as that is the current scope, we will integrate and incorporate other resources to help and inform and train, however the focus should be on health and health professionals.
 - The name needs to be something easy to brand and discuss, as well as easily incorporated into websites and communication pieces.
 - Elements include: Health Sciences based, professional education, and interprofessional character of education and training. How do we put these in a name and capture all of that but keep the scope?
 - Need to create a hook for both internal and external communications
 - As an action point, we will request everyone send in recommendations of names to Dave or Kelsey and we will compile them and send them out for you to rank in your order of preference. Dave will present the two or three consensus favorites to the Board of Deans to see what resonates with them.
 - We just need to get close, because we'll be able to define this once we have our own name.
- Review of Agenda Handout
 - The Facilities subcommittee has identified a potential facility, they viewed a number of sites and created a weighted score system to rank them.
 - Space with the highest score was the 2nd floor of the South Campus Center, a space including a portion of the lounge and some classrooms that are not heavily used.
 - Moving forward with the facilities component is predicated on getting a commitment for funding from the Provost.
 - A critical element for this subcommittee is the governance structure and finance piece, which we talked about last month.
 - A shared, equitable commitment broken into two elements, a basic commitment and a commitment that recognizes utilization.
 - There is no real strategy for this yet, as the ABB model does not fit our needs, please continue talking with your deans and financial people about it.

- There is a need for us to come up with a tangible way to move forward, meeting with Planning and Budgeting is on hold until the budget gets worked out so at this point find out if we have buy-in from your individual deans.
- HSA will serve as the central organizing entity, to help allocate funds and move them to schools, and keeping track of who is doing what.
- This will require clarity regarding the curriculum so that schools can look at the opportunities available for their students and keep track of the costs as well as the number of students participating, this could be used as a base-line metric to determine resource allocation
- Based on the current timeline, there is a need to move this forward, we need to have a draft governance structure ready to present to the Board of Deans in August.
 - It's important to consider incentives and tangible outcomes for faculty and schools
 - Some schools recognize IPE activities, for example the School of Pharmacy, but it is not recognized in all schools

Action Items

Item	Action Item	Date Added	Assigned To	Date Due	Status
IPE Name Suggestions	E-mail suggestions of names to Dave or Kelsey by the end of the month	05/16/2013	All Subcommittee Members	05/31/2013	In Process
Financial Model Discussions	Discuss with your deans the two part financial model we've discussed	05/16/2013	All Subcommittee Members	06/12/2013	In Process

Next Meeting: June 20, 2013