

Date: November 21, 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 (<i>unable to attend</i>) |
| Eric Hausman | ✓ | Nursing |
| Ellen Cosgrove | ✓ | Medicine |
| Dave Green | | Medicine |
| Vicki Anderson-Ellis | ✓ | Social Work |
| Paula Nurius | | Social Work |
| Lawrie Robertson | ✓ | Public Health |
| Susan Allan | | Public Health (<i>unable to attend</i>) |

Guest: Ben Robinson, School of Public Health

Agenda:

- **Financial Model and Reporting**

Financial Model

- Population of the base and activity components of the financial model
 - Bi-phasic financial commitment: base and activity components
 - Base component
 - Base funding for essential core elements (e.g. faculty development, administration, IPE teaching space, capital investments, etc...)
 - Equal commitment across HS Schools
 - Activity component
 - Equitable distribution of operational costs based on involvement in IPE activities (e.g. faculty participation, student participation – number/hours, ongoing facilities maintenance, etc...)
 - IPE Implementation Committee will recommend preferred financial model to HSBOD for approval

Reporting

- IPE Implementation Committee will provide quarterly summaries including:
 - Curriculum (C/M Subcommittee)
 - Student participation metrics (C/M Subcommittee)
 - Faculty participation/development (C/M Subcommittee)
 - Facilities utilization (Facilities Subcommittee)
 - New facilities tracking (Facilities Subcommittee)
 - Communications status (Communications Subcommittee)
 - Financial Update (HSA)
 - Elements?

Next Meeting: December 19, 2013 12pm-1pm in T-269

- Introductions, Ben Robinson will likely take over for Lawrie on the Governance committee once Lawrie retires. They've been working together on this.
- Pick up where we left off last time and look at some of the components of the governance model. Dave Anderson picked out a few of the highest priority components to discuss.
- Dave chose one finance element and one reporting element for discussion.
 - This was initially established as a biphasic finance model. They approved it but we need to look at it closely to make sure we have good recommendations moving forward and also have good information we share with the Deans and Associate Deans.
- The financial piece is at the top, we identified a base component that all schools would support equally to support essential IPE functions, and an activity component reflecting differential participation in IPE events, calculated from some as-yet undefined metrics. These could include numbers of students or faculty involved, how many hours each participate, etc.
- Lawrie Robertson brought up the component of ABB. Dave Anderson mentioned he'd talk directly with office of Planning and Budgeting, and Tom Baillie was on the ABB steering committee. This discussion on the components may actually help with that. If we have a tight discussion around the components in the activity piece I can take that to Gary Quarfoth and show him how the ABB model doesn't fit.
- Ellen Cosgrove suggested moving the faculty from the Base component into the Activity Component, faculty costs may be variable when comparing the numbers of faculty from for example the School of Medicine compared with say the School of Social work. There should be a component such as each school paying for a sixth of the director's salary.
- Vicki Anderson-Ellis would like to discuss the definition of "faculty development" and also note that the facilities piece may also need to be moved as the School of Social Work may have difficulty supporting IPE elements unrelated to direct participation in educational activities.
- Dave Anderson had seen the faculty commitment as a policy commitment by each school towards supporting faculty involvement in IPE activities rather than a specific resource commitment. It is in the financial model because it becomes a financial issue.
 - Ben Robinson discussed the shortfalls of modifying the ABB model; he believes it may not be the best plan and may be counterproductive in the long run.
 - ABB does not do a good job of supporting interdisciplinary research, the model works for more traditional academic activities but the start of the discussion is that the model doesn't work for interdisciplinary activities.
 - Ben Robinson said ABB flows money through to the people who directly earn it; ABB made it very clear who does the actual earning.
 - This could be a framework to provide the justification, as the document that frames this.
 - Eric recommended taking ABB at face value and outlined two models of fund distribution: one to Health Sciences Administration with subsequent distribution to the schools and the second going directly to the schools with subsequent transfers to HSA.. In terms of this today's agenda, Eric suggests a fixed component for a certain number of faculty and then have a variable cost tied to if there are more activities related to faculty participation.
- Christene James says there's one component such a big faculty development session, such as was had in the fall (development activities), and for example a percentage of Jennifer's salary is paid for IPE.
- The suggestion was made to change the wording for the base faculty component to faculty FTE commitment.
 - Use the term Faculty Skills Development for the variable activity piece, and Recognition in the base component.
- At this point we cannot and would not try to identify the specifics within the various financial transactions. This document is intended to outline guiding principles, then review the specifics of IPE activity on a regular basis to calculate the specifics.
- Christene James just signed approval for a new IPE class through Pharmacy; Dave Anderson would like a copy to use as a case study to discuss with the office of Planning and Budgeting.
- We talked about the difference of trying to tweak the entire system, and figure out locally what would work without having to tweak the system. If that's what works that's fine, we just need the Office of Planning and Budgeting to approve.
- There has been a plan of building up to the finance rather than capping it. We'd need some shared administration. Writing this document at the ten thousand foot level it should be able to provide the flexibility, and the general principles of guiding the resources. We would then support this document with specific MOUs designed to provide detailed financial guidance

- Is everyone comfortable with putting in the base a faculty commitment (doesn't require each school to do the same commitment, be it financial or time) and in the activity component have a faculty development component that is scaled between the schools? There was consensus that everyone was comfortable with it.
- Lawrie Robertson suggested that some principles be signed off by the Board of Health Sciences Deans to guide the implementation.
- The committee members agreed that that was a reasonable method of accounting for the different faculty commitments.

Capital Commitment

- What commitment there will be for the facility elements?
- Two components are important, both construction and maintenance components.
- One approach could be to extract the administrative office component that benefits everyone, then split up the classrooms and split that cost 6 ways.
- First discuss the Active learning Classroom facility in South Campus Center, with the idea being this would give us the classroom that the curriculum committee says they need.
 - Is that a cost we would split equally?
 - Ben Robinson suggested splitting the cost by a high level metric, suggests putting most of the components in the base component to prevent people from gaming the system. This should help maintain shared goals and commitments.
 - Present the space using language which clearly conveys the value in the initiatives. We'll have to be careful with terminology.
 - Vicki had a question regarding whether the space will be dedicated solely for IPE or could it be diverted to other uses?
 - Health Sciences Administration would do the scheduling for the active learning space(s), the priority would go to IPE. If there's time leftover likely other things would be scheduled.
 - If there was a policy that the IPE had priority to the exclusion to other classes/activities then Vicki Anderson-Ellis could see that being an equal commitment across all six schools.
 - The caveat was emphasized that no one in the room was authorized to finalize elements of the document without specific review and approval from the Deans.
 - Right now there is no hard requirement but students are strongly advised to attend the foundations piece.
 - Dave will present this to the Deans as a two pronged fork, an Active learning Center, versus doing the whole SCC facility.
 - Ellen Cosgrove was concerned with the accreditation using the lounges.
 - Dave Anderson clarified that the project would take all of the space including the existing retail space and be able to expand the lounge spaces as well as putting in the classrooms, so it would not create an accreditation problem because the lounges could be claimed by all schools since they would be IPE.
 - Looking at a smaller capital investment it seems in this group that it would make sense to look at it as an equal commitment across the schools for the ALC (this is assuming we do not get funds from somewhere else, which we might).
 - Important to get the planning on the ALC going as well.
 - The other advantage is we can start testing the procedures as well. It will be very informative for the capital campaign how we might see education in the future, this would give us a way to test active learning.