

AHC FCC

January 18, 2000

### Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

PRESENT: Muriel Bebeau (chair), Tim Wiedmann, Jim Boulger, Stephanie Valberg, Judith Garrard

REGRETS: Patricia Ferrieri, Robert Miller, Kathleen Krichbaum

GUESTS: Marty Dworkin (Project Director)

[In these minutes: The Visioning Process for the AHC]

### CRAFTING THE VISION FOR THE AHC

Professor Bebeau welcomed members and introduced Professor Marty Dworkin, Project Director for the Visioning Process. She then turned to Professor Dworkin to describe the proposed visioning process starting from the set of large global questions raised by SVP Cerra at his "State of the AHC" address. The question, he said, is how does the visioning working group most effectively deal with the questions in the context of the AHC? He then identified the group charged to oversee the entire process. They are: Muriel Bebeau, (FCC Chair), Terry Bock, (Administrative Project Manager), Frank Cerra (ex officio) and Marty Dworkin, (Project Director).

One approach the working group considered was to take each of the questions and then have a subcommittee deal with it, Professor Dworkin went on to explain. Each subcommittee would be comprised of faculty from each of the colleges so that each of the questions would receive a broad perspective. The alternative point of view was to have a series of subcommittees based on colleges. Each college subcommittee would then examine all of the questions and develop a report from the collegiate point of view. The next step would be synthesizing the information. The working group had considerable thought and discussion and the process was supported when presented to the AHC FCC.

PHASE A: Seven subcommittees would be established with Professor Dworkin serving as the chair of the entire group. Each of the subcommittees would represent a particular college of the AHC and addressing all five of the questions from the collegiate point of view. PHASE B: after approximately three months, those committees will have done their jobs and will be disassembled and then reassembled on the basis of the questions with representatives from each of the colleges, he added. The collegiate reports will then be put together in an overarching AHC report. The approach will guarantee that each college has input into these issues, he said.

The question about who is on these committees is a key question because the composition and leadership of these committees will determine the quality and to some extent what comes out of the process. Professors Dworkin and Bebeau met with SVP Cerra to discuss possible names drawn from each of the seven colleges. SVP Cerra is expected to present the list of names to the FCC at his meeting with the committee on Jan. 19. It is expected that the seven chairs will be identified within the next 7-10 days. Each of these chairs will then consult with their respective colleges and consultative committees and put together their committees.

In addition, a parallel Regents committee has been established. Regents Reed, Larson, Baraga and Neel comprise this group. Three of the four are physicians. They will take on the same charge as the seven subcommittees but will serve in an advisory capacity.

Professor Dworkin expects the writing of the report (Phase C) to take place by June 15.

Major suggestions, comments and concerns from AHC FCC members during discussion with Marty Dworkin about the AHC Visioning Process:

This is an important effort and it is as important as it is daunting. It is equally important to get the word out that it is important.

- The legacy of the Brody era has created a cynicism and distrust. If we don't collectively come up with a vision it will have been a fairly empty exercise and will be viewed much the same as Brody's reengineering
- Credibility is the key in the entire process.
- There is a medical centric view of the AHC. However, the changing nature of the delivery of health care demands an increased recognition of the role of all of the aspects of the AHC. Strengthening all of the schools in the AHC makes the Medical School stronger.
- Three months is a very ambitious time line. Because of this there won't be time to have the same kind of consultation that one would have in a protracted process.
- Regents should be invited to attend meetings in both Phase A and B. The Regents have expressed an interest in meeting with the faculty.
- The process should ensure that the vision is that of the AHC.
- Are the questions, the right questions? The Oversight Group meets with the Regents Subcommittee and will discuss the questions and how they might want to participate in the process.
- Professor Dworkin should make a presentation at the Feb. 10 Faculty Assembly meeting.
- There is value in developing a website; however, expecting faculty to access a website to obtain all of the information regarding the process is not practical.
- A communication plan is critical. Communication regarding Phase A, the primary communication should come from the faculty chair within the colleges. Reminders could be published in the calendar. Because it is going to be a fast moving process, the communication will need to be timely and effective.
- Staff support will be critical to the success of the effort.
- Important the FCC members go back to their respective colleges and inform the faculty that the FCC supports the process and in fact, initiated the process.
- The composition of each individual committee will be an activity carried out by the chair of each subcommittee in consultation with his/her college if there is a consultative committee. Setting up the committees is critical. It was suggested that subcommittee membership have the endorsement of the faculty within each college.
- The list of chairs will be presented to the Deans for information but not approval. The Deans are not the selection committee.
- Important to the credibility of the process is how the individual selects the members of the subcommittee. The process must represent the faculty.
- Overwhelmingly, members opposed the inclusion of the sub-questions as they seemed to pertain particularly to the Medical School.
- Use of the language from the "land-grant" mission was encouraged.
- Several members echoed the sentiment that the use of the word "marketplace" was unappealing. "Marketplace" should be defined and expanded. From an ethical perspective, it is an inappropriate use of a word. As health care professionals, we deal with patients and clients, not customers. Students are not customers.
- Rather than asking "will you" ask "how will you?"
- Sub-questions could be developed at the collegiate level.
- With respect to question #5, a statement about ethics ought to be included in the accountability piece.
- Eliminate the use of acronyms in written communication.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Vickie Courtney

University of Minnesota

AHC