



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Division of Epidemiology
School of Public Health
Stadium Gate 27
611 Beacon Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 376-4056

FILE d
HP/DP

Done 2/27/86
February 26, 1986

TO: Edith Leyasmeyer
FROM: Henry Blackburn
SUBJECT: General Commentary of Center for Health Promotion/Disease
Prevention Proposal as of 2/24/86

B

Don't you get the feeling we're still too amorphous as a planning group. Don't we need an executive group to more clearly delineate mission. We've gotten inputs of ideas and now we need to focus, give people responsibilities and assignments for certain areas. We could get away from conflicts of interest by having the scientific content reviewed by the school's Research Committee and "appropriateness" to the overall Center concept reviewed by the dean and yourself and maybe one or two other senior persons on an Executive Group for Center.

I guess I also see a problem of faculty motivation now, since there's nothing specifically to shoot for in the current status, either in overall concept and vision, in broad content areas that include all SPH interests and skills, or likely funding in the near future.

I see a further problem in using BRSG funds for "development" because school policy has been so very laboriously, carefully and thoughtfully worked out over recent years and the allocations are now functioning with great fairness and clearly within the NIH guidelines for the use of BRSG funds. In other words, I don't think they should be generally or largely usurped for development funds for a Center; rather for specific school researches that might relate to development. At least that issue should be subjected to discussion at the Administrative Council level.

I think we urgently need a new statement of the mission and directions of the Center, and a new organizational matrix that has a clearer separation of standing functional units from specific projects.

I think the Department of Health must be represented at the level of the executive group and at the level of a functional unit. The extensive past discussions with them cannot be ignored. They have more to offer us now than before in visible programs.

I noticed that the current administrative chart included only the recently submitted projects. I think it's important in an administrative diagram to show all the anticipated components, which should include the Minnesota