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

FILED
HP/DP

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

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 <u>must</u> 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 <u>all</u> the anticipated components, which should include the Minnesota

Cardiovascular Prevention Program as well as the Cancer and other existing
school HP/DP activities (youth and youth health education, the Department of
Health program, and so forth). Again, I refer to an extinct former version.
It's not all bad!

It would be helpful to me if you could help separate the name and functions of
the Clearinghouse and Training Center I proposed and the communications-media
idea that you included. We need terminology that we can all agree on, as well
as understanding the relative function of those sections.

I have not been involved in dean's office deliberations with the Division of
Epidemiology MHHP Media Section concerning communications for this Center and
for the school as a whole. I feel a need to be involved in those deliberations
and commitments that affect 100% research-supported personnel. I am delighted,
of course, that they are able to advise and meet school needs, but Epi. faculty
needs to be kept informed of requests for production. We already must farm out
many media production needs because they are overburdened now on specific
research obligations.

Bob Kane asked about how to relate to Community Advisory Boards. We did not
address that, other than agreeing we wouldn't assemble them until we knew where
we're going in the school and had a vision and proposal to point to. In our
experience, advisory boards depend on the nature of the program and nature of
the community. In some communities, the advisory board needs to function as a
planning and implementation group or relegate this function to various task
forces. In other communities an advisory board is needed simply to give
credibility to a program entering the community, and then be "converted" to
task forces or promotions councils for specific activities, when the initial
year or two of the project is behind. I guess I would counsel against putting
together a Community Advisory Board at this time, with its multiple interests
and expectations, when we haven't yet a proposal or visible means of support.

/gb