

Meeting Minutes
Council on Linkages Between Academia and Public Health Practice
Core Competencies Workgroup
Via Conference Call
Wednesday, April 30, 2008, 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. ET

Members Present: Diane Downing, Kristine Gebby, Janet Place, Nancy McKenney, Jeanne Matthews, John Gwinn, Mark Edgar, Dawn Gentsch, Catherine Seldin

Staff Present: Ron, Bialek, Kathy Miner, Ruth Gelles

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
<p>Presentation of final draft and brief summary of most recent changes</p>	<p>Kathy Miner briefly spoke about the latest updates to the new draft. She asked the group how they would like her to proceed to condense the comments. She reviewed some of the original agreements, including keeping the original 8 eight domains and no internal modifiers (e.g., “if applicable,” “if appropriate”).</p> <p>Ron Bialek said that Dr. Miner, Diane Downing, Ruth Gelles and himself should attempt to make judgment calls on the final comments. This draft will be sent to the Workgroup for final comments, and then to the Council.</p> <p>Kristine Gebby felt that Dr. Miner should make most of the judgment calls and only if the issue is monumental should others be involved at this point. She also felt that putting out less rather than more is better because much will be added during the public comment period.</p> <p>Workgroup members agreed that less would be better at this point.</p> <p>Mr. Bialek suggested a “compromise” between the absolute minimum and a million choices. Go with the smaller list, however, have some competencies can have asterisks with specific, targeted questions.</p> <p>Dr. Miner pointed out that the Core Competencies are guideposts rather than hard and fast rules. Users may well change and tweak them for their own use.</p>	

	<p>Workgroup members liked Mr. Bialek’s idea of allowing a few choices on <i>some</i> competencies in the public comment period.</p> <p>Members agreed that it is important, when evaluating comments, to pay attention to whether the comment came from a specialist or generalist. Comments from a generalist should have more weight, because they do not have such a vested interest in a specific area.</p>	
Discussion of final draft	<p>Members discussed the specific questions sent by Nancy McKenney in the Management Domain. She mentioned some terms, such as “cost-utility analyses,” which were unclear to her colleagues.</p> <p>Dr. Miner said she would work to craft the comments into competencies and simplify the language. She said she would rather have less specificity, rather than more.</p> <p>Ms. Downing mentioned that some of this will be covered in the introduction. For example, we will specify that the draft was written to be general, rather than being specific to a region or discipline for language choices.</p> <p>Members discussed the 7th competency in the Communication Skills Domain. It seemed that this is simply an employment issue, not a competency. What would the lower tier be, “understands, but does not adhere to, policy?”</p> <p>Dr. Miner felt that we are making serious progress and that we could keep going forever, but there just is not time. Members agreed.</p>	<p>Dr. Miner will produce one final draft, which will be sent to the Workgroup, as well as the Council. Further discussions regarding the public comment period must wait until funding is determined.</p>
Stay involved	<p>Members are encouraged to stay involved through the Council’s website, as well as the “Friends of the Council” email list and the public comment period.</p>	