

# Minutes of AAAPC Committee Held 21 September 2010

1. **Attendance:** Dimity, Jon, Marie, Faline, Deb, Richard, and Kitty
2. **Apologies:** Marjan, Danielle, Sarah, Ellen, and Joachim
3. **Minutes of last meeting** of the AAAPC, held 17 August 2010, were approved.

#### 4. **Business Arising:**

4.1 Jon reported on his discussions with Jane Gunn about the fields of research grant applications: Jane remains reticent about explicitly raising the issue with ERA. A primary care four digit code might merely highlight how little primary care research is being undertaken. The highest ranking journal, the MJA is an A grade journal but primary care routinely publishes in grade B and grade C journals. The Australian Journal of Primary Care has a C grade. The concern is that drawing attention to this may have an adverse affect on funding for primary care. Marie is to ask Jane if it would be worthwhile to lobby when the ERA next considers grading for the medical journals. Marie is to obtain a list of the journals with their grading and place this on the AAAPC website. Kitty is to advise members of the posting.

4.2 Jon reported on the revamped AAAPC discussion forum and the debate on the developments in the PHCRED funding model: It is time to get back to Vicky Murphy to raise discussions about future primary care strategy. The working party needs to be re-instituted. What is the way forward: funding a small number of selected centres or increase the capacity building? Jon argued that the constraints of the funding model mean that some form of competitive tendering is the only viable way of sustaining this research as the funding pool is too small to be spread over all bodies that would seek a share of the funding. Richard queried whether the funding of a small number of selected centres was a sensible way forward; on consequence is that funding is taken away from rural and regional communities. Dimity queried whether, as the economy picks up, it would make more sense to push for increased funding. Dimity suggested a meeting with Vicky Murphy to re-visit this issue. The type of centres to be funded might be looked at again to allow smaller programs and universities to participate in this field of research. There is a likelihood that a division will be created between teaching universities and research universities. Dimity offered to summarize this discussion in a letter to be circulated to the executive for comments and then sent on to Vicky Murphy. Richard thought that the intention was to consult again before a final decision is taken. Dimity felt that within the AAAPC there were at least three different positions on the proposed PHCRED funding model: universities that are ready to have a centre funded and have multiple post docs and start on international research; other universities that are getting there but not yet ready; new bodies that have not yet considered these issues. Richard argued that with a smaller the number of centres, the criteria based on track record would be exclusive. If the emphasis was on collaboration with other organisations was a high priority, then the funding would go further than if it was focussed on the

best science. Jon thought the AAAPC needs to very clear that there are these three distinct groups and that the Department needs to think about how it can respond to these different needs and where it wants to invest. Dimity will write a position statement to be sent to the committee for feedback.

4.3 Ellen has sent an email to the committee concerning her discussions with Vicky Murphy

**5. The Newsletter:** No action required on this. Kitty to start organising articles for December issue

## **6. General Business**

### 6.1 Membership

6.1.1 New members: Professor Sterling Humphries, Kay Jones and Sylvia King. Kitty advised that there was no issue with publishing information about new members on the website, as long as the new members agree. Kitty will add this, the consent to being posted on the website, to the application form.

6.1.2 Finances: Jon agreed to carry on signing AAAPC cheques. There is \$27,000 in the current bank account. Kitty reported that she had received a letter from Julia Walters commenting that the travelling fellowship had been wonderful and that she would be sending in all her bills. There are also about \$8,000 to come out of the current account for website development and Kitty's wage for 2010

### 6.2 Communications to President

6.2.1 Letters from:

Mark Nelson with a discussion paper on patient safety and primary health care

Michelle Clewitt on the PIP teaching incentive guidelines, and

Tarun Sen Gupta seeking nominees from the AAAPC to help chair a session and a couple of sessions on research papers at the GP10 conference (Parker, Marie and Richard are all attending). Kitty will email Tarun advising him of the three exec members who are attending the conference and invite him to make contact.

**7. The PIP funding developments:** 23 November 2010 is a possible date for a meeting, Sydney is the preferred venue. A number of HoDs cannot attend. Kitty is to email Nigel and Danielle to ask if they can attend a Sydney meeting. Richard is to ask John if he can attend. Dimity mentioned that another letter has been sent out to the Departments this week, confirming the negotiations: GPs will be paid for the supervision of only one student, regardless of the number of students supervised. The maximum payment of \$100 per session remains in place and up to two sessions can be claimed per GP per day. Claim forms will be accepted up to 12 months after the training session. Comments are invited by participating Universities on the new claim form for payments, with a deadline of 28 October 2010. Dimity is to ask for the deadline to be extended until after the Sydney meeting of 23 November 2010. Dimity is to work on an agenda for the Sydney meeting.

**8. Discussion Paper on Patient Safety in Primary Health Care (Mark Nelson):** A letter came from

Chris Bogoli, the CEO of The Commission asking for comments on the discussion paper on Patient Safety and Quality Survey. Mark wondered if this was something that the AAAPC should make a submission on, rather than leave it up to the individual members. Dimity noted that there are some excellent suggestions in the paper but the cost and time of implementing them does not seem to have been addressed. It was felt that the diverse nature of AAAPC members made it difficult to make submissions on behalf of the membership. The document can be posted on the website, and Kitty is to email members advising of this document and of how they can send in their personal submissions.

**9. Next Meeting:** Tuesday 19 October 2010 – NB. The clocks will have gone forward.

**10. Other Business:** None

## ASSIGNED ACTIONS

### **Dimity is to:**

- ask for the deadline on comments on the new PIP payment form to be extended from 28 October 2010 until after the Sydney meeting of 23 November 2010
- work on a draft agenda for the Sydney meeting, and
- write a position statement on the developments in the PHCRED funding model which will then be sent to the committee for feedback.

### **Marie is to:**

- ask Jane if it would be worthwhile to lobby when the ERA next considers grading for the medical journals, and
- obtain a list of the journals with their grading and place this on the AAAPC website and Kitty is to advise members of the posting.

### **Kitty is to:**

- post the discussion document: 'Patient Safety in Primary Health Care' on the AAAPC website, and email members alerting them to this document and advising how they can send in their personal submissions
- email Tarun Sen Gupta advising him of the three exec members who are attending the GP10 conference (Parker, Marie and Richard are all attending).and invite him to make contact with them
- add a consent clause 'to being posted on the website', to the membership application form, and
- advise members of the list of journals, once posted on the website (see Marie, above).