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Executive Summary

Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry aims to become one of the top three medical and dental schools in Canada within the next 10 years. To achieve this goal, Schulich needs to develop a robust and vibrant academic culture based on strong research and scholarship. The objective of this white paper is to evaluate the existing research organization and infrastructure at Schulich and to propose strategic changes to enhance future research successes. The Research Review Task Force recommends that both organizational and cultural changes are needed to create and instill a “culture of research” within Schulich. These institutional and cultural changes are complementary, and both are needed to foster research excellence throughout the school. The Task Force also recommends specific programmatic changes to support research and research infrastructure within Schulich.

The following actions are recommended by the Task Force:

- Enhance the position of Associate Dean, Research to Vice Dean, Research
- Reorganize the Research Office with additional positions phased in over the next three years, initially focused on grant facilitation and assistance in the preparation of major grant applications
- Work with the departments, undergraduate and postgraduate programs, partner organizations, faculty members and trainees to implement a “culture of research”
- Target additional resources for research infrastructure and alleviation of animal care costs
- Expand the existing Gap competition
- Increase the focus on research in CIHR pillars 2, 3 and 4
- Develop an inventory of Schulich’s research interests and skills to provide necessary input for team building, new research collaborations and new research opportunities

The investments in research will be evaluated regularly using objective metrics. We expect that Schulich will become one of the top five medical/dental schools in Canada within five years, and top three within ten years.
1) Background

The Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry (Schulich) has a reputation as a school that provides an outstanding education for its students and trainees. Although Schulich has a strong history of medical and dental achievements based on research in certain areas, a common perception of Schulich externally as well as internally is that it provides high quality education for students to become excellent medical and dental professionals, but not to become excellent researchers. Importantly, this impression is found not only among our students and trainees but also among some faculty.

Western’s President, Dr. Amit Chakma, has a stated goal of making Western one of the top 5 research intensive universities in Canada. If Western is to meet this goal, much of the momentum must come from Schulich, as its researchers (including researchers at our affiliates) account for approximately 60% of research funding at Western. Further, the new Dean of Schulich, Dr. Michael Strong, has clearly stated his intent for Schulich to be “the lead Canadian centre for the study of the spectrum of diseases of aging.” To meet these goals, Western needs a robust and vibrant research culture at Schulich.

### Research Revenue for The University of Western Ontario
2005/06 – 2009/10

![Graph showing research revenue for Schulich and other faculties from 2005/06 to 2009/10.](image)

Source: IPB

Various indicators suggest that Schulich is not keeping up with its competition in research. One such indicator is the total research revenue. In recent years, the school has been ranked either 7th or 8th amongst the 16 Canadian medical schools in terms of research revenue. While comparably sized medical schools such as McMaster University and the University of Alberta have risen in the rankings in recent years, Schulich’s position in the middle of the pack is unchanged.
### Ranking of Canadian Faculties of Medicine by Biomedical and Health Care Research Revenues 2004/05 - 2008/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Medicine</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Ontario</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AFMC.

Schulich has a strong record of research in fields including neurological sciences, diabetes, imaging and medical biophysics, and the school continues to excel in many areas. Individual research programs across Schulich also continue to do well, garnering both national and international recognition and funding. Overall however, Schulich’s success rates at national competitions, previously above the median for the country, have now fallen to match those of the rest of the country. Biomedical research (CIHR pillar 1) continues to be strong at Schulich, and the failure to progress in funding successes can be, in part, attributed to a failure to fully embrace emerging areas of research or funding opportunities such as large scale clinical research e.g. leadership in multicentre trials, translational research, and large scale population and health services research – areas now identified as CIHR’s pillars 2, 3 and 4. These areas have been targeted by CIHR as part of its roadmap (Strategy on Patient-Oriented Research – SPOR) to enhance knowledge translation to improved health outcomes for Canadians.
There is concern that Schulich is not adapting quickly enough to changes in the research world – in terms of agility and responsiveness to new funding and research opportunities, and in terms of capitalizing on our existing base of research excellence to build to a new level.

We are at a critical juncture to focus our attention to research. The new leadership at Western, Schulich and the affiliated teaching hospitals and research institutes, and forthcoming new funding opportunities provincially, nationally and internationally provide the milieu to attain the desired goals. The objective of this white paper is to evaluate the existing research organization and infrastructure at Schulich and propose strategic changes to enhance future research successes.

2) Context

The timing for a new focus on research is excellent. Dr. Michael Strong was appointed the new Dean to Schulich in 2010. The alignment of a new leadership at Schulich, new President and Provost at Western, and new CEOs at the affiliated teaching hospitals, LHSC and SJHC, represents a rare opportunity for changing the environment for research at Schulich and its affiliated organizations, and bringing a renewed emphasis on research. There is broad consensus among the leadership on the desire to enhance and improve our research performance and profile.

Our goal is to fundamentally redevelop Schulich’s research infrastructure to enhance our competitiveness and to position Schulich within the top 5 research intensive medical schools in Canada.
within the next 5 years – and amongst the top 3 within 10 years. This will include strategic investments in personnel, infrastructure support, alleviation of animal care inequities, and investments in core research facilities through a mixture of endowment fund utilization, economies gained from an in-depth operational review, and strategic investments with Western and affiliated organizations.

Schulich has a number of existing strengths on which to build, including:

- a strong base of successful researchers and research teams, particularly in biomedical research - many with strong national and international reputation;
- recent recruitment of key researchers (CERC and CRCs) collaboratively with partner faculties and research institutes;
- prior successes in large grant competitions (CFI, NCE, Team Grants);
- investments in core facilities and infrastructure needed to support research (e.g. LRGC, LRPC, animal facilities);
- upgrades to research space and animal housing over the course of recent years; and
- the alignment of Schulich with the strategic plans of Western, Robarts and Lawson Health Research Institute (Lawson).

Schulich also has a strong institutional and regional base upon which to build this effort. Southwestern Ontario is an excellent locale for biomedical research. It consists of both rural and urban populations, and all major ethnic populations. This population is at the leading edge of demographic trends for all of Canada. Through past initiatives (e.g. Lifecycle Research Network), Schulich has already built research collaborations with universities in Southwestern Ontario, namely the University of Windsor, University of Guelph and University of Waterloo.

At the same time, Schulich has some identified weaknesses including:

- a culture, both institutionally and across the faculty, that fails to promote research strongly as a core value at all levels of the organization;
- a lack of incentives and capacity for researchers to engage in large grant competitions, even when the willingness to undertake and the benefits of such grant submissions are evident;
- a failure to fully capitalize on previous successes (e.g. Innovarium) or to take advantage of new large grant opportunities;
- a failure to pro-actively reinvest in core facilities in order to anticipate evolving research trends;
- a failure to meaningfully invest in clinical, translational, and population health research through targeted infrastructure redevelopment; and
- a failure to pro-actively support faculty renewal through targeted recruitment in support of the educational and research mission.

One of the concerns is a perceived lack of interest in research by MD and DDS students and postgraduate clinical trainees (residents). While a small number of research-intensive residents are undertaking training to be future clinician scientists or clinician researchers, usually with faculty and mentors who are themselves clinician scientists or clinician researchers, many MD and DDS students and clinical trainees leave Western without exposure to research. As a result, they do not develop an interest in undertaking research training and research-intensive careers. These students and trainees
are the future of health care; a lack of appreciation for and interest in research by this group is of concern.

The external environment for health research has also changed. CIHR’s budget is expected to remain at current levels for the near future without substantial increases in the operating grants program but with targeted increases in some programs such as SPOR. While CIHR remains an important funding source for biomedical and medical research, Schulich cannot depend on CIHR as the sole funding source for future research. Thus, Schulich will need to explore new opportunities for funding and to cultivate stronger relationships with local, provincial, and national governments and agencies, as well as with industry.

3) Research Review Task Force

To address these many issues, the Dean of Schulich Medicine & Dentistry convened a Research Review Task Force in the fall of 2010. The Task Force was charged with undertaking an intensive data-driven process to review the administrative infrastructure and strategies necessary to ensure that within the next 10 years, Schulich will be identified as one of the top 3 research intensive medical schools in the country and to increase our ranking internationally. The Task Force was not charged with addressing Schulich’s research themes of excellence or identifying priority research areas for investment, as Schulich’s Health Research Plan continues to provide this guidance. The terms of reference of the Task Force are in Appendix 1.

The Task Force was comprised of researchers from across Schulich and its partner institutions. It was divided into a Steering Committee plus four working groups to focus on the needs of specific themes of research: basic science; clinical science; education and training; and health services, policy, and population health. Each of the working groups met several times and prepared a working paper based on its discussions.

To inform the Task Force’s discussions, site visits were made to both the University of Alberta and McGill University, while the infrastructure at McMaster was reviewed by phone interviews (see Summary of Findings in Appendix 2). These site visits highlighted the wide variation in administrative practices and procedures in use across our peer institutions to support research. While some practices such as the provision of assistance to put together major research proposals are common, others pertain to needs and resource availability at an individual institution. Finally, a retreat was held in November 2010 which was attended by approximately 40 researchers. Questions posed at the retreat are in Appendix 3.

This discussion paper incorporates the input generated from this process. The School will utilize this document as the template upon which the organization will move ahead over the next 3-5 years to implement the infrastructure adjustments required to enhance our research successes.

4) Findings of the Task Force

The Task Force confirmed that both organizational and cultural changes are needed in order to create and instill a “culture of research” within Schulich. These institutional and cultural changes are complementary, and both are needed to foster research excellence throughout the school. In addition, the Task Force recommended specific programmatic changes for the support of research and research infrastructure within Schulich.

Cultural changes
Schulich requires a strategy and vision to instill a “culture of research” throughout the organization – that is, the conviction that research is an intrinsic expectation of all faculty and trainees within the academic health centre. Instilling such a culture within Schulich will require changes in faculty roles and expectations, changes in students’ expectations, and changes in current programs and practices at Schulich.

For students and trainees, this means that everyone will have a substantive exposure to research as part of their educational programs. To implement this will require the participation of all departments and undergraduate and postgraduate programs, together with supervisors and researchers, to develop strategies and implement changes to the existing training programs.

For faculty, this means that everyone will have to accept that research is essential to their role, and a necessary component of their workload. This research component will differ substantially – from a small 5%-10% up to 75%, depending on the role category of each faculty. The nature of individual faculty members’ involvement in research will also vary, i.e. some research-intensive faculty will be active PIs or co-PIs on research grants, while other faculty will be involved in research through activities such as active participation as collaborators in multidisciplinary teams, facilitating translation, contributing to clinical trials, assisting with outreach, or mentoring.

This focus on research should not be interpreted that Schulich will value clinicians or educators less than researchers, as all are essential for Schulich to be successful as an academic institution. The Task Force recognized that this increased emphasis on research may have a negative impact for some whose career has been focused on excellence in clinical care or teaching. In the current competitive funding climate and with the focus on translation, research success is often achieved by teams. Each member of the team plays an important role and should be appropriately recognized in annual performance reviews and promotion and tenure considerations. In order to provide time for faculty to become engaged in research, Schulich, together with its affiliated institutions, will need to address issues related to workload and the balance between patient care, service, education, and research.

Critical to the “cultural change” is the recognition that a vibrant academic centre must allow room for all aspects of its academic mission (clinical, research and education) to develop in parallel and be recognized equally. To this end, Schulich must be more active in recognizing and acknowledging both research and education scholarship achievements through appropriate workload agreements with the faculty and recognition of academic successes with Schulich awards and nominations for major national and international awards. Schulich may also wish to create a mechanism to acknowledge the contributions of faculty as co-PIs, participants, and collaborators to the overall research endeavor. Such recognition may encourage clinicians to become more involved in research activities and interact and collaborate with their basic science counterparts.

In addition, there is little reward or recognition presently to faculty taking on leadership roles in major endeavors such as core facilities or major research grant proposals. We need to “incentivize” and support faculty to take on leadership roles in larger projects such as group, team or infrastructure grants, or to participate in major group/team grants.

This new “culture of research” will place added responsibility on the faculty. This is a two-way relationship - the School will expect more involvement and performance in research from the faculty, while the faculty will expect additional support and recognition from the School.
A recurrent theme amongst several of the working groups was that not all faculty members serve as good role models for students. Although a significant investment is made in developing the next generation of academics from our student population, many faculty do not present research as an attractive career (either in academic or non-academic positions).

In addition to efforts to recruit excellent students, we need to provide students and trainees with positive role models for research. This applies to both clinical and basic realms. At present, medical and dental trainees often receive minimal exposure to research activities and often are not exposed to interdisciplinary research. We need to institute changes in the undergraduate and postgraduate medical/dental education programs to embed research training in conjunction with clinical training, and to institute a mandatory research rotation as part of the residency programs.

Departments will play an important role in the development and implementation of a new culture of research in Schulich. Each department will need to define its own “best practices” based on its own specialty and impact on health. It is acknowledged that different strategies will have to be developed for each department based on multiple factors including the type of department (e.g. basic science or clinical), existing culture and infrastructure, existing faculty and personnel, resources available, etc. However, each department should adapt its own research strategic vision based on the general and overall concepts developed within this white paper and the research strategic vision of Schulich and Western. Departments will also need to take a role in defining mentorship practices and in providing financial support for research and researchers. Schulich and the departments may need to look at the option of providing stipends for faculty who assume responsibilities for mentoring and internal grant reviews.

**Organizational changes**

The Task Force agreed that organizational changes are needed for the Schulich Research Office to support the School’s new emphasis on research. The Task Force reached consensus on several points.

**Vice Dean Research:** First, there was general agreement on enhancing the current position of Associate Dean Research to **Vice Dean Research**. The Vice Dean will provide strategic vision, oversight, liaison and communication (internal and external), and advocacy for research for Schulich. The incumbent will have a major role in enhancing Schulich’s profile both nationally and internationally, as well as serving as the key senior leadership member identifying novel funding opportunities. The individual will be the voice of Schulich Research both nationally and internationally. The position will require a major commitment of time (0.8-1.0 FTE) and will be the primary academic and administrative role for the incumbent. The position will have a clear mandate, goals and accountability. Given the consensus on this aspect, development of this position description and recruitment for this position has already been initiated (Appendix 6).

**Additional Staff:** The Task Force agreed that the there is a need for additional personnel in the Schulich Research Office to meet new requirements and responsibilities. Various models for reorganizing the Research Office were discussed. Task Force members differed as to whether various roles required new decanal appointments (Assistant/Associate Deans) or new staff (PMA/UWOSA). Decanal positions in specific areas (e.g. knowledge translation, mentorship) could provide leadership and higher visibility, and could facilitate interactions with counterparts from other faculties and universities. However, decanal appointments generally require a limited commitment of faculty time (0.2-0.5 FTE) whereas a staff person devotes 100% of time to a position. Cost considerations must also be taken into account. The Task Force concluded that for each position or function, the role description should be carefully...
crafted with defined metrics and deliverables, following which a determination of the nature of the appointment could be undertaken in an informed manner.

There was consensus on a need for increased resources for research facilitation. “Grant Facilitators” (also known as “grant specialists” or “research consultants”) would assist with coordination of major grants and enhance the quality of grants. Grant Facilitators will be knowledgeable about research resources available locally (within Schulich, Western, and London), provincially, nationally and internationally; assist with developing components of proposals such as budgets and administrative needs (REB, ROLA, biohazards, etc.); provide assistance with developing narrative for ancillary components of research applications such as HQP and “Benefits to Canada”. In addition, Grant Facilitators will provide assistance with editing and with the use of good grantsmanship practices. In essence, Grant Facilitators will help faculty members translate good ideas into great grant applications. This is critical in the current peer-review funding climate as a few decimal points in scores can make a difference between being funded or not.

Grant Facilitators will also assist with team building - actively developing research teams to respond to funding and research opportunities. This will include identifying team leaders and key individuals, actively promoting team development, fostering potential links with external investigators/teams, and encouraging networking. They will be skilled at identifying the research community needs and aligning these needs with opportunities. They will help serve as matchmakers, linking researchers to new opportunities, and linking researchers with each other.

There was a difference of opinion on the various other types/scope of staff positions required for the office. Some Task Force members suggested new staff positions be created to address specific areas of expertise including industry liaison, government liaison, knowledge translation, international research, specialists in pillars 3 and 4, and health policy roles. While these positions may not be immediate priorities, some personnel may be added to meet these roles in the longer-term. In the short term, the Vice Dean will fill some of these roles, together with the new staff. A position focused on research infrastructure was also suggested. However, as SSMD provides financial support for facilities but is not presently involved in the direct management of research facilities, this was not considered justified. Also suggested were additional staff to address graduate student, postdoctoral, and clinical trainee needs. (Note: A discussion of graduate staffing needs is taking place separately; thus, these concerns are not addressed in this Research Review).

**Research Advisory Council:** The Task Force suggested the formation of a new Research Advisory Council (RAC). The RAC would be chaired by the Vice Dean and membership would include representatives from Schulich, Lawson, LHSC and SJHC, Research Western, Windsor, Robarts, and from other Western faculties with substantial activities in the area of health research (FHS, Social Science). The purpose of the Council would be to help mould London as an Academic Health Sciences Centre and serve as a conduit to/from the research community. This new RAC would replace the existing Schulich Research Committee.

**Programmatic changes**

The Task Force identified a number of specific areas for the targeted investment of funds.

**Gap/Bridging Funds:** Schulich currently supports a “Gap” competition for researchers whose highly-rated CIHR Operating Grant applications are not funded. The Task Force members agreed that an expanded gap support is needed, particularly in light of declining funding rates at CIHR. In addition, there is a need for bridge funding for faculty members at all career levels. This expansion of Gap/bridge...
funding will be linked to mentoring – actively assisting researchers to improve their grantsmanship and evidence of full preparation including a well-conducted internal peer-review.

**Support for Proposal Preparation:** Provision of resources targeted for the preparation of large proposals (RFAs, team grants, CFI applications, etc.) would be helpful. Preparation of these applications is often complex and time-consuming, and faculty may be reluctant to take on the additional workload and responsibility for these. These resources may be in addition to the assistance provided by newly hired Grants Facilitators.

**Support for Core Research Facilities:** Task Force members agreed on the need for enhanced support for core research facilities and infrastructure. Schulich currently provides a limited amount of operating/maintenance funding for selected core research facilities, with funding allocated through a competitive process. However, the available resources are insufficient to meet all the needs. Further, as CFI/IOF funding runs out, many researchers and departments are struggling to meet the costs of ongoing operations and necessary upgrades. Schulich has taken steps to address these concerns in its recently submitted Budget.

The provision of additional resources for facility support will mandate a critical evaluation of core facilities support. It is reasonable to expect that as new areas of research develop, new core facilities may be required, while others may need long term funding stabilization, and still others may no longer be required. There should be a culture developed around core facilities which does not speak to entitlement, but rather to renewal and critical evaluation.

**Animal Facilities:** The Task Force expressed specific concerns about the costs of cage charges for animal care facilities. Schulich has taken steps to address these concerns in its recently submitted Budget. Schulich proposes to partner with the University to reduce the costs to researchers. Based on current cost estimates in order to bring our per diem rates to the mean rates at Ontario universities, an infusion of approximately $210K per annum will be required to subsidize this.

**Mentorship:** Mentorship of new/young researchers should be approached more consistently and seriously throughout the whole school. This is essential for helping new faculty establish themselves as independent researchers. Mentorship activities may include not only topics such as grantsmanship and internal peer review, but also assistance in such areas as leadership, activities to promote knowledge translation, and advice on supervising trainees. The Departments will need to take an active role in this effort. Schulich’s recent mentorship document at [http://www.schulich.uwo.ca/executivecommittees/documents/committee/Joint/2009_2010/SCHULICH%20MENTORSHIP%20PROGRAM_June2010.pdf](http://www.schulich.uwo.ca/executivecommittees/documents/committee/Joint/2009_2010/SCHULICH%20MENTORSHIP%20PROGRAM_June2010.pdf) addresses these issues. Given the increasingly competitive climate for research, mentorship and assistance with grantsmanship should also be extended to more established investigators in mid career rank if they so desire and as resources permit.

**Fostering Student Research:** In order to foster student interest in research, additional resources may be needed to expand support for student research activities. Current programs such as Summer Research Training Program (SRTP) and Schulich Research Opportunities Program (SROP) for undergraduates which enable students to gain research experience are limited by the available resources. In addition, the portfolio of programs to foster student and trainee research should be evaluated. Some new programs may be developed, or additional funding for programs such as the Clinical Investigator Program (CIP) may be useful for assisting with research costs for students (e.g. awards for attending research conferences, seed funding for postdocs or resident research).

**Training Future Clinicians in Basic Clinical Research Methodologies:** The majority of clinical trainees at the postgraduate (residency level) are interested in clinical research as their career goals are in keeping
with being clinician researchers or clinician teachers. However, many if not most are not equipped to conduct clinical research using fundamentally sound research methodologies. As Schulich plans to launch the MPH Program, medical/dental trainees will have the opportunity to enroll in this program and learn sound research methodologies. Once the program matures, the school should investigate the possibility of expanding into an MD/MPH Program for undergraduate medical/dental students.

Knowledge Translation: Knowledge Translation (KT), is of growing concern to funding agencies and to governments. Schulich currently lacks in-depth capacity in KT and appears to lag in this area. Schulich, and indeed the University, is significantly disadvantaged by the lack of a strategic plan on developing knowledge translation and health policy research – although fledgling and non-cohesive efforts of the latter are in process. Further, KT is often not well incorporated into funding applications. It often appears to be an afterthought, rather than an integrated component of a project. We need to take steps to foster KT and to solve translational problems. Part of the solution to this need may be to foster more interactions between basic scientists and clinicians, and between clinicians and population health and health policy researchers. Education in KT should be a component of the MPH Program.

Other Issues Raised by the Task Force

City-wide Integration: Schulich is in the early phases of discussions with relevant stakeholders within the city of London and the region to develop a Southwestern Ontario Academic Health Science Network (SWO AHSN). The current health sector research environment in London and Southwestern Ontario is not organized to provide real vision for the future. This research network would provide an umbrella organization to develop a cohesive approach to research, education, and fundraising, thereby allowing Schulich, related faculties, teaching hospitals, research institutes and centres, and individual researchers to gain a competitive advantage across all aspects of our efforts. This approach will help develop a sense of cohesiveness in London research community and will ultimately provide an advantage when applying for large national and international grants. Initially viewed as a city-wide effort, this has the potential to grow into a regional network, incorporating SWOMEN and other regional academic institutions.

There was general agreement by the Task Force that this move to a single organization is the correct direction for Schulich. The Task Force identified that a number of existing barriers will need to be addressed. Issues include organizational concerns (loss of identity), legal issues, fundraising/financial issues related to the foundations, etc. Resolving these issues will be a lengthy process.

As a first step, Schulich will continue to work with the Lawson Health Research Institute to harmonize administrative processes and remove duplication in administrative activities between Schulich/Western and the Lawson Health Research Institute. This will simplify procedures for researchers and reduce barriers (for example, related to involving students in research at the hospitals). A few initial steps have already been taken – for example, deadlines for ResearchNet submissions for CIHR Operating Grants have been harmonized. These are small items, but can be major annoyances for researchers. As part of this effort to harmonize research processes, we will also review the processes and procedures involving students and trainees – e.g. access to facilities, training requirements, security checks, N96 fits, WHMIS, etc. – in order to facilitate rather than impede the inclusion of students in research.

Other topics: The Task Force raised a number of other issues and interesting ideas, many of which extended beyond the limited mandate of the group. While these issues are of importance to Schulich, they are either not immediate priorities, or are being addressed elsewhere through other processes. Although not addressed in detail in this paper, we would like to note them for future discussion:
Internationalization with specific reference to research;
Creation of a new M.Ed. program;
The need for additional health policy expertise within Schulich. Note that the creation of the new Masters in Public Health program should help address this need;
Needs for additional high-quality research space;
Funding and funding models for graduate studies, and the administrative infrastructure required to support Schulich graduate programs;
Issues related to postdoctoral trainees;
Support for young investigators (distinct from Gap or bridge funding);
Support for mid-career level investigators;
Involvement of University of Windsor faculty in research;
How to ensure that every new recruitment is viewed as “strategic”; and
Needs for expanded interactions and partnerships across the University.

5) Actions
The following actions will provide a strategic blueprint to guide Schulich over the next 3-5 years to develop the infrastructure adjustments that will be required to enhance our research funding and productivity to achieve the desired goal. This plan will balance the allocation of new resources between personnel, infrastructure and other research needs. A summary of this plan is in Appendix 4.

I. The role of Associate Dean, Research will be redefined to the position of Vice Dean, Research. This position will be filled by a competitive process and will be expected to be a research-intensive individual either currently, or with a track record of such. The development of the position description is currently underway as a component of this review.

At this time, no new Associate Deans or Assistant Deans for Research will be created; however, this decision may be reexamined once a Vice Dean is in place.

II. The Schulich Research Office will be reorganized, with additional positions phased in over the next three years. An emphasis for new positions will be on grant facilitation and on assistance with the preparation of major/large research grant applications. The goal for these new positions is to improve Schulich’s competitiveness and increase the level of external research funding. In addition, staff will be added as necessary to manage research programs (e.g. SRTP, SROP, etc), facilitate grants and awards, and provide administrative/support staff. A draft Organizational Chart is in Appendix 5. In conjunction with the new capacity for grant facilitation, Schulich will provide seed funding for grant preparation on a limited basis.

III. Schulich will work with the departments, postgraduate and graduate programs, our partner organizations, faculty members and trainees to implement a “culture of research” at Schulich. Actions will include:
a. Work with departments to develop best practices for mentoring students, trainees, and junior faculty; it is acknowledged that each department may vary in its practice, however, they will be based on faculty guidelines

b. Work with postgraduate training programs to increase trainees’ involvement with research during residency and fellowships

c. Recognize faculty who are involved with research as members of teams/groups (as opposed to PIs or co-PIs) in annual performance reviews and promotion and tenure

d. Increase the recognition of faculty members for their research achievements through internal and external awards (e.g. Hellmuth, Distinguished University Professor, Faculty Scholar, NSERC awards, fellowship in the Canadian Academy of Health Sciences, Royal Society, etc.)

e. Work with partners (affiliated hospitals, research institutes, faculties) to incorporate some aspect of research or research-related activity into all faculty role descriptions

IV. Schulich will target additional resources for research infrastructure – core research facilities and to ensure that necessary core research facilities are maintained and are accessible for Schulich researchers.

V. Schulich will also undertake a critical review of its core research facilities, to determine where there may be gaps or unmet needs, updating of infrastructure, and to determine how its resources for the operations and maintenance of facilities can be best used.

VI. Schulich will target resources to alleviate excessive cage charges for Schulich researchers. The intent is to bring per diem rates into alignment with facilities within Ontario.

VII. Schulich will expand the existing Gap competition and will create a bridge funding program that recognizes the challenges of current CIHR funding. Faculty with highly-rated operating grants applications that have just missed the funding cut-off and for which rigorous internal peer review was utilized prior to submission will be eligible to receive one-time, non-renewable support at a higher level than currently provided to bridge to the next competition, based on demonstrated need.

VIII. Recognizing that Schulich has traditionally been strong in CIHR pillar 1 (biomedical research), we will take actions to increase our focus on CIHR pillars 2, 3, and 4 (clinical; health systems and services; and the social, cultural and environmental factors that affect the health of populations).

IX. Develop an Inventory of Schulich research interests and skills, to provide necessary input for teambuilding, establishing new research collaborations, and fostering new research opportunities. This will also benefit Schulich’s communication needs and help increase the public face of SSMD research.

6) Desired Outcomes and Metrics

Our vision is that in 10 years, Schulich will be is ranked within the top 3 medical schools in Canada in research. London and southwest Ontario will have developed a cohesive “academic health network” and will be viewed, both internally and externally, as a “destination” for excellent researchers.
In the short-term, within the next three years the Schulich Research Office will be fully staffed. Schulich will increase the number of group/team/large funding applications.

Medium-term, within the next five years, we will see increased successes in Tri-Council operating grants (significantly above national average in every competition), infrastructure grants and other larger awards from national and international funding agencies and industry.

We will develop and track metrics to determine whether we have been successful with these strategic investments. Metrics may include:

- Research revenues
- Numbers and types (pillars or themes) of applications
- Success rates
- New collaborations/groups/teams developed
- New basic/clinical collaborations developed
- Publications (total number; change in number of principal authored publications in peer-reviewed journals) and impact
- Metrics related to students (# grad students, # med/dents undergraduate or postgraduate students engaged in research projects)
Preamble: The research mission of the Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry has been clearly delineated in the document entitled “Shaping the Future of Health Care through excellence in Research. Our Research Mission 2008 – 2012”. In this, Schulich identified 7 areas of research excellence, including biomedical imaging research; cancer; cardiovascular, respiratory health and metabolic diseases; maternal, fetal, child and family health; infection and immunity; musculoskeletal health; and neuroscience and mental health. In addition, seven areas of emerging strength were identified, including aging and geriatric medicine; clinical pharmacology and personalized medicine; environment and health; genomics, proteomics and bioinformatics; health services, delivery and policy; innovative surgical therapies; and population health. The document also speaks to the need to coordinate research space planning across Schulich and the University and its affiliated research institutes, as well as the need to organize new space for Schulich researchers in a thematic manner. Prior to this, the 2006 academic plan described Schulich strategic directions as including “enhancing our research capacity, productivity and impact”.

Embedded within these documents were key action items:

- Increase the number of faculty with external peer review research funding and aim to become one of the top medical and dental schools in the country with most grant funds per capita faculty
- Increase the ratio of PhD to MSc students
- Increase the numbers of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows with external scholarships
- Increase the number of medicine and dental undergraduate students involved in research
- Increase the number of clinician scientists and clinician researchers obtaining external salary and research support
- Ensure that core facilities become financially stable
- Increase interactions and collaborations with partner universities in southwestern Ontario

In the interval since the crafting of this document, the CIHR has published a new strategic plan that focuses on 4 directions: investing in world-class research excellence, addressing health and health system research priorities, accelerating the capture of health and economic benefits of health research; and achieving organizational excellence, foster ethics and demonstrate impact. Research funding to
Schulich has declined in spite of notable exceptions. While this can be argued to reflect the increasingly stringent funding opportunities, it can also be argued that Schulich is ill-positioned to capitalize on its strategic objectives for research or to adapt to the new CIHR mandate.

**Mandate:** In this light, the SSMD Research Task Force will be struck to critically evaluate the infrastructure of SSMD as it relates to the support of research. The Task Force will address the following:

- To critically review the role of the associate Dean Research and determine whether this position would be better served as a Vice-Dean. If so, to define the terms of reference for this position.
- To critically review and make recommendations regarding the organizational scope and priorities of the Research Office.
- To review the funding and mentorship of research-intensive faculty within Schulich with emphasis on both new and mid-career level.
- To critically review the nature of the current status of health research across London, and specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of multiple independent research facilities.
- The Task Force will be expected to provide a blueprint for reorganization of the Research Office and its interactions with Research Western, other faculties at Western, and Lawson with the ultimate aim of improving successes in heath research at Schulich and Western.

**Membership:** The Task Force will consist of representative membership from across the community of London health researchers and will include representation from Education (CERI), Robarts, Lawson, clinical and basic researchers from both Medicine and Dentistry, as well as from key campus partners. As individuals are confirmed for their participation, this list will be forwarded.

The panels will meet biweekly with the intent of producing a “white paper” on the reorganization of the Schulich Research Office by late 2010.

**Team Structure:** Because of the number of individuals to be involved in this process, with relatively short time lines, the membership will be divided into specific working groups.

a) Leadership team: This team will meet biweekly as a coordinating group with representation from each of the working subgroups.

   a. Meetings will take place in Room 3702, Dean’s Conference Room

   b. Meetings will be of one hour duration, commencing Thursday September 16, 0700 hrs

   c. It is anticipated that two smaller groups from the steering committee will make site visits (single day) to comparable Canadian Medical Schools (specifically University of
Alberta (Edmonton); McGill) where existing successful Faculty of Medicine Research Offices have been established. Dr Han’s office will work towards establishing the liaison with his counterpart offices with the anticipation that each site will be visited by a team of 3 individuals, including the SSMD COO (Dwayne Martins).

d. The leadership team will be responsible for drafting the white paper for presentation at SSMD ECSC.

b) Working groups: The working groups (leadership identified) will include Education Research and Training, Basic Science Research, Clinical Science Research, and Health Services & Policy, and Population Health.

c) Each of the working groups will be expected to meet biweekly in order to address the 4 key items delineated in the mandate section, and to do so using a SWOT analysis format. In addition, several issues of importance cut across all the working groups, including Knowledge Translation, Interdisciplinarity and Partnerships, and matters related to Research Ethics Review, and all the groups should address these issues.

Time Line:

a. **3 Sept 2010**: Presentation of terms of reference to ECSC for feedback and further recommendations regarding the scope of the review and committee membership

b. **16 Sept 2010**: Initial meeting of steering committee

c. **Sept – Oct 2010**: Working group deliberations

d. **November 20, 2010**: Single day Retreat (venue to be announced) for all task force members to collate individual working group products into a single document

e. **January 2010**: Presentation of draft white paper to SSMD senior leadership council for review

f. **January 2011**: Presentation of draft paper to ECSC for review

g. **February 2011**: Distribution of draft paper to Task Force members, Schulich Research Committee, and other interested groups for comment
### Appendix 2 – Comparison of Schulich Research with Peer Institutions: Summary of Findings from Site Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Schulich (Current)</th>
<th>University of Alberta</th>
<th>McGill University</th>
<th>McMaster University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Assoc Dean Research 1 Associate Dean Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies 1 Senior Consultant 3 staff</td>
<td>Vice Dean, Research (VDR) 3 ADRs 3 Directors 1 Senior Administrator 4 staff 1 Grant Facilitator (University - located in RSO) 9 staff working in RSO for grant administration</td>
<td>Vice Dean Sciences &amp; Strategic Initiatives 1 Assoc Dean Research 1 Assoc Dean Grad Studies 1 Assoc Dean Faculty Affairs (appts) 4 Managers (Sr. Admin) 6 Staff (4 Research, 2 Grad Studies)</td>
<td>Assoc Dean Research 4 Sr Grants Advisors 1 Grants Specialist 1 Mgr 7 other staff (13 total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is the Research Office of the medical school organized? Organizational chart? Staff and job descriptions?</strong></td>
<td>AD Grad &amp; Postdoc works independently and consults with ADR Senior Consultant works mainly with ADR 1 staff works for both ADs 1 staff works mainly with AD GPS</td>
<td>Directors report to VDR and meet once/wk Research Committee meets twice/month and discuss issues at high level for decisions; adjudicates grants and appointments including CRCs Staff serve ADRs and Directors, report through Senior Administrator</td>
<td>ADRs report to VD and Dean 2 ADs work independently 1 Strategic Grants Officer dedicated to CFI, CRC, FRSQ 1 Sr. Admin Coordinator for Internal Peer Review</td>
<td>ADR reports to Dean; dotted line to VP Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the reporting relationship of the organization?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How has the faculty Research office staff/responsibilities evolved (e.g. bottom-up demand from faculty vs. top-down implementation from university/faculty)?</strong></td>
<td>Has been top-down implementation from faculty</td>
<td>Restructured when the new Dean and the VDR were appointed 1 yr ago. Recommendation from the Task Force and top-down decision.</td>
<td>Restructured after Task Force led by Sandra Crocker 1 yr ago R Quirion appointed to new position created</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Schulich (Current)</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget and Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a separate budget for the Research Office? What is the budget of the Research Office? What is the source of funds for the budget?</td>
<td>Research Office budget covers only staff salary/benefits and operating costs (phone, copier, etc.) All program funds come from the Dean</td>
<td>550K from VPR for administration 700K from Provost for start-ups 1.2M indirect cost transfer from central – used exclusively to support animal facilities (operated by the faculty and not by central) 600K from central as indirect cost from all other grants used for activities including summer studentships, bridge or gap funding, travel and other awards, etc.</td>
<td>No separate budget except for salaries for personnel, stipends for decanal positions Funding for special programs - bridge funding (eJournal Press to track internal peer review) - Personnel awards (bridge for FRSQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the indirect cost of research transferred from central university to your medical school? What is the main use of these funds?</td>
<td>270k in RISF transferred from UWO; used by SSMD for core research facilities</td>
<td>1.2 M transferred from central (total tri-council grants about 200 M); used exclusively for animal facilities</td>
<td>Variable depending on faculty or research institute (23-50%) Research office activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the faculty had the resources to further expand their Research office, what would be their top priorities? How do you set priorities?</td>
<td>Discussions in progress - Research Review Task Force</td>
<td>Priorities – Core facilities (none funded from faculty at present) Grant writing and facilitation Priorities set by the Research Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Schulich (Current)</th>
<th>University of Alberta</th>
<th>McGill University</th>
<th>McMaster University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the Research Office in operating grants and major grants (Team grants, NCEs, CFIs, etc)</td>
<td>Little direct role in the development of grants Approval of operating grants Workshops on grantsmanship Research Western supports major grants</td>
<td>New Director in CIHR Special Projects – responsible for internal peer review RSO assist in major grants Some grant writing support available via freelancers ($200/h); plan to have some support through faculty – first 10 hours to be free, subsequently will be charged $45/hour for grant preparations from the Office.</td>
<td>Strategic Grants Officer for CFI, CRC and FRSQ</td>
<td>4 Grants Advisors for CIHR, Major Projects Faculty of Health Sciences coordinates CIHR Operating grants for all university, not just Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is mentorship organized in your faculty? Is it mandatory?</td>
<td>Mentorship via departments; new SSMD mentorship policy</td>
<td>Mentorship variable among departments, no responsibility from Office of Research. Mentorship not mandatory.</td>
<td>Mentorship not mandatory at present, being discussed as strategic planning</td>
<td>Mentorship not mandatory but encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is internal peer review organized in your faculty? Is it mandatory? Are there incentives for faculty members contributing to internal peer review or mentorship</td>
<td>Varies by department. No mandatory faculty peer review. Incentive: Gap funding contingent on peer review of CIHR application.</td>
<td>In development. New Director position will be responsible. Incentives for internal reviewers with credit towards faculty support towards grant preparation being considered.</td>
<td>Senior Admin Coordinator for IPR, not mandatory but eligible for bridge funding only if demonstrate IPR (tracked with eJournal Press software) Incentives for IPR, mentoring – recognition as service in APR and promotions/tenure</td>
<td>Peer review at department level. Required for new faculty; others are encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is research space allocated in your faculty? Are there guidelines based on performance or funding that are used for space allocation?</td>
<td>Departmental decision; variable guidelines</td>
<td>Being developed based on funding, number of personnel, pillar of research Lots of space available with recent build up of both wet and dry laboratories</td>
<td>Space owned by faculty; allocation using Famis software Space requests in special forms and considered by the Dean</td>
<td>Ad hoc; based on performance/funding or on potential of individual; some flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Schulich (Current)</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the graduate training and postdoctoral fellowships organized and administered in your faculty? How are teaching assistant funds distributed – department or faculty?</td>
<td>AD for Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies responsible for recruitment and organization Council of Graduate Study Program Chairs Teaching assistant funds distributed by departments (2010); may change</td>
<td>ADR for graduate studies; mostly responsible for recruitment and awards Most organization of enrolment and graduation through the Faculty of Graduate Studies Has a Council of Graduate Chairs PDFs not organized by faculty; appointments by departments; able to participate in faculty workshops; no recognition in place</td>
<td>AD for Graduate Studies with 1 Senior Administrator and 2 staff Faculty of Graduate Studies (Marty Kreisworth with 3 Associate Deans – 1 for FOM, Dentistry, Kinesiology and Business) 19 Graduate Programs Responsible for CIP, Summer Research Program (MD/PhD under 2 separate Ass Deans) Funds distributed to Programs</td>
<td>AD Graduate TA/fellowships not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the mid-career level faculty supported?</td>
<td>No program at present except for those hired in tenure-tracked stream</td>
<td>Not addressed at present</td>
<td>FRSQ</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the recruitment of CRCs organized in your faculty? What is the requirement for long term commitment by a department in the consideration of the allocation of a CRC?</td>
<td>CRCs which become available are allocated based on proposals to university SSMD requests CRC proposals from departments and ranks internally</td>
<td>CRCs in Health allocated to faculty CRCs allocated based on 3 yr rolling average of triouncil funding; stays with the faculty Research Committee calls for nominations from departments and adjudicate the nominations</td>
<td>Central allocates CRCs based on triouncil funding Recruitment through Associate Dean Faculty Affairs CRCs only for recruitment until now; retention being considered James McGill Professorship from endowment for retention</td>
<td>Primarily used for recruitment; some use for retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you encourage and facilitate translational research? Health Services and Policy research?</td>
<td>No specific program Health Services and Policy research in development</td>
<td>ADR Clinical Research responsible for clinical and translational research Centre for Health Outcomes Research; new Director recently appointed No funding from Capital Health or AHFMR (in flux) 2 M from ICARE still available for Clinical Research but the strategy still being discussed</td>
<td>No specific program</td>
<td>Clinical depts. encouraged to partner with basic depts. and research institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Schulich (Current)</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you support your core facilities? Animal facilities?</td>
<td>RISF funds used for core facilities ($270k) (prior support via TPC-allocated funding) Animal facilities managed centrally</td>
<td>No support for core facilities from faculty at present. New ADR starting to organize with 2 core facilities (imaging and cell sorting) Animal facilities operated by the faculty; 4 M operating cost; 1.2 M from indirect cost directed towards the animal facilities; animal care cost in the lower end of the scale for all universities; planning to increase per diem rates.</td>
<td>No support for core facilities from faculty, mostly by user fees</td>
<td>REB and animal facilities coordinated by Faculty, not by central university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there supporting mechanisms for faculty members who need bridge or gap funding?</td>
<td>Gap competition – awards range 10-15k. Gap limited to CIHR Operating Grant applications</td>
<td>Bridge or gap funding available; awards currently ~ 20-30K; VDR wishes to increase to 50K; criteria being developed, currently as first come first serve basis; Research Committee adjudicates funding</td>
<td>Bridge funding for 30% or better $35K Require documentation of internal peer review tracked by eJournal Press software</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the reporting relationship with the Dean?</td>
<td>Good; ADR meets regularly with Dean once/2 wks ADR sits on the Faculty Leadership Committee which meets once/2 wks</td>
<td>VDR meets with the Dean 1-3 times/month; VDR is part of the Executive of the Faculty which meets with the Dean once/week; Dean available ad hoc if necessary</td>
<td>ADR a member of senior leadership team which meets twice/wk ADR meets with the Dean once every 2 wks to 1 month</td>
<td>Dean = VP Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship with the central university? Is there a Vice Provost position in your university that serves for all health faculties (Medicine, Dentistry, Health Sciences, Nursing, etc)?</td>
<td>Good working relationship with central university; no regular meetings, held ad hoc No Vice Provost Health</td>
<td>The Dean and VDR meet with VPR once/month No Vice Provost position; Associate VPR is from the Faculty of Medicine and therefore access to VPR is good.</td>
<td>Very good relationship with Associate Vice Principal of Sponsored Research (Sandra Cocker) Internationalization under AVP of Sponsored Research 1 Director for NIH and international agencies</td>
<td>ADR has dotted line to VP Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Schulich (Current)</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you distribute the research support provided by the central university and your office?</td>
<td>Research Western provides grant facilitators who are shared by all faculties.</td>
<td>1 Grant Facilitator from RSO to the faculty with 9 staff for the faculty. 1 Director for CIHR grants and 1 Director to review the grants (not all reviewed; focus on those faculty with not good track record in the past).</td>
<td>60 staff in central research office. Maintains database. Separate arm of sponsored research for CRCs and CFIs.</td>
<td>Fac of Health Sci handles CIHR for all university; in exchange, univ handles NSERC/SSHRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship with other faculties within the university?</td>
<td>Good — interdisciplinary activities encouraged (e.g. CRC recruits, IDIs).</td>
<td>Good; opportunity for interfaculty joint proposals. Interdisciplinary research opportunities within the faculty (basic and clinical).</td>
<td>Good; no official collaborative programs.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship with the hospitals and research institutes? How do you distribute the research support provided by the hospitals and your office?</td>
<td>In progress: new ADR/Vice Dean proposed. Lawson submits own proposals and accounting of research funds.</td>
<td>In progress; new ADR in Clinical Research who is a methodologist; Capital Health has no funding for research.</td>
<td>Complicated relationship with hospitals; each hospital based research institute has separate administrative structure.</td>
<td>All peer review goes through university; all industry goes through hospitals; much coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for the external relationships (not fund raising) in your research office? How is this function distributed within your Research Office with the Dean?</td>
<td>Shared between the Dean and ADR.</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>VD Strategic &amp; Research Initiatives (R Quirion) involved; the Dean is mostly responsible.</td>
<td>AD Research; also Dean and dept chairs; Contacts needs to be coordinated with University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 - Questions posed at Research Retreat, November 20, 2010

Questions on Organizational and Operational Changes
What organizational changes are required to enhance Schulich's research position?

Consider:

1. What changes in organization are required – Decanal team and Research Office Personnel?

2. Budget – How would you allocate to infrastructure and initiatives (guidelines)?

3. How can we use additional resources to best position ourselves to be successful in grant competitions both nationally and internationally? What should be the role of departments vs. the role of Schulich in terms of research facilitation (mentorship, internal peer review, space, core facilities, etc.)?

4. Should Schulich be more aggressive in identifying and supporting the most promising research "stars" and/or areas? What are the resource and focus implications of these changes?

Questions on Attitudinal and/or Cultural Changes
What attitudinal or cultural changes are required to enhance Schulich's research position?

Consider:

1. What changes in incentives or culture are required?

2. What are the cultural implications for Schulich if the faculty becomes more aggressive in identifying and supporting the most promising research "stars" and/or areas?

3. How can Schulich address the translational issues of basic and clinical research, often termed the Valleys of Death by CIHR? (Implicit in this question is what are the processes and requirements to undertake in a meaningful manner the translation from biomedical to clinical and from clinical to population based health and health policy? Can Schulich establish a pre-eminent position in this sphere (pillars 2, 3 and 4?)

4. How can Schulich produce and sustain the next wave of Canadian researchers?

5. What institutional changes can Schulich adopt to become more collaborative? If health research is to be organized in a citywide basis (including Lawson/UWO integration), how can Schulich help to achieve this?
## Appendix 4 – Summary of Proposed Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire Vice Dean Research</td>
<td>Development of Job Description in process</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganize Schulich Research Office</td>
<td>New org chart proposed</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire additional staff for Research Office, including new Grants Facilitators to focus on development of large grants</td>
<td>Development of Job Descriptions initiated</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand support for Gap/bridge funding</td>
<td>Expanded Gap to begin based on results of March 2011 CIHR competition</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand support for core research facilities</td>
<td>Request included in 2011 budget submission</td>
<td>Summer/Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviate inequities in animal cage charges</td>
<td>Request included in 2011 budget submission</td>
<td>Summer/Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake critical study of core research facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall/Winter 2011/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand focus on CIHR pillars 2, 3, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an inventory of Schulich research interests and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a “culture of research” at Schulich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop best practices for mentoring students, trainees, and junior faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin Winter/Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together with postgraduate training programs, increase trainees’ involvement with research during residency</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase mechanisms for recognition of faculty achievement in research</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with partners to incorporate some aspect of research or research-related activity into all faculty role descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5 – Proposed Structure for Schulich Research Office

Chief Operating Officer, SSMD

Vice Dean Research

Assoc Director, Research (PMA)

Senior Consultant, Research 1 (PMA 2011)

Senior Consultant, Research 2 (PMA 2011)

Senior Consultant, Research 3 (PMA 2011)

Research Officer, Robarts * (PMA 2011)

* Dotted line report to Schulich Research

Pgm Manager (student & internal (UWOSO/PMA )

Awards/ Grant Support (PMA 2011/12)

Secretary / Reception (UWOSA position)

Research Advisory Council

Assoc Dean, Grad & Postdoctoral

Graduate Program Coordinator

Additional graduate staff positions under discussion

Additional graduate staff positions under discussion
Appendix 6 – Proposed Job Description for Vice Dean, Research

Note: These are points which will be incorporated into formal position descriptions

Vice Dean, Research

Mandate:
- Provide strategic vision and oversight for research in SSMD
- Serve as liaison and advocate for research with internal (SSMD, other Western faculties, Research Western, Lawson) and external (Province, Ottawa, industry) communities
- Oversee research endeavors within the Dean's Office
- Work closely with Department Chairs, Program Directors, Centre Directors, etc. to foster research
- Engage faculty in new research opportunities
- Build bridges between basic / clinical researchers, disciplines, research pillars, and institutions
- Help foster a commitment to research throughout SSMD, from undergraduate students through to senior faculty
- Work with clinical departments to instill a commitment and support for research, for both faculty and trainees, and remove barriers to expanding research activities
- Assist and advise the Dean on research matters
- Address barriers to research (institutional, etc.)
- Represent SSMD research at a national level

Qualifications:
- Strong research record as evidenced by research funding, awards and publications in high-impact journals
- Track record of leadership in research (e.g. national/international grants panels, editorial boards, leadership role in societies, invitations for speaking, etc.)
- Track record in leadership in innovation, vision, and team-building
- Demonstrated administrative and organizational skills
- Vision for research at SSMD

Time commitment: 80%-100%
Grants Consultant
(aka “Grants Specialist” or “Strategic Grants Officer” or “Research Consultant”. Several positions anticipated)

Qualifications
- Masters degree; PhD degree an asset
- Demonstrated background and/or interest in science and research issues
- Experience in grantsmanship
- Excellent communication and writing skills

Responsibilities
- Identify opportunities for all types of research funding (contract, grant, industry, etc.)
- Ensure Schulich's effective participation in major research funding programs
- Provides expert guidance, problem solving and support to research groups/teams and principal investigators to ensure the strongest possible funding proposals are submitted
- Facilitates and coordinates large grant applications such as CFI or team grants
- Collaborates with researchers to prepare and submit grant applications according to agency requirements and deadlines.
- Works with researchers to prepare budgets for grants.
- Meets with researchers to discuss grant applications, requirements and deadlines
- Edits and critiques funding proposals
- Assists with fostering and instilling excellent grantsmanship skills throughout Schulich