



Dalla Lana School of Public Health Strategic Planning Exercise Towards 2021 and Beyond

Partnerships, Engagements, and External Relations Sub-Committee Report

SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Natasha Crowcroft co-chair
Fiona Miller co-chair
David Klein
Jennifer Gibson
Greg Marchildon
Heather Manson
Carol Strike
Jeremiah Hwee (Dalla Lana School of Public Health student rep)
Robert Royer (IHPME student rep)
Arun Chockalingam
Julie Foisy/ Ellie Goldenberg (staff)
Christina Lopez (staff)

SUB-COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Building on numerous, diverse and both well-established and relatively novel municipal, provincial, national and international relationships oriented around a vast range of public health topics:

(1) Clarify the range and definition of “partnership” in relation to the general public, general vs specialist training in public health, academic vs non-academic, and the many communications networks available School-wide

(2) Assess opportunities, demands, ways and means to launch new or enhance ongoing significant **initiatives in public health research, training and policy** that have strongest potential to realize strategic goals of multiple partners

(3) Develop a framework, rationale and starting principles for putting in motion a **priority-setting** strategy

(4) To provide advice to the Dalla Lana School faculty on **how to make decisions** about which strategic partnerships and external relations to invest in, and what resources to deploy on what time-frame”



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Preamble

- The PEER sub-committee has provisionally accepted the typology of relationships identified by our name.
- As currently conceived, this typology distinguishes by degree of formality and purposefulness.
 - Institutional partnerships are organization-to-organization relationships. Partnerships involve specific commitments of resources in service of specific and mutually beneficial goals; they may be driven by us or invited by others. Partnerships are typically formalized by agreements..
 - Engagements are collaborative relationships, including with individuals, and are not restricted to specific aims; they may be driven by us invited by others. Engagements may be more or less formal but are ultimately voluntary in nature and defined by shared areas of interest and common goals, i.e., “collaborations”. Engagement requires sustained effort to ensure mutual benefit. Engagements may involve *internal* relationships (among faculty, among students, among staff, and between all of these constituencies) as well as relationships with *external* communities, be these organizations, sub-populations or individuals (e.g., ‘the public’).
 - External relations are relationships of mutual awareness. Good external relations enable us to be knowledgeable and responsive actors. As well, good external relations are a necessary precursor to engagement (e.g., from faculty, students) or partnership.
- As we note below, more work is needed to refine or revise this typology, and develop clear definitions that can be used consistently by all School units.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Strategic Direction One

A. Provide a clear statement of the first suggested strategic direction.

Seek ways to improve the state of our host city-region (Toronto/GTA), including improving health, through pursuing relationships of all sorts, including new and enhanced institutional partnerships, engagements and external relations.

B. Provide clear rationale/statements on the following:

1. What will be the anticipated return / “payoff” / “value” on direction?
(Measured in different ways, likely for various stakeholders)

This is a responsibility of the university as a public institution. As well, moving in this strategic direction is likely to generate benefits for faculty, staff and students, by improving opportunities for research, education and experience-based training, and broader public impact, including through public service. Benefits to positive public profile are harder to quantify, but are seen in the attitudes to institutions such as Ryerson, which has been much stronger historically in giving to the community.

2. Does this direction align with the strategic plans of the University of Toronto, or any of its other faculties, units or partners (alignment is not a requirement; refer to documents on Crush site)?
If yes, please specify how.

Yes, this is a clearly identified priority in President Gertler’s recent “Three Priorities: A Discussion Paper”

3. Alignment with current themes at the School, or its units (direction does not have to align with any current themes) and list any relevant cross-cutting themes that the strategic direction incorporates.

Yes, this aligns with IHPME’s strategic directions with respect to Impact. It also aligns with two of the DLSPH 2012 Strategic Directions: # 3-2 Partner with practitioners, students, policy-makers and community members to facilitate the results of research being applied to practice; and also #4 - Create a collective vision for a shared academic future with the University, community-based affiliates and other public health partners locally and internationally.

4. Outline the implementation resources you imagine would be important/ helpful.
(Implementation does not need to be the focus)

Unsure, but building partnerships is not worthwhile unless sustainable, requires significant consistent dedicated time and may also require dollars to match or stimulate initiatives.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

5. Comment on the risk of the suggested strategic direction

Unsure that there are significant risks aside from the opportunity costs. The risks of not developing such partnerships are evident. It is highly likely that others at the University will pursue them given Prof Gertler's paper, and this is a space that public health should be occupying as a natural home.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Strategic Direction Two

A. Provide a clear statement of the second suggested strategic direction.

We should leverage the opportunities afforded to us by our location within Toronto to become the go-to academic partner and collaborator for studying public health/health system issues and for developing practice-ready approaches to addressing these issues for Ontario. Opportunities arise from the fact that Toronto is the home of the provincial government and major public agencies (Public Health Ontario, Cancer Care Ontario, etc.) that serve as stewards of provincial resources.

B. Provide clear rationale/statements on the following:

1. What will be the anticipated return / “payoff” / “value” on direction?
(Measured in different ways likely for various stakeholders)

This will position the School as a system leader in promoting health in partnership with relevant actors,¹ and generate benefits for faculty and students, by improving opportunities for research, education and experience-based training, and broader public impact, including through public service.

2. Does this direction align with the strategic plans of the University of Toronto, or any of its other faculties, units or partners (alignment is not a requirement; refer to documents on Crush site)?
If yes, please specify how.

Yes, this aligns with President Gertler’s recent “Three Priorities: A Discussion Paper” with respect to contributing to the local community.

3. Alignment with current themes at the School, or its units (direction does not have to align with any current themes) and list any relevant cross-cutting themes that the strategic direction incorporates.

Yes, this aligns with IHPME commitment to Impact. It also aligns with at least three of the DLSPH 2012 Strategic Directions: #2 Lead research innovation in population and public health that answers questions of local, provincial, national and international societal relevance; # 3-2 Partner with practitioners, students, policy-makers and community members to facilitate the results of research being applied to practice; and also #4 - Create a collective vision for a shared academic future with the University, community-based affiliates and other public health partners locally and internationally²

¹ Note: if this strategic direction is proposing a broader provincial reach in general, then we should reach beyond these government agencies and be engaging with LHINs, district/public health units, municipalities, schools, environmental agencies, healthcare organizations, federal/provincial bodies and other agencies across the province.

² It also aligns with early directions in DLSPH on infectious diseases, as well as global health and smart cities



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

4. Outline the implementation resources you imagine would be important/ helpful.
(Implementation does not need to be the focus)

Unsure. Some initiatives might be resource neutral. Others such as building new partnerships will require dedicated funding, faculty and staff time.

5. Comment on the risk of the suggested strategic direction

Unsure. All new partnerships and strategic priorities risk alienating existing partnerships, which could result in the loss of key opportunities for leveraging research as well as teaching and training resources for students.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Strategic Direction Three

A. Provide a clear statement of the third suggested strategic direction.

Seek ways to significantly improve engagement with status only and adjunct faculty, whose roles in education, research and service are of vital importance to the School, and to partnership with collaborating health and health-related institutions

There is a need to ensure mutual benefit in these relationships, such that both the School and these vital collaborators achieve meaningful value. As well, it is important to consider how the organizations at which status only and adjunct faculty work can identify and realize meaningful value.

In aid of this strategic goal, there is a need to work with our collaborators and their home organizations to identify what they want from engagement with the School, and what strategies School units might use to strengthen these relationships (e.g., IHPME partnered positions, student placements). As well, we might develop performance indicators to measure the quality of these relationships.

B. Provide clear rationale/statements on the following:

1. What will be the anticipated return / “payoff” / “value” on direction?
(Measured in different ways likely for various stakeholders)

The value is in ensuring the continued and vital engagement of status only and adjunct faculty, and in retaining the support of their home organizations for these collaborations. The value lies also in avoiding the risk that exists for our all units, and the School as a whole - particularly in the current fiscal climate - that unless we show ourselves to be a beneficial collaborator, we may lose access to this talent.

As well, these relationships provide opportunities for our students to gain experience-based learning opportunities.

2. Does this direction align with the strategic plans of the University of Toronto, or any of its other faculties, units or partners (*alignment is not a requirement; refer to documents on Crush site*)? If yes, please specify how.

Unsure

3. Alignment with current themes at the School, or its units (direction does not have to align with any current themes) and list any relevant cross-cutting themes that the strategic direction incorporates.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Yes, this aligns with IHPME's strategic directions with respect to building partnerships. It also aligns with at least three of the DLSPH 2012 Strategic Directions: #2 Lead research innovation in population and public health that answers questions of local, provincial, national and international societal relevance; # 3-2 Partner with practitioners, students, policy-makers and community members to facilitate the results of research being applied to practice; and also #4 - Create a collective vision for a shared academic future with the University, community-based affiliates and other public health partners locally and internationally

4. Outline the implementation resources you imagine would be important/ helpful.
(Implementation does not need to be the focus)

Unsure, but we anticipate that the resources gained through sustaining and enlarging access to status-only faculty teaching time and their organizations' support and training opportunities for students greatly exceeds any resources that may be invested.

5. Comment on the risk of the suggested strategic direction

Unsure, but the risk of not investing in this area in an increasingly resource constrained environment for the public sector is that organizations pull their staff out of teaching and other contributions to the University.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Strategic Direction Four

A. Provide a clear statement of the fourth suggested strategic direction.

Prioritize relationships locally and globally that can (i) enhance opportunities for students for experience-based learning, user-engaged knowledge production, employment, impact and public service, and (ii) enhance the school's global profile and the impact of its teaching, training, public service and research³

B. Provide clear rationale/statements on the following:

1. What will be the anticipated return / “payoff” / “value” on direction?
(Measured in different ways likely for various stakeholders)

Greater engagement with knowledge users, practitioners, policy makers and related stakeholders can advance student learning, and better prepare students for successful careers. As well, it can help the School to attract excellent candidates and to demonstrate the value and beneficial impacts of our educational programs. Further, many of our partners and collaborators would value greater access to our students.

Since Toronto is the home of people from every part of the world, it thus affords the opportunity to evaluate innovative public health programs and system strategies for global change that could be implemented in other parts of the world, in high, middle or low income settings

2. Does this direction align with the strategic plans of the University of Toronto, or any of its other faculties, units or partners (alignment is not a requirement; refer to documents on Crush site)?
If yes, please specify how.

Yes, this aligns with the direction of President Gertler's recent “Three Priorities: A Discussion Paper”

3. Alignment with current themes at the School, or its units (direction does not have to align with any current themes) and list any relevant cross-cutting themes that the strategic direction incorporates.

Yes, this aligns with IHPME's strategic directions with respect to strengthening our educational offerings. It also aligns with at least three of the DLSPH 2012 Strategic Directions: #2 Lead research innovation in population and public health that answers questions of local, provincial, national and international societal relevance; # 3-2 Partner with practitioners, students, policy-makers and

³ Thought may be needed on how to prioritize partnerships in relation to the overall mission of the DLSPH to improve health



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

community members to facilitate the results of research being applied to practice; and also #4 - Create a collective vision for a shared academic future with the University, community-based affiliates and other public health partners locally and internationally

4. Outline the implementation resources you imagine would be important/ helpful.
(Implementation does not need to be the focus)

We would need to provide dedicated resources to provide these opportunities for students.

5. Comment on the risk of the suggested strategic direction

Unsure



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Strategic Direction Five

A. Provide a clear statement of the fifth suggested strategic direction.

Develop a unified presence for partners so that the school is a single identity for partners, however multi-faceted, through the following activities:

Develop a clear typology of relationships, and a unified approach to partnerships across constituent units of the School – identifying definitions and core principles – admitting that priorities for which partnerships to pursue will not be uniform across units.

As part of this, conduct a mapping exercise, to generate and share knowledge about the nature of our current partnerships.

B. Provide clear rationale/statements on the following:

1. What will be the anticipated return / “payoff” / “value” on direction?
(Measured in different ways likely for various stakeholders)

Such an effort allows the School to communicate more clearly and consistently with current and potential partners and collaborators, and demonstrate the reach of School activities. As well, it facilitates shared knowledge within the School, which may benefit students or faculty with interests in engaging these collaborators, and in turn may aid collaborators to gain more from these relationships. As well, there is a strategic need to avoid confusion where multiple School units have relationships with the same organizations.

2. Does this direction align with the strategic plans of the University of Toronto, or any of its other faculties, units or partners (alignment is not a requirement; refer to documents on Crush site)?
If yes, please specify how.

Unsure

3. Alignment with current themes at the School, or its units (direction does not have to align with any current themes) and list any relevant cross-cutting themes that the strategic direction incorporates.

Yes, this aligns with IHPME’s strategic directions with respect to building our partnerships.

Aligns with DLSPH global health priority.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DALLA LANA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

4. Outline the implementation resources you imagine would be important/ helpful.
(Implementation does not need to be the focus)

Unsure

5. Comment on the risk of the suggested strategic direction

Unsure