Health Sciences
Academic Structure Initiative
Town Hall

November 15, 2012 at 11:00 a.m.
Frederic Gaspard Theatre, Basic Medical Sciences, Bannatyne Campus
& Senate Chambers, EITC, Fort Garry Campus
Town Hall Purpose

• To present options for consideration, and invite discussion and initial feedback on options.

• To detail proposed next steps regarding consultation and formal proposal development.
Background to Initiative

• Launched by the President in January of 2012.

• Designed to address concerns that complex academic structure is impeding the University’s ability to deliver on its mandate.

• Goal is to develop a plan to create a structure that enhances our academic work and better reflects our size and scope.
Background to Initiative

• Beginning with the health sciences *cluster*, Provost was asked to work with deans/directors to identify options to reduce the number of faculties/schools from 20 to a number closer to the national median of 13 by 2017.

• Health sciences proposal or set of options to be developed for consideration by December of 2012.
Overview of Process and Findings

• Since launch, health sciences deans/directors have engaged in an extensive period of discussion of the benefits and risks of a more integrated structure.

• Benefits and risks considered in light of key emerging trends:
  
  – Increasing emphasis on team-based, multi-and-inter-disciplinary research as signaled by CIHR, CIHI and others.

  – Similar direction in clinical world – focus on inter-disciplinary health care as means to improve quality of care and patient safety.

  – Increasing importance placed on the need for interprofessional education and consistent standards of care by all professional accreditation bodies.
Overview of Process and Findings

• Identified ten thematic areas where greater integration would have clear benefits and established working groups in three of these areas (research; graduate studies; tenure and promotion) to further explore and advise on opportunities and challenges.

• Discussion by deans/directors and thematic working groups was significantly informed and shaped by input and feedback from faculty, staff and students solicited through various venues.

• Also examined the structures of academic health sciences across the country – results showed a variety of structures that are considerably more integrated than at the UM.
Overview of Process and Findings

- Discussion, analysis and work to date point to clear and significant benefits of a more integrated structure:
  - Enhanced collaboration
  - Acceleration of interprofessional health education
  - Enhanced research competitiveness, resulting from a more holistic approach to research planning and development
  - Greater opportunities for innovation in academic program development and community outreach
  - Reduction in the burden of common administrative functions (accreditation, clinical placements)
  - More strategic use of resources (human, physical, financial)
Options for Consideration

• Various options for a more integrated structure that would capture these benefits were discussed and debated.

• Based on discussions as well as feedback received to date, two options are presented for consideration and initial feedback.
Option 1

• Create a new Faculty of Health Sciences by uniting **five** existing faculties (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Human Ecology) and **two** existing schools (Dental Hygiene, Medical Rehabilitation).

• Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, along with Medical Rehabilitation, would be Colleges within the new Faculty of Health Sciences.

• Departments in the Faculty of Human Ecology (Family Social Sciences, Human Nutritional Sciences, Textile Sciences) would become part of the College of Medicine.

• School of Dental Hygiene would be a School within the College of Dentistry.

• Faculty of Kinesiology & Recreation Management would not be part of a new Faculty of Health Sciences and would continue to explore potential opportunities and alignments with other clusters.
Option 1

Faculty of Health Sciences

- College of Dentistry (includes School of Dental Hygiene)
- College of Nursing
- College of Medical Rehabilitation

- College of Medicine (includes Human Ecology Departments)
- College of Pharmacy

Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management
Option 2

• Create a new Faculty of Health Sciences by uniting four existing faculties (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy) and two existing schools (Dental Hygiene, Medical Rehabilitation).

• Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, along with Medical Rehabilitation, would be Colleges within the new Faculty of Health Sciences.

• School of Dental Hygiene would be a School within the College of Dentistry.

• Create a new faculty structured around the concept of ‘healthy living’ by uniting two existing faculties (Kinesiology and Recreation Management, Human Ecology) and explore possible alignment of other University units within this new faculty.
Option 2

- Faculty of Health Sciences
  - College of Dentistry
    - (includes School of Dental Hygiene)
  - College of Medicine
  - College of Nursing
  - College of Pharmacy
  - College of Medical Rehabilitation

- Faculty of ‘Healthy Living’
  - Union of:
    - Human Ecology
    - Kinesiology and Recreation Management
    - Others??
Features of Options

• Creates powerful and unique alliance among the health sciences.

• Provides an opportunity to create a substantial, integrated focus on healthy living by uniting faculties and perhaps other units with a primary focus in this area.

• Both options capture the benefits of a more integrated structure.

• Strong collaboration between Faculties would be a hallmark of either of the options.
Governance and Administration

Faculty of Health Sciences (FHSc)

- Responsible for overall integrated planning (academic, financial capital) and resource allocation.

- Faculty platforms would be developed to foster integrated planning and enhance support in key areas (e.g., research development/services, faculty development and evaluation, capital planning, accreditation).

- Administrative functions would be integrated and coordinated to reduce duplication of effort and make better use of resources (e.g., finance, human resources, IT, marketing and communication).
Governance and Administration

Colleges

• Provide identity to each professional area, especially relating to professional regulatory body requirements and accreditation standards.

• Responsible for development, delivery and administration of degree and diploma programs.

• Are partners in the Faculty’s ongoing mission of interprofessional health sciences education, research and outreach.

• Serve as the face of the professional programs to the community, alumni and professions.
Reporting Structure

• Head of FHSc would report to the Provost and would represent the Faculty and its Colleges on Provost’s Council.

• Head of FHSc would carry the title Dean and Vice-Provost (Health Sciences).

• Current Dean of Medicine would serve as founding Dean and Vice-Provost of FHSc:
  – Pragmatic
  – Consistent with structures elsewhere when Medicine is part of a larger health sciences faculty (e.g., McMaster, Queen’s)
  – Subsequent leadership would be appointed in accordance with University’s policy on Appointment of Deans/Directors of Faculties/Schools (as appropriately revised to reflect presence of Colleges)
Reporting Structure

• Heads of Colleges would report to the Dean and Vice-Provost, FHSc and carry the title of Dean of College ‘X’.

• Heads of Colleges would also carry the title of Vice-Dean of the FHSc:
  – Signals role and responsibilities as member of the Faculty’s leadership team
  – Expected to both lead professional area and contribute to broader vision of the Faculty
  – Would have faculty-wide responsibilities in given areas, in addition to College responsibilities

• Directors of schools within Colleges would report to respective College Dean (e.g., Dental Hygiene).
Related Opportunities

Bachelors of Health Sciences/Health Studies

• Current programs are administered by Human Ecology in partnership with Arts and Science.

• Undersubscribed as not well known; very different than elsewhere where programs are in high demand.

• Significant opportunity to invigorate/further develop these programs through greater participation of health sciences units; strong interest in doing so.
Related Opportunities

Bannatyne Campus

• Relocation of Nursing to Bannatyne would enhance the ability to create and realize a shared vision of FHSc.

• Integrated campus and FHSc planning could address the concerns and needs of the whole of the campus and Faculty; a shared vision that provides integrated services to all students, faculty and staff (e.g. Bistro, improved infrastructure, enhanced student services).

• Opportunities exist to make this a reality, but more planning and work is required.
Related Opportunities

Departmental Structure and Program Offerings

• More integrated faculty structure(s) creates opportunity for comprehensive review of departmental structures.

• Review would provide opportunity to explore new structures that could facilitate academic work (e.g., in the area of public health).
# Proposed Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November, 2012</td>
<td>Options presented to community for comment and reaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2012 to January, 2013</td>
<td>Consultation/discussions within and between the units involved, with faculty, staff and students and an invitation for individual and group feedback, suggestions and commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January to February, 2013</td>
<td>Deans, Directors and Provost consider feedback, suggestions and reactions and draft a formal proposal with respect to structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February to April, 2013</td>
<td>Consideration and discussion by affected Faculty and School Councils, with advice and expressions of support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April to June, 2013</td>
<td>Proposal for structural change, along with advice/commentary from the Faculty/School Councils is submitted to Senate for consideration and recommendation to the Board. This will include review by the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee and Senate Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2013</td>
<td>Recommendation to approve, in principle, and recommend that the Board approve the structural change(s) is considered by Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation for approval, in principle, is considered by the Board of Governors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2013 to June, 2014</td>
<td>Transition and implementation work undertaken, including development and approval of administrative and governance documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2014</td>
<td>New structure officially begins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

• Initial Feedback?

• Slides posted on Provost’s website
  www.umanitoba.ca/admin/vp_academic

• Academic Structure Initiative Website