**ISAG Report Draft Format**

**O’Brien Institute for Public Health International Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG)**

**Monday, June 17 – Tuesday, June 18, 2019**

We invite you to use the headings on page 2 (adapted from the Institute’s Research Impact Framework) or modify them as you see fit. Each section could include an assessment of progress on previous recommendations along with any new suggestions, gleaned from both the written materials and in-person meetings. Please also consider the questions implied in both documents:

* Now that we have met our early goal of standing among the other six University of Calgary health research institutes, and are well on our way to national recognition, **which *international* public health research organization(s) should we aspire to emulate? Knowing that no one organization is likely to be best in all the areas in which we are interested, what is the particular topic in which you believe this/these organization(s) is world-leading, and what are the characteristics that make them so? (i.e. against what metrics can/should we measure ourselves?)**
* With the goal of standing among international comparators:
  + what should the Institute aspire to in the next 5 – 10 years?
  + what significant (international) opportunities should we aim to compete for or emulate (*eg*. Gates Foundation, MacArthur Foundation 100&Change, Global Burden of Disease project, *etc*) and what strategies are needed for success?
  + what strategies/partnerships might help us develop O’Brien Health International? (along with additional levels of WHO, World Bank, OECD, Global Health initiatives)
* How can the Institute diversify its funding to ensure financial sustainability?
* How best can the Institute manage succession planning for the Scientific Director role?

1. Overview of most notable overall impressions
   1. Overall assessment of:
      1. Leadership
      2. Quality of work
      3. Competitiveness
      4. National impact
      5. Future directions
   2. The Institute supports research in many domains. Can it succeed in this way? Is there a good balance of ‘breadth’ to ensure relevance and ‘focus’ to ensure competitiveness for funding and talent? Given current metrics: where should the Institute focus to improve research performance and impact?
   3. The Institute has numerous programs that have been effective in supporting local and national research. What modifications or additions are required to support members working at an international level?
   4. Is the Institute using resources wisely? Are there better ways to deploy resources? Is the administrative structure appropriate?
   5. Progress since last report
2. Framework of RIA
   1. Resources
      1. Members
      2. Research Environment
      3. Institute Support Team
      4. Institute operating funding
   2. Activities
      1. Knowledge generation
      2. Knowledge Translation
      3. Network Development
      4. Partnership Building
      5. Capacity Building
   3. Institute Products
      1. Increased Knowledge Pool
      2. Empowered Membership
      3. Effective partnerships
      4. Research-to-impact pipeline
   4. Short-Term Outcomes (Institute Mission)
      1. Research excellence
      2. Better informed communities
   5. Long-Term Outcomes (Institute Vision)
      1. Better health
      2. Better health care
   6. What’s ahead
3. Updated SWOT analysis
4. Summary of strategic recommendations