

November 27, 2023

To: UBC Vancouver Senate

From: Gage Averill, Provost and Vice-President Academic, UBC Vancouver

Re: **Annual Report to Senate on External Reviews of Academic Units, 2022-23**

---

**For information:**

We are pleased to submit the following report on UBCV External Reviews that took place in the previous academic year. This report will briefly summarize each review, highlighting the key findings and recommendations and the units' preliminary responses. We are grateful to the Faculties and their internal units for contributing much of the content for this report.

**External Review Summaries:**

**Page:**

• Faculty of Applied Science (October 2022) .....	2
• School of Community and Regional Planning (January 2023) .....	4
• Department of Materials Engineering (October 2022) .....	5
• Department of Mechanical Engineering (October 2022) .....	6
• Department of French, Hispanic & Italian Studies (November 2022) .....	7
• Centre for Disease Control (May 2023) .....	8
• International Collaboration on Repair Discoveries (February 2023) .....	10
• Life Sciences Institute (January 2023) .....	12
• Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy (November 2022) .....	14
• Vancouver Prostate Centre (January 2023) .....	16
• Faculty of Science (April 2023) .....	18
• Department of Botany (April 2023) .....	20
Deferred from previous Report to Senate:	
• Department of Theatre and Film (March 2022) .....	22
• Centre for Applied Ethics (February 2022) .....	23

**Mid-Term Progress Reports on External Reviews 2019-20:**

The following units undertook external reviews in the 2019-2020 year, and thus are at the approximate mid-point between reviews. They have reported to the Provost Office on the status of implementing the recommendations.

- School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
- Department of History
- Allard School of Law
- Faculty of Medicine
- Department of Surgery
- Department of Urologic Sciences
- Human Early Learning Partnership
- Providence Health Care Research Institute
- Equity & Inclusion Office

**Faculty of Applied Science**  
Summary of External Review: October 2022

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *The Faculty is a global leader for education, innovation and research. It has outstanding and dedicated faculty and staff, and high-quality students. The Dean is highly respected and liked.*
- *It is widely viewed as a leader in collaboration with outreach to the community as well as industry.*
- *The attrition of first year engineering students to second year is high. The Faculty has been examining first year student wellbeing and stressors and, as a result, several resources have been developed to assist first-year students.*
- *The Faculty provides a wide range of top-notch undergraduate programs and has one of the largest co-op programs in Canada with an 80% placement rate for engineering students. The demands for the engineering programs are extremely high.*
- *Wellbeing of graduate research students has become a concern, resulting from a reduction in face to face meetings, supervisions, and labs, a challenge that began with the COVID pandemic. Also, there is no required minimum amount for postdoctoral stipends.*
- *The gender diversity of the engineering student population is still challenging, although the percentage of women in graduate programs at Okanagan is well above those in other engineering schools nationwide.*
- *The current budget allocation is not equitable across all units.*
- *The faculty has experienced a tremendous growth in research and doubled its research funding from 2017 to 2021. This is a remarkable achievement unparalleled in other Canadian higher educational institutions, and UBCO has been playing a key role in this.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

- *To address the high attrition of first-year engineering students to second year, consider altering the first-year curricula and pedagogy.*
- *To address demand, we strongly recommend considering a significant increase in the number of seats given to the engineering programs at UBC.*
- *Every possible effort should be made to enhance wellbeing of graduate students and concern about stipend amounts.*
- *To enhance gender diversity and EDI, the Faculty should have more involvement in the central admission process and the process should consider factors other than mark cutoff in evaluating student profiles.*
- *The review committee agrees with the Dean that, as it exists within the Faculty, the current budget allocation model is not equitable. The Faculty should modify the current budget allocation model to enable strategic growth.*
- *Several matters require attention to further integrate the engineering units at Vancouver and the Okanagan.*
- *Despite the successes in research growth, there seem to be untapped opportunities for additional collaborative research initiatives.*

**Faculty Response:**

- *The Faculty is exploring the creation of a new First Year Success Initiative to analyze retention, progression and success of first year undergraduate engineering students. We will review the*

support programs developed at peer institutions to inform the development of an innovative student support program based on best practices.

- The Faculty has developed a Strategic Growth Initiative to increase the number of domestic and international seats and meet the exceptionally high demand for APSC programs. The Faculty is preparing to increase the number of research faculty to fully support the planned student growth. To support student and faculty expansion, the Faculty continues to advocate for a planned new building.
- The Faculty has formed a dedicated working group on graduate student stipends and affordability. In the medium term, the Graduate Advisors Committee will be asked to explore challenges and propose solutions towards stronger engagement between PhD students and their supervisors; graduating within an appropriate timeframe; and students understanding their rights and the processes available to elevate their concerns.
- The Faculty will undertake a review of the admission processes with specific attention to gender bias in admissions and the role of the Faculty.
- The Faculty has established a working group to review the current budget model, develop a detailed understanding of the challenges and inequities, and recommend scenarios for an updated budget model for the Faculty.
- To increase collaboration and partnership between the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses, the Faculty will work to ensure that staff are integrated and provide services across both campuses; explore the logistics/policies that would support cross-appointments; and continue the travel fund to encourage mobility between campuses, with space for visits and collaboration.
- The Faculty has developed a Research Leadership Development Program and invested in our research and partnerships team capacity to support larger scale research proposal development.

**School of Community and Regional Planning**  
**Faculty of Applied Science**  
Summary of External Review: January 2023

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *Positive endorsement of all aspects of the School's work, describing the School as having made "extraordinary progress" and as being "an academically dynamic unit."*
- *A new director was hired; a ten year strategic plan developed and is being implemented; 12 new faculty have been hired. The clarity, boldness and coherence of vision and leadership was noted.*
- *Significant program development and revision has taken place: the accredited Masters of Community and Regional Planning (MCRP) and PhD curricula have been substantially revised; and Provincial approval granted for a new Major in Urban Studies (with Geography).*
- *The Indigenous Community Planning (ICP) concentration (within the MCRP), based on a 13-year partnership with the Musqueam Indian Band, was recognized as of international significance.*
- *Challenges for the school include the disadvantageous tuition allocation model through which SCARP is financed, a governance structure that concentrates responsibility in the position of the director and the disjointed space across two buildings for classrooms, offices and community gathering.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

- *APSC should swiftly implement a more equitable funding allocation model within the Faculty.*
- *Adequate, secure, long-term funding support for the Indigenous Community Planning concentration should be a priority.*
- *SCARP's current funding limits the School's ability to contribute to the Faculty.*
- *Attention should be focused on student experience, which has been impacted by a combination of staff turnover and inadequate student funding.*

**School's Response:**

- The School welcomes the report and the fulsome endorsement of the SCARP Strategic Plan and progress with implementation. The School will maintain the current trajectory and priorities.
- The School will work with the Faculty of Applied Science to review the funding model. Some progress has been made by allowing the School to recruit to a PAEI position.
- Progress is being made, but work still remains, to secure long-term sustainable funding for ICP and compensation for Musqueam.
- The School has recruited for a student-facing staff position and onboarding the new employee is underway.

**Department of Materials Engineering**  
**Faculty of Applied Science**  
Summary of External Review: October 2022

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *Materials Engineering at UBC is a strong, vibrant department with engaged students, staff and faculty.*
- *The research enterprise of the Department ranks among the very best in Canada.*
- *Graduate students generally feel happy and supported by their supervisors and the Department.*
- *Undergraduate students were generally positive about the Materials Engineering program.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

- *Additional delegation of responsibilities is needed to assist the Head with their workload, provide opportunities for development of junior faculty members and for succession planning.*
- *Implement a mentoring program for tenure-track Educational Leadership faculty.*
- *Address the concerns centered around the community and social aspects raised by the Graduate Students.*
- *The undergraduate education curriculum should be reviewed and revised to reflect the breadth of Materials expertise within the Department, to emphasize sustainability, and to increase flexibility in choice of elective courses.*

**Department's Response:**

- Since the review, the Department has appointed two Associate Heads to assist with providing overall leadership to the Graduate and Undergraduate programs.
- The Department agrees with the importance of providing mentorship opportunities for EL faculty and anticipates that a formal mentoring program can be established in the near future as more EL faculty members are promoted in the coming years. In the meantime, the Department Head has purposefully made connections for new faculty members with more senior colleagues outside of the Department and will continue to look for mentoring opportunities where possible.
- For the Graduate students, the Department has recognized that activities and connections across the research groups seem to have been lost and is working to renew these connections.
- A recent revision of the undergraduate curriculum implemented in the last academic year is addressing this recommendation. Further revisions are being considered.

**Department of Mechanical Engineering**  
**Faculty of Applied Science**  
Summary of External Review: October 2022

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *The state of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at UBC is strong.*
- *The Department has an enviable undergraduate program, healthy graduate programs and excellent instructional laboratories.*
- *The Department has a culture of collegiality, transparency and democratic governance, with some progress being made in terms of equity, diversity, inclusion and Indigeneity.*
- *The Department is well managed by a popular Head, and excellent staff who are highly appreciated by the faculty and students.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

- *Undertake a phased approach to meeting department space needs.*
- *Capitalize on opportunities for revenue growth and resource optimization*
- *Enhance the MECH student experience, especially for graduate students.*
- *Improve departmental governance, culture, equity, diversity and Indigeneity.*
- *Excel in recruitment and retention.*

**Department's Response:**

- The Department will advocate for a faculty-wide space audit and re-purposing of under-utilized classrooms as dedicated study spaces for students and as meeting rooms. The Department will also advocate for access to shared facilities, in the yet to be built Applied One as well as work towards ensuring the Department has a “centralized” home to bring people together.
- The Department will review the professional Masters programs, strengthen connections to UBCO and other units in UBCV and strengthen research activities, by building on areas of existing strength and emerging fields.
- The Department will create an infographic to support and guide students, identify and promote the Graduate Pathways to Success offerings at G +PS, and continue to sponsor activities to create community among the students beyond their labs.
- The Department will improve communication of decisions, assess the Department's staff structure to identify areas of improvement, and establish key performance indicators and actual targets to achieve equity and cultivate an entrepreneurial culture. Indigenization is being included in the MECH 400 course.
- The Department is actively working on succession plans for staff and will develop guiding principles on how to react to opportunistic openings.

**Department of French, Hispanic, & Italian Studies**  
**Faculty of Arts**

Summary of External Review: November 2022

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *The Department has made impressive achievements in:*
  - 1) *Overcoming long-standing challenges in integrating different programs through the development of Romance Studies.*
  - 2) *Maintaining a high quality of undergraduate teaching and pedagogical strategies.*
  - 3) *Excellent supervision and mentorship of graduate students.*
  - 4) *High quality of faculty research output and Tri-Council research awards.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

- *Curriculum review to better integrate French, Hispanic, and Italian Studies and to provide students with a more coherent curriculum.*
- *Introduce new ways of expanding the Romance Studies Program to include language and culture; Introduce a Major in Italian Studies.*
- *Re-evaluating administrative workload, particularly for junior faculty.*
- *Greater funding for graduate students that is in better parity with other Humanities units at UBC and does not rely so heavily on TA assignments; increased clarity in communicating graduate funding packages to incoming students, particularly around TA allocations and responsibilities.*

**Department's Response:**

- Complete curriculum renewal of Spanish and reinstate a Major in Italian Studies; Implement hybrid language courses; Expand course offerings in Romance Studies.
- Strengthen the Department's commitment to engage concretely with UBC's Indigenous Strategic Plan.
- Continue to advocate for more competitive graduate funding to attract top students; examine the possibility of offering a co-op program for PhD students.
- Conduct a comprehensive workload assessment to determine the current distribution of tasks, responsibilities, and expectations among faculty and staff.

**Faculty Response:**

- The Department Head and members of the executive have already met with the Dean of Arts and the Acting Associate Dean of Equity, Innovation and Strategy to discuss approaches to Faculty succession planning, curriculum innovations, and balancing workload.
- The Department might work with the Associate Dean of Equity, Innovation, and Strategy on the Indigenous Strategic Plan self-assessment and implementation.
- The Faculty can work with the Department to advocate for more graduate student funding, TA allocations, and on a prospective co-op program for PhD students.

**Centre for Disease Control  
Faculty of Medicine**  
Summary of External Review: May 2023

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *“Our overall assessment is that UBC CDC is highly research productive. We would judge most of its research outputs to be nationally leading, with a subset being internationally leading. Staff and student morale appear to be generally high, despite the challenges and work pressure imposed by the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic”.*
- *Reviewers noted that relationships with UBC could be clearer and that we should boost engagement of UBC CDC staff and students with departments and schools. They also noted that while we benefit from being lodged within PHSA, projects and grants managed by the health authority are not as easy to track as those based in UBC accounts and systems. They noted that almost all the funding for scientists and faculty at UBCCDC comes from PHSA, that scientists so funded have little room for career advancement and that clinicians have no formal protected time. They urged further evolution of our strategic planning approach and ongoing efforts to involve Indigenous perspectives.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee and Relevant Responses:**

1. *Opportunities for UBC CDC researchers and students to interact with colleagues in UBC Faculty of Medicine departments should be improved. This is particularly important for early-career researchers, who will benefit the most from the wider academic stimulus provided by engagement with the university departments.*
8. *PHSA: Career progression and salary enhancement opportunities for highly research productive BCCDC scientists employed by PHSA are limited, with most emphasis being placed on rewarding management responsibilities and service delivery.*
10. *UBC: As far as we could determine, very few UBC CDC faculty (i.e. assistant professor and above) are UBC-funded, or funded by external research fellowships (such as Canada Research Chairs). The large majority are either PHSA-funded via UBC or have adjunct appointments with UBC. While we understand the financial model of UBC FoM, we feel UBC needs to invest in new substantive academic appointments based at UBC CDC. This is required for UBC CDC to increase its proportion of internationally-leading research, to increase the interaction between UBC CDC and UBC FoM, and to secure leadership succession planning.*
4. *An integrated budget also showing PHSA- and UBC- held annual research spend (as compared with total grant award amounts) and staffing costs (broken down by academic, research and service percentage contributions) would give a much clearer picture of the scale and competitiveness of activity. Routinely generating such integrated financial summaries should also help in overall UBC CDC planning and management.*
5. *There would be benefits to a more formalized approach to strategy development, backed by governance and management structures which allow for strategy to inform future investment. If the goal is for UBC CDC to be world-leading in its research outputs then we note that focus is essential – choosing what areas not to pursue is as important as identifying priorities.*



12. *We recommend that dedicated funding tracks should be considered to enhance research addressing the public health needs of Indigenous communities, with Indigenous involvement in research initiatives. We would also recommend that UBC CDC develops a strategy for research actively involving Indigenous groups, with clear priorities and measurable performance goals and indicators.*

**Centre's Response to the Key Recommendations:**

Response to recommendation 1: We are pleased to encourage faculty members and students to attend core meetings and academic activities of their home department or school. We will charge our existing student engagement committee with the additional goal of engagement within the Faculty of Medicine. We will look to initiate regular meetings (twice yearly) with the leadership of key departments and schools to set goals and gauge progress.

Response to recommendation 8: Along with other research institutions at PHSA, we are actively reviewing scientist classifications with a view to rewarding research excellence and creating opportunities for career progression. Further, we need to make sure that scientists have administrative and operational support to facilitate success.

Response to recommendation 10: While we're aware of constraints to the Faculty budget, we are happy to work closely with the Dean's office and the School of Population and Public Health to define future hires that can build on our existing potential and assure succession of leadership. The faculty, its departments and schools benefit from a great deal of research activity and teaching from PHSA-funded faculty, and some reciprocity would help keep the effort sustainable. It may also be possible for UBC to help in terms of infrastructure. Our laboratory-based researchers have insufficient research space at present and could benefit from collaborative planning with UBC toward more research space.

Response to recommendation 4: We are confident that we can account for UBC-held funds. The challenge is the parallel tracking of grants and contracts awarded to PHSA/BCCDC as entities like the Federal Government often prefer to contract directly with the health authority. We launched a project earlier this year with BCCDC Operations. This should enable better explanation of the full scope of research funding but also clearer accountability on spend over time for accounts at PHSA.

Response to recommendation 5: We agree that articulation of research strategy is important. To date, we have done so by integrating strategic planning of research with strategic planning for our overall public health care mission, in the spirit of "Research is Care" and have benefited from advice from our External Research Advisory Committee. Moving forward, we can articulate a more focused research strategy by addressing priority actions that facilitate excellence across key domains.

Response to recommendation 12: While BCCDC is not a research funder, we have a moral imperative, professional duty, and legal obligation to redress the harms of the colonial system, particularly as it relates to the centre. PHSA's Mandate Letter states that advancing reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples is a priority. Our full response outlines initiatives positioning BCCDC with this recommendation and describes BCCDC research projects led or co-led by Indigenous people. We will play an active role in growing those described activities, becoming a welcoming and safe home for more Indigenous trainees and lifting up Indigenous researchers to leadership positions. We will make it a priority to engage with UBC, the BCCDC Foundation and other funding agencies around creating dedicated lines of funding.

**International Collaboration on Repair Discoveries**  
**Faculty of Medicine**  
Summary of External Review: February 2023

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *ICORD is an outstanding multidisciplinary spinal cord injury (SCI)-focused unit with high productivity and strong international impact, as evidenced by consistent metrics. Together with partners such as Praxis, it has major impacts on the SCI field.*
- *ICORD continues to be a world-leading center for research in SCI. The review team believes there is a need for more granular mission planning and that there has been a significant dilution of the original focus on repair discoveries. Many entities are involved in understanding the interrelationships of ICORD: FOM, BCIP, VCHRI, RHF, and Praxis. However, understanding how they interconnect and influence strategic planning is a challenge.*
- *It does not seem that ICORD has yet translated many repair discoveries, although the contributions to significant themes in repair biology have been substantial. The new BME faculty materials scientist and cell biology recruits may help discover translatable therapeutics. A limited involvement of ICORD investigators in single-site or multisite randomized placebo control trials to bring therapies to the clinic was noted.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

*Recommendation 4: Take an ICORD therapeutic repair-restoration program from pre-clinical testing to clinical trial testing in the next five years. In the process, create a translation team that includes preclinical researchers guided by the requirements of regulatory cGMP and scale-up issues. Involve the appropriate clinicians and have weekly meetings throughout the translation time frame. Plan for suitable outcome measures at Phases 1 and 2 and envision how a larger-scale clinical trial could be configured and funded. Also, include significant rehabilitative components and neurophysiological endpoints if suitable.*

*Recommendation 5: Retain and strengthen the core repair (hard science) mission of ICORD and creatively facilitate the translation of discoveries.*

*Recommendation 9: Broaden the Neuroscience specific focus. Create a more extensive interaction with the Center for Brain Health and foster collaboration around relevant pathomechanisms across neurological problems.*

*Recommendation 11: Space. Relocate Digital Emergency Medicine to the sixth floor to reduce 3rd Floor congestion and interference with SCI clinical research. Devote the remainder of 6th floor space for ICORD use.*

*Recommendation 19: Strengthen the engagement of ICORD with public and private sectors, including partnerships with industry for commercialization and implementation of preclinical discoveries into observational and randomized clinical trials.*

*Recommendation 22: Can UBC increase the support of ICORD administration and office support? For example, a Grant Facilitator position has been lost at ICORD, which raises concerns with multicenter application production that is needed to target large-scale external funding. Is there VCH support for Blusson maintenance? RHF supports some administrative team members, and their funding is up to renewal. Overall, external funding is a concern for sustainable administrative positions at ICORD.*

## **Response to the Key Recommendations:**

Response to recommendation 4: The reviewers recommend to “Take an ICORD therapeutic repair-restoration program from pre-clinical testing to clinical trial testing in the next 5 years.” What follows in the report can only be interpreted as an example what the MIAMI project did in the case of their Schwann cell trial (cGMP ect.) – which was a good lesson to the research world how involved a cell trial is from the regulatory perspectives. We do not agree that a cell transplantation program is the (only) route to repair. The inclusion of “significant rehabilitative components and neurophysiological endpoints if suitable” is certainly a good suggestion and circles back to 1b above (a PT-PhD in neuromodulation).

Response to recommendation 5: “Retain and strengthen the core repair (hard science) mission of ICORD” ... We like to be more careful with the language in this recommendation (“hard science”) it could create unnecessary schisms. Yet, we generally do not disagree that the core repair mission should be strengthened whereby the repair definition should not be as narrow as expressed under 4 (GMP, cells). Our participation in large consortium grant initiatives is only one testimony of our commitment to repair (DARPA, NFRF). Future strategic discussion will continue to take these considerations into consideration.

Response to recommendation 9: “Broaden the Neuroscience specific focus.”... “Create more interactions with the DMCBH” We appreciate that comment and agree that this area could and should be expanded on; however the limited time during the interviews and limited space in our self-report did not provide much detail here for the benefit of the reviewers’ understanding of the collaborations under way.

Response to recommendation 11: “Relocate Digital Medicine to the 6th floor.” We have repeatedly requested such a move to accommodate our expanding clinical programs on floor 3 which has the ramp, as an emergency egress, an important feature as elevators can’t be used in cases of emergency and often break down.

Response to recommendation 19: “Strengthen the engagement of ICORD with public and private sectors, including partnerships with industry for commercialization and implementation of preclinical discoveries to observational and randomized clinical trials.” We agree that this an area for further expansion of what is currently ongoing in this direction (neuromodulation, NIRS monitoring, wheelchair and exercise machine designs, wound healing etc.). It is though hugely resource demanding and therefore needs to be on a case-by-case basis as the opportunities arise. Partnering with Praxis in its accelerate/incubate program is ongoing.

Response to recommendation 22: “ensure the Departmental positions of retiring ICORD PIs are not lost.” While ICORD is not in control of faculty positions (which as such no longer exist), we have been actively pursuing this issue in the past by joining forces with the Departments in Faculty Renewal Program applications. We have also been attracting new members in established positions to become members in ICORD. The renewal of our two (part-time) Zoology positions will be challenging as Zoology sees little value in supporting faculty in a Centre that was moved from Science to Medicine.

**Life Sciences Institute  
Faculty of Medicine**

Summary of External Review: January 2023

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *The LSI was founded in 2005 with a mandate to support globally competitive biological research, and is the largest Institute dedicated to fundamental life sciences research in Canada.*
- *The LSI's interdisciplinary environment is home to ~90 PIs from 13 departments (primarily FoM, FoS), and provides operational support and professionally run core facilities.*
- *The most significant challenge highlighted in the last external review was the need to decide if the LSI should be more than the 'sum of its parts', with its own scientific mission and identity. LSI's size and scope provide unique opportunities to create a world-leading life sciences research enterprise, which most stakeholders agree should be the goal.*
- *Key developments over the past five years include recruitment of Josef Penninger as Director in 2018. After bringing then Deputy Director Jim Johnson on board in 2021, this leadership team made significant progress in attracting new resources to the Institute and in generating excitement around a unifying vision. Progress includes: 1) developing a strategic plan; 2) expanding core facilities; 3) reorganizing into research focus teams emphasizing high impact problems and disease relevance; 4) creating the Biological Resilience Initiative (BRI), a unifying theme used to become a UBC GREx Institute; 5) securing the commitment of 6 new faculty positions and other resources.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee** (recommendations addressed together are grouped):

- *1, 5, 6, 10, 15. That LSI build upon the Biological Resilience Initiative, leveraging additional funds through new collaborations, engagement of the private sector and philanthropic sources. That the University establishes and supports a higher profile for LSI to assist in awareness throughout the UBC community, including...provincial health authority institutions...hospital research centres, Academy of Translational Medicine...many unexploited synergies. That LSI faculty be invited to present to donors, to work with the advancement office to increase understanding of the work of the LSI.*
- *2, 3, 4. That clearer governance be established. A new governance model be explored similar to the School of Biomedical Engineering that provides a sustainable funding stream. That LSI leadership be given greater exposure to the Faculty and University leadership and advancement opportunities.*
- *7, 12. That LSI leadership be allocated proportional CFI application envelopes relative to Tri-Council share. Investment in grant preparation has been highly successful and should be expanded. Diversification of grant funding is encouraged...Collaborative studies between faculty members is ripe for doubling.*
- *8. That UBC review how LSI facilities fit into the overall University maintenance plan...before failures occur.*
- *9. That LSI negotiate with the Faculties of Science and Medicine for additional funding to subsidize extra-LSI users of the core facilities...departments should recognize the support their own faculty are enjoying.*
- *11. Access to tissues and tumour banks should be encouraged within the UBC system along with simplification of Material Transfer Agreements, ethical consent and data exchange.*
- *13, 14. Although most recruitment falls to the departments, it is important to ensure LSI representation on search committees. The overall environment for research at LSI is excellent but due to the nature of appointments and lack of resources, the LSI plays second fiddle to the departments. This could be rectified by at least doubling the central support budget which would benefit all faculty, staff and trainees.*

- 16. *Formal recognition of the roles of the LSI and the constituent departments with respect to trainee support should be established...potential roles for the LSI in technology training, interdisciplinary research and community and career building that no single department could achieve.*
- 17, 18. *Establish a trainee exchange or visiting fellow program [for] other campuses and afford access and training to technologies available at LSI...given significant the Indigenous population at the Northern BC campus [this would] greatly increase opportunities for Indigenous trainees. Establish new opportunities for Indigenous scholars and build relationships with researchers, especially in Northern BC but also in other areas, to directly encourage inclusion and participation of Indigenous and underrepresented populations in activities at LSI. To act and not rest upon the intent to increase diversity.*

### **Response to the Key Recommendations:**

- 1, 5, 6, 10, 15. The BRI created an overarching vision for LSI research that is inclusive of all members, provides a “face” to the LSI, and has potential to nucleate this key topic within UBC and beyond. To fully leverage the potential of this initiative we need significantly more funding and increased profile. Fundraising efforts around Research Focus Teams are underway but will require more support from UBC’s fundraising apparatus.
- 2, 3, 4. It is critical that LSI leadership sit at the tables that matter to be able to control its own fate. We would like more frequent touchpoints with FoM, FoS, and UBC upper admin. The proposal to explore that the Biological Resilience Initiative (and parts of LSI) become a School is indeed very interesting because it allows such independence and control of its own fate within the current structures of UBC. Therefore, the School idea should be seriously advanced.
- 7, 12. LSI researchers bring in ~\$40 M/year and ~\$ 10 M/year in tri-council overheads, very little of which reaches the LSI. Receiving 50% of the Tri-Council share would finance most cores/initiatives, and allow LSI leadership to execute on the strategic plan. The envisioned Research Focus Teams are in part built to explore and expand into other resources. We are building in this area but need more financial support.
- 8. This is critical, as the building is getting old and needs new IT infrastructure, cooling/heating, etc.
- 9. The new LSI cores have democratized access to technologies that many PIs, especially ECRs, otherwise could not afford. Core facilities increase efficiency, prevent waste, and build community.
- 11. We agree. We have been doing this, but this could be markedly improved, in particular MTAs, ethics etc. which would promote interactions.
- 13, 14. We agree, LSI should not be just a real estate provider but actively involved in hiring. LSI has engaged Departments for the six BRI positions. This can be only solved if UBC leadership steps in, re-allocates tri-council overheads to LSI, and gives LSI leadership real powers in hiring, fundraising, etc. as was initially envisioned when LSI was created.
- 16. We agree. The cores can be used for training and community building that transcends departments. Career development workshops, grants/writing support, job fairs etc should be expanded. LSI could also lead in advancing the postdoctoral community. Student communities are already well integrated in the departments and there is no need to create parallel structures.
- 17, 18. Establishing new cores created an opportunity to develop such programs, increase awareness and reach out to other UBC campuses and Indigenous trainees. By design, our BRI GREx has potential to directly encourage inclusion and participation of Indigenous and underrepresented groups in LSI activities. This initiative was never properly executed because of inadequate funding but needs to be prioritized.

**Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy**  
**Faculty of Medicine**  
Summary of External Review: November 2022

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *Since the last review, the team was impressed with advances and found all recommendations were addressed including:*
  - *addition of domestic and international seats, with associated faculty positions*
  - *strong relationships between the Department leadership and the Dean's office*
  - *strides in research mission and poised to meet its goals including a focus on partnerships*
  - *clinical community pleased with outreach activities and linkages with outside agencies*
  - *administrative staff are a well-functioning cohesiveness group*
  - *search for new department leadership; led to a strong, talented leader being hired*
- *The Department has built a strong international reputation in education and research.*
- *Current Department Head has a succession plan to mentor the next Department Head.*
- *OSOT is a thriving, forward-thinking unit with an outcome-focused strategic plan in alignment with the Faculty of Medicine (FOM) and UBC goals.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

2. *Establish an Associate Department Head role for the implementation, ongoing coordination, evaluation, and periodic accreditation of the distributed sites.*
3. *Build an evaluation plan in the short term that supports a responsive quality improvement process and in the longer term specific to the distributed learning model.*
4. *To support expansion, establish a plan to recruit sufficient fieldwork sites that considers incentives (supervisor remuneration), practitioners' wellbeing and strengthened funding for rural fieldwork.*
8. *To build on the successes of creating a JEDI culture (in admissions, faculty and staff hires; in transforming curriculum content), measure the impact in advancing teaching and learning.*
10. *Establish a strategy to support team cohesion across sites, build collaborations that support team effectiveness and a sense of belonging.*
11. *A review of space needs on the Vancouver campus including lecture hall to accommodate 150.*

**Response to the Key Recommendations:**

2. We agree that an *Associate Head, Expansion* is essential and is being recruited. This role will support accreditation of distributed sites; updating operational and academic policies, committee structure, organizational charts, program evaluation etc to include distributed sites; revising faculty workload guidelines; and 'listen and learn' together to address issues/develop solutions with distributed sites.
3. A *formative and summative evaluation plan* for our North sites began prior to the external review and was augmented in the months that followed the external reviews to May 2023.
  - In Spring 2022, implemented a multi-stakeholder formative and summative program evaluation that over 14 months had 12 evaluation points, including a valued pilot test in June 2022 with six

Vancouver students moving to the North for three weeks to test classrooms, labs and new conferencing technology. We then conducted a faculty survey focusing on preparation and perceptions of distributed teaching. We did mid-term surveys, informal discussions, end-of-term townhalls, and instructor reflections – all for “just-in-time” information. Collated data was presented back to faculty and students with an action plan for improvement.

- Formative touch-points will continue in 2023-2024.
  - Summative evaluation (course/SGT evaluations, National OT Certification Exam, and employer surveys, etc) as described in the MOT Program Evaluation Plan will continue.
4. In the last 5-7 years we had, on average, 60 offers of *fieldwork* not needed by UBC students. These were most often in non-urban locations. With expansion, however, these placements will be used by the UBC class and further placements will be required. The issue of:
- payment and other incentives for clinical educators will require a collaborative approach that includes the Dean’s Office, Ministry of Health, AVED, practitioners & UBC health professions.
  - funding for required rural fieldwork to support the often prohibitive costs, is now appearing in budgets. We have funding for 16 rural placements. However, we need to defray the cost of fieldwork for 64 such placements annually.
8. OSOT faculty have a strong value for inclusion that is reflected in the MOT curriculum and our research for many years. We are proud of this. Future actions include working with our EDI committee to develop a systematic approach and evaluation plan of JEDI initiatives.
10. We began hiring new faculty & staff in 2021 for the North. To *support team cohesion*, they came to Vancouver 1-2 times/month to shadow the curriculum and participate in lecturers, lab classes, experiential learning activities, and grading calibrations; and to participate in onboarding meetings where they met department staff, faculty and leadership, identify and met mentors, and participated in monthly Department Executive Council meetings, annual curriculum retreat, admissions interviews and work of committees. To understand cohesion and belonging among MOT students in Vancouver and North, we conducted a survey, 9 weeks (Nov 2022) into the launch of the MOT program in the North. Survey responses showed 86% of students felt a sense of belonging; 96% felt they had a community of peers to support their learning; and 94% felt they had support of the faculty. There was no difference between Vancouver & North. Overall, these data suggested a positive sense of belonging and support among students. Maintaining this will require attention and will include: further entrenching OSOT principles to enhance belonging and engagement of students, faculty and staff; and encourage engagement of representatives from all sites to participate in the OT Student Society, on OSOT committees, in departmental initiatives, and events.
11. Our *current space* on the UBC Point Grey campus in Vancouver is at capacity, limiting education and research goals. The need for a 150-person lecture theatre has been discussed with the FOM Director of Facilities. Developing this space is one piece of the plan that is in-keeping with supporting collaboration and a sense of belonging across sites.

**Vancouver Prostate Centre**  
**Faculty of Medicine**  
Summary of External Review: January 2023

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *The VPC has been extraordinarily successful as an internationally recognized translational research center as evidenced by impactful publications, peer-reviewed grants, and drug development. It has grown to over 200 researchers and staff members and serves as a rich training program for the next generation of prostate cancer researchers.*
- *With UBC tech transfer support, VPC investigators have been able to translate novel scientific discoveries directly to the clinic.*
- *The VPC mission aligns with the strategic plans of the Faculty of Medicine at UBC and its four pillars of education, research, organization, and partnership.*
- *While highly focused on prostate cancer, the VPC started to encompass other disciplines and has a new strategic initiative to expand into an Institute of Urologic Sciences.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

*Recommendation 1: Renewal of Director. This is a critical time for the Center as it embarks on a large campaign and plans for a possible transition towards an Institute, strongly built upon the current Director's vision and leadership as well as close relationships within the broader UBC/VCH network. Therefore, the Committee recommends renewal of Dr. Gleave for another term (or until a succession is planned) with a runway to enable close mentorship and successful transition of leadership. This succession plan should be developed within the next 2-3 years to ensure effective and timely replacement director(s) by the end of term.*

*Recommendation 2: Update Governance Structure. The Center has experienced rapid growth now with over 200 researchers and support staff. The Committee suggests formulation of an updated governance structure potentially with broader delegation of duties, such as additional roles to foster engagement and communication across the Center and with other stakeholders. This could include, for instance, an Associate Director of Faculty Development, Lab Operations Committee, and other positions or intermediate committees that report directly to the EC. In addition, the EC could be expanded to include early career researchers and include operations staff. This should assist in effective communication, both top-down and bottom-up. It will also potentially improve career development for some and give an opportunity to demonstrate better representation of women and minorities on these structures. UBC/VHRI members could also serve on the VPC advisory board to enhance communication and transparency as the center grows.*

*Recommendation 3: Faculty Development. Given the overall productivity of the VPC and its growth as a translational research center within UBC, the Committee recommends an evaluation of metrics that could facilitate the recognition and position of faculty within UBC and potentially increase the number of funded faculty through a fair and equitable process. This has improved with more F-slots and two CRC chairs since the last review, which enhanced morale and increased UBC presence in the center. Regardless of type of appointment (e.g., tenure, grant funded, partner), there should be a more formalized mentoring program so that all faculty members are aware of requirements for promotion and what steps are needed. For non-clinical faculty members (including partners), mentoring committees could have representation from other departments at UBC that could help identify opportunities such as teaching that are needed for promotion.*



*Recommendation 4: Critical Assessment of Current and Future Space Needs. The current Center is physically at maximum capacity and requires additional space and renovations. This was a consistent issue brought up by faculty, trainees, and staff members. Resources should be identified in collaboration with VCHRI and UBC to optimize utilization of current space and identify new space opportunities in geographic proximity, as this will become even more of an issue as VPC seeks to expand.*

**Response to the Key Recommendations:**

Response to recommendation 1: I agree with the reviewers that succession planning is a key focus for the next 5 years as the Centre potentially evolves into an Institute of Urologic Sciences. This has been a major focus of the Executive. A successful CERC recruitment to fulfill this role did not turn out to be long term. Instead, we evolved our management structure as discussed under Recommendation 2 below. Going forward, our focus will be on identifying Co-Directors of laboratory and clinical research to share this leadership role. Formalization of plans for succession have been developed within the next two years and implemented within three years.

Response to recommendation 2: The VPC has evolved its governance structure over the past decade, from a three Co-Director leadership structure into a more corporate model, required and shaped by the CECR funding at VPC, with a single Executive Director supported by an executive committee of five scientists representing the cores of the Centre, along with a COO and CFO. This has worked well. The review committee does raise relevant suggestions to improve access of all members to leadership as the VPC has grown, and we agree that additional committees can be formed to broaden faculty and leadership development.

Response to recommendation 3: The review committee identifies a high per scientist grant funding, patent production, and publication output at the VPC. They highlight a discrepancy between this input, output and impact by VPC scientists and UBC-funded scientist salary support. This has been somewhat addressed with two recent CRC recruits and a clinician scientist funded position. However, the numbers of UBC supported scientists and clinician scientists continue to be low and disproportionate to the input/output/impact of the Centre. I look forward to working with UBC FoM to continue to track these metrics and look for opportunities to address these inequities. The review committee recommends a formalized mentoring program so that all faculty members are aware of requirements for promotion. There is an established mentoring program within the VPC and DUS, including a research advisory committee, which helps with both mentoring and selection of research opportunities for graduate, post-graduate, and post doctoral trainees. I will highlight the P&T process for early career faculty for inclusion within this committee.

Response to recommendation 4: The review committee highlights that the current Center is physically at maximum capacity and requires additional space and renovations. Resources should be identified in collaboration with VCHRI and UBC to optimize utilization of current space and identify new space opportunities in geographic proximity, as this will become even more of an issue as VPC seeks to expand. The leadership of VPC recognizes that space constraints are a barrier to ongoing growth and research productivity. The current space has been expanded in the past because of significant CFI awards and we have worked with leadership within the Faculty of Medicine (FoM) to look at ongoing expansion into dry lab space within the Robert Ho Research Centre to help support our growing computational needs. The leadership of VPC continues to look forward to working with the FoM in this regard.

## Faculty of Science

Summary of External Review: April 2023

### **Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *The Faculty is a large and multi-faceted organization that collaborates well with other Faculties. The Associate and Assistant Deans work well with the Dean and are appropriate in number to the size and complexity of the Faculty, in addition to being gender diverse.*
- *The undergraduate students who met with the committee expressed high satisfaction with their experience. The Graduate students interviewed expressed concerns, such as salary amounts, the extra cost of exceeding four years to complete theses, and mentor relationships.*
- *The Faculty is actively working to increase gender and racial diversity in faculty hiring, but as with most such faculties in North America, more work is needed.*
- *The Faculty has an excellent and deserved international research reputation, and faculty members have won numerous prestigious national and international recognitions. There is strong interdisciplinary activity within the Faculty and with other Faculties. Support for facilitating new projects is strong within the faculty and from the VPRI office. Funding is a concern.*
- *The faculty faces significant challenges regarding the condition of some of its most important facilities, especially for undergraduate education. Addressing this is critical for both the faculty and the institution to meet the fast-growing needs of STEM.*
- *Enhancing communication from the Dean's office to the departments was identified as an area for improvement.*
- *The review committee was impressed with the dedication and excellence of the Educational leadership faculty who indicated that they felt respected and supported and are eager to be more fully integrated into the faculty's governance.*
- *The Faculty demonstrates its commitment to outreach and engagement with programs such as Science 101 that engages the Downtown Eastside community and plays an important role in opening the campus to people who have been traditionally excluded from the benefits of higher education.*

### **Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

- *Address graduate student support, including but not limited to salary issues. Graduate students should be made more aware of the Ombuds office and its services.*
- *Increase transparency in communications between layers of faculty leadership, especially around budgeting and development of complex projects.*
- *Work strategically to build robust and innovative research partnerships with special attention given to models of industrial affiliation.*
- *Prioritize urgent infrastructure needs, especially for the Chemistry and Math buildings.*

### **Faculty Response:**

- *The Faculty and Departments are strongly committed to increasing graduate stipends. At present, this effort awaits a ruling on the proposed union for graduate research assistants. The Faculty and Department Heads will look into ways we might address variations in graduate student support between departments, and within departments, and provide more clarity to our graduate students and their advisors. We will periodically inform our graduate students and postdocs about the Ombudsperson, and alert that office that periodic outreach is desirable.*

- The decentralized nature of the Faculty makes strong communications of utmost importance, and we work constantly to improve communications. We feel the day-to-day operational issues are effective. As the reviewers note, we are in an environment of constant change so it is an ongoing process to work on the flow of information that is two-way. We have added the position of Director of Strategic Projects who is charged with being a liaison between the units and the Dean's Office. It is critical to increasingly engage faculty and staff in discussions of faculty direction and strategy, to develop a shared sense of priorities and underlying values within the Faculty that will inform their implementation. We will continue to hone our presentations about budget and planning, to be sure they are clear and focussed.
- The Faculty will continue to work closely with the Vice-President Research & Innovation Office to seek out new opportunities and contacts for research partnerships. Judging from the number of patents and IP licences, Science faculty have been quite successful in translating their research into industrial applications and new companies, particularly in the key areas of biotechnology, mining, chemistry and quantum technology. We agree with the reviewers' suggestion to increase the support that we provide to help researchers build industrial partnerships. The Faculty has recently put in place an Executive Director of Corporate Innovation and Collaboration.
- Our top priority for infrastructure is to continue and accelerate efforts to build a new Chemistry Teaching and Research complex. We will intensify our advocacy work with the provincial government and other stakeholders who benefit most from the growth in UBC STEM graduates. It is our aim to advance this project to Exec 3 and Board 1 in the coming year. These steps will require UBC to secure commitments from the province to partner in the construction of these critical teaching and research buildings, and subsequently, the replacement of the Math Complex.

**Department of Botany**  
**Faculty of Science**  
Summary of External Review: April 2023

**Key Findings/Highlights of the Review Committee:**

- *Botany is an outstanding department with regard to both research and teaching missions that continue to build on a long history of excellence.*
- *Botany also has excellent infrastructure and facilities and makes good use of their space.*
- *Botany's graduate and postdoctoral training is hampered by low stipends and salaries, a widespread problem at UBC.*
- *The depletion of research faculty ranks in Botany is leading to challenges in fulfilling the teaching mission and maintaining the diverse research expertise of the department.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

*For the Department:*

- *Maintain exceptional level of undergraduate teaching via faculty recruitment in target areas in which the department's teaching is currently over-extended.*
- *Consider taking measures to reduce the time to graduate degree completion, especially in the M.Sc. program.*
- *Some of the above recommendations will require new faculty hires, which is clearly a top priority for the Botany Department moving forward.*

*For University Administration:*

- *Review methods for accounting for departmental teaching effort and workload in courses with significant lab or field components, not just lectures, and ensure equitable accounting for faculty workload across units.*

**Department's Response:**

*For the Department:*

- The recent support of Dean Aronson for the new cluster hire affords us the opportunity to be forward-thinking and develop longer-term strategies for both research and teaching endeavours. We will pursue several new faculty hires: a replacement in mycology to replace a faculty member who is retiring in 2024; an expert in Indigenous botanical knowledge, which was proposed to be a joint hire with Forestry; and a cluster hire of three new plant cell and molecular faculty in the general area of Food Security and Plant Resilience (a future direction for the department). Currently, the Head is working with the Dean of Land and Food Systems and Director of the Michael Smith Laboratories to develop a campus vision for the area of Food Security, and maximize the University's effort in the area, where Botany will be a major player, if not the leader. We believe we can participate in, and be a leader in one of next grand challenges in plant biology—how to feed a growing global population on less arable land, in the face of a rapidly changing climate—and we plan to work closely with colleagues in LFS, MSL, and Forestry to usher in this vision.
- Reducing the time to completion, is indeed something attainable and something the department has discussed in the past, and will attempt to address in the future. A possible mechanism is to reduce the course requirement necessary for MSc students, thus permitting students to put more time towards prioritizing their research projects earlier in their degrees.

For University Administration:

We recognize the massive workload of teaching in the large Introductory Biology courses, especially in the area of course coordination and are actively working to implement a suggestion of Dean Aronson's, to find ways that staff can support course coordinators. Our recent hire of a Manager in the Biology Program (a new position) is one step in this direction.

**Department of Theatre and Film**  
**Faculty of Arts**  
Summary of External Review: March 2022

**Key Findings of the Review Committee:**

- *The Department is still struggling with some of the structural/ infrastructural challenges identified in the last external review.*
- *There is a lot of good will in the Department, but the different areas still seem to function as separate units. Each unit or program needs to better communicate with other units/ programs for change to happen.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

*Geography*

- *Buildings need to be renovated and repaired for safety and accessibility; Faculty and staff should be in the same building to encourage a sense of community.*

*Governance*

- *Changes in the current administrative structure to include one Head and three Associate Heads.*
- *Establish a committee to ensure clarity, transparency and equity in workloads and to address gender imbalances in administration and leadership.*

*Curriculum*

- *A more robust Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) with multiple concentrations*
- *Creation of a Student Handbook to guide Undergraduate and Graduate Students through their respective programs*

**Department's Response:**

- Consolidation of the Department's faculty to evolve the Theatre and Film "Brand" for 2023 and beyond including major curriculum and program review.
- Centering equity concerns, particularly the gender imbalances in leadership.
- Creation of an Associate Head position.
- Establish a robust communication system to ensure stronger connections between faculty and programs to build a collegial Departmental culture.
- Increase internal and external funding for faculty and graduate students.

**Faculty Response:**

- The Dean *Pro Tem*, Associate Dean Academic, and Associate Dean of Equity, Innovation and Strategy met with the Department to identify main priorities moving forward and to discuss ways of improving the governance structure and the culture of collegiality in the Department
- The Department might work with the Associate Dean of Equity, Innovation, and Strategy to address questions around gender equity.
- The Faculty can work with the Department to find ways to upgrade equipment and to plan buildings for safety and accessibility reasons.

**Centre for Applied Ethics  
Faculty of Medicine**

Summary of External Review: February 2022

**Key Findings of the Review Committee**

*Given the invitation to be bold, we adopted a four-part framework for our deliberations:*

- *First, we considered the role of UBC as a prominent public university in British Columbia and Canada and what should be expected of such a university with a core academic mission of teaching, research, and service.*
- *Second, we considered what it would require for UBC to realize the vision of leadership and impact expressed so articulately by a UBC alumnus in the UBC 2018-2028 Strategic Plan.*
- *Third, we considered what a university centre for applied ethics, like the CAE, might look like if it were designed today given the daunting suite of 21<sup>st</sup> century challenges, for which innovative thinking, rigorous analysis, creative partnerships, novel solutions, and practical guidance are needed locally and globally.*
- *Finally, we considered how well the CAE is currently positioned to establish UBC as a global leader in applied ethics and what steps the university would need to take to ensure this type of global leadership could be achieved and sustained.*

**Key Recommendations of the Review Committee:**

*As one senior UBC administrator told us: “[the CAE] should be one of the most important centres at the university.” It is clear from our review that the status quo is not an option for the CAE. Rather, we believe that what is needed is a fundamental recognition of applied ethics as constitutive of and essential to UBC’s strategy as a global public university and its commitment to “foster global citizenship and advance a sustainable and just society across British Columbia, Canada and the world”.*

*The UBC should engage in a comprehensive strategic planning process, led by the Faculty of Medicine and the Provost’s Office, to re-imagine a world-leading Centre for Applied Ethics for the 21st century at UBC. In addition, we encourage the Faculty of Medicine and SPPH to:*

*Provide dedicated administrative support for the CAE day-to-day operations.*

- *Support the CAE to develop an interim Academic and Business Plan to provide continuity and stability for the centre during the process of strategic renewal.*

**Response to the Key Recommendations:**

CAE faculty also lead in the way that applied ethics is done. This typically involves building collaborative relationships with practitioners and “end users” in the areas we study, such as patients and research subjects, and engaging in translational activities with clinicians, technologists, lawyers, policy makers, and business and practice leaders. We have longstanding experience and leadership in creating research that is inclusive and rigorous.

Another strength of CAE—and opportunity for growth—lies in our capacity to bring people together from across both UBC campuses and from society more broadly to address the “wicked” ethical problems that cut across traditional areas of study. In addition to carrying out our own research projects, CAE helps increase the research capacity of the university by advancing the ethical lens, capability and strength of people who are conducting the university’s research.

The external report has identified several weaknesses of CAE. They note that the Centre's external reputation has diminished over time. I agree with this overall assessment, largely because the Centre held a high status as a pioneer in applied ethics, especially within the Canadian context. I will note, though, that the expertise of each of the review committee members was limited to one subfield in applied ethics (health ethics, broadly construed), and that they overlooked the current scholarly reputation of the Centre in other areas, e.g. ethics related to science and business. That being said, there are definitely areas in need of improvement, such as the need to give the CAE "brand" a more prominent profile both at UBC and in the wider academic community. I see two responses here, which could be pursued concurrently. One route, is to leverage CAE's place within SPPH, and to position ourselves as a leader in Global Health and Public Health Ethics. Importantly, this would involve a change in emphasis and branding, but would need to be done in a way that would not alter the fundamental mission of CAE.

A second route would be to use CAE's (and as the external reviewers pointed out, my own) convening power to gather the many ethicists across the UBC faculties and partner institutions to discuss our collective will to establish a greater external profile for "Ethics at UBC", and if that collective will exists, to discuss ways that CAE could lead an effort to achieve it. With the above in mind, we propose using Centre endowment funds to hire a CAE administrator (likely part-time), whose primary responsibilities would include (a) fostering connections and collaborations among CAE faculty, across UBC, and across society with health authorities, professional associations, governments, etc., (b) managing external communications—including by producing a newsletter and an annual report, and by refreshing the Centre's website, and (c) coordinating collaborative grant proposals. We also aim to continue our practice of bringing in postdoctoral fellows who, in the recent past, have created connections across UBC leading to successful grant proposals.

We accept that there should be a strategic assessment of the opportunities of CAE within UBC. It is critical, however, that this review be conducted by specialists in applied ethics from across the university, and from our partner institutions such as the health authorities, the School of Public Policy and Global Affairs, and the Dhillon Centre for Business Ethics.

I strongly recommend that the Chair of this strategic review be a senior applied ethicist at UBC who has research interests in areas that intersect with health, but also has expertise and interests that cover the range of the Centre's activities. I would recommend we establish a standing advisory committee to CAE, also led by a senior applied ethicist at UBC with expertise and interests that span widely across fields of applied ethics.

We also agree with the external reviewers that CAE can only fulfill its potential through increased institutional support. At a minimum, this will include allowing CAE to hire a tenure stream position in applied ethics. If the approval is not immediate, then it would make sense to consult with the proposed advisory committee to hire in an area that best meets the strategic needs of CAE, as identified through the strategic review process.