



EDU:C Under Review	The Wilson Centre
Commissioning Officer	Professor Trevor Young, Dean
Review Date	November 18, 2020

Reviewers are asked to provide a report that satisfies the following:

- *Identifies and commends the EDU:C's notably strong and innovative attributes*
- *Describes the EDU:C's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement*
- *Recommends specific steps to be taken to improve the EDU:C, distinguishing between those the unit can itself take and those that require external action*
- *Recognizes the institution's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation*
- *Respects the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process*
- *Addresses all elements of the terms of reference*

Thank you for inviting us to participate in the review. We received excellent support for the review including the timely provision of documents (plus an addendum covering the period January 2020 – August 2020) and management of logistics. We recognize the amount of work that is required to prepare for reviews and commend the team for the clarity and comprehensiveness of the material.

We were very impressed by the work of the Wilson Centre. Dr. Cynthia Whitehead is clearly respected and valued for her work within the Centre and across the University. Dr. Whitehead brings a level of steadiness and stability to the Centre while creating an environment in which people can thrive but also rise to and assume new challenges.

The discussions we had with the scientists, researchers, partners, and learners confirm the documentation and provide further evidence of the work accomplished during the period January 2015-December 2019. The scholarly productivity (e.g., grants, peer review publications, and presentations) is substantial. In addition, we found evidence of the very positive and helpful relationships within and outside the unit as the unit has ably supported many new endeavors and collaborations. We recognize that our interpretations may have been limited by Zoom configuration of meetings and by the necessity of conducting the review in one day—the latter making it less possible to engage with participants individually.

While outside of the scope of the review, we particularly commend the Wilson Centre for its work during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Centre continued to obtain grants and publish. While education research continued to be a major focus of work this year, faculty engaged in innovative work related to COVID-19, equity, diversity and inclusion, indigenous health professions education, and curriculum reform and revision. They participated in knowledge production, committees and developmental initiatives. The Centre is to be commended for its continued work supporting its graduate students; advancing educational and clinical processes and practices across the Toronto Academic Health Sciences Network; supporting the accreditation efforts occurring during 2020 at University of Toronto and Northern Ontario School of Medicine and the Committee on Accreditation for Canadian Medical Schools; and ensuring that regular educational activities continue (e.g., Wilson Centre Research Day).

In the remainder of the report, we specifically address the areas posed by the terms of reference for this review. We acknowledge there may be errors and misunderstandings in our interpretation of the documentation and from our discussions during the day. We met with Drs. Hodges and Spadafora representing the leadership for the two sponsoring organizations (University Health Network and University of Toronto), Dr. Whitehead (Wilson Centre Director), the governance and management committee membership, scientists, researchers, Dr. Mylopoulos (Lead for Fellowship and Doctoral Concentration), fellows and doctoral students, partners and administrative staff.

1. RELATIONSHIPS

- scope and nature of relationships with cognate Departments/EDUs
- strength of the morale of members, learners, and staff
- extent to which the EDU:C has developed or sustained fruitful partnerships with affiliated hospitals, research institutes, organizations, and other universities in order to foster research, creative professional activities, and education
- scope and nature of the EDU:C's relationship with external government, academic, and professional organizations
- social impact of the EDU:C in terms of outreach—locally, nationally, and internationally

Scope and nature of relationships with cognate Departments/EDUs. The Centre has developed very positive and strong and respectful relationships within Toronto (e.g., through The Institute for Education Research (TIER) with the other educational groups at UHN and other hospitals within the Toronto Academic Health Science Network (TAHSN). It has contributed to educational programs across the Temerty Faculty of Medicine. The relationships are diverse. The bilateral and supportive nature of the relationships was highlighted on several occasions.

Strength and morale of members, learners and staff. Morale was high. People are collegial and collaborative within the Wilson Centre but also with the partners and researchers/scientists who come to the Centre. People expressed the high value of coming to the Centre and feeling a part of the Centre. The lack of a hierarchy within the Centre was noted; people described pitching in and doing what was needed to support others and get the job(s) done. Scientists described explicitly supporting colleagues including colleague's work in other departments. Staff described scientist and fellows readily 'pitching in.' The support staff also noted that they were provided with equipment for home offices during COVID or how people would help move equipment as needed into and around the Centre. The researchers commented on how their work within their own unit and the Wilson Centre was complementary to the Centre and valued by their home unit. They described their collaborations as part of a 'community of practice' and being able to be in a 'special place' that enabled them to grow and be nourished.

Several facilitators appear to drive the unit's supportive nature. Some we identified related to the people themselves of whom both Dr. Whitehead and Ms. Arteaga were commended repeatedly; the democratization of the management committee enabling a distributed or team-based approach to decision making; and the space which appears to be a critical facilitator of relationships and opportunities for idea generation, collaboration, problem solving, support, mentoring, innovation, and efficient productivity.

During the meeting with the researcher group, we learned a potential threat to morale might be the dichotomy between those who were 'scientists' vs. 'researchers.' A 70% time requirement to be a 'scientist' might be too rigid a distinction and there may be other criteria to establish the title of 'scientist.'

Partnerships The Centre is an EDU:C with governance from both the University and University Health Network. As such, the Wilson Centre has numerous partnerships within both parent organizations and with external organizations. From both the documents and the meetings, the partnerships appeared productive and mutually supportive at the level of the individual and the collective. The Wilson Centre appeared to be able to do its work effectively and was described as a 'crown jewel' for both organizations.

Scope and nature of EDU:C's relationships The nature of the University's appointment structure (i.e., through Departments) means that the faculty members are embedded in key areas of the Faculty as well as within the UHN structure. Some of these include The Institute for Education Research (TIER) at UHN, Centre for Faculty Development, and the University of Toronto UME, Centre for Interprofessional Education, CACE, and PGME. In addition to this, faculty members are integrally involved with the major Canadian professional organizations (e.g., Royal College, College of Family Physicians of Canada) with many serving in key capacities. Further recent appointments have increased connections with other health disciplines. The relationships appear solid, although we note that it will be important to ensure that relationships be reviewed to assess whether they continue to benefit the individuals at the Wilson Centre, the Centre itself, and the partner organization. With particular reference to potential international relationships, it was noted that work has been undertaken to delineate roles that might be of a consultative nature rather than a partnership.

Social impact. The Centre and its members are having an impact. This is demonstrated in many ways and clearly exists at local, national, and international levels:

- Scientists and researchers express commitment to and demonstrate active engagement in work with Indigenous communities and in equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives.
- There are large numbers of publications in high impact journals as well citations from these publications representing an impact on the scholarly work others are undertaking.
- The members are engaged in local service to the University and health facilities. This is particularly noted in the work being carried out related to the undergraduate curriculum and its reform, the initiatives in the areas of equity, diversity and inclusion, and indigenous health education scholarship. Several interviewees also noted activities related to teaching and committee work across both UHN and UofT.
- There are strong international collaborations including the development of a Master of Health Sciences Education in Ethiopia through the Toronto Addis Ababa Academic Collaboration with its 4 cohorts of learners; scholarly work with Maastricht University and the Health Outcomes, and the Medical Education Research (HOMER) unit of the National Healthcare Group's Education Office in Singapore.
- The scientists and researchers are active in national and international education programs including, but not limited to, CCME, AMEE, AAMC-RIME, IAMSE, and Simulation Summit to list a few.
- The scientists and researchers are active as members of editorial teams for prominent medical education journals including Academic Medicine, Medical Education, Advances in Health Sciences Education, Canadian Journal of Medical Education and Advances in Simulation.
- The Wilson Centre has been a desirable place for collaboration as evidenced by the numbers of international visiting scholars at Wilson Centre.

2. RESEARCH

- **scope, quality, and relevance of research activities**
- **appropriateness of research activities for learners**
- **appropriateness of the level of research activity and funding relative to national and international comparators**
- **appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human resources**

[In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.]

Scope and relevance of research activities. The scope, quality and relevance of the research activities is probably best captured by the interface of research grants and research publications. The group have obtained research grants totaling about \$37 million (including 2020 funding) with over half from Tri-Council funding and the remainder from other Canadian and international sources. Large grants, such as those presented on the self-study lists, are typically awarded to researchers who have demonstrated success with dissemination and other outcomes. In the case of the Wilson Centre, the members documented 782 publications (with another 154 in 2020). This is in addition to 614 invited presentations (to 2019), other presentations (e.g., workshops, orals, posters, etc.), and competitive awards and prizes. Most of the publications are in high impact journals spanning education research, health professions education, medicine, and other disciplines. As the Canadian landscape has changed, the scholarly work has turned to the immediate needs presented by COVID-19 but also to scholarship in the critically important areas of Indigenous health education and diversity and inclusion. The work is undertaken with strong networks of Canadian and international researchers and Wilson Centre alumni who continue to work together. The research is robust and informs the work of others. In addition, the partners spoke to the important contributions that Wilson Centre scientists were making to their units.

Appropriateness of research activities for learners. Both fellows and PhD students feel their needs are being met by the support they are receiving at the Wilson Centre. We did not hear any comments from the learners suggesting issues with the curriculum. Indeed, it appeared that most courses were being co-taught with guest lecturers adding to the robustness of the program.

The scope and quality of the work being done within the Wilson Centre makes it inviting and appropriate for students from a wide variety of disciplines. More importantly, they are well situated for work across the health professions in new and evolving areas with recently appointed scientists providing expertise in anthropology, paramedic medicine, occupational therapy, and audiology. Having the PhD concentration in Health Professions Education Research housed within the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation at the Dalla Lana School of Public Health appears to be a good 'fit' for the group.

Appropriateness of the level of research activity and funding relative to national and international comparators. The levels and types of funding received by the Wilson Centre group are significant and far surpass that of other units in Canada but also internationally. It must also be noted that educational research funding is generally considered modest vis a vis other research areas (e.g., basic sciences) which makes their acquisition of grants even more noteworthy. They are to be commended for their attainment of Tri-Council and CFI funding as well as funding from other organizations. With the creation of TIER, they will in future have the potential to gain Canada Research Chairs, again unusual for health professions education units in Canada.

Use of human resources. The scientists, researchers, and administrative staff give generously of their time. Everyone appears to be working at a high level of productivity to the extent that can be discerned from the documents and the meetings. Success of the unit may relate to key individuals' interpersonal skills, support for and commitment to the team, and the mission.

3. EDUCATION

- scope and quality of educational activities and initiatives (e.g., courses, programs, communication strategies)
- extent to which the EDU:C is fulfilling its education mandate

Scope and quality of educational activities and initiatives. The scope and quality of the educational activities and initiatives are broad and of high quality.

The Centre has a PhD concentration in health professions education research and also supports fellows enrolled in other graduate programs who want to come to the Centre for two years to work with scientists. In addition, members are engaged in teaching within University of Toronto and Temerty Faculty of Medicine educational programs at all levels (e.g., UME, PGME, CPD, and Faculty Development). The Centre is also noted for its atelier programs which attract national and international participants, Educational Days, and rounds. At an international level, they have a new partnership through the Toronto Addis Ababa Ethiopia Academic Collaboration which has accepted four cohorts of students into a Master of Health Sciences Education (to end of 2019).

The Centre and its members are integrated effectively into supporting developmental and committee work across the continuum of Temerty educational programs. In some cases, this has occurred through departmental appointments. In other cases, faculty members and the Centre were recognized for their expertise and invited to assume leadership or committee roles involved in new initiatives (e.g., curriculum renewal, indigenous health professions education). In assuming this work, attention is paid to ensuring that the work is complementary to the researchers' own scholarship or can lead to scholarly work.

In terms of quality, the students we spoke to were fully engaged in and enthusiastic about their program. They also talked about their support from the scientists. They felt they could talk to any scientist at the Centre. They could knock on doors. The scientists were committed to mentorship and understood what it meant to be a good mentor opening their labs to students, sharing their research and their ideas. They enjoyed the willingness of the scientists to have debates with other colleagues and learners. They also commented that the scientists were concerned about their personal wellbeing as well as their productivity. While there are two streams in the PhD program, the students didn't see the division between the two streams as a barrier as they could take courses in either stream and talk to all scientists.

Similarly, the partners were very positive and noted how much they appreciated the work being done by Wilson Centre scientists and researchers to improve their educational initiatives. They noted how much more engaged the scientists had become with their units over the past years and also how helpful it was to their units. They commented on the warmth and generosity shown by the Centre. The bilateral nature of the relationship was recognized in so far as the partners were providing a living laboratory while the scientists were able to expand their impact on education; it was clearly seen as a 'win-win' opportunity.

Education mandate: The Centre’s vision is to be a global leader in advancing healthcare education and practice through research. It does this in conjunction with its missions of fostering the discovery of theory and newer knowledge, knowledge translation, and cultivating future research leaders in healthcare education and practice. An examination of the numbers of publications, presentations, and other scholarly work demonstrates its fulfillment of both creating new knowledge and knowledge translation activities. Its role in leadership development is partly noted by the scientists and researchers who have left to assume leadership roles in other settings as well as by the roles which scientists, researchers, and alumni have assumed.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL + FINANCIAL STRUCTURE

- **appropriateness and effectiveness of the EDU:C’s organizational and financial structure, and its use of existing human, physical, and financial resources**
[In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution’s autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.]
- **appropriateness with which resource allocation, including space and infrastructure support, has been managed**
- **opportunities for new revenue generation**

Appropriateness and effectiveness of organizational and financial structure. It does appear that the organizational and financial structures have been functional and enable stability and opportunities for the members. The Centre is an extra-departmental unit (EDU:C) at the University and governed by both the University Health Network (UHN) and jointly governed by UofT and UHN. This is the structure that was put in place at the outset and has continued. This type of unit is intended to be multidisciplinary and multi-departmental with a goal of fostering research and scholarly interest in a defined research domain. As noted in several documents, an EDU:C has limitations as it can’t offer graduate courses and programs, make budgetary appointments, or administer research funds. We did note that the creation of a PhD concentration within the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation at the Dalla Lana School of Public Health appears to have resolved the issue of offering a graduate program. We heard the concern about budgetary appointments as the scientists are funded through a variety of mechanisms with variable contracts. For the PhDs within the Temerty School of Medicine, the lack of sabbatical and tenure possibility has continued to be problematic and they have noted that some of their former colleagues have achieved tenure at other Universities. Moving to an EDU:A has been suggested as a solution; however, the reviewers can’t comment on the appropriateness of moving to a EDU:A as that type of recommendation is out of the scope of this review.

The organizational structure is considered protective and the Memorandum of Understanding between UHN and UofT was recently renewed for the period 2019-2023. This arrangement is described as providing a layer of protection from potential shifts in priorities and leadership. There is governance oversight from both Dean and CEO (or delegates). The dual structure permits continuity of funding and setting of overall objectives. At the level of the Centre, itself, there is a governance committee from the two organizations with the purpose of oversight over strategic directions, faculty and staff resource planning, and financial resource planning (including the annual budget). Within the Centre, there is a management committee with responsibility for oversight of the day to day success of the Centre. The members of the management committee have key functional roles within the Centre (i.e., for operations, the educational programs, fund development, etc.). The committee works as a team making collective decisions in key areas of responsibility; this is felt to be helpful in sharing the ‘load’ but also permits individuals to develop their own expertise to assume new positions in the future. Both the governance and management committees reviewed their terms of reference in 2019. Adjustments were made to the management committee.

In addition to the opportunities that the University of Toronto affords to the members, the UHN recently created The Institute for Education Research (TIER). The Wilson Centre is one of UHN's 6 centres of education excellence (others focus on simulation, IPE and other areas). This structure has facilitated collaboration with other scientists and researchers. It also enables Wilson Centre scientists access to Canada Research Chairs. Dr. Woods, a Wilson Centre scientist, is the Research Institute Director of TIER.

Appropriateness with which resource allocation (space & infrastructure) have been managed. The infrastructure supporting the Wilson Centre appears to be functional. There are two infrastructures supporting the Wilson Centre—the UofT and UHN. There is a MOU that provides the legal mechanism for the Centre to operate. Both organizations contribute to ensuring the work of the Wilson Centre. For example, the UofT handles funding for the scientists. UHN handles funding for the administrative staff and researchers. The Centre can access IT support, legal and human resources through Toronto General Hospital. Grants are handled through the financial structures in place for all researchers. UHN provides space for the Centre.

It is a large centre with people physically housed within and outside the Centre (across UofT and its affiliated institutions). Collectively, as of December 2019, the Centre encompassed 20 scientists, 15 researchers, 20 cross-appointed researchers, 33 invited members, 153 general members, and 3 current staff, 17 current fellows, and 10 PhD students.

Space is available within the Toronto General Hospital. This space houses office, equipment for scientists, staff and fellows. The space meets most of the day to day needs and supports high levels of collaboration. Given the significant levels of research funding and numbers of people hired by grants as well as the learners they are supporting, there are challenges to finding research space needed for computer stations, tabletop simulators, etc. They do not have space or equipment for larger simulation studies, advanced computing or longitudinal experiments requiring ongoing data collection over weeks or months. They have to rent space as part of research grants. They do have access to UHN/ UofT space for events and meetings available at reduced cost. As they needed classroom space for graduate program, they have rearranged offices and conference rooms to create space for large and small seminars. It has been suggested that space for some research activities (e.g., simulation) might be available given the 2016 merger of UofT and the Michener Centre. Further, UHN is undertaking a major review of space, which along with findings related to COVID may affect decisions related to space.

The reviewers recognize that space for current activities and for growth is limited at present. Given the ongoing work at UHN to assess space and its allocation, the merger with the Michener Centre and other opportunities that may be available on the University of Toronto's three campuses, the reviewers are reluctant to suggest how the space needs may be resolved. It appears important to note that there is also a relational aspect to space. Pre-COVID, the office configurations for scientists and shared space meant easy access for discussions/collaborations. Should space change, attention will need to be paid to its potential impact on academic and collegial interactions, relationships, and productivity.

Opportunities for new revenue generation. New sources of funding are required to support PhD students as well as professional opportunities for scientists and others associated with the Wilson Centre. Some sources of revenue have been proposed including fund development, consulting, and fees assessed to special students (e.g., visiting learners). We were not able to assess the viability of the sources, although, it appeared there were mixed levels of confidence in the fund development strategies being pursued.

5. LONG-RANGE PLANNING CHALLENGES

- clear articulation of a strategic academic plan that is consistent with the University's and Faculty's academic plans
- management, vision, and leadership challenges in the next 5 years
- consistency with the Faculty's commitment to inclusion, equity, and diversity
- planning for advancement and leadership in approaching alternative sources of revenue, and appropriateness of development/fundraising initiatives
- space and infrastructure considerations

Strategic academic plan consistent with University and Faculty's academic plans. The Centre has an academic plan that is consistent with University and Faculty plans.

The Centre has a strategic refresh plan for 2017-2020 that was thoughtfully and democratically developed by its members. It identified 7 conceptual strategies: knowledge production, scholars' development, engagement, collaboration, analytics, good citizenship, and funding. While the actions for each of the areas are articulated, the metrics are lacking for the most part, and there is no description of what would happen in each of the years that the plan was operational.

The Temerty Faculty of Medicine's strategic plan emphasizes collaboration, imagination (innovation) and equity. The Wilson Centre's plan and actions are in alignment with this plan. The Dean's Report (2020) emphasizes the importance of equity, diversity, and inclusion and indigenous medical education. The Dean's Report also emphasizes optimizing learning environments and research and innovation leadership. All of these areas are ones that are integral to the work of the Wilson Centre.

The University's Towards 2030 plan is a much higher level document grappling with projected changes, the management of three campuses, and financial issues. Nonetheless, it emphasizes areas which the Wilson Centre engages in including research productivity, student experience, and internationalization.

The Centre is well situated in terms of activities and plans within the Temerty Faculty of Medicine and University of Toronto plans. As the 2017-2020 plan is coming to an end, the Centre will need to develop a new plan with metrics to facilitate regular and ongoing monitoring.

Management, vision and leadership challenges in the next 5 years. Under Dr. Whitehead's leadership, there has been stability for the last 5 years in contrast to the period from July 2009 – Aug 2015 which experienced several changes in leadership. The unit developed a refresh plan for 2017-2020 with strategies and actions which the group will need to update along with mechanisms to monitor the various components. The challenges for the next 5 years are unclear given COVID and likely new and emerging pressures on health and educational structures. However, it is anticipated the Wilson Centre will be able to rise to the challenges given their flexibility, nimbleness, and collaborations during 2020. Further, it is noted that scientists are being encouraged to develop and explore leadership opportunities on the Senior Management Committee and within the University of Toronto's educational programs; these opportunities auger well for sustained leadership and succession planning.

Consistency with Faculty's commitment to inclusion, equity and diversity. The Wilson Centre is fully engaged in and providing leadership related to inclusion, equity, and diversity. Its faculty and scientists are active within UofT and UHN committee structures, they have received grants, and published/presented their work in support of this commitment. There are several scientists, researchers, and fellows engaged in this work. These activities are integral to the Temerty's work in this area.

Planning for advancement and leadership in approaching alternative sources of revenue and appropriateness of development/fund raising efforts. The unit's alternative fund development plans are based on philanthropy, consulting, and educational endeavors. It is not clear how effective or likely these are to be fruitful, particularly at this time. Certainly, they are one of the few educational units in Canada to have philanthropic support (i.e., BMO Financial Group Chair and the Richard and Elizabeth Currie Chair in Health Professions Education Research) which could make the unit attractive to philanthropists.

Space and infrastructure considerations. Space is one of the key issues they face. They have limited space for the work they are undertaking. They made significant adjustments to create classroom space for the PhD concentration. Within their own space, it has proven difficult to undertake some types of research (e.g., longitudinal studies, simulation, and advanced computing studies). As UHN and UofT consider overall space utilization, it will be important to include Wilson Centre needs in these considerations. The Centre is regarded as a 'jewel' by both organizations. Accommodations will need to be made to ensure that the Centre can do the work it needs to do—in the relational manner that currently propels its success—in order for it to continue to be a global leader in advancing health care education and practice through research.

Generally, the infrastructure provided by UofT and UHN appears to be supportive in most cases. As noted, there is variability in the types and nature of appointments which each of the scientists hold. Professional development (i.e., sabbaticals) may require different arrangements to permit scientists to periodically refresh their scholarship.

6. INTERNATIONAL COMPARATORS

- assessment of the EDU:C under review relative to the best in Canada/North America and internationally, including areas of strength and opportunities

Assessment of the EDU:C relative to other units in Canada/N America/Internationally. The vision of the Wilson Centre is to be a global leader in advancing health care education and practice through research. While international comparisons are always fraught with challenges in terms of determining metrics, two documents indicate that the Wilson Centre continues to be the most productive educational unit within Canada and internationally. First, there is a published study that looks at productivity, and it positions Toronto (and presumably the Wilson Centre) at the top in Canada and in other jurisdictions. See: *Doja A, Horsley T, Sampson M. Productivity in medical education research: an examination of countries of origin. BMC Med Educ. 2014 Nov 18;14:243. doi: 10.1186/s12909-014-0243-8. PMID: 25404502; PMCID: PMC4239316.* Canada was identified as a leader in that study. Secondly, as part of an internal examination at the University of Calgary (Office of Health and Medical Education), Rachel Ellaway examined peer-review medical education publications from 2013-2018 and found that Toronto had the highest numbers of publications within Canada [See: The Office of Health and Medical Education Scholarship. Health and Medical Education Scholarship in Calgary. Calgary, AB: The University of Calgary, 2019.

<https://cumming.ucalgary.ca/sites/default/files/teams/15/OHMES%20five%20year%20report%20-%20final%20Feb%202020%20distrib.pdf>]

Strengths. The Centre has many strengths:

- The Wilson Centre holds the utmost renown and esteem nationally and internationally. Indeed, it is a critical element of the UofT 'brand'.
- The Centre demonstrates the ability to attract and attain grant funding for important work and dissemination.
- The team expresses a commitment to collaborative research and advancing research in and through practice.
- The well trained and highly productive scientists and researchers recognize the importance of research informing practice and practice informing research.
- Wilson Centre members present work broadly in educational and other important forums locally, nationally and internationally and attract leaders and emerging leaders to their programs and ateliers.
- Scientists and researchers are able to establish and maintain networks with other centres locally, nationally and internationally. The team expresses, and has demonstrated, a commitment to equity, diversity and inclusion and in particular supporting Indigenous scholars and learners; educating non-Indigenous members of the Wilson Centre about Indigenous health and cultural safety; and collaborating with Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations to advance Indigenous health education.
- Scientists and researchers are able to navigate and work within the highly productive environment for research and scholarly work that Temerty Faculty of Medicine and University of Toronto provide.
- Scientists are able to be promoted and be competitive. During the period of 2015-2019, 6 scientists and 3 researchers were promoted to Associate Professor and 1 scientist and 1 researcher were promoted to Professor. Scientists have held and/or continue to hold Canada Research Chairs, endowed chairs, professorships and other awards. This suggests the environment is conducive to recognition and advancement.
- Work is seen as relevant to both education and health care. Scientists have been engaged in planning and implementation processes for the UME curriculum renewal; in the development of person centred care and the expansion of medical education to include equity, diversity and inclusion; aligning PGME with new directions related to competency based medical education; and in informing and contributing to continuing professional development innovation.

Opportunities. The Centre has opportunities:

- Given, the numbers of partnerships and relationships in which the Wilson Centre engages, there are many opportunities for the Centre. A critical task going forward will be to *prioritize* the opportunities and ensure they are meaningfully aligned with the vision of the Centre and its governing organizations.
- Ensuring that the Centre's theoretical research yields the practical application that they value and espouse. The mission statement emphasizes the importance of research in healthcare education informing practice and research in the practice of healthcare informing education. Therefore, opportunities exist for the Centre to develop metrics and measure the practical application of its research outputs.

7. CONCLUSIONS

- overall assessment of strengths and concerns, and recommendations for future directions

The Wilson Centre is exemplary and regarded as a national and international leader. As noted by the leadership in both UHN and UofT, the Centre is a 'jewel'. It has a superior reputation for excellence and collaboration at local, national, and international levels.

Strengths.

- The Wilson Centre is a global exemplar for educational research and productivity.
- The Wilson Centre has skillfully built their base of scientists and researchers and foci over time.
- The Wilson Centre and its personnel have a shared vision and mission.
- The personnel are driven to succeed and are highly productive. The team is highly collaborative and collegial in their work. One does not sense competition amongst scientists. This may relate to the array of diverse backgrounds and pursuits of different grants; at the same time, they are also able to collaborate on projects of mutual interest.
- The learners are positive about their program and their opportunities to undertake research. They are also positive about the research that they see within the Wilson Centre.
- There is a sense of community with regular check-ins of scientists, researchers, administrative staff, and learners. People help each other out so that everyone is better for it.

Concerns.

- The scientists and researchers are highly productive individually and collectively. Academic centres can be challenging environments in which to work as the expectations that people will always be competitive for grants, publish in high impact journals, present work internationally, and be available for service and leadership roles. To avoid burnout, it will be important to ensure that people are recognized for appropriate and sustainable levels of achievement.
- The issue of tenure has been raised in several documents over many years. We heard it again during our review. It must be noted that this issue is beyond that of the Centre and possibly the Faculty. It may need to be resolved by the Board of Governors.
- The current location and space are prized and highly facilitative. Nonetheless, although interviewees repeatedly lauded the space, documents indicated that space may be limited, particularly for some types of work. As discussions related to space are undertaken, it will be important to ensure that the robust opportunities for exchange of ideas and collaborations are not lost.
- Extra funding (and funding for new growth and development) is limited. There is a need for funding to support graduate students and sustain the professional development of the scientists.
- Opportunities are being created to enable the scientists to gain experience in leadership roles across UofT and UHN. Continued attention will need to be paid to ensure these opportunities continue for succession planning within the Wilson Centre and its governing organizations.
- The Wilson Centre currently enjoys open exchanges of ideas—a requirement for innovation and success. However, with success may come the threat of 'risk avoidance'. Leaders will need to remain vigilant to continue truly innovative (boundary-spanning) research and maintain their willingness to challenge orthodoxy.

Recommendations.

- The Centre developed a strategic refresh plan for 2017 to 2020. It was well conceptualized. Between the report and the publication in Academic Medicine (Byrne et al., Acad Med, 2019), the plan's features and process are effectively described. The plan provides strategies and actions. As the Centre goes forward, the next plan should have provision for annual reporting and metrics for each of the key areas so that progress can be monitored.
- The Wilson Centre and its members have been very effective at carving out its place within the research and scholarly realm as demonstrated by grants, publications, and presentations. In this it is a world-leader. The Centre and its members are also engaged widely in teaching and service work at local, national, and international levels. Attention needs to be paid to future development to ensure that relationships are meaningful for both the Centre and the other unit/group. It is also important that new undertakings are carefully assessed to ensure that they are feasible and aligned with the goals of the Temerty Faculty of Medicine and the University of Toronto.
- Continued attention to fund development is needed to support Centre growth, fund graduate students and to support time for individuals' professional development.
- The Centre needs to be attentive to its capacity to accommodate learners. In particular, it was noted that researchers and scientists were engaged in teaching along the continuum of medical education as well as with PhD students and fellows. As the number of PhD students grows along with the demand for requisite supervision of dissertations and teaching, the Centre may need to reconsider how it allocates, values and supports the workload. It may also need to reconsider measures of success and access to roles and titles such as 'scientist'.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Prof. David HIRSH – George E. Thibault Academy Associate Professor and Director, Harvard Medical School Academy

Prof. Emerita Jocelyn LOCKYER – Dept. of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary

SIGNATURES

