

CANADIAN REPORT CARD AND CHANGES SINCE 2013

Last updated: February 23rd, 2017

Following both releases of the previous UAEM University Report Cards in 2013 and 2015 respectively, we chose to solicit direct feedback from universities regarding how to improve the process. As a result in the 2015 version we chose to evaluate Canadian and American universities separately due to the significant differences between the two school systems. Based on interest from UAEM students to replicate the project for Canadian schools, a methodology for the Canadian iteration of the report card was drafted over the summer of 2016, aiming to evaluate Canadian universities and their contribution to biomedical research of neglected diseases, access to medicines, and education concerning access and innovation issues.

The Canadian iteration specifically evaluates the universities that are members of the U15.

This first Canadian iteration of the University Report Card includes expanded sections with new questions regarding open access, the Zika epidemic, alternative research and development models, clinical trials transparency, and research on Canadian drug pricing mechanisms. In addition, a fourth “Transparency” section has been added to the Canadian iteration to evaluate access to publicly available data from each university.

As a result of these significant improvements and alterations, it should be recognized that there are considerable differences between this iteration and the 2013 and 2015 Report Card methodologies.

Revised questions are listed below.

Innovation Survey

Innovation Question 1 (IQ1): This question is new to the methodology and distinguishes between grant monies provided by three specific organizations: What is the university’s total funding received from a) Canadian Institutes of Health Research, b) Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, or c) Gates Foundation grants for global health research, training and collaborations? (These are the largest Canadian funders that provide comprehensive public grants data).

IQ2: IQ2 combines the IQ1 and IQ2 questions from the first report card methodology into one comprehensive statement. IQ2 includes public grant databases and funding disclosures from more than 100 sources, not just the ones previously listed on Q1 of the first methodology, ie: U.S. National Institutes of Health, U.S. National Science Foundation, Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Howard Hughes Institute.

IQ3 and IQ4: Both questions focus on information gathered from PubMed publications: IQ3 asks what percentage of publications is focused on global health. IQ4 asks what percentage is focused specifically on neglected diseases, including neglected aspects of HIV, TB, Malaria, and what percentage is focused on access to medicines in resource-limited populations. The revised methodology has an increased focus on open-access data. A question about research pertaining to global health issues and neglected diseases and published in PubMed for a specific university is also now included. The new questions regarding open-access now include access to technology and access to research publications.

IQ6: This question is new to the methodology and considers the number of grants awarded by Grand Challenges Canada: How many Grand Challenges Canada grants has the university been awarded during FY2015 and FY2016? As a major source of funding for Canadian universities, Grand Challenges Canada aims to develop innovative ideas with demonstrated potential to save and improve lives in low and middle income countries.

IQ7: This new question is not graded, but will be used to get a sense of how Canadian universities are responding to the lack of innovation for a current global health crisis: In the wake of the current Zika epidemic, how has your institution responded to the innovation gap that currently exists for diagnosis and treatment of this disease?

IQ8: This question in the revised methodology rewards universities in partnership with or funded by alternative models of research and development, including drug discovery and data-sharing platforms, prizes, philanthropy for drug discovery, drug patent pools, and public-private partnerships.

IQ9: This new question considers the present efforts by the university to engage in and/or support research on Canadian drug pricing mechanisms that ensure equitable access to affordable medicines.

IQ10: This new question asks universities to identify any partnerships they have with the pharmaceutical industry.

Access Survey

Access Question 1 (AQ1): The revised methodology takes into account public commitment to licensing medical discoveries in ways that promote access in high-income countries in addition to low- and middle-income countries.

AQ2: This added question asks about whether the university has adopted a policy statement regarding open-access publications and/or provides support for open access publishing. It also considers the percentage of the university's journal articles that are released in open access publications.

AQ7: This new question assesses the ways in which the university has publicly acknowledged the importance of alternative models of research and development (R&D) in ensuring access to medical innovation and whether the university is directly engaged with or funded by alternative biomedical R&D initiatives.

AQ8: This question assesses the percentage of clinical trials data that is being published by the university within 12 months of trial completion. It was added particularly in response to the feedback received by global health administrators who were surveyed as a follow-up to the 2015 UAEM Global Health Report Card for U.S institutions.

Empowerment Survey

Empowerment Question 1 (EQ1): The revised methodology's first empowerment question includes two parts that help to more accurately report a university's opportunities for student access to global health education and engagement. Part A asks about the existence of a department, university institute, or non-degree program in global health. Part B asks specifically about degree programs and other academic tracks surrounding global health at the university being evaluated.

EQ2 & EQ3: Both the revised and original methodologies ask about the impact of Intellectual property (IP) policies, research priorities, and global access to medical innovations. The revised methodology includes an evaluation of whether or not a school has courses addressing 'the policy and legal context of biomedical R&D, and more specifically the impact of intellectual property policies, on research priorities and global access to medical innovations', instead of simply calculating the percentage of courses from a curriculum from the survey and data collection. The revised methodology does not ask for data from the pharmacy school, nor does it require the university to state the specific classes that it offers and during which year(s).

EQ4: This question is no longer a bonus question. It now asks about campus global health events surrounding: 1) impact of intellectual property rights on research priorities and global access to medical innovations, 2) neglected diseases and health needs of low and middle income countries, and 3) drug pricing in Canada and/or other high income countries. In the new methodology, universities are asked to provide a link to the event information for verification.

EQ5: This question is an addition to the previous methodology asking if the university offers its students opportunities to study, work, or conduct research abroad in global health.

EQ6: This new question is not graded, but will be used to identify any formal global health partnership(s) between the university and a university in a low or middle income countries.

EQ7: This new question assesses the ways in which the university offers opportunities to learn more about alternative models of research and development through courses and workshops.

Transparency Survey

This section is new to the methodology and is devoted to the evaluation of quality, validity and availability of public data obtained online for the answering of questions in the three previous sections, as well as responsiveness to survey emails and discrepancy of reported and internally obtained data.

Transparency Question 1 (TQ1): The revised methodology's first transparency question assesses the responsiveness of the university's Technology Transfer Office (TTO) towards emails sent from UAEM regarding the Innovation and Access section surveys.

TQ2: This question evaluates the availability and sufficiency of online public data relevant to survey questions in each of the three other sections of the methodology:

Part A evaluates online available data for the Access section.

Part B evaluates online available data for the Innovation section.

Part C evaluates online available data for the Empowerment section.

TQ3: This question assesses the level of discrepancy between data obtained from universities in their submitted response forms and the data obtained by UAEM from publicly available data sources.

TQ4: This question is not graded, but will be used to assess whether the university has clear guidelines devoted to conflict of interest policies regarding partnerships with industry.

If you have any questions related to the updates or others, please email reportcard@uaem.org