**BREAK-OUT GROUP SSPH+ FACULTY MEETING TUE 15 JUNE 2021
SESSION A2 / A3, 13:30-15:00**

**THEME: Where do we go? The SSPH+ Strategy 2023-2027**

Format: Plenary intro – state of strategy development (10min); parallel break-out groups of 50 minutes (incl. self-organized coffee break) followed by a plenary for group presentation and discussion (30min)

Number of parallel groups: groups of 3 to max. 5 participants

Material provided in advance: This info to all (delivered file via CHAT and [online](https://ssphplus.ch/en/calls-events/events/faculty-meeting-2021/) (column right, under link of session A2); 5 min after start)

Moderator: (1 per group) Self-organized

Rapporteur: (1 per group) Self-organized (can be the moderator)

**Context and objective:** In 2023, SSPH+ enters its next funding and strategic period. Thus, shaping the strategy of the future is a crucial process of this year. In this session you will learn where we stand with the strategic planning for 2023-2027. This includes results from the survey (closed on June 3) where you provided feedback on the current drafts of the future vision, mission and motivation. In break-out groups you will discuss specific strategic questions and challenges (see below) and provide inputs in the development of the strategy and the related financial concept 2023-2027 (to be adopted by the Foundation Board in the December 2021 meeting).

**How to work:** Your break-out group has an automatically assigned GROUP NUMBER. Start with the TOPIC with the same NUMBER. Take your time with this question. Once you are done, move on to the next question (from the LAST one, go to TOPIC 1). You do not have to work on all topics.

**MODERATORS** make sure the discussion is well structured and all participants can express their ideas.

**RAPPORTEURS** use this WORD file to fill in the major thoughts, ideas, controversies 🡪 send this file/“minutes” to snocera@ssphplus.ch right after the session. You will briefly (3 minutes) summarize the main input from the group work in the plenary (if you want you can share the screen).

**Please fill in the name of the participants of this group:**

**TOPIC 1: Supporting “Working Groups” to think, develop, implement together**

As the only inter-university national network of academic leaders in public health, SSPH+ represents a very wide expertise. However, public health is multidimensional and multidisciplinary, touching on many domains where other academics (and non-academics) provide relevant expertise too. To foster exchange under the lead of SSPH+ partners, the Directorate considers to launch new calls to get support for “working groups” (WGs, as a working title only, or “task forces” or “think tanks”. etc.). Selected SSPH+ applicants could lead some outcome-oriented collaborative WGs on a proposed topic to assemble and steer all relevant constituencies and stakeholders needed to address issues relevant to progress in the chosen domain of public health. Applicants will propose the content (e.g., emerging science-to-policy issues, development of the training landscape, guidelines on a societal issue, promotion of a health relevant regulation, etc.).

QUESTION: What do you think of SSPH+ supporting such “WGs”, initiated and led by SSPH+ partners? How would you frame such competitive calls (e.g., selection criteria, duration of the support, possible outcomes, level of funding)? Shall “working groups” include internal (SSPH+) as well as external constituencies alike?

**YOUR SUMMARY / MINUTES:**

**TOPIC 2: “SSPH+ Parliament”**

The current governance of SSPH+ is based on a) the oversight by the Foundation Board (two members per Foundation university) with board meetings in May and December and Commission (President and Deputy) meetings held 4-6 times with the Directorate, b) the Directorate with its administrative office in Zurich (90% FTE Dean & 2 Deputies; 150% FTE for head, admin, and fundraising and 250% FTE for project specific coordination (e.g., GlobalP3HS; Inter-university Graduate Campus). The faculty meets once a year. Ad hoc meetings may be held occasionally on specific topics. Given this structure, all operational decisions are taken by the Directorate (where needed with approval from Board or Commission).

QUESTION: How would you like SSPH+ to function in the future, in particular: would you like to have more formal/regular opportunities to provide inputs, debate or shape decisions, provide ideas or proposals or plan social events? Why yes? Why not? If yes, how (e.g., a “parliament” or a “steering board” or some “working group” structure, some internal “scientific committee” to define relevant public health issues that SSPH+ should promote, etc.) and how should it be operated? Etc.

**YOUR SUMMARY / MINUTES:**

**TOPIC 3: SSPH+ “SOUNDING BOARD” (or “EXTERNAL ADVISORY BOARD” or “COMMISSION”)**

As described in TOPIC 2, the SSPH+ governance at this stage relies on the Foundation Board and the Directorate to steer all operations for and with the faculty, fellows, PhD students and partners. SSPH+ has no external body that provides advice, reflects from the outside, and/or acts as a messenger for SSPH+. A “Sounding Board” could include different personalities and stakeholders from politics, business and society to enable an exchange of interest and opinions.

QUESTION: Should the SSPH+ governance structure have an (external) “Sounding Board” in the future? Why yes? Why not? If yes, what would its main objectives be? Some advisory role? On what? What name should it have? How would you design it (e.g., size, top priority constituencies to be represented in the board apart from the Federal Office of PH as an obvious one)?

**YOUR SUMMARY / MINUTES:**

**TOPIC 4: “SSPH+ Donors Club”**

In line with the current strategy and decisions of the Board, SSPH+ has a fundraiser since several years. The objective is to raise funds which SSPH+ can provide to its constituencies to foster research and training. The Corona Immunitas’ experience underscores the prime role of funders, both public and private, and the key role of communication and trust in fundraising. Other organizations have created “Donors Clubs” (working title) as part of the organizational structure to strengthen the acquisition of funds. Members would not only be donors, but also ambassadors for the vision of an inter-university public health network.

QUESTION: Would you support such a “club / board / commission”? Would members be representatives of both private and public organizations? Do you see potential conflicts (instead of an added value) with activities of your institution or university? If yes, how would those be avoided? What criteria would you define to qualify as a “club” member?

**YOUR SUMMARY / MINUTES:**

**TOPIC 5: SSPH+ in the international context**

Although SSPH+ core activities have a major focus on strengthening SSPH+ as a Swiss network, the network partners are heavily involved also in international dimensions of global public health. SSPH+ projects such as GlobalP3HS or the new collaboration with a call on equity and health (Julius Baer Foundation) are inherently global in nature. In formal terms, however, SSPH+ per se is only a member of the Association of Schools of Public Health of the European Region (ASPHER) and the Organization for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in the European System (ORPHEUS). Since many years and until May 2021, SSPH+ was represented on the Board of ASPHER (Fred Paccaud, followed by Nino Künzli), a term that now expired. SSPH+ has a cooperation with ASPHER for the journal Public Health Reviews, now taken over from ASPHER. Otherwise, SSPH+ is not per se (as an organization) formally represented in any internationally oriented constituency. Many SSPH+ network partners have, however, a range of formal and informal partnerships around the globe. Moreover, the survey about the drafts of the Vision, Mission and Motivation resulted in various comments to not restrict SSPH+ only “nationally” but keep a global perspective.

QUESTION: Should SSPH+ dedicate part of its energy more explicitly (beyond the core activities mentioned above) toward an international dimension? Why or why not? Should SSPH+ be a formal member/associate of other organizations/associations? In which cases would it be more appropriate to leave the participation to a certain association to the single member universities and when would the institutional representation through SSPH+ be preferred? How would such engagements be managed? (e.g., some SSPH+ working group led by mandated SSPH+ partners?)

**YOUR SUMMARY / MINUTES:**