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Motivation and Relevance
1. **Assess Mutual Benefits:**
   Assess and compare mutual benefits of global health partnerships, for North American versus international partners.

2. **Roadmap:**
   Develop a strategic roadmap to guide North American academic global health programs.
Global Health Partnerships: Guiding Questions

1. What types of partnership? What is their distribution?
2. What are key funding sources?
3. What is the geographical distribution of partnerships?
4. Which partnerships have been most beneficial to date?
5. What are evolving priorities for future partnerships?
6. What types of collaborations are most beneficial?
7. What are areas for further improvement?
8. How well are partners working together?
9. Is there evidence for equity?
10. What are the implications for global health programs?
Methods

Data Gathering

- Survey Questionnaires
  - Appendix A: North American Institutions
  - Appendix B: International Institutions
- Structured Interviews:
  - Appendix C: Interview Guide
- Literature Review:
  - Appendix F: Case Study Articles

Analysis

- Statistical Analysis
  - Descriptive Comparison
  - Regression Analyses
- Thematic Analysis
  - Qualitative Survey Data
  - Structured Interview Data
  - Literature Review
North American Academic Institutions (n = 82)

- 81.2% of CUGH membership (at time of study) responded!
  - Comprise 67.7% of the American Association of Universities’ membership

- Type of Institutions
  - 58.5% Public
  - 41.5% Private

- Overall institutional student enrollment ranges from 2,500 to 40,000+

- 68.4% of North American GH partnerships are part of larger institutional partnerships
International Partner Institutions (n = 47)

- 75.8% of identified sample responded

- Type of Institutions:
  - 61.7% Public Academic
  - 10.6% Private Academic
  - 19.2% NGO
  - 8.6% Government/Other Agency
Locations of International Partner Institutions
Classification of International Partnerships by North American Universities

- High Performing Partnerships: 43%
- Middle Standing Partnerships: 40%
- Struggling Partnerships: 17%
Perceived of Importance of Various Funding Sources for North American Institution Global Health Partnerships

- University
  - Essential: 50.7%
  - High Importance: 26.0%
  - Medium Importance: 9.3%
  - Low Importance: 6.7%
  - Not Important: 5.3%
  - Do Not Receive: 5.0%

- NIH
  - Essential: 30.7%
  - High Importance: 14.7%
  - Medium Importance: 16.0%
  - Low Importance: 22.7%
  - Not Important: 21.3%
  - Do Not Receive: 8.0%

- PEPFAR
  - Essential: 11.0%
  - High Importance: 25.3%
  - Medium Importance: 12.3%
  - Low Importance: 4.1%
  - Not Important: 2.7%
  - Do Not Receive: 1.3%

- Other Federal Government
  - Essential: 21.3%
  - High Importance: 21.3%
  - Medium Importance: 20.0%
  - Low Importance: 21.3%
  - Not Important: 4.0%
  - Do Not Receive: 4.0%

- Other External Grants or Contracts
  - Essential: 17.3%
  - High Importance: 17.3%
  - Medium Importance: 17.3%
  - Low Importance: 13.3%
  - Not Important: 6.7%
  - Do Not Receive: 6.7%

- Private Donors
  - Essential: 18.7%
  - High Importance: 28.0%
  - Medium Importance: 26.7%
  - Low Importance: 26.7%
  - Not Important: 26.7%
  - Do Not Receive: 26.7%
Perceived of Importance of Various Funding Sources for International Institution Global Health Partnerships
Geographic Location of International Institutions’ 516 Partners

- United States, 37.2%
- Canada, 11.6%
- Europe, 20.9%
- Latin America, 10.1%
- Africa, 9.5%
- Asia Pacific, 10.7%

Type of Partnerships Producing Greatest Benefit for International Partners to Date

- 37 (97%): South-North
- 1 (3%): South-South
International institutions’ anticipated prioritization for developing future partnerships

- 61% South-North
- 39% South-South

South-South | South-North
Perceived Benefits from Research Collaborations

- **North American Academic Institutions' Perception of the Benefits for Their Own Institution**
- **International Institutions' Perception of the Benefits for Their Own Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Benefits</th>
<th>North American</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Beneficial</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Beneficial</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Beneficial</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Global Health Partnership Benefits
Re: Global or Local Health Impact

- North American Academic Institutions' Perception of the Benefits for Their Own Institution
- International Institutions' Perception of the Benefits for Their Own Institution

Bar chart showing the percentage of perceived benefits for various types of impact:
- 4.0% Harmful
- 5.4% Not Beneficial
- 21.3% Somewhat Beneficial
- 34.7% Beneficial
- 40.5% Very Beneficial
- 18.9% Beneficial
- 40.0% Very Beneficial
Factors Correlated with Perceived Benefits from Partnerships

**North American Universities**
- Funding from all sources (esp. NIH, PEPFAR, other federal agencies, external grants/contracts, and foundations)
- Being part of larger institutional partnerships
- Effectiveness of partnership collaborations

**International Institutions**
- Funding from all sources (esp. the NA university, NIH, foundations, and UN agencies)
- Collaborations and investments received
- Level of **North American student preparation**
- Effectiveness of partnership collaborations
How Well Global Health Partners are Working Together in **Monitoring and Evaluation**

![Bar chart showing distribution of responses regarding monitoring and evaluation.](chart.png)
International Partners’ Institutional Needs-fulfillment in Seven Areas

- Medical Professional Training Program
- Collaborative Research
- Clinical or Public Health Interventions
- Health Systems Development
- Technology Exchange
- Policy Development & Advocacy
- Practicum Experience for Students

Legend:
- Poor
- Fair
- Well
- Very Well
- Excellent
A Framework for Success of GH Programs

1. Gauge Enthusiasm, Identify Champions, and Organize a Core Team
2. Prepare a Strategic Plan
3. Secure Institutional Support and Baseline Funding
4. Establish a Centralized Presence
5. Develop Future Leaders
6. Guide Student Enthusiasm and Manage Expectations
7. Develop Existing and Identify New Global Health Partnerships
8. Program Monitoring and Evaluation
9. Develop and Maintain Communication
10. Build Cross-University Interdisciplinary Networks
### Strengths

- 1st in-depth investigation of North American / International Global Health Partnerships
- High CUGH and LMIC response rates
- Mixed methods design
- Questionnaires vetted by representatives of CUGH and international institutions

### Limitations

- **Selection bias**
  - Survey analysis limited to CUGH
  - Higher representation of stronger partnerships in international sample
- Respondent fatigue/survey attrition
- English only surveys
- Subjective responses
So, global health partnerships report benefits and equity — but, what is the objective evidence of impact of global health on research, education, and service?
Global migration of clinical trials

Top 10 Medical Breakthroughs of 2011

1. Scientists Use Cloning to Create Stem Cells
2. A First-Ever Malaria Vaccine

3. **HIV Treatment As Prevention**

4. The Food Pyramid Becomes a Plate
5. Body Parts Grown in the Lab
6. The Curious Link Between Bacteria and Colon Cancer
7. A Silver Bullet for Weight Loss?
8. Dogs That Can Sniff Out Lung Cancer
9. You're as Old as Your Spit Says You Are
10. A Death Risk Predictor?
Efficacy proven in RCTs ≠ Real world effectiveness and scale-up
↓
Impact evaluation methods with
Counterfactual comparisons
Figure 1
Number of new HIV infections among children in 21 Global Plan priority countries, 2000–2014

Source: UNAIDS 2014 estimates.
Tachi Yamada, President, Global Health Program – BMGF

- What does academia contribute to global health? “Innovation and discovery”
- Also education and training of thousands of new global health students and graduates?
Over 175 reports, presentations, and tools delivered to teams at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

**No. of Completed Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4, Y5)</th>
<th>Strategic Support &amp; Operations</th>
<th>Landscape Analyses</th>
<th>Data &amp; Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Infrastructure for Global Health
Partnerships in Research, Education, and Service

FACES Network: 160 clinics; 140,000 persons received HIV Rx
International Infrastructure
1. Partnerships are quite varied

2. Diverse funding sources

3. International partners report needs well fulfilled

4. International partners perceive South-North partnerships most beneficial to date.

5. Need for improved communication and M&E

6. Roadmap for developing Global Health programs
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