



Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (Senate Document #17-18-12)

TO Darryll J. Pines | President

FROM Laura Dugan | Chair, University Senate

I am pleased to forward the accompanying legislation for your consideration and approval. Lisa Taneyhill, Chair of the University Research Council, presented the Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (Senate Document #17-18-12), which the University Senate approved at its meeting on April 20, 2021. Please inform the Senate of your decision and any administrative action related to your conclusion.

Approved:

Date:

04-27-2021

**Darryll J. Pines
President**

Copies of this approval and the accompanying legislation will be forwarded to:

- Ann G. Wylie**, Interim Senior Vice President and Provost
- Reka Montfort**, Executive Secretary and Director, University Senate
- Michael Poterala**, Vice President and General Counsel
- Cynthia Hale**, Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
- John Bertot**, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
- Elizabeth Beise**, Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs
- Rhonda Smith**, Acting Director, Division of Academic Affairs
- Laurie Locascio**, Vice President for Research
- Eric Chapman**, Associate Vice President for Research Development
- Wendy Montgomery**, Director, Office of Research Administration
- Lisa Taneyhill**, Chair, University Research Council



Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes

PRESENTED BY Lisa Taneyhill, Chair

REVIEW DATES SEC – April 9, 2021 | SENATE – April 20, 2021

VOTING METHOD In a single vote

RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT [IV-1.00\(A\) – University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes](#)

NECESSARY APPROVALS Senate, President

ISSUE

In September 2017, Provost Rankin asked if the Senate could conduct a comprehensive review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (IV-1.00[A]). The Policy was created in 1991 and had not been reviewed since, and Provost Rankin noted that implementation and enforcement of the Policy was inconsistent throughout campus. The University has grown and its educational and research missions have evolved and the Policy must be revised to align with that evolution, best practices, and consistent standards. The review was delayed to allow for broader input, and the Research Council was formally charged on June 3, 2019.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Research Council makes the following recommendations in (I) Policy Revisions & Development, and (II) Administrative Recommendations:

I. Policy Revisions & Development

1. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes be revised as shown immediately following this report.
2. The Research Council recommends that the new University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic or Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00 [D]) as shown immediately following this report be approved.
3. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes as shown immediately following this report be approved. The Guidelines may be updated periodically and should be comprehensively reviewed by the Senate along with the Policy in 2026.

4. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) be amended to remove the requirement that centers be reviewed with academic units, as shown immediately following this report.

II. Administrative Recommendations

1. The provisions within the revised Policy should be applied to all existing entities at the University of Maryland, and all new entities should be created in alignment with the processes specified in the Policy.
2. The Division of Research should create and maintain a central repository of information on all University centers and institutes. The repository should include an online public-facing list of all centers and institutes, as well as an internal database that can be used to track key details about each center and institute. The database will need to be maintained and updated regularly.
3. The University should create a standard application form or template to ensure that all proposals for new centers and institutes address key elements outlined in the Guidelines.
4. The University should develop guidance on establishing and reviewing centers and institutes to assist Deans and department chairs in conducting review processes that are in alignment with the Policy and Guidelines. The Division of Research should provide unit heads with advanced notice of an upcoming review to allow units to prepare for the review process.
5. Each Approval Authority should establish a staggered schedule for reviewing existing centers and institutes under the provisions of the revised Policy to ease implementation. Schedules should incorporate entities that already have an existing review cycle, but should also establish a review cycle for centers and institutes that have not been reviewed on a periodic basis. All existing centers and institutes should be reviewed under this structure within five years of adoption of the revisions to the Policy.
6. Unit Heads should consider conducting annual discussions with center and institute Directors to broadly assess progress towards annual objectives, including challenges and opportunities that the center or institute faced that year and tangible outcomes, where appropriate.
7. Approval Authorities should consider the name of any existing center or institute that does not align with the naming conventions specified in the revised Policy at the time of the entity's next review, and may approve the continued use of the existing name as an exception to the naming conventions in the Policy. In these cases, the entity will be governed by the Policy specifications that are associated with the level at which they operate, rather than those associated with the name of the entity. New entities created under this Policy should be created with names that align with the level at which they operate, unless the name of the entity is dictated by an external funding agency or other external needs.
8. The University Senate should conduct a review of the Policy and the Guidelines and their implementation in 2026 to determine whether additional modifications are needed.

COUNCIL WORK

The Research Council began working on its charge in September 2019 and initially divided its work into two phases. In Fall 2019, the Council focused on gathering information related to its charge, and in late Spring 2020, the Council started developing Policy revisions based on that information.

The Council reviewed data gathered from each College on existing centers and institutes, the report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee, and the current Policy.

The Council engaged key stakeholder groups to solicit feedback throughout its review. In Fall 2019, the Council held open forums and meetings with center and institute directors and faculty, the deans, and graduate students engaged in centers and institutes to get preliminary feedback on current implementation and potential issues with the current Policy. The Council sent out a survey to center and institute directors, faculty, and students to solicit additional input and feedback. The information from that feedback was compiled and distilled into preliminary directions for the Policy revisions, which was presented to the University Senate, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and key stakeholder groups for additional feedback in March 2020.

The Research Council refined the preliminary directions based on the feedback that it received and used them to develop Policy language. The Research Council presented the revised Policy draft to key stakeholder groups and solicited additional feedback. As the Council worked to finalize the Policy revisions, the COVID-19 pandemic moved the University to the virtual environment in March 2020 and made it challenging for the Council to continue its work. Therefore, the Council was unable to meet its deadline in Spring 2020 and reconvened under the leadership of its new chair in Fall 2020.

In September 2020, the Research Council reviewed a revised draft of the Policy, which incorporated a new section related to reviews of directors of centers and institutes, and solicited additional input on that aspect of the Policy from key stakeholder groups including the Senate, the Council of Deans, the Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs, the Research Directors, the Academic Leadership Forum, and Provost Rankin. The feedback received included input on the director review, as well as on other aspects of the draft Policy. The Council spent the remainder of Fall 2020 incorporating the additional feedback received from the key stakeholder groups. In January 2021, the Council also solicited feedback from interim Provost Wylie. The Council developed a revised version of the Policy and solicited final suggestions from the deans, the Vice President for Research, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and interim Provost Wylie.

In the course of its review, the Research Council found that it would be necessary to develop a Policy to review the directors of centers and institutes similar to the one used for department chairs. That new Policy was developed in collaboration with John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and was modeled after the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Department Chairs and Directors of Academic Units (I-6.00[C]). In addition, procedural and implementation elements associated with the centers and institutes Policy were separated out into a new University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Academic and Research-Based Centers and Institutes that will provide more specific guidance on the processes associated with the Policy. Finally, the Research Council found that a minor amendment was necessary in the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) in order to remove a conflict with a new provision in the centers and institutes Policy that allows Unit Heads and Approval Authorities to decide whether center and institute reviews “should be reviewed independently or as part of the review of the academic Unit within which it resides.” The amendment would simply remove the clause, “Centers contained within a unit shall be reviewed along with the unit.” The revised Policy, the new Guidelines, and the new director review Policy were distributed to the deans, the Vice President for Research, and the Senior Vice President and Provost for additional feedback before they were finalized. The Policies and Guidelines were also reviewed by the Office of General Counsel. The Research Council approved its final recommendations in an email vote on April 1, 2021.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could choose not to accept the recommendations. However, the University would then lose an opportunity to establish consistent processes for establishing, reviewing, and dissolving centers and institutes as well as develop standard implementation practices.

RISKS

There are no known risks to the University in adopting these recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are financial implications associated with some of the aspects of the recommendations, such as with developing the central repository of all centers and institutes.



Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes

2020-2021 Council Members

Lisa Taneyhill (Chair)
Eric Chapman (Ex-Officio VP Research Rep)
Michele Eastman (Ex-Officio President's Rep)
Blessing Enekwe (Ex-Officio Graduate School Rep)
Cindi Hale (Ex-Officio Provost's Rep)
Wendy Montgomery (Ex-Officio Dir. of ORA Rep)
Doug Roberts (Ex-Officio Undergraduate Studies Rep)
Peter Chung (Faculty)
Niklas Elmqvist (Faculty)
Valentine Hacquard (Faculty)
Ming Hu (Faculty)

Amy Pate (Faculty)
Debra Shapiro (Faculty)
Kathleen Stewart (Faculty)
Arpita Upadhyaya (Faculty)
Rubie Mize (Staff)
Grace Henry (Graduate Student)
Charlee Bezilla (Graduate Student)
Ngoc Bui (Undergraduate Student)

Date of Submission

April 2021

BACKGROUND

In September 2017, Provost Rankin met with the Senate leadership and asked if the Senate could conduct a comprehensive review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (IV-1.00[A]) (Appendix 2). The Policy was created in 1991 and had not been reviewed since, and Provost Rankin noted that implementation and enforcement of the Policy was inconsistent throughout campus. The Senate leadership brought the proposal to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), which voted to charge the University Research Council with a review of the Policy in September 2017.

The Research Council's review was delayed in order to allow the new Vice President for Research an opportunity to provide input on the charge to the Council. Provost Rankin also suggested that the Research Council should consider the report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee (Appendix 3) to inform its work, resulting in an additional delay. The Research Council, chaired by George Hurtt, was formally charged (Appendix 1) on June 3, 2019. The initial deadline for the Research Council to complete its work on the charge was March 30, 2020 but the COVID-19 pandemic in the Spring 2020 semester delayed the Council's work and resulted in the need for a delay to the deadline. The Research Council returned to its work under the leadership of its new chair, Lisa Taneyhill, at the start of the Fall 2020 semester.

CHARGE

The Research Council was charged with reviewing the report and recommendations of the Research Institute Advisory Committee; similar policies on the establishment and review of centers and institutes at Big 10 and other peer institutions; data on the number, size, structure, and administration of existing centers and institutes at the University; best practice models in colleges that have developed new guidelines for their centers and institutes; the existing procedures for periodic reviews; and the definitions of the types of centers and institutes in the current Policy. The Council was also asked to consult with a representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President

and Provost, faculty and graduate students actively engaged in interdisciplinary research within centers and institutes, and the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee. As part of its review, the Council was tasked with considering whether the current Policy is aligned with the University's educational and research missions; the role of graduate students in centers and institutes and the impact of potential organizational changes on their research; whether the establishment of centers and institutes should include sunset provisions; and whether new entities should be initiated with a probationary status before attaining permanent status. The complete charge to the Research Council is included in Appendix 1.

CURRENT PRACTICE

The current Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes was created in 1991. Since that time, the University has grown and its educational and research missions have evolved. Over the past 30 years, the Policy has been implemented inconsistently and enforcement has been sporadic and uneven across campus.

The Research Institute Advisory Committee (RIAC) investigated a set of existing centers and institutes that have annual expenditures of over \$2M a year, including the Institute for Bioscience and Biotechnology Research (IBBR), the Institute for Systems Research (ISR), the Language Science Center (LSC), and the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), among others. The RIAC's report identified wide variation in centers and institutes in terms of funding sources, governance structures, clarity of mission, review processes, and other details. The committee also noted the existence of significant overlap and duplication amongst centers on campus. For example, there are several dedicated cybersecurity centers and another group of language centers. The report also highlighted several best practices that are not currently used at the University that should be considered, such as the use of probationary periods to implement corrective measures or writing in sunset clauses when a center or institute is established.

Based on information received from the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, it was clear that there is no current centralized repository of information on all existing centers and institutes that includes general information on each, and no tracking of review processes or timelines. This lack of centralized information has led to some of the duplication and makes it challenging for the University to take advantage of funding opportunities that may arise if there is no awareness of what types of centers and institutes are available to leverage those opportunities.

COUNCIL WORK

The Research Council began working on its charge in September 2019 and initially divided its work into two phases. In Fall 2019, the Council focused on gathering information related to its charge and in late Spring 2020, the Council started developing Policy revisions based on that information. The Council reviewed data gathered from each College on existing centers and institutes, the report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee, and the current Policy.

The Research Council gathered and reviewed information on policies and practices at Big 10 and other peer institutions, including University of Texas, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, University of California-Berkeley, and University of California-Los Angeles. Findings from peer data show that most institutions have a more organized process for centers and institutes. The current University Policy touches on many of the key elements identified in best practices, but the Policy is ambiguous and does not give enough structure to the process to ensure that it is consistently followed or enforced. Peer institutions typically have detailed levels for different types of entities,

which guide a defined proposal and establishment process and a detailed periodic review process. Peers also typically address issues related to administrative structures, funding models, termination processes, and sunseting plans in more detail. A summary of the peer institution best practices can be found in Appendix 5; full details on peer institution policies can be found in Appendix 6.

The Council engaged key stakeholder groups to solicit feedback throughout its review. The main themes of the feedback gathered from key stakeholder groups are summarized in Appendix 4. In Fall 2019, the Council held open forums and meetings with center and institute directors and faculty, the deans, and graduate students engaged in centers and institutes to get preliminary feedback on current implementation and potential issues with the current Policy. The Council sent out a survey to center and institute directors, faculty, and students to solicit additional input and feedback. The information from that feedback was compiled and distilled into preliminary directions for the revisions, which was presented to the University Senate, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and key stakeholder groups for additional feedback in March 2020.

The Research Council refined the preliminary directions based on the feedback that it received and used them to develop Policy language. The Research Council presented the revised Policy draft to key stakeholder groups and solicited additional feedback. As the Council worked to finalize the Policy revisions, the COVID-19 pandemic moved the University to the virtual environment in March 2020 and made it challenging for the Council to continue its work. Therefore, the Council was unable to meet its deadline in Spring 2020 and reconvened under the leadership of its new chair, Lisa Taneyhill, in Fall 2020.

In September 2020, the Research Council reviewed a revised draft of the Policy, which incorporated a new section related to reviews of directors of centers and institutes, and solicited additional input on that aspect of the Policy from key stakeholder groups including the Senate, the Council of Deans, the Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs, the Research Directors, the Academic Leadership Forum, and Provost Rankin. The feedback received included input on the director review, as well as on other aspects of the draft Policy. The Council spent the remainder of Fall 2020 incorporating the additional feedback received from the key stakeholder groups. In January 2021, the Council also solicited feedback from interim Provost Wylie. The Council developed a revised version of the Policy and solicited final suggestions from the deans, the Vice President for Research, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and interim Provost Wylie.

In the course of its review, the Research Council found that it would be necessary to develop a separate policy to review the directors of centers and institutes similar to the one used for department chairs. That new Policy was developed in collaboration with John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and was modeled after the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Department Chairs and Directors of Academic Units (I-6.00[C]). In addition, procedural and implementation elements associated with the Centers and Institutes Policy were separated out into a new University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Academic and Research-Based Centers and Institutes that will provide more specific guidance on the processes associated with the Policy. Finally, the Research Council found that a minor amendment was necessary in the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) in order to remove a conflict with a new provision in the Centers and Institutes Policy that allows Unit Heads and Approval Authorities to decide whether center and institute reviews “should be reviewed independently or as part of the review of the academic Unit within which it resides.” The amendment would simply remove the clause, “Centers contained within a unit shall be reviewed along with the unit.” The revised Policy, the new Guidelines, and the new director review Policy were distributed to the deans, the Vice President for Research, and the Senior Vice President and Provost for

additional feedback before they were finalized. The Policies and Guidelines were also reviewed by the Office of General Counsel.

The Research Council approved its final recommendations in an email vote concluding on April 1, 2021.

RESEARCH COUNCIL FINDINGS

The Research Council compiled feedback from the forums, survey data, and the peer policy information that it had gathered. The Council used these findings to develop key principles for the Policy that were presented to the Senate in March 2020. The Research Council developed a draft Policy based on the principles and worked closely with key stakeholder groups to refine the draft. Based on those discussions, the Council identified the need for a separate Policy on the review of center and institute directors and guidelines that support the implementation of the Policy. The key principles that underpin the Policy and guidelines include the following:

- A central repository of all centers and institutes is needed, with a public-facing list and internal data components;
- Current levels of group, center, and institute should be retained;
- More detail is needed on the different levels of centers at the University;
- Flexibility is needed for the unit head and the approval authority to be able to adapt processes to the needs of a specific Unit or entity;
- There should be a standard formal proposal with key elements to create new centers or institutes and a defined approval pathway;
 - Standard elements for a proposal should include aspects that reflect how the entity would fit within the context of the University, such as alignment with the University's mission, graduate student engagement, and how it differs from existing entities at the University.
- Proposals from external funding opportunities should be able to be a substitute for the formal University proposal to establish a center or institute, and the University proposal review process should not create additional burdens or delays that impede the external processes;
- The University's research, teaching, and service missions should be considered in proposals and reviews;
 - Contributions to all three aspects should not be required, but all three should be considered in the proposal and review processes to assess how the entity fits within the broader context of the University; and
 - Including graduate students should be encouraged as one way of addressing the educational mission.
- Probationary periods or sunset provisions should not be required to be built in from the outset;
- Centers should be able to be reviewed independently or as a part of the academic unit within which it resides, at the discretion of the Unit Head and Approval Authority;
- Review processes for centers and institutes should be more clearly specified, and should vary based on the level at which the center or institute operates.
 - Review processes should not be needed for groups; and
 - Elements from external funding agency reviews should be able to be used in the University's review process.
- Review cycles should be established for new and existing entities;
- Procedures for sunsetting a center or institute in the wake of a negative review should be specified as a potential outcome;

- Reorganizations, restructurings, and renamings should be addressed in the Policy as options following a periodic review;
- Implementation of the revised Policy should apply to existing centers and institutes through the periodic review process at the time of their next review;
- Termination processes should be defined both as a potential outcome of a periodic review and as an option outside of a review cycle, if warranted;
- A Director review process should be established;
- There should be separation between the Policy and implementation processes; and
- There should be provisions that speak to oversight and enforcement of Policy implementation.

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED POLICY REVISIONS

The Research Council has developed various revisions to the University of Maryland Policy & Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers & Institutes (IV-1.00[A]) that align with the principles that it developed following extensive feedback sessions with key stakeholder groups. The Council also developed a new University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic or Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00 [D]), as well as implementation guidance in the University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes. The proposed Policy revisions and Guidelines are included in the recommendations, and seek to:

- Clarify the scope of the Policy to exclude any entities with the term “center” in the name that are not intended to be covered by this Policy, such as the Health Center, Xfinity Center, Teaching & Learning Transformation Center, Extension Centers, and others by renaming the Policy to add “Academic and Research-Based Centers & Institutes” and adding related modifiers to language throughout the Policy;
- Add and clarify definitions within the Policy and ensure consistency in definitions across all policies and guidelines related to centers and institutes;
- Specify implementation and tracking mechanisms in the Policy and Guidelines by tasking the Division of Research with tracking all centers and institutes and notifying Unit Heads of the need to conduct a periodic review on schedule (Policy) and by indicating that any approvals of new entities or changes to existing entities should be reported to the Division of Research for tracking purposes (Guidelines);
- Describe and define Groups and Institutes while establishing specific levels of organization for centers with Department Level Centers, College Level Centers, and Intercollegiate Level Centers;
- Specify the Unit Head and Approval Authority for each level at which entities operate and indicate the duties and roles of the Unit Head and the Approval Authority in the proposal review and periodic review processes, as well as in determining outcomes following periodic reviews;
- Broaden language on funding models in recognition that existing entities vary widely on levels of internal and external support;
- Clarify provisions on faculty appointments with respect to tenure home, joint appointments, and primary appointments for professional track faculty;
- Require a formal proposal and specify suggested proposal elements as well as the proposal review process for establishing a center or institute;
- Include an element in the proposal and proposal review processes on how the entity contributes to the research, teaching, and/or service aspects of the University’s mission with an understanding that graduate student participation is one way of addressing the University’s educational mission;

- Indicate that when entities are established as the result of an external funding opportunity, the proposal associated with the external process may be substituted for the proposal within the University's process, and the proposal review process will be routed through the appropriate pathway for such a proposal rather than through the standard approval process;
- Create a formal periodic review process for new and existing entities, with an initial review for a new entity after five years and a standard seven-year cycle for established entities;
- Provide flexibility to Unit Heads and Approval Authorities to modify specific aspects of the proposal review and periodic review processes to fit the needs of their Unit or the entity being reviewed, as appropriate;
- Ensure that periodic reviews measure progress against benchmarks and metrics for success specific to the entity being reviewed, and that reviews consider additional elements as specified in the Guidelines;
- Indicate that components of external funding agency reviews can be used to fulfill elements of a periodic review at the discretion of the Unit Head;
- Require a formal comprehensive review of the Director of all centers and institutes in the last year of their current appointment or on a five-year cycle for Directors with ongoing terms, which includes a representative review committee and specific review components and specified outcomes that may follow such a review;
- Identify and distinguish from each other potential outcomes from a periodic review process including probation, sunseting, and termination;
- Provide a pathway for reorganizing or renaming existing entities following a periodic review;
- Ensure the continuation of graduate student support when entities are sunsetted or terminated;
- Provide a pathway to terminate entities that are in violation of USM or University Policy, federal regulations, or state or federal law at any time, including outside of a periodic review process; and
- Provide guidance on implementation of the new Policy provisions for existing entities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Research Council makes the following recommendations in (I) Policy Revisions & Development, and (II) Administrative Recommendations:

I. Policy Revisions & Development

1. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes be revised as shown immediately following this report.
2. The Research Council recommends that the new University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic or Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00 [D]) as shown immediately following this report be approved.
3. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes as shown immediately following this report be approved. The Guidelines may be updated periodically and should be comprehensively reviewed by the Senate along with the Policy in 2026.

4. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) be amended to remove the requirement that centers be reviewed with academic units, as shown immediately following this report.

II. Administrative Recommendations

1. The provisions within the revised Policy should be applied to all existing entities at the University of Maryland, and all new entities should be created in alignment with the processes specified in the Policy.
2. The Division of Research should create and maintain a central repository of information on all University centers and institutes. The repository should include an online public-facing list of all centers and institutes, as well as an internal database that can be used to track key details about each center and institute. The database will need to be maintained and updated regularly.
3. The University should create a standard application form or template to ensure that all proposals for new centers and institutes address key elements outlined in the Guidelines.
4. The University should develop guidance on establishing and reviewing centers and institutes to assist Deans and department chairs in conducting review processes that are in alignment with the Policy and Guidelines. The Division of Research should provide unit heads with advanced notice of an upcoming review to allow units to prepare for the review process.
5. Each Approval Authority should establish a staggered schedule for reviewing existing centers and institutes under the provisions of the revised Policy to ease implementation. Schedules should incorporate entities that already have an existing review cycle, but should also establish a review cycle for centers and institutes that have not been reviewed on a periodic basis. All existing centers and institutes should be reviewed under this structure within five years of adoption of the revisions to the Policy.
6. Unit Heads should consider conducting annual discussions with center and institute Directors to broadly assess progress towards annual objectives, including challenges and opportunities that the center or institute faced that year and tangible outcomes, where appropriate.
7. Approval Authorities should consider the name of any existing center or institute that does not align with the naming conventions specified in the revised Policy at the time of the entity's next review, and may approve the continued use of the existing name as an exception to the naming conventions in the Policy. In these cases, the entity will be governed by the Policy specifications that are associated with the level at which they operate, rather than those associated with the name of the entity. New entities created under this Policy should be created with names that align with the level at which they operate, unless the name of the entity is dictated by an external funding agency or other external needs.
8. The University Senate should conduct a review of the Policy and the Guidelines and their implementation in 2026 to determine whether additional modifications are needed.

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee
- Appendix 2 — Current Centers & Institutes Policy

- Appendix 3 — Report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee
- Appendix 4 — Main Themes in Feedback from Key Stakeholder Groups
- Appendix 5 — Summary of Peer Institution Best Practices
- Appendix 6 — Peer Institution Policies



**IV-1.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR
THE ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC &
RESEARCH-BASED CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**

(Approved by the President August 1, 1991; Amended xxxx)

I. Purpose

The University of Maryland encourages faculty, staff, students, and administrators to engage in areas of common academic and research interests. The creation of academic and/or research-based entities that help to organize and engage faculty, staff, and/or students from one or more disciplines around those interests can expand the research enterprise, foster collaboration, and support the University's educational mission. To this end, the establishment, review, oversight, and termination of these entities will be guided by the procedures established in this Policy, in order to protect the legitimate interests of faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

II. Definitions

- A. "Academic Director" means the head of a School within a College, who is equivalent to a Department Chair.
- B. "Approval Authority" means the administrator or administrators with authority and oversight of the establishment, review, and termination of a Center or Institute. Depending on the level at which the entity operates, the Approval Authority may be a Department Chair, a Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, the Senior Vice President and Provost, or the President.
- C. "Center" means an academic and/or research-based entity, which engages faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within one Unit or across multiple Units. A Center may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.
- D. "College Level Center" means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from a single College and may involve engagement from multiple departments or areas of focus within the College.
- E. "Department Chair" means the head of an academic department.
- F. "Department Level Center" means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from a single department within a departmentalized College.
- G. "Director" means the head of an academic and/or research-based Center or Institute.

- H. “Group” means an informal collection of faculty members gathered to promote a common area of academic or research interest.
- I. “Institute” means an academic and/or research-based entity with prominence and stature that is typically intended to have a level of permanence similar to that of an academic department. Institutes engage faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within a College, across multiple Colleges, or University-wide. An Institute may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.
- J. “Intercollegiate Level Center” means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from two or more Colleges and involves engagement from multiple areas of focus across the University.
- K. “Multi-Institutional Center or Institute” means an entity created collaboratively between the University of Maryland and another institution, in order to advance the missions of both institutions or of the University System of Maryland (USM).
- L. “Unit” means an academic and/or research-based department, Institute, College or School, or Division.
- M. “Unit Head” means the administrator or administrators responsible for a Unit and the individual(s) to which the Director reports. A Unit Head may be an Institute Director, Academic Director, Department Chair, Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, or the Senior Vice President and Provost.

III. Policy

- A. The University recognizes Groups, Centers, and Institutes as organizational entities intended to facilitate research, foster collaboration, and enhance the academic experience.
- B. Centers and Institutes must comply with applicable University and USM policies. Centers and Institutes that receive federal funds must ensure compliance with the federal regulations and guidelines that govern federal grants, contracts, and other funding agreements, including those regarding the responsible conduct of research.
- C. The establishment of new Centers and Institutes should be aligned with the definitions of these entities in section II. of this Policy. Existing Centers and Institutes that do not meet the specifications of these entities in the definitions in section II. of this Policy are not required to be redefined or renamed solely for that reason. Renaming and reorganization may be a potential outcome of a periodic review process as defined in section VIII. of this Policy.

- D. Centers and Institutes have a diverse range of financial models. Centers and Institutes should seek and maintain a level of support consistent with their mission and expectations, which could include funding from internal and external sources.
- E. Centers and Institutes have varied missions, and with few exceptions do not award degrees. If applicable, Centers and Institutes should foster relationships with academic programs to support the University's educational mission.
- F. Centers may not serve as a tenure home.
- G. Institutes within the Division of Academic Affairs may serve as a tenure home with the approval of both the Senior Vice President and Provost and the President. All Institutes outside of the Division of Academic Affairs may not serve as a tenure home. Tenured/Tenure-Track (TTK) Faculty with a tenure home in an Institute may also hold a joint appointment in an academic department or non-departmentalized College/School.
- H. Faculty contracts establishing joint appointments with Centers or Institutes must define the nature of the faculty member's responsibilities with the entity and any potential limitations to their appointment.
- I. Centers and Institutes may be the primary appointment home for professional track (PTK) faculty and must establish and follow a plan of organization and policies, guidelines, and procedures for PTK faculty, in alignment with the University's policies and guidelines.

IV. Entities and Levels of Organization

A. Groups

1. Groups may be short-lived, or may persist as the interest of the faculty develops.
2. Groups typically consist of faculty within one Unit but may include faculty from multiple Units.
3. Groups may use naming conventions including "Group," "Research Group," "Research Laboratory," or other appropriate terminology, as long as the name does not improperly imply that the Group is a Center or Institute, as defined by this Policy.
4. Groups may evolve over time and establish themselves as Centers or Institutes by following the process defined in section V.B. of this Policy.

B. Centers

1. Centers may operate within one Unit or across multiple Units.

2. Centers should have a formal administrative structure and should be headed by a Director who will report to the Unit Head.
3. Centers will be organized within the following levels:
 - a. Centers within Institutes: The Unit Head for Centers within Institutes will be the Director of the Institute in which the Center resides. The Approval Authority is the administrator(s) to which the Institute Director reports, depending on the level at which the Institute resides.
 - b. Department Level Center: The Unit Head for a Department Level Center will be the Department Chair of the Unit in which the Department Level Center resides. The Approval Authority for a Department Level Center is the Dean.
 - c. College Level Center: The Unit Head for a College Level Center will be the Dean of the College in which the College Level Center resides. The Approval Authority for a College Level Center is the Senior Vice President and Provost. In the case of a College Level Center engaged in research activities, the Vice President for Research will be consulted when considering actions affecting the entity.
 - d. Intercollegiate Level Center: The Unit Head for an Intercollegiate Level Center will be specified at the time of its establishment. Intercollegiate Level Centers may report to one Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, or the Senior Vice President and Provost, as appropriate to the level, structure, needs, and focus of the Intercollegiate Level Center. The Approval Authority for an Intercollegiate Level Center is either the Senior Vice President and Provost or the President. In the case of an Intercollegiate Level Center engaged in research activities, the Vice President for Research will be consulted when considering actions affecting the entity.

C. Institutes

1. Institutes may operate within one College, across multiple Colleges, University-wide, or across multiple institutions.
2. Institutes should have a formal administrative structure and should be headed by a Director who will report to the Unit Head.
3. The Unit Head for an Institute will be specified at the time of its establishment, as appropriate to the structure, needs, and focus of the Institute.
4. The Approval Authority for an Institute may be a Dean(s), the Vice President for Research, the Senior Vice President and Provost, or the President.

V. Proposal and Establishment

A. Groups

1. Groups may be established at any time with appropriate notice to the Unit Head(s) of the Department(s) or College(s) in which they reside.
2. The name of a new Group must be approved by the Unit Head(s), in order to ensure that it is appropriate within the broader context of the Unit and does not overlap with terminology used for other named entities.
3. The Unit(s) will be responsible for maintaining records of all Groups and providing information about the Group in departmental communications and on departmental websites.

B. Centers and Institutes

1. The establishment of a new Center or Institute must be guided by a formal proposal.
2. A proposal for the establishment of a new Center or Institute may be prepared by informal groups of interested faculty and administrators, a committee appointed for the purpose of determining the need, desirability, and feasibility of a Center or Institute, or any similar formal or informal group.
3. Proposers are encouraged to consult with the Division of Research as a resource when determining the long-term feasibility of securing external funds in a specific research area.
4. The specific elements that should be included in a formal proposal are defined in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*.
5. In cases where a Center or Institute is being established as a result of an external funding opportunity, the proposal associated with that process may be substituted for the formal proposal.
6. All proposals should be submitted to the proposed Unit Head, who will oversee the review of the proposal.

VI. Review Process for Proposals

- A. Proposal review processes should be based on the level of the entity.
- B. Proposals initiated in response to external funding opportunities should be routed through the pathway appropriate to the funding process.
- C. The specific review processes for each type of entity are defined in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*.

D. Approval Process for Center & Institute Proposals

1. The Approval Authority will determine whether to approve the establishment of the proposed Center or Institute. The establishment of Centers and Institutes that are formed as a result of a successful external funding opportunity will be automatically approved by the University. The Approval Authority for entities at different levels of organization are specified in section IV. above.
2. The naming of all approved Centers and Institutes should be in alignment with the mission of the entity and avoid duplication with existing entities. Philanthropic and honorific namings of Centers and Institutes must be in accordance with the USM Policy on the Naming of Facilities & Programs (VI-4.00).
3. Proposals to establish Institutes will be reported to the University System of Maryland.
 - a. The Chancellor will be notified of the establishment of all Institutes.
 - b. The establishment of a Multi-Institutional Center or Institute will require the approvals of the Presidents of each institution and the Chancellor.
 - c. The establishment of a Center or Institute that is administratively separate from the University of Maryland will require the approval of the President, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents.

VII. Periodic Review Processes

A. Review of Groups

1. Groups need not undergo a formal periodic review process.

B. Reviews of Centers & Institutes

1. All Reviews should be tracked by the Division of Research, which will notify Unit Heads of the need to initiate a review.
2. New Centers and Institutes must be reviewed within five (5) years of establishment.
3. The initial review of a new Center or Institute is a major milestone in assessing its future viability and subsequent reviews will assess continued sustainability.
4. Reviews of established Centers and Institutes will be conducted within seven (7) years of the completion of the last review.

5. The Approval Authority, in consultation with the Unit Head, may determine whether a Center or Institute should be reviewed independently or as part of the review of the academic Unit within which it resides.
 6. Unit Heads will be responsible for ensuring that reviews occur on schedule, and will oversee the review process.
 - a. All reviews should begin with a self-assessment conducted by the Director of the Center or Institute.
 - b. Reviews for Institutes should include an external review. Reviews for Centers may include an external review, if deemed necessary by the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research.
 - c. The Unit Head may appoint a representative review committee, which would be responsible for conducting the review and submitting its findings in a written report. In the absence of a review committee, the Unit Head shall conduct the review and develop the written report.
 - d. Reviews should measure progress against the benchmarks and metrics for success identified during the establishment of the entity and/or refined in subsequent reviews.
 - e. The specific elements of the review process are defined in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*.
 - f. Components of external funding agency reviews may be used to fulfill elements of a periodic review, when authorized by the Unit Head.
 - g. The written report from the review committee and/or external review(s) should be sent to the Unit Head for consideration.
 7. The Unit Head will make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.
 8. The Approval Authority will make a final determination on actions following a review as defined in section VIII. below.
 9. Upon completion of all review processes, notification of the outcome should be forwarded to the Director, Unit Head, and the Division of Research.
- C. Center and Institute Directors must undergo a formal comprehensive review in accordance with the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic and Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00[D]).

VIII. Outcomes Following Periodic Reviews of Centers & Institutes

- A. The Center or Institute may be approved to continue normal operations with no modifications.
- B. The University will abide by the rules and regulations of external funding agencies or state or federal funding requirements, if changes are warranted for Centers and Institutes primarily funded by those sources.
- C. Reorganization or renaming procedures may be initiated.
 - 1. If the Approval Authority determines that a reorganization is warranted following a review, the Unit Head may initiate procedures to transition the Center or Institute to a different type of entity.
 - a. The Unit Head may consider a variety of options for reorganizing an existing Center or may consider other structural changes appropriate to the needs identified in the review.
 - b. The Unit Head should consult with the faculty and administrators engaged in the entity's work, as well as with the relevant College(s)/School(s), the Dean(s), the Senior Vice President and Provost, and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, prior to approving a reorganization.
 - c. If the proposed reorganization would result in the creation of a new Center, the new Center should be approved through the process for establishing a Center outlined in section V.B. of this Policy.
 - 2. If the review indicates that the name of the entity should be changed, the Unit Head may initiate a process to rename the entity. Philanthropic and honorific namings must be in accordance with the USM Policy on the Naming of Facilities & Programs (VI-4.00).
 - a. The Unit Head should consider any agreements with external funding agencies or affiliated laboratories regarding the name of the entity.
 - b. The Unit Head should consult with faculty and administrators engaged in the work of the entity to develop a new name, and may consider engaging departmental or College-level committees, as appropriate.
 - c. The Unit Head should determine whether a proposed new name would conflict with names used by existing Centers or Institutes at the University that focus on similar or related topics, and whether the proposed name is appropriate for the level at which the entity operates.

- d. The Unit Head may approve a new name for the entity after consultation with key stakeholders and the Approval Authority, and should notify the Division of Research of the change.

D. The Center or Institute may be placed on probation.

1. The Unit Head, in consultation with the Director, will develop a plan of corrective actions that must be taken during the probationary period to address the factors that led to the negative review.
2. The Center or Institute will have up to two years from the point at which the plan is finalized to implement the corrective actions.
3. The Center or Institute will submit a self-assessment to the Unit Head detailing its progress in addressing the factors that led to the negative review within two years.
4. The Unit Head will review the self-assessment and make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.
5. The Approval Authority will make a final determination on actions following the implementation of the plan. The Approval Authority may:
 - a. Remove probationary status and approve the continuation of normal operations;
 - b. Determine whether additional corrective actions are needed;
 - c. Determine whether additional time to address specific issues would be appropriate; or
 - d. Initiate sunseting procedures.

E. The Approval Authority may initiate sunseting procedures when a period of time is needed in order to appropriately complete or phase out the activities of the entity.

1. The Unit Head will develop the sunseting plan, in consultation with the Approval Authority, as appropriate. The Unit Head may engage the Director in the development of the sunseting plan.
2. The sunseting plan should address, among other things:
 - a. The time frame of the phase-out period, which may range from a few months to up to two years;
 - b. The reassignment or expiration of faculty/staff appointments;

- c. Plans for ensuring the continued support of graduate students whose research is associated with the entity; and
 - d. Plans for how to address any remaining funding commitments and other financial matters.
 - 3. The Unit Head will be responsible for taking any necessary steps to remove a Center or Institute from any public-facing websites or materials and notifying the Division of Research following sunseting.
- F. The Approval Authority may initiate termination procedures as specified in section IX. below.

IX. Termination

- A. Groups, Centers, and Institutes may be terminated at any time by the Approval Authority, in consultation with the Unit Head, for violation(s) of USM or University policy, federal regulations, or state or federal law.
- B. Groups, Centers, and Institutes may be terminated at any time by the Unit Head due to inactivity, lack of funding, or lack of interest by the faculty to sustain the entity's activities.
 - 1. Groups may be terminated by the Unit Head if the faculty within the Group have left the University or are no longer interested in actively pursuing the focus area.
 - 2. Termination may also be initiated by the faculty within the Group, Center, or Institute when faculty support for the entity no longer exists, if there is no interest among the faculty in participating in or leading the entity, or when the entity is no longer financially viable. Requests for termination may be submitted to the Unit Head for consideration.
- C. Centers and Institutes may be terminated as a result of the periodic review process.
 - 1. Termination of Centers and Institutes may be initiated by the Unit Head if at the time of review, they determine that a Center or Institute is inactive and has no existing faculty or staff dedicated to its work.
 - 2. Centers and Institutes may be terminated as a result of a negative review or following a negative outcome from a probationary period, at the discretion of the Approval Authority.
- D. The process of dissolving a Center or Institute must:

1. Take into consideration the contractual obligations and employment agreements with the faculty and staff associated with the entity, and determine how these will be fulfilled;
2. Abide by any contractual agreements with external agencies and/or affiliated laboratories;
3. Ensure the continued support of graduate students whose research is associated with the entity; and
4. Provide for the appropriate closure of any active research space, including but not limited to the disposal of hazards, data, and supplies and equipment, in compliance with Environmental Safety, Sustainability, and Risk (ESSR) and other applicable oversight entities.

X. Implementation

- A. The requirement for regular reviews of academic and/or research-based Centers and Institutes applies to all such entities defined in this Policy, established prior to July 2021, as well as to any new entities created under this Policy.
- B. Existing Centers and Institutes should transition to the new review processes established in this Policy at the time of their next review.
- C. Centers and Institutes that have not been reviewed within the past five years or that do not have a defined review cycle should be reviewed as soon as is practical but no later than five years from the approval of this Policy, using the processes outlined in this Policy.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH-BASED CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

I. Introduction

The University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Academic & Research-Based Centers and Institutes ([IV-1.00\[A\]](#)) (“the Policy”) defines and provides for the development of entities meant to facilitate research, foster collaboration, and enhance the academic experience. These Guidelines were created to support the implementation of the Policy, in the interest of enhancing consistency while recognizing that these entities vary widely across the University.

II. Proposal and Review Process for New Centers & Institutes

A. New Centers and Institutes are established through a formal proposal process, as indicated in the Policy.

1. Proposals should typically include the following elements:

- a. A description of the purpose and mission of the proposed entity;
- b. A description of whether and how the proposed entity addresses the teaching, research, and service missions of the University of Maryland;
- c. A description of the value the proposed entity provides to the University;
- d. A description of whether and how the proposed entity intends to incorporate graduate students and undergraduate students;
- e. An explanation of how the proposed entity differs from existing Centers, Institutes, or departments at the University that focus on similar or related topics;
- f. An overview of expected interdisciplinary connections and collaborations, if appropriate;
- g. Details regarding the proposed administrative and organizational structure, as well as any planned advisory or governance structures;
- h. A description of new and/or specialized space, infrastructural, technological, and information assets or services needed for the entity;
- i. An overview of the financial model of the proposed entity;
- j. Benchmarks and metrics to be used in measuring the proposed entity’s progress and success; and

- k. A research and/or budget plan for the first five years of operations.
 2. Proposals should include additional information specific to the entity being proposed, including any information relevant to external funding agencies, if applicable.
 3. Centers and Institutes that are initiated in response to an external funding opportunity may substitute the proposal associated with that process for the formal proposal.
- B. Proposals for Centers and Institutes should be routed through the appropriate Unit Head, Approval Authority, and the Office of Research Administration, if the proposal involves external funding.
- C. The proposal review process for establishing new Centers and Institutes should be overseen by the proposed Unit Head and conducted in alignment with the Policy.
1. Proposal review processes should be based on the level of the entity.
 - a. Reviews of proposals to establish new Centers within an Institute should include consideration at the level of the Institute.
 - i. The Institute Director should review the proposal, and may submit it to the appropriate faculty advisory committee for review.
 - ii. The Institute Director should consider the recommendation from any faculty advisory committee, if appropriate, and the merits of the proposal, and should make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.
 - b. Reviews of proposals to establish new Department Level Centers should include consideration at the level of the department.
 - i. The Unit Head should review the proposal, and may submit it to the appropriate departmental faculty advisory committee for review.
 - ii. The Unit Head should consider the recommendation from any faculty advisory committee, if appropriate, and the merits of the proposal, and should make a recommendation to the Dean.
 - c. Review of proposals for College Level Centers, Intercollegiate Level Centers, and Institutes may need consideration at the level of the College or the University.
 - i. The Unit Head(s) may submit the proposal to the relevant College faculty advisory committee(s) for review.
 - ii. In reviewing the proposal, the Unit Head(s) should consider the merits of the proposal and the feasibility of the request(s) for space and funding necessary to create and maintain the Center.

- (1) Funding sources may include, but are not limited to College funds, short-term commitments from the University, and/or external funds.
 - (2) The Unit Head(s) should work in consultation with the Approval Authority on assessing the space and funding aspects of the proposal.
 - (a) The Senior Vice President and Provost may request that proposals that capitalize on special funding opportunities where the College cannot supply all necessary resources, or those that involve large or long-term commitments from University funds, be reviewed by the University's Academic Planning Advisory Committee (APAC).
 - (b) The Senior Vice President and Provost may ask APAC to review other proposals for College Level Centers, Intercollegiate Level Centers, and Institutes, as appropriate.
2. Proposals initiated in response to external funding opportunities should be routed through the pathway appropriate to the funding process.

III. Governance Structure & Policies

- A. Centers and Institutes should establish a Plan of Organization that aligns with the principles of shared governance within the Unit(s) to which it reports.
 1. The Plan should identify the entity's administrative and governance structures and define titles recognized within the entity.
 2. The Plan must be approved by the Unit(s) to which the entity reports.
- B. Centers and Institutes should establish policies, guidelines, and procedures for professional track (PTK) faculty in alignment with similar University policies and procedures (e.g., Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion (AEP) policies and merit pay policies, title series, and promotion ladders relevant to the PTK faculty within the specific entity) that must be approved by the appropriate Approval Authority or approval body.

IV. Periodic Reviews of Centers & Institutes

- A. All existing and new Centers and Institutes are subject to periodic reviews as specified in the Policy.
- B. Periodic reviews of Centers and Institutes should include consideration of the following elements:
 1. Continued alignment with the goals, mission, and purpose of the University and the Unit(s) affiliated with the entity;

2. An assessment of activities and trend data since the establishment of the entity or since the last review;
 3. An evaluation of challenges and opportunities since the last review;
 4. An assessment of financial viability;
 5. An assessment of the efficacy of organizational and administrative structures;
 6. Quality of any related instruction, advising, mentorship, or professional development activities;
 7. Research activities including peer-reviewed publications, scholarship, and creative activities performed by the Center or Institute since the last review;
 8. Information on whether the entity has had an impact on recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty;
 9. Information on how the entity plays a positive role in community engagement, community service, and outreach activities;
 10. Stakeholder feedback;
 11. A reevaluation of the benchmarks and metrics for success; and
 12. An assessment of whether changes are needed to enable future success.
- C. As indicated in the Policy, reviews for Department Level Centers, College Level Centers, and Intercollegiate Level Centers may include an external review.
1. The Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, should determine whether an external review should be conducted.
 - a. For Department Level Centers, the Approval Authority in consultation with the Unit Head should make a recommendation to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, on whether an external review should be conducted for a specific Center. For College Level Centers and Intercollegiate Level Centers, the Unit Head should make a recommendation to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, on whether an external review should be conducted for a specific Center.
 - b. If an external review is not recommended by the Unit Head and/or the Approval Authority, the Director of a Center may make a request for an external review to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, if they feel it is warranted.

V. Implementation of the Policy

- A. The Division of Research should maintain a centralized database and public-facing information on all Centers and Institutes at the University.
- B. The Division of Research should be notified at the conclusion of the proposal and periodic review processes and in other instances when modifications are implemented, so that the public-facing information and internal tracking mechanisms can be updated as appropriate. At a minimum, the Division of Research should be notified of:
 - 1. Approved proposals for new Centers and Institutes;
 - 2. Approved name changes or reorganizations of existing entities;
 - 3. Any outcomes following periodic review processes, including probation and sunseting plans; and
 - 4. Termination of Centers and Institutes.

VI. Review & Revision of the Guidelines

- A. The Guidelines should be updated periodically to provide additional guidance associated with the Policy, as needed.
- B. The Guidelines are subject to a comprehensive review and revision at times when the Policy is reviewed and revised.



I-6.00 (D) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON THE REVIEW OF DIRECTORS OF ACADEMIC OR RESEARCH-BASED CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

Approved by the President April X, 2021

I. Purpose

The administrative performance of Directors of academic or research-based Centers or Institutes shall be subject to recurrent, formal, and comprehensive review. The purpose of the review is to evaluate how well the Director is fulfilling their administrative responsibilities and whether they have been ensuring the long-term success of the Center or Institute. The review process seeks to provide constructive recommendations for improving the Director's performance and supporting their continued professional development.

II. Definitions

- A. "Academic Director" means the head of a School within a College, who is equivalent to a Department Chair.
- B. "Approval Authority" means the administrator or administrators with authority and oversight of the review of academic or research-based Center or Institute Directors. Depending on the level at which the entity operates, the Approval Authority may be a Department Chair, Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, the Senior Vice President and Provost, or the President.
- C. "Center" means an academic and/or research-based entity, which engages faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within one Unit or across multiple Units. A Center may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.
- D. "Department Chair" means the head of an academic department.
- E. "Director" means the head of an academic and/or research-based Center or Institute.
- F. "Institute" means an academic and/or research-based entity with prominence and stature that is typically intended to have a level of permanence similar to that of an academic department. Institutes engage faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within a College, across multiple Colleges, or University-wide. An Institute may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.

- G. “Unit” means an academic and/or research-based Center, Institute, Department, College or School, or Division.
- H. “Unit Head” means the administrator or administrators responsible for a Unit and the individual(s) to whom the Director reports. A Unit Head may be an Institute Director, Academic Director, Department Chair, Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, or the Senior Vice President and Provost.

III. Policy

- A. This Policy applies to the review of Directors of academic and/or research-based Centers or Institutes. The review of Department Chairs and Academic Directors is covered by the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Department Chairs and Directors of Academic Units (I-6.00[C]).
- B. A Director whose appointment is expected to be considered for continuation shall undergo a periodic and comprehensive review.
- C. A Director may request a review even if they are not contemplating a continuation of their appointment.
- D. The review should normally occur at the beginning of the last year of the Director’s current appointment, or every five (5) years in cases where the term of the appointment is indefinite.
 - 1. A Unit Head may initiate a review earlier, if deemed appropriate.

IV. Review Process

- A. The Unit Head will establish the timeline for the review and the review process should generally be completed within six (6) months.
- B. The Unit Head will appoint a representative review committee including faculty, staff, and students that reflects the diversity goals of the University. The Unit Head should consult appropriately before appointing members to the review committee.
- C. The Unit Head will charge the review committee with developing evaluative criteria appropriate to the mission of the Unit, conducting the review, and submitting its findings in a written report.
- D. Reviews must include an assessment of the following major components:
 - 1. How well the Director is fulfilling their administrative responsibilities based on those articulated at the time of appointment;

2. Consideration of the Director's role in the long-term viability of the Center or Institute;
 3. How the Director's leadership has impacted the Center or Institute's progress in meeting its benchmarks and metrics for success;
 4. Input from faculty, staff, and students associated with the Center or Institute;
 5. Input from the Director being reviewed;
 6. Input from external stakeholders, as appropriate; and
 7. Constructive recommendations for continued success.
- E. The Unit Head may specify additional components and/or additional steps in the review process, as appropriate to the size and structure of the entity that the Director leads.
- F. Components of external funding agency reviews of Directors may be used to fulfill elements of the University review process, when authorized by the Unit Head.

V. Assessment Following the Review Process

- A. A decision about whether the appointment will be continued will be formally considered upon the completion of the review process.
- B. The Unit Head will begin by considering the review committee's report and providing a copy of the report to the Director under review.
- C. The Unit Head will give the Director an opportunity to respond to the report in writing. If the Director chooses to respond, that response will be attached to the review committee's report as a permanent appendix.
- D. The Unit Head will develop an evaluative report, giving consideration to the review committee's report and the Director's response.
1. The evaluative report should indicate the Director's present strengths and weaknesses and shall endorse specific recommendations regarding professional development, continuation of the appointment, or other relevant matters pertaining to the Director for the Approval Authority's consideration.
 2. Financial implications and an agenda for implementation may also be a part of the recommendations in the evaluative report.

- E. The Unit Head shall then convene a meeting with the Director under review to discuss the evaluative report and the appropriateness of continuing the Director's appointment for another term.

VI. Final Outcome

- A. The Unit Head will assess whether the Director should be reappointed and will make a request for reappointment to the Approval Authority, if appropriate.
 - 1. If reappointment is recommended, the Unit Head shall submit a copy of the review committee's report and the evaluative report to the Approval Authority.
 - 2. If reappointment is not recommended by the Unit Head, the Director should be informed of the Unit Head's decision and the review committee's report should be forwarded to the Approval Authority and the Office of Faculty Affairs, where it will be kept on file.
 - 3. The external funding agency or affiliated laboratory associated with the entity should be notified of the Unit Head's decision regarding the Director's appointment.
- B. The Approval Authority will make a final determination regarding actions following the review process.
- C. The Approval Authority will consider the Unit Head's evaluative report and the review committee's report when making a final determination on the request for reappointment.
- D. The Approval Authority's decision on the request for reappointment will be transmitted to the Unit Head.
 - 1. Upon notification of the Approval Authority's decision to approve the request for reappointment, the Unit Head will inform the Director of the decision and will distribute a summary of the review committee's report to the members of the Unit. A copy of the Unit Head's letter to the Approval Authority, the review committee's report, and the Approval Authority's reply will be kept on file in the Office of Faculty Affairs.
 - 2. If reappointment is not recommended by the Approval Authority, the Director should be informed of the decision and the review committee's report should be forwarded to the Unit Head and the Office of Faculty Affairs, where it will be kept on file.

3. The external funding agency or affiliated laboratory associated with the entity should be notified of the Approval Authority's decision regarding the Director's appointment.
- E. In cases where the Director is not reappointed to their role, the Approval Authority should work with the Unit Head to:
1. Appoint an interim Director and follow any external entity guidelines to initiate a search to identify a permanent replacement to serve as Director of the entity; and
 2. Guide externally-funded entities through the transition to a new Director and any potential shifts in funding or any other terms of the externally-funded entity.

**I-6.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON THE REVIEW OF
ACADEMIC UNITS**

(Approved by the President November 10, 2001; Amended xxxx)

I. Overview of the Unit Review Process

Periodic review of an academic unit's pursuit of excellence can contribute significantly to the enhancement of the unit's progress and respond to the University's responsibility for efficient use of resources. Each academic unit on campus shall undergo a review at no more than seven-year intervals. ~~Centers contained within a unit shall be reviewed along with the unit.~~ The primary goal of this review will be to improve the unit's effectiveness and quality--by providing the unit and the administration with a clear assessment of the unit's strengths and weaknesses and by providing the unit with the opportunity for periodic self-examination. Each dean is responsible for preparing and circulating a schedule of reviews for his or her units, for initiating the reviews, and for reporting to the **Senior Vice President and** Provost on the results of the reviews.

The review process shall have several components: an internal self-study including the accumulation of relevant data, external review of the unit, and proper utilization of the results of the review. An internal **review** committee will be selected and charged with the self-study and the accumulation of data. An external **review** committee will be selected and charged with the external review. In order to ensure proper utilization of the results of the review, the internal self-study and the external review reports should be made available to the unit, the Dean, and the **Senior Vice President and** Provost in a timely manner. The entire length of time required for the review from the beginning of the self-study to the completion of the external review should be no more than one-year, and ideally no more than six months. The arrangements for the external review and the conduct of the self-study should be done concurrently, so that the external review can occur immediately after the completion of the self-study.

The campus has an unusually wide variety of units that include performing arts departments and professional schools that undergo accreditation reviews or have other external constraints. Thus, the review procedures must allow flexibility--in the time period between reviews, in the composition of the committees, and in the data gathered. For example, units requiring accreditation may wish to adjust the timing of their academic reviews to coincide with the accreditation reviews so as to maximize the value of the review process, or they may, with the approval of the **Senior Vice President and** Provost, have the accreditation review serve as all or a portion of the unit review. To the extent possible, however, all reviews should address common criteria.

II. Selection of Review Committees

The Dean of the unit under review shall have primary responsibility for the selection of the external review committee, according to procedures outlined in the College Plan of

Organization or bylaws, and for ensuring the completion of an appropriate self-study. It is the Dean's responsibility to ensure that the composition of the committees is in concert with the goals of the review. Where the College or School is not departmentalized or where the unit reports directly to the **Senior Vice President and Provost**, the **Senior Vice President and Provost** shall have responsibility for selecting the committees. If an accreditation review is approved to serve as the external review, then the accreditation review committee serves the function of the external review committee.

The internal self-study committee shall (where appropriate) include faculty, students (undergraduate and graduate where appropriate), and staff members and shall (where appropriate) include faculty from outside the unit.

The external **review** committee will usually consist of three to five off-campus scholars or professionals of significant accomplishment who can be relied upon to provide an objective and authoritative assessment of the unit. In making these appointments, the Dean shall solicit nominees from the Chair of the unit under review. For units that undergo accreditation or other externally organized reviews, the information supplied by the accreditation or other review team should be fully utilized; this may eliminate the need for an external review committee or make it possible to use a smaller, more focused, external **review** committee. The scope of the required additional review will be at the discretion of the Dean, in consultation with the **Senior Vice President and Provost**. The external **review** committee members should be provided with a copy of the internal self-study a few weeks in advance of their visit to campus.

III. Charge to Committees

In addition to accumulating factual data and soliciting and reporting the views of unit members and other interested parties, the internal self-study committee should develop a coherent picture of what the unit does and how it operates. The committee should provide its assessment of how successful the unit is in fulfilling its mission, and how well it functions as an organization. The unit's success in fostering diversity and providing a supportive climate for all its members should be discussed. The committee report should include the unit's strategic vision of its future directions and a realistic assessment of the actions necessary to move it to a higher level of achievement.

A particular responsibility of the external **review** committee is to assess how the unit and its programs compare with disciplinary norms. This includes scholarly success and stature, the choice of areas of study, the structure of academic programs, and the quality of graduates and their placement. The external **review** committee should also provide its view of the appropriate future directions of the unit, and of the actions needed to move it to a higher level of achievement.

The quality of the review will depend critically on the nature of the charge given to the review committees. At a minimum, the committees will receive copies of this policy on Review of Academic Units. Detailed charges, specific and appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the unit at the time of the review, should also be given by the Dean. The

following points define the issues to be addressed, but should be construed merely as illustrative of these issues.

A. Charge Concerning Quality of Undergraduate Instruction

The self-study and external review committees should attempt to evaluate the nature of the undergraduate experience by addressing the quality of the intellectual environment, the teaching, and the curriculum. As appropriate to the discipline, this might involve issues such as the following:

1. How well does the curriculum fit the philosophy and purpose of the undergraduate program? Does it reflect both adequate generalization and specialization? Does it reflect up-to-date thinking in the field?
2. How well is information fluency assured for all undergraduate majors? How well is information technology incorporated in instruction? Are graduates of the program prepared to use information resources and technology at a level appropriate to the discipline?
3. Do the courses offer sufficient breadth and depth? Are proper sequences established among courses? Is there a well-established departmental honors program and are there opportunities for honors and independent study projects? Is there a capstone course or other senior experience designated to integrate the undergraduate work and to provide a transition to graduate school or career?
4. Are there sufficient numbers of courses and seats offered to meet the needs for majors, other programs for which the unit provides service, and general education? Are the courses offered with adequate frequency?
5. Do all programs (for majors, for general education, service courses for other programs, and electives for personal enrichment) motivate students and foster learning, follow the catalog descriptions, and use up-to-date materials that reflect current thinking in the field? Where possible, courses should be visited.
6. For laboratory courses: Is the apparatus adequately maintained? Are all lab manuals easily updateable and maintainable using modern software? Are all lab manuals accurate and up-to-date? Do students have adequate workspace, or are they overcrowded?
7. What has been the outcome of the teaching assessment process, which was described in the information package?
8. How does the unit collect information on student learning outcomes and use this assessment in curriculum revisions?
9. Is there recognition for superior academic performance?
10. What is the availability of financial assistance, honors programs, experiential learning programs, and assistance in developing potential? Is there an environment that fosters collaboration, learning, and community morale?
11. What is the availability of lectures, readings, performances, informal group meetings, off-campus experts in the field, and undergraduate organizations? What communication is there about current action and concerns, as well as research, scholarship, and creative activity in the field?
12. What is the nature of the contact with faculty, especially mentoring, other than in the

classroom and during formal office and advising hours? What kind of in-and out-of-class contact with other students is there, particularly those from diverse racial, economic, and cultural backgrounds?

13. Does the academic unit support and enforce University policy on academic integrity? Are faculty aware of undergraduate referral procedures?

B. Charge Concerning Quality of Graduate Instruction

The committees should attempt to evaluate the nature of the intellectual environment of the unit. This would involve, among other considerations, the following:

1. The quality of the graduate courses. Where possible, some courses should be visited.
2. How well is information fluency assured for all graduate students? How well is information technology incorporated in instruction? Are graduates of the program prepared to use information resources and technology at a level appropriate to the discipline?
3. The combinations of courses that define particular programs. Are they the right combinations? Are certain courses missing? Is there appropriate balance?
4. The content and substance of the different graduate programs within the unit and their relationship to what is important in the discipline.
5. The general intellectual environment of the department, independent of the formal graduate program (e.g., active speaking series, collaboration of faculty, team research, scholarship, and creative activity, people who appear to be excited by the newness of ideas in the unit, and the like).
6. The funding of graduate students as fellows and teaching and research assistants. Where assistantships are involved, what is the appropriateness of the assignments to the students' development as instructors, scholars, and/or artists?
7. Does the academic unit support and enforce University policy on academic integrity? Are faculty aware of graduate referral procedures?
8. What is the nature of the contact with faculty, especially mentoring, other than in the classroom and during formal office and advising hours? What kind of in- and out-of-class contact with other students is there, particularly those from diverse racial, economic, and cultural backgrounds?

C. Charge Concerning Advising

The committees should attempt to evaluate the quality of the advising systems for undergraduate and graduate students.

1. Is there a sufficient level of advising to support student needs and wishes appropriately? Does it encourage students to make acceptable progress toward their degrees? Does it make appropriate referrals to other services outside the unit?
2. Do students receive adequate and current information about courses and programs in the unit? To what extent do students have access to current information about requirements, deadlines, and important opportunities within the unit, such as special events, student groups, opportunities for research, scholarship, and creative activity,

and the like? Do majors receive adequate and current information about graduate programs, financial aid and scholarship opportunities, career interests, and experiential learning programs?

3. Do students receive adequate and current information about programs, courses, services and opportunities outside the unit, including adequate advising about the general education program?
4. What is the reputation of the advising staff with students, faculty, alumni, parents, and others?

D. Charge Concerning Service Activities

It is important that service contributions of the unit be evaluated carefully, particularly in those units where service can be a major component of activity, such as in education and agriculture. A survey of service clients may be essential in order to respond fully to this charge. Issues to be addressed include the following:

1. What is the nature and extent of service offered by the unit and what audiences are the recipients of this service? Is the extent of the service offered commensurate with the objectives and capacity of the unit?
2. What has been the reaction towards the service from the recipients of it? What is the reputation of the unit among the recipients of the service? Are there objective measures of the quality of the service (e.g., manuals, curricula, and the like)?

E. Charge Concerning Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

The external review committee should be asked to address the following questions in their review.

1. What is the committee's assessment of the dissertations recently produced with regard to quality, area of inquiry, importance, innovation, and the like?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the department in research, scholarship, and creative activity?
3. What are the major foci of unit research, scholarship, and creative activity and how do these relate to the field in terms of importance and innovation? Does the unit lack foci, are its efforts in research, scholarship, and creative activity scattered?
4. Who are the leading faculty in research, scholarship, and creative activity? How might other faculty be assisted in improving their productivity?
5. Are the resources that are presently available being used in the best possible ways? What might be some alternative uses of the same resources that might be more productive?
6. How can a minimal amount of resources, such as one line or a small amount of money be effectively used to increase the capacity of the unit for research, scholarship, and creative activity?

F. Charge Concerning Recommendations

Many recommendations that would improve a given unit might not be feasible because of

the expense involved and the requirements of other units within the University. Therefore, the committees are encouraged to focus their recommendations upon what can and should be done within existing resources, unless the Dean expressly indicates otherwise. Where a committee feels that additional resources must be added in order for the unit to be able to function (e.g., facility improvements because of unsafe laboratory conditions), the committee should recommend the minimum addition that will satisfy the unit's requirements. Since there will always be competition for scarce resources that involves units not being reviewed by these committees, recommendations that many positions or large amounts of funds be added to the unit are not likely to be useful and turn attention away from what realistically can be done.

IV. Unit Reports

1. The internal self-study and external **review** committee reports should be factual and explicit.
2. The Chair of the unit under review will distribute the self-study report to the faculty and will deliver a copy to the Dean who will transmit it to the members of the external review committee in advance of their visit to campus. The external review committee should be asked to submit their final report within thirty days of their campus visit, and upon receipt, the Dean shall transmit a copy of the report to the Chair of the unit under review. The Chair of the unit under review shall distribute the external review **committee** report to the faculty immediately upon receipt and, with the advice of the faculty, may respond to the report within thirty calendar days of the Chair's receipt of that report. Should the Chair of the unit under review respond to the report, the response shall be attached to that report as a permanent appendix.
3. The Dean shall prepare an evaluative report of the unit under review, giving due consideration to (a) internal self-study and (b) the report of the external review **committee** and any response by the Chair, and after consultation with the Chair shall transmit it promptly to the **Senior Vice President and** Provost along with copies of the internal self-study and the external review.
4. The **Senior Vice President and** Provost shall promptly convene a meeting with the Dean and the Chair of the unit under review to discuss the documents received.
5. The **Senior Vice President and** Provost shall prepare a summary report on the unit review, giving due consideration to (a) the internal self-study, (b) the report of the external review committee and any response by the Chair, and (c) the Dean's evaluative report. The summary report shall endorse various recommendations and, as appropriate, discuss their financial implications and agenda for implementation. The **Senior Vice President and** Provost's summary report shall be transmitted to the Dean, the Chair, and the faculty of the unit within thirty calendar days of the meeting with the Dean and Chair. It will also serve as the required Institutional report to the Board of Regents.

Appendix A: Information to be Provided to the Committee

The internal self-study shall include and be informed by information regularly collected and published by the Office of Institutional Research, ~~and~~ Planning, **and Assessment (IRPA)**, additional information provided by the Dean's office, an assessment of information resources provided by the University **L**ibraries, and information derived from unit files including information generated from internal and external accreditation reviews. The resulting information package should be appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the unit. For academic departments and Colleges or Schools that are not departmentalized, the items in the package should include the following (depending on the specific degrees offered):

1. Five-year numbers of undergraduate and graduate students (full-time and part-time), degrees awarded, mean length of time to complete bachelors degree(s), numbers of faculty and staff (full-time, part-time, and budgeted FTE), graduate assistants, credit hours taught to majors and non-majors, SAT/ACT scores of majors, GRE scores and undergraduate GPA of graduate students, contracts and grants received, faculty salary comparisons, and expenditures of non-restricted funds.
2. Information on the number of applications for admission to the graduate program, the quality of schools that are represented, the number of acceptances, identification of specializations and number of students in each, and other similar material concerning the appeal of the program to prospective graduate students.
3. Positions accepted by recent professional Master's and Ph.D. graduates, awards and honors received by recent graduates, entry level salary of graduates, and frequency distribution of years required to complete professional masters and doctoral programs.
4. The abstract pages from all Ph.D. dissertations since the last review.
5. Summaries of recent achievements in research, scholarship, and creative activity of the faculty and of recent graduate students. These should include an indication of the quality of the journals and presses involved, and citation counts of publications, or other evidence of the importance of the faculty's achievements; the curriculum vitae of each faculty should also be made available.
6. Courses offered, categorized by audience (graduate students, undergraduate majors, general education, service to other units, electives).
7. Undergraduate curriculum and any requirements for admission to major.
8. Advisors, number and FTE (separately for faculty and staff), for undergraduates and graduates, and for theses and dissertations.
9. Description of the advising system for undergraduates and graduates, including the procedures for selection, training, coordination, and monitoring of the advising staff.
10. Description of the process used to assess teaching, and of the procedures used for the selection, training, coordination, and monitoring of the teaching staff, including teaching assistants.
11. Results of student questionnaires on advising and teaching.
12. Plan of Organization of the unit, including committees and memberships.
13. Appropriate statistics computed from the above data.
14. Information on departmental resources both physical and financial



**Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes
(Senate Document #17-18-12)
Research Council | Chair: George Hurtt**

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Lanford request that the Research Council review the University of Maryland Policy & Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers & Institutes ([IV-1.00\[A\]](#)).

Specifically, it asks that you:

1. Review the report and recommendations provided by the Research Institute Advisory Committee.
2. Review similar policies on the establishment and review of centers & institutes at Big 10 and other peer institutions by reviewing existing information and doing additional research, as needed.
3. Review data on the number, size, structure, and administration of existing centers & institutes at the University, including those established for retention purposes, and consider their variations and missions.
4. Review best practice models in those colleges that have developed new guidelines for their institutes.
5. Review the definitions of the types of centers & institutes in the current policy and suggest whether they should be revised.
6. Consult with a representative of the Office of the Provost.
7. Consult with faculty and graduate students actively engaged in interdisciplinary research within centers and institutes.
8. Consult with the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.
9. Consider whether the current policy is aligned with our educational and research missions.
10. Consider the role of graduate students in centers and institutes and the impact of potential organizational changes on their research, especially for those in interdisciplinary programs, dual doctorates, or masters/PhD programs.
11. Consider whether the establishment of centers and institutes should include sunset provisions.

12. Review the current and proposed procedures for the periodic review of centers & institutes and consider whether the policy should be revised.
13. Consider the proposal to initiate new centers and institutes with a probationary status before attaining permanent status and recommend whether it is appropriate for the University.
14. Provide a preliminary update on findings to the University Senate.
15. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policy.
16. If appropriate, recommend whether University policy should be revised and submit recommendations for Senate consideration.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **March 30, 2020**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



**IV-1.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE
ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**
(Approved by the President August 1, 1991)

A. Policy

Although faculty may from time to time establish informal relationships for the purposes of conducting research, or of fostering improvement of teaching or curricula, or of enhancing service to the State in a particular area, they must follow certain procedures, as described below, for inclusion in official administrative lists and for periodic review.

Institutes, Bureaus, Centers, Laboratories, Research Teams, and other similar groups and organizations form useful devices for organizing groups of faculty and staff from different disciplines to focus teaching, research and/or service in an area of common interest and concern. Centers, Bureaus, and Institutes should be justified on the basis of their contributions and relationships to academic programs, but with a very few exceptions, these entities shall not offer courses or oversee degree programs. To provide an orderly method for the establishment of Centers, Institutes, and interdisciplinary units known by other names, it is appropriate to devise guidelines or procedures that provide for appropriate faculty and administrative review. These units are expected to be supported largely by external funding and not exert significant claims on State or university resources. Yet the legitimate interests of faculty proponents and of administrators in whose jurisdictions the units may be located must be protected. These procedures are intended to protect those interests but are not so complex as to render the establishment of the units such a lengthy and time-consuming task that few will venture to propose them; they comply with the University System Policy for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes in the University of Maryland System, approved by the Board of Regents on January 11, 1990. (IV-1.00)

B. Group

The first, and simplest type of unit compares to an established specialization area within a department, such as organic chemistry, counseling psychology, or nuclear physics. Characteristically, it is an ad hoc collection of faculty members gathered together as a "Group" to promote an area of common interest. "Groups" and projects in this category might be shortlived. Such a group shall be titled "Research Group for _____" or "Laboratory for _____" etc. No formal procedure for its establishment is involved other than written approval of the Dean for the unit in which the faculty are housed.

C. Center

The second level of organization compares to an academic program without departmental status. Typical of this type of organization is a "Center." It has more permanency than the "group" referred to above. It may involve external and/or State funding and may appear as an organized unit in the working budget. Usually, it will have a formal administrative structure, headed by a Director. The Director and a secretary may be, at least partially, supported by general funds. Procedures for establishment of a "Center for ____" are as follows:

1. A formal proposal for the establishment of a new Center shall be prepared by its proponents, who may be informal groups of interested faculty and administrators, a committee appointed for the purpose of determining the need, desirability and feasibility of a Center, or any similar formal or informal group.
2. The proposal shall include a statement of the purpose of the Center; the rationale for its establishment; details of its membership, governance, and administration; initial and prospective funding; space needs, and other requirements.
3. The proposal shall be submitted by the organizing proponents to the Dean(s) of the College(s) to whom the Center Director will report. In those circumstances in which a Center will reside within a Department, the proposal will first be submitted to the Department Chair. The Dean(s) will submit the proposal to the Programs, Courses, and Curriculum Committee(s) of the College(s) in which the Center is to reside, for advice and recommendation.
4. After review by the College(s)
 - a. The Dean(s) of the College(s) in which the Center will reside will be responsible for identifying the source of resources (if any) necessary to create and maintain the Center. These may be extramural funds, department funds, College funds, and/or small, short-term commitments from Graduate School DRIF monies. A proposal requiring, in the view of the Graduate Dean, large or long-term commitments from Graduate School DRIF will fall under provisions 4.b. below. If the proposed center requires space, the Dean(s) will be responsible for identifying the source of additional space as well. The proposal, including commitment of funds, space, etc. will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval. The Vice President has the option of consulting The Academic Planning Advisory Committee, but is likely to do so only if a major redirection of resources appears to be involved.
 - b. In unusual circumstances, a special funding opportunity may require a commitment of more resources than the College(s) involved can afford. (e.g., NSF Science and Technology Centers). In these cases, the Dean(s) of the College(s) involved shall be responsible for identifying the resources the College(s) can commit and enumerating those which would need to be met by the campus. At the campus level, the full review process would be required in these cases, including review by APAC and final approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. APAC shall develop guidelines for its review.

5. It is understood that in the review process, alterations may be recommended and made in the proposal by any of the reviewing administrators.

D. Institute or Bureau

The third level of organization compares with an academic department. Typical of this type of organization is an "Institute" or "Bureau." It is expected to continue indefinitely and, thus, have greater permanency than a Center.

It may have both external and general funding, but it should be included in the working budget and have a formal administrative and governance structure. Just as a Program may propose conversion to an Institute. Procedures for establishment of an Institute are similar to those used for the establishment of new academic departments, and are as follows:

1. Same as 1) above
2. Same as 2) above
3. Same as 3) above
4. Same as 4) above, except that the Vice President recommends approval to the President.
5. Upon approval by the Vice President, the proposal is forwarded to the President. After review and approval by the President, the proposal is forwarded to the Chancellor for information. It is understood that in the review process, alterations may be recommended and made in the proposal by any of the reviewing administrators.

E. The Periodic Review of Centers, Institutes, Etc.

1. Institutes and Bureaus

Institutes and Bureaus shall be subject to the same review procedures as academic departments.

2. Centers

It is expected that Centers will be established with the provision that their functions, productivity, fiscal condition, and continuance will be periodically reviewed. The procedure for review is as follows:

- a. Every five years, each Center shall submit a review of its activities to the Dean(s) to which it reports. This review shall include the following types of information: date Center established, purpose, major activities over previous five years, funding and major categories of expenses, number of personnel associated with the Center and source of support for each, relationship to institution, benefits to institution.

Upon receiving the review, the Dean(s) shall choose one of the following administrative actions: maintain the Center in its current state; institute a broader scale review; change the definition, operators and/or director of the Center; terminate the Center.

Each Dean shall submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a report of these reviews and the administrative actions.

- b. A Center which is established with (other than one-time) funding from outside its College(s), i.e., one established according to 4.b. above, will follow the same procedure with one additional step. The review will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who, in consultation with APAC, shall choose whether to continue to terminate the campus' portion of the Center's funding.
 - c. Those Centers which reside entirely within one Department and report to the Department Chair shall be reviewed as part of the Department review.
3. For those Centers existing as of July, 1988, Deans shall establish a staggered schedule of reviews beginning in five years.

Report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee

June 4, 2018

The Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research asked us to review policies, procedures, and practices for the establishment, operation, and review of research institutes at the University of Maryland; to compare our policies, procedures, and practices to those of peer institutions; and to provide recommendations on best practices for how existing and new institutes can operate more efficiently and effectively at executing their mission on behalf of the University. The charge to the committee is at Appendix A; the committee membership is at Appendix B. The committee met five times during the spring semester.

Recognizing that the largest research centers are larger than many institutes, the Provost and the Committee agreed to expand the scope to include major research centers. For the purposes of this review, the Committee considered research centers with annual expenditures of more than \$2 million per year. To investigate a range of practices of current institutes and major centers at the University of Maryland, we examined the following units: UMIACS, START, ESSIC, IREAP, NFLC, CRESST, CASL, MPRC, CEST, SYSYNC, IPST, IBBR, CAPER, ISR, LSC, IGSR, NCSGRE, MIAEH,¹ and MC2; a summary is given in Appendix C. We also investigated policies and practices at peer institutions, including Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Illinois, Northwestern, and the University of California San Diego; a summary is given in Appendix D.

It was apparent from this review that no single set of policies and procedures for the establishment, operation, and review of institutes and centers will be sufficient. Indeed, our investigations revealed that peer institutions often do not adhere to what appear to be their own detailed and well-defined policies and procedures for research centers. We recognize that there will arise special and unanticipated circumstances that will require flexibility and exceptions. We offer the following recommendations as a starting point for any new institute or major research center.

- **Creation of new institutes and centers.** The creation of new institutes and centers should be considered when needed to pursue interdisciplinary research involving faculty from more than one department, school, or college; or when the creation of an institute or center is required to compete for a major funding opportunity. The creation of institutes and centers within a single department should be discouraged unless there is a compelling rationale.

In addition, creation of a center with significant subject-matter overlap with an existing center should be strongly discouraged. Overlap creates internal competition and seeds confusion to government and private sponsors about which entity does what. The creation

¹The Maryland Institute for Applied Environmental Health (MIAEH) is not a research institute; It is an academic unit similar to a department. Policies for research institutes are not appropriate for an academic unit such as MIAEH, and so we have omitted MIAEH from the list of institutes in appendix C. Consideration should be given to rationalizing the University's use of the term "institute" by converting MIAEH into a department.

of an overlapping center with a new director and administrative support also creates inefficiency. There will be exceptions, of course, but efforts should be made to unify research efforts in a particular domain. Advocates for the new center should explore how the mission or capacity of the existing center could be expanded to satisfy their needs and aspirations. At this time, there is overlap in a number of centers or initiatives, to include cybersecurity; brain and performance; environment and sustainability; and language science.

Although research institutes and centers are created primarily to pursue research with the potential for substantial external funding, in rare cases it may be desirable to do so for the purpose of education, training, or service, or to develop and enhance capability in an area for which there is no immediate prospect of significant external funding.

- **Probationary Status.** Most new institutes and centers should be established on a temporary basis. After a probationary period of three to five years, a decision should be made on whether the institute or center has met its initial goals and should be given permanent status. A key component of evaluating permanent status is securing a significant external contract or grant and the likelihood that future funding will continue. In the case of an institute, soft money might be provided for the probationary period, which will be converted to base budget when the institute is made permanent. (This would not apply to institutes or centers that are established by legislation or provided core State or Federal funding.)
- **Approvals.** Proponents of a new institute or center should prepare a detailed proposal containing a mission statement, a governance plan, and a business/operating plan with staffing, proposed expenditures and sources of revenue to cover those expenditures, space needs, and other requirements. The proposal must contain goals to be met within the probationary period, to inform a decision on whether to grant permanent status. The proposal should be first submitted to the relevant unit heads for their advice and recommendation; then to the relevant dean(s) for their advice and recommendation; and then to the Provost and Vice President for Research for approval.
- **Governance.** Institutes and centers should have a director that is responsible for all aspects of their operation. For institutes and centers that reside primarily within a single college and draw faculty from multiple departments, the director should report to the dean. For institutes and centers with activities within multiple colleges, a lead college and dean with primary administrative responsibility should be designated. The director should report to the lead dean, who should consult with the other deans on a regular basis. For institutes and centers with substantial activities in three or more colleges, consideration should be given to having the director report to an executive committee comprised of the relevant deans and chaired by the Vice President for Research.
- **Tenured/tenure-track faculty appointments.** In our review of UMD institutes and centers we discovered several different models for appointments of tenured/tenure-track faculty in

institutes and centers. In some cases, the appointment and salary were split on a permanent or indefinite basis with a tenure-home department, with the institute or center paying its share of the salary (typically half) from hard or soft funds. This makes it difficult for the center to respond to changes in funding patterns by changing faculty membership, and also makes it difficult for the department to absorb the full salary if the faculty member leaves the center, loses funding, or if the center ceases to exist. In one case (ISR), base funds are transferred from the department to the institute to support the institute's share of the faculty member's time. This drains the department of faculty capacity without providing compensation for the lost teaching and service time. We recommend that these types of appointments be phased out as faculty retire, and that no new faculty appointments of these types be made.

We recommend that all tenured/tenure-track appointments permanently reside entirely within academic departments. In other words, departments should ultimately be responsible for 100% of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member's salary. For a specified and limited period of time, some portion of the faculty member's FTE and salary may reside in an institute or center, by mutual agreement of the department chair and the institute or center director. The fraction of the salary need not match the FTE. Alternatively, an institute or center can buy out a portion of a faculty member's time, in the same way and at the same rate as the faculty member could use a grant or contract to buy out time in the absence of the institute or center. In both cases, the institute or center (or the faculty PI) would compensate the department for the reduction in teaching and service commitment to the department. Such agreements may have a term of one to three years but should not be indefinite or permanent.

Special arrangements may be needed in some cases. For example, a tenured faculty member might be recruited to direct an institute on a full-time basis, with the salary paid entirely by the institute. Although a department might be willing to grant tenure to facilitate such an appointment, the department may be reluctant or unable to absorb the full salary when the faculty member steps down as institute director. In such cases, special arrangements may be necessary to provide the department with additional base budget for the appointment.

- **Start-up funding.** In some cases, institutes and centers are founded with an external grant or contract that provides core administrative funding, or base budget is provided by the legislature or the University. In other cases, internal start-up funding is needed to provide for the first several years of operation, before grants, contracts, and DRIF return can provide full funding.

We recommend that a special fund be created to provide start-up funding and/or shared services for new institutes and centers, to supplement funding from colleges, the Provost, and VPR. Because the primary purpose of new institutes and centers is to secure significant additional external funding, which would generate additional F&A, we believe it is appropriate to create and sustain this fund with a small percentage of the F&A that is

collected on all grants and contracts. This would represent an investment by the entire University to grow the research enterprise and, with it, the F&A recovery and DRIF distribution that benefit the entire campus. An allocation of 1 percent of F&A (off the top) would provide about \$800,000 per year for this purpose. We recommend that the Provost and Vice President for Research jointly control the allocation of these funds. These funds may be allocated to directly support a new institute or center (e.g., to match funds provided by colleges) or to hire central staff that would support one or more nascent centers.

- **Consider revising F&A/DRIF distribution.** Currently, DRIF distribution between a department and an institute or center is determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on which unit administers the grant or contract and how faculty time is divided between the department and the institute or center. Departments often view this as a zero-sum game, because the institute or center receives DRIF only at the expense of the department. Of course, it is not a zero-sum game if faculty are able to secure more funding than would have been possible without the existence of the interdisciplinary institute or center—which, as noted above, is the primary rationale for the creation of research institutes and centers. Even so, departments often view institutes and centers as a drain on their human, financial, and space resources, not as an instrument for expanding those resources. But institutes and centers—particularly those that do not have significant State or other core funding—need DRIF return to fund overhead activities and expenses that cannot be direct-charged to grants and contracts.

One solution would be to provide the necessary DRIF return to institutes and major centers from a different or higher level—for example, off the top of the F&A that is collected. A significant portion (about half) of the F&A that is collected on an institute or center grant or contract is for administration of the grant or contract, which includes essential functions performed by institute or center personnel. Currently, a small number of institutes (e.g., ESSIC, NFLC, UMCERSI) receive a rebate of a fraction of the F&A collected on their grants and contracts to pay for institute administrative functions. This has been done on an ad-hoc, case-by-case basis, to conform to the particular financial situations of these centers. It would be preferable if a standard and transparent process were adopted to decide when an F&A rebate was appropriate for an institute or center, and what amount or percentage should be rebated.

It is beyond the charge to this committee to recommend a revision of F&A or DRIF distribution. Any revision would have far-reaching impacts and would require careful analysis. We simply note that DRIF is vital to the operation of institutes and centers, but distributing DRIF to institutes and centers at the expense of departments is a significant disincentive to the growth of research institutes and centers. In addition, the two-year delay between F&A collection and DRIF distribution presents a significant challenge for institutes and centers that are starting up, growing rapidly, or have large fluctuations in expenditures.

One idea that has been proposed previously is to rebate to institutes and centers one-quarter of the F&A that is collected on institute/center grants and contracts. Institutes or centers with University or other core funding could have this funding subtracted from the rebate. Consider, for example, an institute with \$15.45 million in grants and contracts (of which \$10 million is direct cost and \$5.45 million is indirect) and \$1 million in University funding. In this proposal, the F&A rebate would be one quarter of the F&A ($\$5.45/4 = \1.362 million) minus the University funding (\$1 million), or \$362,000. In this case, University funding (including the rebate) would be about 12% of the institute budget. If the maximum rebate was 20% of the F&A collected, University funding would be 10% of the institute budget.

We recommend that a group be convened to consider the financial impacts of an F&A rebate along these lines.

- **Flexibility in HR policies.** Many State and University human resources policies are based on the assumption that employees are State-funded. Serious problems are created when these policies are applied to institute and center employees that are funded entirely by grants and contracts. For example, a center employee who accumulates unused annual leave while working on a contract generates an unfunded liability when he or she takes the leave after the end of the contract period or leaves the center. This could be mitigated by limiting the accumulation or pay-out of annual leave, or by creating a fringe benefit pool to pay these expenses. As another example, soft-funded researchers are subject to the same limits on merit salary increases as State-funded faculty, even though they may be responsible for raising their own funding. Similarly, soft-funded researchers are required to take furloughs in the interest of fairness, even though this can result in an underspend and the return of funds to the sponsor. Neither of the last two financially benefits the university (and actually decreases indirect cost recovery), and both can lead to the departure of center staff. Efforts to provide flexibility in applying these policies to such positions would improve the operation of centers.
- **Review.** Currently, some colleges periodically (about once every five years) review centers; for centers or institutes secured by an external award, the sponsor reviews on a regular basis (as often as every three years); internally funded efforts, particularly those supported by the Tier 3 mechanism, are regularly evaluated by the VPR's office. The committee recommends a more structured and formal review process be developed— particularly when there are multiple, internal funding sources that are supporting the start of a new research center. The reviews should examine in some detail the amount of external funding pursued and secured, programs developed and related efforts. When funding from the Provost and VPR is provided to such efforts, both offices should designate a representative to take part in the review (as well as a faculty member external to the center under review). The review should be a significant factor in helping to determine if a center continues to receive internal funding, and for what duration.

Other institutions, such as UC San Diego, have a robust review process, where major research centers are reviewed on a recurring five-year cycle. There are a number of criteria by which the centers are reviewed, and a report is submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Research, Provost, and Deans of colleges involved in the center.

- **Sunsetting.** Sunsetting a center or institute can be required due to any number of factors. For example, the center director may retire or move to a different university and no other faculty member wishes to lead the effort; it becomes difficult to secure external funding; or internal university funding is redirected. The formal review process highlighted above should provide a recommendation to the Provost, VPR, and the deans most closely associated with the research center about whether it should continue in its current capacity, return to a probationary status, or be sunsetted. If there is a recommendation to sunset, the recommendation should be endorsed by the Provost and VPR and the deans responsible for the center.
- **Reform of existing institutes and centers.** The above recommendations apply to new institutes and centers. If these recommendations are adopted, it would be beneficial to gradually reform existing institutes and centers, as appropriate. As noted above, permanent or indefinite faculty appointments in existing institutes and centers could be phased out as the faculty in these appointments retire, and all new appointments be made in the manner we recommend. One might also consider moving existing institutes and centers to the governance model recommended above. For example, IBBR could report to one or more deans instead of the Provost; and the Center for Smart Growth, the Language Science Center, and the Brain and Behavior Institute might report to a committee of deans chaired by the VPR.

Finally, we note the existence of duplication and overlap in the mission of existing institutes and centers. For example, there are three efforts focused on language (CASL, LSC, and NFLC), two in cybersecurity (MC2 and MaGIC); two in brain and behavior (BBI and CSMHHP); and multiple efforts in environmental and sustainability research. In such cases, the Provost and VPR could appoint a small task force to investigate the benefits and impacts of a more unified approach.

Appendix A: Charge to Research Institute Advisory Committee

1. Assess the current situation with respect to operating procedures and use of funds in our existing research institutes. This includes but is not limited to models associated with (a) joint appointments; (b) course relief; (c) use of shared laboratory and equipment. Determine how research institutes and centers are established and managed at our peer institutions—i.e., identify best practices if possible.
2. Develop a set of operating principles and procedures that reflect best practice and that best support the mission/purpose of research institutes that we should adopt for any new institutes formed in the future.
3. Outline the criteria and approvals that should determine whether or not a new institute is formed.
4. In order to do 2 & 3 it is probably also necessary to:
 - a. Define the general mission of research institutes
 - b. Outline how funding for an institute should be provided and criteria that should determine funding levels and distribution
 - c. Outline how funding should be used to support the research mission
 - d. Suggest how indirect cost return from institute activities should be distributed and used
5. Outline best practices for review of research centers and institutes.
6. Identify existing problems, anomalies, etc that need to be addressed and suggest remedies if possible, noting any obvious practices to avoid going forward.
7. Resolution of reporting and space issues, how to deal with closing or bridging funding when grant support is lost.

Appendix B: Committee Membership

Steve Fetter, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (co-chair)

Eric Chapman, Assistant Vice President for Research Development (co-chair)

Linda Aldoory, Professor, Communication; Associate Dean for Research and Programming,
College of Arts and Humanities

Michael Ball, Professor and Senior Associate Dean for Faculty, School of Business; Institute for
Systems Research

William Bentley, Professor, Bioengineering; Director, Institute for Biomedical Devices

Ann Holmes, Assistant Dean for Finance and Administration, College of Behavioral and Social
Sciences

Gary LaFree, Professor, Criminology; Director, National Center for the Study of Terrorism and
Responses to Terrorism (START)

Donald Milton, Professor, Public Health; Director, Maryland Institute of Applied Environmental
Health

Maureen Meyer, Assistant Dean for Finance, School of Engineering

Fernando Miralles-Wilhelm, Professor and Interim Director, Earth System Sciences
Interdisciplinary Center

Mihai Pop, Professor, Computer Science; Director, Institute for Advanced Computer Studies
(UMIACS)

Staff

Hana Kabashi, Project Manager, Division of Research

Appendix C: Selected Research Institutes and Centers at UMD

Institutes

Institute for Bioscience and Biotechnology Research

- IBBR was created out of two previous Centers: Center for Biosystems Research (CBR) and Center for Advanced Research in Biotechnology (CARB). IBBR was created by adding the Center for Biomolecular Therapeutics from UMB. The IBBR headquarters is at Shady Grove.
- Approval Process – IBBR was created by the Chancellor, the Regents, and University Presidents owing to the need for distribution of UMBI assets. It is an Institute joint between UMB, UMCP, and NIST.
- IBBR's Director reports to the Provost of UMD. The IBBR Director has an advisory executive committee.
- IBBR has over 120 researcher appointments from three different institutions: NIST, UMB, and UMD. Owing to the lack of uniformity for appointments, IBBR created "IBBR Fellows," consisting of Federal employees from NIST and tenured/tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty from UMCP and UMB.
- For non-tenure track faculty, 3-year contract renewable, then 5-year contract once tenured, renewable (following campus policy).
- IBBR funds 100% for the line (to-date) and transitioning to 50:50 split. Note that UMBI paid the entire salary for its faculty (with the exception of 2 joint appointees). The tenured or tenure-track positions were in UMBI. Thus, when UMBI was ended, all tenured UMBI faculty were transitioned to departments within USM campuses. IBBR faculty were transitioned to positions within UMB and UMCP. Their salaries remain with IBBR.
- Faculty receive a reduction in course load.
- Budget is a mix of hard, soft, and F&A return (from the Provost Office).
- Annual reporting.

Institute for Governmental Service and Research

- Established in 1948, IGSR is the second oldest public service unit on campus after Maryland Cooperative Extension. In 1958, the UM Board of Regents voted to include the Institute in UMD's budget.
- The director of the Institute reports to the Vice President of Research through the Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff.
- There are 8 PTK faculty and 6 hourly faculty appointees. There are no tenured/tenure-track faculty, nor any joint appointments.
- There is one full-time, non-exempt administrative assistant, two part-time, contingent I exempt staff working on projects, one full-time exempt IT staff, and three full-time, exempt staff performing various administrative functions, including HR, budget/finance, communication, research development and administration.
- FY17 Expenses: \$1.3 million; FY17 State Budget: \$478,233; FY17 DRIF: \$35,311
- Periodic project/program reviews (2-3x/year) and annual performance reviews.

Institute for Physical Science and Technology

- IPST was established in 1976 as a merger of the Institute for Fluid Dynamics and Applied Mathematics (IFDAM) and the Institute for Molecular Physics (IMP). Both Institutes were established shortly after World War II in response to interest by the US Navy in supporting research in fluid dynamics and applied mathematics (IFDAM) and high-pressure physics and engineering (IMP). The Institute addresses this mission by supporting research in areas at the intersection of traditional disciplines; initiating and promoting recruitment of faculty with joint IPST-departmental appointments; and sponsoring interdisciplinary PhD programs. The Institute oversees the Chemical Physics (CHPH) and Biophysics (BIPH) programs, and supports (together with MATH and CSCAMM) the Applied Mathematics and Statistics and Scientific Computation (AMSC) program.
- The Director is the chief administrative officer and has those responsibilities and powers assigned by the College (CMNS) and the University and is appointed by the University.
- The Assembly is the deliberative body of the Institute. It may consider any matter affecting the Institute or its members. It is responsible for its own organization, meetings, and elections.
- Faculty hold joint appointments with departments, e.g. IPST/Physics, with tenure in the department (with one exception).
 - 36 permanent members, 9 research appointments
 - IPST faculty appointments are permanent, and IPST provides a portion of the faculty member's salary, typically reflecting the fractional appointment in IPST.
 - Course relief is handled differently with various departments.
- An internal administrative staff comprised of: Director of Administrative Services; Assistant Director, Program specialists, Coordinators, Assistants, and Engineering technicians
- FY17 Numbers
 - Total State Budget: ~\$3M; State Budget Expended: <\$2.5M; Annual Sponsored Research Awards: ~\$3M; DRIF funds received: \$180-200K
- The Institute is undergoing an External Review during the current (Spring 2018) semester, with the visit of the review committee scheduled for April 23-24. A Self-Study has been prepared and made available to the committee. The previous external review occurred during the 2009-10 academic year.
- The lack of a uniform CMNS-wide policy on DRIF splits for faculty with joint appointments means that these splits are often negotiated and re-negotiated case by case. This is time-consuming and occasionally leads to tension between units.
- The IPST model of permanent rather than renewable appointments is somewhat unusual, but has resulted in a core of faculty with a long-term commitment to the well-being of the Institute.

Institute for Research in Electronics & Applied Physics

- Established in 1978 as the Laboratory for Plasma and Fusion Energy Studies, the name changed in 1988 to the Laboratory for Plasma Research, and then in 2001 to IREAP.
- Director reports to two Deans (CMNS and Engineering), but is administered in CMNS

- IREAP has an Executive Committee that includes membership from tenured/tenure track faculty, professional track faculty, and staff on rotating basis. Terms are usually 1 or 2 years. Ex officio members include directors of administrative services and technical operations. IREAP holds 2-4 Executive Committee meetings a year to review cost share and commitment proposals, DRIF distributions and other IREAP business. Each February/March there is a State of the Institute Assembly where the director presents the previous year's data.
- Faculty is a mix of various types of appointments:
 - 20 Tenure/Tenure track; 10 Professional Track
 - 11 joint appointments; 9 affiliate appointments
 - Joint appointments receive a portion of their salary from IREAP's State faculty lines.
 - Teaching expectations for faculty with joint appointments are handled by the academic departments, and vary by department.
 - IREAP makes no distinction between joint and affiliate appointments; all have voting privileges and are represented on IREAP committees.
- FY17 Expenditures: \$19,267,276; FY17 State Budget: \$995,216 (increased to \$1,209,466 in FY 18); DRIF distributions: \$405,163.
 - Given its research portfolio, IREAP has a relatively lean state budget, relying heavily on DRIF to fund not only operating expenses but a significant portion of salaries.
 - Faculty rely on DRIF primarily for expenses that cannot be charged to awards and contracts: travel unrelated to awards, computer purchases, job advertising and publicity expenses, hosting visitors, etc. The DRIF return is comparable to their peers in ECE and MSE, but higher than Physics.
- Reviewed per campus policy for Centers and Institutes. Last review was March 2017.
- IREAP has not conducted a faculty search in many years. The lack of faculty hiring authority and the unwillingness to allocate faculty lines to the Institute is a major detriment to their strategic planning.

Institute for Systems Research

- ISR was founded in 1985 as the Systems Research Center (SRC), one of the first cohorts of Engineering Research Centers funded by the National Science Foundation. Original NSF funding ~\$2M per year; received permanent state funding (~\$3M per year) in 1989; renamed ISR in 1992. Maintained center status and NSF funding until 1998.
- Director reports to Dean of Engineering and has status of department chair.
- Executive and administrative committees are all elected.
- Institute is comprised of joint appointments, affiliate faculty from across campus. There are a small number of permanent appointments that but be renewed every three years. ISR originally paid 50% of salary of joint appointments and teaching load was cut in half (12 to 6); today the load is reduced from 9 to 6. A new joint appoint from outside ENGR is funded using soft money at less than 50%.
- Staff units: finance, administration, external relations, public relations and information management, computing and the MSSE program.

- State Budget: 2003: ~\$3.2M; 2015: ~\$3.2M; in between it has fluctuated up and down. FY15 Operational Costs: ~\$3.2M
- External Funding: 2010: \$12.9M; 2011: \$15.3M; 2012: \$16.6M; 2013: \$16.9M; 2014 \$14.5M. Other sources of income include: soft money support (Provost, Dean, VPR, etc.); sabbaticals; foundations; budget cuts; DRIF, ENPM
- The ISR has had a number of reviews (probably not strictly periodic); In 2015, it had a very comprehensive external review. Originally, it had very frequent NSF reviews and recently had a review and celebration on the occasion of its 25th anniversary.
- Issues/Concerns:
 - Because of the way joint appointments are funded, other engineering department chairs no longer see strong advantages to ISR joint appointments.
 - Because of the lack of central/flexible funding, it can be challenging to rally ISR faculty around new research areas.
 - The MSSE program has never reached its perceived potential; one challenge is that faculty do not have teaching responsibilities as part of their joint appointments.
 - While there have been many successful industry projects and relationships, the industry partner program has had its ups and downs.

University of Maryland Institute for Advanced Computer Studies

- UMIACS was created at the initiative of President Toll to advance the development of hardware architecture components, algorithms, software systems, and computational mathematics needed for advanced computer systems of the future, including supercomputers. The Institute was also expected to facilitate collaboration between the University, industry, and federal government.
- The director of the Institute reports to the CMNS Dean. An elected steering committee advises the director. Major changes in the organization of the Institute require a vote of the Assembly.
- 72 faculty and 8 research scientists, the majority working in 16 centers and labs in UMIACS. Two thirds are from computer science and electrical and computer engineering. Faculty appointments are rotating (3-year term for asst. and assoc. and 5 years for full). Six permanent faculty; no new permanent faculty will be appointed. Appointees are paid part of the salary.
- Director of Business Operations manages all the financial and human resources and a staff of four responsible for pre/post-award grant management, payroll, human resources, purchasing, etc. Director of Communications and a half-time assistant manage communications and website content. Director of IT manages a staff of 5 FTE as well as hourly student workers.
 - The IT group establishes and manages advanced computing infrastructures for sponsored projects and also provides basic IT services to all faculty, staff, and students in the Institute.
 - The Institute and each Center also have a coordinator responsible for managing events, travel reimbursements, and grants related to the Centers.

- UMIACS: \$3.7M base, Center for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology: \$750K base, Maryland Cybersecurity Center: \$350K base. External funding: ~\$20M annually.
- The Institute is reviewed every 10 years according to the founding documents. The last external review occurred in 2015. The review process also considers the Centers organized within the Institute.
- The funding model, wherein faculty receive a significant amount of salary support from the Institute, makes it difficult to evolve the composition of the Institute and adapt to the changing research landscape. Fund reversals to CMNS whenever CS faculty leave the Institute has resulted in a declining base budget, further limiting our ability to serve the broad campus community.

Centers

Center for Addictions, Personality and Emotion Research

- The Center for Addictions, Personality, and Emotion Research (CAPER) was created informally at the department level as the name for a particular faculty member's research group. It was never officially constituted as a center at the campus level, never received hard budget support from the campus, and is being phased out now that the faculty PI has moved to another university.
- CAPER started in approximately 2005. There was no formal approval process as this center was one of many laboratories or groups within the psychology department. The current chair is not sure how it came to be that it acquired the word "center;" it may have been used to create a name that was memorable. Around 2011 a subunit was created in the financial system under PSYC to allow for ease of management of CAPER-related accounts.
- No formal governance structure. The director met individually with the dean and may have attended the chairs and directors meeting.
- No formal faculty appointments. Affiliated faculty were those who conducted collaborative projects with Carl Lejuez. Currently there are 4 PTK faculty assigned administratively in the payroll system to this subunit. These faculty work on last grants associated with CAPER.
- FY17 expenditures: \$565,657; no state budget in FY17. Psychology PIs receive one-third of the DRIF return received by the department from their grant. All PI portions related to CAPER grants were returned to a general CAPER DRIF account, rather than to individual faculty. Based on data since FY14, CAPER received around 10% of the total DRIF return received by department.

Center for Advanced Study of Language

- CASL was established in 2003 as a University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) sponsored by the NSA to improve the USG language capabilities.
- CASL executive director reports to the Vice President for Research. The sponsor appoints a USG official (contracting officer representative) to approve all work performed under the UARC contract.

- CASL currently has 4 admin staff for finance, contracts, and HR; 6 IT staff; and 5 security staff. The large IT and security staff are to meet the unique needs of a SCIF. There currently are 29 research staff (research scientists and faculty specialists).
- Joint TTK faculty were appointed to SLLC and HESP (and perhaps other units in the past). CASL provided partial funding with no defined work expectation or course release. An MOU required CASL had to give two years notice of intent to terminate the joint appointments (and maintain an escrow with two years of salary). All other faculty appointments were PTK; most were 100% CASL.
- FY18-19 expenditures are expected to be \$7-10 million per year.
- Dedicated 130,000 SF building (RPB1), most of which is a sensitive compartmented information facility (SCIF).
- Reviewed every five years as part of the contract renewal.
- Sponsorship transferred from NSA to the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence on 1 Oct 2017; NSA funding ended 1 April 2018. No hard budget; DRIF return is unable to pay for large fixed costs associated with operating a SCIF.

Center for Research and Exploration in Space Sciences & Technology II

- CRESST II is a cooperative agreement between NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) and UMD, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Catholic University, Howard University, and Southeastern Universities Research Association. CRESST II was established in April 1, 2017 with the award of the CRESST II cooperative agreement to UMD. The proposal for CRESST II was written with the knowledge of the CMNS Dean and the Vice President for Research and with their assistance in discussions with senior administrators at the partner institutions. The approval process was the support to write the proposal and the selection by the GSFC review committee and GSFC senior management.
- CRESST II is not a center or institute in the UMD structure; it is more like a grant.
- CRESST II has a board that consists of the relevant dean and the Vice President for Research at UMD and UMBC, the Vice Provost at Howard, the President of SURA, and Associate Provost for Research at Catholic. Because it is a grant, it is administrated through Office of Sponsored Research.
- The scientists in CRESST II that are assigned to UMD are given PTK faculty or faculty specialist appointments through the astronomy department. There are no joint appointments with other departments. CRESST II scientists are paid 100% from grant money.
- CRESST II has 2 UMD administrative staff (a program manager and a business manager) who are paid entirely by the cooperative agreement. One is.
- FY17 Expenditures: \$16.5 million. DRIF distribution is normal, with astronomy as the only department. CRESST II gets university assistance to pay for payroll, travel, appointment, and benefits administration. These are all items that are explicitly included in the stated off-campus overhead rate and hence must be paid by the university.
- 5-year grant period with optional second 5-year renewal at the choice of GSFC.

Language Science Center

- Started in summer 2013 and involved Tier 3 DRI as well as an investment in faculty positions and space commitment from Provost. It was built on a 10-year grassroots effort, plus a 2-year process initiated by the VPR along with a cluster hire.
- On soft money: director (25%) and three assistant directors
- On hard money: associate directors (2 w/approx. 50% salary that flows via LSC)
- Management committee, executive committee and various initiatives. Most faculty have unpaid appointments.
- Oversight by Provost and VPR, with involvement of at least 5 colleges. Deans of ARHU and BSOS oversee.
- Mix of state and external funding with small amounts of DRIF. Initial Tier 3 provided \$300k/yr, mostly covering soft-funded positions. Two \$3M external awards (1 NSF training grant; 1 IES Goal 3 project) plus smaller external awards.
- 4500 sf dedicated space in HJ Patterson Hall; moved in 1 year ago. Research community uses labs and equipment across campus.
- No formal review yet.

Maryland Cybersecurity Center

- MC2 was created in 2010 as a result of a call for proposals from the Provost's office. MOU between CMNS and Engineering was signed in July 2011.
- The center reports to the UMIACS director, and indirectly to the deans of CMNS and Engineering.
- There was an advisory board in the past, but not currently. (The board was disbanded when MaGIC was formed.)
- All faculty in MC2 are rotating and are subject to renewal by the UMIACS APT committee.
 - Original MOU specified funding for 9 positions, 4 each in CS and ECE, and one position for the director.
 - Appointments are made by agreement by the CS and ECE chairs and UMIACS director. The director is appointed with the blessing of the Deans of CMNS and Engineering.
 - Currently 5 faculty formally supported in MC2.
 - No reduction in course load.
- FY17 Expenditures: \$619,962; FY17 State Budget: \$366,970; almost no DRIF.
- No reviews have taken place since its inception.

National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism

- START was established in January 2005 as a U.S. Department of Homeland Security Center of Excellence, with an initial \$12 million grant.
- Awarded DHS renewal grants in 2008 and 2012.
- Has Director and Executive Director with branches for Research and Transition.
- 101 total UMD employees with a START affiliation: 52 full-time faculty, 32 hourly workers, 8 researchers with appointments in other departments paid in part through START awards, 7 exempt staff, 2 non-exempt staff. Has interns spread all throughout the center, working alongside project advisors, researchers and faculty.

- FY17 Expenditures: \$12,714,406; FY17 State Funding: \$213,901; FY17 External Funding: \$21,666,139. START HQ submitted 61 proposals in FY17. \$4.1M in revenue from education programs since 2005.
- Has experienced both on and off campus rates and spaces; new space opened April 2018.

National Foreign Language Center

- Originally established as a 501-3(c) think tank in Washington, DC, in 1986. It was affiliated with Johns Hopkins through the 1990s but joined UMD in March 2000 through an MOU with then-ARHU Dean Jim Harris and then-NFLC Director Dick Brecht (who was a UMD faculty member at the time). Its focus shifted from a foundation-supported think tank to a DOD-supported federal contractor after 9/11, when the country realized it lacked the practical foreign language skills it needed to secure the nation and remain economically competitive.
- Executive Director, Executive Committee, several subcommittees and a senior leadership committee of about 20 individuals.
- About 100 total employees; no tenured faculty and no traditional faculty assistants.
- Budget varies between \$10-15M per year, with only about \$190K in state funding per year.
- No space on campus or any campus facilities; space is rented off campus.
- USM-sponsored internal audit that we just completed in 2018.

Appendix D: Policies at Selected Peer Institutions

Northwestern University

- A very flexible approach with no formal policy. Administration is supportive of new centers and generally try to make things work. There is some effort to standardize practices.
- The approval/establishment process is very variable.
- In evaluating centers and deciding whether to fund a center, Northwestern is not as focused on external funding as is UMD.
- Faculty generally are not supported through institutes and centers.
- Some centers have hard budget. Hard money is provided for start-up and can be removed after a period of time.
- The colleges (Deans) and the VPR receive the bulk of F&A return; very little is returned departments, centers, or faculty, so this is less of an issue than is UMD. There is little fighting over DRIF. Departments receive significant tuition revenue from MS programs—a much larger source of funding for engineering than at UMD.
- Reviews are supposed to be every 5 years but this is not strictly enforced. The structure of reviews is not standardized.

Ohio State University

- Two levels of center: university-level (two or more colleges) and college level
- University-level centers
 - A highly structured and detailed approval process that requires completing a template and seeking approval from the Council on Academic Affairs the University Senate—a 6-month process.
 - Start-up funding is a combination of initial grants and contracts, college contributions, and central hard and soft funding
 - Progress report required after two years, full review after 4 years.
 - Of the 80 university-level centers, eight report to VPR; the remainder report to the relevant deans, with a lead dean appointed on a rotating basis.
 - A structured process for periodic reviews is being implemented. Only one university-level has been sunset, at the request of the lead dean.
 - The approval and review process run by the Provost's Office.
- College-level centers are approved by and report to the dean.
- Faculty tenure is held only by academic departments, not university- or college-level centers, but appointment may be split between a department and a center.

University of California, San Diego

- The associate vice provost for research is a former UMD faculty member.
- If a center spans more than one school or college, the center is managed centrally by the vice chancellor for research.
- There is an established and thorough review process that happens once every five years. They have extensive material that we could draw on to structure reviews.

- A shared administrative core of five to seven people in the VPR office manage and serve the various centers that report to the VPR.
- There are no faculty appointments in centers or institutes.

University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana

- Creating centers is part of the strategic plan of the university. The number of centers created yearly is high (11 new centers this year).
- Centers are reviewed every 5 years.
- Faculty appointments are tied to departments and supported through center grants and departmental contributions.
- A number of centers receive special considerations and receive an additional percentage of the F&A return, but the process for this is unclear.
- New centers can be given temporary or permanent status. The approval process for temporary centers is abbreviated and designed to allow the unit time to formalize the intended mission, aspects of unit organization, faculty engagement and long-term funding strategies over a 3-5 year period. Most new units pursue temporary status. If the proposed unit has secured stable long-term funding and the vision of the unit has been determined, a new unit may pursue permanent status.
- Centers v. Institutes
 - Centers are typically units of research or public service situated within a college, school or department.
 - Institutes are typically units of research or public service situated at the campus-level or span multiple colleges or schools and involve faculty and staff from a range of academic disciplines. Institutes may house smaller or temporarily approved centers.
- They provide an online template for center/institute proposals

University of Michigan

- Has a best practices documents outlining detailed processes for establishing, operating, reviewing, and sunseting centers and institutes, but our point of contact noted that the best practices document is ignored and irrelevant.
- Similar to UMD – institutes and centers are formed using ad-hoc criteria and practices.
- Sunsetting is a serious problem. They are moving more towards a “try before you buy” approach and have approved temporary units on a trial basis.

MAIN THEMES IN FEEDBACK FROM KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

The Research Council met with key stakeholder groups in Fall 2019 to better understand the scope of the problems and concerns with the existing policy and its implementation across the University. The following summarizes the main themes raised through feedback process:

- There is no central repository of information related to centers and institutes at the University.
- There are no clear, stated definitions or levels at the University of what constitutes a center versus an institute; different types of centers (departmental, collegiate, intercollegiate, university-wide, etc.); or the differences in bureaus, laboratories, research teams, and other entities.
- There should be a better understanding of how scale, size, purpose, and funding model(s) align with the different types of centers, institutes or other entities.
- There should be more clarity about what aspect of the University mission a center or institute supports. There is an articulated desire to ensure that it is made clear when the mission extends beyond research to include education and service. Graduate students, in particular, were vocal about a center or institute's role in attracting students and providing training and employment opportunities.
- There is no formal establishment or approval process for centers and institutes at the University. Other institutions detail information that is required when proposing a center or institute and a number of peers have comprehensive proposal forms.
- Inclusion of graduate students should be considered from the outset of the proposal; inclusion of graduate students should not be a requirement but would be optimal.
- There are no consistent guidelines on the administrative structure or operations of centers or institutes at the University. At other institutions, examples of these details in policies include provisions indicating that the director is named immediately; an advisory committee is established; the director may only be a tenured faculty member unless the chancellor makes an exception; or there are formal governance structures.
- There should be clarification on institutional support and DRIF return rates. There does not seem to be a lot of information publicly available about DRIF return percentages at other institutions. At our University, the dean is responsible for identifying funding sources, and long-term support and/or higher DRIF return rates are negotiated at a higher level.
- There is no standard internal and/or external review process for centers or institutes at the University. Most institutions use a five-year review cycle, though there is some

deviation. Most institutions have lists of review criteria, and most of the metrics by which an entity will be judged are created when the proposal for creating the entity is approved. There are formal processes and review committee composition requirements. Existing templates and forms could be adjusted for our University's purposes.

- There are no existing sunset provisions and no sense of what criteria should be used in determining when and how to close, revise, or repurpose a center or institute. Other institutions have criteria and a clear process by which all of these scenarios may play out.
- One key component of transitioning or sunseting centers or institutes is ensuring that attention is paid to establishing a thoughtful plan for the orderly transfer or termination of non-faculty personnel.
- There are no probationary periods at the University, either those created when a new center or institute is being created or those enacted after a less than wholly positive review.
- There should be procedures on how to transition existing centers and institutes to a new structure, process, or system, particularly in the area of reviews.

Centers & Institutes Peer Best Practices

- I. Levels - range 3 to 6 levels
 - A. 4 levels: departmental, College/School, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, multi-College (Wisconsin)
 - B. 3 levels: Collegiate, Intercollegiate, University-Wide (Minnesota)
 - C. 3 levels: School, campus, and university-wide (Indiana)
 - D. 5 levels: Departmental, Decanal, Chancellor/Exec VP (require Senate input for creation & termination), Presidential (require Senate input for creation & termination), Board of Governors; (Rutgers)
 - E. 6 levels: Agency Center - affiliated with; Admin Center - admin focused; Sponsored Research Center - soft funded; faculty member center - recruitment/retention; School/College center - within a single unit; University designation - across multiple units; (Michigan)
 - F. 6 levels: Organized Research Unit (ORUs)= Institute vs. Center vs. Laboratory (multi-disciplinary) vs. Museum or Field Station vs. Station vs. Multicampus research units/programs/initiatives. (UC Berkeley)
 - G. 4 Levels: Research Institutes (larger scale) vs. Research Consortia (collective and extensive) vs. Research Center vs. "Industry Membership Program. (Penn St.)
 - H. **3 levels: Group (Research Group or Laboratory, collection of faculty members), Center (akin to academic program), Institute or Bureau (akin to academic department). (UMD)**
- II. Center Establishment
 - A. Proposal
 1. a detailed description of the multi-departmental center function, justification, relevance to the University's strategic plans, participating departments and faculty, administration, funding, formal name; evidence that the multi-departmental center will more effectively achieve stated academic objectives than traditional departmental, school, or college structures. (Nebraska)
 2. Name, Director, Mission & Purpose, Opportunity/Justification, current activities, organizational structure & governance;

public/private partnerships; Financial Support; Program Description; Admin of Grants; Staffing; Membership Policies, Membership Participation; Space; Data & Equipment; Endorsements; Evaluation; Impacts; Timeframe; Life Cycle; (Rutgers)

3. Executive summary, Business plan (strategic vision, initiatives/programs, peer assessment, administration & key faculty, milestones & timeline, resources required, financial planning, metrics of sustainability & success (Michigan)
4. Name of proposed director; names of advisory committee; research plan and budget plan for 2 years of operations and projections for the three following years; names and signatures of faculty who have agreed to participate; business development plan; competitor analysis; and “a date after which central campus financial support is no longer required must be agreed to. There is an expectation that ORUs will become self-supporting within this specified time-frame.” Financial and start-up agreements should be secured. (UC Berkeley)
5. Societal impact, eminence, and assessment of similar units nationally and internationally included in proposals (Northwestern)
6. No formal proposal but research centers must meet these criteria: have an identifiable focus; have on-going funding; have funding including multiple grants and contracts; not a single grant; engage multiple faculty (more than 2) and **graduate students (optimal but not a requirement)**; have some clearly identified rationale for being established; (Penn St.)
7. **A statement of the purpose of the Center; the rationale for its establishment; details of its membership, governance, and administration; initial and prospective funding; space needs, and other requirements (UMD)**

B. Administrative Structure

1. Each ORU is headed by a director and will have an advisory committee/council that assists the director in setting the unit's goals and may assist by critically evaluating its effectiveness on a continuing basis. (Texas)

2. Directors are tenured faculty unless the chancellor makes an exception. All directors report to the VC for research who is the chancellor's designee. Candidates are recommended to the VCR by a search advisory committee. Directors serve for 3-5 year appointments. Director stands up faculty advisory committee to review activities and plans, provide written advice to director, feed the unit's annual report. (UC Berkeley)
3. Centers usually have a formal administrative structure with a Director and perhaps a secretary; Institutes or Bureaus should have a formal administrative and governance structure. (UMD)

C. DRIF Return

1. 45% of indirect cost recoveries (ICR) related to facilities and administration (F&A) will be distributed to the college/department/principal investigator. The division of these funds within each college will be based on the college's policy for distribution. (Illinois)
2. **Dean responsible for identifying source of funds for Centers, including short-term DRIF commitments needed. Long-term or large DRIF contributions will require further review at the campus level (UMD).**

III. Center Review

- A. Most institutions use a 5 year term
- B. Has it met its mandate? Is it relevant to the mission? good financial steward of its resources? Should it stay the same or change, if so how? How is the leadership performing? (Michigan)
- C. mission and purpose; center activities and trend data; evaluation of center activities in view of the mission/purpose; an evaluation of challenges and opportunities; proposed changes (Wisconsin)
- D. preparation of a self-study by the director of the university-wide center, an independent review team is appointed, consisting of distinguished external scholars in the center's primary areas of expertise; internal members may be added to the team as needed. The review team's findings are forwarded to the Executive Vice President for review and action. Actions may include renewal of the center's university-wide designation,

termination, or transition to departmental, collegiate center, or intercollegiate status. (Minnesota)

- E. Charts/self-review template/committee site visit template/review committee questions/final committee report template/etc. (UCLA)
- F. **Institutes & Bureaus follow procedures for academic department review. Centers which reside entirely within one Department and report to the Department Chair shall be reviewed as part of the Department review. Other Centers - will submit a review that includes date Center established, purpose, major activities over previous five years, funding and major categories of expenses, number of personnel associated with the Center and source of support for each, relationship to institution, benefits to institution. (UMD)**

IV. Center Termination - Sunset Provisions

- A. Sunset provisions must be included in the original proposal; When faculty support for a center no longer exists, if there is no interest among the faculty in participating in or leading the center, or when a center is no longer financially viable, the center should be formally discontinued. Requests for discontinuation may be initiated by the center faculty and submitted to the school/college APC. If, at the time of the five-year review, the dean cannot verify that a center is viable, the dean may recommend discontinuation to the school/college APC. Approved requests will be forwarded to the provost for approval by the UAPC, typically as part of an automatic consent agenda. (Wisconsin)
- B. Termination can be a result of review process (Minnesota, Rutgers)
- C. Provisions for sunseting: The center cannot sustain itself financially, either by external or internal funds; The scholarly quality of work performed by the center falls below U-M norms; The original interdisciplinary nature of the center has disappeared; The center is unable to attract new faculty, students, or dedicated leadership. suspension/dissolution of a CI requires a plan to reorganize human resources, institutional and external funding, and infrastructure issues within the organizational framework of the University. (Michigan)
- D. A phase-out period lasting from a few months to up to two years may be provided to permit **orderly transfer or termination of non-faculty personnel**, grants, financial accounts, and programs. (UC Berkeley)

E. URICs that are judged to no longer meet the URIC criteria and institutional strategic value may lose their Office for Research status including any associated financial support. At that point they may be sunset or, in agreement with a school, transition into a school-based center. (Northwestern)

F. **Sunset only discussed through provision that after a review of a Center, the Dean may choose to terminate the Center. (UMD)**

V. Probationary Status

A. Phase 1 (temporary status) - abbreviated process, granted for 3-5 years; Phase 2 (permanent) (Illinois)

B. Reviewed 2 years after initial creation and then at 4 year intervals after. Actions will be recommended to CAA after each review: continuation, conditional continuation with a follow-up in less than four years, and termination. (Ohio St.)

C. **Not discussed in UMD Policy**

VI. Database of Centers

A. Center directors are responsible for updating information in University's database annually (Minnesota)

B. Extensive [ORU DATABASE](#). Link to URL for each, named director, affiliated schools and departments. Searchable. Also a [MAPPING](#) page that shows how ORUs link to departments and schools. (UCLA)

C. There is an Excel sheet that contains a listing of all 250+ entities (name/type/school or college/approval date/college count/URL/etc.). (Wisconsin)

D. Listing - A current listing of Centers and Institutes shall be maintained by the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, together with a record of any such unit which has been suspended or dissolved by action consistent with this policy. (Rutgers)

E. Name, Director, Mission, URL (Northwestern)

F. **Not discussed in UMD Policy**

VII. Reorganization, Restructuring, and Renaming

A. Provisions for Renaming, Reorganization, and Restructuring with approval process (Rutgers, Wisconsin)

B. **Not discussed in UMD Policy**

VIII. Application of Policy to Existing Centers & institutes

A. The necessity for regular review of research centers and institutes applies to those units founded before the adoption of this policy. Such centers and institutes should work with the appropriate office (Dean, Campus research official, VPR) to develop a plan for review within one year of the date this policy is adopted, following the recommendations herein. (Indiana)

B. All existing academic centers established outside of this rule shall be reviewed under the requirements of this rule. Those not in compliance with the rule shall be allowed one additional year to make appropriate adjustments to allow for their continuation. (Ohio St.)

C. **For those Centers existing as of July, 1988, Deans shall establish a staggered schedule of reviews beginning in five years (UMD).**

Appendix 6 – Peer Institution Policies

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

Institution	URL	Key features
University of Michigan	http://provost.umich.edu/programs/bpci/	<p>“...we have identified best practices, attributes, and structures within our centers, helping them to continue to be vibrant, productive, successful, and efficient.” <i>University of Michigan uses best practices rather than “policy” to guide the creation, review and closing of centers. It is flexible and adaptable and could serve as a solid model for UMD.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Best practices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - http://provost.umich.edu/programs/bpci/bpci.pdf, sections of which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Suggested Process on the Formation of Centers or Institutes” with list of criteria; - “Effective Management of Unit and Annual Reports” with list of suggested criteria, documentation, and extensive list of possible metrics; - “Tracking Centers/Institutes/Initiatives” which includes different types categorized and defined (center vs. institute vs. school/college center vs. faculty member center vs. sponsored research center vs. agency center); - “Comprehensive Reviews” (a formal periodic review that generally takes place every five years) with five major objectives; - “Sunsetting, Closing, Discontinuance of a Center” which includes general standards for consideration, “manifestations” that might stem from closure, and tips for correctly transitioning. ● Templates: Business plan template and Bylaws template <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The business plan template (link on site) is incredibly comprehensive and is used to frame a center at its inception. It could be adjusted and touches on many of the points raised in the C&I discussion sessions at UMD.</i>

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● List of centers: http://provost.umich.edu/programs/bpci/bpci_list.html <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organized by cross-campus entities/college and unit/etc. Links to websites provided.
University of Wisconsin	https://kb.wisc.edu/30659	<p>Page organized in the following way:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Introduction II. Defining Centers, Institutes and Center-like Units III. Establishing New Centers IV. Evaluating Centers V. Changes to Existing Centers <p>Center-like units are defined. They must be officially approved at various levels (up through the BoR) in a work-flow controlled system. There is an Excel sheet that contains a listing of all 250+ entities (name/type/school or college/approval date/college count/URL/etc.). Sunset provisions must be included in the original proposal (which is not to exceed 10 pages and must address a set of points including purpose/mission/governance/funding/etc. at a minimum.</p> <p>Review involves a periodic report that should include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mission and purpose - center activities and trend data - evaluation of center activities in view of the mission/purpose - an evaluation of challenges and opportunities - proposed changes <p>“Every five years, the provost will initiate a request to deans for a summary report on center activity since the prior review.”</p> <p>Provision V is unique in that it is more nuanced than just addressing sunseting. It includes guidance on renaming centers, reorganizing or restructuring centers, and discontinuing centers. <i>UMD might consider</i></p>

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		<i>looking at this portion of UW's policy, specifically, as it is more comprehensive.</i>
University of North Carolina System	https://www.northcarolina.edu/Research-and-Discovery/Centers-and-Institutes	Organized at a system level by 400.5[R] policy: Regulations on Planning, Establishing, and Reviewing Centers and Institutes in the University of North Carolina 260+ centers. Purpose to “provide a framework upon which campuses should build detailed policies and protocols to guide the planning, establishment, management, and discontinuation of institutional centers and institutes.”
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	https://provost.illinois.edu/policies/policies/establishing-a-new-unit-of-research-or-public-service-including-centers-and-institutes/	New Centers/Institutes have 2 options: phase 1 (temporary) or phase 2 (permanent); Phase 1 is an abbreviated process but most then go to phase 2; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Phase 1 granted for 3-5 years ● Phase 2 permanently establishes New centers need to be reviewed by the Senate Educational Policy Committee; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal Template Definitions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Centers - units of research or public service situated within a college, school or department ● Institutes - units of research or public service are situated at the campus-level or span across colleges or schools and involve faculty and staff from a range of academic disciplines. Institutes may house smaller or temporarily approved centers.
University of Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Creating and Evaluating Interdisciplinary Centers ● University-wide Centers: Establishing, Operating and Evaluating 	3 Types of Centers: collegiate, intercollegiate, university-wide; *Center directors are responsible for updating information in University's database annually University-Wide Center status requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A profile of the center including focus, brief history, organizational structure and governance, participants, research productivity, and evidence of excellence.

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Collegiate and Intercollegiate Centers: Establishing, Operating and Evaluating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A strategic plan for the center. ● An explanation of the relationship between the center’s goals and the University’s strategic objectives. ● Rationale for designation as a University-wide Center. ● Budget information including a concise budget history, a current budget, and budget projections. <p>Potential external review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Degree of strategic importance to the University ● Extent and complexity of the effort including number entities involved ● Need for central resources ● Prospect for leveraging central resources to secure external funding <p>Must be approved by Provost & President</p> <p>Operating Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● facilitate continuous progress toward the academic objectives cited in its authorization request ● demonstrate its ability to offer competitive or educational advantages ● document how it measurably contributes to the University's strategic goals <p>Review Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● preparation of a self-study by the director of the university-wide center, ● an independent review team is appointed, consisting of distinguished external scholars in the center’s primary areas of expertise; ● internal members may be added to the team as needed. ● The review team’s findings, are forwarded to the Executive Vice President for review and action.
--	--	---

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions may include renewal of the center’s university-wide designation, termination, or transition to departmental, collegiate center, or intercollegiate status.
Penn State University	https://policy.psu.edu/policies/rag05	<p>Definitions provided. All involve research entities, to which this policy speaks, specifically. Research Institutes (larger scale) vs. Research Consortia (collective and extensive) vs. Research Center vs. <u>“Industry Membership Program.”</u> The latter involves industry-supported basic research. Unique in this specific labelling of industry supported work. There is a whole process at Penn for establishing these kinds of units.</p> <p>Research CENTERS should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. have an identifiable focus 2. have on-going funding 3. have funding including multiple grants and contracts; not a single grant 4. <u>engage multiple faculty (more than 2)</u> and graduate students (optimal but not a requirement) 5. have some clearly identified rationale for being established <p>Faculty appointments, in particular, and a minimum number.</p> <p>“All newly formed Research Institutes, Consortia, and Centers should be established with the approval of the Senior Vice President for Research. Approvals will be forwarded from the Senior Vice President for Research to the Executive Vice President and Provost.”</p>
Michigan State University	https://research.msu.edu/institutes-centers-and-labs-by-college/	Pretty thin. There is a listing and a form for establishing a center linked to the site, but very little in the way of framework.
University of Iowa	https://www.iowaregents.edu/plans-and-policies/board-policy-manual/37-	The policy is controlled at the Board of Regents level. It was just revised. “Proposals to create new centers or institutes at the

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

	<p>approval-and-closing-of-new-centers-and-institutes</p>	<p>universities shall be submitted to the Board Office. Following review by the Board Office and the Council of Provosts, the Board Office shall place the request on the agenda for the next appropriate meeting of the Board of Regents' Academic Affairs Committee. The Committee shall review the proposal and recommend action by the Board of Regents or take other action as it deems appropriate.”</p> <p>FORM to create center. Does include a table that describes funding sources for 7 years. Site to include an evaluation plan.</p> <p>All Iowa institutions should report up to the Board on Centers and Institutes on a SEVEN (7) year cycle. Each unit must have completed an annual review FORM. The Board will periodically pick and audit centers/institutes from submitted reports.</p> <p>Lots of guidance about NAMING entities after individuals. There is a form to complete.</p> <p>“Requests to close a center or institute shall be reported to the Board Office on Form H (PDF). After reviewing the request, the Board Office shall place the proposal on the agenda of the Academic Affairs Committee.”</p> <p>The listing links to webpages. The list itself is controlled by an individual who edits the list. https://research.uiowa.edu/directory-centers-and-institutes</p>
<p>Northwestern University</p>	<p>https://www.research.northwestern.edu/institutes-and-centers/ (list)</p>	<p>Found a list at university and at unit level.</p> <p>University Research Institutes and Centers (URICs) LIFE CYCLE documentation. “Requests are typically made to University leadership, specifically the Provost, Vice-President for Research (VPR), or a Dean.</p>

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

	<p>https://urica.northwestern.edu/center-support/new-institutes-or-centers/</p>	<p>The requests may initiate the establishment of a task force, followed by a series of discussions, including programmatic and administrative planning, assessment of the program alignment with a URIC or a school-based center, short-term and long-term resources that are required, and sustainability. The prospective director is required to submit a proposal including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Center’s mission and vision • <u>Societal impact</u> • Demonstrated need; evidence that the new initiative could not be undertaken in the absence of the proposed URIC • Impact on Northwestern <u>eminence</u> • <u>Assessment of similar units nationally and internationally</u> • Current and planned interdisciplinary research collaborations that provide a foundation for the URIC’s activities • Proposed research and educational activities • Proposed team and a strategy for membership growth • A business plan – current and future external funding (federal and non-federal), as well as internal support • Budget • Sustainability plan • Metrics to assess success” <p>Underlined items that seem to deviate from others. Really rigorous planning, a market analysis, etc.</p> <p>Once a new URIC is approved, the VPR appoints the director for a 3-year term, agreed upon by the director and the appropriate research deans. Rigorous ANNUAL reviews by Office for Research senior leadership.</p> <p>“URICs that are judged to no longer meet the URIC criteria and institutional strategic value <u>may lose their Office for Research status</u> including any associated financial support. At that point they may be</p>
--	--	---

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		<p>sunset or, in agreement with a school, transition into a school-based center.”</p>
<p>Ohio State University</p>	<p>https://oaa.osu.edu/centers-and-institutes</p> <p>3335-3-36 Centers and institutes.</p>	<p>Controlled largely by the council on academic affairs (CAA).</p> <p>For university centers, if a proposed entity is approved by the CAA it will go to the <u>university senate</u> for final approval. It will then be communicated to the board of trustees.</p> <p>For college centers, deans may establish and the CAA is notified. The office of academic affairs keeps records and a list.</p> <p>“With the approval of the council on academic affairs, the faculty of a school or college may delegate to an academic center the authority to <u>offer courses or degree programs</u> established under the auspices of that school or college...University faculty and staff may <u>affiliate</u> with the academic center under procedures approved by its oversight committee. <u>Academic centers shall not serve as tenure initiating units.</u>”</p> <p>Each university and college center must have an <u>oversight committee</u>.</p> <p>University centers: Reviewed 2 years after initial creation and then at 4 year intervals after. Actions will be recommended to CAA after each review: “continuation, conditional continuation with a follow-up in less than four years, and termination.”</p> <p>College centers monitored by deans through annual reports. Notification of decision to academic affairs through CAA.</p> <p><u>** [Per “grandfathering”]**</u></p> <p><u>Provisions for previously established centers:</u> “All existing academic centers established outside of this rule shall be reviewed under the requirements of this rule. Those not in compliance with the rule shall</p>

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		<p>be allowed one additional year to make appropriate adjustments to allow for their continuation.”</p> <p>Start-up centers are given more flexibility. Expedited review of request from VP or dean, then approval by CAA, then one year until another review. If funding secured, then it will go through the regular process. If not, an extension may be granted through CAA.</p>
Purdue University	https://www.purdue.edu/research/centers-institutes-cores/list.php	There is an application form that is useful but not much more detail offered.
Indiana University	https://policies.iu.edu/policies/rp-11-002-establishment-centers-institutes/index.html	<p>Defines 3 levels of centers & institutes: school, campus, and university-wide;</p> <p>Policy Organization: Scope, Policy Statement (types, what they should include, evaluated and held accountable for benchmarks), A. Types of Research centers & institutes - school, campus, university-wide; B. Naming; C. Exceptions; D. Application of Policy to Existing Centers & institutes; Reason for Policy; Procedure; A. Establishing School & Campus; B. Establishing University-Wide (apps will include & reviewed under the following criteria); Reviewing School & Campus; Reviewing University Wide; Administration of Research Centers & Institutes;</p>
University of Nebraska	https://nebraska.edu/-/media/unca/docs/offices-and-policies/policies/board-governing-documents/board-of-regents-bylaws.pdf?la=en (section 2.11 - page 19)	<p>Pretty limited information in policy.</p> <p>Creation - A proposal for approval should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a detailed description of the multi-departmental center function, ● justification, ● relevance to the University’s strategic plans, ● participating departments and faculty, administration, funding, formal name

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence that the multi-departmental center will more effectively achieve stated academic objectives than traditional departmental, school, or college structures.
Rutgers University	https://policies.rutgers.edu/1015-currentpdf	<p>Revised in 2017; Levels: classified according to their level of approval and reporting relationship - Departmental, Decanal, Chancellor/Exec VP (require Senate input for creation & termination), Presidential (require Senate input for creation & termination), Board of Governors; basic requirement that it is not unreasonably duplicative, Proposal Guidelines for establishing a center;</p> <p>Review Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New & Renewal process: 5yr term 6mo prior director submits self-assessment (how met initial expectations & criteria for renewal); Supervisor has 3 options: suspend, terminate, or renew without additional review but can also seek an internal review or request an external review; after additional information, final decision is made and notification provided; Renewals should include justification from reviews, changes in funding/space/staffing, time of renewal, and criteria for evaluation in subsequent renewals; suspension/dissolution of a CI requires a plan to reorganize human resources, institutional and external funding, and infrastructure issues within the organizational framework of the University. For existing entities: a date set that takes into consideration the length of time the CI has already been in existence, but no more than five years in the future. <p>Includes info on Listing of Centers & Institutes; Tenure resides in department so hires must be joint between center & department; Restructuring & Reorganization requires same approval process as creating</p>

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

<p>University of Texas System</p>	<p>https://www.utsystem.edu/sites/default/files/offices/board-of-regents/rules-regulations/40602.pdf</p>	<p>Rule 40602 on Organized Research Units (ORU). Designation of ORUs: Institute (“major” and “broad based”) vs. Laboratory (non-departmental and maintains facilities for research in several departments) vs. Center (“anticipated <u>annual budgets of at least \$3,000,000</u>”) vs. Non-ORU Center (less than \$3M).</p> <p>“Procedure for Establishment of ORUs. An ORU is established upon submittal and approval of a proposal by the president and the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. The proposal should describe the purpose and benefits of the ORU to the institution, the faculty members and other participants, research and other activity plans, space requirements, and budget needs. If institutional space or funds are committed, confirmation of such commitments from the appropriate institutional representative should be included in the proposal.”</p> <p>Naming regulations included: Rule 80307</p> <p>“Advisory Committee or Council. Each ORU is headed by a director and <u>will have an advisory committee/council</u> that assists the director in setting the unit’s goals and may assist by critically evaluating its effectiveness on a continuing basis.”</p> <p>Each ORU <u>must be reviewed at least every SIX (6) years</u> by an ad hoc committee. “The committee’s report will be forwarded to the president, who, in consultation with others, will determine whether the ORU should continue, be phased out, or be discontinued. The president shall forward the recommendation and ad hoc committee’s report to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs.”</p>
-----------------------------------	--	--

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

<p>University of California- Berkeley</p>	<p>https://vcresearch.berkeley.edu/research-policies/oru-policy-procedure</p>	<p>ORU policy conforms to larger UCal policy. Established by Chancellor or designee. May be subject to review every FIVE (5) YEARS.</p> <p>ORUs= Institute vs. Center vs. Laboratory (multi-disciplinary) vs. Museum or Field Station vs. Station vs. Multicampus research units/programs/initiatives.</p> <p><u>Directors are tenured faculty unless the chancellor makes an exception.</u> Speaks to stipends. All directors report to the VC for research who is the chancellor’s designee. Candidates are recommended to the VCR by a search advisory committee. Directors serve for 3-5 year appointments. Director stands up faculty advisory committee to review activities and plans, provide written advice to director, feed the unit’s annual report.</p> <p>Affiliated faculty, researchers, and students encouraged.</p> <p>ORU budgets usually mixed (private/philanthropic/grants/income incurred/etc. <u>“Additional funds may be provided by the VCRO.</u> Typically, appointments funded solely by ORU resources will be time limited to the life of a project or an ORU, after which neither the ORU nor VCRO will be responsible for salary commitments for such appointments. When budgets permit it, the VCR may agree to also provide temporary funds to an ORU in support of other ORU-related activities. <u>The use and term of such temporary funds shall be determined and agreed upon between the VCR and the Director.”</u> The VCR is at liberty to review and adjust ORU budgets annually.</p> <p>The VCR establishes ORUs. Guidelines included for ORU creation. Should include <u>name of proposed director; names of advisory committee; research plan and budget plan for 2 years of operations and projections for the three following years; names and signatures of faculty who have agreed to participate; business development plan;</u></p>
---	--	---

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		<p><u>competitor analysis; and “a date after which central campus financial support is no longer required must be agreed to. There is an expectation that ORUs will becomes self-supporting within this specified time-frame.”</u> Financial and start-up agreements should be secured.</p> <p>Annual reports will be submitted prior to disbursement of the next year of funding for the ORU. At least every TEN (10) years there will be a rigorous, in-depth peer review of every existing ORU that will involve non-UC,B researchers, tours, etc.</p> <p>The VCR or review committees may recommend continuance or closure of ORUs. “A <u>phase-out period</u> lasting from a few months to up to two years may be provided to permit orderly transfer or termination of non-faculty personnel, grants, financial accounts, and programs.”</p>
<p>University of California- Los Angeles</p>	<p>http://www.ucla.edu/about/centers-and-institutes</p>	<p>Extensive ORU DATABASE. Link to URL, named director, affiliated schools and departments. Searchable. Also a MAPPING page that shows how ORUs link to departments and schools.</p> <p>States that they are governed by UC-wide policy (see above).</p> <p>Extensive guidance on the review process, which takes place every FIVE (5) years. Charts/self-review template/committee site visit template/review committee questions/final committee report template/etc. https://www.icca.ucla.edu/review-information</p>