

PERIODIC REVIEW AND REAUTHORIZATION OF
COLLEGE & DEPARTMENT INSTITUTES/CENTERS (NON-ACADEMIC UNITS)
GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

Coupled with strategic planning, periodic peer review for reauthorization is essential to advancing academic excellence, and ensuring the Institutes/Centers are well positioned to successfully respond to opportunities and to support the needs of faculty who desire to contribute to cross-cutting, interdisciplinary scholarship and innovation.

For discipline-centered departments, the Academic Program Review is the primary means to maintain and improve quality, where the intent is to be a periodic self-examination process that includes peer feedback, and provides guidance on ongoing strategic actions to realize future opportunities. For interdisciplinary Institutes/Centers, the objective of the Periodic Review is similar: a process designed to provide a clear assessment of the strengths and challenges and guide the future direction of activities.

An effective periodic review is beneficial to the Institute/Center in planning for the future, fully engages the faculty and administration in the development of the self-study, external peer review, unit response and the subsequent implementation of the recommendations. As a result, Institutes/Centers can realize many benefits and outcomes from a quality review tailored to the scope and scale of its activities, including:

- An examination of the quality and value of the Centers/Institute's activities by the faculty and students.
- A clarification, evaluation, and perhaps revision, of the Centers/Institute's goals, strengths, challenges, and opportunities.
- An improved source of information to help guide the Centers/Institute's future actions, activities, and decisions on resources.
- An assessment of Centers/Institute's objectives and how they enable achievement of the University's strategic priorities and goals.

As delegated by the President, the Vice President for Research is responsible for the oversight and documentation of the periodic review and reauthorization processes of all Institutes/Centers. As such, the office for Research, Discovery & Innovation (RDI) serves as the main point of contact for this process, although the periodic review and reauthorization is a collaborative process with senior university administrators, college deans, and department heads whose faculty are Institute/Center members. NOTE: The Institute/Center is responsible for all expenses incurred by the Periodic Review process.

1. Periodic Review

All Institutes/Centers are expected to undergo periodic review for reauthorization after its initial establishment period (no more than 5 years) and renewal period (no more than 7 years). The office for Research, Discovery & Innovation (RDI) initiates the need for review by informing the Cognizant Administrator (typically the dean). In extenuating circumstances, the Cognizant Administrator can request in writing an extension of up to one year from the Vice President for Research. In the absence of timely completion of the initial periodic review process, the Centers/Institute will be suspended and "sunsetted" after the establishment period has been completed. The Institute/Center then will no longer be considered a campus unit and is not permitted to continue to act as a campus unit from that time onward.

The Cognizant Administrator is expected to conduct a periodic review of the Institute/Center in coordination with RDI (see "Sample Calendar of Activities" outlining the review process). Typically, there are three components to the periodic review:

- Internal Self-Study Report;
- External peer review of the Institute/Center that produces an Evaluation Report with recommendations for the Institute/Center;
- Internal Review Response outlining specific actions the Institute/Center will take to address the Evaluation Report's recommendations over the following performance period.

The Cognizant Administrator may tailor the specific scope and depth of these components to the context of the individual department/college, but must maintain the intent of a systematic review toward continuous improvement of the Institute/Center.

The Self-Study Report (see *Self Study Report Sample Outline*) should reflect on the Institute/Center's past accomplishments and present needs to refine its future mission, achieve its goals and expand impact. The external peer review should be conducted by a team of individuals who have national expertise in areas that are common with the Institute/Center. The external review team is appointed by the Cognizant Administrator whose composition must include majority representation from outside the University of Arizona and at least one faculty member from the University of Arizona who is not affiliated with the Institute/Center. The external review team should conduct a campus visit that includes meetings with relevant administrators, faculty, staff, students, affiliate and advisory members to gain a more thorough understanding of the Institute/Center to conduct their evaluation.

The External Review Evaluation Report should focus on recommendations to strengthen the Institute/Center within existing resources and operating context, as well as suggestions for investment that would have the greatest impact to advance its mission. The Final Report should include:

- Brief Introduction.
- Strengths and Weaknesses.
- Recommendations that are specific, concrete, and feasible that can be reasonably implemented within the resources currently in place.
- Other sections at the Team's discretion.

After the External Review Evaluation Report is received, the Institute/Center Director and Cognizant Administrator should meet to discuss its recommendations and mutually identify actions and timelines to

address them. These are summarized in an External Review Response which is submitted as part of the reauthorization request to the Vice President for Research.

Institute/Center faculty, staff, students, affiliate and advisory members are expected to be actively engaged in all phases of the review process. They are expected to be familiar with the Self-Study Report, participate in the Review Team's campus visit, and actively participate in the development of the Institute/Center response.

2. Periodic Reviews in Conjunction with Academic Program Review (APR)

The Cognizant Administrator may request from the office for Research, Discovery & Innovation (RDI) that the periodic review be conducted in conjunction with a college or departmental Academic Program Review (APR). In the case of a combined review, primary coordination responsibility is through the Provost's Office but RDI should participate in coordination meetings as needed. The APR Self Study Report must include a separate section for the Institute/Center following the *Self Study Report Sample Outline*. Selection of the external review team should follow the Provost's Office *APR Procedure Manual* but should reflect expertise inclusive of the Institute/Center to effectively evaluate its contribution to the department or college.

3. Reauthorization of Institutes/Centers

Reauthorization may be requested by the Cognizant Administrator following either the initial 5-year or ongoing 7-year performance periods. Following completion of the Periodic Review, the Cognizant Administrator submits a request for reauthorization to the Vice President for Research that includes:

- Cover letter with the following information:
 - o Summary appraisal of the Institute/Center performance and future strategy for success;
 - o Desired period of reauthorization (up to 7 years);
 - o (as appropriate) Request for modification in the type, mission or purpose of the Institute/Center and description of the proposed changes as described in the *Guidance on Establishment and Modification of Centers and Institutes*.

- Copies of the periodic review supporting documents (reports, review response, etc.).

If the Periodic Review recommends the Institute/Center proceed into the next performance period without significant modifications from the previous authorization period, only a brief review by the Vice President for Research will be necessary. If substantive changes in the type, mission or purpose are requested, a more intensive review will be conducted appropriate to the nature and scope of the requested changes. For major and fundamental changes to the Institute/Center, the Cognizant Administrator may be requested to submit material as described in the *Guidance on Establishment and Modification of Centers and Institutes* which may include review by the Dean's and/or Provost's Council.

The Vice President for Research makes the final determination of reauthorization. The office for Research, Discovery & Innovation is responsible to disseminate this determination to the Cognizant Administrator, Institute/Center Director, and others as appropriate.