

GUIDANCE FOR THE PERIODIC REVIEW AND REAUTHORIZATION OF CENTERS/INSTITUTES (NON-ACADEMIC UNIT)

Coupled with strategic planning, periodic peer review is essential to advancing academic excellence, and to ensure the Centers and Institutes 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, 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. Although the “level of analysis” differs between departments and centers/institutes, the objective of period review is similar – a process designed to a) provide a clear assessment of the strengths and challenges and b) guide the future direction of activities. An effective review, that is one that is beneficial to the Center or Institute in planning for the future, is one that fully engages the faculty and administration from the development of the self-study, peer review and report, unit response and subsequent implementation of the recommendations. As a result, Centers and Institutes can realize many benefits from a quality review tailored to the scope and scale of its activities. Some of the most positive outcomes include:

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

The review and reauthorization process is a positive approach focused on self-examination and critical peer feedback in order to advance research and outreach activities to support the innovation and partnership missions of the University of Arizona.

As delegated by the President, the Senior Vice President for Research is responsible for the coordination, oversight and implementation of the periodic review and reauthorization processes of all Centers and Institutes. As such, Research, Discovery & Innovation serves as the main point of contact for this process, although the periodic review and reauthorization is a collaborative process with the Deans of the Colleges and other (Senior) Vice Presidents, and the Heads of Departments/Schools whose faculty are Center/Institute members.

1. Periodic Review

All Centers and Institutes are expected to undergo periodic review for reauthorization, no less than every 7 years. The Senior Vice President of Research initiates the need for review, as well as maintains the review schedule, and is responsible for the documentation of the review and its outcome. In extenuating circumstances, the Cognizant Administrator can request in writing an extension of up to one year to the Senior Vice President for Research.

For College Centers and Institutes (CC/Is), the Senior Vice President for Research initiates the need for review by informing the Cognizant Administrator. The Cognizant Administrator (typically the dean) is expected to conduct a systematic review appropriate to the nature, scope and scale of the Center or Institute at after the initial approval (no more than 5 years) and renewal (no more than 7 years) periods.

At the Dean's discretion, this periodic review can be accomplished as a portion of an Academic Program Review (APR). Research, Discovery & Innovation (RDI) will notify the College of the center/institute review schedule and together will determine which will undergo a periodic review in combination with the 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 shall be delivered to RDI when distributed to the Provost's Office and must include a separate section for the College Center/Institute following the *Self Study Report Sample Outline*. Selection of the external review team follows the Provost's Office APR Procedure Manual but should reflect expertise inclusive of the Center/Institute to effectively evaluate its contribution to the college and university missions as outlined in the Self Study Report. The Site Visit shall include initial and exit meetings with the Associate Vice President for Research responsible for that center/institute's periodic review.

The results of this review, and any planned actions to be implemented shall be reported to the Senior Vice President for Research. Requests to modify the Center or Institute are submitted by the Cognizant Administrator to the Senior Vice President for Research, as described in the *Guidance on Establishment and Modification of Centers and Institutes*.

In the absence of timely completion of the attendant periodic review process, Centers and Institutes will be suspended and "sunsetting" after the term of approval has been completed, and the Center or Institute then will no longer be considered a campus unit and is not permitted to continue to act as a campus unit at that time.

For University Institutes and Centers (UI/Cs), there are four components to review: 1) internal self study, 2) external peer review of the URC/I, 3) a final report that provides a clear plan for applying the results of the review, 4) specific responses to the program review developed by the SVPR, and may include other pertinent vice presidents, deans, and department heads.

A standard review procedure has been established to ensure institutional consistency and provide the necessary data to facilitate strategic planning. Reviews are scheduled typically on a regular 5-year cycle, in the last year of the authorized operating period, which reflects the faster "time-scale of responsiveness" for Center/Institute in comparison to departments, and allows for a manageable number of URC/Is to be reviewed each year. Program review also can be initiated by the Director or SVPR at any time.



The Senior Vice President for Research initiates the need for review by informing the Center/Institute Directors. The Center/Institute Director, in consultation with the members, and the pertinent cognizant deans, submits nominations to the SVPR for those to serve on the Review Team. The Review Team composition will vary among C/Is, reflecting the varying scope of activities of differing Institutes and Centers. The Review Team composition should be reflective of the university's core value of diversity in perspectives, and thus will typically include: 1) at least two individuals who are employed at other peer or similarly well-regarded institutions, agencies, or industries (faculty or similarly qualified professionals) outside of the University of Arizona who have expertise in areas that are common with the URC/I under review; 2) at least one faculty member from the University of Arizona who is not affiliated with the Institute or Center, 3) one member from the Research Advisory Council.

The Director coordinates with Center/Institute Members in the preparation of the self-study report, and then submits the self-study materials to RDI at least 3 months in advance of the scheduled review date.

SVPR appoints Review Team and designates one member as Chair, schedules the on-campus review (typically one in the fall, one in the spring), pays for the travel and honoraria costs of the external reviewers, develops the charge statement for the Review Team after soliciting input from the cognizant Deans, and establishes the review team meeting schedule framework.

The Institute/Center is responsible to: 1) develop execute the specific review team itinerary according to the schedule framework, 2) to provide suitable meeting space and logistical support during the review, 3) to review the Review report, 4) to provide a written response to the Review Team Report, and 5) to meet with the SVPR, RDI and other pertinent university personnel to complete the review process.

The Review Team shall examine the self-study report and charge, and conduct the campus visit. The campus visit should include an opening meeting with the Center/Institute Director, SVPR, the relevant dean(s) and head(s) to discuss the process, charge, and answer any questions. The team shall meet with C/I members and affiliates, relevant Head(s), designated staff, and graduate students (where appropriate) to gain a more thorough understanding of the Center/Institute. Two exit meetings also are required: one with the Director, members, and designated staff where the Review Team provides their frank initial assessment of the goals, plans, and strengths/areas for improvement. The second exit interview is to be conducted with the SVPR, relevant dean(s) and any other pertinent central administrator, to provide preliminary review and evaluation of the Center/Institute. Within 30 days of the conclusion of on-campus site visit, the Review Team shall submit the written evaluative review. The review should focus recommendations on what actions can be taken to strengthen the UI/C within existing resources and operating context, and to make a few, substantive suggestions for investment that would have the greatest impact to advance quality and increase research and engagement activities.

Center/Institute members and designated staff are expected to be actively engaged in all phases of the review process. Prior to beginning the self-study process, the members should be engaging in ongoing planning that helps the Center/Institute be responsive to opportunities, reflecting on its past accomplishments and present needs to refine its future mission, achieve its goals and expand research. Member faculty and designated staff are expected to be familiar with the self-study report, participate in the Review Team's campus visit and meet with the Team, and actively participate in the development of the Center/Institute response.



The SVPR, relevant dean(s) then meet with the Director and Members to discuss the Review Team report and recommendations, and mutually identify useful strategies and timelines to implement the recommendations put forth by the Review Team.

Based on this discussion, the Center/Institute then submits a draft Review Response that describes the planned actions to the review to RDI within 30 days of receipt of the Review Team report.

Upon acceptance of the Center/Institute's Response, the SVPR submits a report to the President that also is disseminated to the Center/Institute Director and members, which briefly describes: 1) the review process, 2) Review Team recommendations, 3) the Center/Institute's response, 4) anticipated changes that will result from the review, and how these recommendations and planned actions will advance the Center/Institute and expand research in support of academic excellence and the University's goals, and 4) what, if any, resources are needed to accomplish the recommendations. The SVPR then works with C/I and university leadership, and through the University budget process, to collaboratively pursue the results of the review.

2. Reauthorization for All Centers and Institutes

Reauthorization can 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 renewal to the Center/Institute Coordinator with Research, Discovery & Innovation, which includes:

- cover letter that includes a) his/her appraisal of the Center/Institute performance and future strategy for success, b) the desired period of reauthorization (up to 7 years), and c) request for modification in the type, mission or purpose of the Center/Institute (if any) and description of the proposed changes,
- copy of the periodic review,
- current membership list and selection process,
- any industry or other membership agreements or similar memoranda (existing or new),
- a summary budget showing income and expense amounts, sources and uses for the current and each of the past two years.
- A budget plan for the requested reauthorization period (first year on the budget template, plus narrative on any expected changes in the reauthorization period)

The Senior Vice President for Research will review these materials, working with the submitting units for approval for reauthorization.

If the Center or Institute will proceed in the next performance period unchanged from the time of last authorization, only a brief review by the Senior Vice President for Research will be necessary. If substantive changes in the type, mission or purpose are requested, a more intensive review will be initiated appropriate to the nature and scope of the requested changes. This review may include vetting by the Dean's and/or Provost's council or review by other pertinent offices (e.g. Office of the General Counsel). For major and fundamental changes to the Center or Institute, the Cognizant Administrator may be requested to submit material described in the *Guidance for Establishment of a Center or Institute*



The Senior Vice President for Research makes a recommendation to the President, who makes the final determination. Research, Discovery & Innovation is responsible to disseminate this determination to the Cognizant Administrator, Director, relevant deans and department heads.

In order to carry out an appropriate review, upon notification by the Senior Vice President for Research of the need for review, ideally a year before the last term of authorized operation. The Director, Cognizant Administrator, and relevant units are urged to begin this renewal process early in the last year of their approved term.

For those Centers and Institutes without established reauthorization dates as of FY16, Research, Discovery & Innovation will work with the Cognizant Administrator to set these dates going forward, taking care to distribute them across the allowable reauthorization period to minimize review burden in any given year.

Centers and Institutes that have past the period of their authorization at the beginning of July 1, 2017, and not under review at that time, must then cease and desist operation as a unit of the University of Arizona.

