

Principles and Procedures for the Review of University Centers

All University centers and institutes (hereafter “University centers” or “centers”), as defined in 3335-3-6 (rev. 2008), must be reviewed two years after initial establishment and at four year intervals thereafter, as articulated in 3335-3-36.

The following priorities will guide the review of existing centers (those established before adoption of the 2008 revision to 3335-3-36). Of highest priority are those University centers that

- 1) have not been reviewed in the past five years or are *not* subject to close periodic scrutiny by an appropriate review agency, accreditation body, or funding agency typically composed of distinguished faculty, researchers, or community partners with expertise in the relevant area;
- 2) have experienced substantial growth in administrative staff over the past five years not fully anticipated or funded by initial budget allocations or subsequent external funding or earnings;
- 3) were initially justified on the basis of external funding, but where the amount of external funding has proven to be insufficient to cover operating costs;
- 4) are deemed inactive.

The following principles and procedures will govern all reviews of University centers and are proposed as a guide for the review of College centers. The review of University centers will be conducted by the Centers Subcommittee of CAA (which includes members from both CAA and the URC) and will proceed according to the terms outlined in the “Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers.”

The Centers Subcommittee may, at its discretion, appoint ad hoc committees (always including faculty with expertise in the relevant subject area, but usually also including administrators) to supervise the review process outlined below. Given that multiple centers may need to be reviewed, the Centers Subcommittee may appoint several ad hoc committees in any given year.

Specifically, such review by the subcommittee or an ad hoc committee appointed by the Centers Subcommittee (hereafter “subcommittee”) will include the following:

- 1) **Statement of rationale for the review.** The general rationale for undertaking the review should be clearly explained to all parties. These include
 - a. the university policy requiring regular reviews of centers,

- b. the need to ensure cost-effective and successful stewardship of University resources,
- c. the need for centers to provide valued and productive services to the University.

2) **A comprehensive self-study.** The center under review will complete a self-study in which it provides the subcommittee specific information regarding its MISSION, FACULTY, ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE, BUDGET, and EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND BENCHMARKS. To this end, the self-study will include the following:

a. *The original MISSION statement and center proposal.*

The self-study must include (as appendices) the original mission statement, proposal establishing the center, any annual reports, or other relevant founding documents or materials.

In this section, describe or list all center activities, events, initiatives, etc., that have contributed to fulfilling the mission and objectives of the center. If current activities of the center differ from those originally envisaged or articulated in the mission statement, explain this evolution.

b. *A statement on FACULTY and student involvement and contribution.*

The self-study must include (as appendices) a list of past and current faculty and graduate student affiliates or associates.

In this section, describe or list all faculty publications, lectures, grants, or other activities related to their work with the center, focusing on those that contribute most centrally to the mission of the center. Also describe or list all student publications, lectures, grants, or other activities related to their work with the center.

c. *A statement on ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND RESPONSIBILITIES.*

The self-study must include (as an appendix) a document describing the administrative structure of the center and a copy of the pattern of administration.

In this section, describe the responsibilities and activities of all administrative staff and the oversight committee, indicating their contributions to the mission of the center and its objectives.

d. *A BUDGET report.*

The self-study must include (as an appendix) a budget report or summary (for all years previous to this review and since the last review) and a projected budget for the next four years.

In this section, describe the budgetary context for the center, outlining specific information regarding those expenses charged to the University's general funds. Externally generated funds produced by the center should be itemized and linked to the functions and services articulated in the mission statement.

e. A statement of EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND BENCHMARKS

The self-study must include (as an appendix) a document listing the evaluative criteria and benchmarks articulated in the original center proposal

In this section, identify and describe the degree to which the center has met (or failed to meet) its stated evaluative criteria or benchmarks. Identify and justify any new evaluative measures created and describe the degree to which the center has met these criteria or benchmarks. Provide specific narrative information or data as appropriate. Attach as appendices any documents (e.g., letters of commendation, awards, news releases) that demonstrate how the center has met its criteria or benchmarks.

- 3) **Review of the self-study by the subcommittee.** Upon its receipt, the subcommittee will discuss and assess the self-study.
- 4) **Discussion and consultation by the subcommittee with the center administration.** The subcommittee will meet with the director, oversight committee, and other administrative staff (as deemed appropriate) to discuss the self-study.
- 5) **Discussion and consultation by the subcommittee with stakeholders.** The subcommittee will meet with stakeholders, including (but are not limited to) the directors of relevant units or programs and chairs and deans of relevant units or units heavily involved in the programs or services offered by the center. These parties will be fully informed of the review and consulted during the review process.
- 6) **Completion of a final report.** The subcommittee will prepare a final evaluative report that will include all items described in 1-5 above. Recommendations regarding the status of the center (i.e., continuation, conditional continuation or

termination) will be based on the review outlined above and must focus on the degree to which the center

- a. has fulfilled or is fulfilling its stated mission,
- b. is working within its own budgetary constraints, and
- c. is meeting its own evaluative criteria and benchmarks.

The center director and oversight committee will have an opportunity to review and comment on the final report and/or consult with the subcommittee before it forwards its report to OAA and CAA.

- 7) **Presentation of the final report to OAA and CAA.** The report of the subcommittee and its recommendations will be forwarded to OAA and CAA. If further action is required, that action will follow the processes and procedures outlined in 3335-3-36.