

*Update on the Development of the  
University of Maryland Policy and  
Procedures for the Establishment and  
Review of Centers and Institutes*

*Lisa Taneyhill  
Chair, Research Council*

# Centers & Institutes: Background

- ▶ This policy was last reviewed and revised in 1991.
- ▶ Concerns have been raised over:
  - ▶ inconsistent guidelines and definitions on types of centers and institutes, structure and operations;
  - ▶ lack of formal processes for establishment, review, creation of sunset provisions, or termination;
  - ▶ no enforcement mechanisms;
  - ▶ no robust tracking of centers and institutes; etc.

# Research Council Charge

- ▶ The Research Council was charged with reviewing the current policy and making recommendations to the Senate.
- ▶ The Research Council intends this review to be constructive, and seeks to develop best practices.
- ▶ The Research Council does not intend to interfere with existing successful centers or institutes.

# Research Council's Work to Date I

- ▶ Reviewed current policy and report of Research Institute Advisory Committee
- ▶ Requested information on centers & institutes from each College
- ▶ Collected and analyzed peer institution policies
- ▶ Collected and analyzed feedback from center & institute directors, graduate students involved in centers, deans, the Senate, and others through forums, meetings, and a survey

# Research Council's Work to Date II

- ▶ Guiding principles (see following slides) were developed based upon input received
- ▶ The Senate Office worked with the outgoing Chair, the incoming Chair, the VPR, and others to develop revisions to the policy to implement those principles
- ▶ Additional revisions were considered and implemented where appropriate to enhance clarity and consistency
- ▶ We are now returning to key stakeholders (Council of Deans, CADFA, Senate, ALF, RDC, and others) before taking the final policy to the Senate for approval

# Recap: Guiding Principles (May 2020)

- ▶ Central database is needed, with public-facing list and internal data components.
- ▶ Current levels of group, center, and institute should be retained.
  - ▶ More detail is needed on the different types of centers at the University.
- ▶ There should be a common proposal with key elements to create new centers or institutes.
  - ▶ Elements could include role, alignment with the University's mission, graduate student engagement, and performance metrics.

# Guiding Principles

- ▶ UMD's research, teaching, and service mission should be considered in proposals and reviews.
  - ▶ Contributions to all three aspects are not required, but all three should be considered.
  - ▶ Including graduate students is one way of addressing the educational mission.
- ▶ The initial review of a center or institute should be considered a major milestone.
  - ▶ There was some consideration of creating a probationary period at the outset, but this principle was ultimately decided against.

# Guiding Principles

- ▶ Review processes for centers & institutes should be more clearly specified, and may need to vary based on the type of level of center or institute.
  - ▶ Review processes are not needed for groups
- ▶ Sunset provisions should not be required to be built in from the outset.
- ▶ Provisions and procedures for sunseting a center or institute in the wake of a negative review should be specified.
- ▶ Termination procedures may be initiated as a result of a negative review or outside of a review.

# Centers & Institutes: Revisions

- ▶ Centers & Institutes: Director Review
  - ▶ Based on feedback received by the Research Council, a new section on reviews of directors of centers & institutes was developed.
    - ▶ This section was developed in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
    - ▶ The process mirrors the review of department chairs, where appropriate.
- ▶ A number of organizational and stylistic changes were made.

# Input Needed

## Centers & Institutes: Director Review

- ▶ Should the Director Review be conducted at the same time as the center or institute review?
- ▶ Should there be an overall timeline for the director review process?
- ▶ How long should the Director Review cycle be?
- ▶ Should there be variation in the Director Review process based on the level at which the Center or Institute operates?

# Thank you & General Comments

## Centers & Institutes Policy

### ▶ Timeline

- ▶ Currently socializing key points of the revised draft policy with key stakeholders to get feedback and finalize the policy.
- ▶ Plan to present the final policy at the December Senate meeting.

### ▶ Feedback

- ▶ We welcome your thoughts
- ▶ Survey: <https://go.umd.edu/ctrs-instit-policy-feedback>