

**GUIDANCE FOR
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION INSTITUTES,
RESEARCH CENTERS and RESEARCH CORE FACILITIES**

PREAMBLE

BACKGROUND

Research Centers and Institutes have long been an important contributor to the academic strength and intellectual vitality of the University of Oregon (UO). Indeed, one could argue that much of what has made the UO a unique institution is epitomized by the collaborative and innovative nature of the work carried out in our Centers and Institutes. However, the development of this structure has largely been organic and historical, creating a heterogeneous administrative structure and potentially limiting our capacity to address a continually changing research and innovation landscape. In addressing its charge by the President, the Research Advisory Board discovered that all of the University's peer institutions had clear guidance for the establishment, review and renewal of university research centers and institutes. The University of Oregon has none. This document therefore seeks to establish an appropriate set of guidelines for the establishment and administration of university research centers and institutes that report to the Office of Research, Innovation and Graduate Education (RIGE).

PROCESS

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Nov 2012 | In the meeting of the Executive Leadership Team, President Gottfredson queried Vice President for Research & Innovation (VPRI) Espy what constitutes a university-level (RIGE) research institute or center and requests. VPRI Espy responded there are no definitions or processes to establish, review, or renew university research centers and institutes. |
| Jan 2013 | VPRI Espy convened Research Advisory Board (RAB) meeting to begin discussion on the topic and plan a process for coming up with an appropriate guidance |
| Feb 2013 | RAB formed three task groups to investigate center and institute structure at other universities, as well as general principles for what the UO might look for in responsive center and institute guidelines |
| March 2013 | Task groups conducted their work |
| April 2013 | Task groups reported back to full RAB. Major conclusions:
1) all other institutions investigated have formal policies in place.
2) Many have widely varying numbers of centers and institutes. Usually only a small subset of centers and institutes are at the university or institutional level (~15%) and report to the university's VP Research.
3) Task groups also identified potential differences between centers and institutes and defined what general principles should be addressed in resulting guidance. |

May 5, 2014

APPROVED FINAL

- June 2013 RAB discussed research core facility structure in relation to university research center and institute discussion
- Summer 2013 RIGE staff gathered information from RAB task groups and produced first working draft guidance for University Research Institutes and Centers
- Oct 2013 RAB discussed initial draft guidance
- Nov 2013 RAB discussed revised draft, planned process for next steps in input, suggested discussion by Centers & Institutes Directors a priority step.
- Dec 2013 In the C&I Council meeting, a brief summary of the RAB actions was discussed with the directors.
- Feb 2014 Center and Institute Council initial discussion of draft guidance. RIGE staff then incorporated feedback from initial C&I Council discussion and develop a revised draft.
- March 2014 final Center & Institute Council discussion of revised guidance
- April 2014 Academic Leadership Team Review
- May 2014 ELT Review
- May 2014 Guidance Adopted

**GUIDANCE FOR
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION INSTITUTES,
RESEARCH CENTERS and RESEARCH CORE FACILITIES**

I. DEFINITIONS OF INSTITUTION-LEVEL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

University Research & Innovation Institutes, University Research Centers and University Research Core Facilities are administered under the auspices of the Office for Research, Innovation & Graduate Education (RIGE) Facilities and report to the Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI). These administrative units are led by a Director who is appointed by the Vice President for Research & Innovation.

- A. **UNIVERSITY RESEARCH & INNOVATION INSTITUTE:** A University Research & Innovation Institute is a unit that is organized to support multi- and interdisciplinary research and innovation involving a number of faculty, staff and students who conduct specialized activities that require support beyond what can be provided by a traditional college and/or department. As such, University Research & Innovation Institutes are expected to include faculty of three or more departments/units and/or from two or more colleges, and/or include substantial research and innovation portfolios. Such units are broad in scope and are characterized by their programmatic autonomy from an individual discipline or college, by having a budget that is fiscally independent of other academic units and requiring independent administrative support (i.e., one full time staff member). Furthermore, University Research & Innovation Institutes often are the drivers of multi- or interdisciplinary graduate education, as well as require specialized infrastructure (e.g., space, facilities or equipment). University Research & Innovation Institutes are expected to have substantial external funding (typically over \$2 million/year) from either extramural sponsors or donor resources. An advisory board that typically includes individuals from outside the university meets no less than once per year and provides guidance to the Institute and VPRI on strategic opportunities and operational matters. A University Research & Innovation Institute is hereafter referred to as “Institute”.
- B. **UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTER:** A University Research Center is a unit organized to support multi- and interdisciplinary research in a manner that is less comprehensive than an Institute, but that still requires and/or benefits from specialized support mechanisms beyond those provided by a department or college. University Research Centers rely primarily on other existing units for their administrative support and typically are characterized by less programmatic and fiscal independence than University Research & Innovation Institutes. University Research Centers focus on broader themes that draw on multiple departments and/or colleges report to the VPRI and are administered under the auspices of RIGE. Other research centers that focus on a specific topic or theme would typically be report to, and be administered by, the affiliated department or college. A University Research Center is hereafter referred to as “Center”.
- C. **UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORE FACILITY:** RIGE Research Core Facilities (RRCFs) are organized to support the research and innovation activities of UO faculty, staff and students by enabling organized access to expertise, facilities or equipment using a

shared, financially sound and sustainable cost recovery service center model. RRCFs are available for use by the UO community, as well by external users where appropriate. RRCFs report to the VPRI and are administered by RIGE. A University Research Core Facility is hereafter referred to as “Facility”. Please consult the specialized guidance provided for the administration and operation of RRCFs by RIGE, <http://research.uoregon.edu/research-units>

II. ANNUAL REPORTING

Each Institute, Center, and Facility shall provide information annually to RIGE listing its faculty, delineating its annualized budget and describing its activities, accomplishments, and impact, and strategic goals for the upcoming year. The Annual Report form and Budget Template for Institutes and Centers is contained in Appendix A and B, respectively.

An inventory of Institutes, Centers and Facilities shall be maintained by RIGE and reported annually to the President and Provost.

III. ESTABLISHMENT

- A. In general, new Institutes or Centers will be created in circumstances where the academic goals cannot be met adequately by existing, traditional university structures, such as a department or college.
- B. Proposals to create an Institute, Center or Facility should be submitted to RIGE for review. Proposals for new Institutes and Centers must include a formal set of operating procedures and budget plan, following the guidance in the template in Appendix C.

Because Institute and Centers support intellectual interests of faculty that transcend a single department, college, or mission, ongoing discussion among faculty, department heads/Directors, and Deans is expected in developing the proposal to establish a new Institute or Center. A formal recommendation for establishment of a new Institute or Center by the cognizant departments heads, directors and college deans is expected to be obtained by the Institute or Center faculty prior to implementation.

- C. Budget plans to establish an Institute or Center must be developed in consultation with the RIGE leadership, and formally approved by the VPRI and Vice President for Finance & Administration (VPFA). Additionally, an assessment of potential university liabilities by the campus legal counsel must accompany the request for establishment. Early discussions with the VPRI and pertinent RIGE leadership before initiating the proposal process are strongly encouraged.
- D. All Institutes and Centers must identify the structure and staff with primary responsibility for the oversight and management of the organization’s financial operations. All Institute and Center faculty, staff, and students are expected to follow applicable university, state, and federal policies regarding administration and operation. Institutes and Centers are expected to operate within available allocated resources and not accrue budget deficits at the end of each fiscal year. Violations of these expectations may result in administrative action by the University, including but not limited to dissolution of an Institute, Center or Facility.

- E. Proposals for the establishment of new Institutes and Centers will be reviewed by the Research Advisory Board, and if endorsed, then will be reviewed by the VPRI.
- F. New Institutes and Centers must be approved by the President upon the recommendation of the VPRI. New Institutes and Centers will be authorized for an initial germination period of three years.

III. RENEWAL

Following germination and successful meeting of milestones determined by formal programmatic review administered by RIGE, authorization by the VPRI for continued operation is permitted, typically for a six-year period. Review criteria for continued authorization include, and are not be limited to: 1) success in the accomplishment of the unit's mission and its specific goals; 2) depth and breadth of impact in scholarship and innovation; 3) the Institute's or Center's support of the university research and/or innovation mission; and 4) maintenance of fiscal solvency.

At the end of authorized operating period, Institutes and Centers have the opportunity to seek renewal authorization, consider redefining their mission and/or emphasis (e.g., reforming as a new unit), or move toward orderly dissolution. Institutes or Centers that are not reviewed and/or specifically reauthorized will be 'sunsetting' and may not continue their operations beyond the authorized period. In circumstances where more protracted planning and discussion may be needed, Institutes or Centers also may be deemed inactive and 'mothballed' pending further review or action.

V. REVIEW PROCEDURE

Program review, coupled with strategic planning, is essential to advancing academic excellence, where program review is the primary means to maintain and improve quality, and to ensure the Institute or Center is well positioned to respond to opportunities and is meeting the needs of faculty. The intent of program review is to be a periodic self-examination that will contribute to ongoing strategic actions to realize future opportunities. The objectives of the review are to provide a clear assessment of the unit's strengths and weaknesses and to develop a guide for the unit's future direction. An effective review, that is one that is beneficial to the unit in planning for the future, is one that fully engages the faculty and administration from the development of the self-study, to the program response, to the final report, and subsequent implementation of the accepted recommendations. As a result, Institutes and Centers can realize many benefits from a thorough program review. Some of the most positive outcomes include:

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

The review process is a positive approach focused on self-examination and critical feedback in order to advance the research and innovation missions of the University of Oregon. It supports programs' desires to develop, evolve and reaffirm their own and the University's commitment to academic excellence. There are four components to program review: 1) internal self-study, 2) an external review of the unit, 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 VPRI, and includes other pertinent vice presidents, deans, and department heads.

As delegated by the President, the Vice President for Research & Innovation is responsible for coordinating the necessary periodic review of University Research & Innovation Institutes and University Research Centers. As such, RIGE is the main point of contact for units being reviewed, and has responsibility for oversight and implementation of the review process. While these Institutes and Centers are university wide and report to the VPRI, program review is a collaborative process with the Deans of the Colleges and Schools and the Heads of Departments whose faculty are affiliated with the Institute/Center.

A standard review procedure has been established to insure institutional consistency and provide the necessary data to facilitate strategic planning. Reviews are scheduled typically on a regular 6-year cycle, in the last year of the authorized operating period, which reflects the faster time-scale of responsiveness for Institute/Center in comparison to departments, and allows for a manageable number of units to be reviewed each year. Program review also can be initiated by the Director or VPRI at any time.

- A. By July 1, the Institute/Center Director, in consultation with the faculty, and pertinent cognizant department heads/deans, submits nominations for those to serve on the Review Team. The Review Team composition will vary unit to unit, 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 Oregon who have expertise in areas that are common with the unit under review; and 2) one member from the Center & Institutes Council.
- B. The Director coordinates with Institute/Center faculty in the preparation of the self-study report, and then submits the self-study materials to RIGE by October 15.
- C. VPRI appoints Review Team and designates one member as Chair, schedules the on-campus review (typically in the Winter or early Spring terms), pays for the travel and honoraria costs of the external reviewers, and develops the charge statement for the Review Team after soliciting input from the cognizant Dean(s) and Head(s).
- D. The Institute/Center is responsible to: 1) develop the review team itinerary schedule, 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 RIGE and other pertinent university personnel to complete the review process.

- E. 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 Institute/Center Director, VPRI, RIGE leadership, the cognizant dean(s) and head(s) to discuss the process, charge, and answer any questions. The team shall meet with faculty, cognizant Head(s), designated staff, and graduate students (where appropriate) to gain a more thorough understanding of the Institute/Center. Two exit meetings also are required: one with the Director, Faculty, and designated staff where the Review Team provides their frank initial assessment of the goals, plans, and strengths/areas needing improvement. The second exit interview is to be conducted with the VPRI, RIGE leadership, cognizant dean(s) and any other pertinent central administrator, to provide preliminary review and evaluation of the Institute/Center. 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 unit within existing resources and operating context, and to make one or two suggestions for investment that would have the greatest impact to advance quality.
- F. Institute/Center faculty and designated staff are expected to be actively engaged in all phases of the review process. Prior to beginning the of the self-study process, the faculty should be engaging in ongoing, annual planning that helps the Institute/Center be responsive to opportunities, reflecting on its past accomplishments and present needs to refine its future mission, goals and objectives. Institute/Center 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 Institute/Center response.
- G. The VPRI, cognizant dean(s) then meet with the Director and faculty 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.
- H. Based on this discussion, the Institute/Center then submits a draft Review Response that describes the planned actions that will be implemented to RIGE within 45 days of receipt of the Review Team report.
- I. Upon acceptance of the Institute/Center's Response, the VPRI submits a report to the President that also is disseminated to the Institute/Center faculty, which briefly describes: 1) the review process, 2) Review Team recommendations, 3) the Institute/Center's response, 4) anticipated changes that will result from the review, 5) how the recommendations and planned actions will advance the Institute/Center, support academic excellence and the University's goals, and 4) what resources are needed to accomplish the recommendations.

V. CHANGES

Institutes or Centers may request a change in designation based on these definitions at any time. Such requests will include a rationale for the proposed change in designation and will be reviewed and approved by the appropriate approval authority as if it were a newly created organization. Name changes to Institutes, Centers or Facilities must be approved by the VPRI.

VI. AFFILIATIONS

With approval from the VPRI (and other university officials where relevant), Institutes, Centers, or Facilities can enter into formal affiliation agreements with other entities, which are defined as contractual arrangements between the unit of the university and an extramural agency or organization for the purpose of joint activities toward mutual objectives. Such agreements may include, but not be limited to, shared facilities and/or equipment, joint personnel appointments, joint budgetary contributions, and cooperative administrative structures. The mere receipt of extramural funding from outside agencies (federal or otherwise) in the form of grants is excluded from this definition. In addition, agreements between the university and industrial affiliates, associates, sponsors or similar entities involving intellectual property rights shall not be included in the definition of formal affiliation agreement.

APPENDIX A: University Research & Innovation Institute or University Research Center

ANNUAL REPORT

INSTITUTE/CENTER NAME: _____

FY: _____ **Director:** _____

1. State the mission of the Institute/Center
2. Summarize changes to Institute/Center faculty, organizational structure, activities, or resources. Please include discussion of any new initiatives implemented or investments made the past year (e.g., replacement or upgrade of equipment or expertise) and their resultant impact.
3. The following impact metrics have been designed to measure the research/innovation/training outcomes. Please list:
 - Institute/Center research, training and innovation activities/events
 - Awards or distinguished honors received in this FY for all Institute/Center faculty and students
 - Other accomplishments not included above

RIGE will pull via Department/College annual activity report process:

- *Publications by Institute/Center faculty (include reference; e.g., authors, title, journal/publisher, volume, date)*

RIGE will pull internally:

- *List of technology transfer disclosures, patents and copyrights, spin-outs formed*
- *List of new extramural funds secured, faculty PI and amounts (new grants and contracts; donors) of all Institute/Center faculty*
- *List of ongoing extramural funds secured, faculty PI and amounts (new grants and contracts; donors) of all Institute/Center faculty*

APPENDIX B: University Research & Innovation Institute or University Research Center

ANNUAL BUDGET TEMPLATE

INSTITUTE/CENTER NAME: _____

FY: _____ **Director:** _____

1. List of Faculty (*prepopulated from RIGE*)
2. Institute/Center staff & FTE (*prepopulated by RIGE in draft org chart*)
3. List of names/level of all students who received training in affiliation with the Institute/Center (undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral)
4. Describe at least two short term goals for the next FY and two longer term goals for the Institute/Center.
5. What strategies will be used by the Director to successfully achieve these goals?
6. What are the expectations of the Institute or Center faculty to successfully achieve these goals?
7. What actions can RIGE take to help facilitate the efforts of Institute/Center faculty?

APPENDIX C – *under development*:

University Research & Innovation Institute or University Research Center

PROGRAM REVIEW SELF STUDY

INSTITUTE/CENTER NAME: _____

FY: _____ ***Director:*** _____

Institute/Center Mission Statement

Narrative describing context of Institute/Center

Compiled Information Reported Annually (completed by RIGE)

Financial Information (completed by RIGE)

Challenges in Research, Innovation and Graduate Education

Opportunities in Research, Innovation, and Graduate Education