

G. Policies and Procedures Governing Centers and Institutes

Policies and Procedures Governing Centers and Institutes

I. Introduction: Purpose and Scope

This document delineates the policies and procedures for planning, establishing, reviewing, and discontinuing centers and institutes at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. These policies and procedures are built on the framework provided by The UNC Policy Manual 400.5[R], Planning, Establishing, and Reviewing Centers and Institutes in The University of North Carolina, approved October 21, 2009.

These policies and procedures are intended to facilitate the establishment and operation of appropriate centers and institutes at UNC-Chapel Hill, to prevent the creation of units that unnecessarily duplicate the mission and programs of existing units, and to describe UNC-Chapel Hill administrators' responsibility, authority, and accountability for the leadership and management of centers and institutes. Regulations and processes described in this document apply to all organized research, instructional, and public service units that represent themselves as centers or institutes of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Because designation as a center or institute connotes an organizational representation of UNC-Chapel Hill's significant programmatic capacity, such designations are reserved for those units that have complied with these policies and procedures.

II. General Information and Definitions

Centers and institutes provide a vehicle for cross-disciplinary collaboration to maximize the capacity of the University to address complex problems, conduct research, educate students, and serve the needs of the state, the nation, and the world. They strengthen and enrich efforts to fulfill the University's tripartite instructional, research, and service mission and provide enhanced opportunities for faculty, staff, and students.

University centers and institutes are organized administrative units that

- provide support to faculty, staff, and students from different disciplines in research, instructional, and/or public service endeavors that benefit from coordination across multiple perspectives and units **and/or**
- ensure the professional curation of scientific, scholarly, natural, or cultural resources and collections and provide these to organizations and individuals within the university and/or in the larger community for the purposes of research, education, and public service **and**
- result in strengthened and enriched programs in research, teaching, and/or service; enhanced opportunities for faculty, staff, students, and the public; and heightened economic impact in the state.

Such centers may be organized under the auspices of a dean or group of deans and based within a department, school or college, or group of schools; or they may be pan-university and under the auspices of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost or the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development.

Each center or institute is designated as either a research, instructional, or public service unit, depending on its primary mission and core activities, but may be involved in complementary activities in the other areas. Centers and institutes do not have jurisdiction over academic curricula but may offer courses in cooperation with academic units.

The terms *center* and *institute* are used interchangeably; however, the term *institute* sometimes reflects a broader scope and may indicate a unit containing smaller centers within it.

Centers and institutes may be *institutional*, involving departments and schools within UNC-Chapel Hill, or *inter-institutional*, supporting and promoting collaboration across institutions of higher education within the UNC system or beyond. Inter-institutional centers and institutes designate one campus as the administrative campus to be responsible for general and fiscal oversight. For certain units designated as University System Multi-Campus Centers and Institutes, UNC General Administration maintains a level of involvement, as described in The UNC Policy Manual 400.5[R], Section C.

Units or programs that are *not* considered university centers or institutes under these policies include the following:

- Those whose mission is to provide focused services to specific university or community constituencies. Examples include the Writing Center, the NC Health Careers Access Program, and the NC Children's Center for Clinical Excellence.
- Buildings that are called centers, e.g., the FedEx Global Education Center.
- Centers focused primarily on the clinical care of patients, e.g., the Diabetes Care Clinic and the Ear and Hearing Center.
- Centers embedded within larger centers or institutes.
- Entities within departments that would be more appropriately considered research, public service, or clinical services programs of individual faculty members.

III. Oversight

The Centers and Institutes Review Committee, appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, oversees the creation, review, and discontinuation of centers and institutes, including evaluating the merit of proposals for new centers and institutes and reviewing the performance and continued viability of existing centers. Committee members are the Executive Associate Provost (Chair), Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, Associate Provost for Academic Initiatives, Associate Provost for Finance and Academic Planning, and three deans chosen from among the professional schools and the College of Arts and Sciences, who are appointed on a rotating basis.

IV. Establishing New Centers and Institutes

Establishing a new center or institute at any level within the University (campus-wide, school-based, or departmental) is a two-step process involving first a request for

authorization to plan and then a request for authorization to establish. The Centers and Institutes Review Committee oversees both steps and forwards recommendations to the Provost, who makes a determination regarding the request to plan or establish. Final approval to establish a center or institute is given by the Chancellor.

A. Authorization to Plan

To request authorization to plan a new center or institute, the person or team proposing the unit will submit to the Executive Associate Provost, in his or her role as Chair of the Centers and Institutes Review Committee, a letter that includes the following information:

1. Relevance of the proposed center or institute to the mission of UNC-Chapel Hill and the UNC system.
2. Mission, goals, and objectives of the proposed unit and an explanation of why these cannot be met within existing university structures.
3. Description of how the proposed unit differs from other centers, institutes, and units within UNC-Chapel Hill, the UNC system, and the state, and proposed relationships with them.
4. Description of the people and units involved.
5. Estimated funding needed to initiate and sustain the proposed center or institute for five years and potential sources of funding during that period.
6. Estimated space, facilities, and equipment needs and plans for meeting these needs.
7. If relevant, information about the inter-institutional nature of the proposed unit with regard to mission, leadership, activities, funding, or other aspects.
8. Proposed timeline for establishing the center or institute. If a time-limited center is proposed, e.g., one established only for the duration of certain external funding, estimated "sunset" date.

The Centers and Institutes Review Committee will evaluate the request within thirty days of receipt and make a recommendation to the Provost. Within thirty days of receiving the recommendation from the Committee, the Provost will communicate a decision regarding permission to plan and, if permission is granted, the expected timeline for completion of the plan and request for authorization to establish. The planning period will have a maximum duration of two years. If a request for authorization to establish is not presented within two years, a new request for authorization to plan must be submitted.

B. Authorization to Establish

When planning is complete, the person or team proposing the center or institute will submit to the Executive Associate Provost, in his or her role as Chair of the Centers and Institutes Review Committee, a written proposal that includes the following information:

1. A name for the proposed center or institute that appropriately reflects the unit's mission and scope.
2. The proposed unit's designation as either a research, instructional, or public service unit, in accordance with its primary mission and with the understanding that it may

- conduct complementary activities outside its designated primary mission.
3. The mission, goals, and objectives of the proposed center or institute.
 4. The anticipated benefit of the unit's work to the research, instructional, or public service programs of UNC-Chapel Hill; and, if inter-institutional arrangements are involved, the anticipated benefit to the participating institutions.
 5. A description of how the achievement of the unit's mission, goals, and objectives will be measured, documented, and assessed.
 6. Description of the organizational structure, including reporting lines, leadership, staffing, and advisory boards, and an organizational chart showing both the unit's relationship to existing campus units and the internal organization of the unit. If relevant, evidence that any necessary inter-unit agreements have been reached.
 7. Letter of support from the administrator to whom the unit will report.
 8. Names of key leaders, faculty, staff, advisory board members, and/or affiliates.
 9. If relevant, evidence that inter-institutional agreements regarding leadership, governance, activities, funding, and other aspects have been reached by the collaborating Chancellors or their designees.
 10. Description of space, facilities, and equipment needs and how those needs will be met.
 11. Five-year budget detailing personnel and non-personnel costs and sources of revenue.
 12. Acceptance of requirements for periodic review of the center or institute and of the director (see sections V and VI below). If a time-limited center is proposed, e.g., one established only for the duration of certain external funding, explicit acknowledgment of the "sunset" date.

The Centers and Institutes Review Committee will evaluate the request within thirty to sixty days of receipt and make a recommendation to the Provost. Within thirty days of receiving the recommendation from the Committee, the Provost will determine whether to (1) approve the request to establish and forward it to the Chancellor for final approval or (2) deny the request and communicate that decision to those submitting the proposal. The Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost will notify the UNC Office of Research and Sponsored Programs of the establishment of a new center or institute.

V. Periodic Review of Center and Institute Directors

Each center or institute will have a director who is responsible for the day-to-day programmatic, fiscal, and personnel decisions of the unit. Recruitment and hiring of center directors will follow the University's usual human resources policies and procedures.

Not later than the fourth year following the initial appointment, and not less frequently than every five years thereafter, each center or institute director will undergo a performance review. The administrative officer to whom the center or institute reports, hereafter referred to as the "appointing officer," will be responsible for initiating the review and for acting on its recommendations.

The review will be conducted by a committee chosen by the appointing officer, who may consult with the center director in choosing committee members. The majority of the committee members shall be individuals outside the unit under review. The primary responsibility of the review committee is to serve as a conduit and organizing mechanism for information and feedback concerning the performance of the director being reviewed. The appointing officer will provide guidance to the committee regarding expectations of the director under review and the types of information that would be most helpful for the committee to collect and summarize, e.g., position description, annual reports, budget and planning documents, evaluation summaries, or project reports.

The committee shall solicit comment from individuals, who may provide input (1) in writing via letter or email, (2) in person, or (3) by telephone. Written comments become part of the permanent personnel file and are available to the director under review. Those who meet with the review committee may choose to remain anonymous with regard to attribution of specific comments; however, a list of all persons appearing before the committee shall be part of the official record of the committee's work. No allegation by any individual of misconduct on the part of the director under review will be accepted except upon the basis of a written, signed statement from the individual making the allegation.

The committee will submit a written report to the appointing officer, who will share the report with the director under review and invite a response. The report and all accompanying documents will become a confidential part of the personnel file of the person being reviewed and will therefore be open to his or her examination.

The review should be completed within an eight-to-twelve week period.

Directors of campus-wide centers and institutes will be reviewed following the procedures described in Appendix A.

VI. Periodic review of centers and institutes

A review of each center or institute must be conducted periodically as a mechanism for evaluating the relevance and effectiveness of the center as an academic and administrative entity. The initial review will occur three to five years after the center or institute is established, and subsequent reviews will occur every eight years. A review may occur sooner at the discretion of the appointing officer, who also may adjust the timing of the review so that it coincides with the review of the director.

External review by a national accrediting or funding body may be considered equivalent to a center review; therefore, such review may serve as periodic review unless the appointing officer or the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost otherwise requests a review. Examples of such reviews include national museum accreditation review and the grant renewal process for area studies centers funded under Title VI or for other units established by a center grant. Accreditation review and grant renewal processes will **not** substitute for periodic review of the director.

The administrative officer to whom the unit reports will choose and appoint reviewers based on their expertise in the field represented by the center under review. Reviewers may be internal or external to the university. For pan-university centers, the review team must include at least three reviewers; at least one must be external to the University, and one must be designated as chair.

The review will focus on the following:

1. Mission, goals, and objectives, and their relationship to those of the university.
2. Degree to which the center's mission, goals, and activities are unique or duplicated elsewhere on campus or within the UNC system.
3. Significant accomplishments in the past five years in research, instruction, and/or public service and engagement.
4. Degree of success in achieving mission and reaching desired outcomes.
5. How and to what extent the center promotes interdisciplinary work.
6. University and community partnerships (if applicable).
7. Quality and quantity of scholarly and/or public service activity by faculty, professional staff, and students.
8. Organizational structure; number and types of personnel.
9. Summary budget data for past five years, including amount and sources of funding, changes in funding over the years, number and types of grants and contracts, and administrative costs. For initial reviews, comparison of current budget with budget proposed at inception.
10. Summary of technology transfer activities (if applicable).
11. Barriers to achievement of mission or goals.
12. Vision for the future of the center or institute, including program improvement plans.

The reviewers may obtain data regarding the above aspects from various print or electronic documents; a concise self-study report prepared by the center director (required for pan-university centers); and/or interviews with the appointing officer, center director, center staff, and center affiliates (faculty, students, staff, others). If the unit is an inter-institutional center or institute, the reviewers will gather input from representatives of participating institutions. The reviewers will submit a single, concise written report to the appointing officer, typically within one month following completion of the review of data. The report will address the following:

1. Degree to which the mission of the program is realistic, feasible, and capable of meeting the needs of the university and wider community.
2. Extent to which the center's mission, goals, and activities are unique or duplicated elsewhere on campus or within the UNC system.
3. Degree of success in achieving mission and reaching desired outcomes; adequacy of programs and initiatives in fulfilling research, instruction, and/or public service missions and meeting the needs of constituents and stakeholders.
4. Quality of the student experience and success in career placement (if applicable).
5. Effectiveness of leadership, organizational structure, and administrative resources.

6. Quality of institutional relationships.
7. Adequacy of funding and facilities; for recently-established centers, congruence of current budget with budget proposed at inception.
8. Feasibility of the program's plans for the future.
9. Recommendations for improving academic and administrative effectiveness.

The appointing officer will transmit the report, whether generated by the external accrediting or funding body or by the university-appointed reviewers, to the center director, dean (for school-based centers only), and the Centers and Institutes Review Committee. The Committee then will make recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost regarding (1) the center's continued viability, (2) an action plan for changes or improvements, and (3) timeline for the next review. The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost will communicate his or her decisions to the center or institute director, the administrative officer to whom the unit reports, and the dean (for school-based centers only).

The entire review process typically should be completed within a four-month period.

VII. Discontinuation of Centers and Institutes

Following a review as described in Section VI above or a formal written request by the administrative officer to whom the center or institute reports, the Centers and Institutes Review Committee may recommend to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost the discontinuation of a center or institute under the following circumstances:

1. The unit unnecessarily duplicates the mission and/or activities of another unit at UNC-Chapel Hill or within the UNC system.
2. Insufficient financial, human, or facilities resources are available to support the unit.
3. The major supporting grant or award has been terminated.
4. The center or institute has failed to achieve its mission, goals, or objectives.
5. The mission, goals, and objectives of the center or institute are no longer congruent with those of the administrative unit to which it reports or the University.

If the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost determines that discontinuation is warranted, he or she will ask the Chancellor to approve this action, and then will notify the UNC Office of Research and Sponsored Programs of the action. Inter-institutional centers will require documented agreement by the Chancellors at the collaborating institutions before the recommendation to discontinue is presented to the Chancellor of UNC-Chapel Hill. The administrative officer to whom the center or institute reports, in collaboration with the center director, will develop a plan for phasing out the unit to allow orderly termination or transfer of contractual obligations and an effort to find alternative employment for full-time staff. The phase-out period may not be more than one year in duration, except for units with collections or facilities requiring additional time for responsible disposition.

Appendix A. Procedures for review of directors of campus-wide and inter-institutional centers and institutes

The appointing officer will appoint a review committee consisting of at least five members. The majority of the committee members shall be individuals outside the unit under review. One or two committee members may be selected from the unit under review, except where doing so would compromise the operation of the unit or jeopardize the confidentiality of the information provided by the member. The appointing officer shall appoint as chair of the review committee an individual who is employed outside the unit of the individual being reviewed. The appointing officer shall invite the person being reviewed to suggest three individuals to serve on the review committee and will select at least one of these individuals to serve. The appointing officer may select the remaining review committee members at large, in consultation with the chair of the committee if desired, and may include faculty, EPA Non-Faculty employees and SPA employees. Where appropriate, one or two additional faculty or administrators from other universities, agencies, or institutions may be invited by the appointing officer to serve on the review committee.

At his or her discretion, the appointing officer may designate an individual to staff the review. The designated staff member shall work with the chair of the review committee and its members to ensure that the review proceeds in an efficient, timely manner. The designated staff member is authorized to provide procedural guidance and to serve as a liaison between the review committee and the appointing officer. At the request of the chair of the review committee, the designated staff member may attend committee meetings to explain the review process and to respond to procedural questions; however, the designated staff member shall not be a sitting member of the committee and shall not provide evaluative comment or attempt to influence the findings or recommendations of the review.

The chair of the review committee will lead committee meetings, delegate assignments, and be responsible for ensuring that the review committee's written report accurately reflects the content of its deliberations and the information it has received. The chair is responsible for keeping minutes of the committee's discussions in accordance with State law, and shall assure that information on which any aspect of the committee's recommendations is based is reliable, including attribution to sources, especially in the case of expressed concerns regarding performance of the director and any allegations of misconduct.

The appointing officer will meet with the review committee to deliver its charge and inform the committee of his or her expectations for the director under review. The appointing officer or the designated staff member will provide guidance on the types of information that might be most helpful for the committee to collect and summarize. The review committee also will meet with the director being reviewed to discuss his or her goals and performance and to obtain relevant information, such as the unit's annual reports, lists of key collaborators, and planning documents.

The primary responsibility of the review committee is to serve as a conduit and organizing mechanism for feedback concerning the performance of the director being reviewed. The

review committee is responsible for submitting a final report reflecting a fair and representative sample of views present among those knowledgeable about that individual's performance. Toward that end, the committee should widely solicit feedback from those who collaborate or interact with or receive services provided by the director or the administrative unit or units reporting to that person. As appropriate, the committee shall solicit feedback from members of the faculty, students, post-doctoral fellows, and university staff members, as well as from individuals working for relevant organizations outside the university. The review committee shall take special care to solicit feedback from employees within the unit or units reporting to the individual under review, being mindful that some employees may be more comfortable providing oral rather than written comments.

Individuals may communicate with the review committee in a number of ways. Listed below are four communication methods that have been reviewed and approved by University legal counsel. The aim of these various mechanisms is to provide an honest, frank, and reliable method for review that is fair both to the individual being reviewed and the reviewers.

1. *Letter to the committee.* Written communication with the review committee may be by signed letter. Written comments become part of the permanent personnel file and are available to the director of the center or institute. Unsigned or anonymous letters will not be accepted.
2. *Email to the chair or any member of the review committee.* According to University policy, email is treated as written correspondence. As such, email comments are printed and become a part of the committee's file which is turned over to the appointing officer at the end of the process and which is part of the personnel file of the center or institute director.
3. *Telephone call to or personal meeting with the chair or any member of the review committee.* Notes relating to information provided by telephone or personal meeting are the property of the individual committee member and do not become part of the committee's file and are therefore not turned over to the appointing officer at the end of the process. Such personal notes cannot constitute a "shadow file" on the director under review. Such notes should be used only as memory aids for purposes of discussion and then discarded.
4. *Personal appearance before the review committee.* Individuals appearing before the review committee may declare at the beginning of their appearance their wish to remain anonymous, insofar as attribution in the committee minutes of specific comments. However, a list of all persons appearing before the committee shall be kept by the committee chair and shall be part of the official records of the review committee's work. No allegation by any individual of misconduct on the part of the director under review will be accepted except upon the basis of a written, signed statement from the individual making the allegation. As with telephone calls or personal meetings with the chair or members of the review committee, notes

generated by a committee member during an individual's meeting with the committee as a whole are the property of the committee member and do not become a part of the committee's file and are not turned over to the appointing officer.

Faculty, staff, and students also may communicate directly with the appointing officer to provide input, and the appointing officer also may consult with those outside the review committee in the course of the review process.

It is the responsibility of the appointing officer and the director under review to assure that the open exchange of views envisioned by this process remains free of any act or threat of reprisal for responsible use of this process to express opinions about the job performance of the director under review.

A final written report of the review committee shall be submitted to the appointing officer, who may then meet with the committee to discuss any issues that require elaboration or clarification. The appointing officer will share the report and discuss its content with the director being reviewed and invite a response. All documents generated by the review committee shall become a confidential part of the personnel file of the person being reviewed and shall therefore be open to his or her examination.

The review typically should be completed within an eight-week period.