



**Memorial**  
University of Newfoundland

## **PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY INSTITUTES AND CENTRES**

March 2001

### **Introduction**

The Planning and Budget Committee is responsible for academic program review at Memorial. As such it has established procedures for the Review of Units and Programs. This document supplements those review procedures so as to establish procedures for the regular review of research institutes and centres at Memorial. The majority of research institutes and centres are directly associated with a recognized academic unit (department/school/faculty). Reviews of these organizations will be included in the Academic Program Review (APR) of those units and should be guided by the "Procedures for the Review of Units and Programs." A small number of research institutes and centres at Memorial are too broadly interdisciplinary to be dealt with in this manner or are not directly associated with any academic unit. This document is intended to provide these organizations with procedures which are comparable to the procedures for academic units but which recognize the distinctive nature of these organizations within the University. As with the APR, the review of research institutes and centres is carried out by units under the authority of Senate and is designed to support the objectives of the University. The purposes of the review of research institutes and centres are:

- ? To evaluate the quality, success, and role of research institutes and centres in the fulfillment of their own and the University's mission and strategic goals
- ? To encourage strategic planning, innovation and improvement in institutes and centres
- ? To provide an occasion for institutes and centres to identify opportunities and find ways to pursue them
- ? To avail of fresh perspectives from colleagues outside of Memorial.

This review process should be regarded as formative. That is, it is an opportunity for the members of the institute or centre to work collegially to identify areas of strength and find ways of improving upon what it does.

Institutes and centres will normally be reviewed at seven-year intervals, but this pattern may be amended so as to accommodate accreditation or other mandated reviews or in individual cases upon the recommendation of the Director, Vice President (Research) or the Vice-President (Academic).

In order to maintain the arms-length relationships appropriate for certain aspects of reviews, some functions will be performed by a Dean of Record. This is the Dean of the School or Faculty to whom the institute or centre principally reports. In the event that an institute or centre is designated to report to the Vice-President (Research), rather than to a Dean, the duties of "Dean of Record" will be assumed by the Vice-President (Research).

The review process will be centrally funded through the office of the Vice-President (Academic).

### **The Process**

1. Upon request, Deans and Directors, in consultation with the Vice-President (Research), submits to the Vice-President (Academic) a list of institutes and centres and a suggested order for their review.
2. The PBC reviews submissions from the Vice-President (Research) and establishes an appropriate schedule for reviewing institutes and centres in coordination with the reviews of academic units and programs, which is then referred to the Office of the Vice-President (Academic) for coordination.
3. The PBC or its delegate(s) meets with members of the institute or centre concerned to provide information about the review process. The institute or centre can, at that time, establish additional, discipline-specific criteria and indicators for the review as necessary.
4. The Review Panel is appointed according to the procedures below.
5. The institute or centre conducts a thorough Self-Study and submits this to the Dean of Record for distribution to the Review Panel.
6. The Panel reviews the Self-Study, and may request additional information from the institute or centre.
7. The Panel conducts a one or two-day review of the institute or centre. When completed, the draft Panel Report is submitted to the Dean of Record who checks it for factual accuracy. Following any necessary revisions by the Panel, the Dean circulates it to faculty and staff within the institute or centre.
8. The institute or centre prepares a formal response to the Panel Report and submits this to the Dean of Record.
9. The Dean of Record and the Director of the institute or centre meet to discuss the final Review Report (consisting of the Self-Study, Review Panel Report, and the unit's response), particularly any recommendations that have been made. Together they formulate an action plan, including a timeline and an assignment, of responsibilities, which is then circulated to faculty and professional staff within the institute or centre for discussion and comment.
10. The Dean of Record and the Director hold a follow-up meeting to make any amendments to the action plan that may be necessary.
11. The Review Report and the action plan, are forwarded to the Vice-President (Research) and the PBC for consideration in respect of planning and budget. A copy of the action plan is distributed to faculty and staff within the institute or centre.

12. One year after submission of the Report, the Dean of Record will submit to the PBC a report on progress towards implementation of the action plan. The PBC may request further progress reports.

### **Organization and Responsibilities**

A Coordinator, reporting to the Vice-President (Academic), is designated to facilitate the process of Academic Reviews for the PBC. This individual shall:

- ? confer with Deans and/or Vice-President (Research) to schedule reviews following units/programs being selected for review by the PBC
- ? confer with the Director of each institute or centre under review to determine a budget that will cover data collection and analysis, personnel time, payments to external reviewers, travel and miscellaneous office expenses
- ? assist in arranging for site visits by external reviewers (travel, accommodations, hosting, etc.)
- ? assist, as required, in the gathering of supporting materials for both the Self-Study and the Panel Review
- ? serve as custodian for review documents subsequent to the Review
- ? perform other duties, as required, in support of the review process

The Coordinator will be appointed by the Vice-President (Academic). In the case of Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, the appointment will be made by the Vice-President (Academic) on the recommendation of the Principal of the College.

Each review is conducted by a Review Panel. The Panel will normally be composed of four members, all from disciplines or areas of expertise related, so far as possible, to that of the unit under review. Two of the panelists will be Memorial University of Newfoundland faculty or professional staff not associated with the activities of the institute or centre under review, and two will be faculty or professionally qualified individuals from other institutions or recognized experts in the field from outside of the University community.

1. One Memorial University of Newfoundland member from outside the institute or centre under review chosen by the Dean of Record.
2. One Memorial University of Newfoundland member from outside the institute or centre chosen by members of the institute or centre under review.
3. Two external members representing the area of research of the unit under review, chosen by the Dean of Record. At least one of these will be chosen from a list of three or more names provided by the members of the institute or centre under review.

On occasion, based on the scope of the review, the Director may recommend to the PBC through the Vice-President (Academic) that only one external reviewer be enlisted for the Review Panel. In this instance, that one will be chosen from a list of three or more names provided by the members of the institute or centre under review.

The Dean of Record will appoint one of the internal Panelists to be Chair of the Panel. After consulting with the Chair of the Panel and the Director of the institute or centre to be reviewed, the Coordinator will establish the time of the review and will set a schedule for the accomplishment of the review.

The full review process can be summarized into three parts: Self-Study, Review, and Follow-up. In preparation for the review, the institute or centre will undertake a self-study based on the guidelines that appear later in this document. The self-study phase is central, providing the basis for further deliberations and goal setting within the context of University priorities.

The preparation of documentation for the review will be the responsibility of a member of the institute or centre designated by the Director. The responsibilities of others are as follows:

**Faculty members will provide:**

- ? either a CV, a standard Research Council personal information form, or other documentation of activity since the last review.
- ? any additional materials pertinent to the member's research projects not sufficiently covered by CV or personal information report.

Where applicable, one graduate and/or undergraduate student will be chosen by students within the unit to participate in the Self-Study and to consult with the Review Panel.

Students (where applicable), faculty, staff and any other associates with the institute or centre deemed appropriate, will be available for interview or survey during the preparation of the review documents (internally) and the review itself (with external reviewers).

Panelists are encouraged to request additional materials as needed. The Dean of Record will ensure that all interests within the institute or centre are included in the review process. All Panel members will participate in all aspects of the review and in the formation of the Panel's written report. It is the responsibility of the Review Panel chairperson to ensure that members of the Panel work together throughout the review and that the final report reflects the views of all members of the Panel.

The Panel's draft Report should be completed within one month of the review and forwarded by the Panel chairperson to the Coordinator for transmission to the Dean of Record in accordance with point 7 of the process. The Dean of Record is responsible for keeping the institute or centre informed of actions taken pursuant to the review.

**The purposes of the Self-Study are:**

- ? Description, mission statement, and assessment of the institute or centre (organization, projects, programs, management, resources, and where applicable, teaching and courses);
- ? Description of plans or proposed innovations for the institute or centre for the future;
- ? Assessment of the contribution of the institute or centre to the areas of research, the University and its priorities, and the province.

Those institutes and centres which are involved in undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and supervision should follow the self-study guidelines from the "Procedures for the Review of Units and Programs," particularly sections B, C & D, in regards to their unit's teaching activities, in addition to those identified below.

### **A. Strategic Objectives**

1. What are the strategic objectives of the institute or centre?
2. To what extent are the institute's or centre's stated objectives being met? What is the evidence for these achievements?
3. How does the institute or centre support the mission and objectives of the University and other programs within the University?
4. How are the efforts of the institute or centre focused upon achieving the level of excellence (provincial, national, international) to which the institute or centre aspires?

### **B. Faculty Contribution**

1. How effectively does the faculty's research and scholarly activity coincide with the institute's or centre's mission?
2. What is the quality and impact of the scholarly contributions of faculty and professional staff.
3. How effectively are the faculty and professional staff engaged with relevant professional communities locally, regionally, and nationally?
4. How effectively are the faculty and professional staff engaged in relationships with business, government, cultural or other relevant communities?
5. How effectively are the faculty and professional staff active, and recognized, participants in regional, national, and international professional organizations?
6. Are the faculty generating a level of external grants and contracts appropriate to the institute's or centre's mission?
7. Are the contracts and grants received by faculty consistent with the strategic goals of the institute or centre?

### **C. Administrative Support/Efficiency**

1. Is the institute or centre receiving appropriate direct resources and support from the University?

2. Is the institute or centre pursuing sources of appropriate support from appropriate organizations, funding agencies and/or corporations outside of the University?
3. How adequate and effective are infrastructural resources and support (e.g., media, communications, space, recruitment, equipment)?
4. How effectively is the institute or centre able to generate external funding sufficient to cover the costs of its own operations?
5. How effectively does the unit promote new initiatives, plans, collegial spirit, and active community involvement?
6. What major initiatives and improvements should faculty, professional staff, and administrators be taking to enhance the unit?
7. How well are administrative and professional support staff contributing to the research and strategic goals of the institute or centre?
8. How effectively does the institute or centre deploy its resources?

**Additional documentation in support of the above should include:**

- ? A copy of the institute's or centre's budget.
- ? A copy of Memorial University's Strategic Framework.
- ? Breakdown of FTE faculty, professionals and salaried staff by rank, function, workload.
- ? Statement concerning any proposed changes to the institute's or centre's resources and an explanation of these proposed changes.

It is important that the self-study achieve a proper balance between details and inclusiveness, and available resources (especially time). The self-study should provide enough information to be useful and understandable by professionals outside the institute or centre, within and outside the University. The self-study should be considered as the central element for the external peer review process.

**Review Schedule and List of Responsibilities**

After the members of the Panel have discussed procedures among themselves, they will meet with the Dean of Record and the Director of the Institute or Centre under review. This meeting serves as an orientation to the review and gives panelists the opportunity to ask questions about the process and the unit. The Dean of Record or the Director then escorts the panelists on a tour of the unit's facilities and of other campus facilities pertinent to the unit's operations.

It is important that all faculty and professional staff of the unit have the opportunity to meet with the Panel. Time should be set aside for individuals and groups of faculty, professional staff, support staff and, where applicable, student representatives to meet with the panelists. The panel should also have the opportunity to meet with other stakeholders in the institute or centre, both from within and outside the University, as appropriate. Members of the Panel may also conduct any other interviews that they or the Director have requested. With the consent of the Dean of Record and members of the unit

concerned, some interviews may be conducted, and information gathered, by the Memorial internal panel members prior to the arrival of the external reviewers.

The review will include time for the panelists to meet alone to outline their report and to distribute the writing responsibilities. At the conclusion of the review, the team will hold an exit interview with the Dean of Record and the Director of the Institute or Centre. The Report is due one month following the completion of the review.

### **The Review Report**

As much as is reasonably possible, the report should place the institute or centre under review in the larger context of organizations of a similar kind in Canada, and where appropriate outside of Canada, and should assess the unit according to the norms for such organizations. It should address any major issues facing the unit, comment on the compatibility of the unit's mission, achievements, plans and goals with those of other units associated with the institute or centre and with those of the University mission, and suggest strategies for achieving unit and University goals. The Report should contain recommendations which, in the view of the Panel, will lead to improvements in the program. The Report should focus on the unit as a whole without reference to individuals and be written to inform both the unit and Senate. To accomplish these purposes the Report should, where applicable and appropriate, consider the following points:

### **Faculty and Staff**

1. How well are faculty and staff resources being used?
2. How successful is the institute or centre in implementing University employment equity policies?
3. Are faculty and staff workloads equitable and appropriate to the institute's or centre's missions?
4. Are administrative decisions made and administrative tasks carried out efficiently and effectively?
5. How does the institute or centre rank among those in similar institutions regarding research productivity and quality, external funding, programs and where applicable, teaching loads?

### **Research and Scholarship**

1. Are the research and scholarship of the faculty and professional staff appropriate to the mission of the institute or centre?
2. Are research facilities and library resources sufficiently supportive of faculty research?
3. Is the generation of external funding adequate to meet the needs of the institute's or centre's mission?
4. Are the faculty's associations with regional, national and international organizations compatible with the mission of the institute or centre?

## **Community Service**

1. Is the institute or centre fulfilling opportunities to serve the community?
2. How does the institute's or centre's mission respond to the needs and priorities of the community?

## **Entrepreneurship**

1. Is the institute or centre seeking and pursuing appropriate opportunities for entrepreneurial activities?
2. Is the institute or centre seeking a wide variety of activities in order to generate external funding sufficient to cover the costs of its own operations?

## **University Support**

1. Is the institute or centre receiving adequate resources from its Faculty and from the University at large?
2. Are its facilities adequate? Attention should be paid to space, equipment, computing, laboratory and library resources.
3. Is it adequately staffed?
4. Does the reporting structure ensure managerial efficiency and administrative effectiveness within the institute or centre?

## **Plans, Goals, and Resource Allocation**

1. Are the objectives of the institute or centre appropriate to the mission of the University?
2. Is the institute or centre trying to do too much?
3. What has the "value-added" of the institute or centre been in the context of the overhead and other costs borne by the University on behalf of the institute or centre?
4. How might the institute's or centre's resources be redistributed to realize its goals and those of the University?
5. Should the institute or centre continue in its present form?

## **APPENDIX**

These separate review procedures are intended for use by those broadly interdisciplinary or semi-independent centres and institutes which would not easily come under the regular review practice for academic units. Those institutes and centres which have been identified so far are:

- ? Centre for Applied Health Research
- ? C-CAR, Centre for Chemical Analysis Research
- ? ISER - Institute for Social and Economic Research
- ? J. R. Smallwood Foundation for Newfoundland and Labrador Studies



- ? Ocean Sciences Centre
- ? Public Policy Research Centre
- ? Telemedicine/TETRA Centre