Washington State University

Policies and Procedures to Establish, Review, and Renew Centers and Institutes

Updated April 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: Introduction

The Research and Arts Committee (RAC) of the Faculty Senate currently reviews proposals and makes recommendations for the approval of new centers and institutes. The RAC reports to the Faculty Senate and the president through the Vice President for Research (VPR). Ultimate approval of centers/institutes (C/Is) rests with the Board of Regents. To further expedite the process following Faculty Senate approval, the Board of Regents has delegated final approval to the President. The RAC also currently receives annual reports from C/Is and reviews and renews C/Is every five years.

Following the work of the Centers, Institutes, and Laboratories (CILs) Task Force—a joint venture of the Office of Research and the Faculty Senate (see Appendix A for charter)—a comprehensive set of recommendations for new policies and procedures to establish, review, and renew C/Is were approved by the WSU Faculty Senate and the WSU Board of Regents. The current document is a result of the implementation of these recommendations. Appendix B provides the Executive Summary of the initial recommendations document, including rationales for major changes. Appendix C provides a table overviewing changes from the previous policies and procedures to the new policies and procedures. Given the Board of Regents approval and the subsequent rollout of the electronic submission process, all C/Is falling under the domain of the Faculty Senate must follow the policies and procedures herein for application, assessment. and renewal.

Overview of Centers/Institutes

Academic, discipline-based departments and schools are the primary units at Washington State University (WSU) for carrying out the university's missions of research, teaching, service, and/or outreach. However, **centers/institutes** (C/Is) are a critical contributor to the academic strength and vibrancy of WSU, because they address challenging problems and explore new and exciting opportunities. They embrace WSU's interdisciplinary culture by connecting faculty with complementary interests that typically transcend disciplinary boundaries.

The scope, mission, and lifespan of centers and institutes can be highly variable, but they all must further WSU's missions in ways that cannot be addressed through existing academic units without being duplicative.

As described in more detail in this document, new C/Is must be approved by the direct oversight authority/authorities for the C/I, the Research and Arts Committee (RAC; primary subcommittee of the Faculty Senate for C/I approval), the Faculty Senate, and the Board of Regents (which has delegated this final approval to the University President). Ongoing C/Is must be reviewed by the oversight authority/authorities and the RAC, with the review results communicated to the Faculty Senate. Certain C/Is also require routine external review.

Definitions

Centers and Institutes (C/Is)

C/Is have an academic mission and vision broader than that of individual academic units. Alternatively, C/Is can be organized around the investigation of a fairly specific theme or issue but encompass interdisciplinary work and facilitate interdisciplinary activities involving faculty from across different academic units. In either scope of mission or scope of faculty involvement, a center or institute accomplishes work that goes beyond the boundaries of existing academic units. Likewise, C/Is are devoted to focused and sustained scholarly and creative activity in an area of interest that is of broad interest to the university, and may provide resources to the rest of the university. C/Is may have dedicated staff, space, and administrative support outside of departments and colleges. There is no specific distinction between a center and an institute; the group forming the unit typically selects the preferred name. In fact, a unit could be an approved C/I without using the name "center" or "institute" in the unit's title (e.g., a program of excellence with center status).

College C/I

A college-level C/I may involve faculty from one or more colleges and/or campuses. Resources come from the colleges involved (and are limited to the department/school level). The oversight authority/authorities is a college-level administrator or administrators (or their designees).

University C/I

A university-level C/I generally involves faculty from more than one college and/or campus. Resources may be received from department/schools or colleges, but the distinction from college-level C/Is is that university-level C/Is receive central, university resources. Any C/I receiving ongoing, recurring central funding (in any amount) is considered a University C/I. The oversight authority/authorities is a university-level administrator (i.e., either the Vice President for Research or the Provost, depending on the classification of the unit). However, also reporting to academic Deans or campus Chancellors may also be appropriate for some University C/Is.

Both college-level and university-level C/Is are further defined by their primary objectives. Upon formation, a C/I may have many goals within their mission and/or vision statements. However, their primary goal(s) will define the type of C/I unit as follows:

> _Note_. _The oversight of a C/I—and the corresponding classification as a college C/I or a university-level, C/I—may change during the span of a C/I's existence. The classification is made to determine appropriate lines of reporting and oversight, where the most meaningful feedback can be provided to the director and core faculty of the C/I. This classification may need to change if investment of resources changes over the life of the C/I._

Organized Research Units (ORUs)

If the <u>primary</u> mission of the C/I is research/scholarship, even if it includes other missions such as teaching, outreach, or service, then it is an ORU. Classification as an ORU C/I does not preclude a C/I from pursuing work in other areas.

Teaching, Service, and/or Outreach Units (TSOUs)

If the <u>primary</u> mission of the C/I is teaching, service, and/or outreach (or any combination of these three elements), even if it includes other missions such as research, then it is a TSOU. Classification as a TSOU C/I does not preclude a C/I from pursuing work in other areas. If the research mission is not primary to the unit but the activities of the research mission specifically receives significant funding from the college or University, the C/I should be classified as an ORU.

> <u>*Note*</u>*. Importantly, any associated teaching is done in individual departments or interdisciplinary programs. However, a C/I may, and should be encouraged to, sponsor and/or conduct workshops, short courses, seminars, symposia, colloquia, etc., and may encourage individual departments to offer special editions of courses for academic credit.*

Other Collaborative Units

Collaborative units that <u>do not</u> receive college- or university-level resources but that still contribute to WSU's mission are discouraged from using the term *center* or *institute*. Rather, they are more appropriately identified as *collaborative, initiative, team, consortium, network*, etc. Such collaborative units <u>do not</u> have to follow the policies and procedures herein unless they later decide to change to a center or institute.

Laboratories and Core Facilities

Previously, core laboratories were required to apply through and be regularly reviewed by the Faculty Senate. However, the policies and procedures outlined herein focuses exclusively on establishing and reviewing centers and institutes. Core laboratories and other core facilities are established and reviewed through another process through the Office of Research. Under the current definitions, "laboratory" is a designation for entities that are primarily service centers or for individual researcher-led laboratories that want to promote their research interests.

Cost Recovery Centers/Service Centers

Some University centers are cost recovery or service centers that do not fit the description of a center for the purposes of the policies and procedures outlined herein. That is, they are not under the purview of the RAC or Faculty Senate and, therefore, do not follow these processes. For example, there are many centers under the Division of Student Affairs (such as the Academic Success and Career Center, Chinook Student Center, CougarCard Center, Elson S. Floyd Cultural Center, Center for Civic Engagement, University Recreation / Student Recreation Center) that are not part of this C/I process.

Centers Created Solely for Center Grants

Centers that are created solely for a specific center grant for a *time-limited* project that will not continue after the center grant funding ends do not fit the description of a center for the purposes of the policies and procedures outlined herein. Such centers are considered equivalent to one-time grant-funded projects. If these centers were to expand to seek additional funding and to become ongoing, then they should apply for official center status through these procedures.

Stakeholders

University-wide stakeholders (in the C/I process) will be invited to provide comment during any new C/I proposal comment period. This information will be collected and considered by the RAC. Stakeholders for both ORUs and TSOUs include the academic Deans, campus Chancellors, and Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs. If the proposed C/I is an ORU, stakeholders also include the Associate Deans for Research, Vice Chancellors for Research, the Research Council, and the University Research Infrastructure Committee. All current C/I directors also will be notified for comment. The Library Committee also will be consulted if the application indicates an additional impact on the library resources.

SECTION 2: Establishing a Center/Institute or Collaborative Unit (CICU)

Step 1: Complete Online Request Form and Provide Supporting Documentation

The request to establish a new C/I is initiated through a standardized form and file upload process in myResearch (https://myresearch.wsu.edu/ or directly access the CICU form tab by linking to https://myresearch.wsu.edu/cicu/formlist), which can be accessed after entering a valid WSU Network ID and password. Follow the path: myResearch → CICU tab (if on the homepage) → My Forms → Create New Registration Form. From here, complete the online **Center/Institute/Collaborative Unit (CICU) Registration Form**. Be sure to select a *new* center/institute. See Appendix D for sample of online form.

Required elements of the application to become a C/I include the following:
- Proposed name of C/I, name and title of director, address, and telephone number. Note that a unit could be an approved C/I without using the name "center" or "institute" in the unit's title (e.g., a program of excellence with center status).
- Name of unit(s) where the C/I will be administratively housed and other participating units
- Identification of primary mission of the C/I as well as mission statement, including specific research goals
- Brief description of the major areas of focus (100 words or less) and keywords (two to six)
- Description of value added by creation of the unit, considering the land-grant university mission
- List of associated members and college/department affiliations as well as criteria for membership
- Advisory board (if applicable)
- External funding possibilities (if applicable)
- Notification if a similar unit exists at WSU and differentiation of this unit from any that are similar
- Notification of any impact on University Libraries beyond the impact of the individual participating unit(s)
- Notification of requested central funding; contributions of central funding must be determined before the C/I application is submitted
- Specification of review metrics (coordinated with goals and agreed upon by the oversight authority/authorities; it is important that there be common themes to metrics across C/Is; see Appendix E for example metrics)
- Organization chart
- Budget overview (if applicable) including income, subsidies, and expenditures in sufficient detail to determine whether the benefits produced by the C/I are commensurate with the costs to the university, college, or department; evidence of approval at the appropriate level is needed; if there is no budget, a statement that the establishment of the unit will not take additional resources must be included
- Support letter from the proposed oversight authority/authorities. In addition to providing support and rationale for the overall establishment of the C/I, the oversight

authority/authorities must address approval of the allocated budget (if applicable) in the support letter.

Note that required supporting documentation includes an organization chart, a budget overview, and a letter of support from all oversight authorities (administratively at the Dean's level or higher). One of the questions on the online form is whether the primary mission is research or teaching, service, and/or outreach. This item is an important one and will help in categorizing the C/I as an ORU or TSOU. Although an option to select "both" is available (i.e., if neither research nor teaching/service/outreach is primary but both are equally weighted), this option is a rare occurrence.

Given that faculty are primarily housed in departments/schools within colleges, C/Is must be created through consultation and approval of these academic units. The C/I must show that it provides value added to the mission of the University and accomplishes tasks not possible through the existing academic units. **The faculty member(s) initiating the C/I must work with the all relevant deans and/or chancellors to gather support (e.g., space, personnel, funds, F&A return), before the application is submitted.**

Note that the procedures to establish a new C/I apply to any WSU-associated C/I, including joint centers and institutes with commercial establishments or with other universities.

The online form will be forwarded both to the Principal Assistant of the Faculty Senate for logging purposes and to the chair(s) of the Research and Arts Committee (RAC) to initiate the review and approval process through the RAC.

Step 2: Proposed C/I Undergoes Review and Approval Process

Research and Arts Committee Process
The RAC, a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, must approve the creation of all new C/Is (both ORUs and TSOUs). The request form must be completed online by the Director of the proposed unit, with approval of all relevant academic dean(s)/campus chancellor(s) of the college(s)/campus(es) involved.

The RAC will check to ensure the proposed new C/I does not appear to overlap with an existing center or institute. If there appears to be a conflict or significant overlap in mission, the RAC will seek further clarification from the director of the proposed C/I to avoid unnecessary duplication.

The RAC will email the proposal form and appropriate supporting documentation to relevant stakeholders. This email will serve to communicate the request to establish a new C/I and to provide an opportunity to obtain comments from them. The comment period will be **10 business days**. The purpose of this process is to provide an opportunity to obtain comments from stakeholders which can be considered by the RAC. **The comment period is not an approval process.** Stakeholders (invited to provide comment) for all C/I proposals include the academic Deans, campus Chancellors, and Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs. If the proposed C/I is an ORU, stakeholders also include the Associate

Deans for Research, Vice Chancellors for Research, the Research Council, and the University Research Infrastructure Committee. All current C/I directors also will be notified for comment.

Again, proposals will be sent to keep stakeholders informed and to provide an opportunity for comment only, with specific directions included (e.g., documentation of any duplication with an existing unit; identification of stakeholders who may like to be involved but who have not been approached). The Library Committee also will be consulted if the application indicates an additional impact on the library resources.

Following the comment period of 10 business days, the RAC will review comments from stakeholders and facilitate in addressing any concerns as necessary (including any concerns raised by the Library Committee). The RAC will complete a straightforward checklist (Appendix F) to ensure all necessary documentation is in place and no unresolved concerns exist. Once the checklist requirements are met and any concerns are adequately addressed (or after 10 business days if no concerns are raised), the RAC will approve the C/I and send its recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

When the application and feedback is reviewed by the RAC, the C/I director may attend to answer questions (optional). If necessary for finalizing decision, the RAC will schedule a meeting date with the director of the proposed C/I for presentation of further information and clarification with the RAC.

> Note. If a resolution to any raised concerns cannot be met at the level of the RAC, these concerns will be sent to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, which includes the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, for review and arbitration.

Faculty Senate Process

Once the RAC approves the C/I, it will be added to the Faculty Senate agenda as a discussion item. During the subsequent Faculty Senate meeting, the C/I will be added to the agenda as an action item (and will be voted on). The Faculty Senate meets every two weeks during the academic year; therefore, this process should take no more than 4 weeks following the RAC approval.

Once approved by the Faculty Senate, a recommendation to approve the new C/I will be sent from the Faculty Senate to the Board of Regents (it is recommended by the CILs Task Force that the Board of Regents delegate authority final approval to the University President).

Once final approval is in place, the C/I will receive an approval letter with standardized annual reporting dates. The first annual report should occur within one year of initial approval. Regular annual reports must cover 12 months, but the exact dates can be negotiated between the C/I director and the oversight authority/authorities. That is, it can cover any 12-month period that is most consistent with other required reporting for the particular C/I, whether it be on the calendar year, the fiscal year, or some other timeframe. Once determined, a due date for annual reports will be set with the RAC to be no later than December 1st (e.g., for C/Is using a fiscal year reporting cycle) or no later than August 1st (e.g., for C/Is using a calendar year reporting cycle). Such a timeline should allow ample time after the end of those reporting cycles to create and submit the annual report.

Note. If for any reason, the C/I was not approved, the unit can appeal to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee within 30 days.

Step 3: Addition to Registry and Creation of Public-Facing Website for the C/I

Immediately upon notification of approval, the C/I will be added to a publically available ORU or TSOU Registry, as appropriate. The new C/I will be notified when added to the Registry.

Within three months of being added to the Registry, the new C/I must have developed a C/I website, which will link from the ORU or TSOU Registry. A template will be made available to help in building the website. C/Is will be asked to update websites annually with a standard deadline consistent with the due date of the annual report to make all necessary changes. The annual report form will include an attestation of C/I website accuracy. To this end, it is imperative that C/I directors are able to make changes to their C/I websites or are able to communicate directly with the technical team responsible for website management to allow timely edits to be made. This issue can be addressed with the help of the recommended implementation team.

For tracking purposes, all C/Is must receive an ORG number from Human Resource Services within this same time period (i.e., the first three months).

In summary, the routing to establish a new C/I is as follows:
1) Proposed Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC; for procedural review)
4) Stakeholders (for review and comment)
5) RAC (for resolution and approval)
6) Faculty Senate (for discussion and approval)
7) Board of Regents (recommendation sent from Faculty Senate for final approval; it is recommended by the CILs Task Force that the Board of Regents delegate authority final approval to the University President).

Registration Grandfather Clause for Currently Approved C/Is (applicable calendar year 2020 only)

All *existing* centers and institutes (i.e., previously approved by the Faculty Senate before Fall 2019) will retain their designation. These previously-approved C/Is must register in the new system but do not have to reapply (i.e., no application and approval process but must file a registration form). The request to register an existing C/I is initiated through a standardized form and file upload process in myResearch (https://myresearch.wsu.edu/ or directly access the CICU form tab by linking to https://myresearch.wsu.edu/cicu/formlist), which can be accessed after entering a valid WSU Network ID and password. Follow the path: myResearch → CICU tab (if on the homepage) → My Forms → Create New Registration Form. From here, complete the online **Center/Institute/Collaborative Unit (CICU) Registration Form**. Be sure to select *existing* center/institute. See Appendix G for sample of online form. Appendix E provides example metrics. Once registered, the C/Is must follow the policies

and procedures herein. Specifically, the C/Is will be subject to the same review requirements (annual reports and five-year reviews).

Existing Faculty Senate-approved C/Is can opt out of the new procedures and become a collaborative unit (with approval from the oversight authority/authorities) but will need to undergo a name change that does not use the name *center* or *institute*. They will still need to be registered as a collaborative unit (see Appendix H) but will not have the same reporting requirements.

Registering Collaborative Units (CUs) Other Than a C/I:

For communication purposes both internal and external to WSU, collaborative units other than C/Is can also opt to register in the Collaborative Unit Registry. Inclusion on this Registry excludes the use of the term *center* or *institute* in the name of the unit. Collaborative units that opt for inclusion on the Registry (which is encouraged) must file a simple online registration form.

The request to register a collaborative unit is initiated through a standardized form and file upload process in myResearch (https://myresearch.wsu.edu/ or directly access the CICU form tab by linking to https://myresearch.wsu.edu/cicu/formlist), which can be accessed after entering a valid WSU Network ID and password. Follow the path: myResearch → CICU tab (if on the homepage) → My Forms → Create New Registration Form. From here, complete the online **Center/Institute/Collaborative Unit (CICU) Registration Form**. Be sure to select *collaborative unit*. See Appendix H for sample of online form.

Once registered, the collaborative unit will remain on the registry unless they request to be removed. There is no approval process through Faculty Senate for other collaborative units and no further reporting requirements to the RAC or the Faculty Senate.

SECTION 3: Assessment and Renewal of Centers and Institutes

Overview

All active Centers and Institutes (C/I) must undergo regular review to assess ongoing alignment with university, college, and/or departmental missions, monitor success in accomplishing stated objectives (relative to agreed-upon metrics), and ensure sound financial management (if applicable). This assessment will include annual reports, along with a more extensive review every five years in accordance with the accountability plan outlined in the request to establish a C/I with the established oversight authority/authorities.

> _Note_. In addition to annual reporting and five-year reviews, the RAC or its representative can audit any C/I, as part of its regular audit schedule, or based on any other information or awareness of events related to the C/I.

Review Objectives

These reviews typically have a number of objectives, which include but are not limited to the following:
1. Has the C/I met the mandate for which it was established?
2. Does the C/I's direction, goals, strengths, and weaknesses meet WSU's strategic goals?
3. Has the C/I leveraged its resources appropriately and responsibly?
4. Does the current format of the C/I need to change, stay the same or change directions, and if so, what would be the future direction?
5. Has the C/I been productive and has it met the milestones set forth in its application or previous renewal?
6. How is the current leadership performing? Is the organizational structure and governance still appropriate?
7. Do C/I members think that their needs are being met? Is the C/I fostering collaboration and providing new opportunities for its members?
8. Has the C/I increased visibility of WSU?
9. What changes have been made to the vision, goals, name, administration, funding, or any other aspects that were reported during approval/last report or review?

Annual Reports

All C/Is must provide an annual report for continued renewal. The submission of an annual report is initiated through a standardized form and file upload process in myResearch (https://myresearch.wsu.edu/ or directly access the CICU form tab by linking to https://myresearch.wsu.edu/cicu/formlist), which can be accessed after entering a valid WSU Network ID and password. Follow the path: myResearch page → CICU tab (if on the homepage) → My Forms → Find C/I on the list → Create Annual Report. This selection will create a new annual report form in the

form pool. Click on this new form in the pool and, from here, complete the online **Annual Report for Continued Renewal of a Center/Institute**. See Appendix I for sample of online form.

The annual report form for all C/Is is the same (i.e., for both College C/Is and University C/Is and for both ORUs and TSOUs). However, each C/I may wish to report different metrics (as proposed in the original application and agreed upon with the oversight authority/authorities) and more extensive C/Is (especially University C/Is) are expected to provide more detail and depth. It is important that there be common themes to metrics across C/Is. The annual report should be submitted by the date that was negotiated and set with the RAC based on their reporting cycle (either December 1st or August 1st). The reports will be submitted to the oversight authority/authorities established for the C/I (for review) and to the RAC (for archive). The performance of the C/I will be based on metrics set forth in the application for approval as a C/I.

Required elements of an annual report include the following (which will be submitted through a standardized online form and file upload process):
- Name of C/I, name and title of director, address, telephone number, and website address (including attestation of website accuracy)
- Name of unit(s) where the C/I is administratively housed and other participating units
- Mission statement, including specific research goals
- Brief description of the major areas of focus (100 words or less) and keywords (two to six)
- List of associated members and college/department affiliations as well as criteria for membership
- Advisory board (if applicable)
- Highlights of the C/I accomplishments and impact on WSU (using agreed-upon metrics*). Include summary of how the C/I fosters interdisciplinary research, service, and training activities, with an emphasis on how the C/I provides "value added" to existing university activities; list partnerships with external stakeholders
- Updated organization chart
- Budget overview (if applicable) including income, subsidies, and expenditures in sufficient detail to determine whether the benefits produced by the C/I are commensurate with the costs to the university, college, or department
    - If the C/I includes service centers, a description of services and revenue and expenses analysis
- If C/I has failed to meet benchmarks, a justification of this failure and a plan for self-correction

*Please reference the important note in Appendix E regarding counting individual C/I members' accomplishments in the annual report outcome metrics. Specifically, best practices should include a reference to the C/I (e.g., byline, acknowledgements, Method section) in publications and creative works, and only products warranting such reference should be counted in the outcome metrics. Similarly, the C/I ORG number should be used in any funding applications tied to the C/I, and only applications/awards using the ORG number should be counted in the outcome metrics. Until such best practices are fully implemented, C/I members are asked to select only work products that are a clear

result of affiliation with or collaboration through the C/I to be included in the annual report metrics. In summary, the goal of an annual report for a C/I is to clearly highlight the contributions made possible by the C/I. There is no expectation that every accomplishment of any given C/I member would be included in the annual report metrics. Indeed, such a circumstance would be highly uncommon. Oversight authority/authorities should further communicate this expectation to C/I directors so that annual report metrics clearly highlight contributions that are unique given the existence of the C/I.

RAC Process for Annual Reports

Given a set due date of no later than either August 1st or December 1st for the annual reporting cycle, the oversight authority/authorities should communicate with the RAC no later than **March 31st** of each year to inform that a satisfactory annual report was received for the unit's activities during the previous year, including attestation of the updated website. The RAC should receive the annual report at that time for archiving purposes but will not review the report itself (only needs to receive confirmation of the decision of the oversight authority/authorities for continued renewal). If a report has not been received by the RAC by that date, the RAC will inform the C/I that they have 30 days to comply or they will be removed from the ORU or TSOU Registry and will have to reapply (unless a reasonable extension is warranted). Again, the annual report period must cover 12 months, but the exact dates can be negotiated between the C/I director and the oversight authority/authorities. That is, it can cover any 12-month period that is most consistent with other required reporting for the particular C/I, whether it be on the calendar year, the fiscal year, or some other timeframe.

In summary, the routing of the annual reports are as follows:
1) Proposed Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC; for archiving only)

Five-year Reviews

College C/Is:
College C/Is will undergo a five-year review and renewal process, the full extent of which will be determined by all relevant dean(s)/chancellor(s) of the college(s)/campus(es) in which the C/I resides (or the appropriate oversight authority/authorities as decided during approval). It is expected that the C/I will submit a self-study, which will be a collection of the past five annual reports as well as an executive summary that overviews the accomplishments of the past five years, a five-year vision that previews the ongoing direction of the C/I, and a support letter from the oversight authority/authorities. Specifically, the executive summary should emphasize productivity (e.g., grants awarded, publications, students trained) and whether the C/I has been meeting goals, whereas the five-year vision should focus on future plans. The executive summary must be limited to three single-spaced pages, and the five-year vision must be limited to two single-spaced pages.

> Budgetary review: The budget of each College C/I will be included in the budget of the college(s)/campus(es) in which the C/I resides. The budget allocation, if any, should be set

annually by all relevant dean(s)/chancellor(s) of the college(s)/campus(es) following established procedures for chair and faculty consultation.

University C/I:

All C/Is receiving university resources will undergo an extensive review and renewal every five years. If the C/I is subject to a formal external review by a funding agency, then a separate self-study may not be required if the external review meets all of the review criteria set forth by the university. An external review, however, is required for all five-year reviews of University C/Is. The self-study for this external review will be the collection of the past five annual reports, an executive summary (limited to three single-spaced pages), a five-year vision (limited to two single-spaced pages), and a support letter from the oversight authority/authorities. It may include additional information if requested by the external review committee for the specific C/I.

For Both College and University C/Is

The submission of a five-year review is initiated through a standardized form and file upload process in myResearch (https://myresearch.wsu.edu/ or directly access the CICU form tab by linking to https://myresearch.wsu.edu/cicu/formlist), which can be accessed after entering a valid WSU Network ID and password. Follow the path: myResearch page → CICU tab (if on the homepage) → My Forms → Find C/I on the list → Create Five-Year Review. This selection will create a new annual report form in the form pool. Click on this new form in the pool and, from here, complete the online **Five Year Report**. See Appendix J for sample of online form.

The performance of the C/I will be based on metrics set forth in the application for approval as a C/I (it is important that there be common themes to metrics across C/Is; suggested metrics are listed in Appendix E). If the review committee makes recommendations for improvement in certain areas, the C/I has one year in which to make the suggested changes or develop an action plan. The review committee may also recommend that the C/I be renewed provisionally for a shorter period of time, with full renewal after meeting specified performance goals. It is recommended that all University C/Is establish an external advisory board that meets periodically to provide input regarding all of the elements described above, and make recommendations for future improvements—this board may provide the external review for the five-year review, or a different set of reviewers may be chosen.

Budgetary review: Detailed budget information must be provided as part of the annual university budgetary review, including income, subsidies, and expenditures, to determine whether the benefits produced by the C/I are commensurate with the costs to the university and/or colleges involved. The financial integrity of the C/I is the responsibility of the director, and all deficits should be resolved by the end of each fiscal year. The budget allocation to a C/I will be established annually as part of the normal budget process. The proposed budget should cover faculty support, staff, students, supplies, equipment, and space. The budget should also include a plan for provision of necessary resources beyond university-provided funding, including external awards, philanthropy, indirect costs, service fees, etc.

RAC Process for Five-year Reviews

Due dates for the five-year self-study to RAC will be no later than November 1st for C/Is with an annual reporting cycle of August 1st and no later than March 1st for C/Is with an annual reporting cycle of December 1st. Once the five-year self-study (collection of five annual reports, executive summary, five-year vision, and support letter from all oversight authorities that details their review and disposition of the five-year review) is received by the RAC, it will be reviewed for final processing. The review and disposition by the external review committee (if applicable and required for University C/Is) should also be provided to the RAC for this review.

The RAC will complete the five-year review checklist (Appendix K). If a five-year review has not been received by the due date, the RAC will inform the C/I that they have 30 days to comply or they will be removed from the ORU or TSOU Registry and will have to reapply (unless a reasonable extension is warranted). Once completed, the RAC will communicate the results of the review back to the C/I and will submit information regarding its continued renewal to the Faculty Senate as an information item.

In summary, the routing of the five-year reviews are as follows:
1) Proposed Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC; for procedural review and approval of renewal; due by either November 1 or March 1, depending on cycle)
4) Faculty Senate (as an information item)

Five-Year Review Grandfather Clause for C/Is Approved Before 2020

C/Is that previously have been approved by the Faculty Senate and who transition to the ORU or TSOU Registry in 2020 will maintain their current five-year review due date. As such, their **first** five-year review under the new policies and procedures will not include a full set of five annual reports. These units must submit as many annual reports as available since transitioning to the new process (which will be a minimum of one annual report) and must include additional information in the executive summary about the years not covered in the annual report. These units can submit additional pages to report on accomplishments for years included in the five-year range that are not otherwise covered by annual reports.

SECTION 4: Other Procedures

Transition of a C/I

Options for Transition
- Transitioning from a College C/I to a University C/I (see Transition Period below);
- Transitioning from a University C/I to a College C/I (see Transition Period below);
- Discontinuing and redistributing C/I resources and members to another C/I (see Discontinuation of a C/I below);
- Discontinuing and liquidating resources with return of assets (e.g., equipment, space, funding, staff) to the original stakeholders. The original application to become a C/I may include language regarding distribution of assets (see Discontinuation of a C/I below).

Transition Period
- At each five-year review period, all C/Is will be evaluated and reviewed to determine whether a status change is needed. However, a College C/I can request a review for a change in status to a University C/I (or vice versa) at any annual report period, or a change in status may be triggered by a change in funding status or other factor.

Discontinuation of a C/I

When a C/I no longer meets WSU or member needs, it may be necessary to change the status of the C/I (i.e., to a collaborative unit), or discontinue it completely. Factors that may cause a C/I to transition or be discontinued include:
- C/I can no longer sustain itself financially by either internal or external funds;
- The scholarly quality of work or productivity of the C/I falls below WSU norms;
- The interdisciplinary nature of the C/I has diminished;
- The C/I can no longer attract faculty, students, or leadership.

Other factors to consider include:
- Completion of contractual obligations to stakeholders or funding agencies;
- Transitioning data from databases and servers, with special emphasis on maintaining data privacy and security;
- Relocating staff;
- Decommissioning facilities, if necessary.

If it is determined that a C/I should be discontinued, the director, in consultation with the oversight authority/authorities, will develop a plan for phasing out the C/I. The phase-out period must not last more than one year after the end of the academic year in which the decision to terminate the C/I was made.

Requests for discontinuation must be done through the online form provided for the purpose. Note that this form currently is under construction. A mock-up of the form appears in Appendix L. Until the

online form is released, C/Is can send an email to the RAC c/o the Faculty Senate to request a discontinuation. The information appearing in the mock-up form should be included in the email, and the discontinuation must be approved by the oversight authority.

C/I discontinuation must be approved by the RAC before such announcements can appear on the website or be made public. The RAC will then send the notice of discontinuation to the same stakeholders who receive new C/I proposals as well as to the Faculty Senate as an information item for the agenda.

In summary, the routing of the Discontinuation form is as follows:
   1) Center/Institute Director
   2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
   3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC for approval)

Name Changes for a C/I

On occasion, the name of a C/I needs to be changed. The nature for such name changes could range from minor changes (e.g., aesthetic/cosmetic/positioning) to major changes (e.g., as a result of a change in the mission or scope of the C/I).

Requests for name changes to C/Is must be done through the online form provided for the purpose. Note that this form currently is under construction. A mock-up of the form appears in Appendix M. Until the online form is released, C/Is can send an email to the RAC c/o the Faculty Senate to request a name change. The information appearing in the mock-up form should be included in the email, and the name change must be approved by the oversight authority.

Name changes must be approved by the RAC, before such changes can appear on the website or promotion materials. The RAC will then send the notice of name change to the same stakeholders who receive new C/I proposals and to the Faculty Senate as an information item for the agenda.

In summary, the routing of the Name Change form is as follows:
   1) Center/Institute Director
   2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
   3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC for approval)

Expedited Requests for Approval of a C/I

If there is justification for an expedited approval (e.g., to apply for a center grant, to accept a large donation), the aforementioned process can be expedited by limiting the initial comment period to 5 business days (instead of 10 business days). The oversight authority/authorities must submit a short letter (in addition to support letter) that requests the expedited process with a rationale. Once moved to the Faculty Senate agenda, a senator may request that approval of the C/I be moved from a discussion item to an action item, citing the expedition justification (however, note that motion would

require approval and is not guaranteed). Both of these steps should only be taken under extraordinary circumstances where an expedited process is clearly warranted.

If the expedited process timeline is still insufficient due to extraordinary circumstances, the Provost and VPR can contact Faculty Senate/RAC directly to determine the best course of action, including the possibility of establishing an **interim C/I status**. **Only** the Provost and VPR's offices can initiate the interim status procedure and must do so in conjunction with one another.

Overview of the C/I Process

An overview of the entire process for establishing, reviewing, and renewing **centers and institutes** is found in Appendix N, with a quick overview in Appendix O.

Appendixes

Appendix A: WSU Centers, Institutes and Laboratories (CILs) Task Force Charter

Charge: A CILs Task Force, co-sponsored by the Office of Research and the Faculty Senate, will review the existing CILs guidelines, including definitions/categories; review the processes for the establishment/approval of new CILs and review of CILs; and make recommendations for updating the guidelines and processes, including review criteria and metrics.

Need:
WSU currently has 52 Senate-approved CILs. Other entities across the University also use CIL designations without official sanction. CILs are critical to the mission and vibrancy of WSU. CILs also play a role in educating the next generation of scholars, providing training programs, offering service-learning opportunities, and boosting research productivity by providing "value added" benefits.

As part of the University's Drive to 25 vision and continued efforts to become more strategic and transparent in all areas, revising the current definitions and criteria for forming and reviewing CILs is key to fostering the success of CILs and assessing their impact on advancing the mission and goals of WSU. Evaluating the structure, goals, objectives, and expectations for CILs is necessary to ensure WSU and its CILs continue forging a path conducive to creativity and innovation.

Process:
The Task Force will:
- Investigate definitions and model structures of centers, institutes, and laboratories from other universities and identify which models are most appropriate for WSU
- Review WSU's existing definitions for centers, institutes, and laboratories, and determine whether those definitions remain relevant or whether new designations are more appropriate
- Make recommendations for classifying existing CILs consistent with revised definitions
- Review existing guidelines for establishing CILs and recommend warranted adjustments in light of this review
- Establish and propose a timeframe for review of CILs
- Develop and propose a template for CIL progress reports, and define appropriate metrics for evaluation so that CILs can be compared across the university
- Consider a process allowing interim status for CILs formed by extraordinary funding events that can be put in place while the full application review is underway

Composition of Task Force:

The Task Force will be co-chaired by Andrea Lazarus, Assistant VP Research (responsible for overseeing CILs), and Tammy Barry and Babu John Mariadoss, Co-Chairs of the Research and Arts Committee (the Faculty Senate Committee responsible for making recommendations for approving and reviewing CILs). The Office of Research and the Research and Arts Committee will fill the Task Force membership collaboratively by drawing from a cross-section of faculty in order to represent multidisciplinary research, scholarly and creative activities, and teaching and service.

Review:

The Task Force will prepare a report with recommendations to the Provost, the VP for Research, and the Faculty Senate for their consideration.

Task Force Members:

Office of Research

Andrea Lazarus (Asst VP Research, CILS, College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences), Co-Chair

Research and Arts Committee

Tammy Barry (College of Arts and Sciences), Co-Chair
Babu John Mariadoss (Carson College of Business), Co-Chair

Faculty

Donald Bender (Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture)
Linda Eddy (College of Nursing, Vancouver)
Jonah Firestone (College of Education)
Brian French (College of Education)
Laura Lavine (College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences)
Michael McDonell (Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine)
Jon Oatley (College of Veterinary Medicine)
Jeff Savage (College of Arts and Sciences)
Steve Simasko (College of Veterinary Medicine)
Hans van Dongen (Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine)
Michael Wolcott (Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture)

Appendix B: Executive Summary of the CILs Task Force Recommendations Document

*Note this Appendix includes the Executive Summary of the CILs Task Force Report presented to the Faculty Senate in January 2019 and approved by the WSU Board of Regents in May 2019. It contains language describing the previous policies and procedures (effective through academic year 2018-2019) and suggested changes from the CILs Task Force. It is included to provide a **historical perspective and rationales** for the new procedures.*

The Research and Arts Committee (RAC) of the Faculty Senate currently reviews proposals and makes recommendations for the approval of new Centers, Institutes and Laboratories (CILs) and makes reports to the Faculty Senate and the president through the Vice President for Research (VPR). Ultimate approval is provided by the Board of Regents. The RAC also currently reviews and renews CILs every five years.

A CILs Task Force was convened at the request of the VPR and the Faculty Senate in November 2017 to review policies and procedures associated with defining, creating, reviewing, and renewing CILs at WSU. The Task Force, chaired by representatives from the Office of Research and the RAC and engaging stakeholders across all colleges and campuses, met periodically throughout 2017 and 2018. **See [Appendix A](#) for [Charter](#) and list of [Task Force Members](#)**. Quarterly meetings were also held with the Associate Deans of Research of WSU colleges and the VPR to provide an update on activities. The two co-chairs from the RAC also regularly updated the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

The current definitions and guidelines regarding centers/institutes (C/Is) were reviewed and discussed by the Task Force. It was quickly acknowledged that the existing procedures created a barrier for C/I directors to submit applications to the RAC for formal approval, resulting in the proliferation of entities that used the C/I designation without oversight. Furthermore, the review process was considered to be cumbersome and inefficient. In addition, there were no provisions for discontinuing C/Is that were no longer meeting stated goals. Subsequent discussions then focused on reviewing definitions of C/Is, their respective missions and objectives, criteria for establishment, and expectations for outcomes. It was determined that:

- Most C/Is require some degree of institutional commitment, whether from central or college-based resources;
- C/Is that require significant institutional commitments should meet more stringent requirements for approval and renewal;
- C/Is should be fiscally responsible to those units providing resources;
- Whereas some C/Is have academic, research, and teaching missions, some C/Is may meet only one or two missions;
- Some collaborative units exist that do not require institutional resources but that support and advance the University's mission.

Recommendations

After reviewing guidelines from numerous peer institutions as well as WSU's current CILs guidelines, the Task Force put forth the following recommendations.

1) **Change in RAC's Role from Determination to Administration**

   Goals: Reduce need for RAC to make determinations about the suitability and sustainability of C/Is, ensure processes and procedures are uniformly followed and implemented by all C/Is, reduce the recursive procedures involved in applying for and renewing a C/I.

   The streamlined and standardized information received at application and review periods (described in more detail below)—with clear support and disposition from the oversight authority/authorities providing fiscal or other resources as well as input/comments from stakeholders—should reduce the need for RAC to make determinations about the suitability and need for C/Is. These changes should allow the RAC to oversee the *process* of establishment and review of C/Is and ensure the most updated information is available to the University community and the general public. The oversight of these processes should be tracked through standardized checklists to greatly reduce the recursive procedures involved in applying for and renewing a C/I.

2) **Definitions of C/Is**

   Goal: Define centers/institutes using the most meaningful designations.

   Rather than differentiate centers from institutes, which has been, at least in practice, an arbitrary definition in the past, a common definition should be used for all C/Is. Differentiation of C/Is should be based on their level of institutional commitment and investment (university or college-based) as well as their differing missions (categorized as Organized Research Units [ORUs] for those with research as a primary mission, or Teaching, Service, and/or Outreach Units [TSOUs] for those with one or more of these elements as their primary mission). Differentiating by level of support invested and mission are more meaningful designations than differentiating between a center and institute.

3) **Collaborative Units**

   Goal: Capture other collaborative units that are formed, which are working toward objectives similar to C/Is.

   Entities that may be looser collaborations of faculty that do not require institutional resources should still be recognized and encouraged. Specifically, a second category of collaborative units should be available (i.e., collaboratives or initiatives). These collaborative units should be formally recognized and tracked by the University but should differ from C/Is and, thus, have fewer requirements for approval and renewal.

4) **Laboratories**

   Goal: Exclude entities that do not fit well in this process.

   The designation of Laboratories as formal entities appears unnecessary given the majority of the current approved units using this designation are acting as service centers and fall under

other oversight accordingly. Furthermore, many individual faculty research labs use laboratory in the name; however, such entities would not require Faculty Senate approval or oversight. Therefore, approval of laboratories should no longer be part of the C/I process.

5) **Central Registry**

Goal: Easily identify C/Is and other collaborative units in one common place for communication and collaboration.

A central registry should be established for all C/Is and collaborative units so that the WSU community, as well as the general public, can easily identify these various units in one common place. The Registry should indicate the C/I categorization at the university- or college-level and as an ROU or TSOU. The Registry should also capture other collaborative units. The Registry should facilitate greater collaboration within and outside the university.

6) **Comment Period**

Goals: Include broader input from University-wide stakeholders in the C/I process, minimize duplication, identify opportunities early in the process for extended collaborations.

The process to establish a new C/I should include a comment period during which University-wide stakeholders in the C/I process are invited to provide input. This information should be collected and considered by the RAC. This change would allow RAC to consider broader input in making recommendations, would minimize duplication among C/Is, and would identify opportunities early in the process for extended collaborations. For example, stakeholders for both ORUs and TSOUs would include the academic Deans, campus Chancellors, and Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs. If the proposed C/I is an ORU, stakeholders would also include the Associate Deans for Research, Vice Chancellors for Research, the Research Council, and the University Research Infrastructure Committee. All current C/I directors will also be notified for comment. The Library Committee should also be consulted if the application indicates an additional impact on the library resources (a required item on all applications) but otherwise should no longer have to be a regularly reviewing committee for new C/Is.

7) **Streamlined, Data-driven Process**

Goals: Decrease barriers, encourage recognition of C/Is, encourage entrepreneurship, ensure the most updated information is available to the University community and the general public.

Barriers to obtaining formal approval as a C/I should be minimized to encourage more C/Is to gain recognition and prevent duplication. As such, the application, review, and renewal processes for C/Is should be better streamlined and should capture the most important data to evaluate C/Is across a set of common metrics, which will be beneficial to institutional-level assessment. Online forms should be used to assist with streamlining the process, allowing input from multiple stakeholders in a specified timeframe, progressing efficiently through the approval/review steps, and creating a searchable database of metrics. As noted earlier, it is recommended that Library Committee no longer review new C/I applications; however, the committee would be invited to participate in the comment period if library impact is checked on the application form for a new C/I. Likewise, given the recommended changes to tie reports and reviews back to the fiscal oversight authority/authorities (see Recommendation 8 below), it is recommended that the Budget Committee no longer specifically review new C/Is as that

would be a duplicated effort. In further interest of streamlining the process and minimizing barriers—and given that the recommended process increases accountability and oversight and obtains initial input from a wide range of University stakeholders—it is recommended that the Board of Regents delegate the final approval process for C/Is to President Schulz. Doing so would greatly reduce the time period from application to final approval of a new C/I. ***If these recommendations are put into place, it is estimated that application to final approval of C/Is would be reduced from about one year to about eight weeks.***

8) **Reports and Reviews**

Goals: Provide more frequent (annual) snapshots of the C/I performance, streamline and better standardize the five-year review process.

Directors of established C/Is should submit short, form-based annual reports to the respective C/I oversight authority/authorities (and archived by the RAC). These annual reports should be submitted—along with a brief executive summary and five-year vision—as the five-year review self-study that is reviewed by the RAC for continuation of the C/I. This process would provide the oversight authority/authorities more frequent (annual) snapshots of the C/I performance on agreed-upon metrics and would streamline and better standardize the five-year review process. The RAC should continue to formally review five-year self-study reviews only but should also ensure at specified checkpoints each year that the annual reports have been completed and are archived by the RAC.

9) **Oversight Authority/Authorities and Relation to RAC**

Goals: Ensure reporting data is returning to fiscal oversight authority/authorities to make determinations, reduce need for RAC to make determinations about the suitability and sustainability of C/Is.

To ensure that decisions about C/Is are data-driven, it is important to establish an oversight authority/authorities of each ORU or TSOU at the time of application for a new C/I. The oversight authority/authorities should be at the Dean's level or higher (e.g., Dean/Chancellor for a college/campus-level C/I; Provost or VPR for a university-level C/I). The oversight authority/authorities should make recommendation to the RAC to establish a C/I (at which time the RAC will gather comments, reconcile discrepancies, check procedures, approve the C/I, and recommend it to the Faculty Senate). The oversight authority/authorities also should receive all annual reports and communicate intention for continued renewal to the RAC (RAC only archives the annual reports). Finally, the oversight authority/authorities should receive five-year self-study reviews and make a recommendation to the RAC to renew the C/I to RAC (RAC only checks procedures then provides renewal information to the Faculty Senate). In summary, it is recommended that the oversight authority/authorities recommends to RAC the establishment, continued renewal (annually), and renewal (every five years) of C/Is, whereas the RAC completes a checklist on new applications and five-year reviews and only archives annual reports.

10) **Interim Status**

Goal: Allow a procedure for C/Is that need to be formed quickly due to an extraordinary funding event (e.g., center grant, large donated gift).

A process to allow *interim status* for C/Is that need to be formed quickly due to an extraordinary funding event (e.g., center grant, large donated gift) should be in place. Interim status would allow a C/I to begin to use their name, consistent with the need for the funding. The C/I should still go through the standard application process to establish the C/I within a short time (i.e., 90 days) following obtaining interim status. Establishing a new C/I first through interim status should be infrequent and should be initiated by the Office of Research and the Office of the Provost.

11) **Additional Procedures**

Goal: Establish formal and codified procedures for renaming, transitioning, and discontinuing a C/I.

Formal and codified procedures for renaming, transitioning, and discontinuing a C/I should be in place.

12) **Assigned ORG Number**

Goal: Better tracking of funds received by C/Is.

All C/Is should receive an ORG number from Human Resource Services for tracking purposes.

13) **Implementation Team**

Goals: Develop infrastructure and initiate new procedures, assist established C/Is with the transition, identify "C/Is" that have not gone through proper procedures to assist them in doing so.

An implementation team should be formed to initiate the new C/I procedures, including ushering in the online form process. This team should also be tasked with reviewing the existing Faculty-Senate approved C/Is to help correctly register each in the appropriate Registry category (i.e., ROU, TSOU, or collaborative unit; college- or university-level). The team should also help Faculty Senate-approved C/Is transition to the new annual report and five-year review procedures. Finally, the implementation team should identify existing entities identifying as a center or institute but that have not gone through the appropriate approval process to assist them in either initiating that process or changing their name consistent with a collaborative unit. Again, these entities should be added to the appropriate Registry through assistance by the implementation team. Notably, the importance of ample support (both technical and administrative) should be underscored for implementation of these recommendations. Increased support to the RAC will also be needed on an ongoing basis due to the annual report process.

14) **F&A Incentives**

Goal: Determine how to incentivize C/Is that receive external funding.

The Task Force discussed F&A support of C/Is and the possibility of incentivizing C/Is that obtain grant funding, given F&A is so closely tied to identifying the fiscal oversight authority/authorities. However, these decisions were deemed to be outside of the scope of the group's charter. It is recommended that these issues be sent to the F&A Committee.

With these recommendations in mind, online approval forms were developed to streamline the approval process, and the review time through the Faculty Senate approval process was substantially reduced. An emphasis was placed on approval by those units providing fiscal or other resources, reducing the need for the RAC and Faculty Senate to make determination regarding the need, suitability, and sustainability of proposed C/Is. An annual report process was also established to maintain a focus on meeting goals, with a cumulative five-year review. Procedures for transitioning, renaming, or discontinuing C/Is were also established. It is expected that all C/Is and other collaborative units at WSU, whether currently formally approved or not, will complete a respective application process (depending on unit type) and thus will be entered into a central registry of C/Is and collaborative units.

These newly-developed policies and procedures consistent with the aforementioned recommendations are outlined in the accompanying document. A table providing a comprehensive summary of the changes to existing CILs policies and procedures is provided in Appendix C.

The CILs Task Force intentions with these suggested changes is to facilitate entrepreneurship, innovation, and collaboration at WSU while also establishing improved oversight and accountability for centers/institutes.

On behalf of the CILs Task Force:

Andrea Lazarus (College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences; Assistant VP Research, CILS)
Tammy Barry (College of Arts and Sciences; Co-Chair of RAC)
Babu John Mariadoss (Carson College of Business; Co-Chair of RAC)
Co-chairs of the Centers, Institutes, and Laboratories (CILs) Task Force

Appendix C: Table of Key Changes Proposed by CILs Task Force

*Note this Appendix includes the Table of Key Changes Proposed by the CILs Task Force Report presented to the Faculty Senate in January 2019 and approved by the WSU Board of Regents in May 2019. It is included to provide a **historical perspective** for the new procedures.*

No	Description	Previous Procedures	Approved New Procedures
1	Definitions of Centers and Institutes (C/Is)	Centers and Institutes are defined distinctively	The titles of Centers and Institutes are interchangeable
2	Levels of Centers and Institutes (C/Is)	No such levels	Differentiated College and University C/Is
3	Differentiation between Research and Teaching Units	No such differentiation	Explicit differentiation between Organized Research Units and Organized Teaching/Service/Outreach and
4	Collaborative Units	No discussion of Collaborative Units	Collaborative Units are defined and procedures are available for registration of such units or to move current C/Is to this designation
5	Laboratories and Core Facilities	Laboratories designated as formal entities (like C/Is)	Laboratories not identified as formal entities for C/I purposes
6	Initial approval of C/Is	Majority of oversight rests with Research and Arts Committee (RAC)	Oversight authority rests with funding entity (i.e., college heads or University administrator) with review by RAC
7	Time for initial approval of C/Is	6-12 months	As few as 2 months from initial request to get through Faculty Senate (then approved by the University President, as delegated by the Board of Regents*)
8	Steps involved in approval of C/Is with RAC	Several steps: Application, Presentation, Review, Clarification, Recommendation for approval	Three step process: Application, followed by review and recommendation for approval, and registration (then approved by the University President, as delegated by the Board of Regents*)
9	Entities involved in approval process	Budget, Library, RAC, Faculty Senate, Board of Regents	RAC with input from stakeholders (e.g., Office of Research, College and campus heads, current C/I directors), Faculty Senate, University President (as delegated by the Board of Regents*)

Based on the Task Force recommendation, the Board of Regents approved delegation of authority of final approval to the University President.

No	Description	Previous Procedures	Approved New Procedures
10	Nature of approval process	Email, presentations, review	Online application, comment period, and review with use of process checklists by RAC
11	Registration and website requirements	No registry or website requirements	After approval, C/Is added to a Registry and required to develop a website within three months
12	Assessment and renewal of C/Is	Once every five years with extensive review by RAC	Annual reports and five year reviews with use of process checklists by RAC
13	Five year reviews for College and University C/Is	No differentiation exists between College and University C/Is	Different procedures for five-year reviews of College and University C/Is
14	Transitioning between College C/I and University C/I	No differentiation exists between College and University C/Is	Procedure established for transitions
15	Discontinuation of C/Is	No provisions for discontinuation	Detailed procedures available for discontinuation of existing C/Is
16	Name changes between Centers and Institutes	Not possible, due to distinct definitions	Possible, and detailed procedures available
17	Expedited requests and interim status	Expedited requests not possible, interim status is rare	Detailed procedures available for expedited and interim status
18	Institutes established in collaboration with commercial establishments	No procedure available for approving joint institutes with commercial establishments	New procedures will apply to any C/Is developed in collaboration with commercial establishments
19	Institutes established in collaboration with other universities	No procedure available for approving joint institutes with other universities	New procedures will apply to any C/Is developed jointly with other universities
20	Process of existing C/Is – approved and un-approved	Existing procedures dis-incentivizes un-approved C/Is to become public about their operations	Proposed procedure accommodates all existing C/Is through a registration and streamlining process

Appendix D: Center/Institute/Collaborative Unit (CICU) Registration Form (<u>New</u> Center/Institute Example)

What is the **primary** mission of the proposed unit?

○ Research

○ Teaching, Service, and/or Outreach

○ Both (uncommon – neither research nor teaching/service outreach is primary but both are equally weighted)

Preference for annual and five-year reporting due dates (please choose one):

○ Annual report submission due August 1; five-year report submission due November 1

○ Annual report submission due December 1; five-year report submission due March 1

Mission statement, including specific goals (no more than a paragraph is expected):

Brief description of major focus areas (100 words or less is expected):

Keywords for major focus areas (list two to six):

Value added by creation of the unit (consider all aspects of a land-grant university mission - no more than a paragraph is expected):

Associated members and their department/school affiliation:

Criteria for membership:

Does this CICU have an Advisory Board?

☑ Yes   ○ No

Please list Board members:

Some open-ended items only appear if "yes" is selected.

Are there external funding possibilities related to this CICU?

☑ Yes   ○ No

Please list (be as specific as possible, e.g., listing example RFAs):

Does a similar unit exist within WSU?

☑ Yes

◯ No

Some open-ended items only appear if "yes" is selected.

How is this unit different?

Will the establishment of this unit impact the University Libraries beyond the impact already in place from the individual participating unit(s) (e.g., increased journal subscription needs)?

☑ Yes

◯ No

What is the expected impact?

List specific metrics for evaluation and review (must be coordinated with goals and agreed upon by oversight authority/authorities; it is important that there be common themes to metrics across C/Is):

Please upload the most recent organization chart (include leadership structure, faculty, staff, and advisory units as applicable; be sure to include oversight authority/authorities):

Org Chart: Select Org Chart file...   ⚠

Budget overview, showing revenue (e.g., central funding, endowments, external funding, indirect cost recovery, projected income from service centers, tuition) and expenses (e.g., salaries, tuition, equipment purchase **description** of services and revenue and expenses **analysis**

Budget Overview (Note: You cannot edit this without re-uploading a new file):   Select Budget Overview file...   ⚠

Support letter(s) from proposed line(s) of authority (e.g., Dean, Chancellor, VPR, Provost). In addition to providing support and rationale for the overall establishme
[At Least One is Required]

Support Letter: [Select Support Letter file...]

Support Letter: [Select Support Letter file...]

Support Letter: [Select Support Letter file...]

Oversight Authority/Authorities
[At Least One is Required]

Oversight Authority/Authorities Note: must be at the college Dean level or higher.

Lookup Person: [(last name/wsu id)] [🔍]

[Save Form]

Note: In addition to providing support and rationale for the overall establishment of the C/I, the oversight authority/authorities must address approval of the allocated budget (if applicable) in the support letter.

Routing of Form to Establish a Center or Institute:
1) Proposed Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC; for procedural review)
4) Stakeholders (for review and comment)
5) RAC (for resolution and approval)
6) Faculty Senate (for discussion and approval)
7) Board of Regents (who has delegated this authority to the University President; for final approval)

Note. Immediately upon final approval, the new center or institute will be added to a publically available Organized Research Units (ORU) or Teaching, Service, and/or Outreach Units (TSOU) Registry, as appropriate. Within three months of approval and being added to the Registry, the new center or institute must have developed a center or institute website, which will link from the ORU or TSOU Registry. A template will be made available to help in building the website.

Appendix E: Example Outcome Metrics

Financial
- Revenue (university subsidies, endowments, external funding, indirect cost recovery, income from service centers, etc.)
- Expenses (salaries, tuition, equipment purchase and upkeep, licenses, operational expenses, outreach activities, etc.)

Operational
- Organization chart
- Faculty FTEs, staff FTE
- Total space (square footage)
- Members and affiliations

Teaching
- Undergraduate students taught
- Graduate students taught
- Graduate students accepted
- Graduate students graduated
- Courses offered

Research and Creative Works *
Productivity
- External awards
- Grants submitted/received
- Collaborative grants submitted/received
- Publications
- Collaborative publications
- Juried shows, gallery showings, etc.
- Projects completed
- Honors and awards
- Patents, licenses, companies formed, etc.

Visibility and Impact
- Ranking
- Media mentions
- External stakeholders
- Presentations
- Outreach activities
- Economic impact

* **Important Note:** It is the expectation that any research or creative work that is included in the outcome metrics for a C/I should be directly relevant to the goals of the C/I and should have been

supported, at least in part, directly by the C/I. Going forward, best practices for publications or creative works would include naming the C/I in the affiliation byline or the acknowledgements. If applicable, it may also be appropriate to list the C/I by name in the Method of a publication. As this best practice becomes commonplace, only publications and creative works meeting such requirements would be counted in the outcome metrics. In the meantime, C/I members are asked to select only publications and creative works that are a clear result of affiliation with or collaboration through the C/I to be included in the annual report metrics. Best practices for grant submissions going forward is to use the C/I ORG number on any such submissions so that funding applications and awards can be tied directly to the C/I. In the meantime, C/I members are asked to select only grants that are a clear result of affiliation with or collaboration through the C/I to be included in the annual report metrics. In summary, the goal of an annual report for a C/I is to clearly highlight the contributions made possible by the C/I. There is no expectation that every accomplishment of any given C/I member would be included in the annual report metrics. Indeed, such a circumstance would be highly uncommon. Oversight authority/authorities should further communicate this expectation to C/I directors so that annual report metrics clearly highlight contributions that are unique given the existence of the C/I.

Appendix F: RAC Checklist for Establishing a New Center/Institute

Name of Center/Institute: _____

Director of Center/Institute: _____

Oversight Authority/Authorities: _____

_____

Reviewer from RAC: _____

Criterion:	Criterion Met:		Notes:
Request form to establish a C/I completed	Yes ☐	No ☐	Date received: _____
Request form reviewed and approved by all oversight authorities with approval letter(s)	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Cleary identifies oversight authority, which appears appropriate given the proposal	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Includes organization chart	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Includes detailed budget or statement that no resources are needed	Yes ☐	No ☐	
No apparent significant duplication with existing C/Is, per RAC review	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Sent to stakeholders for review and comment	Yes ☐	No ☐	Date sent: _____
No comments in 10 business days or comments are resolved	Yes ☐	No ☐	
If applicable, any issues raised by the Library Committee are resolved	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐		
If applicable, any issues noted by RAC are resolved	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐		

Approved by RAC and sent to Faculty Senate on _____ as a Discussion item (for eventual vote).
(Date)

Attach additional page(s) as needed to provide any suggestions for potential coordination among C/Is or any feedback toward improvement.

Appendix G: Center/Institute/Collaborative Unit (CICU) Registration Form (<u>Existing</u> Center/Institute Example)

*This form will be used for a limited period to **transition currently approved** centers/institutes to the ORU or TSOU Registry. This form is for use **only** by C/Is that already appear on the Faculty Senate approval list. The following information can be obtained from the original application or the most recent review (copy and paste) but also can be updated through this form. If a name change is requested at this point, [Appendix M](#) must also be submitted.*

Mission statement, including specific goals (no more than a paragraph is expected):

Brief description of major focus areas (100 words or less is expected):

Keywords for major focus areas (list two to six):

Associated members and their department/school affiliation:

Criteria for membership:

Does this CICU have an Advisory Board?
☑ Yes   ○ No

This open-ended item only appears if "yes" is selected.

Please list Board members:

List specific metrics for evaluation and review (must be coordinated with goals and agreed upon by oversight authority/authorities; it is important that there be common themes to metrics across C/Is):

Please upload the most recent organization chart (from original application or latest review but also can be updated at this stage; include leadership structure, faculty, staff, and advisory units as applicable; be sure to include oversight authority/authorities):

Org Chart: Select Org Chart file...   ⚠

Routing of Form to Register an Existing (Already Approved) C/I:
1) Current Center/Institute Director
2) Research and Arts Committee (RAC for approval)

Note. The RAC will use this information to confirm that the C/I is already approved by the Faculty Senate and to place all relevant information in the ORU or TSOU Registry. The C/I will be notified when the registration process is completed. Once all currently approved C/Is have been transitioned to the Registry, this form will be obsolete.

This form must be filed by the end of the Spring 2020 semester.

Appendix H: Center/Institute/Collaborative Unit (CICU) Registration Form (Collaborative Unit Example)

*This form is for use **only** by collaborative units that wish to appear on the Collaborative Unit Registry but that do not use the name "center" or "institute."*

Keywords for major focus areas (list two to six):

Associated members and their department/school affiliation:

Criteria for membership:

Does this CICU have an Advisory Board?

✔ Yes ○ No

Please list Board members:

Oversight Authority/Authorities

[At Least One is Required]

Oversight Authority/Authorities Note: must be at the college Dean level or higher.

Lookup Person: (last name/wsu id) 🔍

Save Form

Routing of Form to Register a Collaborative Unit:
1) Current Director of Collaborative Unit
2) Research and Arts Committee (RAC for approval)

Note. All registering collaborative units will be placed on the Collaborative Unit Registry. Inclusion on the Collaborative Unit Registry does not require Faculty Senate approval.

Appendix I: Annual Report for Continued Renewal of a Center/Institute

Note**. *In addition to submitting this form annually, the five-year review self-study will include the last five completed annual report forms.***

Brief description of major focus areas (100 words or less):

Brief description

Keywords for major focus areas (list two to six):

Keywords

Major

Associated members and their department/school affiliation:

Other people, their departments

Criteria for membership:

Membership

Advisory board (if applicable):

Yes

Highlight specific impact on WSU in the past year (if applicable; e.g., rankings, media mentions, external stakeholders, outreach activities, economic impact):

Attach the following:

Accomplishments within the past year relative to established metrics (in the initial application and as agreed upon by the oversight authority/authorities); include and note any evidence of collaboration with

Accomplishments:　Select Accomplishments file...　⚠

Organization chart (include leadership structure, faculty, staff, and advisory units as applicable; be sure to include oversight authority/authorities)

Org Chart:　Select Org Chart file...　⚠

Budget overview, showing revenue (e.g., university subsidies, endowments, external funding, indirect cost recovery, projected income from service centers, tuition) and expenses (e.g., salaries, tuition, equipm **description** of services and revenue and expenses **analysis**

Budget Overview:　Select Budget Overview file...　⚠

If applicable, a **justification** of failure to meet benchmarks and a plan for self-correction

Justification of Failure:　Select Justification of Failure file...

Save Form

Routing of Annual Report Form:
1) Proposed Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC; for archiving only)

<u>Note</u>. The oversight authority/authorities should inform the Research and Arts Committee (RAC) via email no later than **March 31st** every year that a satisfactory annual report was received for the unit's activities during the previous year, including attestation of the updated website. The RAC only needs to receive confirmation of the annual report and the decision of the oversight authority/authorities for continued renewal, not the report itself. If a report has not been received by the oversight authority/authorities by that date, the RAC will inform the C/I that they have 30 days to comply or they will be removed from the ORU or TSOU Registry and will have to reapply (unless a reasonable extension is warranted).

Appendix J: Five-Year Review for Renewal of a Center/Institute

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of Research
CICU Form

A-Z Index   myWSU   WSU Home   WSU Search   Logout

MyHome | Grants | Proposal Dev | Training | Compliance | Expertise | CICU | Admin

5-Year Report for a Center/Institute

Name of Unit
Test

Director and Contact Information

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	WSU ID
Hecox	Karen	1171814

Executive Summary (up to 3 pages maximum):

Select Executive Summary file... ⚠

> Annual Reports (Last 5 approved) will be auto-populated with links to the annual reports.

Annual Reports (Last 5 approved):

Five-Year Vision (up to 2 pages maximum):   Select Five-Year Vision file... ⚠

Support letter(s) from proposed line(s) of authority (e.g., Dean, Chancellor, VPR, Provost). In addition to providing support and rationale for the overall establishment of the
[At Least One is Required]

Support Letter: Select Support Letter file...

Support Letter: Select Support Letter file...

Support Letter: Select Support Letter file...

Save Form

Office of Research Support and Operations
Copyright

Routing of Five-Year Self-Study Reviews (i.e., collection of last five annual reports with an executive summary and five-year vision):

1) Proposed Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC; for procedural review and approval of renewal)
4) Faculty Senate (as an information item)

Appendix K: RAC Review Checklist for Center/Institute Five-Year Review and Renewal

Name of Center/Institute: _____

Director of Center/Institute: _____

Oversight Authority/Authorities: _____

_____

Reviewer from RAC: _____

Criterion:	Criterion Met:	Notes:
Five-year self-study of C/I completed [includes last five annual reports (with metrics reports), executive summary, and vision]	Yes ☐ No ☐	Date received: _____
Five-year self-study reviewed and approved by oversight authority/authorities (includes support letter[s])	Yes ☐ No ☐	
If University C/I, external review completed	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐	
Includes most recent organization chart (in last annual report)	Yes ☐ No ☐	
Includes most recent budget overview (in last annual report)	Yes ☐ No ☐	
If service center, includes a description of services and revenue/expenses analysis	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐	
Metrics reports match what was established/agreed upon metrics and are tied to goals	Yes ☐ No ☐	
If applicable, includes justification of failure to meet benchmarks and a self-correction plan	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐	
If applicable, any issues noted by RAC are resolved	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐	

Approved by RAC and sent to Faculty Senate on _____ as an information item.
                                                              (Date)

Attach additional page(s) as needed to provide any feedback toward improvement.

Appendix L: Request Form to Discontinue a Center or Institute

Note. This form is under construction. A mock-up of the form appears below. Until released, C/Is can send an email to the RAC c/o the Faculty Senate to request a discontinuation. The information below should be included in the email, and the discontinuation must be approved by the oversight authority.

Date of discontinuation request:

Name of unit:

Director and contact information (telephone, email, faculty website address):

C/I website URL:

Discontinuation initiated by: [e.g., C/I director, oversight authority/authorities; provide role(s) and name(s)]

Rationale for discontinuation:

Effective date (must be within one year of this request):

Do both C/I director and oversight authority/authorities wish to discontinue the unit?

☐ Yes

☐ No; explain:

Are there any factors to consider in the discontinuation of the unit (e.g., completion of contractual obligations to stakeholders or funding agencies; transitioning data relocating staff; decommissioning facilities)?

Attach the following:

- **Detailed phase-out plan** for discontinued unit.

Routing of Form to Discontinue a Center or Institute:

1) Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC for approval)

Note. Discontinuation of a center or institute must be approved by the RAC before such announcements can appear on the website or be made public. The RAC will then send the notice of discontinuation to stakeholders as well as to the Faculty Senate as an information item for the agenda.

Appendix M: Request Form to Rename a Center or Institute

Note. This form is under construction. A mock-up of the form appears below. Until released, C/Is can send an email to the RAC c/o the Faculty Senate to request a name change. The information below should be included in the email, and the new name must be approved by the oversight authority.

Date of rename request:

Current name of unit:

Director and contact information (telephone, email, faculty website address):

C/I website URL:

Proposed new name of unit:

Rationale for name change:

Have the mission and/or goals of the unit changed? If so, please describe (*single paragraph*):

Have the major focus areas changed? If so, please describe (*100 words or less*)**:**

Have the keywords for major focus areas changed? If so, please describe:

Name change will be effective upon approval; if a future effective date is preferred, please indicate:

Attach the following:
- **Organization chart** (if significantly changed since last annual report).

Routing of Form to Rename a Center or Institute:
1) Center/Institute Director
2) Oversight Authority/Authorities
3) Research and Arts Committee (RAC for approval)

Note. Name changes for a center or institute must be approved by the RAC before such announcements can appear on the website or be made public. The RAC will then send the notice of discontinuation to stakeholders as well as to the Faculty Senate as an information item for the agenda.

Appendix N: Flow Chart—Establishing, Reviewing, and Renewing Centers/Institutes

Overall Process

Approval Process

- Proposed C/I director submits online request form and supporting documentation to RAC
  - Determines oversight authority/authorities and establishes the C/I as a (1) ORU or TSOU; and (2) College C/I or University C/I
- RAC sends proposal form to all stakeholders (allows 10 business days for comment)
- RAC completes approval checklist, facilitates resolution of any concerns, approves C/I, and sends to Faculty Senate
- Faculty Senate discusses (first meeting) then votes to approve (second meeting); meetings are every two weeks, so the Faculty Senate process is approximately 4 weeks following RAC approval
- Faculty Senate sends recommendation to the University President (as delegated by the Board of Regents) for final approval of C/I

Newly Established

- Dates for annual reporting will be negotiated and set with the RAC
  - August 1st or December 1st
- Immediately following Faculty Senate approval, the new C/I is placed on either ORU registry or the TSOU registry
- Within three months of approval and placement on the registry, the new C/I must establish a public-facing webpage that links from the appropriate registry

Annual Reports

- C/I director submits annual report form to the oversight authority/authorities and RAC
  - Includes attestation of annual update to website as needed
- Oversight authority/authorities confirms with the RAC that the annual report was satisfactory for continued renewal
- RAC tracks continued renewed status of the C/I and receives annual reports only for archiving purposes

Five-year Reviews

- C/I director submits five-year review (collection of last five annual reports, executive summary, and five-year vision) to the oversight authority/authorities and RAC
- More extensive than annual report and includes thorough budgetary review
- University C/Is have an external review (either part of this process or another external review can be accepted if includes all elements needed)
- The five-year review includes the oversight authority/authorities' disposition and support for continuation (due November 1 or March 1, depending on cycle)
- RAC completes five-year review checklist, approves, and sends to Faculty Senate as an information item

Appendix O: Quick Overview—Establishing, Reviewing, and Renewing Centers and Institutes

Application and Approval Process

| Application from C/I (including approval by Oversight Authority/ Authorities) | Research and Arts Committee Reviews (checklist) | Stakeholders (comment period) | Research and Arts Committee Approves (checklist; resolution of issues) | Faculty Senate Approves (discussion, then voting) | Board of Regents (delegated to University President; final approval) | Approved and Added to Registry |

Annual Report and Continued Renewal Process

| Annual Report from C/I to Oversight Authority/ Authorities and Research and Arts Committee | Research and Arts Committee (archives only) | Continued Renewal |

Five-year Review and Renewal Process

Five-year self-study from C/I to Oversight Authority/ Authorities and RAC → External Review (if University C/I) → Research and Arts Committee Approves (checklist) → Faculty Senate (information item only) → Renewal