



The University of Georgia

University Council
Athens, Georgia 30602

August 15, 2008

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – 2008-2009

Mr. David E. Shipley, Chair

Agricultural and Environmental Sciences - Dr. Timothy L. Foutz

Arts and Sciences - Dr. Richard E. Siegesmund (Arts)

Dr. Rodney Mauricio (Sciences)

Business - Dr. James S. Linck

Ecology - Dr. James W. Porter

Education - Dr. Yvette Q. Getch

Environment and Design - Mr. Scott S. Weinberg

Family and Consumer Sciences - Dr. Jan M. Hathcote

Forestry and Natural Resources - Dr. Ronald L. Hendrick

Journalism and Mass Communication - Dr. Wendy A. Macias

Law – No representative

Pharmacy - Dr. Keith N. Herist

Public and International Affairs - Dr. Anthony M. Bertelli

Public Health – Dr. Phaedra S. Corso

Social Work - Dr. Patricia M. Reeves

Veterinary Medicine - Dr. K. Paige Carmichael

Graduate School - Dr. Malcolm R. Adams

Undergraduate Student Representative – Ms. Jamie Beggerly

Graduate Student Representative – Ms. Amrita Veliyath

Dear Colleagues:

The attached revision of the Academic Affairs Policy Statement No. 7, Centers and Institutes, will be an agenda item for the August 22, 2008, Full University Curriculum Committee meeting.

These proposed revisions are the work of the Centers & Institutes Task Force: Bob Boehmer, Assoc. Provost for Institutional Effectiveness; Allan Aycock, Director, Program Review and Assessment; Melenie Lankau, Co-chair, Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC); Robert Scott, Associate VP for Research; Russell Malmberg, Associate Dean for Research in the Franklin College; and myself, Chair of the UCC.

We have tried to clarify a number of issues related to the establishment and review of Centers and Institutes and, at the request of PRAC, considered several other issues as well. Here is a summary of the proposed revisions.

1. Centers and Institutes (C&I) will be required to provide a detailed set of goals and metrics to measure progress toward those goals in the original proposal and all reviews. These will enable review teams to analyze the progress of the C&I and assess whether it is adding value.

Executive Committee, Benefits Committee, Committee on Facilities, Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Committee on Statutes, Bylaws, and Committees,
Committee on Student Affairs, Curriculum Committee, Educational Affairs Committee, Faculty Admissions Committee,
Faculty Affairs Committee, Faculty Grievance Committee, Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee,
Faculty/Staff Parking Appeals Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, University Libraries Committee, University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

2. The policy statement now makes clear the definition of C&I (with the essential difference that institutes can offer courses and have degree programs) and charges them with demonstrating that they are adding value during regular review to justify their continued operation.
3. It now requests that C&I define or clarify precise reporting lines, requiring identification of the specific administrative position within an administrative unit.
4. It requires that proposals for new C&I detail the existence and planned acquisition of resources (fiscal, physical and human), including clear guarantees of faculty effort from home units to conduct C&I operations.
5. It has now clarified that promotion and tenure of participating faculty rests with the home PTU (note that we plan to recommend separately that the definition of PTU be clarified in future guidelines for appointment, promotion and tenure)
6. It now contains much more specificity about the review process, requiring every C&I to be reviewed on a regular cycle and providing alternative review procedures, one of which must be chosen by every C&I. This includes an initial third year review for new C&I or any C&I not yet reviewed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Shipley". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the final letter.

Mr. David E. Shipley, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

cc: Dr. Arnett C. Mace, Jr.
Professor Jere W. Morehead

CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

<http://www.curriculumsystems.uga.edu/Policies/aaps7.html>

Academic Affairs Policy Statement No. 7

1. References

- a. Academic Affairs Handbook, Board of Regents, University System of Georgia, July 1, 1986.
- b. Centers and Institutes policy statement approved by the University Council, January 26, 1993 and revised June 4, 1998.

2. Objectives-Definitions

~~1. Centers and institutes constitute an~~are organizational forms designed to ~~serve further~~ the university's instructional, research, and public service missions ~~in ways which that cannot be addressed through traditional structures, such as departments, schools, and colleges, otherwise be served.~~ Though centers and institutes are ~~becoming~~ an integral part of the university, their respective missions should not duplicate those of departments, schools, and colleges. ~~Instead, they should offer programs or opportunities that cannot be offered at least as well through existing structures.~~ The key ingredient of any center or institute is "value added." ~~Briefly stated, what can it do programmatically that cannot be done at least as well without it?~~

~~Definitions~~Centers and institutes normally have less permanency than departments, schools, or colleges. As such, all centers and institutes shall be reviewed periodically and carry the burden of demonstrating that they are in fact adding value.

~~a. Center~~

~~A center~~Both centers and institutes provides an organizational base for ~~university research-mission-related activities in a given one or more academic area or closely related areas. They pursue activities that may include, but are not limited to, it often provides a vehicle for interdisciplinary research in a given area involving faculty and students from a variety of internal administrative structures. It may be involved in the offering of continuing education activities related to its-their area(s) of interest. or The center structure may facilitate~~inge efforts of the college or university to obtain extramural funding in specific areas. ~~It~~Both serves as a formalized link between the academic community and the professional community in the area(s) of ~~foeus~~interest.

~~A center, however, is not an autonomous structure within the internal statutory organization of a college or university. It is administratively most often an appendage of one of the traditional administrative structures, such as a department, school, or college. A center canis not be involved in the independent offering of credit courses or degree programs, while an institute may -~~

~~a. Institute~~

~~An institute shares the center's focus on research, provisions of opportunity for interdisciplinary activity, involvement in continuing education activities, values in facilitating efforts to obtain extramural funding, and service as a link between the academic and professional communities. It is, however, a more formal structure and may be equivalent to an autonomous unit within the internal structure of the college or university such as department, division, school, or college. It will, unlike a center be involved in the offering of credit courses and may offer degree programs.~~

This definition of center is not to be confused with facilities that include "Center" in their name (e.g., The Ramsey Student Center) or units that provide ongoing administrative or support services (e.g., The Learning Disabilities Center)

This definition of institute is not to be confused with the ~~An exception to this definition concerns usage used~~ in adult and continuing education. One of several formats used to group adult learners for non-credit instruction or instruction earning CEU's (continuing education units) is the institute. Institutes of this sort are typically conducted over a fixed period of time and address specialized areas of concern or practice, ~~and adding~~ to the knowledge which participants already have on the subject. ~~An institute may be conducted in one day; may involve a series of meetings from one to several days' duration; or, if continuity is desired, may meet annually. Typically, the pattern of an institute includes a keynote address which delineates one or more problems to be addressed; use of small groups to address the problem(s); and summarizations of small group progress in one or more plenary sessions. (Source: Vice President for Service, approved by the University Council, June 8, 1995).~~

3. Administration of Centers/Institutes

a. Administrative locationAdministrative Unit

Centers and institutes may be administratively located within a department, school, college, or other unit or report directly to a vice president. The most decentralized administrative level consistent with meeting the center or institute mission is preferred.

b. Appointments

Institute and center directors will be appointed with standard review processes which may vary depending upon the executive officer to whom the director reports.

Tenure-track faculty who participate in center/institutes will be appointed to departments or schools in accordance with normal appointment procedures with the exception that search committees will be formed jointly of department/school and center/institute faculty. Both entities must agree on the employment of a new tenure-track faculty member. Non-tenure track faculty with time budgeted in a center/institute as well as

in other units will have their promotions and merit raises managed in a manner determined at the time of appointment.

Although some portion of tenure-track faculty time may be budgeted in a center/institute, tenure and promotion processes will be initiated through the relevant promotion-tenure unit (department or school PTU). However, the ~~departmental-PTU~~ review process will be organized to reflect the advice and recommendation of a center/institute if a third or more of the faculty member's appointment is in the center/institute. Merit salary decisions for those faculty with time divided between a department/school and a center/institute will be made jointly.

Part of the time a tenure-track faculty member has budgeted in a department should include formal instruction. An exception to this teaching responsibility requires the approval of the appropriate department head and dean. This is to insure that center/institute tenure-track faculty have regular contact with the department in which tenure resides, and, in particular, with teaching.

If a tenure-track faculty member is appointed jointly and the department does wish to recommend tenure but the center or institute does not wish to continue the appointment, then it will be the responsibility of the department, if tenure is approved in the university review process, to come up with the funds required to purchase the faculty time from the center or institute. If the department does not wish to tenure a person, even though the center or institute favors tenure, then tenure will not be awarded (other than through a successful appeal based principally, as our Guidelines now provide, on process). A position vacated because tenure was not awarded will not be allocated by the department for different purposes without the explicit knowledge of the center or institute director and the explicit approval of the cognizant department head, dean, or vice president. Similarly if the services of a non-tenure track faculty member are not to be continued in a center/institute, and another unit sharing that person's services wishes to retain his or her services, then the other unit is responsible for obtaining any needed salary.

5.4. Establishment of Centers/Institutes

a. Criteria

Establishment and maintenance of centers/institutes must be based upon a defined program with measurable outcomes, and defined policies and operating procedures, and a defined review process. Their establishment is justified when it is clear that their respective missions support and enhance the programs of the university. Even then, they must have missions which demonstrably cannot be accomplished in an efficient and effective manner by existing departments, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, or other units.

b. Proposals

Proposals must include a narrative ~~which that~~ states center/institute goals and describes how they will meet the above criteria; the statement of goals must include specific outcomes and metrics that will be used to measure progress toward the goals.

The proposal must indicate the administrative unit and the leadership position within that unit to which the center/institute reports and must designate the process by which the center/institute will be reviewed. The center/institute may be reviewed: (a) as an independent unit in Program Review; (b) as part of the Program Review of the administrative unit; (c) by the administrative unit; or (d) in another specified and approved manner.

Proposals should also contain:

1. A statement of Operating Procedures and Policies. These should include a description of the structure, the roles and responsibilities of any participating units, an advisory committee structure, and the processes for appointment or reappointment.
2. A description of amounts and sources of anticipated income. Anticipated financial arrangements between the center/institute and other units, if any, should also be described. A projected budget covering the first three years of operation should be included and should detail expenditures and income expected.
3. A description of the faculty and staff necessary to initiate its programs and maintain its operations for the first three years.
4. A description of the physical resources that the center/institute will occupy and utilize during its first three years.
4. ~~A list of participating faculty, their home units, and their roles in the center/institute, including a description of amounts and sources of anticipated income. Anticipated financial arrangements between the center/institute and other units, if any, should also be described. Sources for funding for the first year should be specified.~~
- 3.5. A description of the formal arrangements through which faculty will participate with the center/institute, will be evaluated for promotion, tenure, and salary increases, and the extent to which each affiliated faculty member will have his or her salary contained in its budget.
6. If an institute offers or plans to offer a degree program (see 9), include clear, formal agreements with home units of faculty that guarantee their availability to teach courses needed by students in the program.

~~1. A list of participating faculty and their roles in the center/institute. Typically, these would be faculty who have worked together on precursors to the proposed center or institute.~~

~~5.7.~~ Letters of support from affected departments, schools, colleges, other units, and the administrator who would have oversight responsibilities.

~~1. A plan for how unavailable resources are going to be acquired.~~

~~1. A description of anticipated additional staff or faculty, if any.~~

~~8.3.~~ A description of the responsibilities of any participating units.

~~9.4.~~ Recommendations, if appropriate, for the creation of courses or degrees and how they are integral to the functioning of the institute.

6.5. Procedure

A proposal may be originated by any interested staff or faculty but, prior to submission for formal review, must be submitted for recommendations and comments to the head of those units whose faculty and staff are involved. The route or review will depend in part on the originating source. For example, a proposal originating within a single college would have successive reviews by the appropriate committee within the college and by the dean. Should the proposal contain a graduate program including courses or a degree, then it should be routed from the school or college dean to the Graduate School Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council. Were a proposal to originate from faculty crossing school or college lines, then it must be reviewed at the college level in each of the respective schools and colleges. Were a proposal to originate outside of the typical school or college structure and be linked to units within a school or college, it would be reviewed first at that school or college. From the dean of the school or college the proposal must be sent to the relevant vice president(s). The proposal must be routed to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. From the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost the proposal will be sent to the University Curriculum Committee and then to the University Council who will make a recommendation to the President. After approval by the President, a proposal for an on-campus center will be forwarded to the Board of Regents as information. A proposal for a residence center or an institute will require approval of both the President and the Board of Regents.

If a Center or Institute proposal is approved, a copy of the proposal, with approvals, must be sent to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for its records.

7.6. Annual Reports and Reviews

a. Annual Reports

Centers and institutes should submit a brief annual report to their administrative unit that includes an indication of progress toward the goals

defined in the initial proposal, using the metrics defined in the initial proposal.

b. *Reviews*

Centers and institutes that exist at the time of this policy revision (xx September 2008?), and have undergone reviews in the past, at the time of their next review, must revise (or create) a statement that details center/institute goals and describes how they are meeting the criteria specified in 4a. The statement of goals must include specific outcomes and metrics that are being used to measure progress toward the goals (see 4b). In addition, existing centers and institutes will be required to file annual reports as described above following their next review.

Centers and institutes that exist on xx September 2008? but have never been reviewed must undergo an initial review by the administrative unit, to be completed within three years of this policy revision. In preparation for this review, the center or institute must revise or create the statement of goals with metrics and select the review process as detailed in 4b. Following the initial review, these centers and institutes will be required to file annual reports as described above.

Centers/institutes created after xx September 2008? will undergo an initial review by the administrative unit, to be completed by the end of the third year of existence. The center/institute should summarize progress toward its stated goals and demonstrate how it adds value to the university. Thereafter, the center/institute shall be reviewed as part of the normal cycle review as specified in its initial proposal (see 4b).

Centers/institutes undergoing review must address any changes to resources, commitments, or operating agreements as specified in the original proposal or most recent review. Each of the elements of section 4b of the proposal should be addressed and any revisions detailed.

The review report for a third-year or normal cycle review of a center or institute must include a statement that continuation of the center or institute is either recommended or not recommended. If continuation is not recommended, the administrative unit head shall decide whether to invoke the process for dissolution, described below.

~~—Documentation. The annual reports and all reviews of a center or institute will be made available to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The annual report and all reviews of a center or institute will be made available to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for its records.~~

a. *Centers/Institutes established after January 26, 1993*

Newly created centers and institutes will be reviewed during their third year of existence in a manner consistent with the University guidelines for periodic review of all academic programs. Following the third year review

centers and institutes will be reviewed periodically on the same basis as will be all other University programs.

a-c. Centers/Institutes established prior to January 26, 1993

~~With the establishment of periodic review of all academic programs, all existing centers and institutes will be reviewed. Depending upon circumstances prevailing at the time of review, centers which do not meet these criteria may be recommended for (1) changes in title, (2) changes in function or organization, or (3) dissolution. However, centers and institutes existing at the time that the University Council established program review guidelines (effective July 1, 1990) will not necessarily be required to meet all such guidelines. If their mission is important to the University, exemption from one or more guidelines may be recommended if compliance would serve no useful purpose. Those recommended for functional or structural changes will have a specified time scale over which to make them.~~

8.6. Recommendations for Changes or Dissolution

Recommendations for dissolution may be made either (1) as a result of periodic institutional review consistent with program review guidelines, or (2) through typical department, school or college, or institutional processes.

Recommendations for dissolution will be made if a center or institute fails to meet the substantive conditions for its establishment or does not provide the "value added" requisite of a center or institute. Any such recommendations should include a statement on how affected faculty and staff will be reassigned, and how affected students in any degree program will be handled.-

Recommendations either for significant changes in mission of, or for dissolution of, centers and institutes will be reviewed by an appropriate standing committee of the University Council which in turn will make its recommendation to the Council.

All recommendations for change or dissolution require approval by the President before implementation. If dissolution of an institute is recommended, Board of Regents approval is required before implementation.