Texas A&M University System Policy 11.02, Creation of Centers and Institutes, requires centers and institutes to be monitored and periodically reviewed at least every five years. The guidelines described here define the process and responsible parties involved in conducting the review and evaluation of the centers and institutes included in or affiliated with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (College). The intent is to periodically evaluate the center or institute to monitor achievement, impact, and relevance to mission. Official recognition of the center of institute is required to be by Board of Regents minute order or some similar institutional administrative mechanism. These guideline do not apply to the experiment stations and substations throughout the state, now considered Research and Extension Centers, which are reviewed in accordance with Research Procedure 12.99.99.A0.02.

Click here to view Definitions.

PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1.0 RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

1.1 The Executive Associate Dean will be the member CEO/desigee as specified in System Policy 11.02. The Executive Associate Dean retains overall accountability for the centers and institutes established under the College.

1.2 Pursuant to System Regulation 11.02.01, the responsible administrative official is the academic officer or program administrator to whom the center or institute director reports. For centers established under the College, the Department Head of the affiliated college department will be the responsible administrative official.

1.3 The Office of the Vice Chancellor, as designated by the responsible administrative official, will establish a review committee for the purposes of evaluating the center or institute’s periodic review report and making a recommendation regarding the continuation of the center or institute. The review committee will be comprised of members from the College, AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension Service (where applicable).

2.0 MONITORING

2.1 The responsible administrative official will oversee the ongoing monitoring of the center or institute.

2.1.1 Monitoring includes ensuring that the center or institute’s operations are consistent with the board-approved proposal by reviewing annual reports on the center or institute’s operations (governance and oversight, fiscal operations and budget, funding sources, and research and/or educational activities).

2.1.2 The center or institute director will provide a report on the center or institute’s operations during the last year. The report will coincide with the annual performance review of the director unless otherwise specified by the responsible administrative official.

2.1.3 The monitoring report will include a program overview, operational overview, and future plans. The report will utilize the Impacts – Challenges – Priorities (ICP) Form.
2.1.4 If applicable, the responsible administrative official will evaluate the center or institute’s progress implementing the changes approved by the Executive Associate Dean in prior periodic reviews.

2.2 The responsible administrative official will annually evaluate the performance of the center or institute director to ensure that the director and staff comply with all applicable laws, system policies and regulations, and AgriLife rules and procedures, and College guidelines.

3.0 PERIODIC REVIEWS

3.1 Centers and institutes will be reviewed at least every five years unless more frequently as stated in the guiding documents that established them. Postponement of scheduled reviews must be approved by the Executive Associate Dean.

3.2 The periodic review will be based on metrics relevant to the stated mission and goals for the unit. These metrics may include external funding, publications, intellectual property, program development, achievement of faculty or students, awards, and recognitions. Consideration may be given to less tangible evidence of impact and accomplishment such as social trends or larger scale effects. The review will include the unit’s plans for the next evaluation period and how suitable and achievable those plans are.

3.3 The responsible administrative official designates the review committee as defined in section 1.3 to initiate the review process by requesting that the center or institute director provide a report on the center of institute’s operations during the review period. The director will have 30 days to provide the report.

3.4 Makeup and roles of the review committee

(a) The committee will be comprised of AgriLife and College leadership.

(b) A committee chair will be assigned and be responsible for completing the evaluation sheet and making a recommendation on continuing the center or institute.

(c) The committee members will serve indefinitely at the discretion of the Office of the Vice Chancellor.

(d) Scope and charge of the committee:

1. Evaluate the performance of the center or institute.

2. Measure the effectiveness of the center or institute.

3. Determine if the center or institute fits into the mission of the AgriLife/College.

4. Determine whether the center or institute serves as a productive incubator of interdisciplinary research, education, and other scholarly activities, engaging faculty broadly across the agency and departments.

5. Recommend whether the center or institute should be continued, modified, or discontinued.

3.5 The committee will meet in-person with representatives of the center or institute. At the meeting, the center or institute director, and the department head of the affiliated department (if applicable) will have the opportunity to present their report in either a formal presentation or informal discussion format.

3.6 The director of the center or institute is responsible for providing a report utilizing the AgriLife Five-Year Review Form. The report will include information regarding the following areas:

(a) Program Overview

1. Mission and goals of the center or institute.

2. Top five to ten accomplishments over the past five years. (These accomplishments may include program development, activities/seminars, research projects, significant publications,
international visitors/lectures, external support/contracts and grants, licenses/patents, graduate student support/involvement, external linkages/partnerships, and/or visiting faculty).

3. Benefits derived from the center or institute and how the College/AgriLife has benefitted from the center or institute over the past five years.

4. Overall impact/outcomes relative to the mission of the center or institute (i.e., economic, societal, and environmental impacts, as appropriate).

(b) Operational Overview

1. Current staffing and source of funding within the center or institute.

2. List of faculty members who are associated with the center or institute, including their name, rank, department, and college.

3. Facilities of center or institute: facilities directly under the management of the center or institute, with details such as building number, room number, square footage, purpose, etc.

4. Collaborations: with various industries, agencies, colleges and/or departments, over the past five years, detailing any plans to expand or reduce collaborations. Highlight any international collaborations.

5. Advisory Groups: detail any advisory group(s) that have been in existence for the past five years.

6. Current FY budget and three-year historical budget summary for the center or institute to include: source of funds, contracts and grants, how funds were allocated within the center or institute, and how these funds were allocated to the faculty.

(c) Future Plans/Opportunities

1. Future goals and aspirations of the center or institute.

2. Greatest needs in meeting the mission and goals for the current FY and beyond.

3.7 The committee analyzes the report, evaluates the performance of the center or institute, and submits a report to the Executive Associate Dean using the AgriLife Center and Institute Review Evaluation Sheet documenting the committee’s evaluation and recommendations as to the continuation, revision, or dissolution of the center or institute. If a center or institute is established between AgriLife and another member, the responsible administrative official’s report goes to both the Executive Associate Dean and the CEOs or designees of the other members who provide a joint decision.

3.8 The Executive Associate Dean provides a written decision to the center or institute director.

3.9 Subsequent ongoing monitoring and periodic reviews evaluate, to the extent necessary, the center or institute’s progress in implementing the changes approved by the Executive Associate Dean or designee.

4.0 REPORTING

4.1 Completed periodic reviews will be forwarded by the responsible administrative official or designee to the System Office of Academic Affairs and the System Office of Research using the designated Laserfiche portal.

5.0 MAJOR CHANGES OR DISSOLUTION

5.1 If major changes in function, focus, or funding sources of the center or institute are proposed, approval by the Executive Associate Dean is required. If the Executive Associate Dean approves, subsequent approval is required from Texas A&M University, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents.
5.2 If the College proposes to dissolve a center or institute, the Executive Associate Dean must submit a request for dissolution to the Chancellor for approval.

RELATED STATUTES, POLICIES, OR REQUIREMENTS

System Policy 11.02, Creation of Centers and Institutes

System Regulation 11.02.01, Management and Evaluation of Centers and Institutes

University SAP 11.02.99.M0.01, Centers and Institutes

DEFINITIONS

Unless otherwise stated, all terms used in these guidelines have the meaning assigned by System Policy 11.02, System Regulation 11.02.01, and University SAP 11.02.99.M0.01.
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