IV-1.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES
(Approved by the President August 1, 1991)

A. Policy

Although faculty may from time to time establish informal relationships for the purposes of conducting research, or of fostering improvement of teaching or curricula, or of enhancing service to the State in a particular area, they must follow certain procedures, as described below, for inclusion in official administrative lists and for periodic review.

Institutes, Bureaus, Centers, Laboratories, Research Teams, and other similar groups and organizations form useful devices for organizing groups of faculty and staff from different disciplines to focus teaching, research and/or service in an area of common interest and concern. Centers, Bureaus, and Institutes should be justified on the basis of their contributions and relationships to academic programs, but with a very few exceptions, these entities shall not offer courses or oversee degree programs. To provide an orderly method for the establishment of Centers, Institutes, and interdisciplinary units known by other names, it is appropriate to devise guidelines or procedures that provide for appropriate faculty and administrative review. These units are expected to be supported largely by external funding and not exert significant claims on State or university resources. Yet the legitimate interests of faculty proponents and of administrators in whose jurisdictions the units may be located must be protected. These procedures are intended to protect those interests but are not so complex as to render the establishment of the units such a lengthy and time-consuming task that few will venture to propose them; they comply with the University System Policy for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes in the University of Maryland System, approved by the Board of Regents on January 11, 1990. (IV-1.00)

B. Group

The first, and simplest type of unit compares to an established specialization area within a department, such as organic chemistry, counseling psychology, or nuclear physics. Characteristically, it is an ad hoc collection of faculty members gathered together as a "Group" to promote an area of common interest. "Groups" and projects in this category might be short-lived. Such a group shall be titled "Research Group for ________" or "Laboratory for ________" etc. No formal procedure for its establishment is involved other than written approval of the Dean for the unit in which the faculty are housed.

C. Center

The second level of organization compares to an academic program without departmental status. Typical of this type of organization is a "Center." It has more permanency than the "group" referred to above. It may involve external and/or State funding and may appear as an organized
unit in the working budget. Usually, it will have a formal administrative structure, headed by a
Director. The Director and a secretary may be, at least partially, supported by general funds.
Procedures for establishment of a "Center for ____" are as follows:

1. A formal proposal for the establishment of a new Center shall be prepared by its
proponents, who may be informal groups of interested faculty and administrators, a
committee appointed for the purpose of determining the need, desirability and feasibility
of a Center, or any similar formal or informal group.

2. The proposal shall include a statement of the purpose of the Center; the rationale for its
establishment; details of its membership, governance, and administration; initial and
prospective funding; space needs, and other requirements.

3. The proposal shall be submitted by the organizing proponents to the Dean(s) of the
College(s) to whom the Center Director will report. In those circumstances in which a
Center will reside within a Department, the proposal will first be submitted to the
Department Chair. The Dean(s) will submit the proposal to the Programs, Courses, and
Curriculum Committee(s) of the College(s) in which the Center is to reside, for advice
and recommendation.

4. After review by the College(s)

   a. The Dean(s) of the College(s) in which the Center will reside will be responsible for
      identifying the source of resources (if any) necessary to create and maintain the
      Center. These may be extramural funds, department funds, College funds, and/or
      small, short-term commitments from Graduate School DRIF monies. A proposal
      requiring, in the view of the Graduate Dean, large or long-term commitments from
      Graduate School DRIF will fall under provisions 4.b. below. If the proposed center
      requires space, the Dean(s) will be responsible for identifying the source of additional
      space as well. The proposal, including commitment of funds, space, etc. will be
      forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval. The Vice
      President has the option of consulting The Academic Planning Advisory Committee,
      but is likely to do so only if a major redirection of resources appears to be involved.

   b. In unusual circumstances, a special funding opportunity may require a commitment of
      more resources than the College(s) involved can afford. (e.g., NSF Science and
      Technology Centers). In these cases, the Dean(s) of the College(s) involved shall be
      responsible for identifying the resources the College(s) can commit and enumerating
      those which would need to be met by the campus. At the campus level, the full
      review process would be required in these cases, including review by APAC and final
      approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. APAC shall develop guidelines
      for its review.

5. It is understood that in the review process, alterations may be recommended and made in
the proposal by any of the reviewing administrators.
D. Institute or Bureau

The third level of organization compares with an academic department. Typical of this type of organization is an "Institute" or "Bureau." It is expected to continue indefinitely and, thus, have greater permanency than a Center.

It may have both external and general funding, but it should be included in the working budget and have a formal administrative and governance structure. Just as a Program may propose conversion to an Institute. Procedures for establishment of an Institute are similar to those used for the establishment of new academic departments, and are as follows:

1. Same as 1) above
2. Same as 2) above
3. Same as 3) above
4. Same as 4) above, except that the Vice President recommends approval to the President.
5. Upon approval by the Vice President, the proposal is forwarded to the President. After review and approval by the President, the proposal is forwarded to the Chancellor for information. It is understood that in the review process, alterations may be recommended and made in the proposal by any of the reviewing administrators.

E. The Periodic Review of Centers, Institutes, Etc.

1. Institutes and Bureaus

Institutes and Bureaus shall be subject to the same review procedures as academic departments.

2. Centers

It is expected that Centers will be established with the provision that their functions, productivity, fiscal condition, and continuance will be periodically reviewed. The procedure for review is as follows:

a. Every five years, each Center shall submit a review of its activities to the Dean(s) to which it reports. This review shall include the following types of information: date Center established, purpose, major activities over previous five years, funding and major categories of expenses, number of personnel associated with the Center and source of support for each, relationship to institution, benefits to institution.

Upon receiving the review, the Dean(s) shall choose one of the following administrative actions: maintain the Center in its current state; institute a broader
scale review; change the definition, operators and/or director of the Center; terminate the Center.

Each Dean shall submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a report of these reviews and the administrative actions.

b. A Center which is established with (other than one-time) funding from outside its College(s), i.e., one established according to 4.b. above, will follow the same procedure with one additional step. The review will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who, in consultation with APAC, shall choose whether to continue to terminate the campus’ portion of the Center’s funding.

c. Those Centers which reside entirely within one Department and report to the Department Chair shall be reviewed as part of the Department review.

3. For those Centers existing as of July, 1988, Deans shall establish a staggered schedule of reviews beginning in five years.