List of Appendices

Appendix A: List of Institutes and Centers

UMass Boston boasts approximately 50 interdisciplinary research organizations that bring faculty and students together from across the university to pursue research, teaching, and service on broad scholarly and social topics.

The following free-standing institutes and centers are administered by the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

- Center for Social Development and Education (Gary Siperstein)
- Center for Survey Research Trent Buskirk)
- Institute for Asian American Studies (Paul Watanabe)
- Institute for Community Inclusion (Cindy Thomas)
- Massachusetts Office of Public Collaboration (Susan Jeghelian)
- The Mauricio Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy (Lorna Rivera)
- Urban Harbors Institute (Kristin Uiterwyk)
- Venture Development Center (William Brah)
- William Joiner Institute for the Study of War and Social Consequences (Tom Kane)
- William Monroe Trotter Institute for the Study of Black Culture (Barbara Lewis)

The following university-wide institutes and centers are operationally managed by collective leadership teams appointed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

- Center of Science and Mathematics in Context (Arthur Eisenkraft)
- Center for Personalized Cancer Therapy (Jill Macoska)
- Confucius Institute (Baifeng Sun)
- Developmental Sciences Research Center (unknown)
- Institute for Early Education Leadership and Innovation (Anne Douglas)
- Institute for International and Comparative Education Wenfan Van)
- Sustainable Solutions Lab (Rebecca Herst)

The following institutes and centers are administered by their college or department.

- Adult Literacy Resource Institute (unknown)
- Andrew Fiske Memorial Center for Archaeological Research (Stephen Mrozowski)
- Broadening Advanced Technological Education Connections (Deborah Boisvert
- Center for Coastal Environmental Sensing Networks (Robert Chen)
- Center for Collaborative Leadership (Lisa DeAngelis)
- Center for Environmental Health, Science, and Technology
- Center for Governance and Sustainability (Maria Ivanova)
- Center for Green Chemistry (Robert L. Carter)
- Center for Innovation and Excellence in eLearning (Alan Girelli)
- Center for Innovative Teaching (no director)
- Center for Peace, Democracy, and Development (Darren Kew)
- Center for Portuguese Language - Instituto Camoes (unknown)
- Center for Rebuilding Sustainable Communities after Disasters (Adenrele Awotona)
- Center for Social and Demographic Research on Aging (Jan Mutchler)
- Center for Social Policy (Susan Crandall)
- Center for Sustainable Enterprise and Regional Competitiveness (David Levy)
- Center for the Study of Gender, Security, and Human Rights (Carol Cohn)
- Center for the Study of the Humanities, Culture and Society (Rachel Rubin)
- Center for Women in Politics and Public Policy (Ann Bookman)
- Center for World Languages and Cultures (not an institute)
- Center on Media and Society (Matthew Davis)
- China Program Center (no Director CAPS)
- Edward J. Collins, Jr. Center for Public Management (Stephen McGoldrick)
- Entrepreneurship Center (no director)
- Gerontology Institute (Len Fishman)
- GoKids Boston Youth Fitness and Training Center (Suzanne Leveille)
- Institute for Learning and Teaching (no longer exists)
- Institute for New England Native American Studies (Cedric Woods)
- Labor Resource Center (Steve Striffler)
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education (no longer exists)
- Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (James Hermelbracht)
- Pension Action Center (Ann Marie Tabor)

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS BOSTON
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

**UMASS
BOSTON**

100 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston, MA 02125-3393
P: 617.287.5600
F: 617.287.5616
www.umb.edu/provost

November 30, 2018

MEMORANDUM FOR: University Community

FROM: Emily A. McDermott, Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Taskforce on Centers and Institutes

I am pleased to announce the establishment of a joint faculty-administrative Taskforce on Centers and Institutes.

The composition of the Taskforce will be as follows:

- o   5 Administrators
    - William Kiernan, Dean, SGISD, Taskforce Chair
    - Bala Sundaram, Vice Provost for Research
    - Joseph Berger, Dean, College of Education and Human Development
    - Thomas Miller, Associate VCAA for Administrative and Financial Services
    - Chris Giuliani, Associate VC for Administration and Finance
- o   5 Center or Institute Directors
    - Susan Crandall, Director, Center for Social Policy, MGS
    - Anne Douglass, Director, Institute for Early Education Leadership and Innovation, and Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
    - Stephen Mrozowski, Director, Andrew Fiske Memorial Center for Anthropological Research, and Professor, Anthropology
    - Lorna Rivera, Director, Mauricio Gaston Institute, and Associate Professor, Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
    - Paul Watanabe, Director, Institute for Asian American Studies and Professor, Political Science
- o   4 additional Faculty and Professional Staff
    - Jeffrey Burr, Professor and Chair, Gerontology Department
    - Crystal Schaaf, Professor, School for the Environment
    - Greg Sun, Professor and Chair, Engineering Department, and member, Faculty Council Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee
    - Marshall Milner, Executive Director Science Training Programs, CSM

Charge:
The Taskforce is charged to study the missions and funding options of the Centers and Institutes on campus, with the goal of drafting and recommending to the Provost:
- A definitional document that will guide classification of centers and institutes, differentiating among types of mission and mixed missions (e.g., teaching centers, research centers, outreach/service centers);
- Discussion of funding options for centers and institutes depending on mission-type:

- o How can the Office of Advancement support the activities needed for increasing external funding? What are some best practices in terms of improving grant/contract success; operating a soft-money operation; and building long-term funding stability?
- o What incentives might be developed to encourage faculty and staff to put time into fund-raising?
- o Where a center/institute plays an important role in the teaching or community-building/outreach mission of the university, how should its budget be allocated to appropriately reflect the role of internal support?
- Campus guidelines for periodically evaluating centers and institutes for the efficacy with which they meet their missions, for the value and relevance of their programmatic efforts, and for their efficient and appropriate use of funds (staffing, collaboration, leveraging of funding). The recommended guidelines shall be informed by and comply with the Board of Trustees' Policy on Centers and Institutes (T96-066).

The Taskforce will forward its report and recommendations to the Provost by March 20, 2019.

I believe that the creation of this Taskforce will provide a productive way forward for the campus in its goal of furthering the important research and service provided by these entities, while at the same time maintaining the integrity and sustainability, in a resource-constrained environment, of academic programming and the student experience on campus.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS BOSTON
POLICY ON INSTITUTES AND CENTERS

Revised[1]: September 22, 1994

I. PREAMBLE

The purpose of this policy is to define the activities of institutes and centers, to locate them in the administrative structure of the university, to provide for their regular review, and to specify the nature of appointments to institutes.

II. DEFINITIONS

Institute – An institute refers to a distinct and freestanding unit of substantial size, established to enhance the urban land grant university's mission of teaching, research, and service. Institutes will normally be interdisciplinary and applied in nature, often with a substantial public service component. They may vary in emphasis, structure, and activities. Indeed, an essential point of institutes is flexibility—to utilize different combinations of research, service, and teaching resources to focus intensely on policy issues and problems in a defined area.

Center – A center is viewed as a subordinate unit within an existing department, college, or institute[2]. A center should make a significant contribution to the major unit of which it is a part and have an adequate concentration of talent to carry out its mission.

III. SCOPE

A center or institute is an organizational unit that engages in teaching, research, or public service activities. Centers and institutes are, however, distinct from the traditional academic units, such as colleges or departments. Other units bearing the title center, such as the campus day-care center, are not governed by the requirements of this policy.

IV. POLICY ON INSTITUTES

Establishment of Institutes

Proposals to establish institutes will be submitted to the provost for review. Criteria for the establishment of new institutes will include the appropriateness to the mission and goals of the campus, and the adequacy of resources, including capital investment. Upon review of the proposal, the provost will seek the advice and recommendations of the Faculty Council. However, the decision to recommend the establishment of an institute to the chancellor remains with the provost. The president of the university will be informed of the decision to establish a new institute.

---

[1] Titles of officers and administrators updated and format errors corrected May 7, 2004.

[2] Three units on the UMass Boston campus that are designated as centers actually function as institutes. They are Center for Survey Research, the Center for Social Development and Education, and the Joiner Center. These units will retain their names, which have been used for many years and which have a wide recognition on and off campus. They will, however, continue to function as institutes according to the definition given in this policy.

Governance and Administration

Each institute director will report to the vice provost for research. If an institute has explicit functions beyond the area of academic affairs, dotted reporting lines to the appropriate vice chancellor may be established. As directors of independent freestanding entities, institute directors normally do not report to a college dean.

An Institutes and Centers Council, composed of the directors of all campus institutes and centers, will be established. The council's primary purposes will be to promote communication across institutes, to respond to campus policy and governance issues, and to encourage growth and development of the institutes and centers.

Activities

Institutes may promote, advance, solicit, and support research, often involving several disciplines or academic units. Institutes may also publish journals, reports, books, and related publications.

Institutes may support interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary instructional programs by providing instruction or resources to support or enhance degree granting or certificate programs. However, the authority to award degrees is vested in the colleges and the office of graduate studies.

Institutes may support service activities by engaging technical resources within and outside of the university to respond to issues external to the university. Such activities include community service, agency partnerships, technical assistance, outreach, and special events. Institutes may offer workshops, symposia, colloquia, mini-courses, and educational programs to the public as a pro bono service or on a fee basis.

Resources and Personnel

Institutes, as distinct budgetary units, may occupy their own identifiable space, may have professional and classified staff, and may engage faculty from academic departments. Hiring of professional and classified staff by institutes will be done in accordance with the affirmative action and hiring procedures followed by all university units. Institutes may retain consultants and engage contractors. However, only academic units may make official recommendations on faculty appointments.

Each institute will establish a faculty advisory committee that will meet regularly and be consulted on institute programs and plans. This committee will facilitate faculty interchanges between departments, as well as the use of professional staff with appropriate academic credentials as adjunct faculty. These arrangements will be subject to the approval of the institute director in consultation with the faculty advisory committee.

Institutes may appoint fellows for specified lengths of time to participate in the service or research activities of the institute. The selection of unpaid fellows is at the discretion of the institute directors, but such appointments require the approval of the vice provost for research and the concurrence of the provost.

The institute director is responsible for the management of the institute budget.

Review of Institutes

Each institute will be subject to periodic review by a committee external to the institute, established by the vice provost for research in consultation with the director of the institute. Such review will occur at least once within a period of five years from the institute's formal establishment. The criteria for evaluation of an institute will reflect the mission and purpose of the institute as well as its success in making a substantive contribution to the mission of the campus. The president of the university will be informed of the outcome of such reviews.

Institute directors are normally appointed for a period of three years subject to review and renewal upon the recommendation of the vice provost for research to the provost. There will be an annual review of performance of the institute director by the vice provost for research.

Each institute director will submit an annual plan of activities at the beginning of each academic year and will provide quarterly reports on the progress made toward meeting the goals established in the annual plan. Each institute will also prepare a five-year plan for program development and funding (both state and non-state). Such a plan should articulate how an institute intends to acquire non-state funding to enhance its total resources within five years. These plans and reports will be submitted to the vice provost for research.

Termination of Institute

A recommendation to terminate an institute will be made by the vice provost for research to the provost. The procedure will follow the same steps as the establishment of an institute. The provost will seek the advice and recommendations of internal and external bodies, including the Faculty Council, but the decision to recommend to the chancellor the termination of an institute remains with the provost. The termination of an institute will be reported to the president of the university.

V.   POLICY ON CENTERS

Establishment of Centers

As subordinate units, centers will be established through normal governance procedures of the parent unit. The criteria for approval of a new center will include the appropriateness to the mission or goals of an existing department, college, or institute, and the adequacy of available resources. The proposal is approved when it receives the approval of the department chair and the appropriate academic dean or institute director. Establishment of new centers will be reported to the provost, the chancellor, and the president of the university.

Governance and Administration

The department chair and the dean or director of the unit that supervises the center retain full authority and responsibility for the oversight of the center's management and the expenditure of any funds associated with the center. All documents and publications, such as grant and contract proposals, brochures, and news releases, must clearly identify the center as being part of the parent unit.

Activities

A center may be established for the purpose of concentrating research, teaching, or service efforts within a clearly defined academic area.

Resources and Personnel

Any commitment of personnel, space, or other resources must have the prior approval of the appropriate chairperson or director.

Review of Centers

Each center will be subject to periodic review by a committee established by the appropriate academic dean in consultation with the department chair (or by the institute director if the center is within an institute). Such review will occur at least once within a period of five years from the center's formal establishment. The criteria for evaluation of a center will reflect the mission and purpose of the center as well as its success in making a substantive contribution to the mission of the parent unit. Reviews of centers will be reported to the provost, the chancellor, and the president of the university.

Termination of a Center

A decision to terminate a center is made by the dean or department chair of the unit in which the center is housed. The termination of a center will be reported to the provost, the chancellor, and the president.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
POLICY ON CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

I. Definitions

As used in this policy, the following words shall have the following meaning:

Center or Institute -An organizational unit within one or more campuses or the President's Office created to implement academic and training programs, clinical or community service, or research activities that cannot ordinarily be accommodated within existing departmental structures. Entities called "centers" whose purpose is to provide services to the University community (including day care centers, learning centers, computer centers and other such entities as may be so designated by the Chancellor of each campus) shall not be considered Centers or Institutes for the purposes of this policy.

Further, an *Institute* is a distinct and free-standing unit of substantial size. Institutes may engage in a wide variety of research, public service, and instructional activities, typically in areas of broad concern. Institutes are frequently interdisciplinary and embrace ideas and personnel from various departments, colleges, and schools. A *Center* is ordinarily a subordinate unit within an existing department, school, college, or institute; interdisciplinary centers may, however, report to the Provost or Chancellor. Centers should make a significant contribution to the major academic unit of which they are a part.

II. Campus Authority for Centers and Institutes

Each campus shall have policies and procedures governing the definition, establishment, review, administration and termination of Centers and Institutes. Every Center or Institute, whether free-standing units or sub-units of schools, colleges, departments or other organizational units, and regardless of its source of funding, shall be included within the purview of campus policies. The exceptional use of the name center or institute by campus entities that do not conform to the definition of Center or Institute set forth above shall be addressed in each campus policy. Campus policies must be approved by the President of the university. The President shall have the authority to establish, review, and terminate Centers and Institutes that are affiliated with the President's Office.

III. Creation and Approval of Centers and Institutes

Campus approval of new Centers and Institutes shall be based, at a minimum, on the appropriateness of the center or institute to the mission and goals of the campus, and adequacy of resources, including capital investment.

The establishment of a new center or institute shall require the approval of the President upon recommendation of the campus Chancellor.

IV. Review of Centers and Institutes

All campus policies shall provide for the review of Centers and Institutes at least every five years. Centers and Institutes shall be evaluated on their success in meeting their own goals and objectives as well as their substantive contribution to the mission of the campus. Once a Center or Institute has been reviewed, a recommendation to continue said Center or Institute must be approved by the President upon recommendation of the campus Chancellor.

V. Termination

Campus policies governing Centers and Institutes shall include appropriate mechanisms and criteria for the termination of said units.

Appendix E: Summary of Search Activities of Peer Institutions

George Mason University: no clear policies reflecting definitions, evaluation of funding for C&I. Following is a link to all GU policies available on web

https://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/all-policies/   GM does have specific guidelines on costs and indirect costs. Find them at https://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/sponsored-programs-administration/

University of Georgia: the university has a policy addressing the key issues of interest to this taskforce including definitions, administration of C&I, establishment of C&I procedures, annual reports and reviews and finally recommendations for changes and dissolution. Documents are part of the Academic Affairs Handbook Board of Regents (July 1, 1986) as well as the Centers and Institute policy statement approved by the University Council (January 26, 1993 revised June 4, 1998). The link is http://curriculumsystems.uga.edu/curriculum/departments/

Temple University: there are a number of section on the TU web where there is information on the centers and Institute. The basic web is https://www.temple.edu/temple-research/centers-and-institutes It does not appear that they have the policies on definition, funding and review on the web page. Some specific suggestion about funding resources can be found at https://research.temple.edu/grants/key-guidelines-resources/funding-your-project

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee: This university has a number of policies that relate to the definition of what is a center or an institute (https://www4.uwm.edu/secu/docs/other/S10.5_Centers_a_Institutes.pdf) They also have up on line a copy of their Research Strategic Plan (dated 2011) that talks about supporting centers for excellence on campus (https://uwm.edu/officeofresearch/wp-content/uploads/sites/91/2016/02/OR-2011-Strategic-Planning-for-Research-report.pdf) They also have a report that talks about Critical Research Investments and has suggestions from some of the measurement metrics for this (https://uwm.edu/officeofresearch/wp-content/uploads/sites/91/2017/05/2015-Critical-Research-Investments-for-UWM.pdf They also provide information on the review of centers and institutes and the criteria for such review. https://uwm.edu/secu/wp-content/uploads/sites/122/2016/11/S71-Research-Centers-Institutes-approval.pdf This document is quite extensive and provides a great deal of information on the process and criteria.

University of Houston: This university has a medical school and a number of their institutes are not for profit entities: there are polices that drive these research clusters that can be found at http://www.uh.edu/research/about/centers-and-institutes/guidelines/ They have a series of core facilities including animal Behavior Core, Animal Care, center for Life Sciences Technology

http://www.uh.edu/research/about/core-facilities/   The receive annually about $169M in research monies with 12344 applications submitted and 359 funded in the past year.

Virginia Commonwealth University has a range of centers and institutes. There are some broad definitions of the centers and institutes and can be sound at https://policy.vcu.edu/sites/default/files/Research-Related%20Institutes%20and%20Centers.pdf This document provides information on definition of C&I, developing a C&I, evaluation criteria for C&I, modifications of C&I and discontinuation of C&I

Cleveland State University: offers definitions of the different levels of centers and institute at CSU. There is also a timeline for review that is 3 years and there is information on who approves such centers and institutes. Information can be found at https://www.csuohio.edu/research/guidelines-centers This was developed on 2007 and they attribute source to the U of Minnesota. They also offer resource for funding that identifies several different sources including federal, state, private, corporate, international, and internal. These can be found at https://www.csuohio.edu/sprs/finding-funding-for-research Their total external funding for 2017 was about $84M. As support for faculty and writing proposal they have an online resources that organize and support the development of a proposals. This can be found at https://www.csuohio.edu/sprs/proposal-preparation

Wayne State University; provides two types of institutes or centers. A link to the definitions is http://research.wayne.edu/centers-institutes/directory.php There are a range of policies that offer guidance for the type I (academic centers) and type II (research institute). These were developed in 2005 and are reportedly under review. They can be found at http://research.wayne.edu/centers-institutes/policy.php There is guidance on the starting of a center that can be found at http://research.wayne.edu/centers-institutes/starting-a-center-institute.php There is a self-study guideline for centers at http://research.wayne.edu/centers-institutes/pdf/charter-renewal-self-study-guidelines-research-type-ii-centers.pdf

University of Maryland Baltimore County: the University system has policies for the establishment and review of centers and institutes. This policy can be found at https://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionIV/IV100.pdf The have a specific policy on the establishment and review of centers, institutes and laboratories that can be found at https://research.umbc.edu/procedures-for-establishment-and-review-of-centers-institutes-and-laboratories/ They have about $46M in external research funding. Thy provide resources for faculty to =identify funding sources. https://research.umbc.edu/external-funding/

University of Missouri-St. Lewis There is a formal five year review process but not a great deal of detail is available other than this link http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/five%20year%20review.html There is a self-study framework that is included on their web at http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/guideline-centers.html

University of New Orleans they have center and institute guidelines for both what they are and the renewal process. Information is at http://www.uno.edu/research/POLICY2.05.aspx?_ga=2.206110355.1437221443.1547140330-685930529.1547140330 the guidelines for application for one and five year approval can be found at https://www.regents.la.gov/assets/docs/2014/07/Guidelines_for_Application_of_New_Unit_Sept_2011.pdf a range of materials are available for interested faculty in the development on grants at http://new.uno.edu/orsp

University of Michigan has information on their centers and institute including best practices for centers and institutes providing variables that can and are used in the assessment of C&I. http://provost.umich.edu/programs/bpci/bpci.html There is also a best practices tool kit that is available Best Practices for Centers and Institutes: Bylaws Template (DOC) They provide a sample for the establishment of a center at Best Practices for Centers and Institutes: Business Plan Template

University of Buffalo: there are some clear definitions available on the University of Buffalo web site. Definition of centers and institute can be found at http://www.buffalo.edu/research/research-centers/establishing-research-centers-and-institutes.html The establishment of interdisciplinary centers and the evaluation of them can be found at: http://www.buffalo.edu/research/research-centers/forming-new-research-centers.html U. of Buffalo has developed a series of Communities of Excellence that are not centers or institutes but more faculty, student and community think tanks. Information about these efforts can be found at http://www.buffalo.edu/research/research-centers/communities-of-excellence.html

U Mass Amherst: U Mass Amherst has published a special report entitles Centers and Institutes: Comprehensive Policy on Approval and Review (April 3, 2014). This report provides information on the definitions of centers and institutes as well as criteria for review and evaluation of centers and institutes. **https://www.umass.edu/senate/sites/default/files/Centers%20and%20Institutes-Comprehensive%20Policy%20on%20Approval%20and%20Review-Sen.%20Doc.%20No.%2014-032B.pdf**

CUNY City College: There is not a great deal of detail on this site. There are definitions of centers and institutes as well as a listing of more than 100 centers or institutes. http://www2.cuny.edu/about/centers-and-institutes/ These centers focus their efforts on a wide range of areas, including aging, applied sciences, corporate integrity, transportation systems, ethnic studies, performing arts, sustainable energy and urban studies, to name a few. Organized research, training and instruction, and service units, are expected to operate with substantial external support to advance the mission of the University beyond what is possible to accomplish through the basic institutional budget. While tax-levy support for +centers+ and +institutes-> is not prohibited, it should be viewed as an aid to developing external support and never as a guarantee. The link provides information on how centers, institutes, consortia and special initiatives are defined. http://www2.cuny.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/page-

assets/academics/academic-programs/academic-program-
resources/Board_policy_on_centers_and_institutes.pdf Centers are evaluated every ten years
while Institutes are evaluated every 5 years. No sample of the evaluation process or the variables
used in an evaluation were available on the web.

Portland State University: There are three categories that this IHE uses: public service/general
support (generally providing supports to PSU and does not generate revenue), (2)
research/membership centers (generally have research at their focus but can provide
instruction, technical assistance and public service) and (3) academic centers and institutes.
https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/centers-and-institutes

There is a structured review process for the centers and institutes at this university. Some of the
guidelines include focal areas, source of preeminence in teaching, research etc., self-supporting
after 3 to 5 years, return on investment including monetary, scholarly student engagement,
impact and statutory requirements. https://www.pdx.edu/academic-
affairs/sites/www.pdx.edu.academic-
affairs/files/ResearchCenter%26InstituteReview10.1.14%20%281%29.pdf

University of Mass Lowell: There are a number of documents that define centers and institutes.
https://www.uml.edu/docs/2015%20Research%20Center%20Guidelines_tcm18-185151.pdf
There is a three year review process as well as a formal annual report from each center or
institute. Not materials on funding of centers and institutes.

University of Missouri-Kansas City: There are clearly defined units including the following (1)
teaching centers, (2) research centers, (3) outreach/service/extension centers, (4) academic
support centers, (5) fee-based centers and (6) all centers. Within the definition they have
guidance as to the level of funding that is from the university and from other sources for each
group. https://www.umkc.edu/provost/centers/downloads/Definitions-for-Determining-the-
Classification-of-Centers-and-Institutes_March-25-2010.pdf There is little detail on the funding
options for centers and institute available on the web nor is there any information of the
evaluation process that is used by this IHE for periodic evaluation available on the web.

Appendix F: List of Activities of Taskforce

The following is a list of the activities as well as the response rates received by the Taskforce since its inception on December, 2018.

1. Completed web based data collection and analysis of 17 Institutions of Higher Education regarding their practices in defining, evaluating and funding of institutes and centers at their IHE (10 Peer institutions of UMB)
2. Conducted three listening sessions (1/22, 1/29 and 2/13): a total of 142 individuals attended and 54 attendees presented oral testimony
3. Completion of an interactive dialogue with centers and institutes (two individuals representing the leadership of all 45 centers and institutes were invited to attend a discussion hosted by the Taskforce on 2/26/19: two and one half hour meeting). A total of 33 individuals attended representing 11 centers and institutes.
4. Completed interview of 10 Institutions of Higher Education administration or individual center or institute programs regarding the financing and support provided on their campuses (completed by the Funding Options sub-committee)
5. Completed a four week on line web survey (open survey advertised to UMB campus and other interested parties). Received 37 responses from the web survey from a range of individuals
6. Received 10 letters from UMB and outside parties regarding the activities of the Taskforce
7. Total of 8 meetings for all Taskforce members and multiple meeting of sub-committee groups and 5 meetings of leads of sub-committees
8. Open forum to UMB community by taskforce (3/27 from 2:00 to 3:30) to share preliminary recommendations of the report to the Provost for final input from UMB community (60 attended along with 9 taskforce members)
9. Meeting with sub-committee leads scheduled for May 29th at 2:00PM to complete recommendations to be included in final report based on input from all sources
10. Formal report submitted to the Provost on 4/3.
11. Follow up meeting with Provost and full membership of Taskforce in one week (if schedules allow) after the presentation of the report to the Provost

Appendix G: Definition of Sub-Committees of Taskforce

Classification of Centers and Institutes (C&I): *discussion of the categories of C&I based on the aspects of campus mission they support (e.g. student success, research, community engagement, synergistic); key definitional elements and characteristics of each; how are they organized including appropriate reportage and responsibility (department, Dean or Provost); the types of financial structures that would be used to support them over time and expectations.*

Funding options: *generate information and ideas about how to increase funding for C&I with reference to their missions. The sub-committee will approach these goals by collecting information from a list of peer institutions, our own experiences and through information provided by university and community stakeholders. The work of the sub-committee is guided by the following questions: 1) what university resources are available to assist C&I's with growing external funding? 2) what are the activities that may lead to obtaining external funding sources to complement university support for C&I? 3), what are the incentives that should be considered for persons seeking alternative funding?, and 4) what are some of the possible funding options for C&I based on mission?*

Evaluation guidelines for C&I: *With regard to the evaluation of centers and institutes for a range of critical decisions regarding matters such as creation and dissolution, university funding and support, performance, etc., the sub-committee will focus on the following:*

1. *What criteria should be considered in evaluating institutes and centers, e.g., mission and purpose, constituencies, productivity, funding sources, student and faculty engagement, ability to leverage resources, personnel, impact and reputation, community engagement, historical factors, etc.?*
2. *What data and evidence should be utilized in evaluating centers and institutes?*
3. *What processes should be instituted for evaluating centers and institutes? Among the reviews where processes for evaluations may be developed are annual reviews, budget reviews, periodic AQUAD like reviews, etc.*
4. *Who should be involved in evaluating centers and institutes?*

Appendix H: Additional Options from Funding Options Sub-Committee

Funding Options: Potential Funding, Fundraising, and Cost Reduction Strategies

A. University Support

The University could provide funding for operational and related costs through a process of evaluation and negotiation with C&I's. In this way, the University might see itself as an external funder or granting agency with the expectation that some outputs of C&I may be monetized while other outputs may not be monetized, but are still valuable to the University. The University should regularly evaluate the returns on its investment, and may increase or decrease its funding support as a result of periodic evaluations. As such, the following represent some potential options:

1. Direct funding to support operations of C&I's to help the University meet its mission, especially those parts of the mission that are difficult or impossible to monetize and/or those parts of the mission for which external funding is unlikely or insufficient (e.g., engagement with and service provided to members and organizations of vulnerable communities, support provided to state and local governmental agencies; C&I's help in recruitment of faculty). Many corporations are currently monetizing "Goodwill" through Corporate Social Responsibility offices and staff – institutions of higher learning can do the same through thoughtful deliberations and valuation efforts

2. Cost of personnel (Directors who are not TT faculty and staff) who provide support to the academic missions of colleges and departments could be accounted for on the budgets of these academic units (e.g., if a center or institute business manager provides support to a department, some portion of the business manager's salary and fringe benefits should be part of the academic unit budget). The benefits from these personnel for the mission and fundraising objectives of the C&Is should still remain with the Provost for function integrity evaluation purposes however.

3. C&I Directors with appropriate credentials, skills and knowledge may teach courses in relevant academic units. The extent of university support is to be determined based on course load reduction policies (CLR's are available to tenure track faculty with defined teaching loads). For some Directors, funding lines could be partially or fully budgeted to academic units when these Directors contribute to the mission of academic units. The ability of a director to attain new extramural funds for their C&I should be rewarded with reconsideration of their teaching loads to their affiliated college to increase C&I revenue growth in the future. This option represents an opportunity for UMass Boston students to take courses taught

by someone on the cutting edge of certain issues which also improves our ability to recruit students.

4. C&I Directors may fill executive-level administrative support functions. The extent of support would be based on the specific roles and time requirements. An example might be with Joiner Center. The Joiner center could support or collaborate with Enrollment Management and the Veteran's Services Office to recruit veterans from across the country and around the world.

5. The University could establish a funding ratio based on the total revenue a specific center or institute generates. Examples from peer institutions include a 3:1 or 4:1 ratio (external sources to university funding). Achieving these ratios would serve as incentives for C&I's to engage in external fundraising.

6. The University could provide support to C&I's based on their involvement in employing undergraduate and graduate students with external funds (e.g., for every research assistantship paid through external funds, C&I's receive a negotiated amount of support from the University). Employment of students helps with student recruitment, student retention, and student training.

7. Matching funds may be provided by the University in support of research and program grants, as well as foundation and donor support (this is currently done for multiple C&I's). Provost RTF funds might be used for this purpose.

8. Where possible, the University should monetize less tangible, but important contributions to the University (e.g. C&I's contribute to maintaining the University's Minority Serving Institution designation, Carnegie Community Engaged University designation, other?). Although it is difficult to estimate the financial value or return on investment of supporting these less tangible goals, it is apparent that these are university assets that generate broad benefit. One option is to estimate percentage of time that each C&I devotes to the three major categories of the University's mission and then place a value on each.

B. Indirect Cost Return from Grants and Contracts

RTF from externally funded projects could be used more aggressively to fund C&I's (currently, the University keeps 70% and returns 30% to units that generate the funding).

1. The University revisit the formula it uses for distribution of these funds to C&I's. Specifically, funded research conducted through C&Is could receive a higher share of returned indirect costs.

2. C&I's Directors be incentivized to engage in fundraising if they pursue and secure higher indirect rates (above a determined university average for C&I's) from funders that are amenable to a flexible approach to RTF levels. When successful,

the C&I's would get a larger share of RTF based on an as yet to be determined formula.

3. Distribution of RTF be evaluated within the context of whether the C&I's are located within a college or report directly to the Provost's Office. Reviewing levels of support provided to C&I's by the colleges and Provost's Office would need to be undertaken.

C. University Advancement Office (UA) and Development Funds

1. C&I directors work with UA to pursue opportunities for funding from organizations and donors when the C&I's have identified high-value prospects. UA will evaluate the feasibility of pursuing these leads and help facilitate an action plan to pursue.

2. C&I directors work to develop collaborative "themes" across units (C&I's) that attract funders or that will be of greater interest to individual corporations, foundations or high value donors.

3. C&I directors, and if they so choose, a C&I's Fundraising Committee will work UA to create a *Social Responsibility Fund*, pursue high-value prospects willing to seed the fund (e.g. $1M to $5M) and initiate a "challenge," and establish procedures and protocols for accessing these funds once established and solvent..

4. C&I directors attend webinars and/or meetings with UA to learn and understand the UA philosophy, describe the current national fundraising environment, and make suggestions for fundraising.

5. A&F and the Provost's Office continue to work to eliminate restriction on access to ESS funds and development funds. Much progress has been made over the last year, and recommend that push continue.

D. Specific Fundraising Options

1. C&I directors and staff develop Fee-for-Service programs, such as executive training programs to generate new revenue streams.

2. C&I directors work to pursue and develop Inter-Service Agreements (ISAs) with state and local government agencies as a recurring funding mechanism.

3. C&I directors work with legislators to generate NEW funding for C&I's as line items (not earmarks; that is, legislators would not be using existing funding).

4. Work to follow new or innovative funding sources that may require revision or refinement of service offerings traditionally provided by a center or institute.

E. Cost Reduction Strategies

1. C&I directors, where possible, should/shall roll operational costs into the direct funding portions of the budgets of grants and contracts (e.g., identify proportion of salary of an administrative assistant to be paid through the direct costs of projects). The Task Force recognizes that many funding agencies do not allow salaries of Full-time administrators or faculty to be supported with their funds.

2. C&I directors should/shall, where possible, participate in centralized business and grants services (e.g. in lieu of dedicated finance and administrative support for some C&I's would reduce expense profile). Total cost for shared services participation to any C&I would be determined based on level of support required or ability to "purchase" additional time.

3. C&I directors should/shall partner with academic departments to share resources and staff (e.g. Gerontology Department and Gerontology Institute represent one such model of staff sharing).

4. C&I directors that are TT faculty should/shall in lieu of CLR, treat management of C&I's as part of their "service" or "scholarly" activity.

5. Merge different units that may have similar functions and/or focus to gain some administrative efficiency.

6. The ideas offered above would need to be based on input from C&I's.