

# Implementation Guidelines for Sections 7 and 8

With reference to the Lakehead University document entitled “POLICIES & PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRES AND RESEARCH INSTITUTES” approved by Lakehead University Senate February 27, 2004, the following text represents the implementation guidelines for sections 7 and 8 regarding the reporting requirements and review procedures for Research Centres and Institutes (*hereinafter ‘Research Centres and Institutes’ will be referred to as the ‘Centre’*).

## **SECTION 7: Annual Report of the Centre**

By June 30<sup>th</sup> of each year, all Centre Directors are required to submit annual reports to the Office of the Vice President, Research, Economic Development & Innovation (VP REDI). The Office of the VP (REDI) will in turn forward a review summary of all Centre reports including a list of those Centres slated for review to the Senate Research Committee.

The annual report of the Centre contains information which:

1. describes the original purpose of the Centre and includes a list of the specific objectives established since the previous annual report or when the Centre was established. If the original purpose of the Centre has changed substantially, it explains the nature and reasons for the change;
2. lists members of the Centre by category (whether, for example, the members are faculty, post-doctoral fellows or students), and provides an indication of their administrative contribution to the Centre, if any. It should also include the support staff employed by the Centre;
3. lists research projects of the Centre, accompanied by summary tables of relevant grants and contract funding (both active and pending);
4. describes the most important scholarly activities undertaken by the Centre during the preceding year. It should emphasize progress towards achieving the five-year objectives of the Centre rather than the activities of individual members. It is essential to provide information on publications, research support, prizes and awards, patents, licenses, research infrastructure, organization of scholarly events, involvement of visiting scholars and so forth;
5. describes the continuing education activities undertaken by the Centre as well as lists and explains the community outreach activities offered by the Centre;
6. describes the contributions made by the Centre to the training of undergraduate and graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and is accompanied by summary tables listing the names of the trainees, their supervisors, dates of training, dates of receipt of degrees and names of current employers, if appropriate and includes a list of the thesis topics of graduate students and the research projects of postdoctoral fellows;
7. provides a detailed financial statement of the Centre showing revenues and expenditures for the past fiscal year including resources provided by the University (if any), as well as other sources of support for administrative purposes;

8. describes emerging trends that may affect the future activities and operations of the Centre, and provides a brief one year plan and a progress report on the original five-year plan of the Centre identifying future research directions, proposed budget and development strategies.

**In the year that the Centre is due for review**, the Centre's Annual Report will also contain the following additional information:

9. a five-year plan which should identify future research directions and development strategies;
10. letters of support from appropriate faculty deans and other stakeholders indicating continued support for the Centre; and
11. the names of up to three internal and three external appraisers who are deemed competent to assess the work of the Centre and who normally have not collaborated with any member of the Centre during the past six years. The Director will also submit a list of any individuals the University should not contact.

## **SECTION 8: Review Procedures**

The review procedure of Centres can involve several steps. Each of these steps is described below:

### ***A. Review Panel:***

The Senate Research Committee (SRC) in consultation with the Office of the VP (REDI) will appoint a Review Panel consisting of four members. The members of the panel will be selected from the following sectors:

1. One member of the SRC from a related discipline as the Centre;
2. One member as selected by the Office of the Vice President, Research;
3. One member from the list of names provided by the Centre Director in the Annual Report; and
4. One Lakehead University Research Centre Director who falls under the same Tri-Council Funding agency as the Centre being reviewed.

### ***B. Internal Review Process:***

Concentrating on the target areas outlined in Appendix A, the Review Panel will conduct an internal review to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the Centre. Within 30 days of completing the internal review, the Review Panel will prepare an Internal Review Summary, which will contain the following information:

1. a summary of the present status of the Centre, including a feasibility assessment of future projects and activities;
2. one of the following recommendations, supported by a detailed explanation:
  - 2.1. continuation of the Centre in its present form or with enhanced support;
  - 2.2. continuation of the Centre but with a strong recommendation for improvement followed by another internal review in 1-2 years; or
  - 2.3. closure of the Centre (through amalgamation, phasing out or termination);

The Review Panel will also assign one of the following ratings to the Centre under review:

- Excellent – having met most or all of the applicable criteria;
- Good – but need to address some deficiencies in the applicable criteria; or

- Unsatisfactory – with serious deficiencies in terms of the applicable criteria.

The Review Panel will submit their Internal Review Summary to the Centre Director who will have 30 days to provide a written commentary on the summary. The Internal Review Summary and Director's written commentary will be forwarded to the Senate Research Committee for discussion. Within 30 days of the receipt of the Internal Review Summary from the Review Panel, the SRC will convene to discuss its contents. The SRC will forward their recommendation to the Office of the VP (REDI). The VP (REDI) will review the SRC recommendation and with appropriate consultation, determines whether an external review is required. If an external review is not required, the VP (REDI) forwards the recommendation for continuation to the President. The President, with due considerations, forwards the recommendation to Senate for continuation of the Centre and the Centre can carry on as per the directive of the Senate.

### ***C. External Review Process:***

If the Centre is deemed not to have met one or more of the applicable criteria during the internal review, the Internal Review Committee may recommend that the SRC conduct an external review of the Centre. The Senate Research Committee in consultation with the Office of the VP (REDI) and the appointed Internal Review Panel will solicit three external appraisers, some of which may be chosen from those names provided by the Director of the Centre in the annual report. Concentrating on the target areas outlined in Appendix A, the external appraisers will conduct a review to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the Centre. Within 30 days of completing the external review, the external appraisers will prepare an External Appraisal Report, which will contain the following information:

1. a summary of the present status of the Centre, including a feasibility assessment of future projects and activities;
2. one of the following recommendations, supported by a detailed explanation:
  - 2.1. continuation of the Centre in its present form or with enhanced support;
  - 2.2. continuation of the Centre but with a strong recommendation for improvement followed by another internal review in 1-2 years; or
  - 2.3. closure of the Centre (through amalgamation, phasing out or termination);

The external appraisers will also assign one of the following ratings to the Centre under review.

- Excellent – having met all of the applicable criteria;
- Good – but need to address some deficiencies in the applicable criteria ; or
- Unsatisfactory – with serious deficiencies in terms of the applicable criteria.

The external appraisers will forward their report to the Office of the Vice-President, Research who will distribute a copy to the Director of the Centre under review for his/her comment. The Office of the Vice-President, Research must receive the Director's written commentary on the External Appraisal Report within 30 days of the receipt of the report. Additional meetings and consultations may be held, if necessary. The Office of the Vice-President, Research will forward the External Appraisers Report and the Centre Director's comments to the Review Panel for inclusion in their final report.

### ***D. The Final Review Report:***

Within 30 days of the receipt of the External Appraisers Report and the Centre Director's comments from the Office of the Vice President Research, the Review Panel is responsible for preparing the Final Review Report. This report will contain the following information:

1. a summary of the present status of the Centre, including a feasibility assessment of future projects and activities.

2. one of the following recommendations, supported by a detailed explanation:
  - 2.1. continuation of the Centre in its present form or with enhanced support;
  - 2.2. continuation of the Centre but with a strong recommendation for improvement; or
  - 2.3. closure of the Centre (through amalgamation, phasing out or termination);

The Review Panel will also assign one of the following ratings to the Centre under review:

- Excellent – having met all of the applicable criteria;
- Good – but need to address some deficiencies in the applicable criteria; or
- Unsatisfactory – with serious deficiencies in terms of the applicable criteria.

The Review Panel will submit its Final Review Report along with the Centre's Annual Report, the Internal Review Summary, the External Appraisal Report, and the Centre Director's comments to the Senate Research Committee for discussion.

***E. Adoption of the Recommendations of the Review Panel:***

Within 30 days of the receipt of the Final Report from the Review Panel, the Senate Research Committee will convene to discuss its contents. The SRC will then forward the recommendations to the Vice-President Research for further necessary action and/or decision.

If, after examination and assessment of the documentation, the recommendation of the SRC is to allow the Centre to continue operations, the SRC will forward the recommendation to the Vice President Research. With due considerations, the Vice-President Research will forward the recommendation to the President for approval. The President (or his/her designate) will forward the recommendation to Senate for further necessary action and/or decision.

If, after examination and assessment of the documentation, the recommendation of the SRC is to terminate the Centre, the SRC will forward the recommendation to the Vice President Research. With due considerations, the Vice-President Research will forward the recommendation to the President for approval. The President (or his/her designate) will forward the recommendation to Senate for further necessary action and/or decision.

In the event of a decision to terminate by Senate, the Centre will be disbanded within six months to permit the orderly termination of its responsibilities; this term will only exceed one year in exceptional circumstances.

## **APPENDIX A - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CENTRE REVIEW TARGET AREAS**

The Review Panel and External Appraisers will base their review on the target areas outlined below to assess the extent to which the Centre concerned is achieving its objectives, and judge its potential for future contributions to research excellence at Lakehead University. The reviewers will examine the Centre's annual report, meet with the Director of the Centre, research groups, faculty deans, departmental chairs, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students and support staff associated with the Centre. The review will ascertain whether or not:

- the reasons for establishing the Centre still remain compelling;
- the research, teaching and community outreach activities (if any) of the Centre are well developed;
- the Centre is actively seeking and securing external research funding; and
- the Centre has aligned itself with the overall goals and objectives of the Strategic Research Plan of Lakehead University.

### **Target Areas:**

#### ***A. Research Output and Publications***

The primary contribution of a Centre resides in the research capacity generated by its members beyond what they would produce if the Centre did not exist. The following points are to be taken into consideration when judging the quality of research:

- i. Publication of original work in any of the following:
  - quality refereed journals
  - books, subject to refereeing and/or subsequent review in professional and/or academic publications
  - refereed proceedings of major national and international conferences, particularly when someone from the Centre was invited as a plenary or keynote speaker
- ii. Research support: grants and/or other sources of financial assistance related to the members associated with the Centre
- iii. Prizes/awards
- iv. Patents and licensing
- v. Organization of international scholarly events
- vi. Participation of visiting scholars
- vii. New research infrastructure (such as laboratories, equipment, libraries and databases).

#### ***B. Contribution to Teaching and Training of Highly Qualified Personnel***

Of particular interest in assessing the value and relevance of a Centre is its contribution to research supervision of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. This contribution should

be on a par with, or superior to that of, a good graduate department. For research facilities, contribution to research supervision may or may not be one of its goals and thus this section may be omitted for those research Centres where research supervision is not a goal. The following criteria will be used to evaluate research supervision at a Centre:

- i. Does the Centre enhance and support opportunities for discussions and meetings between research supervisors, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows?
- ii. Does the Centre have resources available to students beyond those accessible through their graduate programs?
- iii. Does the Centre create and support opportunities for students to publish or present at Centre-organized events?
- iv. Does the Centre improve employment prospects for students, for example through networking events and services?

### ***C. Public and Professional Activities***

Public and professional activities include sponsoring or participating in conferences and symposia; editing academic journals and books; acting in an advisory capacity on public commissions, boards and task forces; preparing special reports and working papers; being a member of an editorial board of a refereed journal; and so forth. The nature and type of service to the community will vary depending on the area of interest of the Centre.

### ***D. Research Collaborations***

The review will consider whether the Centre maintains appropriate links with other Centres within the University and externally with other universities, industries and not-for-profit organizations. The appraisers will review the web site of the Centre and assess whether it is meeting the expectations of the University, the scientific community and the public at large with respect to presentation, organization and information. Appraisers will assess the effectiveness of the external advisory committee, if one exists.

### ***E. Financial Viability and Administrative Efficiency***

- i. The administrative organization must be satisfactory and the leadership strong and effective.
- ii. Sufficient support staff should be employed to ensure the effective operation of the Centre, facility and institute.
- iii. The Centre's offices and installations must be appropriate to its work.
- iv. The administrative budget, including all external and internal sources, should be adequate.