**Report of Taskforce on Centers and Institutes**

*(Submitted April 3, 2019)*

1. **Background of issue**
	1. *Overview of Centers and Institutes*

Research Universities nationally have relied of the utilization of centers and institutes (C&Is) as a way of addressing both opportunities and challenges in the arenas of research, teaching and community service. Such entities are organizational forms designed to further the university's instructional, research, and public service missions in ways that cannot be addressed through traditional structures, such as departments, schools, and colleges. While not duplicating the activities and mission of departments, schools, and colleges and building upon their transdisciplinary orientations, C&Is are viewed by many research universities as providing an ability to 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” contributions to students, faculty and the broader community. Resources of C&Is often include external supports in conjunction with internal resources.

The broad overview of the C&Is at UMass Boston shows that the considerable variability in scope and function with a number engaged in supporting the research, teaching and services activities of the University. There are many diverse communities that benefit from the activities of the C&Is of the University and the faculty and staff involved with the C&Is are committed to the mission of both the University and the mission of their respective C&Is. The need for more success in securing external supports is also an area that was noted by several as important.

As is noted in the Charge to the Taskforce on Centers and Institutes Interim Provost Emily McDermott notes that these entities are central to both the research and service provided by the UMass Boston. The Taskforce agrees with the Interim Provost and heard from numerous sources, those in C&Is, faculty aligned with them, students engaged in research and services as well as the many communities that are and have benefited from the research, teaching and services of the many UMass Boston C&Is.

* 1. *Budget and climate issues for UMB*

Over the past three years several complex budget issues have emerged placing considerable stress on the operation of the University. Mandates from the UMass System that the university must achieve an operating margin consistent with the Board-Approved Budget of 0%, as measured by audited financial results for the fiscal year and eventually complying with the 2% operating margin by 2023 have required UMass Boston’s administration and leadership to examine all areas of operation.

As part of the budget balancing process a determination was made by the administration to establish glide paths that would outline a phased budget reduction process for a number of the C&Is that were showing a greater than average contribution to the overall University’s deficit. Concerns about the deficit as well as concerns about the processes used to address the role that operations of the C&Is play both in the programs at the University and in the budget were expressed by many internal to the C&Is, in the administration of the university as well as in the community constituent groups in and outside of the University.

The origins of some of these C&Is came from the legislature in some cases and in others from funds received from interested parties as well as grants and contracts from multiple sources. Some of the current C&Is are closely linked to the unique mission of UMass Boston and its strong social justice and human rights perspectives as well as the many and diverse racial and ethnic communities and cultures represented in its student body and adjoining communities of Greater Boston, the state, nationally and internationally. Other institutes have been more focused on issues affecting selected groups of individuals (e.g., women, veterans, persons with disabilities, etc.), economic stability, arts and expression, science and economic stability, the environment, equality of opportunity, community inclusion and many other thematic areas. In addition to the variations in the foundational impetus and support for the various C&Is there is also considerable variability in both the focus as well as the scope and resources across each. Some have a shared financial base of UMB support and external funding while others have a range of external support and still others have much more significant UMass Boston support.

1. **Nature of Centers and Institutes (C&Is)**
	1. *Brief description of number of C&I*

The UMass Boston web page notes that there are ‘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’ (see Appendix A: List of Institutes and Centers). These C&Is are grouped under three major headings: (1) free standing, (2) collective leadership teams appointed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and (3) college or department based. In the list of free-standing C&Is, 10 such entities are noted; for those appointed by the Provost, there are seven reported; and for the college and department group there are 32 C&Is noted. In a closer review of this list some of the reported C&Is are either disbanded or inactive and there are probably closer to 36 C&Is at UMass Boston.

* 1. *Past budget reductions*

In September 2017 the Provost initiated a process to reduce the level of support provided to 15 of the 17 C&Is establishing a systematic budget reduction process or glide path that would, over a five-year period, lead to a point where these C&Is would be considered self-sufficient. Between October 2017 and January 2018, a series of meeting were held with those 15 center and institute directors and staffs regarding the need for a Glide Path. In February 2018, letters explaining the resulting five-year glide paths were sent to 14 of these C&Is, one was sent on April 5, 2018. Considerable concerns were expressed by the C&Is as well as external constituent groups and elected officials to the administration. In September 2018, and in response to a legislative requirement, the University responded to the state elected officials that given the current structural deficits the University was working to eliminate while maintaining student recruitment, retention and success as its highest priority, would need to address this deficit across several different areas including through reductions in the support provided to these C&Is. Several C&Is prepared a response to the University’s letter to the legislative leadership that contested the characterization of the extent and content of the University’s actions and the basis for the cuts in support.

In 2018 with the above referenced budget issues facing the university the administration reviewed selected historical revenue and expense data to identify those C&Is that were reporting a greater than $60K excess of expense over income (a deficit). There were a total of 17 C&Is identified. There was not concurrence regarding the revenue and expense data among some of the C&Is. There were 19 C&Is that either did not present with a deficit or had a deficit of less than $60K in that fiscal period. Of those the surplus (10 such C&Is) ranged from in excess of $1M to less than $50K. For those showing a deficit the range was from $60K up to $650K. For many of the C&Is that had a deficit of 60K when examining the budget there was a clear indication that they had some level of external support other than UMass Boston monies. In fact, seven of the 17 identified C&Is had about one half of their budget coming from external sources and another four had nearly half of their revenue from external or non-UMass Boston sources. The remaining were reliant predominantly on UMass Boston revenues.

The business models developed by the Provost office for each of these C&Is was assessed across a series of criteria to develop and implement phased reductions through fiscal year 2023. These plans were designed to expand or develop new/innovative revenue sources with both the C&Is and the university through the University Advancement Office. The intended results of the implementation of these plans include: (1) evaluating the details and level of support provided by the university; (2) ensuring the proper apportionment of faculty and staff time between a center or institute and the applicable home college or other funding source(s); (3) developing strategies to build new revenue sources and create greater financial self-sufficiency; and (4) considering the C&I’s contributions to the university’s academic, research and community engagement missions.

* 1. *Current and ongoing challenges:*

The development of the glide paths presented a considerable challenge to the C&Is impacted as it led to a reduction in resources that could be essential to their efforts at securing external funding. With reduction in support, the capacity to seek out alternative funding seemed, to many of the C&I directors and staff, to be a daunting challenge. Equally challenging was the engagement of the University Advancement Office as it was in its early stages of redevelopment. At the same time, the University continued to wrestle with closing a structural deficit that necessitated the development of budget reductions that would help bring the University into compliance with the Board of Trustees and the UMass system directives for delivering a balanced budget as well as continuing to maintain a high-priority on student support/success and tuition management.

1. **Establishment of Taskforce**
	1. *Charge to Taskforce*

On November 30, 2018 Interim Provost McDermott established a joint faculty and administration Taskforce on Centers and Institutes. The Charge to the Taskforce was: (1) to identify a definitional strategy that would serve as a guide to classifying the C&Is at UMass Boston now and in the future, (2) discuss funding options that would be relevant for C&Is to consider and (3) consider the design of periodic evaluation of C&Is that would provide guidance on the mission, programs and financial structures that C&Is should adopt and be evaluated against annually as well as over five year period (see Appendix B: Charge to Taskforce on Centers and Institutes). The Taskforce was to provide guidance to the Interim Provost and not be considered as setting policy for the University. Within the charge, however, the Interim Provost noted that the recommended guidelines shall be informed by and comply with the Board of Trustees’ Policy on Centers and Institutes (T96-066). The Taskforce also felt that similar advice regarding existing UMass Boston policies relating to C&Is should also serve as a guide in our activities. Thus, the Taskforce felt strongly that this charge would consider and take note of existing policies for the UMass System (T96-066) as well as the UMass Boston policy on C&Is (See Appendix C: Policy on Institutes and Centers, University of Massachusetts Boston [September 1994 revised May 200]; and Appendix D: University of Massachusetts Policy on Centers and Institutes T96-096).

Within the UMass Boston Policy under the Governance and Administration section there is a call for the establishment of an ‘Institutes and Centers Council’ and notes this Council be composed of the directors of all campus C&Is. Furthermore, 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*. It is the strong recommendation of the Taskforce that such a Council be immediately established, and that in addition to the description of the activities of the Council that note should be taken that this Council or a subcommittee of the Council be charged with the responsibility of exploring external funding options and opportunities and that this body work closely with University Advancement in this area.

* 1. *Membership of Taskforce*

The Taskforce membership reflects representation from leaders in the C&Is (five members from centers or institutes from a variety of areas), the administration (five members from administration including representatives from the Provost’s office as well as Administration and Finance) and four members from the faculty who have had experience in securing external funding for research and scholarly pursuits. The Chair of the taskforce has more than 46 years in working in and/or directing an Institute at Children’s Hospital and then UMass Boston.

1. **Approach of taskforce**
	1. *Data gathering processes used*

Upon receiving the Charge on November 30th, the Taskforce launched its first conference call on December 19, 2018. This initial meeting reviewed the charge and set in place a strategy to accomplish the tasks at hand. It was the feeling of all that the process of the Taskforce must be transparent and engage the many interested parties including staff and faculty of the C&Is, faculty of the University, other interested staff from the University, UMass Boston students, community constituents, elected officials as well as the leadership of the University. The overall approach included the following: (1) an initial on line survey of several peer Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to UMass Boston to identify current practices in 17 IHEs around the themes of definition of C&I, evaluation practices and funding opportunities (see Appendix E: Summary of Search Across Peer Institutions), (2) development of a series of conference calls for the full membership of the Taskforce, (3) establishment of listening sessions for the full UMB community as well as other interested parties (a total of three such listening sessions), (4) a separate open listening and discussion session for faculty and staff who are working in the C&Is, (5) a web survey that was open to all for a thirty day period gathering information in the three areas of interest to the Taskforce (definitions, evaluation and funding options) as well as any other topics of interest to visitors to this open web survey, (6) a meeting between the funding sub-committee and Adam Wise and Ryan McDonald of the University Advancement office, (7) a community meeting open to all to present initial recommendations from the Taskforce and also gather more specific suggestions from the community (this was our last input session), and (8) a post-report meeting with UMass Boston Interim Provost after the presentation of the report (within one week, if possible, and preferably involving all Taskforce members). Additionally, it should be noted that the sub-committee on funding options reached out to 14 IHEs interviewing or receiving information in the funding options area.

In total 17 IHEs were involved in the web search to collect information related to their research center and institute activities; 14 representatives from the IHEs were interviewed for more specific funding information; 152 people attended the listening sessions with 54 presenting verbal and written testimony; 69 staff from C&Is attended a special meeting (representing 11 of the 49 C&Is with five additional indicating conflicts in schedule that did not allow them to patriciate); 37 responded to the on-line web survey; 17 letters were received from outside parties; 69 attended the open meeting of the Taskforce; and the full taskforce met eight times with an additional five meetings held by the leads in the sub-committees. For a more detailed listing of these specific activities, including dates of each event, see Attachment F: List of Activities of Taskforce.

* 1. *Sub-committees developed*

In the initial meeting it was the feeling of the taskforce that the charge lent itself to the development of sub-committees, and that three such subcommittees should be developed: (1) definitions; (2) evaluation; and (3) funding options. For each sub-committee two Taskforce members were invited to serve as leads for each of the sub-committees. In addition, sub-committees were encouraged to engage other staff or faculty who might be interested in participating (this happened for two sub-committees). The intent was that the non-Taskforce members of the sub-committee would be actively engaged in the discussions but not be considered members of the Taskforce, and thus not attend the taskforce meetings. In addition to the leads for the sub-committees, any taskforce member could serve on one or more of these sub-committees and this did happen in all instances. The definitions of the sub-committee were developed by the leads and shared with the taskforce (see Appendix G: Definition of Sub-Committees). The meeting schedule for the Taskforce meetings, as well as the dates of the listening sessions and open meetings, are provided in Appendix F: List of Activities of Taskforce.

1. **Review of Sub-Committee Findings**

The following section provides an overview of the activities of the three sub-committees of the Taskforce: Definition, Evaluation and Funding Options. The sub-committees reviewed relevant materials from the peer IHEs that were provided (17 IHEs with more than half considered a peer institution to UMass Boston). Each sub-committee developed a scope of work that was consistent with the overall charge of the Taskforce, but that had a clear focus on its respective area. The sub-committees were developed in the first month of the Taskforce and met regularly through the three subsequent months of the Taskforce. In addition to the sub-committee meetings, there were regular Taskforce meetings at which each of the sub-committees provided a brief report on their activities.

While there was considerable conversation about the 15 C&Is that were identified as having a deficit greater than $60K, considerations of the Taskforce purposely included discussions and issues applicable to all the C&Is at UMass Boston. The guidance that is provided by the sub-committees, as well as in the recommendations, at the end of this report are intended to be applied to all C&Is now and in the future at UMass Boston.

*Definition sub-committee discussions:*The definition sub-committee noted in its deliberation that the centers and institutes vary in size, purpose and funding sources. They came into being at different times and under different policies and circumstances. The policies in place have not always been uniformly implemented. Additionally, the reporting authority of the current centers and institutes varies considerably.

UMass Boston’s C&Is are important catalysts to this culture of collaboration, and each play a different but integral role in encouraging innovative scholarship, providing service to society, and strengthening the University’s performance as a nationally recognized research university. UMass Boston’s C&Is provide faculty, students and staff with opportunities to engage in research, training and public service in a myriad of subject areas, bridging discipline silos, while fostering new knowledge that transforms the quality of life in Boston and beyond.

Taking these differences into consideration, the sub-committee recommends that there be a classification system that includes five areas: (1) Research and Training Centers and Institutes, (2) Public Service Centers and Institutes, (3) Degree Granting Centers and Institutes, (4) Academic Support Centers and Institutes and (5) Fee-based Centers and Institutes.

1. Research and Training Centers and Institutes:The primary mission of Research and Training C&Is is to conduct and foster research, and, thereby, provide mentoring and training of students, while frequently generating external grant (and gift) funding for such research. These C&Is may also provide access to specialized facilities to other campus researchers to conduct interdisciplinary research, scholarship, technology transfer, and economic development.
2. Public Service Centers and Institutes: The primary mission of Public Service C&Is is to provide service to communities embraced by UMass Boston’s mission as a public research university with an urban mission. They are typically interdisciplinary and often conduct research and training but have a primary mission to serve the people of Boston and its environs, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and beyond. Legislators and the citizens of Massachusetts may expect that these units will provide service, often at no or minimal charge.
3. Degree Granting Centers and Institutes:The primary mission of Degree Granting C&Is is to serve as a developing program of study, such that it operates much like an academic department. As such, Degree Granting C&Is would be primarily supported by general operating funds. If once a Degree Granting C&I begins to evolve and include/require research as a primary function, reclassification may be considered appropriate.
4. Academic Support Centers and Institutes:The primary mission of Academic Support C&Is is to assist students in their academic programs, not necessarily specific to any major or discipline, such as advising centers, math and writing centers. They are likely to be supported with general revenue funds, but may also receive support from grants, gifts, or student fees.
5. Fee‐based Centers and Institutes:The primary mission of Fee-based C&Is is to provide services in exchange for fees. They may also receive grants or contracts to provide some of their services. The expectation is that C&Is that are primarily fee-based should be self-supporting.

Some, and indeed, most C&Is may engage in activities that fall into more than one of the above classifications. In cases where a center or institute, in addition to the activities associated with its primary classification, substantially engages in one or more other activities, it may be assigned a primary classification and one or more secondary classifications, as may be appropriate.

Additionally, many C&Is mentor and/or train undergraduate and graduate students. Such C&Is may include students in their research, community outreach, or support services, and may provide internships and/or stipends if appropriate and available. In fulfilling the role of mentoring and training students, C&Is may be eligible for additional institutional support (e.g. general operating funds), since not all aspects of the mentoring and training functions can be supported by external funds. Considerations of funding and evaluation should be based upon each center and institute’s primary classification and, when applicable and/or appropriate, its secondary classifications as well.

The definition sub-committee suggests that a Centers and Institutes Council, composed of a subset of the directors of C&Is, be established. The council’s purposes include promoting communication across C&Is, and between C&Is and University administration. The council will also facilitate the sharing and adoption of best practices including identifying opportunities to advance research and training, expand public service, and optimize external funding. This includes working in close collaboration with University Advancement.

In its discussions the members of the sub-committee as well as the members of the Taskforce felt strongly that the definition system is not to determine level of funding as much as to provide an overview of the various activities of C&Is. Some of the activities that are directly related to the UMass Boston mission (teaching and student engagement) would be potentially considered activities that are financially supported by UMB.

This guidance applies to C&Is engaged in the activities described above. Other units, while bearing the title center or institute, such as the University Health Services Counseling Center, are not governed by this definition of C&Is that is being proposed.

*Evaluation sub-committee discussions:*The evaluation sub-committeecharge was broad and intended to frame a strategy for measuring the activities of C&Is for purposes of monitoring and documenting impacts and outcomes annually as well as over a longer period (the five-year review). The sub-committee explored a range of critical decisions regarding matters such as creation and dissolution, university funding and support, performance metrics, etc., and focused on the following:

1. What criteria should be considered in evaluating C&Is, 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 C&Is?
3. What processes should be instituted for evaluating C&Is? Among the reviews where processes for evaluations may be developed are annual reviews, budget reviews, periodic AQUAD like reviews, etc.

Given the scope and importance of the evaluation process the sub-committee felt that there should be a range of variables that are collected and reported on by C&Is as part of their annual report as well as their five-year review process. The sub-committee grouped these variables into three areas: funding, scholarly products and their dissemination, and engaging communities (public service).

Within the funding areas some of the key variables would include but not necessarily be limited to level of external funding, direct support from UMass Boston, sources of funding (amount and duration); number of proposals designed, developed, submitted and funded; nature of engagement of faculty and or staff; range of funding sources (public, private); actual sources (name and title of entities or sources); and a brief synopsis of all applications and status that are funded, in review, or not funded. In addition to funds that a center or institute may secure that go fully and directly to that center and institute it is critical that some recognition be accorded to funds raised for projects that may not directly and fully be engaged in by the center or institute but nonetheless benefit the campus.

In scholarly and teaching efforts, potential variables could include a list of all publications and status, such as: in development, submitting, in review or published; items designed or developed and disseminated (art, community reports, media coverage etc.); presentations (panels, media, community meetings and events other); memberships (individual as well as group that are professional, community or individual); and intellectual and related properties developed, should all be considered

In considering levels of community engagement and/or public service, variables such as: programs designed and developed; projects implemented; community entities participating and nature of that participation; committees formed and nature of committee membership and focus; public participation in policy and or practice development; testimony provided; community organizing and community organization participation and the nature of this participation; reports of impact on community engagement; and public service activities and media outcomes and impacts noted should all be considered

Other potential areas of measurement include engagement of students, number of guest lectures, student advising role, participation on dissertation/thesis/final project committees, number of student internships provided, number of research assistantships provided, level of student tuition support, number of Research Assistants or Graduate assistants funded externally, number of mentees, etc., campus activities (committee membership, service contributions, events participating in, forums etc.), other IHEs, public and private organizations and agencies, community groups and organizations, neighborhood communities, awards and recognitions received.

In remaining consistent with current UMass Boston policies these evaluations could include the review of annual plans as well as five-year reviews In the latter reviews external members should be included in the review process, and should include individuals from organizations, associations or community groups that have direct knowledge or are beneficiaries of the C&I activities, as well as content experts from other IHEs and organization having knowledge in the program areas of the center and or institute being reviewed. All annual plans as well as the five-year reviews should be reviewed and commented on by the administration of the University in a timely fashion providing feedback to the center or institute.

Based upon the results of the annual evaluation there should be a discussion with the C&I director as well as UMass Boston administration to confirm or adjust those services that are requested to be supported by UMass Boston, and those that should rely on eternal funds and resources. Also, this annual review should provide the C&Is with clear information on their contributions and relevance to the mission of the university and the satisfaction of the university with the performance of the institute or center. At any point where there is apparent lack of accomplishment based upon the goals and objectives of the annual plan or documentation of limited performance on the five-year review, a determination by the University administration can be rendered and a process of termination of the center activities initiated. This process will include the administration of the center and/or institute as well as the university administration.

*Funding Options sub-committee discussions:* The funding subcommittee noted that there is no single model used by peer institutions for funding C&I’s. Nor did the sub-committee identify any evidence to suggest that universities rely upon generalized rules to determine funding. For example, our review of several other IHEs did not suggest any norm or best practice regarding self-sufficiency for C&Is. Some universities are very supportive in terms of providing funding for their C&I’s, while others are much less supportive or committed.

Within UMass Boston the sub-committee noted in its discussions that considerable variability in the capabilities of the C&Is to secure external funding exists, but most do understand the importance of this activity now and moving forward. It was also noted that some of the limitations that C&Is are experiencing are based upon their relative size and not having the administrative support or expertise to develop proposals and continue to maintain the day to day activities. As in the case of the definition sub-committee the funding options sub-committee noted that levels of funding must be determined not by definition but by analysis of activities provided and linked to the mission of the university. Given this, it is imperative that the C&Is administration have active engagement with the University administration addressing activities undertaken and activities supported as well as level of support on an annual basis.

Given the changing fiscal climate and the need to increase the ability of C&Is to secure external support, there is a need to identify administrative support options that can be provided where limited administrative resources exists within C&Is. Additionally, it is urgent that the activities of the C&Is that are to be paid for through University resources (teaching, mentoring, administrative activities for the University) be identified and considered part of the annual planning of all C&Is. There was some discussion about establishing a minimum allocation to support all C&Is from university funding (possibly a 1 to 4 or 1 to 3 ratio of university supports to external supports), but there remains a challenge in monetizing and establishing the activities of the C&I directors and staff such that those that are truly based in the mission of the university could potentially be supported through university resources. This determination year-to-year may be part of the annual conversation with the C&I leadership, and that of the university in the coming years.

There should be some incentive system considered that would simulate increased interest among C&Is in securing external funds in the coming years. Options such as the creation of a Social Responsibility Fund or a standing Development Committee that is part of the Council on Centers and Institutes may be strategies to consider. Other considerations for creating incentives would be expanding the use of Research Trust Funds (possibly having a variable level of return of indirect to the C&Is) or offering administrative support in the areas of grant and budget development, and in the identification of external funding opportunities based upon levels of expertise available in the C&Is.

University Advancement is being reorganized at UMass Boston. In the future, UA may be able to play a much larger role than in prior years as the core area of interest and capacity emerge from the C&Is, and they are able to be linked to the outreach efforts by UA. Other activities that can generate fee for service revenue, Inter-Service Agreements with public entities and membership efforts may be sources of revenue for C&Is.

The funding options sub-committee also noted that efforts in balancing budgets may also be accomplished through more effective management of the costs of the C&Is. Such efforts as noted above around the provision of centralized services addressing the administration and budget development of proposals could be very beneficial to several of the C&Is and potentially reduce or control costs. Other options include the increased role of the administration and C&Is in the collaborative approaches around common themes such as conflict resolution, community inclusion, cross generation projects. The Taskforce noted that there were several C&Is that appeared to have such shared interests but limited collaboration across C&Is. Also, in the development of proposals for external support some of the personnel costs (program, support and administration) may be able to be placed on the budgets that are being submitted thus reducing costs to the University. Finally, a more streamlined effort to support shared projects across multiple centers and institutes especially in shared indirect recovery would be appropriate to consider (See Appendix H: Additional Funding Options from Funding Options Sub-Committee)

1. **Recommendations and Implementation steps**

The following section lists the recommendations and provides possible implementation timeline for the recommendations. The steps are organized under three key groups: administration, Institutes and Centers Council, and the C&Is (individually and/or collectively). Each of these recommendations as presented suggests a key step that each group can take to increase the capability of the C&Is to carry out their important roles for the university and the communities, expand their research, teaching and community service activities and increase their levels of and capacity to raise external funding.

The recommendations are built upon the information gathered from the peer IHEs, the content offered from the listening sessions, the reflections of the C&Is faculty and staff at their open meeting, the content received from the web survey addressing the three key areas of the taskforce charge (definition, evaluation and funding options) and finally the content derived from the town hall type meeting convened by the Taskforce to share initial recommendations with parties at UMass Boston and other interested parties.

The recommendations are offered as guidance to the Interim Provost and in response to the charge provided to the Taskforce on Centers and Institutes. Additionally, they reflect alignment with the policies that are already in place at the UMass System as well as UMass Boston.

*Recommendations for the Administration*

These recommendations are proposed to be implemented by the administration of the University (primarily the Office of the Provost and its staff) and include the following:

-Establish a **Council for Institutes and Centers.** This council be composed of the directors of all campus C&Is with the primary purpose of promoting communication across institutes, responding to campus policy and governance issues, and encouraging growth and development of the C&Is. Ex-officio membership from the Office of the Provost as well as the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance as well as University Advancement should be considered as participants with the Council. To accomplish its tasks the Taskforce would recommend that a sub-committee structure be utilized and that there be an executive committee elected from its membership. The terms of membership will be three years with a phase in of the membership. This task should be initiated immediately.

-Establish a **Central Business and Grant Services Group.** This entity can support the free-standing C&Is in completing the financial and administrative business and grant functions associated with center and institute operations. This Group should be established and operational by July 1, 2019.

-Establish a **Change in Glide-Path Trajectory**. The Provost’s Office work with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance to adjust the trajectory of the Glide Paths to 1) retain start of FY19 funding levels; 2) require development of a flat and a 3% budget reduction scenario consistent with all other entities at UMass Boston; and 3) establish key performance expectations and metrics. This will also apply to all the C&Is not on the glide path as well. Planning will begin immediately.

-Maintain C&Is as a high priority for **University Advancement.** University Advancement will identify potential external funding options based upon areas of shared interest/common themes across the C&Is, and identify potential high-value prospects including individual donors, corporations and foundations. University Advancement assist in the development of the plan for nurturing and securing interest among those sources. UA assist in training center and institute staff in presentations to potential funders. This should be implemented in two months.

-Designate a **Center and Institute Advocate** on the Provost’s Staff. This member serves as the Provost’s representative to the Council for Institutes and Centers, works with C&Is in the development of their annual plans and their five-year review, improves C&Is grant/contract proposal performance, and serves as an information resource to the Provost regarding all C&I activities and accomplishments. This appointment should be made in one month.

-Complete **Appropriate Reallocation of Center and Institute Expenses**. Identify within C&Is what activities could potentially be supported by UMass Boston resources including but not limited to teaching, administrative activities for UMass Boston, and other activities to be considered. This would be done in collaboration with the Council and completed within four months of the start of the council.

-Develop **Quarterly Reporting Outline and Variables.** The Center and Institute Advocate, work with the Council for Institutes and Centers to develop the reporting requirement for each of the C&Is. Implement plan within 6 months

-Implement process of the new **Definition of Centers and Institutes.** Put in place within the first 3 months after appointing the Center and Institute Advocate, and tie this effort to the development of the annual plans for each institute and center

*Recommendations for the Council for Institutes and Centers*

These recommendations will be implemented primarily by the Council for Institutes and Centers in collaboration with the administration of the University (primarily the Office of the Provost and its staff) include the flowing:

-Promote and identify **areas of shared interest** across multiple C&Is as well as C&Is and faculty. Begin exploring sources of support through UA and ORSP (immediate or within 30-60 days)

-Promote and launch in collaboration with UA a **Social Responsibility Fund** to support a broad range of activities in C&Is. Activities may include: matching funds of grants or donations, teaching of courses, unique recognitions [Minority Serving Institution], research support, RA support, etc. This project begins within four months of the establishment of the Council.

-Implement, in collaboration with the Provost Office, an **evaluation system for all** C&Is including annual as well as five-year reviews. This process should be completed in three months.

-Establish quarterly **review of recommendations and implementation steps** and report to the Provost on progress and any concerns. First review should be within 6 months of appointing the Council for Institutes and Centers.

*Recommendations for the Centers and Institutes at UMB*

These recommendations that will be implemented primarily by the C&Is individually and in collaboration with the administration of the University (primarily the Office of the Provost and its staff) include the flowing:

- Establish an **annual strategic plan** for program and funding activities. Within 90 days each C&Is will complete the framework of a plan and **indicate targets (percentage increase in or absolute increases) in external funding** for the current year.

- **Evaluate changing federal, state, and local funding** opportunities and/or priorities.

-Participate in **shared services** through the Central Business and Grant Services group or within the center or institute’s home college/department.

-Establish **common research themes** that are more broadly marketable to foundations, grants or contracts as well as other funding sources

-Engage and work with University Advancement to **identify potential high-value prospects** (e.g. individual donors, corporations or foundations) that may have an affinity for the center or institute work.

-Engage with and utilize **ORSP’s Pivot system** to identify, track and pursue grant and contract opportunities.

-**Strengthen integration and collaboration** with colleges, departments, other centers and institutes, individual faculty researchers, or other institutions.
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