

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
SENATE REVIEWS OF CENTRES AND INSTITUTES

**Procedures and Terms of Reference for
Committees Conducting Senate Reviews of Centres and Institutes**
(Approved by Senate February 26, 2007)

A. Objectives and Scope

The general objectives of the Senate review process are to:

- i) provide a vehicle for accountability by the university to its communities;
- ii) improve the University's academic/research and academic/research support activities;
and
- iii) provide information for planning, budgeting, and other decision-making processes.

The principal focus of the review of a Centre/Institute is to consider its academic/research plan, current performance, relationships, and contribution to the mission of the university.

The Senate Review of a Centre/Institute should consider, and where appropriate make explicit recommendations on, the following matters:

1. The appropriateness of the Centre/Institute's mission, priorities, and academic/research plan.
2. The performance of the Centre/Institute, particularly in light of its mission and academic/research plan. The review should address the extent and quality of the Centre/Institute's activities, taking into account the performance and satisfaction of faculty, staff, students, the Centre/Institute's research programs, and relations to other stakeholders.
3. The organizational structure, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Centre/Institute, including governance, administration, and human resource and financial management.
4. Implications of trends in the Centre/Institute's environment, and the Centre/Institute's role in the region.
5. The relationship between and among the constituent units, if any, of the Centre/Institute.
6. The relationships between the Centre/Institute and other units and programs at Dalhousie, including the Centre/Institute's involvement in interdisciplinary collaboration in teaching, learning, and research activities.

7. The relationships between the Centre/Institute and other units or programs in the region.
8. The physical facilities available to the Centre/Institute.
9. Community and professional service activities, and education-where applicable
10. The application of the university's equity policies within the Centre/Institute.
11. Any other issues which are identified as part of the initial mandate of the Review Committee or which arise during the deliberations of the Review Committee, provided that these are consistent with the general objectives of the Senate Centre/Institute Review process.

B. Procedures

1. After consultation with the Dean of the Faculty or the Vice-President Research, the Vice-Chair of Senate shall propose to the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee (SAPBC), a three-year schedule of reviews. Wherever possible, the schedule of Senate Reviews shall be coordinated with decanal and accreditation reviews.
2. In January of the year in which a Centre/Institute is to be reviewed, the Dean of the Faculty (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) will consult with the Director of the Centre/Institute and determine a mutually agreed upon list of potential nominees for the position of Chair of the Review Committee. The Dean will approach the potential candidates in order of priority until the position is filled. The Chair of a Review Committee shall be a Dalhousie faculty member with a primary appointment in a unit other than the Centre/Institute under review.
3. Once the chair of the Committee is determined the Chair of the Committee, the Dean of the Faculty (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) will consult with the Director of the Centre/Institute and determine a mutually agreed upon list of potential nominees for other members of the Committee. Normally, each Review Committee shall include three faculty members plus the Chair, none of whom shall have a principal appointment in the Centre/Institute under review, a student in the Centre/Institute (if appropriate).
4. Each Review Committee shall consult with the Dean, the President, the Vice-President Academic and Provost, the Vice-President Research, and the Dean of Graduate Studies to identify any specific issues which should be addressed in the review. The SAPBC may also relay to the Review Committee any specific issues which it believes should be examined.

5. The Review Committee, in consultation with the Director of the Centre/Institute, shall select two external reviewers from outside the University. If the Review Committee and the Director are unable to reach an agreement on the selection of external reviewers, the Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) shall select reviewers from lists of names proposed separately by the Review Committee and by the Director.
6. Prior to the end of June, the Centre/Institute shall submit a self-study that includes:
 - a. a report that addresses the matters identified in Section A;
 - b. a new or revised academic/research plan;
 - c. commentary on specific issues identified in step 4. above;
 - d. identification of, and commentary on, further issues on which the Centre/Institute is seeking the advice of the Committee or the external reviewers, or both;
 - e. copies of recent annual reports, as appendices, if applicable; and
 - f. a brief overview of Centre/Institute issues addressed since the last Senate Review.
7. The external reviewers shall review their Terms of Reference and the material prepared by the Centre/Institute. They shall jointly visit the campus (in early October, if possible) and interview appropriate individuals and groups, and shall independently prepare and submit to the Review Committee reports containing commentary and explicit recommendations. In those reports, reviewers are to avoid references to identifiable individuals. The reports shall be submitted within six weeks of the site visit to Chair of the Review Committee. External reviewers shall be paid an honorarium of \$500 per day (from the budget of the Faculties involved) and be reimbursed for reasonable travel expenses.
8. In addition to the information provided by the Centre/Institute, the Committee shall collect other pertinent information, including written and oral input from individuals and groups within and, where appropriate, outside the University. The Committee must contact all Centre/Institute members in the Centre/Institute (individually by letter) to indicate its existence and purpose, and its willingness to meet with members (and receive written submissions, at the option of the Centre/Institute member). The Committee shall normally meet with the Director, staff, students (graduate and undergraduate), the President, Vice-Presidents, and representatives of external constituencies. It shall widely advertise its existence and its receptiveness to submissions from students, concerned individuals, and groups.
9. For the review to succeed and gain full cooperation from the participants, it should be seen to be conducted fairly. Therefore, the Review Committee should communicate as openly and regularly as possible with the Centre/Institute throughout the process, and shall treat all submissions as confidential.
10. The Committee shall prepare a confidential draft report based on the information available to it. This draft report shall address all matters identified in these Terms of Reference and shall

contain explicitly-identified recommendations to the Centre/Institute, to the University and to other bodies as appropriate.

11. The Committee shall transmit its draft report, along with the external reviewers' reports, to the Director who shall respond within two weeks with corrections to errors of fact, any concerns regarding personal references, and comments on the implications of the proposed recommendations. Since the draft reports are confidential, they are not to be shared with others; nevertheless, the Director may consult with other officials in the Centre/Institute regarding the accuracy of specific details in the reports, should such consultation be helpful.
12. Before finalizing its recommendations, the Committee may discuss with other relevant units at Dalhousie the potential impact that implementation of the recommendations might have on those units.
13. The Committee shall finalize its report and transmit the final report, with the external reviewers' reports as appendices, to the Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) by the 2nd Friday in February. Prior to transmittal, the Committee shall delete any personal references in the external reviewers' reports.
14. The final report (including external reviewers' reports) will be made available to the Director and all members of the Centre/Institute by the Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes). The Director will be responsible for prepare a response to the report which will be submitted to the Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) within six weeks. The final report, the external reviewers report and the response from the director of the Centre/Institute will be shared with the President, Vice-President Academic and Provost, and the Vice-President Research.
15. The Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) will report the results of the review and the Centre/Institute's response to the SAPBC. In turn, SAPBC may choose to have the review matters considered by Senate. The Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) will also be responsible for ensuring the Centre/Institute in question takes appropriate action.
16. With 12-18 months of report to SAPBC, the Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) will report to the Vice-President Academic and Provost on the progress made in implementing recommendations contained in the report.

Appendix: Summary of Proposed Centre/Institute Review Schedule

Year 1, Winter-Spring: Preparation

January	Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) appoints Chair of Review Committee (B-2) ¹
January-March	Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) appoints members of Review Committee (B-3)
January-June	Centre/Institute prepares Self-Study (B-6)
March-April	Review Committee identifies specific issues (B-4)
March-June	Review Committee selects external reviewers (B-5)
End of June	Review Committee and external reviewers receive Self-Study (B-6)

Year 2, Fall: Review

September-October	Review Committee interviews and deliberations (B-8, B-9, B-10)
Early October	Site visit by external reviewers (B-7)
Mid-November	Review Committee receives external reviewers' reports (B-7)
November-December	Review Committee completes interviews and prepares report (B-8, B-9)

Year 2, Winter-Spring: Consideration of Review Report

Early January	Review Committee transmits draft report to <u>Director</u> (B-11)
Late January	Director responds to draft report (B-11)
February 15	Review Committee submits final report to Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) (B-13)
Mid-February	Review Committee Report distributed to Director of the Centre/Institute who in turn shares it with members of the Centre Institute. (B-14)
Late March	Centre/Institute responds to Review Committee Report (B-14)
April	Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres

¹ Numbers in parentheses refer to item numbers in the Procedures section of this document.

and Institutes) considers Review Committee Report and reports to SAPBC.

Follow-up

May-June Within 1 month Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) informs the Centre/Institute concerned, and any other units of the university affected, of needed actions and the date by which these actions shall occur (B-16)

July – December 12 – 18 months later Dean (or the Vice-President Research in the case of multi-Faculty Centres and Institutes) reports to SAPBC on the status of the recommendations; follow-up action by SAPBC as appropriate (B-17, B-18)