

Guidelines for Center and Institute Proposals and Periodic Progress Reports (To be posted on the OIRAP website)

Guidelines for Center and Institute (CI) Proposals – at a minimum, all items (as appropriate) should be addressed in the proposal to establish a CI. Additional information may be requested as well.

1. **CI Name.** The CI's name should convey the CI's focus clearly, even to those outside the field. If the proposed name is similar to that of another unit (an existing school, college, department, academic program, or center), a letter of endorsement from the existing unit with the similar name should be appended to the proposal.
2. **Director Name, Title, Department and School Affiliation.** Include this information for all founding members as well.
3. **Purpose and Mission.** What is the proposed purpose and mission of the new CI? Explain why this activity could not be as successfully carried out in an existing department or center. Clearly identify the ways in which the proposed CI will advance the goals and priorities of the University and/or the school or department as applicable.
4. **Opportunity/Justification.** Describe the combination of intellectual capital, research environment, and external factors that creates favorable conditions for the CI's success. Provide a justification and explanation of the need for creating the CI. Departmental centers are required to justify and explain why their purpose is distinct from that of the department.
5. **Current Activities.** Describe interdisciplinary research, teaching and outreach collaborations already underway that provide a foundation on which to build the CI's activities.
6. **Organizational Structure and Governance.** How will the CI be organized? Will it operate within a department, within a school or college, as a unit of the Graduate School, or across multiple schools and colleges? If it is interdisciplinary, how will interactions among departments and schools/colleges be managed? What will be its governance and administrative structure? How will its leadership be identified and to whom will its leadership report? What are the proposed responsibilities of the Director? By what process is the Director appointed, evaluated, and/or reappointed? For CIs that will be active in more than one school or college, the proposal must specify how the Deans will coordinate responsibility for center oversight and review. Ideally, a lead school will be specified. If the CI will operate such that there is no single lead Dean, then the proposal should make the organizational structure and lines of responsibility very clear. Will there be internal/external advisory boards? If so, provide information on the types/names of members you will recruit for participation and why. Draft by-laws that include the above information should also be provided.
7. **Public-Private Partnerships.** What public/private partnerships do you already have in place (i.e. federal/state funding, corporate contracts, etc.)? What are the opportunities for public-private partnerships? What role will these partners play in the proposed CI? What contributions will they make and what benefits will be generated as a result of such partnerships?
8. **Financial Support.** What is the budget needed for the CI and what will be its funding source? If the identified support is lost, what are the prospects for continuation of the CI? Please note in particular whether state funds, particularly new state funds, will support the CI.
9. **Program Description.** Describe the planned research, teaching, outreach, activities and public/private partnership programs of the CI, target audiences and timeline for implementation.

10. **Administration of Grants.** When faculty members who participate in a CI succeed in securing grants associated with the CI's mission and activities, will the grants be administered by the CI or the faculty member's home department? Will it be possible to share administration and in what cases might that be appropriate? What process will be used to assign or share credit for extramural funding between the CI and the Principal Investigator's department?
11. **Staffing.** It is important to identify faculty and staff who plan to participate in the CI's activities. By what mechanism is the participation of new members solicited? Where the interests of CIs and departments intersect, it may be important to clarify how activities of participants (faculty and staff) are allocated or credited among participants' various units, or to have procedures for engaging interested parties in discussion of this topic. How will administrative support be provided? Is it adequate to support the mission of the CI? If an existing campus unit or an academic department will provide such support, include this information in the letters of endorsement appended.
12. **Membership Policies.** Describe the policies and requirements for approving both internal and external members, including the responsibilities and benefits of membership.
13. **Member Participation.** Provide an initial list of participating faculty (include home academic department) and staff and expected contributions.
14. **Space.** Where will the CI's staff and activities be housed? Is the space adequate? If there is a need for more space, what plans exist to accommodate this need? Have the departmental/sponsoring unit and school/college facilities staff been consulted? If an existing campus unit or an academic department will provide such space, include this information in the letters of endorsement appended. Has the Office of Space Management been consulted and informed of the space to be used by the CI?
15. **Endorsements.** Here it is important to address two issues: shared, similar or overlapping interests, and shared resources. This process assumes that relevant units have received drafts of the plan and that concerns are addressed or accounted for in the final version submitted for approval. Letters of endorsement may be appended to the proposal. Issues to address include:
 - a. Does the CI's function or organization overlap the efforts of departments, schools, colleges, or other CIs at the university?
 - b. Does the CI have the support of those who may be affected by it? The proposal should provide evidence that all interested units are aware of plans for establishing the CI and were afforded an opportunity to comment on the proposal to establish the new entity. Early communication may help in discovering individuals with similar interests and in fostering their participation.
 - c. Will the CI draw on another unit's resources? ("Resources" include staff, courses, and space as well as faculty time). If so, those units should be asked to provide a memo of support for the endeavor, and in it, to articulate a shared understanding of their contribution to the CI.
 - d. Proposals should include written comments on the proposal, and endorsements from department chairs, Deans, Directors, and/or key faculty who will provide essential support for and who have an interest in the new CI.
16. **Evaluation.** What is the proposed evaluation process for the CI? The process should reflect the size and breadth of the CI's activities. Explain the goals and expectations of accomplishment (these must involve clear outcomes and measurable impacts and they will serve as key elements in the review at the time renewal is considered).

17. **Impacts.** Will the new CI draw new kinds of talented faculty and/or students? Is the focal area critically important to the success of the University? Is it potentially transforming? Will it allow Rutgers to become the leading program among peer institutions? Does it impact on others beyond those participating in the initiative itself? Does it increase the potential for conducting higher levels of research? Does it increase the potential for securing major grant funding?
18. **Timeframe.** Describe the proposed timeframe for securing the requested commitments and moving forward with establishment of the CI.
19. **Life Cycle:** Growth or discontinuation. CIs should have clearly defined missions that address specific goals. The issues that stimulate creation of these units will evolve, and it is important to consider the ongoing need for the CI. The proposal should address the expected life cycle for the CI: Under what circumstances should it cease to exist? For example, CIs should be closed when faculty cease to participate, when new leaders cannot be identified, when resources that support the CI are no longer available, or when its original purpose is no longer relevant. The proposal must include specific "sunset" provisions appropriate to the CI being proposed.

Rutgers Centers and Institutes: Periodic Progress Report Information

CI Periodic Progress Reports should include (as appropriate), but not be limited to, the following information. Additional information may be requested by the reporting unit.

- a. Changes from prior years. An assessment of changes from prior years in the CI's status.
- b. Progress. A summary of progress toward the objectives cited in the CI proposal document and/or the prior progress report.
- c. Objectives. Updated short- and longer-term objectives.
- d. Quantitative benchmarks (see below).
 - In a CI's initial periodic progress report, a listing of quantitative benchmarks should be accompanied by retrospective historical performance.
 - In subsequent progress reports, the center's current performance with respect to its quantitative benchmarks should be added to the data compiled for prior years.
- e. Financial Status. A year end budget for the last 3 years showing all sources of income (i.e. grants, service fees, membership fees, F&A return, etc.) and expenses. Revenue and expense projections for the upcoming year.
- f. Publications. A listing of publications that are a part of the CI's programs.
- g. Awards and proposals. A summary of the CI's research and other awards and proposals.
- h. Public-Private Partnerships. A summary of public and private partnerships (if appropriate); indicate any resources (both financial and intellectual) that these partnerships have generated.

Rutgers Centers and Institutes: Periodic Progress Report Information, Benchmarks* (Examples)

Faculty

CI publications: number; index of quality/impact

Citations of CI publications

Intellectual property disclosures, patents, licenses, start-ups

CI faculty who are members of the national academies or comparable bodies

CI faculty awards from professional societies

Other CI faculty member honors/recognition

Collaborations

Internal: departments/schools represented by faculty/staff involved in collaborative research and other activities

Public-Private Partnerships: academic institutions, industrial partners, federal laboratories, other external entities involved in collaborative CI research and other activities

Education

Educational programs leading to a degree

Courses which are part of a degree program

Training programs

Other educational programs, including symposia and colloquia for internal and external audiences

Outreach

Industrial/external relations programs

Educational outreach programs (e.g., high school students, teachers)

Service to society

Funding

Externally funded research and other awards

Total CI award activity (including awards to CI-affiliated faculty that are an integral part of the CI's program but are administered by the department)

Research/Activities funded by University or CI funds

Research and other expenditures

Research and other proposals submitted

Resources

Diversity of funding sources

Amount of discretionary funds

Personnel

Facilities and assets

Tangible return to Rutgers

Fiscal return

Support for students/fellows (doctoral, postdoctoral, undergraduate)

Shared research/other facilities

Intellectual property

*CIs are encouraged to use data from the Rutgers Faculty Survey, as appropriate, when completing the Benchmarks section of the Report.