UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Karen Chad, Vice-President Research
              Jay Kalra, Chair, Planning and Priorities Committee of Council

FROM: Jim Basinger, Acting Associate Vice-President Research and
              Chair, Implementation Team for the Management of Centres

DATE: February 18, 2010

RE: ***Final Report of the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres***

_____

As a final task as Chair of the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres, I am pleased to provide you with the Final Report of the Implementation Team. The mandate of the Implementation Team was to consider the recommendations of the former Task Force on the Management of Centres and submit a report to the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council on the advisability and feasibility of their implementation. In reviewing the recommendations of the Task Force report, the Implementation Team determined to focus on the development of reporting and review processes for centres, as these represented the areas upon which the majority of the Task Force recommendations impinged.

Accordingly, the Implementation Team met on seven occasions between September 9, 2009, to January 27, 2010, and initiated a broad consultation on the proposed centres reporting and review processes, which included Members of the Associate Deans Research Forum, Centres Forum, Deans' Council, the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council, and centres directors. In addition, the team conducted a broad scan of centres policies and practices at major universities across Canada.

The proposed reporting and review processes outlined in the attached report and accompanying templates was developed based upon a set of guiding principles as outlined in the report. The processes were also developed to be harmonious with the university's framework for assessment as outlined in *A Framework for Assessment: Beyond Systematic Program Review.* Most importantly, the Implementation Team approached the development of the review process from the view of recognizing the many accomplishments and contributions of centres across the spectrum of research, teaching, outreach, and service and ensuring their integration within the university's integrated planning process.

With the submission of its report, the Implementation Team is dissolved. Further consideration of the report and its release to the broader community is now at the discretion of the Office of the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee. However, I would be pleased to clarify or amplify on any aspects of the report, and wish to convey to you my appreciation for the contributions of the members of the Implementation Team in producing the report now before you.

Sincerely,

Jim Basinger

Attachment: *Final Report of the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres*

REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

PREAMBLE

The Implementation Team for the Management of Centres and the former Task Force on the Management of Centres follow upon the directive within the university's Policy on Centres, *"to establish the appropriate mechanisms to give assurance of relevance and continued viability in a changing environment, and to acknowledge the high demands for accountability and transparency."*[1]

The Implementation Team, in reviewing the recommendations of the Task Force report, focused specifically on the development of reporting and review processes for centres to assist centres in the achievement of their goals and to assist the reporting authority for the centre in being fully engaged with the centre. The reporting and review processes are intended to be relevant across the various types of centres, which encompass a wide diversity of reporting structures, activities, funding arrangements, and interactions with others.

The review process presented is intended to augment the work of centres and provide recognition of the many accomplishments of centres across the spectrum of research, teaching, outreach, and service. In the past, the achievements of centres have been recognized in an *ad hoc* fashion, leaving many centres directors and members to believe the activities and accomplishments of centres are unrecognized, unvalued and unrewarded. Likewise, there has been no formal means by which to acknowledge and address the barriers that exist for centres to accomplish their stated goals and objectives. The reporting and review processes proposed in this report provide opportunities to address both of these dimensions, and further support centres in being recognized as meaningful participants within the university's integrated planning process.

In recognition of and in support for the diversity of centres, the review process has been structured so that the authority and responsibility for the review are devolved to the centre director and reporting authority, rather than through a central coordinating office. Within the framework provided, the centre director and reporting authority for the centre are primarily responsible for decisions regarding the nature and scope of the review, selections of reviewers, standards for assessment, and outcomes desired. By employing a process that provides for autonomy for many of the decisions related to centres, the Implementation Team has attempted to maintain the flexibility that currently exists with respect to centres, but clarifies the responsibilities and accountabilities of centres within the university's structure and within the context of integrated planning.

---

[1] *University of Saskatchewan Policy on Centres,* March 2004

BACKGROUND

The Implementation Team for the Management of Centres was constituted to review the recommendations of the Task Force on the Management of Centres. Specifically, the Task Force was mandated to:

- Develop guidelines for the assessment of centres and propose a mechanism to support such assessment; and
- Develop guidelines for the effective management of centres including, but not limited to, governance structures, financial viability, and resource support.[2]

The Task Force's Final Report was released in April 2007, and included 23 recommendations regarding the reporting, review, governance, and finances of centres.

To advance the work of the Task Force, the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres was created in September, 2009, under the offices of the Vice-President Research and Provost and Vice-President Academic. The mandate of the Implementation Team was to carefully consider the Task Force recommendations with a view to their implementation, culminating in a report to the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee of University Council, at which time the team would be dissolved. The membership and terms of reference of the Implementation Team are found in Appendix A.

In its consideration of the Task Force recommendations, the Implementation Team determined to focus on the areas of the development of: (1) a reporting mechanism for centres; and (2) a review process for centres. The basis for this decision was the number of key recommendations within the Task Force report hinging upon these aspects. Further, the Task Force Report identifies that, *"These reporting and review requirements were seen to be valuable for a variety of reasons including accountability and transparency, but also as a means to advertise, communicate and even boast about accomplishments"*[3]. In addition, by definition a formal reporting and review process for centres would ensure that the university-level concerns regarding the governance and finances of centres would be addressed through the process. Specific issues related to governance and financial aspects were viewed by the Implementation Team as more appropriately falling under the authority of the reporting authority of the centre.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

In addressing its mandate, the Implementation Team arrived at a number of principles to guide its work:

- That the review process developed be flexible and inclusive regarding the timing and nature of the review, the selection of the review team, and the process for conducting the review.

---

[2] *University Task Force on the Management of Centres: Discussion Paper,* February 2006
[3] *Final Report of the Task Force on the Management of Centres,* April 2007

- That the reporting and review processes developed not be particularly onerous, administratively or financially, or duplicate existing review processes.

- That the review process not be managed through a central, coordinating office, although the Institutional Planning and Assessment Office would be available as a point of consultation. Rather, the responsibility and planning for the process should be devolved to those most directly involved: the centre director and the reporting authority for the centre (e.g. Dean, VPR).

- That the review process developed be aligned with the principles articulated within the university's assessment framework: *A Framework for Assessment: Beyond Systematic Program Review.*

- That the review process provides a forum for highlighting the diversity of centres and their many successes and contributions.

- That the standards by which centres are assessed are directly aligned with the centre's own stated goals and objectives.

- That the review process result in a renewable term for each centre, tied to the review process.

CONSULTATION

The Implementation Team sought broad and collegial consultation throughout the university community, seeking feedback and suggestions for improvement on the proposed reporting and review processes and related templates from members of Deans' Council, the Associate Deans Research Forum, Centres Forum, the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council, and centres directors. A summary of the groups that participated in the consultation process is attached as Appendix B. The Implementation Team gratefully acknowledges the assistance and feedback received from those consulted.

In addition, the Implementation Team conducted a broad scan of the centres policies and practices at major universities across Canada as a first step in considering its mandate.

CENTRES REPORTING AND REVIEW PROCESSES

To assist units in preparing annual reports and undergoing review, the Implementation Team prepared a number of templates. The "snap-shot" template (Appendix C) is intended to provide a web presence for all university centres, accessed through the university calendar and periodically updated. At a glance, pertinent details of the centre will immediately be apparent, including the goals and objectives of the centre, types of activities undertaken, governance, and membership. The details indicated for internal use will assist the university in better understanding the administrative reporting structure and financial scope of its centres.

The annual report template (Appendix D) is intended to assist centres in preparing their annual reports, and expands upon the information requested in the "snap-shot" template to allow the centre to elaborate upon its activities and speak to its accomplishments. An annual financial report is a key aspect of the annual report, and the template for a financial statement (Appendix E) is configured upon the university's UniFi accounting system. The timing of the submission of the annual report is flexible, as determined by the centre director and reporting authority for the centre, based upon the centre's fiscal year-end. The implementation team recognized there are many centres on campus which already prepare detailed annual reports. For these centres, there is no need to prepare a separate annual report; however, the report format should be reviewed to ensure the report includes the substantive elements outlined in the template.

The reporting and review processes outlined in Appendices D-F are intended to apply universally to all centres.   However, the manner in which they are approached exists as a point of negotiation between the centre director and the reporting authority for the centre, based upon the centre's unique situation.   In particular, the timing of the review is not prescribed or externally imposed. In general, unless there are extenuating factors, reviews are intended to occur no sooner than every five years, and at most, ten years apart. If an existing review process is already employed, the centre may elect to build upon the review to avoid duplication, again ensuring the substantive elements outlined in the proposed review process are included. For those centres involved in the delivery of programs, the centre review will likely coincide with the planned review of the programs associated with the centres.

In consideration that the university's centres vary widely in size and scope and in the nature of the activities they undertake, the review process is designed to be simple and flexible, utilizing the standard components of a self-study document and external review. The intent is that the self-study document be succinct and not overly onerous to produce, with much of the material readily available through the centre's annual reports. Reviews will be conducted by teams of three individuals, including at minimum one external reviewer. In this regard, the external reviewer(s) selected is an important consideration, providing objective insight and clarity to the process. In keeping with the principle for devolution of the review process from a central agency, the selection of reviewers is made by the reporting authority for the centre, in consultation with the centre director and in consideration of recommendations by the centre director.

Most importantly, the standards by which the centre will be assessed are directly related to the centre's own stated goals and objectives. In addition, university-level guidelines on standards for assessment have been developed (see Appendix G) to assist centres and their reviewers in conducting the review in the context of the university's broad aspirations for centres as expressed in the preamble to the centres policy: *"Centres are intended to strengthen, coordinate or facilitate scholarly purposes or activities not readily undertaken within the University's departmental and unit structures, and are intended to offer new areas of activity consistent with the University's strategic direction and priorities."*[4] A key purpose of the review is that the outcomes be integrated with the university's planning processes in order to enhance the academic interests and goals of the university.

To ensure the continued vitality and vibrancy of the university, the outcome of the review process will lead to the establishment of a term for each centre, which will be tied to the next review of the centre. The reviewers' report will inform the decisions made regarding the future of the centre; however, the authority to determine the continuation of the centre rests with the reporting authority for the centre, in

---

[4] *University of Saskatchewan Policy on Centres,* March 2004

consultation with the centre director. If the centre is not meeting its goals and objectives, the reporting authority may recommend dissolution of the centre, or may consider restructuring of the centre to permit the centre to continue its activities, for instance as a research group, but without the status of a university centre. Failure on the part of the centre to submit an annual report may also form the basis for dissolution of the centre, given the accountability dimension inherent within a reporting mechanism, with the submission of annual reports a fundamental indicator of the centre's engagement with the university.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to enact a reporting and review process for centres, and to provide for a method for dissolution of a centre, a number of revisions to the centres policy and guidelines are recommended, including:

- That the centres policy include a review process for centres, which would include reference to the identification of a term for each centre to coincide with the next review of the centre;

- That the centres policy include the requirement for each centre to report annually;

- That the centres policy emphasize the importance of the integration of centres into the university's integrated planning process;

- That the guidelines for applications for the establishment of centres direct that the goals and objectives of the centre be developed in anticipation of a future review;

- That a process for dissolution of a centre be established, which would include consideration of any legal agreements, financial or otherwise, physical and human resources, and the effect on teaching and any other obligations of the centre;

- That procedures and authority for approval for dissolution of the centre be consistent with that required for establishment of the centre.

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REVIEWS

The Implementation Team was very much aware of its call upon university resources to support the centres review process, and financial exigency was the primary reason for the recommendation that the majority of reviews for college centres (type A) occur at a distance, and that it would be reviews of university-level centres (types B&C) that would involve site visits by external reviewers. A cost-shared model to support centres review is recommended, with shared contributions from central university resources combined with college and unit resources.

CONCLUSION

The initiative to create an "implementation team" to consider the management of centres, arose from the desire to assist centres and those they report to in developing, guiding, and enhancing the contributions of centres as an integral part of the university landscape. Coupled with the desire for a clearer articulation of the many centres on campus, was the accompanying desire to provide a means to more effectively recognize and celebrate the many accomplishments and contributions of centres.

The Implementation Team's focus on the creation of a reporting mechanism and a review process for centres is intended to strengthen university centres, promote accountability and transparency, and provide centres directors and those they report to with the series of tools to assist in the management of centres. With the submission of its report, the Implementation Team will dissolve, leaving the recommended policy revisions to be considered and enacted by the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council. Upon receipt of the centres review process by Council, the request for the "snap-shot" templates will be initiated as the first outcome of the process. The initiative to implement the formal reporting and review process, if not already in existence, remains in the hands of the reporting authorities for centres to enact.

In conducting its work, the Implementation Team was struck by the immense diversity of centres across campus and their many contributions to the vitality and creativity of the university in its pursuit of research, teaching, scholarly and artistic work, and in meeting the needs of the community at large. The Implementation Team believes that a clear and coordinated reporting and review process as outlined within will assist centres in their management, and thereby facilitate centres to achieve their highest aspirations.

Respectfully submitted:

Jim Basinger (Chair)
Sandra Calver (Administrative Support)
Patricia Farnese
Jim Germida
Karsten Liber
David Parkinson
Kevin Schneider
Lorraine Shantz
Ken Van Rees

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Implementation Team Mandate and Membership

Appendix B: Consultation Summary

Appendix C: Status 'Snap-Shot' Report Template

Appendix D: Annual Report Template

Appendix E: Financial Template

Appendix F: Centres Review Process

Appendix G: University-level Guidelines on Standards for Assessment

Appendix H: University of Saskatchewan Policy on Centres (March 2004)

Appendix I: Guidelines for the Establishment of Centres (June 2008)

Appendix J: Task Force Report on the Management of Centres (April 2007)

Appendix K: University List of Units, Centres, Divisions, Institutes and Groups (as of February 2010)

Appendix L: *A Framework for Assessment: Beyond Systematic Program Review* (December 2008)

APPENDIX A: IMPLEMENTATION TEAM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Background

In May 2006 the Office of the Vice-President Research launched a Task Force on the Management of Centres charged with developing a series of recommendations on the management and assessment of centres at the University of Saskatchewan. Specifically, the Task Force was mandated to:

- Develop guidelines for the assessment of centres and propose a mechanism to support such assessment; [and]
- Develop guidelines for the effective management of centres including, but not limited to, governance structures, financial viability, and resource support.[1]

The Task Force's *Final Report* was released in April 2007 (presented to University Council in September 2007 through the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council) and included 23 recommendations (attached) addressing assessment, financial policy, resource allocation, management, governance, and accompanying responsibilities and accountabilities for centres from across the University.

Implementation Team Mandate

Implementation of the recommendations of several task forces associated with the Office of the Vice-President Research and undertaken during the first planning cycle was one of the initiatives identified in the *Office of the Vice-President Research Unit Strategic Plan (2008/09 – 2011/12)*. Further, "it is now an institutional responsibility to implement the collegially developed recommendations [and] to continue the forward momentum initiated … as attempts are made to overcome management challenges, operational concerns, and other issues specific"[2] to the work of task forces including the Task Force on the Management of Centres. The mandate of this Implementation Team will be to ensure that the extensive work and thoughtful recommendations put forward by the Task Force are not overlooked or left unattended to, and instead considered and where appropriate and feasible, are put into action. Keeping in mind that the Task Force Report was tabled in April 2007, the institution must also address emerging issues concerning the management of centres.

The Implementation Team's mandate will include, but need not be limited to, the following:

1. Careful consideration, review, and prioritization of:

    a. the recommendations of the Task Force on the Management of Centres; and,
    b. emerging issues concerning the establishment and management of centres;

---

[1] *University Task Force on the Management of Centres: Discussion Paper*, February 2006
[2] *Office of the Vice-President Research Unit Strategic Plan (2008/09 – 2011/12), p. 42.*

2. Discussion and consultations with those to be involved in the implementation of recommendations;

3. Development of strategies for implementation of processes for the management of centres;

4. Submission of recommendations to the Vice-President Research and Planning and Priorities Committee of Council.

Further details of the mandate will be finalized by the Implementation Team membership.

Implementation Team Membership

Given the breadth of types of centre across campus, the Implementation Team will need to demonstrate sensitivity to this diversity and membership will include representation of centres of various types. A proposed membership for the Implementation Team is outlined below:

Members

Vice-President Research or Designate (Chair)

Representation from each of:

- Provost and Vice-President Academic
- Associate Deans Research Forum
- Planning and Priorities Committee of University Council (from representatives named to the Centres Subcommittee)
- Type A Centre Directors from the University of Saskatchewan (1)
- Type B/C Centre Directors from the University of Saskatchewan (1)
- Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of University Council.

Resource Personnel

Administrative support will be provided by the Offices of the University Secretary and the Vice-President Research.

Meeting Schedule

The frequency of meetings of the Implementation Team will be determined as needed at the discretion of the Chair.

Timelines

The Implementation Team will be launched in early 2009 and will submit its recommendations to the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council by January 2010.

IMPLEMENTATION TEAM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES MEMBERSHIP

Vice-President Research (designate)
Jim Basinger, Chair   Acting Associate Vice-President Research

Provost and Vice-President Academic (designate)
Jim Germida   Vice-Provost Faculty Relations

Associate Deans Research Forum
Kevin Schneider   Vice-Dean, Science, College of Arts and Science

Centres Forum
Karsten Liber   Director, Toxicology Centre
Ken Van Rees   Centre for Northern Agroforestry and Afforestation

Planning and Priorities Committee of Council
David Parkinson   Interdisciplinary Centre for Culture and Creativity

Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council
Patricia Farnese   Law

Financial Services
Lorraine Shantz   Budget and Special Projects

Administrative Support
Sandra Calver (Secretary)   Coordinator, University Governance, University Secretariat

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE
ON THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

1. The reporting authority for Centres needs to be reviewed to ensure that Centres are not disadvantaged in consideration of resources and that their activities and plans can be properly reflected in Integrated Planning documents and university promotional materials.

2. A clear rationale for reviewing Centres must be established. The rationale should include:
    *   The means to provide the Centre and the University with information which will assist in improving the quality of research and outreach activities and infrastructure of Centres;
    *   The means to guide decisions with respect to the allocation of resources to Centres; and
    *   The means to assess a Centre with respect to the achievement of its goals and objectives and to determine whether the goals and objectives need to be revised or the Centre restructured or dissolved.

3. A statement in the Policy on Centres needs to be made about the responsibilities and authorities of Deans/VPs to which Centres report. A clear delineation of the reporting authority's responsibilities should also be included in the documentation approving the establishment of a Centre. The list of responsibilities should include:
    *   Recommending the establishment/dissolution of the Centre;
    *   Approving the annual budget;
    *   Operational and financial monitoring including receiving and, following discussions with the Director, approving the annual report;
    *   Establishment of a regular review process (see recommendation 4, below).

4. The Dean to which a Centre reports should be the individual who is responsible for the review. It is expected that in fulfilling these responsibilities the Dean will consult with the Centre members and Director, and with the Department Head where the Centre significantly impacts, or resides primarily within, a Department. The Dean's responsibilities include:
    *   Determining the cycle of review (see 6, below);
    *   Determining the size and scope of the review process (including whether the review will be paper-based or involve an on-site visit by a review team; where a Centre is automatically reviewed by some external agency, the Dean to whom it reports should have the right and responsibility to exempt it from an additional review as appropriate). Where a review is to be primarily paper-based, the Dean should consider making available an opportunity for the reviewers to consult with the Centre members via video- or tele-conference;
    *   Establishing the terms of reference for the review committee and determining its membership (whether internal [U. of S.] or external reviewers, or both);
    *   Receiving the review report, providing an opportunity for the Centre to respond, evaluating the review and response, and forwarding the review and response with recommendations to the Planning Committee of Council for its information and further action if necessary or appropriate.

5. As each of these types of Centres receive university resources and have broad impacts often extending into the local, provincial or national communities, a rigorous review process should be put in place. It is strongly recommended that the process involve an on-site visit by a review team consisting of at least 2 external reviewers. The VP to which a Centre reports should be the

individual who is responsible for the review and it is expected that in fulfilling these responsibilities the VP will consult extensively with the Centre Director and members. The VPs responsibilities should include:

- Determining the cycle of review (see 5, below);
- Determining the size and scope of the review process (including whether the review will be paper-based or involve an on-site visit by a review team; where a Centre is automatically reviewed by some external agency, the VP to whom it reports should have the right and responsibility to exempt it from an additional review as appropriate). Where a review is to be primarily paper-based, the VP should consider making available an opportunity for the reviewers to consult with the Centre members via video- or tele-conference;
- Establishing the terms of reference for the review committee and, in consultation with the Director and members, determining its composition;
- Receiving the review report, providing an opportunity for the Centre to respond, evaluating the review and response, and forwarding the review and response with recommendations to the Planning Committee of Council for its information and further action if necessary or appropriate.

6. Reviews of Centres should be on a cycle of review consonant with the University's Integrated Planning Cycle. Unless special circumstances prevail, reviews should be a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 10 years apart. Reviews should be staged, like the SPR process, so that the entire process is manageable and not too much effort and stress is placed on any single unit.

7. The Centre Director/CEO, in consultation with the members of the Centre, should be charged with creating a self-study document which would include a clear statement of the goals and objectives of the Centre and documentation pertaining to the achievements of the Centre with respect to said goals and objectives. Included, wherever and whenever possible should be surveys of the 'clients/benefactors' of the Centre regarding their interactions and satisfactions with the Centre and suggestions for improvement.

8. Resources to support reviews of centres should be dependent on the type and size of centre that is reviewed. The costs of reviewing Centres which report to a Dean should be borne by the College to which they report. Funding for reviews should be provided from central sources for those Centres which report to a Vice-President.

9. Academic units and College Review Committees should be reminded and encouraged to value and reward all types of activities that are considered to be of value to the University. One opportunity to value these activities is to celebrate significant Centre accomplishments in College and University promotional materials. Centre Directors should provide to the Dean or VP to whom they report copies of press releases, notifications of grants received, and other significant accomplishments.

10. Colleges need to recognize, and Deans should ensure, that participation and accomplishment within a Centre is considered in recommendations and decisions about tenure, promotion and special salary increases.

11. VPs to whom Centres report should work with Centre Directors to routinely provide input to Heads and Deans about the activities and accomplishments of Centres and particularly about the activities and accomplishments of Centre Directors.

12. From the perspective of the Centre, its members, and the university, it is highly desirable that an adequate infrastructure and operating/research budget be in place when a new Centre is approved. Where it is uncertain that the proponents of a proposed Centre have secured adequate resources and yet it is decided to create the Centre, a specified and relatively early date for the first review should be established.

13. Space Planning should be charged with reviewing the entitlements of currently existing Research Centres and, where possible, providing adequate space.

14. VPs and Deans to which Centres report should, in reviewing the annual report and budget of the Centre, discuss the needs of the Centre with the Director.

15. Centres, like Departments and administrative units, should receive invitations to participate fully in University planning and budgeting exercises.

16. Centre Directors should be invited to College meetings and be given the opportunity to annually address the meeting and present a report.

17. A University-wide forum of Centres should be created, chaired by the VP Research, to meet at least once per term to discuss matters of mutual interest.

18. Centres should be required to provide annual financial reports for each year of the review period. For larger Centres, the reports should include a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures with the current year's actual results, a comparison to the budget for the current year and a comparison to the actual results for the previous year. If the Centre has significant long-term tangible capital assets, a description and, where possible, cost and age of these assets should be provided. The Statement of Revenue and Expenditures and a list of long-term tangible capital assets (where relevant) are the minimum expectations. Centres should be encouraged to prepare additional information, such as variance analysis, for their own use as well as to serve the review process. Such Centres should ensure that they have the administrative support required to track revenue and expenditures and generate reports. Centres with little financial activity should have a reporting requirement restricted to a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures which display current year's actual results and a comparison to the actual results for the previous year.

19. If Centres form a part of the College structure they should be included in growth and development planning.

20. The Dean/VP to which a Centre reports should develop a protocol for actively managing the financial matters of the Centre. A description of the protocol should be included with any application for the establishment of a new Centre.

21. Type A Centres should be required to establish clear governance arrangements. The Dean to whom each Centre reports should be involved in the discussions of these arrangements. The discussions should consider whether a Management/Advisory Board is necessary or appropriate and whether the Dean will serve (ex officio) on the Board. The arrangements would normally include at least one annual meeting between the Dean, the Centre Director, and the Board if it exists.

22. The role, responsibility, and authority of the Dean to whom a Centre reports must be clearly identified in all proposals to establish a new Centre (see Recommendation 2) and in all existing Centres where it is unclear. Some aspects of the role would include leadership and encouragement and, where the Dean deems it necessary, appropriate and the opportunity exists, lobbying and fund-raising on behalf of the Centre; the Dean's authority would include the recommendation (to Council) to establish or dissolve a Centre, approval/dismissal (following consultation with the members of the Centre) of an individual to the position of Director, and assignment of space and other resources under the control of the Dean. The responsibilities of the Dean would include such matters as oversight over the financial operations of the Centre, ensuring that the Centre is aware of and follows University policies and practices, and the review of the Centre.

23. The role, responsibility, and authority of the VP to whom a Centre reports must be clearly identified in all proposals to establish a new Centre and in all existing Centres where it is unclear. Some aspects of the role would include leadership and encouragement and, where the VP deems it necessary, appropriate and the opportunity exists, lobbying and fund-raising on behalf of the Centre; the VP's authority would include the recommendation (to Council) to establish or dissolve a Centre, approval/dismissal (following consultation with the members of the Centre) of an individual to the position of Director, and assignment of space and other resources under the control of the VP as approved by the President's Executive Committee and/or the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning. The responsibilities of the VP would include such matters as oversight over the financial operations of the Centre, ensuring that the Centre is aware of and follows University policies and practices, and the review of the Centre.

APPENDIX B: CENTRES REPORTING AND REVIEW

IMPLEMENTATION TEAM CONSULTATION

Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council
November 13, 2009

Centres Forum
November 20, 2009

Associate Deans Research Forum
November 23, 2009

Deans' Council
November 24, 2009

Centres Directors
November 30, 2009 and December 4, 2009

APPENDIX C: TEMPLATE FOR CENTRES 'SNAPSHOT' STATUS REPORTS

[TITLE OF CENTRE] STATUS REPORT
[insert url for Centre website]

The following is intended for posting on the university website:

As briefly as possible, provide a description of the following (1-2 pages).

Mission:

Goals and objectives of the centre:

Types of activities undertaken to achieve mandate: e.g. research; graduate student training; student experience; programming; outreach

Governance:

Attach the current membership of the director, executive, and any advisory bodies.

Attach a list of current centre members, including external members and member terms where relevant.

The following is intended for internal use only

Date of last annual report submitted to university senior administrator (e.g. Dean, VPR):

Centre type (e.g. A B C D):

Date established:

Administrative reporting structure:

Statement of Operating Revenue and Expenses (attach most recent statement).

APPENDIX D: TEMPLATE FOR CENTRES ANNUAL REPORTS

[TITLE OF CENTRE] ANNUAL REPORT

Centre's mission:

Goals and objectives of the Centre, including their relationship to the university's strategic goals and objectives:

As briefly as possible describe how the centre has worked to reach its goals and objectives during the last year (e.g. research; graduate student training; student experience; programming; outreach).

Describe any significant changes that have occurred since the last annual report (for example, changes in activity, membership, governance) and how they have impacted the centre's activities.

Describe any activities/interactions with the larger community beyond the campus of the University of Saskatchewan.

Provide a list of centre members and membership terms, if applicable.

Provide a list of students (undergraduate, graduate), postdoctoral fellows, and visiting scholars who worked within the centre during the last year.

Summarize those significant accomplishments which can be attributed to the centre since the last annual report. What distinct opportunities does the centre create or have access to that would not be available if the centre did not exist? What distinguishes the centre from other entities?   What are the direct outcomes of the resources invested in the centre?

Summarize the artistic and scholarly contributions and external funding relevant to the centre's mission and objectives attained by the centre's members.

Provide an annual financial report that identifies the fiscal year end for the centre. The report should include a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures consistent with the financial template provided (attached).   The financial report should include a reflection of the in-kind resources received by the centre. The in-kind resources may be part of the Statement of Revenue and Expenditures or provided as a textual description within the report. Please comment on expenditures showing how they support the objectives of the centre. If the centre anticipates a significant expenditure to replace capital assets in the upcoming year, please provide a brief description and estimate of the replacement cost.

APPENDIX E: FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Financial Statement for _____

Fund Number(s):
Fiscal Year End:
For the Period: Month/Year to Month/Year

	Budget Reporting Year (eg: 2009-10)	**Actuals Reporting Year** (eg: 2009-10)	**Budget Upcoming Year** (eg: 2010-11)
OPERATING REVENUE:			
Grants and Contracts that support centre operations:			
Government of Canada			
Government of Saskatchewan			
Other Governments			
Non-government			
Industry			
Donations			
External Sales			
Operating Allocation (from UofS central fund)			
Miscellaneous Income			
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	-	-	-
OPERATING REVENUE EXPENSES:			
Salary Expenses:			
Salaries			
Benefits			
Total Salary Expenses	-	-	-
Non-Salary Expenses:			
Materials and Supplies			
Printing and Photocopying			
Communications			
Professional Fees			
Externally Contracted Services			
Internally Purchased Services			
Other Operational Expenditures			
Travel			
Cost of Goods Sold			
Maintenance, Rental, and Renovations			
Scholarships, Bursaries, and Prizes			
Capital Assets (Computers, Furniture, Equipment, Software)			
Internal Cost Recoveries			
Total Non-Salary Expenses	-	-	-
Interfund Transfers:			
(Revenue/expenses from another UofS College/Unit)			
(_Identify sources/uses_)			
Total Interfund Transfers	-	-	-
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE EXPENSES	-	-	-
Total Revenue less Expenses	-	-	-
Fund Balance, Beginning of the Fiscal Year		-	-
Fund Balance, End of the Fiscal Year (_must reconcile to UniFi_ **)**	-	-	-

APPENDIX F: CENTRES REVIEW PROCESS

The centres review process supports the comprehensive assessment strategy and broad principles for quality assurance, quality improvement, and accountability articulated within the university's *Framework for Assessment: Beyond SPR*.   The review process is intended to be flexible and collegial, providing centres with the opportunity to benefit from insights obtained through self-reflection upon progress towards stated goals and to benefit from the feedback of others. Likewise, the review process is intended to be formative and will evolve over time.

Although there is no central coordination of centre reviews, the University's Institutional Planning and Assessment Office is a resource and point of contact regarding assessment.

NOTICE AND TIMING OF REVIEW

Notice of the review will be communicated to the centre director by the reporting authority for the centre. Reviews will occur at a minimum of five and a maximum of ten years apart. An earlier review may take place if significant concerns are expressed related to the centre's governance and/or financial status, or in relation to fulfillment of the centre's mission and goals.

The timing and nature of the review will be determined through discussion of the reporting authority for the centre with the centre director and will include consideration of whether the review will involve a site visit by the external reviewer(s). The decision regarding a site visit will be based in part upon financial considerations, with most college-based centres undergoing review at a distance.   If the centre is involved in an existing review process, including for example, program review or assessment by an external agency, the centre's review may complement the existing process by ensuring the substantive elements of the process outlined as follows are incorporated within the review.

SELF-STUDY/SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

The self-study report should succinctly summarize the centre's activities, achievements and contributions since last reviewed and in relationship to the university's integrated plan and relevant college and unit plans. The report should be written based upon consultation with the centre's staff, members, colleagues, stakeholders, and students associated with centre activities, and upon the annual reports submitted during the review period.

The self-study should include the following, as appropriate, given the nature of the centre's mandate and function:

- A statement of the centre's goals and objectives and how the centre has achieved its objectives;
- A detailed description of the centre's governance;
- Current membership list as defined by the centre [this may include, for example, the director, members of any advisory body, faculty and staff members];
- A current list of all students, graduate students and post-doctoral fellows associated with the centre;
- A plan identifying future directions and development strategies;
- A report on the centre's activities and contributions to the university community and others, including any academic programs associated with or offered by the centre;
- An indication of those synergies and opportunities afforded the centre as an entity distinct from more traditional structures, and which would not be available otherwise;
- An indication of any operational barriers or impediments to success which may exist for the centre, and their impact upon the ability of the centre to achieve its objectives and goals;
- A multi-year financial plan identifying annual operating costs, continued and potential sources of revenue, and strategies for acquiring funds on a sustainable cost-recovery basis;
- A recognition of in-kind resources received by the centre;
- Letters of support for the centre's renewal from key stakeholders, including confirmation of any continuing resource commitments to the centre; and
- The most recent annual report(s), including annual financial statements, attached as an appendix.

APPOINTMENT OF REVIEW TEAM

In general, the review team will consist of a minimum of three members, who are not associated directly with the centre. Within the team, at least one member will be internal to the university and at least one of the remaining members will be external to the university, with external assessment considered an essential feature of the review.

The reporting authority for the centre will normally be responsible for selection of the review team, in consultation with the centre director. The centre director will have the opportunity to nominate individuals the director believes most qualified to serve as reviewers. Members may include: a senior researcher with administrative experience and no direct involvement with the centre; the director of another comparable centre; a researcher who is not affiliated with the centre, but who is knowledgeable in the field of activity; other members as deemed appropriate.

The review team will develop its own process for conducting the review, in consultation with the reporting authority for the centre and based upon the guidelines provided. Each centre is responsible for identifying those to be consulted during the review and will propose the timing and format of site visits by reviewers, if applicable. In general, the review process for site-based reviews should involve both formal and informal meetings with the centre director and any advisory bodies, representatives of external partners or funding agencies or other identified stakeholders, and including students.

UNIVERSITY-LEVEL GUIDELINES ON STANDARDS FOR ASSESSMENT

To assist centres and reviewers in determining the standards by which centres should be assessed, a set of guidelines outlining the university's broad expectations for centres is attached. These are intended to broadly outline the categories for assessment and inform the centre director and reporting authority in developing the centre's own terms of reference for the review, based upon the goals and objectives of the centre.

REVIEWERS' REPORT

At the outset of the review, the reviewers should be provided with direction regarding the nature and expectations of the report, including consideration of any confidential aspects within the report and how these will be handled. The report should specifically address the centre's progress towards meeting its goals and objectives, as expressed within the terms of reference for the review developed by the centre director and reporting authority. In general, the primary focus of the review is an assessment of the extent to which the centre has fulfilled its objectives and continues to meet the definition of a centre, the appropriateness of its future goals, and its current and projected financial viability. The integration of the centre within the university and value added by the centre to the university as a whole is also a key dimension of the review.

The reviewers' report will be submitted to the reporting authority for the centre and to the centre director. The centre director will have the opportunity to respond to the report and ensure there are no factual errors prior to release of the report to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council. The expectation is that the reviewers' report will also be shared with members of the centre.

The terms of reference developed for the review should accompany the reviewers' report. The intent is that the terms of reference developed be made broadly available to inform the university's review process for centres over time.

REVIEW OUTCOME

The reviewers' report, including findings and recommendations of the Planning and Priorities Committee, will serve as advice to the reporting authority in the determination of outcomes of the review process. An outcome of the review will be the establishment of a term for each centre, extending to the next planned review of the centre. If continuation of the centre is not to occur, the process leading to dissolution of the centre will be initiated by the reporting authority for the centre.

A decision to discontinue a centre will require a plan to phase the centre out of existence developed by the reporting authority for the centre, in consultation with the centre director, which will address, among

other issues, the consideration of any physical and human resources and any related legal and contractual agreements, including collectively bargained agreements. The plan will be submitted to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council. University Council and/or Board of Governors approval will be sought for the dissolution of the centre as appropriate and consistent with approval required for establishment of the centre.

The process leading to dissolution of a centre may be initiated in response to a negative review; however, a negative review may also result in restructuring of the centre to strengthen and enhance its activities. The dissolution of a centre may also be initiated at the express wish of the centre director and members at any time. Further, dissolution of the centre may be an outcome initiated upon failure of the centre to submit an annual report in the absence of any mitigating factors, given the importance of reporting annually as a fundamental responsibility of all centres, demonstrating accountability and engagement.

APPENDIX G: UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES ON ASSESSMENT STANDARDS

FOR THE REVIEW OF CENTRES

From a university-level perspective, a key outcome of the centres review process is a clearer understanding of how the centre could advance its goals and objectives, and enhance the university's research, teaching and service activities and profile. In addition to this broadly-set expectation, each centre will also have the opportunity, in consultation with the reporting authority for the centre, to establish its own individual terms of reference for the centre's review. These terms will uniquely reflect the desired outcomes from the review and take into consideration the scope of the review, as determined, among other considerations, by the size and diversity of the centre, centre type (college situated or cross-college), mission, and mandate of the centre.

As part of the review process, the following broad guidelines are intended to assist and guide centres and reviewers in assessing the degree to which centres meet, aspire towards, and exceed the university's expectations of the wide array of centres it encompasses.

Each centre will have a clearly outlined and articulated set of goals aligned with the university's strategic goals and priorities. The centre will exhibit self-knowledge and insight regarding its aspirations and the challenges and opportunities that exist relative to its goals.

For centres focused primarily on research, the centre will have an established research profile, evidenced by the centre's research activity and engagement, which contributes to the university's research, scholarly and artistic work profile. The centre's pursuit of excellence in scholarship and collaborative research will enhance the university's research intensiveness and undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral research training.

For centres focused primarily on service, the centre will have an established service model, evidenced by the centre's efficient, relevant, and innovative service delivery, which enhances the ability of the university to deliver a broad array of services. The centre will be attuned to the needs of its clients, and its relationship and contributions to the university.

For centres focused primarily on teaching and learning, the centre will be engaged in innovative programming, evidenced by a supportive learning environment and collaborative modalities, which contribute to the university's educational goals. The centre will aspire towards the delivery of undergraduate and graduate programs of the highest quality to achieve excellence in teaching and learning.

The accomplishments of the centre will be tangible and measured against the objectives, goals, and mandate of the centre. The centre will provide evidence in support of its stated accomplishments. If evidence in support of the centre's achievements is not available, the centre will indicate what steps are required to enable the centre to report in the future on key activity and output indicators.

The centre will adopt the university concepts of outreach and engagement, evidenced by interaction with external communities and flexible partnerships. The centre will partner with others outside the university, through the sharing of knowledge and resources, to enrich creative activity, address societal issues and contribute to the public good.

The centre will influence aspects related to the university's core mission for research, teaching and learning, and service. Regardless of the centre's primary orientation, the centre will exhibit an integrated approach in its pursuits. As an example, the research efforts and results from a research-based centre, should also inform the university's teaching and learning activities and desire for enhanced interdisciplinary scholarship.

The centre will add value to the institution as an entity distinct from the traditional structures of a department, school, or college and the *ad-hoc* nature of a research group. The centre will exist to accomplish a unique goal that could not be accomplished as effectively through another existing structure. The vitality of the centre will be immediately evident in its activities, which will cross boundaries and create novel synergies.

The activities of the centre will be integrated within the university, to benefit the university as a whole. The centre will be engaged in and responsive to the university's integrated planning process and strategic goals. The relationship and governance of the centre within the university will be collaborative and enhance the university's commitment to work more effectively across unit and institutional boundaries. The alignment of the centre to the university's strategic goals and partnerships will ensure the centre is a fully integrated and contributing member to the university.

The centre will effectively deploy existing resources and actively seek new resources. The centre will actively seek to leverage external funding and efficiently manage its resources, including in-kind resources, to sustain the activities of the centre on a long-term basis. The centre will proactively develop a plan to remediate any financial deficit.

APPENDIX H: UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
POLICY ON CENTRES
2004

PREAMBLE: The University of Saskatchewan encourages the establishment of centres to enhance the academic interests of the University and its faculty in the pursuit of research, teaching, scholarly and artistic work, and to meet the needs of the community at large.

Centres are intended to strengthen, coordinate or facilitate scholarly purposes or activities not readily undertaken within the University's departmental and unit structures, and are intended to offer new areas of activity consistent with the University's strategic direction and priorities. The University values the strengths and many contributions of existing centres, and seeks to ensure their ongoing success. To this end and in keeping with good governance, the University has a responsibility to establish the appropriate mechanisms to give assurance of relevance and continued viability in a changing environment, and to acknowledge the high demands for accountability and transparency. The existing policy on centres, developed in 1997, has been revised and updated, to facilitate the creation of centres, protect their integrity, and improve essential communication within the University, required with Integrated Planning and for full accountability. These objectives and terms are fully consistent with the establishment and management of similar entities at other universities in Canada and the United States.

The University recognizes creation of centres as indicative of the vitality, creativity and inventiveness of the academic community, and supports such enterprise to the fullest extent possible. For the purposes of orderly functioning this policy sets out definitions and principles for the creation, monitoring and review of centres. Companion Guidelines to assist in streamlining the processes involved will be developed to support and assist all University of Saskatchewan centres.

<div align="center">***************</div>

1.0   Definition of a Centre

The University currently hosts a variety of centres, variously known as centres, institutes, units, organizations, networks, or programs, including incorporated entities.

For purposes of this policy, a centre is a formally structured organization which is not a division, department or college, but which is established within or in conjunction with the University of Saskatchewan, for the pursuit or support of: scholarly, artistic, scientific, or technological objectives; teaching; or outreach.

This should include, but not necessarily be limited to 1) performing disciplinary or multi-disciplinary research, teaching, scholarly or artistic activity; 2) offering new curricular and extra-curricular educational opportunities; 3) demonstrating or stimulating research, scholarly, artistic or business opportunities; 4) providing outreach activities.

2.0   Accountability

Each Centre must have a clear line of accountability to a Dean or Vice-President.

Drawing on existing policy and practice, and for ease of identifying future reporting responsibilities consistent with Integrated Planning, centres will be designated as Type A, Type B, Type C or Type D.

Type A   Type A centres are those that are organizationally part of one college, and report to a Dean, and do not involve substantial resources. These centres involve activities that complement and enhance the work of primarily one college, and could involve multi-disciplinary and multi-faculty work. The activities of such centres should be congruent with approved College Plans and would be established with the Dean's endorsement and Council approval. Responsibility for funding of these centres rests with the college. (Informal association of faculty that have no claim on tangible resources, but use the University name or facilities should make known their objectives to the relevant dean.)

Type B   Type B centres are those that involve activities beyond the scope of a single college and/or involve significant resources and will require the endorsement of the Deans involved, the appropriate Vice-President (usually the Vice-President Research) and Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning (PCIP) before seeking the approval of Council. These centres are organizationally part of the University and are subject to University management and control, reporting to a designated Dean or an appropriate Vice-President (usually the Vice-President Research).

Type C   Type C centres are centres that are incorporated and legally distinct from the University, and which have academic/research implications for the University. These centres must have the authorization of the Vice-Presidents and secure Council approval before being recommended to the Board of Governors. These centres may be either a cooperative relationship involving the sharing of resources, or a landlord-tenant relationship, reflecting the academic interest of the University in the centre's activities and recognizing the University's community obligation to promote the greatest community use of its faculties and resources. These centres will report on their academic and research activities to a Dean to the extent possible, and/or to an appropriate Vice-President. A financial report must also be provided to the Vice-President (Finance and Resources) for the Board, and all legal requirements of incorporated entities met.

Type D   Type D centres are legally incorporated entities, established to promote the best interests of the University, but which are not engaged in the University's academic affairs. Such centres may be proposed by a college or administrative unit, and their establishment would require the approval of the Vice-President Finance and Resources, and/or appropriate Deans or Vice-President, PCIP and the Board of Governors. Type D centres would report on an annual basis to the appropriate Dean and/or Vice-President and to the Board of Governors of the University.

3.0   **Financing**
The financial support of a centre should be based on at least medium-term (3-5 years) financial support by government, community, industry and /or the University. The financial viability should not be based solely on a short-term grant or contract.

The cost structure of a centre should be identified, including such items as administrative and infrastructure support, IT, multimedia and Library costs.

The responsible Dean or Vice-President of a centre should be aware of its budget plans, and in seeking additional donations the centre should be aware of and be consistent with the University's fundraising plan, coordinating fundraising needs with the University

4.0   **Management**
All University centres must have a management structure (manager or management board and /or a named executive officer). The scale of the management structure will be dependent on the category type of the centre and may range from a single individual to a highly structured board.

5.0   **Reporting Requirements**
Type A, B and C centres shall report at least annually to the responsible Dean or Vice- President.

Reporting will include activities and accomplishments, finances and budget/business plan for the coming year.

Type D centres will report through the Vice-President Finance and Resources or relevant Vice-President as required by the Board of Governors

6.0   **Review of a Centre**
Each centre will be subject to systematic review in a form appropriate to its activities, as determined by the Dean or Vice-President to whom it reports.

7.0   **Integrated Planning**
Each centre will be involved in Integrated Planning through the units with which it interacts, with the centre plan, usually as part of a College Plan, conveyed by the responsible Dean or Vice-President.

8.0   **Standing Subcommittee of Planning on Centres**
A standing Subcommittee on Centres will be created.
- To facilitate the creation of new centres
- To monitor adherence to the Policy
- To develop and review the Policy and Guidelines
- To oversee the disestablishment of centres
- To maintain a list of active centres

Membership on this Subcommittee will be drawn from the Planning, Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work, and Budget Committees of Council, the Offices of the three Vice-Presidents and will be supported by the University Secretary's Office. The Subcommittee will report to Council through the Planning Committee.

9.0   **Implementation and Transition**
Upon approval of this policy, it will become effective immediately with respect to proposals for new centres

Early implementation of the new policy for existing centres is necessary to assist in Integrated Planning and to satisfy the legal requirements of the institution's auditors and the expectations of the Board of Governors to exercise its stewardship obligations.

A transitional period is envisaged to establish the appropriate category for each centre and to ensure full integration into the planning initiatives and thrust of the academic enterprise, as well as to provide the opportunity to benefit from resources available.

10.0   **Guidelines**
Guidelines shall be developed by the Standing Subcommittee on Centres to facilitate the implementation of this Policy.

Guidelines adopted by the Board of Governors on June 12, 1997, currently exist regarding Type D incorporation.

APPENDIX I: GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATIONS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN (without attached forms)

June 19, 2008

PART I: <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

A policy on the establishment of Centres was approved by Council on December 18, 2003. According to this policy, a Centre is

> A formally structured organization which is not a division, department or college, but which is established within or in conjunction with the University of Saskatchewan, for the pursuit or support of scholarly, artistic, scientific or technological objectives; teaching; or outreach.

Though the policy is intended to encourage members of the University community to work with colleagues under a wide range of arrangements and for a variety of purposes, the focus of the "Centre" concept is on research, scholarly and artistic work, and, where appropriate, on involvement in graduate, undergraduate or certificate programs. As distinct from groups of researchers who work in collaboration for particular projects or for limited periods, it is expected that a Centre would have some degree of formal structure, and a continuing existence.

The characteristics of the different types of Centres described in the policy are outlined below.

Centre proponents must submit a **Formal Proposal** including the information requested under the template in Part II of these guidelines. Proposals for Centres will be reviewed by a Subcommittee of the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council. The Subcommittee on Centres will include representation from the Planning and Priorities Committee, the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee, the Office of the Vice-President Research, the Office of the Vice-President Finance and Resources, the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic, and the Office of the University Secretary. The Subcommittee will make recommendations for approval of proposed Centres through the Planning and Priorities Committee to Council.

Centres proponents are encouraged to contact the Office of the University Secretary to seek advice regarding the process to establish a centre (contact: Sandra Calver, Coordinator, University Governance).

As Type B and C Centres will entail the allocation of College or University resources, proponents will be required to submit a **Business Plan**, as well as reports of consultations with representatives of the Library, Information and Communication Technology and Facilities Management concerning the resource implications of the proposal. These documents are also described in Part II of these guidelines.

Types of Centres

Type A   Type A Centres are those that are organizationally part of one college, and report to a Dean, and do not involve substantial resources. These Centres involve activities that complement and enhance the work of primarily one college, and could involve multi-disciplinary and multi-faculty work. The activities of such Centres should be congruent with approved College Plans and would be established with the Dean's endorsement and Council approval. Responsibility for funding of these Centres rests with the college. (Informal association of faculty that have no claim on tangible resources, but use the University name or facilities should make known their objectives to the relevant dean.)

Type B   Type B Centres are those that involve activities beyond the scope of a single college and/or involve significant resources and will require the endorsement of the Deans involved, the appropriate Vice-President (usually the Vice-President Research) and Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning (PCIP) before seeking the approval of Council. These Centres are organizationally part of the University and are subject to University management and control, reporting to a designated Dean or an appropriate Vice-President (usually the Vice-President Research).

Type C   Type C Centres are Centres that are incorporated and legally distinct from the University, and which have academic/research implications for the University. These Centres must have the authorization of the Vice-Presidents and secure Council approval before being recommended to the Board of Governors. These Centres may be either a cooperative relationship involving the sharing of resources, or a landlord-tenant relationship, reflecting the academic interest of the University in the Centre's activities and recognizing the University's community obligation to promote the greatest community use of its faculties and resources. These Centres will report on their academic and research activities to a Dean to the extent possible, and/or to an appropriate Vice-President. A financial report must also be provided to the Vice-President (Finance and Resources) for the Board, and all legal requirements of incorporated entities met.

Type D   Type D Centres are legally incorporated entities, established to support the activities of the University, but which have no academic focus. Such Centres may be proposed by a college or administrative unit, and their establishment would require the approval of the Vice-President Finance and Resources, PCIP and the Board of Governors. Type D Centres would report on an annual basis to the Vice-President Finance and Resources and through that office to the Board.

PART II: FORMAL PROPOSAL FOR A TYPE A, TYPE B, or TYPE C CENTRE

The Formal Proposal allows the Subcommittee on Centres to ensure that all of the resource implications of the proposal have been considered, and that an administrative structure will be in place to maintain accountability and access to needed resources.

The following is a template to guide the preparation of a Formal Proposal.

1. Name of Centre.

2. Type of Centre.
· Type A (College-level: reports to a Dean, and does not involve substantial resources)
· Type B (University-level: reports to a designated Dean or Vice-President, with activities beyond the scope of a college and involving significant resources)
· Type C (University-level incorporated)

3. Academic Plan.
Goals and Objectives: Please explain why this Centre is needed. Provide a brief description of the goals of the Centre and consistency with institutional priorities as expressed in the Strategic Directions and in the Foundational documents. Include a discussion of the following issues:
- Outline the rationale for the Centre, and provide a brief description of the range of activities which are envisioned to be associated with the Centre.
- What activities will be encompassed within the Centre that cannot be undertaken within existing units?
- Also indicate the academic units in the University which will be involved in or affected by the Centre. This statement should include information about Centre objectives, need for the Centre, demand, uniqueness and the expertise of the sponsoring unit.
- Where relevant, the proposal should also indicate whether the establishment of the Centre is consistent with the goals of constituent colleges stated in Integrated College Plans, and whether the creation of the Centre has been identified as an objective in any Integrated College Plan.

Impact and relationships: Please indicate how this proposal relates to department or college activities and plans, including the impact it will have on department activities, on colleagues, on students and on other departments or colleges. This section should include a description of the links which are anticipated with individuals, groups or organizations at other institutions or outside the university setting.

Scholarly Work: Identify as specifically as possible particular scholars or groups of researchers who would be employed by or affiliated with the work of the center. This section should describe how the expertise and activities of these scholars will contribute to the work of the Centre, or enable it to realize its objectives.

4. Proponents.
Provide the identity and academic affiliation of the proponents.

Consultation: Describe the consultation process followed in putting together this proposal, including letters of support from Dean(s), from Research Services and others as appropriate.

Proponents of Type B and C Centres will also be required to provide evidence of consultations concerning appropriate resources with the Library, Information and Communication Technology, and Facilities Management. Forms for this purpose are attached to these guidelines. The forms should be signed by the representative(s) with whom the consultation has taken place, who

should be given an opportunity to comment on the implications for their operations of the Formal Proposal.

5. Centre Management.
Describe clearly the management structure which will be put in place to administer the Centre. This description should indicate the identity and affiliation of the members of any management board or committee. The Dean or Vice-President who is administratively accountable for the Centre should be identified, and the mechanisms for reporting should be outlined.

A contact person or persons should be identified.

6. Resources and Budget.
The process for approval of the creation of Centres is intended to ensure that the allocation of University resources to them is made in a way which is consistent with the allocation of resources to other activities within the University, and also that Centres have a clear means through which they can access the resources necessary to their effective operation.

Please describe the proposed financial basis for the Centre.   This should include the sources of funding for the Centre, such as research grants, and whether an allocation of funds or in-kind resources from a department, college or the University will be required.

Proponents of Type B and C Centres will be required to provide the Subcommittee with a Business Plan. This Plan should be formulated in consultation with a Financial Analyst within the Budget and Special Projects Office of the University's Financial Services Division.   The Business Plan should indicate how resources will be acquired and used, and these projections should, insofar as that is possible, be aligned with the timing of integrated planning cycles.

7. Support.
Indicate the Vice-President, Dean(s) or other appropriate administrators who are supportive of the project. Letters of support from the Dean and/or Vice-President should be attached to the proposal. In the case of a Type A Centre, a letter of support from the Dean administratively responsible for the Centre is required. For a Type B or Type C Centre a letter of comment and support is required from the Vice President Research, from PCIP, and from the Deans of the sponsoring Colleges.

8. Governance.
Provide a description of the governance structure, and the management and reporting arrangements that will support the work of this centre. If the Centre will be responsible for programming indicate how the program will be managed and who should be considered the contact person for program information and administration (e.g. liaison with the Registrar). If programs will be offered collaboratively, outline the College-level approvals required and the consultation that has taken place with participating Colleges.

9. Systematic Assessment.
It is expected that the operations of each Centre will be reviewed in the context of the University integrated planning process. The scope and timing of the review should be included as part of

the proposal. The review will be co-ordinated by the Dean or Vice-President who is administratively responsible for the work of the Centre.

Attachments.
Attached to the Formal Proposal should be any letters of support, the Business Plan, and the required consultation forms.

APPENDIX J: TASK FORCE ON THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

FINAL REPORT (without appendices)

April 2, 2007

Executive Summary

The 2003 revision to the Policy on Centres identified the need "to establish the appropriate mechanisms to give assurance of relevance and continued viability in a changing environment, and to acknowledge the high demands for accountability and transparency". A Task Force on the Management of Centres was created with a mandate to investigate this matter and to report with recommendations on the management and assessment of Centres.

Centres and the Deans/VPs to whom Centres report were consulted via surveys prepared by the Task Force. Centre Directors were given the opportunity to meet with the Task Force to discuss its findings and recommendations.

The members of the Task Force were impressed and somewhat overwhelmed by the extremely wide range in size, scope and diversity of purpose of the 70+ Centres on our campus. Given the legal status of Types C and D Centres, the Task Force focused its attention on Types A and B Centres. The current typology of Centres, based on reporting lines, seems inadequate and the Task Force suggests an additional, functional, categorization scheme.

Many Directors reported a disconnection between their Centres and the larger units in which they are embedded. That disconnection was confirmed in some cases by Deans and VPs who were unsure of their authorities and responsibilities. The consequences of this disconnection include a sense among some Directors that the activities and accomplishments of the Centres they manage are unrecognized, unvalued and unrewarded.

Some Centre Directors believe that they report to the wrong authority and this is confirmed by the Deans to whom they report. The outcome for the Centres is that there is no real 'champion' and Directors feel that they are short-changed in the competition for resources.

There was consensus among Directors that annual reports including financial statements and budget projections, and regular reviews are necessary and appropriate. These reporting and review requirements were seen to be valuable for a variety of reasons including accountability and transparency but also as a means to advertise, communicate and even boast about accomplishments. They also provide Centres with opportunities to request additional resources.

By means of 23 recommendations the Task Force provides its best advice and guidance about these matters. In creating these recommendations the members of the Task Force attempted to maintain the flexibility that currently exists with respect to Centres but clarifying responsibilities and creating requirements that will move us along the path towards greater accountability and transparency.

BACKGROUND

In 2003, University Council recommended and the Board of Governors approved a revised Policy on Centres. The preamble to the Policy reads as follows:

> *The University of Saskatchewan encourages the establishment of Centres to enhance the academic interests of the University and its faculty in the pursuit of research, teaching, scholarly and artistic work, and to meet the needs of the community at large.*
>
> *Centres are intended to strengthen, coordinate or facilitate scholarly purposes or activities not readily undertaken within the University's departmental and unit structures, and are intended to offer new areas of activity consistent with the University's strategic direction and priorities. The University values the strengths and many contributions of existing Centres, and seeks to ensure their ongoing success. To this end and in keeping with good governance, the University has a responsibility to establish the appropriate mechanisms to give assurance of relevance and continued viability in a changing environment, and to acknowledge the high demands for accountability and transparency. The existing policy on Centres, developed in 1997, has been revised and updated, to facilitate the creation of Centres, protect their integrity, and improve essential communication within the University, required with Integrated Planning and for full accountability. These objectives and terms are fully consistent with the establishment and management of similar entities at other universities in Canada and the United States.*
>
> *The University recognizes creation of Centres as indicative of the vitality, creativity and inventiveness of the academic community, and supports such enterprise to the fullest extent possible. For the purposes of orderly functioning this policy sets out definitions and principles for the creation, monitoring and review of Centres. Companion Guidelines to assist in streamlining the processes involved will be developed to support and assist all University of Saskatchewan Centres.*

Centres at the University of Saskatchewan comprise a wide variety of organizations which vary enormously in size and scope, budgets and management structures. This diversity is both a strength (the dimensions of the Centre can be designed to fit the needs of a particular group) and a challenge (to decisions about resource allocations and appropriate governance and review processes, for example). Responding to the challenge and as a first-step towards the development of the Companion Guidelines referred to above, the Task Force on the Management of Centres was established on May 1, 2006 by the Office of the Vice-President Research under the auspices of the Task Force on Changing Structures. The Task Force was charged with the responsibility to develop a series of recommendations relating to the management and assessment of Centres "with a view to ensuring that these entities are best positioned to fulfill their mission to enhance the academic interests and goals of the university" (University Task Force on the Management of Centres).

Task Force Mandate
The Task Force was asked to:
- Develop guidelines for the assessment of Centres and to propose a mechanism to support such assessments; and
- Develop guidelines for the effective management of Centres including, but not limited to governance structures, financial viability and resource support

In particular, the Task Force was asked to consider the following:

1. Approaches to the evaluation of Centre activity and performance which are sensitive to Centres' mandates and the priorities of the University. Consideration will be given to:

- Developing a suite of indicators and/or evaluation template that may be used (in part or in its entirety) to evaluate Centre activities. Any such suite of indicators will address the breadth in size, scope and mandate of University Centres.
- Expectations around the frequency of Centre review and responsible parties.
- Mechanisms and authority for extending Centre mandates or dissolving units.

2. The relationship of Centres to the University including opportunities and barriers which impact on Centre activities. Consideration will be given to:
   - Understanding the role of University faculty in Centres and examining mechanisms to recognize, encourage and credit faculty participation in Centres.
   - Centre access to infrastructure, programs and resources at the department, college and university-level.
   - Mechanisms to engage Centres in college and university planning and decision-making exercises including consideration of an expanded mandate and membership of the Centres' Forum.
   - Role of Centres in enhancing the University's reputation in teaching, research or outreach.

3. Principals and expectations related to the financial support of Centres including:
   - Responsibility of Centres to generate revenue from government, community and/or industry partners, and programs and policies to support such activities;
   - Potential, criteria and mechanism for the University to provide (some) core-support or incubation of Centres';
   - Opportunities for sharing resources for Centres with complementary mandates.
   - Impact of variable and core support on Centre activities, University expectations of Centres, etc.;
   - Resource implications of Centre development (or evolution) to larger-scale entities including understanding differing resource needs, possible thresholds or criteria for resource allocations, etc.

4. Governance structures of Centres including:
   - Reporting lines;
   - University representation on and authority of Centre boards, and the relationship of such boards to the University proper;
   - Financial accountability.
5. Mechanisms to support management and review of Centres. Consideration will be given to:
   - Understanding the various reporting structures for Centres; current reporting mechanisms; and policy and audit reporting and review requirements;
   - Support for review and management processes.

ACTIVITIES OF THE TASK FORCE

The Chair of the Task Force met with a number of bodies to discuss processes to accomplish the mandate of the Committee. Included in these consultations were: The Task Force on Changing Structures; the Centres SubCommittee of the Planning Committee of Council, the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council, the Associate Deans Research Forum, and the Centres Forum reporting to the Vice President Research. Vice President Franklin and Dean Wishart subsequently invited the Directors[1] of all Centres to attend a meeting to discuss these same items; approximately fifty people attended the meeting.

At its inaugural meeting, the Task Force considered its mandate and ways to obtain the data necessary to respond to the issues identified in the elaboration of the mandate. The Task Force decided to create two surveys, one for Centre Directors and a second for the VP's and Deans' to which Centres report. Five Subcommittees (corresponding to the five numbered items described under the Task Force Mandate above) were formed to identify questions and items to be included in the surveys.

A term research assistant position was advertised and recruited to assist with the creation of a web-based survey and a preliminary data summary.

Notices of the survey and requests to complete them were sent to all Directors and to each VP/Dean who had one or more Centres reporting to them. VP's/Deans were asked to complete a survey for every Centre they were responsible for (recognizing that, in many instances, the responses to particular questions would be identical from one survey to another).

The Research Assistant prepared data files which included the (multiple) responses for each question for both surveys and provided a written summary of the responses to each question.

The data files and the Research Assistant's summaries were provided to the Subcommittees. Each Subcommittee was charged with reviewing the responses to those survey questions pertaining to its section of the mandate and to write its own summary and tentative set of recommendations.

The Task Force then reconvened as a whole to consider the entire set of responses to both surveys and the summaries/recommendations of the Subcommittees. Based on the discussions of the entire Task Force a DRAFT Final Report was then prepared for presentation to and obtain feedback from the Centres in order to create a Final Report.

FINDINGS

To determine the Centres to which the survey would be distributed, a request was made to the University Secretary's Office to provide a list of Centres. Such a list is maintained at http://www.usask.ca/calendar/faculty&staff/ucdi/.

Although all Centre Directors received an invitation to complete the survey subsequent discussions with Corporate Administration led the Task Force to exclude Type C and D Centres from consideration in this report. These Centres are defined as incorporated and legally distinct from the University. Type C Centres have academic/research implications for the University, while Type D Centres are not engaged in the University's academic affairs. Type C Centres include CLS Inc., Prairie Swine Centre Inc., Saskatchewan Food Industry Development Centre Inc. and Prairie Diagnostic Services Inc. As

---

[1] This report uses the term Director to refer to the academic leader of a Centre.

incorporated entities, these Centres are distinctly separate from the University and follow the rules legislated under their act of incorporation (ie/ Non-Profit Corporation Act of Saskatchewan, Business Corporations Act of Saskatchewan), and fall outside the direct scope of authority of regular University policies and practices. In recognition of the value of a review of Type C Centre activity and performance, it is recommended that a process be established by the Vice-President Finance and Resources which accomplishes the objectives of an evaluation of their activity and performance, but also recognizes their unique governance structure. Type D Centres, which are not engaged in academic affairs, are accountable to the Board of Governors of the University through the Vice-President (Finance & Resources) and have their own guidelines.

TERMINOLOGY

Centres come in a variety of types and sizes. There is an equally large variety of names including, of course, Centres but also Institutes, Units, Programs, Groups, Divisions, Networks, and Initiatives. Nomenclature does not seem as problematic as the extreme variety—one Dean stated that "This Centre is so different from the research Centres that your group is thinking about that rolling it into the same review process would be absurd."

In discussing the responses to the Survey, members of the Task Force had considerable difficulty in drawing any conclusions that cut across all types of Centres, or even within particular Centre types as defined by the current Policy on Centres. This is because of the very wide variety of mandates that exist in the current complement of Centres. Some Centres exist to give research synergies visibility within the University and on the National and International stage and perhaps provide a means by which resources may be shared. Some exist to provide core functions to the University (e.g. Animal Resources Centre, Gwenna Moss Teaching and Learning Centre). Others exist because they provide a mechanism for essential outreach and service to the community, thereby contributing to the University's sense of place.

A Centre's relationship to the University, and hence the way it is administered and the level of evaluation that would be necessary, might be more appropriately determined by its essential function than by its place in the University's administrative structure (i.e. type A, B, C or D). A Centre's function is central to the question of why the Centre exists from the University's point of view and informs us of the questions that need to be asked to determine the Centre's effectiveness. Re-classifying Centres according to function will allow the governance and assessment of those Centres to be better determined.

The responses of Directors of university Centres to question 3 (What is the vision/purpose/goal of your Centre?) revealed that a Centre can be placed in one of 4 categories:
> Research and Dissemination Centres
> Academic Programming and Experience Centres
> Health Service Provision Centres
> University Resource Centres

Centre Directors were contacted and asked to identify the functional category of their Centre; a preliminary classification is provided in Appendix 5. The University of Saskatchewan is encouraged to reconsider the typology of Centres to employ a more meaningful functional categorization.

A concern expressed by several Deans and by some Resource Centres was the reporting line through a particular College when the activities of the Centre are university-wide. Examples include the Museum of Antiquities, the Kenderdine Gallery, and the Division of Biomedical Engineering. This makes it difficult for these Centres to apply for additional resources (in direct competition with units more central

to the mission of the College), and for the Dean to incorporate the Centre's plans and initiatives into the College's Integrated Plan.

Recommendation:

1. The reporting authority for Centres needs to be reviewed to ensure that Centres are not disadvantaged in consideration of resources and that their activities and plans can be properly reflected in Integrated Planning documents and university promotional materials.

Evaluation of Centre Activity and Performance

The Task Force considers that monitoring and evaluation of Centre activity and performance needs to occur at two levels. On an annual basis, the Dean or VP to which a Centre reports needs to exercise oversight, minimally at a budgetary level and preferably including the activities and accomplishments of the Centre. This matter is dealt with under the heading Relationship of Centres to the University (pp. 8-9). The remainder of this section deals with a more intensive review of cumulative Centre activity and performance over a longer time-scale.

The members of the Task Force are aware of the possibility of the establishment of an Assessment Office which would operate under the authority of the Provost. The size and mandate of such an office was unclear, but it was agreed that an Assessment Office would have a role to play in the reviews of Centres. Presumably the Dean or VP responsible for a Centre would work with the Assessment Office in establishing the details of the review (see Recommendation 3).

The survey for Centre Directors contained a number of questions about evaluations of Centres and, as expected, the responses were somewhat variable. Newer Centres have not been reviewed and those which have been reviewed had reviews in the last five-ten years, often in the context of a larger review of the unit to which they report. In most cases, Centres which had undergone reviews found the process to be helpful, if only because they were required to examine their goals and objectives and to determine whether their activities and achievements were appropriate given the stated goals and objectives.

While Directors almost unanimously agreed that Centres should be reviewed, there were several concerns identified that need to be addressed. First and foremost is the need for a clear rationale for review—reviews yes, but to what purpose or end? Several Directors wondered whether this was a basis on which to argue for more resources while others were concerned that the purpose might be to disestablish Centres. A number of the larger Centres have ongoing reviews of various sorts and Directors are genuinely concerned about duplication of efforts and judgments. Directors of more recently established Centres were concerned about premature review.

Recommendation:

2. A clear rationale for reviewing Centres must be established. The rationale should include:
   - The means to provide the Centre and the University with information which will assist in improving the quality of research and outreach activities and infrastructure of Centres;
   - The means to guide decisions with respect to the allocation of resources to Centres; and
   - The means to assess a Centre with respect to the achievement of its goals and objectives and to determine whether the goals and objectives need to be revised or the Centre restructured or dissolved.

Concerning the type of review, while a majority of the Centre Directors favoured an on-site review, the smaller the Centre the more Directors were in favour of paper-based reviews involving internal and/or local (community) reviewers. The Survey for Deans/VPs to which Centres report also contained several questions about reviews. The responses to these questions were, if anything, more variable than those

provided by Centre Directors, perhaps due to the confusion that the former have with respect to their responsibility for and authority over Centres. This is a matter with requires clarification. Deans/VPs were also concerned about the costs of site reviews and many indicated that, unless funds were provided from central administration, their choice would be the lower-cost paper-based review.

Recommendation:

3. A statement in the Policy on Centres needs to be made about the responsibilities and authorities of Deans/VPs to which Centres report. A clear delineation of the reporting authority's responsibilities should also be included in the documentation approving the establishment of a Centre. The list of responsibilities should include:
    - Recommending the establishment/dissolution of the Centre;
    - Approving the annual budget;
    - Operational and financial monitoring including receiving and, following discussions with the Director, approving the annual report;
    - Establishment of a regular review process (see recommendation 4, below).

If Centres are to be reviewed however, it was clearly understood that the Deans/VPs would be involved, indeed, "in charge" of the review process. Many responses were of the nature that the Dean/VP should direct and establish the review committee and its terms of reference and determine the scope of the review.

On the matter of the type of review, it would appear that Deans/VPs, like the Directors would base the determination on the purpose of the review and the size and scope of the Centre. Consequently, whether a paper-based or on-site review is necessary and whether internal and/or external reviewers should be employed is to be determined by the type and size of Centre and the purpose to which the review would be put.

Recommendations:

Type A Centres:

4. The Dean to which a Centre reports should be the individual who is responsible for the review. It is expected that in fulfilling these responsibilities the Dean will consult with the Centre members and Director, and with the Department Head where the Centre significantly impacts, or resides primarily within, a Department. The Dean's responsibilities include:
    - Determining the cycle of review (see 6, below);
    - Determining the size and scope of the review process (including whether the review will be paper-based or involve an on-site visit by a review team; where a Centre is automatically reviewed by some external agency, the Dean to whom it reports should have the right and responsibility to exempt it from an additional review as appropriate). Where a review is to be primarily paper-based, Dean should consider making available an opportunity for the reviewers to consult with the Centre members via video- or tele-conference;
    - Establishing the terms of reference for the review committee and determining its membership (whether internal [U. of S.] or external reviewers, or both);
    - Receiving the review report, providing an opportunity for the Centre to respond, evaluating the review and response, and forwarding the review and response with recommendations to the Planning Committee of Council for its information and further action if necessary or appropriate.

Type B Centres:

5. As each of these types of Centres receive university resources and have broad impacts often extending into the local, provincial or national communities, a rigorous review process should be put in place. It is strongly recommended that the process involve an on-site visit by a review team consisting of at least 2 external reviewers. The VP to which a Centre

- Determining the cycle of review (see 5, below);
- Determining the size and scope of the review process (including whether the review will be paper-based or involve an on-site visit by a review team; where a Centre is automatically reviewed by some external agency, the VP to whom it reports should have the right and responsibility to exempt it from an additional review as appropriate). Where a review is to be primarily paper-based, the VP should consider making available an opportunity for the reviewers to consult with the Centre members via video- or tele-conference;
- Establishing the terms of reference for the review committee and, in consultation with the Director and members, determining its composition;
- Receiving the review report, providing an opportunity for the Centre to respond, evaluating the review and response, and forwarding the review and response with recommendations to the Planning Committee of Council for its information and further action if necessary or appropriate.

There was general agreement that reviews should be conducted on a cyclical basis with a minimum of five and a maximum of ten years intervening between reviews.
Recommendation:
6. Reviews of Centres should be on a cycle of review consonant with the University's Integrated Planning Cycle. Unless special circumstances prevail, reviews should be a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 10 years apart. Reviews should be staged, like the SPR process, so that the entire process is manageable and not too much effort and stress is placed on any single unit.

Almost all Directors reported that the Centres have capacity to prepare a 'self-study' but most were concerned about the costs of such preparation and Directors of smaller Centres in particular identified the need of administrative help. As one means to simply the self-study, the Task Force considered that the Annual Reports should be compiled and submitted as part of the self-study.

Directors generally agreed that evaluations of Centres should involve a comparison of the stated goals and objectives of the Centre with outcome measures such as publications or knowledge transfer in other ways, or increased grant support from external agencies.
Recommendation:
7. The Centre Director/CEO, in consultation with the members of the Centre, should be charged with creating a self-study document which would include a clear statement of the goals and objectives of the Centre and documentation pertaining to the achievements of the Centre with respect to said goals and objectives. Included, wherever and whenever possible should be surveys of the 'clients/benefactors' of the Centre regarding their interactions and satisfactions with the Centre and suggestions for improvement.

On the matter of which organization should pay for the review, VPs and Deans generally considered that the best arrangement would be a sharing of costs between Central Administration and the organization to which a Centre reported. It was acknowledged by several respondents that a paper-based review, which should be cheaper to institute, should be employed where possible and would definitely be the review of choice if no central funding was available.
Recommendation:
8. Resources to support reviews of centres should be dependent on the type and size of centre that is reviewed. The costs of reviewing Centres which report to a Dean should be borne by

the College to which they report. Funding for reviews should be provided from central sources for those Centres which report to a Vice-President.

Centre Directors expressed some frustration with processes and demands which are costly in time and effort and which produce no response or an untimely response from the authority which demands reports and insists on reviews. Deans and Vice-Presidents to whom Centres report have a responsibility to provide timely feedback and to keep a Centre "in the loop" in discussions leading to recommendations about the outcomes of the review.

Relationship of Centres to the University

There is some concern among Centre Directors that insufficient attention is paid to Centres and that faculty who create or become involved in Centres are not sufficiently recognized for their contributions to Centres activities. This may well be due to the widespread practice of academic units at both department and college levels to value published works at the expense of other types of work and accomplishments. A second issue might be that, in some instances a faculty member's involvement in a Centre is not considered an assigned duty. Finally, a Centre may not be considered integral to the goals and objectives of the larger unit (College or University); consequently, faculty who become involved in the Centre may sometimes be considered to be expending efforts on unvalued activities.

The Task Force takes it as a given that Centres make valuable contributions to the University. Indeed, there is much evidence to support that assumption in the completed surveys. Research Centres are frequently established because the typical structures of the university are not filling a need, be that need for support for interdisciplinarity, community involvement and participation, or knowledge translation/commercialization. A goodly number of graduate students operate within, or with the assistance of, Centres. It is in the interest of the University therefore to encourage its faculty to become involved in Centres which are considered integral to the University mission.
Recommendations:
9.   Academic units and College Review Committees should be reminded and encouraged to value and reward all types of activities that are considered to be of value to the University. One opportunity to value these activities is to celebrate significant Centre accomplishments in College and University promotional materials. Centre Directors should provide to the Dean or VP to whom they report copies of press releases, notifications of grants received, and other significant accomplishments.
10. Colleges need to recognize, and Deans should ensure, that participation and accomplishment within a Centre is considered in recommendations and decisions about tenure, promotion and special salary increases.
11. VPs to whom Centres report should work with Centre Directors to routinely provide input to Heads and Deans about the activities and accomplishments of Centres and particularly about the activities and accomplishments of Centre Directors.

Many Centres, particularly Research Centres, sit outside the traditional structure of the institution (department-college-university) and consequently have no regular access to infrastructure.   Most of these Centres reported inadequate infrastructure, particularly shortages of administrative help and of space, resulting in a general feeling that Centres are not able to live up to their potential--that so much more could be accomplished given adequate support. In an early DRAFT Report, the TaskForce recommended that Centres only be established if adequate infrastructure existed or was promised. This recommendation was supported by several Deans. By contrast, many members of the Centres Forum

were concerned about a possible stifling effect of that recommendation on Centre creation and development, and the next recommendation was modified to reflect that concern.

Recommendations:

12. From the perspective of the Centre, its members, and the university, it is highly desirable that an adequate infrastructure and operating/research budget be in place when a new Centre is approved. Where it is uncertain that the proponents of a proposed Centre have secured adequate resources and yet it is decided to create the Centre, a specified and relatively early date for the first review should be established.

13. Space Planning should be charged with reviewing the entitlements of currently existing Research Centres and, where possible, providing adequate space.

14. VPs and Deans to which Centres report should, in reviewing the annual report and budget of the Centre, discuss the needs of the Centre with the Director.

Centre Directors were evenly divided in their (positive and negative) responses to Survey Questions 7 (**"Are the goals of the Centre mentioned anywhere within University of Saskatchewan Integrated Plan documents?"**) and 8 (**"Does the current reporting structure for your Centre promote linkages between the Centre and University planning initiatives?"**). Thus, some Centres evidently feel connected and involved with the University while others, even some of our larger Centres, consider themselves on the periphery and not much connected. In order to take best advantage of the opportunities created by Centres and faculty initiatives, VPs and Deans need to seek opportunities to better integrate Centres with the operations of the University.

Recommendation:

15. Centres, like Departments and administrative units, should receive invitations to participate fully in University planning and budgeting exercises.

16. Centre Directors should be invited to College meetings and be given the opportunity to annually address the meeting and present a report.

17. A University-wide forum of Centres should be created, chaired by the VP Research, to meet at least once per term to discuss matters of mutual interest.

Financial Relationships between Centres and the University

It is generally understood that the University must provide adequate resources for the type of Centres we have identified as University Resource Centres and for some of the Academic Programming and Experience Centres. For the remaining types of Centres however, the necessity, feasibility or desirability of university-level support is unclear. In general, the expectation should be that Centres obtain some or all of their operating funds from external sources whereas the university would provide basic infrastructure support (office space, light, heat, etc.). This is not to suggest that there are some Research and Outreach Centres, Health Service Provision Centres, and Policy Research Development and Dissemination Centres which might be considered crucial to the mission of the University or a college and which therefore would receive operating funds.

Reporting authorities, particularly at the College level, do not seem to be much involved in the financial management of many Centres and the members of the Task Force conclude that this must change. The Dean or VP to whom a Centre reports is responsible for the financial operations of the Centre including deficits.

Responses from the Centres indicate that they understand the relationship with their reporting structure but many do not have the resources to provide annual financial statements. Would Centres be more successful if they had additional administrative support, at least in their early stages? If the University

sees Centres as a strategic element in prosecuting its Integrated Plan, these Centres will require additional administrative support.

Twenty-four of forty-one responses by Deans/VPs indicated that some sort of financial statement is provided by Type A Centres; five of twelve respondents receive some sort of report from type B Centres. While Deans or VP's have direct responsibility for type A and B Centres, it appears that more than half of the A and B Centres do not provide financial statements. Of concern to at least some of these Centres is their ability to provide such reports; one type B Centre Director reported that funding sources are so disparate and the UNIFI reporting system so inadequate that a full-time staff member is required to manage the accounts and to prepare reports. This is obviously beyond the capabilities of most Centres and there must be recognition that where the reporting requirement is extensive administrative support, preferably operating budget support, may need to be provided to the Centre.

Recommendation:

18. Centres should be required to provide annual financial reports for each year of the review period. For larger Centres, the reports should include a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures with the current year's actual results, a comparison to the budget for the current year and a comparison to the actual results for the previous year. If the Centre has significant long-term tangible capital assets, a description and, where possible, cost and age of these assets should be provided. The Statement of Revenue and Expenditures and a list of long-term tangible capital assets (where relevant) are the minimum expectations. Centres should be encouraged to prepare additional information, such as variance analysis, for their own use as well as to serve the review process. Such Centres should ensure that they have the administrative support required to track revenue and expenditures and generate reports. Centres with little financial activity should have a reporting requirement restricted to a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures which display current year's actual results and a comparison to the actual results for the previous year.

Deans/VPs report that they review the financial reports made by Centres and occasionally discuss the report with the Director (presumably in the case of a deficit). The financial report is distributed to appropriate committees and filed. It appears that this information is not part of the College or University planning cycle.

Recommendation:

19. If Centres form a part of the College structure they should be included in growth and development planning.

Only sixteen out of forty-three responses from Deans/VPs to whom Type A Centres indicated that these Direct Reports felt responsible for financial oversight. Several of the sixteen who acknowledged responsibility delegated this to an analyst. However, the terms of reference for these Centres clearly indicates that the Deans/VPs bear financial responsibility and it would thus appear that there is a large gap in management practice and potential risk of varying seriousness to the University.

Recommendation:

20. The Dean/VP to which a Centre reports should develop a protocol for actively managing the financial matters of the Centre. A description of the protocol should be included with any application for the establishment of a new Centre.

Governance Structure of Centres

Given the variation in size, scope and function of Centres, it will not be surprising to learn that the 'governance' arrangements apparently range from little or no formal structure (typical of small, 'A' type Centres) to a legally constituted Board of Directors that has responsibility for:

- legal and primary oversight
- setting strategic directions
- assessment of management performance
- financial control
- managing risk
- reporting and communicating with stakeholders.

Concerning 'A' type Centres, governance arrangements appear to have been haphazardly established; some have a management structure, many do not; some provide an annual report to the Dean, some do not; some Directors meet or consult regularly with the Dean while others never have. There is a great deal of uncertainty amongst Deans about the level of responsibility they have for and the authority they have over Centres that report to them. Typical Dean's responses to the question "What is the role, if any, of the Dean in the Governance Structure of the Centre?" were "No role", "Not applicable", and "There is basically no interaction between the Director of this Centre and the Dean's Office". Finally, Deans had quite divergent views on whether they should serve on Advisory Boards of these types of Centres; it is the view of the Task Force that this practice should be permitted and perhaps even encouraged but not required.

Recommendation:

21. Type A Centres should be required to establish clear governance arrangements. The Dean to whom each Centre reports should be involved in the discussions of these arrangements. The discussions should consider whether a Management/Advisory Board is necessary or appropriate and whether the Dean will serve (ex officio) on the Board. The arrangements would normally include at least one annual meeting between the Dean, the Centre Director, and the Board if it exists.

Dean's responses to the question "What is the Dean's authority with respect to Centres?" included "None specified", "Not applicable", and "I am not sure what the extent of the authority of the Dean is."

Recommendation:

22. The role, responsibility, and authority of the Dean to whom a Centre reports must be clearly identified in all proposals to establish a new Centre (see Recommendation 2) and in all existing Centres where it is unclear. Some aspects of the role would include leadership and encouragement and, where the Dean deems it necessary, appropriate, and the opportunity exists, lobbying and fund-raising on behalf of the Centre; the Dean's authority would include the recommendation (to Council) to establish or dissolve a Centre, approval/dismissal (following consultation with the members of the Centre) of an individual to the position of Director, and assignment of space and other resources under the control of the Dean. The responsibilities of the Dean would include such matters as oversight over the financial operations of the Centre, ensuring that the Centre is aware of and follows University policies and practices, and the review of the Centre.

Type B Centres all seem to have well-defined and functioning governance structures. However, the Task Force is uncertain whether the role, responsibility and authority of the VP to whom a Centre reports is clearly defined.

Recommendation:

23. The role, responsibility, and authority of the VP to whom a Centre reports must be clearly identified in all proposals to establish a new Centre and in all existing Centres where it is unclear. Some aspects of the role would include leadership and encouragement and, where the VP deems it necessary, appropriate and the opportunity exists, lobbying and fund-raising on behalf of the Centre; the VP's authority would include the recommendation (to Council) to establish or dissolve a Centre, approval/dismissal (following consultation with the members of the Centre) of an individual to the position of Director, and assignment of space and other resources under the control of the VP as

approved by the President's Executive Committee and/or the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning. The responsibilities of the VP would include such matters as oversight over the financial operations of the Centre, ensuring that the Centre is aware of and follows University policies and practices, and the review of the Centre.

Within the context of the Dean's or VP's responsibility for the appointment of the Director and the recommendation for dissolving a Centre, Directors are rightfully concerned about the succession of leadership and maintaining active membership in a Centre. Many Centres are 'fragile' in that they depend on the active involvement of small numbers of individuals; the loss of a prominent member of a Centre may mean its demise if (s)he is not replaced. Centres play little or sometimes no role in the selection of new faculty who replace those who leave the University. It is possible for Deans (ironically, less so for VPs) to create opportunities for Centres to have input or provide advice to Search Committees through the formation of Search Subcommittees (this practice already is in place in the College of Medicine). At the very least Centres should have an opportunity to point out to a Search Committee the impact on Centre/University activity of the loss of a specific type of expertise.

CONCLUSION

At the University of Saskatchewan there is much that we have got 'right' about Centres. There is a good deal of flexibility in the establishment of Centres and the arrangements under which they operate. Then again, there are pieces missing that would be expected of any modern organization including among other things clear roles and responsibilities for those involved, accountabilities, assessments, appropriate recognitions, and clear communications.

This report responds to the directives identified in the mandate of the Task Force with a series of recommendations that the members of the Task Force believe will be helpful in dealing with the "missing pieces" referred to above. We leave it to others to accept or reject our recommendations and to implement those that are considered useful.

Respectfully submitted:

Kevin Ansdell	Graham Scoles
Jo-Anne Dillon	Bryan Schreiner
Ed Kendall	Ray Spiteri
Lou Hammond-Ketilson	Terry Summers
Karsten Liber	Jim Thornhill
Pauline Melis	Kate Wilson (Administrative Assistant)
John Patience	Tom Wishart (Chair)
Rob Pywell	Judy Yungwirth

APPENDIX K: UNITS, CENTRES, DIVISIONS, INSTITUTES, & GROUPS
as of February, 2010

UNIVERSITY

Animal Resources Centre
Director – Olfert, E. D., Department of Veterinary Pathology

Canadian Centre for Health and Safety in Agriculture (CCHSA)
Director – Gordon, J., Department of Medicine

Centre for Continuing and Distance Education (CCDE)
Director – Cram, R.

Centre for Discovery in Learning
Director – D'Eon, M., College of Medicine

Centre for the Study of Co–operatives
Director – Hammond Ketilson, L., Department of Management & Marketing

Community-University Institute for Social Research (CUISR)
University Co-Director – Clarke, L., Department of Human Resources and Organizational Behaviour
Community Co-Director – Holden, W., City of Saskatoon

Diefenbaker Canada Centre
Director – Atkinson, A.

Division of Biomedical Engineering
Chair – Zhang, C., of Mechanical Engineering

Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness
Acting Academic Lead – Schweir, R., Department of Curriculum Studies

Indigenous Peoples' Health Research Centre (IPHRC)
 Director – Episkenew, J., University of Regina

International Centre for Governance and Development (ICGD)
Director – Sarkar, A. K., Department of Management and Marketing

Saskatchewan Drug Research Institute (SDRI)
Director – Mitchell, D.G.

Saskatchewan Population Health and Evaluation Research Unit, Inc. (SPHERU)
Director – Jeffrey, B., Faculty of Social Work, University of Regina

Saskatchewan Structural Sciences Centre (SSSC)
Director – Ward, D., Department of Chemistry

Toxicology Centre
Acting Director – Siciliano, S., Department of Soil Science

University Learning Centre
Acting Director – Schweir, R., Department of Curriculum Studies

University of Saskatchewan Language Centre
Director – Parkinson, D.M.**University of Saskatchewan Process Philosophy Research Unit (USPPRU)**
Co-director – Flynn, M., Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education
Co-director – Regnier, R. H., Department of Educational Foundations
Co-director – Woodhouse, H., Department of Educational Foundations

Vaccine and Infectious Disease Organization (VIDO)
Director – Potter, A.

W. Brett Wilson Centre for Entrepreneurial Excellence
Director – Sanj, S., Department of Management and Marketing

Women's Studies Research Unit
Executive Director – Green, M.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND BIORESOURCES

Centre for Northern Agroforestry and Afforestation
Director – Van Rees, K., AFIF Chair, Department of Soil Science

Centre for Studies in Agriculture, Law and the Environment (CSALE)
Director – Hesseln, H., Department of Bioresource Policy, Business and Economics

CIBC Centre for Agricultural Entrepreneurship
College of Agriculture and Bioresources

Crop Development Centre (CDC)
Managing Director – Murrell, D.

Feeds Innovation Institute (FII)
Acting Executive Director – Christensen, C.

Saskatchewan Centre for Soil Research (SCSR)
Director – Walley, F., Department of Soil Science

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCE

Centre for Algebra, Logic and Computation (CALC)
Director – Marshall, M., Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Centre for High-Performance Computing (HPC)
Director – Spiteri, R., Department of Computer Science

Eighteenth Century Studies
Acting Director – Stephanson, R. A., Department of English

Humanities Research Unit
Director – Findlay, L. M., Department of English
Co-director – Battiste, M., Department of Educational Foundations

Institute for Aboriginal and Indigenous Graduate Studies and Research (IAIGSR)
, Tait, C., Department of Native Studies

Institute for Computer and Information Technology
Schneider, K., Department of Computer Science

Institute of Space and Atmospheric Studies (ISAS)
Chair – St.-Maurice, J-P., Department of Physics and Engineering Physics

Interdisciplinary Centre for Culture and Creativity (ICCC)
Director – Parkinson, D.J., Department of English

Social Research Unit
Director – Schissel, B., Department of Sociology

Subatomic Physics Institute (SPIN)
Spokesperson – Steele, T. G., Department of Physics and Engineering Physics

EDWARDS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Centre for the Advancement of Accounting Education
Director – Vaidyanathan, G., Department of Accounting

Centre for Strategic Financial Management
Director – Wilson, C., Department of Finance and Management Science

Hanlon Centre for International Business Studies
Director –Entwistle, G., Associate Dean of Research

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Aboriginal Education Research Centre (AERC)
Academic Director – Battiste, M., Department of Educational Foundations

Child and Youth Development Institute
Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education

Saskatchewan Educational Leadership Unit (SELU)
Director – Scharf, M. P., Department of Educational Administration

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Environmental Engineering Division
Acting Chair – Lin, Y.-H., Department of Chemical Engineering

Ron and Jane Graham Centre for the Study of Communication
Academic Director – MacLennan, J., D.K. Seaman Chair in Communication, College of Engineering

Saskatchewan Centre of Excellence in Transportation and Infrastructure
Director – Berthelot, C., Department of Civil and Geological Engineering

COLLEGE OF LAW

Native Law Centre of Canada
Research Director – Henderson, J. Y.

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

Centre for Integrative Medicine (CIM)
Managing Director - Epstein, M. Department of Community Health and Epidemiology
Medical Director - Schnurr, J. Department of Community Health and Epidemiology

Neuropsychiatry Research Unit (NRU)
Director – Li, X.–M., Department of Psychiatry

Prairie Region Health Promotion Research Centre
Director – Williams, L., Department of Community Health and Epidemiology

Prairie Women's Health Centre of Excellence
Administrator – Willson, K., Department of Community Health and Epidemiology

Saskatchewan Cancer Control Research Program
Director – Leis, A. M., Department of Community Health and Epidemiology

Saskatchewan Neuroscience Network (SNN)
Coordinator – Doucette, J. R., Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology

Saskatchewan Sociobehavioural Cancer Research Satellite Centre
Director - Leis, A. M., Department of Community Health and Epidemiology

Saskatchewan Stroke Research Centre (SSRC)
Director – Kalra, J., Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

HEALTH SERVICE PROVISION CENTRES

Alvin Buckwold Child Development Program
Medical Director – Blakley, P.

Cardiovascular Risk Factor Reduction Unit
Director – Wilson, T.W., Department of Medicine

Division of Oncology
Head - Popkin, D. R., Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences

Geriatric Assessment Program
Department of Medicine

Northern Medical Services Division
Department of Family Medicine

Saskatchewan Institute on Prevention of Handicaps
Director – Shanks, J.

Saskatchewan Pediatric Auditory Rehabilitation Centre (SPARC)
Program Head – Brewster, L.

Sleep Disorder Clinic
Director – Skomro, R., Department of Medicine

COLLEGE OF NURSING

Centre for the Advancement of the Study of Nursing Education and Interprofessional Education (CASNIE)
Director – Ferguson, L., College of Nursing

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY AND NUTRITION

Nutrition Resource and Volunteer Centre
Director – Berenbaum, S. L., College of Pharmacy and Nutrition
http://www.usask.ca/pharmacy-nutrition/services/nrvc/

WESTERN COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Canadian Co–operative Wildlife Health Centre (CCWHC)
Executive Director – Leighton, F. A., Department of Veterinary Pathology

ST. THOMAS MORE COLLEGE

Prairie Centre for the Study of Ukrainian Heritage
Director – Kordan, B., Department of Political Studies

<u>RESEARCH GROUPS</u>

HUMANITIES RESEARCH GROUPS

Electronic Text Research at the U of S (ETRUS)
Coordinator – Liu, Y., Department of English

ENGINEERING RESEARCH GROUPS

Bio-sciences, Bio-engineering, Bio-processing
Energy, Production and Processing, Transport, Electrical Energy, and Utilization
Environment, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development
Information and Communication Technologies and Intelligent Systems
Materials Science and Applications

HEALTH SCIENCES RESEARCH GROUPS

Cardiovascular Research Group
Group Leader – Gopalakrishnan, V., Department of Pharmacology

Gene Expression Mapping Using Synchrotron Light (GEMS) Research Group
Group Leader – Roesler, B., Department of Biochemistry

Genomic Medicine and Pathobiology Research Group
Cancer Stem Cell Research Initiative
Co-Leader - Decoteau, J., Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
Co-Leader - Geyer, R., Department of Biochemistry

Immunology Research Group
Co-Leader - Bretscher, P., Department of Microbiology and Immunology
Co-Leader - Gordon, J., Department of Veterinary Microbiology

Institute of Child and Adult Arthritis Research (ICAARe)
Group Leader – Rosenberg, A., Department of Pediatrics

Molecular Design Research Group
Group Leader - Delbaere, L., Department of Biochemistry

Neural Systems and Plasticity Research Group
Group Leader - Corcoran, M., Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology

Obesity Research Group
Group Leader - Chad, K., College of Kinesiology

Primary Health Care Research Group
Group Leader – Ramsden, V., Department of Family Medicine

Reproductive Biology Research Unit
Director – Pierson, R. A., Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences

Reproductive Science and Medicine Research Group (RBRU)
Co-Leader – Pierson, R., Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences
Co-Leader – Adams, G., Department of Veterinary Biomedical Sciences

Research Group on Aging
Group Leader – Juurlink, B., Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology

Saskatchewan Team for Research and Evaluation of Addictions and Mental Health Services (STREAM)
Co-Leader – Dell, C., Canada Research Chair – Addictions, Department of Sociology
Co-Leader – Tempier, R., Department of Psychiatry

Tissue Engineering
Leader – Chen., X., Department of Mechanical Engineering

Quality End of Life Care
Principal Investigator – Duggleby, W., College of Nursing

ORGANIZATIONS REPORTING TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Canadian Light Source Inc. (CLS)
Executive Director – Hormes, J..

Prairie Swine Centre Inc. (PSCI)
President and CEO – Whittington, L.

Prairie Diagnostic Services, Inc.
Director – Jonas, M.

Saskatchewan Food Industry Development Centre Inc.
President – Prefontaine, D.

Western Beef Development Centre
President and CEO – Gullacher, D.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNIVERSITY

Cameco MS Neuroscience Research Center
Director – Verge, V.M.K., Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology

Health Research Division, Saskatchewan Cancer Agency
Executive Director – Carlsen, S. A., Department of Microbiology and Immunology

POS Pilot Plant Corporation
President and CEO – Morgan, R. E.

Regional Psychiatric Centre (Prairies) Correctional Service of Canada
Acting Executive Director – Guenther, P.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

A Framework for Assessment: Beyond Systematic Program Review

As of December 2008

The University of Saskatchewan must be driven by considerations of quality. Being driven by quality means listening to others: peers when it comes to research, students when it comes to teaching, the community when it comes to service. It also means setting standards and estimating progress towards goals.

A Framework for Planning at the University of Saskatchewan

In the new global environment, our competition for faculty, students, and research support is international. Increasingly, our obligations and opportunities are also international. We cannot serve our students, our disciplines, and our communities if we are content to measure ourselves locally. This is not a matter of formal standards, but rather a willingness to open ourselves to evaluation and aim for high quality in all we do. This will be the uncompromising commitment we expect of everyone and every activity.

The Strategic Directions

Quality is an abiding interest of universities the world over. Beginning with *A Framework for Planning* in 1998, the University of Saskatchewan has been unequivocal in key policy and planning documents about its commitment to quality, first and foremost in its academic programs, evidenced through the adoption in 1999 of Systematic Program Review (SPR) and the completion of a first six-year cycle of reviews by 2005. More recently, the University has signaled its interest in a more broadly based approach to assessment in the *Strategic Directions* (2002), the *First Integrated Plan* (2004), and the *Second Integrated Plan* (2008).[1]

Existing University-based quality and accountability efforts, however thorough they are perceived to be by the University of Saskatchewan community, must be placed within the broader public context and interest that is emerging nationally and internationally about higher education. Publications such as *Maclean's*, the *Globe and Mail,* the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, and *USA Today* are only the tip of the iceberg. Today, universities all over the world are coming under increased scrutiny from the general public, from funding providers and policy makers, from students, and from each other as competition for students, faculty, professional staff, and resources increase. Governments, taxpayers, students, and parents are demanding more information about the outcomes of the educational programs they are funding. Students are seeking assurances about the quality of their degree programs as tuition fees increase. Boards are looking for ways to measure progress and performance and to demonstrate accountability and value for dollars expended. If current trends are any indication, the future will be one in which universities spend more time explaining what they do and why they do it to a growing list of stakeholders and interested groups.

External pressures are not the only, or even the primary, reason to re-consider existing assessment strategies. Universities have a practical and philosophical stake in maintaining and demonstrating academic integrity. Academic freedom gives universities (through colleges and departments) wide

---

[1] For a discussion of the assessment context at the University of Saskatchewan and national and international trends, please see Attachment One.

latitude in devising curriculum and programs, but it does not exempt them from the obligation to ensure that what is offered meets international standards. While universities may be the best judges of their own performance, they need to back up these judgments with processes that involve evidence and external referents. This is the purpose of formal assessment processes: to give rigour to judgment and thereby create shared confidence.

This paper outlines a comprehensive assessment strategy for the University of Saskatchewan. For these purposes *assessment is defined as the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs, research performance, and organizational structures undertaken for the purposes of improving student learning and development, improving and assuring quality in program and service offerings, stimulating creative research and scholarly endeavours, and achieving alignment with institution-wide goals.* Building on the lessons of SPR and the widespread desire to ensure that programming and services are of the highest quality, this paper identifies areas of high priority for University-level attention and their implications for the campus community.

It is important to state at the outset that the University of Saskatchewan is not starting from scratch. The University already has many of the key features of an institutional strategy (SPR results, accreditation results, student enrolment data, qualitative information from student focus groups and interviews, institutional level and national surveys, workplace assessments, and targeted unit reviews) in place. What we need to do now is to establish assessment priorities and link them to institutional level planning and decision-making. Keeping in mind that there are limits to our energy and resources, faculty, staff and students can expect to participate in several of these initiatives, although not all at once, and not with the same intensity as with SPR. They can also expect to learn more about the results of our assessment efforts through a communication process which is aimed to ensure that our challenges are understood, our achievements are acknowledged and celebrated, and continued progress towards collective goals is estimated.

Principles Guiding Assessment at the University of Saskatchewan
Assessment is an essential practice of the modern university. By its very nature, assessment provides feedback on progress towards agreed-upon goals or standards and expectations, occasional opportunities to reflect on progress and prospects as well as to make adjustments and obtain further feedback. It is not, as such, a punitive process. Assessment initiatives are therefore an integral component of a larger institutional planning process, not just another thing to do simply for its intrinsic value.

Because a wide variety of potential objects of assessment exists, choices about what is assessed and why, how often selected aspects are assessed, and who is responsible, are necessary. To assist, a set of guiding principles for assessment initiatives at the University of Saskatchewan has been developed.

> *Principle One: Assessment initiatives should be closely linked to the cycles of Integrated Planning and used to inform University, college and administrative unit planning.* This would ensure that assessment initiatives are closely linked to the University's major goal setting, decision-making, and resource allocation process addressing the most obvious limitation of the SPR process.

> *Principle Two: The University should give priority to assessment initiatives that promise the greatest impact in helping the University achieve the goals and priorities stated through the Integrated Planning process.* Having linked assessment and planning, it should be evident that the activities that are assessed should be those that matter most to the University's agreed upon goals and priorities.

Principle Three: The University should undertake a comprehensive and inclusive array of assessment initiatives such that academic and administrative units, services, programs and activities are all subject to appropriate forms of review. Given the wide variety of organizational units and functions on campus, a flexible approach with a variety of tools for self-assessment should be provided to support unit-based assessment initiatives. A common template or framework for similar assessment initiatives should be provided.

Principle Four: Guidelines and standards should be developed and published to ensure consistency of processes, expectations associated with the assessment tool, and alignment with institutional goals and priorities. For example, a typical review will include a self-study, an invitation to nationally and internationally recognized peers to participate in a paper-based or on-site visit, an opportunity to hear from key stakeholders (e.g., students, colleagues, user groups), and an interactive discussion of findings.

Principle Five: Assessment initiatives should be complementary and should provide a holistic view of University of Saskatchewan activities. Available information from a variety of sources (University-level, college or administrative unit specific) should be used and re-used for a number of purposes thereby reducing duplication of effort and work at the college and administrative unit levels.

Principle Six: Responsibility for assessment initiatives should be vested at a variety of levels within the University and should balance responsibility with accountability. Given the wide variety of objects of assessment, academic and administrative unit leaders should assume responsibility for identifying specific assessment opportunities and report on outcomes in their college or administrative unit plans. The guiding philosophy should be permissive, providing pro-active and cyclical opportunities for academic and administrative leaders to take responsibility for assessment within a clearly defined University-level assessment framework with established priorities and standards.

Principle Seven: Results of University-level assessment initiatives should be made generally available to the University community and beyond through a variety of mechanisms including annual reports, websites, Provost's Reports, *On Campus News* and other communications vehicles. Opportunities should be provided to celebrate accomplishments, share learning, and exchange information.

Principle Eight: Responsibility and authority for oversight and management of University-level assessment initiatives should be vested in the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning (PCIP), an administrative body comprised of the Vice-Presidents, ***and coordinated by the Integrated Planning Office (IPO) under the supervision of PCIP.*** University Council, Senate and Board of Governors have strong interests in outcomes and should be provided with annual reports on progress. More frequent updates of major assessment initiatives will be provided as appropriate.

Purposes of Assessment

The *First Integrated Plan* envisioned an assessment system that would be broader than SPR. It proposed the integration and coordination of assessment activities to serve the University community in three broad areas: facilitation, consultation, and leadership for institutional assessment activities; communication of assessment results to the University and wider communities; and, creation of a repository for assessment activities on campus. The *Second Integrated Plan* envisions a comprehensive quality assurance framework to be fully implemented by the end of the second planning cycle (2011/12).

Three broad purposes for assessment at the University of Saskatchewan have been identified:

1. ***Quality improvement*** is the commitment to continuously bring performance and agreed upon goals into closer alignment. It requires benchmarking current efforts, adopting exemplary practices, and monitoring changes in student, staff and faculty practices. Quality improvement is primarily a formative process; we assess to learn and, upon learning, we act. While quality improvement is continuous, we expect concentrated effort to coincide with the opportunities presented by the cycles of Integrated Planning.

2. ***Quality assurance*** refers to the periodic testing of performance against expectations. It requires well developed standards and metrics, coupled with consensus on what constitutes levels of acceptable performance (minimal to superior). Quality assurance is therefore primarily summative in character. The inability to meet minimum standards must be followed by concrete ameliorative actions or by the suspension of activity. Quality assurance can take place at any time, but deans, vice-presidents and others should take advantage of natural opportunities, such as accreditation cycles and changes in leadership, to commission assessments of performance.

3. ***Accountability*** refers to a set of mechanisms or procedures that ensure regular communication about outcomes, desired outcomes, successes and failures. It represents our commitment to openness and transparency because it provides information about what we are doing, how well we are doing it, and what else we need to do to achieve our goals. It obliges us to assume responsibility for our plans, our actions, and our use of public resources. And it obliges us to consider how our activities are perceived by external sources.

In short, *quality improvement* is about recognizing what we do well, innovating, seeking new ideas, and doing better. *Quality assurance* is about proving that we have done so and comparing ourselves with our peers. While both should involve external referents, quality assurance in particular requires objective, impartial, information. *Accountability* links both activities by reporting out to the University's key stakeholders (its students, its faculty, the Board, the Government, and the general public) that progress is being made towards goals and priorities.

Areas of Priority for Assessment at the University of Saskatchewan
Assessment initiatives already occupy a significant amount of attention at the University of Saskatchewan. This increasingly complex and costly set of activities requires oversight, coordination, and connection to the Integrated Planning process. Broadly speaking, assessment initiatives can be organized into three categories: *academic* (teaching and learning, research and scholarly accomplishment, outreach and engagement); *operational* (efficiency and effectiveness, attracting resources, building relationships); and *reputational* (local, national and international). Not surprisingly, the University of Saskatchewan has placed the highest priority on academic assessment initiatives because this is the University's central mission; yet as our experience with SPR demonstrates, our efforts have not been all-inclusive. Moving towards a comprehensive approach will mean placing attention on all three categories (academic, operational and reputational), and increased levels of coordination with agreed-upon standards and timeframes. Given limited human and financial resources, our assessment efforts in the immediate future will of necessity be selective, leveraging the greatest impact for the University and advancing institutional goals and priorities.

Initial descriptions of the areas of priority for assessment follow. Additional details will emerge as policies are developed over the coming months.

Academic Assessment
This area of assessment encompasses the teaching and learning, research and scholarship missions of the University: the quality of the academic programs; student achievement and outcomes; the demonstration

of identified learning outcomes; the quality and nature of the student experience in the classroom and beyond; the quality and impact of the research, scholarly and artistic work conducted by faculty and students; the nature and quality of outreach and engagement initiatives. This is a daunting list. We are already conducting assessment initiatives in many areas and we are poised to begin some new initiatives in others. The priorities for the second planning cycle are:

1. ***Graduate Program Review.*** The *Strategic Directions* identified the expansion of graduate work as one of four key institutional goals. Between 1999 and 2005, SPR was used to evaluate the quality of graduate and undergraduate degree programs. Now that the first cycle of program reviews is complete, a new quality assurance process, intended to replace SPR and focusing on graduate programs, will be developed to bring the University of Saskatchewan into alignment with review processes in other parts of Canada (e.g. Ontario).

   Building on lessons learned from SPR, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research will develop a separate, streamlined, and cyclical review process for graduate programs, including professional programs, to be implemented beginning in the 2009/10 academic year.[2] This process will recognize the diversity of purpose of graduate programs and will address disciplinary differences. All graduate programs will be reviewed according to a pre-determined schedule which will be established following consultation with the Dean(s) of the 'home' college and the Provost and Vice-President Academic. Documentation will address the recommendations of the most recent SPR (or subsequent) site visit and follow a template to be designed by the College of Graduate Studies and Research in collaboration with the Integrated Planning Office (IPO). The schedule and results of reviews will be broadly shared with the campus community through University Council and specifically with the Academic Programs Committee (APC). The Dean(s) of the 'home' college will be involved at critical points in the review process (self-study, site team visit, outcomes).

   These reviews will be summative in character; program sponsors, deans and others will learn about opportunities for improvement, but graduate reviews will be principally for the purpose of quality assurance. A simplified outcome grid will determine if programs can continue to admit students and receive financial support. Where changes are required (as opposed to being recommended), the Dean will monitor progress and determine when, and if, a program should be suspended or recommenced. Program reviews will be timed to ensure that programs have had sufficient time to implement improvements suggested in previous reviews or to allow for completion of the program by a sufficient cohort of students.

   The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research will be responsible for managing the process for the University under the broad supervision of the Provost's Office. The Dean will establish the University's policy for graduate program review following consultation with University Council and in collaboration with the Integrated Planning Office (IPO).

2. ***Undergraduate Curriculum Reviews.*** Given the experience of SPR, the focus of accreditation reviews, and the linkages to Integrated Planning proposed below, undergraduate program reviews will no longer be conducted systematically (as occurred under SPR). This paper proposes the

---

[2] It is possible that the Graduate Program Review Process will begin earlier, but this implementation timeline allows for the development of the policy and procedures, including a consultation process with the Academic Programs Committee, and the preparation of self-studies for the first programs to be reviewed.

selective and occasional reviews of undergraduate degree programs, under the supervision of the Provost and the APC, to understand the level to which the University is achieving its curricular goals and learning outcomes. Such reviews will typically be aggregated at the degree level (e.g., BA, BSc, BFA, BMus, BComm, BEng, MD, LLB etc) but may occasionally be discipline-specific (e.g. History, Accounting, Civil Engineering).

Building on the goals outlined in the *Teaching and Learning Foundational Document*, these reviews will provide opportunities for focusing on examination of the curriculum, the design and structure of degree programs, learning objectives and outcomes, program and curricular innovations and enhancements including experiential learning opportunities, study-abroad programs, discovery-based learning opportunities, alternate pedagogical approaches (problem-based learning, active learning etc), the quality of teaching, and technology in support of academic programs (both in classroom and distributed modalities), the quality of the faculty delivering the degree program, the impact of the faculty research, scholarly and artistic activity on the program, and outreach and engagement initiatives and approaches sponsored by the program or in which the program participates. Undergraduate curriculum reviews will be sponsored by the Provost and supported by the IPO. The advice of the APC will be solicited regarding which undergraduate degree programs should be reviewed; outcomes will be shared with APC and other Council committees as appropriate.

3. ***Understanding the Student Experience***. The *Strategic Directions* identified two critical goals in the context of the student experience: 'establish the University of Saskatchewan as a major presence in graduate education'; and 'recruit and retain a diverse and academically promising body of students and prepare them for success in the knowledge age'. Since 2000, the University has increased its information base about the nature of the student experience on our campus through participation in a number of institution-level surveys. These include: the *Canadian University Survey Consortium (CUSC)*, 2001 – 2008; the *National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)*, 2006 and 2008; the *Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI),* 2003; the *Saskatchewan Advanced Education and Employment: Graduate Outcomes of 2004/05 Class* (with other post-secondary institutions), 2007; the *Student Outcomes Survey*, 2000; and the *Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (GPSS)*, 2007. The results of these surveys have been analyzed as part of the background research conducted for the *Teaching and Learning Foundational Document* and are available to the campus community through the IPO website: www.usask.ca/ip. In addition, the University completed a major study of *Student Retention* (2006); information about the results of this study is provided in the *Teaching and Learning Foundational Document*. Based on these studies, the Foundational Document presents a number of key areas in which the University needs to make important advances over the next decade (see pages 32 – 38 of the March 20, 2008 draft).

Through the process of review of college and administrative unit plans for the second planning cycle, it is evident that there is increased interest in gathering and understanding student opinion about their educational experience. Colleges and units have identified surveys as one tool; as Attachment Two demonstrates, the University already conducts a large number of surveys. As a first step, the IPO will develop a survey policy to ensure that students are not overwhelmed with survey requests from a wide variety of sources. Other tools, such as focus groups, will also need to be developed. In all cases, the University needs to invest in dissemination of the findings to increase mutual understanding about successes and challenges.

Beginning immediately, the IPO will take responsibility for coordinating a selected group of major University-level surveys and disseminating information about findings to the general

University community. The IPO will work collaboratively with other University offices and departments to maintain an inventory of major University-level surveys, to integrate findings, to develop a survey policy, and to coordinate and communicate the results. The APC and the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) will be the foci for Council.

4. ***Research Accomplishments and Standing***. The *Strategic Directions* called for a campus-wide commitment to research, scholarly and artistic work and the identification of areas of research strength in which focused investment would garner national and international recognition for the University. The *Foundational Document on Research Scholarly and Artistic Work*, approved by University Council in 2004, subsequently identified two goals for the University's research efforts: "to be established as among the top ten medical/doctoral universities in Canada and as one of a select few internationally in key areas". To assess progress and prospects, the University will need to identify ways in which success in research, scholarly and artistic work (both activity and impact) can be measured. The Vice-President Research, working with the Council Committee on Research Scholarly and Artistic Work, will be charged with responsibility for developing a set of indicators by which progress can be gauged. This effort will form part of the overall institutional strategy associated with assessing progress towards University-level plans and goals (described below).

Operational Assessment

This area of assessment encompasses the efficiency and effectiveness of the University's various organizational structures; the University's capacity to attract resources (human, financial); the University's progress towards its goals and plans; the University's internal culture and relationships; and the effectiveness of the University's relationships with external bodies (governments, private sector, friends). While Attachment Three demonstrates that organizational units have been the objects of selective reviews and assessments over the past decade, the Integrated Planning Initiative requires assessment of institutional level priorities within a national context. The immediate priorities are:

5. ***Progress towards University-level Plans and Goals.*** Since 2002, beginning with the *Strategic Directions*, the University has developed a series of institution-wide goals and priorities. It has developed a substantial collection of Foundational Documents, implemented its *First Integrated Plan*, and just approved its second. Good practice in assessment requires that progress towards goals is monitored and communicated broadly to internal and external stakeholder groups. The first step in this regard was taken when the Provost devoted his 2006 annual Academic Agenda address to the first integrated planning "report card." A second 'report card' was distributed in early Fall 2007 and a final report on the *First Integrated Plan* will follow in 2008/09. In addition, the Vice-Presidents, acting as Executive Sponsors for the Foundational Documents, have provided occasional reports to the general University community beginning in the 2006/07 academic year. There is a strong University-wide interest in the results of this effort, given that all of these documents have been approved by either University Council, the Board of Governors, or both.

   Typical assessment efforts associated with institutional goals and priorities involve the development of performance measures aimed at tracking progress and the identification of peers for comparison and benchmarks. Other universities are in the process of creating 'scorecards' or 'dashboards' to highlight progress. At our University, a critical first step will be the establishment of an information strategy to provide the information needed for institutional decision-making.

   As a matter of priority, the IPO will be responsible for coordinating/leading the development of a set of performance measures to identify progress against the *Strategic Directions*, current and

future Integrated Plans, and the Foundational Documents and, working with the Office of Communications, for ensuring that the results are broadly communicated within the University community and beyond. Critical to the success of this responsibility will be a broadly-based consultative approach drawing from the expertise available within the campus community and from exemplary practices in other universities in Canada and around the world.

6. ***Selective Reviews of Academic and Administrative Units For Quality Assurance and Accountability.*** Increasingly, review processes encompassing all university organizational entities are occurring. Integrated Planning has hastened this trend at the University of Saskatchewan as academic and administrative planning are increasingly connected. While some academic and administrative units were assessed in the past decade (See Attachment Three for details), a systematic unit review process has not been established. Such a process is not intended, but it is anticipated that, from time to time, the President, Vice-Presidents or Deans will wish to sponsor single reviews of academic or administrative units independent of the enhanced planning reviews described below to gauge quality or to address specific issues/concerns.

   During the second planning cycle, selective reviews of academic and administrative units will continue. A process spearheaded by the Provost will be devised for these occasional and selective reviews, and will include the establishment of clear terms of reference, timelines, expectations, external peer evaluations, for both academic and administrative units. The IPO will be expected to develop standards and supervise the process. Support will be provided by the appropriate Vice-Presidential office for reviews conducted within their portfolio.

   The emphasis on unit reviews does not compromise the University's ability to look at aspects of operational activity selectively. For example, deferred maintenance, financial processes, and information technology systems might all be reviewed to ascertain whether they are achieving goals/expectations.

7. ***Unit Reviews for Quality Improvement and Enhanced Planning.*** Universities the world over conduct 'unit reviews', usually college or department based, to determine, through a process of informed judgment, the quality and suitability of academic endeavours and their alignment with institutional priorities and goals. In the 1970s and early 1980s, the University of Saskatchewan conducted unit reviews linked to appointments of deans; many universities in Canada have adopted this approach. As already indicated in Attachment Three, the University conducted a substantial number of 'one-off' reviews of units over the past decade at the same time as the SPR process examined the quality of the University's degree programs.

   Building on the important connection between unit reviews and resource allocation processes, colleges, schools, academic support units such as the Library and the University Learning Centre, and major administrative units will participate in a voluntary, formative, pro-active process of self-assessment during the second planning cycle (2008/09 to 2011/12) and thereafter intended to support the development of the college/unit plan. For academic units, the self-assessment may include curricular innovations, teaching and learning practices, the quality of scholarship and research, administrative and organizational structures, the performance of outreach and public service activities, and the state of facilities and infrastructure. The purpose of the assessment will be to assist colleges, schools, academic support units, and major administrative units in their planning efforts. The Dean, Executive Director, or Associate Vice-President will consult the Provost's Office for general advice, standards and/or templates and make a determination about the nature and scope of the assessment to be undertaken but the impetus for a decision to proceed with a formative assessment will rest with the Dean, Executive Director or Associate Vice-

President. Following from the Final Report of the Task Force on Centres, the Vice-President Research will develop a review process in collaboration with the IPO and be responsible for reviews of research centres.

Reputational Assessment

This area of assessment encompasses those activities which assist the University to position itself within the higher education landscape in Canada and internationally; i.e., the University's external profile. Initiatives are based on examination of relationships with particular 'stakeholder' groups (e.g., guidance counselors, parents, faculty peers, Canadian business and social leaders, other universities, alumni, etc.), and typically examine how the University is perceived by external constituencies. Current efforts in this area of assessment are very limited as is our ability to evaluate how efforts to improve visibility and reputation translate to value for the University (recruitment and retention of faculty and students, policy decisions, funding, partnerships, etc.). We need to move from qualitative observations to quantifiable results. The immediate priorities are:

8. ***Strategic Communications.***   The University of Saskatchewan's reputation is built by the academic programs we teach, the research and scholarship we create, the people we hire, and the business practices we follow. Working with the IPO, the Communications Office will establish a strategic communications plan which is based on a series of periodic surveys aimed at understanding how the University is perceived within Saskatchewan, Western Canada and nationally. This work will be geared to support college/unit efforts which are already in place and it will help to position the University within Canada's higher education landscape.

Conclusion

The areas of priority described above represent a reasonable, measured approach building on the lessons learned through SPR and other recent review processes at our University and exemplary practices elsewhere. While they represent a substantial institutional assessment commitment, they do not exhaust all assessment possibilities. For example, Deans or administrative unit heads might commission reviews of programs, services, or units reporting to them, or access workplace assessments provided by the Human Resources Division. University Council might identify other aspects of University activity which would warrant in-depth scrutiny, such as interdisciplinary programs, honours programs or 'first year experience' initiatives for students. By starting with those areas that provide the greatest impact and utilize existing University-level resources most effectively a comprehensive assessment strategy will be initiated. This strategy should fulfill the expectations outlined in the *Strategic Directions,* in the *First Integrated Plan* and in the *Second Integrated Plan*, but it will undoubtedly evolve based on our collective experience.

Implementation: Who is Responsible for What, by When?

Learning from the SPR process and using it as a base allows the University to meet the assessment challenge by being selective in its approach and less time and resource intensive in aggregate. Care must still be taken to avoid poor investments. Put another way, the University cannot afford to over tax its faculty and staff by failing to coordinate planning and assessment activities as much as possible. Scarce resources must be preserved for the work of actually delivering a high quality educational experience and conducting research, scholarly and artistic work; outreach; and operational excellence.

This paper should make it clear that responsibility for assessment is widespread within the University; no one unit can or will be assigned responsibility to implement this process. Further, oversight of progress towards collective goals is shared between the governing bodies of the University. The Board of Governors, University Council and Senate all have an interest in the University's progress,

in the quality of its programs and services, in the efficiency of its use of resources, in its reputation. The Board has signaled an active and ongoing interest in quality assurance and in understanding institutional progress against national competitors. University Council has an intense interest in the quality of the academic programs and can provide advice about the use of institutional resources. At a minimum, all three governing bodies will require regular reports on progress. In some cases, described earlier in this paper, Council will play a significant role in the identification of programs for review and in the interpretation of results.

Given the diversity of assessment initiatives identified, responsibility for implementation needs to be assigned (see Table One below). Administratively, the IPO is uniquely positioned to link University-level assessment initiatives with institutional planning and decision-making and it will be assigned the tasks of high-level analysis to inform University-level planning and coordination. In addition, the

TABLE ONE: Overview of University-level Assessment Initiatives				
Assessment Category	*Area of Priority*	*Principal Reason(s) for Assessment*	*Responsibility Assignment*	*Frequency*
ACADEMIC				
	Graduate Programs	Quality Assurance	Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies and Research	Once every 6 – 8 years*
	Undergraduate Curriculum Reviews	Quality Assurance	Provost and Deans	Once every 10 years**
	Understanding the Student Experience	Quality Improvement	Integrated Planning Office	Linked to survey instrument
	Research Accomplishment and Success	Accountability	Vice-President Research	Linked to planning cycles
OPERATIONAL				
	Progress towards University-level Goals and Plans	Accountability	Integrated Planning Office	Occasional during planning cycles; final report once every four years Performance Measures annual update
	Unit reviews for Enhanced Planning	Quality Improvement	Deans, administrative unit heads	Linked to planning cycles
	Selective Reviews of Academic and Administrative Units	Quality Assurance, Accountability	Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning	As needed
REPUTATIONAL				
	Strategic Communications Plan	Quality Improvement, Accountability	President's Executive Committee	Linked to planning cycles

* New graduate programs will only be reviewed following completion of a sufficient cohort of students.
** Undergraduate programs which are subject to external accreditation by professional bodies will normally not be subject to a University-sponsored curriculum review (the accreditation review will be determined to be 'in lieu of'). If the Provost's Committee or the President determines that a University-sponsored review should be undertaken, the cycle of accreditation will be taken into account in establishing dates for a University-sponsored review to occur.

NOTE: The Integrated Planning Office (IPO) will coordinate efforts under each assessment category by maintaining and publishing an annual schedule of assessment initiatives, will consult broadly with units or programs which may be subject to review, and will support a limited number of assessment activities at the request of the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning (PCIP).

IPO will be asked to develop standards for assessment initiatives associated with planning and quality assurance, maintain an inventory of reviews/assessments, integrate and communicate outcomes to ensure better decision-making at all levels. It will also be asked to provide advice to colleges and units wishing to conduct an assessment initiative and be a referral point for other types of assessment which might be brought to bear on specific issues (financial, human). It will also be expected to provide analysis of the information provided through the various assessment processes and to make regular reports with aggregated interpretations/conclusions about the results available to the general University community.

It is important to underscore the responsibility of both the Board of Governors and the University Council in oversight of institutional progress towards collective goals.

Table One (above) provides a high-level overview of the implementation plan for University-level assessment initiatives at the University of Saskatchewan.

Table Two (below) provides a rough guide about when to expect University-level assessment initiatives to unfold now that the *Second Integrated Plan* has been approved and implementation has begun.

TABLE TWO: Proposed Implementation Schedule	
2008/09	• Submission for approval to University Council and Board of Governors by October, 2008. • Establishment of assessment function within the Integrated Planning Office (Fall 2008) • Participation in University-level surveys and communication of results • Development, finalization, and approval of Graduate Program Review process, template, standards, and schedule • Development of University-level performance indicators and benchmarks to assess progress against the *Strategic Directions*, the Foundational Documents, and the *Integrated Plan* • Development of standards for academic and administrative unit reviews for quality assurance including research centres • Final Progress Report on *First Integrated Plan* and First Planning Cycle • Selected unit and program reviews (as identified by President and/or Provost)
2009/10	• Graduate Program Review begins • Development of standards for academic and administrative unit reviews for enhanced planning for all units • Development of template for optional undergraduate curriculum review(s) • Participation in University-level surveys and communication of results continues • Other assessment activities continue
2010/11	• Formative academic unit and academic support unit reviews begin in advance of Third Planning Cycle • Participation in University-level surveys and communication of results continues • Other assessment activities continue

Conclusion and Next Steps

The assessment initiatives described above represent a substantial commitment of University of Saskatchewan resources toward an effort which may seem to some observers as somewhat tangential to the core mandate of the institution. It is true that to do assessment well will mean that scarce resources have to be allocated to support assessment initiatives. Many of the initial resources that are needed are already in place or can be reallocated from existing central resources to support assessment. However, a modest level of new resources (less than $200,000) will be required to support Graduate Program Review, University-level surveys, and academic and administrative unit reviews (although these will be cost-shared).

It is important to note, however, that costs associated with doing assessment pale in comparison to the costs of not doing assessment at all. The strategy proposed in this paper is a selective one, focusing on University–wide priorities and goals and linking assessment to resource allocation processes. This approach should give good value for the investment because the outcomes will shape the future of the University. While assessment is a broad topic, our assessment program does not need to be so broad that it is all consuming; it does, however, need to exist and it needs to measure those activities that matter most to us. We cannot afford to do anything less.

Drafted by Pauline Melis, Assistant Provost, Institutional Planning and Assessment
Attachment One: *The Assessment Context at the University of Saskatchewan and Beyond*
Attachment Two: *A Selected List of Major Surveys Conducted at the University of Saskatchewan: 1994 – 2007*
Attachment Three: *A Selected List of Unit Reviews Conducted at the University of Saskatchewan: 1994 – 2006*