

# **Establishing and Assessing Emerging Research Initiatives, Research Centers, and Institutes at Northern Illinois University**

Last update: June 21, 2021(v3)  
May 4, 2020 (v2)  
August 21, 2018 (v1)  
(Appendix C - Log of Policy Changes)

## **Scope**

Scholarly activities occur across a spectrum of institutional structures, from single faculty or principal investigator efforts, to informal and formal research groups with varying numbers of faculty, to formal institutionally established centers and institutes. This document describes processes for creation, assessment, and continuation or termination of formal research units at Northern Illinois University.

## **Principles**

The guiding principles for establishing and assessing research units follow.

1. The University must have the agility to support research initiatives of varying formality and complexity encompassing single investigators, investigator teams, and centers.
2. Faculty driven and strategic initiatives should address research and scholarly areas with significant discovery, societal, or economic impact.
3. The scholarly or research focus of research units must align with the University's strategic initiatives and goals.
4. Organizational structures must accommodate and recognize initiatives with both research and curricular components.
5. Research units should have a strategy to become self-sustaining as appropriate for the discipline.
6. Oversight, assessment, and evaluation should occur at the supervisory level above that of the research structure. (As examples, an initiative housed in a single department should be overseen by the Chair and/or Dean; interdisciplinary initiatives involving more than one department within a college should be overseen by the Dean; and research initiatives involving more than one college should be overseen by the Vice President (VP) of Research and Innovation Partnerships (RIPS). For practical purposes, a leading college should be identified if multiple colleges are involved. Moreover, research initiatives approaching the size of their natural administrative unit should be overseen by a Dean or by the VP of RIPS.
7. Assessment and evaluation of all research initiatives should occur periodically; and a continuation/termination decision should be taken at regular intervals.
8. At a minimum, research units must have documented missions; short-term and long-term strategic plans; clearly identified leader/leadership structures and processes for selecting leadership and leadership succession; regular assessment and evaluation plans; and sunset provisions.

The following key questions should be addressed when establishing a research unit.

1. What research and scholarship advantages are realized if a unit is created?
2. What is the likelihood of long-term active participation by faculty and students?
3. What impact will the new unit have on the participating faculties' academic department and scholarly work?
4. What resources will be required to support the new unit?
5. What types of external funding are available to support the new unit and projects?
6. Does the University have the expertise and resources for establishing and maintaining an acknowledged and respected enterprise?

These principles and questions suggest the formation of three distinct types of formal research units, each reflecting increasing levels of formality and complexity and which collectively offer a path for organizational growth. The level of complexity does not necessarily suggest a progressive path must be followed; but specifies the expectations for each type of research unit. Thus, initiatives can start at any level. These policies do not pertain to laboratories (e.g., computer, technology, and science), faculty groups working together, or research groups formed solely to address grantors' needs.

### **Definition of Formal Research Units**

The formal research units are defined as:

- **Emerging Research Initiatives (ERI)** which provide the least formal mechanism to explore focused areas of emerging research or respond to new opportunities. ERIs are typically proposed by faculty and have an expected lifetime of four years.
- **Research Centers (Center)** which address broad or complicated research questions or grand challenges. They should aspire to generate enough resources to carry on research and administrative activities by leveraging internal capabilities and external partnerships. A Center has formal structure and may consider applying for IBHE standing.
- **Research Institutes (Institute)** which are a collection of two or more Centers and additional ERIs with a unifying and overarching theme. An Institute has formal structure and may consider applying for IBHE standing.

Consistent with the guiding principles, ERIs, Centers, and Institutes should have a number of common characteristics: formal structure with a spokesperson or director, a research mission and goals, and assessment criteria and metrics. Additional requirements are appropriate for units of increasing complexity.

Although this policy statement pertains to Centers and Institutes with research activities, Centers and Institutes may also offer courses for student credit or confer degrees. The establishment, management, and assessment of the academic components of Centers and Institutes are overseen by the Division of Academic Affairs and described elsewhere. The characteristics and requirements related to research components of ERIs, Centers, and Institutes are described below.

### **Distribution of Facilities and Administration Funds**

Distribution of Facilities and Administration Funds (F&A, also called indirect funds or overhead) to ERIs, Centers, and Institutes will be addressed in a separate policy developed and maintained by Sponsored Programs Administration.

### **Regular Policy Review**

The policy for Establishing and Assessing Emerging Research Initiatives, Research Centers, and Institutes at Northern Illinois University will be reviewed periodically, typically biennially, and, when required, updated to meet the needs of the different units and the institution.

## Emerging Research Initiatives

### Establishing an Emerging Research Initiative

Emerging Research Initiatives (ERI) provide a relatively informal mechanism for faculty and staff to explore well-defined new research opportunities. ERIs are temporary and after four years will be terminated, continued for a single additional two-year period, or converted to a Center. The University may provide initial or startup resources, but ERIs should attempt to generate sufficient resources to help sustain research and administrative activities. ERIs may also request inclusion into an existing Center or Institute.

To initiate an ERI, proponents should first informally engage with University leadership. Thereafter, if appropriate, a written proposal should be submitted to the VP of RIPS. The proposal will be necessary for institutional recognition of the ERI and possible identification and assignment of resources to the ERI.

During the initial, exploratory phase, the proponents should:

1. Prepare a short “white paper,” approximately two pages, describing the ERI’s goals, the alignment with the university mission (<http://www.niu.edu/at-a-glance/mission.shtml>), and value for the academic units involved.
2. Confirm the support of Deans, Department Chairs, and existing Centers and/or Institutes, as appropriate.
3. Engage in preliminary discussion with the VP of RIPS regarding goals and resources.

Should there be sufficient informal institutional support to proceed, a written proposal, approximately ten pages, with the following components should be submitted to the VP of RIPS:

1. Mission, purpose, goals, and objectives
2. Evidence of the need for new or increased activities
3. Discussion of the research activities and strategy
  - a. Introduction/description of the activity or activities addressed
  - b. Methodological approaches
  - c. Significance of the research
  - d. Timeline to complete the research
  - e. Resources needed (these may be provided as “start-up” or one-time resources)
  - f. Barriers to completion of the project
  - g. Communication/online plan
4. Participating faculty and their qualifications
5. Impact of the proposed research on faculty scholarship; ERI home department(s), college(s), and university; and students.
6. An assessment of the potential to become a Center, including potential for external funding opportunities.
7. Evaluation criteria for future assessment. Four general evaluation criteria and corresponding performance metrics are suggested in Appendices A and B, respectively.

The VP of RIPS, in consultation with the involved departments and colleges, will determine if the ERI should be institutionally recognized and receive resources. The decision will be based on the persuasiveness of the research agenda and the likelihood the research strategy will succeed. All recognized ERIs will be listed on the RIPS website.

### *Evaluation of Emerging Research Initiatives*

ERIs are not permanent entities and will be subject to review prior to conversion to a Center or termination. Two years after the establishment of the ERI, a status report will be required to ensure that the ERI is meeting goals and to provide an opportunity for strategic adjustments. A comprehensive assessment, including data from all previous years, will be performed during the fourth year.

Status reports and assessments will be jointly managed by the VP of RIPS and the Dean of the College or the Deans of the Colleges hosting the ERI. An advisory committee, formed by the VP of RIPS in consultation with the Deans involved, will review the progress of the ERI. After the status report, the advisory committee will recommend corrective actions, if required. After the comprehensive review, the committee will recommend termination, continuation for one additional two-year period, or conversion to a Center.

The comprehensive assessment of the ERI will be based on a written report, public presentations to the committee, VP of RIPS, and Deans involved, and the responses to questions prompted by the report and presentation. The content of the ERI written report; which should be approximately ten pages, should comprise the following information.

1. Introduction
2. Mission, purpose, goals, and objectives
3. Evaluation Criteria
  - a. Mission
  - b. Productivity in relationship to research, scholarship, creativity and artistry
  - c. Diversity of faculty, staff, postdocs, and students
  - d. Level of engagement by faculty, staff, postdocs, and students (quantitatively, in terms of FTE)
  - e. Other criteria or additional information
4. Explanation of ERI value and enhancement of affiliate scholarship
5. Strategic plan and timeline to increase affiliate scholarship and sustainability
6. Address comments and recommendations from the previous review (After the first-two year review)
7. Budget including operations, personnel and revenue
8. Conclusion

An ERI should strengthen and enhance a well-defined research area, such that the efforts of the ERI exceed those of individuals in that area. A successful ERI must articulate the added value brought to the research enterprise, catalyze collaborative efforts that might not otherwise occur, provide infrastructure beyond that available to individual researchers, and encourage student and faculty involvement. Accordingly, the committee will use the report, answers to the questions

generated from the report, and the presentation to form an opinion on the success and future viability of the ERI.

*Termination of an Emerging Research Initiatives or Transition to a Center*

No longer than four years after inception, based on the recommendations of the review advisory committee, the VP of RIPS in consultation with the Deans of the Colleges hosting the ERI will determine if the ERI should be terminated, extended for a single additional two-year period, or converted to a Center. If an extension is granted, a decision for termination or conversion to a Center will be determined at the sixth year, utilizing the review process established for the fourth-year review.

Final authority for determining the status of the ERI will rest with the VP of RIPS and will be documented. Reconsideration of the decision can be requested based only on factual corrections or clarifications. If terminated as an ERI, the effort may continue at the principal investigator level with the same considerations as any other principal investigator effort.

To be considered for transition to Center status, the ERI should demonstrate success according to the evaluation criteria, demonstrate financial sustainability, and demonstrate clear potential for broadening of research efforts. The process for conversion of an ERI to a Research Center (or, equivalently, establishing a Research Center) is described in the next Section.

## Research Centers

### Establishing a Research Center

Research Centers offer a formal mechanism for faculty and staff to pursue established research projects or complicated research questions and grand challenges. Centers are reviewed every fourth year. After their first two four-year reviews the Centers are considered for continuation or termination at each subsequent eight-year review. They are characterized by high potential for external funding and partnerships. Centers may have a physical or virtual footprint. The University may provide annual resources, but Centers must generate sufficient resources to significantly contribute to research and administrative activities. Centers may also request inclusion in an existing Institute.

To initiate a Center, proponents should first informally engage with University leadership. Thereafter, if appropriate, a written proposal should be submitted to the VP of RIPS. The proposal will be necessary for institutional recognition of the Center and identification and assignment of resources to the Center.

During the initial, exploratory phase, the proponents should:

1. Prepare a short “white paper,” less than five pages, describing the Center’s goals, the alignment with the university mission (<http://www.niu.edu/at-a-glance/mission.shtml>), and the value for the academic units involved.
2. Confirm the support of Deans, Department Chairs, and existing Centers and Institutes, as appropriate.
3. Engage in preliminary discussion with the VP of RIPS regarding goals and resources.

Should there be sufficient informal institutional support to proceed, a written proposal, less than twenty pages, with the following components, should be submitted to the VP of RIPS:

1. Center mission, purpose, goals, and objectives
2. Evidence of the need for broad activities
3. Discussion of the research activities and strategy
4. Impact of the proposed research on faculty scholarship, college(s), the university, and students.
5. The nature and types of internal and external partnerships that will be formed or strengthened.
6. Structure and Governance
  - a. Introduction
  - b. Structure of the Center, noting key responsibilities and roles, considering both initial and longer term needs
  - c. Leadership structure, administrative structure, and processes
  - d. Internal and external advisory bodies
7. Communication/online plan
8. Research compliance requirements
9. Participating faculty and their qualifications

10. Funding requirements:
  - a. Potential for external funding
  - b. Detailed information about funding needed for Center operations
  - c. Timeline to generate income to sustain the Center
11. Space requirements:
  - a. Short-term and longer-term needs of the Center's activities
  - b. Special requirements to execute the Centers' activities
  - c. Space proposed for the Center beyond that available
  - d. Special needs for equipment
12. Evaluation criteria for future assessment. With respect to assessment, seven general evaluation criteria and corresponding performance metrics for Centers are suggested in Appendices A and B, respectively.

To review the proposal for establishing a Center, the VP of RIPS will convene an advisory panel in consultation with the Provost. The advisory panel will be charged with evaluating the Center proposal and presented materials to determine alignment with the University's mission and strategic plan, expected contributions to the center's field of study, scholarly outcomes, potential for innovation in the field of study, and social benefit. The panel will provide a recommendation concerning establishment of the center to the VP of RIPS and the Provost for final determination.

#### Evaluation of Research Centers

Regular assessment will ensure that the Center is meeting goals and provide an opportunity for implementing strategic adjustments. Center reviews will occur every fourth year and be jointly managed by the VP of RIPS and the Deans of the Colleges hosting the Center. An advisory committee, formed by the VP of RIPS in consultation with the Deans involved, will assess the progress of the Center and recommend corrective actions if needed.

The comprehensive assessment of the Center will be based on a written report and the responses to questions prompted by the report. The Center director will present the information about the center to the committee, VP of RIPS, and Deans involved. The content of the Center written report; which should be approximately twenty pages, should comprise the following information, if applicable.

1. Introduction
2. Mission, purpose, goals, and objectives
3. Evaluation Criteria
  - a. Mission
  - b. Productivity in relationship to research, scholarship, creativity and artistry
  - c. Diversity of faculty, staff, postdocs, and students
  - d. Level of engagement by faculty, staff, postdocs, and students (quantitatively, in terms of FTE)
  - e. Attraction of new external and internal funds
  - f. National and international reputation and prominence
  - g. Relationships and partnerships
  - h. Other criteria or additional information



4. Explanation of the Center's value and enhancement of affiliate scholarship
5. Describe the strategic plan and plan timeline to increase affiliate scholarship and sustainability; and resources needed for the next five years
6. Budget including operations, personnel and revenue
7. Address comments and recommendations from the previous review (after the first-four year review)
8. Conclusion

A Center should strengthen and enhance the targeted research areas such that the efforts of the Center exceed those of individuals. A successful Center must articulate the added value brought to the research enterprise, catalyze collaborative efforts that might not otherwise occur, provide infrastructure beyond that available to individual researchers, and encourage student and faculty involvement. Accordingly, the committee will use the presentations and report information to form an opinion on the success and future viability of the Center.

A center with IBHE standing can utilize the report to comply with university and IBHE's requirements.

#### *Termination or Continuation of a Research Center or Transition to an Institute*

Every fourth year after the first two four-year reviews, the VP of RIPS and the Provost, in consultation with the Deans of the Colleges hosting the Center, will determine if the Center should be recommended for termination, continuation, or Institute status. To ensure a broad set of perspectives, the VP of RIPS will form an advisory committee to review the Center according to the evaluation procedure and criteria described for the regular reviews. The advisory committee will provide a recommendation for termination, continuation, or transition to an Institute. A recommendation for continuation may include advice on how to improve or correct operations. Based on the results of the review and recommendations of the advisory committee, the VP of RIPS and the Provost will determine the status of the Center. Reconsideration of the decision can be requested based only on factual corrections or clarifications.

If terminated as a Center, the effort may continue at the principal investigator level with the same considerations as any other principal investigator effort. To be considered for transition to Institute status, the Center should consistently demonstrate success at each term of the evaluation criteria and a broadening of the research activities to two or more sustainable and distinct efforts. The Institute application process is described in the next Section.

## Research Institutes

### Establishing a Research Institute

Research Institutes are a collection of two or more Centers and additional ERIs with a unifying and overarching theme. Institutes are considered permanent, are reviewed every four years, and undergo a continuation or termination review every eight years. Institutes may have a physical or virtual footprint. They are characterized by continuous external funding and robust external partnerships. The University may augment resources, but Institutes must generally self-fund research and administrative activities.

To initiate an Institute, a written proposal, with the following components, should be submitted to the VP of RIPS:

1. Institute mission, purpose, goals, and objectives
2. Evidence of the need for broad activities
3. Discussion of research activities and strategy
4. Impact of the proposed Institute on faculty research, the University, and students, explicitly describing the benefit of an overarching Institute rather than independent Centers.
5. The nature and types of internal and external partnerships that will be formed or strengthened
6. Structure and Governance
  - a. Introduction
  - b. Structure of the Institute, key responsibilities, and roles, considering both initial and longer term needs
  - c. Leadership structure, administrative structure, and processes
  - d. Internal and external advisory bodies
7. Communication/online plan
8. Research compliance requirements
9. Participating faculty and their qualifications
10. Funding requirements:
  - a. Potential for external funding
  - b. Detailed information about funding needed for operations
  - c. Timeline to generate income to sustain the Institute
11. Space requirements:
  - a. Short-term and longer-term needs of the Center's activities
  - b. Special requirements to execute the Centers' activities
  - c. Space proposed for the Center beyond that available
  - d. Special needs for equipment
12. Evaluation criteria for future assessment. With respect to assessment, nine general evaluation criteria and corresponding performance metrics for Institutes are suggested in Appendices A and B, respectively.

To review the proposal for establishing an Institute, the VP of RIPS will convene an advisory panel in consultation with the Provost. The advisory panel will be charged with evaluating the Institute proposal and presented materials to determine alignment with the University's mission and strategic plan, expected contributions to the Institute's fields of study, scholarly outcomes,

potential for innovation in the field of study, and social benefit. The panel will provide a recommendation concerning creation of an Institute. The VP of RIPS and the Provost shall present a final recommendation for the President's approval.

### Evaluation of Institute

Regular assessment will ensure that the Institute is meeting goals and provide an opportunity for implementing strategic adjustments. Institute reviews will occur every four years and will be jointly managed by the VP of RIPS and the Provost. An advisory committee, formed by the VP of RIPS and Provost, will assess the progress of the Institute and recommend corrective actions if needed. Component Research Centers and ERIs under an Institute will be evaluated following the pertinent protocols mentioned in previous sections in this document.

The comprehensive assessment of the Institute will be based on a written report, public presentations to the committee, VP of RIPS, and Provost, and the responses to questions prompted by the report and presentation. The content of the Center Institute report; which should be approximately twenty pages plus appendices, should comprise the following information, if applicable.

1. Introduction
2. Mission, purpose, goals, and objectives
3. Evaluation Criteria
  - a. Mission
  - b. Productivity in relationship to research, scholarship, creativity and artistry
  - c. Diversity of faculty, staff, postdocs, and students
  - d. Level of engagement by faculty, staff, postdocs, and students (quantitatively, in terms of FTE)
  - e. Attraction of new external and internal funds
  - f. National and international reputation and prominence
  - g. Relationships and partnerships
  - h. Interdisciplinarity
  - i. Public visibility
  - j. Other criteria or additional activities relevant to evaluation of the Institute
4. Explanation of the Institute's value and its enhancement of Center and ERI scholarship
5. Describe the strategic plan and plan timeline to increase affiliate scholarship and sustainability; and resources needed for the next five years
6. Budget including operations, personnel and revenue
7. Address comments and recommendations from the previous review (after the first-four year review)
8. Conclusion
9. Appendices comprised of most recent individual ERI and Center reviews.

A successful Institute must articulate the added value brought to the research enterprise, catalyze collaborative efforts that might not otherwise occur, and provide infrastructure beyond that available to individual Centers. Accordingly, the committee will use the report, answers to the

questions generated from the report, and the presentation to form an opinion on the success and future viability of the Institute.

An institute with IBHE standing can utilize the report to comply with university and IBHE's requirements.

#### *Termination or Continuation of an Institute*

Every eighth year, the VP of RIPS and the Provost, in consultation with the Dean of the College or the Deans of the Colleges hosting the Institute, will form an advisory committee to review the Institute according to the evaluation procedure and criteria described for the reviews. The advisory committee will provide a recommendation for termination or continuation of the Institute. In the case of continuation, the committee may also provide recommendations and corrections for operation of the Institute.

In the case of termination, the committee may recommend continued operation of the component Centers and ERIs. Based on the results of the review and recommendations of the advisory committee, the VP of RIPS and the Provost shall present a final recommendation for the President's approval. Reconsideration of the decision can be requested based only on factual corrections or clarifications.

## Appendix A<sup>1</sup>

General Assessment Criteria for research units:

General Evaluation Criterion	ERI	RC	RI
1. Mission	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Productivity in relationship to research, scholarship, creativity and artistry	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Diversity of faculty, staff, postdocs, and students	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. Level of engagement by faculty, staff, postdocs, and students	Yes	Yes	Yes
5. Attraction of new external and internal funds	No	Yes	Yes
6. National and international reputation and prominence	No	Yes	Yes
7. Relationships and partnerships	No	Yes	Yes
8. Interdisciplinarity	No	No	Yes
9. Public visibility	No	No	Yes

Emerging Research Initiatives (ERI); Research Centers (RC); Research Institutes (RI)

---

<sup>1</sup> As adapted from the Research and Innovation Advisory Council report from the Centers and Institutes Metrics Taskforce – Research.

## Appendix B<sup>2</sup>

Performance metrics and indicators for each general evaluation criterion.

### General Evaluation Criterion: 1. Mission

Evaluation specific criterion	Performance metrics/indicators
Contribution of Center's mission, goals, and objectives to institutional mission and strategic plan, institutional excellence in research, scholarship, or creativity/artistry, and institutional prestige and competitiveness	Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers
Intellectual merit of the Center's mission, goals, and objectives in advancing research, scholarship, or creativity/artistry (e.g., cutting-edge, groundbreaking, innovative, high-risk research)	Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers
Broader impacts of the Center's mission, goals, and objectives in addressing complex, important, salient questions and societal problems locally, regionally, national, or internationally (e.g., public health, diversity and social justice, economic prosperity, national security, education)	Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers

### General Evaluation Criterion: 2. Productivity in relationship to research, scholarship, creativity and artistry

Evaluation specific criterion	Performance metrics/indicators
Presentations (e.g., posters, papers, symposia) at regional, national, or international meetings	Average number of presentations per Center affiliate during time period; unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period; number of presentations per student affiliate (if available)
Artistic works (e.g., performances, exhibitions, compositions, other creative productions in the visual or performing arts—specific criteria to be determined by relevant center directors)	Average number of artistic works per Center affiliate during time period; unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period; number of artistic works per student affiliate (if available)
Journal articles	Average number of journal articles per Center affiliate during time period; unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period; comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate NIU

---

<sup>2</sup> As adapted from the Research and Innovation Advisory Council report from the Centers and Institutes Metrics Taskforce – Research.

	<p>comparison group (e.g., home department, hypothetical hybrid of multiple relevant departments); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate external comparison group (e.g., department at a peer institution, hypothetical hybrid department at a peer institution, other center/s); number of journal articles per student affiliate (if available)</p>
Publications in review	<p>Average number of publications in review per Center affiliate at end of time period; unduplicated count overall at end of time period; number of publication in review per student affiliate (if available)</p>
Publications in press/with contract	<p>Average number of publications in press/with contract per Center affiliate at end of time period; unduplicated count overall at end of time period; number of publications in press per student affiliate (if available)</p>
Books/monographs	<p>Average number of books per Center affiliate during time period, overall and by type (i.e., books/monographs, textbooks, edited books); unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period, overall and by type (i.e., books/monographs, textbooks, edited books); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate NIU comparison group (e.g., home department, hypothetical hybrid of multiple relevant departments); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate external comparison group (e.g., department at a peer institution, hypothetical hybrid department at a peer institution, other center/s); number of book/monographs per student affiliate (if available)</p>
Book chapters	<p>Average number of book chapters per Center affiliate during time period; unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period;</p>

	number of book chapters per student affiliate (if available)
Citations	Average number of citations per Center affiliate at end of time period; count overall and by affiliate at end of time period; comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate NIU comparison group (e.g., home department, hypothetical hybrid of multiple relevant departments); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate external comparison group (e.g., department at a peer institution, hypothetical hybrid department at a peer institution, other center(s))
Patents or patents-pending and any associated licenses/royalties; Published software/computer programs; Inventions, products with commercial or technology transfer value	Unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period, with narrative detail provided (e.g., type, nature, purpose)
Published conference proceedings	Average number of published conference proceedings per Center affiliate during time period; unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period; comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate NIU comparison group (e.g., home department, hypothetical hybrid of multiple relevant departments); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate external comparison group (e.g., department at a peer institution, hypothetical hybrid department at a peer institution, other center/s); number of published conference proceedings per student affiliate (if available)
Exemplary recognition related to research, scholarship, or creativity/artistry (e.g., awards and honors, invited lectures or keynote talks, fellowships, invited visiting professorships)	Unduplicated count overall during time period, with narrative detail provided (e.g., type, nature, purpose); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate NIU comparison group (e.g., home department, hypothetical hybrid of multiple relevant departments);



	<p>comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate external comparison group (e.g., department at a peer institution, hypothetical hybrid department at a peer institution, other center/s); number of exemplary recognitions related to research, scholarship, or creativity/artistry per student's affiliate (if available)</p>
Overall productivity	<p>Academic Analytics-based Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index (FSPI) for each affiliate at end of time period (as appropriate for discipline and available); h-index from Scopus for each affiliate at end of time period (as appropriate for discipline and available); h-index from Web of Science for each affiliate at end of time period (as appropriate for discipline and available); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate NIU comparison group (e.g., home department, hypothetical hybrid of multiple relevant departments); comparison of Center affiliate productivity to appropriate external comparison group (e.g., department at a peer institution, hypothetical hybrid department at a peer institution, other center/s)</p>
Other publications or research, scholarly, creative/artistic products (e.g., technical notes, book reviews, exhibit catalogs, review essays, reports, and non-reviewed papers, measurement instruments/assessments)	<p>Unduplicated count overall during time period, with narrative detail provided (e.g., type, nature, purpose)</p>
Quality of scholarship (e.g., seminal publications, high-impact publications, invited articles or talks, authorship order, presentation/exhibition/performance venue, national/international reach)	<p>Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary, including as appropriate quantitative indicators (e.g., impact factor, acceptance rate, journal or article rank, within-field press rank)</p>

**General Evaluation Criterion: 3. Diversity of faculty, staff, postdocs, and students**

<b>Evaluation specific criterion</b>	<b>Performance metrics/indicators</b>
Diversity of faculty, staff, and postdoc affiliates in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, international status (and contribution to recruitment and retention of diverse populations)	Faculty, staff, and postdoc membership headcounts and percentages by gender, race/ethnicity, and international status; Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary concerning efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty, staff, and postdocs
Diversity of student affiliates in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, international student status (and contribution to recruitment and retention of diverse populations)	Student membership headcounts and percentages by gender, race/ethnicity, and international status; Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary concerning efforts to recruit and retain diverse students

**General Evaluation Criterion: 4. Level of engagement by faculty, staff, postdocs, and students**

<b>Evaluation specific criterion</b>	<b>Performance metrics/indicators</b>
Membership of faculty, staff, and postdocs	Membership counts during time period, overall, by type, and by discipline
Membership of undergraduate students and graduate students	Membership counts during time period, overall, by type, and by discipline
Level of participation of members	Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary concerning level of member participation in Center activities (e.g., seminars, lectures, programs, accessing of digital resources, social media engagement)

**General Evaluation Criterion: 5. Attraction of new external and internal funds**

Evaluation specific criterion	Performance metrics/indicators
Submitted proposals or applications for internal grants, contracts, or other agreements (e.g., Research and Artistry Grants), with research unit affiliates in primary role (e.g., PI, Co-PI, sub-contract), including proposals or applications in review	Unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period, with narrative detail provided (e.g., type, source); Total grant, contract, or other agreement funds requested during time period
Awarded internal grants, contracts, or other agreements (e.g., Research and Artistry Grants), with research unit affiliates in primary role (e.g., PI, Co-PI, sub-contract)	Unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period, with narrative detail provided (e.g., type, source); Total grant, contract, or other agreement funds received during time period
Submitted proposals or applications for external grants, contracts, and other agreements (federal agencies, foundations, state agencies, military contracts, other sources), with research unit affiliates in primary role (e.g., PI, Co-PI, sub-contract), including proposals or applications in review	Unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period; Total grant, contract, or other agreement funds requested during time period (broken down by direct versus indirect)
Awarded external grants, contracts, and other agreements (federal agencies, foundations, state agencies, military contracts, other sources), with research unit faculty in primary role (e.g., PI, Co-PI, sub-contract)	Unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period; Total grant, contract, or other agreement funds received during time period (broken down by direct versus indirect); Comparison of research unit affiliate productivity to appropriate NIU comparison group (e.g., home department, hypothetical hybrid of multiple relevant departments); Comparison of research unit affiliate productivity to appropriate external comparison group (e.g., department at a peer institution, hypothetical hybrid department at a peer institution, other research unit/s)
Submitted proposals or applications for funded fellowships	Unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period and year-by-year count trends during time period, with narrative detail provided (e.g., type, source); Total fellowship application funds requested during time period

<p>Awarded funded fellowships</p>	<p>Unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period, with narrative detail provided (e.g., type, source); Total fellowship funds received during time period</p>
<p>Quality of proposed and/or awarded external grants, contracts, other agreements, and fellowships in terms of general purpose (e.g., research, instruction, other sponsored activities), specific purpose (e.g., applied research, basic research, equipment, conference, research training, testing/evaluation), general source (e.g., federal, state, corporate/business, public/non-profits, foundations, foreign), specific source (e.g., National Science Foundation, Institute of Education Sciences), and personnel (e.g., whether NIU is lead institution or sub-contract)</p>	<p>Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary, including as appropriate quantitative indicators (e.g., merit review scores, program proposal success rate, number of involved affiliated faculty and students)</p>
<p>Fundraising/donations/gifts/in-kind contributions (e.g., sponsored Endowed Chairs, GAship, lecture series) and internal funding (e.g., university, college(s), department(s), and RIPS) to support operations</p>	<p>Cash value of contributions, and/or narrative summary concerning other contributions, during time period by year AND annual funding level (total funding (external and internal funding) and expenses))</p>

**General Evaluation Criterion: 6. National and international reputation and prominence**

<p><b>Evaluation specific criterion</b></p>	<p><b>Performance metrics/indicators</b></p>
<p>National and international reputation and prominence of research unit and its affiliates in terms of significant professional or public service activities (e.g., service on invited grant panels, service on national boards, service as external reviewers, service on advisory boards, editorial board memberships, founding and publishing of journals, journal reviewerships, policy development, professional organization recognition, awards or honors)</p>	<p>Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary</p>

### General Evaluation Criterion: 7. Relationships and partnerships

Evaluation specific criterion	Performance metrics/indicators
Research unit engagement and partnerships with external entities, organizations, agencies, and individuals (e.g., industry, external labs and researchers, philanthropists, NGOs, corporations, schools, communities) (both supply-side and demand-side)	Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary
Research unit engagement and partnerships with internal entities, organizations, agencies, and individuals (e.g., departments, colleges, other research units, Outreach, Engagement, and Regional Development)	Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary

### General Evaluation Criterion: 8. Interdisciplinarity

Evaluation specific criterion	Performance metrics/indicators
Interdisciplinarity/multi-disciplinarity of membership	Simpson's Diversity Index calculated with respect to discipline for faculty and staff membership; Simpson's Diversity Index calculated with respect to discipline for student and postdoc membership
Interdisciplinarity/multi-disciplinarity of research, scholarly, and creative/artistic outputs	For each specific criterion selected within Productivity in relationship to research, scholarship, creativity and artistry (e.g., presentations, journal articles, books/monographs), unduplicated count overall and year-by-year count trends during time period

### General Evaluation Criterion: 9. Public visibility

Evaluation specific criterion	Performance metrics/indicators
Public media and press contributions (e.g., addresses/speeches, radio, television appearances, testimony before legislative agencies) and other activities (e.g., dissemination-focused outreach, continuing education, social media, web), public recognition of the quality of research, scholarship, or creativity/artistry in an internationally or nationally prestigious media venue (e.g., <i>New York Times</i> , <i>Good Morning America</i> ) that promote research unit visibility among internal and external audiences	Ratings provided by either external reviewers or representative NIU faculty reviewers, based on narrative summary

## Appendix C

### Log of Policy Changes

<b>Date of Changes</b>	<b>Versions</b>	<b>Changes</b>
21-Jun-21	version 3 (v3)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Added a clarification about the Strategic Plan information.</li><li>2. Added a clarification of comments and recommendations from previous review.</li><li>3. Added Appendix C (Log of policy changes).</li></ol>
5-May-20	version 2 (v2)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Added that the assessment committee will generate questions after reviewing the report and before the center's director presentation.</li></ol>
21-Aug-18	version 1 (v1)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Added information about IBHE for centers and institutes.</li><li>2. Changed the word "problems" to "areas" through the document</li><li>3. Added "objectives" under mission.</li></ol>

**//NOTHING FOLLOWS//**