UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE

REVISED GUIDELINES FOR ACCREDITED RESEARCH GROUPING**S**

1. INTRODUCTION

Following a decision regarding the naming of inter- and / or intra-Faculty teaching or research groups (Approved by Senate and Council via PC6/99; 15 June), the University Research Committee (URC) further refined the categorisation of *research-specific* groupings that fall under its remit [Approved by Senate and Council via PC6/2017; 21 June 2017]. This categorisation applies to URC-accredited research-specific groupings only, is based on good practice, and reflects a systematic classification according to size, structure, scope, and objectives. For accounting purposes, all research-specific groupings have departmental and Faculty homes. Directors of groupings are permanent academic staff based in departments. For URC-accreditation purposes, nomenclature is limited to units, centres and institutes. Designations such as groups, programmes, projects, initiatives or platforms are not encouraged.

Unit
- Operationally a unit is smaller than a centre or an institute.
- Has a focused research mandate that may span across disciplines or rest with one discipline.
- Has a defined structure led by a director and includes a critical mass of researchers.
- The director should be, at minimum, a nationally recognised researcher on the permanent academic staff.
- On-going projects and measurable outcomes evolve from its focused research theme.

Centre
- Operationally a centre is larger than a unit.
- Has a broad research mandate that spans across disciplines or rests with one discipline.
- Has a formal management structure with a director of international standing, a number of research staff and a team of researchers.
- The director and at least one research staff member should be on the permanent academic staff.
- On-going projects and measurable outcomes evolve from its broad research mandate.
- Is sustainable over a long period.

Institute
- Operationally an institute is larger than a centre and may be housed in a defined, visible space.
- Has a broad research mandate that spans across disciplines or sub-disciplines and implies extensive collaboration on a wide range of associated research questions.
- Has a formal management structure with a director of considerable international standing and several research teams, which are individually headed by internationally recognised researchers, and constitute a large-scale network of researchers.
- The director and several team leaders should be permanent academic staff who generate significant research outputs as a product of their contribution (commitment) to the institute.
- Categorisation of membership based on the percentage of time spent in the institute is encouraged. Membership categories would for example include full, affiliate, associate and adjunct, thus indicating varying degrees of time commitment to the institute.
- On-going projects and measurable outcomes evolve from its broad research mandate.
- Is sustainable over a long-term period.

2. CATEGORIES OF ACCREDITATION

2.1 FIVE-YEAR ACCREDITATION

Groupings with five-year accreditation meet all the criteria as set out in section 4 of this document and undergo external peer-review once every five years.

2.2 THREE-YEAR ACCREDITATION (Developmental Model)

'Developmental' groupings may be considered for three-year accreditation if they do not yet meet all accreditation criteria relevant to the group's definition but aspire to meet a clearly articulated strategic goal. Such groupings undergo an internal paper-review in the final six months of the first three-year cycle. The review will focus on the productivity of the group as measured against the criteria for the level of grouping, as well as against its proposed strategic goal. If supported, the research grouping would convert to the five-year accreditation cycle. Alternatively, its accreditation will be withdrawn.

TABLE 1: NOMENCLATURE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE THREE TYPES OF RESEARCH GROUPINGS

	FIVE-YEAR ACCREDITATION		
	RESEARCH UNIT	**RESEARCH CENTRE**	**RESEARCH INSTITUTE**
RESEARCH MANDATE	A focused research mandate that largely lies within one discipline.	A broad research mandate that may span across disciplines or rest with one discipline.	A broad research mandate (with wide ranging research questions) that spans across disciplines.
MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE (See Appendix 5 for Governance of University Institutes (established through a top down, executive-driven process)	A defined management structure with a director who is nationally recognised in their field. Typically hosted by the department of the Director, and affiliated to faculty. Administrative support typically provided by the host department. Operational and financial sustainability overseen by HOD. Reports to the URC through the HoD, with approval by the Dean.	A formal management structure with a director who is internationally recognised in their field and researchers with agreed management roles. Typically hosted by either the Department or Faculty of the Director, as appropriate to the breadth of research mandate. If hosted by a department, will be affiliated to the department's faculty. Will typically have an advisory or steering committee, chaired by an appropriate senior member of the host department or faculty . May have different membership categories based on proportion of time committed to Centre activities (e.g. Full, Associate, Affiliate, Adjunct). Administrative support provided by host department or faculty. Further dedicated administrative and technical support staff (where relevant) are provided through the resources of the Centre. Operational and financial sustainability overseen by HOD or Dean, depending on hosting arrangements. Reports to the URC via HoD or Dean, depending on hosting arrangement.	A formal management structure with an internationally recognised director and several established researchers and academic staff with agreed management roles. Typically hosted by a Faculty within which the Institute has a critical mass of membership. Governed by an advisory board, usually comprising a mix of internal and external members, chaired by the DVC for Research. Typically has a management committee, made up of senior academic and operational staff. Typically, will have different membership categories based on proportion of time committed to Centre activities (e.g. Full, Associate, Affiliate, Adjunct). Has dedicated administrative and technical support staff (where relevant) provided through Institute resourcing. This is supplemented by financial and HR support provided by the Faculty. Reports to the URC via the DVC for Research.
MINIMUM CORE TEAM STAFFING REQUIREMENTS	One full-time permanent academic staff member who is the director. A team of researchers, who may include other permanent and contract academic and research staff, as well as postdocs and research students.	More than two full-time permanent academic staff members of whom one must be the director. One or more teams of researchers, who may include other permanent and contract academic and research staff, as well as postdocs and research students.	Five or more academic staff members of whom one must be the director. Several teams of researchers, each of which may include other permanent and contract academic and research staff, as well as postdocs and research students.

TEAM CREDENTIALS AND REQUIREMENTS	The director should hold a PhD and should be an established research scholar who is nationally recognised. Possibly limited institutional collaborations. Members who belong to other accredited groupings must produce distinct bodies of work to qualify as members of more than one grouping.	The director should hold a PhD and have considerable national and international standing. The Centre's research agenda may be of a disciplinary, multi-, inter- or transdisciplinary nature or a combination, with evidence of members working collaboratively in the Centre.	The director should hold a PhD and be a distinguished international researcher. Team leaders should have considerable national and/or international standing. The Institute's research agenda is typically of a multi-, inter- or transdisciplinary nature or a combination, with evidence of members and research teams working collaboratively in the Institute.
EXPECTED COLLABORATIONS[1] AND OUTPUTS BEYOND THE RESEARCH GROUPING ITSELF	Collaborations beyond the grouping within and outside UCT are encouraged, but not essential. Membership of more than one research grouping must undertake research that aligns distinctly with the agenda of each grouping. Outputs should typically be reported against the most relevant grouping. However, where there is clear justification for dual attribution, this should be acknowledged.	Extensive and relevant institutional, national and international collaborations. Membership of more than one research grouping must undertake research that aligns distinctly with the agenda of each grouping. Outputs should typically be reported against the most relevant grouping. However, where there is clear justification for dual attribution, this should be clearly acknowledged.	Extensive and relevant institutional, national and international collaborations. Membership of more than one research grouping must undertake research that aligns distinctly with the agenda of each grouping. Outputs should typically be reported against the most relevant grouping. However, where there is clear justification for dual attribution, this should be clearly reported.
SOCIALLY RESPONSIVE[2] RESEARCH AND ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP	The research groupings are encouraged to contribute to socially responsive research, applicable to the field of study where relevant. The groupings should include explicitly in their application and reporting whether, and if so, how the research agenda of the grouping achieves this. Where relevant, a local focus should be included. Commitment to meaningful and active collaboration and stakeholder engagement across the stages of the research life cycle, including incorporating 'public user' insights into production, design and technology for maximum impact should be included, where relevant		

[1] The term 'collaborations' should be widely interpreted. It could range from informal networking and demonstrated cognisance of other knowledge areas, to full-scale extensive research collaborations and co-authored publications.
[2] The term 'social responsiveness' refers to work that meets a direct need or renders a direct service in, and to society. Society is broadly defined as all external non-academic constituencies. It does not include civic and outreach activities of staff that are not linked to their disciplinary or professional expertise. Nor does it encompass work with academic constituencies such as external examining, editing of peer-reviewed journals etc. The concern with engagement (based on solid disciplinary or professional expertise) with non-academic constituencies provides a sound complement to the activities of engagement with academic constituencies.

3.   BENEFITS OF ACCREDITATION

Accredited status strengthens the identity and branding of the grouping, and provides an officially recognised platform for collaboration. The URC funds and coordinates the external peer-review process that takes place every five years, which provides an opportunity for self-reflection and showcasing as well as hosting two world-renowned scholars in the relevant field. The review also places the grouping on the Faculty radar and requires the dean to position the review report in the context of the Faculty's own planning and budget.

It should be noted that accredited research groupings derive no direct financial benefit from the URC and are expected to raise their own funds through research grants and contracts. Deans are encouraged to consider the needs of their accredited groupings in their Faculty plans. Infrastructure and administrative support must be negotiated with the host Faculty. In the case of cross faculty groupings, support may be jointly negotiated.

In addition, groupings that have been reviewed in the past year and achieved positive reports (including groupings accredited by the South African Medical Research Council) are invited to bid for a two-year postdoctoral research fellowship that is awarded on a competitive basis. These fellowships are made available annually, on condition of URC funding being available.

In some cases, research funding requiring mentorship is made available exclusively to application from accredited research groupings. Further, the Research Office actively showcases the research outputs of a selection of productive research groupings each year, raising the profile of their research.

4.   APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS FOR ACCREDITATION AS A RESEARCH GROUPING

The applicant needs to ensure that the *Application Check-List for Accreditation Proposals* (available from the Research Office) is completed.
The applicant submits the application via the relevant head of department to the dean for endorsement**.** Should the dean endorse the application, he/she must provide the URC with a brief motivation on why and how the Faculty would support the grouping.
The endorsed application is sent to the Research Office, for tabling at the URC.
- URC, through its Committee of Research Review (CRR) assesses the application against set criteria. It may request the applicant grouping to present their motivation to the CRR in person. The URC has the right (in consultation with the research grouping and associated dean) to reclassify the application to the appropriate category should this be required.
- If the proposal is supported by the CRR and thereby URC, a summary of the application is tabled at SEC for their endorsement; and then published in the next *Principal's Circular* for information.
- The research grouping, head of department and dean are informed of the outcome of the application.

5.   ACCREDITATION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

A proposal for establishing a research grouping will be assessed against the following criteria

a.   **Strategic gain**
It is common practice for researchers to collaborate loosely across a range of cognate projects and fields. What is the strategic gain of formalising such activity under the umbrella of an accredited research grouping?
b.   **Research agenda**
How well is the grouping's research agenda defined, with a set of on-going projects that are inter-linked or focused around a common theme? Are the broad timelines and team responsibilities appropriately articulated?
c.   **Core research team and linkages to other research groupings or networks**
Are these linkages clearly defined and articulated? Members who belong to other accredited groupings must produce distinct bodies of work to qualify as members of more than one grouping except where units / centres are embedded in an institute or units are embedded in centres. In the

embedded case, the outputs may be claimed both by the unit / centre and by the centre / institute under which the unit / centre falls.

d. **Non-financial support**
Are the required infrastructural resources readily available and accessible, e.g. space, support staff, equipment?

e. **Current financial viability**
Does the proposed grouping have current financial viability in terms of operational costs, human capital development resources and infrastructural support?

f. **Future sustainability**
Is there a clear three-year budget forecast to enable sustainability in terms of staffing and operating costs?

g. **Quality of collaborative research outputs**
Is there good evidence of generating quality research in relation to the research agenda over the past 3-5 years as a collective group? The quality of the research activities is reflected in measurable outputs such as accredited, peer-reviewed publications; funding generated through grants and / or contracts; throughput of postgraduate students; research impact case studies, including contribution to policy and the registration of patents. Where applicable to the research agenda, socially responsive research is recommended and should be in evidence. Researchers are referred to the UCT research assessment guidelines for further input.

Note: Groupings that are able to meet this criterion on accreditation immediately enter the five-year cycle, which means they will be reviewed five years after being accredited. The review panel includes expert-peers external to UCT.

OR

If the above collaboration and outputs are not yet in place – Is there a clearly articulated strategic goal for the (developmental) accreditation of the grouping? Has the application clearly motivated why and how such collaboration will occur and what the envisaged collective outputs will be in relation to the proposed research agenda, if granted accreditation?

Note: Groupings in this category that achieve three-year accreditation will undergo a paper-review in the final six months of the first three-year cycle to assess evidence of a collaborative body of work that resulted from the three-year accreditation. Groupings will submit Progress Reports which also address the issues raised in their accreditation outcomes. If satisfactory, the grouping enters the five-year review cycle, as above. If not, the grouping's three-year accreditation is withdrawn.

h. **Research productivity**
What are the planned research outputs of the grouping, in terms of quality and quantity? Does functioning as a grouping enhance the research productivity of the individual academics within the group?

i. **Human Capital Development**
Is there evidence of current postgraduate student participation in the grouping? Is there evidence of a proactive student recruitment strategy?

j. **Equity and redress**
Is there a development plan, if appropriate, to ensure transformation in terms of equity imperatives?

k. **Governance structure**
Is there evidence of an effective governance structure to monitor activities and initiate improvements?

l. **Socially responsive research and knowledge exchange**
To what extent will the grouping's research, or a portion of it, contribute to social impact, address grand challenges with social, cultural, legal and environmental reach and inform policy and practice locally, nationally, continentally and globally? To what extent will the new knowledge generated, or a portion of it, have potential for translation into new ventures and businesses with economic and societal benefit?

m. **Visibility**
Does the grouping have a clear plan on how it will enhance its visibility in the public domain?

n. **Proposal eligibility**

Does the proposal appropriately address the nomenclature guidelines of a 'Unit', 'Centre' or 'Institute'? The purpose of the nomenclature guidelines is to ensure internal consistency as well as alignment with international good practice. The URC will exercise discretion where a change in nomenclature would impinge on the branding strategy or established reputation of a grouping that is already fully operational.

6. REVIEW OF URC-ACCREDITED RESEARCH GROUPINGS

6.1. APPROACH AND STRATEGY

Quality Assurance (QA) of research groupings at UCT is informed by national as well as international benchmarks for research, such as publications, postgraduate theses and competitive grants that are all subject to peer review. A variety of mechanisms also continue to be developed to measure the social impact of research. Although the process is informed by international good practice as well as strategic priorities, it is also driven internally by the choices of the university itself. The process also takes discipline-specific conditions and criteria into consideration, for example to acknowledge that the criteria for research output from the College of Music will not necessarily be the same as those for Chemical Engineering.

6.2. TYPES OF REVIEW

Reviews are implemented as follows:

In the 1st cycle of accreditation

- External peer-review in the fifth year (in the case of a five-year accredited grouping).
- URC (internal) review during the last six months of the third year (in the case of a three-year accredited grouping). The review constitutes the submission of a Progress Report which is reviewed by the URC in order to consider five-year accreditation. Depending on the outcome of the review, the grouping is de-accredited or enters the five-year cycle of external reviews.

Subsequent cycles,

- All groupings have a peer-review every five years.
- All reviews are conducted in the final year of the applicable accreditation cycle.

6.3. PROCESS

6.3.1 External peer-review in the fifth year

Each grouping is reviewed once in the final year of its accreditation cycle, except where such groupings are subjected to credible external review in that year, as in the case of Medical Research Council groupings hosted at UCT.

Research groupings identified for review submit self-review portfolios according to the Guidelines for Preparing Self-Review Portfolios (See Appendix 1).

The review panel consists of the DVC Research and Internationalisation in his / her capacity as Chair of the URC; two external reviewers[3] who are recognised experts in the field and are selected by the Chair from five nominees provided by the relevant faculty; two internal reviewers nominated by the host dean, from fields relevant to the research agenda under review; the executive director of research; the relevant dean and the relevant head of department, and the leadership of the Research Institute in which a unit or centre is based should it be applicable. Continuity is built into the panel membership through the Chair

---

[3] See Appendix 2 for guidelines on selecting expert reviewers.

(the URC Chair or the Executive Director of Research) and the consistent participation of up to five URC members. This core membership also ensures consistency across the reviews. Prior relations between members of the panel and the grouping must be fully declared and considered. The Research Office provides administrative support, supplying the review panel with the necessary documentation and a servicing officer.

The review typically lasts half a day, depending on the size and scope of the grouping to be reviewed. The review may also include a site visit, if applicable. The review may take place in person, as a hybrid event or online.

A joint review report[4] is produced by the two external panellists within four weeks of the review. The role of the internal reviewer/s is to assist the external reviewers by bringing UCT-focussed insight into the review process and, if appropriate, engage with external reviewers on the report prior to it being submitted to the URC.

A response to the external reviewers' report is prepared (preferably jointly) by the grouping director and the dean, which is tabled together with the review report at the URC's Committee on Research Reviews (CRR) meeting. Both the dean and director are invited to attend the CRR meeting to have an opportunity to clarify and elaborate on the Faculty's position (in consultation with the relevant Head of Department) in relation to the tabled comments. A decision on further accreditation is reached at this meeting.

The URC may:

- unconditionally endorse the research grouping's accreditation for the next cycle; or
- require an improvement plan according to agreed-upon timelines; or
- request a change in nomenclature if the grouping classification is deemed to be inappropriate as a result of the review findings; or
- withdraw accreditation if the outcome of the review is negative.

The URC decisions are communicated to the Senate Executive Committee for endorsement and via the Senate Principal's Circular for information.

Both self-review portfolios and review reports are treated as confidential, although these are made available for institutional audits. A consolidated summary of the year's review outcomes is included in an annual report tabled at the URC. A selection of groupings may be show-cased in the annual Report on Research to Senate and Council.

Where applicable, the schedule of reviews will be clustered according to research fields in order to optimize – as much as possible – the contribution of any particular external reviewer that could serve on more than one panel in the course of his / her visit.

6.3.2 URC paper-review after three-years

In the case of research groupings receiving 3-year accreditation, a progress report is submitted in the last six months of the three-year accreditation cycle. This report will determine whether the groupings receive 5-year accreditation or whether it is de-accredited.

Descriptive information for progress report

- Describe the nature of the research activities undertaken in the research groupings under review. Outline the key focus areas and quantify the associated research outputs.
- Outline any structures or processes that exist to coordinate the research activities and enable collaboration. Indicate whether the grouping has a formal management structure.

---

[4] See Appendix 3 for guidelines for the reviewers on preparing a review report.

- Explain the mechanisms and practices for promoting research and sustaining and developing an active and vital research culture in the research grouping under review.
- Describe the nature and quality of the research infrastructure, including facilities for research students.
- Provide a statement about the main objectives and activities in research over the next five years. The panel's attention should be drawn to ongoing research work that is not producing immediate visible outcomes.
- Provide a financial summary for the grouping, indicating financial status over the past 3 years and forthcoming 2 years.

7.   PROCESS FOR APPOINTMENT OF NEW DIRECTORS

In the event that a director of a grouping must be changed, the current director, through consultation with the research team and supported by the Head of Department in which the grouping is based, submits the nomination letter and Curriculum Vitae of the proposed director to the URC. In the case of a Research Institute, the nomination for a proposed director must be supported by the grouping's Advisory Board. If supported by the URC, the decision will be endorsed by the SEC and published for information via the Senate Principal's Circular (PC).

8.   PROCESS FOR THE DISESTABLISHMENT AND DE-ACCREDITATION OF ACCREDITED RESEARCH GROUPINGS

In the event that a grouping is to be disestablished or de-accredited, the Dean must submit a letter to the URC motivating the reason for the disestablishment or de-accreditation. If the decision is supported by the URC, the letter of motivation and the URC's recommendation with respect to the de-accreditation will be submitted to the Senate Executive Committee for final ratification.

Appendix 1

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE RESEARCH SECTION OF THE SELF-REVIEW PORTFOLIO

The following considerations should inform the research section of the **self-review portfolios** (SRPs) of research groupings, although the research grouping under review may use their discretion in the final structure of the SRP:

FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS

Descriptive Information

- Describe the nature of the research activities undertaken in the research grouping under review. Outline the key focus areas or research themes and quantify their associated research outputs.
- Outline any structures or processes that exist to coordinate the research activities and enable collaboration.
- Explain the mechanisms and practices for promoting research and sustaining and developing an active and vital research culture in the research grouping under review.
- Describe the nature and quality of the research infrastructure, including facilities for research students.
- Describe any arrangements that are in place for supporting interdisciplinary or collaborative research.
- Provide information on relationships with industry and commerce or other research users and, where appropriate, the account taken of national policy initiatives and objectives.
- Describe the arrangements for the development and support of the research work of staff.
- Describe any arrangements for developing younger and / or new researchers and for integrating them into a wider, supportive research culture.
- Describe the grouping's contribution to socially responsive research, where applicable.
- Describe the grouping's research impact and contribution to knowledge exchange, where applicable.
- Provide a statement about the main objectives and activities in research over the next five years. The panel's attention should be drawn to ongoing research work that is not producing immediate visible outcomes.
- Provide financial statements for the past 5 years and a forecast of income for the coming 5 years (as is known currently) together with expected budget required.
- Provide details on the grouping's risk management strategy.

Questions on quality of research output

- What counts as 'research output' in the context of this research grouping's review? (Books, journals, patents, reports, materials, images, devices, performances etc.). Include a self-assessment of the quality of research outputs, including – where applicable – bibliometrics and impact and use cases.
- What self-defined goals and criteria have been established for the research activities of this research grouping's review?
- What measures of quality are applicable in your context (and what debates typically attend these measures)?
- How does your research grouping's output fare in terms of these goals, criteria and measures?
- What conditions contribute to your current output profile?
- What initiatives are underway, or are planned, to further strengthen the quality of your output in terms of these measures?

Questions on the development of research capacity

- What developmental goals does this research grouping have for future research projects or directions?
- What is the current demographic profile of researchers in this research grouping, as well as qualifications and track record?
- What goals does this research grouping have in terms of this profile (e.g. succession planning, capacity gaps, equity issues etc.), and how are these related to broader institutional or national goals?
- What initiatives are underway, or are planned, to address the capacity developmental goals of the research grouping?
- Provide a reflection on achievement and identification of strategies to attain a diversified postgraduate student community, particularly targeting recruitment strategies.
- What conditions currently support or frustrate the rollout of capacity development initiatives?
- Is there a succession plan in place?

NOTE: In cases where there is not much critical mass and the existence of a grouping depends on the research interest of the director, it is acceptable not to have a succession plan in place, on condition that the relevant Faculty accepts that the grouping will no longer be accredited when the leadership retires or leaves the institution.

Research groupings under review may want to comment on how they fare in terms of a combination of the following evaluation criteria, which are based on existing practice as well as on international examples of good practice. We acknowledge that the following approaches may not be universally applicable and that considerable debate exists over the use of these measures.

It would be important for research groupings under review to show how they are taking these debates forward in their own context of research:

- Quality of journal publications and other research outputs using appropriate international mechanisms of measure;
- Social impact of the research and how this is measured / evaluated;
- Promotion of socially responsive research, and ways in which this is embedded in collaboration and postgraduate training;
- Knowledge exchange and translation;
- Quantitative assessment to measure the number of research outputs as with the DHET system for subsidy purposes;
- NRF rating of academics, across all disciplines;
- Level of collaborative work, nationally and internationally;
- Level of relationship established through research with industry, civil society and government departments;
- The critical mass of researchers, postgraduates and postdoctoral fellows within a specific research field;
- Income generated through appropriately-costed contracts; and
- Internal and external funding.

Appendix 2

AN ADAPTED NRF GUIDE TO THE SELECTION OF REVIEWERS

This section draws largely on Appendix 3 of ***The Evaluation and Rating of the Research Performance of Researchers in South Africa** –through the National Research Foundation (NRF),* October 2002.

- The selection of appropriate reviewers constitutes the very essence of the review system. Great circumspection in nominating reviewers is needed. At least five external research active reviewers should be nominated who *are best able to assess the scope and impact of recent research and other scholastic outputs, activities and contributions* of the research grouping*.* **Relationships between members of the research grouping and reviewers should be indicated and reasons for each nomination should be given in order to provide additional information for the selection of reviewers. There should also be an opportunity to decide which reviewers should not be approached.** Two of the five nominated reviewers will be selected.

- It must be affirmed that the reviewers nominated are genuine peers and that they are experts in the particular field (either by reputation, citation, publications, members of editorial boards of journals etc.).

- Where reviewers are not rated by the NRF, *curricula vitae* of reviewers are required in order to assist with the identification of suitable reviewers.

- In some cases the research grouping's work may cover several divergent fields. Reviewers should therefore be chosen to ensure that the scope and impact of the work is adequately covered.

- Reviewers who are generalists and those who are aware of the 'broader picture' are essential in the evaluation of groupings which do prescriptive research because they can place the research into a wider context.

- Care must be taken not to approach the same reviewer too often. When a particular person is suitable for several reviews he / she could be approached for some of them but could also be asked to suggest names of other suitable reviewers.

- Final approval of reviewers is the prerogative of the URC Chair who reserves the right to select reviewers outside of earlier nominations.

Appendix 3

A GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS: THE RESEARCH SECTION OF THE SELF-REVIEW PORTFOLIO

The following is offered as a guide for conducting the review process and completing the **review report.** Reviewers are expected to consider:

- The extent to which the self-review portfolio adheres to the *Guidelines for preparing the research section of the self-review portfolio* as in Appendix 1.
- The extent to which there is a focussed or interlinked research agenda.
- The extent and quality of the research conducted in the grouping.
- Linkages to other research groupings or networks.
- Governance and management / planning structure.
- Sustainability in terms of leadership and resources.
- Capacity building (including equity and redress issues) through recruitment and participation of postgraduate students and / or postdoctoral fellows.
- Any other strengths and weaknesses of the research grouping based on the information provided in the self-review portfolio and the review.
- The classification of the grouping as a unit, centre or institute and its justification in terms of the URC guidelines for nomenclature. Based on examples of good practice nationally and internationally, these guidelines aim to provide some consistency in nomenclature across the University.
- A succession plan that would effectively manage handover once a director retires.
- The risk management strategy.
- The review process itself and ways in which it may be improved.

(In cases where there is not much critical mass and the existence of a grouping depends on the research interest of the director, it is acceptable not to have a succession plan in place, on condition that the relevant Faculty accepts that the unit will be de-accredited when the leadership retires or leaves the institution.)

Appendix 4

A GUIDE FOR JOINTLY ACCREDITED UCT-SAMRC RESEARCH GROUPINGS

The following applies to jointly accredited UCT-SAMRC research groupings:

- As the URC recognises the review criteria of the South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC), only the latter will review jointly accredited research groupings until such time that SAMRC-accreditation no longer applies;
- The Faculty of Health Sciences must inform the URC of any changes in research groupings' names or their research directors;
- When a joint UCT-SAMRC research grouping ceases to have SAMRC-accreditation for whatever reasons, the unit director must inform the Faculty of Health Sciences Research Office (FRO) which will inform the URC accordingly;
- Should the research grouping not want to continue with being URC-accredited, they can either dissolve the unit or continue informally as a research grouping. They must advise the FRO accordingly which in turn will inform the URC;
- Should the research grouping wish to continue being URC-accredited they must inform the FRO which will in turn inform the URC. The URC will then officially acknowledge the accredited status of the research grouping subject to consideration of the last SAMRC external reviewers' report;
- The research grouping needs not undergo a review when transitioning from UCT-SAMRC to URC-accredited status but will go straight into the URC five-year review cycle, i.e. their first review will be five years after their last SAMRC review and in accordance with the URC criteria;
- At their first URC review, the research grouping will have to demonstrate that they are viable even though they have not received SAMRC funding; and
- The URC review guidelines should inform the research grouping's strategic planning.

Appendix 5

GUIDELINES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INSTITUTES

UCT has, over the last several years, established a number of large interdisciplinary research initiatives and institutes. These groupings are called "University Institutes or University Initiatives" to distinguish them from other recognised research groupings[5] as having either gone through a competitive selection process for prioritisation or having been established for strategic purposes. These include the Institute of Infectious Disease & Molecular Medicine (IDM); the Vice Chancellor's Strategic Initiatives;[6] and four interdisciplinary institutes[7] that were established as the result of a competitive process. All of these have membership from multiple faculties – both individual staff members and from recognised and informal research groupings, and most have external adjunct and honorary members as well. As such they require governance arrangements that support and facilitate membership and operation across traditional departmental, faculty and other university structures.

Currently, the University Research Committee (URC) has three categories of recognised research groupings, which are - at least in theory - differentiated by size, breadth of research enquiry and degree of interdisciplinarity:

- Research Unit - A focused research mandate that may span across disciplines or rest with one discipline.
- Research Centre - A broad research mandate that may span across disciplines or rest with one discipline.
- Research Institute - A broad research mandate (with wide ranging research questions) that spans across disciplines.

The key differentiation between these entities relates to the breadth of research enquiry, where at one extreme a Unit will have a focused research question, and at the other an Institute works in a broad domain, with multiple research questions. Research of Units and Centres *may* cross disciplines, while Institutes *must* span disciplines. An institute will necessarily draw on expertise from multiple departments and (likely) research groupings, but may be wholly situated within a faculty, or may span faculties. This document is specifically for *University Institutes and Initiatives* that span faculties, but many of the principles may be applicable to recognised groupings that do not span faculties, but do span departments.

An overarching principle governing niversity Institutes is that they are hosted by a faculty, but governed by the university.

A host faculty will be one in which a significant proportion of the critical mass of membership of the Institute lies. The relationship between the host Faculty and the Institute will be articulated by a MoU. In general, the host faculty will offer the following support:

- Provide space for the Institute;
- Provide administrative support not available within the Institute, for e.g. HR, Finance;
- Provide academic support to the Institute, for e.g. approval and administration of academic programmes
- Through the Dean and their alternates, will act on the Institute's behalf within existing university structures – such as in central budget, space, equipment and building requests.

---

[5] Other institutes may develop bottom up (there is no competition), might be more focused, can apply for accreditation, and require different governance arrangements and levels of central funding not discussed here.

[6] The African Climate and Development Initiative (ACDI); The Safety & Violence Initiative (SaVI); The Poverty & Inequality Initiative (PII).

[7] Future Water; Neuroscience Institute; Institute for Communities and Wildlife in Africa; and Institute for Democracy, Citizenship and Public Policy In Africa.

The **university governance** aims to ensure cross faculty and university level support, guidance and evaluation of the Institute, and through these governance arrangements, have clear agreements with each faculty and their departments on the "rules of engagement" of individuals and research groupings that make up the Institute membership.

In general, governance arrangements will include:

- A clear statement of purpose for the Institute – as might be expected when applying for URC accreditation – supported by all faculties from which membership of the Institute will be drawn.
- A constitution that formalises the purpose, governance, financial and other institutional arrangements, types of membership, etc.
- A governing board – typically chaired by the DVC Research and Internationalisation, and with senior representation from all supporting faculties (the Dean, or their nominated deputy Dean, senior members of the Institute, and external advisors). The Board acts to provide strategic advice on the direction and management of the Institute, as well as acting as advocates for the Institute in external settings.
- A management or leadership committee – typically led by the director, along with a leadership team drawn from the Institute membership. The management committee is responsible for delivery of strategic and operational decision making of the Institute.
- Operational staff to support the Director and Management Committee in implementing the Institutes activities.
- Rules of engagement including establishing MoUs between:

    o Individual faculties and the Institute that describe the ways in which the faculty will support and engage with the Institute – for example, in registration and examination of graduate students, on the attribution of research outputs, on cost recovery and GOB salaries covered by research proposals, and on the principles by which departments within the faculty should approach academic and research staff affiliation / membership of the Institute.
    o Each accredited research group (that forms part of the Institute), and the Institute.
    o Individual members and the Institute.

Appendix 6

GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF RESEARCH GROUPINGS BY EXTERNAL BODIES

The following applies to research groupings that are typically evaluated by external international and national professional bodies such as COEs:

- The Director must inform the URC of external evaluations before they take place, and the URC must have a representation in such reviews to raise URC criteria of evaluation.
- The final review report must be tabled at CRR meetings for assessment along with the feedback from the grouping's director and from the faculty.
- The Committee will use the reports to determine the status of the grouping and decide on the continuation or upgrade of the grouping's accreditation status.