University of Management and Technology

Performance and Reporting Framework of Existing Research Centers

Policy Name	Performance and Reporting Framework of Existing Research Centers
Policy Version	R-2026/10
File No	OPD/ORIC/01/Rev/30-Sep-2026
Next Scheduled Review	2 Years
Effective Date	Oct 1, 2026
Approved By	Executive Committee
Amendment Authority	Executive Committee
Administered By	Vice Provost Research office through Research Steering Committee
Policy Custodian	Office of Planning Development
E-Approval ID	7280
Distribution	Office of the Chairman and President Office of Rector DG All Concerned Offices

ACTION	NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE
Initiated by	Dr. Fatima Sajjad	UMT STRATPLAN PILLAR 3 INITIATIVE 2	18-4-2026
Revised & reviewed by	Dr. Sammia Shahid	PROVOST	30-4-2026
Reviewed by	Adeel Ahmed Khan	OPD	6-5-2026
Reviewed by	Imran Zahid	OPD	7-5-2026
Reviewed by	Shahzad Khan	OCP	27-8-2026
Reviewed by	Ahmed Abdullah	DG	30-9-2026
Approved by	Executive Committee	OCP	30-9-2026

Table of Contents

1 Overview....3
2 Objective....3
3 Scope....3
4 Basis of Performance Evaluation....3
5 Evaluation Periods....3
6 Impact Activities Performance Framework (1.0 Years)....4
7 Impact Outcomes Performance Framework (3 Years)....4
8 Reporting and Accountability Mechanism....4
9 Standard Center Performance Report Structure....5
10 Evidence and Data-Quality Requirements....5
11 Support-Performance Linkage....6
12 Performance Review and Administrative Action....6
13 Framework Review....6

1 Overview

The Research Centers Performance and Reporting Framework establishes a separate, evidence-based mechanism for evaluating UMT research centers according to their distinct mandates. It recognizes centers as interdisciplinary hubs for knowledge creation and real-world problem solving, knowledge mobilization, training and mentorship, and social or economic impact, rather than evaluating them through criteria identical to academic departments or Schools.

2 Objective

The framework is designed to define performance expectations and reporting requirements for research centers, assess both short-term impact activities and longer-term impact outcomes, link accountability with institutional support, and provide evidence for decisions concerning continuation, facilitation, improvement, merger, restructuring, or closure.

3 Scope

This framework applies to all UMT research centers; Center Heads/Directors; participating faculty, researchers, students and research assistants; relevant Deans; the Provost/Rector's Office; the proposed Dean-level center oversight position; ORIC; and institutional support offices responsible for finance, procurement, human resources, information technology, communications, partnerships, and administration.

4 Basis of Performance Evaluation

Center performance shall be gauged in terms of its contribution to creating new knowledge, solving or addressing real-world problems, sharing and mobilizing knowledge, training and mentoring researchers, and generating social, economic, educational, policy, or institutional impact.

Principle	Application
Mandate-Based Assessment	Performance shall be assessed against the approved center mandate and the four pillars of knowledge creation/problem solving, knowledge mobilization, training/mentorship, and social or economic impact.
Impact over Activity Volume	Breakthrough discoveries, meaningful solutions, new academic debates, international recognition, policy influence, and implemented outcomes shall receive greater consideration than activity counts alone.
Capacity and Time Sensitivity	Assessment shall recognize that most UMT centers currently operate with one or two team members and that high-impact research may require a reasonable timeframe, particularly in disciplines such as the social sciences.
Evidence and Attribution	Only outputs and outcomes clearly attributable to the center and supported by verifiable evidence shall be reported.
Support-Performance Linkage	Performance expectations shall be considered together with the human, financial, technical, digital, and physical support provided by the University.

5 Evaluation Periods

Evaluation Component	Period	Purpose
Impact Activities	1.0 years	Assessment of short-term research, collaboration, visibility, knowledge-mobilization, professional-engagement, and project-development activities.
Impact Outcomes	3 years	Assessment of longer-term advancement of knowledge, innovation, policy or educational influence, real-world solutions, networks, recognition, and broader societal impact.

6 Impact Activities Performance Framework (1.0 Years)

The following indicators gauge the short-term impact activities of a center. For each item, the center shall report the number achieved, concise details, relevant dates and partners, and a reference to supporting evidence.

S. No.	Impact Activity	Number and Details
1	Innovative/impactful projects with a financial-sustainability plan and evidence of impact, including recognition by academics, government, or academic societies	
2	Grant wins / funded projects	
3	Keynote speeches / invited talks	
4	Collaborations / partnerships	
5	Seminars / workshops	
6	International conferences	
7	Journal publications	
8	Policy reports	
9	Print, electronic, and social-media engagement	
10	Conference presentations	
11	Conference organization	
12	Collaborative projects / consultations	

7 Impact Outcomes Performance Framework (3 Years)

The following indicators gauge the longer-term impact of a center. Reported outcomes must be supported by evidence such as documents, pictures, programs, partner or beneficiary feedback, recognition, awards, adoption records, or other credible proof of influence and use.

S. No.	Impact Outcome	Details / Evidence
1	Shaping an academic debate	
2	Advancing specialized knowledge	
3	Innovations	
4	Policy influence / policy contribution	
5	Curriculum changes / educational innovations	
6	Real-world problems solved / solutions proposed	
7	Community, network, or partnership building	
8	Societal or political change or influence	
9	Consultations offered	
10	Awards / recognition	
11	Global recognition	

8 Reporting and Accountability Mechanism

Research-center reporting shall operate independently from departmental or School performance reporting. Centers shall maintain structured academic linkages with relevant Schools/Institutes and report to the Provost/Rector's Office.

Role	Reporting Responsibility
Center Head / Director	Maintain the center record; complete and certify the 1.0-year activity report and three-year outcome report; ensure that evidence is complete; report financial and operational constraints; and implement approved corrective or growth actions.
Relevant Deans (normally at least three)	Review interdisciplinary relevance, faculty and student contribution, and academic quality; facilitate access to expertise; and endorse the report without absorbing the center into a departmental structure.
Dean-Level Center Oversight Position	Monitor center performance and the performance of support departments; validate whether required institutional support was provided; prepare transparent consolidated reporting; and escalate unresolved barriers to the competent authority.
Provost & Rector's Office	Receive and review center reports; confirm performance findings; decide institutional support, improvement measures, merger, restructuring, leadership change, or closure recommendations; and hold responsible units accountable.
ORIC and Support Departments	Verify grants, finance, procurement, staffing, digital support, communications, partnerships, and other institutional records; provide timely facilitation; and respond to support gaps recorded in the report.

9 Standard Center Performance Report Structure

Report Section	Required Content
A. Center Profile and Approved Mandate	Center name, approved mandate, leadership, faculty membership, participating Schools/Institutes, staff, beneficiaries, and reporting period.
B. Executive Summary	Major achievements, significant impact, important constraints, and decisions or support required.
C. Impact Activities (1.0 Years)	Completed Impact Activities table, including number, details, dates, partners, and evidence references.
D. Impact Outcomes (3 Years)	Completed Impact Outcomes table with a narrative explaining the significance, use, influence, and sustainability of each claimed outcome.
E. Financial and Sustainability Position	Funding secured, revenue generated, expenditure, overheads, project pipeline, sustainability plan, and financial or administrative constraints.
F. Institutional Support and Gaps	Staffing, course-load support, space, digital access, financial facilitation, procurement, and other support received or pending.
G. Improvement and Next-Period Plan	Unmet commitments, corrective actions, future priorities, faculty/team development, partnership plan, and requested resources.
H. Evidence Annex	Indexed documents, pictures, programs, partner feedback, recognition, awards, official records, links, and other supporting evidence.
I. Certification and Endorsement	Certification by the Center Head/Director, endorsement by relevant Deans, verification by support departments where applicable, and review by the center oversight authority.

10 Evidence and Data-Quality Requirements

a. Evidence must be attributable to the center and the relevant reporting period, verifiable, and retained in the designated institutional repository.

b. The same output may support more than one dimension only where it demonstrates genuinely different contributions; the same numerical result shall not be double counted.

c. MoUs and partnerships shall be reported only where there is evidence of active work, outputs, exchange, funding, events, or another substantive result.

d. Submitted manuscripts, grant applications, patent applications, and proposals shall be distinguished from accepted, awarded, filed, granted, completed, adopted, or implemented results.

e. Finance-related claims shall be verified by the competent office. Publications, awards, policy influence, and societal impact shall be supported by recognized records, acknowledgements, adoption, use, partner feedback, or beneficiary evidence.

11 Support-Performance Linkage

Center performance cannot be assessed fairly without recording the institutional support provided. Each report shall therefore document the availability and timeliness of the following requirements:

a. At least one qualified coordinator, assistant, or senior officer for research support, documentation, and general coordination.

b. Efficient and transparent grant and financial systems, separately identifiable project/center funds, and timely access to approved resources.

c. Dedicated Microsoft Teams or equivalent institutional access for centers engaged in international collaboration and online academic activities.

d. Appropriate course-load reduction for Principal Investigators leading funded projects and reasonable campus-attendance flexibility for field-based researchers and center heads developing partnerships.

e. Dedicated quiet research space and collaborative space for workshops, training, meetings, and partner engagement.

f. Appropriate administrative allowance and course-load support for Center Directors where approved responsibilities, team size, and accountability requirements are met.

12 Performance Review and Administrative Action

This revised framework does not apply fixed percentage weights to the indicators. Evaluation shall be evidence-based and shall consider the quality and significance of short-term activities, the strength of three-year outcomes, the center's existing capacity, the timeframe required for meaningful research, international collaboration and recognition, and the institutional support actually provided.

a. Strong and credible performance may lead to continued or enhanced support, recognition, approved incentives, expansion of the team, and facilitation of larger projects.

b. Where progress is limited but the mandate remains relevant, a time-bound improvement plan and specific support measures may be approved.

c. Persistent dormancy, duplication, weak accountability, or failure to demonstrate credible progress may result in merger, restructuring, leadership review, closure, or de-notification through the competent approval process.

d. The performance of support departments shall also be transparently reported where delays or deficiencies materially affect center projects, outputs, or impact.

13 Framework Review

The framework shall be reviewed after the first complete three-year evaluation cycle, or earlier where required by institutional strategy. Any revision shall preserve the distinction between short-term impact activities and longer-term impact outcomes and shall continue to align performance expectations with accountability and adequate institutional support.



