

Office of the President  
June 13, 2006

Members, Board of Trustees:

## PROPOSED AMENDED REVISION TO THE GOVERNING REGULATIONS

Recommendation: that the attached proposed amended revision to Governing Regulation IX (GR-IX) Reviews of Educational Units and Their Chief Administrative Officers, of the University of Kentucky, which was received for preliminary consideration by the Board of Trustees on April 25, 2006, be approved.

The following amendments have been made to this proposed revision of Governing Regulation IX (GR-IX):

Section 1, Program Review, paragraph 1, line 3, “The review period shall normally be from five (5) to seven (7) years.” This sentence has been amended to retain rather than delete the numerals (5) and (7) following the words five and seven.

Section 3, Policies and Procedures for Reviews, paragraph 2, a sentence was inadvertently omitted from the April 25, 2006 proposed revision. The sentence follows sentence 1 of paragraph 2 and reads, “A review of the performance of any chief administrative officer at other than the regular interval may be initiated by the officer, the officer’s supervisor, or the President.”

Note: Proposed additions are underlined; proposed deletions are lined through.

Background: In 2001, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) approved their revised accreditation standards, *The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*. The importance of ongoing planning and evaluation activities are reflected in the revised *Principles* as follows:

Core Requirement 2.5 states: “The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that incorporate a systematic review of programs and services that (a) results in continuing improvement, and (b) demonstrates that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (p. 15)

Comprehensive Standard 3.2.10 states: “The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators, including the chief executive officer, on a periodic basis.” (p. 22)

## PART IX

### REVIEWS OF ~~EDUCATIONAL~~ ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS AND THEIR CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

#### 1. Program Review

The ~~work performance~~ of each educational and administrative unit in the University\* ~~and of the unit's chief administrative officer~~ shall be reviewed comprehensively at regular intervals by an ad hoc committee. The review periods shall normally be from five (5) to seven (7) years, ~~except (1) for educational units where the review period shall depend upon the term of office of the chair, the reviews being made so that the results are available when decisions to appoint or reappoint chairs are to be made, and (2) for units headed by acting administrators, where the review period shall be one year.~~

Ad hoc review committees for educational units shall be formed principally from faculty personnel, shall normally include members internal and external to the unit being reviewed, and may include members external to the University. Review committees for administrative units shall be formed from affected constituencies, including faculty and staff employees, shall normally include members internal and external to the unit being reviewed, and may include members external to the University.

#### 2. Review of Chief Administrative Officers

The performance of chief administrative officers shall be reviewed comprehensively at regular intervals. The reviews shall be designed to provide information to enhance leadership and unit effectiveness and to guide compensation and employment decisions.

Ad hoc review committees for chief administrative officers at the level of Provost, executive vice presidents, and deans shall be formed with representatives from affected constituencies and may include members external to the unit or university.

#### 3. Policies and Procedures for Reviews

Policies and procedures for conducting program reviews and reviews of chief administrative officers, as established by the President after consultation with appropriate administrative and faculty groups, including the University Senate and Staff Senate, are described in the Administrative Regulations (AR II-1.0-6). Policies and procedures for conducting reviews of department chairs and school directors, as appropriate for the individual colleges, shall be established jointly by the dean and the college faculty.

A review of the work performance of any ~~educational~~ unit at other than the regular interval may be initiated by the chief administrative officer of the unit, by an administrative officer

responsible for the unit, or by the President. A review of the performance of any chief administrative officer at other than the regular interval may be initiated by the officer, the officer's supervisor, or the President. Ordinarily such ~~a~~ reviews shall also be initiated if requested by a majority of the faculty ~~members of an educational~~ the unit, or the staff employees of an administrative unit. Such requests shall be submitted to ~~unless~~ the administrative officer to whom the unit reports, who shall provide a written explanation if the officer disapproves the request. ~~justification for not initiating the review.~~

~~Procedures for appointment of review committees and for conduct of reviews, which have been established by the President after consultation with appropriate administrative and faculty groups including the University Senate Council, are described in the *Administrative Regulations* (AR II-1.0-6). Such review committees shall be formed principally from faculty personnel, shall normally include members internal and external to the unit being reviewed, and may include members external to the University.~~

---

\*Includes departments, schools, graduate centers, colleges, interdisciplinary instructional programs, and multidisciplinary research centers and institutes.

Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 states: “The institution identifies expected outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative and educational support services; assesses whether it achieves these outcomes; and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of those results.” (p. 22)

GR-IX is being revised to align with changes to be made to the Administrative Regulations governing program review and review of chief administrative officers in order to ensure compliance with the SACS standards. The Governing Regulations currently focus on educational units and deans and department chairs as needing review. The proposed GR-IX revision will require program review for both educational and administrative units (which includes educational support units). It will also extend required reviews of deans and department chairs to include other chief administrative officers who are not addressed in the current version. The Administrative Regulations are being revised accordingly.

---

Action taken:     Approved     Disapproved     Other \_\_\_\_\_