

# Administrative Regulation 3:16 (Interim)

## Review of Chief Administrative Officers of the University

### Index

---

[Introduction](#)

[Definition of Chief Administrative Officer](#)

[Types of Review](#)

[Leadership and Administrative Skills Performance Criteria](#)

[Accountability](#)

## I. Introduction

---

This regulation sets forth definitions, policies, and procedures to ensure a comprehensive, meaningful review of Chief Administrative Officers of the University.

The major purposes of the review of Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) are to enhance leadership effectiveness and provide accountability in ensuring fidelity to the University's vision, mission, and values. Other purposes of the review are to promote a climate of cooperation among faculty and staff employees and their respective administrative officers; maximize effectiveness of the unit's execution of its responsibilities; and provide feedback for performance assessment and continuous improvement. CAOs reviewed under this administrative regulation are exempt from regular Performance Evaluation (PE) procedures conducted by Human Resources. The review of directors and chairs of educational units is exercised as provided by *Governing Regulations VII and IX*.<sup>1</sup>

## II. Definition of Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)

---

For the purposes of this regulation, "Chief Administrative Officers" at the University of Kentucky includes the following positions:

1. President (who is evaluated by the Board of Trustees in accordance with *Governing Regulation II*)
2. Provost

---

<sup>1</sup> Some portions of the reviews resulting from this regulation will not be disclosed pursuant to the open records law exception and AG Open Records Decision 99-ORD-137, In re: William C. Jacobs/University of Kentucky.

3. Executive Vice Presidents
4. Deans
5. Other unit heads as designated by the President, Provost, or executive vice presidents. In making decisions regarding the inclusion or exclusion of unit heads, the following criteria applies:
  - (a) Level and scope of institutional responsibility and impact; and,
  - (b) Unit size in terms of budget and/or personnel.

### III. Types of Review

---

Three distinct types of review are used to assess leadership performance: annual, formative, and summative. When any two occur within the same fiscal year, the annual review becomes a component of the formative or summative reviews.

#### A. Annual Review

1. The annual review must be conducted for all CAOs listed in II above, except the President who is evaluated by the Board of Trustees.
2. The primary purpose of the annual review is to provide input that will guide compensation decisions, identify areas of strength, and build on opportunities for improvement, both individually and at the unit level. Each fiscal year, each CAO and the CAO's supervisor must have a formally scheduled interview focusing explicitly on the systematic review and assessment of the CAO's job performance as it relates to the unit's progress in the previous fiscal year. The discussion must focus on:
  - (a) Progress in meeting goals or objectives;
  - (b) Unit plans and goals for the upcoming year; and
  - (c) An assessment of leadership, management, and administrative skills, including strengths and opportunities for improvement.

#### B. Formative Review

1. A formative review must be conducted for the Provost, executive vice presidents, and deans, and is encouraged but not required for other CAOs and can be initiated by the President, Provost, or executive vice presidents.
2. The primary purpose of the formative review is developmental. The formative review is a one-time occurrence carried out after the third year of their official appointment but no later than the fourth year in office of their official appointment. The supervisor of a CAO must conduct an evaluation survey to provide the CAO with constructive feedback on performance and to aid in improving leadership and administrative skills.
3. The performance criteria are those delineated below in Section IV. The survey must seek feedback from all affected constituencies, such as direct reports, faculty, staff employees, peers, students, and others external to the University, as appropriate.
4. The Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness must maintain a schedule of formative reviews, notify supervisors of upcoming reviews, and provide support for the process to ensure consistency across all units.

5. The formative review must culminate with a summary dialog between the CAO and the CAO's supervisor, identification of strengths and opportunities for improvement, and a plan of action for performance improvement.

### C. Summative Review

1. A summative review must be conducted for the Provost, executive vice presidents, and deans.
2. The purpose of the summative review is to provide input for establishing future performance goals and expectations and for making compensation and employment decisions.
3. The summative review of deans must occur at least 9-months prior to reappointment, or at an intervening occasion as might be initiated pursuant to the majority vote of the College Faculty (*Governing Regulation IX*). Such a vote is coordinated by an elected representative body of that Faculty. A summative review will not be required for deans who do not intend to seek reappointment.
4. The summative review of the Provost and executive vice presidents must occur seven years after the initial appointment, and then at least every seven years thereafter, or at an intervening occasion as might be initiated pursuant to the majority vote of the faculty, in the case of the Provost, or the staff employees, in the case of executive vice presidents (*Governing Regulation IX*). Such a vote is be coordinated by an elected representative body of the faculty or staff employees.
5. The Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness maintains a schedule of summative reviews, notifies supervisors of upcoming reviews, and provides support for the process to ensure consistency across all units.
6. The summative review process must consist of the following:
  - (a) A written self-assessment of performance, including measurable goals or objectives that emerged from strategic planning activities and previous reviews, prepared by the officer and submitted to the COA's supervisor;
  - (b) An evaluation survey adopted by the University, after consultation with the University Senate and Staff Senate, as appropriate, and affected CAOs, to solicit feedback from all affected constituencies, such as direct reports, faculty, staff employees, peers, students, and others external to the University;
  - (c) Appointment of at least a five-person review committee by the CAO's supervisor in consultation with the CAO and with representation from affected constituencies, such as direct reports, faculty, staff employees, peers, students, and others external to the University. For educational units and academic administrators, the CAO's supervisor must appoint at least one review committee member from nominations to be provided by the University Senate. For administrative units, the CAO's supervisor must appoint at least one review committee member from nominations to be provided by the Staff Senate. As appropriate, a student representative may also be appointed from nominations to be provided by the Student Government Association.
  - (d) Analysis by the review committee of the CAO's self-assessment and the results of the evaluation survey; collection of additional information as deemed necessary by the committee, including both quantitative and qualitative input from sources internal and external to the unit, as appropriate;
  - (e) Preparation by the review committee of a summary report of its findings to be submitted to the CAO's supervisor and to include strengths and opportunities for improvement in specific areas; and

- (f) Discussion of the self-assessment and performance report prepared by the supervisor between the CAO and the CAO's supervisor and development of a feedback report to the CAO's constituents.

## IV. Leadership and Administrative Skills Performance Criteria

---

The following criteria guide the assessment of CAO performance in all reviews: leadership and administrative skills, personnel management and development, and organizational management. The Office of Strategic Planning & Institutional Effectiveness maintains an inventory of evaluation survey items related to the criteria that includes a set of items common to all CAOs and additional items specific to CAO positions. The CAO and the CAO's supervisor may also agree upon additional, more specialized criteria and items targeting a unit's particular functions or a CAO's unique duties. Whenever feasible, the University will contract with an outside vendor to conduct the evaluation surveys to ensure the confidentiality of responses. Survey instruments should contain as many of the following criteria for demonstrating leadership and administrative skills as possible and as appropriate:

### A. Leadership

1. Developing and specifying goals, objectives, and key indicators to align with the University-wide strategic plan;
2. Implementing unit plans and strategies for achieving unit goals and objectives;
3. Promoting innovative and creative approaches;
4. Building and maintaining support for unit goals and objectives;
5. Engaging in regular, evidence-based evaluations of unit performance;
6. Establishing and maintaining open lines of communication;
7. Representing unit strengths, achievements and needs in the wider University community and beyond;
8. Establishing an environment of openness, accessibility, consensus-building, and collegiality within the unit; and,
9. Requiring strict, unit-wide adherence to all University anti-discrimination policies.

### B. Personnel Management and Development

1. Ensuring a work environment characterized by respect, dignity, and fairness for all personnel;
2. Recruiting and retaining the best-qualified individuals;
3. Ensuring the unit contributes to the fulfillment and sustainability of University diversity goals;
4. Supporting the on-going development of all unit personnel;
5. Setting high expectations and acknowledging and rewarding demonstrated excellence;
6. Ensuring evidence-based assessment of personnel performance;
7. Making appropriate personnel decisions based on performance assessment results;

8. Implementing a systematic review of current and future key positions and identifying and developing potential candidates to fill vacancies that occur; and
9. Ensuring consistent, unit-wide compliance with all Human Resources Policies and Procedures.

### C. Organizational Management

1. Ensuring collaborative, evidence-based and timely decision making throughout the unit;
2. Advocating for the unit in University budget and resource development/allocation processes;
3. Ensuring consistent and timely unit compliance with all University reporting and other administrative/business requirements, policies, and procedures;
4. Allocating unit resources in support of unit goals, objectives, and priorities;
5. Engaging in and encouraging efforts to obtain external resources in support of unit goals and priorities; and
6. Ensuring all levels within the unit are well informed about issues, priorities, and expectations of the wider University community.

## V. Accountability

---

The Office of Strategic Planning & Institutional Effectiveness maintains a schedule of formative and summative reviews along with a status report on each review scheduled in any given year. Evidence of the CAO review process will be used to demonstrate the University's compliance with Standard 5.4 (Qualified administrative/academic officers) which states: The institution employs and regularly evaluates administrative and academic officers with appropriate experience and qualifications to lead the institution.

## References and Related Materials

---

GR Part VII, University Organization

GR Part IX, Reviews of Organizational Units and Their Chief Administrative Officers

AG Open Records Decision 99-ORD-137 In re: William C. Jacobs/University of Kentucky

SACSCOC Principle 5.4 Qualified administrative/academic officers, The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2018

## Revision History

---

AR II-1.0-6, Part II, Review of the Chief Administrative Officers of Educational Units: 9/17/1992, 8/23/1993

AR 1:4, The Strategic Planning, Assessment, and Budgeting Cycle: 11/15/2006

AR 3:16, Review of Chief Administrative Officers: 9/9/2013, (Updated 7/10/2015), 8/26/2022

For questions, contact: [Office of Legal Counsel](#)