

RESPONSES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY SYSTEM  
TO RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE  
OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

November 6, 1992

The Reaffirmation Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools conducted its visit of the University of Kentucky on September 13-16, 1992. The Committee has presented the University System of the University of Kentucky with 21 recommendations in the "Recommendations" section (pages 155-157) of the Committee's report. One additional recommendation on page 147 of the report was apparently omitted unintentionally from the summary of recommendations, thus bringing the number of recommendations to 22.

The responses which follow reveal that the University has already established policies or procedures to address some of the recommendations and that definite plans have been established to address the others.

For the convenience of the reader, each of the Reaffirmation Committee's recommendations will be repeated followed immediately by the University's response. Also included will be the page number in the Committee's report where the recommendation appears.

## 1.1 Institutional Commitment and Responsibilities

**Recommendation 1:** That the University's senior leadership act to devise, create, and implement an institutional plan to follow-up the recommendations and suggestions in the Self-Study Report. (p. 9)

The University has completed an exhaustive and comprehensive self-study with the goal of improving the quality of the University and its programs. It was an open process, inviting the participation of the entire University community, thus making it all the more important that an effective, open implementation process follows.

As an initial step in implementing the self-study, the findings and recommendations from the Self-Study have been referred to the Strategic Planning Team. This group was constituted in July 1992 to conduct a comprehensive review of the Strategic Plan, focusing on the current plan, refining its goals and objectives, and suggesting revisions. A revised plan was distributed to the University community in September for comments and suggestions. The proposed revision includes a modification in the strategic goals as suggested by the Self-Study.

A part of the implementation process for the Self-Study recommendations involves a continuation of the Steering Committee, serving a referral and monitoring function. The President has asked the Steering Committee to continue to function until June 30, 1993. The Committee's role will be to assist the President in referring the Self-Study recommendations and SACS suggestions to the appropriate University office, agency, or council for implementation and follow-up with university offices to ensure recommendations are addressed.

These referrals will be made by December 1992. In its monitoring function, the Committee will assist the President in conducting a follow-up on the progress in implementing the recommendations and in preparing his report to the University by September 1993. As a part of the monitoring effort, the committee will assist with the transition of this responsibility to staff in the Office of the President prior to June 30, 1993.

The Steering Committee will be assisted with the services of the Self-Study Director through June 30, 1993. He will be given additional release time from his regular duties and part-time secretarial support during this period.

### 3.1 Planning and Evaluation

**Recommendation 2:** That an office or officer be charged with the responsibility of working with all units to evaluate the extent to which the units' goals have been met and to review and document the use of these ongoing evaluations to improve educational programs, services, and operations. (p. 14)

Since 1989, the University has had a Strategic Plan detailing a mission, goals, objectives, and measures of progress. Individual units have been asked to develop mission statements, goals, and expected results as well as expected learning outcomes in their education programs. The latter has largely been developed and implemented through institutional effectiveness coordinators, with coordinators in place for each sector or vice presidential area.

In September 1992, the University implemented a new administrative regulation pertaining to review and evaluation of educational units (Exhibit A). The intent of this new administrative regulation is to link unit-level strategic planning and goal determination with the annual and periodic evaluation process. Each year, units will be asked to identify their goals for the year (from its Strategic Plan), then report back at year's end on progress in reaching those goals. These annual activities and reports will serve as an important part of the information base for the next external periodic review of the unit.

The University agrees that its approach in implementing institutional effectiveness responsibilities has been a highly decentralized effort. Decentralization has helped personnel in the sectors and units to increase the familiarity with the principles of institutional effectiveness, but additional central coordination is needed to ensure the effectiveness efforts are institutionalized and consistent throughout the University.

A goal is to develop a process which is centrally developed and coordinated but where the substance of the planning and evaluation activities are distributed to the decision making units. Consequently, the President will establish a policy framework, in consultation with the Self-Study Steering Committee and in conjunction with Recommendation 3, describing and defining the central coordination role and responsibilities and its relationship to the sectors and units. The framework will also describe those institutional effectiveness and institutional research functions and activities to be assigned and distributed to the sectors and units. The President intends to assign responsibility for the University-wide leadership and coordination of the institutional effectiveness and institutional research efforts as additional responsibilities to the present Office of Planning and Budget, effective July 1, 1993. (See response to Recommendation 3.)

### 3.2 Institutional Research

**Recommendation 3:** The Committee recommends that procedures be developed and responsibility be assigned for evaluating all formal institutional research functions. (p. 15)

Any university which seeks to be a great university must continuously monitor its strengths and weaknesses in order to identify areas for improvement and must also provide analytic services for decision making. Much of this can be done through a sound, well designed and coordinated institutional research function. While the University community is not anxious to see additional resources flow into administrative offices, the Self-Study was clear on the need to commit additional resources for institutional research. Resources, comparable to those reallocated to institutional research on the Lexington Campus during the past three years and available in the Community College System for many years, need to be reallocated to institutional research throughout the University.

As noted in the response to Recommendation 2, a solution to this problem is not simple, especially at a time when there are serious discussions underway concerning realignment and restructuring within the University. The Steering Committee will work with the President and his staff to evaluate all existing formal and informal institutional research functions and to identify a model whereby institutional research can be conducted to provide needed support for programs within the sectors, with University-wide direction and coordination from the Office of Planning and Budget. The Office of Planning and Budget will be re-named by July 1, 1993 to reflect its additional responsibilities for institutional effectiveness and institutional research.

#### 4.1.1 Undergraduate Admissions

Recommendation 4: That a clear and concise statement of current admissions practices and procedures be developed and made available to all constituencies. (p. 21)

The University's Office of Admissions has prepared the following concise overview of admission practices and policies. It will be given wide dissemination both inside and outside the institution through inclusion in the "viewbook" which is prepared for distribution to potential students, their parents, guidance counselors and University officials who deal with admission of students such as academic advisors in the respective colleges.

The revised statement follows:

"As a selective admission institution, the University of Kentucky offers automatic admission to freshman applicants whose high school grades, nationally standardized test scores (ACT or SAT), and completed curriculum predict successful academic performance as a UK student.

In addition, up to ten percent of the freshman class may be selected from applicants who do not meet the requirements for automatic admission. In these cases the Office of Admissions will consider such factors as rigor of the high school curriculum (e.g., honors courses), out-of-class accomplishments, extracurricular activities and personal achievements.

Transfer students with 24 or more semester hours from an accredited institution must have a cumulative 2.0 grade point average in all course work to be eligible for admission. Applicants with fewer than 24 semester hours of transfer credit must have a 2.0 grade point average in all college course work attempted and submit a high school transcript and nationally standardized test scores (ACT or SAT) that indicate they meet selective admission standards for freshmen.

The application deadline for fall semester admission is August 1, but freshmen are encouraged to apply by February 15 to receive priority consideration for admission. Some programs and academic colleges have deadlines that differ from those for general admission to UK. Please refer to Special Application Dates and Procedures at the end of this section for information on deadlines and procedures for selective admission colleges and programs. (Not reproduced here, but it appears on page 11 of the 1992-93 UK Bulletin).

Scholarship student-athletes who do not meet standards for automatic admission may be admitted if they meet the Southeastern Conference and National Collegiate Athletic Association academic eligibility requirements. Applicants who have less than a 2.0 high school grade point average on a 4.0 scale will not be admitted except through action of the Faculty Committee on Admission by Exception.

All applicants denied admission as undergraduates have the right to appeal that decision to the Faculty Committee on Admission by Exception. Details regarding how to accomplish that are available from the UK Office of Admissions."

#### 4.1.1 Undergraduate Admissions

**Recommendation 5: That the University review its admissions equations and policies on a regular basis. (p.21)**

Implemented during 1984, the selective admission procedures and standards of the University were reviewed in detail during 1989-1991 by the University Senate's ad hoc Committee to Review Selective Admissions. This led to adoption of significant revisions and adjustments to the policies and procedures in place at UK. A major change was establishment of an Admissions Advisory Committee consisting of nine members. This group is charged with reviewing admission policies and has authority from the University Senate to effect change. For the 1992-93 academic year the Committee has decided to focus on admission criteria for certain categories of students: minority students, student athletes, and students from rural areas. It will also be reviewing admission standards for non-degree students and for transfer students.

This review will include a discussion of the equation to determine automatic admission criteria which was removed from the Senate Rules during 1990. This equation had governed automatic admission but that has been supplanted by revised rules which assign that responsibility to the Admissions Advisory Committee.

#### 4.1.3 Undergraduate Curriculum

**Recommendation 6:** That appropriate University academic officials assess the high lack of success in CHE 105 and MA 123, find the causes, and take corrective action. (p. 25)

In all probability the high lack of success in CHE 105 and MA 123 is due to several factors including student preparation, academic advising, the teaching process, and the difficulty of recognizing high-risk students early enough in the process to compensate for poor performance. The Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies have appointed an ad hoc committee to examine these courses and to recommend procedures for addressing the problem.

It should be noted that part of the solution for CHE 105 is already in place. It is now possible for students not faring well in this course to transfer to a less mathematically based chemistry offering (CHE 109) without loss of time or academic credit. Although this development is only part of the solution, it indicates that the University is aware of the problem and is beginning to address it.

We anticipate that by July 1, 1993 we will have in place a series of steps designed to eliminate the excessive failure and/or dropout rate in these courses.

## 4.2 Graduate Program

**Recommendation 7:** That the Graduate School in consort with institutional research officials and offices be charged with development of a sound data base for graduate education. (p. 30)

The Graduate School acknowledges the need to provide a more comprehensive data base for graduate education than is presently available. During the past two years, some advances have been made in this direction; during the remainder of 1992-93, we expect to consolidate data already available in several sources (including some in hard copy) in order to establish a more comprehensive, accessible data base for purposes of planning and evaluation.

The UK Graduate School is currently utilizing two computer systems for data storage and retrieval: graduate student records are maintained on the University's Student Information System (SIS) and graduate applications data are entered and stored on the GRAD system on a WANG computer run by Information Systems. At present, individual graduate programs have read-only access to both SIS and the GRAD system. Statistical reports on graduate students' records for the period since 1988 can be generated by FOCUS/SIS which is available not only to the Graduate School but to each college and sub-unit in the University.

The Graduate School's plan for development of a comprehensive data base includes modification of data management procedures in order to increase the accessibility of information on graduate education at all levels, including University administrative officers as well as Directors of Graduate Studies. A data base on Advisory Committees for doctoral students is nearing completion, and the Graduate School is actively exploring the feasibility of moving graduate applications to SIS to provide greater access at all levels.

The required modifications of SIS are being jointly investigated by the Associate Registrar and the Academic Coordinator for graduate admissions.

Computer systems used to store information on graduate students became operational in 1988. Thus, collaborative efforts with all sectors of the campus are being undertaken to compile a historical data base which will contain information on graduate students from 1984-88. This data base will contain semester by semester summary information on each student's academic performance as well as demographic information and application materials. Plans call for this historical data base to be developed by Summer 1993 as a complement to institutional data available on graduate education through SIS since 1988.

These efforts are being undertaken collaboratively with the Lexington Campus Office of Planning and Assessment and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the Medical Center, as well as with Central Administration's Office of Planning and Budget.

#### 4.4.1 Selection of Faculty

**Recommendation 8:** That the University act to develop a written statement for the recruitment and selection of faculty and to place these procedures in published documents. (p. 39)

While the University is committed to recruiting outstanding faculty the procedures for recruitment are not clearly delineated. Recruitment methods have evolved over time and it is important that we now articulate and standardize the procedures. To accomplish this task, the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus and the Chancellor of the Medical Center will develop a written statement for recruitment and selection of faculty for those appointments effective after July 1, 1993. The statement will be disseminated to all administrators and faculty and will be included in the next edition of the Faculty Handbook. Since chairs and deans are responsible for faculty recruitment, they will be given a copy of the policy upon appointment to their respective administrative position.

#### 4.4.1 Selection of Faculty

Recommendation 9: That the University gather and maintain documentation regarding the appropriateness of the academic preparation of faculty: (a) where highest earned degree is from a non-regionally accredited institution, and (b) whose highest earned degree is from an institution outside the United States. (p. 39)

The expectation that a careful review of the academic preparation of faculty take place during the appointment process will be a standard specified in the Policy for Recruitment and Selection of Faculty that is to be developed in response to Recommendation 8. Additionally, each unit that hires an individual whose highest earned degree is from an institution outside the United States will be expected to submit, in writing, justification for these hires. The Chancellor of each Sector will maintain a record of the number of faculty in these two categories and the reasons for their hiring.

It is the policy of the University not to employ any full time faculty who earned their highest degree from a non-regionally accredited institution. We are not aware that any such persons are members of the faculty. Presently, however, the Lexington Campus is in the process of collecting additional credential information on all faculty, part-time instructors, and teaching assistants to assure that the institution is in compliance with the recommendation and the University's policy. (The Medical Center has maintained such a data base for the past five years.) Once this process is complete, it will be possible to identify all faculty who have their highest degree from a non-regionally accredited institution, or whose highest earned degree is from an institution outside of the United States.

Documentation of the appropriateness of academic preparation of existing faculty will become a required part of faculty files effective December 1, 1992. For all future appointments, such documentation of the appropriateness of the academic preparation will be a required part of the appointment process in the event the highest degree earned is from an institution outside the United States or a non-regionally accredited institution. This procedure will be included as one element of the policy which will be developed to standardize the recruitment and appointment of faculty as required by Recommendation 8.

#### 4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.2 Academic and Professional Preparation

**Recommendation 10:** That appropriate University academic administrators act promptly to insure that all part-time faculty who teach courses leading to the baccalaureate degrees meet Commission on Colleges and institutional criteria for such instruction. (p. 40)

All instructors who do not meet the minimum SACS qualifications are reported annually to SACS in the institutional profile. Deans prepare the data for this report and provide the justification for use of all such instructors. As noted in the Self-Study Report, the University now requires all new faculty to provide official transcripts upon appointment. Beginning with the spring of 1993, official transcripts will be required of all part-time instructors. The official transcripts will identify any part-time instructor who does not meet the criteria; anyone without proper academic credentials and without equivalent skills as identified by SACS criteria will not be permitted to teach, and the appropriate Chancellor will not sign the employment contract. Deans will be required to certify the part-time instructor's credentials prior to the semester in which they will teach.

#### 4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.2 Academic and Professional Preparation

**Recommendation 11:** That constructive and specific steps be taken to create comprehensive and centralized data bases for the professional qualifications and competencies of all full-time and part-time faculty as well as Teaching Assistants for each college and school of the University.  
(p. 41)

In the process of collecting data for the 1992 SACS profile, information will be compiled from the departments on all instructors teaching in the fall of 1992. This data on part-time instructors and teaching assistants will be entered into the Lexington Campus database on full-time faculty. The University is also implementing a major new administrative computing system, the Human Resource System (HRS), this year. This system is currently running parallel and is scheduled to be operational in January 1993. Once HRS is operational, the faculty portion of the system will be implemented. The data on faculty qualifications collected this fall on the Lexington Campus will be used as the initial data for the HRS implementation.

Information on full-time and part-time faculty qualifications and competencies have been entered into the Medical Center faculty data base for the past five years. When the HRS system is operational, information from the Medical Center faculty data base will be uploaded to the HRS system.

The data which will be required in the new HRS system is comprehensive and will meet the needs of the University community in a distributed environment. Colleges as well as departments will be able to enter their own data and generate management reports they need. The Lexington Campus Planning and Assessment office will make basic model programs available for use with this system and will share with departments to facilitate and promote immediate use of the database.

#### 4.4.2.3 Graduate Faculty Qualifications

**Recommendation 12:** That the University eliminate the use of graduate students in doctoral instructional programs and carefully review its policies for faculty degree exceptions in the teaching of any graduate course. (p. 44)

The University of Kentucky agrees entirely with the recommendation that graduate students who have not completed the Ph.D. not be used in doctoral instructional programs. Under the rules of the Graduate School, faculty with instructional or other roles in graduate education at the master's or doctoral levels must hold the doctor's degree or its equivalent in scholarly reputation. Exceptions have been made in Master's programs only when a recommended instructor holds the master's or other equivalent degree and there is evidence of professional experience and expertise in the material of instruction.

Apparently, there was an isolated case of a graduate student giving doctoral level instruction in the past. We can find no evidence of the use of doctoral candidates in the instruction of doctoral level courses (600-700 levels) at the present time. Nor will it be permitted to take place in the future. Deans and department chairs have been so informed.

The Graduate School will provide written reminders on a regular basis to Deans, Department Chairs, and Directors of Graduate Studies that this practice is unacceptable, including a statement of the expected standards for persons undertaking doctoral level instruction. Departments wishing to utilize persons who do not hold an earned doctorate in the field will be required to provide justification of employment of such faculty on the basis of other competence or academic credentials, particularly in master's only programs. Additionally, faculty assigned to teach all courses at the 600/700 level will be monitored to ensure that they hold the doctorate in the teaching or a related discipline.

#### 4.4.3 Part-Time Faculty

**Recommendation 13:** That complete data be gathered concerning the numbers, role, and academic preparation of part-time faculty so the University can analyze and control the employment of these faculty. (p. 46)

The Lexington Campus Course Analysis Report which is referenced in the Self-Study Report showed course sections taught by three levels of instructors: full-time faculty (regular and special title series), teaching assistants, and all others. The 'all other' category mentioned in the Report and this recommendation includes part-time instructors, administrative faculty who teach (deans, vice chancellors, etc.), and faculty in other title series (such as librarians, extension title series, etc.). Beginning with the fall 1992 analysis, the data will be broken out so that part-time instructors can be identified. The report will be distributed to Deans and chairs for their information and action. The academic preparation of the part-time instructors is currently in the Medical Center faculty data base and will be included in the University-wide faculty database as discussed in other recommendations. In the future, the reporting change noted above will be included in course analysis reports which will be developed by the Medical Center and the Lexington Campus.

#### 4.4.3 Part-Time Faculty

**Recommendation 14:** That the University provide for appropriate orientation, supervision, and evaluation of all part-time faculty members. (p. 47)

Part-time faculty members at a large comprehensive university like the University of Kentucky are a very diverse group. Although some of them are new to the profession of teaching, the vast majority have had considerable academic experience. Some hold Ph.D.'s, some have had extensive classroom experience before coming to the University, and some are long-time staff members who are very knowledgeable about the University system and the academic expectations of the institution. An effective orientation program for this population must address a wide variety of needs.

Under the aegis of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies the Lexington Campus has in place a general orientation program for teaching assistants (one week) and a similar but shorter program (one day) for new faculty. Since part-time faculty are more akin to the latter group, and it is important that they consider themselves a part of the faculty, we propose to extend the faculty orientation to two days and to increase the diversity of activities in order to meet the needs of both full and part-time faculty. In addition to the usual sessions on such matters as research, student services, minority and gender issues in the classroom, promotion and tenure, and general principles of instruction, we will incorporate more focused sessions on items such as small group discussions, lecturing techniques, grading, and syllabus development. We will run concurrent sessions so as to allow both groups to take advantage of those sessions most related to their teaching responsibilities. In addition, part-time faculty will be able to attend

sessions in the teaching assistant orientation which may be of particular benefit to them.

The Medical Center annually conducts a two and one-half day retreat at an off-campus site to orient new faculty in the Medical Center. The Medical Center will develop a similar orientation for new part-time faculty and will conduct this orientation each semester since many part-time faculty only teach one semester. The orientation will be an abbreviated version of the two and one-half day retreat and will include information on educational and administrative issues.

The University will require departments which use part-time instructors to provide a discipline-specific orientation for their part-time instructors as they do now for their incoming teaching assistants. The departments will also be asked to put into place an adequate system for supervising and evaluating the performance of part-time instructors in a manner similar to but not identical with that used for teaching assistants. Departments will be asked to develop adequate methods for assessing classroom performance of part-time faculty.

#### 4.4.4 Graduate Teaching Assistants

**Recommendation 15:** That appropriate University officials insure that the University avoid heavy dependence on Graduate Teaching Assistants to conduct classroom instruction. (p. 47)

Forty percent of the lower division courses on the Lexington Campus are taught by full-time faculty; 41 percent by teaching assistants, and 19 percent by part-time faculty and other UK staff. In upper division courses, 74.9 percent of the sections are taught by full-time instructors. The University agrees that we should avoid heavy dependence on graduate teaching assistants, particularly in freshmen year courses. As a result, the Lexington Campus Chancellor has identified as a priority greater involvement of full-time faculty in teaching introductory courses. A request for additional faculty that would alleviate the use of all teaching assistants who have not yet earned the masters' degree was included as a top priority in the last budget request to the state. The goal of the Lexington Campus strategic plan is to exceed the SACS minimum requirement of 18 credit hours in the teaching discipline and require by Fall 1994 all graduate teaching assistants who have primary teaching responsibilities hold a master's degree in the discipline or its equivalent. The Medical Center rarely uses graduate teaching assistants to conduct classroom instruction.

It should be noted, however, that the use of graduate teaching assistants in higher education is a long-standing practice. Part of a research university's mission is to prepare the next generation of the professoriate to teach. As a result, programs at the University of Kentucky have been put into place which assist the teaching assistants with developing effective teaching skills. The percentage of the instructional load carried by teaching

assistants and part-time instructors has been monitored at the chancellor's level by summary reports distributed to the deans and chairs. The dean of each college will continue to be responsible for ensuring the quality of instruction.

#### 4.4.4 Graduate Teaching Assistants

**Recommendation 16:** That the University provide a published set of guidelines for institution-wide graduate assistantship administration, including appointment criteria, remuneration, rights and responsibilities, evaluation, and reappointment. (p. 48)

The University has been aware of the need to provide in a single source of information relating to administrative guidelines for graduate students generally, and for graduate assistants, both teaching and research, in particular.

The Graduate School has already begun the development of a guidebook for graduate students at the University of Kentucky which will deal with a variety of information generally. Specific information will be provided on guidelines for institution-wide graduate assistantship administration, including appointment criteria, remuneration, rights and responsibilities, and evaluation and reappointment as set forth in the University's Administrative Regulations and the University's booklet entitled Student Rights and Responsibilities. This guidebook for graduate students will be prepared in draft form for prior consultation with college deans, the Graduate Council, Directors of Graduate Studies, Department Chairs, Legal Counsel, and other administrative officers before it is distributed in final form. It is anticipated that the guidebook will be available for distribution before the Fall 1993 Semester.

#### 4.4.4 Graduate Teaching Assistants

**Recommendation 17:** That the institution provide a structure for administrative oversight at a level above that of the individual academic units to assure conformity with institutional policies and procedures. (p. 48)

Deans of the colleges are responsible for administrative oversight of departmental practices in the recruitment, employment, and evaluation of teaching assistants and have been so informed. In the past, information was not easily available to deans to assist with monitoring this aspect of the instructional programs in their colleges. With the recent development of two new data bases, Student Information System (SIS) and Human Resource System (HRS), and additional data on graduate teaching assistants discussed in the response to other recommendations, information will now be available to deans to assist them in monitoring compliance with these policies and procedures.

### 5.5.1 Scope and Accountability

**Recommendation 18:** That assessment and evaluation of student services be conducted in a consistent manner and that student profiles be developed to aid in assessment and evaluation. (p. 125)

Currently, all programs and services that fall under the Student Affairs Division are evaluated on a five-year cycle. Each unit is required to do a self-study utilizing the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs guidelines. In addition, each unit is required to utilize an outside review group to evaluate their self-study, to independently review the unit and to make suggestions and recommendations for change and improvement. These reports are reviewed by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and each unit is required to develop written responses to the recommendations and suggestions.

Plans are currently going forward to establish, in concert with the Lexington Campus Office of Planning and Assessment, an ongoing data base on student characteristics and attitudes. This data base will build on the data recently collected through the Lexington Campus Office of Planning and Assessment and Self-Study surveys of undergraduate, graduate and professional, and commuter students as well as graduating seniors and recent alumni, and will assist in development of student profiles. Additionally, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs is developing a plan to consolidate current individual department data bases so that they may be more readily available for assessment and evaluation. The Division of Student Affairs has also developed a plan for ongoing student oriented research and has identified a professional staff member to coordinate this effort. These efforts should be in place and operational no later than Fall 1993.

## 5.5.2 Resources

**Recommendation 19:** That the relocation, centralization, and accessibility of services be fully examined with a view of bringing them together in a better fashion. (p. 125).

A draft proposal for a comprehensive Student Services Center has been developed and forwarded to the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus. Currently, the relocation of Residence Life, Dean of Students, Minority Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to the Funkhouser Building is being planned. Funkhouser is centrally located on campus and presently houses the Office of Admissions, the Registrar, the Housing Office and the Office of Financial Aid. Space in this building has been identified, cost estimates have been developed and the Chancellor has placed this project high on his list for renovation dollars. The project awaits funding.

### 5.5.3.1 Academic Advising, Counseling and Career Development

**Recommendation 20:** That the University develop a consistent, coordinated, and evaluated academic advisement system. (p. 126)

Developing "a consistent, coordinated and evaluated system" for the University of Kentucky is a process best carried out in stages, but the foundations for such a system are already beginning to take shape. A Retention Committee appointed by the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus has been meeting since mid-September, and this group will be making specific recommendations about issues, including advising, which affect student retention most especially in the freshman year. A campus wide Advising Network of individuals who work in the different colleges has been meeting for two years and has advised both the Chancellor and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies on matters related to advising and to the academic program for undergraduates as a whole. Undeclared students are currently advised in the College of Arts & Sciences, but the Chancellor has declared that part of his agenda for 1992-93 is to transfer that responsibility to the Office of Undergraduate Studies in order to lighten the burden of Arts & Sciences and to provide a more centralized venue for advising undeclared students. Thus, we will have a nucleus of a coordinated program of advising. In addition, the Chancellor plans to reallocate personnel, identified during the realignment and restructuring process of 1992-1993, from other roles in the University to advising.

It is essential to retain a strong core of advisors in the individual colleges who are knowledgeable about major programs and who are committed to students in their area. For this reason a close liaison and a consistent

policy on advising must be established between the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the individual academic units in order to serve the needs of undergraduates in the most effect and efficient means possible. The exact nature of that relationship, the nature of the policy, and the specific responsibilities of the several parties is yet to be determined. The Office of Undergraduate Studies will seek the advice of the Advising Network and the Retention Committee in developing a coordinated system for advising across the campus, and it anticipates that a plan will be in place by the end of the current academic year.

It should be noted that the new system of using Teaching Portfolios, adopted by the University Senate, includes a section on advising for those faculty who carry a significant responsibility in this area. Thus, we have in place the foundation for recognizing and rewarding individuals who do commendable work in advising, and this fact will help our efforts to coordinate and improve the advising system as a whole.

### 5.5.3.2 Student Government, Student Activities, and Publications

**Recommendation 21:** That the University develop a comprehensive student governance plan that clearly delineates the lines of authority and means of student input into decision making.  
(p. 127)

Currently students have numerous opportunities for input and involvement in University governance. These range from representation on the Board of Trustees, to membership on the Faculty Senate and its various committees, to academic College Advisory Committees, to membership on all major University Administrative councils and committees, and all other University committees including the Student Code Committee and the Student Health Advisory Committee. Assignment to these committees are coordinated through the Office of the President, the Student Government Association, the University Senate and the Division of Student Affairs. Additionally, students have numerous opportunities for self governance through the Student Government Association, the Student Activities Board, the Student Organizations Assembly, Inter-fraternity Council, Panhellenic Council, the Residence Hall Association, the Black Student Union and more than 200 clubs and organizations.

Together with the Student Government Association (SGA), plans will be developed to better coordinate these efforts and to more adequately inform students of the opportunities for involvement and the channels and procedures available to institute new policies and to change existing ones. Orientation programs, UK 101, the student handbook and student media will all be utilized to apprise students. This joint effort will begin in November 1992 to assure its completion in time for the beginning of the next academic year and for inclusion in appropriate publications.

## 6.5 Externally Funded Grants and Contracts

**Recommendation 22:** The Committee recommends that procedures for the allocation of indirect costs be examined to insure that the institution will not become dependent upon indirect costs allowances for regular operating expenses. (p. 147)

The University of Kentucky's Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Chancellors, prepares the annual budget for re-investment of the indirect cost dollars in support of the university's infrastructure for research and graduate education. The Vice President is assisted in allocating funds among the various programmatic priorities by the Vice Chancellors for Research and Graduate Studies (who represent and consult with their respective Chancellors and Deans) and the Dean of the Graduate School. The University Research Advisory Committee, comprised of senior research-active faculty and associate deans for research, also review the budget and make recommendations prior to the budget's being approved by the Board of Directors of the University of Kentucky Research Foundation.

The amount of funding for each priority (start up funds for new faculty, matching funds for equipment purchases in connection with research grants, dollars for support of graduate fellowships and assistantships, research-related travel, seed money for new research projects, incentive funds for departments, etc.) varies from year to year. The Vice President, the Vice Chancellors and the Dean of the Graduate School track expenditures in each category, to insure that faculty members and department chairs are in fact making the intended expenditures in support of research and graduate education. In the case of the incentive funds, which are block grants to departments of 12.5 percent (Lexington Campus and units in Research and Graduate Studies) or 10 percent (Medical Center), itemized annual reports of

expenditures are provided. It is the view of the Vice President and the Vice President's senior co-workers that the mechanisms for consultation on budgeting and monitoring of indirect cost dollar allocations provide appropriate assurance that indirect cost allowances are not depended upon for regular operating expenses.

Over the past several years, the amount of money (\$1.045 million) transferred from the indirect cost dollars pool without a label as to programs to be supported to the general funds of the University has remained constant. In 1991-92, this amounted to slightly less than 10 percent of the total dollars collected in the indirect costs category. Since the University provides a number of staff positions and related support (the Graduate School, clerical and technical support staff, etc.) on general fund dollars, this transfer seems reasonable and appropriate.

The University of Kentucky is well aware that its policy of re-investment of virtually all indirect cost dollars received in direct development of its infrastructure for research and graduate education distinguishes it from a number of other research-intensive universities. The University is committed to preserving this positive aspect of the research environment.

1640Q

## EXHIBIT A

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS	IDENTIFICATION	PAGE
	AR II-1.0-6	1
	DATE EFFECTIVE	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED
	9/17/92	2/20/86

## REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL UNITS

The purpose of program/unit review is to improve the quality of teaching and learning, research, and public service by systematically reviewing mission, goals, priorities, activities and outcomes. Continuous program/unit improvement requires a planning process which integrates current goals and priorities with the basic mission. Continual improvement also requires a review process which evaluates progress toward goal achievement and provides feedback which assists in refinement of plans and direction for the unit. The planning and review processes used by each unit should be appropriate to that unit, but all such processes will include three basic elements: (I) strategic planning; (II) annual review; and (III) periodic review.

The primary concern is the degree of progress of the educational unit. Thus, the chief administrative officers of the educational units will be evaluated in terms of the unit(s) and program(s) for which they are responsible and not in isolation from these, in relation to the contributions of their units to the broader goals of the University and the Commonwealth, in relation to available resources and support, in relation to established University priorities, and in terms of the responsibilities defined in the Governing Regulations.

(I) STRATEGIC PLANNING. The University's Strategic Plan establishes the broad framework for planning at all levels of the institution. Within this framework, each unit must engage in a continuous planning process which involves faculty, staff and students. Clear goals and expected outcomes should be developed for the unit overall as well as for each of its instructional, research, and service programs.

(II) ANNUAL REVIEW. The performance of each educational unit (including any college, community college, school, department, graduate center, research center/institute, and interdisciplinary instructional program) should be reviewed annually by the administrator to whom the unit reports. The annual review should be utilized to assess progress toward goals and to modify where deemed appropriate the unit's goals, priorities, and expected outcomes.

(III) PERIODIC REVIEW. The unit's performance will be comprehensively evaluated periodically. The primary purpose of both annual review and periodic review is improvement in the quality and effectiveness of the units and their programs.

#### I. Strategic Plan

Each unit shall have a strategic plan which includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:

A. Mission Statement

Statement of the unit's mission, a description of each of the unit's instructional, research, and public service programs, and an explanation of how each supports the University's mission.

B. Environmental/Self-Assessment

An assessment of the unit's strengths and weaknesses, and an assessment of external environmental trends influencing the unit at the present and in the future (e.g., quality and quantity of faculty, students, and staff; support provided to the University and to the public; quality of facilities and equipment; demand by majors and by non-majors; demand for graduates; etc.).

C. Current Priorities and Objectives

Statement of the unit's current goals and priorities in instruction, research, and service. For each of the priorities identified, the unit should designate:

1. Expected Results, Standards of Progress, and Evaluation Methods

Description of the criteria or standards used to determine progress toward goals of the unit along with a description of evaluation techniques and methods (qualitative and/or quantitative) used to assess goal attainment.

2. Use of Results

Description of how the results of assessment and evaluation activities are used both to improve program quality and the overall effectiveness of the unit and to refine unit goals, priorities, and expected outcomes in the unit's plan.

D. Educational Outcomes for Degree Programs

Statement of each degree program's goals and expected educational outcomes for students who complete the program. For each educational outcome, the unit should designate:

1. Standards of Progress and Evaluation Methods

Description of the standards used to determine progress toward goals of each degree program in the unit along with a description of evaluation techniques and methods (qualitative and/or quantitative) used to assess goal attainment.

2. Use of Results

Description of how the results of assessment and evaluation activities are used to improve program quality and the overall effectiveness

of the unit and to refine unit goals, priorities, and expected outcomes as it relates to degree programs.

#### E. Implementation Plan

A copy of the unit's plan which identifies actions to be taken and a time frame for accomplishment of goals.

The planning cycle for departments and other units below the college and vice presidential level will normally be determined by the dean of the college, or president in the Community Colleges, in consultation with the appropriate chancellor/vice president. Plans must be completed at least once during a unit's review period, typically in the self-study year as preparation for the periodic review. In each planning cycle, the unit's plan must be reviewed by the administrator to whom the unit reports. Resource allocation requests should be included in the deliberations of the unit administrator's subsequent plans when budget matters are considered.

### II. Annual Review

The purpose of the annual review is to assess progress in accomplishing goals and objectives during the year based upon the resources available and to identify objectives for the next academic year. Objectives would be based on the goals and priorities of the unit's plan.

The annual review will consist of a concise report to the unit's administrative superior which summarizes: (1) accomplishments during the past year; (2) adjustments made to the unit's strategic plan, objectives, or programs; and, (3) goals and priorities for the next year.

### III. Periodic Review

The purpose of periodic review is to provide the unit with the opportunity for an in-depth analysis of itself, a review of its strategic plan, and a review by a committee external to the unit, regarding effectiveness in meeting goals in instruction, research, and public service. Specifically, the periodic review phase of the planning and review cycle includes the following three components: (1) preparation of a self-study report by the unit, (2) evaluation by a review team external to the unit, and (3) revision of the unit's strategic plan as based on recommendations from the self-study process and the periodic review team.

Review schedule: The Chancellors for the Lexington Campus, the Medical Center, and the Community College System and the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies shall conduct reviews of all colleges and educational units under their administrative authority according to a set schedule. This formal, structured review of each educational unit is usually scheduled every four to six years.

In the case of a community college, periodic review will occur at least once in each five-year period and usually during the decennial institutional self-study related to accreditation or during the fifth year after such a study.

Notification that the periodic review process is about to begin shall be provided to the unit by the appropriate administrative superior approximately three months prior to the formal appointment of the review team. This notification shall signal the initial development of the self-study report. The focus of the unit's internal review and the resultant self-study should be the quality of the unit's programs. Areas of special interest to the unit shall be identified at the beginning of the periodic review by the unit administrator and of the administrative superior, usually a dean, for educational units and by the dean and chancellor/vice president for college and center/institute reviews.

To avoid duplication of effort, the periodic review should be coordinated with accreditation or other external reviews whenever possible. Any information gathered for accreditation self-study or other evaluation reports completed within the past three years, including the unit's annual reports, should serve as the core of the periodic review.

Changing a periodic review schedule: The periodic review of any educational unit at other than the regularly scheduled time may be requested by a majority of the members of the unit, the chief administrative officer of the unit, or the administrative officer to whom the chief administrator reports. Such requests must be in writing, must include a rationale for the "off-schedule" review, and must be submitted to the appropriate chancellor/vice president. "Off-schedule" reviews also may be initiated by the appropriate chancellor/vice president or by the President. Any change in schedule must be approved by the appropriate chancellor/vice president who communicates such changes to the President and the Senate Council or Community College Council, whichever is appropriate. Extension of a regularly scheduled periodic review shall not exceed two years.

A. Unit Self-Study Report

In the first step of the periodic review, the unit prepares a self-study report. The report shall provide background data and other information needed by the periodic review team. The unit's strategic plan and the results of the annual reviews shall serve as an important source of information for this report. In addition, the report shall include information on at least the following points relating to the unit:

1. Current Plans

A copy of the unit's current strategic plan and annual reports since the last unit self-study shall be provided. The plans should include those items outlined in the strategic plan section of this regulation (see Section I.) including statements of the unit's current goals, objectives, priorities, expected results and criteria used to evaluate success in meeting the unit's goals for instruction, research, and service.

2. Evaluation of Planning and Decision Making

A description and evaluation of the effectiveness of the unit's planning process along with the appropriateness of faculty and others'

participation in the planning process shall be provided. Description of the extent to which the unit's strategic plan is appropriate given resources available and whether the plan is being implemented shall be provided.

### 3. Quality of Degree Programs and Educational Outcomes

Evidence of quality instruction, research and public service shall be provided including statements of each degree program's goals and expected educational accomplishments and outcomes for students who complete each program in the unit.

### 4. Recommendations

Recommendations for modifications in the structure, programs, or goals of the programs of this unit shall be included as well as recommendations for eliminating functions which cannot be adequately supported.

The nature of the unit and/or any special focus given the periodic review may require that additional issues be addressed in the unit's self-study report.

#### B. Team Review

The purpose of the team review is to provide the unit with an external perspective. This includes a judgment of program quality and assessment of the effectiveness of the instructional, research, and public service programs.

After consultation with the unit's administrative officer, the administrative officer to which the unit reports will appoint and charge an ad hoc Review Team. Review teams for departments shall be appointed by the college dean after consultation with the appropriate college council. The Chancellor/Vice President shall consult with the Senate Council to seek nominations prior to appointment of review teams for colleges. The appropriate dean(s) shall also be consulted prior to appointment of the review team.

The review team for instructional units shall be formed principally from faculty members and shall include faculty members from within and without the unit being reviewed. (Individuals from within the unit will be expected to not participate in matters which will prevent members of the unit from being candid.) The team shall also include undergraduate and graduate student representation as appropriate and may include alumni and practicing professionals. The review team for research units shall include faculty members in the field and may include researchers knowledgeable in the field from outside the University.

Each review team should collect information it deems most appropriate, but certain information shall be incorporated in all reviews. However, systematic assessment and evaluation will involve all unit faculty, staff, and students (where appropriate) regarding the operation and progress of the unit.

The review team should focus its review and recommendations on the following major areas:

- (1) Quality of the degree programs and student learning
- (2) Quality of research and service programs and benchmark comparisons
- (3) Quality of faculty/staff and unit productivity
- (4) Quality of recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, staff and student body.
- (5) Quality of management, adherence to policies and collegial environment
- (6) Quality of planning, evaluation, and resources maximizing program effectiveness in terms of allocation

Upon completion of this phase of the periodic review, the review team should meet with the unit faculty, staff, and chairperson/director and with the unit's immediate administrative supervisor to discuss the findings.

The substance of the review team's report is to be shared with the administrative officer of the unit being evaluated, and the full report is to be forwarded to the next levels of administration, including the appropriate chancellor/vice president. An executive summary of the report is to be prepared by the chancellor/vice president and forwarded to the President.

In the case of unit reviews, the administrative officer receiving the review team's report shall provide a preliminary copy of it to each faculty/professional staff member in the unit and shall make a preliminary copy available to students and staff. Before distribution, the preliminary report may be edited by the administrator to whom the report is submitted to eliminate material clearly invasive of personal privacy and material which may be libelous.

In the case of college reviews, the chancellor/vice president shall provide each faculty member/professional staff in the college with a summary of the review team's final report. This summary shall include all major findings and conclusions and all recommendations. In addition, copies of the full, final report shall be distributed to each department/division in the college and to the University Library for access by faculty, staff, and students. Before providing access, copies of the final report may be edited by the chancellor/vice president to whom the report is submitted to eliminate material clearly invasive of personal privacy and material which may be libelous.

In the case of both reviews, the administrative officer receiving the reports will work cooperatively with the unit leadership to address issues and recommendations raised throughout the review process. A brief report addressing the activities planned to respond to the recommendations will be prepared by the administrative officer, filed with the unit evaluated, and forwarded through appropriate administrative channels to the chancellor/vice president.

C. Revision of the Strategic Plan and Implementation

Upon completion of the periodic review phase of the planning cycle, the unit will revise and refine its strategic plan based on the recommendations from the unit's self-study as well as those of the periodic review team. In addition, the unit will prepare as part of the regular annual review process an implementation plan which designates responsibility and sets a schedule for activities to achieve goals based on agreed upon recommendations.

In this concluding step of the periodic review, the unit assimilates the recommendations from the periodic review to refine its strategic plan, thus completing one planning and review cycle and beginning another.

D. Preparation of the Council on Higher Education Program Review Documents

Because the goals of the University's unit review and the program assessment review required by the Kentucky Council on Higher Education are compatible, the report prepared under this administrative regulation may be used as the basis for the review required by the Kentucky Council on Higher Education. Since the University's schedule for programs does not coincide with the Council on Higher Education's, a summary of the findings of the most recent internal unit review may be used unless deemed otherwise by the chancellor/vice president of that sector/area. Because the academic structure varies by sector/area, the chancellor/vice president in each sector/area will assign responsibility for completion of these reports. The reports will be submitted to the Council on Higher Education by the President. (See Appendix I.)

APPENDIX I

The chancellor/vice president or designate shall prepare the Program Summary Report for each of the unit's degree programs when the program is scheduled for review by the Kentucky Council on Higher Education.

INSTRUCTIONS RELATED TO THE PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORT

The Program Summary Report consists of two parts. Part One is the title page. Part Two presents specific information about the educational unit administering the degree program.

Part One: Title Page

The title page is designed as follows. Copies may be obtained through the Office of the chancellor/vice president in each sector/area.

TITLE PAGE FOR PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORT

INSTITUTION \_\_\_\_\_

CHANCELLOR/VICE PRESIDENT AREA \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION/INSTITUTE \_\_\_\_\_

DEGREE PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_ DEGREE LEVEL \_\_\_\_\_

ACCREDITATION STATUS \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER DEGREE PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT/DIVISION

PROGRAM NAME

DEGREE

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF REVIEW \_\_\_\_\_

DATE SUBMITTED TO PRESIDENT'S OFFICE \_\_\_\_\_

CIP # \_\_\_\_\_

Part Two: Degree Program Information for Council on Higher Education

A. Matters for Attention of the Unit Administrator

If the program is on the list to be reviewed by the Council on Higher Education staff, the unit administrator will provide information for each degree program in three to five single spaced pages addressing the following:

- I. Response to staff concerns.
- II. Criteria assessed and findings on Qualitative Assessment of the Program.
- III. Criteria assessed on findings on Performance Review of the Program.
- IV. Program implications from the Institutional Plan.
- V. Conclusions and recommendations.

B. Matters for Specific Attention of the chancellor/vice president of the University

1. Although the program review and initial recommendations may involve several structures such as the review team and the educational unit administering the program, the conclusions and recommendations submitted to the Council on Higher Education as part of the Program Summary Report should be those arrived at or agreed to by the administration of the University.

2. The program performance objectives presented in the Program Summary Report should be those accepted by the administration of the University and incorporated in the University's planning process.

3. The administration of the University shall be responsible for the preparation of the final draft of each Program Summary Report.

4. The administration of the University should be prepared to substantiate claims made in the Program Summary Report and to respond to specific questions on the report.

5. All reports are approved by the chancellor/vice president before being submitted to the President of the University.