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I. Introduction

This Administrative Regulation establishes the policies, procedures, and responsibilities for institutional effectiveness activities at the University. Decisions regarding institutional effectiveness activities are a collaborative and consultative process among University stakeholders.

The University’s accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) expects the University to engage in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide evidence-based planning and evaluation processes that:

- incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes;
- result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and
- demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

(See SACSCOC Core Requirement 2.5 and Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1, The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2012)

II. Entities Affected

This regulation applies to all units of the University.
III. Definitions

A. Planning, Assessment, and Budgeting Cycle (Cycle)

The “Cycle” is the ongoing and institution-wide planning and evaluation process through which the University monitors the effectiveness of its units, programs, and services to inform decision making in the areas of resource allocation and budgeting to support the University’s mission.

B. Unit

A “Unit” is an organizational entity within the University that provides educational or administrative programs, services and operations, as defined in Governing Regulation VII.

C. Educational Unit

An “educational unit” has as its primary mission the performance of educational activities in instruction, research, and service. An educational unit is subject to the University Senate review process. (Governing Regulation VII) Major educational units are assigned primary oversight for implementing and coordinating institutional effectiveness activities for their areas. Examples of major educational units are colleges, the Graduate School, Libraries, and other educational units as designated by the Provost. For a current list of major educational units, refer to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness’ website.

D. Administrative Unit

Any unit not meeting the definition of an educational unit is considered an administrative unit. (Governing Regulation VII) Major administrative units have primary oversight for implementing and coordinating institutional effectiveness activities for their areas. Examples of major administrative units are Human Resources, Athletics, Division of Student Affairs, and Facilities Management and other administrative units as designated by the President. For a current list of major administrative units, refer to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness’ website.

E. Component Unit

For purposes of this regulation, a “component unit” is any unit within a major educational or major administrative unit that is not itself designated as a major educational unit or administrative unit. Examples of component units are educational departments and schools (e.g., English Department, School of Accountancy) and unit administrative areas (e.g., Office of Institutional Effectiveness).

F. Educational Programs

Pursuant to GR VII and GR I, “educational programs” are educational activities in the mission areas of instruction, research, or service that are created, coordinated, and offered by or under the supervision of the faculty of an educational unit. Educational programs in the area of instruction that combine courses and related activities toward certificates or diplomas, or toward bachelor’s, master’s, specialist, or doctoral degrees, require in certain cases the approval of the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (GR IV). In the areas of research and service, examples of educational programs include postdoctoral studies by residents and clinical fellows (AR 5:4) and postdoctoral scholars and fellows (AR 5:1), continuing education, and a wide variety of community outreach programs (AR 3:8).

G. Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)

“Chief Administrative Officer” is defined in Administrative Regulation 3:16.
IV. Responsibilities for Institutional Effectiveness Activities

A. Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees is responsible for approving the University mission, strategic plan, and annual operating and capital budgets. The Board has final authority for all budget matters.

B. The President

The President is responsible for initiating the development of the University Strategic Plan and annual operating budget. The President is accountable to the Board for assessing and documenting institutional effectiveness.

C. Chief Administrative Officers

Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) have general delegated responsibility for the Cycle at all levels of their respective educational and administrative units. They are responsible for implementing policies and procedures of the Cycle, ensuring the linkages between assessment and ongoing planning and budgeting decisions are made evident at all levels.

D. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE):

1. Oversees University planning and assessment activities;

2. Maintains an institutional research function that allows for timely access to accurate, consistent institutional data and serves as the central repository for program and unit review results and annual progress reports;

3. In consultation with appropriate university constituents, develops, publishes, and disseminates procedures and activities to be used in the University planning and assessment process;

4. Oversees the development, implementation, and evaluation of University planning, assessment and institutional effectiveness committee activities and initiatives.

5. Provides training in planning and assessment processes.

E. The University Budget Office

The University Budget Office (UBO) is responsible for developing and maintaining the University’s annual operating and capital budget. The annual operating and capital budget reflects the allocation of resources in support of the University’s strategic plan. The UBO coordinates the budget development process and the submission to the Board for approval. The UBO is responsible for implementation, maintenance, and a year-end evaluation of the University’s approved and amended, if necessary, annual operating and capital budget. The UBO is also responsible for the development and submission of the Executive Budget Request to the Council on Postsecondary Education The UBO performs various analyses and research which inform the budget process.

V. Planning
The planning component of the Cycle is used to identify and prioritize the actions the University and its units can take to help the University accomplish its goals and fulfill its mission. Through planning, the University defines its direction and makes decisions on allocating resources.

A. University Strategic Planning

1. The President is responsible for initiating the University’s strategic planning process by determining the period of time covered by the plan and appointing a committee to develop an updated strategic plan.

2. The University’s strategic plan shall be reviewed or revised at least every five (5) years.

3. The University’s strategic plan shall be revised in concert with regular reviews, and revision if necessary, to the University mission statement to ensure changes in the University’s mission are reflected in the University’s strategic plan. (GR I). Changes in the University’s mission may also be mandated by the Kentucky General Assembly.

4. The University’s strategic plan shall include the following core components: mission statement, measurable goals or objectives, strategies, and measures of progress.

B. Unit Strategic Planning

1. All major educational and administrative units shall have strategic plans that align with and support the University Strategic Plan. These strategic plans shall include the following components (as appropriate): a mission statement, measurable goals or objectives, strategies, and measures of progress.

2. Following any revision of the University Strategic Plan, the strategic plans of major educational and administrative units shall be readjusted to ensure alignment with the University Strategic Plan. The readjustment of major educational and administrative units may also require component units to revise strategic planning initiatives and activities.

3. All component units within a major educational or administrative unit shall participate in strategic planning activities. The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) of the major unit, in consultation with OIE, shall determine the appropriate extent and scope of its component strategic planning activities.

VI. Assessment

The assessment component of the Cycle is the ongoing process through which units plan, monitor, and evaluate the effectiveness of programs, operations, resources, and services in meeting the University’s mission and strategic initiatives. The University and its units identify expected outcomes, assess whether or not the outcomes are achieved, and provide action plans for continuous improvement based on the analysis of the results (SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1, The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2012).

All units shall participate in the following assessment activities, as appropriate:

A. Periodic Review

1. The Periodic Review is used to evaluate unit performance and effectiveness with respect to the quality of educational and student support programs, resources, and administrative processes and services. The results of the periodic review are used for developing strategic planning and unit initiatives.
2. All major educational and administrative units shall undergo periodic reviews.

3. All educational programs shall undergo periodic reviews independent from that of the major educational unit review, either as stand alone programs, or as a part of the major educational unit review.

4. The appropriate extent and scope of administrative and educational component unit reviews shall be determined by the appropriate CAO, in consultation with the OIE, and the President, Provost, or appropriate administrative designee.

5. For units and educational programs required to conduct periodic review, the review shall occur every five (5) to seven (7) years.

B. Annual Progress Report

The Annual Progress Report is used to document unit progress toward achieving unit strategic planning initiatives based on the results and recommendations of its periodic review. The Annual Progress Report shall include the following, as appropriate: mission statement, measurable goals or objectives, strategies, and measures of progress, assessment methods, and a process to use assessment results for quality enhancement, including linkages to future planning and budgeting.

C. Annual Student Learning Outcomes Report

The Student Learning Outcomes Report is produced annually to document the continuous improvement of student learning and are required by all educational programs. This report shall focus on student learning outcomes; however, units may also include assessments of program curricula and teaching effectiveness.

D. Review of Chief Administrative Officers

The performance of CAOs shall be reviewed comprehensively at regular intervals. The reviews shall be designed to provide information to enhance both leadership and unit effectiveness, and to guide compensation and employment decision.

VII. Budgeting

The budgeting component of the Cycle is the process in which resources are allocated to implement the strategic plan. The budgeting process is aligned with the University’s planning and assessment activities to allocate fiscal resources, foster accountability, and translate plans into action. All budget matters shall follow the general organizational structure of the University. The University’s fiscal plans and resource allocations are informed by and aligned with the University’s strategic plan. All general, hospital, auxiliary, restricted, and affiliated corporation funds are subject to this regulation and shall be expended only as authorized by the Board of Trustees.

VIII. Procedures

A. Periodic Review

Pursuant to Governing Regulation IX, policies and procedures for conducting periodic reviews are established by the President after consultation with appropriate administrative and faculty groups, including the University Senate and Staff Senate. Procedures for conducting periodic reviews are contained in Appendix A to this Administrative Regulation.
B. Review of Chief Administrative Officers

Pursuant to *Governing Regulation IX*, policies and procedures for conducting reviews of CAOs are established by the President after consultation with appropriate administrative and faculty groups, including the University Senate and Staff Senate. Policies and procedures for conducting reviews of department chairs and school directors, as appropriate for the individual colleges are established jointly by the dean and the college faculty. Procedures for conducting reviews of CAOs are described in *Administrative Regulation 3:16*.

C. Budgeting Procedures

Procedures for University budgeting activities are determined by the President in accordance with applicable *Kentucky Revised Statutes* and the University’s *Governing Regulations*. Budgeting procedures are described in *Administrative Regulation 8:9*.

D. Planning, Assessment, and Other Institutional Effectiveness Activities

Procedures for planning, assessment, and other institutional effectiveness activities are determined by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in consultation with appropriate University constituents. These procedures are available from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness: [http://www.uky.edu/IRPE/](http://www.uky.edu/IRPE/).
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Periodic review is the primary vehicle for assessment of educational and administrative units and for documentation of institutional effectiveness. The purpose of periodic review is to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning, research, public service, and operations. It does so by systematically examining missions, goals, objectives, resources, activities, processes, and outcomes of programs and services.

A. Definitions

1. “Unit” means all organizational entities that provide educational and administrative programs or services; includes colleges, departments, schools, programs, research centers and institutes (degree and non-degree granting), and program and service centers.

2. “Unit Head” means individuals who initiate periodic review, receive recommendations resulting from self-study and external review committees, and negotiate the implementation plan with their supervisor; includes college deans, department chairpersons, directors, and other administrators, as appropriate.

3. “Assessment” means an ongoing process through which units evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of programs and services to facilitate decision-making and quality enhancement.

4. “Institutional Research” means the collection and analysis of data on the institution’s programs, resources, and processes to support effective planning, assessment, and decision-making.

B. Responsibilities

1. The President shall establish university-wide expectations for conducting periodic reviews and using assessment results in planning and budgeting decisions to facilitate continuous quality enhancement.

2. The President, Provost and executive vice presidents shall facilitate periodic reviews to ensure linkages are made between assessment results and ongoing planning and budgeting decisions.

3. The deans, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, associate and vice provosts, department chairpersons, directors, and other administrators shall carry out periodic reviews for all educational and administrative units within their areas of responsibility to ensure linkages are made between assessment results and ongoing planning and budgeting decisions.

4. The Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness shall:
   
   (a) consult with unit heads to maintain a 5-7 year periodic review schedule;

   (b) initiate the annual periodic review process;

   (c) ensure availability of institutional data necessary to conduct effective periodic reviews, based on a periodic needs assessment;

   (d) make available annual training for external review committee members;

   (e) submit an annual report describing the status of periodic reviews and annual progress reports to the President, Provost and executive vice presidents;
(f) maintain and annually evaluate an institutional research function that works to ensure timely access to accurate, consistent data;

(g) maintain and annually evaluate an assessment function that assists units in developing valid and reliable assessment methods; and

(h) serve as a central repository for periodic review results and annual progress reports.

D. Institutional Effectiveness Criteria

The University and each of its units shall have:

1. A mission statement that is evaluated and updated during the periodic review;

2. Clear, concise, measurable unit goals and objectives that are consistent with the unit mission. These statements may reflect inputs and processes, but shall reflect outcomes. The goals and objectives of academic programs, including general education, degree offerings, and certificates, shall address the quality of student learning by describing educational outcomes for students who complete the program.

3. A description of assessment methods, including the specific evaluation techniques and criteria used to determine progress; and,

4. A process to use assessment results for quality enhancement, including linkages to future planning and budgeting.

E. Periodic Review Components

The periodic review process has four components:

1. Unit self-study.

   The unit shall first prepare a self-study report that covers the time since the last review (5-7 years). The nature of the unit and its programs and services or any special focus given to the periodic review may require additional elements in the self-study; however, the self-study shall include, as appropriate:

   (a) Periodic Review Documents: strategic plan (i.e. mission statement, goals and objectives, and criteria for measuring progress), organizational chart or structure, and annual progress reports since the last self-study.

   (b) Resources: summary information about the adequacy of budget, facilities, equipment, personnel, including faculty and staff numbers and demographics, and support from other university units essential to effective operations, such as research, engagement, development, alumni affairs, human resources, facilities management, financial units, and information technology.

   (c) Input from Affected Constituents: As appropriate, units shall collect evaluation data from faculty, staff and students who are affected by the delivery of programs and services of the unit.

   (d) Adherence to Policies and Procedures: evidence of adherence to university policies and procedures. For educational units, this includes evidence of adherence to educational policies and procedures established through the faculty governance process, including consistency in applying policies related to grading, probation, and termination; evidence of adherence to
procedures on faculty personnel actions and budget request preparation that are established jointly by the unit faculty and the unit head.

(e) Evaluation of Quality and Productivity: evidence of the quality of the collegial environment, including the climate for diversity, and evidence of quality and productivity in instruction, research, public service, or operations, including, as appropriate, the quality of:

i. faculty and staff employees, communications and interactions;

ii. orientation, advising and other student services programs;

iii. student learning outcomes;

iv. customer or client satisfaction;

v. business and operating procedures;


2. External Review

This component provides an external perspective regarding the quality and effectiveness of the unit’s programs, services, resources, processes, and operations. Its purpose is to assure an objective, unbiased assessment of the unit. An external review committee shall:

(a) examine the self study report;

(b) use appropriate data collection techniques that help assure objectivity to engage in additional information-seeking, as necessary;

(c) assess the validity of the conclusions reached in the self-study;

(d) identify additional strengths and recommendations for quality enhancement; and,

(e) prepare a final report.

3. Implementation Plan

The unit shall use assessment results and recommendations resulting from the self-study and the external review to develop an implementation plan that sets the agenda for change and quality enhancement over the next 5-7 year cycle. (see required implementation plan form at http://www.uky.edu/Assessment/prog.shtml) The implementation plan, finalized in educational units by the approval of the unit faculty, results from deliberations among unit faculty, staff employees, and/or students under the leadership of the unit head. Approval of the implementation plan by the unit head’s supervisor signals an acknowledgement that unit needs will be given due consideration in future resource allocation decisions. It is the responsibility of the unit, however, to use the implementation plan as documentation of future plans and resource needs during appropriate times in the budgeting process. Following approval of the implementation plan, the planning, budgeting, and assessment cycle begins anew, as the unit:

(a) evaluates and revises its strategic plan;

(b) seeks funding through the annual operating budget process or from other sources; and,
(c) develops an assessment plan for the next 5-7 year cycle.  
(see suggested assessment plan form at http://www.uky.edu/IRPE/ie/program_review.html)

4. Annual Progress Reports

This component strengthens the link between periodic review and subsequent planning, budgeting, and assessment activities. Each unit shall prepare an annual progress report that:

(a) identifies goals and objectives selected for assessment during the year;

(b) describes assessment methods and criteria for success;

(c) presents results; and,

(d) uses results to formulate plans for quality enhancement.

F. Periodic Review Procedures

1. Schedule

In accordance with Governing Regulation IX-1, a formal, structured periodic review is scheduled at least once every 5-7 years. The process for scheduling periodic reviews shall include:

(a) Flexibility for unit heads, with input from unit faculty and staff employees, to negotiate with the President, Provost, or appropriate executive vice president at which level in the organizational structure a meaningful, effective, and efficient periodic review should be conducted.

(b) Notification by the Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness that the periodic review is about to begin. The notification shall occur approximately six months prior to appointment of the external review committee, signaling initial development of the self-study report.

(c) Opportunity to request a delay in the regularly scheduled time, not to exceed two years. The change may be requested by a majority of the faculty members of an educational unit, a majority of staff employees in an administrative unit, or an appropriate administrator. Such requests shall be in writing, include a rationale, and be approved by the President, Provost, or appropriate executive vice president.

(d) Opportunity for an off-schedule review, which may be initiated by a majority of faculty members in an educational unit, a majority of staff employees in an administrative unit, or an appropriate administrator. If the administrator to whom the unit reports disapproves of a unit request for an off-schedule review, the administrator shall provide a written explanation.

2. Type of Review

Periodic reviews can be either focused or comprehensive. A comprehensive review includes the entire unit and its programs and services. A focused review is a thorough study of one or more major aspects of a unit and its programs and services. The option of a focused review is dependent on a successful comprehensive review in the previous cycle.

3. Accreditation Review Substitutions

Reports from external accrediting agencies may be substituted for the periodic review self-study, if approved by the President, Provost or appropriate executive vice president, and if the Vice President
for Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness has certified that appropriate critical conditions are met.

4. Preparation of the Self-Study

The unit head shall ensure broad-based involvement in the development and review of the self-study, the identification of strengths, and recommendations for quality enhancement. Upon completion, a copy of the self-study shall be forwarded to the appropriate administrator (see process flowchart and timeline at http://www.uky.edu/IRPE/ie/program_review.html).

5. Appointment of the External Review Committee

(a) For educational units, after consultation with the unit head, the administrator to whom the unit head reports shall appoint and charge an ad hoc External Review Committee (see process flowchart and timeline at http://www.uky.edu/Assessment/prog.shtml) consisting of six to eight members. The administrator also designates an experienced External Review Committee Chair, who should be external to the University, if possible. Additionally:

i. The college dean shall appoint review committees for academic departments after consultation with the elected college faculty council, or other appropriate college body as identified in the college faculty rules.

ii. The Provost shall consult with the University Senate Council to seek nominations prior to appointment of review committees for colleges.

iii. The appropriate dean(s) shall also be consulted prior to appointment of the review committee for colleges.

iv. The review committee for educational units shall be composed primarily of faculty members external to the unit, two of whom shall be faculty members in the same discipline or college and who are external to the University. The requirement for two committee members external to the University may be relaxed for units visited by an onsite committee in order to obtain external accreditation.

v. One or two unit representatives shall be appointed to support the external review committee. These representatives shall participate in an ex officio capacity, facilitating work of the external review committee through provision of information about the internal self-study and other relevant documentation requested by the external review committee.

vi. The committee shall include student representation, if appropriate, and may include alumni and practicing professionals.

vii. The review committee for multidisciplinary research centers and institutes shall include faculty members in the field and shall include at least one researcher knowledgeable in the field from outside the University.

(b) For administrative units, the administrator to whom the unit head reports shall appoint the external review committee and an appropriate Chair after consultation with the unit head:

i. The President, Provost, or appropriate executive vice president may be consulted in these appointments.

ii. The review committee shall be composed of faculty, staff employees, or students from outside the unit being reviewed and shall represent the stakeholders and constituencies affected by the programs and services of the unit.
iii. One or two members of the self-study committee shall be appointed to support the external review committee. These representatives shall participate in an ex officio capacity, facilitating work of the external review committee through provision of information about the internal self-study and other relevant documentation requested by the external review committee.

6. Distribution and Use of External Review Findings

Upon completion of the external review committee's investigation (see process flowchart and timeline at http://www.uky.edu/IRPE/ie/program_review.html), the review committee should meet with the unit and its leadership to discuss preliminary findings, after which the review committee shall complete a written report and forward it to the next level of administration. Upon receipt of the external review committee report, the administrator to whom the unit head reports shall:

(a) review the report for factual errors and other sensitive information;

(b) eliminate material clearly invasive of personal privacy and which may be libelous;

(c) meet with the unit head to discuss the review findings and all recommendations;

(d) make the report available to faculty, staff employees, and students and widely communicate information about access to the report among these groups;

(e) work cooperatively with the unit head and unit members to address issues and recommendations;

(f) approve an implementation plan developed by the unit; and,

(g) forward the implementation plan to the appropriate administrator(s) for consideration in budgetary decision-making.