



Review of Chief Administrative Officers of the University

Major Topics

[Purpose](#)

[Definition of Chief Administrative Officer](#)

[Types of Review](#)

[Leadership and Administrative Skills Performance Criteria](#)

[Accountability](#)

I. Introduction

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

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

II. Definition of Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)

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

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

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

3. Executive Vice President
4. Dean
5. Senior Vice Provost
6. Vice President
7. Associate/Vice Provost
8. Unit heads of the following: Alumni Association, Athletics, Controller, Treasurer, University Hospital, Human Resources, and Physical Plant.
9. Other unit heads as designated by the President, Provost, or executive vice presidents. In making decisions regarding the inclusion or exclusion of unit heads, the following criteria shall apply:
 - (a) Level and scope of institutional responsibility and impact; and,
 - (b) Unit size in terms of budget and/or personnel.

III. Types of Review

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

A. Annual Review

1. The annual review shall be conducted for all CAOs listed in II above, except the President who is evaluated by the Board of Trustees.
2. The primary purpose of the annual review is to provide input that will guide compensation decisions, identify areas of strength, and build on opportunities for improvement, both individually and at the unit level. By January 31 of the fiscal year, each CAO and the CAO's supervisor shall have a formally scheduled interview focusing explicitly on the systematic review and assessment of the CAO's job performance as it relates to the unit's progress in the previous fiscal year. The discussion shall focus on:
 - (a) The CAO's written annual report of progress in meeting previously determined measurable goals or objectives and highlights of the unit's accomplishments (CAOs who assume their responsibilities during the course of the fiscal year may be exempt from this component);
 - (b) Unit plans and goals for the upcoming year; and
 - (c) An assessment of leadership, management, and administrative skills, including strengths and opportunities for improvement.

B. Formative Review

1. A formative review shall be conducted for the Provost, executive vice presidents, deans, senior vice provosts, vice presidents, and associate/vice provosts. It shall be optional for other unit heads designated as CAO's.

2. The primary purpose of the formative review is developmental. The formative review shall be a one-time occurrence carried out in the first three months of the third year in office. The supervisor of a CAO shall conduct an evaluation survey to provide the CAO with constructive feedback on performance and to aid in improving leadership and administrative skills.
3. The performance criteria shall be those delineated below in Section IV. The survey shall seek feedback from all affected constituencies, such as direct reports, faculty, staff employees, peers, students, and others external to the University, as appropriate.
4. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall maintain a schedule of formative reviews, notify supervisors of upcoming reviews, and provide support for the process to ensure consistency across all units.
5. The formative review shall culminate with a summary dialog between the CAO and the CAO's supervisor, identification of strengths and opportunities for improvement, and a plan of action for performance improvement.

C. Summative Review

1. A summative review shall be conducted for the Provost, executive vice presidents, and deans.
2. The purpose of the summative review is to provide input for establishing future performance goals and expectations and for making compensation and employment decisions.
3. The summative review of deans shall occur at least every five years, beginning three years after the one-time formative review, or at an intervening occasion as might be initiated pursuant to the majority vote of the College Faculty (GR IX). Such a vote shall be coordinated by an elected representative body of that Faculty.
4. The summative review of the Provost and executive vice presidents shall occur at least every five years, beginning three years after the one-time formative review, or at an intervening occasion as might be initiated pursuant to the majority vote of the Faculty, in the case of the Provost, or the staff employees, in the case of executive vice presidents (GR IX). Such a vote shall be coordinated by an elected representative body of the Faculty or staff employees.
5. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall maintain a schedule of summative reviews, notify supervisors of upcoming reviews, and provide support for the process to ensure consistency across all units.
6. The summative review shall consist of the following:
 - (a) A written self-assessment of performance, including measurable goals or objectives that emerged from strategic planning activities and previous reviews, prepared by the officer and submitted to the COA's supervisor;
 - (b) An evaluation survey adopted by the University, after consultation with the University Senate and Staff Senate, as appropriate, and affected CAOs, to solicit feedback from all affected constituencies, such as direct reports, faculty, staff employees, peers, students, and others external to the University;
 - (c) Appointment of at least a five-person review committee by the CAO's supervisor in consultation with the CAO and with representation from affected constituencies, such as direct reports, faculty, staff employees, peers, students, and others external to the University. For educational units and academic administrators, the CAO's supervisor shall appoint at least one review committee member from nominations to be provided by the University Senate. For administrative

units, the CAO's supervisor shall appoint at least one review committee member from nominations to be provided by the Staff Senate. As appropriate, a student representative may also be appointed from nominations to be provided by the Student Government Association. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall provide training to review committee members to ensure appropriate coordination, standardization, and confidentiality of the review process;

- (d) Analysis by the review committee of the CAO's self-assessment and the results of the evaluation survey; collection of additional information as deemed necessary by the committee, including both quantitative and qualitative input from sources internal and external to the unit, as appropriate;
- (e) Preparation by the review committee of a performance report to be submitted to the COA's supervisor and to include strengths and opportunities for improvement in specific areas;
- (f) Discussion of the self-assessment and performance report between the CAO and the CAO's supervisor and development of a summary report and plan for continuous improvement; and
- (g) Dissemination of the summary report and improvement plan to the faculty/staff of the CAO's domain.

IV. Leadership and Administrative Skills Performance Criteria

The following criteria shall guide the assessment of CAO performance in all reviews: leadership and administrative skills, personnel management and development, and organizational management. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall maintain an inventory of evaluation survey items related to the criteria that includes a set of items common to all CAOs and additional items specific to CAO positions. The CAO and the CAO's supervisor may also agree upon additional, more specialized criteria and items targeting a unit's particular functions or a CAO's unique duties. Criteria for demonstrating leadership and administrative skills include, but are not limited to:

A. Leadership

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

B. Personnel Management and Development

1. Ensuring a work environment characterized by respect, dignity and fairness for all personnel;
2. Recruiting and retaining the best-qualified individuals;
3. Ensuring the unit contributes to the fulfillment and sustainability of University diversity goals;
4. Supporting the on-going development of all unit personnel;
5. Setting high expectations and acknowledging and rewarding demonstrated excellence;
6. Ensuring evidence-based assessment of personnel performance;
7. Making appropriate personnel decisions based on performance assessment results;
8. Implementing a systematic review of current and future key positions and identifying and developing potential candidates to fill vacancies that occur; and
9. Ensuring consistent, unit-wide compliance with all Human Resources Policies and Procedures.

C. Organizational Management

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

V. Accountability

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall maintain a web-based schedule of formative and summative reviews along with a status report on each review scheduled in any given year. The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Analytics and Technologies shall submit an annual report describing the status of each formative or summative review scheduled for the year to the President, Provost, and executive vice presidents.

References and Related Materials

GR Part VII, University Organization

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

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

Revision History

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

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

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

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