

ASACR 6

Office of the President
December 2, 2025

Members, Board of Trustees:

UK FRAME: FEEDBACK-RESPONSIVE ALLOCATION, METRICS AND EVALUATION

Recommendation: that the Board of Trustees approve the UK FRAME (Feedback-Responsive Allocation, Metrics and Evaluation) faculty productivity evaluation structure, to take effect July 1, 2026, with the faculty to be informed by January 1, 2026.

Background: Kentucky's General Assembly passed legislation in Spring 2025 requiring evaluation of the performance and productivity of faculty members at least once every four years (i.e., House Bill 424, which amended KRS 164.230) using a centralized review process under the authority of the colleges and/or the University President. The legislation states that, "The evaluation process shall be established by the board and provided to all faculty members by January 1, 2026, to become effective July 1, 2026."

The Faculty Senate, in its advisory capacity, was engaged by the Provost to develop faculty productivity review models for consideration that are transparent, encourage professional development, ensure accountability and reward excellence. One of their recommended models provides the basis of UK FRAME, which has been further developed with additional consultation.

The Provost of the University supports this recommendation.

Action taken: ☒ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Other _____

Faculty Productivity – UK FRAME

Introduction

Kentucky's General Assembly passed legislation in spring 2025 regarding how often faculty should be evaluated for their performance and requiring measures to be enacted around productivity.

Specifically, [House Bill 424](#), which amended [KRS 164.230](#), does the following:

- Authorizes removing faculty members “regardless of status” for “cause,” a term expanded to include “failure to meet college or university performance and productivity requirements.”
- Mandates centralization of that review process under the authority of the colleges and/or the university President.
- Establishes deadlines and time parameters for this work. The legislation states that, “the evaluation process shall be established by the board and provided to all faculty members by January 1, 2026, to become effective July 1, 2026.”

Meeting the moment and intent of HB 424

Current standards

Although the University of Kentucky currently has in place a process that meets or exceeds the charge related to HB 424, the institution is taking this opportunity to elevate and strengthen our process, underscoring the centrality of the educational mission as evidenced by teaching, learning, scholarship and discovery, care and service at Kentucky's land-grant institution.

Currently, the university — through colleges and academic units — assesses faculty either every year or every other year. Further, administrative regulations establish post-tenure review procedures, including the means to remove tenured faculty members for failing to meet productivity expectations.

Collaboration and principles for a new model

As the institution sought to make revisions and strengthen its policies in accordance with the intent of HB 424, the Faculty Senate, as a body representing faculty, was charged with making recommendations for a model. Additionally, the colleges were charged through the deans to advise on implementation with some potential cross-cutting and discipline specific metrics that could be feasibly measured and monitored, creating the final robust model.

The following represents the principles of this model developed from this input:

- Productivity will be aggregated across colleges with quality and quantity related goals.
- The model will define college as well as individual metrics.
- Annual reviews of all faculty should be conducted.

- Clearly defined expectations for productivity for each educational unit should be established and applied consistently across all faculty.
- Fairness and consistency should be the expectation across all colleges and academic units in alignment with established college Financial Allocation Models (FAM).
- Reviews and metrics should be cognizant of economic realities, particularly around faculty instruction and research.
- To that end, a tiered system should be established for how to designate faculty as meeting expectations, exceeding expectations or not meeting expectations.
- Regular feedback should be provided to help faculty understand and improve their performance review scores.
- A reward system should be created and implemented for faculty exceeding expectations.
- There must be alignment of productivity expectations around the appointment and promotion process with clearly defined metrics informing the statements of evidence for each department.
- Further, there should be alignment with the university's due-process regulations, both when determining merit and when faculty members might be subject to removal for cause.

Methodology

Productivity expectations for colleges and faculty will include metrics including but not limited to the below:

Note that all metrics and thresholds will be tailored to each college, acknowledging meaningful structural and disciplinary differences. These considerations are also informed by the College Productivity Model (CPM), which provides a common set of reference metrics that are easily measured and used for benchmarking and context.

Evaluation should be based on statements of evidence of departments and educational units with metrics weighted by Distribution of Effort (DOE), as assigned by the department chair and dean. Regular feedback should be provided to faculty to improve performance and guide future formulation of DOE.

Instruction

- **College-level (alignment with College Productivity Model (CPM)),** (Although individuals are scored on their own merit by individual faculty metrics, college level metrics will help with benchmarking and transparency):
 - Section and Attempted Credit Hour (ACH) production
 - Degrees per Faculty Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)
 - Tenure Faculty ACH / Total ACH
 - Full-Time Faculty ACH / Total ACH
- **Individual faculty clarifying metrics** (metrics will be put into DOE for appropriate weighting along with any additional discipline specific metrics):
 - Class level (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate)
 - Large-section instruction
 - Writing-intensive class delivery
 - Thesis and dissertation supervision
 - Level of Instruction (based on credit hours and sections)
- **Quality of instruction** will also be incorporated through resources such as Teacher Course Evaluations (TCEs), peer review and other relevant indicators.

Research

- **College-level considerations and individual faculty contributions** will include the External Research Comp / Research Comp metric (aligned also with CPM research metric).
 - Additional metrics and thresholds will be tailored to each college, recognizing structural differences across disciplines.
- **Quality** will also potentially be included, utilizing resources such as a tiered evaluation of publications, for example.

Service

- **Service is also a critical part of the faculty** mission and will be included and recognized as such through the metric creation process. For example, Clinical faculty could have clinical volume and quality metrics incorporated.

Assessment

- Following annual data assessment, deans will verify that all faculty members were reviewed according to policy and maintain the appropriate documentation for institutional reporting.
- The performance rating will be converted into a three-point scale for reporting to the provost's office for the Productivity Review, where:
 - 3 – Exceeds Expectations
 - 2 – Meets Expectations
 - 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- The college will flag faculty performance reviews with a “Does Not Meet Expectations” rating, for a remediation improvement plan with a time appropriate and fair process to be developed in consultation with shared governance bodies.
- A dean's office may periodically examine educational unit review practices to ensure fairness, consistency and alignment with university and college policy.
- The colleges will work to ensure the expectations associated with each rating align with the educational unit standards, the Distribution Of Effort (DOE) expectations and time allocation that are derived from the aggregated college distributions that align with budgetary principles.
- For Those that “Exceed Expectations,” the university will investigate opportunities for additional recognition.

Timeline for individual faculty requirements

- **December 2025:** The Board will review and consider the model.
- **January 1, 2026:** The process/model will be provided to all faculty members with metrics defined and clarified.
- **July 1, 2026:** Following the initial portfolio development for each faculty, approval and certification must occur at the dean level followed by review and approval at the provost level. Full implementation of the Model will start on July 1, 2026.
 - Each faculty member will meet regularly with their chair and other mentors through the academic year to discuss progress.

- **July 1, 2027-June 30, 2028:** The first annual review based on the new model — for work that took place during the 2026-2027 academic year — will occur for all faculty through the 2027-28 cycle and then annually thereafter in accordance with the policy.

Performance to Meet Kentucky's Priorities

As the University of, for and with Kentucky, it has never been more important that this institution be aligned with the state's policy and workforce priorities.

Our mission, as charged by the Board of Trustees, is to work with partners to do more than any institution in the country to advance the state we serve. That mission — as demonstrated and realized through education, research, service and care — can and should help drive Kentucky's economic vitality, ensure a stronger state and create and sustain a quality of life that helps our state's continued growth.

A college degree continues to be critical. The Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, for example, recently projected that 42% of jobs in 2031 will require at least a B.A. or B.S., up from 35% today.

This projection alone only serves to underscore the importance of an outstanding, high-quality college education. Faculty — what they do in classrooms, research labs, clinical settings and areas of service throughout the state — are central to our goal of a Kentucky that tomorrow is healthier, wealthier and wiser than it is today. Measuring what we do and how we do it, as a means of accountability and alignment with the state's needs and priorities, is one way we can demonstrate our intent and our commitment.