Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees
University of Kentucky
Tuesday, June 30, 2026

The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky met on Monday, December 1, 2025, in the Gatton Student Center, Harris Ballroom.

I. Meeting Opened

Chair Brockman called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. and asked Secretary Myers to report the attendance.

II. Roll Call

The following members of the Executive Committee were present: Britt Brockman, Todd Case, Jim Gray, Elizabeth McCoy, Hannah Myers and Robert Vance. Secretary Myers announced that a quorum was present.

III. Approval of Minutes

Chair Brockman stated that the minutes of the December 1, 2025, Executive Committee meeting had been distributed. Trustee Case moved approval of the minutes, and Trustee McCoy seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

IV. Chair's Report

ECR 1 Presidential Evaluation Process

Chair Brockman introduced ECR 1, the recommendation that the Board approve the process, timeline and preliminary list of survey questions as part of the 2025-26 Presidential Evaluation.

As in the past, the evaluation of the President's performance in 2025-26 will include input from various constituencies; and each member of the Board will be asked to provide an evaluation of the President. The chair of the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee, in consultation with the President, will agree on a set of questions. The evaluation will consider the President's performance across the range of responsibilities of the office and missions of the University, including strategic priorities adopted by the Board of Trustees. The performance assessment document may contain both qualitative and quantitative components.

Assessment of the President's performance will be transmitted to the Board from electronic survey responses from various constituent groups, including members of the Board. In addition to the electronic responses, the President will prepare and submit an annual self-evaluation to the Board.

The Executive Committee will review the President's self-evaluation, a summary of the survey responses, and will meet with the President to provide feedback. The Executive Committee will share the information with the full Board of Trustees and propose any potential recommendations to the Board.

This process would be used to assess the President's performance and provide feedback on his accomplishments and challenges. It also would be used to determine any changes to the President's compensation.

Chair Brockman asked for a motion to approve ECR 1. Trustee Vance moved approval; Trustee case seconded the motion. Chair Brockman asked for any discussion; hearing none he called for a vote and ECR 1 passed without dissent.

ECR 2 Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation

Chair Brockman introduced ECR 2, the recommendation that the Board of Trustees approve the process, timeline and preliminary list of survey questions as part of the 2025-26 Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation.

Pursuant to Governing Regulation II and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) Standard 4.2.g (Board self-evaluation), the Board of Trustees is obligated to perform an annual self-evaluation.

The Executive Committee shall serve as the self-evaluation review committee and shall involve the entire Board of Trustees.

Assessment of the Board's performance will be transmitted to the Board from electronic survey responses, and the Executive Committee will review the survey results and provide a report to the full Board of Trustees and propose any potential recommendations to the Board.

The process is intended to gather information and guide self-reflection for the Board as a mechanism for improvement.

Chair Brockman asked for a motion to approve ECR 2. Trustee McCoy moved approval; Trustee Gray seconded the motion. Chair Brockman asked for any discussion; hearing none he called for a vote and ECR 2 passed without dissent.

V. UK Governing Regulations Review Work Group Report

Chair Brockman invited Governing Regulations Review Work Group Co-Chairs Heather Bush, Dean, College of Public Health; and George Wright, Senior Advisor to the President for their report.

Dean Bush reported that the workgroup was formed in response to a motion adopted by the Board of Trustees in April 2026 directing a collaborative review of the University's governing regulations related to certain appointments. The charge was to determine whether current processes support effective governance while allowing the University to remain timely and competitive in hiring. She noted that the group included representatives from the faculty, staff, Student Government Association, and alumni, and

that members met regularly and worked collaboratively throughout the review process.

She stated that the workgroup first defined its scope by focusing on dean appointments within major academic units, as the motion arose during discussions regarding the hiring of new deans. She explained that deans occupy a unique role as chief administrative officers of colleges, carrying responsibilities for academic leadership, fiscal management and personnel oversight. She emphasized that the administrative appointment of a dean is distinct from any underlying faculty appointment.

Dr. Bush reported that the workgroup met six times between May and June and reviewed governing regulations before and after the 2024 governance changes. Members examined current appointment processes, dean offer letters, prior Board materials and benchmark data from 40 peer and aspirational institutions. She noted that legal counsel, Human Resources and the Provost's Office provided technical guidance and analysis throughout the review.

She explained the historical context for the discussion, beginning with the Board's approval of the University's strategic plan, UK's Purpose, in October 2021 and the adoption of Project Accelerate in October 2023. She stated that Project Accelerate challenged the University to become more nimble and responsive in advancing Kentucky's economic and workforce needs. She noted that the initiative also prompted extensive campus conversations regarding governance and included benchmarking of governance structures at Kentucky public institutions, Southeastern Conference (SEC) institutions and neighboring flagship and land-grant universities.

Dr. Bush reported that following extensive engagement with faculty, staff and students, the Board approved governance changes in June 2024 by a vote of 19-1. She stated that the University's current governance structure recognizes the Board as the ultimate policymaking authority while delegating administrative authority to the President, who is advised by faculty, staff, student and presidential advisory groups.

She noted that the workgroup reviewed faculty and administrative appointment data from the decade preceding the governance changes. During that period, the Board approved 215 permanent faculty administrative appointments, 144 interim or acting appointments, 25 dean appointments and 179 senior faculty appointments involving tenure and senior rank. She emphasized that every appointment brought before the Board during that period was approved. She also observed that personnel reports presented to the Board often included all personnel actions and could reach 50 to 70 pages in length.

She reported that the workgroup conducted a comparative review of 40 institutions, including SEC and Big Ten universities, neighboring flagship institutions, the University of Louisville and other aspirational peers. The analysis found that approximately 30 percent of institutions required board approval for dean appointments while 57 percent delegated that authority to a president, provost or another administrative official. She noted that five institutions could not be clearly classified based on their published policies.

Dr. Bush stated that among SEC institutions, 11 of 16 delegate dean appointments to the president while only a small number continue to require board approval. She further noted that many aspirational institutions, including Florida, North Carolina, Northwestern, Texas, Tennessee, Texas A&M, UCLA, USC, Vanderbilt and Virginia, similarly delegate

dean appointment authority to administrators. She added that the University has one of the larger governing boards among peer institutions and that all institutions with boards of comparable or larger size delegate dean appointments to the administration.

She explained the process for expedited faculty appointments involving senior faculty hires. Candidates must prepare extensive dossiers, undergo external review, receive departmental evaluation and move through multiple levels of academic review before receiving Provost approval and ultimately Board consideration. She noted that recent data showed an average of approximately 244 days from receipt of an approved offer letter to Board consideration and approximately 189 days from receipt of an approved offer letter to Provost approval.

Dr. Bush summarized the workgroup's findings, stating that most benchmark institutions delegate dean appointment authority to a president or chief academic officer, including the majority of SEC institutions. She noted that the University's larger board size aligns with peer institutions that likewise delegate this authority. She also observed that dean and faculty appointment data from the previous decade demonstrated no issues with Board approval of appointments. However, she stated that faculty appointment processes for senior hires are lengthy and can impede timely recruitment.

She reported that the workgroup identified three potential paths forward. Option 1 would maintain the current process, leaving dean appointments at the administrative level. She noted that the workgroup concluded this approach best aligns with the University's goal of being more nimble and advancing the objectives of Project Accelerate.

She explained that Option 2 would establish a hybrid model distinguishing between academic and administrative appointments. Under this approach, the Board would continue to approve academic appointments upon recommendation of the President while the President would make final administrative appointments following appropriate consultation. She stated that individuals already holding faculty appointments or seeking only administrative appointments would have those appointments reported to the Board.

Dr. Bush stated that Option 3 would return to the pre-2024 governance model in which dean appointments require Board approval. She noted that this approach recognizes the dual academic and administrative nature of the dean's role but would require consideration of the impact that timing requirements may have on recruitment and hiring processes. She concluded the report and thanked the Board for its consideration.

Chair Brockman commended Dean Bush and the committee for the significant work completed over six meetings, noting that committee members had taken their responsibilities seriously and performed an extraordinary amount of work.

Dr. Brockman then asked for clarification regarding the process of hiring a dean who also seeks an academic appointment and questioned how the University could hire a dean and only determine two-thirds of a year later whether the individual would receive the associated academic appointment. He stated that the process seemed unreasonable and asked how such a situation occurs. He further questioned what would happen if the academic appointment were ultimately denied after the dean had already been hired.

Dean Bush stated that Chair Brockman's observation was accurate and noted that offer letters for external dean candidates historically stated that appointments were subject to Board of Trustees approval. She added that the letters also noted that such appointments had always been approved. Dean Bush said this reflects a longstanding awareness that requiring Board approval can create uncertainty for candidates awaiting a final decision and noted that colleagues involved in the hiring process could provide additional perspective.

General Counsel Bill Thro stated that dean offer letters have long included a contingency that appointments are subject to Board of Trustees approval and, where applicable, the tenure approval process. He noted that while candidates have historically been informed that such approvals have always been granted, external candidates understand that final approval is not guaranteed.

Mr. Thro explained that candidates assume some risk when accepting a dean position before all approvals are complete. He noted that a dean whose appointment or tenure were not approved after beginning service could choose to leave the University, highlighting the uncertainty that can result from extended approval timelines.

Trustee Petrone clarified that the expedited tenure process is not limited to dean appointments. It applies to any senior faculty hire at the associate or full professor level when tenure is granted upon appointment, making it the standard process for all such academic hires above the rank of assistant professor.

Trustee Swanson noted that the discussion of timeliness focused on the 55-day Board portion of the process, while the overall timeline is 189 days. She questioned how the longer process could be expedited and suggested that requirements such as letter writing may contribute to delays.

Trustee Gosney asked how the timeline compared to other universities and if the length was typical.

Dean Bush stated that comparing timelines with other universities was outside the scope of the review. However, she noted anecdotally that colleagues who have joined the University from other institutions are often surprised by the length of the process, suggesting it may be longer than what they have experienced elsewhere.

Chair Brockman asked whether there were any additional questions to clarify the committee's scope and, hearing none, thanked the committee for its work.

ECR 3 Proposed Governing Regulation Revision Concerning Dean Appointments

Chair Brockman introduced ECR 3, the recommendation that the Board of Trustees direct the President to propose a revision to the University's Governing Regulations to ensure Dean appointments are approved by the Board of Trustees.

Chair Brockman asked for a motion to approve ECR 3. Trustee Gray moved approval; Trustee Vance seconded the motion. Chair Brockman opened the floor for discussion and stated that he was presenting ECR 3 as a point of reference for the Board's discussion of potential options. He explained that the proposal would restore the

dean approval process to the structure that existed before the 2024 change, resulting in a longer timeline.

Chair Brockman said he was submitting ECR 3 based on conversations with several Board members and noted that, to his knowledge, no dean appointment had ever been denied in the University's history. He stated that it would therefore be reasonable for the Board to approve dean appointments without additional review but invited discussion from the Executive Committee and other Board members regarding the merits of that approach and any alternative views.

Secretary Myers asked if the work group had a recommendation.

Dean Bush stated that, if the options were ranked based on organizational nimbleness, the committee would rank them in the order presented: Option 1, followed by Option 2, and then Option 3.

Trustee Gray stated that the Board's experience over the past decade shows that no dean recommendation has been returned for further review or withdrawn after being presented, suggesting that the proposed process would not delay approval timelines. He added that the process provides assurance to University constituents that the Board is exercising meaningful oversight and fulfilling its governance responsibilities.

Chair Brockman asked for any further discussion; hearing none he called for a vote. ECR 3 passed with four members voting in favor and Trustee McCoy voting against the motion.

VI. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hannah M. Myers

Hannah M. Myers,
Secretary