

Appointment and Evaluation of Academic Unit Administrators at the University of Kentucky

College Deans and Department Heads at the University of Kentucky Prior to 1963

Prior to 1960, the practice, indeed the codified regulation, was that college deans and department heads had lifetime appointments to their positions. For example, the Board's Governing Regulations of 1918 specified

"Deans of colleges ... Heads of Departments ... are placed on permanent appointment upon the recommendation of the President, and with the approval of the Board."¹

This practice continued to be codified through the 1955 revisions of the Governing Regulations:

"Each of the following individuals and groups shall also have continuous tenure ... the deans of all colleges... the heads of all departments"²

Upon their appointments, new deans would receive an appointment letter that literally stated that their appointment as dean was a "lifetime" appointment and that no university action would disturb that status. Further, the Board's Governing Regulations made no provision that the performance of the college deans or department heads was subject to review or evaluation. With each passing decade, the faculty became more unsatisfied that this arrangement provided the quality of leadership that was needed by the academic departments and colleges. For example, in 1954, the UK Chapter of the AAUP issued a report that included the recommendation:

"We recommend that any department in which the members vote unanimously to undertake rotational or elective headship be permitted to organize according to this principle."³

In 1957 the Russians launched Sputnik, prompting a national assessment to invigorate the University environments to ensure that students were being trained in the highest quality educational environment. At the University of Kentucky, the faculty leaders in 1959 and 1960 again urged that the lifetime appointment of deans and heads was holding back the response of the University to rapidly jumpstart the quality of its research and educational programs. A committee appointed by President Dickey ("Committee of Fifteen," chaired by **Thomas Clark**), to assess the status of UK on this point that found:⁴



"There has been considerable criticism of deans and heads of departments at the Spindletop Conference of 1960" of the University Faculty [= today's University Senate], [so] the subcommittee then decided to send a questionnaire to all members of the faculty of professorial ranks." "[T]he great majority of the faculty would like a five-year term, subject to reappointment (or re-election)...A majority also felt that departmental policies should be decided not by the head alone, but by the whole department..."⁴

Final recommendations of the Subcommittee:

- "1. Heads of departments and deans should be appointed only after consultation with the [faculty] staff..." (underlining in original).
- "2. Heads of departments and deans should (1) either be appointed for a five-year term with provision for reappointment for one or more additional terms, or (2) should be subject to a careful re-examination of every five years..."
- "3. [T]he subcommittee recommends that the Administration begin a re-examination of the deans, and that the deans begin with a re-examination of the department heads, with all reasonable expedition..."⁴

Hence, in the December 1960 revision to the Board's Governing Regulations, the provision was made:

"No person shall be deemed to have tenure in a specific administrative assignment... When any administrative officer of the University reaches 65, his superior, after consultation with the officer, may recommend the officer's relief from administrative duties... and with the approval of the President, he will be relieved of his administrative responsibilities and given a new assignment by the Board of Trustees."⁵

However, this revision did not resolve the question of the status of those administrators less than 65 years old who had been "tenured" into their position as dean or chair prior to 1960. Nor did this revision either establish specific term limits or require any review or evaluation of performance of any sitting dean or department head.

In 1962, the AAUP Committee on University Government submitted recommendations regarding procedures to be followed in the selection of deans and heads, that recommended term appointments for heads and deans.⁶

While these pressures of these unreviewed, lifetime appointments were boiling to the surface in the above manifestations, in a separate corner of the University (almost as not a part of the University) large amounts of resources were being channeled into the start-up of the UK Medical Center (i.e., the new Hospital and the new Medical Colleges). The rest of the University was rapidly coming to the conclusion that UK needed to move away from the corporate-style command structure had failed to make UK nationally renowned. However, right at this time of the early 1960's, in the starting-up UK Hospital and Medical Colleges, the corporate management-decision structure inherent in the running of a hospital business (decision-making boss and implementing medical staff), was also being chosen as the decision-structure of the academic colleges and academic departments, including the basic science departments. For example, in 1962 the following parallelism of the corporate command structure of the Hospital was being made to the Chairman-Professorial series structure in the academic departments of the College of Medicine:⁷

<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>Hospital Rank</u>
Professor and Chairman	Director of the Service
Professor	Senior Physician
Associate Professor	Associate Physician
Assistant Professor	Assistant Physician
Instructor/Assistant/Fellow	Clinical Assistant Physician

In addition, the College of Medicine "Faculty Council" was not composed of elected faculty representatives, but was actually just the assembly of the Heads of the academic departments, and was to be only advisory to the Dean. This organizational mentality was strongly promoted by Medical Center VP William Willard (who also arranged that he was both the VP of the Medical Center and the Dean of the College of Medicine). VP Willard *specifically* objected to the concept that an academic department faculty body would have any official role to lodge its "vote" as a body on any departmental policy matter.^{8,9}

However, utilizing the strong emphasis of the recommendations of both the President's Committee of Fifteen (1960) and the UK Chapter of the AAUP (1962), that department heads and deans be subjected to (renewable) term limits and evaluations, the University Faculty Council [= Senate Council today] developed and submitted to the University Faculty [= Senate today] a series of recommendations,¹⁰ including:

"Recommendation II ..

- 1) That heads of departments, directors and chairmen be appointed for terms not to exceed four years.
- 2) That incumbents be eligible for reappointment.
- 3) That review and evaluation of each head of department position be made by the Dean of the College..
- 4) That it be normal practice, particularly in large departments, that the head, director or chairman shall not serve more than eight years continuously.
- 5) That appointment be made after consultation with the senior [faculty] staff of the department...

"Recommendation III ...

- 1) That deans be appointed for terms not to exceed five years.
- 2) That incumbents be eligible for reappointment.
- 3) That review and evaluation be made of each dean's position by the Executive Vice President and/or President

These recommendations were presented to the University Faculty's February 1963 meeting,¹¹ where new senators (who themselves were academic department Heads) from the new colleges of Medicine and Dentistry did not support the concept of term limits for heads and deans, with the outcome that the action item was tabled. At the following meeting of the much chagrined University Faculty Council¹² the opinion was expressed

"that the Colleges of Medicine and Dentistry presented a strong group in the Faculty [= Senate] which promised to become much stronger; that these colleges are strongly staffed academically, clerically, and in service personnel, have plenty of room, equipment, and operational budget, therefore, face none of the problems with which the rest of the University (excluding perhaps the College of Agriculture) is confronted. Hence they are completely insensitive to these problems, yet they are a formidable group in the University Faculty [= Senate] decisions."

And the following week the Faculty Council determined that it ought seek another meeting of the University Faculty [= Senate] to raise the question of untabling action on the recommendations.¹³ Before that happened, the Faculty Council met two months later with the short-list candidate for new UK President, John Oswald from the University of California.¹⁴ It would appear from the subsequent events that the University Faculty Council found in the future President John Oswald the means to effectuate its recommendations on department heads and deans that had been tabled.

Terms Limits and Evaluations of Department Heads and Deans Under New President John Oswald – 1963

At his first substantive Board meeting upon becoming University President, **John Oswald** sought and obtained the approval to promulgate new University policies for¹⁵



“... A change in the name and concept of department head to department chairman --- this position will normally rotate among the senior members of a department and this position should be viewed as part of the responsibility of a senior faculty member.

“... A procedure for periodic review of deans and department chairmen.”

Pursuant to that authorization, President Oswald (after first discussing the drafts with the University Faculty Council), distributed the new policy. This new policy prescribed a prominent role of faculty advisory committees, whose membership was appointed by the President from a short list supplied by the (elected faculty representatives on the) University Faculty Council. The new policy¹⁶ included the following provisions:

“Procedure for the Appointment and Review of Deans and Department Chairmen”

“Purposes

...To institute a periodic review of deans and department chairmen utilizing a faculty advisory committee which would make recommendations to the President”

...To institute a concept of the department chairmanship which would normally be a rotating position”

For the appointment and review of “Department Chairmen” the policy issued by President Oswald stated

“When a vacancy occurs the dean shall consult with the tenure members of the department and obtain a list of nominees for the position. These will then be forwarded along with the dean’s recommendation to the President. The President will normally make the appointment after consultation with the dean but occasionally he may appoint an advisory committee **from a list of names suggested by the Faculty Council** to examine the nomination first.

“A chairman will be reappointed beyond the four-year or six-year period of his occupancy in this position only after review by an appropriate **faculty advisory committee** appointed by the President **from a list of names suggested by the Faculty Council**. The chairman may be reappointed for a second term but only in exceptional cases after two terms.”

For the appointment and review of “Deans” the policy issued by President Oswald¹⁶ stated:

“In reviewing nominees [the President] will consult with an **ad hoc faculty advisory committee** appointed by the President from **a list of names proposed by the Faculty Council**. The President may also consult with other individuals within or outside the University prior to his final recommendation [to the Board of Trustees].

“As early as beginning of a dean’s fifth year of service and not later than the beginning of the seventh year, the President shall request from an **advisory committee of the faculty** a review of the accomplishment of the dean. This committee will be appointed from a panel of names **prepared by the Faculty Council**. Upon receipt of the report of this committee and after consultation with the dean, the President shall decide whether the dean should continue in office. When a dean is to be reappointed the President shall make this recommendation to the Board of Trustees...”

For each dean to be next be evaluated, President Oswald solicited and obtained from the University Faculty Council the names of faculty to serve on the respective faculty advisory committee.¹⁷ In addition to the above process of review and potential removal of deans, over the same period of time President Oswald systematically initiated the review and removal of a number of “entrenched,” long-time department heads (actually, after

October 1963, department “chairmen”). In contrast to the process of today, there was great confidentiality around the names of the members of the advisory committees for review of deans and chairs.

President Oswald implemented this review policy with an additional perspective not evident in the official policy itself. John Oswald described in his oral history to the UK Archives after his departure (in 1968) as President, that when he first arrived at UK, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees (who was also the Governor) met privately with the President and identified five specific (entrenched) deans that the President was to review with the objective of removing these deans from their positions.¹⁸ Thus, by way of this new process of review of the performance of the deans, over the next three years President Oswald obtained the resignations or retirement of Deans **Carpenter** (College of Commerce), **White** (Arts and Sciences), **Shaver** (Engineering) and **Ginger** (Education).



A fifth dean was not removed. Dean Ginger greatly resisted the perspective that the President was authorized to remove him from his deanship, and only upon considerable pressure from President Oswald (“I will fire you”)¹⁸ did Ginger send a public notice to the college faculty of Ginger’s decision to “relinquish” his deanship.¹⁹ In addition, President Oswald did not want that Medical Center VP Willard also occupy a second position as Dean of the College of Medicine, and he caused Willard to relinquish that deanship.

Codification of Appointment and Evaluation of Deans and Chairpersons – 1970-1972

One result of the outcomes of President Oswald’s reviews of deans (i.e., the removal of several deans) was that the remaining deans were very resistant to being reviewed themselves, lest they also become removed. The deans were fine with the procedure that the deans would review, and possibly not reappointment, the department chairmen. However, having seen the ‘body count’ of removed deans, the remaining deans (perhaps understandably “gun-shy”) were not only against term limits for deans, but they did not want to even be performance reviewed under an open-ended term system.



In 1965 the Board of Trustees directed President Oswald to initiate a process of drafting revisions to the 1960 Governing Regulations that would codify these (and other) new University practices. After two years of that process languishing, Special Assistant to the President, Paul Nagel, suggested to President Oswald²⁰ that the former Chair of the Faculty Council, **Ralph Weaver**, would likely relish the assignment of kick-starting the process by making a preliminary draft of revised Governing Regulations, that a joint Board-Faculty committee could then use as a starting point. Ralph Weaver agreed to President Oswald’s solicitation for this assignment, and beginning January 1968 received a half-time special assignment to President Oswald’s office to make that draft.²¹ President Oswald left UK in August 1968, just as Ralph Weaver was finishing this “Working Copy.”²³ That Working Copy contained new material relating to the review of department chairmen and deans,²⁴ but that draft language reflected the great opposition raised by the remaining deans to any formal policy of dean term limits, or of even review of the performance of deans²⁵ (with whom Ralph Weaver consulted in preparing that Working Copy²³)

On the aspect of term limits, the Working Copy draft contained the following new provisions:

“Ordinarily, a department member will be asked to serve as chairman for only one term. However, a chairman may be reappointed when the faculty advisory committee appointed to review the work of the department (see Section IX) finds that the particular circumstances and needs of the department make it desirable. Reappointment beyond the second term may occur under exceptional circumstances when it is deemed to be in the best interests of the University. This practice may vary from discipline to discipline.”²⁶

However, there is no mention of the terms or evaluation of deans that was contained in President Oswald’s October 1963 policy announcement. Instead, the impact of the concerns of the deans is seen by proposition in the Working Copy for entirely new section of the Governing Regulations, entitled “Review of Educational

Units.” That is, the deans would not be reviewed as individuals, but rather their performance review would be implicitly contained in the periodic review of the performance of the college for which they were responsible. The only other mechanism for review of deans, who in the Working Copy had no term limits, was an implicit mechanism by way of an ad hoc, off-cycle review at the request of the faculty of the unit whose justification for an off-cycle review could be their concern on the performance of the dean:

“The work of each educational unit in the University shall be reviewed at regular intervals by faculty advisory committees... Ordinarily, such a review would be initiated if requested by a majority of the members of the unit...The committees shall normally include members from within and without the unit being reviewed and may include members from without the University.”²⁷

This pendulum swing away from explicit review of the performance of deans was clearly noticed by the faculty senators at a special evening meeting of the Senate in November 1968,²⁸ whereupon the faculty senators specified that the proposed new section on unit reviews be revised as underlined below, yielding the Governing Regulations language finally adopted by the Board of Trustees in May of 1970²⁹ (underlining):

“The work of each educational unit in the University and its chief administrative officer shall be reviewed at regular intervals by faculty advisory committees²⁸

During the next two years, toward the implementation of this Governing Regulation in the form of an Administrative Regulation, the Senate Council received reports on the activities of a subcommittee “*studying criteria for the review of colleges.*”³⁰ It was reported in March 1971 that

“the type of committee has been generally agreed upon: 5 faculty, (three from within and two from without the college to be reviewed); 1 student, 1 alumnus. These were agreed upon to be chosen in the following manner: the faculty by an elective process in the college with twice as many names to be elected [as] to be selected; **the two others to be chosen by the Senate Council.** The student would be left up to the Student Advisory Councils in that college; and the alumnus would come from the faculty council or its counterpart, as a recommendation, in that college... it was agreed that the committee should be an open one and that its operations would consist of conferring with the chairmen within the college; conferring by appointment with any faculty member of that college who so requested; to the end of development of an instrument which would indicate a qualitative analysis of the dean and the college’s program.”

That fall, the Senate Council met specifically with President Singletary, who was getting close to issuing the new (first time) Administrative Regulation concerning evaluation of educational units and their administrators. In particular, the Senate Council wanted to discuss with President Singletary “*Criteria for administrative evaluation.*”³¹



Finally, in October 1972, the President **Otis Singletary** issued the first-time, three page Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-6.³² The content of the issued AR II-1.0-6 reflected the strong tension between the desire of the faculty to evaluate the performance of their college deans *per se*, and the resistance of the deans to being evaluated as individuals, by the faculty. Hence, the regulation oscillates between these tensions in the following example ways:

“The primary question is of the degree of progress of the 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 them.”

However, at the same time the evaluation would be

“ in terms of the responsibilities defined in the Governing Regulations”

for deans as the (singular) chief administrative officer of the college. In addition, the faculty succeeded that

“A regular annual review session with the chief administrative officer of each educational unit will be scheduled by his immediate administrative supervisor...”

yet

“... there will be no requirement for the involvement of faculty, students, alumni ...”

Faculty involvement and input in the evaluation would only occur in “Periodic Evaluations” under the charge of an appointed “*ad hoc* Review and Evaluation Committee” composed principally of faculty, with student and

alumni members. To the extent that criteria are identified for evaluation of the dean's performance by his/her individual actions, there was provision for discrete and separate evaluation of two "responsibilities defined in the Governing Regulations" that relate to the dean's academic capacity as the Chair of the college faculty body. Under the Governing Regulations, the college faculty body (GR VII.A.4), or department faculty body (GR VII.A.6) has essentially two areas of decision-making authority (1) development of academic policy of the unit and (2) establishment of the parliamentary Rules and committee structure by which the college faculty will make decisions on its academic policy. The performance of the dean (or department chair), as the Chair of the college (or of the department) faculty body to effectively lead those activities was expressly evaluated under the questions:

"Are the operating procedures of the unit compatible with the Governing Regulations, Rules of the Senate, rules of the unit, and any other applicable regulations?"

"Does the faculty have adequate opportunity for participation in the development of academic policy, or academic programs...?"

Finally, the review was to culminate in a report that

"should contain an evaluation of the current level of performance of the unit and of its leadership..."

Revision of the Administrative Regulations for Evaluation of Deans and Chairpersons – 1982+



After the self study and SACS review of 1980-1981, a major revision, prepared by Special Assistant to the President **Paul Sears**, was made in 1982 of the Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-6. However, the additional four pages of regulation were entirely related to acquisition and reporting of data and analyses relating to the functioning of the programs of the unit. No changes were made to the parts of the regulations concerning evaluation of the performance of deans (or chairpersons) and the role of faculty in that process. This did not sit well with the faculty. The Senate Council promptly in 1983 appointed a committee to investigate the feasibility of faculty evaluation of administrators. The committee reported back favorably on the concept.³³ The Senate Council then appointed a larger committee (Chaired by Wilbur Frye) to actually prepare a recommendation on procedures and an evaluation instrument.³⁴ The committee in fall 1984 reported to the University Senate³⁵ that the existing process in AR II-1.0-6 could be used to improve the evaluation process, in particular to

"ensure a satisfactory level of faculty input and to ensure that significant findings of the evaluations are made available to the faculty of the units concerned" [and]

"the evaluation should be limited to deans and department chairmen of academic units" [and]

"President Singletary would agree to minor changes in the University Regulations necessary to provide for regular evaluation of units and their administrators" [and]

"The deans interviewed showed the strongest support of any group of administrators for the proposal. They felt such an evaluation would help them improve their performance ..." [and concluding]

"Special attention must be given to three areas:

"(1) developing an evaluation instrument based on the duties and responsibilities of deans and department chairmen as outlined in the University Regulations, (2) developing the evaluation procedures and guidelines, and (3) determining how the results will be used."

The committee further worked on developing an official recommendation to serve these aspects, which it submitted to the University Senate for discussion in March 1985,³⁶ modified further, and submitted for a vote in April 1985.³⁷ However, in view of their experience of ongoing nonenforcement of the existing review regulations, many faculty senators skeptically envisioned that these proposed new regulations, that included new activities to review the performance of deans and chairpersons, would entail more paperwork for faculty with no prospect of a impactful outcome – the proposal was voted down by the University Senate.



The Senate Council however was convinced that a need existed to make explicit provision in the University regulations for faculty input into the review of performance of deans and chairs, per se. The Senate Council Chair **Wilbur Frye** appointed an ad hoc Committee on Educational Unit Review, and charged it to:

“study the possibility of recommending revisions to the regulations to achieve a greater degree of consistency and regularity with regard to the review of educational units and to review the possibility of extending the review process to administrative offices above the deans’ level; and if additional administrative offices are to be reviewed, how should faculty input into the process be involved.”³⁸

The committee, chaired by Jesse Harris (Psychology), interviewed all college deans, the chancellors, and in April 1987, President Singletary.³⁹ A committee report was drafted, which emphasized aspects such as ensuring the unit/unit administrator reviews would happen on time unless acceleration or delay was concurred with by majority vote of the faculty; that a copy of the review (redacted for personally private portions) would be made available to all faculty, students and staff (which had not been a previous requirement); and that there would be a maximum limit (12 years) for service as a department chair or dean (with further extension only upon the positive vote of 2/3 of the faculty). However, President Singletary then retired and new President **David Roselle** arrived. This situation created a distracting philosophical division within the Senate Council as



to whether the propositions in the committee report, with its recommendation for a new high level committee that would ensure both timely reviews and follow-up on the outcomes of reviews, would disrupt initial good relations between new President David Roselle and the Senate Council. By Fall 1987 the momentum in the Senate Council to move forward with the “Harris Committee Report” recommendations was sputtering.⁴⁰

A year later in fall 1988, the Senate Council again visited the question of what to do next. Professor Harris urged that there were many sound recommendations in the report and that the report ought to reach the Senate, which up till that time had not received any official information or update about the contents of the report’s recommendations. It was noted that some of the recommendations of the Harris report were already in the Administrative Recommendations, but that these had become recommended in the report out of frustration that the corresponding provisions of the Administrative Recommendations were not being administratively enforced and implemented. The need for organized maintenance of the evaluations and diligent follow-up on their findings (so that the exercise had not been a waste of time) was also emphasized. The Senate Council directed the Senate Council Chair to identify where the Administrative Regulations were deficient with respect to the recommendations of the Harris Committee Report, and from there to seek the agreement of President Roselle to incorporate those additional recommendations into the Administrative Regulation.⁴¹

Finally in April 1989,⁴² the Senate Council voted to endorse a number of recommendations of the Harris Committee Report, including the provisions described above concerning timeliness of unit/unit administrator reviews, provision of the outcome reports to the unit faculty, students and staff, and the length of terms of department chairpersons and deans. However, President Roselle then unexpectedly resigned several months later, and the process stalled again!

Adoption of the Current Administrative Regulations for Evaluation of Deans and Chairpersons – 1992-93

After President David Roselle’s resignation in December 1989, the Board of Trustees appointed Charles Wethington as Interim President, a position he held until October 1990, upon which he was appointed as President. The University was beginning another self-study/ SACS review, on top of which was the determination in 1991 that the 1982 UK Administrative Regulation for review of educational units was not in compliance with the Kentucky Council of Higher Education Program Review requirements for “assessment.” Senate Council Chair **Marcus McEllistrem** saw this an opportunity to dovetail in a re-initiated discussion within the Senate Council of revisions to the Administrative Regulations concerning the evaluation of deans and chairs. Dr. McEllistrem developed proposed revision to the Administrative Regulations concerning evaluation of deans, directors and chairs, which the Senate Council discussed in fall 1991.^{43,44} President Charles Wethington then asked his





Special Assistant for Academic Affairs, **Juanita Fleming**, to lead the initiative to revise this Administrative Regulation.⁴⁵ A committee was formed of Juanita Fleming, Phyllis Nash, and Marcus McEllistrem (interacting with Loys Mather who was in the self-study)^{45,46} to draft revisions to this regulation that would serve the faculty's interest in evaluation of deans, directors and chairs, and that would also satisfy the requirements of the CPE Program Review and SACS expectations. As a part of strengthening of the section of the regulation concerning review of deans, directors and chairs, Juanita Fleming put out a call for suggestions on what

ought to be criteria by which the performance of these unit administrators should be evaluated. A number of faculty inputted suggestions, many of which were incorporated into the draft new regulation. The draft was submitted to the Senate Council, which approved it, and then submitted to the President, who wanted some changes that were accommodated,⁴⁷ and it was finally issued in September 1992 as a revised Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-6.⁴⁸

This new regulation prescribed that

“Although the evaluation of unit leaders shall be coordinated with that of the units themselves, it is a separate and distinct process.”

For the first time, this regulation included a new Section II, devoted specifically and solely to the procedures and criteria for evaluation of the performance of deans, directors and chairs on the occasion of each unit periodic review. It further prescribed that

“These evaluations shall include written assessment from faculty members of the unit. All faculty will be invited to contribute written reviews.”

The criteria developed were described as stemming from the responsibilities of the unit administrator as defined in the Governing Regulations GR VII.⁴⁹ The regulation did not make any provision for the faculty, staff or students of the unit to have access to the “*brief executive written summary of comments received*” from the unit faculty by the higher administrator who was conducting the evaluation, nor access to the “*written summary of the [performance] evaluation*” [that] shall be provided to the unit administrator being reviewed.” Finally, the criteria for evaluation did not include any component for assessment as to whether the unit administrator had successfully accommodated, by subsequent performance, areas for improvement identified in the previous evaluation.

There remained a strong feeling in the Senate Council that there needed to be provision for faculty evaluation of unit administrators more often than just during the periodic unit reviews, especially in view of that some unit reviews would occur at up to six year intervals. Therefore, upon the request of the Senate Council, the Administrative Regulation was further amended in August of 1993⁵⁰ to require that the faculty input of performance of their higher unit administrators be solicited every two years. This final amendment then, yielded the final form of AR II-1.0-6 that continued for the next 12 years through 2005.⁵¹

Epilogue. As the University enters the 2005 calendar year, an ongoing complaint about this process is that, the new Lexington Campus Chancellor **Elizabeth Zinser** appointed in July 1994 simply refused, through her resignation in 2001, to enforce that college deans would be evaluated by faculty, as was required to be done under the written regulations. Nor did President Charles Wethington enforce upon Chancellor Zinser to comply with this requirement of his own Administrative Regulation. This regulatory requirement, that the faculty had worked for so many years to become incorporated into the Administrative Regulations, was essentially made a nullity on the Lexington Campus by Chancellor Zinser. In contrast, on the Medical Center side of campus, Assistant Chancellor Phyllis Nash diligently implemented the regulation. An evaluation form instrument was devised for evaluation of deans⁵² and evaluation of chairs,⁵³ and studiously every two years the faculties of the respective Medical Center units received a copy of the instrument with a solicitation for their participation.



There has still remained unresolved to many faculty whether their time and effort put into the process, especially for evaluation of deans, really has any impact on the performance of the evaluated deans, or whether the evaluations they submit in effect ‘disappear’ without effect. Relating to that concern still remains the policy that the faculty have no access to the outcome of the evaluation process, by which they could monitor that the evaluation exercise was conducted so as to have a meaningful impact on the performance of the unit

administrator. Also still without satisfactory answer to many faculty is the effect of faculty evaluations on the continuance of the dean in this position, and that despite the provision by the Board's Governing Regulations (instituted by President Oswald 40 years ago) that department chairpersons are reappointed beyond a second term (10-12 years) only upon exceptional circumstances, in some colleges department chairs have continued to be routinely reappointed for 20, 25, even 30 years, with no "exceptional circumstance" having been identified.

Those questions and others may become resolved in an exercise initiated by Dr. Connie Ray, Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, who in the spring of 2005 has begun a University-wide discussion with the University Senate and academic deans on new processes and context for evaluation of deans.

References

- ¹ Board of Trustees Governing Regulations, 1918, Section GR XIII
- ² Board of Trustees Governing Regulations, 1918, Section GR XI
- ³ January 1954 Report of the "Committee on University Government", University of Kentucky Chapter of AAUP: "The Place of the Faculty in the Government of the University of Kentucky" Committee membership included: Howard Beers (Chairman), Stephen Diachun (years later, a Faculty Trustee); Gladys Kammerer (see: <http://biology.uky.edu/djones/PDF/5/5.xiii/The%20Case%20of%20Gladys%20KammererIV.pdf>), Paul Oberst (elected in 1960 as one of the two original Faculty Trustees); Ralph Weaver (elected first Senate Council Chair, 1962).
- ⁴ "Report of the Subcommittee on Deans and Heads of Departments"; appointed by the President's Committee of Fifteen in December 1960, with the Faculty Trustee Thomas Clark as its Chairman.
- ⁵ Board of Trustees Governing Regulations, 1918, Section GR XI.5
- ⁶ 01-18-63 Memorandum from Faculty Council to University Faculty
- ⁷ Hospital employee list dated April 1962
- ⁸ 03-31-64 Letter from VP William Willard to President Oswald re proposed changes in Governing Regulations:
"Personally, I would eliminate all references to voting."
- ⁹ 04-10-64 letter drafted from President Oswald to VP William Willard re dissatisfaction with VP Willard's attitude: *"I was most disappointed in the negative nature of your statement on the definition of department chairmen."*
- ¹⁰ 01-13-63 Recommendation Faculty Council [= today's Senate Council] to University Faculty [= today's University Senate]
- ¹¹ 02-11-63 Minutes University Faculty
- ¹² 02-13-63 Minutes Faculty Council
- ¹³ 02-21-63 Minutes Faculty Council
- ¹⁴ 04-19-63 Minutes Faculty Council
- ¹⁵ 10-18-63 Minutes Board of Trustees, item J "Changes in Academic Personnel Policy"
- ¹⁶ 10-28-63 Memorandum from President Oswald to all University Faculty
- ¹⁷ 03-03-64 letter from President Oswald to Faculty Council Chair Ralph Weaver soliciting names for appointment to review committee for Arts and Sciences Dean M. M. White.
- ¹⁸ Transcript of Oral History to UK provided by John Oswald on
- ¹⁹ 06-28-66 Memorandum from Education Dean Lyman Ginger to College of Education faculty, stating *"an announcement has been made by the President relative to my relinquishing the Deanship of the College of Education..."*
- ²⁰ 10-04-67 letter from Paul Nagel, Special Asst. to President Oswald re recommendation of Ralph Weaver
- ²¹ 1968 document from UK Archives President Oswald papers listing assignments to joint Board/Faculty committee to revise Governing Regulations
- ²² 01-18-68 letter from John Oswald to School of Biology Chair Sam Conti re January 1 to June 30, 1968 special assignment of Ralph Weaver *"to revise the Governing Regulations of the University and to prepare an Administrative Manual"*
- ²³ 09-30-68 Cover letter from Ralph Weaver to Senate Council re Working Copy draft GRs
- ²⁴ September 30, 1968 "Working Copy" of "Proposed Revision of the Governing Regulations of the University of Kentucky by Ralph Weaver (with hand notes of amendment by Faculty Trustee Paul Oberst)

- ²⁵ 11-20-68 letter from Ralph Weaver to Faculty Trustee Paul Oberst describing Weaver's consultation with the Dean Administrative Council of the President in preparation of the draft "Working Copy" of the GRs
- ²⁶ Section GR VIII.A.4, page 49, Working Copy, Proposed Revisions of the Governing Regulations of the University of Kentucky, Sept. 30, 1968
- ²⁷ Section GR VIII.A.4, pages 49A and 50, Working Copy, Proposed Revisions of the Governing Regulations of the University of Kentucky, Sept. 30, 1968
- ²⁸ 11-04-68 Minutes University Senate page 6
- ³⁰ 03-23-71 Minutes Senate Council
- ³¹ 09-01-71 Minutes Senate Council
- ³⁸ 09-16-87 Minutes Senate Council
- ⁴⁰ 09-16-87 Minutes Senate Council
- ⁴¹ 11-07-88 Minutes Senate Council
- ⁴² 04-17-89 Minutes Senate Council
- ⁴³ 10-21-91 Minutes Senate Council
- ⁴⁴ 10-28-91 Minutes Senate Council
- ⁴⁵ Marcus McEllistrem, personal communication phone call, April 1, 2005
- ⁴⁶ Loys Mather, personal communication phone call, April 1, 2005
- ⁴⁷ Phyllis Nash, personal communication phone call, April 1, 2005
- ⁴⁸ 09-17-92 Administrative Regulations AR II-1.0-6
- ⁴⁹ Part II of 09-17-92 AR II-1.0-6 states at its outset:
II. Performance Criteria - Major responsibilities of deans/community college presidents/chairpersons/directors are stated in Governing Regulations PART VII. Listed below is a further elaboration of the performance expectations and responsibilities of heads of educational units intended to assist them in meeting the expectations of the University in leadership and administration of the unit.
- ⁵⁰ August 1993 Minutes Senate Council
- ⁵¹ 023-17-93 Administrative Regulations AR II-1.0-6 <http://www.uky.edu/Regulations/AR/ar027.pdf>
- ⁵² Medical Center instrument for evaluation of performance of deans
- ⁵³ Medical Center instrument for evaluation of performance of chairs