

History of the University of Kentucky Lecturer Title (Series)

Prior to President John Oswald (before 1963).....	1
President Oswald Establishes Definition of Regular Title Series 1963.....	1
President Oswald, Faculty Council Explore “Lecturer” as a Nonresearch Tenure-Track Title Series 1963-4.....	1
Faculty Offered Promotion From Untenured Assistant Professor to Lecturer With Tenure – Spring 1964..	2
Refinement of Lecturer Title Series Proposal to be of a Four-Rank, Tenure-Track Series – Fall 1964.....	3
Faculty Council Balks at University-wide Policy for a Four-Rank, Tenure-Track Lecturer Title Series.....	4
Promulgation of “Lecturer” as a Nontenure Track, Rankless, NonProfessorial Faculty Title – April 1965..	5
Tenure-Probation Accruing Status of Full-time Non-Tenure Track Lecturer Position During 1964-1977.....	6
Upon Appeal UK Lecturer Faculty Win DeFacto Tenure (As Assistant Professors).....	7
Status of Lecturer Rank Today.....	8

Prior to President John Oswald (before 1963)

Prior to 1963, there had not been promulgated a system of various faculty “title series.” The Board of Trustees Governing Regulations did specifically identify the four faculty ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, and the Board’s minutes each year showed its action on appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty to these ranks. The first official reference to apparent full-time employment as “Lecturer” is the new listing in the 1904 UK “Bulletin” of three “Lecturers” as being “Faculty.” However, because there was no policy about the criteria for any of these ranks, each rank could be applied to faculty doing either teaching, research, service (e.g., extension, or clinical patient care) or any combination.

President Oswald Establishes Definition of Regular Title Series 1963

With the approval of the Board of Trustees, the newly appointed President **John Oswald** (from the University of California, Davis) established in October 1963 (what the following year became called) the Regular Title Series of faculty ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, along with the criteria relating to research and teaching and service for appointment to each rank.¹ In his capacity as Chair of the Senate, he also worked immediately with the Faculty Council to have newly established, as committees of the University Senate, committees called “Area Committees” that would advise the President on the merit of dossiers proposing the promotion or tenure of faculty, prior to the President’s decision on each.¹ The requirement for a major research component for professorial appointment in these ranks immediately created a problem for how the Area Committees would in spring of 1964 handle dossiers dealing with faculty who had (for years) be assigned primarily nonresearch duties.



President Oswald, Faculty Council Explore “Lecturer” as a Nonresearch Tenure-Track Title Series 1963-4

The initial (September 30, 1963) draft of the criterial document that became what today is the criterial policy for the Regular Title Series ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor contained a fourth, entry level rank of not Instructor, but “Lecturer.” Two weeks later, the Faculty Council in discussing this document and its new criteria for Regular Title Series felt the “basis for promotion seems to be based to heavily on research...” and that the “position of Lecturer needs clarification.”² Consequently, the next draft, which the President discussed personally with the Faculty Council several days later had the fourth, entry level rank completely omitted from the policy draft. About the same time as the President had submitted to the Faculty Council and also discussed at that meeting a draft of a revision of the University’s procedural regulations for tenure, which made reference to faculty being “transferred to the rank of Lecturer with tenure.”³ He “clarified” the academic status he envisioned for Lecturers, in particular as to how he thought that title could solve the problem of tenure evaluation of faculty with superb teaching credentials but insufficient research credentials. He explained that he would for the spring 1964 process entertain recommendations submitted by the newly-established Area Committees (and the ad hoc committees that would advise the Area Committees) if any of the Area Committees recommended that the candidate “*be promoted to associate professor with tenure*” or “*remain an assistant professor with tenure on account of teaching prowess and promise*” or that the individual be “*changed to a lecturer with tenure; or be recommended for release.*” The President further clarified that

“the term ‘lecturer’ was defined as one who is doing a good job teaching,” and that the tenured Lecturer could later become promoted to the higher tenured rank of Senior Lecturer.⁴ Three days later, the Board approved the promulgation of the draft of the Regular Title Series criteria that the President had discussed with the Faculty Council.⁵

Two weeks later, Special Assistant to the President **Doug Schwartz**⁶, then drafted for the Faculty Council’s assessment a revision of the tenure procedures policy, and a more formal statement of the definition of the lecturer series of ranks; the proposed ranks being “Lecturer” and “Senior Lecturer.” This draft definition of the series of ranks for the Lecturer title also specified



“Appointees in this series will be judged on the basis of teaching of exceptional quality or teaching **so specialized in character** that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by regular faculty members or by strictly temporary appointees. Research abilities or production are not considered important for this position.”⁷

The Faculty Council then recommended “the appointment to **lecturer** made optional for those with the rank of assistant professor or below who already have been assigned tenure.”⁸ Based on this and other Faculty Council feedback, the Special Assistant Schwartz in early December 1963 prepared a second draft definition of Lecturer, in which the definitional language was modified to prescribe “**Research abilities or scholarly productivity are not considered important for this position**” and that “lecturers will usually be contracted for special purposes,” while retaining the tenure provisions for lecturers.⁹ The Faculty Council determined itself that “the statement[s] on Lecturer, and Tenure should be reviewed by the Council as soon as feasible.”¹⁰

As the year turned to 1964, it was increasingly important that an official decision be made as to whether the draft of the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer series of ranks would be officially established, because the newly established Area Committees were soon to be receiving (for the first time ever) the promotion/tenure dossiers, some of which were likely to concern faculty whose primary duties had been teaching. The Faculty Council had an extensive discussion of the topic in January 1964 with Special Assistant to the President Doug Schwartz, where the “decision was reached that the rank of Lecturer might well be at the level of Associate Professor (without research), Senior Lecturer at the rank of Professor (without research).”¹¹ In addition, the Faculty Council approved as its hoped for final version for submission to the President the new policy statement on tenure procedures for amending into the Governing Regulations, which stated in part:

“Following a review period not to exceed seven years, an Assistant Professor (or equivalent ranks as adjudged by the President) shall be (1) promoted to Associate Professor with tenure, (2) be **promoted to Lecturer** or other equivalent rank with tenure, or (3) have his appointment terminated.”¹¹

The following week, the Faculty Council yet again affirmed its support for the policy it approved the previous week, and further discussed how the ranks of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer (both being tenurable) related to the ranks of Instructor and Assistant Professor.

“A suggestion was made that a Lecturer might be defined to encompass the level of Assistant Professor and the lower level of Associate Professor, and that Senior Lecturer might be defined to encompass the upper level of Associate Professor and the full Professor.”¹²

Faculty Offered Promotion From Untenured Assistant Professor to Lecturer With Tenure – Spring 1964

Although the Faculty Council had not yet finalized its position on the language of the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer policy draft, from the above apparent momentum toward such a use of tenured Lecturer ranks, President Oswald would have reasonably anticipated (from Doug Schwartz re Schwartz’ liaison discussions with the Faculty Council) that tenured Lecturer ranks were going to provide the policy solution to the issue of what faculty titles/ranks, other than the titles and three professorial ranks of the Regular Title Series, would be applied to persons deemed to merit tenure but who did not have sufficient research merit to become tenured with a

professorial title the Regular Title Series. Soon thereafter Medical Center VP Willard recommended the one year appointment as Lecturer of a European scholar whose status in his home institution was described by Willard as equivalent to an “Associate Professor,”¹³ and whose academic duties would be classroom lecturing (not clinical-patient duties). Over the next six weeks, President Oswald three times utilized the option of offering “promotion” of the untenured assistant professor to the rank of Lecturer with tenure.¹⁴ For example, when Special Assistant Douglas Schwartz recommended to the President in one case:

“...that he should be given the rank of lecturer with tenure since teaching would appear to be his strong area and his research area is not yet of graduate faculty quality...This would appear to be one of those areas where a lecturer position may be needed.”¹⁵

President Oswald then advised the Dean:

“The Area Academic Personnel Committee for the Social Sciences ... recommends, and I concur, that Mr. [] be given the rank of Lecturer and that he be granted tenure... The Committee realizes that his field is one in which there are relatively few Ph.D.’s and in which little scholarly research is conducted, but they also realize that Professor [] is currently performing more than adequately and would be difficult to replace. For these reasons, it is the recommendation of the Committee that he be granted tenure.”¹⁶

The minutes of the Board of Trustees show that subsequently the President did recommend to the Board, and the Board approved, that this individual be conferred the status of Lecturer with tenure.¹⁷ This is one of two contemporaneous cases shown in the published minutes of the Board of Trustees of individuals being granted tenure as Lecturer at the University of Kentucky.¹⁷

Refinement of Lecturer Title Series Proposal to be of a Four-Rank, Tenure-Track Series – Fall 1964

While the above cases of Lecturer with tenure were being offered or made, the Faculty Council continued to debate the final form of the Lecturer policy statement. The Faculty Council asked Doug Schwartz to make available the “Administrative Manual of the University of California,”¹⁸ which had much influenced President Oswald’s academic view on faculty titles and ranks, and from which much of the draft definition of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer had been lifted nearly verbatim.^{7,9,19} The Faculty Council did not find the University of California Lecturer definitions to provide any further helpful clarification in application toward the University of Kentucky situation, so in late January 1964 they divided up responsibilities to each quickly investigate and report back the practices at specific other universities.²⁰ Comparison of the reports led to “the conclusion that the use of the term “lecturer” was generally to fulfill an interim or special need rather than a permanent rank progression that paralleled the professorial series.”²¹ At the beginning of February 1964, there occurred in the Faculty Council

“substantial discussion of the matter of needs for special ranks to meet the needs of particular colleges. Dr. **Ed Pelligrino** [Faculty Council Vice Chair and the Chairman of the Department of Medicine, College of Medicine] presented problems that would be created by the proposed **lecturer** and associate ranks in the College of Medicine for people in the clinical area whose responsibilities did not fit the teaching research concept of the professorial series.... this led to the point that there were other areas such as Agriculture where the problems of specialized activities suggested that perhaps other series of ranks might be needed that would more appropriately define the functions of individuals than the proposed **lecturer** and associate ranks. It was felt that there was need to explore further the possibility that still other needs of this type existed in other colleges in the University and that prior to taking a position the Faculty Council might well consult with appropriate faculty members to define these needs more completely before acting on the proposal with respect to the lecturer **ranks**.”²⁰



In view of the potential non-fit of the title “Lecturer” to the specialized nonresearch duties of faculty in some UK colleges, the Faculty Council in mid-February 1964 decided that the deans of “*all colleges where problems of specialized activities suggested other series of ranks than the proposed lecturer and associate ranks should be consulted,*” by **Ralph Weaver**, the Faculty Council Chair. By the end of March,



“The Chairman reported that the Council could not proceed on the matter of defining special ranks to meet the needs of particular colleges until all recommendations were in from the applicable college deans. In this connection, he reported that he had received a letter from the Dean of the College of Commerce which he read to the Council.”²²

While that letter from the Dean of Commerce has not been located in any archival files, in months thereafter two teaching intensive, nonresearch members of the faculty of that college, were recommended for, and received, tenure as Lecturers instead of as tenure as Assistant or Associate Professors.¹⁷ Thus, it may be that the Dean of the College of Commerce was in that letter expressing support for the solution to the “titles problem” of offering tenure with the title “Lecturer” for such situations.

After two more months of slow progress in getting input back from each college on whether special ranks were needed for their faculty,^{22,23} Faculty Council Chair Weaver stated he would ask a Mr. Barrows [in the President’s Office] to assist in gathering information from other institutions “*to use as criteria in determining policy to follow in establishing the lecturer series at the University.*”²⁴ By August 1964, this material was received,²⁵ and the Faculty Council Chair Ralph Weaver wrote to the President of “the distressingly low status of ‘lecturer’ ” at the various universities.²⁶

The spring 1964 promotion and tenure activities, and the difficulties the Area Committees and President had in applying the “Lecturer” rank to cases of nonresearch faculty led to renewed efforts to find a solution before the spring 1965 wave of promotion/tenure cases. During the fall 1964, Faculty Council discussions accelerated toward finalizing the posture of “Lecturer” within the University of Kentucky faculty titles and ranks. In October 1964, a new Special Assistant to President Oswald ,



Tom Lewis (later Dean of Law), advised President Oswald that faculty strongly preferred to be called “Professor” rather than “Lecturer,” so it would be necessary to “beef-up” the Lecturer rank by adding some new ranks below it. He proposed to President Oswald a potential, new four-rank Lecturer Title Series, composed of the entry rank of “Associate,” then “Associate Lecturer,” then “Lecturer” and finally “Senior Lecturer,”²⁷ the last two of which were tenureable. (This rank system was still drawing heavily from the system in use

in the University of California¹⁹). The concept was that these four ranks would parallel the Regular Title Series ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, and promotions could take place from one title series over to the other (e.g., from untenured assistant professor to tenured Lecturer, as had already been recommended in three cases in the spring of 1964).^{27,28} Included was a detailed draft definition of the rank of “Associate,”²⁹ a new draft definition of “Lecturer”³⁰ and a contrasting draft definition of “Instructor.”³¹ These drafts were circulated to the Deans³² and the Faculty Council.³³ New language in the draft for the Lecturer series, in addition to the two new lower ranks, was the specification

“The Lecturer title series is in no sense intended to serve, nor shall it be used to serve, as a refuge for non-promotable Instructors or Assistant Professors: rather, it is a title series which recognizes the need in some departments for specialized teaching and the value in certain circumstances of retaining an individual because of his exceptional ability as a teacher.”³⁰

Faculty Council Balks at University-wide Policy for a Four-Rank, Tenure-Track Lecturer Title Series

The above quoted new language reflects the balking that the President was receiving from Regular Title Series faculty about whether tenuring teaching-only faculty constituted a lowering of standards for tenure. In fact, this language is the origin of the language that we have today’s Administrative Regulations for the Special Title Series (see chapter on History of Special Title Series). When this draft reached the Faculty Council, it caused sufficient

pause that they specifically inquired to Special Assistant to the President Tom Lewis for assurance that the President would not submit the statement to the Board for approval until the Faculty Council first provided its evaluation of the draft.^{34,35} However, during this time, **William Willard**, Vice President of the Medical Center (and then Dean of the College of Medicine), was lodging with the President his “*real reservations about a dual system of faculty titles...I don’t think it will be possible to avoid a second-class stigma.*” He stated to the President that he was reluctantly willing to endorse establishment of “one series for the full-time faculty who have research attainment” and another for full-time faculty who “*are deemed competent in teaching and in other respects but who have little research productivity.*”³⁶ However, he was adamant that the four rank “Lecturer” series would not be applied to clinical faculty:



“The various Lecturer titles would ... apply to full-time staff ... who are neither qualified in research nor primarily engaged in clinical teaching.”³⁷

As Special Assistant to the President Tom Lewis, described it to President Oswald, there was, to put it mildly, a “*degree of resistance*” from the medical faculty to the potential application of “Lecturer” to designate clinical faculty activities.³⁸

Promulgation of “Lecturer” as a Nontenure Track, Rankless, NonProfessorial Faculty Title – April 1965

Opposition to expansion of the “Lecturer” title for it to be generally applied University-wide to nonresearch faculty in the various colleges (opposition exemplified above by VP William Willard, above) led to the collapse of the proposal for a four-rank, tenure track Lecturer Title Series, at least as far as application to the UK colleges. Special Assistant Tom Lewis suggested to President Oswald

“A remaining problem will be the Community Colleges. They very much want to have titles...The lecturer series could be forced upon them...”³⁹

Tom Lewis further suggested to the President that a solution for nonresearch faculty might not reside in the “Lecturer” title, but rather to “*Create usages by which all would be called “Professor.”*”³⁹ By the end of January 1965, the President had dropped his efforts to develop a four-rank Lecturer Title Series as a nonresearch, tenure-track title series, and took that trajectory instead toward a direction that, after a long and torturous process, eventually culminated with the establishment of the Special Title Series (see Chapters on Histories of Special Title Series). The discussion on the final nature of the “Lecturer” title continued in the Faculty Council through April 1965, including consideration of Tom Lewis’ suggested application of the “Lecturer” title series to the Community College System faculty⁴⁰ (However, it did not become utilized in that system; see Chapter on History of Community College System Title Series).

The minutes of the March 26 meeting of the Senate Council two weeks earlier had also stated “Motion was made to delay consideration of the Lecturer ... in order to consider more urgent business.”⁴¹ The earlier, fall 1964 proposal for the series of four Lecturer ranks (initially offered by President Oswald and his Special Assistant Tom Lewis), had been an alternative to the “titles problem” of nonresearch faculty. The consideration by the Senate Council (renamed at the March Senate meeting) that it was not “urgent,” is interpreted by this writer as reflecting that the Faculty Council considered that it had identified the Special Title Series as the answer to the “titles problem.” A week later (April 2), the discussion of the Lecturer proposal was cast as an “extended discussion of the proposed rank of Lecturer, both with respect to the main campus and to the Community Colleges. No specific recommendations were proposed, but it was generally agreed that at an early date the Council should meet with Dr. Albright, Dean Hartford, and Mr. Lewis in order to discuss the matter further.”⁴⁰ (Notice the change to singular tense, i.e., a proposal for a “rank” of Lecturer). The following week (Friday April 9) Senate Council minutes continued “It was decided to request a breakfast meeting with President Oswald, Dean Hartford, and Mr. Lewis on Monday, April 19, at 7:30 a.m. ...[a]... principal item for the agenda: a discussion of the proposed new rank of “Lecturer” ...”⁴² This writer infers that at the April 19

breakfast with the President, there was agreement for a description of a single rank “Lecturer”, because 9 days later, the President published to Deans and Department Chairmen a memorandum that promulgated the rankless, non-tenured title “Lecturer,” in form that we which have today, in which the policy prescribed that “Lecturer” was to normally be used for part-time teaching duties. (Also, no responsibility is assigned, nor any accountability made in performance evaluation, for Lecturer participation in faculty governance activities, so correspondingly, no automatic rights of membership or voting in the faculty body are provided to individuals hired as Lecturers.^{43,44} The decision as to whether these membership or voting privileges are extended to a Lecturer rests with the vote of the full-time tenured/tenure track faculty, assistant professor or higher, in the given department or college⁴⁵ – see below).

Tenure-Probation Accruing Status of Full-time Non-Tenure Track Lecturer Position During 1964-1977

Although the status of “Lecturer” was in April 1965 established as a nontenure-track, single rank Title,⁴⁴ for the period from late 1963 through 1964, President Oswald in his correspondence had been utilizing it as a tenure-track status.¹⁷ This ambiance of Lecturers having a tenure-probation-accruing status, just as Instructors and Assistant Professors had a tenure-probation-accruing status, continued to impact Lecturers even after the President’s April 1965 policy was issued stating that the Lecturer position was not a position in which tenure would be finally conferred⁴⁴ (also remember that two faculty had already been conferred tenure as Lecturers¹⁷).

In response to the pressure of the official position of the national AAUP that tenure must be awarded after a specified number of years of continuous full-time service at any “faculty” rank, the Board of Trustees in Dec. 1960 promulgated the policy that after five years of continuous service as even just an Assistant Professor, a tenure status was in essence attained “*de facto*” even without overt Board action⁴⁶ (but the Board balked at having *de facto* tenure be awarded solely due to service as Instructor⁴⁷). The Board of Trustees had adopted in 1964 President Oswald’s new tenure policy of mandatory “promote or out” after a probationary period of three years as Instructor and “tenure or out” after seven years total as Assistant Professor, or as Instructor plus Assistant Professor, where tenure from 1965 on would only be attained upon overt Board approval action.⁴⁸ (The Board in 1963 had also adopted the policy that after two years of full-time employment in a faculty position, the faculty member must receive one year of terminal contract notice if the full-time employment is to be ended⁴⁹).

President Oswald’s April 1965 policy announcement on “Lecturer” stated that



“Tenure will not be gained by an appointee in this title”

but his policy announcement did not make any statement about whether time spent as a full-time Lecturer would not count towards the tenure probationary period. This 1965 policy memorandum concerning the “Lecturer” title, including the provision quoted immediately above, became formally codified in 1972, as AR II-1.0-1.I.G, in the first volume of Administrative Regulations that were issued by new President **Otis Singletary**⁴⁴.

In addition, the Governing Regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees in May 1970, in the section about the tenure probationary period, stated that at the end of the tenure probationary period

“all persons of assistant professor rank ... shall (1) be promoted to associate professor with tenure, (2) **be transferred to a non-research rank with tenure**, or (3) have their appointments terminated.”⁴⁵

This above provision in the Governing Regulations also became reprinted in the new 1972 Administrative Regulations AR II-1.0-1.⁵⁰ The reference to transfer to a “non-research rank” did not identify or limit the situation to a specific nonresearch faculty title series. Thus, this Governing Regulation, together with that the President’s 1965 policy language and new Administrative Regulation, was interpreted by some full-time Lecturer faculty to mean that full-time Lecturers could *accrue* service towards probation for their full-time teaching duties as a

Lecturer, and that once the seven year probationary period was exceeded, they must be conferred tenure at a nonresearch rank (which in the 1972 regulations could only be either Special Title Series or Lecturer). In a further background context, in 1972 the U.S. Supreme Court had established in the case of *Perry vs. Sendermann* that under certain conditions Universities were indeed obligated to confer *de facto* tenure to faculty.⁵¹

Upon Appeal UK Lecturer Faculty Win DeFacto Tenure (As Assistant Professors)

In the 1972 tenure-appeal case of a Lecturer in the Department of Germanic Languages and Literature, the documentation showed that individual had been appointed and reappointed as a full-time Instructor from Sept. 1961 to May 1966.⁵² The University claimed that in the fall of 1966, the individual had been changed to a part-time Lecturer,⁵³ and thereby supposedly taking the faculty member off of a tenure-accruing probationary track (although the University conceded that no contract showing that change had been signed between the individual and the University⁵⁴). The University claimed that the individual had, beginning from fall 1966, become employed as a part-time Lecturer each year until fall of 1971, when the individual was presented a one year terminal contract notice.⁵³ The individual claimed upon appeal that the individual's teaching duties for the 1966-1967 year were the same as for the preceding years of 1961-1966 (and the individual in fact received a salary increase for 1966-1967 as well). The individual asserted that these University actions were not consistent with the University's claim that the full-time employment as Instructor had changed 'down' to part-time Lecturer.⁵⁵ It was the appeal of the individual that, by reason of that teaching employment duties had not changed, and that therefore change to part-time Lecturer had not actually happened, it meant that the individual had in essence continued to be employed as an Instructor each year after 1966 through 1971, making a 10 year period of continuous full-time teaching employment (1961-1971).

The appeal asserted that this ten years of apparent continuous full-time employment essentially as Instructor thereby far exceeded the seven-year promotion and tenure probationary period, and therefore triggered "*de facto* tenure" for the individual. The Senate Advisory Committee for Privilege and Tenure supported the appeal argument, recommending that the individual be granted tenure as an Assistant Professor in the Special Title Series,⁵⁶ to which President Otis Singletary agreed and the Board of Trustees rendered final approval action at its January 1973 meeting.⁵⁷ A second case similar to this occurred for an individual hired (in 1964) as an Instructor, who was moved to a full-time Lecturer position three years later, and finally promoted to Assistant Professor in 1973 (nine years total). The University administration conceded in 1974 that the individual was due for "*de facto*" tenure as an Assistant Professor in the Honors Program,⁵⁸ which was by action of the Board of Trustees finally conferred in 1977.⁵⁹

A common thread in these two cases (and two more early 1970's cases) concerned the interest of the University in complying with a 1940 tenure policy statement of the AAUP, which basically stated that appointment of an individual in a full-time teaching position of Instructor or higher for longer than the probationary period shall result in the award of tenure. In these two cases of faculty whose combined time as full-time Instructor and full-time Lecturer exceeded the probationary period, the conflict was resolved in favor of awarding *de facto* tenure at the Assistant Professor level. By the time the fourth case occurred in 1977, the VP for Academic Affairs **Lewis Cochran** needed to assure an eyebrow-raised President Singletary that it was the last such case that he foresaw coming forward:



"These cases arose from the fact that departments used the Lecturer title in earlier years to carry people on longer terms of employment without facing the tenure issue, but following the interpretive statement of the 1940 statement of the AAUP, this option was no longer possible" and "we will be inclined to consider all full-time teaching assignments to be included in the probationary period regardless of the academic title of the individual."⁶⁰

Status of Lecturer Rank Today

Faculty Employee. The Administrative Regulation entitled “Human Resources Policies and Procedures Manual” is the regulation that defines which University employees are “faculty employees” and which are “staff employees.”⁶¹ Section 4.1.1 of that regulation states that Lecturers are “faculty” employees not “staff” employees. However, having status of “faculty employee” for the employment purposes of health insurance, retirement, academic freedom, etc., does not endow the individual with the faculty status that “professorial” faculty have for the faculty governance purposes of faculty decision-making activities in the University.

Not a Member of the College/Departmental Faculty Decision-making Body. When an individual has for employment purposes a status of a “faculty employee” in a college, it does not make the individual automatically a “member” of “the college faculty” or a “member” of “the department faculty,” where the “college faculty” and the “department faculty” are those bodies of faculty that act as a group to decide by vote on what will be certain academic policies for the college or the department. The automatic “members” of the “college faculty” body (or the “department faculty” body) are the tenured and tenure-track faculty with the professorial rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.⁶² Lecturers thus are not automatically “members” of either the “college faculty” body or the “department faculty” body and therefore do not automatically have a status to be casting decision-making votes on matters that are under the jurisdiction of the “college faculty” and the “department faculty.” The tenured and tenure-track faculty with the rank of Assistant Professor or above who constitute the automatic members of the “college faculty” or “department faculty” are authorized to decide on a college by college, department by department basis whether or not to extend “privileges” of “membership” in the body to Lecturers who are employed in their college/department.⁶² In addition, tenured and tenure track faculty who constitute the “college faculty” or “department faculty” body are authorized to extend “voting” privileges to Lecturers, but this is not an “all or none” situation – voting privileges may be extended onto to certain topical areas on which the college/department faculty body votes.⁶²

Codification of Present Lecturer Niche. Once the University decided that Lecturers would not be used for the tenure-track niche that the Special Title Series was instead developed for, the University regulations were progressively modified to distinguish the niche of Lecturers from the niche of the professorial tenure-track faculty. For example, soon after the above 1973 and 1974 cases of Lecturers accruing sufficient probationary period to acquire, upon appeal, *de facto* tenure, the University amended the Administrative Regulations (01/20/75) to alter the provision concerning “transferred to a nonresearch rank with tenure” at the end of a probationary period, to more specific language that did not include Lecturers:

“shall be promoted to associate professor with tenure or shall not have their appointments renewed except in those cases where approval is granted for appointment with tenure in the special title series.”⁶³

The closing reference to special title series had its roots in the number of cases in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s of persons being awarded tenure at the rank of assistant professor in the Special Title Series. The following year, one of the individuals from the College of Commerce who in 1964 had been recommended for, and then accepted, tenure as Lecturer was still in that status, which unfortunately for the University administration provided a live example for other Lecturers to point to of a Lecturer having a tenured status, in contradiction to the above, January 1975 change to the Administrative Regulations. Thus, the Board of Trustees on April 6, 1976 changed his status to that of Assistant Professor in the Special Title Series with⁶² tenure. That Board action ended the last link to the brief era at UK of Lecturer as a faculty title with tenure. (In 1979, the parent language in the Governing Regulations of the original “transfer [] to a nonresearch rank” as a third outcome option of the tenure review was changed to similar language as the immediately above 1975 change to the Administrative Regulations, but the change to the 1979 change to in the Governing Regulations did not include the third option language concerning a special title series option).⁶⁴ In a continuing effort to

cause the title of Lecturer to be as qualitatively distinct from any of the four ranks in the professorial title series as possible, the Administrative Regulation on “Lecturer” was again amended and recodified (as AR II-1.0-1.II.P) in 1983 to remove all reference to “Lecturer” as being a faculty “title.”⁶⁵ In 1998, yet additional distinguishing language was added, that

“Lecturers do not have the same responsibilities and professional obligations of faculty in Regular, Special Title, Extension or Librarian Series,” and

“If a lecturer subsequently is appointed in the Regular, Special Title, Extension or Librarian Series, time spent as a lecturer shall not count toward eligibility for sabbatical leave nor as a part of the individual’s probationary period.”⁶⁶

yielding the language in the Administrative Regulations AR II-1.0-1.II.S that we have today. Also in 1998, at the initiative of the Senate Council and University Senate, a recommendation to amend the Administrative Regulation on Lecturers was sent forward to the University administration, supporting the provision of health benefits to full-time Lecturers. However, the Senate Council was quite concerned that the University administration be clear that the Senate Council’s support for benefits for full-time Lecturers not be mistaken as supporting a proliferation of the non-tenure Lecturer positions at the expense of tenure-track Regular or Special Title positions:

“the Council had agreed ...that Lecturers should be given benefits, but at the same time expressed reservations that Lecturer positions not be proliferated”⁶⁷

When the Senate Council’s recommendation on this point reached the University Senate, a Senator captured this sentiment with the statement from the floor:

“There has been a lot of discussion about this being a top twenty university. He does not feel that at Princeton, Harvard, or any other top twenty university there are going to be a large percentage of lecturers. It is very unfair to the students who are paying tuition to not have the advantage of having instructors with absolutely top level of education. It is an invitation to the administration to cut costs of education.”⁶⁸

At which point the following amendment was by majority vote added to the Senate action item on Lecturers:

the number of lecturers in a department must be based on the written approval of the tenured faculty of that department.”⁶⁸

The University Senate then unanimously adopted the Lecturer action item, including the above amendment.



Creation of new rank of Senior Lecturer. In the fall of 2004, the University Provost **Mike Nietzel** initiated a proposal to create a second, higher rank for Lecturer, that of “Senior Lecturer.” The proposal generated much discussion at three meetings of the Senate Council.^{70, 71, 72} The rationale that the Senate Council received⁷³ described several reasons for the proposal, including that the SACS accreditation review had identified the University has having too many part-time faculty. Hence, the Provost describe his proposal as one in which part-time faculty positions would be combined into full time Lecturer positions, and in order to retain quality Lecturers, some enhancements could include potential promotion to a higher rank that would include a promotion salary bonus, and a potential five year contract as Senior Lecturer. However, there was much skepticism in the Senate Council that this was a slippery slope toward undermining the tenure system. To alleviate those concerns, the Provost agreed to include provisions that the tenured faculty of the unit could by vote place an upper limit on the number (and %) of Lecturers hired into a department. Also, the provision was made that the department faculty would establish the criteria for appointment, retention, promotion and merit evaluation of the Lecturers. Also the provision for a five year contract was eliminated.

The proposal then went to the University Senate, where again there was very strong resistance to the proposal. The Chair of the Department of English attended, and warned the senators as to what happened to that department (i.e., 37% of the full time faculty were Lecturers) – which was shifting the center of gravity of the department away from the tenured/tenure-track faculty and over to the nontenure track faculty (Lecturers). The Chair warned that the English Department was “the canary in the mine” as to what could happen if the University went down that slippery slope. After a much heated discussion, the University Senate narrowly approved the proposal,⁷⁴ which included all the amendments that had been made at the level of the Senate Council. At this writing, the proposal is being prepared for submission to the Board of Trustees, because the creation of a new faculty rank requires Board approval.

SOURCE REFERENCES

¹ October 28, 1963 final policy memo sent to all faculty and academic administrators

² Faculty Council Minutes Oct. 10, 1963

³ Draft of “Criteria of Evaluation for Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Merit Increases” provided to Faculty Council September 30, 1964

⁴ Faculty Council Minutes Oct. 15, 1963. The full statement of Lecturer philosophy recorded in the Faculty Council minutes is: “...points of discussion and suggested means of resolvment were: “lecturer” was defined as one who is doing a good job teaching but is doing nothing on the creative side, and “senior lecturer” as one who is extremely distinguished in the teaching field over a long period of time but who has never had the time or inclination to perform on the creative side.” In addition, an actual transcript of the discussion at that meeting between President Oswald and the Faculty Council members included the following exchanges:

Oswald: “...I can’t quite see giving him tenure as an assistant professor. The other alternative, of course, if he’s a good teacher and is not on the creative side of the University and the scholarly side, he can well be made a lecturer with tenure. I would hate to see tenure go with an assistant professorship.”

.....
Oswald: “...then you are using the term professor in connection with someone who is really not at all on the creative side. Why not at the end of this period, if the decision is made to keep him, but not promote him, I’d much prefer to see with a title of lecturer or something that denotes he is just a teacher and he is not on the – give him tenure as a lecturer ... I have some reluctance about the term professorship.”

.....
Cochran: “Still a problem. Take the College of Engineering as an example. There are a sizeable number of people there with masters that will not take a further degree on the campus. Under present Governing Regulations they would be considered this year for tenure...”

Oswald: “Really, I don’t really hesitate keeping the with tenure if they are doing a good job teaching. The thing I hesitate is using the assistant professorship.”

Ward: “I think the history and evolution of the University explains a great deal and I think our rank of assistant professor, permanent or semi-permanent, is more or less equivalent to what you are calling lecturer. I mean it has been this way through the years. If you go back 30 or 40 years ago when there was not emphasis on research and writing at all, a person of personal stature, quality, and this sort of thing in the University community went on to full professor.... I could name some in the English Department, say the director of Freshman English who is not a research man, I guess you would call him a creative teacher, but he is not a research man. he is associate professor...”

Oswald: “...Professor implies teaching and research whether it is assistant or associate ...one of three things happens. He is promoted to associate professor, he is changed to a lecturer but with tenure or he ... is out...”

.....
Kuiper: “We have had very few people called lecturer. I think you could count them on the fingers of one hand for the last 30 years.”

.....
Ward: “...I suspect we are at the point where we’ve got to make a start and be where Berkeley was, maybe 20 or 30 years ago, in its definition of ranks, etc.

Oswald: “Actually this lecturer business at Berkeley is not 20 or 30 years ago. It is 10 years ago so it is relatively recent there.

Ward: “Fried of mine at Harvard is a lecturer. He is an eminently distinguished man in many, many ways but he is a lecturer ... I think we are coming to the point where we’ve got to redefine.”

- ⁵ Minutes, Board of Trustees, Oct. 18, 1965
- ⁶ A faculty member from the Anthropology department who had a national research reputation, who was an elected member of the Faculty Council but who agreed to serve as Special Assistant to the President
- ⁷ Spec Asst to Pres Schwartz' first draft to Faculty Council of Lecturer definition 11-05-63
- ⁸ Faculty Council 11-07-63 Minutes of discussion with Pres Spec Asst Schwartz on draft Lecturer definition. The full text in the Faculty Council minutes states: "The Lecturer statement was discussed and it was suggested that the paragraphs under Definition and Types of Appointment be combined and "Lecturer" and "Senior Lecturer" be defined in separate paragraphs; that the statements under Appointment and promotion procedure and Reappointments are repetitive and should be re-edited; and that under Criteria for Appointment and Review the words "that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by regular faculty members" should be omitted and a period placed after the word "character"."
- ⁹ Spec Asst to Pres Schwartz' second draft to Faculty Council of Lecturer definition 12-04-63
- ¹⁰ Minutes, Faculty Council, Dec. 2, 1963
- ¹¹ Faculty Council Minutes January 20, 1964.
- ¹² Faculty Council Minutes January 27, 1964
- ¹³
- ¹⁴ Feb. 4 letter of President to Dean of Agriculture and Home Economics; February 22, 1964 letter to Dean of Engineering; March 30, 1964 letter to Dean of Commerce
- ¹⁵ Letter from Doug Schwartz to President Oswald March 25, 1964
- ¹⁶ Letter from President Oswald to Dean Clyde Carpenter, College of Commerce March 39, 1964
- ¹⁷ Minutes, Board of Trustees, January 15, 1965
- ¹⁸ President Oswald's copy to Spec Asst Tom Lewis of Univ of Calif 1962 policies on faculty title series.pdf
- ¹⁹ For example, today 40 years later, the University of California, Davis, Academic Personnel Manual on Lecturer and Senior Lecturer (web links: [APM 283](#) and [APM 285](#)) still read nearly verbatim with the 1964 draft definitions submitted to the UK Faculty Council.
- ²⁰ Faculty Council Minutes January 27, 1964
- ²¹ Faculty Council Minutes February 1, 1964
- ²² Faculty Council Minutes March 23, 1964
- ²³ Faculty Council Minutes April 20, 1964
- ²⁴ Faculty Council Minutes April 27, 1964
- ²⁵ Faculty Council Minutes August 25, 1964
- ²⁶ Faculty Council Chair Weaver letter to President Oswald August 5, 1964
- ²⁷ Spec Asst to President ca. Oct 1964 memo to President re draft Associate, Instructor definitions.pdf
- ²⁸ Spec Asst to Pres Lewis' notes preceding draft Lecturer statement of 10-24-64.pdf
- ²⁹ Draft Associate policy definitional statement 10-26-64 by President Oswald
- ³⁰ Spec Asst to Pres Lewis' third draft to Faculty Council of Lecturer definition 10-24-64.pdf
- ³¹ Draft Instructor policy definitional statement 10-26-64 by President Oswald to Faculty Council 11-25-64
- ³² Draft Associate policy definitional statement 10-26-64 by President Oswald to Deans
- ³³ Draft Associate policy definitional statement 10-26-64 by President Oswald to Faculty Council 11-25-64
- ³⁴ Faculty Council Minutes December 3, 1964
- ³⁵ Faculty Council Minutes December 10, 1964
- ³⁶ September 14, 1968 memo from WP William Willard to President Oswald
- ³⁷ December 22, 1964 memo from VP William Willard to President Oswald
- ³⁸ November 5, 1964 memo from Special Assistant to President Tom Lewis to President Oswald
- ³⁹ Letter from Special Assistant Tom Lewis to President Oswald January 12, 1964
- ⁴⁰ Senate Council Minutes April 2, 1965
- ⁴¹ Faculty Council Minutes March 26, 1964
- ⁴² Senate Council Minutes April 9, 1965
- ⁴³ President Oswald's April 15, 1965 memorandum establishing Lecturer Title, Adjunct Title Series and Special Title Series
- ⁴⁴ Current Administrative Regulation concerning definition of "Lecturer." [Page II - Appointments](#)

⁴⁵ Board of Trustees Minutes, May 5, 1970

⁴⁶ Board of Trustees Governing Regulations adopted December 1960

⁴⁷ 1960 Administrative cover memo explaining rationale for the Board not adopting the AAUP tenure policy to the level of Instructors whose time had exceeded the probationary period “We have tried to concede as much as possible in this section to the A.A.U.P. Committee’s request, without putting the Administration in an untenable position.”

⁴⁸ Board of Trustees action at its Sept. 15, 1964 meeting.

⁴⁹ Board of Trustees action at its April 1963 meeting

⁵⁰ Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-1, Dated March 1, 1972 [First Issuance of AR II-1.0-1 on March 1, 1972](#)

⁵¹ text of court decision posted at <http://www.thisnation.com/library/perry.html>

⁵² 05-06-66 Letter from “Normal H. Binger, Associate Professor of German, Departmental Representative for German” to “Whomever it may concern” attesting that the individual “has been employed full-time since 1961 as an instructor in German in this department.”

⁵³ 04-04-72 Letter from Dean Wimberly Royster to Roger Eichhorn, Chairman, Senate Advisory Committee for Privilege and Tenure

⁵⁴ 05-15-72 “Report of the Chairman”, Roger Eichhorn, to President Otis Singletary

⁵⁵ 02-12-72 Appeal document from the individual to Roger Eichhorn, Chairman, Senate Advisory Committee for Privilege and Tenure

⁵⁶ 05-15-72 “Majority Report” , Senate Advisory Committee for Privilege and Tenure, to President Otis Singletary

⁵⁷ 01-16-73 Board of Trustees Minutes showing “Tenure Granted [name] Assistant Professor, Special Title Series, Language Instruction in German, Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, College of Arts and Sciences, retroactive to January 1, 1973”

⁵⁸ 11-05-74 Letter from Vice President for Academic Affairs Lewis Cochran “[name] is in fact in excessive probation and eligible for de facto tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor.”

⁵⁹ Board of Trustees Minutes showing “Tenure Granted [name] Assistant Professor, (with tenure), Honors Program, Undergraduate Studies, retroactive 9/1/77

⁶⁰ 09-02-77 letter from Vice President for Academic Affairs Lewis Cochran to President Otis Singletary

⁶¹ <http://www.uky.edu/HR/policies/hrpp004.html>

⁶² GR VII.A.4-6; see [University Organization](#)

⁶³ Amendment to Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-1.G January 20, 1975

⁶⁴ Board of Trustees Minutes April 6, 1976

⁶⁵ Amendment to Governing Regulations GR X.B.2, 1979 – see today’s GR language [Regulations Affecting Academic Employment](#)

⁶⁶ Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-1.II.P, dated April 4, 1983

⁶⁷ ARII-1.0-1.II.S [Page II - Appointments](#)

⁶⁸ Senate Council minutes, 04/21/97

⁶⁹ Senate Minutes, 04/12/98 ([April 13, 1998](#))

⁷⁰ 11-01-04 Minutes Senate Council <http://www.uky.edu/USC/New/SCMinutes/SC%20Minutes%20November%201%202004%20FINAL.htm>

⁷¹ [AR Regarding Lecturers](#) for November 1, 2004 Senate Council meeting

⁷¹ 11-15-04 Minutes Senate Council <http://www.uky.edu/USC/New/SCMinutes/SC%20Minutes%20Nov%2015-FINAL.htm>

⁷² [Proposed AR changes regarding Lecturers](#) for November 15, 2004 Senate Council meeting

⁷² 01-20-05 Minutes Senate Council www.uky.edu/USC/New/SCMinutes/SC%20Minutes%20Jan%2024%202005%20FINAL.htm

⁷³ [Proposed changes to the AR regarding Lecturers](#) for January 24, 2005 Senate Council meeting

⁷⁴ 03-07-05 Minutes University Senate [Proposed Changes to AR regarding Lecturers](#)

⁷³ [Provost's Rationale](#)

Acknowledgements: This writer expresses great appreciation to Frank Stanger, University Archives, and to Rebecca Scott, University Senate Council Office Administrative Coordinator, without whose assistance in accessing archival documents the above research would not have been possible.

(c) April 12, 2005 Davy Jones, University of Kentucky