

# A Legislative History of the University of Kentucky Faculty Special Title Series – Part I

## Contents

I. The Mandate for the New President in 1963: A Nationally Ranked University in Research.....	1
II. The President Seeks the Concurrence of the Elected University Faculty Council – Fall 1963.....	1
III. Immediate Crisis in the Implementation of the Research Mandate.....	2
IV. Solution to the Titles Problem: Multiple Titles, Parenthetical Title, NonResearch Title or None of These?...	3
V. A Solution to “Titles Problem”: a “Special Title Series” – Delimiting Parameters.....	8
VI. Reaction of the University to the Faculty Council’s Special Title Series Proposal.....	9
VII. College Deans Submit Proposals for Special Title Series Positions Under the New STS Policy.....	11
VIII. Special Title Series Policy: Not Only New Special Titles, But Also New Special Ranks.....	14
IX. Formal Codification of the Special Title Series Policy as an Administrative Regulation.....	15
X. Epilogue on the Establishment of the Special Title Series.....	16

### I. The Mandate for the New President in 1963: A Nationally Ranked University in Research

In July 1963, the Board of Trustees appointed **John Oswald** as President of the University of Kentucky,<sup>1</sup> with a mandate to increase the national stature of UK, especially in research. However, the University had not previously directly connected promotion, tenure or salary increase of faculty to any required performance of research.<sup>2</sup> Thus, to make such a connection for the first time would be a major change in the academic culture of the University - a culture which would not be easily changed, having become comfortable in its inertia. President Oswald approached this situation by carefully first obtaining the support of the Faculty Council (the elected representative body of the faculty who would be directly affected) and then taking that faculty support with him to the Board of Trustees (his employer) before proceeding to issue new policies that would put research activity at the center of expected faculty activities.



The President drafted a University-wide policy in which

“Four areas of activity are important in the evaluation of faculty for appointment, promotion and merit increase:

1. teaching
2. research and other creative activity
3. professional status and activity
4. University and public service

..... a major consideration in any appointment or promotion which carries tenure must be superior intellectual attainment as evidenced both in teaching, and in research or other creative activity.”<sup>3</sup>

### II. The President Seeks the Concurrence of the Elected University Faculty (= Senate) Council – Fall 1963

The President obtained the Faculty Council “buy-in” through the following approach. In his discussions with the Faculty Council in October 1963, either directly<sup>4</sup> or through his Special Assistant<sup>5</sup> (Dr. Doug Schwartz), the President described that policy-making responsibility and accountability would be newly placed with the University faculty. Academically, the departmental faculties would of necessity be the creative engine *responsible* for their departmental program initiatives in both research and teaching.<sup>6</sup> However, along with that responsibility would come the *accountability*. Thus, a “carrot” would be that the responsibility for identifying the national-reputation-building research areas for their departmental programmatic initiatives would be placed in the hands of the respective department faculty (rather than being administrative decisions). This approach made sense in terms of President Oswald’s mandate to increase the University’s national posture in research, on the premise that it is the faculty in each discipline that are most qualified within the University to identify those areas of their discipline that are, on their academic merits, “cutting edge” areas.

However, along with programmatic policy-making responsibility of the department faculties would also come the corresponding accountability for that responsibility: their promotion, tenure and salary increase would be evaluated in relation to the success of the research activity.<sup>3</sup> The President further secured faculty “buy-in” with the carrot of another new policy, in which for the first time the department chairperson would be procedurally obligated to obtain and transmit the opinions of the department faculty on promotion and tenure cases originating from their department.<sup>7</sup> That is, it would not be solely administrators applying these new criteria (that included research-related criteria) to individual personnel cases, but the faculty of the department would have their “hands on” the application of these criteria to their peers as well. As yet a further carrot, the President Oswald proposed that faculty “Area Committees” (i.e., that were to be committees of the Faculty Council<sup>8</sup>) would be newly created above the level of the deans, that would again oversee the proper application of these promotion and tenure criteria to the individual cases being recommended up from the colleges.<sup>9</sup> With these procedural “carrots,” the President secured the support of the Faculty Council prior to then taking all the policy proposals to the Board for approval. As described by the Minutes of the Faculty Council,

“In summing up, the President stated he would digest for the Trustees at their meeting Friday the sum result of this meeting with the Council as it pertains to common [evaluation] criteria...”<sup>10</sup>

At that (October 1963) meeting of the Board’s Executive Committee, the President requested, and the Board’s Executive Committee approved, President Oswald’s proposal for

“the establishment and application of uniform evaluation criteria for appointments and promotions in the academic ranks ...for judging faculty achievement... [by way of a]... statement of uniform criteria to serve as a basis for the appointment and promotion of faculty members of all colleges.<sup>11</sup> ... In other words, I am in the process of developing some uniform criteria for evaluating teaching, evaluating research productivity and public service ... I think its very important that for example, if we are going to use the term “associate professor” that associate professor in the University means that this man is involved in creative work and research as well as teaching, regardless of which college he is in. In other words, I think its important that if you are going to bring a man in as associate professor that we know that whenever this term associate professor is used in the University that it means that the same criteria is used in judgment. In other words, there should not be departments in which the term associate professor is used when the man is doing no creative work, say, he is only doing teaching.”<sup>12,13</sup>

However, in response to a question from the Chairman of the Board (the Governor), President Oswald created a nuanced recognition that there may exceptional situations, the rarest of exceptions, when he responded:

Now these systems must be flexible, in other words, ... *we certainly would not want to get ourselves into a position with procedures that are so standardized that we are not flexible enough to get a good man when we saw him.* On the other hand, we want to be sure that we are not bringing in faculty who really would not be a part of the creative and scholarship effort in the University.<sup>12</sup>

By cover memorandum of Oct. 28, 1963, addressed to the entire University faculty, President Oswald then described the promulgation of these “*criteria for evaluation of faculty appointments, promotions and merit increases,*” and described that he had “*discussed this with the Trustees and have received authority to proceed.*”<sup>14</sup>

### **III. Immediate Crisis in the Implementation of the Research Mandate**

At the outset of President Oswald’s initial discussions with the Faculty Council in October 1963 on the four areas of activity, including research, that would be the basis for evaluating faculty performance, it immediately became clear that there were problems in how the criteria would be applied to certain areas of faculty

assignment that did not up till that time include significant research activity. What about Professors with heavy teaching loads – what were their salary prospects? What about tenured Associate Professors who are excellent teachers, but with no research activity – what were their prospects for future promotion? What about untenured Assistant Professors who are excellent teachers, but with no research activity – what were their prospects for future tenure? How should Academic Area Committees evaluate proposals for promotion or tenure for the above cases? As Special Assistant **Doug Schwartz** reported in a memo to the President in early October 1963,



“Non-Research Professors. A question was raised on what to do with the non-research professor of the type found in medicine, for example... These positions are difficult to fill and, if given some other title, would be impossible to fill.”<sup>15</sup>

President Oswald was initially quite skeptical of such philosophy, hand-written note on that correspondence: “*I doubt this.*”

However, in direct discussions of the Faculty Council with the President, the Council (while strongly supporting that the proposed new criteria would apply to the vast majority of University faculty) did persuade President Oswald that there may be exceptional circumstances in which the University would be best served by awarding tenure to an individual despite that individual’s lack of research excellence.<sup>4</sup> For such situations, President Oswald in October 1963 explained that the Area Committees could consider situations of assistant professors where the individual is recommended to “remain an assistant professor with tenure on account of teaching prowess and promise” or that the individual be “changed to a **lecturer** with tenure.” He 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**.”<sup>4</sup>

#### IV. Solution to the Titles Problem: Multiple Titles, Parenthetical Title, NonResearch Title or None of These?

By the turn of 1964 though, additional discussion in the Faculty Council made it evident that the title “**Lecturer**” would not be a satisfactory University-wide alternative title to “Professor” in the cases of exceptional circumstance that were envisioned. In a February 1964 Faculty Council meeting

“**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.”<sup>16</sup> (underlining added here)



The Faculty (Senate) Council Chair determined that “all colleges where problems of **specialized activities** suggested other series of ranks than the proposed **lecturer** and associate ranks should be consulted” Faculty



“Dr. **[Ralph] Weaver** [Faculty Council Chair] was requested, through personal interview, to ask each of the deans to submit recommendations for faculty titles in those areas where the criteria for regular professorial ranks would not be appropriate for retention and promotion, emphasizing that the Council would insist on these [Oswald 1963] criteria for the regular professorial ranks.”<sup>16</sup> (underlining in original)

Unfortunately, over the course of the next month of Faculty Council meetings,

“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.”<sup>17</sup> ....“The Chairman reported receipt of a negative reply from the Art Department toward **special** academic ranks and Dr. Pellegrino reported negatively for the College of Medicine. The Chairman commented on the lack of progress being made in this area.”<sup>18</sup>

Dean William A. Seay  
Agricultural Experiment Station

February 4, 1964

Dear Dean Seay:

The Area Academic Personnel Committee for the Biological and Medical Sciences has reviewed the recommendation and background materials relative to granting tenure to [redacted] and have recommended that this be done.

I concur in the recommendation that she be granted tenure but I question whether or not the title of Assistant Professor should be retained. Although [redacted] is doing work which is of real value, it is not at the level usually associated with professorial rank at the University. Therefore, I would appreciate your comments on the possibility of changing to a more appropriate title, such as Lecturer, carrying tenure.

Sincerely yours,  
John W. Oswald

Meanwhile, by late January 1964, the newly created Area Committees were beginning to receive and assess dossiers for cases proposing promotion and tenure, including for cases in which the individual did not have significant research assignment or evidence of research excellence. In the absence of having yet identified alternative professorial titles for those rare situations in which tenure still appeared warranted, the President’s ‘default’ plan of utilizing the title “Lecturer” with tenure was employed. During the spring of 1964, there were three occasions in which the candidate was offered the choice of either Lecturer with tenure (exampled at left), or to receive an untenured reappointment and reconsideration the following year. Over the next year, there were two actual cases in which the untenured assistant professor accepted the offer of “promotion” to tenured **Lecturer**.

However, neither President Oswald nor the faculty on the Area Committees were satisfied that such outcomes were the best long term solution, especially because in a number of disciplines “**Lecturer**” as opposed to a professorial title was not recognized in the given field, and the imposition of a “**Lecturer**” title was vigorously opposed by that discipline’s faculty. The Biological and Medical Sciences Area Committee summarized its opinion on the “titles problem” to President Oswald in late February 1964,

“Because nursing education is very largely undergraduate and vocational in character, there appears to be little possibility that professorial titles in this College will ever be equivalent to those in most of the other colleges of the University. The Committee would be more comfortable about this decision and about prospective promotions in the College of Nursing if titles other than those used in other academic areas could be found.” With respect to a position related to duties in **Pharmacy Central Supply** of the Hospital, “Although training in this area is of great importance, it is largely vocational in character. A resolution of this problem might be found in the use of different titles as has been suggested for the College of Nursing... it may take some time to develop a permanent solution for faculty members in this category.”<sup>18</sup>



The Medical Center Vice President (and then also Dean of the College of Medicine) **William Willard**, was especially strident in his opposition to the notion that there be a second system of titles for those faculty who by their University assignment (such as in the Medical Center) were not performing significant levels of research. As he wrote to President Oswald in early fall 1964

“Academic titles for “non-research” faculty. Although I have real reservations about a dual system of titles, I am willing to establish such a system, one series for the full-time faculty who have research attainments, and another for full-time faculty who are not accomplished in

research but are important for other reasons. I can accept this dichotomy only with the understanding that the “non-research” faculty would have all the prerogatives of other full-time faculty such as membership on the Faculty Council, committees, eligibility for membership at Spindletop Hall and any other fringes benefits and not become second-class faculty citizens. (Personally, I don’t think it will be possible to avoid a second-class stigma, but I may be wrong. I’m will to give it a trial anyway.) Also I would need assurance that all colleges in the University will have a dual title system so that all colleges will be on a uniform basis.”<sup>19</sup>

The College of Agriculture Dean **William Seay**, with the specialized non-research niche of its extension faculty, had similar concerns that appropriate professorial titles would be utilized for the extension faculty.<sup>20, 21</sup>



During the fall of 1964, the various colleges, especially Medicine, Dentistry and Agriculture, iterated with President Oswald and his Special Assistant, **Tom Lewis**, toward identifying a satisfactory resolution to the “titles” problem. By December 9, the College of Medicine was supporting a system (that VP Willard was told by Howard Bost would be prepared by Special Assistant to the President Tom Lewis as “*a version which he will regard as a final draft for the President’s use in submission to the Faculty Council*”) in which

“The various parenthetical series following the titles [e.g., Associate Professor (Clinical)] would be used only in University records and with respect to appointment and merit reviews. In usage of the title for other purposes the parenthetical series designation would be dropped, including usage in the University catalog, in publications, in curriculum vitae.”<sup>22</sup>

The Faculty Council Chair had at that moment in December 1964 also

“received a letter from [an Area Committee Chair] urging early finalization. Council members also emphasized the need for early resolvment”<sup>23</sup>

A week later, the Dean Seay and Special Assistant Tom Lewis again corresponded on a different strategy for the College of Agriculture of a larger series of different titles and ranks for extension-related personnel.<sup>24</sup> The following week, VP Willard instead reiterated Dec. 22 directly to President Oswald his support on behalf of the Colleges of Medicine and Dentistry, for the “*parenthetical modifier*” solution, emphasizing that the parenthetical modifier would be dropped for public purposes such as the University catalog, publications and curriculum vitae.<sup>25</sup> (Also remember that yet another solution involving yet other titles, of “Lecturer (with tenure)”, was already being employed by the College of Commerce, with two individuals to receive that status at the imminent January 1965 Board of Trustees meeting). The following day, the Faculty Council met again, to receive a report from Faculty Trustee Lewis Cochran, that on the status of ranks and titles, Executive Vice President Albright had been generally favorable but Graduate School Dean A.B. Kirwan negative, but it is not clear from the record what proposal was before them that they were divided over.<sup>26</sup>

The Faculty Council then had a dinner with President Oswald after the turn of the year on January 4,<sup>26</sup> at which President Oswald discussed his contemplation of potential rare situations of “*the desire to keep and promote an outstanding teacher, perhaps in history or literature, simply because of his value and fame as a teacher.*”<sup>27</sup> The Faculty Council at its next meeting three days later “*discussed ranks and titles but took no action.*”<sup>28</sup> However, during these discussions the Faculty Council was reaching a consensus that it did not want a University solution of each of the colleges having its own and different system of ranks and titles for its faculty, rather it wanted a University-wide system centered in the same professorial titles and ranks of assistant professor, associate professor and professor.<sup>29</sup>

Hence, five more days later in mid-January 1965, Special Assistant Tom Lewis penned a redrafted proposal to President Oswald that constituted a major philosophical shift, yet another “*alternative solution to the title problem.*”<sup>29</sup> Lewis was attempting to resolve the conflicting forces of

(1) Oswald’s insistence (likely emphasized at the dinner the week before with the Faculty Council) on maintaining the integrity of his now-released policy that (for all but the rarest exception, such as an outstanding teacher situation) acquisition of tenure with the title “associate professor” required attaining the criteria for excellence on both teaching and research

(2) Willard’s insistence that there be no publicly visible (stigma) designation associated with the title of persons who were granted a professorial title with tenure, but who did not have a record of excellence in research

(3) versus the widespread faculty rejection in most colleges of “Lecturer” as such an alternative tenure track title

(4) the Dean of Agriculture’s solution of a large number of different academic titles for the various possible specialized niches

(5) the solution used by the College of Commerce of conferring tenure to Lecturers.

Lewis devised the idea of a single, University-wide “Non-Research Series”, where the single parenthetical descriptor (“Non-Research”) would be dropped for all public purposes and be used only in records of internal personnel processes.<sup>30</sup>

“As I understand the problem, the need for a separate series of titles for non-research personnel stems from the desirability of identifying non-research positions and of maintaining the purity of criteria for the main series which involves a commitment to research.” (underlining in original)...If creativity, for example, is an equivalent of research for title purposes, the nature of creativity must be carefully defined lest too many or too few persons acquire the professorial title. Unfortunately, the concept of creativity is not easily captured in words ...” As to one suggestion to “call everyone the same thing and apply criteria as appropriate to the real function performed by the individual ... I think you are convinced [this] won’t work administratively... Since the crux of the matter seems to be a fear of using a second-class title and the thrust of [a different suggestion] is to create usages by which all would be called “Professor”, a solution which satisfies people on this score should be acceptable. Use of the parenthetical modifier is such a solution ... it would work in this way:”

Instructor  
Assistant Professor  
Associate Professor (NR Series)(“the position would have to be justified”)  
Professor (NR Series)

“The parenthetical modifier would serve all the purposes ... as far as identification of position is concerned”... “Associate Professor (NR) would be equivalent to the rank of “lecturer” as distinguished from Associate Lecturer or Senior Lecturer” [where at that time in the President’s thinking, tenure could be attached to Lecturer and Senior Lecturer]

The President approved this alternative for presentation at his immediately upcoming meeting with the college deans. For that meeting, Special Assistant Tom Lewis then prepared a formalized policy draft,<sup>31</sup> reprinted in part below:

## “Draft “NON-RESEARCH SERIES” APPOINTMENTS”

“The phrase [Non-Research Series] shall appear as a modifier of the primary title in all official University records (excluding the University catalogue) and in official communications concerning merit review....

“The Non-Research Series is in no sense intended to serve, nor shall it be used to serve as a refuge for non-promotable Assistant Professors; rather it is a title series which recognizes the needs of a few departments for **specialized teaching** and the value in certain limited circumstances of retaining an individual because of his exceptional ability as a teacher....

“Non-Research Series should be recommended only where one of the two following conditions is fully satisfied:

- 1) Teaching capability of truly exceptional quality, justifying the creation of a permanent position which carries no research responsibilities.
- 2) Teaching needs so **specialized in character** that they cannot be met with equal effectiveness by faculty members in the regular professorial ranks or by strictly temporary appointees....

“The criteria established for the evaluation of persons in the regular professorial ranks, except those related to the function of research, are appropriate for persons in the N-R Series ...”

“This appointment does not imply the responsibility of engaging in research; however, if the appointee desires to do so, and the department in which he serves considers him competent for such work, it may provide him with the appropriate facilities...”



The President asked the Deans for their written comments back (through Tom Lewis) on this draft proposal handed out at his meeting with the deans. Some such as Nursing Dean **Marcia Dake** over last two weeks of January quickly provided the proposal to their college faculty. The College of Nursing Faculty Council acted and Dean Dake reported back

“The proposed use of the parenthetical modifier of “Non-Research Series” ...has the endorsement of the Faculty Council of the College of Nursing”...”The non-research series is interpreted to differentiate from the regular academic ranks primarily, if not exclusively, in the area of research. Should not “service” be defined as a responsibility for the “non-research series”?<sup>32</sup>



Graduate School Dean **A. B. Kirwan** importantly offered:

“I would suggest that instead of using the negative suffix “non-research” ... that we use some positive suffix....”<sup>33</sup>

While the Acting Dean of the College of Commerce, **Robert Rudd** noted to Tom Lewis that an important philosophical premise for the new title series remained to be determined

“after hearing the presentation by the President I am not certain ... whether or not in terms of encumbent (sic) employees the case is going to be considered in terms of the merits of the individual for appointment to a non-research series currently or whether he case is going to be considered primarily on the merits of the needs for a slot in order to accomplish the teaching mission... a substantial difference in the number of non-research slots [ ] would be created depending on which of these two choices is elected.”<sup>34</sup>

## V. A Solution to “Titles Problem”: a “Special Title Series” – Delimiting Parameters

At its February 12, 1965 meeting, the Faculty Council then assessed the matter, making a number of very substantive and even philosophical changes prior to its final ‘buy in’ for an alternative to the Regular Title Series. The Faculty Council developed a solution defined by the following parameters<sup>35</sup>

**First**, the title series would be renamed as the “Special Title Series,” to place the emphasis on that each position to be created in this title series was a need for a “specialized” nonresearch activity.

**Second**, the new series would only be used for positions in which the very nature of the teaching or service activity was so different from that performed by persons in the Regular Title Series that the criteria used to evaluate teaching and service of Regular Title Series faculty were inappropriate to use to evaluate persons in this alternative title series. Very important for the future understanding of this premise of this title series was the stipulation of intent that:

“[The October 1963 Regular Title Series criteria<sup>3</sup>] appear to be satisfactory for the great majority of positions. There are, however, a few areas **where research and creative work, in the usually accepted sense, do not constitute a significant part of a staff member’s activity** ... the University has established programs in some of these areas and has the need for professionally competent people to meet the teaching and public service responsibilities required by these programs. To meet **these** responsibilities effectively and to maintain a competitive position in the manpower market, it is proposed that a “Special Title” professorial series be established...

This parameter is so fundamental to the circumscription of the Special Title Series that the Faculty Council made the specific amendment to the policy language of:

“Therefore, the appointment or promotion of an individual to the Special Title Series should be recommended only where teaching or other needs are **so specialized in character** that they can be met with greater effectiveness by faculty members in the special series... (underlining added here)

That is, the condition that justifies establishment of the position is not a ‘special (=urgent) need’ of the teaching (or service) program for numerically more teaching (or service) hands, but rather it is the specialized character of the teaching or service activities. The individual has a “Special” title (rather than a “Regular” title) on account of the “specialized” character of the non-research assignment.

**Third**, the Faculty Council expanded the kind of specialized activity that might be involved to include not just a specialized “teaching” activity, but also a specialized “public service” activity (thus satisfying the advocacy by VP Willard for the clinical patient care activities of the clinical faculty and the advocacy of Dean Seay for the extension activities of faculty whose positions were funded through the Cooperative Extension Service).

**Fourth**, consequent to each of the above, the Faculty Council rejected the provision in the “Non-Research Series” draft that a department could discretionarily provide research opportunities/facilities to the individual appointed in this series. The Faculty Council also modified a corresponding provision from the “Non-Research Series” draft to make it clear that

“Appointment to a Special Title position **will not** normally imply a specific responsibility to engage in **research**...[in contrast to] persons in the regular professorial ranks, of whom research and publication is a specific requirement”<sup>58</sup>

**Fifth**, to further reflect that the Special Title Series is solely for ‘specialized in character’ duties, the Faculty Council deleted entirely from the “Non-Research Series” draft the other, second condition under which



appointment could be made to the series (i.e., the merit of the individual’s exceptional teaching skills is not to be a basis to establish a Special Title Series position).

**Sixth**, to yet further reflect that Special Title Series positions are not to be conceptualized as merely “Regular Title Series duties minus the research”, but is solely for specialized activities, the Faculty Council deleted the concept in the “Non-Research Series” draft that evaluation toward promotion and tenure would be on the basis of “[t]he criteria established for the evaluation of persons in the regular professorial ranks, except those related to the function of research,” and replaced it with the concept that on a position-by-position (i.e., specialized assignment-by-specialized assignment) basis, evaluation would be by “*criteria appropriate to and approved for [the] special position.*” Further reflecting that the criteria established for evaluating the teaching and service assignments of a Regular Title Series nature (already approved by the Faculty Council) would not be applicable to these specialized in character assignments, the criteria for appointment and promotion to these positions would have to be reviewed by a faculty Area Committee prior to consideration of any individual for the position.

**Seventh**, the titles of persons appointed in this series of ranks would be “Special” and recognizable from the titles of person in the Regular Title Series - not by the parenthetical method proposed for the “Non-Research Series,” but by incorporation of a special, appropriate descriptor into the professorial title of the individual appointed to the position. The implementation would follow these examples:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Title Series</u>
Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor of Medicine	Regular Title Series
Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor of Music	Regular Title Series
Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor of English	Regular Title Series
Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor of <b>Clinical</b> Medicine	Special Title Series
Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor of <b>Applied</b> Music	Special Title Series
Assistant Professor (or Associate Professor) (or Professor)	Assistant Professor of <b>Freshman Rhetoric</b>	Special Title Series

Each of these seven specific policy modifications made to create the Special Title Series proposal became the final adopted University policy (see below), and each are still the codified policy language in force in the University of Kentucky in 2005. Each of these seven policy modifications was specifically designed to distinguish the policy of the Special Title Series from the provisions proposed the month earlier for a “Non-Research Series.” (As will be seen below, many of the problems that have since arisen in the exercise of the Special Title Series policy are due to failure to understand, or apparently premeditated attempts to circumvent, these specific restrictions that were placed into the Special Title Series policy by the (elected) Faculty Council, and to which the University Senate concurred).

Finally, the Faculty Council proposed to President Oswald a managerial approach to implementation of the new policy, by way of a draft Request Form that would be used by the initiating departments in requesting and justifying to the President of a Special Title Series position for the department.<sup>36</sup> The President in principle adopted that such a form would be managerially used in the implementation, but the President added a specific further informational item to be filled out on the form:

“Reasons why research or creative effort is inappropriate or should not be expected in this position”<sup>37</sup>

## VI. Reaction of the University to the Faculty Council's Special Title Series Proposal

The above "Special Title Series" solution to the "titles problem" concerning non-research faculty was not the "Non-Research Series" solution proposed in January by the President (through Tom Lewis), nor was it the "parenthetical modifier" solution so fervently advocated by VP William Willard (because the title did publicly identify and distinguish the Special Title Series faculty from the Regular Title Series faculty). Thus, Tom Lewis closely counseled President Oswald:

"The advantages of a Council solution in this sensitive area would be many. I would make it clear that it is a Faculty Council proposal, not simply a Council concurrence in your proposal."<sup>27</sup>

The President heeded that advice, and in early March 1965 provided the Faculty Council's Special Title Series policy proposal to his administrative Council of Academic Deans [a close comparison of the version adopted by the Faculty Council with the version submitted to the Council of Deans shows some editorial adjustment, such as changing the phrase "*nor shall it be used to serve as a refuge*" to "*not intended to serve as a means for appointing or promoting*"].<sup>38</sup>

To: Council of Academic Deans and Vice Presidents

From: John W. Oswald

Enclosed are draft copies for discussion of two academic title series: 1) Special Title Professorial Appointments, and 2) Professor (Adjunct Series). As you will recall, at the last meeting we discussed the possibility of establishing a non-research, professorial series. It was the unanimous judgment of the Faculty Council that it would be better to handle this problem by the establishment of the Special Title series.

The President asked the Faculty Council not to bring the Special Title Series proposal to the March 1965 Senate meeting, but to wait until after the President had discussed it with the deans, and then the President would have further discussion with the Faculty Council.<sup>39</sup> The President then scheduled a March 23 breakfast to discuss "ranks and titles" with the Faculty Council.<sup>40</sup> On March 26 the Faculty Council Chair "*reported that the Special Title Series had been returned without change and the Secretary was directed to circulate the ... Special Title Series to the University Faculty so that [this] series might be considered at the April University Faculty meeting.*"<sup>41</sup> The Faculty Council did not appear hesitant to publicly take credit/blame as the originator of the Special Title Series, because in its cover memo of distribution of this agenda item to the members of the University Senate, the Faculty Council described

"President Oswald requested the Faculty Council to recommend to him another series [for these certain kinds of duties and services] ... After considering other possible solutions, the Council has finally submitted the attached Special Title" series.<sup>42</sup>

The President attended the April 12 University Senate meeting, at which the Special Title Series proposal was discussed, and apparently saw that the faculty senators did not raise any serious objections.<sup>43</sup> The President however did not immediately move the Special Title Series further toward promulgation, until some ongoing parallel discussions were completed by he and the Senate Council of other still-on-the-table proposals for the four rank "Lecturer" Series and the parenthetical "Clinical Professor Series" of ranks. After several discussions within the Senate Council, and between the Senate Council and the President,<sup>41,44,45</sup> the four rank, tenureable "Lecturer" proposal was dropped in favor of a single rank, nontenure "Lecturer,"<sup>45</sup> the function of which was to be contracted, part-time teaching duties. Also, the "Clinical Professor Series"<sup>45</sup> series of ranks was in concept also reduced to a potential single rank ("Clinical Professor"), but even this proposal did not survive and VP Willard's strong desire for a stand-alone Clinical Professor title (series) was altogether disapproved at a final breakfast meeting with the President.<sup>45</sup> Hence, nine days later, the President published to Deans and Department Chairmen a memorandum that promulgated as University-wide policies the Special Title Series and the single rank/title of "Lecturer."<sup>46</sup>

The final Special Title Series policy promulgated by the April 28, 1965 memorandum of President Oswald reiterated that for the Regular Title Series professorial ranks

“Research and creative effort are among the criteria. It was recognized that some departments have **specialized teaching** needs not accurately reflected in the criteria established for the professorial ranks, and that a limited number of special titles or positions would have to be created to provide for these needs...I invite your attention to the language in the enclosure emphasizing that this special title series is a limited one...”<sup>47</sup> (underlining added here)

## VII. College Deans Submit Proposals for Special Title Series Positions Under the New STS Policy

During the summer of 1965, a number of college deans submitted proposals for Special Title Series positions, each testing the meaning and reach of the new policy, from the perspective of their own particular agenda. Clearly the most confrontational with the President was VP William Willard, who expressed great frustration with the policy, which he interpreted as embodying a great lack of appreciation or understanding by President Oswald for the patient care activities of the clinical faculty. A separate accounting of the how the sparring between a determined President Oswald, and a just as determined VP Willard, yielded the Medical Center Clinical Special Title Series is presented elsewhere (see: **Clinical Faculty Titles and Ranks in the UK Medical Center Part I - The First Decade**).

Several deans though did make the similar mistakes of proposing Special Title Series positions that either (1) had teaching/service duties that were not specialized in character, or (2) were merely Regular Title Series duties with the research component missing, or (3) contained a significant research component to the Special Title Series assignment. In each case, Executive Vice President Albright disapproved the request and explained how the request was in contradiction to the Special Title Series policy.

College of Nursing Special Title Series Proposals. In an example involving a proposal from Dean Dake (College of Nursing) both the Area Committee and President Oswald disapproved a proposal for a Special Title Series position, expressly because the Dean had included in the proposal that the hired individual would be responsible to perform research that resulted in research publications. It was necessary that the Dean finally

“revised the proposed definition of “Associate Professor of Clinical Nursing” and “Professor of Clinical Nursing” to eliminate the implications of research achievements, **therefore distinguishing these positions from regular faculty titles.**”<sup>48</sup>

However, VP Albright again had to disapprove the subsequently revised proposal, because the described teaching and service duties were not specialized in character, but merely the same kind of teaching and service activities as would be done by Regular Title Series. He explained to the Area Committee (which itself was mistaken on this point):

“The establishment of a Special Title Series for a position implies that special functions are to be performed [that] cannot be appraised adequately by the criteria applicable in the regular academic series. Hence, specifically differentiating criteria are necessary for an objective evaluation in a Special Title Series. The [Area] Committee’s report seems to say that the criteria, with the exception of the one on “creative productivity”, for evaluation in the regular academic series should prevail in the Special Title Series for Nursing. If this is the case, then the establishment of a Special Title Series has little, if any, justification.”<sup>49</sup>



School of Home Economics Special Title Series Proposals. In a case involving the first Special Title Series proposals from the School of Home Economics, a proposal from Dean **Jean Brannan** for a Professor of Home Economics in Business (1970) was initially disapproved by the now-oriented Area Committee, because of the Area Committee found errors of both lack of specialized function and the inclusion of a significant research assignment:

“1. The teaching activities described do not appear to be unlike other teaching functions in the University.  
2. The indicated criteria which emphasizes innovation and developing new knowledge relevant to the field would appear to us to suggest the need for research. Consequently, the publication criteria listed for the rank of Professor should apply equally to the rank of Associate Professor rank.  
....The general view of the Committee regarding this proposal was that the assignment described is such that the regular academic series would be appropriate in this case.”<sup>50</sup>



College of Engineering Special Title Series Proposals. In an example from the College of Engineering, Dean **Robert Shaver** requested a Special Title Series positions in Applied Metallurgy (Feb. 1966), but the request as framed was disapproved by Executive Vice President Albright, because

“the teaching, public administration and service, and design and operation of metallurgical equipment are normal expectations of persons holding rank in the regular series.”<sup>51</sup>



College of Education Special Title Series Proposals. Executive Vice President Albright agreed that in the areas of clinical speech and audiology, special education, and student teaching, that teaching duties of a specialized nature were involved. However, the proposal for Special Title Series positions in these areas was disapproved for lack of appointment and promotion criteria that were correspondingly specialized for evaluation of the specialized duties. Albright explained to Dean **Lyman Ginger**:

...specific differentiating criteria are necessary for an objective evaluation in the Special Title Series. A criterion, for example, that simply states “demonstrated professional competence in the field” provides little guidance for an Area Committee to use as a basis for appraisal.... the criteria should provide more adequate guidance to what constitutes “demonstrated competence” ... examples of “national recognition” and “extraordinary service” would be helpful.”<sup>52</sup>

College of Dentistry Special Title Series Proposals. Dean of Dentistry **Alvin Morris**, whose college contained clinical programs with clinical faculty, was of a philosophical bend similar to VP Willard, and was at odds with President Oswald over whether the Special Title Series policy, in which positions were designated as Special Title, could or could not meet the needs of his clinical college. As Dean Morris wrote to President Oswald



“While “the two-title system” will serve an important function in the University, I feel the need for a somewhat broader interpretation of its application than is provided in your memorandum of April 28, 1965...Perhaps my key point is that I feel a “non-research” designation should be applied primarily to individuals rather than to positions. [to which Oswald in the margins wrote “No.” Dean Morris’ letter aptly continued] “ I recognize that this is contrary to the intent of your memorandum.”<sup>53</sup>

Area Committee Advises Oswald on Tensions in Navigating Special Title Series Policy. The above examples show that the tension that rapidly developed between the college deans’ desire for “managerial flexibility” in utilizing tenure-track faculty in very different assignments versus President Oswald’s enforcement of his philosophical determination that national research status will be gained by UK only through tough adherence to the policy that all faculty (with the rarest of specialized exceptions) must be assigned with expectations of excellence in both teaching and research. In addition, the Area Committees that were applying that policy in developing recommendations on faculty promotion and tenure also developed experience that prompted urgent comment to the President. In particular, such comment came from the Biological and Medical Sciences Area Committee that made recommendations on both nonclinical and clinical faculty:

“The Committee has consistently interpreted this [October 1963 policy] statement in such a way that it would be extremely difficult if not completely impossible for any faculty member to

be recommended for promotion to the rank of Professor in the regular series in our area unless he had published original research. A significant, though decreasing, number of faculty members by virtue of their assignments in teaching and service, have very little opportunity to conduct original research...Special titles in the special title series are considered second class and though additional special titles may appear to offer a solution, the Committee feels that retention of top individuals in teaching and essential service roles may be difficult. The Area Committee, therefore, would be inclined to expect a trend toward somewhat greater flexibility in the regular title series and fewer special titles.”<sup>54</sup>



College of Medicine Special Title Series Proposals. The tension between VP Willard and President Oswald on what constituted a Regular Title Series Faculty Member came to a boil in June 1966, with **Executive VP A. D. Albright's** decision to agree with the Biological and Medical Area Committee's recommendation deny VP Willard's recommendation to promote two faculty in the Regular Title Series, and instead to:

“to promote in the **clinical series** ...to the rank of Associate Professor of **Clinical** Medicine and ... to the rank of Associate Professor of **Clinical** Pathology.”<sup>55</sup>

This outcome infuriated VP Willard, who wrote to President Oswald:

“These decisions are not acceptable [and] bring into sharp focus the need to modify either our criteria or our procedures for handling clinical faculty”<sup>56</sup>

“It is not possible for most clinical faculty members to be equally proficient in all the criteria listed for evaluation...There are some faculty who are most valuable to the institution who engage in virtually no research...The essential point is that all factors must be given recognition, that promotion should and must be based upon suitable performance judged by any one or combination of criteria, that adequate research cannot be an essential criteria for every faculty member in order to merit promotion.”

“The effect is to say that those with regular titles are “regular” faculty; the others are second class and not really up to University standards. This may be all right in Arts and Sciences, but it is not all right for ... the Medical Center”

“The faculty member's performance should be **evaluated against the assignment** which he is given to do ... This approach would require that letters from department chairmen and deans provide, in effect, **a job description**. Supporting letters should be relevant to the job description.”

“Some **modification in** the wording of the policy statement governing appointment and promotion and **the criteria for evaluation** would be needed for guidance of deans, department chairmen and the area committees.”

“The creation of a **new area committee** ... should be considered. This committee would review Medical Center clinical faculty.”<sup>57,58</sup>

Subsequently, VP Willard began a sustained and determined effort over the next four years to, frankly, undercut or circumvent the University-level Special Title Series policy *as it had been promulgated by President Oswald*. VP Willard's efforts in this regard culminated in an agreement in January 1970 by the relatively new (and the present authors infers, carefully underinformed) President Singletary,<sup>59</sup> under which VP Willard created a separate policy for the Medical Center colleges. For a specific accounting of how the Medical Center Clinical Special Title Series<sup>60</sup> and the Clinical Sciences and Special Title Series Area Committee<sup>61</sup> came to be in the form that each took for much of the 1970's and 1980's, see the Chapter on: “**Clinical Faculty Titles and Ranks in the UK Medical Center - Part I - The First Decade.**” The depth of frustration of faculty and administration who felt that research was being overemphasized to the detriment of teaching continued to boil at such a pitch, that in 1972, some legislators were persuaded to propose an amendment of the state “tenure law” at KRS 164.230. That law stated that no professor or teacher could be removed from their position

“except for incompetency, neglect of or refusal to perform his duty, or for immoral conduct.”

However, the proposed amendment would have the law read

“no faculty member possessing either tenure or non-tenured status shall be removed or denied renewal of contract for failure to publish research or other scholarly works.”<sup>62,63</sup>

This proposed legislation, HB 89 (SB 191) was not finally adopted by the General Assembly of 1972.

### VIII. Special Title Series Policy: Not Only New Special Titles, But Also New Special Ranks

Although the primary emphasis of the new policy was on what Special Titles would be associated with individuals at their ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor, the policy document also provided room for the proposal of alternative, specially-named Ranks. The example that still exists in 2005 is in the Librarian Titles Series (a form of Special Title Series), in which the title “Librarian” has four ranks of **IV, III, II and I**.<sup>64</sup> However, these are not the only special ranks that have been used within the Special Title Series policy.

Another example of a Special Rank established under the Special Title Series policy was that of “**Assistant**” in the College of Medicine. As described in the request submitted by VP Willard in the fall of 1965

“I am requesting ... a special title series for the clinical departments involving the Senior Residents in the various clinical services... The Senior Residents are generally involved significantly in the clinical teaching program of the department... Some medical schools grant Senior Residents the title of Instructor ... Other schools use the title which we have proposed, viz. Assistant... Because the status of these individuals differs from regular faculty members and the appointments are usually for only one year and not renewable it seems better to use to have a special title series.”<sup>65</sup>

President Oswald approved the request, anticipating from VP Willard’s further description that between six to twelve of such positions would be used.<sup>66</sup>

In another example, the Dean Dake of the College of Nursing the requested:

“The largest percentage of potential faculty candidates are new graduates of masters degree programs. Many have had little or no experience in nursing, teaching, and/or collegiate teaching. In addition, it is occasionally necessary to appoint persons with teaching experience who do not hold masters degree. It is considered inappropriate to recommend such persons for the regular instructor rank ... “Assistant Instructor” which would be applied on a year by year basis, perhaps with a maximum of two years, and perhaps without fringe benefits would meet a need in the College of Nursing.”<sup>32</sup>

This lower, fifth rank would be the entry-level rank leading to Instructor of Clinical Nursing, Assistant Professor of Clinical Nursing, Associate Professor of Clinical Nursing, and Professor of Clinical Nursing. After discussion and agreement by Dean Dake for an alternative rank name of “**Teaching Associate**,” Executive VP Albright informed VP Willard that he approved

“...Teaching Associate as a prelude to a four-step series”<sup>67</sup>

Therefore, even after VP Willard engineered through new President Singletary in January of 1970 that all Special Title Series positions and future position descriptions in the Medical Center colleges would be subsumed under a generic, one-fits-all position description/promotion criteria, the College

Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky, Friday, June 17, 1966

-5-

Henry H. Bauer, Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, Arts and Sciences, beginning September 1, 1966  
Donald B. Coleman, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Arts and Sciences, beginning September 1, 1966  
Loretta Denman, **Professor of Clinical Nursing**, College of Nursing, beginning May 1, 1966  
Loren J. Humphrey, Associate Professor of Surgery, with tenure, joint appointment in the Departments of Surgery and Cell Biology, College of Medicine, beginning June 1, 1966  
Delores E. Johnson, **Teaching Associate of Clinical Nursing**, College of Nursing, beginning September 1, 1966  
Herbert Myron Kauffman, Jr., Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery, College of Medicine (salary over \$15,000) effective June 1, 1966  
Donald Leigh, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Arts and Sciences, (this is a joint appointment with tenure with the Department of Engineering Mechanics), effective July 1, 1966

of Nursing was an exception to that policy by virtue of that it possessed this fifth rank in its Special Title Series. The minutes of the Board of Trustees then show for the next five years that the Board approved a number of faculty appointees at this fifth, entry rank of “Teaching Associate of Clinical Nursing.”

However, in July of 1971, Medical Center VP Peter Bosomworth requested to President Singletary that

“Based on a recommendation of the faculty of the College of Nursing and supported by the Dean of the College, I am recommending that the criteria which now apply to the College of Medicine in relation to Special Title Series be dropped and the general criteria for Medical Center Special Title Series be substituted. The College would like to retain the suffix of Clinical Nursing to officially designate the Special Title Series recipients versus the regular rank.”<sup>68</sup>

Although the “Medical Center Clinical Sciences and Special Title Series Area Committee” was also asked to advise on the request, President Singletary approved the request prior to the report from the Area Committee, and the fifth rank of Teaching Associate in Clinical Nursing ceased to be used.

On the aspect of Special Ranks, these alternative ranks were reflected in a little-noticed provision put into the major revision of its Governing Regulations that the Board of Trustees adopted May of 1970. The revised regulation stated (and still states today)

“Academic ranks in the University System shall consist of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, and other ranks that are fully **or partially equivalent** to these recognized ranks.”<sup>69</sup>

This ending clause to this sentence has usually been interpreted with focus on that the “fully ... equivalent” ranks are those of Librarian IV, III, II, and I, respectively, in relation to Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, consequent to the Board of Trustees’ 1966 action declaring such equivalency. However, the reference to “partially equivalent” ranks is intended to accommodate the alternative ranks that may be proposed within the Special Title Series framework, such as the “Assistant” and the “Teaching Associate” ranks discussed above. This clause also accommodated prospectively any further adjustment to the status of “Lecturer,” which had at that time a tenured faculty member in the College of Commerce, where that tenure action had occurred earlier at a time (1964-5) that tenured Lecturer was being contemplated as the solution to the “titles problem” (before the decision that the “Special Title Series” would instead become the solution).<sup>70</sup> Also, the Faculty Council during 1964 had debated that “*a Lecturer might be defined to encompass the level of Assistant Professor and the lower level of Associate Professor.*”<sup>71</sup> The 1972 codification of the Special Title Series policy (see below) promulgated language that made the subsequent restriction that the ranks in the Special Title Series above the level of Instructor must parallel the three ranks used in the Regular Title Series.

## IX. Formal Codification of the Special Title Series Policy as an Administrative Regulation



Shortly after his appointment as the new University of Kentucky President in fall 1969, **Otis Singletary** desired to codify the various Oswald-era faculty personnel policy memos into a manual of “Administrative Regulations.”<sup>72-74</sup> The Administrative Regulation on the “Special Title Series” was drafted,<sup>75</sup> examined by the University Senate Council<sup>76</sup> and finally promulgated in March of 1972.<sup>75</sup> The codification closely followed the language in the parent policy memo of President Oswald dated April 28, 1965, including retaining the statement of the nonresearch purpose of the Special Title Series is to “*meet the teaching and service responsibilities for those areas whose endeavors do not include research or creative work*” and that “[a]ppointment to a Special Title Position will not normally imply a specific responsibility to engage in research.”

## X. Epilogue on the Establishment of the Special Title Series

At this point in its legislative development (1972), the policy for Special Title Series had been officially codified into the Administrative Regulations; its function to be a means of hiring more teaching hands to satisfy heaving programmatic teaching needs was rejected; its function for specialized nonresearch duties relating to teaching and service was expressly stated; its legislative origin in that function was clearly traced. However, the exemplified the efforts of various college deans from the outset to use Special Title Series position as instruments of broad managerial convenience (and in some cases, for convenience of an individual faculty member), rather than for specialized assignments, set the stage for repeating cycles of overreach beyond the codified language and administrative/adjudicatory admonition in response. A review of this fate of the Special Title Series is presented in: “**A Legislative History of the University of Kentucky Faculty Special Title Series – Part II**”

### References

<sup>1</sup> July 30 1963 Minutes, Board of Trustees

<sup>2</sup> For example, see

<http://biology.uky.edu/djones/PDF/5/5.xiii/The%20Case%20of%20Gladys%20KammererIV.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> 10-28-63 [President Oswald’s Oct 1963 Memo on Faculty Appt/Promotion/Tenure Criteria](#)

<sup>4</sup> Faculty Council Minutes Oct. 15, 1963

<sup>5</sup> Faculty Council Minutes Oct. 10, 1963

<sup>6</sup> “PROPOSED REVISION OF THE GOVERNING REGULATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY A Working Copy September 30, 1968.” Excerpt from page 30 - “*The department faculty ... has primary responsibility for the development of policies on such matters as academic requirements, courses of study, class schedules, graduate and research programs and service functions.*”

<sup>7</sup> September 30, 1963 draft to Faculty Council of proposed amendments to Governing Regulations

<sup>8</sup> October 24, 1963 Minutes, University Faculty Council

<sup>9</sup> December 18, 1963 Memorandum from President Oswald to Deans and Department Chairmen

<sup>10</sup> October 15, 1963 Minutes, Board of Trustees

<sup>11</sup> October 18, 1963 Minutes, Executive Committee Board of Trustees

<sup>12</sup> Transcription of tape recording of October 18, 1963 meeting of the Executive Committee Board of Trustees

<sup>13</sup> In a portend of the conflict to come between President Oswald and VP of the Medical Center William Willard, the Board Chair asked Willard to comment on President Oswald’s policy proposals, which in addition to the requirement for both teaching and research for attainment of Associate Professor rank, also included that Area Committees above the level of the College, composed of members from various colleges, would evaluate dossiers forwarded from each college. Willard’s response was to not respond at all to the new requirement for both teaching and research, and instead to speak favorably for the higher reviewing Area Committees, but even for the latter, his hedging language portended the conflict he would have with Oswald over his belief that the Area Committee for Biological and Medical Sciences was stacked with nonclinical biologists who did not understand the merit of the non-bench-science contributions of the clinical faculty. Willard’s comments at this Executive Committee meeting went as follows:

**Board Chairman:** Do you have any comment on this, Dr. Willard?

**VP Willard:** I think my comment would be that I think that the intent here is good ... a broadening to involve other than just college lines is a very desirable move. I think the exact way the mechanics work can be developed ... to iron those bugs .. I’m sure they can be smoothed out. So I think in principle we ought to move ahead with this.



<sup>14</sup> October 28, 1963 memorandum from President Oswald to all University faculty  
<sup>15</sup> October 11, 1963 letter from Special Assistant Doug Schwartz to President John Oswald  
<sup>16</sup> February 1, 1964 Faculty Council Minutes  
<sup>17</sup> Faculty Council Minutes March 2, 1964  
<sup>18</sup> Feb. 21, 1964 Area Committee letter to President Oswald  
<sup>19</sup> September 18, 1964 letter from VP William Willard to President Oswald  
<sup>20</sup> May 4, 1964 letter from Dean Seay to President Oswald  
<sup>21</sup> May 12, 1964 letter from Dean Seay to Faculty Council Chair Ralph Weaver  
<sup>22</sup> December 10, 1964 Minutes Faculty Council  
<sup>23</sup> Dec. 9, 1964 letter from Howard Bost to VP William Willard  
<sup>24</sup> December 16, 1964 cover letter with draft attachments from Tom Lewis to Dean Seay  
<sup>25</sup> December 22, 1964 memo from Dean William Willard to President Oswald  
<sup>26</sup> December 31, 1964 Faculty Council Minutes  
<sup>27</sup> February 18, 1965 letter from Special Assistant Tom Lewis to President Oswald  
<sup>28</sup> January 7, 1964 Minutes, Senate Council  
<sup>29</sup> Personnel communication of the author with Dr. Edmund Pellegrino, March 15, 2005, during a visit of Dr. Pellegrino to the University of Kentucky.  
<sup>30</sup> January 12, 1964 letter from Special Assistant to the President Tom Lewis to President Oswald  
<sup>31</sup> January 18, 1964 draft prepared by Special Assistant Tom Lewis, re: “NonResearch Series”  
<sup>32</sup> January 21, 1965 letter from College of Nursing Dean Marcia Dake to Special Assistant Tom Lewis  
<sup>33</sup> January 19, 1965 letter from Graduate School Dean A. B. Kirwan to Special Assistant Tom Lewis  
<sup>34</sup> January 27, 1965 letter from Dean of Commerce to Special Assistant Tom Lewis  
<sup>35</sup> February 12, 1965 Special Title Series proposal approved by Faculty Council  
<sup>36</sup> “Request for New Special Title Professorial Series” draft form approved by Faculty Council 02-12-65  
<sup>37</sup> “Request for New Special Title Professorial Series” form promulgated by President Oswald 04-28-65  
<sup>38</sup> March 3, 1965 memorandum from President Oswald to his Council of Academic Deans  
<sup>39</sup> March 5, 1965 Minutes, Faculty Council  
<sup>40</sup> March 12, 1965 Minutes, Faculty Council  
<sup>41</sup> March 26, 1965 Minutes, Faculty Council  
<sup>42</sup> March 30 memorandum from Faculty Council to the University Faculty (= University Senate)  
<sup>43</sup> April 12, 1965 Minutes, University Senate (name changes at March 1965 meeting of University Faculty)  
<sup>44</sup> April 2 Minutes, University Senate Council  
<sup>45</sup> April 9 Minutes, University Senate Council  
<sup>46</sup> April 28, 1965 memorandum from President Oswald to Deans and Chairpersons on “Lecturer”  
<sup>47</sup> April 28, 1965 memorandum from President Oswald to Deans and Chairpersons on “Special Title Series”  
<sup>48</sup> July 29, 1965 letter from VP William Willard to President John Oswald  
<sup>49</sup> November 24, 1965 letter from Executive VP A.D. Albright to Don Jacobson, Chair, Area Committee for Biological and Medical Sciences  
<sup>50</sup> January 30, 1970 letter from Provost Lewis Cochran to Dean Jean Brannan, School of Home Economics  
<sup>51</sup> February 7, 1966 letter from Provost Lewis Cochran to Dean Robert Shaver, College of Engineering  
<sup>52</sup> November 15, 1965 letter from Executive VP A.D. Albright to Education Dean Lyman Ginger  
<sup>53</sup> June 2, 1965 letter from Dean Al Morris to President John Oswald  
<sup>54</sup> December 22, 1966 letter from Robert Jacobson, Chair Biological and Medical Sciences Academic Area Advisory Committee, to President John Oswald  
<sup>55</sup> June 22, 1966 memo from Executive VP Willard Albright to VP Willard (bold font added here)  
<sup>56</sup> June 30, 1966 memo from VP Willard to President Oswald (the shorter of two memos with this date).  
<sup>57</sup> June 30, 1966 memo from VP Willard to President Oswald (the longer of two memos with this date).  
<sup>58</sup> Compare this policy posture of VP Willard that “*the faculty member’s performance should be evaluated against the assignment which he is given to do*” with President Oswald’s policy posture, as articulated by his Special Assistant Tom Lewis “*call everyone the same thing and apply criteria as appropriate to the real*

*function performed by the individual ... I think you are convinced [this] won't work administratively.*" – see reference 29.

- <sup>59</sup> Jan. 14, 1970 memo from President Singletary to VP Willard
- <sup>60</sup> "Medical Center Special Title Series Approved January 1970" two page document
- <sup>61</sup> March 9, 1970 memo from President Singletary to Medical Center faculty
- <sup>62</sup> February 17, 1972 memo from Senate Council to all University Faculty explaining the legislation
- <sup>63</sup> March 1, 1972 Senate Council resolution sent to President Singletary expressing opposition to the legislation
- <sup>64</sup> February 18, 1966 Minutes, Board of Trustees
- <sup>65</sup> August 30, 1965 letter from VP William Willard to President John Oswald
- <sup>66</sup> September 16, 1965 letter from President John Oswald to VP William Willard
- <sup>67</sup> August 19, 1965 letter from Executive VP A.D. Albright to Dean of Nursing Marcia Dake
- <sup>68</sup> July 28, 1971 letter from VP Peter Bosomworth to President Otis Singletary
- <sup>69</sup> Governing Regulations GR VII.A.2
- <sup>70</sup> January 15, 1965 Minutes, Board of Trustees
- <sup>71</sup> Faculty Council Minutes January 27, 1964
- <sup>72</sup> The President exercised his position as Chair of the University Senate (as per Board of Trustees Governing Regulations May 1970, Section III)
- <sup>73</sup> In his capacity as Chair of the Senate, President Singletary sought the assistance of the "University Senate Advisory Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure," which consisted of the Chairpersons of the various Academic Area Advisory Committees of the University Senate. Source: October 7, 1970 letter from Senate Council Chair William Plucknett to President Otis Singletary
- <sup>74</sup> The committee was chaired by William Garrigus. Source: January 27, 1968 letter from President Otis Singletary to William Garrigus
- <sup>75</sup> "Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Termination of Faculty," March 31, 1971 [Univ. Senate Adv. Comm. on Appt., Promotion and Tenure Mar. 31, 1971](#)
- <sup>76</sup> Minutes, June 1, 1971, University Senate Council
- <sup>77</sup> [First Issuance of AR II-1.0-1 on March 1, 1972](#)

(c) Davy Jones, April 13, 2005 Acknowledgements: The author wishes to express his great appreciation to Frank Stanger, University Archives; Rebecca Scott, University Senate Council Administrative Coordinator, for facilitating this author's access to documents containing historical information utilized in preparing this writing.