East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

5-4-1987

1987 May 4 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes

Part of the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University, "1987 May 4 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (1987). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 328. https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/328

This Agendas and Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Agendas and Minutes at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.



East Tennessee State University Box 23534A • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

May 4, 1987

Forum Room, Culp Center, 3:30 p.m.

- VI. CALL TO ORDER
- VII. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES
- III. TREASURER'S REPORT ANNOUNCEMENTS
 - IV. ETSU TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY UPDATE
 - V. COMMITTEE Academic Affairs - Dr. Lucero Concerns and Grievances - Dr. LeCroy Exit Interview - Dr. Hougland Senate Elections - Mr. Verhegge Senate Executive Committee meeting with Dr. Beller and Dr. Alfonso
 - VI. MEETING REPORTS THEC - April 24, 1987 University Council - April 28, 1987
- VII. ADJOURNMENT



East Tennessee State University Box 23534A • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 1987 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:38 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the April 20, 1987, meeting were approved by voice vote.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next meeting of F.S. will be June 8, 1987. The first meeting of the fall semester will be August 31. Dr. Fisher suggested that departments needing to elect new representatives should take action before August 31.

Dr. Fisher announced that the state legislature had passed a bill allowing payroll deduction for AAUP dues.

Fisher reported that through a contact made at the SBR conference in Nashville he had learned that ETSU'S SACS reaccreditation is due for 1988. A question about this will be added to the agenda of the Executive Committee meeting with Drs. Beller and Alfonso on May 11.

Radio Shack is now offering reductions in cost of computer equipment, in addition to those arrangements with IBM and SBR.

On the agenda for the Executive Committee meeting, May 11 are library funding, faculty handbook, sick leave bank trustee appointments, general education program study, retiree I.D. cards, graduate faculty membership, SBR conference report, public availability of university items, 1987-88 salary guides.

Dr. Fisher called attention to a list of Sub-Committees of the House Education Committee and the Senate Education Committee (see Hand-out #1).

Hand-out #2 includes tables comparing salaries of ETSU and other SBR and UT system schools, a list of SGA senators and officers for 1987-88, a photocopy of the part of the March 1987 Administrative Action dealing with faculty evaluation and employee handbooks, and a comparison of ETSU with other Faculty Senate Minutes May 4, 1987

Tennessee colleges and universities regarding release time.

Hand-out #3 includes the agenda of the April 24 THEC meeting, a list of Centers of Excellence (FY 1988), a "Comparison of Recommendations of the Commission and the Governor's Operating and Capital Appropriations 1987-88" with tables, a "Summary of Major Goals and Strategies" of THEC and ETSU Proposed Funding for 1987-88 (including comments from the President's Council meeting).

David Close asked how much money was to be allocated for equipment. Dr. Fisher stated that details were not known and therefore not included on the hand-out.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Concerns and Grievances - Anne LeCroy reported that recommendations on the Morgan case had been made. Copies of the committee's report will be made and distributed for a vote at the June 8 Faculty Senate meeting.

Exit Interviews - Margaret Hougland said that this committee's report is not final. There was a return rate of less than 10% of questionnaires sent out. There had been one request for an interview.

Senate Elections - Richard Verhegge called attention to hand-out #4, a listing of the number of faculty representation by school/college/unit and a list of senators whose terms expire in 1987. The by-laws state that there should be three senators from each school/college plus one per each 25 faculty members; the Library has one representative. Dr. Fisher asked whether we should have representatives from Developmental Studies. Verhegge said that this possibility was not considered. Fisher will explore this idea.

Dr. Fisher asked if there were other suggested agenda items for the Executive Committee meeting, May 11. Dr. John Taylor suggested an update on the searches for deans. Verhegge suggested a discussion on the procedure for tenuring of deans.

Dr. Fisher announced that a director of the Bookstore had been chosen.

ETSU PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY UPDATE

The Tenure Policy is completed and on its way to the SBR.

Faculty Senate Minutes May 4, 1987

> The Executive committee has reviewed the Promotion policy up to the Criteria section. (The Committee will be meeting May 8 to complete the review.)

MEETING REPORTS

The agenda for the THEC Meeting can be seen on hand-out #3. No further comments were made.

University Council met April 28. Dr. Skalko presented a proposal for a Division of Health Sciences. This proposal will be an agenda item for the June 8 Faculty Senate meeting. (Copies will be sent out.)

Dr. Taylor added that the functions of the University Council and the Strategic Planning Task Force had been combined.

Dr. Fisher announced that the closing of Greenwood Drive for most of the summer will probably cause significant traffic problems for Boundary Road; everyone should be aware of the situation.

Betsy Williams suggested that the Senate send a congratulatory note to the students of University High who participated in the Academic Decathlon. They placed tenth in the nation. The motion was made by Anne LeCroy, seconded by Mark Airhart and carried by voice vote.

-3-

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

avil B. Marris

Carol B. Norris Secretary

CBN/kja

Faculty Senate Meeting May 4, 1987 Attendance Record

Senators Present

Anne LeCroy Creg Bishop F. Steb Hipple Paul Walwick Paul Monaco Margaret Hougland Mitch Robinson Carol Pullen Richard Verhegge Mark Airhart Linda Kerley Betty Edwards Katherine Dibble John Taylor Gordon Ludolf Betsy Williams Jim Pleasant Karen Renzaglia David Close Gwen Thomas David Chi Glenda DeJarnette Carol Norris William Fisher

Senators Absent

Peggy Cantrell Carole Connolly Don Ferguson James Fields Pat Flaherty Lester Hartsell Don Jones Ruth Ketron (excused) Al Lucero Joseph Mattson Etta Saltos Bob Samuels John Stone Bob Stout Frederick Waage Eduardo Zayas-Bazan

Guests

Wilsie Bishop

CAROL NORRIS UNIVERSITY LIBRARY P.O. BOX 22450A CAMPUS MAIL JUN 3 - 1987



East Tennessee State University Box 23534A • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

Below is a list of Sub-Committees of the <u>House Education Committee</u> and the members of those Sub-Committees. If you have a question concerning your assignment, please let me know. In addition to the members listed, the House Education Committee Chairman is a voting member of all Sub-Committees.

K-12 Sub-Committee

Whitson, Chairman Hobbs, Vice-Chairman Bell Good Herron Peroulas Robinson Starnes Winningham Higher Ed Sub-Committee

Bivens, Chairman Turner, Vice-Chairman Bell Henry Jones Odom Starnes Tankersley Whitson Winningham

Below is a list of Subcommittees of the Senate Education Committee and the members of those Subcommittees.

K-12

Anna Belle O'Brien, Chair Ben Atchley Leonard Dunavant John Rucker J. B. Shockley

Higher Education

Carl Moore, Chair Tommy Burks Curtis Person J. B. Shockley Avon Williams

EXPLANATION OF STATISTICAL DATA

Instructional Faculty. The instructional staff faculty is defined as those members of the instructional/research staff who are employed on a full-time basis and whose major regular assignment is instruction, including those with released time for research. Institutions are asked to exclude (1) instructional faculty who are employed to teach less than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two four-month sessions, (2) instructional faculty in preclinical and clinical medicine, (3) instructional faculty who are employed on a part-time basis, (4) administrative officers with titles such as dean of students, librarian, registrar, coach, etc., even though they may devote part of their time to classroom instruction and may have faculty status, and (5) undergraduate or graduate students who assist in the instruction of courses, but have titles such as teaching assistant, teaching fellow, etc.

Salary. This figure represents the contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other form of remuneration. Where faculty members are given duties for eleven or twelve months, salaries are converted to a standard academic-year basis by applying a factor of 9/11 or 81.8 percent or by the official factor used in a publicly announced formula which is reflected in a footnote in the Appendix Tables of this report.

Fringe Benefits. In general, the major benefits include those where the institution (or state) makes a definitive payment of a specified amount on behalf of and for the benefit of the individual faculty member. The major benefits include the institution's (or state's) contribution for: (1) Social Security (for consistency, the previously announced rate of 7.15 percent of the first \$42,000 of salary has been used in calculating these payments, (2) retirement contributions (the employer's contributions are included regardless of the plan's vesting provision), (3) medical insurance, (4) life insurance, (5) dental insurance, (6) disability income protection, (7) unemployment compensation, (8) worker's compensation, (9) tuition for faculty children (both waivers and remissions are included), (10) other benefits in kind with cash alternatives (for the majority, these include benefits such as moving expenses, housing, bonuses, etc.). Since the objective of the study is the measurement of income available for personal consumption, as distinct from professional purposes, benefits of a professional nature (such as convention travel, membership fees, grading assistance, faculty clubs, etc.) are not included.

Compensation. Compensation represents salary plus the institution's (or state's) contribution to major fringe benefits.

Rating of Average Salary and Average Compensation. The rating is based on the actual distribution of average salaries and/or average compensations for comparable institutions. For definition of comparable institution, see definition of categories and the explanation of ratings in Column (2) below.

Definition of Categories. The definition of categories given here is that instituted by the National Center for Education Statistics and adopted by AAUP in 1983-84. The roman numerals are used for the purpose of this report with the NCES identification given in parentheses. It should be noted that category IIC (Specialized Institutions) which was used in previous reports has been dropped. Institutions formerly classified as "IIC" are now included in other categories (depending on the level of program offerings and the number of degrees awarded). In previous years, data on earned degrees were obtained from NCES. Because these data have not been available in a timely mannner, starting with this survey we ask institutions to assign their own category based on the most recent information available.

Category I (Doctoral-Level Institutions). These are institutions characterized by a significant level and breadth of activity in and commitment to doctoral-level education as measured by the number of doctorate recipients and the diversity in doctoral-level program offerings. Included in this category are those institutions which grant a minimum of thirty doctoral-level degrees. These degrees must be granted in three or more doctoral-level programs.

Category IIA (Comprehensive Institutions). These institutions are characterized by diverse post-baccalaureate programs (including first-professional), but do not engage in significant doctoral-level education. Specifically, this category includes institutions not considered specialized schools in which a number of doctoral-level degrees granted is fewer than thirty or in which fewer than three doctoral-level programs are offered. In addition, these institutions must grant a minimum of thirty post-baccalaureate degrees and either grant degrees in three or more post-baccalaureate programs or, alternatively, have an interdisciplinary program at the post-baccalaureate level.

Category IIB (General Baccalaureate Institutions). These institutions are characterized by their primary emphasis on general undergraduate baccalaureate-level education. They are not significantly engaged in post-baccalaureate education. Included are institutions which are not considered as specialized and in which the number of post-baccalaureate degrees granted is fewer than thirty or in which fewer than three postbaccalaureate-level programs are offered and which either (a) grant baccalaureate degrees in three or more program areas, or (b) offer a baccalaureate program in interdisciplinary studies.

Category III (Two-year Institutions with Academic Ranks). These are institutions that confer at least 75 percent of their degrees and awards for work below bachelor's degree.

Category IV. The definition is the same as that of Category III but these two-year colleges do not use the standard academic ranks. These institutions are listed in Appendix II of this report.

Definition of data presented in Appendixes I and II:

Col. (1) *Institution's category*—The definition of categories is given above.

Col. (2) *Ratings of Average Salary*—Each rating represents the percentile interval in which the institution's average salary in a given rank lies ($1^* = 95$ th percentile or above, 1 = 80th percentile to 94.9%; 2 = 60th percentile to 79.9%, etc.). An average salary lower than the 20th percentile is rated 5. The

ratings have been assigned using the actual average salary which is then rounded to the nearest hundred for publication in Col. (3).

Col. (3) Average Salary by Rank and for All Ranks Combined— This figure represents the average contracted salary (adjusted to a standard academic-year basis, when necessary) excluding summer teaching, extra load, etc., which has been rounded to the nearest hundred dollars; an entry of 33.3 would stand for an average salary between 33,250 and 33,349. The All Ranks (AR) figure includes the rank of lecturer and the category No Rank which are not displayed here.

Col. (4) Rating of Average Compensation—Same definition as that given for Col. (2) above, but for compensation which is salary plus fringe benefits.

Col. (5) Average Compensation by Rank and for All Ranks Combined—This figure represents the average salary plus average fringe benefits and, as for average salary, the figure has been rounded to the nearest hundred dollars.

Col. (6) *Benefits as a Percentage of Average Salary*—This percentage which has been rounded to the nearest unit represents the overall percentage of fringe benefits as a percentage of average salary for all ranks combined.

Col. (7) *Percentage of Tenured Faculty*—This percentage is that of tenured faculty in a given rank.

Col. (8) Percentage Increase in Salary for Continuing Faculty— The percentage increase in salary is that for continuing faculty or faculty members remaining on staff in 1986–87. This figure represents an increase in salary for *individuals* as opposed to a change in salary levels for a given rank from 1985–86 to 1986–87. For the purpose of reporting this information, the institution is asked to provide the data by rank but using, in a case of promotion, the rank held in 1985–86. Therefore, the increase shown is that of individuals in a given rank during academic year 1985–86. This figure reflects both across-the-board and promotion increments.

Col. (9) Number of Full-time Faculty Members by Rank and by *Gender*—This number represents the total number of full-time faculty in a given rank.

Col. (10) Average Salary by Rank and by Gender—These figures, like those in Col. (3), have been rounded to the nearest hundred dollars. The average is not shown and is replaced by dashes when the number of individuals in a given rank and/or gender is five or fewer. This policy has been adopted to protect the confidentiality of individual salaries.

Cautionary Notes

With the exception of the number of faculty members shown in Col. (10), data are not given when the number of individuals in a given rank and/or gender is five or fewer. This policy was adopted to protect the confidentiality of individual salaries and because an average with so few individuals could be misleading when used for comparison purposes. In such cases, dashes appear in the affected columns.

The data presented in this report were gathered by Maryse Eymonerie Associates which conducted a survey including 2,670 colleges and universities. Institutions that do not employ full-time faculty or have only faculty members who donate their time or had fewer then five full-time faculty members in 1985-86 were not included. The questionnaire used by Maryse Eymonerie Associates is Form MEA 22.

Average Salary and Average Compensation are likely to be affected by a number of peripheral influences. For example, an institution may use a high proportion of part-time graduate assistants whose compensations are not included in the average figures for full-time faculty. Figures for these institutions, therefore, overstate the typical remuneration of those who carry the teaching burden. Average figures for small institutions may also be influenced by the fact that in a given year a relatively large number of their higher paid faculty may be on leave without pay or may have retired. In addition, actual improvements in the economic well-being of the faculty may be concealed in any given year by promotions, which can exercise a double-edged effect upon the average reported in both the higher and lower ranks. Unfortunately, we have found no feasible way to make appropriate adjustments for these occurrences and can only caution the reader to keep these points in mind.

APPENDIX I	N O	(1)		(2)			(3)				(4)			(5)			
	T	INST		ATIN				SALARI		RANK			NG OF	AV			PBYR		
	Е				SALARY		-	HOUSAN	-				E CONP.		(IN		SANDS)		
NAME OF INSTITUTION	S	GORY	PR	AO A	I IN	PR	A0	AI	IN	AR	PR	A 0	AI IN	PR	80	AI	IN	AR	
TENNESSEE																			
Austin Peay State University	1	114		-	5			23.0			4		55	45.6	34.	7 29.	1 22.9	36.3	
Belmont College		118	-		2			23.2			3		32	37.2	30.	3 27.	5 24.7	7 31.2	
Bethel College		118		55				19.4				-	5	•-••	23.	7 22.	9	· 24.3	
Bryan College		118		55		••••	21.1	19.0	••••	20.1		5	5	••••	24.	5 22.	2	· 23.6	
Carson-Newman College	6	118	4	43		30.2	24.8	23.0		25.7		4		36.2	30.	3 27.	1 ••••	- 30.8	
Chattanooga St.Tech.Comm.Col		111	-	21		34.8	31.0	28.8	22.4	27.4		-	12	44.7	39.	9 37.	2 29.3	2 35.4	
Christian Brothers College	1	IIB	3	42		34.0	25.9	24.4		27.8	3	-		41.2	2 32.	3 29.	4	34.0	
Cleveland State Comm. Coll.		111	4	44		30.2	26.5	5 23.6		26.3	4	3	3	38.6	5 35.	3 31.	.6	34.8	
Columbia State Comm. College		111		22	3	••••	30.7	27.6	22.0	26.5		2	12	••••	40.	3 36.	3 29.	0 34.9	
David Lipscomb College	_	118	3	3 3	3	32.0	26.9	23.1	19.5	26.1	3	3	3 4	38.4	32.	4 28	0 22.	3 31.2	
Dyersburg State Comm. Coll.		111	5	4 4	4	28.8	26.1	22.6	20.6	5 24.6	4	4	4 3	38.2	2 34.	8 30	2 27.	7 32.9	
East Tennessee State Univ.		114	3	33	4	38.8	32.6	5 26.9	21.1	30.5	3	3	33	46.9	7 39.	6 32	8 25.	8 37.0	
Freed-Hardeman College		118	3	33	5	31.8	27.3	3 23.1	17.0	24.9	3	3	35	37.7	7 31.	9 26	.8 19.	5 29.0	
Kiwassee College		111	5	55	5	19.0	18.2	2 16.6	15.6	5 17.5	5	5	55	23.2	2 21.	1 19	.9 17.	9 20.7	
Jackson State Comm. College		111	4	4 4	4	30.1	27.2	24.0	20.0	24.8	4	3	33	39.4	4 35.	7 31	7 26.	5 32.7	
Lambuth College		118	5	4 4		24.5	23.7	21.2		22.9	5	4	4	31.3	5 29.	7 25	.5	28.1	
Lane College		118	5	5 5	5	21.2	2 18.8	3 17.9	16.	18.4	5	5	55	23.4	4 21.	1 20	.0 18.	0 20.5	
Lee College		IIB	4	4 4	4	27.8	3 23.3	3 20.4	17.9	22.2	4	4	44	33.4	4 27.	9 24	.1 20.	5 26.4	
Maryville College		IIB	5	5 4	5	27.0) 22.(5 20.8	16.9	22.3	5	5	45	31.8	3 27.	4 24	6 19.	2 26.5	
Hiddle Tenn. State Univ.		114	2	2 3	3	41.5	5 34 .5	5 27.4	21.	5 33.4	2	1	22	54.3	3 45.	5 35	.4 27.	7 44.4	
Rhodes College		IIB	1	2 3	5	40.0	31.7	3 23.9)	30.8	1	1	3	51.0	5 40.	9 27	.8	- 38.9	
Roane State Community Coll.		111	3	4 4	5	32.0	5 27.2	2 22.8	18.	2 23.9	3	3	4 4	42.7	7 35.	8 30	.2 24.	3 31.6	
State Tech. Inst. at Memphis		111	4	4 4	3	32.2	2 26.8	8 23.4	20.8	3 25.6	3	3	33	42.5	5 35.	2 30	.7 26.	8 33.5	
Tennessee Technological Univ	1		2	2 2	4	40.8	3 33.0	0 27.5	20.	8 33.1	2	2	23	52.7	7 42.	6 35	.1 26.	5 42.6	
Tusculum College		118		5						18.8	5		5					- 22.1	
Union University		IIB		4 4						9 23.1	4	4	4 4					2 27.4	
University of the South			2							• 34.6	-	3						- 44.5	
Univ.of Tennessee-Knoxville		1		4 4						2 37.3	3	4	4 4					7 46.6	
Univ.of Tennessee-Chattanga.		-	3	-						2 31.9	3	3	3 4					7 39.7	
Univ.of Tennessee-Martin		3 IIB								5 31.9			1 2					0 40.4	
Univ.of Tennessee-Inst.Agri.	_	_	2	_						8 37.8	_	_	1 4			_	_	0 47.2	
Vanderbilt University		1	-		5 1*					4 41.5	2		2 1					1 51.1	
Volunteer State Comm.College		-	4		4 4					4 26.1	-	4	4 4					8 35.1	
volunteer State Comm.College		111	4	4 1	• 4	51.4	* 20.	1 22.5	y 19.	4 20.1	2	4	4 4	40.0	5 34.	.7 ZY	.0 23.	0 37.1	

.

		(6)	G	7)		(8)				(9)					(10)										
		BEN.AS	PERCENT						EASE IN Ng Fac)		MBER ME		FULL		e fa Wohe		Y	A\		E SAL Men	ARY BY	RANK	AND B	Y SEX Men	K
		SALARY	PR AO	AI	IN	PR	AO	AI	IN	PR	AO	AI	IN	PR	AO	AI	IN	PR	AO	AI	IN	PR	AO	AI	IN
TENNESSEE	<u>.</u>																								
Austin Peay State University	1	28.	96.76	51.		5.7	6.7	7.4	6.7	64	37	34	4	9	13	27	8	35.3	28.2	24.0	••••	33.2	25.3	21.8	••••
Belmont College	•	17.	83. 61.	11.		4.4	4.9	[•] 5.9	4.5	29	18	15	4	6	13	21	3	31.8	26.1	24.3	••••	30.6	25.3	22.5	
Bethel College		17.	ALI	. 17.			·0.0		••••	4	8	2	1	1		4		••••	••••	••••					
Bryan College		17.	50.	44.			0.0	0.0		4	10	11		1		5	1	••••	••••	••••					
Carson-Newman College	6	20.	93.86	38.		4.7	5.5	5.6		28	18	19	1	2	11	15	1	••••	25.2	23.8		••••	24.1	22.0	
Chattanooga St.Tech.Comm.Col		29.	ALL ALL	67.	8.					8	26	17	26	1	14	13	25		31.0	28.6	22.1		31.0	29.1	22.8
Christian Brothers College	1	22.	96.66	42.						23	27	17		1	8	7		••••	26.5	24.3		••••	23.6	24.7	
Cleveland State Comm. Coll.		32.	ALL ALI	. ALL		11.7	5.8	5.6		10	23	8		2	13	12		••••	26.8	23.3		••••	26.1	23.9	
Columbia State Comm. College		31.	ALI	. 71.	12.	••••	6.9	7.1	8.4	3	5	10	11	2	8	7	14	••••	••••	28.4	23.3	••••		26.3	21.0
David Lipscomb College		. 19.	91. 50.	13.		5.9	6.6	6.8	7.1	33	19	21	15	. 1	1	3	7	••••			19.5	••••	••••		19.6
Dyersburg State Comm. Coll.		34.	88. 69	20.						6	5	3	2	2	8	7	6	••••	••••			••••		• • • •	
East Tennessee State Univ.		21.	94.82	. 43.	27.	7.1	7.6	8.0	8.1	99	97	66	32	12	21	60	45	39.0	32.8	27.7	22.3	37.6	31.6	26.0	20.3
Freed-Hardeman College		17.	ALL 94	. 52.		2.3	2.4	2.8	2.4	11	13	21	4		4	6	5	••••	••••	23.3	• •			22.6	••••
Hiwassee College		18.	71.44	. 17.			••••			6	4	1	5	1	5	5	1	••••	••••	••••	÷				
Jackson State Comm. College		32.	ALL 90	. 65.	5.		5.8	6.1	6.4	5	20	9	11	1	11	8	8		27.9	25.2	20.6	••••	25.8 2	22.7	19.1
Lambuth College		23.	93.75	. 33.		6.3	6.3	7.3		13	6	9		1	2	12		••••	••••	24.2		••••	1	19.0	
Lane College		11.	50.90	. 43.	36.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6	10	4	4	2		3	7	••••	••••	••••	••••		3		
Lee College		19.	ALL 74	. 64.	8.	0.0	4.1	2.2	6.0	11	12	14	8	2	7	8	4	••••	24.4	20.3		••••	21.5	20.5	
Maryville College		18.	91.79	. 18.			9.3			9	9	4	2	2	5	7	5	••••	••••	••••	••••				
Middle Tenn. State Univ.		33.	96.76	. 36.	3.	5.4	5.6	5.5	7.5	155	70	66	23	15	19	52	42	41.7	35.0	28.6	22.7	40.2	32.8	26.0	20.8
Rhodes College		26.	96.83	. 3.		9.5	5.3	9.3		• 27	25	17	2		4	13	3			24.6			;	22.9	
Roane State Community Coll.		32.	ALL AL	ALL		5.8	6.5	5.8	5.8	4	25	13	7	4	12	13	21		27.6	23.0	18.1	••••	26.2 2	22.6	18.2
State Tech. Inst. at Hemphis		31.	ALL 83	. 50.		5.5	5.1	5.8	5.9	20	29	21	21	9	12	9	16	32.4	27.1	23.9	21.3	31.6	26.1	22.2	20.2
Tennessee Technological Univ	1	29.	98.86	. 46.	6.	5.7	8.2	6.0	5.7	125	69	73	10	8	9	34	23	41.0	33.3	28.0	21.9	37.3	31.1	26.3	20.3
Tusculum College		17.	83.	18.		11.4	••••	8.7		5	2	8	2	1	3	3	1		••••	••••		•••••			
Union University		18.	86.39	. 6.		4.5	5.3	5.5	5.7	13	13	16	4	1	5	17	10		••••	22.1	••••		;	21.3	
University of the South	ĩ	29.	96.63	. 11.		7.6	6.4	6.4	••••	48	18	13	2	2	1	6	2	••••	••••	25.9	••••	••••	2	24.6	••••
Univ.of Tennessee-Knoxville		25.	97.84	. 18.	5.	7.5	7.3	7.7	15.3	472	276	133	27	39	73	90	30	46.0	33.8	30.1	21.7	40.6	31.4 2	27.7	20.9
Univ.of Tennessee-Chattanga.		24.	99.7 0	. 11.		7.3	9.3	8.3	8.1	71	63	41	5	6	21	31	9	38.9	32.4	28.2	••••	34.9	30.1 2	26.1	••••
Univ.of Tennessee-Martin	3	27.	ALL 86	. 46.	_	6.7	8.6	7.3	27.1	86		25		10	18	14	6	35.7	31.0	27.9		35.4	29.3	24.3	
Univ.of Tennessee-Inst.Agri.		25.	91.84				7.8			75	60	28	5	3	3	6	1	••••	••••	31.1	••••			28.9	
Vanderbilt University		23.	97.83				9.4			229			9	11	36	47	2						36.5		
Volunteer State Comm.College		35.	ALL 95	. 67.		4.0	4.7	4.8	9.6	12	25	2	8	4	17	10	3	••••	26.5	••••	••••	••••	27.0 ·	• • • •	••••

*

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: • Members of Academic Council, Departmental Chairs

FROM: • Dorman G. Stout

SUBJECT: • SGA Inauguration

DATE: • April 17, 1987

The SGA Inauguration of officers for 1987-88 will take place at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 20 in the Ampitheater (Tennessee Room of upper level Culp Center if weather is inclement). You are cordially invited and urged to attend or send a representative. The ceremony and brief visiting time afterwards will last approximately 15 minutes.

Listed below are the names of the Executive Officers and Senators. Whether your area is represented by the academic majors listed or not, your support will be appreciated. Please join us for this important occasion and take the opportunity to meet some of the student leaders for next year.

1987-88 SGA Executive Officers

President	Richard Munsey	Management
Vice President	Jason Eagle	Political Science
Secretary/Treasurer	Howard Tedrick	Pre Medical



T.G. Ailstock	Political Science	Richard Rinehart	Computer Science
Lanny Bise	Criminal Justice	Laura Rippetoe	Marketing
Greg Brink	Undecided	Kris Shelley	Engineering
Scott Bullington	Management	Jeanie Sompayrac	Health Educ.
Sherry Davenport	Political Science	Donna Stephenson	Mass Comm.
Patra Dotson	Marketing	Kristie Underwood	Accounting
Abby Eblen	Biology	Paige Williams	Undecided
Tammy Faulkner	Marketing	Amy Worthington	Special Educ.
Ginger Fountain	Mass Comm.	John Young	Spanish
Melanie Hammond	Dental Hygiene		
Lisa Hickman	Elem. Educ.		
Kristy Huffman	Art		
Michael Johnson	Bus. Education		
Jennifer Kidd	Computer Science		
Randy King	Art		
Angie Lamb	Elem. Education		
Wayne Martin	Engineering & Technology		
Scott McCarter	Management		
Dean Michael	Real Estate		
Sarah Morton	Elem. Educ.		
John Osborne	Mass Communications		
Jeff Otten	Pre Business		
Albert Priselac	Philosophy		



DGS/sm

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: •	Charles H. Johnson
FROM: •	David L. Kite, University Comptroller
SUBJECT: •	Federal Withholding Tax on Summer Salary
DATE: •	March 18, 1987

In response to your letter of March 16, IRS Code Section 3402 regarding federal withholding tax has not changed; therefore, the university's procedure of deducting 20% from summer pay has not changed. Since there are no changes, I do not see a need in notifying the faculty.

DLK:db

cc: LDT. William Fisher, President Faculty Senate A Newsletter Dedicated to the Improvement of Instruction in American and Canadian Schools and Colleges



FOR: Superintendents, College Presidents, Principals, Boards of Education, Deans & Vice Presidents of Instruction, College Trustees, Division & Department Chairpersons, Quality Faculty.

VOLUME 1, EDITION 4

ISSN: 0892-0923

MARCH 1987

EDITOR'S CORNER

Board Policies in Evaluation Build "Team" Work

A aculty are and should be well protected from the whims and prejudices of poor administrators and board members. On the other hand, good board policies and procedures in the hiring, evaluation, remediation, and firing of faculty and other staff can make or break the integrity and quality of the educational institution.



There are several key ingredients that must be present to assist in the effective recruitment, retention, or dismissal of personnel. They are: (1) a strong governing board, (2) a strong superintendent or college president and key staff people, (3) mutual support and understanding, and (4) clearly defined personnel policies and procedures.

The lack of any one of these four key ingredients will spell doom—resulting in chaotic attempts to establish a well-conceived and effectively managed personnel system.

The establishment of well-defined and understood board policies will provide the basis for administrators to properly supervise, monitor, evaluate, and make personnel recommendations that will require board support at various times.

In short, when governing board members and their administrators agree upon and work together on personnel policies, quality control has an excellent chance to be maintained by a school or college. A "team" approach should evolve that will make a much more pleasant experience when retention, tenure and merit decisions come forward from administrators.

Such a cooperative relationship should also create a clearer atmosphere for what must be accomplished when administrators come forward with the hard decisions of non-renewal of a contract, a notice to remedy, or a decision to fire a tenured faculty member.

Hans A. Andrews Editor

AVOIDING NEPOTISM, PATRONAGE, and POLITICALLY MOTIVATED PERSONNEL DECISIONS

Prestige for board members will come from good policies, properly administered. Students' success in colleges, in jobs, and in improvements in community relations give personnel management meaning. The outcomes of a successful personnel management system will more than outweigh *all* other decisions and votes cast by any board members.

Boards must know the law and avoid arbitrary and capricious action in making personnel decisions. They must provide hiring, evaluation, promotion, and dismissal policies and procedures that remove any and all doubt about politically motivated appointments, nepotism, and patronage taking precedence over open search appointments.

Boards' Non-Delegatable Power2Governors' Task Forces Around the Country3Faculty EvaluationIf Done WellDiscrimination or Valid Evaluation?5

Source: Jasiek, C.R.; Wisgoski, A., & Andrews, H.A. (1985) "The Trustee Role in College Personnel Management," *Active Trustceship for a Changing Era.* G. F. Petty (Ed.). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 51, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 87-97.

IN THIS ISSUE

Administrative Action

Page 4

SAMPLE BOARD POLICIES

Board policies provide the guidance necessary to the administration of a school district to carry out their roles in a meaningful and legal manner.

The following are sample policies relative to faculty evaluation:

BOARD POLICY—Evaluation of Faculty, Assistants to Instruction, and Counselors: Tenured, Non-Tenured, and Part-Time

It is the policy of the governing board that all faculty of this school district shall be evaluated by their supervisors in order to assure that quality in instruction and other professional conduct is maintained.

BOARD POLICY-Decision Not to Rehire Non-Tenured, Full-Time and Instructional Support Personnel

A decision to not rehire (dismiss) a non-tenured faculty member for the ensuing school year or term will be made by the Board of Education reviewing the Superintendent's recommendation.

These policies provide the framework from which the administration can work. Surely, the quality of administrators, their sincere intent to carry out board policies, and well-developed procedures all will be key factors affecting how well such board policies are carried out.

FACULTY EVALUATION ...

IF DONE WELL

According to Duke and Stiggins in a recent publication, ". . . teacher evaluation can lead to improved performance, personal growth, and professional esteem. Done poorly, it can produce anxiety or ennui and drive talented teachers from the profession."

Some 30 teachers who had experienced positive growth partly attributed to an effective evaluation system were studied in the publication *Teacher Evaluation: Five Keys to Growth.* Some of the major elements identified in the successful teacher evaluations were as follows:

- □ There is systemwide commitment to the evaluation process by the school board, administrators and teachers.
- Development of evaluation systems occurs in a context where administrators and teachers are full partners in the design and monitoring of the evaluation process.
- Necessary resources—staff, materials, funds, training—are available.
- □ There is a clear sense of the goal or purpose for the evaluation process.

- □ Carefully planned and delivered feedback procedures, rich in specific suggestions for change by the individual teacher, are in place.
- □ Recommended and required evaluation procedures are carried out to the letter.
- □ Teacher evaluation is based on the individual teacher's competence, personal expectations, openness to suggestions, orientation to change, subject knowledge and experience.
- Persons responsible for teacher evaluation should have credibility, patience, trust and a good supervisory track record as well as the ability to persuade those being evaluated of the need to change.
- Regular evaluation of existing evaluation procedures, improvement of the teacher evaluation environment and upgrading of the skills of those persons responsible for teacher evaluation occur on an ongoing basis.

There were more "keys" presented in this study. The publication was a joint effort of the American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary Principals, and the National Education Association.

"HIRED" OR "PROMISE OF HIRE"

It has been pointed out by Thomas (1985) that yearly disappointed "prospective employees" sue school boards because they feel a promise to hire them has been broken. Thomas explains "unless the board has taken *duly recorded official action* (emphasis added) to sign or authorize a teacher's employment contract, the district has not entered into a contract, no matter what school administrators may have promised."

There are, however, avenues of relief for such prospective employees:

Even when there is no valid contract between the parties, a court can apply the legal doctrine of detrimental reliance to find that a prospective employee was unjustly harmed and is entitled to damages. This doctrine, also known as promissory estoppel, may be invoked in the following situation: a promise, apparently made in good faith, causes a person to alter his position to his detriment in the reasonable belief that the promise would be performed. Before this doctrine is applied, a trial court must find: (1) the detriment suffered in reliance must be substantial in an economic sense; (2) the loss to the prospective employee must have been foreseeable to the promisor; and (3) the prospective employee must have acted reasonably in justifiable reliance on the promise as made. (Thomas, pp. 63-64)

Source: Thomas, S.B. (1985). The Yearbook of School Law.

March 1987

Decisions Worth Knowing

EMPLOYEE HANDBOOKS

Employee handbooks have taken on a new significance with a recent ruling by the Illinois Supreme Court. The ruling "makes it clear that the content of an employee handbook must be considered a part of the contractual relationship between employer and employee.

If, for example, your handbook for classified staff promises that no employee will be fired without good cause or without a fair hearing, the school board can be held liable if an employee is fired without being given good reason or without a hearing.

In Duldulao v. Saint Mary of Nazareth Hospital Center, the court held that ". . . an employee handbook or other policy statement creates enforceable contractual rights if the traditional requirements for contract formation are present. The requirements for contract formation include offer, acceptance, and consideration." The court went on to say "The language of the policy statement must contain a promise clear enough that an employee would reasonably believe that an offer has been made."

Source: IASB School Board Newsbulletin, No. 419, Feb. 23, 1987, Springfield, IL.

DISCRIMINATION OR VALID EVALUATION?

A Pennsylvania case involved denial of promotion to full professor based upon evaluations that found the person having an accent that affected his teaching effectiveness. Was this discrimination?

In Hou v. Pennsylvania Department of Education, 573 F. Supp. 1539 (W. D. Pa. 1983), a faculty member alleged discrimination in the denial of his promotion to full professor. The district court found that the denial was based on valid, educationally sound reasons. As a person of Chinese origin, the plaintiff did have a distinct accent and manner of speech which could affect communication skills. Since communication skills are important to good teaching, evaluations which mentioned the plaintiff's accent as a factor affecting teaching were not discriminatory.

MATTERS OF FREE SPEECH

In Landrum v. Eastern Ky. Univ., 578 F. Supp. 241 (E. D. Ky. 1984), a faculty member alleged he had been denied tenure because of his speech in violation of the first amendment, but the court found in favor of the school:

The plaintiff had made a number of critical statements to various groups about the dean and the vice president. His department chairman stated that the plaintiff would tend to withdraw support from endeavors if a decision was made with which he disagreed. The plaintiff alleged that these pronouncements were within the purview of free speech and could not be used as the reason to deny tenure. The district court ruled that when an employee speaks out, not on matters of public concern but rather on matters of personal interest as an employee, his pronouncements are outside the scope of the first amendment. The court stated that, "(t)he first amendment does not require a public office to be run as a roundtable for employee complaints over internal office affairs." Plaintiff's speech in this case was characterized by the court as that of "individual disputes and grievances." (Thomas, p. 309.)

BOARD CONFLICT OF INTEREST

School boards have been supported in taking direct action to deal with conflict of interest. In Wohl v. Ambach, 482 N. Y. S. 2d 129 (N. Y. App. Div. 1984), a board member was denied permission to attend a meeting of one of the school district's committees:

A New York school board denied one of its members permission to attend a meeting, as an observer, of the school district's Committee on the Handicapped. A New York appeals court, in upholding the Board's decision, held that a full and open discussion of the committee's business would be chilled, if not prevented, by the board member's presence. It was further concluded that his attendance might unduly influence the deliberations of the committee and affect its final recommendations to the board concerning the future of the district's special education program. (Thomas, p. 225.)

FACULTY INCOMPETENCE

School governing boards and administrators should be aware that incompetence can be established in a faculty member's work in both the classroom and other job responsibilities. This is illustrated by Sutherby v. Gobles Bd. of Educ., 348 N. W. 2d 277 (Mich. Ct. App. 1984):

Professional competence covers more than just classroom behavior and teaching skills. The Court of Appeals of Michigan upheld a tenured teacher's dismissal for incompetence even though his classroom performance had been satisfactory. His failure to comply with reasonable administrative rules and regulations that are required for the effective operation of the school and the school system justified his dismissal for incompetence. (Thomas, p. 115.)

(See "Decisions" on page 6.)

Release Time Awarded Faculty Organization Presidents Public Institutions of Higher Education State of Tennessee

Institution	one class per term	one class per year	one-half time off	none
Austin Peay	x			
Chattanooga	x			
Cleveland		x		
Columbia				x
Dyersburg		x		
East Tn St			x	
Jackson St		x		
Middle Tn			x	
Memphis State	×			
Motlow St		x		
Nashville St Tech	x			
UT Chattanooga	x			
UT Knoxville			x	
Roane State		x		
Shelby State		x		
State Tech Memphis	x			
State Tech Knox	x			
Tenn State	x			
Tenn Tech	x			
Tri Cities St Tech	x			
Vol State				x
Walters State		×		

Prepared by Beverly Griffin 4/87

••

1

• *

CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FY 1988

£.	Original Commission Recommendation for FY 1988 Funds		F Recommendations FY 1987 Carryover
Creative Arts, APSU	463,000	463,000	0
Field Biology, APSU	260,000	179,180	4,000
Appalachian Studies, ETS		267,000	0,
Early Childhood, ETSU Banking, ETSU	110,000 280,000	45,000 0	65,000 ¹ 150,000
Accountancy, MSU	350,000	0	100,000
Applied Psychology, MSU	720,000	720,000	0
Communicative Disorders,	-	348,000	15,000
Earthquake Information, 1	-	832,000	60,000
Egyptology, MSU	125,000	125,000	0
Teacher Education, MSU	500,000	290,000	60,000
Historic Preservation, M	ISU 161,000	161,000	02
Popular Music, MTSU	173,000	17,532	98,800 ²
Recording Arts, MTSU	222,045	162,633	10,720
Basic Skills, TSU	350,000	300,000	30,000 ³
Information Systems, TSU	550,000	190,000	210,000
Manufacturing, TTU	1,500,000	1,454,000	46,000
Water Resources, TTU	1,200,000	1,200,000	04
Electric Power, TTU	1,050,000	900,681	22,000
Teacher Educ. Eval., TTU	250,000	0	115,000
Computer Applications, U	rc 925,000	809,000	51,743
Science Alliance, UTK	4,050,000	3,360,000	560,000
Theatre, UTK	230,000	0	0
Entrepreneurship, UTK	230,000	93,000	10,000
Materials Processing, UT	•	798,000	0
Waste Management, UTK	550,995	448,000	0
Math/Science Teaching, U	IM 175,000	105,000	200,000
Neuroscience, UTMphs	670,000	517,000	0
Molecular Science, UTMph		541,000	0
Pediatric Pharmacokinetic UTMphs	cs, 250,000	192,000	0
Livestock Disease, UTIA	640,000	492,974	
Laser Applications, UTSI	995,000 \$20,200,000	758,000 \$15,766,574	0 \$1,803,263

1
2 includes \$50,000 from ETSU Banking
3 does not include additional committed carryover from FY 1986
4 does not include additional committed carryover from FY 1986
includes \$20,000 from TTU Teacher Education Evaluation

·

COMPARISON OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION AND THE GOVERNOR OPERATING AND CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS 1987-88

PART A: OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS

Table 1 compares 1986-87 higher education appropriations with amounts recommended by the Commission (November 7, 1986) and the Governor for 1987-88.

A. Higher Education Appropriations

The Governor has recommended 1987-88 operating appropriations of \$636,237,000, which represents a 1.2% increase over 1986-87 Legislative recurring and non-recurring appropriations. Major components of the operating appropriations are as follows:

- 1. Instructional and Basic Operating Increases in instructional and basic operating funds provide needed improvements in the scope and quality of higher education by supporting faculty salaries, staffing and instructional materials competitive with peer institutions; college preparatory institutes for underprepared students; enrollment growth where warranted; support of medical and agriculture programs; and full funding of the State Student Grant Program. The amount for Instructional and Basic Operating represents an increase of \$18.3 million over 1986-87 Legislative appropriations for this component.
- 2. <u>Compensation Increase</u> The Governor's Budget includes funds sufficient for a four percent increase in salaries and benefits for all higher education employees. A part of the cost of the salary increase will be from revenue generated from a recommended fee increase of seven percent. The Governor's Budget includes \$13.8 million in state appropriations and \$10.8 million in additional fee revenue for the four percent increase.
- 3. **Desegregation Program** A total of \$5.0 million has been included for activities designed to promote desegregation in both student bodies and faculties. Activities specifically required in the Stipulation of Settlement in Geier and other special efforts are included. Institutions use these funds, together with other available resources, to support desegregation programs.

Included are funds for grants and scholarships and other programs to encourage enrollment and retention of other-race students at all levels and funds for several programs designed to increase the number of other-race faculty and staff. College preparatory programs, full-funding of the formula, and full-funding of the student grant program also advance desegregation.

TABLE 3

· .

نو : در مر:

COMMISSION'S AND GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS CAPITAL OUTLAY 1987-88

		Commission's Recommendation (January 7, 1986)	Governor's Recommendation				
CATE	GORY I: CRITICALLY-NEEDED PROJECTS						
1.	MTSU Asbestos Abatement Business Bldg.	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000				
2.	ETSU Asbestos Abatement Burgin Dossett	1,818,000	1,818,000				
3.	APSU Asbestos Abatement Student Center	125,000	125,000				
CATE	GORY II: TSU PROJECTS						
4.	TSU Campus Improvements	7,440,000	*				
5.	TSU Industrial Arts Renovation	1,675,000	0				
6.	TSU Kean Hall Renovation, Full-Planning	300,000	0				
7.	TSU Student Center Renovation	1,200,000	0				
CATEGORY III: OTHER CAPITAL PROJECTS							
8.	STIK Pellissippi Land Acquisition Supp.	225,000	225,000				
9.	UTIA W. TN Office Bldg. Equip.	200,000	200,000				
10.	ETSU Family Pract. Ctrs. Lease Buy-outs	1,715,000	0				
11.	ETSU Clinical Education Facility	3,000,000	0				
12.	UTK Science Research Center	20,000,000	0				
13.	UTC Physical Plant	5,600,000	0				
14.	UTSI Adv. Lab Fac./Complete Hangar	3,120,000	0				
15.	UT Memphis Steam Line	2,175,000	0				
16.	MTSU Mass Communications Bldg.	12,760,000	0				
17.	TCSTI Campus Expansion, Phase I	4,856,000	0				
18.	SSCC Land Acquisition	350,000	0				
19.	UTIA Biotech Research Fac. Preplan	400,000	0				
	GRAND TOTAL 1987-88	\$67,079,000	\$2,488,000				

*Some funding is included in capital maintenance.

TABLE 2

۰.

COMMISSION AND GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS CAPITAL MAINTENANCE PROJECTS 1987-88

. .

_

6

.

Pric	prity, Institution and Project	Reco	mission's mmendation mber 7, 1986)	overnor's
1.	ETSU PCB EPA Compliance	\$	140,000	\$ 140,000
2.	TSU Remove PCB Transformers		594,000	594,000
3.	ETSU Reroof Sam Wilson & Maintenance Bl	dg.	175,000	175,000
4.	MSU Roof Replacement-7 Building		420,000	420,000
5.	TTU Reroof Prescott Hall & Warehouse		119,000	119,000
6.	CSTCC Reroof Technology Building		134,000	134,000
7.	DSCC Replace Library & Administration F	oofs	94,000	94,000
8.	JSCC Reroof Lower Gym		184,000	184,000
9.	SSCC Reroof Gill Classroom Bldg.		44,000	44,000
10.	McKenzie AVTS Reroof Bldgs.	10	117,000	117,000
11.	Morristown AVTS Replace Roofs Bldgs. 2	& 3	99,000	99,000
12.	Oneida AVTS Reroof Shop Classroom Bldg.		55,000	55,000
13.	APSU Browning Computer Center A/C		52,000	52,000
14.	CoSCC HVAC System Warf Bldg.		23,000	23,000
15.	MSU Brick & Concrete Repairs		232,000	232,000
16.	TTU Exterior Wall Update-7 Bldgs.		65,000	65,000
17.	TSU Campus Outside Improvements		**	746,000
18.	MTSU Domestic Hot Water Conversion		490,000	490,000*
19.	TTU Small Coal Fired Boiler		721,000	721,000*
20.	TCSTI Energy ConserTruck Shop, Shop B	ldg.	133,000	133,000
21.	Hartsville AVTS Replace HVAC System		76,000	76,000
22.	Harriman AVTS Renovate Heating System		29,000	29,000
23.	Livingston AVTS Boiler Replacement Bldg	. 5	38,000	38,000

Pric	ority, Institution and Project	Commission's Recommendation (November 7, 1986)	Governor's Recommendation		
24.	Paris AVTS Install Gas Heat & Air Unit	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000*		
25.	APSU Window & Exterior Door Replace.	226,000	226,000		
26.	ETSU Old Student Center Fire Safety	348,000	348,000		
27.	TSU Outside Lighting Installation	**	137,000		
28.	TSU Bldg. Outside Cleaning & Caulking	**	0		
29.	TSU Physics & Math Upgrade	750,000	0		
30.	TSU Utility Tunnel Drain	**	0		
31.	TSU Gentry Swimming Pool Hot Water Syst	em **	0		
32.	TSU Waterproof Veranda Downtown	**	0		
33.	TSU Upgrade Fire Meters & Boxes	**	0		
	TOTAL STATE BOARD OF REGENTS	\$5,382,000	\$5,515,000		

TABLE 2 (Continued)

* Other Funds will be used for these projects.

** These TSU projects are recommended as Campus Improvements in the capital outlay project listing.

÷

VI. Summary of Major Goals and Strategies

During the 1987-93 period, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and other members of the postsecondary education community will seek ways of strengthening undergraduate education; advancing graduate and professional education; serving Tennessee through enhanced educational opportunity, upgraded research, and expanded public service; and fostering more effective use of resources. The following goals and implementing strategies provide a policy framework for the development of specific initiatives by the appropriate commission, board, or institution. Biennial reports by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission shall evaluate the progress which has been made in achieving these goals in the years ahead.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

- I. Focus the undergraduate curriculum and instruction on developing a student's ability to adjust to changes in society and career and on affording opportunity to realize one's individual potential.
 - A. The development of integrated core curricula, including assurance of computer literacy and coherent learning outcomes, for effective and innovative general education.
 - B. Strengthen both traditional undergraduate liberal arts and pre-professional majors, including the participation in formal programs which incorporate travel to other countries, making certain that funding and other policies do not encourage excessive vocationalism by focusing disproportionate resources on career programs.
 - C. Encourage personnel and funding policies that support and reward distinctively superior undergraduate teaching, giving attention to teaching formats that require greatest involvement by students in

learning (i.e., writing, seminars, internships, laboratory activities, etc.).

- D. Ensure adequate funding for faculty and staff development programs, including travel to other countries, designed to improve undergraduate teaching.
- E. Ensure that teacher education programs reflect the directives found within Principles: Teacher Education in Tennessee (adopted by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the State Board of Education, and the State Certification Commission).
- II. Focus emphasis on improving students' participation in and preparation for beginning undergraduate education.
 - A. Communicate broadly that Tennessee accepts the College Board's Academic Preparation for College as a definitive statement of standards toward which entering students should aspire and which the colleges will presume. (Brochures for statewide dissemination to be completed by Commission and governing boards by September 1, 1988.)
 - B. Encourage collaborative activity with the elementary and secondary schools aimed at improving the preparation of college-bound students and the communication of acmission and retention scandards of all collegiate institutions.
- III. Focus assessment activity on strategies for improving student learning and institutional performance.
 - A. Ensure that all assessment complements academic planning, program improvement, and student learning and focuses attention and priority on quality instruction.
 - B. Ensure that the "performance funding" component of the formula pieces greatest emphasis on instructional improvement and that the absence of

accrediting bodies for certain undergraduate disciplines does not inadvertently divert resources from those disciplines. (New Performance Funding guidelines will become effective August 1, 1987.)

- C. Provide appropriate assessment and placement for incoming freshmen in order to assure that freshmen courses are, in fact, college level ones, articulating collegiate testing programs with those in K-12, where possible.
- D. Encourage the Commission, governing boards, and the general public to ask penetrating questions about institutional commitment to the improvement of undergraduate education.
- IV. Provide appropriate tools for undergraduate education and training.
 - A. Ensure that computers, well-equipped laboratories, and other tools are available to support the undergraduate curriculum, in a forward-thinking and cost-effective manner.
 - B. Ensure that resources for salaries encourage commitment to all aspects of undergraduate programming (i.e., general education, the major disciplines, vocational or technical education and training programs, and support offerings.).
- V. Focus comparable emphasis on issues of student access, i.e. admission, and student success, i.e. retention, progression, and graduation.
 - A. Increase the rate of participation by all Tennesseans in higher education until it is competitive with that of both the region and the nation by establishing direct linkages to high schools and middle schools and by structuring undergraduate programs to make them more accessible to non-traditional students.
 - B. Ensure that the funding formula addresses academic advisement, strengthens support structures for students including "freshmen

experience" or similar orientation activities aimed at improving student retention, provides the appropriate amount of support for intercollegiate athletics, and focuses funding for soment affairs on coherent programs aimed at either realizing individual potential in students or building a sense of cultural awareness and social responsibility.

- C. On the basis of a study, establish and improve the articulation framework for all institutions- public, private and parochial - in the interest of facilitating access. (Report by the Commission to be completed by July 1, 1989.)
- D. Sustain the emphasis on student financial aid to ensure that all prepared and capable students have an opportunity to participate in higher education.

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

VI. Offer effective graduate and professional instructional programs.

- A. Promote sharpened institutional perception of roles.
- B. Provide resources to maintain appropriate libraries, laboratories, and computer resources.
- C. Strengthen graduation requirements in all programs to meet the standards of the Tennessee Conference of Graduate Schools.
- D. Refine mechanisms and standards to promote quality in short courses offered for credit, as well as other programs offered by public and private institutions.
- E. Review policies governing state support of programs at private institutions.
- VII. Attract and nurture able, highly motivated graduate and professional students of diverse backgrounds.

- A. Identify and recruit more older students through increased cooperation with the business community.
- B. Improve level and availability of stipends, scholarships, and loans.
- C. Encourage appropriate alternative standards for admission in addition to those based on undergraduate grades and standardized test scores.
- D. Contact students, especially minority students, early in their schooling or careers to encourage their interest in graduate and professional education through individual campus efforts and statewide initiatives, including an annual conference for potential minority applicants to be coordinated by the Commission.

VIII. Attract and retain able and dedicated faculties and staff.

- A. Encourage universities to provide incentives that promote excellence in teaching and scholarship.
- B. Promote opportunities for aevelopment, including faculty exchange programs with colleges and universities in other countries, retraining, and professional advancement, tailored to the character of individual institutions.
- C. <u>Review and refine the existing retirement programs to ensure adequate</u> credit for out-of-state employment thereby making this benefit more attractive.
- D. On the basis of a study involving the governing boards and the State Department of Personnel, develop early retirement plans for faculty and staff. (Report by the Commission to be completed by December 30, 1988.)
- IX. Support expanded, higher-quality research initiatives.
 - A. Provide release time and other facuity development opportunities, tailored to the individual campus.

APPENDIX B

FORMAT FOR MISSION STATEMENTS

- 1. Final format will be a narrative statement about two pages long.
- 2. Identify whether institution is regional or comprehensive.
- 3. Identify the levels of degrees offered by the institution.
- 4. Identify the primary service area of the institution (with some broader statement added for comprehensive universities).
- 5. Identify the intended clientele of the institution including some description of the mix of degree students as set forth below
 - a. undergraduate vs. graduate enrollment
 - b. traditional college-age students vs. older students
 - c. residential vs. commuter enrollment
 - d. full-time vs. part-time enrollment
 - e. white vs. non-white enrollment
 - f. on-campus vs. off-campus enrollment

Indicate significant changes from historical patterns, including changes in total enrollment.

- 6. Identify the intended level of non-degree instruction in comparison with degree instruction and the intended clientele for non-degree instruction. Indicate any significant changes from historical pattern.
- 7. Identify instructional areas by major taxonomy and level of instruction. Indicate plans to significantly expand or contract instructional areas by major taxonomy and by level of instruction.
- 8. Identify by major taxonomy areas of relatively large commitment of resources for
 - a. instruction
 - b. research
 - c. service

Indicate plans to significantly expand or contract resources in each of these three activities by major taxonomy.

- 9. Identify plans to significantly expand or contract the number of instructional sites and to significantly change the allocation of resources among them.
- 10. Mission statements should be valid for five years and may indicate a range of alternatives to be developed during the period.

PROCESS

Target date for completion: November 1988

- a. Approved mission formats disseminated to campuses
- b. Proposed statements submitted to governing board staffs and Commission staff
- c. Staffs of Commission and governing boards to review proposed statements and adopt responses
- **d.** Requests for documentation/alteration made to campuses
- e. Changes negotiated with campuses by governing board staffs
- f. Revised statements approved by governing boards
- g. Revised statements approved by Commission

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

PROPOSED FUNDING

1987-88

REVENUE:

i

Recommended Appropriation 1987-88		\$31,416,000
Actual Appropriation 1986-87		29,428,000
Appropriation Increase		\$1,988,000
Fee Increase (7.0%) Maintenance Fee (Stable Enrol)	673,000	
FTE Enrollment decrease 1.65%	158,700	
Net Increase		514,300
Out-of-State (Stable Enrollment)		180,100
TOTAL NÉW MONEY		\$2,682,400
INCREASED COSTS:		
4 % Salary Increase and Benifits		1,361,200
Graduate Assistant Program		110,000
Longevity Unfunded		150,500
Desegregation		27,000
Utility Rate Increase		130,400
Total		\$1,779,100
BALANCE		903,300
1 % SALARY INCREASE		3
Faculty 195,000 Administrative 66,000 Support 79,300		

1

340,300 Total

٠. .

1987 - 88 ETSU Budget Comments

- 1. Graduate assistant program stipends funds increase of \$ 110,000 already incorporated in the existing budget proposals.
- 2. Non Medical School faculty pay increase decision will involve either a fixed dollar amount or a percentage increase on each individual salary base.
- 3. Final total budget action by the Deans has to be in the hands of the administration by Tuesday May 5, 1987 for final presidential review and action.
- 4. ETSU budget is scheduled to be in the hands of the Board of Regents by May 29, 1987.

5.	Presentl	y unallocated new 1987 - 88 ETSU funds	\$ 1,013,300	
	а.	Student Affairs Division improvements	101,715 =	911,585
	b.	Academic Affairs General Operating expense increases	562,220 =	349,365
	c.	Academic Affairs Divisions Supply and travel increases	186,220 =	163,145
	d.	1% Faculty Merit Pay Funds	195,000 =	(31,855)

SENATE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Senate Representation

The Senate Elections Committee has reviewed faculty representation for each college/school or equivalent academic unit based on 1986 tenured and tenure track faculty figures. Representation for each unit based on Article II. C. of the Faculty Senate By-laws is as follows:

			Faculty Senators		
School/College/Unit	<pre># of Faculty*</pre>	1986-1987	1987-1988		
Applied Science and Technology	30	4	4		
Arts and Sciences	165	10	9		
Business	46	4	4		
Education	75	6	6		
Library	15	1	1		
Medicine	119	8	7		
Nursing	27	4	4		
Public and Allied Health	27	4	4		
		41	39		

ŝ.,

*Tenured and tenure track as of September 1, 1986.

Senators whose terms expire in 1987.

Applied Science and Technology Mattson, Joseph

Arts and Sciences Cantrell, Peggy Hartsell, Lester McCroy, Annc

Business Fisher, William Ludolf, Gordon

Education Edwards, Betty Thomas, Gwen

Medicine Houghland, Margaret Robinson, Mitchell Stout, Robert

Nursing Verhegge, Richard

Public and Allied Health Flaherty, Pat 1986 - 87 FACULTY SENATE ROSTER - William Fisher, President

12.1

-

.

1900 - 07 FRODE		de korek - willan risher,	Trestdent	
COLLEGE OR SCHOOL	TERM EXPIRE	DEPARIMENT S	CAMPUS BOX	CAMPUS PHONE
Lied Science & Technology				
Mattson, Joseph Fields, James Pleasant, James Saltos, Etta	87 88 88 89	Technology Technology Computer Science Home Economics	19060A 19060A 23830A 22630A	4310 4460 6962 4411
Arts & Sciences				
Cantrell, Peggy Hartsell, Lester LeCroy, Anne (Exec. Comm.) Close, David Waage, Frederick Zayas-Bazan, Eduardo	87 87 88 88 88 88 88 88	Psychology Mathematics English Physics English Foreign Languages	21970A 22390A 22990A 22060A 24292 22480A	6660 5579 5991 5646 5998 6896
Renzaglia, Karen Samuels, Robert Walwick, Paul	89 89 89	Biological Sciences Biological Sciences Speech	23590A 23590A 22510A	6930/6931 4350/6924 4323
Business				
Fisher, William (Pres.) Ludolf, Gordon (Treas.) Dople, F. Steb Cero, Alfonso (Exec. Comm.)	87 87 88 89	Management & Marketing Economics & Finance Economics & Finance Office Management	24471 23080A 23500A 20320A	5304 5365 5677 6986
Education				
Edwards, Betty Thomas, Gwen Stone, John Taylor, John (Exec. Comm.) Connolly, Carole Jones, Don	87 87 88 88 89 89	University School Physical Ed. & Rec. Human Dev. & Learning Curriculum & Instruction University School Human Dev. & Learning	21460A 22120A * 18940A 21910A 21460A 18940A	4357 5387 4440 4298 4333 4188
Library				
Norris, Carol (Secretary)	88	University Library	22450A	5345
Medicine				
Hougland, Margaret (Pres.Elect Robinson, Mitchell Stout, Robert Airhart, Mark Chi, David Liams, Elizabeth (Exec.Com Ferguson, Don Monaco, Paul	87 87 88 88	Anatomy Biochemistry Microbiology Anatomy Internal Medicine Medical Library Microbiology Biophysics Dept.	19960A 19930A 19870A 19960A 21160A 23290A 19870A 15130A	6243 6302 6299/6294 6251 6287 6254 6296 6216
Muring		e.		
Verhegge, Richard Kerley, Linda Dibble, Katherine Pullen, Carol	87 88 89 89	A.D. Nursing Baccalaureate Nursing Baccalaureate Nursing A.D. Nursing	22780A 22240A 22240A 22780A	4400 4345 4635 4395
Public & Allied Health				20 ° j
Flaherty, Pat DeJarnette, Glenda Ketron, Ruth Bishop, Creg	87 88 88 89	Nave Paramedical Ctr. Communicative Disorders Dental Hygiene Environmental Health	19690A 21790A 23200A 22960A	543-2230 5819 4482 5246