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Can a university serve the needs of society and the individual without subserving one at the expense of the other? Can the mass receive its necessity while at the same time guaranteeing the individual his freedom? This was the subject and problem of the study, but it was confined to The University of Tennessee. Four broad areas were considered: (1) the educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) governance, and (4) research and service. The purpose of the study was to examine the present system organization of The University of Tennessee and to suggest ways in which this system could be restructured to more effectively achieve the goals which were published in June 1968.

The procedures followed were to review the literature and research in the four areas noted above and to examine three innovative programs at the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, and the State University of New York, College of Old Westbury. This was followed by an examination of the present organization of The University of Tennessee systems organization, with structured interviews detailing function as well as form. A suggested reorganization was presented which was intended to improve the means toward the desired end.

The study found that the systems organization of The University of Tennessee as of June 1970 was not structured to reach the published goals. The four areas studied need more support from system and from the campuses, and one step suggested as a means toward achieving these objectives was to reorganize the structure of system. While the politicization of education was acknowledged, the danger of political control was stressed.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Problem</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the problem</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the study</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of data</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the Study</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Educational Program</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Governance of Higher Education</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The academic community</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The independent community</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city council model</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Service in Higher Education</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Profiles</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of California at Santa Cruz</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Wisconsin at Green Bay</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York, College of Old Westbury</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming Changes in Bureaucracy.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. THE REORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Before July 1, 1968</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville Campus</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Campus.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis Medical Units.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga Campus</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville Campus</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization After July 1, 1968.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Development and Administration.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Business and Finance.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive Assistant to the President</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Goals and Functions</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Educational Program.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Service</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. A STRUCTURE TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION AND IMPROVE COORDINATION</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Educational Program.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Service.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban problems.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural affairs.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction.</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the Findings</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIXES.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C.</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E.</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>The University of Tennessee Projections to 1980--</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Credit Fall Quarter Enrollment by Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Degree Programs of The University of Tennessee, All Campuses Combined</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Degree Programs of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Degree Programs of The University of Tennessee, at Martin</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Degree Programs of The University of Tennessee, Medical Units</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Degree Programs of The University of Tennessee's Downtown Memphis Center</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Degree Programs of The University of Tennessee, at Nashville</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Degree Programs of The University of Tennessee, at Chattanooga</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Distribution of Estimated Expenditures for Research from Both State and Non-state Funds</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development and Administration; General Counsel</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Government, Industry and Law Center; Business and Finance</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic Affairs; Institutional Research</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Suggested Organizational Structure for the Systems-level</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher education has received more attention than at any time in its history. More money has been allocated to it, more criticism has been leveled at it from within and without, and more people have been involved in its many aspects. Most agree upon the necessity for post-secondary education, but few concur upon the ends or the means. Some of the most hallowed concepts and traditional values have entwined in the rising debate about these means and ends. Free choice conflicts with equal opportunity. Specialization competes with a general, liberal education. Personal freedom combats institutional necessity, and meritocracy and equality conflict with the standards of the institution. The living-learning dichotomy has been confronted as artificial, and the whole of the curriculum is conceived by many as irrelevant.

The flood of literature about higher education deals with these, and other, problems. Criticism has been leveled and solutions proposed from nearly every point of view in the spectrum. When the extremely diverse types of post-secondary education are considered, the difficulty of a single solution, a single goal, or even of a single philosophy becomes apparent. And, although money has been available as never before, the supply is not unlimited, and the various institutions must compete for the resources. They must also compete with public elementary, secondary, and vocational education as well as with the other public agencies.
Higher education seems confronted with the necessity of being all things to all men as well as being the thing to a single man.

M. K. Curry, Jr., the President of Bishop College, has stated the problem is one of governance.

Obviously, the great problem facing the university today, in the midst of a technological revolution which makes possible more and more efficiency and which permits a larger and more diverse enrollment, is that of meshing properly and effectively the yearning for justice with the requirements of efficiency and those of stability. The students equate justice with freedom, and absolute justice with absolute freedom. The administrators and board members, and sometimes the faculties, who are also concerned with efficiency and stability think it necessary to limit freedom and to defer justice. Their efforts to do so leave them open to attack from the students who cry now for more and more proportional representation in the decision making process. The resolution of this problem will probably come from a clearer definition of the roles in representative government.

Perhaps the real question is: Who governs in a representative government? Mill was more concerned with who should not govern than with who should. According to him, one thing is certain, "The representative body ought not to govern." He insisted that "there is a radical distinction between controlling the business of government and actually doing it," and therefore "opposed administration by representative bodies." Thus, according to Mill, "Deliberation, and only deliberation, is the proper function of the representative assembly."¹

The implication is that the deliberate assembly should decide the end and the governmental structure should carry-out the means. Robert Johnston states, "For all their rhetoric about free discussion, universities are run in an extremely secretive manner."² Others have stated or implied that one of the chief reasons for the problem is that universities no longer have or know a sense of mission. John Gardner said in 1967:


We need in the university community a focused, systematic, responsible, even aggressive concern for the manner in which society is evolving... We need designers of the future. We need to be told how to build a better society, and how to get from here to there.  

Lloyd H. Elliott cautions against too much external concern. He is not convinced that the university is the proper place for redesigning society. It is his belief that the objective of university reform should be:  

... the improvement of the educational program. The objective must not be allowed to become placation of one group or another, a compromise with student power, or a preservation of the status quo. The overriding objective must be a more effective educational program for all concerned. No other motive can be allowed to intrude.  

Yet Stringfellow Barr thinks both purposes are being served by the professors to the detriment of the educational program and the needs of the public sector. He sees the "peripatetic professors" attempting to serve the public sector as consultants in isolated and random fashion which, in turn detracts from the educational program and needs of the students while at the same time being too fragmented to help redesign society.  

Robert M. Hutchins has written that we are now entering an age of a life-long liberal education for all. Countless others have commented  

---


upon the coming Leisure Age, the Post-Industrial Revolution, and the problems of accelerating change. The role of the university in this new world is not yet clear, although it is clear, to some at least, that the university has a key role to play. Can this role be consistent with the ideals of personal freedom and institutional necessity, with the need to improve the educational program and to help redesign society?

Some critics do not see an irreconcilable conflict in the problem or in the solution. Robert Frost, as long ago as 1931, saw the answer as one of recognition—that the problem is not one of opposing sides but of recognizing and understanding the dimensions and of planning accordingly. He used a metaphor to emphasize his point:

Its aim is to restore you to your ideas of free will. It wants to give you back your freedom of will. All right, here it is on a platter. You know you can't tell by name what persons in a certain class will be dead ten years after graduation, but you can tell actuarially how many will be dead. Now, just so this scientist says of the particles of matter flying at a screen, striking a screen; you can't tell what individual particles will come, but you can say in general that a certain number will strike at a given time. It shows, you see, that the individual particle can come freely. I asked Bohr about that particularly, and he said, "Yes, that is so. It can come when it wills and as it wills; and the action of the individual particle is unpredictable. But it is not so of the action of the mass. There you can predict. That gives the individual atom its freedom and the mass its necessity."

Frost's metaphor may suggest the means to the solution. Perhaps the preoccupation with freedom blinds higher education to the necessities of the mass, or perhaps it is believed that freedom, properly pursued, will, per se, solve the problems of the mass. Other political and economic institutions seem to emphasize the dichotomy. Some inhibit freedom

---

for the well being of the mass or the institution, some encourage freedom for the same reasons, and others practice at varying points in between. Higher education reflects this dichotomy, too, but as a microcosm of the macrocosm. Higher education has not traditionally recognized the necessities of the masses as being within its concern, except as part of the educational process. The lack of social commitment by institutions of higher education has thus become one of the targets for criticism.

The student unrest of the decade of the 60's was primarily directed against this institutional rigidity. Social controls and curricula requirements were and are being attacked, but the lack of institutional commitment against social evils and for social improvement is equally provocative. The evidence now indicates many of these internal battles are being won, and the students are now directing their attention toward the larger problems outside the university community. Several have predicted that student unrest will continue during the decade of the 70's, but the issues will be somewhat different. Such words as ecology and ekistics are now common parlance among the students and others. Considering the demands placed upon higher education, it appears some changes in governance, in goals, and in structure are inevitable. Indeed, many changes have taken place over the last decade and more are in prospect.

Not all states agree upon the theory or practice of a public university, nor do the institutions within a given state agree among themselves. Such disagreement may well be part of the solution. If the diversity among and within institutions could be coordinated toward

---

solving educational problems as well as some of the problems of the larger society, it is conceivable higher education could creatively respond to some of the demands being placed upon it.

On July 1, 1968, The University of Tennessee changed its organizational structure. The University of Tennessee at Knoxville has been the parent institution since 1794, but other institutions existed at Martin and Memphis and centers operated at Nashville, Kingsport, Oak Ridge, and Tullahoma. The agricultural program was and is spread over the entire state. Increasing numbers of students and other problems dictated the organizational change. The essence of the change was to create a systems-level administration to coordinate the activities of the individual and autonomous campuses.

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The problem is one of governance and freedom and how to restructure the University to achieve the stated goals. The purpose was to develop a structure which would permit the University to perform Gardner's "focused systematic, responsible, even aggressive concern for the manner in which society is evolving," and, at the same time, to fulfill Elliott's insistence upon "improvement of the educational program." The purpose was to examine individual campuses which are attempting to improve the educational program and to suggest an organizational structure at systems-

9President A. D. Holt, letter to The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees, "Proposed Reorganization of the University of Tennessee," June 17, 1968. (See Appendix A.)

10Gardner, loc. cit.

11Elliott, loc. cit.
level which would guarantee its necessity while permitting the individual his freedom.

It was fully realized that no structure can guarantee the results for which it was created, but the intention was to investigate and outline a structure which would permit improvement in the educational program, preserve the principles of academic freedom, allow for a greater share in governance of the institution by members of the constituency, and arrange for more coordination and planning in helping to solve the problems of the larger society.

Importance of the Study

The increasing clamor and unrest on the campuses of the country suggest some organizational changes are imperative. Also, the awareness of social problems suggests that the traditional detachment and isolation of the university is no longer applicable or acceptable. Many members of university communities are aware of the conflicts and seek solutions. One of the first solutions could be a definition of mission and a restructuring of organization to achieve this mission. This study is designed to contribute toward this solution.

Delimitations

1. The organization which is to be analyzed is restricted to the systems-level of The University of Tennessee.

2. Institutional goals are restricted to (1) the educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) governance, and (4) research and service.

3. The proposed structure is for the State of Tennessee. It may be that the idea will conform to the needs of other states, but the unique problems of each state may differ so much in degree that organizational
details would differ considerably.

4. No attempt is made to examine the economics of higher education.

5. The power struggles which exist within bureaucracies are acknowledged, but they are not within the scope of this study.

6. The power struggles which exist between bureaucracies governing higher education are acknowledged but not included.

7. Since the problem to be considered is relatively new, at least to academia, data are often speculative and presumptive, although a functional analysis was employed.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Systems-level.** The organizational structure created to administer several individual campuses across the State of Tennessee.

**Integrationist Model.** This model of organization refers to the traditional pyramid, with power centralized at the top and delegated by function down the pyramid. The individual is seldom considered as such. This model is based upon mechanical laws.

**Behaviorist Model.** This model of organization refers to the schools of thought in political science, psychology, and other social sciences which believe the job should fit the man and that man has as much impact upon organization as the reverse. The behavior of man in organizations is at least as important as the study of organization itself. This model is based upon biological laws and reflects new discoveries in the life sciences and social sciences.
Ecology. Defined as the mutual relations of individuals and organizations with one another and with their environment, this study or discipline has many implications for the problem.

Ekistics. The science of human settlements.

Educational program. This refers to the entire curricula rather than to specific programs, but it is not restricted to the classroom.

Politicized. Universities no longer exist in academic seclusion, with scholars free to pursue the truth without interference from the "outside" world. It is doubtful if public universities ever had this freedom. As Gardner suggested, universities must now assume the lead in problem solving with the multitude of political, economic, and social problems. Even the definition of pure science is subject to dispute, with many asserting the discoveries of science must be put to the test of social usefulness. A discovery with bad side effects for society would thus be debated outside the university. Politicized thus means that the university is now part of the total community in ways it never was before, and it also means that universities are subject to outside pressures, political, economic, and social, in ways it was not before. It also means the university must be constantly on guard less this politicization become political manipulation or even governance. The university must become more involved in the polis without being governed by the shifting whims of the public.

---


IV. ASSUMPTIONS

1. In view of the published goals and functions, the present systems-level of The University of Tennessee is dysfunctional.

2. Education, at least public higher education, is politicized.

3. Academic freedom can be maintained despite the assumption that education is politicized.

4. Hutchins' statement that we are entering an age of a life-long liberal education, or at least a life-long education, is true.

5. The university cannot return to the abstract pursuit of truth; it must confront the times and become involved in the decisions about the way society is evolving.

6. The individual on the campus and the individual campus can maintain a higher level of free choice if the necessity of the entire system is recognized and planned for.

7. Total planning will permit better utilization of resources, and resource allocation to the various segments of the whole will be based upon the stated purpose of the individual campus and upon its needs.

8. The revolution in technology will continue, permitting wider dissemination of knowledge and services by the university.

9. The Board of Trustees will continue to function much as they have in the past, and they will not take a more active role in the actual administration of the institution.

10. The economics of higher education will continue to operate as an economics of scarcity for the foreseeable future.

11. In order to respond to increasing demands from the larger society, many service projects and activities, previously handled by
individuals, departments, colleges, and campuses, will be coordinated from the systems-level.

V. PROCEDURES

It was the intention of this study to examine The University of Tennessee system and to suggest an organizational pattern at the systems-level which would help to solve the problems of (1) improving the educational program, (2) affirming the commitment to academic freedom, (3) permitting wider participation in governance, and (4) expanding and coordinating the University's commitment to research and service. The stated goals and functions of the University will be used as the end sought, and the suggested organizational structure is proposed as one of the means.

The study also intended to examine some organizational patterns which have emerged upon individual campuses in the nation as examples of ways to achieve the four goals stated above. Such organizational patterns as the cluster college, the theme college, and the constituent college were examined. The University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, and the State University of New York, College of Old Westbury, are organized respectively, as cluster colleges, theme colleges, and constituent colleges.

This study is primarily descriptive, but it is also a functional analysis. A review of the literature pertinent to the problem will be followed by the three profiles referred to above. Following this is a statement of the goals and functions of The University of Tennessee, 1968-1980, and an analysis of the present systems-level structure of The University of Tennessee. The analysis took the structure as perceived
by the individuals interviewed and examined these perceptions against the formal structure. This analysis includes organizational charts and a functional analysis. Then, having taken the stated goals, an organizational structure will be presented which is intended to suggest a structure to cope with the enlarged mission as published. This structure will detail function as well as suggest form. The study will conclude with a summary, recommendations, and conclusions.

Questions posed were:

1. Can the educational program respond to the demands being placed upon it by its many critics?

2. Can academic freedom endure in the face of the increasing politicization of public universities?

3. Does size and complexity prohibit a share in governance by the constituency in the university community?

4. Can research and service be coordinated in such a way as to permit more effective commitment to rural and urban problems and yet not compromise or destroy the three ideals or goals stated above?

Sources of Data

The presentation of the present systems-level organization of The University of Tennessee was an original study. It involved the various campuses as well as the respective divisions in the systems-level. These data were compiled over the period August, 1969, to January, 1970. Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Deans, Directors, division heads, and others over the entire system were interviewed by the Office of Institutional Research of The University of Tennessee, under the direction of the author, and asked to detail form as well as function. Interviews at the systems-
level were conducted personally by the author and centered on questions of mission and the means to achieve it. The interviews were structured to analyze how the individual perceived his mission within the formal structure. Organizational charts are presented of the systems-level only, but these charts were supported by an analysis of function. All of this was preceded by a brief review of the reasons for the change in structure, and the source for this information was President Andrew D. Holt and the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Trustees.

The organizational structure to be suggested for the future will follow the statement of purpose, or philosophy, which was published in June, 1968, and is attached as Appendix C. The organizational structure for The University of Tennessee systems-level will attempt to reflect this statement of purpose and to demonstrate how such a structure could assist in fulfilling the goals outlined.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I contains the introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the importance of the study, delimitations, definition of key terms, basic assumptions, procedures and sources of data, and a brief outline of the organization of the study.

Chapter II reviews the literature pertinent to the problem. Also, a profile of a cluster college, a theme college, and a constituent college will be included in an attempt to suggest ways in which individual campuses could structure themselves.

Chapter III presents a description and functional analysis of The University of Tennessee systems-level organization.

Chapter IV presents the statement of goals and functions for The
University of Tennessee for the period 1968-1980. This is followed by a suggested organizational structure designed to fulfill this mission.

Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

I. INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this chapter to review four areas of academe: (1) the educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) the governance of higher education, and (4) research and service in higher education and the need for more coordination and planning of these functions. Also, the profiles referred to in Chapter I will be presented as examples of changes in structure which attempt to improve these four areas, and, finally, evidence to suggest such reforms in bureaucracy as are necessary will be presented. A summary will conclude the chapter.

Accused of everything from complacency to conspiracy, higher education is perhaps more embattled today than at any time in its history; yet, few will deny the necessity for it. Fewer still would do away with it, but people from almost all persuasions seek to change it. That no single change will serve as a panacea is evident from a study of the history of higher education. Jencks and Riesman have noted that, "During the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, American colleges were conceived and operated as pillars of the locally established church, political orders, and social conventions."14 Since none of these coexisted with one another, it is apparent the educational institutions which reflected their belief would be equally divergent.

The difficulty of a methodological historical study was stated by Laurence Veysey in his book on the development of the American University in the late nineteenth century.

The development of an institutional framework presents peculiar problems to the historian who would seek to account for it. It is often easy to make general statements about the causes for a pattern of institutional arrangements and relationships; yet nothing can be more baffling than the effort to relate these assumed causes to the abundant documentary evidence which is available to illustrate the change. . . . Indeed one may find the date on which such and such a department was established at such and such a university; one may uncover a spirited debate over the details of certain of the new arrangements. But exceedingly little direct evidence may be found on decisions involving the basic shape of the rapidly emerging academic structure. The most fundamental assumptions were not being articulated by those who were acting upon them. . . . One would like to know the reasons for such phenomena as increasing presidential authority, bureaucratic procedures of many sorts, the new functions of the deanship, the appearance of the academic department with its recognized chairman, and the creation of a calculated scale of faculty rank. . . . What one sees as one looks at the leading campuses toward the end of the nineteenth century is a complicated but rather standard series of relationships springing to life before one's eyes--yet practically everyone at the time taking the fundamental choices for granted. . . . One is led, therefore, to reason backward from the evidence of how the academic system functioned toward the causes for its appearance.15

This need to reason backward seems more apt when applied to the more sweeping changes of the recent past. There is abundant evidence, however, of how the system functioned through the decades of the fifties and sixties, just as there is much speculation and theory about how it became dysfunctional, which, in turn, produced the turmoil and agonizing reappraisal of the sixties.

II. THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Assuming education has its mission the goal of the whole man, a

preparation for life, accommodation to the environment, or whatever else it has variously asserted, the most serious charge presently leveled is that of irrelevancy. Again, it is apparent no one knows what is relevant, but much has been written about what is irrelevant and why it is so. A thorough review of this whole question is far beyond the purview of this study; in fact, it would be several studies in itself. A look at the highlights does seem in order, however.

Much of the criticism of irrelevancy seems to derive from the fragmented curriculum. If the broadest possible view is taken first, the comments of Scott Buchanan, the father of the Saint John's curriculum, seem apt.

. . . The proper study of man has been mankind. And now--this is my strong hunch--we are concerned about comprehending the world. We're only beginning to do it, and it's upsetting us pretty badly. . . . Man is being exploded into a thousand fragments. Existentialism shows this. But the world is what we're working at. . . . The existentialists, it seems to me, are reporting . . . the kind of ragged end of the study of man. They're saying there's nothing left of him. Della Mirandola was saying there's everything left of him. The existentialists are reporting the explosion of the object of their central attention, and I'm saying that the world is taking over as the object. . . . The youngsters are talking about this when they talk about cross-cultural experiences--as they do in the Peace Corps.16

The reasons for the fragmented curriculum are too well known to need documentation. The attempts to create inter-disciplinary studies are equally well known, as are the difficulties of such a creation. But Buchanan saw such a creation as imperative if higher education was to escape the charge of irrelevance.

This is the form in which I see the world emerging. That is, the individual young student now saying, "I don't belong to

---

the Establishment because it's provincial, it's outworn, it's
got to be broken up!" But what he's really saying is this:
"I and the Establishment, too, belong to something better and
we've got to find that bigger object." When you go to the
slum, or to another culture, you are seeing it as another part
of something. It isn't just the slum in itself that you're
interested in; you're trying to find what it belongs to in
the way of a larger object."17

Buchanan's analysis would seem to fit the rising emphasis upon
ecology and ekistics. This analysis would also seem to oppose the emphasis
upon specialization, certification, and the various forms of provincialism
characteristic of much of higher education.

Insofar as colleges are devoted to education this description
is accurate enough, but many would argue that education is not
a college's primary function. The crucial raison d'etre of the
American college, the sine qua non of its survival and current
importance, may not be education but certification. Virtually
every college course culminates in an examination and a grade,
and virtually all college curricula lead to some sort of diploma
or degree. A college that does not sort and label its students
in this way evidently cannot find a clientele. . . .18

It is apparent that most students enter college for just such a
label. "The majority of those who enter college are plainly more con-
cerned with accumulating credits and acquiring licenses than with learning
any particular skill while enrolled."19 Yet the charge of irrelevance not
only persists but grows. So-called Experimental colleges are springing
to various degrees of life around the country, and many college catalogues
are beginning to stress the relevance of the curricula. Many critics of
the current practices have offered wide-ranging solutions.

William B. Boyd, the president of Central Michigan University, sees
the solution resting with more student participation in the design of the

17 Ibid., p. 76. 18 Jencks, et al., op. cit., p. 61. 19 Ibid.
Many share his belief. F. Champion Ward, Vice President for Education and Research of the Ford Foundation, lists three crises which education must face in the decade of the seventies:

Today, three spasms are wracking our educational systems. Questions are being asked about American education as a system of means and ends which are drastic, in many cases overdue, and if the pressure keeps up, even likely to be answered over the next 10 years. These seizures may be briefly identified as the crisis of efficiency and support, the crisis of relevance and control, and the crisis of race and class.21

Ward partly shares Boyd's opinion that students should have a greater share in the curriculum.

Suspicious of recent preoccupations with efficiency and support, such students are asking education to justify itself in terms of its relevance to their growth as individual persons and to the transformation of American society and culture. They want education to be pure but not detached, involved in the world, but not subserving worldly ends.22

If the student demand is, in fact, for a vision of the world, for an education free from the onus of certification, for participation in curriculum design, and, above all for relevance, what about the remainder of the educational community? What are the concerns of the faculty, the administrators, Boards of Trustees, and other special interest groups such as alumni, politicians, etc.? Martin Myerson made an extended study of this, and, after analyzing the causes for unrest and dissatisfaction, commented upon the faculty.

The more I met with discontented students, the more I realized that they were not so much objecting to instruction by teaching

---


22Ibid., p. 12.
assistants, or to the large size of classes. They were objecting to being neglected. This was true for graduates as well as undergraduates. Some felt that the teachers were devoting their main energies to research, to outside commitments, to committee work, to their families, rather than to the classroom. Others felt neglected intellectually out of class; they did not have an opportunity to discuss the new ideas that were troubling them. Others felt neglected socially—they felt that they never got to know their teachers as persons and were not known as persons to their teachers. . . . Many of the proposals to get teachers closer to students on American campuses have a somewhat defensive tone, as though faculty had to be led to do their duty. We might as well recognize that faculty have many pulls away from their students, but that they also have many pulls toward them they would not have become teachers. The problem is how to appeal to these latter kinds of pulls in strengthening faculty-student ties.23

Myerson also lists grades, student evaluation of teachers, meritocracy, and undue emphasis upon specialization as symptoms of the breakdown in the educational program. To some extent Jencks and Riesman agree with Myerson, although they take exceptions to some of his recommended solutions.24 Clark Kerr sees the educational program suffering because of confusion over its function. The parts do not recognize their relationship to the whole. He believes all the parts must be able to coexist with each other. "The campus does not have a residual function that requires it to fulfill all the otherwise unmet needs of society. It must pick and choose. Internal consistency is one important principle of choice."25 To resolve fragmentation, he would propose a definite mission for a given campus, and each program should mesh smoothly into that mission. He does not believe a given university can be all things to all men.

---


24 Jencks, et al., op. cit., pp. 64-68.

In sum, the educational program is being examined from many points of view, and little agreement exists on the specific paths to follow. Since some of the proposed solutions seem to challenge the concept of academic freedom, a review of this would seem in order.

III. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Academic freedom is the result of conflicts and contentions which began in the 19th century, and it has been upheld in the courts. To review the history would seem redundant, but a brief review of its function seems applicable.

Encyclopedia Britannica gives the following definition:

Academic freedom embraces freedom in teaching and freedom in learning. . . . It is that freedom of members of the academic community, assembled in universities and colleges, which underlies the effective performance of their functions. In modern understanding it embraces intellectual freedom, which is necessary to the acquisition and exchange of knowledge and to inquiry into the unknown . . . it also includes certain personal freedoms in relation to conduct outside of their institutions, which are deemed essential to faculty members and students as such.26

It would seem such a definition lies outside the arena of conflict, but the practice of this freedom has led some critics to suggest that it is freedom and license rather than freedom and responsibility. Some assert that pursuit of the research or consulting dollar has resulted in further fragmentation of the curriculum, diminution of the teaching function, and further alienation of the student.27 If the professor has more freedom from institutional restraint than other members of other institutions,

27Barr, loc. cit., p. 75.
then he has more responsibility. The question of to whom this responsibility is owed is not satisfactorily resolved. Kerr, as quoted above, would insist such resolution is not possible until the functions of the university and the professor are spelled out much better than now.

Algo D. Henderson sees the abuse of academic freedom, if any, as the result of economic forces encouraged by government and industry: "As John K. Galbraith has recently said, whenever either industry or government wants anything really important to be done, they call upon the universities to loan their faculty." Others see the cause as primarily economic, but others suspect this is but the symptom.

Edward H. Levi believes institutional rigidity is the underlying cause for any abuses of academic freedom.

One can well understand the impatience of those who prefer a different relevance of practical action. In some areas, implementation, leading to a more basic examination of consequences and meaning, has been made an appropriate part of training and research. . . . Nevertheless, they stay within the educational system, caught by its pretense and rigidity. They feel they must stay a long time. Not only has the number of years required for formal education steadily increased as college and graduate work are treated as necessities, but the model presses for the total absorption of the student's interest either in the curriculum or in ancillary activities. We are set on a course that suggests that every young person up to the age of twenty-five, every young family really, should have an educational institution as surrogate for the world.

Many of the critics of the institution as threat to academic freedom seem to believe the system of reward and punishment is the culprit.

28 Ibid., p. 76
Publish or perish is a familiar dictum, and the entire system of faculty rank further inhibits the professor who would be free. Still others believe the institution is an administrator-run affair, with most of the decisions the result of considerations for institutional efficiency.\(^{32}\) But, whatever cause or causes may or may not attribute to the attacks upon academic freedom, the fact that it is subject to attack can scarcely be denied.

IV. THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The conflict between the individual and the state (or institution) is one of the earliest recorded disputes. Antigone told Creon there was a higher law than his, and the matter of individual conscience versus the public good has raged to greater or lesser degree since. Daniel P. Moynihan, President Nixon's key adviser on urban problems, said recently:

In one form or another all of the major domestic problems facing you derive from the erosion of the authority of the institutions of American society. This is a mysterious process of which the most that can be said is that once it starts it tends not to stop. Your task, then, is clear: to restore the authority of American institutions. . . .\(^{33}\)

In a lengthy essay on liberty entitled, "Man vs. the State," Milton Mayer asserted that true liberty was utterly impossible in any sort of organized living arrangement, and that this was more true today than ever before.\(^{34}\) During the question and answer session which followed, Clifton

\(^{32}\)Ward, loc. cit., p. 12.


\(^{34}\)Milton Mayer, "Man vs. the State," Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (Santa Barbara: The Fund for the Republic, 1969), pp. 131-133.
Fadiman may have figured the key to the problem of freedom and governance:

. . . The question is whether within a technological society you can have what are in essence tribal structures. Examples from Moslem culture, or from Early European culture, involve certain assumptions: to wit, the existence of a sparse and very poor population. When you try to institute tribal cultures within an enormous technological web, the connections of the web will sooner or later reach out into the little struggling tribes or communes and begin to destroy them. Within the web of a technological society, is it possible to institute Pluralism . . . ?

Higher education in all its forms is assuredly institutionalized, and the desire for pluralism is everywhere apparent. By the definition of its existence and purpose it should be more free and more pluralistic than other institutions. The thrust seems to be in this direction, but some time-honored practices and traditions had to topple before this thrust could gather momentum. The entire concept of In Loco Parentis, for instance, seems to be on its way out. The administrator-inspired desire for institutional efficiency at the cost of individual identity provoked the student signs, "Do not fold, spindle, or mutilate." The multiversity of Clark Kerr, while administratively coherent, became the object of continuing attacks at Berkeley from 1964 to the present, and the demand for a share in the governance of higher education has been heard from all sectors of the community.

The Committee on Student-Faculty-Administrative Relationship of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges published their recommendations in November of 1969. After tracing the background of the Authoritarian University, the Growth of Faculty Influence, the Growth of Alumni Influence, and the Growth of Student Influence, the committee addressed itself to the present and to alternatives. They suggested that

any comparison between the governance of academic communities and indus-
trial, business, or governmental organizations would "prove futile and
misleading."38 But, they believe some modern organizational theory is
useful in helping to understand governance problems.

Traditional types of formal organization have been based on a
mechanical model which assumed that organizational effectiveness
and efficiency required a set arrangement of parts with specified
functions and operations. Once designed, such an organization,
like a machine, would run itself, requiring only the occasional
replacement of a standardized part. The critical concern was
with a precise, logical, internal structure; a bureaucracy there-
fore required specialization of tasks, standardization of task
performance, line control and centralization of decision making,
uniformity of rules, and no repetition of function.

By avoiding conflict through depersonalization it was felt
that maximum efficiency could be maintained. However, a sig-
nificant amount of research in this country hinted at the
existence . . . of an informal organization. This organi-

tation revolved around the employee's status level, his friend-
ship groups, the meaningfulness of his job—in essence, his
personal motivations.39

The above may be taken as definitions of the integrationist and
behaviorist schools of thought on organization. The Committee expands
its definition of the latter:

... organizational theorists have become critically interested
in those factors, both social and structural, which enable a
social organization to cope with rapidly changing conditions,
which help provide solutions to increasingly complex problems,
and which assist in the management of conflict. The organiza-
tion characteristics which seem to relate to these adaptive
processes include: a marked degree of common interest among
the organization members, a high amount of interaction and
influence, both upward and downward communication, autonomy
and responsibility for individuals at the lower ends of the
organizational hierarchy, and a generally high amount of
influence spread throughout the hierarchy of the organiza-

38 "Statement on Student-Faculty-Administrative Relationships," A
Report to the Senate and Member Institutions of the National Association
of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges by the Committee on Student
Faculty-Administrative Relationships, November 1969, p. 19.

39 Ibid., pp. 19-20.

40 Ibid., pp. 20-21.
The critical distinction between the two schools of thought was summarized by Elizabeth Mann Borgese when she said the fundamental human right of the second half of the twentieth century was the "right to self-management." She sees no basic conflict between man and his institutions. "The new concept of society of man--in line with new concepts in the physical and biological sciences--is not dualistic. Man is society and society is man. Man evolves as society evolves." She concludes by saying she sees, "Self-management as the basic quest of all disruptive forces today."

Self-management is certainly in line with the behaviorist theory of organization. In comparing the current university community with the two theories, the Committee rated it quite low. "Formal as well as informal interaction and influence are relatively low, communication among the different parties is difficult, groups tend to pursue interests . . . influence in disproportionately spread throughout the hierarchy, and the students' authority and responsibility are low." The Committee goes on to recommend specific steps which should be taken to achieve what they call "the social organization" as opposed to the mechanical model. They conclude their report by stating three models of college-university government are emerging which are, presumably, designed to fit the times. They are (1) the Academic Community, (2) the Independent Constituency, and (3) the City Council. The characteristics of each may be summarize as follows.

---


42 Ibid., p. 8.

43 Ibid., p. 22.


46 Ibid., p. 29.
The Academic Community

Community is a self-explanatory term and implies relative smallness. Today's complex universities deny this, and the Academic Community is designed for the department or college level. It is not at the central administrative level. The problem of sharing in the overall governance process is apparent, particularly when the other constituencies involved are considered. The problem of the relative interest of each of the communities must be dealt with, and the final problem is that it does not circumvent the governing board of the institution. But, in spite of the problems, a strong emotional appeal exists for the Academic Community approach, and is being tried at various institutions.47

The Independent Constituency

This approach might be termed the adversary model. It accepts the strong conflicts inherent in size and complexity, and the various groups organize to protect and represent their interests. Each has an association or union, and it may be on the particular campus or even national scope. The AAUP is an example. This model closely follows the methods of collective bargaining, and leaves the administration to deal with each separately. The entire concept is one of bargaining power, not legal rights.48

The City Council Model

The model which is perhaps the most sought after, particularly in large universities, is the City Council Model. It stresses communication and openness. The administration is chosen through a selection process

47 Ibid., pp. 29-31. 48 Ibid., pp. 31-33.
which involves the board of control, the faculty, the students, and perhaps others. Advisory committees sit at all levels of the hierarchy, and questions of a critical nature are referred to the board of control in an open hearing. The end result is something like a city council form of government and even the board of control is elected. This model does not presently contemplate a limited term for the administration, but this seems to be emerging. This model retains the initiative in administration and probably leaves it more flexible than either of the others. It also lends itself to more voice in the decisions made at the central level of administration.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 33-34.}

Variations of these three models exist in particular institutions, but these do seem to be the chief models for academic governance in practice today. If the statements of Moynihan, Fadiman, and Borgese are acceptable, the City Council Model would seem more desirable, particularly for large institutions. It embraces more of the recent theory about men and organizations, and it is not so revolutionary as to invoke instant opposition. It also seems to lend itself to the final question under consideration.

V. RESEARCH AND SERVICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

If higher education is to address itself to the problem enunciated by Gardner, "a focused, systematic, responsible, even aggressive concern for the manner in which society is evolving," it is clear the structure of higher education must be something different from what it is now. Being a relatively new concept, the literature and research in this area is sparse indeed. But the massive problems of our cities, our environment,
and the quality of our lives has pushed the universities toward the center of the stage.

As pointed out earlier, whenever government or industry have a problem beyond their resources they turn to the faculties and resources of the universities. It is only in universities that the intellectual and technical abilities exist for tackling such complex problems, but much of this talent is wasted in random and isolated efforts. Many are coming to believe that better coordination and planning will be necessary to achieve the desired end of societal improvement or even survival. Since such coordination and planning seems, on the surface, to be in conflict with the ideals of academic freedom and the traditional mission of the university, not much has been done as yet. Also, such an approach must, by definition, be ecological, and this means an inter-disciplinary effort which is counter to the departmental structure of many colleges and universities. Some, however, see the situation of the larger society as becoming increasingly desperate and are beginning to suggest new missions and structures for higher education.

Many have observed that institutions of higher education seem to believe conscience is for individuals, not for institutions. Nathan Pusey, the President of Harvard, recently presented the traditional view, "Harvard does not take political stands, but we do speak on matters that affect our well being."\(^50\) Or in answer to a question about Harvard's investment practices, he said, "Our purpose is to invest in places that are selfishly good for Harvard. We do not use our money for social purposes."\(^51\) The


\(^{51}\) Ibid.
furor over institutional research for the CIA, Dow Chemical, and all the rest is too well known. The research and service for the good of the larger society is less well known.

In discussing the university's role regarding the poor, Michael Harrington said, "I think that if the university is not to become a source of elite definitions and elite decision making and elite concepts it must... enter into a relationship with the actual organizations of the people... For example, there are many colleges and universities that have been think-tanking it for some years for the Army, Navy, CIA... How about every college and university in the United States having a think-tank, a bank of data, and expert knowledge available to the people in the community..."52

William Birenbaum said, "The urban-suburban centers where most of our people now live and work are the key staging grounds for the renewal effort... A moment of truth and a time of great risk have arrived for the American academics."53 He goes on to suggest almost total restructuring to conform to a new sense of mission—that of total involvement in the problems of the cities and the environment.54

Arrowsmith puts it succinctly:

I am suggesting that the university itself, in part through the knowledge it creates, in part through its own unprincipled irresponsibility, mindlessly helping to create a distinctive modern chaos—a chaos in which the environment as a whole is nobody's business and bears nobody's design, a conglomerate world whose disorder is exposed by the design-perfection of the parts and their utter unrelatedness. If the parts mostly show superb technical skill, these skills flourish in a general vacuum of design... .

What is now required, if we are to survive this sort of contrived chaos, is nothing less than a new architectonics. "Architectonics, I realize, begs a great many questions. I mean here,


54Ibid., pp. 10-16.
however, not Aristotle's architectonic skill of politics, but something much more like what is coming to be called "ecology"—that is, a discipline of the whole environment, to be arrived at by applying immediate specialized skill to proximate problems considered in a context of related and larger concerns.55

He continues by stating he sees a coming confederation of higher education, which will, in turn, reject the nineteenth-century view of the university's function. He sees cooperation between and among institutions replacing the presently disastrous competition on all levels.56

Much more is being written along these lines, although little is being done as yet. It would seem obvious that some changes in structure as well as mission will be inevitable if some of these projections are to become reality. The first reality seems to be an increasing awareness by many that the mission of the university must be expanded to embrace larger considerations. If this may be seen as the end, then the means will be realized as well.

VI. THREE PROFILES

The University of California at Santa Cruz

In the fall of 1965 the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California was started. "... it was thought that it would be helpful to the University as a whole if the Santa Cruz campus could work out a pattern of organization and procedures that would, to use Clark Kerr's phrase, 'make the University seem small even as it grows large.'"57

The main means of implementing this idea has been the decision to establish on the Santa Cruz campus a series of

55 Arrowsmith, op. cit., pp. 48-49. 56 Ibid., pp. 50-51.

small liberal arts colleges. When the campus opened in September, 1965, there were 650 undergraduates, all members of Cowell College. The 1969-70 academic year will see an enrollment of approximately 3,100 undergraduates; Cowell College will still have the same number of members. And in 1995, when the undergraduate enrollment will be roughly 16,500, Cowell will still be as small as it is now. Yet Cowell students are members of the University as well, and many study with faculty from any of the colleges.

Most members of the faculty are "Fellows" of one of the colleges. They are also members of campuswide "Boards of Studies" in which is vested the responsibility both for guiding disciplinary undergraduate majors and for initiating graduate programs. There will be about 1900 students on campus this year; by 1995, approximately 11,000. The Boards of Studies are organized into three divisions--Humanities, Natural Science, and Social Science--each of which is headed by a Vice Chancellor.

Eventually there also will be several research institutes and professional schools. However, the undergraduate curriculum will continue to be centered in the colleges. In time there will be twenty-five or more colleges, each with its own faculty and educational philosophy, with members varying in number between 500 and 800.58

At Santa Cruz, then, there is no single educational philosophy, no single form of governance, and no single group to establish the educational program. Diversity flourishes within the total institutional framework. Perhaps the opening statement of philosophy from the first two colleges to open will reinforce this point.

*Cowell College*

Cowell College, opened in 1965, has a normal complement of 600 undergraduates and a faculty of 40. The College is committed to imaginativeness in curriculum, in teaching, and in the development of collegiate life. It wishes to combine the best of a traditional education with a spirit of openness and innovation. It further seeks to emphasize the unity rather than humanistic perspective.

Cowell's program favors no single area of inquiry--the interests

of its faculty and students are wide-ranging. Insofar as they share a bias, it is humanistic view of the aims of learning, a central concern for man and his possibilities.59

Stevenson College

Stevenson shares with other colleges a broad commitment to the liberal arts. The several cultures of present-day intellectual life—including the traditional divisions of the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences—are fully represented in the Stevenson faculty and in the College program. The program also reflects special concerns: the increasing interconnections among divisions of disciplined learning, their diverse but often complementary orientations, the particular contributions and potentialities of the modern social sciences, and comparative study in the social sciences and humanities. Students at Stevenson are strongly encouraged to develop their knowledge of external, as well as American, cultures and societies; to incorporate in their programs off-campus "field experience in the country and abroad; and especially, in the upperclass years, to pursue independent study. These concerns help to shape both the curriculum and the extra-curricular life of the College.60

Each college has its own statement of purpose and each outlines the means to achieve this purpose. Students can cross freely back and forth among colleges, but their chosen college remains their base.

The University of Wisconsin at Green Bay

UWGB has an elaborate philosophy which is focused on ecology. To the writer's knowledge this is the only campus in the country with such an approach. Since this is one of the main areas of concern of modern student's, it would seem worth examining.

Preceding from the beliefs that a university cannot operate in a vacuum and that to be alive and effective it must demonstrate imaginative leadership, UWGB has implemented an academic plan that relates the student to the modern world, a plan that attempts to combine the world of books and experience in such a way as to make the student feel that what he is learning and

59 Ibid., p. 9. 60 Ibid., p. 13.
what he is doing have a unity and integrity validating their relevancy.61

The philosophy outlines the contemporary student as the University sees him, which, in essence, states that he has reacted negatively to the education offered on most campuses. The plan at UWGB is to avoid this reaction through the Communiversity.62

We are in great need of a new concept of the socially responsible university to help create or contribute to the socially responsible individual and community. It is time to take a positive creative approach to relating a university and a university education to the larger society. To meet these objectives, I propose that we move firmly and rapidly in the direction of a communiversity. A communiversity is a socially responsible university relating to a socially responsible community. The word university stems from the word universe. Too frequently, the universe has been interpreted by universities as relatively ideal to the degree that the institution manages to separate itself from the community. The communiversity defines the universal character of the institution's concern in different terms: by application of its resources to the living-breathing community of which it is a part.63

The catalogue outlines many specific means it intends to employ in its ecological, problem-solving approach, and it then states the Theme College Organization:

Because ecological inquiry is pandisciplinary, UWGB has organized its colleges within the framework of environmental themes rather than grouping them according to traditional disciplines. Two colleges select certain types of environment for attention. The College of Environmental Sciences emphasizes the problems of the natural environment. The College of Community Sciences focuses on the social environment. The remaining two colleges are concerned with the individual within his environment. The College of Human Biology centers its attention on human adaptability—that is, on the impingement of the environment of the individual. The College of Creative Communication emphasizes the problem

62 Ibid.
63 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
of human identity or the individual's impingement on his environment. Each College incorporates selected aspects of the liberal arts disciplines with certain applied or professional emphases. Each theme college has responsibility for a coordinated program of undergraduate and graduate studies, research, and community outreach programs related to its special environmental concern. Each college is responsible for developing its own course structure at all levels. Interdisciplinary courses are numerous, and interdisciplinary concentrations are required.64

State University of New York, College of Old Westbury

Chancellor Samuel Gould of the State University of New York asked Harris Wofford, Jr., to plan and create a new college at Old Westbury. The location was a 600 acre tract on the North Shore of Long Island, a one hour drive from New York City. It was ultimately to have 5,000 undergraduate students and a undetermined number of master's degree candidates. Wofford was given virtual carte blanche, and he consulted, planned, and interviewed many in an attempt to avoid the mistakes of others.65

Yet the course for organic growth, for all its inherent difficulties and the unnecessary difficulties we may have added, seems to me the most likely way to find an alternative to the departmentalism and giantism of American higher education, and to the alienation of the students. Against Albany's advice to begin with department heads and let them build their departments, I kept hearing John Gardner's countervailing words: The biggest problem in academia is the departmentalization that cuts up the body of knowledge and keeps us from seeing the world steady and whole. The most important task is to find a better form of organization than departments. Start small, he urged, so small that departments don't make any sense, and in doing this you may discover the right alternative; you may discover the liberal college.

In starting small, with under a hundred students in September, 1968, two years ahead of schedule, we think we did discover a good alternative: constituent colleges, like those at Oxford

64 Ibid., p. 6.

and Cambridge in size and autonomy, except that unlike Oxford and Cambridge where the curriculum was settled two hundred years ago, each constituent college at Old Westbury would have the mandate of the college as a whole to search for and design new forms of liberal education.

As we wrote in our catalogue: This plan seeks to apply to Old Westbury the basic principle of federalism which American society has used in so many areas of government and industry—the federal system of competition and coordination already embodied in the structure of the State University of New York. This plan for a college of federate colleges seeks to answer the complaints about the impersonality of a multiversity by combining the variety and large resources of a university with the unity and intensity of a small college.66

Wofford goes on to outline some of the problems faced during the first two years, but, he says, one of the major achievements was the creation of an Academic Council, "representing faculty, students, and administration for the certification of future constituent colleges, assures regular student participation on that and other legislative bodies without domination, and affirms the executive role of the administration and the predominant academic role of the faculty."67

It is too early to measure the success of these three experiments, although a self-study is in progress at Santa Cruz. The relative stability of the three during the turbulence of the late sixties would suggest at least some success has been achieved.

VII. COMING CHANGES IN BUREAUCRACY

While this chapter would seem to suggest drastic revisions are in order for higher education, the idea is not unique to education. Warren G. Bennis is an eloquent critic of the intergrationist model in any field.68

---
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Bureaucracy, as he sees it, was created during the industrial revolution "to organize and direct the activities of a business firm." And few will deny that higher education is also a bureaucracy, with form and function analogous to industry and government.

The parallel to industry is even more pronounced in some of the debates about funding education today. Buchanan and Devletoglu go so far as to draw a model between higher education and industry, or at least economics in the market place. They see students as consumers who do not buy, faculties as producers who do not sell, and taxpayers as owners who do not control. But common to all institutions, bureaucracy seems an inevitable concomitant of size, and growth has been the measure of progress since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. Bennis states that the anatomy of bureaucracy consists of the following components:

1. A well defined chain of command.

2. A system of procedures and rules for dealing with all contingencies relating to work activities.

3. A division of labor based upon specialization.

4. Promotion and selection based on technical competence.

5. Impersonality in human relations.

He then cites at least four relevant threats to bureaucracy as defined in the integrationist model:

1. Rapid and unexpected change.

---
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2. Growth in size where the volume of an organization's traditional activities is not enough to sustain growth.

3. Complexity of modern technology where integration between activities and persons of very diverse, highly specialized competence is required.

4. A basically psychological threat springing from a change in managerial behavior.\textsuperscript{72}

Bennis believes the organization of the future will have characteristics much in common with the ideal referred to earlier by Elizabeth Mann Borgese. The model will not be mechanistic, but instead will reflect the lessons learned from the biological and behavioral sciences.

Adaptive, problem-solving, temporary systems of diverse specialists, linked together by coordinating and task-evaluating executive specialists in an organic flux--this is the organization from that will gradually replace bureaucracy as we know it. As no catchy phrase comes to mind, I call this an organic-adaptive structure. Organizational arrangements of this sort may not only reduce the intergroup conflicts . . . ; it may also induce honest-to-goodness creative collaboration.\textsuperscript{73}

\textbf{VIII. SUMMARY}

This chapter has examined some current thought on four major problems of higher education: (1) the educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) the governance of higher education, and (4) the future role of research and service in higher education. It has also presented three profiles of institutions which are trying to devise new ways to deal with these problems. Finally, this chapter reports a prediction that bureaucracy as it is presently known, must and will change as the result of forces beyond its control.

\textsuperscript{72}\textit{Ibid.} \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{73}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 31.
The major charges against the educational program are irrelevance and fragmentation. Solutions range from student selection of the curriculum to the inter-disciplinary, or ecological, approach. Others suggest a new sense of mission and of function are necessary first steps for reform, but most critics agree that depersonalization in the name of administrative efficiency must be avoided.

Academic freedom is sometimes accused of freedom and license rather than freedom and responsibility. Causes for this charge are leveled at economics, the institution, lack of a clearly defined mission, the interference of government and industry, and the meddling of administrators under the guise of efficiency. Most critics seem to agree that better student-faculty relations should be one of the prime goals.

The governance of higher education is hotly contested from all sides, but most critics agree that the integrationist model is totally undesirable. The behaviorist model is much more to be desired; yet, the destruction of the institution is not the goal by any means. The goal is to restore or to create self-management and a sense of community and shared mission, while at the same time perfecting the institution. Three models currently being practiced are: (1) The Academic Community, (2) The Independent Constituency, and (3) the City Council Model. Among large institutions, the latter is perhaps the more desirable.

Research and service in higher education are presently too fragmented and uncoordinated to be of effective service to the larger community. It is believed the problems and the best way to attack them is by a confederation of universities and colleges. Since the universities are perhaps the only place where the requisite skills can be found to cope with the many problems of the environment. It is thought better coordination
and planning of the three traditional roles of teaching, research, and service within and among university is a necessity. This obviously implies some changes in structure.

Profiles of the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, and the State University of New York, College of Old Westbury, were presented as examples of institutions which are experimenting with new forms in an attempt to deal with the very problems outlined in this chapter.
CHAPTER III

THE REORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

I. INTRODUCTION

The decade of the sixties saw phenomenal growth in institutions of higher education, particularly in the public and land grant institutions. The University of Tennessee shared in this growth. The problems in financing, in facilities, in staffing, in programs, and in management that are associated with such growth are also well known.

In an attempt to cope with these problems more efficiently and more effectively, President A. D. Holt and his staff engaged in a study to plan the reorganization of The University of Tennessee. This study was launched in March, 1968, and its "primary purpose . . . was to determine the most effective type of organization to manage a large, rapidly expanding institution with several primary campuses." Outside consultants from other system-type institutions were used, and the result of the effort was a formal presentation by President A. D. Holt to the Board of Trustees on June 17, 1968, that The University of Tennessee convert to a system-type organization. The date of implementation was to be July 1, 1968.

It will be observed in Appendix A that The University of Tennessee is a multi-campus institution with degree-granting campuses at Knoxville, Chattanooga, Nashville, Martin, and Memphis. The heart of the new proposal
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was to give each of these campuses autonomy under a chancellor and staff, with overall coordination by the President of the system and his staff. It is the intention of this chapter to examine the system organization in relation to its stated objective and in relation to the four general areas outlined in Chapter II.

II. ORGANIZATION BEFORE JULY 1, 1968

A brief review of the organization prior to the change-over follows.

Knoxville Campus

The Knoxville campus was under authority of President A. D. Holt, and his primary executive officer was Dr. Herman E. Spivey, who was Vice President for Academic Affairs. Such offices as the Computer Center, the Office of Institutional Research, Admissions and Financial Aid, as well as the many academic departments reported to him. The Vice President for Development, the Vice President for Finance, and the General Counsel were present and reported to the President.77

Martin Campus

The Martin campus was under the control of the Knoxville campus, and all academic programs were either developed or approved by the Knoxville Vice President for Academic Affairs. Facilities and student affairs programs were also subject to the approval of the Knoxville campus.78

Memphis Medical Units

The medical units have traditionally been autonomous, because,

77 Statement by President A. D. Holt, personal interview, 1970.
78 Ibid.
in part, of the nature of the programs and the unique nature of the mission.\textsuperscript{79}

\textbf{Chattanooga Campus}

At the time the proposal was submitted to the Board of Trustees, the University operated small graduate and extension programs in Chattanooga; however, the intended take-over of the University of Chattanooga was imminent and would coincide with the July 1, 1968, date the new organization was to take effect. The University of Chattanooga was a small liberal arts college with an enrollment of a little over 2,000, and to be included in this take-over was Chattanooga City College, a predominantly black junior college. The need for effective leadership on this new campus was thus most apparent.\textsuperscript{80}

\textbf{Nashville Campus}

This campus was under the direct jurisdiction of the Knoxville campus. It operated mostly as a evening school and as a downtown center for people working in the Nashville area. A new building was under construction, however, and the plans for Nashville's autonomy were in process.\textsuperscript{81}

The activities and programs of the extension programs, the other centers, and the College of Agriculture were also coordinated through the Knoxville campus. The three traditional roles of the university, \textit{viz.}, teaching, research, and service, were thus handled from the

\textsuperscript{79}Statement by Vice President W. H. Read, personal interview, 1970.
\textsuperscript{80}Statement by Vice President Joseph E. Johnson, personal interview, 1970.
\textsuperscript{81}Ibid.
III. ORGANIZATION AFTER JULY 1, 1968

Because of these and other factors, as stated in Appendix A, the consultants and the administration of the University recommend that the University of Tennessee's Board of Trustees adopt a system-type organization in which each primary campus is administered by a principal executive officer (Chancellor) and University-wide administration and coordination are responsibilities of a University President and a group of staff Vice Presidents in broad functional areas.  

The chief subordinate officers to be appointed were: Vice President for Development and Administration, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Business and Finance, Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive Assistant to the President, and General Counsel. At a later time a Vice President for Extension and Services was to be appointed.

The occupants of these positions would report directly to the President and would be responsible for University-wide coordination of their functional areas through effective staff relationships with the Chancellors and their Vice Chancellors, Deans, and Directors.

It was further stated the Vice Presidents would not have direct or line authority. The resulting system-type organization was as follows.

Vice President for Development and Administration

Combining the offices of development and administration may seem

\[82\text{Ibid.}\]
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\[84\text{Ibid., p. 2.}\]
dysfunctional, but it is explained in the proposal submitted by President Holt:

The Vice President for Development and Administration would coordinate the establishment and implementation of development programs for the entire University system. Development would include fund-raising, governmental relations, alumni affairs, public relations, campus planning, capital construction, and architectural services. The occupant of this position would act for the Vice President in his absence and execute any other functions assigned by the President.85

The last sentence of the foregoing explains the combination of the titles. The Vice President for Development and Administration was thus the second man in the structure, and the addition of the word administration to his title was to so designate. The structure and staff for this office are shown in Figure 1, Appendix E.

**Vice President for Academic Affairs**

The Vice President for Academic Affairs would be responsible for the coordination of undergraduate and graduate academic programs, including research, on all campus and would represent the President in the development and implementation of academic programs. Proposals for new academic programs on all campuses would be referred to this office by the President for review and approval.86

A figure for this office is unnecessary, since the Vice President has been the sole occupant since its inception. There is a position for an Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, but this office has not yet been filled.

**Vice President for Business and Finance**

The Vice President for Business and Finance would be the University system's primary fiscal officer and would be responsible for the development and coordination of system-wide policies on budgeting, accounting, plant operation and

---

maintenance, auditing, purchasing, and non-academic personnel administration. This office would develop, in cooperation with the Chancellors, appropriation requests for submission to the Board of Trustees, Higher Education Commission, and the State Department of Finance and Administration.\textsuperscript{87}

Figure 2, Appendix E, demonstrates the structure and staff for this office.

\textbf{Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive Assistant to the President}

The Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive Assistant to the President would be responsible for system-wide studies of management, organization, and academic subjects and would serve as general assistant to the President. The occupant of this position would utilize campus personnel in the execution of studies and would encourage Chancellors to designate staff members to act as liaison agents on studies. In addition, he would work with Chancellors on student affairs problems with system-wide implications.\textsuperscript{88}

Figure 3, Appendix E, demonstrates the structure and staff for this office.

The Vice President for Extension and Service has not yet been appointed, but his duties would make him "... responsible for the coordination of system-wide extension and service activities."\textsuperscript{89}

A final office at the system level was created. President Holt proposed that the Executive Director of the Government, Industry, and Law Center be changed to Executive Director of Urban Affairs and the Government, Industry, and Law Center. The Board of Trustees did not approve the addition of Urban Affairs, and the office remained the same; however, the Director of GILC does report directly to the President. The final structure, as approved, is shown in Figure 2, Appendix E. There, of course, are the major offices, but it demonstrates the line and staff

\textsuperscript{87}Ibid. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{88}Ibid. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{89}Ibid.
arrangements which conform to President Holt's proposal to the Board of Trustees on June 17, 1968. The new structure became effective July 1, 1968.

IV. STATED GOALS AND FUNCTIONS

Almost coinciding with the above proposals, The University of Tennessee submitted to the Higher Education Commission of Tennessee a pamphlet entitled, "Goals and Functions of The University of Tennessee, 1968-80." This pamphlet was approved by the Board of Trustees, but it has not yet been approved by the Higher Education Commission. Since the entire statement is included in Appendix B, it is unnecessary to quote extensively from it here. One paragraph should suffice.

It is not expected that each campus of the University will be exactly like any other campus in the system. Each should develop its own unique character focused on the special needs of its most likely student body and the area it covers. Although each campus should have its own distinctive mission and character, the University of Tennessee system taken as a whole should cover the total spectrum of university instructional, research, and public service needs of the state. Furthermore, as the capstone of higher education in Tennessee, The University of Tennessee has the challenge to achieve and maintain qualitative prestige on an international scale.

Thus, The University of Tennessee at least tentatively committed itself to the four major areas examined in Chapter II. Considering the structure as indicated in this chapter, an analysis at the systems level vis-à-vis the (1) educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) governance, and (4) research and service would seem in order.
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The Educational Program

With a Vice President for Academic Affairs and an unfilled position for an Assistant Vice President constituting the total staff at the systems level, it would seem the educational program is the least concern of the new organization, at least at the systems level. It is true the move toward campus autonomy would remove much of the activity formerly practiced by this office.

The staff of the office would not seem adequate to deal with such questions as coordination, transfer of credits within the system, admission standards, and the entire panoply of problems connected with the educational program. This is not to suggest direction should come from the top; it is, rather, to affirm that innovation, interdisciplinary studies, etc. should originate within the departments and colleges. This is to suggest, however, that the stated objective of coordination and planning between and among campuses is beyond the capacities of one or two men, particularly in problems connected with the Higher Education Commission. When the question of research was added to this office, the definition of the functions of the office became patently more than the current staff could handle.

One of the duties of the Office of the Vice President for Institutional Research is to perform academic studies. These studies are, however, more quantitative than qualitative, and, as can be seen from the figures in Appendix E, the Office of Institutional Research is not adequately staffed to perform even quantitative studies for all the campuses. The Office of Institutional Research has been preoccupied primarily with work in non-academic areas to date. Dr. Robert K. Roney, Director of Institutional Research, submitted the following data for the academic year...
1968-69 and 1969-70: A total of sixty-five studies were completed—thirty-one for system and thirty-four for UT, Knoxville. Furthermore, thirty-three of the sixty-five were administrative studies, twenty-four student affairs studies, and only eight could be termed academic studies.

The other system-level offices are not directly concerned with the educational program, except as physical facilities, funding, etc., would relate. In sum, the educational program does not seem to be now, nor intended to be in the future, a primary concern of the system-level organization. The individual campuses have the responsibility for planning and implementation; the Vice President for Academic Affairs simply approved or disapproves. It is his recommendation which is presented to the Board of Trustees for approval or disapproval. The leadership necessary to remove some of the criticisms listed in Chapter II is, therefore, not at the systems-level. This is in keeping with the stated goal of campus autonomy but somewhat at variance with the supportive role of systems-level.

**Academic Freedom**

Since the question of academic freedom was not specifically dealt with in the provisions for the new organization, it is assumed that academic freedom is also a matter of individual campus concern. Questions about such freedom should properly be addressed to the Chancellor of the particular campus.

As can be seen from the organizational charts of the systems-level organization (Appendix E), physical facilities, fiscal matters, fund raising, legislative and governmental concerns, and alumni affairs occupy most of the time of the systems staff. There is an obvious implication
for academic freedom, but it is more indirect than direct. One obvious point is that the systems people deal more often and more directly with the Board of Trustees, and unless the concept of academic freedom is believed in and adhered to by the systems personnel it could come under attack. A clear commitment to the concept of academic freedom should thus be included in the statement of goals.

An inherent danger in any large organization is lack of communication, and the larger The University of Tennessee becomes the greater this danger may be. The politicization of education is a further threat of the academic freedom. The unending conflicts between "town and gown" seem likely to continue, and the University can become subject to community forces and opinions which are opposed to even the most limited concept of academic freedom. Events at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, during the winter and spring of 1970 seem to support this conclusion.

**Governance**

The question of governance is best answered by the By-Laws approved by the Board of Trustees. Article IV, Sections 10, 11, 12 of the Charter Provisions of The University of Tennessee point up the fact that it is a hierarchical organization, with delegated powers and functions clearly defined.\(^{(92)}\) As suggested in Chapter 11, this is a source of conflict in higher education, and The University of Tennessee is not excepted.

It is clear from the organizational structure that academic governance is not a prime concern of the system organization. Courses, according

\(^{(92)}\)Charter Provisions of The University of Tennessee. (See Appendix C.)
requirements, admission, retention, and requirements for degrees remain with the academic community. Almost the entire remainder of governance rests with the Chancellors or with the President and his staff.

To appreciably alter the methods and practices of governance, the By-Laws would have to be changed. Within the framework of these By-Laws, however, considerable variation may exist upon an individual campus, but the ultimate responsibility rests with the Chancellor or the President. Student involvement in governance, when practiced, is thus of an advisory nature just as is faculty participation when outside the particular concern of the curriculum. It may be fairly stated, then, that faculty and student participation in governance is, except in an advisory way, minimal at The University of Tennessee.

The faculty recommended some changes in this arrangement in a proposal submitted early in 1970. Among other recommendations, the Faculty Senate was to be delegated the power to enact regulations concerning:

1. The educational policy of the University.
2. Policies regarding requirements for admission, retention, readmission, graduation, and honors.
3. Policies for the approval of candidates for degrees.
5. Criteria for the selection of the Chancellor and other campus administrative officers.
6. Criteria in conjunction with corresponding governing bodies of
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the other campuses of the University, for the selection of the President and other system officers.

7. Athletics policies.

To date, however, no action has been taken on these proposals.

**Research and Service**

Research and service are perhaps the most uncoordinated of all the activities of The University of Tennessee at the systems-level. As can be seen from the Figures in Appendix E, no office exists to coordinate these activities. All that is done is done on the campus level. President Holt recognized this need in his proposal to the Board of Trustees for a Vice President for Extension and Service, but this office has not yet been filled. Much is anticipated to happen in this area before long, but at the moment the many things done in service by departments, colleges, and individuals is largely uncoordinated. Most research is channeled through the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research on the Knoxville campus. Other campuses have their own programs. The need to coordinate applied research activities seems apparent, particularly that research which is allied with service functions, assuming, of course, that service activities of the University will become more oriented to problem-solving in urban and rural areas as published in the "Goals and Functions of The University of Tennessee, 1968-1980," (Appendix B).

**V. SUMMARY**

This chapter has presented a brief history of The University of Tennessee as background for the need for reorganization. The reorganization
to a systems-type university with autonomous campuses has been examined, and an examination of the systems-level organization has been presented. This systems-level organization was then examined for its effectiveness in relation to the four broad areas of: (1) educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) governance, and (4) research and service.

Chapter IV will suggest an organizational structure for the systems-level which will be seen able to cope better with these same four broad areas.
CHAPTER IV

A STRUCTURE TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION AND IMPROVE COORDINATION

I. INTRODUCTION

The role of systems-level organization is subject to debate. Should it, for instance, take an active role in the educational program of the individual campuses? Should it, or can it, be involved in coordination of research and service without interfering with academic freedom? Does campus autonomy prohibit systems intervention? Or, put another way, can centralization of some services and functions be achieved without undue interference with campus and individual freedom? This chapter assumes that systems-level organization can and should be involved in certain matters and that this involvement need not interfere with the objectives of campus autonomy or individual freedom.

As Elizabeth Mann Borgese wrote, the separation of the individual and the institution into opposing factions need not continue.94 If her assertion that the fundamental battle being waged today is over the right to self-management is accepted, then the conflict between institutions and individuals can be resolved. This chapter's basic assumption, therefore, is that the right to self-management is the point of much of the contention, and, for the purposes of the structure to be suggested, this right is accepted by the various elements at The University of Tennessee.

This assumption means that any attachment to In Loco Parentis is inapplicable, and that any decision for institutional convenience or necessity should be made only after due deliberation of its impact on individual rights. With these two basic assumptions, this chapter will consider ways in which the four areas of (1) educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) governance, and (4) research and service can be better served by systems-level organization. It will conclude with an organizational chart to support these intentions.

II. THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The charges or irrelevancy, fragmentation, and rigidity are not easily resolved. Much of the solution depends upon sound research and solid implementation. Such research may be beyond the resources of a particular campus, and the implementation may well require budgetary and facilities help which is beyond the resources of an individual campus. Furthermore, the time and effort required to research and explore innovations in the educational program may require more than a particular campus can or will give. Since the campus is involved in the day to day operations of the educational program as well as the multitudinous other duties of running the community, the faculty and staff may well be prohibited from the thoughtful consideration that such questions require. It is doubly difficult to change programs or structure while maintaining an on-going program and campus. Thus, if innovation and change are accepted as desirable or inevitable, adequate staff support from systems would seem imperative.

The rising demand for interdisciplinary studies, for a more humanized learning environment, and for a flexible curriculum further supports
the need for staff assistance from system. To examine these questions with
the proper perspective and detachment, some structure needs to be created
which can do so without the pressures to day-to-day teaching, administering, or confronting. Change for the sake of change is seldom desirable, and change in the face of pressures is seldom constructive. Innovation
should be orderly and serve both the individual, the campus, and the total
institution.

The questions of course designations, transfer of credits, and graduation
requirements also need attention. At present The University of Tenness-
see at Chattanooga is on the semester system, while the campuses at Knox-
ville, Martin, and Nashville are on the quarter system. Course designations
are also a matter for particular colleges or departments, and considerable
confusion and even hardships exist for students transferring within the
system. A means to examine these problems with the end of resolving the
conflicts needs to be created. Coordination between and among campuses
is also needed to insure common goals in the educational programs. This
is not to suggest that identical offerings be made at each campus; it is,
instead, to see that common goals and purposes exist where identical
degrees or courses occur.

As will be mentioned later in this chapter, the demands of support
from the educational program in research and service will require much
coordination and planning. Individual professors, departments and colleges,
as well as the individual campuses do much in the area of research and
service. If, however, The University of Tennessee is to become more
involved in urban problem-solving, the talents and expertise of the seg-
ments will have to be coordinated within the whole. Urban problems are
universally recognized, but little systematic work toward solving these
problems has yet been done. The fragmented approach which is endemic to some of the curriculum can scarcely be recommended as a means to solving urban problems. The urgency of the urban dilemma will doubtless create the first priority at the systems-level, and it would seem obvious that support from the educational program is of equal urgency. The desirability of early involvement is apparent. An inventory of urban commitment and involvement by faculty around the state should be a first step.

The very practical consideration of needing the Board of Trustee's approval for innovations is another reason for systems involvement. Since campus planning of facilities and fiscal allocations come from system, the argument for system involvement in the educational program becomes more persuasive.

As shown in Chapter III, the Academic Vice President is at present a one man operation. If the goals outlined above are to be fulfilled, this office would require considerable expansion. Suggestions for this expansion are listed below:

1. Academic Council. A first need of this office is the input of ideas. Such ideas should suggest ways to avoid irrelevancy, fragmentation, and rigidity, and they should come from as many sources as possible. It is, therefore, suggested that an academic council be created to advise the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This council would consist of outstanding professors from many disciplines who would be given relief from all teaching and other duties to serve as long as needed. The council would not be fixed in number, nor would it be staffed by the same people all the time. Since the nature of the problems to be faced changes constantly, the council would be composed of those best qualified to deal with a given problem at a given time. Almost by definition the council
would be inter-disciplinary and should thus be competent to suggest changes needed to confront the changes of irrelevancy, fragmentation, and rigidity. Ideally, no council member should have to serve more than one academic quarter. The council should also have the authority and money to call in experts from outside the system if a given problem suggested the necessity.

2. Assistant Academic Vice President. The problems of course designations, transfer of credits, and graduation requirements and the other problems connected with academic coordination within the system should be the primary functions of this job. Additionally, the Assistant Academic Vice President would serve as liaison with the campuses and act in the absence of the Academic Vice President.

3. Director of Research and Service. This office would be primarily responsible for inventorying what is being done in academic research and service and maintaining complete and up-to-date records of all such activities. It is foreseen that this office would have access to computer services and would also be involved in federal proposals and requests for grants. A further duty would be to coordinate with Urban Affairs and with Institutional Research.

At the risk of seeming repetitious, it should be stressed that the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs is a staff position. The best of ideas is useless if not acceptable to the ones who must implement them. Thus, the autonomy of the individual campus is not threatened; it is enhanced by staff work which it would not otherwise have access to. System can, of course, suggest, but it cannot dictate.

The Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs could experiment with new forms and models for innovation. The Council could, and should, circulate the results of their deliberations, and the dialogue between
the Council and the Vice President would be beneficial. The Council members would naturally be in constant touch with their department or college, and lines of communication would be improved between faculty and administration.

III. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

At first glance it would seem academic freedom is not an active concern at the systems-level, but even the briefest second thought suggests this concept may be the core of the entire educational enterprise and is thus a primary concern for systems administration. While the systems organization is somewhat remote from the actual teaching which justifies the existence of the whole enterprise, it is primarily responsible for the support which makes this teaching possible. The extent of this support and the way in which it is handled creates the atmosphere and spirit which pervades the entire educational structure.

It is a rare administrator who will not endorse academic freedom, but the actions of many administrators suggest this endorsement is not all it should be. The University of Tennessee Faculty Handbook makes the following statement on academic freedom:

The principal mission of the University is the discovery and dissemination of truth through research, demonstration, and teaching. The Board recognizes that freedom of inquiry and expression is indispensable for this purpose and believes that it and the administration and the faculty should cooperate to that end.\(^95\)

The question which arises over what is "true" has produced some conflicts in the past several years, to which The University of Tennessee is no exception. Actions by students and professors, presumably in the name

\(^{95}\)Faculty Handbook: The University of Tennessee, Approved by the Board of Trustees, 1957 (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, Revised 1965), p. 19.
of truth, have produced counteractions from the State Legislature, the Board of Trustees, and administrators. The most recent example at the University was the so-called April 1970 strike which followed the Kent State killings. Some students and faculty did not attend classes for three days in protest over the shootings and the Cambodian War. At its June 1970 meeting, the Board of Trustees authorized the General Counsel of the University to investigate the matter. The purpose of the investigation was to determine if faculty members had failed to live up to their contracts, but other overtones were suspected by many of the faculty.

In large part this may be due to the fundamental conflict, referred to earlier, between the larger society and the institution, particularly individuals within the institution. This conflict seems to be of two parts. First, the politicization of education has, by definition, the danger of becoming political control rather than the more positive value of involving education in the larger community as a teaching, research, service function.

Lord James of Rusholme put it most succinctly:

Let us consider the actual control of education within a democratic community. Who, in the last resort, ought to run the schools and universities? Who should decide what goes on within them? This is clearly a matter of great importance and great difficulty. Education is one of the principal means by which a society seeks to perpetuate its values; it is through education that it produces the workers of various kinds on whom its prosperity depends; it is partly through education that it will seek to maintain or alter its social structure. On all these grounds the state, in one or another of its manifestations, cannot be disinterested in the educational system, and to many writers who would claim to be thinking in democratic terms in a democratic community all education must come under the control of the state. Nor is this interpretation of democratic sentiment the only force tending to

---

96 Minutes of the June 18, 1970, meeting of the Board of Trustees, The University of Tennessee.
increase the power of the state in education. The quantity and quality of educational provision demanded by a modern community increases the cost to a point which the state alone can provide. It is inevitable that the community will demand ever increasing control over the education which it subsidizes. This is weighty additional reason why, to many people, a democratic educational system means one in which the agencies of education, whether they be schools, or colleges, or universities, are under the control of the democratic state itself, whatever that phrase may mean. 97

The implications of this are obvious, although not necessarily a threat to academic freedom. The manner in which the institution is governed determines the extent to which academic freedom may or may not be threatened. But, as stated earlier, the fact of politicization must be accepted, just as the dangers of such politicization must be recognized.

The other part of the conflict seems to be closely allied to the first danger: the contention between equality and liberty. Again, Lord James of Rusholme:

If a belief in individual liberty is a characteristic element in democratic thought, an adherence to the idea of equality is not less important. It is an idea which is both immensely powerful and essentially ambiguous... It is certainly true that the idea of equality has particularly clear relations with education. It will obviously affect very directly the organization of the educational system. Further, education can be one of the most powerful agents tending towards a greater degree of equality in society. Two quite distant meanings can be attached to the term in educational contexts. On the one hand, we can assert that although all men are manifestly not equal, we must as far as possible treat them as if they were and do all in our power to play down the difference between them. Such a view we may call equalitarian to distinguish it from the other view, which interprets equality as meaning equality of opportunity—which aims, that is to say, at recognizing and accepting the differences between individuals, and seeking to give them the opportunities appropriate to their

particular talents. . . . By seeking to minimize the differences between individuals, the equalitarian philosophy is actually opposed to that important element in democratic thought which regards the individual as having supreme value by very virtue of those attributes which make him unique. . . . We are committed to aim at the mean.\textsuperscript{98}

The guiding philosophy of an institution of higher education can thus have profound effects upon academic freedom. If, for instance, the equalitarian philosophy provides the principles under which the institution operates to the exclusion of other principles, academic freedom could suffer in ways too numerous to mention or list here. The reverse would also apply.

Other factors affect the concept of academic freedom, but these two seem to be the chief ones to consider. This leads to the conclusion that an institution should have a clearly stated philosophy under which it operates and is governed. A prospective faculty member or staff member could then have some idea of what he is getting into, and he would certainly be able to make his choice. An unstated or ambiguous philosophy leaves too much to the discretion of the powers that be, and the winds of public opinion, never too stable, could drastically affect academic freedom. The recent example of the McCarthy era is dramatic enough to use as a case in point.

Although the statement of purpose which The University of Tennessee sent to the Higher Education Commission in Nashville implies a philosophy, it is ambiguous in certain areas and does not contain a clear commitment to academic freedom. The Board of Trustees has affirmed its faith in

\textsuperscript{98}Ibid., pp. 210-211.
such freedom in the absence of a guiding philosophy may not be sufficiently reassuring.

IV. GOVERNANCE

The ultimate authority at The University of Tennessee rests with the Board of Trustees. The Board appoints a President, and he is responsible for administering the will of the Board and is also responsible to the Board. Unless the Board of Trustees were to change this structure, it is apparent that the President is the ultimate and final authority in most matters. In the last few years the attrition rate among college presidents suggests the job may be too much for one man. The manner in which the president governs, however, has an infinite number of varieties. So, rather than suggest a change in structure, this section will deal with the manner of governance.

The structure demonstrated in Chapter III shows that the President is the only line office at the systems-level. The remainder of the systems organization is strictly staff officers. It is important to keep this in mind in the light of the stated commitment to campus autonomy. The first consideration of governance, then, is that the systems-level organization is staff and service in nature. It is, of course, the coordinating agency for the several campuses, but, unless instructed otherwise by the President, it is not regulatory. With this in mind, it is possible to consider governance at the systems-level in connection with the three stated purposes of the university: teaching, research, and service.

The role of systems in teaching has been covered under the sub-heading of "The Educational Program." Research, as shown in Chapter III, is presently coordinated through the office of the Vice Chancellor for
Graduate Studies and Research. As suggested earlier, this might more pro-
perly come under the Vice President for Academic Affairs, particularly since
the system will continue to grow. At present the Vice Chancellor for Grad-
uate Studies and Research reports to the Vice Chancellor of the Knoxville
campus. The need to extend and expand the scope of research activities is
apparent. Institutional research is conducted by the Office of Institu-
tional Research and is under the control of the Vice President for Institu-
tional Research as shown in Chapter III. It also has a Director.

Since the present Vice President for Institutional Research is
also the Executive Assistant to the President as shown on the organiza-
tional chart, institutional research is more or less under the direction
of the President. The need for a Vice President for Institutional Research
is not apparent, and it is suggested that the Director of Institutional
Research report directly to the President or through the Executive Assis-
tant; otherwise the type of research might be determined by the staff
office to which it was attached.

Service will be covered within the next section.

The need for a chief fiscal officer is demonstrated, as is the need
for a General Counsel. Both offices are service functions to the three
chief areas of concern. The question of the advisability of centralizing
or decentralizing the office for fiscal matters has adherents on both
sides, but it is beyond the purview of this paper.

Another question about structure is whether an Executive Vice
President should be appointed. Those who believe the task of President
is more than one man can handle suggest this as an alternative. Others
believe it is but another layer of bureaucracy and further removes the
President from direct contact with the various segments of the community.
Since the existence of such an office has no direct connection with the concerns of this paper, the pros and cons will not be discussed. At the moment it will be assumed the need for an office of Vice President for Institutional Research is not justified, but that the need for an Executive President is demonstrated. Institutional research needs of the individual campus probably suggest the need for such an office on each campus.

The authority to govern obviously is set by law, but the selection of who shall govern has several options. While final authority must rest with the Board of Trustees, the actual selection of the man to fill the various administrative spots should be the responsibility of the entire educational community as recommended in Appendix D. Appendix D contains suggestions from a committee of faculty on the Knoxville campus, but this proposal has not gone beyond the proposal stage. As suggested in Chapter II, the selection of administrative officers, their terms of office, and the other criteria referred to should involve all segments of the university community. The actual details of this process are also beyond the purview of this paper.

V. RESEARCH AND SERVICE

The organizational location for research has been discussed. The question of what kinds of research is not the question here, but the nature of research and the coordination of much of it may change or need restructuring if The University of Tennessee is to become more involved in the problems of the society around it. The likelihood of this happening has been demonstrated earlier. That research connected with the expanded service functions of the University will be the focus of this section.
From the statement of goals and purposes listed in Appendix B, it is projected that the three main areas in which The University of Tennessee will expand its service function are: (1) continuing education, (2) urban problems, and (3) agricultural matters.

Continuing Education

As stated in Chapter I, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins believes the need for a life-long liberal education for all is upon us. This is generally extension courses, correspondence courses, and other terms in higher education, but it is generally agreed that the nature and extent of these offerings need considerable improvement and expansion.\(^99\) It is thus clear that research is needed in this area as well as better methods of dissemination. Increasing technological achievements in communication and electronics suggest the means to reach out farther and better is at hand; it simply needs to be properly utilized by the educational community. The research could be handled by the Academic Council and the Office of Institutional Research.

The University of Tennessee has all the components to achieve this improved service; the need is to coordinate the efforts of the parts into a mosaic of efficiency and service. In these infant stages it may not be necessary to establish an Office of Vice President for Continuing Education, and the efforts, through the initial stages, could be coordinated through the Vice President for Academic Affairs.\(^100\)

\(^99\)Urban Affairs Self-Study, submitted by the Office of the Dean of Continuing Education to the Executive Assistant to the President of The University of Tennessee, July 1, 1970.

\(^100\)Ibid.
As the use of the media increases, TV, radio, etc., it would seem desirable to coordinate these activities through the systems-level, particularly if these services will serve the entire state. The need to sell the best is equally as important as the ideal of having the best to sell. The increasing resistance of state legislatures to rising budgets is well known. The mission of the University needs to be stressed just as the means to achieve this mission requires careful explanation. At present, as shown on the organizational charts, Appendix E, there is a public relations office under the Vice President for Development and Administration. As the responsibilities and awareness increase, this office should be expanded. Ultimately, it may be desirable to create the office of Vice President for Public Relations, but the Director of Public Relations should be under the Vice President for Administration until and if the need for change arises.

Urban Problems

The University of Tennessee has a wide and diverse commitment to urban problems, but most of these activities are by individuals, departments, and colleges. Furthermore, the nature and extent of this commitment across the state is not really known. To correct this deficiency and to attempt to discover the best way to structure an urban affairs center, the university initiated an urban affairs inventory, under the direction of the author, in the summer of 1970. The purpose is, of course, to discover what is being done, by whom it is being done, sources of funding, and the extent of the urban commitment by the various divisions and departments.

The second phase of this study is to develop means to better coordinate and direct The University of Tennessee's activities in urban
affairs. The organization structure which will emerge is yet unknown, but it is probably that a Director of Urban Affairs will be needed at the systems-level. It may eventually require a Vice President for Urban Affairs.

**Agricultural Affairs**

Traditionally, The University of Tennessee has been intimately involved in agricultural matters across the state in almost every level of concern. These programs have been administratively controlled by the Knoxville campus. Since the conversion to system on July 1, 1968, this structure has remained the same. It seems logical for the service aspects of these programs to move to systems-level administration, while the academic programs in agriculture remain administratively under the Chancellor of the Knoxville campus. The service aspects of agriculture spread across the entire state, and by placing them under systems administration, it is probable better coordination could be achieved. The separation of the service activities from the institutional and research programs should permit each to fulfill its mission more effectively.

Such a move would permit wider cooperation and coordination among the other service aspects of systems administration. It is not inconceivable that Urban Affairs and Agricultural Affairs would have several areas of mutual concern which could be better coordinated at the systems-level. It is suggested, therefore, that a Vice President for Agricultural Affairs be created.

**VI. ADMINISTRATION**

The Vice President for Administration would be the chief administrative officer for the system; it would be his function to see to the
implementation of policies and procedures chose by the Board of Trustees and the President. He would also have an Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs at systems level. Since the concept of In Loco Parentis is on the wane, it is not considered necessary to have a Vice President for Student Affairs. These matters are primarily the concern and responsibility of the individual campuses; however, the need to coordinate and assist in planning from the systems-level is obvious. Thus, a man to serve under the Vice President for Administration in this capacity is recommended. The need for computer services is self-evident. It is assumed the computer center is adequate, and it is thought it should be under the Vice President for Administration. Presently, the computer center is under the Treasurer, but as computer capacities increase, this administrative location would become less and less effective. The range of computer services will be increased, and increased coordination will be needed.

The Vice President for Development would be responsible for those duties in development suggested in the organizational charts, Appendix E. Development is in two parts: fund-raising and alumni affairs, and physical facilities. It is not thought these duties are incompatible.

The organizational structure outlined in this chapter should permit The University of Tennessee to fulfill its states goals and purposes (Appendix B) more efficiently and effectively. It should also permit the individual campuses their autonomy and encourage them to experiment with new forms and programs in the educational program. The intent of this structure is to fulfill the ideal suggested by Robert Forst in Chapter I: to provide the mass with its necessity and the individual with his freedom. By centralizing certain functions, planning is better,
allocations more equitable, and the individual campus is freed from the burden of duplicated services so characteristic of higher education.

Freed from many of the tasks of management, the individual campus should be better able to pursue the aims of better teaching and learning.

The organizational chart (Figure 4, Appendix E) is the structure visualized to achieve the immediate ends. This chart outlines the major offices only; the staff within and under these offices is subject to constant change. And, considering the past of change, perhaps the following observation is in order:

The future is unpredictable because the freedom of man makes him unpredictable. He is continually open to change, adapting and creating at rates we should not have believed possible before this generation. The result is that one generation's brilliant design may be the next generation's black refusal. It is collective existentialism, in which the world is decided on afresh at every moment, and where no one, neither the fathers nor the books nor God nor a theory of what is best, makes the rules for us except as we choose them freely anew at every moment. Every generation from now on will face something like the same existential and immediate choice we face—the option of suicide or of freedom with effort, cooperation, and abundance. We can set up structures to help our children keep from killing themselves by accident and to give them time to think what they are doing, but we cannot force them to keep these structures and we cannot finally determine their values. We can only demonstrate our own values in the structure we build for them and then acknowledge that the future is open-ended, to be chosen afresh by new men every morning.

It is this change from drift to choice, to collective responsibility and commitment, that dominates all the other changes today. It is the change from the adolescent to the man. It is the change from evolution by ignorance and fatal acceptance to evolution by intelligence, anticipation, and decision. It is the change from being run by aristocrats, or capitalists, or managers to participatory democracy. We have bitten into the apple of knowledge and our eyes are opened. We have been driven out of the Eden or irresponsibility into the world of decision. We now know that it is we who are responsible for shaping the future. Whether we live or die, we will never go back to irresponsibility again.101

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

While much rhetoric has emerged from the post-Sputnik era, little actual change in the structure and function of higher education has accompanied it. The four areas most criticized have been: (1) the educational program, (2) academic freedom, (3) governance of higher education, and (4) research and service. Equally under attack by the students has been the concept of In Loco Parentis, but this battle may be largely won since the concept finds little support in the courts now. The major thrust of the criticism has been to achieve relevance with freedom, freedom with responsibility, governance by and with the consent of the governed, and research and service free from a detachment to the larger human needs. Combined with these aims has been an awareness that better coordination is needed as well as better planning and resource allocation. The goal, then, has been to create a structure for higher education, particularly public higher education, which combines the virtues of centralization and the freedom of individual autonomy.

The emergence of systems-level organizational structures is relatively new in higher education, although its counterpart has existed for some time in government and industry. The ideal of the systems organization is to provide the fiscal and physical support for the individual campuses within the system so that they can pursue the goals of improved teaching, research, and service without the necessity of having also to provide the management and specialist skills so vital to maintaining
an on-going enterprise of the size most public institutions of higher
education are becoming. The question is, of course, can management be
free from manipulation and can centralization be free from control?

With these concerns as the core of the study, the present systems-
level structure of The University of Tennessee was examined to see how it
supported the four areas. Where it was believed to be non-supportive or
dysfunctional, changes in structure were recommended. The published goals
of The University of Tennessee were used to construct a philosophical base
which is believed vital to the commitment. The study has thus been largely
descriptive and presumptive.

II. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The most serious and continuing charge against the educational pro-
gram has been that of irrelevancy. Causes for this irrelevancy include a
fragmented curriculum, departmentalization of the university, grades,
emphasis upon specialization, confusion over function, and attempts by
universities to be all things to all men. This last charge is leveled
at the multiversity and implies that one of the main faults lies in the
sheer size of many institutions. The unprecedented growth rate over the
past decade also accounts for some of the dissatisfaction.

Closely tied to the educational program is the concept of academic
freedom. Some have accused the academic community of freedom with license
or freedom from responsibility. The causes for the abuses against academic
freedom are various: (1) the pursuit of research or the consulting dollar
by professors, (2) that academic freedom is incapable of resolution until
the functions of the university and the professor are spelled out much
better than now, (3) the introduction of economic forces into the university
by government and industry, (4) institutional rigidity, (5) the system of rewards and punishment, the "publish or perish" syndrome, and the faculty rank system, (6) the policies of administrators which place institutional convenience or need above that of the individual.

The conflict over governance in higher education is also closely tied to the concept of academic freedom. It has been noted that the faith in the authority of American institutions is generally on the wane, and higher education is subject to the same loss of faith. The question was posed of whether or not it is possible to centralize authority and at the same time permit campus autonomy. The fear was expressed that the technology which permits the centralization is the same force which will destroy autonomy. The tensions which arise over the needs of institutional efficiency and individual freedom are widely apparent, and the possibility of encouraging pluralism in the face of efficiency was debated.

Elizabeth Mann Borgese wrote that the major force or idea in society today, at least the Western, technological ones, is the demand for the right to self-management. She also stated that this idea should not be a threat to institutions, since man and his institutions need each other to progress. This points up the conflict between the integrationist theory of organizations and the behaviorist theory, and it is manifested in higher education with the demands of faculty and students for a share in the governance. The Committee on Student-Faculty-Administration Relationship of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges concluded a study on governance and identified three models which seem to prevail: (1) the Academic Community, (2) the Independent Community, and (3) the City Council Model. The Committee recommended the
City Council Model, but they stated the Independent Constituency seemed to be growing.

Research and service has been a traditional role of higher education, but it, too, has been subjected to increasing criticism. The idea of pure research as distinguished from social goals or needs has been particularly attacked. Yet the larger society is keenly aware that the necessary expertise to tackle many social problems is located primarily in the universities and colleges. This has led many to believe that higher education should adopt the concern of Gardner as a stated goal. The public awareness of the deterioration of the environment has enlisted more support for the idea.

Since research and service in higher education has been as fragmented as the curriculum, and for much the same reasons, the necessity for restructuring the university to coordinate the efforts has assumed wider acceptance. The complexity of the urban problems requires an interdisciplinary, or ecological, approach, and the planning and cooperation necessary to achieve this reinforces the necessity for a different structure. All this suggests that the expanded mission of the university requires an enlarged commitment and philosophy different from the nineteenth century one in wide use today.

Examples of three universities which are trying to change their structure and mission to meet these challenges were given. They are: the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, and State University of New York, College of Old Westbury. Each of these fulfills the needs outlined above in different ways, but each is experimenting with changes in the educational program to achieve relevancy, has adopted a philosophy and commitment to academic freedom,
has established an organizational structure to support the commitment and to guarantee a share in governance by the constituency, and has accepted a wider responsibility for research and service. This latter consideration, however, is not as apparent in the three, partly because of their size and resources.

As far as organization is concerned, the thrust seems to be away from the mechanistic, integrationist theory and toward the social, behaviorist theory. This consideration, plus the four functional areas studied, became the focus of Chapters III and IV. The University of Tennessee departed from its traditional structure on July 1, 1968, and adopted the systems-type organization. The University of Tennessee system was to be administered by the President and his staff, and the five main campuses were to be administered by a Chancellor and his staff. The restructuring was done to improve the three primary roles of teaching, research, and service which have been the goals of The University of Tennessee for some years. Chapter III examined the reasons for the change in organization as well as the function of the President and his staff. The four Vice Presidents created under the new organization were: (1) Vice President for Academic Affairs, (2) Vice President for Development and Administration, (3) Vice President for Business and Finance, and (4) Vice President for Institutional Research. Charts were presented to show the staff structure for each vice president.

In June, 1968, The University of Tennessee submitted to the Higher Education Commission a pamphlet entitled, "Goals and Functions of The University of Tennessee, 1968-1980." The entire statement is included as Appendix B to this study, and it was used to demonstrate the University's intention to create campus autonomy as well as to imply a
philosophy. With the structure, the goals and functions, and the implied philosophy as background, Chapter III concluded with an analysis of the existing structure in implementing the stated goals. Particular emphasis was placed upon the educational program, academic freedom, governance, and research and service.

Chapter IV began with the assumption that the right to self-management is a basic right, and it was used as the basis for presenting an organizational model for the systems organization at The University of Tennessee. The four areas under consideration in this study combined with the right to self-management to dictate the structure which was presented. If ekistics is to become the prime consideration of higher education, it was stated that ecology is probably the only means to achieve it. To realize this goal, a chart was presented which listed the major functions of systems-level staff only. These are: (1) President, (2) Executive Assistant to the President, (3) Vice President for Academic Affairs, who is assisted by an Academic Council, an Assistant Vice President, a Director of Continuing Education, and a Director of Research, (4) Director of Institutional Research, (5) Vice President for Urban Affairs, (6) Vice President for Agricultural Affairs, (7) Vice President for Administration, who is assisted by an Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, a Director of Public Relations, and a Director of Computer Services, (8) Vice President for Finance, with the Treasurer of the University serving with him, (9) Vice President for Development, assisted by a Director of Campus Planning and a Director for Annual Giving and Alumni Affairs, and (10) General Counsel.

It was suggested that future events might create the need to appoint a Vice President for Public Relations and a Vice President for Continuing
Education. The various staff positions within each of these functions was not presented, because the nature of the tasks performed would be subject to change and the staffing needs could not be anticipated. It is thought this would be particularly true as experience was gained in coordination and service within the system and to the larger society. It was stressed that this organizational model was to serve rather than to control, and the goal was to help to improve programs and policies in the four primary areas under consideration in this study.

III. CONCLUSIONS

This study was the basis for the following conclusions:

1. The educational program needs more support in the form of research and recommendations for innovation from the systems-level organization of The University of Tennessee system. This is not to challenge campus autonomy, but, instead, it is to provide supportive services which are beyond the capacities of the campus.

2. Academic freedom as well as institutional goals does not have a clear philosophical commitment from The University of Tennessee.

3. Although In Loco Parentis is not, or soon will not be, applicable at The University of Tennessee, student services will continue on the several campuses. These services lack coordination and planning assistance from the systems-level.

4. A means to guarantee a share in governance by the constituency of The University of Tennessee does not exist.

5. Research and service lack coordination and planning at the systems-level.

6. The danger of politicization becoming political control is
real and should be resisted by all means possible. Political control could
easily defeat all the goals of this study and the stated goals of The
University of Tennessee

7. A clear commitment to urban problem-solving by The University
of Tennessee has not yet been made.

8. In view of the stated goals and functions of The University of
Tennessee, the existing systems-level organizational structure is not
adequate.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and conclusions of this study suggested the following
recommendations.

1. An Academic Council should be created to explore means to
achieve innovations in the curriculum, to examine current curriculum
offerings for applicability or relevance, and to recommend changes to
the various campuses. The request for change should originate from the
campus, however. Possible changes in the structure of colleges and de-
partments would be included in the deliberations of the Academic Council.
The Council would assist the individual campuses with their educational
program in all ways the campus believed useful.

2. A clearly stated and agreed upon philosophy for The University
of Tennessee is recommended. This philosophy would include a commitment
to academic freedom as well as a statement of institutional goals. The
goals should be reasonably specific but open-ended, since changing times
will doubtless necessitate changing goals.

3. A function of the UT-system should be to develop better coor-
dination and planning of student services.
4. The City Council Model of governance should be encouraged, rather than let the Independent Constituency Model become fact by default. Policies and procedures should be instituted toward this end.

5. The organizational structure of the UT-system should be expanded to include functions to guarantee better coordination and planning in research and service. This reorganization should demonstrate a clear commitment to urban problem-solving, as well as agricultural problem-solving.

6. Although the politicization of education is probably inevitable, policies, procedures, and structures should be so designed as to try to avoid political control by any segment of society.
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LETTER FROM PRESIDENT A. D. HOLT TO THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES, "PROPOSED REORGANIZATION
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE"

June 17, 1968

TO: The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees

FROM: President A. D. Holt

SUBJECT: Proposed Reorganization of the University of Tennessee

A major reorganization study of the University of Tennessee was launched in March, 1968. The primary purpose of the study was to determine the most effective type of organization to manage a large, rapidly expanding institution with several primary campuses. The study involved the President and all members of his cabinet. In addition, outstanding higher educators--Dr. Elmer Ellis (Former President of the University of Missouri), Dr. Otis Singletary (Executive Vice Chancellor of the University of Texas System), Dr. Cecil Taylor (Chancellor of Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge)--were employed as consultants to assist in the evaluation of the current organization and to develop recommendations for reorganization. Dr. John Polger, Executive Director of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, also participated in the study.

The study was prompted by the following factors which indicated the need for a reorganization:

1. The University of Tennessee is the twenty-third largest institution in the United States with an enrollment of approximately 28,000 students. Enrollment is expected to move upward during the coming years.

2. The University is a multi-campus institution with degree-granting campuses at Knoxville, Chattanooga, Nashville, Martin, and Memphis. Each of these campuses needs strong leadership and a relatively high degree of independence in the development of programs. At the same time a high level of effective coordination is needed for all campuses and programs within the system.

3. Under the present organization the President of the entire University is chief executive officer of the Knoxville campus, the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the University is the principal academic officer for the Knoxville campus, and the Vice President for Finance for the University is chief finance office for the Knoxville campus.

On the basis of the preceding factors, the consultants and the administration of the University recommend that the University of Tennessee's
Board of Trustees adopt a system-type organization in which each primary campus is administered by a principal executive officer (Chancellor), and University-wide administration and coordination are responsibilities of a University President and a group of staff Vice Presidents in broad functional areas. Detailed recommendations to accomplish this objective are presented below:

1. The chief executive officer of the University of Tennessee would be the President who would be appointed by and responsible to the Board of Trustees.

2. Each primary campus of the University would be administered by a Chancellor who would be appointed by the President with approval of the Board of Trustees. Each Chancellor would be directly responsible to the President and would appoint cabinet members in the areas of academic affairs, finance and business, student personnel, and development. The title of Vice Chancellor may be used for these second-level campus personnel, but usage of the title would not be extensive, especially on the smaller campuses. Chancellors would be appointed at Knoxville, Martin, Memphis, and Chattanooga. A chancellor would be added at Nashville when this campus reaches an appropriate level in its development.

Chancellors and their staff members would operate within system-wide policies and would maintain coordinative relationships with the President and his staff members.

3. The President would appoint immediately the following system-level personnel with University-wide responsibilities in the indicated functional areas: Vice President for Development and Administration, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Business and Finance, Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive Assistant to the President, and General Counsel. At the appropriate time the President would also appoint a Vice President for Extension and Services. The occupants of these positions would report directly to the President and would be responsible for University-wide coordination of their functional areas through effective staff relationships with the Chancellors and their Vice Chancellors, Deans, and Directors. Presidential staff members would not exercise direct or line authority over the Chancellors or their subordinates but would represent the President in carrying out functional assignments.

4. The General Counsel would handle legal matters for the entire University system, would be responsible for the preparation and execution of all legal documents, and would represent the University in all legal actions. The General Counsel would also continue as Secretary to the Board of Trustees.

5. The Vice President for Development and Administration would coordinate the establishment and implementation of development programs for the entire University system. Development would include fund-raising, governmental relations, alumni affairs, public relations and information, campus planning, capital construction, and architectural services. The
occupant of this position would act for the President in his absence and execute any other functions assigned by the President.

6. The Vice President for Academic Affairs would be responsible for the coordination of undergraduate and graduate academic programs, including research, on all campuses and would represent the President in the development and implementation of academic programs. Proposals for new academic programs on all campuses would be referred to this office by the President for review and approval.

7. The Vice President for Business and Finance would be the University system's primary fiscal officer and would be responsible for the development and coordination of system-wide policies on budgeting, accounting, plant operation and maintenance, auditing, purchasing, and non-academic personnel administration. This office would develop, in cooperation with the Chancellors, appropriation requests for submission to the Board of Trustees, Higher Education Commission, and the State Department of Finance and Administration.

One member of the staff of the Vice President for Business and Finance would be nominated by the President as Treasurer of the University of Tennessee and be elected by the Board of Trustees.

8. The Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive Assistant to the President would be responsible for system-wide studies on management, organization, and academic subjects and would serve as general assistant to the President. The occupant of this position would utilize campus personnel in the execution of studies and would encourage Chancellors to designate staff members to act as liaison agents on studies. In addition, he would work with Chancellors on student affairs problems with system-wide implications.

9. The Vice President for Extension and Service would be responsible for the coordination of system-wide extension and service activities when this position is established.

10. The Executive Director of the Government, Industry, and Law Center would continue to report to the President. The title of the position would be changed to the Executive Director of Urban Affairs and the Government, Industry, and Law Center. The occupant of this position would be responsible for coordinating and implementing programs in urban affairs and the functions of the Government, Industry, and Law Center in conjunction with the Chancellors of the several campuses.

11. Each Chancellor would be primarily responsible for student affairs because each campus has unique student housing and activities programs.

12. Directors of Athletics on the several campuses would report to the Chancellors.

13. The state-wide agricultural programs in extension and experimentation, as well as the instructional program at Knoxville, would be
under the direction of the Chancellor of the Knoxville campus. Because of the state-wide nature of agricultural experimentation and extension and the existence of a Dean of Resident Agricultural Instruction, Director of Experiment Stations, and Director of Agricultural Extension, the Dean of Agriculture would become the Vice Chancellor. The title of the College of Agriculture would be changed to the Institute of Agriculture, consisting of the College of Agriculture, Agricultural Extension Service, and Agricultural Experiment Stations. Each of these agencies would be headed by a Dean.

14. The state-wide extension program of the Division of University Extension would be a responsibility of the Chancellor of the Knoxville campus until such time as the position of Vice President for Extension and Service is established on the President's staff. The Division would continue to be headed by the Dean of General Extension.

15. The Chancellor of the Knoxville campus would be responsible for the Space Institute, School of Social Work, the UT-Oak Ridge School of Bio-medical Sciences, the Kingsport Center, the Downtown Memphis Center, and the Downtown Nashville Center until a Chancellor is selected for that campus.

16. The following persons are recommended for appointment to the designated positions:

Vice President for Development and Administration  
(Dr. Edward J. Boling)
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
(Dr. Jack Williams)
Vice President for Business and Finance  
(Mr. W. H. Read)
Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive Assistant to the President  
(Dr. Joseph E. Johnson)
General Counsel and Secretary of the Board  
(Mr. John C. Baugh)
Treasurer of the University  
(Mr. Brodie Baynes)
Chancellor of the Knoxville Campus  
(Dr. Charles H. Weaver)
Chancellor of the Martin Campus  
(Dr. Archie Dykes)
Chancellor of the Medical Units  
(Dr. Homer F. Marsh)
Executive Director of Urban Affairs and the Government, Industry, and Law Center  
(Mr. Robert S. Hutchison)
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Knoxville)  
(Dr. Lawrence Silverman)
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Knoxville)  
(Dr. Walter Herndon)
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (Knoxville)  
(Dr. Robert C. Gordon)
Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research (Knoxville)
(Dr. Hilton A. Smith)
Vice Chancellor for the Institute of Agriculture (Knoxville)
(Dr. Webster Pendergrass)
Vice Chancellor for Development (Martin)
(Dr. Jack Mays)
Assistant General Counsel and Assistant Secretary of the
Board of Trustees
(Mr. James Drinnon)
Vice President for Academic Affairs (until resignation date)
(Dr. Herman E. Spivey)

**Recommended Board Action**—It is recommended that the Board of Trustees adopt the preceding proposed organizational plan to be effective July 1, 1968, and authorize the President to implement it through the establishment of the University of Tennessee system. It is also recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the appointment of the persons nominated for each of the designated administrative positions at the salaries listed in the approved budget.

The Secretary of the Board of Trustees is directed to prepare appropriate amendments to the by-laws of the Board of Trustees and submit them to the Board at its 1968 fall meeting.
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1968-1980

The University of Tennessee
Knoxville 37916
Office of the President

June 26, 1968

Dr. John Folger, Executive Director
Tennessee Commission on Higher Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Dear Dr. Folger:

Submitted herewith is a preliminary statement of the proposed role and functions of The University of Tennessee within the state educational system during the period of 1968-1980. Detailed in the report is information on goals and functions, students, programs of instruction, research, community services, extension work, changes in instruction, and top institutional priorities of the 1968-80 period for the total University and the individual campuses.

The University of Tennessee submits its role and scope document to the Higher Education Commission with the understanding that it is a tentative statement which is subject to alteration as conditions change, in that it is not feasible to establish a fixed plan for ten years within a dynamic, expanding educational system.

On behalf of our Board of Trustees, faculty, and administration, I submit this report as an indicator of the present goals and functions of The University of Tennessee system, insofar as they can be foreseen at this time.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. Holt
President
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ROLE, SCOPE, AND MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

The University of Tennessee

The University of Tennessee is a multi-campus, comprehensive state university system with instructional, research, and public service obligations to the total state, as well as some responsibilities to the intellectual needs of the larger world. Two legislative acts of the state provide the University with its comprehensive mission: an act of 1869 designating the then "East Tennessee University" as the state's Federal Land-Grant Institution and an act of 1879 commissioning it as "The University of Tennessee."

Its nature as a land-grant and state university requires that it be a center of learning, a center of research, and a center of service. It is an agency responsible for the enlargement and communication of knowledge and also for extended service through professional training, consultation, and continuing adult education for people throughout the state.

As the capstone of the state's educational system and the state's chief research agency, the University is expected to provide instructional programs and research in all fields and at all levels of higher education that are needed by the people and agencies of the state. Furthermore, again as the state's top educational agency The University of Tennessee has an obligation to make sure that its programs are superior in quality, continually improving, and forward-looking. Implicit in this obligation is the maintenance of an outstanding faculty and the
provision of adequate resources with which they may work. The University deserves to be a major state university at least equal in quality to the senior statewide public universities in other progressive states. Such a state university is necessary to the economic and cultural development of a dynamic state.

It is not expected that each campus of the University will be exactly like any other campus in the system. Each should develop its own unique character focused on the special needs of its most likely student body and the area it serves. Although each campus should have its own distinctive mission and character, The University of Tennessee system taken as a whole should cover the total spectrum of university institutional, research, and public service needs of the state. Furthermore, as the capstone of higher education in Tennessee, the University of Tennessee has the challenge to achieve and maintain qualitative prestige on an international scale.

An effort is made to describe below the essential role, mission, and scope of each of the campuses.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

The Knoxville campus, the oldest and largest of the University, holds a leading role in the educational programs of the University system and the state. Especially on the advanced graduate level (the doctoral level) and in research activity and public services, the Knoxville campus has an obligation far above that of any other institution in the state.

The Knoxville campus offers doctoral work in almost fifty fields of study, master's work in approximately one hundred areas of specialization, and professional programs in agriculture, architecture, education,
engineering, home economics, business, communications, and law. The degree of specialization is demonstrated by the existence of more than one hundred undergraduate majors. The scope and complexity of the offerings of this campus and the staff and material resources which support them necessarily involve the campus in an equally comprehensive range of research and public service activities. Research occurs in each department and in organized research agencies such as the Bureau of Public Administration and the Center of Business and Economic Research. The institution's land-grant heritage generates a dynamic agricultural research program at the agricultural experiment stations and a strong statewide agricultural extension service to stimulate the utilization of research and sound agricultural practice. Public service activities are carried on by many departments, and the Division of University Extension has pioneered in serving the entire state through programs such as conferences, institutes, correspondence study, short courses, and evening schools. The Knoxville campus should stay abreast of the most recent developments in teaching, research, and public service in the years to come. This campus should seek to provide undergraduate, professional, and graduate curricula in new areas of knowledge which exist or will develop for which there is a demand in the State of Tennessee.

Because of the specialized nature and the broad scope of the programs on the Knoxville campus, it is expected that there will be a need to provide for an increasing number of juniors, seniors, and graduate students as the community colleges of the state take care of more and more of the freshman and sophomore enrollment. For this reason the Knoxville campus should evolve admission and retention standards consistent with its distribution of enrollment and its emphasis on advanced and professional programs.
While no immediate need exists to restrict enrollment, aside from out-of-state students, this campus should look forward to a maximum enrollment of approximately 28,500 students enrolled for day classes. As that time approaches, in the mid-1970's, it will become increasingly necessary to restrict enrollments to certain classes, particularly the freshman class.

Because of its higher degree of complexity and diversity in staff and facilities, the Knoxville campus can be expected to serve other University centers or campuses in certain instructional areas. The television and motion picture production equipment, central computer facilities, tele-lecture equipment, and other technological devices located on this campus could be used to extend programs, and specialized services throughout the University.

Research efforts, excluding medical research, should be especially emphasized on the Knoxville campus as an important element in teaching as well as an aid in assisting the economic-social position of Tennesseans and the region in general. Such efforts would be supported by state, federal, and industrial-commercial sources of revenue.

The Knoxville campus has the most comprehensive mission, serving the entire state, and the most specialized and diverse programs of any institution in the state. During the next twelve years, it should have as its goal the enrichment of existing teaching, research, and service activities, the expansion of its curricula and services to meet state-wide needs for professional, graduate, and specialized education, and the achievement of international prestige as a major cosmopolitan center of learning.
The University of Tennessee at Martin

In broad reference, the role and function of The University of Tennessee at Martin are similar to those of the total University: instruction, research, and public service. But in terms of emphasis and focus, the Martin campus is primarily an instructional unit with significant responsibility for public service in West Tennessee and a lesser but growing responsibility for and concern with research.

Looking toward the future, the primary objective of The University of Tennessee at Martin will continue to be the provision of superior undergraduate instruction in a wide range of disciplines to students drawn from broad areas of the state. At the same time, however, graduate programs through the master's level will need to be initiated in a number of disciplines. Such programs will not only meet existing needs in these disciplines but will also greatly strengthen the undergraduate programs by making the institution more attractive to faculty and by fostering a stimulating campus intellectual climate. Public service and research functions will expand in pace with program development and as the needs of the area warrant and resources of the campus permit.

Because of certain unique characteristics of the Martin campus, especially its affiliation with the Knoxville campus and its basically residential character, unusual opportunities exist for experimentation and innovation in undergraduate education. If these opportunities are used to maximum advantage, The University of Tennessee at Martin could become highly experimental and innovative in character and thus serve, in addition to the more traditional functions, an important role as a center in undergraduate education in Tennessee.

In summary, The University of Tennessee at Martin is primarily
a regional and residential institution of fairly broad curricular scope focusing on instruction through the master's level, public service obligations within its area, the need for further development in research as an enrichment of its instructional capacity, and a prime opportunity for educational experimentation.

The University of Tennessee Medical Units

The primary purpose of the Medical Units is to provide to the people of Tennessee education and training opportunities in the health professions and allied fields. To achieve this objective, it is essential that the teaching faculty of the Medical Units also be actively engaged in research and public services related to the health sciences. The latter takes the form of the provision of health care to the sick and of a growing program of continuing education for members of the health professions throughout the State of Tennessee.

In Memphis, the Medical Units campus is the center for instruction and training in the health professions. Included are the College of Basic Medical Sciences, Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Nursing, the Graduate School-Medical Sciences, the Department of Continuing Education. Within this framework, a wide range of programs in the ancillary or paramedical specialities also is offered. The University provides the faculty and buildings for most of the classroom and laboratory training of students, while clinical experience is provided in adjoining hospitals or clinics owned by the City of Memphis or in government-supported and privately endowed facilities within the Memphis Medical Center. In addition, the Memorial Research Center and Hospital in Knoxville is an integral part of the Medical Units. This institution is committed to research,
graduate training of interns and residents, nursing education at the diploma level, and the care of patients of the Knoxville-Knox County area. All component agencies of the Medical Units are fully accredited by the appropriate national organization.

The Medical Units will be expected to have the most highly specialized and diverse health education programs in the state. During the next decade additional graduate and post-graduate programs will be developed. Paramedical training will be initiated in those areas for which there is a statewide need. Increased attention will be given to the provision of continuing health education, especially at the post-graduate level throughout the state.

Since enrollment in the College of Medicine is limited to two hundred students a year, establishment of a new medical school associated with the Memorial Research Center and Hospital in Knoxville will be necessary as the demand for physicians and other medical specialists increases.

The Medical Units will be responsible for the provision of broad and specialized training in all the health-related professions, for research in the basic medical sciences, and for public service through continuing professional education programs. The Medical Units' mission is statewide and, in fact, its responsibilities extend far beyond, since its programs must be abreast of the most recent advances in the health sciences throughout the world.

The University of Tennessee, Downtown Memphis Center

The University of Tennessee's Downtown Memphis Center now operates as a unit of the Division of University Extension, but it is mentioned
separately in this document because it is expected to become a Joint University Center, sponsored by The University of Tennessee and Memphis State University.

The role of the Downtown Memphis Center is to provide college-level continuing education opportunities to adults in the Memphis area who cannot avail themselves of traditional campus programs. Its scope includes credit courses (predominantly undergraduate), non-credit courses, conferences, seminars, institutes, and workshops for those seeking self and professional improvement. Programs are offered primarily in the evening to accommodate employed persons.

When the Joint University Center is established, its role and scope will encompass that of the Downtown Memphis Center with some significant changes. It will incorporate the programs of the Downtown Memphis State Center, eliminating some duplications. Curricula changes will not necessarily consist of dropping any present credit or non-credit offering, but rather offering more courses for credit and, in time, instituting baccalaureate degree programs for persons who must attend college in the evening. The Center will develop programs which are directly specifically at the unique educational, social, and cultural needs of this major urban area.

The University of Tennessee at Nashville

The Nashville campus of The University of Tennessee currently operates as a unit of the Division of General University Extension, but it is planned that it will become a separate campus within the very near future. It is developing into a degree-granting evening center for the adult, employed citizens of the Greater Nashville area and an extension
center to meet the needs of its immediate area and, in some cases, the entire state. Its present scope includes a wide range of credit courses offerings in the arts and sciences, business administration, education, and engineering; an associate degree in nursing, extension graduate courses in home economics, business, and engineering; and a comprehensive program in conferences, institutes, seminars, and short courses. In addition, the campus is the home base for the Center for Career Development and Training, for the Tennessee Industrial Research Advisory Service, a field station for other programs of the Government-Industry-Law Center, and a branch of the Bureau of Public Administration. In addition, a large Graduate School of Social Work is located at the Nashville Center.

Undergraduate degrees will be offered in the arts and sciences, business administration, engineering, education, and other areas for which there is need as soon as standards of accreditation are met. Graduate work at the master's level may be expected in a limited number of disciplines, such as public administration, engineering, business, education, and, perhaps, home economics. Attention will be given to education and training needs for government service especially because of the close geographical relationship with state government. The Nashville campus can be expected to expand opportunities for individuals to continue their vocational or professional education beyond and apart from their degrees through non-credit seminars, short courses, and institutes.

While research is not expected to be a primary focus of the Nashville campus, undoubtedly it will be involved in research activities in certain broad areas, especially public and social services. It should
provide unique research service directed toward the solution of problems of state government.

The Nashville Center will continue to serve primarily adult, employed persons in evening programs. However, conferences, institutes, seminars, short courses, nursing education, and career development training will be offered during the day.

In summary, the Nashville campus will serve the higher education needs of employed persons in a major metropolitan area and will provide extended services particularly related to state and local government.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

The University of Tennessee is in the process of developing in the Greater Chattanooga area a four-year senior university with graduate-level coursework which will serve the southern East Tennessee region and the entire state. The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will help meet requests for higher education from residents of the state and will provide the curricula required by students desiring to continue college who have graduated from the community college system now developing in Tennessee. Furthermore, the Chattanooga campus will facilitate a more orderly growth in The University of Tennessee system.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will enable a large number of deserving youths to attend college. This institution will begin with the following curricula: arts and sciences, business administration, education, engineering, and nursing. Other baccalaureate degree programs will be added as needs justify. Graduate programs at the master's level will be developed in all of these areas, except nursing, as soon as personnel, equipment, and student demand warrant. In close
collaboration with the Knoxville faculty, limited doctoral programs, especially in science and engineering, will be desirable in the near future. The institution will provide pre-professional work to students planning careers in medicine, law, architecture, agriculture, and other professional fields.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will offer an extensive evening program of credit and non-credit courses to meet the needs of working adults. Extension services will undoubtedly be required for the large business and industrial complex in Chattanooga-Hamilton County.

Initially, The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga might be expected to serve primarily the greater Chattanooga area. Special attention will be given, also, to the development of educational programs for the disadvantaged. Within a few years this geographical base for students will change. With additional residence halls and broad curricula, the institution may reasonably be expected to serve 10,000 students some ten years after opening. The student body, by then, should be representative of the state and include a reasonable number of out-of-state students.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will provide a full four-year university program with graduate work in a limited number of areas for which there is sufficient demand. It will serve the only Tennessee metropolitan area not now having a public-aided institution of higher learning.
II

ENROLLMENTS

On the base of national, regional, and state trends, enrollment of students in The University of Tennessee system is predicted to rise throughout the 1970's, moving from approximately 29,000 students in 1967-1968 to a conservative estimate of about 57,000 in 1980-1981. These figures include all campuses and centers of the University, but exclude registrations for correspondence courses, short courses, institutes, and conferences. It should be noted, however, that these enrollment projections are for existing campuses and centers and do not assume establishment of additional campuses.

The University of Tennessee will serve students from every county in Tennessee, will enroll a reasonable number of out-of-state students, and will admit a limited number of qualified international students. It is the University's intention to keep the out-of-state enrollment at no more than 20 per cent of the total enrollment. At this time, it is neither necessary nor desirable to restrict the enrollment of qualified graduate students from outside the state of Tennessee.

Enrollment projections for the entire University of Tennessee are included in Table I.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Enrollment on the Knoxville campus of The University of Tennessee will be limited to approximately 28,500 (headcount) day students. From Table I, it may be seen that this number of students may reasonably be expected by the mid-1970's. Within this enrollment figure, it is
## TABLE I

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE PROJECTIONS TO 1980*--DEGREE CREDIT FALL QUARTER ENROLLMENT BY LOCATION AND PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL-ALL</strong></td>
<td>31,257</td>
<td>36,280</td>
<td>39,085</td>
<td>41,845</td>
<td>44,636</td>
<td>47,103</td>
<td>49,424</td>
<td>51,387</td>
<td>57,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoxville Day</strong></td>
<td>19,382</td>
<td>20,774</td>
<td>22,024</td>
<td>23,108</td>
<td>24,573</td>
<td>25,865</td>
<td>27,072</td>
<td>27,949</td>
<td>28,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>16,417</td>
<td>17,572</td>
<td>18,603</td>
<td>19,583</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>21,758</td>
<td>22,742</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>5,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoxville Evening</strong></td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chattanooga Branch</strong></td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,069</td>
<td>6,569</td>
<td>7,069</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>4,325</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>4,975</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martin Branch</strong></td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>4,705</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>5,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Units</strong></td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memphis (Downtown) Center</strong></td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nashville Center</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Social Work</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoxville</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nashville</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memphis</strong></td>
<td>890</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Centers</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.T.-M.S.U.</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space Institute</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingsport</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oak Ridge</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ormond C. Corry's projections, March 15, 1968, with modifications.*
expected that the number and proportion of upper division, graduate, and professional students will increase. The reasons for this expectation are the establishment and growth of public junior colleges, the expansion of regular universities, and the further development of other campuses of The University of Tennessee which accommodate a large number of lower division students in less specialized programs. The number of lower division students is expected to be stabilized at approximately 12,000 to insure conformity to the total enrollment limitation of 28,500.

Total enrollment projections for the Knoxville campus are contained in Table I.

Enrollment projections show that undergraduate enrollment on the Knoxville campus will increase by approximately 50 per cent by 1980 while graduate enrollment will rise by approximately 85 per cent. In addition to the Knoxville day enrollment, the increase in students at the off-campus graduate centers controlled by the Knoxville campus is expected to move from about 900 to about 1,200—an increase of 35 per cent.

By standards in current use, the ability level of entering students has risen significantly over the past five years, from an average composite ACT score of 19 to 22, without a substantial change in admission requirements. It is expected that this level will rise further. However, it is hoped that the specialized programs of the Knoxville campus will always be open to students from our state with the demonstrated ability to pursue them successfully.

The Knoxville campus will continue to enroll students from throughout the state, virtually all states, and many nations of the world. Out-of-state undergraduate enrollment will be maintained at a
reasonable level—approximately 20 per cent of total enrollment. Graduate students will be enrolled without a geographical limitation.

While it is not possible to predict the percentage of increase in the number of adult part-time students involved in University programs, it is certain that the number seeking additional education will be larger and that The University of Tennessee in Knoxville has a major responsibility in meeting this need. In the next decade, we must live with the fact that the time-span between discovery of new knowledge and its application will be critically short and that obsolescence in terms of education and training will be even more rapid than now. Hence, more adults will return to the University for higher educational programs.

The University of Tennessee Medical Units

The University of Tennessee Medical Units limited its enrollment in medicine and dentistry several years ago and does not consider it feasible at this time to enlarge enrollments in these fields. There will be, however, moderate increases in the number of graduate students in the College of Basic Medical Sciences and in enrollments in nursing, pharmacy, and the paramedical fields. A total increase of approximately 250 in Memphis is expected during the coming decade.

The Board of Trustees of The University of Tennessee has authorized a new College of Medicine in Knoxville when enrollment demands justify it. It will be needed before 1980 and should accommodate entering classes of at least 100 students. Establishment of a medical school in Knoxville would facilitate development of educational programs in other areas of the health sciences. Additional students at a new College of Medicine are not included in the projected enrollment.
Priority in enrollment at the Medical Units has been and will be given to qualified Tennessee residents. The University is committed to meeting the health education needs of the state.

Because of the rapid expansion of knowledge in the health sciences, it is expected that continuing education enrollments will expand significantly.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Initial enrollment, as shown in Table I, [page 104] at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga is expected to be approximately 2,950 students and is anticipated to grow to more than 10,000 by 1980. While graduate enrollment will rise significantly in numbers (250 to 700), it will likely decrease as a percentage of total enrollments because of the emphasis on this campus on undergraduate programs. No enrollment ceilings are planned at this time.

In its early years the Chattanooga campus will serve primarily students from Chattanooga-Hamilton County and the immediate area. As additional residence halls are erected, students will be drawn from the entire state, and a reasonable number of out-of-state students will be enrolled.

The number of part-time and adult students will undoubtedly increase because of the continuing education and evening programs for the Chattanooga area.

Since the admission standards for The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will be similar to those of other University campuses, it is expected that the ability levels of the students will be comparable to those on other campuses and will rise gradually over the years. At
Chattanooga, as on every other campus, it will be the University's objective to provide access to all students with promise of the capacity to succeed academically.

The University of Tennessee at Martin

Total enrollment at Martin is expected to rise from 3,169 in 1967-1968 to 6,350 in 1980-1981. Graduate enrollment will move from 33 students in 1967-1968 to 370 in 1980-1981. The graduate program at Martin began in the summer quarter of 1967. Students at Martin will come primarily from Northwest Tennessee and metropolitan areas in Middle and West Tennessee, including Memphis, Jackson, and Nashville. The geographical spread of students is directly affected by the availability of residence halls because Martin has a relatively small commuter enrollment.

The Martin campus has very few adult and part-time students. However, students in these categories will increase if the industrial and business expansion planned for Northwest Tennessee is realized, resulting in greater emphasis on continuing education programs.

The Martin campus will strive to provide access to all students with promise of the capacity to succeed in the academic profession. Any movement in the student's ability level will be upward because of better high school preparation and the influence of the junior colleges.

The University of Tennessee, Downtown Memphis and Nashville Centers

Enrollment at the Nashville Center is projected to move from 1,743 students in 1967-1968 to approximately 3,750 students in 1980-1981 while enrollment at the Downtown Memphis Center will grow from 864 to 1,605. The projection for Memphis may be affected by the creation of the Joint University Center. These students will be drawn largely from the Nashville
and Memphis metropolitan areas. Persons who come to these centers for conferences, institutes and short courses will represent all areas of the state. They are not included in the enrollment projections.

Virtually all of the students at these two centers will be employed adults who attend classes on a part-time basis. The primary purpose of these centers is to serve part-time students through evening courses.

The ability level of students is not expected to change as a result of University requirements.
III

PROGRAMS OF INSTRUCTION

The University of Tennessee

The University of Tennessee will experience a significant broadening of its offerings by 1980. The Knoxville campus graduate and professional programs will be strengthened and enlarged. New graduate programs will be introduced in a limited number of disciplines on the Martin, Chattanooga, Nashville, and Medical Units campuses. Baccalaureate degree programs for which there is sufficient demand and justification will be added on all campuses. The Medical Units at Memphis will continue its present professional and graduate programs and add associate degree programs in the paramedical fields. Other campuses will be involved in associate degree programs only on a very limited basis.

The particular needs and problems of urban areas in Tennessee will grow during the coming decade. Hence, The University of Tennessee with its statewide obligations for instruction, research, and service will devote special attention to urban affairs. This objective will be accomplished through the Center for Government, Industry, and Law, the Municipal Technical Advisory Service, the Center for Career Development and Training, and other existing or newly developed agencies.

The subsequent sections indicate the degrees presently offered, and some of those which will be developed on the several campuses of the University system.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

The University of Tennessee's Knoxville campus confers doctoral
degrees in nearly all traditional academic areas. The Knoxville campus encompasses the School of Social Work, the Space Institute at Tullahoma, the University of Tennessee-Oak Ridge School of Biomedical Sciences, the Kingsport Graduate Center, the University of Tennessee-Memphis State University Graduate Program in Education, and graduate programs at Knoxville. In those departments in which doctorates are not yet available, doctoral programs will be developed as soon as demand is sufficient and resources are available. Exclusive of the broad collegiate programs summarized in Table II, the University will most likely initiate multidisciplinary endeavors in fields such as computer science, ecology, urban affairs, bioengineering, and international education. In addition the University will probably develop certain new professional programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels, including library science and others for which a legitimate need arises. [See also Table III]

The State of Tennessee does not have a School of Veterinary Medicine and is unable to enroll all its qualified students in out-of-state Schools of Veterinary Medicine. Hence, during the next few years the state should create a School of Veterinary Medicine, providing adequate financial support is available. Since the University of Tennessee's main campus is responsible for professional education, and since it has an extensive agricultural program and is engaged in human medicine programs, the School of Veterinary Medicine should be located on the University's Knoxville campus. At the time it appears possible to establish the School of Veterinary Medicine, the feasibility of simultaneously developing a School of Human Medicine in Knoxville under control of the Chancellor of the Medical Units should be explored. The projected need for the School of Human Medicine is included in the section concerning the Medical Units.
### TABLE II

**DEGREE PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, ALL CAMPUSES COMBINED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Level of Offering</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
<th>Four-Year</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Health Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Medical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(D.D.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(M.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Pharm.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Professions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>X (J.D.)</td>
<td>0(S.J.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>X&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>X&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X indicates a degree is given; 0, a degree is planned.

<sup>a</sup>Specialist in Education certificate awarded at Knoxville.

<sup>b</sup>Certificate now given; associate degree planned.

<sup>c</sup>Qualified degree.

<sup>d</sup>For public school librarians only (M.S.L.S., planned).
TABLE III

DEGREE PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Level of Offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-Year Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education$^a$</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>0$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>0 (M.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>0 (D.V.M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology$^c$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>X$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X indicates a degree is offered; 0, a degree is planned.

$^a$Specialist of Education Certificate is awarded.

$^b$See Medical Units.

$^c$A Knoxville program administered through the Medical Units.

$^d$For public school librarians only (M.S.L.S., planned.)
The University of Tennessee at Martin [Table IV]

It is anticipated that by 1980 degree programs will be offered on the Martin campus in agriculture, business, education, engineering, engineering technology, home economics, mathematics, nursing, the natural sciences, the social sciences, the arts and humanities (including music), and others for which there is sufficient demand and for which resources are available. Among these, the only areas in which no programs now exist are engineering technology and nursing. Much of the curriculum development during the period 1968-80 will focus on the strengthening and enriching of existing curricula, along with the development of additional majors and stronger majors within present programs. It is not anticipated that any existing programs will be discontinued, nor is it expected that any doctoral programs will be developed prior to 1980. However, programs at the master's level should be developed in a number of areas.

The University of Tennessee Medical Units [Table V]

The University of Tennessee Medical Units offers graduate and professional degrees in the health sciences, and certificates are awarded in a number of technological fields including X-ray technology and dental hygiene. In the near future, the associate degree will be substituted for the certificate for health personnel in auxiliary and paramedical fields. Also, a baccalaureate degree in dental hygiene may be added.

Beginning in the fall of 1968, to meet the need for individuals trained as hospital-based pharmacists, the College of Pharmacy will offer a program leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy degree, which will be a "professional" rather than a "graduate school" degree.

Master's programs in pedodontics, orthodontics, and periodontics are
TABLE IV

DEGREE PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT MARTIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
<th>Four-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X indicates a degree is offered; 0, a degree is planned.
### TABLE V

DEGREE PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE MEDICAL UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
<th>Four-Year</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>X,(0)(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Medical Sciences</td>
<td>X,(0)(^b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (D.D.S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X(M.D.)</td>
<td>O(M.D.)(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X(M.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X indicates a degree is offered; 0, a degree is planned.

\(^a\)Three-year diploma program in Knoxville, baccalaureate degree is planned.

\(^b\)Certificate now awarded; associate degree planned.

\(^c\)Under study for Knoxville.

\(^d\)Ph.D. now offered; Doctor of Pharmacy planned.
planned by the College of Dentistry. These programs would replace two currently offered clinical programs.

During the next decade additional master's and doctoral programs in the health sciences will be added to meet reasonable demands. These would include advanced degrees in nursing and others of the basic medical sciences.

A diploma program in nursing is now offered at the University of Tennessee Memorial Research Center and Hospital in Knoxville. The Medical Units plans to convert this program to a baccalaureate degree program.

The growing population of the State of Tennessee, increasing numbers of graduates who wish to study human medicine, the fixed enrollment of the existing College of Medicine at Memphis, and the national and state need for physicians will require soon the establishment of a second medical school in Tennessee. Since the Medical Units has primary statewide responsibility for professional medical education, already has experience in the operation of a medical school, and has a hospital, medical research, and graduate medical education programs in Knoxville, the second medical school should be created within the Medical Units and located at Knoxville. It should be developed in conjunction with the University Memorial Research Center and Hospital and in cooperation with a School of Veterinary Medicine on the Knoxville campus.

The University of Tennessee, Downtown Memphis Center [Table VI]

The Downtown Memphis Center currently operates as a unit of the Division of General University Extension. It is an extension center with evening courses for adults. In addition to a wider range of non-credit programs, two years of resident credit work may be earned at the Center.
**TABLE VI**

DEGREE PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE'S
DOWNTOWN MEMPHIS CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Level of Offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aExcludes extension graduate offerings, administered through Knoxville.

0 indicates a program is offered.
in the fields of arts and sciences, education, business, and engineering. A limited amount of extension graduate credit work is also offered in these areas and home economics.

Currently, a program leading to an associate degree in business is being planned. Although baccalaureate degrees are not anticipated immediately, it is expected that during the coming decade baccalaureate degrees will be developed in education, business, engineering, some areas of the arts and sciences, and other areas for which there is sufficient need and for which resources are available. The master's degree may be developed in a limited number of fields, such as education, business, and engineering.

Likewise a much more diversified and enlarged program of conferences, workshops, and seminars is urgently needed to assist in the continuing education of the businesses and professions in the great metropolis of Memphis.

When agreement is reached on the plan now being considered by The University of Tennessee and Memphis State University to combine their Downtown Memphis Centers into a Joint University Center, planning for the future will involve both institutions.

The University of Tennessee at Nashville [Table VII]

The University of Tennessee at Nashville is a continuing education center for adults, offering non-credit and resident credit work applicable to a baccalaureate degree. At present an associate degree in nursing and a baccalaureate in business administration may be earned at this campus.

Baccalaureate degrees in arts and sciences, education, and engineering are planned, as is a master's level program in public administration.
Associate degree programs in other allied health sciences will also be developed. Other degree programs may be created as the need arises.

As in true of Memphis, a greatly enlarged program of continuing education and public service is needed in Nashville.

**TABLE VII**

*DEGREE PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
<th>Four-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (including mathematics)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aExcludes extension and resident graduate offerings, administered through Knoxville.

X indicates a program is offered; 0, it is planned.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga [Table VIII]

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will begin with four principal areas of study: arts and sciences, education, business administration, and engineering. A four-year university and a limited graduate program will be built around these curricula. In addition, an associate degree in nursing will be offered. Graduate courses now being offered by The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will be
continued and others developed as student demand, faculty availability, and library and laboratory facilities permit. Other baccalaureate and master's degree programs will be developed as the need arises, as well as a limited program of doctoral work in collaboration with the Knoxville campus.

TABLE VIII

DEGREE PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Level of Offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 indicates a program is planned.

²Administered, for the foreseeable future, from Knoxville but offered in Chattanooga.
IV

RESEARCH

As Tennessee's state university and land-grant institution, The University of Tennessee considers research to be one of its three prime objectives. The other two are instruction and public service. The University's heavy involvement in graduate and professional education and its extension program of service directed toward the solution of problems which face government, business, agriculture, and industry require a strong commitment to research. In fulfilling this commitment, the University has become the state's primary research agency.

Basic research is essential to effective instruction at the graduate and professional levels. Original investigations are underway in all of the approximately 100 areas approved for graduate majors since graduate study in itself includes research experience. In addition, several University organizations, located at Knoxville, exist primarily for research service. These include the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Engineering Experiment Station, the Center for Business and Economic Research, the Bureau of Educational Research and Service, the Bureau of Public Administration, the Water Research Center, and the Memorial Research Center which is a part of the Medical Units. At the Medical Units in Memphis special research agencies include the Clinical Research Center and the Brain Research Center. The University of Tennessee Space Institute at Tullahoma, the Graduate School of Social Work at Nashville, and the University of Tennessee-Oak Ridge Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences also place considerable emphasis on research in appropriate areas. The Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research and his
staff foster and encourage research throughout the University.

With the increasing complexity of all fields of knowledge and the development of unique problems in many areas of activity, original investigation must be expanded as much as possible in the next decade while maintaining within the University a reasonable balance with the growing requirements for instruction and public service. The growth of graduate and professional enrollment within The University of Tennessee system also will require more attention to research for faculty and students. The particular problems of urban areas demand special research effort.

It is somewhat difficult to predict what areas of research will be emphasized within the next decade, but, if present trends continue, investigation in the biological, behavioral, and social sciences, plus learning methods and educational research, will receive expanding emphasis. Because of early developments and established levels of activity, research efforts in agriculture, engineering, and the physical sciences will be expanded less rapidly. However, the close cooperation between The University of Tennessee, the Arnold Engineering Development Center, and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory will cause greater emphasis on investigations into the physical sciences and engineering at The University of Tennessee than at other state universities.

Table IX shows the distribution of estimated expenditures for research from both state and non-state funds. These estimates assume that research funds, particularly from federal sources, will be available at their present or at a greater level well before 1980, that there will be increased emphasis on education and the social sciences, and that the Humanities Foundation will flourish and expand in the future. These estimates may well be exceeded with greater federal, state, and private support for research.
### TABLE IX

**DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR RESEARCH FROM BOTH STATE AND NON-STATE FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Biological Sciences</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical Sciences and Math</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Law, Social Science and Education</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Health Sciences</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Business and Economics</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Engineering and Architecture</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures (All Sources)**
- $14,500,000
- $23,000,000
- $29,500,000

**Non-State Funds**
- 12,350,000
- 19,550,000
- 25,000,000

**State Funds**
- 2,150,000
- 3,450,000
- 4,500,000
The research effort for 1967-68 will approximately $14,500,000 of which support from the state amounts to some $2,150,000. The major portion of state support went to the Agricultural Experiment Station ($1,639,000), and the remainder supported the Memorial Research Center ($150,000) and the several research organizations at Knoxville ($361,000).

As the University continues to grow an expansion of its research effort is especially important as instructional and public service programs are expanded. As typical of the current situation, sizeable future support is expected from federal sources. However, the state must provide funds to support research in areas which do not attract outside financing and in problems which are of particular significance to Tennessee. In addition, the state must also allocate "seed" money to get young professors started on research projects and to attract non-state support.

In 1967-68, a great majority of the research funds were expended at the Knoxville campus and at the Medical Units. Of the $14,500,000 research budget, $9,400,000 was spent at Knoxville, and $5,100,000 was spent at the Medical Units, including the Memorial Research Center. This pattern is expected to continue in 1975 and 1980, but research budgets will be established or expanded at Martin and Chattanooga because graduate programs and the retention and attraction of faculty demand a reasonable level of research activity. Also, research closely related to the problems of state and local government will be initiated at the Nashville campus. However, the vast majority of the research effort and funds will continue to be concentrated at Knoxville and Memphis because of heavy commitment to graduate and professional education and research programs.
SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY AND STATE

The statewide obligation of The University of Tennessee for instruction, research, and extension along with its heavy involvement in research results in a significant commitment to public service. During the coming decade, as in the past, the University's teaching programs and research findings will extend beyond the campus to reach people in every community and area in Tennessee. Extension and public service are a part of the work of every University campus and all academic departments on each campus. However, certain University agencies were created specifically to promote and coordinate statewide activities which can be served best by the University's educational resources. These special agencies are briefly described below:

Agricultural Extension Service

This agency specializes in agriculture and home economics and is sponsored jointly by the University, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and county government. An Extension program exists in every Tennessee county and assists farmers and homemakers in the solution of their problems and in the use of the latest research findings in agriculture and home economics.

Division of General University Extension

This agency exists to provide extended services in all educational areas exclusive of agriculture and home economics and has a statewide responsibility for these activities. The Division's programs include the Teaching Materials and Films Center, Radio and Television Services,
Class Instruction, Conferences and Institutes, Correspondence Instruction, Program Planning and Library Services, Publications, State Agency, Title I Higher Education Act 1965, University Extension Civil Defense Program, and the Municipal Technical Advisory Service. Major centers of the Division are located in Knoxville, Memphis, Nashville, and Oak Ridge.

**Government-Industry-Law Center**

The Government-Industry-Law Center acts as a liaison agency between the University community and governmental, industrial and business agencies in the provision of research and consultative services to these agencies. The Tennessee Industrial Research Advisory Service specializes in securing research and technical assistance for the state's industrial and business organizations. The Center for Career Development and Training is engaged in the development and implementation of a comprehensive training program—seminars, institutes, and short courses—for state and local government employees and officials. The GILC is also responsible for several federal-state programs which provide special services in the solution of urban problems.

**Division of Continuing Education--Medical Units**

The Medical Units has a Division of Continuing Education which is actively engaged in the provision of conferences, institutes, short courses, and seminars for members of the health professions throughout the state. This is a rapidly expanding program which is one of the first in the nation to be accredited.

In the coming decade The University of Tennessee will continue to offer resident and extension credit programs at the graduate or undergraduate level in any area of the state in which there is an evident need.
With the development of junior colleges and the expansion of senior institutions, it is expected that the emphasis of off-campus programs will be in professional areas and at the upper division and graduate levels.

The growing demand for adult education in the form of institutes, seminars, short courses, and conferences is expected to result in an expansion of these activities, particularly in Knoxville, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Memphis. The Center for Career Development and Training in Nashville is expected to experience rapid growth in providing training for local and state government employees. Special post-graduate educational programs for business, industry, and the professions will be developed to enable personnel to maintain a current understanding of their specialties. The extensive programs in agricultural extension will be continued with a sensitivity toward the enormous technological advances being made in that field.

The University of Tennessee through its campuses in Knoxville, Memphis, Nashville, and Chattanooga will give particular and special attention to the needs of urban areas in its extension and service programs. This goal will be achieved, in part, through the expansion of the activities of the Municipal Technical Advisory Service and the Government-Industry-Law Center and by the creation of an Urban Institute or Center which will stimulate and guide urban research and services. The focus of these extension activities on urban needs and problems will be complemented by basic educational and research programs in sociology, political science, planning, education, business, architecture, and engineering.

In cooperation with the Tennessee State Educational Network, The University of Tennessee will seek to devise educational programs at the adult level for transmission throughout the state. A likely development
will be the use of state-wide radio and television services to reach people in their homes. A plan is now evolving for an elaborate four-channel closed-circuit television and audio system which will give the University the capability of teaching four different courses or holding four different conferences twenty-four hours a day by television, and a full service for FM radio, plus constant use of a broad band channel for computer data transmission from any of seven University centers in the state. This facility would be available to other institutions of higher education under a planned scheduling procedure, and would provide the capability of transmitting slides, transparencies, multilithed and printed teaching materials, and visual impressions of objects from any of the seven centers to any of the others. The system could be used from midnight until dawn for transmitting materials that can be automatically taped for use in classes the following day.

Other educational media and programs which will see increased use in extension services within the next decade are motion pictures, printed materials on special topics for individuals and groups, independent study by a combination of correspondence and three-day or one-week seminars on the campus or in the centers.

In addition to the four established University agencies (Agricultural Extension, Division of General University Extension, Government-Industry-Law Center, and the Division of Continuing Education of the Medical Units) with statewide responsibilities for extension, public service, and continuing education, each of the campuses of the University has an obligation to meet the special needs of its immediate service area.
VI

OFF-CAMPUS DEGREE CREDIT PROGRAMS

Off-campus degree credit work is now offered through the Division of General University Extension and the Graduate School. The Division of General Extension operates centers in Nashville, Memphis, and Knoxville. The enrollments and programs of these centers are presented in Sections I, II, or III. The Graduate School offers extension and resident credit work in the following centers which are administered from the Knoxville campus:

The University of Tennessee Space Institute at Tullahoma
Kingsport University Center
Oak Ridge Resident Graduate Program
School of Social Work (Memphis, Knoxville, and Nashville)
University of Chattanooga-University of Tennessee Graduate Program
University of Tennessee-Memphis State University Center
University of Tennessee-Oak Ridge Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences

Enrollment projections for all of these centers except the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences are presented in Section II. The Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences now has about ten students and expects to grow to an approximate 100 students during the next ten years.

The University expects a more rapid growth in the next decade than in recent years in credit courses offered in resident or extension centers throughout the state. Such growth has been some 5 per cent to 7 per cent during the past five years, but with new emphasis in Nashville, a joint center in Memphis, and much more work in Chattanooga, it is probable that the rate will accelerate. The offering of courses in smaller cities of Tennessee from a base at the centers will receive more attention during the next ten years.
While it is doubtful that additional off-campus centers will be established for general lower division work because of the development of other public educational institutions within the state, the extension of graduate and professional programs is expected to expand.

With the development of The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, an extension center will be established there to serve the needs of South-east Tennessee. A center is now being considered for The University of Tennessee at Martin. The Joint University Center in Memphis, which is now in the planning stage, will be unique in offering work at two major universities in one downtown adult learning center. The Nashville Center is growing rapidly into a large evening degree-granting center for adults who can study only at irregular hours, thus providing an opportunity for working adults who cannot attend school in the traditional manner. The planned center in Chattanooga will offer many evening classes on the campus, but will also offer classes in the smaller communities in the area.
QUALITATIVE CHANGES IN INSTRUCTION

As the state's top educational agency The University of Tennessee has an obligation to make sure that its instructional programs are superior in quality, continually improving, and forward-looking. The institution has the challenge to achieve and maintain qualitative prestige on an international scale. Certain qualitative objectives in instruction are inherent in the particular role and scope of each of the several campuses.

Enrollment growth on the Knoxville campus will be differentially concentrated at the upper division, professional, and graduate levels. Accordingly, an increasing proportion of the faculty must have a higher degree of professional competence in research and in the guidance and direction of graduate and professional programs. The ratio between student and faculty will have to be lower as greater numbers of graduate and professional students are enrolled.

Doctoral programs on the Knoxville campus will require the most extensive and specialized library holdings. In addition, facilities and equipment uniquely suited for research must be provided. Increased attention will be given to the training of graduate students as teachers through closer supervision and guidance.

The Knoxville faculty will be actively involved in experimentation and innovation with instructional methods and media, including audio-tutorial techniques, team teaching, and independent study and the use of television, tele-writer, programmed instruction, computer-assisted teaching, and living-learning centers. While these methods and equipment may lead to more effective learning, they involve considerable expense for
acquisition and operation.

Post-doctoral programs at Knoxville will undoubtedly increase and require corresponding improved faculty qualifications and additional expense.

At Martin there must be a larger percentage of the faculty with terminal degrees who possess the capacity for innovation and stimulating classroom teaching. Attempts will be made to improve the faculty-student ratio, thereby giving faculty members more opportunity to work with individual students as a part of a planned emphases on counseling and guidance. A rapid increase in library holdings is required, particularly, in areas in which graduate programs will be inaugurated in the future.

At the present time the Medical Units is giving consideration to the adoption of a single annual admissions plan for the Colleges of Medicine and Dentistry to replace the biannual admissions in medicine and the four admissions a year in dentistry. Some medical educators contend that the proposed plan would be a qualitative improvement. If the plan is adopted, it will require additional funds for operations and physical plant expansion because of larger entering classes and the longer period of time required to complete a degree.

Both the Nashville and Memphis Centers need a sharply increased proportion of full-time rather than part-time faculty, and the added faculty members need to be qualified with terminal degrees. Both centers require substantial improvement of library holdings and installation of technological devices providing access to educational resources on other campuses. In general, extension must be recognized as having a clear and respected professional status.
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga will begin with a substantial faculty in the arts and sciences. The initial thrust will be the acquisition of faculty members in the professional areas of business, education, engineering, and nursing. Planned enrollment growth on the Chattanooga campus and expansion of curricula will require substantial expansion of library holdings.

To make the most effective use of highly qualified professional faculty, the University should provide increased clerical and supporting personnel, better communications services, and more efficient working spaces.

Experience gained by the Knoxville faculty in the use of new instructional media and the thoughtful adoption of such media and techniques on other University campuses will be of significant benefit to the entire University system.
VIII

PRIORITIES FOR INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The University of Tennessee is a large, cosmopolitan, complex institution with several campuses which have different goals and objectives because of varying types and levels of programs and activities. Hence, priorities for institutional development will be established for each major campus as well as the total University.

As Tennessee's state university and land-grant institution, The University of Tennessee is responsible for instruction, research, and public service throughout the state. While these primary functions are given varying emphasis on the University's different campuses, each function should receive equal attention in the development of the total institution. For this reason, priorities are established within each of the functional responsibilities of The University of Tennessee. These priorities are set forth below:

**Instruction.** First priority will be given to the development of academic programs of the highest quality at all levels and in all fields offered within the University system. In the initiation of new programs, emphasis will be given to graduate and professional areas. A large increase in the number of fields in which the system offers general baccalaureate degrees is not anticipated during the next decade, and the University will offer only a limited number of associate degree programs.

**Research.** The University of Tennessee is the state's primary research agency. In the development and execution of research programs, emphasis will be given to basic research which is closely related to
graduate and professional education programs. This type of research is essential to effective instruction at the graduate and professional levels. Research which is directed toward the solution of community, state, or regional problems is essential, but should not be undertaken to the neglect of basic research. Research efforts which are applied to highly specific problems with little potential for a generalization of the research findings will receive lower priority than research which is basic or devoted to the resolution of public problems and issues.

**Public service.** A major concern of The University of Tennessee is public service throughout the entire state. Primary attention will be given to continuing higher education, including resident credit and extension courses, conferences, institutes, seminars, and short courses. Extended services to rural and urban areas will also be emphasized in an effort to aid communities in the solution of the many problems which they encounter. Particular attention will be given to the training of the government officials and employees. Extended services at the national and international level will be developed, but not in proportion to those services described above.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

A prime objective during the next several years will be the achievement and maintenance of high quality and prestigious programs at all levels on the Knoxville campus. The special graduate and professional mission of this campus does not diminish responsibility for outstanding undergraduate programs. In graduate fields for which there is an evident need, new doctoral programs will be proposed and inaugurated as early as staff and resources will permit. Attainment of these goals will require
simultaneous emphasis on basic research, the employment of highly qualified full-time faculty, the recruitment of outstanding students, and the continued improvement of physical facilities.

Special attention will be given to education for the professions with the expansion of existing professional programs and establishment of others, such as veterinary medicine and library science. Similar attention will be given to public service and continuing education which this campus is uniquely qualified to offer. This campus will coordinate and stimulate public service activities throughout the University system.

Although the quality of academic programs will be enhanced and improved, they will not be greatly expanded numerically at the general undergraduate level because of the work of the public junior colleges, regional universities, and other University campuses.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Superior baccalaureate education in the arts and sciences and a limited number of professional fields, such as education, engineering, business, and nursing will be given first priority. Implementation of education for the professions will require employment of persons proficient in each professional subject.

Responsibility to provide continuing education and public service for adults and the business and industrial community follows closely the first priority. Attention will be given to experimental compensatory programs for the disadvantaged.

On the Chattanooga campus in the immediate future graduate instruction and research will have a subordinate priority except in a limited number of areas, mostly at the masters level, in business, education and engineering.
The University of Tennessee at Nashville

The Nashville campus will place first emphasis upon providing educational opportunities for employed persons seeking degrees or other self-improvement. It will be a focal point for extension and service to governmental agencies, business, and industry.

It is not expected that the Nashville campus will be heavily involved in graduate education or research except in areas related to governmental agencies and public services.

The University of Tennessee, Downtown Memphis Center

The Downtown Memphis Center will concentrate upon the development of superior undergraduate education for employed persons who must secure their education during the evening hours.

Particular attention will also be given to continuing education and public service, especially related to the needs of this large urban area. Graduate and research activities will be restricted in magnitude.

The University of Tennessee at Martin

The development of outstanding undergraduate academic programs in a traditional campus setting is the major objective, but master's degree programs in a few broad, general disciplines will be established during the coming decade. Institution of graduate programs will, of necessity, involve a modest increase in research activities.

The Martin campus will be involved in some public service and adult education activities commensurate with the needs of the surrounding area. Needs created by the growing industrialization of the area will receive special attention.
The University of Tennessee Medical Units

The Medical Units, first, will meet the demand for well-trained physicians, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, basic medical scientists, and paramedical personnel as the state's population and need for health education will extended to insure continued accreditation of the colleges within the Medical Units. Superior academic and clinical programs require an active involvement in basic and applied research.

Establishment of a second publicly-aided medical school in conjunction with the Memorial Research Center and Hospital at Knoxville will be requested during the coming decade.

A lower, but nevertheless significant, priority will be given to statewide continuing education programs for health professions.
APPENDIX C

CHARTER PROVISIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DURATION AND SEAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1The word "charter" as here used means a compilation of the more fundamental legislative acts relating specifically to The University of Tennessee. A complete compilation of all of the legislative acts relating to the University through 1947, compiled by Mr. Wassell Randolph, a member of the Board of Trustees, is in the University Library and the office of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

2Acts of Tennessee, 1879, ch. 75. The University is an Agency of the State of Tennessee, University v. Bank, 157 Tenn. 87; Grigsby v. Bank, 158 Tenn. 185; Authority v. Knoxville, 174 Tenn. 85-86.

3Acts of Tennessee, 1807, ch. 64, sec. 1.

4Acts of Tennessee, 1807, ch. 64, sec. 8.

5Acts of Tennessee, 1807, ch. 64. sec. 5; Acts of Tennessee, 1839-1840, ch. 98, sec. 5; Acts of Tennessee 1868, ch. 12; Tennessee Code Annotated, sec. 561. (Hereinafter referred to as Code.)
### POWERS OF THE UNIVERSITY:  
#### Sue and be Sued  
**SECTION 1.** The University, under its corporate name, may sue and be sued in any court of law or equity in this state or elsewhere.  

#### Confer Degrees  
**SECTION 2.** The University, by and through its President and professors, with the advice and consent of a majority of the Trustees, shall have full power and authority, at any session of the Board of Trustees, to confer on any student in the University, or any other person deemed proper, any degree known and used in colleges or universities in any of the United States.  

#### Purchase, Hold and Dispose of Property  
**SECTION 3.** The University, under its corporate name, shall be capable in law, to purchase, receive and hold to it and its successors forever, or for any less estate, any lands, tenements, goods or chattels, which shall be given, granted, devised to it or purchased by it to the use of the University; and to use, sell, exchange, assign, transfer, convey, or dispose of any of the real or personal estate of the University, by deed or otherwise, in such manner as a majority of the Trustees of the University shall deem most advantageous for the use of the University.  

#### Borrow Money, Purchase Real Estate and Erect Buildings  
**SECTION 4.** The University shall have full authority to borrow money, to erect buildings and also to purchase real estate and to issue evidences of indebtedness therefor which shall bear not more than six per cent interest, which shall be exempt from taxation but which shall not constitute indebtedness of the State of Tennessee.  

---

6Acts of Tennessee, 1807, ch. 64, sec. 1.  

7This clause would seem to authorize the granting of honorary degrees by the University.  

8Acts of Tennessee, 1807, ch. 64, sec. 5; Acts of Tennessee, 1839-1840, ch. 98, sec. 5.  

9Acts of Tennessee, 1807, ch. 64, sec. 1 and 7; Acts of Tennessee, 1839-1840, ch. 98, sec. 5.  

SECTION 5. The University shall have, use and enjoy all rights, privileges and powers usually conferred upon universities.¹¹

Article VI

SECTION 1. The governing body of the University shall be a Board of Trustees consisting of the following persons: The Governor of the State, the Commissioner of Education, the Commissioner of Agriculture, the Executive Director of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, and the President of the University, all of whom shall be ex-officio members;¹² also one Trustee representing each Congressional District of the state; and also two Trustees representing Knox County, two representing Shelby County, one representing Weakley County, and one representing Hamilton County. At least one-third of the Trustees shall be members of the principal minority political party in the state and at least one-third shall be alumni of the University.¹³

SECTION 2. All appointive Trustees shall be appointed by the Governor and shall be confirmed by the State Senate.¹⁴ All appointive Trustees shall be eligible for re-appointment.¹⁵

SECTION 3. Commencing with the successive expirations of the present 14-year terms, the term of office of each appointive Trustee shall be nine years beginning June 1 of the year of appointment.¹⁶

SECTION 4. The Trustees shall always foster, encourage and inculcate loyalty to both the state and national governments as well in the general administration of the University as in the discipline of the students.¹⁷

SECTION 5. (a) Each Trustee, before acting in his appointment, shall take before some judge or justice of the peace an oath faithfully, honestly and impartially to discharge the duties of his appointment; and that in all votes by him to be given as a Trustee, he will so vote as in his judgment will best promote the interests of the University and education therein.¹⁸

¹¹Acts of Tennessee, 1839-1840, ch. 98, sec. 5.
¹²Code, sec. 49-3301.
¹³Code, sec. 49-3302.
¹⁴Code, sec. 49-3302.
¹⁵Code, sec. 49-3303.
¹⁶Code, sec. 49-3303.
¹⁷Acts of Tennessee, 1868-1869, ch. 12, sec.
¹⁸Acts of Tennessee, 1807, ch. 64, sec. 6.
(b) The Board of Trustees shall deposit with the Secretary of State their bond made payable to the State of Tennessee with security approved by the Governor and the State Comptroller, in amount required from time to time.

SECTION 6. The removal of any Trustee from the county or Congressional District which he represents, ipso facto, will vacate his position. The failure of a Trustee to attend three regular meetings of the Board in succession shall be cause for his removal and shall authorize the Board to call on the Governor to appoint his successor.

SECTION 7. No Trustee shall be financially interested in any contract or transaction affecting the interest of the University, nor procure or be a party in any way to procuring the appointment of any relative to any position of trust or profit connected with the University. Violation of this provision shall subject the Trustee so offending to removal by the Governor or by the Board.

SECTION 8. In case of a vacancy on the Board from any cause the Governor shall appoint a successor to fill the unexpired term.

SECTION 9. The Board shall fix the beginning and ending of every scholastic session at such time or times as it shall deem conducive to the interest of the University.

SECTION 10. The Board shall appoint an Executive Committee and such standing committees as may be advisable for the transaction of the business of the University. It also may appoint special committees.

SECTION 11. The Board shall have authority to transact at any called meeting any business it is authorized at stated meetings.

19 Code, sec. 49-3305.  
20 Code, sec. 49-3304.  
22 Code, sec. 49-3304.  
23 Acts of Tennessee, 1837-1838, ch. 266, sec. 2.  
25 Code, sec. 49-3306.
BY-LAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE*

ARTICLE I

SECTION 1. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, which is the governing body of The University of Tennessee, shall have full and complete control over its organization and administration, also over its constituent parts and its financial affairs. All Trustees, both ex officio and appointed, (except the Executive Director of the Tennessee Higher Education Committee, who is a non-voting member), shall have a vote on matters coming before the Board, or before any committee thereof of which they are members.

SECTION 2. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHALL:

(a) Establish policies controlling the scope of the educational opportunities to be offered by the University and also policies determining its operation in general; however, the planning and development of curricula shall be the function of the faculties;

(b) Have full authority to determine and to control the activities and policies of all organizations and activities that bear, or that may be carried under, the name of the University;

(c) Not undertake to direct matters of administration or of executive action except through the President; and

(d) Control the election, appointment and removal of all the officers, faculty and employees of the University and the fixing of their compensation. At its annual meeting, the Board shall elect and fix the compensation of the President and of all other executive and administrative officers and the members of the faculties; and fix the compensation of all other employees as it may deem necessary for the proper operation and management of the University. All such elections shall be for one year or during the pleasure of the Board. Appointments for special services for a less period may be made.

SECTION 3. EACH TRUSTEE, so far as his time will permit, shall keep himself informed as to the work of the University and its several campuses, colleges, schools, departments and activities, both educational and business.

SECTION 4. THE OFFICERS OF THE BOARD shall be a Chairman and a Vice Chairman, who shall be members of the Board and who shall be elected at the annual meeting to serve for one year and until their successors shall be elected and shall have qualified; and a Secretary who need not be a member of the Board and who shall be elected to serve at the will and pleasure of the Board. He may be the General Counsel and the Secretary of the University also.

SECTION 5. THE CHAIRMAN shall preside at all meetings of the Board. In his absence the Vice Chairman shall preside. In the absence of the

*Exact copy; footnotes cited and numbered identical to original.
Chairman and the Vice Chairman, the Board may choose a Chairman pro tempore.

SECTION 6. THE SECRETARY of the Board shall perform the following duties:

(a) Attend all meetings of the Board and take and preserve in a proper minute book the minutes of all Board meetings; also send promptly to each member of the Board a copy of the minutes of each meeting.

(b) Attend all meetings of the Executive, Finance, and Buildings and Grounds Committees of the Board and of all other committees appointed by the Board, of all which committees he shall be, ex officio, the Secretary; send promptly to each member of each committee a copy of the minutes of each meeting of that committee, and to each of the other members of the Board a copy of the minutes of each meeting of the Executive Committee.

(c) Assist the President in preparing the agenda for every meeting of the Board of Trustees, listing in outline each matter to be considered at every meeting, copy of which when practicable shall accompany the notice of the meeting, but if impracticable it shall be sent before the meeting; and prepare a like agenda, when practicable, for each meeting of the Executive Committee and for meetings of other committees, when requested by the committee chairman.

(d) Record all calls for meetings of the Board and of the Executive Committee; notify all members of the Board and of that committee of each meeting; notify the members of other committees of the Board of any committee whenever requested so to do by the chairman of the committee; notify promptly the members of all special committees created by the Board of their appointment; and given written notice to each Trustee or officer of the University of any special service assigned to him by the Board or a committee, promptly after the adoption of the resolution prescribing the service, together with a copy of the pertinent resolution.

(e) Keep a special book entitled "By-Laws" into which shall be copies the By-Laws of the University and which shall be kept up to date by also copying therein all amendments to existing By-Laws and new By-laws adopted; make pertinent notation at the proper place in the original By-Laws of all changes or additions and the date of the change or addition; and, likewise, note therein any By-Laws that may be repealed and the date of repeal.

(f) Keep, in a proper book, a record of the names of all the Trustees, the dates of their appointments and the dates of the expirations of their terms of office.

(g) Secure and preserve a copy of each written report made by the committees of the Board of Trustees.

(h) Preserve all record books, correspondence and papers belonging or pertaining to the business of the Board, except as otherwise provided.
(i) Assist the President in seeing that all orders and resolutions of the Board of Trustees and of the Executive Committee shall be made effective.

(j) Perform such other services and keep such additional records as may be directed by the Board of Trustees, by the Executive Committee or by the President of the University; and assist the Board of Trustees, its officers and committees, and the President in discharging their duties.

SECTION 7. IN THE ABSENCE OF THE SECRETARY and the Assistant Secretary of the Board from any meeting of the Board or of the Executive, Finance or Buildings and Grounds Committees, or of any committee of which he is Secretary, a Secretary pro tempore may be appointed by the Board or by the committee, which Secretary pro tempore shall be charged with the duty of sending copies of the minutes of the meeting for which he acts, to the members of the Board or of the committee, as the case may be, as required of the Secretary in Section 6 above.

ARTICLE II

SECTION 1. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES shall hold three meetings annually, viz., the stated annual meeting fixed by statute, a fall meeting, and a winter meeting which shall be held on day or days as may be determined by the Board and held on the campus at Knoxville or at such other place as the Board shall determine, written notice thereof to be given by the Secretary to the Trustees at least five days before the meeting.

SECTION 2. SPECIAL MEETINGS of the Board as may be necessary may be called (a) by its Chairman, (b) or by the President of the University, or (c) by the Secretary of the Board upon the written request of three (3) or more of its members. The call for every special meeting shall state the business to be considered.

SECTION 3. THE BOARD MAY ADJOURN any stated or called meeting to any date that it may set for such adjournment. Any annual or special meeting of the Board, if a quorum be not present, may be adjourned by the members attending from time to time until a quorum shall be present.

SECTION 4. SEVEN (7) MEMBERS of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

SECTION 5. AT LEAST FIVE (5) DAYS written notice of the stated annual of the Board shall be sent by the Secretary of the Board to all Trustees.

---


2Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3306.

3Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3306.

4Tenn. Code, Sec. 49-3306. See: Article I, sec. 6(c).
SECTION 6. SPECIAL MEETINGS of the Board may be called on less than five (5) days notice and, if urgent, by telegram or telephone to each Board member who must be advised of the purpose or purposes of the meeting.

SECTION 7. MATTERS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDUM of the stated annual, fall, and winter meetings, or stated in the call for a special meeting, may be considered only upon an affirmative vote which shall represent a majority of the entire Board.

SECTION 8. INDIVIDUALS desiring to appear at any Board meeting to present in person any matter shall make written application to the Secretary of the Board, setting out the matter to be presented, at least thirty (30) days before the date set for the meeting so that the matter to be presented can be placed upon the agenda for the meeting; otherwise the request of any individual to appear before the Board will not be granted except upon favorable majority vote of the Trustees present at the meeting.

ARTICLE III

SECTION 1. THE FOLLOWING STANDING COMMITTEES\(^5\) chosen from members of the Board of Trustees shall be appointed by the Board upon the nomination of the President promptly after the annual meeting following each biennial session of the General Assembly of the State, to serve for two years and until their successors shall be appointed, to-wit:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FINANCE AND BUSINESS COMMITTEE
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS COMMITTEE
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE
ATHLETICS COMMITTEE
DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE
FACULTY AND STAFF AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
MEDICAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
URBAN AFFAIRS AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

SECTION 2. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,\(^6\) THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE shall have five (5) or more members. All other standing committees shall have three (3) or more members. At least one (1) member of the Finance and Business Committee and one (1) member of the Buildings and Grounds Committee shall be named on the Executive Committee.

SECTION 3. (a) THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE shall act for the Board between its meetings and shall transact all business of the Board specifically

\(^5\)Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3307.

\(^6\)Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3307.
committed to it and any other necessary business in harmony with the
general policy of the Board as determined at stated or called meetings.\(^7\)
It shall have power to approve the condemnation or purchase by the Univer-
sity of properties at all locations which in its judgment shall be advan-
tageous for the University to acquire and at such prices and on such terms
as it may consider satisfactory and the officers of the University, after
such approval, shall consummate each such acquisition by doing the neces-
sary acts and executing the necessary papers.

(b) This committee shall meet on the call of the President or of
its Chairman at such time and place as shall be designated in the call.

(c) Four (4) members of this committee shall constitute a quorum,\(^8\)
but a less number attending may adjourn the meeting until a quorum shall
be present.

(d) An agendum prepared pursuant to Article I, sec. 6(c) shall
accompany the notice of every meeting of this committee when practicable,
but if impracticable the notice shall state the purpose or purposes for
which the meeting is called. Matters not set forth on the agendum or in
the notice shall be considered only on affirmative vote which shall repre-
sent a majority of the entire committee.

(e) If by reason of urgency notice of this committee cannot be
given pursuant to Article I, sec. 6(d), notice may be given by the Secre-
tary of the Board by telegram or telephone to the committee members who
must be advised of the purpose or purposes of the meeting.

SECTION 4. THE FINANCE AND BUSINESS COMMITTEE shall formulate the poli-
cies and recommend their adoption by the Board of Trustees in all matters
relating to finance and business, including the investment of University
funds, annual operating budgets, capital outlay budgets which are developed
in conjunction with the Buildings and Grounds Committee, and the establish-
ment of tuition and fee rates.

This committee shall review and recommend for adoption the Univer-
sity's operating and capital outlay budgets and the requests for operating
and capital outlay appropriations to be submitted to the General Assembly,
the Governor, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

This committee shall advise with the President and the General
Counsel on legal affairs affecting or relating to the University.

SECTION 5. (a) THE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS COMMITTEE shall approve and
recommend to the Board or to the Executive Committee the purchase of real
estate, the construction of specific buildings and other capital improve-
ments, the selection of architects and engineers for capital projects, the

\(^7\)Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3307.

\(^8\)Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3307.
award of construction contracts and the naming of buildings, and shall approve and recommend to the Finance and Business Committee the annual or biennial capital outlay budget and the requests for capital outlay appropriations.

(b) All matters involving ordinary repairs, changes, adjustments and improvements for the purpose of putting and keeping in good condition the buildings, grounds and equipment of the University, wherever located, for their efficient use are committed to the President of the University.

SECTION 6. THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend all proposals concerning the development of new academic programs and the revision of existing programs relating to instruction, research and service, the establishment of new academic organizations, such as major campuses, colleges, institutes, and the adoption of admissions and retention standards.

SECTION 7. THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend to the Board, or to the appropriate committee of the Board, policies and proposals concerning the Institute of Agriculture, College of Agriculture, Agricultural Extension Service, and the Agricultural Experiment Station and concerning the development and management of State-wide agricultural instruction, research and service.

SECTION 8. THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend to the Board or to the Executive Committee policies and proposals concerning intercollegiate athletics programs and activities on each campus of the University.

SECTION 9. THE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend to the Board, the Executive Committee, or to other appropriate committees, policies and proposals affecting general financial support of the University from all sources and shall advise and counsel the President and Vice President for Development and Administration on matters relating to programs of legislative, alumni and public relations.

SECTION 10. THE FACULTY AND STAFF AFFAIRS COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend to the Board or to the Executive Committee policies and proposals concerning faculty and staff retirement, employee benefits, employee rights and privileges, and other personnel policy matters.

SECTION 11. THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend to the Board or to the Executive Committee policies and proposals concerning the development and management of the Medical Units in Memphis, The University of Tennessee Memorial Research Center and Hospital in Knoxville, and other health facilities and programs throughout the State.

SECTION 12. THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend to the Board or to the Executive Committee policies and proposals concerning student affairs, including rights and privileges, discipline, and special activities of students on all campuses of the University.
SECTION 13. THE URBAN AFFAIRS AND SERVICES COMMITTEE shall review, approve, and recommend to the Board or to the Executive Committee policies and proposals concerning the Division of University Extension, research, training, and public service to the urban areas of the State of Tennessee.

SECTION 14. (a) EACH STANDING COMMITTEE shall, in the area of its specific responsibility consider and make recommendations to the Board, or to another appropriate committee of the Board, as to any matter referred to it by the Board or by the Administration, and it may make such recommendations on its own initiative after full consultation with the Administration.

THE CHAIRMAN OF EACH STANDING COMMITTEE, except the Executive Committee, is expected to call, at least yearly, a meeting of his committee, and more frequently if additional sessions are needed.

(b) In addition to the standing committees listed above, the President of the University or the Chairman of the Board may appoint special committees for specific assignments.

(c) Well in advance of the retirement of a Vice President, Chancellor, Dean, or other principal administrative officer of the University on any of its campuses, the President shall confer with the proper standing committee relative to the successor to be appointed. Likewise, if for any reason such as office should be vacated, the President shall confer with the proper standing committee relative to the successor to be appointed.

SECTION 15. (a) THE CHAIRMAN of each standing committee shall be designated by the Board of Trustees, upon the recommendation of the President, biennially as each such committee shall be appointed. The chairman of each special committee shall likewise be designated upon the creation of the committee. A vacancy in the chairmanship of any committee shall be filled in the same manner.

(b) A meeting of any committee may be called by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, by the President, or by the committee chairman, and shall be called by the Secretary of the Board upon the written request of two members of the committee.

(c) Unless otherwise provided, a majority of the members of each standing or special committee shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE IV

SECTION 1. THE SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS of The University of Tennessee shall be the President, the Vice Presidents, the General Counsel, the Secretary, the Treasurer, and the Chancellors. The Board shall have the authority, from time to time, to create and to fill additional offices and to abolish at its pleasure any office so created.

SECTION 2. The President shall be the chief executive officer of The University of Tennessee. He shall exercise complete executive authority
over the institutions comprising The University of Tennessee, subject to
the direction and control of the Board of Trustees.

The President shall be the primary spokesman for The University of
Tennessee to the alumni of the institution, the new media, the educational
world, and the general public. He shall initiate administer University
policies, speak for the University as its official head, and coordinate
all activities of each campus of the institution directly or through his
designated representatives. As chief executive, he shall be responsible
for the presentation of all University policies and recommendations to the
General Assembly, the Governor, the Board of Trustees, State budget offi-
cials, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, and the federal govern-
ment.

The President shall formulate the educational and administrative
policies of The University of Tennessee and shall perform all duties pre-
scribed by the Board of Trustees. He shall be responsible to the Board
of Trustees for the prompt and effective execution of all laws relating
to the University and of all resolutions, policies, rules, and regula-
tions adopted by the Board of Trustees and by the Executive Committee.

The President shall make nominations for all personnel appoint-
ments and all recommendations for promotions, salaries, transfers, sus-
pensions, and dismissals of administrative, academic and non-academic
staff members of the institutions comprising The University of Tennessee.

The President shall be responsible to the Board of Trustees for the
preparation of the budget of The University of Tennessee and its presenta-
tion to the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the Governor and the
State Department of Finance and Administration, and the General Assembly.

The President shall be the leader and coordinator of all institu-
tions of The University of Tennessee and shall promote the general welfare
and development of the University in its several parts and as a whole. He
shall have the authority to decide all questions of jurisdiction not other-
wise defined between the several institutions, facilities, and officers.
The faculties, staff, or students or any member thereof may have the right
of appeal from the Chancellor to the President. The channel for official
communications between the President and the several institutions in all
matters shall be through the Chancellors.

The President shall assume ultimate control over all budgets of the
University and shall approve major budgetary revisions.

The President shall establish an administrative organization to
execute policies of The University of Tennessee. He shall insure that
the University and its component institutions are properly staffed to
discharge their responsibilities. He shall also establish and maintain
adequate lines of communication.

In the execution of his duties and responsibilities, the President
may delegate to subordinate officers portions of his duties, but this
action shall not reduce the President's responsibility. He shall be a member ex officio of all standing and other committees of the Board.

In addition to the foregoing powers and duties, the President shall be charged with these specific powers and duties:

(a) He shall make a full report by December 20th of each even-numbered year reflecting the activities of the University for the biennium ending the preceding June 30th, which shall be submitted, if possible, to the Board of Trustees for its approval, otherwise to the Executive Committee for approval, and after being approved, a copy shall be transmitted to the Governor and a copy to each house of the General Assembly. This report shall include an audited statement of all receipts and disbursements for the biennium which ended June 30th next preceding and it may be accompanied by the reports of the deans and such other officers of the University as the President may deem desirable.9

(b) He shall have authority to execute all bonds, mortgages, deeds, leases, and other contracts, under the Seal of the University, except where required by law to be otherwise signed and executed and except where the execution thereof shall be delegated specifically by the Board of Trustees or by the Executive Committee to some other officer of the University.

(c) He shall cause to be prepared annually with the assistance of the Vice Presidents, Chancellors, deans and other officers of the University's operating budget for the next fiscal year. The budget shall list the persons to be appointed to the faculties of the various colleges and the personnel to be employed by the various divisions and Departments of the University with the compensation to be paid each. The President shall submit the budget to the Finance Committee in ample time for its consideration and approval before transmitting the budget to the Board. Between meetings of the Board the President shall approve and report to the Executive Committee any appointments and employments that may become necessary.

(d) He shall be responsible that the academic policies and procedures, including admission to the University, promotions and graduation, shall be enforced and that adequate records of these procedures shall be maintained; recommend to the Board for the award of degrees or certificates those whom the faculties have found qualified; and sign all diplomas and certificates granted by the University, unless his facsimile signature is placed thereon with his permission.

(e) He shall perform such other duties as may be delegated to him by the Board of Trustees, or by any standing or special committee of the Board, including the securing of such reports and statements on the activities of the University as may be requested.

SECTION 3. (a) THE VICE PRESIDENTS shall be elected and removed in the same manner as the President and each shall be directly responsible to the

---

9Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3309.
President. They shall perform such duties as may be delegated to them from time to time by the President and by the Board of Trustees.

(b) THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION shall be responsible for the establishment and administration of development programs for the entire University, shall assume administrative responsibility for the University in the absence of the President, and shall execute other functions which may be assigned by the President. He shall be primarily responsible, University-wide, for the raising of funds from alumni, private individuals, corporations, and foundations; maintenance of a sound program of governmental relations at local, state, and federal levels; management of alumni affairs for the total University; campus planning on all University campuses; provision of architectural services; the development and supervision of capital construction programs; and the operation of public relations and information services. Certain functions (campus planning, architectural services, and capital construction) will be managed by the Vice President and his staff with appropriate coordination with campus personnel. Other functions (fund-raising, alumni affairs, governmental relations, and public relations) will be coordinated by a central staff and through cooperative relationships with functional personnel on each campus. The Vice President and his staff members will provide initiative, coordination, and service for campus staff members who are responsible to the Chancellors of the several campuses.

(c) THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS shall be responsible for the coordination of undergraduate and graduate academic programs, including research and service, on all campuses and shall represent the President in the development and implementation of academic programs. He shall encourage the initiation and maintenance of quality academic programs on all campuses, review on behalf of the President proposals for new academic programs within the University system, and provide coordination of research and grant proposals. The occupant of this position will perform a coordinative service in academic affairs through functional relationships with the Chancellors and their chief academic, research, and service officers. Coordination will be achieved through general policies which allow maximum campus flexibility, autonomy, and initiative and by the use of committees or councils of campus academic personnel.

(d) THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUSINESS AND FINANCE shall be responsible for the development and coordination of University-wide policies and operations concerning budgeting, accounting, auditing, administrative data processing, purchasing, non-academic personnel administration, plant operation and maintenance, the motor pool, and the treasury function. He shall prepare, in cooperation with the Chancellors, appropriations requests for submission to the President, the Board of Trustees, the Higher Education Commission, the State Department of Finance and Administration, and the State General Assembly. He shall be responsible for the operation of a non-academic personnel office which will implement policy for the University and perform detailed personnel administration for the Knoxville campus. The administrative data processing unit at Knoxville will be supervised by the Vice President for Business and Finance and will perform central services for the system and specific services for the Knoxville campus. He
will operate the University Motor Pool which will serve the entire University. The Treasurer will be responsible to the Vice President for Business and Finance and will perform accounting, auditing, and disbursing for the University and certain specific services for the Knoxville campus. The Vice President for Business and Finance will be responsible for the attainment of reasonable standards of plant operation and maintenance on all campuses. He will perform his duties through certain staff members who are responsible to him and through functional relationships with the Chancellors and their personnel in business and finance.

(e) THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT shall perform University-wide studies on management, operational, and academic subjects and shall act as general assistant to the President. He shall be responsible for conducting institutional studies initiated by his staff or requested by University and campus personnel. Priority will be given to studies which are of significance in the making of management and academic decisions. The Office of Institutional Research is a service agency for the University and its several campuses. Its responsibilities will be executed by University-wide personnel and through functional relationships with appropriate campus representatives. The Executive Assistant to the President shall perform duties assigned by the President. Assignments will include the scheduling of staff and other meetings, handling of correspondence, implementing decisions made by the President and his staff, and representing the President in appropriate conferences and meetings. The occupant of this position will also work with Chancellors on student affairs problems with University-wide implications.

SECTION 4. WHEN THERE SHALL BE A VACANCY in the office of the President or in the event of the disability of the President, the Executive Committee or the Board of Trustees within their discretion may designate a Vice President who shall assume the duties of the President at the pleasure of the Board.

SECTION 5. THE GENERAL COUNSEL shall be elected and removed in the same manner as the President and shall be directly responsible to the President. He shall serve as, and perform the duties of, legal advisor for the Board of Trustees and The University of Tennessee. He shall be responsible for all legal matters of the University and the several campuses; review and approve all contracts and other documents; and represent the University in all legal actions except when special counsel is retained to handle specific legal actions. The General Counsel may be elected Secretary if the Board shall so order.

SECTION 6. THE SECRETARY shall be elected and removed in the same manner as the President and shall act under the direction of the President to whom he shall be immediately responsible. He shall perform the following duties:

(1) Examine all contracts and other documents to be executed by the President or a Vice President, and secure opinion of legality.

(2) Attest all bonds, mortgages and other contracts requiring the Seal of the University and affix thereto the Seal, of which he shall be Custodian.
(3) Countersign all diplomas and certificates granted by the University.

(4) Keep a special record of all donations to the University, showing the donor's name and the amount, purpose and date of each donation.

(5) And all other duties that may be assigned to him by the President or by the Board of Trustees or by the Executive Council. The Board may combine the offices of General Counsel and Secretary.

SECTION 7. THE TREASURER shall be elected and removed in the same manner as the President and shall act under the direction of the Vice President for Business and Finance to whom he shall be immediately responsible. He shall receive and shall have custody of all money granted by the United States or by the State for the Agricultural Experiment Station; for the benefit of agriculture and of the mechanic arts; for extension teaching in vocational and industrial training, and all other funds of the University whether derived from appropriations, from the federal government, the state legislature, by donation or bequest and any and all other funds received at any time for the purposes of the University, and shall be responsible for the proper handling of such funds in accordance with the statutes making the appropriations and with the policies fixed by the Board of Trustees and by the Executive Committee. He shall give bond in an amount designated by the Board of Trustees and satisfactory to the Governor of the State with security to be approved by the Governor and the Board; the premium on which shall be paid by the University. He shall perform the following duties:

(1) Deposit all moneys and funds belonging to the University, or over which he has control, in such accounts and depositories and upon such conditions and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Board of Trustees or by the Executive Committee.

(2) Disburse the funds of the University as authorized by the Board of Trustees on checks or warrants drawn on any of the depositories of the University, to be signed and countersigned as directed by the Board and carefully preserve as vouchers all warrants and checks after payment.

(3) Maintain adequate record of receipts and disbursements and such other accounting records as may be authorized by the Board of Trustees, and present to the President for transmission to the Board at its annual meeting a statement of all receipts and disbursements for the preceding fiscal year and of the current financial condition of the University. Also, present to the Board of Trustees, the Executive Committee, the Finance Committee, the President or the Budget Officer whenever requested, such statements relative to the finances of the University as any of them may request, and to whom the records in his office shall be open to inspection.

(4) Under the general supervision of the Vice President for Business and Finance, the Treasurer will be responsible for accounting, disbursements, and reporting for the University. In addition, the occupant of
this position will perform certain service functions--collection of revenues, administration of student loans, and detailed accounting--for the Knoxville campus.

SECTION 8. THE CHANCELLORS shall be elected and removed in the same manner as the President and each shall be directly responsible to the President.

The Chancellor who is elected for and assigned jurisdiction over a campus shall be the chief administrative officer and shall be fully responsible for the administration and management of that campus subject to the general supervision of the President and coordinate relationships with the Vice Presidents. The Chancellor shall direct instructional, research, service, student, development, finance and business, and athletics programs on his campus within general policies established by the President and the Board of Trustees. Appropriate functional relationships will be maintained between the Chancellors and the Vice Presidents for Development and Administration, Academic Affairs, Business and Finance, and Institutional Research.

The Chancellor shall recommend to the President appointment of personnel on his campus. He shall recommend major policy and operational changes in the areas of academic affairs, student affairs, business and finance, and development to the President for review and consideration prior to enactment.

SECTION 9. ALL OFFICERS, heads of departments and all other employees whose duties require them to receive moneys on its account and who shall receive donations or bequests made to the University, after receipt of the money shall pay it promptly to the Treasurer with a statement of the amount paid, the date of the payment and the purpose for which paid; except in those cases where money belonging to the University and its accounting to the Treasurer by the collecting agency has been provided for otherwise by the Finance Committee with the approval of the President.

SECTION 10. ALL OTHER OFFICERS, however designated, shall be responsible to the President, directly or through their next superior officer for the efficient operation of the organizational unit or function for which they are responsible.

SECTION 11. In addition to the President, any Vice President shall have the power and authority to sign all approved document, instruments, contracts, bonds, notes, or other papers in connection with the operation of the business of the University; and, in addition to the Secretary, any assistant secretary shall have the power and authority to attest and place the University's Seal on all said documents, instruments, contracts, bonds, notes, or other papers.

Within the scope of, and subject to limitations and restrictions prescribed by, directives and authorizations issued from time to time by the President, University administrative personnel on each campus, such as purchasing agents and business managers, shall have the power and authority to sign and issue purchase orders and conduct ordinary
business affairs on behalf of the University. All contracts and all bonds, mortgages, notes, deeds, leases, and other documents except purchase orders must be signed by the President or a Vice President after the Secretary has obtained appropriate legal and fiscal review thereof. All such executed instruments shall be forwarded by the Secretary to the Office of the Treasurer to be placed in the official files of the University.

SECTION 12. (a) The Board of Trustees is vitally interested in the welfare, safety, and conduct of the students at all campuses and facilities of The University of Tennessee and is dedicated to the maintenance of an environment which preserves conditions conducive to the normal educational processes and to the welfare and safety of students and others. To implement these concepts, the Board of Trustees vests in the President and the respective Chancellors the authority to prescribe and enforce policies, rules, and regulations concerning rights, responsibilities, conduct and discipline of students at the various campuses and facilities of the University. The President and the Chancellors are authorized to take any lawful action necessary to assure the protection of life and property at the several campuses and facilities.

(b) Each Chancellor may appoint an Administrative Council or other similar body and delegate to it certain functions, including approval and control of student organizations, adoption of rules of conduct and discipline of students, and the conduct of disciplinary proceedings involving misconduct or delinquencies of students attending the colleges and schools under its jurisdiction. However, each Chancellor shall retain ultimate control and authority and shall be responsible to the President and the Board of Trustees for all final actions and decisions in these areas.

ARTICLE V

SECTION 1. GENERAL PARLIAMENTARY RULES shall be observed in conducting the business of the Board of Trustees except as they may be modified by rules and regulations adopted by the Board.

SECTION 2. IN THE INTEREST OF CLEARNESS, to prevent misapprehension and to secure accuracy of record, each important motion or resolution (except informal or parliamentary motions) shall be presented in writing by the offerer at the time the motion is made, or he may be granted the privilege of reducing such motion to writing and of presenting it to the Secretary of the Board before adjournment of the meeting.

SECTION 3. A RECORD VOTE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES shall be made upon all motions or resolutions presented to the Board providing for the appropriation or expenditure of the funds of the University; or creating any financial liability against it. A record vote shall be required on all motions providing for any revision of the By-Laws, the adoption of a new By-Law or the repeal of an existing By-Law; and upon the demand of any Board member present for a record vote made before the announcement of a vote otherwise taken.

SECTION 4. IF AT ANY TIME THE PRESIDENT of the University or any person or persons connected with the University having the power to make
appointment to, or a contract of employment for, a position of trust or profit connected with the University, contemplates the appointment to, or the employment for, such position of a relative of a Trustee, he shall report such intention to the Board, or to the Executive Committee, stating the position to be filled or contract to be made, the name of the person to be appointed or employed, his relationship to the member or members of the Board and the qualifications of such person for the duties to be performed; and also whether or not the related member of the Board has been a party to an effort to procure such appointment or employment. 10

SECTION 5. AT ALL REGULAR MEETINGS of the Board of Trustees, and at special meetings so far as the order may be applicable, the following order of business shall be observed unless suspended by unanimous consent or by majority vote of the members present:

1. Roll call.
2. Administering of oath to new members of the Board.
3. Reading of the minutes of the previous meeting and action thereon.
4. Reading of the minutes of the Executive Committee and action thereon.
5. Election of officers.
6. Reports and recommendation of the President of the University.
8. Reports of the standing committees.
9. Reports of special committees.
10. Communications, petitions and memorials.
11. Unfinished and miscellaneous business.

SECTION 6. AS A MATTER OF POLICY, the Board of Trustees is averse to the granting of honorary degrees by the University; however, in exceptional cases and for special reasons the Board may grant such degrees.

SECTION 7. OFFICERS, FACULTY AND STAFF MEMBERS, students, employees, alumni and all others who feel that they may have a grievance against the University shall have the right of appeal through the appropriate Chancellor and the President to the Board of Trustees.

10Tenn. Code, sec. 49-3308.
SECTION 8. A MOTION TO RECONSIDER shall be made by a member who voted for
the motion and must be made at the same meeting.

ARTICLE VI

SECTION 1. THESE BY-LAWS SHALL BE EFFECTIVE UPON ADOPTION AND SHALL SUPER-
SEDE the By-Laws adopted by the Board of Trustees on February 24, 1958, and
all other By-Laws thereafter adopted by the Board.

SECTION 2. THESE BY-LAWS MAY BE CHANGED by amendment, by adoption of a new
By-Law or by repeal of an existing By-Law at any regular meeting of the
Board of Trustees, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, by a
majority vote of record of the entire membership of the Board as consti-
tuted by law at the time, provided that a copy of the amendment or new
By-Law to be offered or notation of the By-Law to be repealed shall be
furnished each Board member in writing at least five (5) days in advance
of the meeting.
FROM: Subcommittee on University Governance; T. G. Carley, J. D. Jones, A. H. Keally, C. E. Patterson, Jr., J. W. Prados, G. A. Wagoner, L. Silverman, Chairman

SUBJECT: Proposal for More Effective Faculty Participation in the Governance of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

The attached documents are the result of extensive subcommittee deliberations aimed in developing more effective procedures for involvement of the faculty in the governance of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. These deliberations have included extensive discussions and examinations of plans of academic governance in effect in a number of other institutions. From these discussions the following major thoughts emerged as a consensus of the subcommittee members:

1. The legal authority for the governance of The University of Tennessee is vested in the Board of Trustees. The Board delegates a portion of its powers to the President of the University, who in turn delegates powers for the control of the Knoxville campus to the Chancellor of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

2. The smooth and effective functioning of a present-day university requires that faculty and students be delegated a degree of policy control in certain areas of close concern to them and in which they possess special competence. The size of The University of Tennessee requires that these powers be exercised through elected representative bodies.

3. The areas of primary student and faculty concern and competence are sufficiently distinct to demand separate faculty and student governing organizations.

4. At the same time, mechanisms for effective and frequent communication between faculty, student, and administrative policy-making (and policy implementing) groups must be provided.

Accordingly, the following changes in the structure of academic governance of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, are recommended:

1. That the present University Senate be reorganized as the Faculty Senate; and that the number of administrative officers in the Senate be reduced, retaining only those who are most
closely associated with the undergraduate and graduate educational programs of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

2. That the powers of the Faculty Senate be more clearly defined and extended to cover all areas of primary academic concern to the faculty.

3. That the present Student Government Association reorganize itself into a Student Senate which will be more nearly representative of all classes of students within the University.

4. That the Student Senate be delegated powers for significant policy control in areas of primary interest to the student members of the academic community.

5. That a University Council consisting of elected representatives of the Faculty Senate and Student Senate, together with members of the central campus administration, be established to confer on a frequent and continuing basis with the Chancellor, to make recommendations to the Chancellor, Faculty Senate and Student Senate concerning any question of University policy, any aspect of governing the University, and any general issue relating to the welfare of the University.

These organizational recommendations are detailed in the attachments presented herewith. These are:

1. An organizational chart showing the relationship between the various governing bodies of the University and indicating areas of primary concern for each.

2. A proposed resolution for action by the Board of Trustees establishing a Faculty Senate.

3. A proposed resolution for action by the Board of Trustees establishing a University Council.

4. A proposed set of by-laws for the Faculty Senate of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

No attempt has been made to specify the details of organization of the Student Senate; those powers shown on the organizational chart as being delegated to the Student Senate were not considered in detail by this Subcommittee, and should be viewed only as very tentative recommendations.

LW:JWP:wjh

Attachments
PROPOSED RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A FACULTY SENATE FOR
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

WHEREAS, the Trustees of The University of Tennessee at their annual meeting in August, 1949, adopted a resolution creating the University Senate; and

WHEREAS, The University of Tennessee has completed a reorganization whereby it has become a systems complex consisting of several universities; and

WHEREAS, The University of Tennessee has, by virtue of said reorganization and unprecedented growth, become a University family of some 35,000 students and 2,000 faculty; and

WHEREAS, the original resolution creating the University Senate contemplated one organization with functions which may have been appropriate for that time; and

WHEREAS, the changed physical, intellectual, and educational climate of today demands differently constituted arrangement to function effectively;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Trustees of The University of Tennessee in a regularly convened meeting do formally adopt the following resolution to effectuate the governance of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville;

BE IT RESOLVED that the resolution of the Board of Trustees of The University of Tennessee adopted at the annual meeting in August, 1949, establishing the University Senate is rescinded, effective________

BE IT FURTHER RESOLTED that in order to facilitate the governance of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, a Faculty Senate be
organized from the faculties of the several colleges and divisions of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

The Faculty Senate will be composed of certain authorized administrative officers of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and of elected representatives from the faculties of each college or division of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in their proportion to the total faculty of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. In other words, by the election process in each college or division, the University Faculty is reduced to a more effective, workable deliberative body.

The actual method of apportioning representatives among colleges and divisions and the rules governing their election shall be determined by the Faculty Senate, except for the purpose of the first election of the Faculty Senate when the election rules will be determined, for that election only, by the University Senate which the Faculty Senate will subsequently replace.

Said Faculty Senate is authorized, in consultation with the Chancellor of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and the academic officers thereof, to enact regulations concerning:

1. The educational policy of the University.

2. Policies regarding requirements for admission, retention, readmission, graduation, and honors.

3. Policies for the approval of candidates for degrees.


5. Criteria for the selection of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and other campus administrative officers.

6. Criteria, in conjunction with other University Senates or corresponding bodies of the other campuses of The University of Tennessee, for the selection of the President, and other system executive officers.
7. Athletics policies.

Said Faculty Senate may also make recommendations on any matter which in its opinion is of concern to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, or The University of Tennessee. Such recommendations may concern, but are not limited to:

1. Policies for the regulation of student conduct, housing, and activities.

2. Priorities for the University budget.

3. Priorities for the University development plan.

4. The general design characteristics of University buildings and the general lay-out of the University campus.

5. Any other matter concerning the general welfare of the University faculty.

The Faculty Senate is hereby authorized to determine its own organization and constitution and to adopt its own by-laws and rules of procedure to facilitate its performance of the functions hereby authorized.
PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR ESTABLISHING A UNIVERSITY COUNCIL
FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

WHEREAS the changed physical, intellectual, and educational climate of today demands that the governing arrangements of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, be differently constituted to function effectively; and

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees at their meeting of ____________ authorized a Faculty Senate to effectuate the governance of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville; and

WHEREAS it is vital for the general welfare of the University that closer collaboration and more effective communications be established among the various components of the University, and especially among the administrative officers, the University faculty, and the student body;

BE IT THEREFORE resolved that a University Council be created for The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

The University Council shall consist of the Chancellor of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, the Vice-Chancellors, three members elected annually from the Faculty Senate, plus the Chairman elected annually by the Senate, and three members elected annually from the Student Senate, plus the President of the Student Senate elected annually by the Student Body.

The University Council shall consider and investigate any question of University policy, any aspect of the governing of the University, and any general issue related to the welfare of the University. It shall make recommendations regarding any such matters to the appropriate decision-making bodies of the University or to the appropriate officers of the University.
The University Council shall oversee the making and the applying of all rules regarding the conduct of resident members of the University Community, whether such rules shall have been made by representative bodies within the University community, or by the officers of the University. Such oversight shall be exercised for the purpose of insuring that such rules protect the rights of individuals and the legitimate interests of the University, and that they are clear in meaning, fair, enforceable, and in conformity with the law and the Constitution of the United States and the State of Tennessee.

The University Council will regularly report to the Faculty Senate and to the Student Senate, either through those members of the Council who are members of the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate or through a joint meeting which will be held at least once a year or upon petition to the Chancellor on the part of a majority of either the Faculty Senate or the Student Senate.

The Chancellor (or his designate) shall act as chairman of the University Council. The University Council shall hold meetings at least once each month, or more often at the request of the Chancellor or of any two faculty or student members of the Council.
Section 1. The Faculty Senate of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, shall have those power and duties which have been, and which may be, delegated to it by the Trustees of The University of Tennessee and by the Faculty of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Section 2. Reports. All actions by the Faculty Senate shall be reported to the Faculty (1) through distribution of the minutes of each Senate meeting, and (2) upon request at any special meeting of the Faculty. Such action shall be subject to revision or alteration by the Faculty; provided that, no rights or acts of third parties shall be affected by such revision or alteration.

ARTICLE II
FACULTY SENATE ORGANIZATION

Section 1. Members, Number, Classification, and Terms of Office. The membership of the Faculty Senate is divided into two classes--ex-officio members and elected members.

Ex-Officio Members. The ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate shall be: (1) the Chancellor, (2) each Vice Chancellor, and (3) the Deans of each academic unit concerned with student instruction. The third category includes the Deans of Agriculture, Architecture, Business Administration, Communications, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, Law, Liberal Arts, and University Extension.
Elected Members. Elected members of the Faculty Senate shall be chosen from those members of the Faculty meeting the following criteria: (1) full-time appointment with the rank, or equivalent rank, of assistant professor or higher; and (2) academic duties consisting of at least half-time teaching, research, and/or departmental administration, at the time of election. The faculty of each College or Division of The University of Tennessee, consisting of full-time faculty with the rank, or equivalent rank, of instructor or higher, shall elect its representatives to the Senate in May of each year. The term of office is to begin on the second Monday of the following Fall Quarter. After completion of a full 3-year term, or any partial term of more than one year, an elected member shall be ineligible for a full year for reelection.

Elective seats shall be apportioned in May of each year among the respective Colleges and Divisions by the Secretary of the Faculty Senate on the basis of the following formula. (1) There shall be a minimum of one elected member for each degree granting College, School, or Resident Center with a full-time faculty of five engaged in teaching or research and having the rank, or equivalent rank, of assistant professor or higher. When a unit has a faculty as defined above of at least fifteen, there shall be three elected members. Above fifteen full-time faculty, one elected member shall be added for each additional twenty until the representation from the unit reached twelve; thereafter, one elected member shall be added for each additional thirty faculty members. Only full-time faculty members at a given location (Knoxville, or a specific off-campus center) will be counted in determining a unit's representation. (2) The above method of determining the number of representatives shall apply to the staffs of each off-campus Center, Institute,
and School reporting to the Knoxville Campus administration. (3) There shall be one elected member from the Agricultural Extension Service.

The regular term of office for elected members shall be three years. The initial representatives of colleges or divisions having three or more seats shall be classified in respect to the time for which they shall severally hold office, by dividing them into three classes, each class consisting of one-third of the elected representatives of each College or Division. The representatives of the first class shall be elected for a term of one year. The representatives of the second class shall be elected for a term of two years; the representatives of the third class shall be elected for a term of three years. Thereafter, at each annual election the successors to the representatives whose terms shall expire in that year shall be elected to hold office for a term of three years, in order that the term of office of one class of representatives shall expire in each year.

In case of an increase in the number of elected representatives authorized for any College or Division by three or any multiple of three, one-third of the additional representatives provided for shall be elected for the term of one year, one-third for the term of two years, and one-third for the term of three years, in order that each class of representatives shall be increased equally. Thereafter, at each annual election, the successor to the representatives whose terms expire that year shall be elected to hold office for a term of three years.

In the event one additional elected representative is authorized for any College or Division, this representative shall be elected for a term of one year; and if two additional representatives for a College or Division are authorized at the same time, the second shall be elected
for a term of two years.

In the event of a decrease of the base of representation for any College or Division, the decrease in representation shall be made at the next expiration of the term of an elected member.

Section 2. Vacancies. In case of any vacancy in the Faculty Senate of any elected representative through death, resignation, promotion (of a member to a position which would make him an ex-officio member), or where a representative ceases to be a member of the faculty electing him or is absent on leave for at least one quarter or is disqualified for other causes, the faculty of the College or Division thus losing its representative shall elect a successor to fill the unexpired term. If, however, an elected member of the Faculty Senate is to be absent from the Knoxville campus at the time of the Senate Meeting of the Summer Quarter, the Dean or Director of that senator's College or Division shall appoint a substitute for such absentee for the sole purpose of representing the said College or Division at the said Summer Quarter meeting, and such appointment shall be certified to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Such substitute, at the meeting for which he is appointed, shall have all the privileges and power of the absentee member he replaces.

Section 3. Meetings. The Faculty Senate shall meet on the second Monday of each quarter, or at the call of the Chairman of the Senate or in his absence the Vice Chairman of the Senate on their own initiative, or pursuant to a petition signed by 15 members of the Senate. Meetings of the Senate shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order unless otherwise provided for in these By-laws.

Section 4. Quorum. A majority of the members shall constitute a
quorum for the transaction of business. The affirmative vote of the majority of those members present shall be necessary for the passage of any resolution or motion, unless otherwise stated in these By-laws.

Section 5. Voting. Voting shall be by voice or show of hands unless, in particular instances, the majority present desire a secret ballot. All elections shall be conducted by secret ballot.

A motion to table a motion shall not cut off debate on the original motion until: (1) opportunity has been given for at least one person besides the mover of the motion to speak in favor of, and two persons against the original motion; and (2) it shall have been indicated by a standing vote that 2/3 of the members present and voting favor the motion to table.

Section 6. Order of Business. At the meetings of the Faculty Senate the Order of Business shall be as follows:

a. The meeting shall be called to order by the Chairman.

b. Previously distributed minutes of the last meeting shall be approved or amended.

c. Unfinished business.

d. Report of Special Committees.


f. New business.

g. Adjournment.

Section 7. Election of Committee on Committees. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall nominate two Senate members from each college to be placed on a ballot for election at the regular meeting of the Senate in the Fall Quarter. Additional nominations may be made from the floor. Each Senate member may vote for one nominee from each college. The nominee with the highest number of votes in each college
shall be the elected members of the Committee on Committees. The chairman of the committee shall be the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, and the President of the Student Government Association shall serve ex-officio.

Section 8. **Election of Committees.** At its regular meeting in the Winter Quarter in each year, the Faculty Senate shall elect the members of all committees except the Committee on Committees. Recommendations for committees shall be made by the Committee on Committees, as specified below under Article III, Section 1.

Section 9. **Election of Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary, and University Councillors.** At its regular meeting in the Fall Quarter of each year the Faculty Senate shall elect a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary, and three members of the University Council, whose terms of office shall be one year to begin immediately upon election.

**ARTICLE III**

**COMMITTEES**

Section 1. **Committee on Committees.** It shall be the duty of the Committee on Committees to make nominations to the Faculty Senate of the membership of all special and standing committees. The Committee on Committees shall render a report to the Senate at its regular meeting in the Winter Quarter of each year and at such other times as may be required.

Section 2. **Standing and Special Committees.** The Committees of the Faculty Senate are:

a. **Academic Affairs Committee:** Membership shall consist of seven elected faculty members and one student designated by the Student Government Association; ex-officio members shall be the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research, the Dean of each school and college, and
a secretary appointed by the chairman. The chairman shall be the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or his designee). This committee shall concern itself with curricula matters, with the study and establishment of institutional goals, with the development of new programs, and with standards for admission, retention, and graduation.

b. Committee on Faculty Affairs: Members shall consist of seven elected members; ex-officio members shall include the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Director of Finance, and the deans of two of the colleges on a rotating basis every two years. This committee shall advise and be consulted in the development of criteria and procedures for appointment, promotion, the granting of tenure, and discharge for cause; it shall make recommendations with respect to policies on retirement, leave, faculty welfare, and fringe benefits. The chairman shall be a faculty member.

c. The Student Affairs Committee: Membership shall consist of seven elected members and three students elected by the Student Government Association; ex-officio members shall include the President of the Student Government Association, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the Dean of Men, and the Dean of Women. The chairman shall be a member of the Faculty Senate. This committee shall advise and make recommendations on student life, rights, privileges, and responsibilities; and on disciplinary matters, student government, and organizations.

d. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate: Membership shall consist of five elected members of the Senate, elected to one year terms; ex-officio members shall be the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, and the three University Councillors elected by the Senate. The chairman shall be the presiding officer of the Faculty Senate. This committee shall arrange the agenda for each Senate meeting and represent the Faculty Senate on an emergency and interim basis to the Chancellor, and with the Chancellor to the President and to the Board of Trustees.

When administrative appointments are to be filled and where it is appropriate for faculty to be of assistance in the recruitment and screening of candidates, the Executive Committee shall assist in the selection of the faculty members of such committees and lend its counsel to the development of procedures for recruitment and screening.

c. Educational Facilities Committee: Membership shall consist of seven elected members who shall serve for a three year term; ex-officio members shall be the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or his designate), the President of the
Student Government Association (or his designee), the Dean of the School of Architecture, the Director of Finance, and the Director of the Physical Plant. This committee will advise the Administration on building priorities, siting and design of new structures, renovation of existing structures, and will help in the nomination of faculty program committees for new structures.

f. The Development and Alumni Relations Committee: Membership shall consist of seven elected members; ex-officio members shall include the Director of Public Relations (or his designee), the President of The University of Tennessee Alumni Association, the President of the Student Government Association (or his designee), and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; the responsibilities of this committee shall include advice and consultation with University officials on alumni programs and alumni relations.

g. The Athletics Committee: Membership shall consist of seven elected faculty members; ex-officio members shall include the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Athletic Director, the Director of the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (or his designee), and the President of the Student Government Association (or his designee). This committee shall concern itself with intramural athletics as well as intercollegiate athletics programs.

h. Such other committees, standing and special, as may be established from time to time. The members of all committees shall hold office for one year from time of their election, unless otherwise specified.

Membership on these committees may include faculty, students, and staff other than Senators; the Chancellor of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is a member ex-officio of all standing committees.

Section 3. In the event of a vacancy in the membership of the Committee on Committees or of any committee, the Faculty Senate shall fill such vacancy by an election at its next regular meeting. The new members shall be elected for the unexpired portion of the term vacated.

ARTICLE IV
OFFICERS

Section 1. The Chairman. The Chairman shall preside at all
meetings of the Faculty Senate, where he shall be bound by the By-laws and Robert's Rules of Order. He shall represent the Faculty on the University Council and on all occasions be considered the chief spokesman of the Faculty Senate and the University Faculty.

Section 2. The Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman of the Faculty Senate shall act as Chairman of the Faculty Senate in the absence of the Chairman. In the event of the death or resignation of the Chairman, he shall become Chairman for the duration of the present term. In his absence, or in the event of his death or resignation, the Senate shall elect a Chairman pro tempore.

Section 3. The Secretary. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall keep the minutes of all action taken by the Senate (there will be no verbatim recording of remarks or discussion, and professional titles will not be recorded); he will send copies of the minutes to all members of the Faculty, including instructors, immediately after each meeting; he will send to all Senate members advance notice of the time and place of all meetings, together with an agenda; and he shall make special reports as requested by The University of Tennessee Faculty, pursuant to Article I, Section 2, of these By-Laws.

Section 4. Representation to the University Council. There shall be three representatives elected from the Faculty Senate to serve with the Chairman of the Faculty Senate on the University Council as spokesman for the Faculty Senate and the University Faculty on all matters that come before the University Council, and to communicate to the Faculty Senate all actions of the University Council.
ARTICLE V

AMENDMENTS

The Faculty Senate shall have the power to make, amend and repeal the By-Laws by a vote of two-thirds majority of those members present at any regular or special meeting of the Senate.
Figure 1. Development and Administration: General Counsel.
Figure 2. Government, Industry and Law Center: Business and Finance.
Figure 3. Academic Affairs: Institutional Research.
Figure 4. Suggested Organizational Structure for the Systems-level.
VITA

William Oscar Oakes, born January 29, 1926, in Johnson City, Tennessee, moved to Knoxville, Tennessee, at age six and completed grades 1-12 in Knoxville City Schools. He graduated from The University of Tennessee in December 1949, after service in World War II. A tour in Korea interrupted his studies, but he received his Master's degree from the University of London in 1952. Part of the studies for this degree were completed at the Sorbonne in Paris and the University of Vienna. Since then he has served as an editor with a publishing house, written short stories and essays, and was for nine years an insurance adjuster. During the academic year 1962-63 he taught at the University of Hawaii, and from 1963-67 he taught at the University of California, Berkeley, and at Drew School in San Francisco. He was an instructor in English at Berkeley and Head of the Humanities Department at Drew School.

He returned to Knoxville in 1967 and taught for three semesters at Rule High School while taking courses at The University of Tennessee in the evening. He became a full-time student at the University in June 1968, and began work toward his doctorate in Educational Administration and Supervision. He will receive his Ed.D. in Educational Administration and Supervision in December 1970. His collateral areas are Public Administration and Philosophy. The dissertation is entitled, "An Organization Model for The University of Tennessee Systems Administration."

On July 15, 1969, William Oakes was employed as Administrative Assistant to the Vice President for Institutional Research and Executive
Assistant to the President of The University of Tennessee. On July 1, 1970, the Vice President for Institutional Research became the Vice President for Development and Administration. Oakes went with him as Administrative Assistant, with responsibility for coordinating Student Affairs within the system as well as the other administrative duties commensurate with the new role of the Vice President.

Oakes is married and has two daughters.