

**Minutes**  
**Faculty Advisory Council**  
**March 12, 2003**  
**Texas State University – Jowers A115**

**Members in Attendance:**

Steve Awoniyi, Nathan Bond, Christopher Brown, Deborah Buswell, María De la Colina (substitute for Marilyn Goodwin), Steven Gordon (substitute for Marla McGhee), Michelle Hamilton, Judy Leavell (substitute for Jennifer Battle), Sharon O’Neal, Alicia Paredes-Scribner, Bobby Patton, Jovita Ross-Gordon, Greg Soukup, Jo Webber,

**Members Absent:**

Jennifer Battle, Brenda Beatty, Marilyn Goodwin, Marla McGhee

**Guests:**

Steve Gordon, Leslie Huling, Gay James, Bob Pankey

-----  
*Chair Webber called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.*

**I. Approval of the Minutes from February 27**

Greg Soukup motioned that the minutes from February 27, 2004 be approved. Christopher Brown seconded the motion. The motion passed.
--

**II. Dean’s Discussion**

A. Research, Scholarship and Grant Writing

**Change:** Dean Beck began his discussion of research, scholarship and grant writing by emphasizing three main points. First of all, faculty members in the College of Education are already accustomed to change. As a result of President Trauth’s efforts to enhance the stature of the university, the standards for scholarly endeavors will increase in the near future. Dean Beck reminded the FAC that change is prevalent in the field of education. Second, Dean Beck acknowledged that the College of Education’s mission differs from those across campus. The COE may need to carve out its own niche and be willing to accept that its goals may not always fit with others across campus. Third, federal initiatives are prompting changes. The federal law of No Child Left Behind currently emphasizes research-based teaching and will continue to do so in the future. To receive grant monies, faculty will need to craft proposals that align with these federal initiatives.

**Rationale for the Proposal:** Dean Beck explained why he wrote and distributed the Tenure and Review Proposal. After examining the COE’s current document and comparing it to others across campus, he noticed differences in the area of scholarship.

Hoping to be proactive, he wrote the document, disseminated it and invited faculty to discuss the issue. His actions were deliberate in order to provoke discussion. Faculty members can either adopt or discard the idea. Vice President Gratz has not responded to the document. Dean Beck wants to continue the discussion on research on scholarly productivity.

**Background Information:** As a way to begin the discussion, Dean Beck played an audiotape recording of a panel discussion that he attended during a conference in Chicago. The tape focused on the role of research in teacher education and specifically mentioned the following points:

- Education should align with either natural sciences or social sciences
- Common approaches in education are not always grounded in research
- Data in education are lacking or used inappropriately
- Some educational theories are sound but not supported by data
- Some policy makers in Congress believe that Colleges of Education are not preparing qualified teachers.

The main speaker on the tape had analyzed over 500 studies and found that the results could not lead to any generalizable principle. The studies were useful in a localized context but did not conform to the traditional forms of scientific research. The speaker stated that studying teacher quality is difficult because scholars struggle with identifying the dependent variables in the research.

Dean Beck also shared some information from the book, Scientific Research in Education. In his opinion, quantitative and qualitative research is valuable, and both paradigms fulfill the goals of No Child Left Behind. He questioned, however, the role of action research.

Finally, Dean Beck commented on the speed of the upcoming changes. It seems that the changes are happening quicker and that today's standards are higher than they were in previous years.

**Current Efforts:** Dean Beck mentioned several efforts that are underway in the College of Education:

- The COE should not move away from what it is currently doing. For example, conducting empirical, peer-reviewed scholarly research is important. The COE should, however, be prepared to respond to outside critics, especially in the area of research.
- Texas State is using differentiated staffing to address these issues.
- Recently, the Faculty Senate has begun to revise the Tenure and Promotion policy at the university level.
- The COE listed scholarship and research as a top priority in its Strategic Plan.

**Open Discussion:** Dean Beck responded to the FAC members' questions.

- What role does the university play? Should faculty members write research and grant proposals that satisfy the current federal initiatives or should we conduct rigorous research that may not be supported?

- How should we structure workloads so that faculty can conduct research? Dean Beck likes offering mini-grants to faculty. In the past, he has used the Indirect Costs Account to support faculty for example, in the form of course release time. The Indirect Cost Account funds are distributed to four groups: the Office of Sponsored Projects, the individual departments in the COE, the Dean and the Principal Investigator.
- Should grants count as scholarship or service? Dean Beck stated that at some universities, grants are treated as service. Former President Supple believed that they were a means to an end. President Supple also believed that departments should have goals for acquiring grants. As a result, each faculty member was not responsible for writing grants. Only those who were interested would work on grants.
- How does the COE establish a culture for conducting research? Dean Beck stated that research is important and that the COE needs to emphasize this point to our new incoming faculty members. According to university policy, the third-year review for new faculty members focuses on teaching. If the professor's teaching cannot be improved, then the professor does not move forward in the tenure process. The fifth-year review, therefore, focuses on the professor's scholarship / research abilities and assumes that his / her teaching abilities are satisfactory. President Trauth believes that research and teaching should be developed simultaneously.
- Should Texas State resemble universities like U.T. and A&M or the alternative certification programs at the Regional Service Centers? Dean Beck believes that Texas State will chart a new course and fill a different niche. He stated that the College of Applied Arts has recently hired a non-tenured, non-teaching professor to conduct research only. One FAC member questioned if Texas State has an image or public relations problem.
- If the College of Education revises its Tenure and Promotion document, who should initiate and guide this process? During the discussion, two concerns were expressed. (1) Are there specific criteria for tenure and promotion? (2) At which level, departmental or college, should the criteria and guidelines be developed? Dean Beck reiterated his support of faculty governance, and he also stated that President Trauth is very committed to the idea. FAC Chair Webber proposed a top-down, bottom-up model where the FAC, Dean Beck and Senators work together to create document that states the general set of priorities about quality and quantity of scholarship and grant writing. The document would be broad and flexible, and it would not stifle efforts at the departmental level. A balanced approach between teaching and research would be emphasized as Texas State moves to a research intensive, not research extensive university.
- How can the College begin this process? Dean Beck suggested that the COE pay attention to its mentoring system. He and the FAC decided to begin writing

guidelines while waiting for the university's Tenure and Promotion Committee to complete its revision of the current PPS.

The following steps in the process were proposed:

1. FAC will set COE guiding principles for this endeavor. These will be global statements that will guide the work of the COE Tenure and promotion committee and departmental work on setting tenure and promotion and merit and performance policies and procedures. FAC will elicit ideas and feedback from their respective departments as we develop these guiding principles.
2. FAC will create a charge for the COE Tenure and Promotion Committee, which will be based on the assumption that this committee will set broad criteria in policy such that departments can establish the specific criteria.
3. Dr. Beck will appoint a COE T & P committee to include volunteers from FAC, his last committee, and any other members we all deem appropriate.
4. The COE T & P committee will present their work at a FAC sponsored forum.
5. Dr. Beck will review the policy drafted by the COE T & P committee.
6. COE faculty will vote or approve the COE policy.
7. Departments will use the policy and the guiding principles to do their specific work on T & P and M & P.

## B. Strategic Planning

At the close of the meeting, Dean Beck shared information about the Strategic Planning process. After spring break the Vice Presidents will present their versions of Strategic Planning. Then, the university will develop its plan, and colleges will have an opportunity to revise their plans.

Vice President Gratz has already presented his plan publicly. He focused on new doctoral programs and engineering, with his first priority being computer science. He would not support the doctorate in College Teaching, claiming that it lacked rigor and included pedagogy. Dean Beck stated that the COE will continue pursuing the doctorate.

Greg Soukup motioned that the meeting be adjourned. Judy Leavell seconded the motion. The motion passed.
--

The FAC will its next meeting on Friday, March 26<sup>th</sup> from 1 to 4 p.m. in ASB South, Room 332. The meeting on April 9<sup>th</sup> was cancelled, due to the Easter Holiday.

***Chair Webber adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.***

Respectfully submitted,

Nathan Bond  
FAC Secretary