

**Minutes**  
**College of Education Faculty Advisory Council**  
**February 28, 2003**  
**SWT – Jowers Building – Room A115**

**Members in Attendance:**

Nathan Bond, Deborah Buswell, Roxane Cuellar-Allsup, Susan Field Waite, Russ Hodges, Moe Johnson, Marla McGhee, Sharon O'Neal, Bobby Patton, Jovita Ross-Gordon, Alicia Paredes Scribner, John Walker, Jo Webber

**Members Absent:**

Beth Erickson, Linda Homeyer

**Guests:**

Steve Gordon

---

FAC Chair Webber called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

**I. Approval of the Minutes from February 14, 2003**

John Walker moved to approve the minutes from February 14. Bobby Patton seconded the motion. The motion passed.
---

**Approval of the Minutes from January 31, 2003**

Russ Hodges moved to approve the minutes from January 31. Deborah Buswell seconded the motion. The motion passed.
---

**II. Old Business:**

**A. Dean Beck**

Dean Beck met with the FAC and discussed budgetary issues related to the College of Education.

**1. New Budget Committee:**

At the time of the FAC meeting, an election was being held for a College Budget Committee. Currently, according to the PPS, only senior faculty members can vote for the Budget Committee, although any faculty member can be elected and serve. Dean Beck encouraged the FAC to be as involved as it wants to be in terms of advice about COE budgets. The newly elected COE Budget Committee would serve in an official capacity and report its findings to the FAC on a regular or as needed basis. According to university policy (PPS 1.04), the College must have a Budget Committee. Until the official committee is elected, the FAC will continue to serve as the interim budget committee.

## 2. An Overview of the College of Education Budget:

Dean Beck presented a PowerPoint slide show, in which he detailed the College of Education's budgets.

**a. COE Budget:** The COE's budget equals approximately 7 million dollars, with 80% of the budget used for faculty salaries. The budget also allows for administrative positions and student workers. Curriculum and Instruction receives approximately 2.2 million, EAPS approximately 1.3 million and HPER approximately 1.9 million.

**b. University Budget:** The Education and General (E&G) portion of the university's budget, on the other hand, equals approximately 124 million dollars. This money comes from both state aid and tuition dollars. About one-third of the university's budget comes from tuition and fees, one-third from fund raising and one-third from state funds. Some money in the budget is designated for specific uses, whereas other money can be more easily moved from one account to the other.

**c. Money Generated:** The amount of money that the university receives is based on the number of semester credit hours that are generated. 1000 and 2000 level courses generate less money for the university, and junior and senior level courses generate more. Master's courses are funded at a third level while PhD courses are funded at a fourth. Undergraduate courses must have 14 students registered while graduate courses must have 8 students to make a class.

**d. Setting the Budget:** The State sets the budget on a biennium timetable with the university currently operating on the last biennium's budget. Since enrollments are increasing, SWT is having difficulty meeting all its expenditures since the money that is generated by the higher enrollments will not be received for two years.

**e. Course Fees:** The College of Education receives money for course fees as follows:

CI	\$52,000
EAPS	\$30,000
HPER	\$70,000
Student teaching and PhD	\$53,000

**f. Budget Cuts:** When the university told the College to reduce its expenditures by 7%, the College found \$135,000. This money came from six sources:

1. unfilled salaried positions
2. travel
3. Maintenance and Operations (MO)
4. Non-HEAF monies (HEAF = Higher Education Assistance Fund).

This fund was established by the State to help non-UT and non-A&M universities, who do not benefit from the Permanent Fund. The resources are used for technology, building construction and other capital expenditures.)

5. Consultant contracts

## 6. Faculty salary savings.

**g. COE Accounts:** The College of Education has 14 accounts with account managers. These include: CI, EAPS, HPER, Dean's Office, PhD Program, Summer School, ObserStudent Teach, Teacher Education and Field Experiences (TEFE), LBJ, Degree Audits (DARS), Advising Center (AdvCent), and Education Contingency (EdCont).

**h. Grants:** When a faculty member writes and receives a grant, some of the indirect cost is returned to the College and some to the department. Some money also goes to the Principle Investigator (PI). Since grants include indirect money, Dean Beck suggested that an oversight committee might be established to make sure that the College was using this money appropriately (i.e. to generate more grant funds).

**i. Departmental Budgets:** The University gives the College and the departments their budgets. Each department, however, has jurisdiction over its own spending, although there is not much flexibility in budgets. The other accounts in the department fall under the jurisdiction of the College of Education. Although the College of Education generates a large percentage of the money, the university does not return the same money to the generating source. Instead, it is shared with other colleges and departments.

**j. Relationship between Committees:** The relationship between the FAC Budget Committee and the new COE Budget Committee was discussed. Since the PPS stipulates that the Budget Committee will advise about budgets that transcend departmental budgets, then the LBJ account and the Indirect Funds could be places where the two budget committees could make recommendations. There are nine other budgets not relegated to departments. In addition, the FAC could work with the new Budget Committee to create the upcoming budget. Communication between the committees will be important.

### **B. Dean Willoughby:**

Because of the length of the meeting, the discussion about the relationship between the FAC and Dean Willoughby was postponed.

### **C. Dean and Chair Evaluations:**

Dean Beck wants input on how to get faculty feedback on Chairs needing summative evaluations. The Dean and the FAC discussed some issues that may prevent faculty members from giving honest feedback in the evaluations. The Dean showed a proposed evaluation plan that coordinates with the existing PPS and that he already uses with the Chairs. The information gleaned from this evaluation could be shared with the faculty. The summative evaluation would be conducted in addition to the one that is conducted by SWT and the Faculty Senate.

#### **D. Workload: PPS 7.05**

Each professor must show a workload of at least 12 semester hours, which is set by the State. At SWT, tenure and tenure-track faculty may be assigned 9 credit hours for teaching and 3 for research. Non tenure-track faculty may be assigned 12 for teaching. At the Dean's level and the university level, there has been some discussion about letting the departments be responsible for workloads and not the individual professor. The Dean showed the PPS on the Internet and highlighted the frequent number of times the word "may" appears in the document. This tiny word gives lots of flexibility in interpreting the PPS on workload.

#### **III. New Business**

The next FAC meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 21<sup>st</sup> in the Education Building, Room 4002-6 from 2 to 4 p.m. Reports on the Restructuring Committee as well as the Committee on Committees will be shared. Dean Beck will attend a meeting in April to further discuss the workload issue.

Bobby Patton moved that the FAC meeting be adjourned. John Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.
--

Respectfully submitted,

Nathan Bond (C&I)  
FAC Secretary