

ing quite so smug when my colleague, who is, himself, a very innovative user of technology in the classroom, pointed out that multimedia and video presentations could be used very effectively to teach student-swimmers various strokes and techniques and, if students were taped while they swam, instructional technology could help them monitor and critique their performance. Ultimately, I conceded the argument to my colleague, agreeing that perhaps students in a swimming class might benefit from the use of instructional technology, but in conceding that minor point, proved a major one: the effectiveness of instructional technology and its appropriateness in any given course is ultimately determined by the instructor.

Technologies change rapidly; the core principles of good instruction do not. As administrators, we must resist the urge to encourage faculty to incorporate technology into instruction for technology's sake, must remember that technology offers a means to an end but should never be considered an end in itself. With UCLA set to become the first U.S. college to make class web pages mandatory across an entire curricu-

lum, it is likely higher education's emphasis on technology will only continue, and it would seem prudent to remind my administrative colleagues of an oft misquoted phrase from William Congreve's *The Old Batchelour*, "Married in haste, we may repent at leisure."

REFERENCES

Creed, Tom. *PowerPoint, No! Cyberspace, Yes*. The National Teaching and Learning Forum May 1997. The National Teaching and Learning Forum. Online. Internet. 1 Aug. 1997. Available WWW : http://www.ntlf.com/html/ti/creed_1.htm.

Congreve, William. *The Old Batchelour*. The Complete Plays of William Congreve. Ed. Herbert Davis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967. 105.

Young, Jeffrey R. *Wave of the Future or Waste? UCLA Requires Web Page for Every Class*. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 1 August. 1997: A21-22.

Teaching and Research: A Symbiotic Relationship

Lyle R. Smith, Regents' Distinguished Professor of Teaching & Learning,
Professor, College of Education, Augusta State University

Those who question the value of research in higher education suggest that the primary function of college and university teachers is to teach and that teachers who conduct research are doing so at the expense of improving their teaching. It also has been suggested that the key to being an effective professor is simply to be able to communicate well with students. This is an unfortunate point of view. Being a good communicator does not necessarily mean that one is a good teacher. The professor must also have something worthwhile to communicate. To have something worthwhile to communicate, teachers must challenge themselves through continuous study and research. In so doing, they then can challenge their students.

Research at the college and university level reinforces teaching. Teaching faculty must stay in the forefront of the knowledge and skills intrinsic in the disciplines they profess. They cannot do this by simply rewording old lecture notes and by professing existing knowledge repeatedly. Outstanding teachers must keep abreast of the journals and must gather new information on the subjects they teach. By doing this, they will have completed the first step on the road to doing original, creative research. Those who do original research are better able to judge the intellectual works of others and to evaluate the quality of those works. They also can use anecdotes or examples spontaneously to answer student ques-

tions or to add substance to discussions. This is much better than simply teaching what others have done, often just echoing or paraphrasing another's work. Not all professors can be expected to generate great research works. But in participating in the research process they become more productive and their students benefit by having teachers who are committed to this process. Augusta State University recognizes that research and teaching should nurture each other, and several efforts aimed at faculty development in research have been initiated.

Departmental Efforts

First, at the "grass roots" level, some academic departments hold informal meetings at which faculty can share research ideas and offer reactions and advice to each other. For example, the Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences has regular meetings with a group of public school mathematics and science teachers in which ideas about teaching and research are shared. Similarly, the Department of Teacher Development has informal meetings on Friday afternoons to discuss research that faculty are doing, and to discuss their plans for future research. As the weeks go by, evidence of new faculty commitments to research has become evident.

University Forums

At a more inclusive level, Augusta State University recently has begun having monthly research forums, and all faculty are encouraged to attend. At these forums, faculty from various departments discuss their research accomplishments. The purpose of these forums is twofold. One purpose is to inspire professors to increase their research efforts. A second purpose is to illustrate the many different types of research that are being performed at Augusta State University with hopes that faculty members will reach a higher level of understanding and respect for one another's work. An example of a typical presentation at one of the research forums follows.

A mathematics educator discussed research in mathematics as compared to social science research involving inferential statistics. Research in mathematics involves the use of deductive rules of logic applied to a set of definitions and a set of axioms. Through accepted procedures involving these rules of logic, generalizations (referred to as theorems) are proven. If the procedures are used correctly, the theorem is accepted by the mathematics community and is added to the knowledge base of mathematics.

Research in the social sciences is viewed differently by the community of social scientists. If a researcher claims that a statistically significant relationship exists between variables, this does not mean that the researcher has proven that this relationship exists. It only means that, if the data have been properly collected and correctly analyzed, then there is a reasonable probability that such a relationship exists. At this point, the social science community is not ready to accept the existence of this relationship and to add it to the social science knowledge base. Instead, the process of testing the relationship in a variety of settings is begun. After many replications in which the relevant variables are examined and measured under various conditions, social scientists may be willing to accept that, at the present time and under certain conditions, a significant relationship appears to exist between the variables. However, this does not mean that the relationship will continue to exist in the future. Because of the illusory nature of this type of research, it is not too farfetched to compare the social scientist to an alchemist.

Of course, the above comparison between research in mathematics and research in the social sciences is overly simplified. The speaker made the contrasts purposely in order to generate dialogue at the faculty forum.

One exciting characteristic of the faculty research forums is that each session is different from the other sessions. The sessions have ranged from a prolific historian explaining techniques that are useful in examining history from various perspectives, to a distinguished ornithologist describing research of the birds of Africa. Several speakers have discussed how they get their students involved in doing research. Often, the ideas of students have spurred professors on to do further research.

Faculty Role Model

Perhaps the greatest effort to invigorate faculty research and development at Augusta State University is based on a recently adopted process by which faculty prepare plans for the academic year. This process has been named the "Faculty Role Model." In the past, faculty completed their annual reports some time in the spring, and administrators recommended merit raises based largely on what was detailed in the reports.

The Faculty Role Model process requires that each faculty member meet early in the academic year with the chairperson. At this meeting, the faculty member proposes plans for the coming year. These plans must detail the faculty member's decisions about how much emphasis will be placed on the areas of teaching, research, and service for the coming year. Each academic department is allowed to set parameters on the minimum and maximum percentages a faculty member can choose for each of the three areas. The departmental parameters must stay within ranges adopted by the entire university faculty. Typically, a department may require that, for those in the department, 50% to 70% of the faculty member's emphasis must focus on teaching (to include such activities as advisement, instructional development, content expertise, course design, evaluation of students, and feedback to students). Similarly, a department might decide that from 20% to 40% of each faculty member's focus must be on research (to include such activities as scholarly publications and research, presentations at conferences, artistic productions and performances, grant writing, and various other forms of educational and intellectual development). A department typically might decide that service is to be emphasized in the range from 10% to 40% (to include such activities as serving on committees, mentoring other faculty in skill development, working with student organizations, and working with community groups). Of course, when the faculty member presents the coming year's plans to the chairperson with the percentages of emphases decided upon, the three percentages must total to 100%.

Once the faculty member presents the proposal to the chairperson, the two of them discuss whether the proposal is reasonable in terms of what is best for the individual, for the department, and the university. Often, the proposal is revised so as to improve the faculty member's prospects for promotion and tenure, or to help the department or university reach certain goals. It is essential that the chairperson and the faculty member guard against plans that might allow the faculty member to "slide" for the year. The purpose of the plan is to challenge the faculty member to work on areas in which greater achievements can be accomplished.

If something unexpected happens during the year (e.g., an offer to edit a journal, an acceptance of a grant, the need to develop new curricula, the opportunity to learn about and use new technology), faculty can renegotiate the plans with

their chairpersons. Periodically during the year, and then near the end of the year, faculty discuss with their chairpersons their progress in accomplishing their plans. This provides for formative evaluation of the faculty, as well as for summative evaluation. Of course, fair and conscientious chairpersons are essential to ensure that this process results in helping faculty reach their full potentials.

The beauty of the Faculty Role Model process is that it

was developed by the faculty of Augusta State University, and the entire faculty approved of the plan. Since all faculty now are evaluated under the same set of rules, promotion and tenure decisions are made in a more evenhanded way. The Faculty Role Model has just recently been adopted by Augusta State University, so the jury is still out on the impact it will have on helping faculty become better teachers and researchers. Early indications are that the results are positive.

At Kennesaw State University...

Master Teaching Program Course Releases for 1997-1998

These KSU faculty members have received course releases through the Master Teaching Program, a competitive awards program funded by the Office of Academic Affairs. The program encourages, recognizes, and rewards tenure-track faculty who demonstrate effective and innovative teaching and have the leadership qualities necessary to develop solutions to complex issues facing KSU in the area of teaching and to guide others in the implementation of those solutions.

Susan Bakewell, Associate Professor of Art - *The New Art History Survey: the Carlos, the High and KSU*

My primary goal is to develop a new survey of art history course, in collaboration with the High Museum of Art in Atlanta and the Carlos Museum of Art and Archaeology at Emory University, for delivery via multi-media and museum site visits. The course will target underserved area urban and rural populations, primarily high-school students and teachers. Course organization will be innovative, structured around a series of global themes applicable to the museums' collections. Melding new technologies with new teaching strategies will make the course, when taught, a model at the local, regional, and national levels. Assessment instruments will be created to evaluate program content, student outcomes, and student satisfaction with program delivery (instructor, technology, and museum site visits). Delivery of the course will constitute the first level of dissemination. Other levels include: possible presentation of a workshop at KSU; panel presentation by collaborating partners at regional and national conferences in 1998 and 1999; an article about this interactive,

innovative, collaborative venture, to be submitted to *Reaching Through Teaching*; an article to be submitted to *College Teaching* or *Educational Research Quarterly*, refereed journals devoted to issues, practice, and research in undergraduate and graduate teaching. GPTV has expressed interest in the project, which, if acted upon, could constitute long-term dissemination.

Joseph Bocchi, Assistant Professor of English - *Producing and Managing 'Texts' Electronically: Collaborative Student Writing between Two Remote University System of Georgia Sites*

This project provides students from two University System of Georgia sites an applied environment for writing in Technical Fields. Students will use on-line technology to work collaboratively between sites to research, plan, manage, develop, and deliver presentations, hypertext, and hypermedia. I will redesign English 312—Scientific and Technical Writing during Fall Quarter 1997 to (1) pilot a non-tandem, on-line offering in Winter 1998 and (2) deliver an on-line tandem with Middle Georgia College during Spring Quarter 1998. Overall, 63 students and 2 professors will participate (25 each in KSU's two 312 sections; 14 students in MGC's English 235—Technical Communication's). KSU Computer Science and Information Systems majors will participate. My 25 GPW 625—Business and Commercial Writing students during Spring 1998 also will (1) use similar on-line techniques for collaboration and (2) serve as an informal advisory board on 312 strategies, technology use, and results. Projected outcomes include: increased student use and application of technology, both in class and out, for collaborative writing tasks typical in Technical Fields; and increased communication with and access to each other and faculty. Faculty will design their respective courses; plan deliveries and complementary content and assignments; and collaborate to develop on-line materials and methods to deliver lectures, facilitate cross-group discussions, and guide assignment execution. Outcomes will be assessed using pre/post surveys and student-keep logs on technology use and contact time. Similar instruments will be used during the Winter 1998 pilot to establish baseline data. This