

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Rarick Hall

Buildings & Facilities

---

February 1977

### Letter, to Warren Corman, from Gerald W. Tomanek, February 28, 1977

Gerald W. Tomanek

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/rarick>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Tomanek, Gerald W., "Letter, to Warren Corman, from Gerald W. Tomanek, February 28, 1977" (1977).  
*Rarick Hall*. 20.  
<https://scholars.fhsu.edu/rarick/20>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Buildings & Facilities at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Rarick Hall by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

Bldg. - new classroom

February 28, 1977

Mr. Warren Corman  
Facilities Officer  
Board of Regents  
Suite 1416, Merchants National Bank  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Mr. Corman:

Having just received a copy of The Planning and Construction of New Facilities at the Board of Regents Institutions by the Legislative Division of Post Audit, we feel compelled to respond to what appears to us to be some rather inaccurate assertions and inappropriate recommendations. To begin, we believe it is possible to accurately refute the majority of negative allegations made in the report--specifically with regard to Fort Hays State and generally with regard to the Kansas Long-Range Physical Planning efforts and guidelines. (Please find attached a specific defense of our new classroom building proposal.) To completely refute the Post Audit report would take a great deal of non-existent staff time--after all, 40 people spent an inordinately large amount of time researching and writing this report, while we have been given less than 3 working days notice to respond. However, we feel it is entirely misleading and inaccurate with regard to current information available at Fort Hays State, concerning Fort Hays State and would like to volunteer a complete refutation of the report--specifically with regard to the assertions made as applied to Fort Hays State--upon request, with sufficient lead time. Meanwhile, may we generally offer some comments on what we feel to be the most obviously questionable recommendations and comments:

1. The report's projected needs have as their basis a 1980 enrollment projection--reportedly by the Board of Regents. First, what are those projections? Secondly, Fort Hays State appears to have been included as having an enrollment decline. On what information was this based? We can demonstrate, with projections as reputable as any of those we are aware of, that our enrollment is not likely to decline by 1980 (see attached report). Certainly we cannot agree that the system as a whole may decline in enrollment, but there is no hard evidence at this time that Fort Hays State as an individual institution will lose headcount students. Furthermore, we are not aware of any recent "official" projections from the Board of Regents. To the best of our knowledge, accurate projections are still in the development process through a subcommittee appointed by the Council of Presidents and working through the Board staff.
2. Projected space needs were determined by using a "square foot per FTE student" criterion--again, reportedly using "official" Board of Regents policy guidelines prior to 1971. Again, we were not aware of any "official" guidelines. Even if this is accurate, it is apparent that using an "FTE student" to determine square foot needs would be highly inaccurate. One does not need space for an "FTE student", but for headcount students. After all, 10 FTE undergraduate students could mean 10 bodies taking 15 credit hours each or 50 bodies taking 3 credit



hours! Space needs could vary greatly in these two cases depending upon the circumstances. Also, the credit hours can remain virtually the same with the same distribution (1-3% increase at Fort Hays State over 2 years) thereby keeping the student FTE roughly the same, while the headcount increases dramatically (10 to 12% at Fort Hays State over 2 years). Again, given certain circumstances, FTE students can remain constant while particular space needs increase drastically due to headcount increases. Another example would be constant headcount, constant FTE and a change in the mix of lab vs. non-lab hours taken or a change in the discipline mix. If a large number of students decide to take 3 more hours of lab type courses and 3 hours less lecture, then we need more space to teach these students in laboratory situations. Nor does it seem possible to argue that an upper division music or art student requires more space to work and learn than it does a lower division English Composition student. If an institution enrolls more art and music students then it legitimately needs more space.

3. Quite simply, we feel the 1968-1971 guidelines and data that appear throughout the report are outdated and obsolete. We feel the Post-Audit Division needs to update its information on all U. S. space guidelines as well as research. Whether in the workbook or not, our institution, and we assume the others, updates all space information annually; constantly receives their long-range plans, evaluates building conditions, searches out remodeling possibilities rather than building new buildings and attempts to keep any new buildings to a minimum size.
4. Caudill, Rowlett and Scott is an internationally known and respected planning firm who was hired to produce a plan based on national standards superior to any past planning efforts of the Kansas system. After nearly two years of hard work and study of other systems, a feasibly workable plan was developed for determining the space needs of our system--a rather conservative system. (For our system, using national standards by their surveys, 1.2 was more realistic than 1.0, but we felt the more conservative 1.0 to be better for Kansas.) To return to a "pre-CRS" state would be not only illogical and wasteful of the taxpayers dollars, but actually damaging in terms of all future planning efforts of Kansas higher education institutions.
5. Certainly, it must appear appealing to the Committee to have a "simple" and straight forward formula" rather than the "complex model" in which they profess to find lacking in the absence of a "common demoninator such as the number of square feet per FTE student." But as with all good formulas, typically the more variance accounted for through the consideration of the multiple variables operating in the situation, the better the prediction made. The less consideration of these variables (discipline of student, level of student, lab vs. non-lab, research space, library space, office space, condition of space, etc.), the more inaccurate the prediction of need. "Real life" situations are seldom simple and cannot be reduced to an "if  $A - B = C$  then  $C + B = A$ " situation. And the more one tries to make them appear simple, the less "real" they become. Though we sympathize with the Committee's desire for simplicity, in the name of reality we cannot go along with it.



February 28, 1977

6. Next, we would like to protest the non-consideration of "condition" of space. Perhaps not all institutions classify their space consistently into the various architectural categories. But the space we are replacing is definitely obsolete (see attached report and pictures). Fort Hays State, and perhaps other institutions, would be more than happy to invite any member of the Committee to visit their "obsolete" buildings to experience the poor conditions within. To Fort Hays State, "obsolete" means "unsafe, uninhabitable and non-conducive to quality teaching and learning."
7. Finally, we would like to protest the publication of this type of report without consultation of anyone at Fort Hays State for rebuttal and without institutional input. It seems difficult to believe that over 40 persons from the Department of Administration, Board of Regents and Regents' institutions were involved and yet no adequate rebuttals were available. Is there not perhaps some way to become aware that this kind of report was being completed before it was so widely distributed? After all regardless of how incorrect or inaccurate the report is eventually shown to be, it can, and may, do irreparable damage to many of us in terms of realistic and accurate long-range physical planning.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We appreciate any efforts on our behalf and would be happy to provide any additional information you may desire.

Sincerely yours,



Gerald Tomanek, President  
Fort Hays Kansas State College

GT:vw

Enclosures

cc: Dr. John J. Conard