

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

11-18-1977

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, November 18, 1977

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, November 18, 1977" (1977).
Faculty Senate. 672.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/672

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

Special Faculty Senate Meeting

November 18, 1977

The meeting was called to order by Ms. Ellen Veed, Faculty Senate President, at 4:30 P.M. in the Santa Fe Room of the Memorial Union.

The Secretary called the Senate roll and the following members were present: Dr. Clifford Edwards, Mr. Mike Meade, Dr. Sam Warfel, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Steven Tramel, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. Suzanne Trauth, Mr. Thaine Clark, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Ed Shearer, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Charles Votaw, Ms. Ellen Veed, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. Robert Meier, Dr. Allen Busch, Dr. Patrick Drinan, Dr. Ron Smith, Dr. Keith Campbell, Dr. Louis Fillinger, Ms. Donna Harsh, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Ms. Sandria (Godwin) Lindsey, Mr. Mac Reed.

Those members absent were: Ms. Joanne Harwick, Dr. Louis Caplan, Mr. Daniel Rupp, Dr. Billy Daley, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Ms. Calvin Thomas, Mr. Donald Jacobs.

Also present were: Dr. Roger Pruitt for Caplan, Mr. Dan Kauffman for Rupp (he was made a duly authorized voting member of Faculty Senate for this meeting in accordance with Faculty Senate by-laws), Ms. Cindy Bross for McNeil, Mr. Jim Walters for Ginther.

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROPOSAL

Presented by Dr. Harold Eickhoff.

A copy of the School of Business proposal was sent to members of COD for their information. This proposal was also sent to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Academic Affairs Committee is meeting Wednesday afternoon to discuss the proposal.

In the discussion of the proposal, Dr. Eickhoff noted that:

- A. In the beginning, he had been skeptical of the proposal.
- B. He had been convinced that a School of Business should be proposed for the following reasons:
 - 1. Quality faculty and students are more easily attracted to a School than to a department.
 - 2. We have had great difficulty attracting Business faculty to the University. The supply of business faculty continues to be very scarce and will continue that way for the foreseeable future.
 - 3. Schools of Business are a standard feature of American higher education. We cannot escape the fact that terminally qualified

faculty are usually products of Business Schools and thus have a strong identification with a School rather than a department. (Attracting a Business Ph.D. to a department in a School of Arts and Sciences is similar to attracting an Arts and Sciences Ph.D. to a School of Education).

4. Grants and non-state funding are more easily attracted to a School than a department.
5. Accreditation is an additional attraction to both faculty and students. The business program cannot be accredited unless it is a "School."
6. The establishment of a School of Business will mean that changes will take place in the existing program. The proposal is not a matter of relabeling the existing package.
7. The establishment of a quality School of Business will be good for the University. We should get better students and they will likely be taking more, rather than less, courses in Arts and Sciences under accreditation standards.
8. Employment possibilities in the business fields are very strong for the next 10 years. As a regional University, we must be responsive to the man power requirements of Western Kansas.
9. Two consultants have indicated that the University would benefit from a School of Business.
10. If we can attract highly qualified faculty and retain those we have, the future of the University is assured. This is true of all areas in the University.

Dr. Garwood noted that Schools of Business usually have Bureaus of Business Research. He feels these units add strength to Universities and help build strong ties to the communities.

Two questions were raised regarding support for the School:

- a. Where would the additional faculty be found?
- b. Why do we need another Dean or Department Chairman?

Dr. Eickhoff replied that the allocation of additional faculty would have to come through the established procedures of the University. Fort Hays State has a Personnel Allocations Committee comprising the three school Deans, two faculty members, the President of the Faculty Senate, the Student Body President and chaired by the Academic Vice President. All requests for additional faculty will be dealt with through this committee and no commitments have been made to allocate faculty to the proposed new School outside this established procedure.

Regarding the need for administrative support, Dr. Eickhoff noted that:

- a. A Dean is vital to the development and maintenance of the School to:
 1. Recruit faculty nationally.
 2. Develop wide contacts by being professionally active on the national scene.
 3. Pursue opportunities in the Western Kansas community to offer the services of the School to a wide range of professionals (insurance, tax, real estate, banking, small businesses, etc.).
 4. Identify and seek sources of outside funding to improve and maintain a Business School.
 5. Evaluate the overall effectiveness of our business offerings to ascertain if the University is meeting the needs of our students and their employers.
- b. The Department chairperson is recommended by both of the consultants.
- c. The need to support the School of Business with an adequate number of chairpersons is as great in a School of Business as elsewhere in the University.

Dr. Eickhoff concluded by expressing his belief that the best hedge against loss of enrollment is quality educational offerings to the citizens of Kansas. Moreover, if the University can demonstrate its dedication to quality education and service to Kansas, support will come from both state and non-state sources.

Question and Answer Session

Dr. Frerer: My understanding is that presently we have two department chairmen. Does this mean that the new School of Business will have a Dean and one department chairman?

Dr. Eickhoff: No. The original proposal states that we would have one Dean and three department chairmen.

Dr. Campbell: What are some of the problems?

Dr. Eickhoff: The problem will always be funding. Adequate funding for this new unit as with any other unit within the University is always a difficult problem. Therefore, I do not view finding funds for this new unit to be any more difficult than finding funds for any other unit within the University. I think funding is the critical thing.

Ms. Pfeifer: I see from an explanation sent to us in the mail there is need for 5.4 faculty positions plus two administrative positions and one classified position. Does this mean these positions will come from some of the existing positions elsewhere on the campus?

Dr. Eickhoff: You must remember that the positions requested in the proposal represent the number of positions required for accreditation. As I indicated in the presentation, any request for additional positions will be dealt with through the Personnel Allocations Committee (PAC). New personnel for the School of Business will be provided by following the duly organized process developed by PAC just as new positions for any other department in the University. Consequently, this system allows for a complete rejuggling of personnel on the campus. My response to you in regard to the faculty positions is that these positions will be allocated by the established procedures used at the time.

Dr. Drinan: Does accreditation mandate these positions?

Dr. Eickhoff: May I direct that answer to Dr. McCullick and Dr. Johansen.

Dr. McCullick: Accreditation mandates that at the under-graduate level, the credit hour production be 400 per faculty member and at the graduate level 300 credit hours per faculty member. Given our present enrollment that would mean adding 5 faculty members.

Dr. Drinan: I think one of the faculty concerns is that an outside accrediting agency would be mandating positions which means we would lose some internal control over these positions. Do you have any idea what sort of time period will be involved to achieve accreditation? Would that be ten years, twenty years. . . ?

Dr. Eickhoff: If I were to pick a number it would be five to seven years. The Chemistry department has the same talking points for accreditation by the American Chemical Society.

Dr. Drinan: This is a unique situation because only a few departments can use external levers to protect faculty positions.

Dr. Smith: Are the current University faculty positions based upon 300 under-graduate credit hours per faculty member?

Dr. Eickhoff: Ms. Kay Dey, how do we get positions?

Ms. Dey: The student to faculty rate is 20 under-graduate students per faculty position, in other words, 300 under-graduate credit hours per faculty position.

Dr. Smith: Will the number of staff positions go up and down in a manner equal to upward or downward changes in credit hour production?

Dr. Johansen: Conceivably if there were a drop in business credit hour production we could be accredited with our present staff. Presently in the department of business we have 511 student credit hours per full time equivalent (FTE).

Dr. Smith: Let's suppose that 4 or 5 years down the line you reach accreditation standards, then two years later student credit hour production in the School of Business decreases by 600 credit hours, could the School of Business lose two faculty positions?

Dr. Johansen: I do not see why not. I would assume that if we lost 800 credit hours we would be in a position to lose two faculty members. On the other hand, if we gained 800 credit hours, I think we could make a real good case to add two faculty positions to the School of Business.

Dr. Frerer: How can we have a School of Business increasing faculty positions if the University is slated to lose positions?

Dr. Eickhoff: That is a problem. My reply to that is that right now we are ahead in the game. Ms. Dey, how many were we slated to lose this year?

Ms. Dey: Around 90.

Dr. Eickhoff: We gained about 375 headcount students. I would emphasize again that staffing the positions for the departments of economics and business would have to go through the normal procedures established by the PAC.

Dr. Pruitt: I served on the Reduction in Personnel Committee (RPC). At that time nursing was striving for accreditation. The administration put pressure on our committee to maintain a favorable student to faculty ratio. Would the administration in an effort to achieve accreditation in the School of Business apply pressure on the PAC at the expense of some other department? In other words, could the School of Business gain positions while other departments might be required to release faculty?

Dr. Eickhoff: There is no administrative commitment to this at this time, nor will there be an administrative commitment to a repeat of that 1973 performance.

Dr. Drinan: How much money will be needed to provide for library holdings which will meet accreditation standards?

Dr. Johansen: There is no library list on what must be present in the library holdings. I am sure there would need to be an expenditure of money to increase our library holdings. I would hope this could be achieved over an extended period of time.

Dr. Drinan: Dr. Eickhoff, to what extent can the funding be expanded to help set up a new School of Business rather than an internal division of the fundings.

Dr. Eickhoff: If we were to submit this proposal with a request for additional resources it would be turned down. Once the School of Business is set up then it would be possible to obtain resources for new and improved programs within the School of Business.

Dr. Drinan: Is the administration prepared to move toward accreditation without additional funding from the state of Kansas?

Dr. Eickhoff: In so far as the resources are available within the institution, YES.

Dr. Watson: Dr. Johansen, do you presently meet the accreditation standards in terms of the terminal degree?

Dr. Johansen: If the three temporary positions we have this year were replaced by terminal degree people and if our enrollment met the student to faculty ratio standards, we could be accredited.

Ms. Veed: Dr. Johansen, what percent of the schools of business are accredited?

Dr. Johansen: I cannot give you a definite answer to your question; there are too many private schools of business.

Dr. Frerer: How many administrative positions are required for the new School of Business?

Dr. Eickhoff: We are committed in the proposal to adding a full time position as a Dean of Business and a half time position for a department chairman.

Dr. Campbell: Is this a true statement? The School of Business in order to become accredited will gain faculty where as the other departments will gain and lose faculty based on enrollment increases or decreases.

Dr. Eickhoff: I suppose that could be true but it would have to be sold to the Allocations Committee.

Dr. Campbell: Is it likely that it could be successfully sold in your opinion?

Dr. Eickhoff: No. I don't think it would be likely sold, not on that basis alone.

Dr. Drinan: I would like to know a little bit of the history of why this proposal is coming now, that is in 1977. My concern to a great extent is it will still be a paper proposal for an accredited School of Business. Accreditation is years down the line. Why would it not be more possible and indeed desirable to spend several years upgrading the department in terms of gaining new positions? This would be closer to meeting accreditation standards; therefore writing the proposal for a new School of Business would be easier and more realistic.

Dr. Eickhoff: It is a matter of sequence which should always be moving towards upgrading the School of Business. However, let me refer this to one of the department chairmen.

Dr. McCullick: I think that the designation of the School of Business is probably going to be an important one. It will be an important asset in attracting qualified faculty to a School of Business and I might add it will cost less dollars. I do believe there are a number of steps we must take to attract qualified students, qualified faculty, and to obtain accreditation. I think building a program under the heading of a School of Business would be a logical starting place.

Mr. Snapp: As an outsider I have background as a graduate of the Law School of Yale. Yale is now 275 years old and they first got their School of Business open last year. Therefore, mathematically, if FHSU opens a School of Business

Mr. Snapp: (Cont.) it will be 200 years ahead of Yale. I think business is here to stay. It is vital that we make business education available to the public. We have got to send out educated people to educate the public. I believe it's a must, don't wait as long as Yale did to start a School of Business.

Dr. Warfel: How will a School of Business affect our School of Liberal Arts? And how would the Destiny Implementation people react to the formation of a School of Business?

Dr. Eickhoff: I doubt if there would be great concern for the Implementation Task Force about the establishment of a School of Business. I view the most sacred part of FHSU as the Liberal Arts thrust and don't see this as infringing upon Arts and Sciences. If I thought this would endanger the School of Arts and Sciences, I would not be supporting a School of Business. One of the things I like about accreditation is that the accreditation standards are very, very demanding with regards to the liberalized education that Business School graduates must have before they may graduate. It is very tough on them. They place a strict limitation on the number of courses that can be taken in the professional business area.

Dr. Miller: When Formula Budgeting becomes a reality will this institution have a free hand in adding or abolishing line positions?

Dr. Eickhoff: Ms. Dey can speak to that.

Ms. Dey: There is nothing definite but it is likely that we will receive dollars and be able to use these dollars as we see fit.

Dr. Miller: Will that mean we will not be tied to any ratio?

Ms. Dey: We will be funded on the actual amount of student credit hours by discipline.

Dr. Miller: The funding will be generated by student credit hour production. Within that funded amount the actual number of line positions can be flexible. Is that correct?

Ms. Dey: That is unpredictable.

Dr. Miller: Thank you.

Mr. Walters: I want to ask Dale Johansen and Jack McCullick, have you had a vote in your respective departments on this proposal?

Dr. McCullick: Yes. Last summer as a matter of fact. When the proposal was first advanced we were greatly concerned. We spent a great deal of time, not only talking with the two consultants, but also discussing the proposal among ourselves. Our consensus was along the lines that we were interested in being part of a School of Business if this were a quality School of Business which down the road would achieve accreditation. We were not interested in simply hooking up with another department and changing the label. Otherwise we did not see any pay off. We do see a pay off for ourselves and for the institution, if there is a School of Business based on the accreditation standards which will assure that this will be truly a professional school.

Ms. Veed: Do we give a degree in Business Education?

Dr. Johansen: Yes.

Dr. Edwards: I think everyone is impressed and gratified with the phenomenal growth in the number of student credit hours in the Department of Business which suggests to me that the department is quite successful without being a school. It would appear that the name would upgrade your faculty quality and I was wondering how the department is doing so well with unqualified faculty? (Laughter)

Dr. Eickhoff: Will the unqualified faculty please stand up? (Laughter)

Dr. Johansen: The answer to that is 19.2 FTE faculty, each working 16 hours a day. In the area of recruitment 100 letters a day, and a lot of dedication on the part of a good faculty.

Dr. Edwards: So the solution is not really hiring doctoral people for school accreditation. The need is to lower student credit hours per FTE.

Dr. Johansen: That is the solution right now. To be accredited today we would need 5.4 FTE. This may change 2, 3, 4, or 5 years down the road.

Dr. Warfel: I did not hear Dr. Johansen respond to the question, which asked how do the members of the Department of Business feel about the establishment of a School of Business?

Dr. Johansen: I have not polled my people recently. At times they may feel it is not worth the effort, but in general they support the formation of a School of Business. I think a School of Business will not only help the business and economics departments but will help the university as a whole to keep students.

Dr. Drinan: I feel that the Faculty Senate favors a School of Business, sometime in the future, but have reservations about going for a School of Business at this time. If the Faculty Senate votes against a School of Business is the administration enthusiastic enough about a School of Business to come back next year with a proposal for a School of Business?

Dr. Eickhoff: My enthusiasm for coming back next year would not be high. I have given this considerable thought and do not think that a year from today the issues will be any different.

Dr. Drinan: I for one would be disappointed if a year from now you would not bring forth another proposal for a School of Business. At this time I happen to agree with the motion from the Academic Affairs Committee sent to each of us by mail.

Dr. Watson: This proposal comes to us at the eleventh month, which has not given support for the concept of a School of Business time to gather momentum. Therefore, I would like to encourage bringing the proposal back to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Eickhoff: I appreciate that.

Dr. Miller: Can we determine whether the new students recruited by the School of Business are students who would not have attended FHSU or whether the student would have come to FHSU anyway, but may have enrolled in another area.

Dr. Johansen: We had last year 220 freshman, today we have 338 freshman in Business.

Dr. Miller: Would 100 of that increase of 118 students which Business experienced this year have majored in music or another department? The tenor of the times is such that we may be redividing at present a small pie. I think it is great, however, that your recruitment has been so successful.

Dr. Eickhoff: We just do not have the data to answer that question.

Dr. McCullick: Every other regents institution except ESU competes for students with a School of Business.

Dr. Frerer: There is no doubt in my mind that a School of Business is attractive to us and the enormous growth in freshman School of Business majors would testify to adding a School of Business. I do not think the school can be hurt by increasing faculty for Business while they are experiencing growth. However, I am concerned about an increase in administrative cost which would happen automatically.

Dr. Edwards: Why can't we let the Dean of Arts and Sciences be the Acting Dean of the new School of Business for three or four years. Then perhaps we could get a new dean.

Dr. Eickhoff: That is possible, but I think it would be unfair to ask an administrator to carry such a double burden.

Dr. Frerer: Exactly what are these two new administrative positions for?

Dr. Johansen: The original proposal would set up a Department of Economics, a Department of Business, and a Department of Business Education. So really we need to add a chairman for the Department of Business Education and a Dean of the School of Business.

Dr. Eickhoff: I have become aware in the year and half that I have been here, that the faculty do not understand what administrators do. I have become concerned enough about University problems to initiate with the Council of Deans (COD) a document describing the role of each administrator. In other words, we will have prepared a job description for each administrator. Even in this time of faculty surpluses it is still hard to recruit outstanding faculty. The quality of faculty determines the quality of the institution. I am becoming increasingly demanding that administrators recruit outstanding faculty.

Ms. Veed: Isn't it true that in most departments the chairman bears the major responsibility for recruitment?

Dr. Eickhoff: Yes, that has been the case in the past.

Dr. Warfel: Since 1972, the year of the cuts, we have added a dean, a special assistant to the president, and a scheduling officer has been requested. This bothers me that at a time when we are experiencing a decline in enrollment we are adding personnel at the top.

Dr. Eickhoff: I do not know all of the things which were considered in regards to developing the present administrative organization. We can look at some of the best schools and find that we are under administered. To fully understand our present organizational setup would require going into a lot of institutional history, which would do little good.

Ms. Dey: I have just done an analysis of the ratio of faculty to administration and find that Emporia has a 3:1 ratio, whereas currently the ratio of FHSU is 5.3:1.

Ms. Veed: I don't want to cut off debate, but could we reasonably finish in 10 minutes?

Dr. Votaw: We are talking about the improvement in the business area without regard to specifics. Is the improvement enough to warrant forming a new School of Business? Is there quantitative data to support this?

Dr. Eickhoff: That is a major concern I have had. Can we be sure that tangible benefits will come to the institution as a result of the proposal? In an effort to get an answer to that question I asked Dr. Johansen and Dr. McCullick to convince me. Then I went to a consultant who was an expert and put this question to him.

Dr. Votaw: Could this consultant be biased?

Dr. Eickhoff: He could be, but in some cases when he has served as a consultant for other schools he has recommended against forming a School of Business. This would suggest to me that he was not biased.

Dr. Votaw: What all did this person consider? Did he consider the competitive situation here? What was different in the Schools where he recommended against forming a School of Business as compared to FHSU, where he recommended forming a School of Business?

Dr. Eickhoff: I do not think that question was put to the consultant.

In closing I would like to say I do appreciate the concern of the faculty that has been expressed to me as well as those concerns expressed during this meeting. If I were a full-time member of this teaching faculty, I would have the same concerns. Perhaps I have spoken too much in the past and all of us have spoken too much about declining enrollments. I think that I would also recognize if I were a faculty member your concerns about your respective disciplines and departments. I can understand that you might have reservations about anything which could serve as a threat to the quality of your respective departments. I consider that praiseworthy and feel that is exactly what you should be concerned with. Although I

have not had a opportunity to meet with the Faculty Senate this year, I have met with many of you and I think you know my concern is both enrollment and quality. Finally, whatever you do with this proposal will not affect my high regard for you and the faculty. Even though we may experience a few differences I know that we are both dedicated to the high quality of FHSU. Thank you very much.

Ms. Veed: We have a report from the Academic Affairs Committee.

Dr. Zakrzewski: I move that the following proposal by the Academic Affairs Committee be adopted.

"The Faculty Senate agrees in principle with the concept of a School of Business. It opposes, however the specific proposal submitted to it on October 31, 1977."

"Given the current academic atmosphere of retrenchment, the Senate wishes to express its concern for:

(a) the proposal's undue focus on administrative positions when University resources are limited; and

(b) the fact that still another segment of the campus would be brought under the shelter of special accreditation requirements."

Seconded by Dr. Miller.

Ms. Veed: The floor is open to discussion.

Dr. Votaw: What specifically is the proposal to which we are objecting?

Ms. Veed: The proposal which you received here at this Faculty Senate Meeting.

Dr. Votaw: I never did really see anything concrete in this proposal. It says let us establish a School of Business. I do not see where the proposal states when we will have an accredited School of Business.

Dr. Miller: Implicit in the proposal is the need to take it to COCAO by December 1.

Dr. Edwards: Just a comment. It's obvious that the involved departments (Business and Economics) do need some help. A 19 hour teaching load is unreasonable.

Ms. Veed: I do not think Dr. Johansen said that. Did you?

Dr. Johansen: NO.

Ms. Veed: I think you said 19 point something instructors.

Dr. Edwards: Even so it is obvious that the Business Faculty are overloaded and it is inevitable that relief will have to be given through the allocation of some faculty.

Motion passed.

Ms. Veed adjourned the special meeting at 5:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. John L. Watson

MR DANIEL KAUFFMAN