

April 2020



TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY													1												
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY .	•	٥	٠	٠	٠	۰	٥	٠	٠	ø	٠	٠	٠	٥	٠	٥	٠	٠	٠	٠	٥	٥	٠	٠	3
STUDY RESE QUESTIONS .	ARCH		٠	•	٥	٥	٠	۰	۰	٥	٥	۰	۰	۰	•	0	٠	۰	۰	۰	۰	۰	٠	۰	3
METHODOLO	GY.	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	•	۰	4
STRUCTURE A	AND Lysis	S.	٠	٠	٠	٠	۰	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	۰	6
COMMUNITY Benchmark	COL	LEG Ane	ES /) C(ANE MF) ST Par	ATE ISO	CO NS	LLE	GES		0	0	0	٥	0	٥	0	0	0	0	0	0	۰	٠	6
CHAPTER 2	EXE	CU	TIV	E S	UM	M	RY																		7
CHAPTER 3	CO	LLE	GE	PR	OCE	SS	ES																		21
SECTION 3.1: State-level	IDEN Goa	ITIF LS	ICA	TIO	N 0	F.	0	۰	۰	0	0	0	0	٥	0	0	۰	0	0	0	0	٠	۰	0	24
SECTION 3.2: Missions Ai	INS ND S	TITU TRA	ITIO TEG	N- C (LEV Goa	EL LS	0	٥	0	٥	0	٥	0	٥	0	0	٥	0	٥	٥	٥	٥	•	0	28
SECTION 3.3 TO DETERMIN	: IDEI Ne ca	NTIF PIT	ICA Al (TIO)UT	N O Lay	F P S P	ROC	CES E ne	SES EDS	SUS S.	ED	٠	٠	٥	۰	۰	¢	٠	۰	۰	٥	٥	٠	٠	31
SECTION 3.4 Of Capital O	: INS UTL <i>I</i>	TITL VY P	JTIC RO.	NS Jec	' PF TS	210F	RITIZ	ZAT	ION	•	۰	۰	۰	•	•	•	•	۰	۰	۰	۰	•	•	•	40

CHAPTER 4 STATE PROCESSES AND STATE-LEVEL GOALS	65
SECTION 4.1: STATE-LEVEL PROCESSES USED To determine capital outlay priorities	68
SECTION 4.2: CASE STUDIES OF THE COLLEGE- AND STATE-LEVEL PROCESSES USED TO DETERMINE CAPITAL OUTLAY PRIORITIES	72
CASE STUDY #1: BROWARD COLLEGE WILLIS HOLCOMBE CENTER RENOVATION (BUILDING 33)	75
CASE STUDY #2: DAYTONA STATE COLLEGE Student services center	81
CASE STUDY #3: EASTERN FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE Melbourne health sciences institute	87
CASE STUDY #4: NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE Engineering Building 310 Renovation	93
CASE STUDY #5: POLK STATE COLLEGE WINTER HAVEN LEARNING RESOURCE BUILDING RENOVATION AND REMODELING	99
CHAPTER 5 SPACE FORMULAS AND UTILIZATION FACTORS	05
SECTION 5.1: PROCESS USED TO Estimate full-time equivalent (FTE).	110
SECTION 5.2 ENROLLMENT AND Space needs level of analysis	119
SECTION 5.3: CURRENT SPACE NEEDS Formulas and utilization factors	20
CHAPTER 6 SPACE UTILIZATION 1	63
SECTION 6.1: INSTITUTIONS' Space management practices	66
SECTION 6.2: EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF SPACE	171

CHAPTER 7 | COLLEGE SNAPSHOTS

NORTH BROWARD COLLEGE **CHIPOLA** NORTHWEST FLORIDA COLLEGE 203 **COLLEGE OF** PALM BEACH CENTRAL FLORIDA 217 STATE COLLEGE. 413 THE COLLEGE OF PASCO-HERNANDO 231 THE FLORIDA KEYS. STATE COLLEGE. DAYTONA PENSACOLA STATE COLLEGE. STATE COLLEGE. . 441 **EASTERN FLORIDA POLK STATE** COLLEGE **FLORIDA ST. JOHNS RIVER** FLORIDA SOUTHWESTERN ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGE STATE COLLEGE. **FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE** SANTA FE . . 301 COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE **GULF COAST** SEMINOLE STATE COLLEGE. . . **HILLSBOROUGH** SOUTH FLORIDA **COMMUNITY COLLEGE** 329 **INDIAN RIVER** STATE COLLEGE OF FLORIDA. STATE COLLEGE. . . LAKE-SUMTER TALLAHASSEE STATE COLLEGE. . . 357 **MIAMI DADE** VALENCIA COLLEGE 371 COLLEGE . . .

v

183

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STAFF

Kathy Hebda Chancellor, Division of Florida Colleges

Suzanne Pridgeon

Deputy Commissioner, Division of Finance and Operations

Jared Ochs Director, Legislative Affairs

Elizabeth Moya Director, Legislative Affairs

Scott Kittel

Associate Vice Chancellor, Financial Policy, Facilities Planning and Budgeting, Campus Safety and Security

Lisa Cook

Director, Facilities Planning & Budgeting, Financial Policy, Facilities Planning and Budgeting, Campus Safety and Security

Caleb Hawkes Director of Legislative Affairs, Governmental Relations and Trustee Affairs

Portia Palmer Director of Workforce Programs & Special Projects

COLLEGE PRIMARY CONTACTS

BROWARD COLLEGE

John Dunnuck Chief Operating Officer, Acting Chief Financial Officer

Mark Griffin Associate Vice President, Facilities Planning & Capital Budgets

CHIPOLA COLLEGE

Steve Young Vice President of Administrative and Business Affairs

COLLEGE OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Steve Ash Interim Vice President of Administration and Finance

Charles A. Prince Jr. Chief Financial Officer

THE COLLEGE OF THE FLORIDA KEYS

W Jean Mauk Vice President, Finance & Administration, VP Financial & Business Services

Dr. Brittany P. Snyder Vice President, Academic Affairs, Vice President/Instructional Affair

DAYTONA STATE COLLEGE

Chris Wainwright Associate Vice President, Facilities Planning

EASTERN FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE

Stockton Whitten AVP, Facilities & Special Projects

FLORIDA GATEWAY COLLEGE

Michelle Holloway Vice President, Business Services

FLORIDA SOUTHWESTERN STATE COLLEGE

Dr. Gina Doeble Vice President, Administrative Services

FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE

Al Little Vice President of Business Services

GULF COAST STATE COLLEGE

Dr. John R. Holdnak President

HILLSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Ben Marshall Director of Facilities Planning/Construction

INDIAN RIVER STATE COLLEGE

Barry Keim Vice President of Financial Services and Chief Financial Officer

LAKE-SUMTER STATE COLLEGE

Dr. Heather Bigard Executive Vice President, Chief Financial & Operation Officer

MIAMI DADE COLLEGE

Leo Bobadilla Vice Provost for Facilities Management

NORTH FLORIDA COLLEGE

Andrew Barnes Dean of Administrative Services

Micah Rodgers Interim Chief Business Officer

NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE

Randall G. White Vice President of Business Operations and Finance

PALM BEACH STATE COLLEGE

John Wasukanis Director of Facilities

PASCO-HERNANDO STATE COLLEGE

Tony Rivas Associate Vice President, Facilities Management & Administrative Services

PENSACOLA STATE COLLEGE

Diane Bracken Director of Facilities, Planning and Construction

POLK STATE COLLEGE

Peter Elliott Vice President Administration/CFO

Dr. Allen Bottorff Interim Vice President for Business Administration and Finance

ST. JOHNS RIVER STATE COLLEGE

Melissa C. Miller Senior Vice President/General Counsel/ Executive Director Palatka Campus

ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGE

Dr. Brian Miles Vice President, Administration/Finance & Technology Nicole Delfino

Administrative Operations Manager

Diana Wright Assistant Vice President, Facility Planning & Institutional Services

SANTA FE COLLEGE

Liam McClay Assistant to the President for Innovation and Governmental Affairs

SEMINOLE STATE COLLEGE OF FLORIDA

Rick Collins Interim Chief Financial Officer, Vice President Business Services

F. Joseph Mazur III Chief Financial Officer, Vice President Business Operations

SOUTH FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE

Glenn W. Little Vice President for Administrative Services

STATE COLLEGE OF FLORIDA, MANATEE-SARASOTA

Julie Jakway Vice President for Business and Administration

TALLAHASSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Don Herr Director of Facilities

VALENCIA COLLEGE

Loren Bender Vice President, Business Operations and Finance

Jose Fernandez Assistant Vice President, Facilities Planning/ Real Estate Development

Shaun Andrews Assistant Vice President, Facilities Planning and Operations

COLLEGE NAMES

	FULL NAME	SHORT NAME
01	Broward College	Broward
02	Chipola College	Chipola
03	College of Central Florida	Central Florida
04	The College of the Florida Keys	Florida Keys
05	Daytona State College	Daytona
06	Eastern Florida State College	Eastern Florida
07	Florida Gateway College	Florida Gateway
08	Florida SouthWestern State College	FL SouthWestern
09	Florida State College at Jacksonville	FL SC at Jax
10	Gulf Coast State College	Gulf Coast
11	Hillsborough Community College	Hillsborough
12	Indian River State College	Indian River
13	Lake-Sumter State College	Lake-Sumter
14	Miami Dade College	Miami Dade
15	North Florida College	North Florida
16	Northwest Florida State College	Northwest FL
17	Palm Beach State College	Palm Beach State
18	Pasco-Hernando State College	Pasco-Hernando
19	Pensacola State College	Pensacola
20	Polk State College	Polk
21	St. Johns River State College	St. Johns River
22	St. Petersburg College	St. Petersburg
23	Santa Fe College	Santa Fe
24	Seminole State College of Florida	Seminole State
25	South Florida State College	South Florida
26	State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota	State College FL
27	Tallahassee Community College	Tallahassee
28	Valencia College	Valencia

ABBREVIATIONS

CIP	Capital Improvement Plan
DFC	Division of Florida Colleges
EPS	Educational Plant Survey
FCS	Florida College System
FDOE	Florida Department of Education
LBR	Legislative Budget Request
PECO	Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service (PECO) Trust Fund
SACS	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math

ACADEMIC SPACE PLANNING

ASF	Assignable Square Feet
NSF	Net Square Feet
GSF	Gross Square Feet
CAFM	Computer Aided Facilities Management
CEFPI	Council of Educational Facility Planners International
COFTE	Capital Outlay Full-Time Equivalent
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
ICS	International Classification Standards
SREF	State Requirements for Educational Facilities (2014)
SS	Student Station
SSO	Student Station Occupancy
WRH	Weekly Room Hour
WSCH	Weekly Student Credit/Contact Hour
WSH	Weekly Seat Hour



SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY



Chapter 1 | Scope and Methodology

CHAPTER 1: Scope and methodology

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to fulfill the requirements of Ch. Senate Bill 2500, Laws of Florida, found in Specific Appropriation 2754, passed during the 2019 session of the Florida Legislature. The Legislature directed the Office of Program and Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) to contract with an independent third party consulting firm to conduct a comprehensive review of the processes used to determine capital outlay facilities space needs at Florida's 28 colleges pursuant to 2019 Florida Statutes, Title XLVIII K-20 Education Code, Chapter 1013 Educational Facilities, Section 1013.31 Educational Plant Survey (EPS); Localized Need Assessment, Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service (PECO) Project Funding. The review is restricted to Education and General (E&G) space, defined as classrooms, vocational laboratories, non-vocational laboratories, offices, and library/study. The relevant portion states as follows:

From the funds in Specific Appropriation 2754, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability is directed to contract with an independent third party consulting firm to conduct a review of the processes used to determine capital outlay facilities space needs of state universities and Florida colleges pursuant to s. 1013.31, Florida Statutes. The review shall evaluate whether state-level processes and those used by individual institutions are consistent with the institution's overall mission, and support state-level goals. The review shall examine space and utilization factors to determine whether they accurately reflect deficits or surpluses of each type of space and result in the most efficient and effective use of space. The review shall also assess the extent to which each institution efficiently and effectively utilizes its current space. The final report shall present the consultant's findings and make specific recommendations to improve the processes used to identify capital outlay projects for state funding, identify any changes or alternatives to ensure that current space and utilization factors represent optimum space requirements, and describe how each institution could use its current space more efficiently and effectively.

STUDY RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In accordance with Specific Appropriation 2754 in Ch. Senate Bill 2500, Laws of Florida, SmithGroup conducted a comprehensive review of capital outlay facilities space at 28 Florida College System institutions. The contract document detailed specific research tasks that SmithGroup was required to address in its review. These tasks are summarized into the four broad categories below.

- 1. Whether the processes used by individual institutions are consistent with the institution's overall mission and support state-level goals;
- 2. Whether state-level processes support state-level goals;
- 3. Whether currently used space and utilization factors accurately reflect deficits or surpluses of each type of space and result in the most efficient and effective use of space, and,
- 4. The extent to which each institution efficiently and effectively utilizes the following space types: classrooms, teaching laboratories (vocational and academic), office, and library/study.

3



METHODOLOGY

SmithGroup conducted the study in three general phases: Discover, Analyze, and Review and Document. The process was structured to investigate the intended four research tasks.

PHASE 1: DISCOVER

SmithGroup commenced the Discover Phase with the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) to establish the research objectives, investigate existing campus conditions, collect and review relevant information from the Division of Florida Colleges (DFC), and ascertain key issues. This phase included:

- Onboarding with OPPAGA: SmithGroup met with OPPAGA staff in late September 2019 to clarify research study expectations; establish project milestones, campus visits, and meeting dates, clarify deliverables and establish early priorities; and, identify points of contact at the Division of Florida Colleges and at each Florida College System (FCS) college who could facilitate data collection and scheduled meetings at each college.
- Division of Florida Colleges Staff: SmithGroup met with staff in late September 2019 and February 2020 to review research questions, study outcomes, understand availability of data sets and methodologies currently used to calculate utilization, and model space projections. After the analyses were in process, SmithGroup met with staff again in February 2020 to review statewide capital outlay and educational plant survey processes, as well as review current metrics and goals for capital outlay project ranking.
- Document and Data Request, Review, and Collection: From September 2019 through February 2020, SmithGroup collected and reviewed publicly accessible documents from college websites and the Division of Florida Colleges. Documentation included strategic and academic plans, Five-Year Educational Plant Surveys, Capital Improvement Plans (CIP), occupational data from the Office of Workforce and Economic Development, actual annualized full-time equivalent (FTE-3) and capital outlay FTE enrollment projections, and space management policies. SmithGroup assembled data about each college from external sources from National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).
- SmithGroup requested significant amounts of data from the Division of Florida Colleges regarding facilities, coursework, staffing, and capital prioritization processes. SmithGroup requested current and historical data from each college that had a selected case study project. SmithGroup examined the completeness, accuracy, and reliability of the data.

PHASE 2: ANALYZE

SmithGroup addressed the four specific research tasks concurrently. In support of these research tasks, this phase included:

- Online Survey: Throughout November and December 2019, SmithGroup conducted a pre-interview online survey with every college. The survey asked questions about capital planning processes and space management practices.
- Interviews: SmithGroup interviewed administrative leadership at every college from October 2019 through mid-January 2020. For 23 colleges, SmithGroup interviewed college representatives via 90-minute video and audio conference calls. For five colleges, these interviews occurred on site. The interviews focused on the four research tasks in relationship to local and state processes. College leaders expressed their opinions and suggestions about space guidelines and the capital outlay process.

- Case Studies: To understand specific capital outlay processes at the local level, five case study projects were selected. SmithGroup interviewed college officials at five colleges about five recent projects.
 - 1. Broward College, Fort Lauderdale, Building 32 Instructional and Support. Completed in 2016-17
 - 2. Daytona State College, Daytona Beach, Building 220–Student Service, Classroom, and Office. Completed in 2016-17
 - 3. Eastern Florida State College, Melbourne, Nursing/Health Building. Completed in 2015-16
 - 4. Polk State College, Winter Haven, Learning Resource Building Renovation. Competed in 2016-17
 - 5. Northwest Florida State College, Niceville, Engineering Technology Building 310 Renovation. Completed in 2017-18
- Capital Outlay Process Analyses: SmithGroup assessed the alignment of capital project requests with space needs assessments, the consistency with role and mission, and their alignment with both college-level and state-level goals. SmithGroup also evaluated if the processes used to develop the capital outlay programs consider such alignment in selecting and prioritizing capital projects.
- Capital Planning Process Flow Diagrams: SmithGroup prepared capital outlay process diagrams that explained the typical outlay process used by colleges and by the Florida College System.
- Enrollment Projection Analysis: SmithGroup assessed the accuracy of the enrollment projection processes through an analysis of actual and projected capital outlay FTE.
- Current and Alternative Space Formulas and Utilization Factor Analysis: SmithGroup created space models for all 28 colleges to understand current State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF, 2014) space factors and their relationship to national best practices and SmithGroup's benchmarking data. SmithGroup analyzed the classrooms, vocational laboratories, non-vocational laboratories, offices, and library/study space categories. SmithGroup calculated space needs based on the SREF and then adapted the space models for all 28 colleges to test alternative space formulas and utilization factors.
- State System Benchmarking: SmithGroup benchmarked the space formulas and utilization factors from more than six community college systems and compared their values and processes with the Florida College System.
- Space Management Best Practices: SmithGroup surveyed the 28 colleges regarding their adoption of best practices in space management.
- Space Utilization Analysis: SmithGroup reviewed current formulas and utilization outcomes for each of the 28 colleges and modeled the existing and planned capacity of classrooms, vocational laboratories, non-vocational laboratories, offices, and library/study spaces. SmithGroup then modeled alternative planning guidelines, assuming the incorporation of best space management practices.

PHASE 3: REVIEW AND DOCUMENT

Using visual graphics and tables, SmithGroup integrated the four research tasks from Phase 2 into a series of sound, welldocumented findings and conclusions regarding state-level and college-level processes used to determine capital outlay facilities space needs and the prioritization of those needs.

Based on a review of best practices and benchmarking outcomes, recommendations were developed, as related to goal congruency, space needs guidelines, and space utilization standards. This phase included:

- Report Outline: SmithGroup submitted to OPPAGA a Report Outline on February 28, 2020. SmithGroup integrated OPPAGA suggestions into the Report Outline.
- Draft Report: SmithGroup submitted the Draft Report on March 20, 2020. SmithGroup integrated OPPAGA suggestions into the Draft Report.
- **Final Report:** SmithGroup submitted the Final Report on April 15, 2020.

5

STRUCTURE AND UNIT OF ANALYSIS

This study focuses on the 28 locally governed public colleges in the Florida College System. While governed locally by district boards of trustees, the colleges are coordinated under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education. The Division of Florida Colleges is the administrative unit under the Florida Department of Education. The mission of the Division of Florida Colleges is to provide leadership and advocacy to promote education innovation and continuous improvement within the Florida College System, fueling economic development for the state of Florida and its citizens.

The Florida College System is comprised of 28 colleges, spanning 72 campuses, 16 centers, and approximately 44 special purpose centers and instructional sites. For this study, the unit of analysis will be at the college-level.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND STATE COLLEGES: BENCHMARKING AND COMPARISONS

Community colleges have traditionally been focused on certificate and associate degrees. Today, a number of community colleges are offering bachelor's degrees to students who complete associate degrees and want to take their training and education to a higher level. Florida was one of the first states to allow colleges to offer baccalaureate programs in narrowly selected fields, rather than offering many programs across a wide swath of disciplines. In the process, all but two colleges removed "community" from their name, with most adopting "state college" designations.

Approximately 90 two-year colleges in 21 states are offering approximately 900 baccalaureate programs across the country, according to Beth Hagan, Executive Director of the Community College Baccalaureate Association, a Florida-based trade association. In addition to Florida's two-dozen two-year institutions offering four-year degree options, more than a dozen community colleges in Washington State now offer baccalaureate degrees. Community colleges in California, Texas, Hawaii, and West Virginia have also been approved or have started offering bachelor's degree programs in select programs over the last year.

As the bachelor's degree is relatively new in two-year colleges, the impact of bachelor's degrees on space standards, space needs analyses, and capital planning processes has not been researched. As a result, SmithGroup used national and state-level comparisons from the community college or two-year sector. The terms "community college" and "two-year college" are identical and will be used interchangeably in this report.



Chapter 2 | Executive Summary

CHAPTER 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

This summary condenses major findings and recommendations of each chapter in a consolidated narrative format. See the remainder of this report for supporting data and analyses.

In general, SmithGroup found:

- The Florida College System capital outlay process does not meet the goals for a process that is flexible, tailored to college needs, transparent, and equitable. At the Division of Florida Colleges (DFC) level, the project prioritization process is data-driven, vision-driven, and defensible. The prioritized projects that the Division of Florida Colleges recommends to the Legislature directly pursue both college-level and state-level goals. However, the ultimate funding decisions are often not related to the Division of Florida Colleges-level capital planning process. The process itself frustrates many of the colleges.
- Any capital outlay process that gives inherent preferences to one type of project will distort capital outlay priorities. Colleges consistently prioritize projects that meet the state's goals, but they may not reflect the greatest need of the college and local community. SmithGroup found that colleges tend to advance projects they believe have the best chance of a high ranking and thus receiving funding. These facilities are needed by the college, but are not necessarily their number one need.
- While relatively accurate in near years, enrollment projections are unacceptably inaccurate in "out-years." Division of Florida Colleges staff generate capital outlay full-time equivalent (COFTE) projections each year by campus site using the latest actual full-time equivalent (FTE) data. The COFTE projections are used to inform facilities planning and calculate space needs. Space needs calculations are based on the unacceptably inaccurate "out-year" five-year projections. However, changing the current COFTE projection process would not result in more efficient or effective use of space, but would provide a more accurate accounting of space needs at the system- and college-levels.
- In most space categories, SREF one-size-fits-all standards are not accurate or appropriate. Florida College System institutions rigorously follow the State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF, 2014) space guidelines because SREF space standards are required by state Statutes. SREF's net square feet (NSF) per COFTE standards provide a high-level snapshot of met and unmet space needs in critical space categories. The continued use of SREF for space needs formulas and utilization factors provides both simplicity and consistency. Yet greater accuracy is possible through more complexity and more effort at both the college and the state levels.
- The Florida College System approach to space utilization expectations does not allow variance for different missions of institutions and different types of sites. Florida College System institutions are increasingly focused on space management practices and are working hard to use their scheduled teaching space more effectively. However, there is room for improvement while acknowledging that unique circumstances related to individual college missions and campus locations can influence which strategies will be most successful.

To address these findings, SmithGroup recommends:

- Revise SREF to be more accurate. Refine space needs formulas to take into account actual and projected space utilization, student station occupancy, and employee data. Current space needs calculations are simplistic, but do not accurately reflect campus, center, and special site needs.
- Update SREF to include modern teaching spaces. Update reported and tracked space typologies and standards to include open laboratories, current and emerging program laboratory types, student success space, and collaboration space.
- Audit facility inventories. Conduct frequent training sessions and regular on-campus audits of college facility inventories. Coordinate with the five-year Educational Plant Survey (EPS) cycle to maintain consistency and accuracy across the system.
- Expand use of space management software. Standardize and incorporate space management software within all state colleges. Train college staff in maintaining institutional data to facilitate accurate reporting.
- Tailor utilization expectations and space standards. Differentiate utilization expectations and space standards based upon metrics such as college location, student FTE, or the college's unique mission and programs. One size does not and should not fit all.
- Consider factors other than space needs. Consider facility age, condition, and relevancy of instructional spaces in determining capital investments. Prioritize projects that repurpose existing space for new programs, renovate space for existing programs, rightsize space for today's course section sizes, and replace existing space that is no longer usable for academic and student support purposes.
- Expand to new sites carefully. Consider leasing space prior to facility acquisition when testing the viability of new site and center locations. A feasibility study should be completed before purchasing land and constructing facilities.

The findings and recommendations are demonstrated through this report's rigorous data collection and analysis.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 3: STATE GOALS AND COLLEGE-LEVEL PROCESSES

The focus of this chapter is to evaluate whether the processes used by each college are consistent with the college's overall mission and support state-level goals. Capital outlay processes at each of the 28 Florida College System institutions should recommend projects that support their missions, as well as Florida Legislative and Florida College System goals. When institutional-level capital outlay processes support the college's mission and statewide goals, the state maximizes its return on the investment on projects that advance the state's ambitious higher education agenda.

SmithGroup's analyses suggest that state-level goals for the Florida College System are clearly identified and closely aligned with Florida's statutory mission and purpose for state colleges. Except for "Responsiveness" and "Affordability" goals, there is strong alignment between the state's goals and college's missions and goals. The colleges understand the role of the Florida College System, but only a few colleges turn to state-level goals to guide their capital outlay processes.

Any capital outlay process that gives inherent preferences to one type of project will distort capital outlay priorities. Colleges consistently prioritize projects that meet the state's goals, but they may not reflect the greatest need of the college and local community. SmithGroup found that colleges tend to advance projects they believe have the best chance of a high ranking and thus receiving funding. These facilities are needed by the college, but are not necessarily their number one need.

SmithGroup recommends the following process changes to strengthen the current capital outlay process:

STATE-LEVEL GOALS ADVANCEMENT

- Better define the state-level goal for "Access." SmithGroup recommends that the Florida College System further investigate its definition of "Access" and develop decision criteria on new sites that include proximity to current campuses, utilization and space needs of existing locations, and delivery alternatives that could be considered in lieu of site acquisition.
- Promote lease-only and donation options. For new instructional sites, SmithGroup recommends that college establish a lease-only option. With rare exceptions, all new instructional sites should be established in donated or leased facilities.
- Closely scrutinize new site acquisition. As a general rule, SmithGroup recommends that acquisition of land, new construction or capital requests for permanent facilities should be considered only after the ability of a site or center to maintain a prescribed level of performance, as measured in student FTE and other performance-based factors. At a prescribed FTE minimum level, a feasibility study with 10-year enrollment projections should be completed to determine if a permanent facility is warranted and if it will be managed as an instructional site or center or developed into a future campus. This decision will influence the acreage needed, the number of buildings, and planned phasing as part of a master planning process.

COLLEGE-LEVEL MISSIONS AND STRATEGIC GOALS ADVANCEMENT

- Encourage better alignment between state-level goals and college-level capital projects. When colleges prioritize their capital projects, they should not only advance their college missions and strategic goals, but also state-level goals. SmithGroup recommends that the Division of Florida Colleges create a mechanism or evaluation process for ensuring that state-level goals are considered and prioritized in the college-level capital planning process.
- Better involve the Division of Florida College staff in campus master planning. Campus master plans play a key role in bridging a college's strategic plan with implementation and capital project planning. Division of Florida College staff involvement in creating a master plan framework would create uniformity of plans across colleges and tightly connect Florida College System-level and state-level goals with each college's plan. Higher Education Coordinating Boards in other states play a formal role. For example, the equivalent Tennessee board has formal master plan approval responsibility. This additional oversight would require legislative action with additional resources for process review and monitoring.

PROCESSES USED TO DETERMINE COLLEGE CAPITAL OUTLAY SPACE NEEDS

Reassess the Educational Plant Survey process. Overall, college representatives desire the process be streamlined. The colleges comply with the Educational Plant Survey process, but feel that the process and interface software used to input the data needs a major overhaul or minimally needs to be streamlined to make a more efficient and effective process. Some noted that a modified version of the Educational Plant Survey should be done every three years as external realities change more often based on student needs.

- Emphasize academic leadership oversight and direction in the Educational Plant Survey process, as it is the core of the capital planning process. The Educational Plant Survey must convey academic program needs and translate these needs to physical requirements.
- Integrate flexibility and adaptability into the Educational Plant Survey process. The Educational Plant Survey process should allow for some flexibility in programming of spaces and facilities to meet the unique needs of the college and the community it supports.
- More fully address facility age in the Educational Plant Survey process. The Educational Plant Survey should more fully address the condition and age of buildings. The condition may be "acceptable" (the ceiling is not falling in), however the Educational Plant Survey is not fully capturing the quality of the environments. Spaces in older legacy buildings may be have greater inefficiencies and it may be more costly to bring these spaces up to current standards.
- Improve the consistency of facility inventory space classification. While the Florida Department of Education facilities/ Capital Outlay Database has Room Use Codes, Definitions, Descriptions, and Limitations, college personnel are not consistent in their application of these codes. SmithGroup recommends providing more information, work sessions or inventory review audits, especially for related instruction classrooms (212), special class laboratories (220, 240), and study spaces (410, 430). This additional oversight would not require legislative action, but would require additional resources for content development, training, inventory review, and ongoing monitoring.

COLLEGES' PRIORITIZATION OF CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS

- Comprehensively review the capital planning process. Most campus representatives during interviews expressed concern that the process is not effective. Some campus representatives noted that the Capital Improvement Plan process should be used only for new construction. College leaders indicated that remodeling and renovation funding should be allocated to each college based on size and age of campus/buildings. Most agreed that providing higher prioritization for infrastructure and maintenance needs is warranted as facilities are falling into disrepair throughout the system, yet there is underlying assumption that values new construction over funding to maintain quality facilities.
- Consistently fund capital projects. For the current capital outlay process to be effective, most college representatives felt that a consistent stream of funding for capital outlay projects and deferred maintenance must be established.
- Carefully indicate preferred project types. Any prioritization scoring process has inherent preferences. To more accurately determine the highest capital needs of the colleges, the Division of Florida Colleges should carefully allocate prioritization points to preferred types of projects in order not to distort each college's prioritization process.
- Coordinate data demands and portability among the Educational Plant Survey, Capital Improvement Plan, and other related capital planning processes. The amount and frequency of data requested by the Division of Florida Colleges staff can be costly for colleges to produce and maintain. Colleges expressed frustration with the amount of time needed for data entry to produce Educational Plant Survey and Capital Improvement Plan documentation. Common elements should be reviewed for the ability to migrate and manage data between the two processes.
- Create a sense of urgency for time-sensitive needs. The mission of colleges includes offering new and emerging programs to reflect the changing educational and economic needs of Florida communities. The capital planning process should identify and evaluate Capital Improvement Plan projects that address immediate or time-sensitive community educational needs. As Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service (PECO) funding has slowed, time-urgent capital projects may not occur on a timely basis to meet high demand, high wage occupational training needs. Colleges may also need to look to internal capital fundraising or viable alternative sources to fund critical and time-sensitive projects.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 4: STATE PROCESSES AND STATE-LEVEL GOALS

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate whether state-level capital planning processes support state-level goals. The capital outlay processes within the Division of Florida Colleges should result in recommended projects that support the state's goals, such as the Florida College System Strategic Plan and the Governor's higher education plans. When the Division of Florida Colleges processes result in project recommendations that fully support state goals, the Legislature can confidently use the Division of Florida Colleges' prioritized list and fund the projects on it. When the Division of Florida Colleges' processes do not appear to support the state goals, the Legislature may not consider the prioritized list to be a credible listing of the state's highest priorities, or the Legislature may not be aware of other project opportunities that would more fully meet state goals.

The Division of Florida Colleges is involved both indirectly and directly in the entire capital outlay process, from the preparation of the college-level Educational Plant Survey (EPS) through the submittal of the Florida College System's prioritized project list to the Legislature. The process is data-driven, vision-driven, and defensible. The prioritized projects that emerge from the process directly pursue state-level goals. However, the ultimate funding decisions are often not related to the college-level and the Florida College System-level capital planning process. The process itself frustrates many of the colleges, and SmithGroup has determined that it does not meet the goals for a process that is flexible, tailored to college needs, transparent, and equitable.

The Legislature has the right to fund any project that it chooses—the direct funding of projects by state legislatures is not uncommon and happens in every state. SmithGroup was told about several buildings that were not prioritized by the college or the Division of Florida Colleges but nonetheless gained Legislative support and received funding approval, a sign that the state-level capital planning process is not fully effective.

SmithGroup understands that the Legislature, Division of Florida Colleges, and the individual colleges all seek a process that is perceived to be as fair and balanced as possible, where the occurrences of project funding primarily driven by politics is rare. Minimizing the process outliers and assuring the Legislature that the prioritized project list represents the Florida College System's greatest needs are the desired outcomes of the following analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. SmithGroup recommends the following process changes to strengthen the current capital outlay process:

- The Division of Florida Colleges should provide flexibility in prioritizing projects based on the uniqueness of each college. The projects prioritized by the Division of Florida Colleges are drawn from each college's top two priorities. The Division of Florida Colleges should prioritize projects that not only promote state strategic goals but also college strategic goals and missions. The missions of colleges are as varied as the colleges themselves and the specific regions they serve. That variety should be considered within the state-level processes.
- Partial and insufficient funding makes complete funding of projects difficult. Addressing the Legislature's pattern of partial funding has always been a major component of the prioritization process. As of 2019–20, the Florida College System had 20 projects partially funded, still needing almost \$300 million to complete. The Legislature funded \$11.2 million for projects for the Florida College System in 2019–20 and \$18.6 million for projects for the Florida College System in 2020–21. Assuming no vetoes for 2020–21, the Florida College System picks up an additional (new) partially funded project. This level of funding, combined with the partial funding of new projects not on the Division of Florida Colleges' prioritized list makes it difficult to complete projects. Several colleges also mentioned during interviews that partially completed projects had slipped substantially as a result of Senate Bill 190, primarily due to being renovation rather than replacement projects.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 5: ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS, SPACE NEEDS FORMULAS

This chapter examines full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment projections for accuracy, as well as space and utilization factors to determine whether they accurately reflect deficits or surpluses of each type of space and result in the most efficient and effective use of space. The goal of this chapter is to determine whether changes to colleges' current FTE projection processes or the state's space and utilization factors would result in more efficient and effective use of each type of space for the system.

ACCURACY OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Division of Florida Colleges staff generate capital outlay FTE (COFTE) projections each year by campus site using the latest actual FTE data. The COFTE projections are used to inform facilities planning and calculates space needs.

While relatively accurate in near years, enrollment projections are unacceptably inaccurate in "out-years." Space needs calculations are based on the unacceptably inaccurate "out-year" five-year projections. Some COFTE projections deviate by 20% or more at the college-level, potentially impacting their score on the Division of Florida Colleges point system for PECO project priority. Changing the current COFTE projection process would not result in more efficient or effective use of space, but would provide a more accurate accounting of space needs at the system- and college-levels.

SmithGroup identified opportunities for improvement and recommends the following process changes to strengthen space planning and current capital outlay process:

- The Florida College System should review and evaluate enrollment projections methodology. Given that the Educational Plant Survey (EPS) uses a five-year FTE projection for calculating space needs and project funding most frequently does not occur until many years after the project is initially prioritized, the accuracy of the model, the data elements, and calculations for estimating enrollment needs to be evaluated with the goal of greater accuracy in the out-years. One example would be the projection methodology used by the National Center for Educational Statistics in their projection of enrollments for postsecondary institutions. The Maryland Higher Education Commission used multiple factors, including disposable income, in projecting enrollments for community colleges through 2028.
- The Division of Florida Colleges should calculate the accuracy of the five-year COFTE enrollment projections yearly. Greater scrutiny, discussion, and the determination of accuracy of college five-year projections would be worthwhile.
- The Florida College System should calculate space needs for PECO project prioritization using the most recent actual (FTE-3) data. For greater accuracy, unmet space needs should be calculated with actual data as a point in time analysis.
- Using enrollment management practices, colleges should look more critically at locations with low FTE and should make adjustments in programs and services to reduce needs for new space. Given the inaccuracy of out-year enrollment projections, the Florida College System should potentially reduce the need for new space driven by enrollment growth by developing a coordinated approach among college-level enrollment management administrators to optimize the use of existing capacity. However, other capital needs driven by poor facility conditions, deferred maintenance, and programmatic suitability would still need to be addressed by all colleges.

ENROLLMENT AND SPACE NEEDS LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

Changes in student population and projected space needs are assessed at the college-level by location. Assessing program-level space needs is possible, but comes at a cost and may not produce intended results. SmithGroup identified opportunities for improvement and recommends the following process changes to strengthen space planning and current capital outlay process:

Consider program-level space needs analysis on a case-by-case basis. The Division of Florida Colleges should discuss with college representatives the assessment of program-level space needs as part of the Educational Plant Survey or master planning process. Perhaps a more informed approach could link program-level space needs with the reporting of instructional space utilization of classrooms and laboratories.

SPACE NEED FORMULAS AND UTILIZATION FACTORS

Florida College System institutions rigorously follow the SREF space guidelines because SREF space standards are required by State Statutes. SREF's NSF per COFTE guidelines provide a high-level snapshot of met and unmet space needs in critical space categories. The continued use of SREF for space needs formulas and utilization factors has several benefits:

- Simplicity. The space needs for all analyzed space categories (classrooms, non-vocational laboratories, vocational laboratories, offices, and library/study) are calculated in the same manner—projected enrollment (COFTE) multiplied by a factor. Only one data input is necessary.
- Consistency. The SREF standards have been used for many years with minor adjustments. Comparisons of current and past years is possible, and relatively little training is required for college staff.

Yet the strengths of the continued use of SREF for space needs formulas and utilization factors are also its weaknesses and the cause of its inaccuracies.

- SREF standards are too simplistic. The SREF space formulas are too simplistic to accurately assess space needs at the campus-level. All space factors are multiplied against COFTE, which is an appropriate approach for classrooms, non-vocational and vocational laboratories, and library/study spaces. Best practices indicate alternative ways to calculate office space needs, using data that is readily available to colleges. The one-size-fits-all straight-line NSF per COFTE formulas over-generate space for larger FTE colleges and under-generate space for smaller FTE colleges.
- SREF standards are one-size-fits-all, but colleges are diverse. Colleges have a wide variety of community needs and college program mixes. SREF space formulas do not account for the diversity or mix of programs, especially in vocational laboratories. The current methodology for projecting space needs uses a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to consider differences in individual institutions mission, strategic goals, and varying needs according to the mix of programs or community needs. For example, a college who strategically wants to improve student success may need to schedule smaller class sizes, create more active learning classrooms, hire additional full-time faculty, and/or enhance academic success tutoring spaces. These strategies would have impacts on the assessment of space needs, but they are difficult to account for in current SREF space factors or the Educational Plant Survey process. The disconnect between the specific needs of colleges and one-size-fits-all space needs formulas and utilization factors means that space factors cannot justify the distinct spaces that some colleges would use most effectively.
- SREF standards are one-size-fits-all, but space needs varies based on FTE size. Colleges become more efficient as FTE increases, a trend that is true for colleges both in and out of Florida, but SREF space needs generation standards are straight-line NSF per COFTE formulas regardless of COFTE level. SREF standards underestimate the need for space at small FTE colleges and overestimates it at large FTE colleges.
- SREF standards are unchanging, but new kinds of space are necessary. Since colleges and the Division of Florida Colleges must use SREF, there is no further effort to refine space needs to reflect strategic initiatives or academic areas that are growing or adding new programs or student service areas that are making changes to enhance student success. Because SREF space categories have been consistent for years, it does not adequately capture new kinds of space that are necessary for student academic success. For example, SREF does not adequately differentiate different types of open laboratories. Open laboratories are used primarily for individuals and groups and are informally scheduled, unscheduled, or open. For many statewide systems, there are multiple types of open laboratories. Because SREF has not adapted to address modern college space demands, colleges are not consistently tracking it and SREF does not accurately indicate the space need. See Chapter 5 for an exploration of the types of open laboratories that SREF could provide standards for.
- SREF classroom standards do not address modern classroom demands. A large majority of colleges do not have effective classrooms, as measured by NSF/student. A low amount of space per student is efficient but not necessarily effective. Research in the emerging field of learning science has shown that active learning produces better student outcomes than traditional lecture. SREF standards mix traditional and computer classrooms, which makes it difficult to calculate the amount of space per student station (seat) since computer classrooms could inflate NSF per station metrics. SmithGroup's visual observation and interviews with campus constituents suggest that most classrooms are traditional and highly

inflexible. For example, a sloped, 1970's era lecture hall with 120 seats might be very efficient at delivering science and psychology lectures, but three 40-seat sections held in a flexible classroom with space for working in groups may be more successful in producing effective learning outcomes.

SREF does not consider quality of space. The SREF formulas do not address space quality. While facility inventory data notes the condition of the space (satisfactory, unsatisfactory, remodel), many colleges do not keep these codes updated. The SREF space factors do not take into account the quality of space and therefore do not provide a complete picture of space needs. Leading national organizations such as National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and APPA have focused attention on the negative impact of deferred maintenance on the condition of facilities in higher education. They advocate for assessing both the facility condition and the suitability of buildings to accommodate the programmatic needs. Older facilities may not meet current standards for climate control or ADA access, and they may also be obsolete for 21st century teaching and learning. Mid-century buildings are often purpose-built and inflexible for accommodating more effective learning and program delivery. Suitability of the space to effectively deliver programs for 21st century education should be considered. The condition, suitability and configuration, and overall quality of existing space can be more important to colleges achieving strategic goals than quantity of space.

The Legislature could authorize the Florida Department of Education to make the capital planning process more accurate by updating and expanding the SREF standards.

More flexibility in space standards would result in more effective space. Changing the SREF space formulas and utilization factors would result in more effective use of space. Evaluations of effectiveness rely on the fit of the space assets to their use, that is, how they are being utilized. The Florida College System model to assess space needs is one dimensional in that it looks at only the quantity of space needs, with a one-size-fits-all approach. The data shows a wide range of conditions related to college size, number of programs, and mission. More tailored space formulas and utilization factors would result in building programs that more accurately reflect the need of colleges, and thus would be more effectively used.

Alternative space factors and methodologies are not only more accurate but also more complex and time-consuming than the current SREF space formulas and methodologies. The balance between accuracy and simplicity should be carefully considered.

- More flexibility in space standards would not result in higher utilized space. Changing the SREF space formulas and utilization factors would not result in more efficient use of space. Target utilization rates for classrooms and teaching laboratories published in the SREF are in line with national practices and standards of other surveyed state systems. As demonstrated in Chapter 6, colleges have difficulty meeting utilization targets for the assessed space types. The impact of distance learning, population density/location, and non-credit and community use are not currently factored into utilization factors but can have an impact on utilization rates.
- Accurate space needs formulas require accurate facilities data. Current room use code designations are often inconsistent. The existing process for validating and maintaining space inventories is managed by college personnel. Division of Florida Colleges staff no longer perform facility inventory audits and there is no peer review. Several colleges reported not having space management software to correctly maintain space data. More complex space needs models are dependent on accurate records, and further accuracy will require additional resources at the college-level.
- Accuracy requires greater complexity. Due to the range of diversity of institutional roles, program mix, student academic levels, and community needs, greater accuracy requires more sophisticated space models with a greater number of variables and inputs. This in turn requires greater effort and accuracy with data collection, with potentially diminishing returns. The administrative processes and the resources required, which are used to develop space models, should align with the capital investments being made. It can be argued that large investments merit greater accountability than small ones. More refined space models may be better situated with master planning efforts. At a system or policy level of capital project planning, it may be enough to have moderately complex space models combined with other prioritization metrics which evaluate utilization and space management practices. Tennessee prioritizes projects with a rubric that weights 24% of the scoring on space need and another 20% on utilization. Texas, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia all include utilization in reporting requirements.

SmithGroup identified opportunities for improvement and recommends the following process changes to strengthen space planning and current capital outlay processes:

- The Division of Florida Colleges should revise its space needs formulas and utilization factors to better model actual space needs. The Division of Florida Colleges should establish more effective space needs guidelines than those found in SREF. The Division of Florida Colleges should consider forming a systemwide study group to evaluate alternative space needs metrics that seek the right balance between complexity and accuracy, that better reflect the needs of each diverse college at the campus, center, and site levels, and that generate more flexibility in meeting utilization standards. See Chapter 5 for recommended topics that the study group should investigate.
- Create a more flexible space needs assessment process. A simpler alternative to developing a graduated and more complex space model would be to create a more flexible process similar to those being used in Texas and Georgia, which would allow Florida College System institutions to exercise professional judgment to consider exceptions or mitigating conditions if so justified by campus leadership.
- Establish room use codes for non-discipline-specific open laboratories. The inclusion of open laboratories (RUC 220/225) in the Non-vocational and Vocational Laboratories categories is problematic in terms of lack of consistency in room use coding and departmental designation, leading to inaccuracies in space needs reporting and underestimation of the actual need for non-discipline specific laboratories critical for student success and completion. SmithGroup recommends that the Division of Florida Colleges study group review and modify room use codes for open laboratories and assignment practices, and the Division of Florida Colleges staff guide colleges to properly code non-discipline-specific open laboratories. The recoding could occur during space audits that are recommended elsewhere.
- Validate room use codes more frequently. Given room use coding issues and the large number of classrooms and laboratories without utilization (Chapter 6), there is a need for external audits to validate that colleges are correctly coding space and assigning proper departmental units. Policy should suggest more frequent facility inventory validations than the five-year process that many colleges use as part of the Educational Plant Survey.
- Augment training for college participants. Employee turnover, lack of adequate human resources, and the need for ongoing training regarding the coding of space and the updating of the facility inventory, as well as knowledge issues with completion of the Educational Plant Survey, are jeopardizing the accuracy of the data and processes. The knowledge level of current employees at several colleges needs to be assessed and a robust training program implemented for new hires. SmithGroup recommends online digital training materials that can be viewed by new employees or act as refresher courses for existing employees. This could be outsourced to a media production firm but will require additional funding.
- Consider beyond space needs. When prioritizing capital requests, the Division of Florida Colleges should consider other factors beyond space needs. To evaluate efficiency and effectiveness, the evaluation of space needs and practices should be expanded to consider other factors such as utilization rates, efficiency measures, and space management practices. Therefore, the colleges should collect, monitor, and report data on the age, condition, and suitability of facilities. Such efforts would require additional resources for this expanded college function. Examples include Space Usage Efficiency measures, as reported by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Nevada System of Higher Education's funding model. The new funding model is based upon the premise that state funding must be equitable to all institutions, simpler and more transparent than the previous formula, aligned with the goals of the state, and based upon national best practices in higher education financing.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 6: SPACE UTILIZATION

The purpose of this chapter is to assess the extent to which each college efficiently and effectively utilizes classrooms and teaching laboratories (vocational and non-vocational).

Florida College System institutions are increasingly focused on space management practices and are working hard to use their scheduled teaching space more effectively. However, there is room for improvement while acknowledging that unique circumstances related to individual college missions and campus locations can influence which strategies will be most successful.

The Florida College System approach to utilization does not address an opportunity to vary the utilization expectations among different types of campuses, and to analyze weekly room hours separately from student station occupancy. For example, a small college may meet the expectation in student station occupancy for a specialized teaching laboratory, but not the weekly room hours due to an enrollment that does not justify multiple course sections.

The Florida College System approach to utilization considers only the primary mission of the colleges, which, per Florida Statute is "responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and career degree education" thus only forcredit courses offered by the college are included in DFC space utilization. Yet the colleges' secondary role of offering programs in community services, adult education, and economic development also requires use of the college's classrooms, teaching laboratories, offices, and meeting spaces. Colleges regularly offer courses provided by workforce programs, partnerships, or use of space by other college and universities.

SmithGroup recommends the following process changes to strengthen the current capital outlay process:

- Expand the space utilization model. Consideration should be given to expanding the space utilization model to account for courses provided by workforce programs, partnerships, or use of space by other college and universities. If course records are difficult to obtain, consideration should be given to removing dedicated rooms used by others from the Division of Florida Colleges' utilization analyses.
- Recognize in policy that space is an asset. Colleges should adopt space policies and procedures that value instructional space as an asset to be allocated according to strategic priorities.
- Encourage the optimization of existing space. The Division of Florida Colleges should help colleges focus on optimizing existing space by continuing to perform utilization analyses.
- Promulgate space management best practices. Best practices regarding space management should be explored and disseminated. The Division of Florida Colleges should facilitate semi-yearly statewide conferences or workshops with all 28 colleges focused on sharing best practices for space optimization and assisting colleges in developing policies and procedures related to instructional utilization. Topics should include strategies to accommodate the space need of new and rapidly growing programs and by facilitating the sharing of best practices and trends.
- Promote space management software. All colleges should employ a space management software application to schedule and monitor space use. The software chosen should be specific to the needs of the college, rather than consistent across the system. All colleges should manage space resources and analyze utilization with software that best supports the parameters particular to the college. The Division of Florida Colleges should establish minimum data points to be included. Colleges should assess what additional data they want to collect and maintain. Data collection and maintenance methods and the usefulness of the data should be shared and discussed at the best practices meetings.
- Promote central scheduling of classrooms. Classrooms should be centrally scheduled by the Registrar, with possible first right of refusal by departments for classroom space to optimize use of instructional space. Discipline-specific teaching laboratories should be scheduled independently; due to their single purpose, central scheduling does not typically increase utilization.

- Establish customized utilization expectations. The Division of Florida Colleges should acknowledge that the 28 colleges vary greatly in size and have different ways of operationalizing their missions, frequently related to their geographic location in the state, and should establish different utilization expectations that address those differences. The differentiated utilization expectations should be adjusted based on the size of the college, institutional mission, or location. Factors include whether the campus has a large or small student FTE and focuses on university transfer or work force development programs.
- **Require minimum utilization in project prioritization.** The Division of Florida Colleges should require minimum utilization rates in addition to space needs when prioritizing capital outlay projects.
- Conduct facility audits. The Division of Florida Colleges should audit the college facility inventories in step with the fiveyear Educational Plant Survey cycle to maintain consistency and accuracy. Additional resources would be required for this expanded function.

Chapter 2 | Executive Summary



Chapter 3 | College Processes

CHAPTER 3: STATE GOALS AND COLLEGE-LEVEL PROCESSES

The focus of this chapter is to evaluate whether the processes used by each college are consistent with the college's overall mission and support state-level goals. Capital outlay processes at each of the 28 Florida College System institutions should recommend projects that support their missions, as well as Florida Legislative and Florida College System goals. When institutional-level capital outlay processes support the college's mission and statewide goals, the state maximizes its return on the investment on projects that advance the state's ambitious higher education agenda.

SmithGroup's analyses suggest that state-level goals for the Florida College System are clearly identified and closely aligned with Florida's statutory mission and purpose for state colleges. Except for "Responsiveness" and "Affordability" goals, there is strong alignment between the state's goals and college's missions and goals. The colleges understand the role of the Florida College System, but only a few colleges turn to state-level goals to guide their capital outlay processes.

Any capital outlay process that gives inherent preferences to one type of project will distort capital outlay priorities. Colleges consistently prioritize projects that meet the state's goals, but they may not reflect the greatest need of the college and local community. SmithGroup found that colleges tend to advance projects they believe have the best chance of a high ranking and thus receiving funding. These facilities are needed by the college, but are not necessarily their number one need.

The analysis methodology was guided by the concept of organizational or goal congruency. Goal congruency can be defined as the integration of multiple goals, either within an institution or between multiple entities. Goal congruency is a result of the alignment of goals to achieve an overarching mission or strategic outcomes. Research by Markley (1995)¹ suggest that goal congruency among various college entities is correlated with greater levels of organizational effectiveness.

¹ F. A. Markley (1995). Goal Congruence as a predictor of organizational effectiveness: A comparative study of ten Colorado community colleges, University of Denver Press, Denver, CO.

SECTION 3.1: IDENTIFICATION OF STATE-LEVEL GOALS

State-level mission and goals were identified at three levels - Florida Statutes, State Board of Education, and Florida College System. Statements are provided at each level and then reviewed from a goal congruency framework. For clarity, **mission** is defined as a description of an entity institutions fundamental purpose. It answers the question, "Why does our entity exist?" The mission articulates the entities' purpose both for those in the organization and for the public. A **goal** describes what an entity or institution expects or hopes to accomplish in the future. It is a desirable or future result that organizations envision, plan, and commit to achieving within a specific time period.

2019 FLORIDA STATUTES

The 2019 Florida Statutes, Title XLVIII, K-20 Education Code, Chapter 1004, Public Postsecondary Education, Section 1004.65 regarding Florida College System institutions; governance, mission, and responsibilities clearly delineate the purpose and mission of Florida College System institutions. Key words are noted in bold.

- "Florida College System institutions are locally based and governed entities with statutory and funding ties to state government. As such, the mission for Florida College System institutions reflects a commitment to be responsive to local educational needs and challenges..."
- 2. "As comprehensive institutions, Florida College System institutions shall provide high-quality, affordable education and training opportunities, shall foster a climate of excellence, and shall provide opportunities to all while combining high standards with an open-door admission policy for lower-division programs. Florida College System institutions shall, as open-access institutions, serve all who can benefit..."
- 3. ^{*}The **primary mission** and responsibility of Florida College System institutions is responding to **community needs** for postsecondary academic education and career degree education. This mission and responsibility include being responsible for:
 - "Providing lower level undergraduate instruction and awarding associate degrees..."
 - "Preparing students directly for careers requiring less than baccalaureate degrees..."
 - Providing student development services, including assessment, student tracking, support for disabled students, advisement, counseling, financial aid, career development, and remedial and tutorial services, to ensure student success."
 - "Promoting economic development for the state within each Florida College System institution district through the provision of special programs..."
 - "Providing dual enrollment instruction."
 - "Providing upper level instruction and awarding baccalaureate degrees as specifically authorized by law."

Florida College System institutions are authorized to offer such programs and courses as are necessary to fulfill their mission. This includes "a **separate and secondary** role for Florida College System institutions includes the offering of programs in:

- 1. Community services that are not directly related to academic or occupational advancement.
- 2. Adult education services, including adult basic education, adult general education, adult secondary education, and high school equivalency examination instruction.
- 3. Recreational and leisure services."

["]Funding for Florida College System institutions shall reflect their mission as follows:

- 1. Postsecondary academic and career education programs and adult general education programs shall have first priority in Florida College System institution funding.
- 2. Community service programs shall be presented to the Legislature with rationale for state funding. The Legislature may identify priority areas for use of these funds."

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mission and goal statements are delineated in the State Board of Education's 2020–2025 Strategic Plan². Since 2012, alignment of the goals of the agency were made consistent with those in Section 1008.31, of Florida Statutes.

MISSION

The mission of Florida's K-20 education system is to increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless efficient system, by allowing them the opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills through learning opportunities and research valued by students, parents and communities.

STRATEGIC GOALS FROM THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION'S 2020-2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

- Highest student achievement, as indicated by evidence of student learning gains at all levels.
- Seamless articulation and maximum access, as measured by evidence of progression, readiness, and access by targeted groups of students identified by the Commissioner of Education.
- Skilled workforce and economic development, as measured by evidence of employment and earnings.
- Quality efficient services, as measured by evidence of return on investment.

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM

The State of Florida offers a very diverse system of higher education. This diversity has been a theme for decades and reflects the composition of the state in terms of demography, geography, and economic development. Florida College System institutions have consistently ranked high in national metrics as several Florida public colleges have won the prestigious Aspen Prize over the last several years. Florida has 28 public colleges, comprising 72 campuses, and 102 centers and special purpose sites each representing one or more counties as part of their local districts. Strategic goals were developed as part of the 2018–2020 Strategic Plan.

MISSION

The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to **high-quality, affordable** academic and career educational programs that **maximize student learning** and success, develop a globally competitive workforce and **respond rapidly** to diverse state and **community needs**.³

STRATEGIC GOALS FROM THE FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM 2018–2020 STRATEGIC PLAN

- Access: Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education at one of our colleges by removing barriers and expanding access.
- Affordability: Maintain affordability—while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage
 of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.
- Achievement: Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.
- Articulation & Workforce: Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upperdivision program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying job.

² http://www.fldoe.org/policy/state-board-of-edu/strategic-plan.stml

³ http://www.fldoe.org/schools/higher-ed/fl-college-system/

STATE-LEVEL MISSION AND GOAL CONGRUENCY

By establishing colleges with missions to meet the student on their level of interest and ability, the State of Florida has provided its students multiple options. This diversity has created a robust academic enterprise. Higher education is a rapidly evolving industry; arguably one of the fastest changing of all industries in our country. The Florida College System recognizes this fact and has worked hard to establish goals and performance indicators for the 28 colleges, which serve more than 733,000 students.

Key mission and goal statements for each entity are summarized in the Mission and Goal Congruency Analysis: State-Level Mission and Goals table. In this congruency analysis, SmithGroup evaluated the frequency of explicit use of words and phrases; the analysis did not attempt to discern implicit meaning or assumptions as these could be subjective in their meaning. Except for "Articulation," Florida College System Goals are congruent with 2019 Florida Statues. Articulation is the process by which one institution matches its courses or requirements to course work completed at another institution. Articulation assures that courses students complete will not have to be repeated at the institution to which they are transferring. As the Florida College System is under the K-20 System, the importance of articulation is noted. Overall the State Board of Education mission and goal statement are less congruent with 2019 Florida Statues and Florida College System declarations.

Florida's colleges have a unique mission to provide open access and affordable education to all who desire to learn. The public college's open access mission includes more than geographic accessibility. The access goal is to ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education. Expanding access is not always synonymous with physical expansion, especially regarding distance delivery of programs and related academic support services via online resources. Florida's 28 public colleges have approximately 174 campuses, centers, and special purpose site locations with new sites being justified based on demographic shifts and providing more convenient access to programs and services.

MISSION AND GOAL CONGRUENCY ANALYSIS State-Level Mission and Goals													
Entity	Mission/Goal Statements												
2019 Florida Statutes	Responsiveness to Local Educational Needs	High Quality and High Standards	Affordable	Career Training/ Workforce Skills/ Economic Development	Student Success	Open-Door/ Open Access	x						
State Board of Education	Х	х	Х	Workforce & Economic Development	Highest Student Achievement	Access	Articulation						
Florida College System	Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Maximize Student Learning Achievement	Access	Articulation						

SECTION 3.1 CONCLUSIONS

SmithGroup found that state-level mission and goals, as defined by the 2019 Florida Statutes, the Florida Department of Education, and the Florida College System are clearly identified. There is less goal congruency between the State Board of Education goals and both 2019 Florida Statutes and Florida College System goals. One reason may be due to the more expansive mission of the Florida State Board of Education as it has oversight of both secondary and postsecondary systems.

ACCESS

The Florida Statutes, State Board of Education, and Florida College System are congruent on the goal of Access. The Florida College System strategic goal of access aims to "ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education at one of our colleges by removing barriers and expanding access." In many cases, the colleges are pursuing the "Access" strategic goal by physical expansion. They are acquiring land or requesting funding to construct new campuses, centers or special purpose sites.
Florida College System back-of-the-bill requests, pursuant to section 1013.40, Florida Statutes, provides Florida College System institutions authorization to acquire or construct facilities from non-PECO sources, which could require general revenue funds for operation and maintenance. The policy states that if property to be acquired that is not adjacent to an existing approved center or campus, then all necessary approvals from the State Board of Education must be received before "any funds" may be expended to acquire the property. There were five back-of-bill requests from colleges to acquire land to support future growth and development for 2019–2020.

Across the United States, there has been a proliferation of higher education branch campuses, centers and instructional sites as two-year colleges reach out to new markets under the strategic goal of access. As an example, a 2010 report prepared by the New Mexico Legislative Council Service supported a moratorium on any new higher-education facilities, calling the current 60 such sites an "untenable" number, especially given New Mexico's poor utilization and graduation rates.

During interviews, college representatives expressed concern that some existing instructional sites are experiencing lower enrollments and program decline due to poor location as a result of changing community demographics or the local shifts in the needs of business and industry. The land and buildings at these sites are owned by the college. As enrollment declines and programs cease, utilization drops. In reviewing Florida College System classroom/laboratory utilization and space data, SmithGroup found that centers and special purpose sites have a higher net square feet per full-time equivalent (FTE) ratio and lower utilization rates than campus locations.

In almost all instances within United States higher education, substantial long-term campus facilities are owned by the college or, in some cases, by a related entity, usually a non-profit foundation where the sole purpose is to enhance the operation of the college. In recent years, substantial interest in leasing has developed. Some states have addressed this directly as witnessed by the Virginia Public-Private Partnership legislation which makes partnership proposals exempt from normal procurement act requirements allowing them to move forward more rapidly.

SECTION 3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Better define the state-level goal for "Access." SmithGroup recommends that the Florida College System further investigate its definition of "Access" and develop decision criteria on new sites that include proximity to current campuses, utilization and space needs of existing locations, and delivery alternatives that could be considered in lieu of site acquisition.
- Promote lease-only and donation options. For new instructional sites, SmithGroup recommends that colleges establish a lease-only option. With rare exceptions, all new instructional sites should be established in donated or leased facilities.
- Closely scrutinize new site acquisition. As a general rule, SmithGroup recommends that acquisition of land, new construction or capital requests for permanent facilities should be considered only after the ability of a site or center to maintain a prescribed level of performance, as measured in student FTE and other performance-based factors. At a prescribed FTE minimum level, a feasibility study with 10-year enrollment projections should be completed to determine if a permanent facility is warranted and if it will be managed as an instructional site or center or developed into a future campus. This decision will influence the acreage needed, the number of buildings, and planned phasing as part of a master planning process.

SECTION 3.2: INSTITUTION-LEVEL MISSIONS AND STRATEGIC GOALS

The purpose of this section is to assess each colleges' overall mission and strategic goals, as related to capital projects, to determine whether they are consistent with the type of college and system/state-level goals. To accomplish this task, SmithGroup completed two analyses. The first compared each of the 28 colleges' strategic plans (mission statements and institutional goals) for alignment with Florida College System mission and goal statements. The second analyses analyzed the alignment between college goals and their first and second capital outlay priorities for 2020–21 Florida College System fiscal year.

INSTITUTIONAL ALIGNMENT WITH FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM MISSION AND GOALS

A viable strategic plan is one of many criteria required for ongoing accreditation. All 28 colleges had current mission statements, strategic plans, and processes in place to develop and refresh these overarching documents. The process typically engages a planning committee structure, including faculty, staff, students, community, and the leadership of each college. Strategic plans are also approved by the local Board of Trustees. Aspirational statements such as college vision and core values were also prominent for most colleges.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS COC) require these documents. All of Florida's 28 colleges are accredited by SACS COC and therefore provide evidence of these documents as part of accreditation and re-accreditation. SACS has divided the criteria for accreditation into 14 sections. All sections have application to this question, but Section 2, Mission; Section 4, Governing Board; Section 7, Institutional Planning and Effectiveness; Section 12, Academic Student Support Services; and, Section 13, Financial and Physical Resources have direct application.

Sustainable strategic plans are not developed in a vacuum. A review of institutional planning documentation notes that the majority of colleges are acknowledging the core components of two-year colleges, as noted in Florida Statute and the Florida College System mission and goals. See Mission and Goal Congruency Analysis: Florida College System Missions and Goals and College Goals Detail on pages 46–59 of this chapter.

The following summary table denotes the findings regarding institutional alignment with Florida College System mission and goals. In summary, 24 of the 28 colleges (86%) included the concept of "Achievement" in their mission and strategic goals. Goals related to "High Quality," "Access," and "Articulation/Workforce" also ranked high in congruency.

Only six (21%) of the colleges noted affordability in their planning statements. This could be because colleges have little control over setting their own tuition and fees. While most of the colleges noted the need to assist in driving the economic vitality of their district and/or the state, only 10 colleges (36%) specifically mentioned the need to develop students for the global job market or economy. The lowest area of alignment is related to responding rapidly. As stated, "The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs."

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM Missions and Goals and College Goals Congruency Analysis Summary							
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce	
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper-division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.	
5	19	6	10	24	20	22	
18%	68%	21%	36%	86%	71%	79%	

Number and Percentage of the 28 Institutions Mission Statements and Strategic Goals Aligning with Florida College System Mission and Goals

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND CAPITAL OUTLAY ALIGNMENT

SmithGroup compared the 28 college's strategic goals and mission statements for alignment of the state's goals as it relates to capital outlay requests for 2010–2021. The alignment of institutional mission and strategic goals and capital project priorities is presented Mission and Goal Congruency Analysis: Florida College System Missions and Goals and 2020-21 Capital Outlay Request Detail on pages 60–63 of this chapter.

Analyzing fixed capital outlay requests for 2020-21, most projects are in alignment with the state's statutory mission and current Florida College System goals. A total of 18 of the 57 projects (32%) are requesting funds for infrastructure, site, or building system upgrades, which are supportive of goals related to instruction or student success but are not directly aligned. Of the 57 projects submitted, 26 or 46% focused on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) related programs and initiatives, with most directly aligned with career training, economic development and articulation. As the capital outlay process is lengthy, often taking five or more years to fund requested projects, colleges did not include statements or need justification related to responsiveness. Similarly, none of the colleges noted affordability in their capital project requests, perhaps because colleges have little control over setting tuition and fees.

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM Missions and Goals and 2020–21 Capital Outlay Request Congruency Analysis Summary							
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce	
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper-division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.	
0	11	0	28	54	12	21	
0%	19%	0%	49%	95%	21%	37%	

Number and Percentage of the 57 2020–21 Capital Outlay Requests Aligning with Florida College System Mission and Goals

SECTION 3.2 CONCLUSIONS

The Florida College System's 28 state colleges have a clear understanding of Florida's statutory mission and state-level strategic goals, but the incorporation of these goals into the capital prioritization process could be improved. When each college was asked about factors or criteria that they used in the development of projects for their Capital Improvement Plan, SmithGroup survey results note that:

- 14 (50%) of the colleges noted referencing the Florida College System mission and goals to develop their Educational Plant Survey.
- 16 (57%) noted referencing the Florida College System mission and goals in their Capital Improvement Plan.
- 14 (50%) noted referencing the Florida College System mission and goals in their prioritization of capital projects.
- 8 (29%) stated that the Florida College System mission and goals were not used their capital planning process.

In ranking the three most important factors or criteria in making decisions about capital project needs, Florida College System mission and goals ranked 12th in a list of 13 criteria, further clarifying misalignment between some capital project requests and statewide goals.

The colleges were much more likely to use their own college mission and strategic goals in the capital outlay process (24 of 28 colleges, 86%), with only one college (4%) reporting that these statements were not utilized. In ranking the three most important factors or criteria in making decisions about capital project needs, institutional mission and goals ranked 2nd in a list of 13 criteria. (Colleges may argue that the institutional mission and goals already sufficiently incorporate Florida College System mission and goals, but SmithGroup congruency analysis noted high congruency for four of the Florida College System missions and low congruency for three of the Florida College System missions.)

SmithGroup survey results and campus interview notes suggest that all colleges use multiple factors in their capital outlay requests, either formally or informally. While there is strong alignment among individual college's mission and strategic goals related to their own capital projects, there are multiple disconnects in how state-level goals are measured and prioritized.

- The Florida College System Strategic Plan is closely aligned with statutory mission. SmithGroup believes that the current Florida College System Strategic Plan closely mirrors the purpose and statutory mission of Florida College System institutions. As such, the language allows adequate interpretation so all capital plans put forward could fit into one or more strategic plan categories.
- The state and colleges concur on the need to prioritize and fund STEM-supporting capital projects. The state's goals and Governor's economic initiatives emphasized STEM instruction. During interviews, colleges expressed frustration with the lack of funding for STEM-related capital projects and the time it takes for projects to move through the process. Colleges noted that capital funds are inadequate to achieve state goals and felt they were falling behind with STEM-related programming. Of the top ten Division of Florida Colleges-ranked projects for 2020–21, six are STEM-related.
- Campus master plans play an important role in alignment with state goals. Except for six of the 28 colleges, each college confirmed that their master plan was a guiding tool in the capital outlay process. Within the master planning process, colleges evaluate the condition of facilities, strategize the feasibility of new sites, update district plans, and reevaluate final placement of requested new buildings. Colleges note the importance of institutional mission and strategic goals, but since colleges fund their own campus master plans, state-level goals are often overlooked. Despite the importance of the campus master plan, this document has no official role in the overall process.

SECTION 3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Encourage better alignment between state-level goals and college-level capital projects. When colleges prioritize their capital projects, they should not only advance their college missions and strategic goals, but also state-level goals. SmithGroup recommends that the Division of Florida Colleges create a mechanism or evaluation process for ensuring that state-level goals are considered and prioritized in the college-level capital planning process.
- Better involve the Division of Florida Colleges staff in campus master planning. Campus master plans play a key role in bridging a college's strategic plan with implementation and capital project planning. Division of Florida Colleges staff involvement in creating a master plan framework would create uniformity of plans among colleges and tightly connect Florida College System-level and state-level goals with each college's plan. Higher Education Coordinating Boards in other states play a formal role. For example, the equivalent Tennessee board has formal approval responsibility. This additional oversight would require legislative action with additional resources for process review and monitoring.

SECTION 3.3: IDENTIFICATION OF PROCESSES USED TO DETERMINE CAPITAL OUTLAY SPACE NEEDS

This section identifies processes used by individual colleges to determine capital outlay facility **space needs** and includes the identification of all formal and informal steps in the process from the local needs assessment to submitting the request to each college's governing board and submitting recommendations to the Division of Florida Colleges.

The identification process started with a thorough review of state and system policies and procedures. After this review, a 26-question online survey was sent to each campus contact. The survey asked questions about each college's capital prioritization process, opinions regarding space needs formulas, and utilization strategies. Representatives from each of the 28 colleges completed the survey for a 100% response rate. Ninety-minute interviews were conducted with representatives from each of the 28 colleges. During these interviews, survey responses were clarified and more detailed questions about processes were answered. Responses from both the survey and interviews were synthesized for use in this section.

CAPITAL OUTLAY SPACE NEEDS PROCESS

As processes have been standardized by state policies and the Division of Florida Colleges staff, all 28 colleges use the same software system and planning guidelines to determine capital outlay space needs. The prescribed process includes the preparation and submittal of a five-year Educational Plant Survey, which contains a summary of existing and recommended square footage. Outcomes of the Educational Plant Survey are used to guide the development of an annual Capital Improvement Plan. A graphical representation of the typical Educational Plant Survey process is noted in *College-Level Capital Outlay Space Needs Process* on pages 32–33.

EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

The Educational Plant Survey and the localized needs assessment is grounded in Florida Statues, Title XLVIII (K-20 Education Code), Chapter 1013 (Educational Facilities) 1013.31 Educational Plant Survey; Localized Need Assessment; Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service (PECO) Project Funding. Specific provisions of the Statute include:

- At least every five years, each board shall arrange for an Educational Plant Survey to aid in formulating plans for housing the educational program and student population, faculty, administrators, staff, and auxiliary and ancillary services of the district or campus, including consideration of the local comprehensive plan.
- Information used by the Department of Education to establish facility needs must include, but need not be limited to, labor market data, needs analysis, and information submitted by the school district or Florida College System institution.
- Each survey shall be conducted by the board or an agency employed by the board. Surveys shall be reviewed and approved by the board.
- The survey report shall include at least an inventory of existing educational and ancillary plants, including safe access facilities; recommendations for existing educational and ancillary plants; recommendations for new educational or ancillary plants, including the general location of each in coordination with the land use plan and safe access facilities; and, campus master plan update and detail for Florida College System institutions.
- Educational Plant Surveys must use uniform data sources and criteria. Each revised Educational Plant Survey and each new Educational Plant Survey supersedes previous surveys.
- Each survey of a special facility, joint-use facility, or cooperative career education facility must be based on capital outlay full-time equivalent (COFTE) student enrollment data prepared by the department for school districts and Florida College System institutions and by the Chancellor of the State University System for universities.
- Each Florida College System institution's survey must reflect the capacity of existing facilities as specified in the inventory maintained by the Department of Education. Projections of facility space needs must comply with standards for determining space needs as specified by rule of the State Board of Education.
- The five-year projection of capital outlay student enrollment must be consistent with the annual report of COFTE student enrollment prepared by the Department of Education.
- Review and validation. The Department of Education shall review and validate the surveys of school districts and Florida College System institutions and any amendments thereto for compliance with these requirements and shall recommend those in compliance for approval by the State Board of Education or the Board of Governors, as appropriate.

COLLEGE-LEVEL CAPITAL OUTLAY SPACE NEEDS PROCESS

CURRENT TYPICAL STEP-BY-STEP PROCESS





EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY PROCESS INITIATION

The college's guiding documents, mission, strategic plan, academic plans, and the master plan are all touchstone components that are part of the capital outlay process. Completion of the Educational Plant Survey is a key component of the capital outlay process. During interviews, college administrators stated that their institutions spend several months preparing to update the five-year Educational Plant Survey. In most colleges the process is directed by an administrative leader at the vice-presidential level. Facility directors and college planners are trained by Florida College System staff on terminology, software, and input variables and usually manage day-to-day processes and data input into the software model at the campus level.

While Florida Statutes and the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) mandate general processes and have developed software systems that facilitate completion at the college-level, each college has adapted the process to reflect their size, facility challenges, and leadership styles of executive administration. In general, rural colleges with lower FTE levels have less defined or more informal processes than very large colleges serving high density urban populations. This formality is also due in part to the number of campuses or sites and the overall size of plant.

Colleges are using multiple factors or criteria in preparing and completing their Educational Plant Surveys. Some colleges noted the development of committees to provide input or interpret outcomes. During interviews, a large majority of colleges stated that instructional units and continuing education/workforce personnel were heavily involved in the decision-making process. See *College Factors in the Development of the Educational Plant Survey* for responses from the online survey regarding the criteria or factors that colleges considered in the development of the Educational Plant Survey.



COLLEGE FACTORS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

SPACE NEEDS WITH THE EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

The development of space needs within the Educational Plant Survey requires three data elements:

- 1. Existing room-by-room facilities inventory
- 2. COFTE projections
- 3. Utilization and space needs generation factors and formulas

FACILITY INVENTORY

Colleges maintain and submit facility inventory data to the Florida College System each semester, or three times per year as system staff use facility data to generate classroom and laboratory utilization reports. During interviews, campus representatives noted that preparation for the Educational Plant Survey process typically involves a thorough validation of the college's facility inventory. While some colleges have a process for continually updating their facility inventory, the five-year Educational Plant Survey planning cycle provides an opportunity for visually certifying existing space. This process is usually managed by facilities personnel.

CAPITAL OUTLAY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (COFTE) PROJECTIONS

The Division of Florida Colleges uses annualized FTE enrollment data. The Division of Florida Colleges annually generates a one-year FTE Enrollment Plan (FEP) and five-year COFTE projections. Colleges have the opportunity to review these projections and either accept or make adjustments as needed to address local circumstances. Most changes suggested by the college are accepted by Division of Florida Colleges. Adjusted COFTE projections are used by the Office of Educational Facilities to calculate space needs within the Educational Plant Survey.

Colleges have the option of accepting the Division Projection Model (with or without adjustments) or using the college's own projections. When college representatives were asked if COFTE projections provided an accurate estimate of future enrollment, 11 or 39% of the 28 colleges stated that they "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" with this statement while 12 or 43% "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statement.

When asked how college's COFTE is calculated, seven of the colleges or 26% noted that they were based on Florida Department of Education standards, but also included adjustments. During interviews, these colleges elaborated on the methods used to calculate their own FTE projections to confirm Florida Department of Education data. The development of college projections is typically in response to changes to local realities in a district's population, academic and career programs (based on occupational demand), as well as past enrollment trends at the campus or site level. One college responded that they used their own methods to calculate COFTE based on local business input and economic conditions, taking into consideration new or expanding programs.



UTILIZATION AND SPACE NEEDS GENERATION FACTORS AND FORMULAS

SREF prescribe space needs generation factors and formulas. SREF establishes the requirements for public educational facilities under the Florida K-20 Education Code and Chapter 1013, Florida Statutes. SREF is applicable to all public educational facilities and plants.

When Florida College System institutions were surveyed regarding how their college's facilities space needs were calculated, all 28 college representatives stated space needs were generated from approved formulas and standards outlined in the 2014 SREF.

Using space need generation factors, formulas, and standards, the Educational Plant Survey calculates three types of need:

- 1. **Summary of Student Stations:** Using utilization standards for general classrooms, non-vocational laboratories, vocational laboratories and projected COFTE, the recommended number of student stations is generated based on five-year COFTE projection. This is compared to existing student stations, including stations that are being remodeled, under renovation or under construction.
- Summary of Existing and Recommended Square Footage: Using space needs generation formulas and COFTE projections, recommended square footage space amounts are generated for 10 assignable and five non-assignable space types. These include:
 - Instructional Spaces
 - Classrooms
 - Non-vocational spaces
 - Vocational spaces

- Non-Instructional Spaces
 - Physical education
 - Library
 - Audiovisual
 - Auditorium/Exhibition
 - Student Services
 - Office
 - Support Services

- Non-Assignable Spaces
 - Custodial Spaces
 - Student Restrooms
 - Staff Restrooms
 - HVAC/Mechanical/Sanitation
 - Circulation

Five-year space allocation quantities are generated and compared to existing space, including spaces under construction or being remodeled. Space deficits and surpluses are documented for each of the 15 categories and totaled by campus site.

3. **Program Facilities List:** Using International Classification Standard (ICS) codes, space and occupant criteria and student stations, space needs are generated for classrooms and each academic and career and technical education program offered at the college by instructional site.

Upon completion, multiple components of the Educational Plant Survey drive the prioritization of capital outlay projects, including five-year building programs by college site. Per statute, the Educational Plant Survey is reviewed and approved by the executive administration and the local Board of Trustees before being submitted to the Florida Department of Education for review and approval. There is some minor variability among the colleges on how the Board of Trustees receives and approves the Educational Plant Survey, but all approaches are generally similar. A steering or planning committee (if formed) is the first body to review and approve the Educational Plant Survey. Second, the president and his/her leadership team or cabinet approves it, and then recommends it to college's Board of Trustees for approval.

SECTION 3.3 CONCLUSIONS

SmithGroup found that most decision-making processes in the Educational Plant Survey are fundamentally similar among the colleges because the Division of Florida Colleges has established procedures and an online software platform to complete the Educational Plant Survey that all colleges follow. Approval processes, as well as data gathering, are standardized as facility inventory and enrollment data are submitted regularly to Division of Florida Colleges staff.

SmithGroup noted the following critiques of this established process.

EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY PROCESS

- Out-of-date systems. Colleges stated during interviews that the current Educational Plant Survey model is a manual, outdated and labor-intensive process. Turnover in personnel and the lack of documentation make it difficult for new hires to understand and complete the documentation. Some colleges hire outside consultants as internal knowledge is limited and Division of Florida Colleges staff are limited in their ability to provide timely information on software use. Colleges stated a need for instructions for initiating a survey, a timeline for completion, and suggested college representatives to include in the process.
- College uniqueness and one-size-fits-all metrics. With a few exceptions, all colleges, from the smallest to the largest colleges, feel the uniqueness of their mission and purpose are not weighted adequately in the process. This is particularly relevant for the smaller rural colleges and those colleges that have responsibility for adult education and vocational education in their districts. Colleges have no ability in the Educational Plant Survey to address unique needs as they respond to statewide economic goals as well as their local communities. Smaller colleges requested the ability to subdivide colleges by size and develop space formulas within tiers.
- Non-credit instruction and partnerships. The process does not consider activities related to non-credit instruction, including some workforce development, adult education and community-based initiatives, all critical to each college's mission. Space dedicated to partners, K-12, and other colleges and universities are not fully acknowledged in the Educational Plant Survey. During interviews, one college estimated that approximately 100,000 square feet of space is being occupied by partner entities.
- Frequency of analysis: During interviews, multiple colleges expressed concern that a five-year Educational Plant Survey cycle is too long as the higher education landscape changes at a faster rate. While colleges have the opportunity to conduct spot surveys, many suggested that the Educational Plant Survey have more dynamic abilities so recommendations and space needs can be conducted in real time or on demand.
- Colleges consider the capital planning process inflexible. The process is not as nimble and responsive to changing college needs as many colleges would like. SmithGroup heard mixed reactions about the ability to change the capital project list as the result of new opportunities or changes in priorities. The Educational Plant Survey (updated every five years) and the Capital Improvement Plan (updated every year) start to lock in projects. College leaders perceive the state-level process as inflexible within the five-year cycles. The leaders of several colleges expressed that since projects typically take many years to receive funding and the funding is not consistent, colleges cannot shift course. College leaders are aware of the Supplemental Education Plant Survey, but expressed the general feeling that once the process is started, variation is not an advisable course of action.

CAPITAL OUTLAY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (COFTE) PROJECTIONS

- Impact of distance learning. Colleges are concerned about adjusting COFTE to account for growing online enrollments. Some colleges noted the absence of scheduling software that can track meeting day and times for blended or hybrid courses, making it difficult to schedule rooms for hybrid courses or online courses with an on-campus component.
- Headcount versus COFTE. Approximately 42% of the colleges suggested that the Educational Plant Survey should consider student headcount as well as FTE. College representatives believe that there are formidable differences in FTE per headcount ratios among the colleges. These differences could impact space needs in library, study, and many student services functions.

UTILIZATION AND SPACE NEEDS GENERATION FACTORS AND FORMULAS

- COFTE driven. Space needs are determined solely by the number of COFTE students. College leadership believe that space needs should also be driven by student degree program changes based on local occupational demand, the quality of existing space, the needs of faculty who are teaching new pedagogies, and current research of how space can impact student success and retention. In the end, both the quality and quantity of space are fundamental in creating meaningful degree programs. Space assignment rubrics have little to offer if the quality/adequacy of space is wanting. See Chapter 5 for analysis and recommendations on this topic.
- Educational Plant Survey software connectivity. Colleges noted in interviews that the Educational Plant Survey software is not connected to other systems, including system-based utilization outcomes, building life expectancy, or college-supplied facility condition data. Colleges want the ability to import facilities condition index and useful building life data into the Educational Plant Survey process. Space needs in older legacy buildings are difficult to justify and it is more costly to bring these facilities up to current codes and technology demands.
- Outdated coding taxonomy. Colleges noted having difficulty aligning current and new programs with established codes in the International Classification Standard. Colleges reported that many of the codes are outdated and do not reflect new career and technical programs.
- Outdated space formulas. Based on online survey results, 18 (64%) of the colleges stated that the space formulas in the SREF (2014) should be updated. Classroom standards do reflect the need for active learning pedagogies; however, the need for open laboratory spaces is changing as students bring their own devices. Today's libraries contain less stack space and more study/collaboration spaces in addition to study spaces being distributed across the campus. Office space guidelines are changing from individual offices to open and hoteling configurations. To improve retention, colleges are adding collaborative learning, study space, and maker spaces to academic buildings. Today's flexible learning spaces require standards not addressed by current SREF standards. Alternative standards will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
- Additional space categories. When asked if additional space categories should be added or deleted from the SREF space needs model, 13 of the 28 (46%) of the college replied yes. Category suggestions included academic support, open laboratories for academic programs (i.e., maker spaces), and collaboration areas outside of formal libraries and learning commons.
- Inconsistent coding. During interviews, campus constituents responded differently to how they are applying room use codes to collaborative learning and study spaces outside of the library. Some colleges reported classifying these spaces as corridor areas (non-assignable), while others are including these spaces in the study category. There is also confusion in applying room use codes to testing, tutoring, math and writing centers, and other study-related special class laboratories.
- Transparency and flexibility. The current space metrics and reporting criteria have the unintended effect of generating space recommendations that are often counterproductive. For example, a campus may show a surplus of office space due to older legacy buildings with offices that exceed current office space standards, and that surplus will preclude new projects from including office space that is needed for programmatic purposes; this then causes inefficiency by disconnecting office space from the programs or services they are intended to serve.
- Multiple campus locations. All colleges in the system have one or more sites or locations. Over time, population shifts, commute patterns and occupational trends can have an impact on enrollment and the utilization of classrooms and laboratories. Colleges expressed concern with achieving the current utilization goal at centers and special purpose sites as its difficult to fill spaces with students from other campuses or sites.

SECTION 3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Reassess the Educational Plant Survey process. Overall, college representatives desire the process be streamlined. The colleges comply with the Educational Plant Survey process, but feel that the process and interface software used to input the data needs a major overhaul or minimally needs to be streamlined to make a more efficient and effective process. Some noted that a modified version of the Educational Plant Survey should be done every three years as external realities change more often based on student needs.
- Emphasize academic leadership oversight and direction in the Educational Plant Survey process, as it is the core of the capital planning process. The Educational Plant Survey must convey academic program needs and translate these needs to physical requirements.
- Integrate flexibility and adaptability into the Educational Plant Survey process. The Educational Plant Survey process should allow for some flexibility in programming of spaces and facilities to meet the unique needs of the college and community it supports.
- More fully address facility age in the Educational Plant Survey process. The Educational Plant Survey should more fully address the condition and age of buildings. The condition may be "acceptable" (the ceiling is not falling in); however, the Educational Plant Survey is not fully capturing the quality of the environments. Spaces in older legacy buildings may be have greater inefficiencies and it may be more costly to bring these spaces up to current standards.
- Improve the consistency of facility inventory space classification. While the Florida Department of Education facilities/ Capital Outlay Database has Room Use Codes, Definitions, Descriptions, and Limitations, college personnel are not consistent in their application of these codes. SmithGroup recommends providing more information, work sessions or inventory review audits, especially for related instruction classrooms (212), special class laboratories (220, 240), and study spaces (410, 430). This additional oversight would not require legislative action, but would require additional resources for content development, training, inventory review, and ongoing monitoring.

SECTION 3.4: INSTITUTIONS' PRIORITIZATION OF CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS

This section identifies processes used by individual colleges to determine **capital outlay facility requests and priorities**, including the identification of all formal and informal steps in the process from the local needs assessment, to submitting the request to each college's governing board and submitting recommendations to the Division of Florida Colleges.

While the Educational Plant Survey is a very structured and data-driven process, the annual submission of each college's fiveyear Capital Improvement Plan includes multiple decision criteria and broad campus participation. The Capital Improvement Plan describes each college's five-year plan for implementation of its building needs funded through the state (PECO, Lottery, General Revenue), Capital Improvement Fees, and local funds. While the Florida Department of Education Office of Financial Policy provides annual reporting procedures, each college determines the type of projects and the prioritization of those projects.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMPONENTS AND PROCESS

Each year, the Florida Department of Education Office of Financial Policy develops Legislative Budget Request (LBR) Reporting Procedures for system colleges. This document notes procedures, schedule of events, and Capital Improvement Plan reporting requirements. The document also contains all forms and instructions attachments for colleges to complete the process.

Submission of the annual capital outlay budget is required in s. 1013.61, F.S., Annual capital outlay budget:

Each board shall, each year, adopt a capital outlay budget for the ensuing year in order that the capital outlay needs of the board for the entire year may be well understood by the public. This capital outlay budget shall be a part of the annual budget and shall be based upon and in harmony with the board's capital outlay plan. This budget shall designate the proposed capital outlay expenditures by project for the year from all fund sources. The board may not expend any funds on any project not included in the budget as amended...

The Legislative Budget Request submitted to the Division of Florida Colleges consists of four parts:

- 1. The Capital Improvement Plan describes each college's five-year plan for implementation of its building needs funded through the state (PECO, Lottery, General Revenue), Capital Improvement Fees, and local funds.
- 2. The request for state funds for operating costs for new facilities.
- 3. Requests authorizing non-state funded projects to request state operating funds.
- 4. Specific college requests for re-appropriation of state funds that need Legislative approval on an individual basis.

All parts of the Legislative Budget Request are to be submitted in a single document. The process begins in mid-April with submission of the Capital Improvement Plan and Legislative Budget Request around July 1st of each year. A Capital Improvement Plan and facilities planning workshop is used to inform college constituents about the process and changes that occur from year-to-year. Each colleges' Board of Trustees is required to approve all parts of the college's Legislative Budget Request. This report will focus solely on the capital improvement planning process.

The Capital Improvement Program covers the five-year period. For this study, the Capital Improvement Plan from 2020–21 through 2024–25 was reviewed for each college. General instructions note that "the plan should include only projects which are based on the recommendations of a current, validated Educational Plant Survey. The number of projects included should be limited to those which reasonably could be developed and placed under contract within the five-year period."

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is comprised of four forms:

- CIP-1: Lists all budgeted projects from all funding sources.
- CIP-2: Summarizes the projects and data presented in the CIP-3 and CIP-4 forms for the individual maintenance/repair, renovation, remodeling, and construction projects of the college's Capital Improvement Program.
- CIP-3: Contains three sections; A) narrative, B) calculation worksheet, and C) scoring worksheet. The CIP-3 is used to justify and describe projects for new facilities, major additions, remodeling and renovations to existing facilities, and property acquisitions which the college plans to initiate during the five years of the CIP.
- CIP-4: Identifies critical maintenance and repair projects, as well as major renovation and site improvement projects.

The Division of Florida Colleges prepares the Florida College System's required project list to submit to the Governor's Office of Planning and Budgeting and the Legislature using information from the forms submitted by each college.

INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES FOR IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS

Colleges begin their annual process with a review of Educational Plant Survey outcomes for each campus, center, and special purpose site, as only projects based on the recommendations of their Educational Plant Survey, as required in Section 1013.64(4) (a), F. S., may be included in the priority list. During interviews, campus representatives describe the process being driven by two key factors.

- 1. The need for specialized space for new and expanding academic and career and technical education programs is given high priority in the process.
- 2. This need is balanced with the need for maintaining, upgrading, or replacing aging campus facilities and infrastructure.

The first factor is related to the needs of academic units in terms of new renovations, remodeling, or construction of facilities for existing and new academic and career and technical education programs. Vice presidents of instruction, as well as deans, are instrumental in working with their units to identify these capital needs. In response to how new career and technical programs or changes to existing programs are accommodated in the capital prioritization process, one college described its process, which is typical of many responses:

Space needs for new career and technical programs have been determined by the demand of the local economy through college leadership, workforce data, academic program advisory groups and the business community. The college identifies existing spaces required to accommodate those programs, and if no spaces are available, the college will prioritize new space in its capital prioritization requests.

Another college described a similar process:

The college strategizes with local and national industry, education and economic development leaders on an ongoing basis for programmatic needs and pedagogical changes. Every five years the college updates the Educational Plant Survey to reflect these changes and visions for the future. During the interim years of the Educational Plant Survey period, the college continually reviews space needs and updates the annual Capital Improvement Plan to reflect current needs. When necessary, a "Spot Survey" is conducted to update the immediate future needs of the college.

The second factor is related to the condition of existing buildings and infrastructure. Several colleges conduct facility condition assessments that assist in identifying or confirming individual maintenance/repair, renovation, remodeling, and construction projects. Several colleges noted that site and infrastructure evaluations are conducted as part of their master planning processes, with this information feeding into the Capital Improvement Plan process.

SmithGroup found that colleges are using multiple factors or criteria in preparing and completing their Capital Improvement Plans. Most colleges noted the development of a planning committee or having campus presidents or other leadership team members manage the process. Several colleges indicated that project needs are determined by executive management with input from deans of career and technical programs and their Board of Trustees. Responses from the online survey noted the following criteria or factors in the capital improvement plan process:



COLLEGE FACTORS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

When colleges were asked to reflect on the three most important factors or criteria in making decisions about capital project needs, condition of facilities, deferred maintenance needs, and President's or Board of Trustees' strategic priorities were noted as highest. During interviews, colleges acknowledged that funding has been reduced or eliminated over the past few years, causing a backlog in renovations and deferred maintenance. Colleges are now spending additional time identifying projects from a life safety and accessibility framework.

MASTER PLANNING AND ALIGNMENT

The master plan is another instrument used to ensure alignment of state goals and capital requests. The importance of a master plan document cannot be overstated. Buildings are a physical manifestation of the strategic and academic plans. Building size, function, adjacency, and support to the existing campus buildings are determined through the master planning process. The master plan serves as a guide for college leadership, supports decisions that senior leadership make, and further assures compliance to mission. Capital outlay requests are 20-or-more-year decisions and can have profound impact to the campus and the college. Master plans assure smart building and good capital outlay decisions. In SmithGroup's survey, all colleges have prepared some form of a master plan and all but two colleges stated that they integrate the Educational Plant Survey into their master plan, which reflects the importance placed on this visionary document.

INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES FOR PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

There are always multiple projects competing for funding, which requires project prioritization. Criteria that contributes to the prioritization process includes the outcomes from the Educational Plant Survey, maintenance needs, enrollment projections, and programmatic changes with career and technical education programs. Competing requests must be weighed against these criteria before the project is selected and advanced. Additionally, each college president uses institutional knowledge gathered by staff, strategic plans, mission, and academic needs to prioritize the college's capital requests.

Given the recent slowdown of PECO funding and the inability to fully fund capital projects in successive years, one of the biggest decisions that college leaders make is whether to submit a capital request for state funding or attempt to complete the project with local funds. Decision making also includes project cost and the immediacy of need.

Ultimately, colleges consider how their potential project requests will be ranked and prioritized at the state-level. Any ranking process has inherent preferences, including the CIP-3C Scoring Worksheet and the Florida College System capital project prioritization process. As an example, the CIP-3C Scoring Worksheet promoted STEM projects and high skill/high wage projects with significant non-state funding support. Interviewees also shared with SmithGroup that the perceived inability of the state to fund large capital projects has changed the inherent preferences in the state-level project ranking to be more heavily weighted to renovations and remodeling projects.

At the Florida College System prioritization level, colleges shape their requests to maximize the number of earned points and thus the ranking of their projects. The projects that receive the highest ranking by the Florida College System may not necessarily be the colleges' highest prioritized need. College leaders noted that funding challenges have acted to create sub-optimal choices, which occur when colleges are guided by political aspirations. There are always many needed facilities on the capital outlay list and many more with good justification that never make the list. An open ended response from the online survey by a college administrator acknowledged that "the capital planning process is completely broken because the Legislature does not fund to a sufficient level. As long as PECO funding is as limited as it is, there is very little to be gained by submitting projects that will never be funded." During interviews, administrators expressed similar attitudes but stopped short of saying that the process is broken. In some cases, the perceived lack of funding is preventing colleges from developing needed career and technical programs or expanding programs that are in high demand.

SECTION 3.4: CONCLUSIONS

Colleges of the future must determine how to successfully walk a tightrope of paradoxes and contradictory expectations. Leaders of these colleges must simultaneously deal with growth and reduction, abundance and scarcity, continuity and change, access, and completion. Complicating this reality is an increasing divide—between colleges in urban and rural areas, between focusing on transfer students and training students for the workforce, between needing to expand and needing to keep an eye on the bottom line.

- Colleges form their Capital Improvement Plan project list to meet college-level goals. SmithGroup found that Florida College System institutions are taking the time to consider multiple options in forming their Capital Improvement Plan projects and their prioritization. The final Capital Improvement Plan project list results in alignment with their internal college-level goals.
- Colleges shape their capital requests to maximize chances of funding. Any capital outlay process that gives inherent preferences to one type of project will distort capital outlay priorities. SmithGroup found that colleges shape their capital requests to maximize their chances of a high ranking and thus funding, which sometimes is not connected with the college's greatest needs. The capital needs of the colleges are great, and while the first priority projects on each college list may not truly represent the highest overall need, those projects still reflect important data-justified capital requests.
- Preference for deferred maintenance projects may create inefficiency in meeting new demands. During interviews, college leaders stated that critical maintenance and remodel projects are one of the highest priorities, making it hard to be responsive to changing occupational demands and teaching trends. A new preference for deferred maintenance and a Division of Florida Colleges revised point system could create unforeseen consequences. Colleges will likely adapt their capital outlay requests to gain funding for deferred maintenance projects over higher priority building projects. Renovations, if not fully funded and planned for properly, could be far more costly than new construction. Renovations disrupt teaching and the rhythm of the impacted departments. New construction and renovations should be complementary, and consideration should be given to both equally. In some cases, building a new building and using the new space as swing space until the renovation is completed may be the less costly and more effective option.
- Delayed and insufficient capital funding creates inefficiency. The Capital Improvement Plan planning process follows a logical, methodical path from establishment of need through prioritization of projects. The process breaks down thereafter when funding for PECO-related projects does not materialize in a timely manner. It may take a decade or more to receive construction funding for Educational Plant Survey-recommended projects. This lengthy process consumes a great deal more of the state's resources than would a more streamlined process. It also creates planning challenges when it takes numerous years to implement supporting facilities.
- College leaders are frustrated with the capital planning process. SmithGroup found that the reason behind a great deal of frustration with the capital outlay process is a disconnect between the level of time and effort in developing Educational Plant Survey and Capital Improvement Plan documentation at the college-level and the lack of benefits or outcomes in terms of dollars awarded to the colleges. Colleges noted that the level of frustration with the process was lower in the past when capital requests were more fully funded. In short, the colleges do not see sufficient return on their investment in the capital outlay process. Division of Florida Colleges staff provide documentation and communicate funding outcomes to colleges in a timely manner.
- College leaders are frustrated by the inconsistency of funding. College leaders felt the current process of only partially funding capital projects or gap years between initial and additional funding makes delivery of projects uncertain and does not consider continued escalation of construction cost after initial funding has been issued. Many noted that the three-year funding cycle process (year 1 for design funding, year 2 for construction funding, year 3 for furniture, fixtures and equipment funding) worked well. This level of unpredictability in funding has resulted in frustration while colleges seek to achieve the state's higher education goals and the Florida College System mission. This was a common refrain along with the inability to set tuition and fee levels, lack or decline in PECO funds, inconsistent funding for physical plant resources, deferred maintenance and capital renewal, and the suspension of operating matching fund programs.

SECTION 3.4: RECOMMENDATIONS

- Comprehensively review the capital planning process. Most campus representatives during interviews expressed concern that the process is not effective. Some campus representatives noted that the Capital Improvement Plan process should be used only for new construction. College leaders indicated that remodeling and renovation funding should be allocated to each college based on size and age of campus/buildings. Most agreed that providing higher prioritization for infrastructure and maintenance needs is warranted as facilities are falling into disrepair throughout the system, yet there is underlying assumption that values new construction over funding to maintain quality facilities.
- **Consistently fund capital projects.** For the current capital outlay process to be effective, most college representatives felt that a consistent stream of funding for capital outlay projects and deferred maintenance must be established.
- Carefully indicate preferred project types. Any prioritization scoring process has inherent preferences. To more accurately determine the highest capital needs of the colleges, the Division of Florida Colleges should carefully allocate prioritization points to preferred types of projects in order not to distort each college's prioritization process.
- Coordinate data demands and portability among the Educational Plant Survey, Capital Improvement Plan, and other related capital planning processes. The amount and frequency of data requested by the Division of Florida Colleges staff can be costly for colleges to produce and maintain. Colleges expressed frustration with the amount of time needed for data entry to produce Educational Plant Survey and Capital Improvement Plan documentation. Common elements should be reviewed for the ability to migrate and manage data between the two processes.
- Create a sense of urgency for time-sensitive needs. The mission of colleges includes offering new and emerging programs to reflect the changing educational and economic needs of Florida communities. The capital planning process should identify and evaluate Capital Improvement Plan projects that address immediate or time-sensitive community educational needs. As PECO funding has slowed, time-urgent capital projects may not occur on a timely basis to meet high demand, and high wage occupational training needs. Colleges may also need to look to internal capital fundraising or viable alternative sources to fund critical and time sensitive projects.

MISSION AND GOAL CONGRUENCY ANALYSIS

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM MISSIONS AND GOALS AND COLLEGE GOALS DETAIL

College	Mission Statement	Strategic Goals/Directions
Broward College	Transforming students' lives and enriching our diverse community through academic excellence, innovation, and meaningful career opportunities.	 Start - Increase the total number of new students enrolled. Succeed - Increase the total number of awards earned. Soar - Increase the total number of post-completion placements. Synergize - Increase non-traditional revenue.
Chipola College	Chipola College provides access to quality learning opportunities toward baccalaureate degrees, associate degrees, and certificates and facilitates the economic, social, and cultural development of the College's service area.	 Expand and maintain student access. Enhance distance learning. Increase students' college readiness and success. Prepare students for careers. Provide a high quality dual enrollment program. Provide a safe and secure campus environment. Manage resources responsibly. Facilitate regional development. Remain a leading institution in the Florida College System.
College of Central Florida	We transform lives and enrich our community by providing a supportive, high-quality learning environment that prepares individuals to excel in work and life.	 Improve achievement of student learning outcomes. Increase student retention and completion. Reimagine the student experience. Improve engagement with employers and economic development partners to prepare the 21st century workforce. Create a college-going culture in our community to increase the number of students who choose CF for higher education. Engage community partners to strengthen diverse social and cultural relationships. Empower a high-performing team. Cultivate a climate of inclusion through an intentional commitment to equity and diversity. Maximize technology to support student learning and college operations.
The College of the Florida Keys	The College of the Florida Keys is an open-access, educational institution dedicated to serving the intellectual, diverse, cultural, and occupational needs of the Florida Keys as well as the global community. The college is committed to student-centric academic programs and services, workforce development, continuing education, diverse partnerships, electronically delivered instruction, and sustainable practices that prepare students for personal success and responsible citizenship.	1. Access: Expand & Maintain 2. Accountability: Community & Environmental 3. Agility: Institutional & Individual 4. Achievement: Students & Stakeholders

Florida College System Mission and Goals						
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.
	x		x			x
	x		x	x	x	x
	x			×	x	×
	x	x		x		x

Chapter 3 | College Processes

College	Mission Statement	Strategic Goals/Directions
Daytona State College	Daytona State College, a comprehensive public college, provides access to a range of flexible programs, from community enrichment to the baccalaureate degree, emphasizing student success, embracing excellence and diversity, as well as fostering innovation to enhance teaching and learning.	 ENSURE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE: Offer quality educational programs that meet the academic and non-academic workforce needs of Volusia and Flagler counties and beyond. ENHANCE STUDENT SUCCESS: Increase student development and academic support to enhance student performance, engagement and retention. BUILD COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS: Expand and create partnerships with business, community and educational organizations that enhance the college mission and vision. EMPHASIZE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: Ensure efficient and effective use of college resources (fiscal, physical, human and technological).
Eastern Florida State College	Eastern Florida State College is committed to engaging our diverse population in quality, accessible learning opportunities that successfully meet individual and community needs	 Improve Academic Performance. Prepare Students for the Job Market. Improve Students' Collegiate Experience. Improve the college's Financial Position.
Florida Gateway College	The mission of Florida Gateway College is to provide superior instruction, nurture individual development, and enrich the community through affordable, quality higher education programs, and lifelong learning opportunities.	 Success: Improve student persistence, retention, and learning through instructional excellence and exceptional support services. Engagement: Promote economic development and community enrichment through business partnerships, service, and engagement. Academics and Lifelong Learning: Foster a culture of cradle to grave learning through formal, non-formal and informal education offerings that provide the foundation for lifelong learning. Assessment, Accountability, and Improvement: Ensure college vitality and enhance college services through a culture of accountability and continuous improvement. Institutional Resource Development: Ensure institutional resources are adequate to enhance student learning, instructional quality, and support educational programs. Access: Develop multiple pathways for equal and equitable access to the college's programs and services by reducing barriers to enrollment and progression and improve student academic achievement and goal attainment.
Florida SouthWestern State College	The mission of Florida SouthWestern State College is to inspire learning; prepare a diverse population for creative and responsible participation in a global society; and serve as a leader for intellectual, economic, and cultural awareness in the community.	 Focus recruiting and admissions upon entering FSW with the intent and commitment to graduate. Explore new workforce-related certificate and degree options benefiting potential FSW students. Support curricular and programmatic innovation to enhance the academic experience, engender student achievement, and increase the number of successful FSW graduates. Review college processes and procedures based on facilitating graduation. Create a college experience that enhances FSW students' - both residential and commuter, traditional and nontraditional - education to become a well-rounded FSW graduate.
Florida State College at Jacksonville	Florida State College at Jacksonville provides high value, relevant life-long education that enhances the intellectual, social, cultural and economic development of our diverse community.	 Provide a Student-Centered Education. Impact Community. Increase Institutional Capacity.

Florida College System Mission and Goals						
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.
x	x		x	x		x
x	x		x	x		x
	x	x		x	x	
			x	x		x
	x			x	x	x

College	Mission Statement	Strategic Goals/Directions
Gulf Coast State College	Gulf Coast State College holds students and community of central importance. The college provides many opportunities for learning and offers a range of programs and services to help students become well-educated, productive citizens. The college is equally dedicated to collaborating with the community to help create or improve economic well-being and to offer the space of the college for social dialog, events of art and culture, and other moments that enhance our quality of life.	 Learning First: Create a culture that focuses on student success by promoting academic excellence and continued improvement in the teaching and learning process. Community Partnerships & Cultural Development: Partner with all constituents to align programs to strengthen the educational, social and economic vitality of the community. Career Pathways: Collaborate with business and industry to deliver responsive and flexible curricula that meet evolving workforce and employer needs. Promoting Access & Completion: Continuously develop new and innovative approaches to recruit, retain and graduate students. Effectiveness, Efficiency & Accountability: Protect the fiscal health of the college to ensure its continued ability to serve and enhance the community.
Hillsborough Community College	To transform lives by providing open access to an exceptional teaching and learning environment that inspires students to contribute to the local community and global society.	 Student Success: Advance success for all students through the measurable achievement of learning outcomes and educational goals. Workforce Development: Foster partnerships that position workforce programs as a catalyst for broader economic development within the region. Sustainable Operations: Develop a collegewide direction that sets the standard for sustainability for the efficient stewardship of resources, both natural and fiscal, that are respectful of future generations. Cultural Inclusion: Foster an inclusive college climate that welcomes, celebrates, and promotes respect for participation and contributions of all students and employees. Continuous Improvement: Continuously improve programs and services through a systematic and ongoing process of strategic planning, assessment and evaluation in which a "culture of evidence" guides our direction.
Indian River State College	As a leader in education and innovation, Indian River State College transforms lives by offering high-quality, affordable and accessible education to the residents of Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee, and St. Lucie counties through traditional and online delivery. IRSC is a comprehensive college accredited to award Baccalaureate Degrees, Associate Degrees, and Career and Technical Certificates.	 Creating a superior teaching and learning environment Cultivating student success Embracing diversity Stimulating economic growth Developing a highly-skilled workforce Building partnerships to expand opportunities Providing cultural enrichment and lifelong learning"
Lake-Sumter State College	Lake-Sumter State College delivers student success through personal attention and flexible pathways leading to rewarding careers and higher wages.	 Student Achievement: Achieve high levels of student success by increasing enrollment, retention, transfer, and completion rates. Academic Programs & Partnerships : Respond to emerging labor market and community needs, enhance existing partnerships, and develop new reciprocal partnerships in the communities we serve. Teaching & Learning: Deliver quality academic programs, resources, and services that support and measurably improve student learning. Facilities & Resource Development: Align college resources to provide a supportive learning and working environment and to achieve financial sustainability. Workplace Environment & Culture: Become a workplace of choice- grounded in mutual respect, shared governance, communication, and a deeply engaged workforce.

Florida College System Mission and Goals						
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.
x				x	x	x
				×	x	x
	x	x		x	x	x
	x			x		x

Chapter 3 | College Processes

College	Mission Statement	Strategic Goals/Directions
Miami Dade College	As democracy's college, Miami Dade College changes lives through accessible, high-quality teaching and learning experiences. The College embraces its responsibility to serve as an economic, cultural and civic leader for the advancement of our diverse global community.	 Student Access and Success: Miami Dade College will support and empower all students from application to completion so they have the opportunity to succeed and make positive, meaningful change in themselves, the community, the nation and the world. Educational Quality: Miami Dade College will drive innovation through teaching, mentoring and learning experiences that transform students, the community, the nation and the world. Institutional Agility: Miami Dade College will strengthen its foresight, capacity and agility to meet the emerging economic, cultural and civic needs of the community.
North Florida College	An exceptional college dedicated to an individualized and supportive academic atmosphere, accessible education, lifelong learning opportunities, and professional growth for our students and communities.	 Increase Student Success: Educate students for personal and professional opportunities. Improve performance accountability: Create and maintain a sustainable and data-driven decision-making campus environment. Strengthen communication: Strengthen information sharing procedures at North Florida College. Increase resource acquisition and allocation: Ensure campus funding acquisition, expenditures, and resource allocation are aligned with strategic plan. Provide a holistic campus experience: Provide a holistic campus experience for students, faculty, and staff.
Northwest Florida State College	Northwest Florida State College improves lives. We deliver outstanding educational programs that are relevant, accessible, and engaging for students of all ages and provide exceptional cultural, athletic, and economic development activities for the communities served. We commit to excellence, creativity, integrity, and service.	 First Choice: through accessible, affordable, and relevant higher education that bolsters community, workforce and economic opportunities. Student Focused: through an engaging campus culture that promotes student success. Successful Pathways: through academic and career programs and services. Institutional Excellence: through innovative partnerships Enhancing Resource Development: for physical, financial, and technological advancement. Encouraging Community Connectivity: through the promotion of athletic, cultural, and environmental activities.
Palm Beach State College	Palm Beach State College provides student-centered learning experiences that transform lives and strengthen our community.	 Engage: We will amplify our impact on the community leading through talented people, innovative practices, diversity, and performance excellence. Expand: Ensure growth by attracting and retaining students through effective alignment of programs, services and resources for a changing marketplace. Excel: Strengthen internal and external relationships through engaging and high quality experiences.

	Florida College System Mission and Goals					
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.
x	x		x	x	x	x
x				x	x	
	x	x	x	x	x	x
	x			x	x	

College	Mission Statement	Strategic Goals/Directions
Pasco-Hernando State College	Pasco-Hernando State College (PHSC) serves the educational needs and interests of its community by awarding certificates, diplomas, associate and baccalaureate degrees. As a comprehensive, multi- campus learning-centered institution, PHSC utilizes various instructional modalities and support services. PHSC provides an accessible, diverse teaching and learning environment rich with opportunities for students to achieve academic success and cultural growth in a global society.	 BEST-IN-CLASS ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT SERVICES: Develop, assess, and enhance academic programs and support services that provide best in-class instruction through a variety of delivery methods to ensure maximum student learning, engagement and success. EXEMPLARY STUDENT RECRUITMENT, ENGAGEMENT, RETENTION, AND COMPLETION: Provide innovative programs and related services for student recruitment, engagement, retention, and support that augment learning to enhance student success and reflect the values of diversity and service. BRAND AND POSITION THE COLLEGE: Brand and position the college as a premier academic institution that engages students, employees, and the community. RESPONSIBLE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP: Advance the stewardship of institutional financial, physical, and human resources by further streamlining College operations where efficiencies can be gained, making optimal use of prior investments in systems and re-aligning infrastructure with evolving needs. SAFE AND SECURE CAMPUSES: Establish the college as a best-practice site for ensuring safe and secure open-campus environments.
Pensacola State College	Pensacola State College, under the governance of a local Board of Trustees, is committed to providing quality, affordable, and accessible educational opportunities through a variety of delivery methods. The College, a member of the Florida College System, offers baccalaureate and associate degrees, workforce certificates, adult education leading to a high school diploma or GED, business and industry training, non-credit continuing education, community outreach, and cultural enrichment opportunities for students and the community.	 Foster a College culture characterized by constancy of purpose in support of our mission and philosophy through the enhancement of diversity, entrepreneurialism, and recognition. Utilize strategic resource management in order to maintain a strong financial infrastructure. Maintain and update College facilities to support mission and programs. The College will expand external funding through fundraising and the writing of grants and contracts. The College will partner with appropriate educational, government, and business institutions to enhance economic and student development. Provide quality instruction through effective curriculum development, accessible delivery, and criterion-based assessment according to a common set of academic standards for each discipline. Improve student success by improved advising and counseling, orientation course, and ways to expand the retention rate for all students. Maintain a focus on our stakeholders and their needs, with the sincere desire and intent to create, communicate, and deliver education and training that has value for our students, customers, clients, partners and our community.
Polk State College	Polk State College, a quality-driven institution, transforms students' lives through the power of education by providing access to affordable associate and baccalaureate degrees, career certificates and workforce employment programs, delivered by diverse, qualified faculty and staff.	 Innovation: Generate, disseminate, and implement new ideas for the benefit of students, staff, and the community. Engagement: Include all Polk State College stakeholders in student success. Community Impact: Extend positive impact from campus to community.

Florida College System Mission and Goals						
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability– while ensuring quality–by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.
	x		X	x	X	
	×	×		x	x	x
	x	x			x	

Chapter 3 | College Processes

College	Mission Statement	Strategic Goals/Directions
St. Johns River State College	St. Johns River State College, an open-access, public institution of higher education in Northeast Florida, promotes excellence in teaching and learning to enrich the lives of its students and strengthen its community. The College offers certificates, associate and baccalaureate degrees, and provides high-quality education, training, and cultural opportunities to encourage scholarly achievement. St. Johns River State College creates a supportive learning environment that includes services and resources to enable students to meet their educational goals.	 Strengthen the Student Experience in Intake and Onboarding. Increase Student Achievement and Success. Contribute to Community Enrichment and Economic Development. Invest in effective collegewide operations.
St. Petersburg College	The mission of St. Petersburg College is to empower our students and community to achieve success and economic mobility through academic excellence and engagement.	 ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE: We will provide a high-quality education for our students by creating an innovative and engaging learning environment within a supportive, collegial culture. ECONOMIC MOBILITY: We will provide opportunities for our students to be prepared for high-wage, high-demand careers and professional growth, which will contribute to their economic success and improve the quality of life within our community as well as assist in ending generational cycles of poverty. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: We will invest in the well-being and growth of our community by serving as a leader, a convener, and a catalyst for positive change. We will maintain this commitment by creating strong partnerships, participating in civic learning and community engagement, and cultivating a community of care.
Santa Fe College	In keeping with our values and goals, Santa Fe College, a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving North Central Florida and beyond, adds value to the lives of our students and enriches our community through excellence in teaching and learning, innovative educational programs and student services, and community leadership and service.	 Access Connection Direction Achievement
Seminole State College of FL	Seminole State College of Florida enhances the educational, economic, and cultural vitality of our region by providing exemplary learning opportunities to our diverse community.	 Advance student learning and development with innovative programs and services that cultivate student engagement and success. Advance employees' opportunities for development and success. Advance partnerships that foster academic excellence, student achievement, and economic vitality. Advance our region as a leader in higher education, workforce development, and community enrichment.
South Florida State College	South Florida State College is an open-access, higher education institution dedicated to providing a learning-centered environment through quality programs, training, and services. Working in partnerships with organizations and communities, the college provides leadership and a comprehensive range of opportunities for the educational, cultural, and economic development of the service district.	 Develop Exemplary Student Services Programs that Support Student Success Formulate Responsive Programs that Meet Community Needs. Provide Students with an Engaging Learning Experience Within and Beyond the Classroom. Create Innovative Programs and Partnerships that Drive Regional Economic Growth and Respond to Sector Strategies. Develop and Implement Diverse Strategies that will Increase Funding Needed to Support Institutional Initiatives. Provide Programs and Resources that Inspire Employee Growth/ Development.

Florida College System Mission and Goals									
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce			
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.			
	x			x	x				
	x					x			
			x	x	x	x			
	x			x		x			
	x			x	x	x			

College	Mission Statement	Strategic Goals/Directions
State College of Florida, Manatee- Sarasota	Guided by measurable standards of institutional excellence, SCF provides engaging and accessible learning environments that result in student success and community prosperity.	 Ensure that SCF programs are available to students in all geographic locations of our service region. Develop a concierge-style student experience focused on enhancing student recruitment and performance outcomes. Aggressively engage faculty/program managers/business and community leaders in collaborative curriculum development from start to implementation for programs that are rapidly responsive to workforce needs. Establish SCF's central role in the educational, cultural and workforce development of our service region.
Tallahassee Community College	The mission of the college is to provide a learning environment that prepares students for success in a global economy by offering higher education pathways, workforce opportunities, and civic engagement.	 Access: Strengthen and expand access by increasing awareness of educational opportunities that are reflective of student, business, and community needs. Student Success: Promote a student-centered environment that focuses on student achievement, engagement and educational excellence. Workforce: Achieve regional and statewide recognition as a premier college of choice for providing workforce training by delivering high quality programs and instruction that enables students to grow, succeed, and stay globally competitive. Partnerships: Nurture collaborative relationships with K-12, universities, businesses, and community partners to develop a cohesive educational strategy that ensures seamless alignment and builds a skilled workforce that leads to economic mobility and increased educational attainment. Resources & Efficiency: Strategically leverage, grow and utilize resources to maximize student success and institutional sustainability and effectiveness.
Valencia College	Valencia provides opportunities for academic, technical, and lifelong learning in a collaborative culture dedicated to inquiry, results, and excellence.	 BUILD PATHWAYS: Design effective and efficient pathways to learning and education. LEARNING ASSURED: Implement optimal learning environments for students. PARTNER WITH COMMUNITY: Coordinate student needs and college goals with community partners INVEST IN EACH OTHER: Establish operational systems based on collaboration and deep stewardship of our work.

Florida College System Mission and Goals								
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce Achievement		Access	Articulation/ Workforce		
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.		
x				x	x	x		
			x	x	x	x		
					x	x		

MISSION AND GOAL CONGRUENCY ANALYSIS

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM MISSIONS AND 2020-21 CAPITAL OUTLAY REQUEST DETAIL

College	College Priority	Florida College System Project Priority	Project	Site / Infrastructure/ Maintenance Improvements	STEM Related	Project Cost
Draward Oallarda	1	11	North Campus B56 Replacement STEM Facility/Remodel B57		х	\$35,516,925
Broward College	2	35	South Campus B99 Aviation Building Remodel and Expansion		x	\$13,402,644
	2	21	Advanced Technology Center		х	\$5,233,148
Chipola College	1	43	Remodel/Ren Fac #300 - (STEM) Natural Science		х	\$13,615,224
College of Central	1	5	Health Science Technology Education Ctr-Ocala		х	\$38,346,085
Florida	2	39	Security Systems (Ocala, Hampton, Vintage Farm, Citrus, Levy)	Х		\$2,608,299
The College of the	1	29	General Renovations, Infrastructure and Site Improvement-Site 1	Х		\$4,500,000
Florida Keys	2	40	Key West Collegiate Academy Classroom and Storm Shelter			\$8,779,321
	1	13	Const Clsrm/Lab/Office, site imp-Deltona	Х		\$13,146,947
Daytona State College	2	55	DeLand Building 5 Ren/Rem Sciences		х	\$5,820,094
Eastern Florida State	1	36	Center for Innovative Technology and Education		х	\$18,047,762
College	2	42	Replacement of Air Handling Units for Melbourne Campus	Х		\$3,555,344
Florida Gateway	1	7	Replace Bldgs 8/9 - Lake City		х	\$16,297,250
College	2	53	Olustee Campus Public Safety Facility			\$7,038,705
Florida SouthWestern	1	23	REM Lee – Bldg K Technology Building Remodel		х	\$9,412,491
State College	2	56	REM Collier – Bldg E and F STEM Remodel		х	\$9,856,145
Florida State College	1	25	Remodel and Addition to Support Bldg. for STEM Educational Facility, Downtown Campus		х	\$13,972,315
at Jacksonville	2	34	Bldgs. C, E, & F, Upgrade STEM Science Labs & Financial Services, Kent Campus		х	\$3,219,575
Gulf Coast State	1	4	Construct STEM Bldg (Replace Bldg 12) – Panama City		х	\$27,490,532
College	2	57	Acquire Adjacent Land – PC Campus	Х		\$4,000,000
Hillsborough	1	30	Renovation to Correct Safety, ADA, Health and Sanitation – Collegewide	х		\$12,000,000
Community College	2	45	Workforce Transition Center - SouthShore		х	\$29,942,638
Indian River State	1	2	Replace Fac 8 Industrial Tech-Ft. Pierce		х	\$23,323,447
College	2	48	Renovate Systems in Facility No. 34, Main Campus	Х		\$14,592,862
Lake-Sumter State	1	17	Emergency Roof Repairs and Replacements – LE/SL	х		\$1,382,000
College	2	24	Safety and Security Enhancements – ALL	х		\$1,230,000

Florida College System Mission and Goals									
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce			
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.			
			x	x		x			
			x	x		x			
			x	x		x			
			x	x					
	x		x	x		x			
				х					
				х					
				х	x				
			x	x	x				
	x		x	x		x			
				x					
				x					
			x		x				
			x	x					
			x	x		x			
			x	x	x				
			x	x					
	x		x	x		x			
					x				
				x					
			x	x	x	x			
	x		x	x		х			
				x					
				x					
				x					

College	College Priority	Florida College System Project Priority	Project	Site / Infrastructure/ Maintenance Improvements	STEM Related	Project Cost				
	2	1	Remodel/Renovate/New – Classrooms/Labs/Support Svcs Bldgs 1, 2 & Site-West		х	\$40,825,000				
Miami Dade College	1	19	Rem/Ren Fac 14 (Gym) for Justice Center-North			\$21,107,100				
	3	50	Remodeling/Renovation – Bldgs 1,2,3,5,7,13, site-North			\$43,700,000				
	1	41	Building 13 Technical Center Manufacturing Program		х	\$13,436,065				
North Florida College	2	49	Building 7&8 Renovation			\$3,612,537				
Northwest Florida	2	26	Remodel Building 420 – Allied Health/Nursing		х	\$12,787,646				
State College	1	46	STEM Facility – Replace Building 320		х	\$28,795,243				
Palm Beach State	1	8	Dental & Medical Services Tech Bldg (Replace Bldgs		х	\$42,387,290				
College	2	38	Student Services Center Building, LW			\$32,313,310				
Pasco Hernando State	1	10	Remodel Bldgs A thru E w/addition & chiller plant-West			\$53,809,782				
College	2	47	Renovate parking lots with additional vehicle spaces,	Х		\$8,000,000				
Pensacola State	1	6	Baars Classroom Building (Replace Bldg 1)-Main			\$34,496,536				
College	2	44	Roadway/Parking/Asphalt Improvement/Replacement	Х		\$4,104,513				
	1	22	Rem/Ren Bldg 4 Class/Lab-Winter Haven		х	\$16,916,650				
Polk State College	2	37	Ren Enhanced Security Collegewide	Х		\$2,234,800				
St. Johns River State	2	9	Rem/Ren Orange Park Campus with Additions			\$18,878,317				
College	1	33	Ren Collegewide Infrastructure	Х		\$23,055,600				
	1	14	Construct New Building to Relocate Health programs, Health Education Center		х	\$56,000,000				
St. Petersburg College	2	52	General Ren/Rem, Roofs, HVAC, ADA, Utilities & Site Improvement – Collegewide	x		\$31,405,000				
	1	3	Construct Clsrm, Lab, & Library Bldg-Blount			\$36,493,446				
Santa Fe College	2	15	Construct New Institute of Technology for Welding, HVAC, Automotive & Advanced Manufacturing Programs at NW Campus		х	\$26,329,948				
Seminole State	1	12	Remodeling / Renovation Building L & F Phase III – S/LM			\$32,110,013				
College of FL	2	27	S/LM Building G (701) Roof Replacement & Envelope Renovation	Х		\$1,284,470				
South Florida State	1	20	Roof Replacements Collegewide	Х		\$2,000,000				
College	2	31	Ren. Collegewide Mechanical Infrastructure	Х		\$1,450,000				
State College of	1	28	Construct Science & Technology Building, Venice Campus		х	\$3,927,839				
Florida, Manatee- Sarasota	2	54	New Student Services and Union, Venice Campus			\$14,879,426				
Tallahassee	2	18	Remodel BIT Bldg. 11 Classrooms into STEM Labs		х	\$10,702,157				
Community College	2	32	Ren Central Utility Plant/Infrastructure-Main	х		\$10,913,099				
	1	16	Construct Building 2-Lake Nona		х	\$42,938,676				
Valencia College	2	51	Remodel Student Services-East Campus			\$6,945,076				
Florida College System Mission and Goals										
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--
Respond Rapidly	High Quality	Affordability	Globally Competitive Workforce	Achievement	Access	Articulation/ Workforce				
The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.	The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.	Maintain affordability— while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.	The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.	Promote student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.	Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.	Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upper- division program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.				
	x		x	х	x	х				
				x						
	x			x		x				
			x	x	x	x				
				x						
			x	x		x				
			X	X						
			x	x		X				
	X			X						
				X						
				X						
				X						
				X						
			X	X						
				×						
				×						
	x		x	x		x				
				x						
	x		x	x		x				
			x	x	x	x				
	x		x	x		x				
				x						
				x						
				x						
	x		x	x	x	x				
				x	x					
			x	x		x				
				x						
			x	x	x	x				
				x						

Chapter 3 | College Processes



Chapter 4 | State Processes and State-Level Goals

CHAPTER 4: STATE PROCESSES AND STATE-LEVEL GOALS

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate whether state-level capital planning processes support state-level goals. The capital outlay processes within the Division of Florida Colleges should result in recommended projects that support the state's goals, such as the Florida College System Strategic Plan and the Governor's higher education plans. When the Division of Florida Colleges processes result in project recommendations that fully support state goals, the Legislature can confidently use the Division of Florida Colleges' prioritized list and fund the projects on it. When the Division of Florida Colleges' processes do not appear to support the state goals, the Legislature may not consider the prioritized list to be a credible listing of the state's highest priorities, or the Legislature may not be aware of other project opportunities that would more fully meet state goals.

The Division of Florida Colleges is involved both indirectly and directly in the entire capital outlay process, from the preparation of the college-level Educational Plant Survey (EPS) through the submittal of the Florida College System's prioritized project list to the Legislature. The process is data-driven, vision-driven, and defensible. The prioritized projects that emerge from the process directly pursue state-level goals. However, the ultimate funding decisions are often not related to the college-level and the Florida College System-level capital planning process. The process itself frustrates many of the colleges, and SmithGroup has determined that it does not meet the goals for a process that is flexible, tailored to college needs, transparent, and equitable.

The Legislature has the right to fund any project that it chooses—the direct funding of projects by state legislatures is not uncommon and happens in every state. SmithGroup was told about several buildings that were not prioritized by the college or the Division of Florida Colleges but nonetheless gained Legislative support and received funding approval, a sign that the state-level capital planning process is not fully effective.

SmithGroup understands that the Legislature, Division of Florida Colleges, and the individual colleges all seek a process that is perceived to be as fair and balanced as possible, where the occurrences of project funding primarily driven by politics is rare. Minimizing the process outliers and assuring the Legislature that the prioritized project list represents the Florida College System's greatest needs are the desired outcomes of the following analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

The analysis evaluates the state-level processes used to determine the Florida College System's highest priority capital outlay requests. The analysis includes a detailed investigation of five recent projects proposed by five different state colleges. This chapter denotes the decision criteria used and whether project prioritization is consistent with and supports system-level/ state-level goals. The process started with a thorough review of state and system policies and procedures. After this review, SmithGroup conducted a comprehensive meeting with Division of Florida Colleges' (DFC) staff to clarify and confirm state-level capital project prioritization processes and their roles.

SECTION 4.1: STATE-LEVEL PROCESSES USED TO DETERMINE CAPITAL OUTLAY PRIORITIES

The state influences the capital outlay priorities both informally at the college-level and formally at the state-level. The collegelevel and Florida College System-level capital outlay processes have numerous built-in checks and balances to ensure space needs formulas, calculations, and capital requests are in accordance with procedural guidelines.

DIVISION OF FLORIDA COLLEGES GUIDANCE AT THE COLLEGE-LEVEL

The capital outlay process begins at the college-level and is driven by the colleges, as described in Chapter 3. Yet the Division of Florida Colleges staff is involved informally through each college's capital planning process by providing structure, consistency, and key data and metrics.

Perhaps the greatest influence that the Division of Florida Colleges has in the capital outlay process at the college-level is in the space planning guidelines that are required by the Division of Florida Colleges. The Division of Florida Colleges provides guidelines to the colleges regarding the process, data, prioritization, and general information needed for the colleges to develop a capital outlay request. Space planning procedures are analyzed in Chapter 5.

The Division of Florida Colleges is responsible for the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)/Legislative Budget Request (LBR) process for the Florida College System (FCS) as specified in sec. 1013.64(4)(a), F.S.; the Office of Educational Facilities (OEF) is responsible for the Educational Plant Survey process for K-12 and Florida College System. (The Office of Educational Facilities functions are detailed in sec. 1013.03, F.S.) The Office of Educational Facilities consults with the Division of Florida Colleges before they make changes to processes or the State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF, 2014) content that affect the Florida College System.

The Division of Florida Colleges sets criteria and provides software that colleges must employ when preparing the Educational Plant Survey every five years, which then forms the basis for the annual Capital Improvement Plan. As noted in Chapter 3, this college-level process is data intensive and there are numerous checks and balances to ensure college adherence to the process. Several colleges expressed satisfaction in the Educational Plant Survey and Capital Improvement Plan processes and felt the exercises were good for their college, while other colleges had concerns with relevancy.

ANNUAL SCHEDULE FOR STATE-LEVEL CAPITAL OUTLAY PROCESS

April	June	July	October	November	December				
Capital Improvement Plan and Facilities Planning Workshop	Educational Plant Surveys completed	Submission of Capital Improvement Plan and Legislative Budget Request to the Division of Florida Colleges	Division's prioritized project list delivered to the Governor's office and the Legislature	Division requests updates from the colleges for Operational Cost of New Facilities (OCNF) and Back-of-Bill items	List reviewed and anomalies discussed with colleges				

DIVISION OF FLORIDA COLLEGES INTERNAL PROCESSES

The Division of Florida Colleges prepares the Florida College System's required project list to submit to the Governor's Office of Planning and Budgeting and the Legislature using information from forms submitted by the colleges. The CIP 2-Project Summary, and the CIP-3 and CIP-4 documents for renovation, remodeling, and construction projects which are prepared and submitted by the colleges form the basis for selection of projects for the Division of Florida Colleges' Legislative Budget Request. See Annual Schedule For State-Level Capital Outlay Process for a timeline for this process.

The Division of Florida Colleges uses a Scoring Worksheet to establish the priority listing of projects recommended to the Legislature. The criteria used in this prioritization was changed in 2019 with passage of Senate Bill 190.

From 2015 to 2019, the Division of Florida Colleges prioritized each college's previously funded and first and second priority projects using five metrics, each with a maximum of ten points, for a possible total of 50 points. This process was in place during the prioritization for total or completion funding of the five case studies in Section 4.2.

- 1. Return on Investment (ROI). Three factors combine to determine ROI: benefit/cost ratio, life cycle cost, and space utilization.
 - The benefit/cost ratio is predetermined for the college based on a cost/benefit study by Economic Modeling Specialist International in 2012–2013.
 - The annualized life cycle cost in \$/SF is determined by identifying the project life as renovation (10 year), remodel
 (20 year), or new construction/replacement (50 year), the gross square feet, and the project cost. Projects are ranked highest to lowest.
 - Scheduled space utilization of classrooms and teaching laboratories as measured in number of hours per student per week (the higher the planned utilization, the higher the project ranked).
- 2. Projects that include or support high-skill, high-wage and/or science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) Programs. Sliding point scale from zero points for no program components or support of another facility that houses such a program (via general classrooms which could be used for STEM instruction) to ten points for projects that include multiple identifiable program components.
- 3. College Priority Order points from ten for first priority to 0.625 for fifth priority.
- 4. **Age** is the factor used to gauge the general need of a proposed renovation, remodel, or replacement. Points are assigned on a sliding scale with facilities 51+ years old receiving the maximum.
- 5. Percentage of **funding available** is used for consideration of projects that already have partial funding. This allows projects with previously appropriated state funds and available local funds to advance in priority.

In 2019, Senate Bill 190 put statutory language in place to limit the Division of Florida Colleges' prioritized project list to colleges' previously funded projects and top two priorities, and revised the methodology for prioritization, employing six metrics with varying maximum point counts.

- 1. The project was **previously funded by the Legislature** and the funds needed for completion are a low percentage of the total project cost. Sliding point scale for all projects submitted that meet the criteria from lowest percentage of project cost at 25 points, next lowest at 24 points, next at 23, etc.
- 2. The project is **building maintenance**, repair of **utility infrastructure** or other project necessary to **maintain the operation** of a Florida College System institution site. Sliding point scale based upon amount of funding requested with lowest cost project receiving the maximum of 25 points, next lowest at 24 points, next at 23, etc. (That is, low cost projects are prioritized over higher cost projects.)
- 3. The project addresses the greatest current year **need for space** as indicated by increased instructional capacity that enhances educational opportunities for the greatest number of students. Sliding scale based upon percentage of total unmet space need of the college. Highest unmet need receives 25 points, second highest unmet need receives 24 points, etc. All colleges with unmet need receive some points. Colleges with a space surplus in the 10 space categories receive no points.
- 4. The project reflects the top **priorities of the college** Board of Trustees. First priority receives 25 points, second priority 15 points and third priority 5 points.
- 5. The project represents the most practical and **cost-effective replacement or renovation** of an existing building, based upon Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service (PECO) funding per gross square foot. Lowest cost per square foot project receives 25 points. Remaining applicable projects receive points relative to the lowest PECO cost per square foot.

- 6. For a project that has not received previous state funding points are awarded for each of **four relevant criteria** for a maximum of 10 points.
 - Funding from private (non-state) sources of 20% or more of project cost earns four points, less than 20% earns two points.
 - The project is needed to preserve the safety of the persons using the facility earns two points.
 - Alignment with a strategic Legislative initiative earns two points.
 - Alignment with a state board initiative earns two points.

If no Legislative or state board initiatives have been identified, points are not awarded in these categories. This was the case for the 2020–21 process.

The prioritization process is data driven. Florida College System staff make no changes to the project inputs or the resulting list. Anomalies, such as a college's number two priority scoring higher than their number one priority, are discussed with each college. During interviews colleges administrators indicated that they consider the process to be transparent and that they typically agree with the scoring of their projects.

The Request for Legislative Authorization (back-of-bill) form is used to request the Legislature to redirect PECO funds appropriated in prior years to another survey-recommended project. The Florida Division of Colleges collects and reviews these requests, but does not evaluate them for recommendation.

The top five Florida College System priorities for fixed capital outlay, 2020–21, include:

- 1. Miami Dade College: Renovation and Remodel, new construction of classrooms, laboratories, support services
- 2. Indian River State College: Industrial Technology Center Replacement
- 3. Santa Fe College: Classroom, Laboratory and Library building (replacement)
- 4. Gulf Coast State College: STEM building
- 5. College of Central Florida: Health Sciences Technology Education Center

Each of these projects aligned well and support state-level mission and goals. The Division of Florida Colleges prioritization process has an implicit mechanism in place to prioritize mission critical and goal congruent projects while slowing the advancement of projects that lack congruency. As the legislative session has concluded, the amount funded for the five highest ranked projects for 2020-21 included \$1 million for Indian River State College (second ranked project) and \$2 million for Gulf Coast Sate College (fourth ranked project).

SECTION 4.1 CONCLUSIONS

Changed prioritization criteria change college-level project lists and the Division of Florida College's prioritized

list. During interviews, some college administrators said that some institutions play the system in an attempt to score additional prioritization points. The creation of new criteria changes the rules and their approach to success. The prioritization process created with the implementation of Senate Bill 190 has been in use for one prioritization cycle. The colleges are still assessing the impact. In comparing the 2019-20 to 2020-21 cycles many projects remained in relatively similar priority order. However, some such as a Seminole State College of Florida remodeling/renovation project moved from priority number two to number twelve, and the project had previously received funding four times beginning in 2007-08. An Indian River State College project moved from number seven to number two.

The prioritization system treats unequal colleges equally. The Division of Florida Colleges process by design intentionally allows for very few deviations in order to provide parity at the state-level. This is also a point of frustration with many colleges. During interviews with campus administrators, SmithGroup heard from several colleges that the one-size-fits-all approach is unfair and not a balanced way to evaluate capital outlay.

- Ultimate decisions are not solely based on data. College leaders feel they put significant and continuous effort into timeconsuming data reporting and monitoring, yet decisions made in the Legislature are ultimately made by considerations that are separate from the data-driven justification. One college leader stated "Formulas and fair processes are important, but I don't believe that most people believe that one can totally remove politics from the equation used as to who's project gets funded first." Several colleges have bypassed the prioritization process and have hired legislative liaisons and work with their political representatives to inform legislators directly of the college's priority needs. There is a great deal of frustration with the process at the college-level that includes the length of time it takes to get a project approved and being governed by a data-driven set of metrics that the colleges feel accomplish little. During interviews with SmithGroup, college leaders also indicated skepticism that the Senate Bill 190 process will reduce political influence from the ultimate capital funding decisions.
- The Legislature does not fund the Division of Florida Colleges' highest priorities. SmithGroup found that while the statelevel capital planning process appears to be data-driven, it is also modified and shaped by state politics. In past years, the Legislature has funded projects that were not included in fixed capital outlay priorities. Of the five highest ranked projects for 2020-21 funding was allocated for priority #2 for Indian River State College and priority #4 for Gulf Coast Sate College.

SECTION 4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Division of Florida Colleges should provide flexibility in prioritizing projects based on the uniqueness of each college. The projects prioritized by the Division of Florida Colleges are drawn from each college's top two priorities. The Division of Florida Colleges should prioritize projects that not only promote state strategic goals but also college strategic goals and missions. The missions of colleges are as varied as the colleges themselves and the specific regions they serve. That variety should be considered within the state-level processes.
- Partial and insufficient funding makes complete funding of projects difficult. Addressing the Legislature's pattern of partial funding has always been a major component of the prioritization process. As of 2019–20, the Florida College System had 20 projects partially funded, still needing almost \$300 million to complete. The Legislature funded \$11.2 million for projects for the Florida College System in 2019–20 and \$18.6 million for projects for the Florida College System in 2020–21. Assuming no vetoes for 2020–21, the Florida College System picks up an additional (new) partially funded project. This level of funding, combined with the partial funding of new projects not on the Division of Florida Colleges' prioritized list makes it difficult to complete projects. Several colleges also mentioned during interviews that partially completed projects had slipped substantially as a result of Senate Bill 190, primarily due to being renovation rather than replacement projects.

SECTION 4.2: CASE STUDIES OF THE COLLEGE- AND STATE-LEVEL PROCESSES USED TO DETERMINE CAPITAL OUTLAY PRIORITIES

SmithGroup systematically traced the origins, justification, supporting analyses, and ultimate recommendation for funding for five recent projects. In coordination with the Division of Florida Colleges staff, five funded projects were selected based on their geographic location in the state, size of the college, and alignment with Strategic Plan guidelines. Four of the projects, according to the college's leadership, represented the college's highest and most urgent demand at the time of the submission. The fifth project was not the highest priority for the college but, following the advice of the Division of Florida Colleges staff, the college listed and prioritized it to increase the project's chances to receive capital funding. The selected five case study projects also represent a diversity of project types.

- Broward College, Willis Holcombe Center Renovation Building 33 (completed 2019)
- Daytona State College, Student Services Building (completed 2019)
- Eastern Florida State College, Melbourne Health Sciences Institute (completed January 2017)
- Northwest Florida State College, Engineering Building 310 Renovation (completed 2019)
- Polk State College, Winter Haven Learning Resource Building Renovation and Remodeling (completed 2017)

SECTION 4.2 CONCLUSIONS

In all five case studies, there is clear alignment with state-level and institution-level mission and strategic goals. The motivation behind these projects varies:

- from a desire to create flexible and efficient space at Broward College,
- to student services and student success at Daytona State College and Polk State College,
- to enhanced academic space at Eastern Florida State College and Northwest Florida State College.

In all cases, the strategic plan, the Educational Plant Survey, and the capital outlay request were aligned. The college leadership reviewed the projects at various stages ensuring compliance with stated objectives. The Division of Florida Colleges appropriately reviewed and prioritized these projects for the Legislature.

SmithGroup found all five capital outlay requests were consistent with the college-level and state-level mission and goals. The Florida College System goals are:

- Respond Rapidly. All of the colleges expressed the desire to meet the Florida College System mission to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs. However, for large projects that require funding for extensive renovations or new facilities, the ability to accomplish this rests with the Legislature, not the individual college. Of these five case studies, the Health Sciences Institute at Eastern Florida State College was most successful. Once the preferred location was finalized, PECO funding for planning and design was followed the next year by construction funding. The Broward College Willis Holcombe Center Renovation came close to responding rapidly with a five-year project duration. The projects at the other three colleges were of significantly longer duration, 15 years at Northwest Florida State College, 20 years at Polk State College, and 25 years at Daytona State College. To meet the state and community needs at these colleges, facility investment was necessary. Thus, these projects failed at achieving the Florida College System's mission to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.
- High Quality. While all of Florida College System institutions strive to provide high quality academic and career education programs that maximize student learning and success and the facilities to support them, the Polk State College Winter Haven Learning Resource Center and Broward College Willis Holcombe Center Renovation exemplify the transformation of sub-standard buildings into facilities that support programs that promote student success.
- Globally Competitive Workforce. By co-locating many of the Eastern Florida State College health care educations programs on the Melbourne Campus, the Health Science Institute building provides a platform for top quality, modern education and training. It is a facility that can adapt to new technologies and health care delivery to continue to provide opportunities for students to be prepared in a globally competitive workforce. The Northwest Florida State College Engineering Building 310 Renovation responds to the state's priority for STEM-related education initiatives.
- Achievement. The Daytona State College Student Services Building focuses on student achievement, so all students have the opportunity to succeed. This is the first impression a potential student receives when entering the building.
- Access. Access can mean several things with respect to education, including the physical barriers to education opportunity. The Broward College Willis Holcombe Center ensures all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education through its location serving a unique student population in downtown Ft. Lauderdale and by removing physical barriers to access. A primary goal of the Polk State College Winter Haven Learning Resources Building was to improve life safety and accessibility in one of the first buildings on campus, constructed under very different building codes and no prescribed accessibility requirements.

SmithGroup's high-level conclusions are presented below. More detailed information regarding each project is included the case study summaries that follow.

- Broward College, Willis Holcombe Center Renovation Building 33. The final funded project was not the one initially identified by the college. This case study is an example that the capital outlay process is durable and flexible in the face of changing circumstances. The project represents an efficient and appropriate use of the back-of-the-bill legislative process. The Legislature had already acknowledged Broward College's need for an expanded and renovated downtown center by fully funding renovations to Building 32. However, through a series of design studies and financial analyses, it was determined that a better, more cost-effective solution was available. The back-of-the-bill process allowed for the reallocation of appropriated funds to quickly achieve the desired solution, without the need to go through the entire project prioritization process again. The process was successful in that the flexibility to shift appropriations were accommodated as additional information became available.
- Daytona State College, Student Services Building. Although the process lasted for almost 20 years from the generation of the original Capital Improvement Plan to construction completion, the project is an outstanding example of achieving a stated goal to focus on student success. This project highlights the importance of funding a visioning/planning phase after the facility need is established but prior to design and construction. As a result of the protracted timeline for project funding, the college's ability to improve the student's campus experience and access to support services was impacted for generations of students.
- Eastern Florida State College, Melbourne Health Sciences Institute. It is not unusual for the scope of a project to change over time as "environmental" conditions change. The protracted funding pattern created an opportunity for the college to reassess and strengthen this case study project. However, the long delay in funding also detracts from the Florida College System's goal to rapidly respond to community needs.
- Northwest Florida State College, Engineering Building 310 Renovation. This project demonstrates how the state's priorities impact local decision-making processes and how state-level agencies strategize with colleges to balance multiple needs. This project was not the highest priority need for the college but, following the advice of Division of Florida College staff, the college listed and prioritized it to better position the college to receive capital funding under the state's STEM economic development initiative. The Division of Florida Colleges suggested that the college shift its local priorities in order to not only increase funding probability for the college but also to meet statewide goals. The college's greater needs were a utility plant upgrade and other general remodeling. Statewide goals do not always address the needs of local communities, the stated mission of Florida's colleges.
- Polk State College, Winter Haven Learning Resource Building Renovation and Remodeling. This project was funded in seven phases, not including the two times it was vetoed by the governor. The Learning Resource Building case study demonstrates the programming and economic harm when funding is distributed over many years and when project completion is not assured. It is more efficient to fund projects at a reasonable scope with the assurance that future funding will be available to complete the project.

SECTION 4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The fives colleges complied with the Division of Florida Colleges process but feel that the process needs a major overhaul or minimally needs to be streamlined to make it more efficient and effective. The process change recommendations supported by and informed by these five case studies are found in other sections of this report.

BROWARD COLLEGE WILLIS HOLCOMBE CENTER RENOVATION (BUILDING 33)

CASE STUDY #1



BROWARD COLLEGE

WILLIS HOLCOMBE CENTER RENOVATION (BUILDING 33)

INTRODUCTION

Date of Interview: November 20, 2019

Interview Participants: Associate Vice President, Facilities Planning and Capital Budgets; Associate Vice President, Facilities Design and Construction; Senior Associate Vice President, Facilities Management; Director, Facilities Planning/Facilities Management

BACKGROUND

COLLEGE MISSION

Transforming students' lives and enriching our diverse community through academic excellence, innovation, and meaningful career opportunities (2017–2022 Strategic Plan)

COLLEGE STRATEGIC GOALS

- Start increase the total number of new students enrolled
- Succeed increase the total number of awards earned
- Soar increase the total number of post-completion placements
- Synergize increase non-traditional revenue

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Broward College Downtown Center is focused on courses that support the creative industries, including the School of Architecture, graphic design, and business courses. The college's literary and arts magazine, Panku, is published at the Willis Holcombe Center.

The project streamlined college functions by remodeling Building 33 to better accommodate both academic and business functions. Administrative and support areas were remodeled to create flexible space and support hoteling. Total office space was minimized by incorporating cubicles and partitioned space. Sufficient workspace was created without infringing on instructional space. An appropriate quantity of instructional space to support the college's student population was maintained allowing the focus to be on improving the quality of that space.

While the project's objectives were constant, but the specific improvements evolved as the college responded to additional information and new opportunities.

- Building 31, which housed instructional and administrative space, was slated for major capital remodeling in 2008. This would have included replacing failing building systems, environmental remediation, and repurposing of space. By 2012, the college determined that the building systems had failed to the point that the project warranted replacement of the building.
- The project scope shifted to the demolition and reconstruction of Building 31. The 2011 Facilities Master Plan outlined the development concepts for the Willis Holcombe Center and the restrictions imposed by the retention and renovation of Building 31. It proposed increasing the academic capacity downtown by moving all administrative services off-site and demolition and replacement of Building 31. The college hired an architect to perform a Castaldi Analysis which substantiated the college's conclusion that it would be more economical to demolish and replace the building than to replace all failing systems and remodel the building. The Castaldi Analysis was approved by the college Board of Trustees and by the Office of Educational Facilities/Florida Department of Education (FDOE).



- Building 32 was located on property owned by Broward College and leased to Florida Atlantic University. When Florida Atlantic University vacated the land lease in 2014 any improvements became the property of the land owner (Broward College). Due to the lack of state funds for new construction, the project focus shifted to the renovation of Building 32.
- Building 31 was evaluated for its potential as a development site in downtown Ft. Lauderdale and it was determined that the value was enhanced by including the Building 32 site in the parcel.
- The project focus finally shifted to the renovation Building 33 and funding was redirected through a back-of-bill process. Building 33 has been renovated through multiple small projects spanning five years.

The pictures on pages 77 and 79 show the admissions/career center, student success center, and student life areas created with the Willis Holcombe Center Renovation (Building 33) project.

PROJECT TIMELINE

- 2008: Building 31 recommended for major capital remodeling.
- 2011: Campus Facilities Master Plan proposes the demolition and replacement of Building 31.
- July 2013: College enters into agreement with Florida Atlantic University to obtain use of Building 32.
- 2013: CIP request of \$15,487,675 to fund remodeling and renovation of Building 32 (148,753 GSF).
- December 2013: Division of Florida Colleges lists the project as #25 on 2014-15 Priority List.
- July 2014: PECO appropriation of \$3,500,000 for Building 32 renovation.
- January 2015: Building 32 ownership transferred from Florida Atlantic University to Broward College.
- March 2016: Division of Florida Colleges lists the project as #27 on 2016–17 Priority List.
- July 2016: PECO appropriation of \$5,000,000 for Building 32 renovation.
- January 2017: Developer selected for the Building 31/32 site.
- 2017: Approval to redirect Building 32 appropriated funds to Building 33 through a legislative back-of-the-bill process.
- 2014–2019: Multiple remodeling and upgrade projects.

BUILDING OCCUPANTS

- Units or departments housed in the facility: Global Education; Student Life; Admissions; Student Affairs.
- Reason or goals for bringing these units or space types together: The units were located in Buildings 31, 32, and 33. Remodeling Building 33 relocated support functions appropriately all in Building 33 and enhanced the ability to serve students.
- Types of activities in the building: academic; academic support; administrative.

PHYSICAL BUILDING

- Types of spaces: classrooms; offices; teaching laboratories; open laboratories.
- Construction phasing: The remodeling was accomplished over five years through multiple construction phases, floor by floor, system by system with concurrent upgrades to meet code. The college directly touched approximately 23,000 net square feet (NSF) of usable space. In addition the college built a new chilled water plant complete with required infrastructure to support the entire building, replaced all six elevators and their controllers, and made upgrades to building systems which affected the entire building.

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

LOCAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Broward College uses the following criteria to prioritize projects.

- 1. Does the project remediate a deficiency in life safety, building code, or accessibility?
- Does the project support the strategic plan "succeed" and the objective "ensure vibrant, welcoming, and functional campuses"?
- 3. Is the project included in the recommendations from the Educational Plant Survey?
- 4. Is the project request influenced by utilization factors?
- 5. Does the project create space efficiencies?
- 6. Is there a condition assessment component?
- 7. Does the project support new academic programming?

- 8. Is there funding from outside sources such as the Foundation?
- 9. Is this a multi-year project that has already received partial funding?
- 10. Does this project relate to an emergency repair not covered under maintenance?
- 11. Does the project better serve our constituents?
- 12. Does the project support a revenue producing initiative?
- Does the project require state funding?
 If so, must be in the Capital Improvement Plan.
- Does the project increase building area?
 If so, must be in the Capital Improvement Plan.

Using this criteria, the college's initial top priority project was the demolition and reconstruction of Building 31, as proposed in the 2011 Campus Facilities Plan. The classroom space was unacceptable and the building experienced frequent system failures due its age dating from the 1950's. The overall condition of the facility was rated as poor and the Board of Trustees, Florida Department of Education, and Office of Educational Facilities all agreed that demolition was justified.

The 2013 Capital Improvement Plan identifies the remodeling/renovation of Building 32 as the top priority, also meeting these criteria. The PECO funding appropriated for the Building 32 project was redirected to Building 33 when an economic analysis indicated that combining buildings 31 and 32 into a single development parcel was in the best interest of the college.

EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

The 2015 Educational Plant Survey identified the need for renovation of downtown campus educational and administrative space in Building 33.

DIVISION OF FLORIDA COLLEGES

The Division of Florida Colleges ranks projects according to the process in place at the time of submittal. Prior to 2016 emphasis was on previously funded projects and the relative need of the college within the system. In 2016–17 and 2017–18 previous funding and STEM were the two main factors. In the two years the Willis Holcombe Center project received funding it was ranked #25 on the 2014–15 Priority List and #27 on the 2016–17 Priority List.





CONSISTENCY WITH MISSION AND STRATEGY

Institution's Mission: "Transforming students' lives and enriching our diverse community through academic excellence, innovation, and meaningful career opportunities."

The renovated building addresses the college mission by improving the quality of the teaching space which has been proven to have a direct correlation with academic success and providing space for innovative programs.

- Institution's Strategic Goals: The project is consistent with the strategic goal "Succeed" and subsequent objective to "ensure vibrant, welcoming, functional campuses." Classroom spaces were renovated. Both student services and student life were remodeled to better serve students. Common areas were renovated to provide a more welcoming environment.
- Institution's Master Plan: The 2011 Facilities Master Plan initiated efforts to demolish and reconstruct Building 31. The last update to the Facilities Master Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2012, and thus the final Building 33 renovation project was not included. The college notes that its Educational Plant Survey and Capital Improvement Plan planning have been more responsive that its Facilities Master Plan. The 2012 Facilities Master Plan assumed constant enrollment growth, which was consistent with past trends in higher education. However, recent experience indicates that enrollment is affected much more dramatically by current economic conditions than previously. Had the college expanded based on the 2012 Facilities Master Plan, the college would be overbuilt. As a result, the college considers the campus master plan a living document and has adjusted it to meet more realistic expectations.
- State-Level Goals: While all college buildings are constructed in support of some aspect of educational success, the Willis Holcombe Center Renovation (Building 33) project directly addressed three of the Florida College System's seven goals— High Quality, Achievement, and Access.
- 1. Respond Rapidly: The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.
- 2. High Quality: The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.
- **3.** Affordability: Maintain affordability—while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.
- 4. Globally Competitive Workforce: The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.
- 5. Achievement: Promote student achievement. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.
- 6. Access: Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.
- **7.** Articulation/Workforce: Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upperdivision program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE PROCESS

The final funded project was not the one initially identified by the college. This case study is an example that the capital outlay process is durable and flexible in the face of changing circumstances. The project represents an efficient and appropriate use of the back-of-the-bill legislative process. The Legislature had already acknowledged Broward College's need for an expanded and renovated downtown center by fully funding renovations to Building 32. However, through a series of design studies and financial analyses, it was determined that a better, more cost-effective solution was available. The back-of-the-bill process allowed for the reallocation of appropriated funds to quickly achieve the desired solution, without the need to go through the entire project prioritization process again. The process was successful in that the flexibility to shift appropriations were accommodated as additional information became available.

At the project's inception, the campus master plan appropriately described and prioritized the demolition and reconstruction of Building 31, based on poor condition of infrastructure and poor quality of educational space. When new real estate opportunities appeared, the college appropriately redefined the project. It identified and programmed the Building 32 renovation project through the Educational Plant Survey process, during which the campuswide space deficit and quality of existing space were reviewed. The college then promoted the project through the Capital Improvement Plan process.

When Building 32 proved to be unacceptable for renovation and when additional space in Building 33 became available from Florida Atlantic University, the college redefined the project as the renovation of Building 33 and made it the college's top priority to meet space needs in downtown Ft. Lauderdale. The Division of Florida Colleges appropriately assessed the Building 32 renovation project against the state's educational goals, and the Legislature funded it.

Most striking about this case study is how flexible the funding process can be. Flexibility is necessary for the Florida College System to meet its goal to respond rapidly to the state's educational and workforce needs. Additionally, flexibility is necessary in the fast-moving real estate markets of Florida's downtowns, such as in Ft. Lauderdale. The college expressed appreciation that the state was willing to work with the college as the realities of the Building 32 renovation were discovered and Building 33 became a viable option.

As a postscript, Buildings 31 and 32 were combined into a single development site for a private developer. A new building is currently being constructed on the site.

CASE STUDY #2

L. GALE LEMERAND STUDENT CENTER

DAYTONA STATE COLLEGE STUDENT SERVICES CENTER

DAYTONA STATE COLLEGE STUDENT SERVICES BUILDING

INTRODUCTION

Date of Interview: December 4, 2019

Interview Participants: President; Provost; Senior Vice President Finance/Chief Business Officer; Associate Vice President, Facilities Planning; Senior Facilities Planner

BACKGROUND

COLLEGE MISSION

Daytona State College, a comprehensive public college, provides access to a range of flexible programs, from community enrichment to the baccalaureate degree, emphasizing student success, embracing excellence and diversity, as well as fostering innovation to enhance teaching and learning. (Going for the Gold: A Strategic Plan for Daytona State College, July 2017–June 2020)

COLLEGE STRATEGIC GOALS

- 1. Ensure Academic Excellence: Offer quality educational programs that meet the academic and non-academic workforce needs of Volusia and Flagler counties and beyond.
- 2. Enhance Student Success: Increase student development and academic support to enhance student performance, engagement and retention.
- **3.** Build Community Partnerships: Expand and create partnerships with business, community and educational organizations that enhance the college mission and vision.
- 4. Emphasize Institutional Effectiveness: Ensure efficient and effective use of college resources (fiscal, physical, human and technological).

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The 1995 Educational Plant Survey identified a need for additional student service space. The campus had outgrown its existing student services facilities. The dining hall was old and crowded. The library had outlived its usefulness. There was a need to enhance facilities to improve student retention and the student experience. Between 1998-2011, the Capital Improvement Plan Priority Request that was approved by Board of Trustees, was ranked #1 in every year's Capital Improvement Plan submission. In 2011-2012, the Legislature funds \$2,400,000 but Governor vetoes funding, In 2012-2013, a partial PECO appropriation of \$2,400,000 was secured. In the Fall 2014, the college explored conceptual design and preliminary site planning of a new Student Center on the Daytona Beach Campus. The college studied possible site locations, planning options, building exterior design, and circulation at both the vehicular and pedestrian scale. The college revised its campus master plan in 2015 to indicate the preferred location.

The new building has dramatically changed the "front door" experience and initial perception of the campus. The new building creates a dynamic gathering space at the center of campus activity. Not only is it a "living room" for the entire campus community, but it also puts on display the services available to students to enhance their academic and social experience at the college.

Evaluation of the potential cost for renovating the existing student services building to address these deficiencies led to a decision to demolish that building and pursue new construction. The 48,000 NSF project significantly reduced the more than 37,000 NSF deficiency in student services space identified in the 2015 Educational Plant Survey, along with providing additional general-purpose classrooms.



The pictures on pages 83–85 show the student life, academic support center, and student gathering areas created in the new Student Services Building.

PROJECT TIMELINE

- 1995: Original EPS generated that indicated a deficiency in student services space.
- 1998-2016: CIP Priority Request approved by Board of Trustees. The new student services building was ranked #1 in every year's CIP.
- 2011: Campus Master Plan indicates need to upgrade the existing student services facilities.
- August 2011: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #148 on 2012-13 Priority List.
- 2011-2012: Legislature funds \$2,400,000 and Governor vetoes funding.
- 2012-2013: PECO partial appropriation of \$2,400,000.
- December 2013: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #15 on 2014–15 Priority List.
- 2014: Building visioning which identified the new campus "front door" location.
- 2014-2015: PECO partial appropriation of \$8,000,000.
- December 2014: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #15 on 2015-16 Priority List.
- 2015-2016: PECO partial appropriation of \$18,852,602.
- 2016: Campus Master Plan revised to recommend new campus "front door" location.
- 2016: Construction Manager contracted, Building Programming Study completed.
- 2016: Board of Trustees Review and Approval of the Scope of Work.
- December 2016: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #1 on 2016-17 Priority List.
- 2016-2017: PECO final appropriation of \$3,575,803 for construction.
- 2017–2019: Site Work and Construction.
- 2019: Construction complete.

BUILDING OCCUPANTS

- Units or departments housed in the facility: Career Services; Academic Support Center; Library; Writing Center; Student Clubs and Organizations; Student Life.
- Reason or goals for bringing these units or space types together: The primary reason to bring these activities together was to enhance student success.
- Types of activities in the building: dining; lounging; group study; teaching; large events; academic support.

PHYSICAL BUILDING

- Types of spaces: dining; student informal collaboration and study; general purpose classrooms; event space.
- Construction phasing: The building was constructed in a single phase.

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

LOCAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Daytona State College prioritizes projects through a rigorous process that includes academic departments and administration. A college need list is established by the Educational Plant Survey, Planning Council Requests referencing the Strategic Plan and an Environmental Scan, academic department planning, and infrastructure life expectancy. The Board of Trustees provides guidance. The President, Senior Executive Staff and District Board of Trustees prioritizes the capital request list. The case study project was first identified in the Capital Improvement Plan in 1998 and was ranked as the first priority.

EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

The building program was developed using 2015 Educational Plant Survey data, including space deficits in student services, library, and classroom categories in the summary of existing and recommended square footage.

DIVISION OF FLORIDA COLLEGES

The Division of Florida Colleges ranks projects according to the process in place at the time of submittal. Prior to 2016 emphasis was on previously funded projects and the relative need of the college within the Florida College System. In 2016–17 and 2017–18 previous funding and STEM were the two main factors.

- #148 on the 2012-13 Priority List dated 8/29/11 when \$2,400,000 was allocated
- #15 on the 2014-15 Priority List dated 12/17/13 when \$8,000,000 was allocated
- #15 on the 2015-16 Priority List dated 12/1/14 when \$18,852,602 was allocated
- #1 on the 2016-17 Priority List dated 3/11/16 when \$3,575,803 was allocated





CONSISTENCY WITH MISSION AND STRATEGY

Institution's Mission: "Daytona State College, a comprehensive public college, provides access to a range of flexible programs, from community enrichment to the baccalaureate degree, emphasizing student success, embracing excellence and diversity, as well as fostering innovation to enhance teaching and learning."

The project focuses on student success, one of the key components of the college mission. The building co-locates critical elements of student success, such as academic support, career services, and student life.

- Institution's Strategic Goals: The project directly addresses the college goal of advancing retention and degree completion.
- Institution's Master Plan: The 2011 campus master plan identified a need to upgrade the existing student services facilities but did not anticipate relocation of student services and the creation of a new front door for the campus. The 2014 visioning process identified the campus "front door" location for the building and a 2016 subsequent update to the master plan.
- State-Level Goals: While all college buildings are constructed in support of some aspect of educational success, the Daytona State College Student Services Building project directly addressed one of the Florida College System's seven goals— Achievement. The new Student Services Building brings together the critical elements for students to achieve success.
- 1. **Respond Rapidly:** The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.
- 2. High Quality: The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.
- **3.** Affordability: Maintain affordability—while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.
- 4. Globally Competitive Workforce: The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.
- 5. Achievement: Promote student achievement. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.
- 6. Access: Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.
- 7. Articulation/Workforce: Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upperdivision program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE PROCESS

Although the process lasted for almost 20 years from the generation of the original Capital Improvement Plan to construction completion, the project is an outstanding example of achieving a stated goal to focus on student success. This project highlights the importance of funding a visioning/planning phase after the facility need is established but prior to design and construction. As a result of the protracted timeline for project funding, the college's ability to improve the student's campus experience and access to support services was impacted for generations of students.

The process to receive funding took longer than the college expected -- the process lasted for almost 20 years from generation of the original Capital Improvement Plan to construction completion. Despite the protracted prioritization and funding process, the project is an outstanding example of achieving a stated goal to focus on student success. The process of identifying the need, then visioning the building solution, verifying its appropriateness through reassessment, and adjustment of the master plan was successful.

The protracted prioritization and funding process enabled a building visioning phase and a revision to the campus master plan that relocated the building on the campus. This more advantageous site significantly improves the campus first impression to potential students and visitors while at the same time making student success a visible presence on the internal campus quadrangle.



CASE STUDY #3

EASTERN FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE MELBOURNE HEALTH SCIENCES INSTITUTE

EASTERN FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE

MELBOURNE HEALTH SCIENCES INSTITUTE

INTRODUCTION

Date of Interview: December 2, 2019

Interview Participants: Chief Financial Officer; Vice President, Operations; Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs/Chief Learning Officer; Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs/Melbourne Campus Provost; Associate Vice President, Facilities and Special Projects; Executive Director Planning and Assessment; Planning and Construction Manager

BACKGROUND

COLLEGE MISSION

Eastern Florida State College is committed to engaging our diverse population in quality, accessible learning opportunities that successfully meet individual and community needs. (Mapping the Future, Strategic Plan 2019-2022)

COLLEGE STRATEGIC GOALS

- Improve Academic Performance
- Prepare Students for the Job Market
- Improve Students' Collegiate Experience
- Improve the College's Financial Position

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Health Sciences Institute was originally proposed to be located on the Cocoa Campus, then the Titusville Campus. The project location was revised to the Melbourne Campus to address the growing population of space industries workers and retirees. Melbourne is the fastest growing part of Brevard County with proximity to clinical placement opportunities with Health First, the local private hospital and health care system. The Melbourne Campus facilitated consolidation of the college health-related programs to a single primary location.

The 60,183 gross square foot new construction building provides teaching and learning spaces appropriate for current health education pedagogy with the opportunity to remodel as necessary to keep up to date. The building also incorporates contemporary student support such as areas for informal learning outside of scheduled courses.

Examples of laboratory spaces created within the Melbourne Health Sciences Institute are shown on pages 89-91.



PROJECT TIMELINE

- 2007: CIP lists a new Health Science Building on the Cocoa Campus as the college's highest priority new construction project.
- 2008: CIP lists a new Health Sciences Facility on the Titusville Campus as the college's number two priority.
- 2009: CIP lists the Health Sciences Facility on the Titusville Campus as the college's number two priority.
- 2009-2010: EPS 1.1 identified a need for health science instruction space at the Titusville Campus.
- 2010: EPS identified a need for an additional 94,911 ASF of vocational labs on the Titusville Campus. It also indicated a deficit of 116,174 ASF on the Melbourne Campus.
- 2010: CIP ranks the Health Sciences Facility on the Titusville Campus as the seventh ranked new construction project.
- 2011: CIP ranks the Health Sciences Facility on the Titusville Campus as number five priority project.
- 2013: CIP list the Health Science Building on the Melbourne Campus with a priority ranking of number one.
- 2014: EPS identified the space need for health science instruction space as 159,209 ASF in Melbourne.
- 2014: Division of Florida Colleges does not include the project on the priority list.
- August 2014: Melbourne campus master plan revised to indicate project.
- 2014-2015: PECO partial appropriation of \$2,430,332 for planning.
- December 2014: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project as #23 on 2015-16 Priority List.
- 2015-2016: PECO final appropriation of \$17,046,241 for construction.

BUILDING OCCUPANTS

- Units or departments housed in the facility: Diagnostic Medical Sonography; Nursing; Pharmacy Technician; Physical Therapy Assistant; Practical Nursing; Radiography; Respiratory Care; Surgical Technology Services; Vascular Sonography.
- Reason or goals for bringing these units or space types together: Consolidation of health care related education and training provides opportunities for efficient use of resources across the various specific disciplines and for enhancement of student interdisciplinary knowledge which will be valuable in practice.
- Types of activities in the building: teaching; academic support.

PHYSICAL BUILDING

- Types of spaces: classrooms; discipline specific laboratories; academic office space; administrative office space; informal learning.
- Construction phasing: The new building was constructed in a single phase.

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

LOCAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The college's internal decision-making process includes discussion and prioritization by the three vice presidents, which are co-located to facilitate communication, and the campus provosts.

EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

The 2010 Educational Plant Survey identified a need for an additional 94,911 ASF of vocational labs on the Titusville Campus. It also indicated a deficit of 116,174 ASF on the Melbourne Campus. By the 2014 Educational Plant Survey, this deficit had increased to 159,209 ASF in Melbourne.

DIVISION OF FLORIDA COLLEGES

The Division of Florida Colleges ranks projects according to the process in place at the time of submittal. Prior to 2016 emphasis was on previously funded projects and the relative need of the college within the system. The Melbourne Health Sciences Institute was not on the Priority List the first year it received funding of \$2,430,332. It was #23 on the Priority List dated 12/1/14 when \$17,046,241 was allocated.









CONSISTENCY WITH MISSION AND STRATEGY

Institution's Mission: "Eastern Florida State College is committed to engaging our diverse population in quality, accessible learning opportunities that successfully meet individual and community needs."

The Health Sciences Institute addresses the mission of eastern Florida State College by locating a comprehensive health care education facility in the fastest growing part of the county. Quality, accessible learning opportunities are provided through clinical placement opportunities in the local community. The community need for health care providers is expanding.

- Institution's Strategic Goals: The Health Sciences Institute addresses the second College goal in directly preparing students for the local and regional job market.
- Institution's Master Plan: A Health Science Building was identified in the 2014 campus master plan. The Health Sciences Institute was constructed in the location identified in the master plan.
- State-Level Goals: While all college buildings are constructed in support of some aspect of educational success, the Eastern Florida State College Melbourne Health Sciences Institute project directly addressed one of the Florida College System's seven goals—Globally Competitive Workplace.
- 1. **Respond Rapidly:** The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.
- 2. High Quality: The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.
- **3.** Affordability: Maintain affordability—while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.
- 4. Globally Competitive Workforce: The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.
- 5. Achievement: Promote student achievement. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.
- 6. Access: Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.
- 7. Articulation/Workforce: Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upperdivision program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE PROCESS

It is not unusual for the scope of a project to change over time as "environmental" conditions change. The protracted funding pattern created an opportunity for the college to reassess and strengthen this case study project. However, the long delay in funding also detracts from the Florida College System's goal to rapidly respond to community needs.

The need for additional health care professionals in Florida has become critical with the influx of workers in booming industries and retirees. This was mentioned by many of the state colleges during their individual interviews. The case study project directly addresses this need.

The college identified the need for a health education building six years prior to Legislative funding. The college benefited from the delay in appropriations as during that time the scope of the project, including consolidation of programs, and relocation to the highest growth area of the county could be clarified. While the college was initially disappointed by the lack of funding for the project on the Cocoa and Titusville campuses, the delay led to a better solution of consolidation of the programs in Melbourne. Once the college had determined the best campus location for health education programs, funding for planning and design was quickly followed by funding for construction.

CASE STUDY #4

NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE ENGINEERING BUILDING 310 RENOVATION

NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE

ENGINEERING BUILDING 310 RENOVATION

INTRODUCTION

Date of Interview: November 19, 2019

Interview Participants: Vice President, Business Operations and Finance; Facilities Director; Facilities Coordinator

BACKGROUND

COLLEGE MISSION

Northwest Florida State College improves lives. We deliver outstanding educational programs that are relevant, accessible, and engaging for students of all ages and provide exceptional cultural, athletic, and economic development activities for the communities served. We commit to excellence, creativity, integrity, and service. (2017-2020 Strategic Plan)

COLLEGE STRATEGIC GOALS

- First Choice: through accessible, affordable, and relevant higher education that bolsters community, workforce and economic opportunities.
- Student Focused: through an engaging campus culture that promotes student success.
- Successful Pathways: through academic and career programs and services.
- Institutional Excellence: through innovative partnerships.
- Enhancing Resource Development: for physical, financial, and technological advancement.
- Encouraging Community Connectivity: through the promotion of athletic, cultural, and environmental activities.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The scope of the renovation was the ground floor of Building 310, including two classrooms, six discipline specific teaching labs, and four faculty offices. A second floor was added to the building with non-PECO College funds to accommodate administrative functions. The first floor has 9,061 square feet of renovation and 748 square feet of new construction. The second floor has 9,131 square feet of new construction.

The first floor was reconfigured to accommodate existing academic programs in more functional, updated space.

The renovated building has not been in use for a sufficient amount of time to properly evaluate it efficacy. One improvement already impacting organizational performance is that all instructional faculty are now located in the building adjacent to their teaching space rather than in another campus building.

Examples of the classroom and laboratory spaces created in the Engineering Building 310 Renovation are shown on pages 95-97.



PROJECT TIMELINE

- 2000-2016: CIP lists project, but not a high college priority.
- 2008: EPS recommends the project.
- 2015: Governor Rick Scott emphasizes STEM education in state budgets and spending priorities.
- 2015: EPS indicates overall campus surplus of space.
- 2016: CIP 2017-2018 listed Building 310 Renovation as its third priority project. First priority was Hot & Chilled Water Utility Plant Upgrade; second priority was General Renovation & Remodeling – All Sites. After consultation with the Division of Florida Colleges staff, the college amended their CIP to list Building 310 Renovation as second priority.
- January 2017: Division of Florida Colleges includes on the statewide priority list the Hot & Chilled Water Utility Plant Upgrade at number 12 for \$3.2 million, and Building 310 Renovation at number 22 for \$2,741,149.
- 2017: PECO appropriations of partial funding for Hot & Chilled Water Utility Plant Upgrade (\$3,000,000) and full funding (\$2,741,149) for Building 310 Renovation.
- 2018: EPS Spot Survey indicates overall campus surplus of space.
- 2018: Construction begins.
- August 2019: Completed for fall semester occupancy.

BUILDING OCCUPANTS

- Units or departments housed in the facility: Cyber Security, Computer Programming, Networking, Drafting and Architecture.
- Reason or goals for bringing these units or space types together: All departments were already located in the building and no new programs accommodated. Faculty were relocated to be adjacent to their primary teaching spaces in order to facilitate better faculty-student communication.
- Types of activities in the building: instruction, instructional support.

PHYSICAL BUILDING

- Types of spaces: classrooms, discipline specific teaching labs and support space, faculty offices and support space.
- Construction phasing: Renovation of the first floor and construction of the second floor was completed in a single phase.

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

LOCAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The college identified the Building 310 project due to the age and condition of the building (over 50 years), including deferred maintenance and deficient electrical service. The first floor of Building 310 lacked current educational technology and the space configuration could have been better for improved functionality. Although Building 310 renovation was included in the annual Capital Improvement Plan lists, the college had higher priority capital projects. Additionally, the Niceville campus had an overall surplus of space.

EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

Both the 2015 Educational Plant Survey and the 2018 Spot Survey indicate an overall surplus of space on the Niceville campus. There is a deficit in satisfactory teaching laboratory space, both vocational and non-vocational. The project was prioritized by the Division of Florida Colleges due to its focus on science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) program space laboratory upgrades, not to satisfy a space need.

DIVISION OF FLORIDA COLLEGES

The Division of Florida Colleges ranks projects according to the process in place at the time of submittal. Prior to 2016, emphasis was on previously funded projects and the relative need of the college within the system. In 2016–17 and 2017–18 previous funding and STEM were the two main factors. Because of the STEM-nature of project, it was first prioritized as #22 on 2017–18 Priority List in January 2017. Within the current project prioritization criteria, it would not be prioritized for funding.





CONSISTENCY WITH MISSION AND STRATEGY

Institution's Mission: "Northwest Florida State College improves lives. We deliver outstanding educational programs that are relevant, accessible, and engaging for students of all ages and provide exceptional cultural, athletic, and economic development activities for the communities served. We commit to excellence, creativity, integrity, and service."

The STEM programs accommodated in the renovation are relevant academic and training programs meeting current workforce needs.

- Institution's Strategic Goals: The renovated facility addresses goal number two: "Student Focused: through an engaging campus culture that promotes student success" by providing learning space that promotes student success.
- Institution's Master Plan: The campus master plan did not recommend the project, since that plan was very old and outdated. Additionally, as a small renovation project, the campus master plans prepared during this 17 year period did not identify this need.
- State-Level Goals: While all college buildings are constructed in support of some aspect of educational success, the Engineering Building 310 Renovation project directly addressed three of the Florida College System's seven goals—Respond Rapidly, High Quality, and Globally Competitive Workforce. In addition, this project supported STEM education, which was a priority of the state governor.
- 1. Respond Rapidly: The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.
- 2. High Quality: The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.
- **3.** Affordability: Maintain affordability—while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.
- 4. Globally Competitive Workforce: The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.
- 5. Achievement: Promote student achievement. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.
- 6. Access: Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.
- 7. Articulation/Workforce: Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upperdivision program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE PROCESS

This project demonstrates how the state's priorities impact local decision-making processes and how state-level agencies strategize with colleges to balance multiple needs. This project was not the highest priority need for the college but, following the advice of Division of Florida College staff, the college listed and prioritized it to better position the college to receive capital funding under the state's STEM economic development initiative. The Division of Florida Colleges suggested that the college shift its local priorities in order to not only increase funding probability for the college but also to meet statewide goals. The college's greater needs were a utility plant upgrade and other general remodeling. Statewide goals do not always address the needs of local communities, the stated mission of Florida's colleges.

As Governor Rick Scott began his second term in 2014, he sought to refocus state universities and colleges on graduating more STEM students to bolster state economic development, as described in the Roadmap to Florida's Future, the statewide strategic plan for economic development. Starting in 2015, the Division of Florida Colleges prioritized each college's first and second priority projects using five metrics. By one metric, projects that include or support high-skill, high-wage and/or STEM programs were given 20% of all possible prioritization points.

When Northwest Florida State College submitted its Capital Improvement Plan to the Division of Florida Colleges in 2016, its STEM-related project was a third-ranked priority, behind a utility plant upgrade and general remodeling. During SmithGroup's discussions with administration, college representatives noted that Building 310 Renovation project was not the highest priority need for the college. Existing engineering-related facilities were undersized and out-of-date, but they served their purpose.

Seeking to meet the state's new capital outlay prioritization goal of funding STEM-related projects, the Division of Florida Colleges staff suggested that the college re-prioritize its capital requests, elevating the Building 310 Renovation project to their second priority so that the Division could recommend it for funding. The college agreed. The Division included the Building 310 Renovation project on the statewide priority list, and the Legislature appropriated PECO funds for the entire project in a single year. (As indicated in the other case studies, the Legislature partially funds many capital projects over two or more funding cycles.)

The change in the college's project priorities was successful—the state invested in STEM-related educational facilities, the college received needed funding to renovate Building 310, and the college has better facilities to train students to meet the engineering-related occupational needs in Okaloosa and Walton Counties. The college is appreciative of receiving the funds.

During that same funding cycle, the college's top priorities were either partially funded (utility plant upgrade) or delayed (general renovations). Several administrators, including those from Northwest Florida State College, mentioned during on-site visits and phone interviews that they adjust project priorities to score additional points in the state funding process, even if the proposed project may not fulfill the greatest needs of the campus or the community. In an environment of very limited capital funding, it is not unusual for institutions to manipulate the system to maximize project priorities with the goal of increasing ranking to secure funding.

This case study serves as an illustration of the consequences of frequently changing the Division of Florida College's project prioritization criteria and using overly specific criteria (STEM, High-Skill, High-Wage) in the calculation of project rankings. During interviews with college administrators, many respondents expressed frustration with the changing prioritization criteria at the Capital Improvement Plan and state-level, since they must respond to each criterion change with edits to their Capital Improvement Plan list and project characterization. This case study demonstrates that the addition of a new promoted criterion such as STEM-related facilities can displace or deemphasize other important project priorities such as new programs to meet occupational demand, the need for new space, or life safety issues.

Florida College System institutions are mandated to serve their surrounding districts and communities, and local college leaders best understand which programs and services are needed to achieve their mission. The college's Capital Improvement Plan priorities indicate their highest needs. This case study demonstrates that specific statewide goals can and will alter local priorities, especially those tied to funding.
CASE STUDY #5

POLK STATE COLLEGE

WINTER HAVEN LEARNING RESOURCE BUILDING RENOVATION AND REMODELING

POLK STATE COLLEGE

WINTER HAVEN LEARNING RESOURCE BUILDING RENOVATION AND REMODELING

INTRODUCTION

Date of Interview: December 3, 2019

Interview Participants: President; Vice President, Academic Affairs; Vice President, Workforce & Economic Development; Vice President, Administration/Chief Financial Officer; Chief Information Officer; Associate Vice President, Communications & Public Affairs; Director, Teaching Learning Computing Center & Learning Resources, Winter Haven; Manager, Planning and Construction; District Director, Facilities

BACKGROUND

COLLEGE MISSION

Polk State College, a quality-driven institution, transforms students' lives through the power of education by providing access to affordable associate and baccalaureate degrees, career certificates and workforce-employment programs, delivered by diverse, qualified faculty and staff. (2017-2022 Strategic Plan)

COLLEGE STRATEGIC GOALS

- Innovation: Generate, disseminate, and implement new ideas for the benefit of students, staff, and the community.
- Engagement: Include all Polk State College stakeholders in student success.
- Community Impact: Extend positive impact from campus to community.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Learning Resource Building was the first structure built on the Winter Haven Campus in 1968. The renovation and remodeling project turned the space into the campus center of academics with classroom, learning, and library services. The renovation and remodeling project was recently completed and resulted in updated facilities for teaching, learning, and student success.

Due to the seventeen-year duration of the project, several different approaches to educational instruction and space have been incorporated, reflecting the continuously evolving approach to education.

Seventeen classrooms were updated with new technology, new furniture, and improved lighting and finishes. The project includes new student and faculty collaboration spaces, along with quiet study areas and improved access to a remodeled Teaching Learning Computing Center where students take placements tests, receive tutoring, and access technological resources.

The project included a redesign of the library. A one-stop circulation and reference desk, a dedicated laboratory for classes, study rooms, technology charging stations are among the many attributes of the significant renovation of the 17,027 square-foot library into a vibrant, state-of-the-art intellectual hub for the campus. This transformation of the library represents a commitment to providing more dedicated and technologically enhanced space where students, faculty, and staff can connect, share, learn, and create. The space is open and inviting with a user-friendly atmosphere where all can benefit from library staff and resources.

The college consulted students about desired use patterns, which were accommodated. The renovated library functions better and student satisfaction with the library has increased. The improved visibility of the tutoring center has enhanced its use significantly. Higher quality, more flexible classrooms are more heavily scheduled and used. Students are engaging with the enhanced technology.



The pictures on pages 101–103 show the informal and collaborative learning, classroom, and renovated library created in the Winter Haven Learning Resource Building Renovation and Remodeling project.

PROJECT TIMELINE

Initial phase construction, including core building systems and first-floor renovation, began in 2002 as part of the "shovel ready" projects list. This phase was completed in 2005. Renovation and remodeling of levels two and three were completed through multiple bid processes and construction phases from 2012 to 2017. In 2012 the state accelerated the reversion timeline for allocated funds. In order to retain the funds already appropriated, even though insufficient to complete the project, the college created more phases, subsequently completing several partial floor renovations.

- 2000: EPS indicates need to remodel the first-floor classrooms, exterior, and roof of Winter Haven Learning Resource Building.
- 2001: CIP Submittal priority #5.
- 2002: Governor's Economic Stimulus Funds appropriation of \$813,218. Construction started on first floor.
- 2003: Governor's Economic Stimulus Funds appropriation of \$3,438,121. Construction continues on first floor.
- 2004: Governor's Economic Stimulus Funds appropriation of \$1,032,114. Construction continues on first floor.
- 2005: Construction completed on first floor.
- 2007: CIP Submittal priority #1, after building code and life safety issues were discovered during first floor construction.
- 2007: Legislative appropriation of \$9,078,308 vetoed by the Governor.
- January 2009: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #24 Remodeling project on 2008-09 Priority List.
- 2008-2009: PECO partial appropriation of \$1,393,861.
- March 2009: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #62 on 2009-10 Priority List.
- 2009-2010: PECO partial appropriation of \$1,300,000.
- 2010: Legislative appropriation of \$10,211,371 vetoed by the Governor.
- 2011: EPS amended to include remodeling of 2nd and 3rd floors and continuation of life safety and code related upgrades.
- 2012: Notification regarding possible reversion of funds. Contracts initiated for Teaching Learning Computing Center design and construction and replacement of air handling unit.
- November 2012: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #13 on 2013-14 Priority List.
- 2013-2014: PECO partial appropriation of \$4,000,000.
- 2014: Construction on second floor continues.
- 2015: Construction begins on third floor.
- March 2016: Division of Florida Colleges prioritizes project #3 on 2016-17 Priority List.
- 2016-2017: PECO final appropriation of \$5,969,184. Construction continues.
- August 2017: Construction complete.

BUILDING OCCUPANTS

- Units or departments housed in the facility: library, testing, tutoring, Teaching Learning Computing Center.
- Reason or goals for bringing these units or space types together: The need for space to engage students and remove barriers was a high priority. For example, tutoring space that is flexible and inviting, encouraging student use.
- Types of activities in the building: teaching all student levels and disciplines in general purpose classrooms, tutoring, testing, student informal collaboration and study.

PHYSICAL BUILDING

- Types of spaces: class auditoriums, library, tutoring center, testing center, active learning classrooms, faculty and staff offices.
- Construction phasing: The project was phased. The phasing had not been determined when the project started. The project needed to be "complete" at the end of any phase as there was no guarantee of additional funding for construction. The college was unable to provide the additional costs related to the forced break up into stand-alone phases.

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

LOCAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

During phase one construction (first floor renovation), building code deficiencies such as non-fire rated wood construction in walls and unrated exit corridors and stairways were identified, which moved the completion of the building renovation to the number one priority in the Capital Improvement Program list.

The project was defined as (classroom) auditorium renovations in the 2001 Capital Improvement Plan, with a priority ranking of five. Higher ranked projects at that time were building systems replacement projects. By 2007 renovation of the Learning Resource Building was the top ranked project.

EDUCATIONAL PLANT SURVEY

The 2000 Educational Plant Survey recommended renovation of the building. Subsequent Educational Plant Survey in 2005 and 2006 continued the renovation recommendation.

DIVISION OF FLORIDA COLLEGES

The Division of Florida Colleges ranks projects according to the process in place at the time of submittal. Prior to 2016 emphasis was on previously funded projects and the relative need of the college within the system. In the four years the Learning Resource Building received funding it rose, fell, and rose again in ranking.

- #24 on the 2008-09 Priority List when \$1,393,861 was allocated. It should be noted that at this time the priority list was split into four categories: renovation, major renovation, remodeling, and new construction. The Learning Resource Building was in the remodeling project category.
- #62 on the 2009–10 Priority List dated 3/24/09 when \$1,300,000 was allocated
- #13 on the 2013-14 Priority List dated 11/16/12 when \$4,000,000 was allocated
- #3 on the 2016–17 Priority List dated 3/11/16 when \$5,969,184 was allocated





CONSISTENCY WITH MISSION AND STRATEGY

Institution's Mission: "Polk State College, a quality-driven institution, transforms students' lives through the power of education by providing access to affordable associate and baccalaureate degrees, career certificates and workforce employment programs, delivered by diverse, qualified faculty and staff."

The college mission statement does not specifically address but implies that to be a quality-driven institution, quality facilities are required for student success.

- Institution's Strategic Goals: Student success is a component of the college's engagement strategic goal. This project focuses on improving the quality of student success space.
- Institution's Master Plan: The master plan is very general and shows the locations and proposed uses of spaces over time, but does not address the details of individual renovation projects. The master plan promotes quality, safe, modern, and technologically-relevant instructional space, which was the impetus for the Learning Resource Center renovation project.
- State-Level Goals: While all college buildings are constructed in support of some aspect of educational success, the Polk State College Winter Haven Learning Resource Building renovation and remodeling project directly addressed two of the Florida College System's seven goals—High Quality and Access.
- 1. **Respond Rapidly:** The mission of the Florida College System is to respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs.
- 2. High Quality: The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success.
- **3.** Affordability: Maintain affordability—while ensuring quality—by keeping tuition low and ensuring students take advantage of financial aid and other cost-saving resources.
- 4. Globally Competitive Workforce: The mission of the Florida College System is to develop a globally competitive workforce.
- 5. Achievement: Promote student achievement. Continuously improve and innovate to support institutional achievement.
- 6. Access: Ensure all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education by removing barriers and expanding access.
- 7. Articulation/Workforce: Prepare students for their next step upon graduation, either through articulation into an upperdivision program or direct entry into the workforce with a high-paying jobs.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE PROCESS

The Learning Resource Building case study demonstrates the programming and economic harm when funding is distributed over many years and when project completion is not assured. It is more efficient to fund projects at a reasonable scope with the assurance that future funding will be available to complete the project.

The Educational Plant Survey identified the need, based on the building's outdated technology and deferred maintenance. The building was constructed in 1968 and had received only minor updates. The project was a relatively low priority for the college, ranked fifth by the college in the 2001 Capital Improvement Plan. Yet the project was "shovel ready" and thus eligible for economic stimulus funding. The project became the college's first priority when it discovered life safety and fire code issues during the initial renovation phase. The open stairwells, a hallmark of this type of mid-century modern design, created conflicts with modern fire safety codes. This resulted in the need for the entire building to be addressed in order to meet modern building code.

This project was funded in seven phases, not including the two times it was vetoed by the governor. The college felt that funding the project in very small segments was frustrating and disruptive. The lack of guaranteed funding to complete the renovation project necessitated making decisions that may have been different if the project completion had been promised. Even if funding was distributed over many years but completion funding was assured, the project could be designed and constructed by a single professional team, thus reducing cost and improving the integrity of the final product. The college could not quantify the additional cost related to the required incremental stand-alone renovations.

The case study also demonstrates that it is frequently more cost effective to combine infrastructure/utility replacement, life safety upgrades, and building repurposing into a single project, rather than attempting to solve each problem independently.



SPACE FORMULAS AND UTILIZATION FACTORS

-

Chapter 5 | Space Formulas and Utilization Factors

CHAPTER 5: ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS, SPACE NEEDS FORMULAS

This chapter examines full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment projections for accuracy, as well as space and utilization factors to determine whether they accurately reflect deficits or surpluses of each type of space and result in the most efficient and effective use of space. The goal of this chapter is to determine whether changes to colleges' current FTE projection processes or the state's space and utilization factors would result in more efficient and effective use of each type of space for the system.

ACCURACY OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Division of Florida Colleges staff generate capital outlay FTE (COFTE) projections each year by campus site using the latest actual FTE data. The COFTE projections are used to inform facilities planning and calculates space needs.

While relatively accurate in near years, enrollment projections are unacceptably inaccurate in "out-years." Space needs calculations are based on the unacceptably inaccurate "out-year" five-year projections. Some COFTE projections deviate by 20% or more at the college-level, potentially impacting their score on the Division of Florida Colleges point system for Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service (PECO) project priority. Changing the current COFTE projection process would not result in more efficient or effective use of space but would provide a more accurate accounting of space needs at the system-and college-level.

ENROLLMENT AND SPACE NEEDS LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

Changes in student population and projected space needs are assessed at the college-level by location. Assessing programlevel space needs is possible but comes at a cost and may not produce intended results.

SPACE NEED FORMULAS AND UTILIZATION FACTORS

Florida College System institutions rigorously follow the State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF, 2014) space guidelines because SREF space standards are required by State Statutes. SREF's net square feet (NSF) per COFTE guidelines provide a high-level snapshot of met and unmet space needs in critical space categories. The continued use of SREF for space needs formulas and utilization factors has several benefits:

- Simplicity. The space needs for all analyzed space categories (classrooms, non-vocational laboratories, vocational laboratories, offices, and library/study) are calculated in the same manner—projected enrollment (COFTE) multiplied by a factor. Only one data input is necessary.
- Consistency. The SREF standards have been used for many years with minor adjustments. Comparisons of current and past years is possible, and relatively little training is required for college staff.

Yet the strengths of the continued use of SREF for space needs formulas and utilization factors are also its weaknesses and the cause of its inaccuracies.

SREF standards are too simplistic. The SREF space formulas are too simplistic to accurately assess space needs at the campus level. All space factors are multiplied against COFTE, which is an appropriate approach for classrooms, nonvocational and vocational laboratories, and library/study spaces. Best practices indicate alternative ways to calculate office space needs, using data that is readily available to colleges. The one-size-fits-all straight-line NSF per COFTE formulas overgenerating space for larger FTE colleges and under-generating space for smaller FTE colleges.

- SREF standards are one-size-fits-all, but colleges are diverse. Colleges have a wide variety of community needs and college program mixes. SREF space formulas do not account for the diversity or mix of programs, especially in vocational laboratories. The current methodology for projecting space needs uses a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to consider differences in individual institutions mission, strategic goals, and varying needs according to the mix of programs or community needs. For example, a college who strategically wants to improve student success may need to schedule smaller class sizes, create more active learning classrooms, hire additional full-time faculty, and/or enhance academic success tutoring spaces. These strategies would have impacts on the assessment of space needs, but they are difficult to account for in current SREF space factors or the Educational Plant Survey (EPS) process. The disconnect between the specific needs of colleges and one-size-fits-all space needs formulas and utilization factors means that space factors cannot justify the distinct spaces that some colleges would use most effectively.
- SREF standards are one-size-fits-all, but space needs varies based on FTE size. Colleges become more efficient as FTE increases, a trend that is true for colleges both in and out of Florida, but SREF space needs generation standards are straight-line NSF per COFTE formulas regardless of COFTE level. SREF guidelines underestimate the need for space at small FTE colleges and overestimates it at large FTE colleges.
- SREF standards are unchanging, but new kinds of space are necessary. Since colleges and the Division of Florida Colleges must use SREF, there is no further effort to refine space needs to reflect strategic initiatives or academic areas that are growing or adding new programs or student service areas that are making changes to enhance student success. Because SREF space categories have been consistent for years, it does not adequately capture new kinds of space that are necessary for student academic success. For example, SREF does not adequately differentiate different types of open laboratories. Open laboratories are used primarily for individuals and groups and are informally scheduled, unscheduled, or open. For many statewide systems, there are multiple types of open laboratories. Because SREF has not adapted to address modern college space demands, colleges are not consistently tracking it and SREF does not accurately indicate the space need. See the Section 5.3 conclusions for an exploration of the types of open laboratories that SREF could provide standards for.
- SREF classroom standards do not address modern classroom demands. A large majority of colleges do not have effective classrooms, as measured by NSF/student. A low amount of space per student is efficient but not necessarily effective. Research in the emerging field of learning science has shown that active learning produces better student outcomes than traditional lecture. SREF standards mix traditional and computer classrooms, which makes it difficult to calculate the amount of space per student station (seat) since computer classrooms could inflate NSF per station metrics. SmithGroup's visual observation and interviews with campus constituents suggest that most classrooms are traditional and highly inflexible. For example, a sloped, 1970's era lecture hall with 120 seats might be very efficient at delivering science and psychology lectures, but three 40-seat sections held in a flexible classroom with space for working in groups may be more successful in producing effective learning outcomes.
- SREF does not consider quality of space. The SREF formulas do not address space quality. While facility inventory data notes the condition of the space (satisfactory, unsatisfactory, remodel), many colleges do not keep these codes updated. The SREF space factors do not take into account the quality of space and therefore do not provide a complete picture of space needs. Leading national organizations such as NACUBO and APPA have focused attention on the negative impact of deferred maintenance on the condition of facilities in higher education. They advocate for assessing both the facility condition and the suitability of buildings to accommodate the programmatic needs. Older facilities may not meet current standards for climate control or ADA access, and they may also be obsolete for 21st century teaching and learning. Mid-century buildings are often purpose-built and inflexible for accommodating more effective learning and program delivery. Suitability of the space to effectively deliver programs for 21st century education should be considered. The condition, suitability and configuration, and overall quality of existing space can be more important to colleges achieving strategic goals than quantity of space.

DATA SETS USED IN THE STUDY

To conduct the analyses, SmithGroup requested several data sets from the Division of Florida Colleges staff. Items requested and received for each of the 28 colleges for the fall 2018 term are as follows:

- Course Data This included the course number and description, student enrollments, course type, start and stop times, start and end dates, and meeting locations for credit courses for each campus, center and special purpose site location.
- Employee Data This consisted of a unit record database of employee by headcount and FTE, including job title and employee category.
- Facilities Inventory This data set provided building name, departmental designation, room number, square footage, and space use classification, on a room-by-room basis.
- Student Enrollment This included five years of actual annualized FTE enrollment (FTE-3) and five years of capital outlay annualized FTE enrollment projections by campus and center location.
- Room Utilization Data set contained classroom and laboratory room utilization metrics for the 2018-19 term (2E Submission), for each campus and center site.

In addition, SmithGroup secured the following information from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Database System (IPEDS).

- Library Data Data included collection volumes, expenditures, and staffing for each college.
- Staffing Data Data included the number of full-time and part-time faculty, staff, and administrators each college.

SECTION 5.1: PROCESS USED TO ESTIMATE FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

This section provides analyses to determine whether the processes used by the Florida College System to estimate FTE student enrollment growth result in reasonable projections. Division of Florida Colleges staff generate COFTE projection each year by campus site using the latest actual FTE data. The COFTE projections are used to inform facilities planning and calculates space needs.

SmithGroup reviewed documents, procedures, and guidelines from the Florida College System Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Procedures, Reporting Year 2019-20, Version 1.0, by the Florida Department of Education. SmithGroup analyzed five-year COFTE and actual end of year FTE data at the college-level from 2015-16 to 2019-20.

Per SREF, COFTE enrollment is the primary driver of the space needs calculations used in the Educational Plant Survey planning process.

COFTE x a space formula = space needs in net square feet (NSF)

Projecting enrollment in five-year increments is therefore relevant in assessing the need for a capital project request.

PROJECTION METHODOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS

Division of Florida Colleges staff provided adjusted COFTE projections for funded lower and upper division enrollments by college site. For this analysis, projections developed in 2014–15 were estimated for 2015–16 through 2020–21. To validate the accuracy of the projections (Florida College System actual FTE-3 enrollment, Funded, 30 credit hours per FTE), upper and lower division was reviewed from 2014–15 through 2018–19. As the 2019–2020 academic year is still in process, mid-year estimates were used based on FTE-1A data. (FTE-1A data is summer end-of-term and fall beginning-of-term enrollment with estimates for winter end-of-term and spring-end-term. The label "A" indicates that it has been adjusted.)

COFTE projections are generated from the FTE Enrollment Plan by distributing the projections by site using the latest FTE data. Typically, the latest FTE data for site distribution is the winter/spring end-of-term data at load date. The COFTE projections are used to inform facilities planning and are done once per year and are submitted to the Educational Facilities, Department of Education, in August of each year, following an FTE-3 meeting of the Enrollment Estimating Conference (EEC).

The procedures for the FTE estimates, the FTE Enrollment Plan, and the COFTE projections were originally adopted by the State Board of Community Colleges, were later adopted by the Council of Presidents, and are documented in the Florida College System Guidelines and Procedures Manual, Procedures for Student FTE (Full-time Equivalent) Estimates and Projections.

The Division of Florida Colleges staff estimates COFTE based on the following methodology, as described in their 2019–20 FTE procedures:

Beginning in 1989–90, the Division of Florida Colleges began using the current Enrollment Projection Model. The Division calculates two types of projections: Budget and Capital Outlay.

The model is based on the participation rate of the FTE to the college's service area district population. A college's service area could be one district, or multiple districts. Simple linear regression is used to project the participation rate. The projected rate is multiplied by the projected population to get the projected FTE. The projected population data are obtained from the Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR), the research arm of the Legislature. The model can use two to six years of historical data and will project six to ten years based on the college totals. The projected college totals are then distributed by program area and by site.

After initial projections are calculated, colleges have the opportunity to review the FTE projections and either accept or make adjustments, as needed for all actual and planned sites. To assist the colleges in verifying the FTE projections, reports for Florida public high school graduates, Florida's population, historical FTE, and projected FTE are available. Colleges have the option of accepting the Division Projection Model (with or without adjustments) or using the college's own projections. Each college must use one or the other option, but not both. Colleges must submit a narrative justification for all projections explaining either the reason for accepting, adjusting, or replacing the Division Projection Model. The Division of Florida Colleges carefully evaluates all projections and narratives before forwarding the information to the Enrollment Estimating Conference principals. The principals consist of House, Senate, Governor's Office, and the Office of Economic and Demographic Research staff. The EEC does not accept projections that are not reasonable or are not fully justified.

ANALYSIS OF PROJECTED AND ACTUAL ENROLLMENTS

Each academic year was analyzed separately using enrollment projections from 2014-15. Projected and actual FTE enrollment by upper and lower division are noted in the tables for each college.

ACADEMIC YEAR 2015-16

The following table notes projected and actual FTE for the academic year 2015-16. Interpreting the table, Miami Dade College was projected (in the 2014-2015 enrollment projections) to generate at total of 55,083 COFTE in the academic year 2015-16. At the end of that academic year, Miami Dade College generated a total of 51,526 actual FTE. The projection was higher than the actual by 3,557 FTE or 6%. Data from each column were summed to obtain totals for all Florida College System institutions. The percentage difference between the COFTE and actual FTE were calculated as follows:

- Upper Division: Projections Underestimated by 3.4%
- Lower Division: Projections Overestimated by 2.2%
- Total: Projections Overestimated by 1.9%

At the system level for academic year 2015–16, the total projection was 334,505 COFTE, with colleges generating 327,992 actual FTE. The COFTE projection was 6,513 FTE or 1.9% higher than actual enrollment.

2015–16 Academic Year	FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM Analysis of Projected and Actual Enrollment									
	2015–16 COFTE Projection		2015-16 Actual FTE			Actual - Projected Difference				
College	UPPER DIVISION	LOWER DIVISION	TOTAL	UPPER DIVISION	LOWER DIVISION	TOTAL	UPPER DIVISION	LOWER DIVISION	TOTAL	Total Percent Difference
Broward	871	28,550	29,421	979	29,073	30,053	108	523	632	2%
Chipola	135	1,330	1,465	128	1,318	1,446	(7)	(12)	(19)	-1%
Central Florida	321	5,248	5,569	335	4,950	5,286	14	(298)	(284)	-5%
Florida Keys	-	660	660	-	715	715	-	55	55	8%
Daytona	908	9,894	10,802	945	10,808	11,754	37	914	952	9%
Eastern Florida	396	10,780	11,176	452	10,083	10,535	56	(697)	(641)	-6%
Florida Gateway	25	1,912	1,937	27	1,954	1,981	2	42	44	2%
FL SouthWestern	621	9,391	10,012	557	9,796	10,353	(64)	405	341	3%
FL SC at Jax	1,398	19,136	20,534	1,648	17,983	19,631	250	(1,153)	(903)	-4%
Gulf Coast	47	3,976	4,023	85	3,769	3,854	38	(207)	(169)	-4%
Hillsborough	-	19,955	19,955	-	20,046	20,046	-	91	91	0%
Indian River	1,389	12,411	13,800	1,496	12,229	13,725	107	(182)	(75)	-1%
Lake-Sumter	43	2,783	2,826	53	2,826	2,879	10	43	53	2%
Miami Dade	2,015	53,068	55,083	1,983	49,543	51,526	(32)	(3,525)	(3,557)	-6%
North Florida	-	831	831	-	814	814	-	(17)	(17)	-2%
Northwest FL	341	4,523	4,864	322	3,928	4,250	(19)	(595)	(614)	-13%
Palm Beach State	621	19,694	20,315	621	19,341	19,962	0	(353)	(353)	-2%
Pasco-Hernando	178	8,009	8,187	192	7,551	7,743	14	(458)	(444)	-5%
Pensacola	236	6,986	7,222	249	6,806	7,054	13	(180)	(168)	-2%
Polk	723	6,433	7,156	726	6,482	7,208	3	49	52	1%
St. Johns River	188	4,498	4,686	182	4,338	4,520	(6)	(160)	(166)	-4%
St. Petersburg	2,649	18,289	20,938	2,643	17,451	20,094	(6)	(838)	(844)	-4%
Santa Fe	404	10,393	10,797	384	10,596	10,980	(20)	203	183	2%
Seminole State	610	12,749	13,359	594	11,936	12,530	(16)	(813)	(829)	-6%
South Florida	101	2,201	2,302	99	2,069	2,168	(2)	(132)	(134)	-6%
State College FL	405	7,141	7,546	427	6,982	7,409	22	(159)	(137)	-2%
Tallahassee	12	9,096	9,108	-	9,349	9,349	(12)	253	241	3%
Valencia	135	29,796	29,931	153	29,974	30,127	18	178	196	1%
SYSTEM Total	14,772	319,733	334,505	15,281	312,711	327,992	509	(7,022)	(6,513)	-1.9%

ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-17

SYSTEM Total

15,027

319,441

334,468

The following table notes projected and actual FTE for the academic year 2016–17. Interpretation of the table is like academic year 2015–16.

Data from each column were summed to obtain totals for all Florida College System institutions. The percentage difference between the COFTE and actual FTE were calculated as follows:

- Upper Division: Projections Underestimated by 7.3%
- Lower Division: Projections Overestimated by 4.6%
- Total: Projections Overestimated by 4.1%

At the system level for academic year 2016–17, the total projection was 334,568 COFTE, with colleges generating 320,900 actual FTE. The COFTE projection was 13,568 FTE or 4.1% higher than actual enrollment.

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM 2016-17 Analysis of Projected and Actual Enrollment **Academic Year** 2016-17 COFTE Projection 2016-17 Actual FTE Actual - Projected Difference College Total UPPER LOWER UPPER LOWER UPPER LOWER TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL Percent DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION Difference Broward 855 28,035 28,890 1,096 28,376 29,471 241 341 581 2% Chipola 135 1,344 1,479 119 1.401 1.520 (16) 57 41 3% Central Florida 396 5,079 5,475 325 4,837 5,162 (71) (242) (313) -6% Florida Keys 715 99 616 616 6 721 6 105 17% _ 5 Daytona 889 9.684 10,573 894 10,764 11,658 1.080 1.085 10% Eastern Florida 519 10,806 11,325 563 10,143 10,706 44 (663) (619) -5% Florida Gateway 30 1,921 1,951 37 2,141 2,178 7 220 227 12% FL SouthWestern 611 9,501 10,112 593 10,048 10,641 (18) 547 529 5% FL SC at Jax 1.413 19.311 20,724 1.784 17,125 18.908 371 (2, 186)(1.816)-9% Gulf Coast 3,795 96 3,580 3,676 52 (171) (119) -3% 44 3.751 Hillsborough 20,080 20,080 19,622 19,622 (458) (458) -2% _ _ _ Indian River 1,430 12,769 14,199 1,506 12,355 13,861 76 (414) (338) -2% 54 2 917 11 Lake-Sumter 43 2 816 2 8 5 9 2 971 101 112 4% Miami Dade 2,059 53,550 55,609 1,927 45,203 47,130 (132) (8,347) (8,479) -15% North Florida _ 850 850 _ 837 837 _ (13) (13) -2% Northwest FL 343 4,620 4,963 300 3,678 3,978 (43) (942) (985) -20% Palm Beach State 627 19.893 20.520 689 19.849 20.537 62 (45) 17 0% Pasco-Hernando 197 8.494 8,691 317 7,409 7,726 120 (1,085) (965) -11% Pensacola 211 6,200 6,411 291 6,818 7,108 80 618 697 11% Polk 683 6,057 6,740 772 5,810 6,582 89 (247) (158) -2% St. Johns River 189 4,537 4,726 180 4,245 4,425 (9) (293) (301) -6% St. Petersburg 2.663 18.374 21.037 2.649 16.350 18.999 (14) (2.024)(2.038)-10% Santa Fe 10,413 417 10,977 11,395 953 389 10.024 28 982 9% Seminole State 13,605 803 11,833 162 (1,131) -7% 641 12,964 12,636 (969)South Florida 2,395 88 2,156 (16) (135) 104 2,291 2,244 (151)-6% 7,584 State College FL 409 7.175 444 6 6 2 6 7 0 7 0 35 (549) (515)-7% Tallahassee 12 8,713 8,725 11 9,115 9,127 (1) 402 402 5% Valencia 135 29,986 30,121 170 29,843 30,012 35 (143) (109) 0%

16,130

304,770

320,900

1,103

(14,671)

(13,568)

-4.1%

ACADEMIC YEAR 2017-18

The following table notes projected and actual FTE for the academic year 2017–18. Interpretation of the table is described in academic year 2015–16.

Data from each column were summed to obtain totals for all Florida College System institutions. The percentage difference between the COFTE and actual FTE were calculated as follows:

- Upper Division: Projections Underestimated by 7.1%
- Lower Division: Projections Overestimated by 5.6%
- Total: Projections Overestimated by 5.0%

Projections underestimated upper division FTE enrollment by 1,095 FTE or 7.3%. At the system level for academic year 2017–18, the total projection was 336,924 COFTE, with colleges generating 320,043 actual FTE. The actual FTE was -16,882 FTE or 5.0% lower than COFTE enrollment.

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM 2017-18 Analysis of Projected and Actual Enrollment **Academic Year** 2017-18 COFTE Projection 2017-18 Actual FTE Actual - Projected Difference College Total UPPER LOWER UPPER LOWER UPPER LOWER TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL Percent DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION Difference Broward 842 27,524 28,366 1,188 27,438 28,626 346 (86) 260 1% 1,350 1,485 1,317 (14) (47) Chipola 135 121 1,439 (33) -3% Central Florida 444 4,990 5,434 344 4,755 5,100 (100) (235) (334) -6% Florida Keys 593 593 22 692 714 22 99 121 20% _ Daytona 867 9,462 10,329 865 10,541 11,406 (2) 1.079 1.077 10% Eastern Florida 647 10,838 11,485 700 10,031 10,731 53 (807) (754) -7% Florida Gateway 1,944 1,979 2,276 24 357 35 59 2,336 332 18% FL SouthWestern 600 9,613 10,213 591 10,513 11,104 (9) 900 891 9% FL SC at Jax 1.443 19,678 21,121 1.689 15,119 16.808 246 (4,559) (4,314) -20% Gulf Coast 41 3,518 3,559 124 3,461 3,585 83 (57) 26 1% Hillsborough 20,201 20,201 20,010 20,010 (191) (191) -1% _ _ _ Indian River 1,469 13,120 14,589 1,489 11,829 13,318 20 (1,291) (1,272) -9% Lake-Sumter 2 912 2 981 46 3 0 6 5 (23) 153 130 69 3.111 4% Miami Dade 2,223 55,564 57,787 1,852 46,336 48,188 (371) (9,228) (9,599) -17% North Florida 867 867 _ 12 853 866 12 (14) (2) 0% Northwest FL 344 4,722 5,066 303 3,585 3,889 (41) (1,137) (1,177) -23% Palm Beach State 20.089 20.725 20.392 89 303 636 725 21.117 392 2% Pasco-Hernando 9,216 7,287 215 9,001 367 7.654 152 (1,714) (1,562) -17% 5,591 Pensacola 185 5,406 339 6,881 7,220 154 1,475 1,629 29% Polk 6,310 642 5,668 748 5,786 6,533 106 118 223 4% 4,574 4,765 4,340 4 St. Johns River 191 195 4,535 (234) (230) -5% 2,711 St. Petersburg 2.676 18.483 21,159 15.857 18.568 35 (2,626) (2, 591)-12% Santa Fe 375 9,650 10,025 439 10,807 11,246 64 1,157 1,221 12% 13,856 11,754 Seminole State 13,184 896 12,650 224 (1,430) (1,206) -9% 672 South Florida 109 2,386 2,495 108 2,255 2,362 (1) (132) (133) -5% State College FL 7,209 7,622 432 6,469 (740)(721) -9% 413 6.901 19 Tallahassee 48 8,723 8,771 12 9,188 9,200 (36) 465 429 5% 37 Valencia 136 30,198 30,334 173 30,655 30,827 457 493 2% SYSTEM Total 15,457 321,467 336,924 16,552 303,491 320,043 1,095 (17,976) (16,882) -5.0%

ACADEMIC YEAR 2018-19

The following table notes projected and actual FTE for the academic year 2018-19. Interpretation of the table is described in academic year 2015-16.

Data from each column were summed to obtain totals for all Florida College System institutions. The percentage difference between the COFTE and actual FTE were calculated as follows:

- Upper Division: Projections Underestimated by 10.6%
- Lower Division: Projections Overestimated by 6.4%
- Total: Projections Overestimated by 5.6%

Projections underestimated upper division FTE enrollment by 1,685 FTE or 7.4%. At the system level for academic year 2018-19, the total projection was 339,245 COFTE, with colleges generating 320,302 actual FTE. The actual projection was -18,943 FTE or 5.6% lower than COFTE enrollment.

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM 2018-19 Analysis of Projected and Actual Enrollment **Academic Year** 2018-19 COFTE Projection 2018-19 Actual FTE Actual - Projected Difference College Total UPPER LOWER UPPER LOWER UPPER LOWER TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL Percent DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION DIVISION Difference Broward 826 27,000 27,826 1,288 27,047 28,335 462 47 509 2% 0 Chipola 135 1,365 1,500 135 1,339 1.475 (26)(25) -2% Central Florida 497 4,929 5,426 339 4,806 5,145 (159) (123) (281) -5% Florida Keys 587 695 13 587 13 708 108 121 21% _ Daytona 850 9.246 10,096 946 10.172 11.118 96 926 1,022 10% Eastern Florida 800 10,857 11,657 839 9,957 10,796 39 (900) (861) -7% Florida Gateway 42 1,960 2,002 83 2,332 2,415 41 372 413 21% FL SouthWestern 587 9,728 10,315 586 10,529 11,115 (1) 801 800 8% (4,828) FL SC at Jax 1.471 20.048 21,519 1.688 15.220 16.908 217 (4.611)-21% Gulf Coast 3,315 131 3,284 92 (123) -1% 39 3.276 3.153 (31) Hillsborough 20.301 20,301 20,466 _ 20,466 _ 165 165 1% _ Indian River 1,506 13,457 14,963 1,525 11,261 12,786 19 (2,177) -15% (2,196)56 (60)Lake-Sumter 116 3 0 5 1 3.167 3 194 3 2 5 0 143 83 3% Miami Dade 2,369 57,334 59,703 1,897 45,589 47,486 (472) (11,746) (12,217) -20% North Florida _ 886 886 16 830 846 16 (56) (40)-4% Northwest FL 344 4,827 5,171 325 3,503 3,829 (19) (1,324) (1,342) -26% 20.324 136 Palm Beach State 20.188 20.829 807 21.131 166 302 1% 641 Pasco-Hernando 235 9.667 9.902 367 7,213 7.580 132 (2,454) (2,322) -23% Pensacola 159 4,602 4,761 411 6,847 7,258 252 2,245 2,497 52% Polk 600 5,259 5,859 761 5,844 6,605 161 585 746 13% St. Johns River 192 4,603 4,795 213 4,376 4,589 21 (227)(206) -4% St. Petersburg 2.696 18.599 21.295 2.713 15.888 18.601 17 (2,711) (2.694)-13% Santa Fe 472 10,612 11,084 111 361 9.266 9.627 1.346 1.457 15% Seminole State 14,117 970 11,888 264 (1,523) -9% 706 13,411 12,858 (1, 259)South Florida 2,600 115 2,256 (15) 130 2,470 2,371 (214) (229) -9% State College FL 417 7280 7.697 432 6 2 5 2 6 6 8 4 15 (1.028)(1.013)-13% Tallahassee 60 8,733 8,793 17 9,062 9,079 (44) 329 286 3% 32,045 Valencia 137 30,399 30,536 457 32,502 320 1,646 1,966 6% SYSTEM Total 15,916 323,329 339,245 17,601 302,701 320,304 1,685 (20,628) (18,943) -5.6%

ACADEMIC YEAR 2019-20

It must be noted that actual data from the 2019–20 academic year will not be finalized until the end of Spring 2020 semester. The FTE-1A report, adopted by the Enrollment Estimating Conference was used for the analysis. The following table notes projected and actual FTE for the academic year 2019–20. Interpretation of the table is described in academic year 2015–16.

Data from each column were summed to obtain totals for all Florida College System institutions. The percentage difference between the actual FTE and COFTE were calculated as follows:

- Upper Division: Projections Underestimated FTE by 16.2%
- Lower Division: Projections Overestimated FTE by 7.3%
- Total: Projections Overestimated FTE by 6.2%

Projections underestimated upper division FTE enrollment by 2,654 FTE or 16.2%. At the system level for academic year 2018-19, the total projection was 341,449 COFTE, with colleges generating an estimated 320,366 FTE. The actual FTE is -21,083 FTE or 6.2% lower than actual enrollment.

2019–20 Academic Year	FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM Analysis of Projected and Actual Enrollment									
	2019-	2019-20 COFTE Projection 2019-20 Actual FTE			E	Actual - Projected Difference				
College	UPPER DIVISION	LOWER DIVISION	TOTAL	UPPER DIVISION	LOWER DIVISION	TOTAL	UPPER DIVISION	LOWER DIVISION	TOTAL	Total Percent Difference
Broward	808	26,472	27,280	1,344	26,102	27,446	536	(370)	166	1%
Chipola	135	1,345	1,480	143	1,262	1,405	8	(83)	(75)	-5%
Central Florida	557	4,882	5,439	364	4,839	5,203	(193)	(43)	(236)	-4%
Florida Keys	-	600	600	32	720	752	32	120	152	25%
Daytona	830	9,032	9,862	946	10,429	11,375	116	1,397	1,513	15%
Eastern Florida	969	10,874	11,843	990	9,797	10,787	21	(1,077)	(1,056)	-9%
Florida Gateway	47	1,966	2,013	112	2,330	2,442	65	364	429	21%
FL SouthWestern	572	9,848	10,420	577	10,550	11,127	5	702	707	7%
FL SC at Jax	1,500	20,418	21,918	1,835	15,468	17,303	335	(4,950)	(4,615)	-21%
Gulf Coast	36	3,031	3,067	116	3,027	3,143	80	(4)	76	2%
Hillsborough	-	20,403	20,403	-	20,624	20,624	-	221	221	1%
Indian River	1,545	13,792	15,337	1,525	11,024	12,549	(20)	(2,768)	(2,788)	-18%
Lake-Sumter	178	3,180	3,358	114	3,243	3,357	(64)	63	(1)	0%
Miami Dade	2,510	59,043	61,553	2,110	44,145	46,255	(400)	(14,898)	(15,298)	-25%
North Florida	-	902	902	23	822	845	23	(80)	(57)	-6%
Northwest FL	344	4,933	5,277	332	3,352	3,684	(12)	(1,581)	(1,593)	-30%
Palm Beach State	645	20,286	20,931	867	20,424	21,291	222	138	360	2%
Pasco-Hernando	254	10,344	10,598	378	7,280	7,658	124	(3,064)	(2,940)	-28%
Pensacola	133	3,780	3,913	449	6,784	7,233	316	3,004	3,320	85%
Polk	554	4,832	5,386	752	5,820	6,572	198	988	1,186	22%
St. Johns River	193	4,628	4,821	242	4,466	4,708	49	(162)	(113)	-2%
St. Petersburg	2,712	18,711	21,423	2,714	15,988	18,702	2	(2,723)	(2,721)	-13%
Santa Fe	345	8,875	9,220	485	10,516	11,001	140	1,641	1,781	19%
Seminole State	742	13,642	14,384	1,120	11,772	12,892	378	(1,870)	(1,492)	-10%
South Florida	165	2,545	2,710	97	2,264	2,361	(68)	(281)	(349)	-13%
State College FL	419	7,356	7,775	400	6,485	6,885	(19)	(871)	(890)	-11%
Tallahassee	75	8,743	8,818	27	8,933	8,960	(48)	190	142	2%
Valencia	138	30,580	30,718	966	32,840	33,806	828	2,260	3,088	10%
SYSTEM Total	16,406	325,043	341,449	19,060	301,306	320,366	2,654	(23,737)	(21,083)	-6.2%

FIVE-YEAR TREND SUMMARY AND IMPACT

Summarizing five-year trends in the following table, projections are less accurate further into the future. The percent deviation in FTE doubled from 1.9% in 2015–16 to 4.1% in 2016–17. In general, four- and five-year projections had the most variability between projection and actuals, especially in upper division courses. Upper division (Bachelor's programs) may have higher deviations as they are still relativity new and may be difficult to predict with current participation rate and linear regression projection methodologies.

PERCENT CHANGE BETWEEN ACTUAL FTE AND PROJECTED COFTE: FIVE YEAR TREND Under and Over Estimation (Actual – Projected)								
Year	2015-16 2016-17 2017-18 2018-19 2019-20							
Total	Over 1.9%	Over 4.1%	Over 5.0%	Over 5.6%	Over 6.2%			
Lower Division	Over 2.2%	Over 4.6%	Over 5.6%	Over 6.4%	Over 7.3%			
Upper Division	Under 3.4%	Under 7.3%	Under 7.1%	Under 10.6%	Under 16.2%			

SmithGroup studied the impact of overestimation of COFTE as related to the space needs calculations used in the Educational Plant Survey capital planning process. SmithGroup calculated an average of 70 NSF per FTE based on current FTE and facilities data for the ten space categories.

For academic year 2018–19, the total Florida College System projection was 339,245 COFTE, with colleges generating 320,302 actual FTE. The COFTE projection was 18,943 FTE or 5.6% higher than actual enrollment. Multiplying 70 NSF per FTE by the 18,943 deviation results in overestimating system space needs by 1,326,010 NSF. As a point of comparison, Broward College, with 10 active campuses and centers, contains 1,361,433 NSF.

PROJECTION ACCURACY BY CAMPUS SIZE

The following graph plots actual FTE enrollment for 2018–19 by the FTE deviation (COFTE and Actual) by college. There is mild positive correlation (+.54) between the two variables, suggesting that enrollment projections for the smaller colleges were generally more accurate than larger ones. This is also visually evident in the graph. SmithGroup also found a strong positive correlation (+.83) between actual FTE and the number of active campus sites. Since COFTE projections estimate enrollment for each campus, center, or special purpose site, the total error rate is magnified as the number of locations increases.



SECTION 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

- While relatively accurate in near years, enrollment projections are unacceptably inaccurate in "out-years". The Florida College System annualized FTE enrollment projections were relatively accurate in the first year (1.9% deviation in 2015-16). When forecasting two to four years in advance, there was greater variability (average of 4.9% deviation). By year five, projections deviated from actual enrollment estimates by 6.2%. Given the impact on space needs formulas, SmithGroup believes that an error rate or yearly deviation of more than 5% over the five-year planning period is unacceptable.
- Space needs calculations are based on the unacceptably inaccurate "out-year" five-year projections. While COFTE projections are prepared and refined on an annual basis, the Educational Plant Survey cycle considers updated COFTE projections every five years (unless the college requests a "Spot Survey").
- Some COFTE projections deviate by 20% or more at the college-level, potentially impacting their score on the Division of Florida Colleges point system for PECO project priority. At the college-level, COFTE projections at seven colleges deviated by 20% or more for 2018-19, potentially impacting space planning outcomes. Changes in the point allocation for the "space needs met" criteria could impact project rankings.
- Changing the current COFTE projection process would not result in more efficient or effective use of space but would provide a more accurate accounting of space needs at the system and college-level. The current COFTE projection process results in relatively accurate near-term enrollment projections, but is unacceptable in the long-term, especially for larger colleges with multiple locations.

SECTION 5.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Florida College System should review and evaluate enrollment projections methodology. Given that the Educational Plant Survey uses a five-year FTE projection for calculating space needs and project funding, the accuracy of the model, the data elements, and calculations for estimating enrollment needs to be evaluated with the goal of greater accuracy in the out-years. One example would be the projection methodology used by the National Center for Educational Statistics in their projection of enrollments for postsecondary institutions. The Maryland Higher Education Commission used multiple factors, including disposable income, in projecting enrollments for community colleges through 2028.
- The Division of Florida Colleges should calculate the accuracy of the five-year COFTE enrollment projections yearly. Greater scrutiny, discussion, and the determination of accuracy of college five-year projections would be worthwhile.
- The Florida College System should calculate space needs for PECO project prioritization using the most recent actual (FTE-3) data. For greater accuracy, unmet space needs should be calculated with actual data as a point in time analysis.
- Using enrollment management practices, colleges should look more critically at locations with low FTE and should make adjustment in programs and services to reduce needs for new space. Given the inaccuracy of out-year enrollment projections, the Florida College System should potentially reduce the need for new space driven by enrollment growth by developing a coordinated approach among college-level enrollment management administrators to optimize the use of existing capacity. However, other capital needs driven by poor facility conditions, deferred maintenance, and programmatic suitability would still need to be addressed by all colleges.

SECTION 5.2 ENROLLMENT AND SPACE NEEDS LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

Section 5.2 answers the question of whether estimated growth of student population and projected space needs are assessed at the college-level, school-level, and/or major-level. As an example, if enrollment in a welding program is projected to grow by 20% while the enrollment in engineering technology is expected to decline by 10% are these enrollment changes and specific space needs for each discipline included in the college-level space needs calculation?

Two-year colleges differ from universities in that students do not major in a field or discipline. In Florida College System institutions, most students declare a career pathway and a program of study within a pathway. Some of the larger colleges offer more than 100 programs of study at the certificate and degree level.

Actual and projected COFTE enrollment is reported by discipline based on an International Classification Standards (ICS) code. In the Educational Plant Survey, a program facilities list is generated from the ICS code that notes the number of stations and total square feet needed at the program level. During interviews college representatives noted that the program facilities list only includes existing programs and not programs that are anticipated at the college over the five-year planning cycle.

Section 1013.31 (I) Florida Statute requires the Office of Workforce and Economic Development to document the need for additional career and adult education programs and the continuation of existing programs before facility construction or renovation related to career and adult education many be included in the Educational Plant Survey. As such, multiple colleges noted in the online survey that they use the Office of Workforce and Economic Development data, a review of local industry trends, and talking to economic development leaders on an ongoing basis to understand the need for new career and technical programs. While program-level projections are used to validate COFTE projections by campus or center location, none of the colleges were able to share enrollment projections by program as part of the capital planning process.

Colleges remarked that space need formulas are at the macro-level, with most being NSF per COFTE metrics, making it difficult to adjust for declines or increases in the various programs. In some cases, declines or increased in FTE may not alter the size of a laboratory. More specifically, college representatives are not using the Educational Plant Survey to make incremental changes such as the impact of decreases in welding program enrollment or increases related to growth in engineering technology.

Colleges noted space needs for new career and technical programs are determined more informally by academic leadership studying the demand of the local economy, workforce data, and recommendations from academic program advisory groups and the business community. Colleges identify existing spaces required to accommodate those programs, and if no spaces are available, college personnel prioritize new space needs in their capital prioritization requests.

SECTION 5.2 CONCLUSIONS

- Changes in student population and projected space needs are assessed at the college-level by location. Educational Plant Survey space needs formulas are at the macro-level, with most being NSF per COFTE or NSF per student station metrics, making it difficult to adjust for declines or increases in the various programs. The fixed structure of the Educational Plant Survey and space standards makes it difficult to modify outcomes at the program level.
- Assessing program-level space needs is possible but comes at a cost and may not produce intended results. Greater accuracy in the assessments of space needs by program is possible, but would require greater complexity and additional supportive data, which in turn requires more time and effort to produce. It is also important to note that assessments of space needs are not always indicators of efficiency and effectiveness.

SECTION 5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

• Consider program-level space needs analysis on a case-by-case basis. The Division of Florida Colleges should discuss with college representatives regarding the assessment of program-level space needs as part of the Educational Plant Survey or master planning process. Perhaps a more informed approach could link program-level space needs with the reporting of instructional space utilization of classrooms and laboratories and included in Capital Improvement Plan documentation and other documents to justify projects.

SECTION 5.3: CURRENT SPACE NEEDS FORMULAS AND UTILIZATION FACTORS

This section reviews other state system guidelines and analyses of internal Florida College System data to determine whether current SREF space need formulas and utilization factors for classrooms, non-vocational and vocational laboratories, offices, and library/study space accurately reflect the actual need for each type.

As part of this task, SmithGroup identified nine leading state systems for best practices regarding space models: Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Indiana, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. Space formulas for each state were examined and compared with SREF's metrics to provide context for evaluating the Florida College System space planning formulas and factors. SmithGroup augmented the nine state space models with national space standards published by the Council of Education Facilities Planners (CEFPI), 2006 which are widely used and well recognized.

Calculated space needs for each college in each space category is determined by applying a NSF standard per COFTE student enrollment, per SREF guidelines. This approach determines how much space the Division of Florida Colleges believes each college should have. It does not acknowledge any differentiation between varying missions, programs, campus locations, the actual number of courses delivered thought distance education, or the total number of faculty and staff on campus. For the analyses that follow, the space needs, as determined by the SREF (NSF standard per COFTE) approach are compared to space needs that result from more detailed approaches that incorporate course-level utilization metrics and staffing data into space needs calculations.

STUDENT FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) CALCULATION

Since Fall 2004, the official formula for computing FTE, as used by the Division of Florida Colleges, is (SSH/30) where SSH is Student Semester Hours. The number of FTE students for Florida College System colleges is the college credits for which students register divided by thirty (30) as specified in SREF. In this approach, **annualized FTE** is calculated by adding summer, fall, and spring student **credit hours** (SCH) and dividing by 30 (it is assumed the average full-time student enrolls in 30 hours of credit courses a year).

Best practices from the other states diverge from the SREF approach to calculating student FTE in two ways.

 Student contact hours. Other states base student FTE on a contact hour, a measure that represents an hour of scheduled instruction provided to students. In many states, a semester credit hour is normally granted for satisfactory completion of one 50-minute session (contact hour) of classroom instruction per week for a semester of not less than sixteen weeks or 112 days. Some states such as Georgia use a 60-minute session to calculate student contact hours for space planning. CEFPI uses weekly student contact hours (WSCH). WSCH is defined as the number of hours classes are scheduled multiplied by the number of students in scheduled classes for the fall semester or term.

Calculating space needs based on student contact hours has been noted as more accurate because a contact hour measures how much time the student actually spends in the classroom. For example, a four credit-hour career and technical education lecture course could meet for five hours per week. Using the credit hour value would underestimate the classroom time by one third. Each college has a different ratio of credit hour to contact hour, depending on curriculum. Therefore, the benefit of using this methodology would reduce underestimation of classroom needs for colleges with lower credit hour to contact hour ratios.

- 2. **Terms considered**. SREF uses annualized FTE by adding summer, fall, and spring FTE. CEFPI and seven of the leading state systems use Fall Semester term FTE in their space needs formulas. Calculating space needs based on only fall term FTE has been proven to be more accurate than using annualized FTE.
 - First, the annualized approach creates differences between colleges which have significant enrollment in summer sessions and those that do not. For example, during 2017-18 academic year, Polk State College generated 953 FTE for the summer term, comprising 14.6% of their total FTE enrollment in 2017-18. By contrast, Valencia College, with 5,437 FTE generated for the summer term, comprised 17.4% of the total FTE enrollment. In using annualized enrollment, FTE is overestimated at colleges with greater summer enrollments, potentially resulting in overbuilding facilities to accommodate an FTE that is spread across the entire year.
 - Additionally, the annualized approach may not be accurate in reflecting the highest-pressure point for classrooms and teaching laboratories, since it is a blend of three semesters. CEFPI uses fall semester because it represents the highest likely demand.

CLASSROOM UTILIZATION - WEEKLY ROOM HOURS (WRH)

All surveyed state systems measure classroom utilization. States can measure classroom utilization through a variety of formulas and methods. Surveyed states measure the percent of classrooms in use during the week, sometimes reported as a percentage of a weekly room hour expectation. These states will consider constructing more classroom space only after existing classrooms are scheduled a minimum number of hours per week. States differ on the hours per week that utilization is assumed, ranging from 30 hours to 44 hours. The nine states noted in our review averaged 34 weekly room hours (WRH), with two of the nine requiring a 40 weekly room hour expectation. The Florida College System uses the SREF standard of 40 weekly room hours for scheduled credit-hour instruction for each site designation. There are additional factors that can impact utilization guidelines. These include, by order of impact, distance learning; campus, center, or site location; and non-credit and community use.

DISTANCE LEARNING

Over the past 15 years, online or distance learning education has become a critical component of all Florida College System institutions. In a national survey, almost 30% of students currently attending a higher education institution take at least some distance education classes and as many as 15% exclusively take online courses to obtain their degree. An annual survey of over 2,800 academic leaders by the Babson Survey Research Group and the College Board notes that online education allows a number of benefits that modern students find attractive. These include convenience, flexibility, as well as the ability to go at one's own pace, to study anytime and anywhere. For many students, the inclusion of online courses and programs has made college attainable.

As noted in the graph Florida College System FTE Enrollment: Total and Distance Learning (2018–19 FTE-3), there is considerable variation in distance learning annualized FTE among the 28 Florida College System institutions. Distance learning includes internet-based courses (including hybrid), lecture capture, web/video conferencing or compressed video, materials, or mixed delivery. For Florida College System institutions, 97% of distance learning FTE was generated in internet-based courses for 2017–18.

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM 2018-19 Annualized FTE Enrollment: **Total and Distance Learning Annualized Distance Percent Distance** College **TOTAL Annualized FTE Delivery FTE** Delivery Broward 28,335 6,017 21% 1,475 24% Chipola 361 Central Florida 5,145 1,730 34% Florida Keys 708 173 24% Daytona 11,118 4,291 39% Eastern Florida 10,796 3,523 33% 50% Florida Gateway 2,415 1,197 FL SouthWestern 11,115 2,859 26% FL SC at Jax 29% 16,908 4,973 **Gulf Coast** 3,284 996 30% Hillsborough 20,466 5,990 29% Indian River 12,786 3,220 25% Lake-Sumter 3,250 1,125 35% Miami Dade 47,486 4,935 10% North Florida 846 314 37% Northwest FL 3,829 1,300 34% Palm Beach State 21,131 4,234 20% Pasco-Hernando 7,580 2,259 30% Pensacola 7,258 1,961 27% Polk 6,605 2,332 35% 4,589 St. Johns River 1,540 34% St. Petersburg 18,601 8,965 48% 11,084 24% Santa Fe 2,620 Seminole State 12,858 4,331 34% South Florida 2,371 457 19% State College FL 2,524 38% 6,684 Tallahassee 9,079 2,660 29% Valencia 32,502 10,068 31% SYSTEM Total 320,302 86,954 27%

In order to estimate the cumulative effect of internet-based courses on campus instructional space, clear definitions for the different modes of instruction are needed. Most researchers and practitioners distinguish three basic modes of learning:

- Web-enhanced Mode involves the enhancement of face-to-face courses through the pedagogically significant use of the web using a course management system, but seat time is not reduced.
- Mixed Mode (hybrid or blended) instruction a fundamental redesign of instruction in which some face-to-face teaching is replaced with online instruction. This has the potential to reduce seat-time demand for on-campus classrooms and laboratories. The lack of effective course scheduling software and inconsistent use patterns can impact seat reductions.
- Wholly Online Instruction online instruction with no face-to-face instructional contact. This mode of instruction, used for the students on campus, has a potential to reduce the demand for on-campus facilities, such as classrooms and laboratories.

Research¹ notes that a large majority of students taking internet-based courses at two-year institutions are also enrolled in seat-based courses.

Research by Bourlova, Bullen, and others² suggest the following:

- The introduction of mixed-mode and fully online sections that are non-distance courses leads to the reduction of classroom space occupancy on a campus.
- Distance learning will only have an impact on campus facilities if the course in question was initially taught face-to-face on campus and later transformed to fully online or mixed mode. The anticipated effect of the introduction of online sections for an existing classroom-based course is a potential increase in student enrollment without the increased use of instructional space on campus.
- If an online course was initially created for distance education, then its implementation has no effect on the campus space occupancy. In other words, even extensive use of e-learning at a higher education institution could have no effect on the campus instructional space occupancy if the e-learning courses are developed and delivered as distance courses and they do not replace existing face-to-face courses.

Florida College System institutions have been offering alternative delivery formats for a number of years. Courses taught faceto-face on campus and later transformed to fully online or mixed mode are much fewer than in the past as these transitions have already occurred. New mixed-mode formats have little to no effect on the campus instructional space occupancy.

In using a contact hour approach to space needs calculations, online and hybrid courses can be removed from the data, allowing a more realistic calculation of space needs based on students physically talking courses on a campus. With NSF per COFTE standards, it is more difficult to adjust for alternative delivery, especially mixed-mode courses. The most common approach is to reduce COFTE, but this process requires developing alternative delivery enrollment projections for each college. As the percent of alternative delivery varies by college, one space standard for all colleges is not recommended.

CAMPUS, CENTER, OR SITE LOCATION

The 28 Florida College System institutions have 174 campus, center, special purpose or site designations. The 72 campus locations vary from 14,633 FTE to 848 FTE for the 2018–19 academic year. The approximately 16 centers average 984 FTE while the approximately 150 special purpose sites average 541 FTE for 2018–19. A total of 25 (16%) of the special purpose sites have 250 FTE or less. The number of sites or locations is related to the mission of access as colleges want to ensure that all Floridians have equal and equitable opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education. Often these opportunities are in remote or more rural areas of the state.

¹ Grade Increase: Tracking Distance Education in the United States, Babson Survey Research Group, 2018.

² The Impact of E-Learning on the Use of Campus Instructional Space, (2005). Bourlova, T. & Bullen, M., Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Two-year colleges with sites located within and serving rural areas are somewhat different than colleges serving highly urbanized population areas. While the size of the campus and program breadth are obvious, there are other factors that are more subtle and are not full realized until these colleges are studied in more depth. In a SmithGroup study of utilization metrics for 16 rural community colleges, a slightly different usage pattern emerged for colleges in rural locations than colleges located in larger metropolitan areas. On average, these rural colleges had lower weekly room hours and student station occupancy that their urban counterparts. In discussing results with enrollment management specialists, course enrollments in rural two-year colleges fluctuate more frequently than enrollments at colleges in urban or suburban colleges.

As communities are smaller, citizens may use college classroom, meeting rooms, auditoriums and gymnasiums with greater frequency as large meeting spaces are unavailable in the community. True to mission, these colleges are serving their communities, but colleges are often penalized as community events are not counted in determining utilization outcomes.

Low enrollment courses, particularly in specialized teaching laboratories are another area of concern. A common biology laboratory will be used to illustrate the issue. Colleges in metropolitan areas with significant population densities usually have no problem scheduling the biology laboratory to utilization standards as there are significant numbers of new and continuing students moving through the pipeline. A high population density surrounding the colleges ensures multiple sections. Larger colleges also have a greater variety of programs, many requiring biology courses as a prerequisite.

In rural colleges or colleges located in areas where the population density is considerably lower, colleges struggle with filling the biology laboratory with enough course sections to meet utilization and space standards. There are simply not enough students enrolled to fill the laboratory 20 or more hours per week. Offering the course only periodically causes issues with students trying to graduate on time. Regardless of capacity or demand, a biology laboratory is needed as the space is highly specialized.

Both contact hour and NSF per COFTE guidelines could under-generate space needs for classrooms and laboratories at colleges located in rural areas.

NON-CREDIT AND COMMUNITY USE

During campus interviews, participants noted that Florida College System utilization outcomes only report credit instruction. For many of the campuses, the same classrooms and laboratories that are used for scheduled credit instruction may also be used for adult education, workforce training, or community outreach. When colleges were asked in the online survey about the percentage of classrooms that are shared or have joint use for community, non-credit, and workforce programs, 12 of the 28 (43%) colleges indicated on average at least 20% of their classrooms are used for these programs, with two (7%) colleges providing 51% or more of their classrooms for shared or joint use.

The use of instructional spaces for other non-credit uses is congruent with the mission of the two-year college. Florida State Statute indicates that the colleges' primary mission includes promoting economic development and a secondary role in providing community services that are not directly related to academic or occupational advancement.

Several colleges reported the use of procedures and scheduling software that tracks utilization of credit, non-credit, and events in classrooms, laboratories, and other publicly used facilities. Knowing the impact of demand on facilities outside of credit instruction, they were vocal in suggesting that utilization should include all scheduled activity to get a more accurate accounting of actual use.

The three aforementioned factors were taken into consideration during the development of revised space standards. SmithGroup recommends an average of 36 weekly room hours at the college-level (all sites and locations), but a lower standard may be warranted for centers or sites in less populated or rural areas. Regardless, the weekly room hour metric by itself is one dimensional and does not paint a full picture of space usage. As noted in the February 2018 OPPAGA research paper, a classroom could be highly scheduled, but only marginally full.

CLASSROOM UTILIZATION - STUDENT STATION OCCUPANCY RATE (SOR)

Many state systems and CEFPI also consider the student station occupancy rate (SOR). This measures the occupancy or fill of classrooms, as a percentage of the number of seats that are occupied. Among the surveyed states, the expectations for classroom SOR ranged from 60% to 67%. The Florida College System institutions uses the SREF standard of 60%.

SmithGroup recommends increasing the student station occupancy rate to 67% at the college-level. When reporting utilization by campus, center, and special purpose sites a lower SOR is recommended for sites in less populated or rural areas.

CLASSROOM UTILIZATION - WEEKLY SEAT HOURS (WSH)

As noted, the weekly room hours metric by itself is one dimensional and does not paint a full picture of classrooms usage as a classroom could be highly scheduled but only marginally full. At the same time, assessing the student station occupancy rate alone is insufficient, since a classroom could host a small number of full classes but remain unused the balance of the week.

Therefore, SmithGroup recommends a single utilization metric that maintains some flexibility to achieve optimum utilization. SmithGroup recommends using weekly seat hours (WSH), which is the product of multiplying weekly room hours by the student station occupancy rate. For example, if the utilization targets for an institution (all locations) are 36 weekly room hours and 67% SSO, then the WSH target is 24.0. This methodology is also noted in the CEFPI literature.

Progressive systems, such as the University System of Georgia, use a variation of this in which they also focus on the utilization of seats. They calculate weekly student contact hours as a percent of each seat being used 40 hours a week, and then define a space need as exceeding 70% of the target. For the purposes of this analysis, WSH will serve as the primary utilization metric because it accounts for both weekly room hours and SOR.

As noted, Indiana and Washington use differentiated guidelines based on the size or location of the institution. At the site level, this type of review is warranted.

CLASSROOM FLEXIBILITY - NET SQUARE FEET PER STUDENT STATION (NSF/SS)

The NSF/SS calculation takes the usable net square feet of the room and divides by the number of student stations or seats in the room. For many years, NSF/SS was a measure of space efficiency. Today, the NSF/SS is viewed as an indication of the flexibility of the space, not a measure of utilization. A lower value indicates less flexibility; 12 NSF/SS is indicative of a raked (sloped) lecture hall with fixed seating. 15–20 NSF/SS indicates a traditional classroom with forward facing tablet armchairs.

Active learning environments that can accommodate a variety of teaching modalities require 25–35 NSF/SS to accommodate increased circulation for group work and movable/reconfigurable tables and chairs. Learning science has shown improved student outcomes with active learning environments, so many colleges are strategically reconfiguring classrooms for smaller sections and greater flexibility.

Chapter 5 | Space Formulas and Utilization Factors

Among the surveyed states, the NSF/SS expectation ranged from 18 to 26 NSF/SS with an average of 22 NSF/SS. As the Florida College System also includes generic computer classrooms in the classroom space category, direct comparisons to state and national averages is less accurate. The Florida College System closely follows the State Requirement for Educational Facilities recommendations. For classrooms the needs generation standard is 25 NSF/SS. The classroom needs generation standard uses 27 NSF/SS to generate space needs, but includes computer classrooms. SmithGroup recommends maintaining the 27 NSF/SS at a college-level in recognition of learning science research which indicates that flexible, active learning environments produce better student outcomes and providing some additional space for laptops or PC's in classrooms.



Within the Florida College System, the average is 27 NSF/SS, indicating that many of the colleges are already moving toward more flexible active learning environments. Note that only one college (Pensacola State College) has a low amount of space per student station. While this may be more efficient, it is not necessarily effective as research in the emerging field of learning science has shown that active learning produces better student outcomes than traditional lecture formats.

CLASSROOM SPACE NEED - NET SQUARE FEET PER STUDENT FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT (NSF/FTE)

The three metrics discussed above also play a critical role in determining space needs. The Florida College System uses the SREF for determining classroom space need. Space needs calculations use annualized COFTE based on projected enrollments from credit hours; not contact hours. There are two formulas for determining classroom space needs:

- 1. Using 40 weekly room hours, 60% station occupancy and 12 student hours per COFTE, a classroom utilization index can be calculated to determine capacity or the number of classroom stations.
 - To determine the number of COFTE students the classroom inventory can accommodate, use the classroom utilization index of 2.0, multiplied by a given number of classroom student stations.
 - To determine the number of classroom student stations needed to accommodate the COFTE, use the classroom utilization index reciprocal of 0.50, multiplied by a given number of COFTE students.



2. The Florida College System measures classroom space needs with an NSF per COFTE enrollment (NSF/COFTE) space factor for the number of stations and total NSF. The classroom NSF/COFTE of 13.5, multiplied by the number of COFTE indicates the approximate amount of NSF in the classroom space category needed for that location.

The following graph notes NSF per 2018-19 FTE for each college.



CLASSROOM NSF PER STUDENT FTE (2018-2019)

An analysis of the existing conditions noted a wide range in NSF/FTE for classrooms throughout the Florida College System. Actual classroom space ranged from 9–32 NSF/FTE with a system average of 14.8. Part of this disparity is likely due the variance in the classroom inventory profile and age of facilities. Another source of variability is the omission of non-credit course use of classrooms from available data.³

In general, the following can be noted:

- Colleges with high classroom NSF/FTE values (18 NSF/FTE or higher) may have higher NSF per station parameters or lower utilization rates, suggesting that the college may be overbuilt in classroom space.
- Colleges with low values (less than 10 NSF/FTE) may have programs with minimal classroom need, less NSF per Station, or higher utilization rates, suggesting that the college may be underbuilt.

³ For example, the Florida Public Safety Institute (FPSI), is operated by Tallahassee Community College on a 1,500-acre site in Gadsden County. The FPSI supports all State law enforcement training as well as local law enforcement and corrections training. At 476,368 NSF, the facility includes classrooms, teaching laboratories, conference center, housing, and more than 183,000 NSF of outdoor firing and driving ranges. Many of the programs are for continuing education with non-credit courses and faculty and were excluded from available data. The extensiveness of facilities at the FPSI combined with the lack of completeness of scheduling data overestimate NSF per FTE metrics for Tallahassee Community College.

SREF SPACE NEEDS GENERATION

Applying SREF classroom space needs formula of 13.5 NSF to Actual 2018–2019 COFTE yields a total Florida College System space need of 4,324,104 NSF of classroom space, per the table entitled *Classroom Space Needs Analysis Using SREF Standards*. Relative to the SREF standard, 16 (57%) of the colleges have a deficit of classroom space. Using SREF standards, the top five colleges with the largest COFTE (Miami Dade College, Valencia College, Broward College, Palm Beach State College, and Hillsborough Community College) all generated deficits of space. Together, the five averaged 29,984 COFTE with a total classroom space deficit of 411,050 NSF. As a comparison, the five colleges with the lowest COFTE (The College of the Florida Keys, North Florida College, Chipola College, South Florida State College, and Florida Gateway College) averaged 1,563 COFTE with a combined space surplus of 40,532 NSF. On average, NSF per FTE formulas tend to overestimate space needs for colleges generating greater than 10,000 FTE.

CLASSROOM SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING SREF STANDARDS								
College	2018–19 Total Existing Annualized Classroom NSF COFTE (A)		SREF Classroom Guideline NSF (B)	SREF Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-B)				
Broward	28,335	245,305	382,523	(137,218)				
Chipola	1,475	21,467	19,913	1,555				
Central Florida	5,145	49,916	69,458	(19,542)				
Florida Keys	708	22,371	9,558	12,813				
Daytona	11,118	148,671	150,093	(1,422)				
Eastern Florida	10,796	178,078	145,746	32,332				
Florida Gateway	2,415	26,041	32,603	(6,562)				
FL SouthWestern	11,115	127,166	150,053	(22,887)				
FL SC at Jax	16,908	300,843	228,258	72,585				
Gulf Coast	3,284	49,179	44,334	4,845				
Hillsborough	20,466	218,848	276,291	(57,443)				
Indian River	12,786	163,911	172,611	(8,700)				
Lake-Sumter	3,250	37,654	43,875	(6,221)				
Miami Dade	47,486	492,799	641,061	(148,262)				
North Florida	846	7,984	11,421	(3,437)				
Northwest FL	3,829	78,016	51,692	26,325				
Palm Beach State	21,131	244,488	285,269	(40,781)				
Pasco-Hernando	7,580	85,372	102,330	(16,958)				
Pensacola	7,258	132,962	97,983	34,979				
Polk	6,605	127,449	89,168	38,282				
St. Johns River	4,589	61,006	61,952	(946)				
St. Petersburg	18,601	261,897	251,114	10,784				
Santa Fe	11,084	134,426	149,634	(15,208)				
Seminole State	12,858	151,170	173,583	(22,413)				
South Florida	2,371	68,171	32,009	36,163				
State College FL	6,684	102,114	90,234	11,880				
Tallahassee	9,079	191,891	122,567	69,325				
Valencia	32,502	411,431	438,777	(27,346)				
SYSTEM	320,304	4,140,626	4,324,104	(183,478)				

To determine whether the SREF space needs formula for classroom space accurately reflects the need for classroom space, SmithGroup analyzed an alternative approach to determining classroom space need that utilized weekly student contact hours for courses delivered in general purpose and computer classrooms. SmithGroup obtained course data for each college from the Fall 2018 term from Division of Florida Colleges staff. SmithGroup incorporated the SREF utilization expectation of 37 hours per week with 67% station occupancy at 27 NSF per station. The following table, *Classroom Space Needs Analysis Using Alternative Guidelines*, notes the outcomes. Relative to the alternative classroom space needs guidelines, all colleges have a surplus of classroom space, indicating that there is excess capacity when applying current utilization expectations.

CLASSROOM SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING ALTERNATIVE GUIDELINES								
College	Existing Classroom NSF (A) Classroom Guideline NSF (C)		Alternative Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-C)	Difference SREF Guideline to Alternative Guideline NSF (B-C)				
Broward	245,305	222,676	22,629	159,847				
Chipola	21,467	9,074	12,393	10,839				
Central Florida	49,916	34,352	15,564	35,106				
Florida Keys	22,371	5,946	16,425	3,612				
Daytona	148,671	54,385	94,286	95,708				
Eastern Florida	178,078	79,289	98,789	66,457				
Florida Gateway	26,041	7,782	18,259	24,821				
FL SouthWestern	127,166	90,892	36,274	59,161				
FL SC at Jax	300,843	97,875	202,968	130,383				
Gulf Coast	49,179	17,845	31,334	26,489				
Hillsborough	218,848	166,293	52,555	109,998				
Indian River	163,911	76,811	87,100	95,800				
Lake-Sumter	37,654	18,718	18,936	25,157				
Miami Dade	492,799	481,692	11,107	159,369				
North Florida	7,984	3,092	4,892	8,329				
Northwest FL	78,016	35,234	42,782	16,458				
Palm Beach State	244,488	222,460	22,028	62,809				
Pasco-Hernando	85,372	55,430	29,942	46,900				
Pensacola	132,962	57,613	75,349	40,370				
Polk	127,449	49,971	77,478	39,197				
St. Johns River	61,006	33,872	27,134	28,080				
St. Petersburg	261,897	114,786	147,111	136,328				
Santa Fe	134,426	100,321	34,105	49,313				
Seminole State	151,170	85,251	65,919	88,332				
South Florida	68,171	18,096	50,075	13,913				
State College FL	102,114	44,296	57,818	45,938				
Tallahassee	191,891	96,309	95,582	26,258				
Valencia	411,431	272,915	138,516	165,862				
SYSTEM	4,140,626	2,553,276	1,587,350	1,770,828				

The alternative guideline using weekly student contact hours and utilization standards generated a systemwide need for 2,553,276 NSF, which is a surplus of 1,587,350 NSF based on existing space. The difference between the SREF standard and the alternative weekly student contact hours guideline is 1,770,828 NSF. The SREF NSF per FTE standard over-generated classroom space need at every college as compared to the alternative approach which is used by a majority of states. The overgeneration of classroom space is demonstrated by lower utilization rates, as analyzed in Chapter 6.

SmithGroup recommends that Florida College System consider adopting a classroom space needs standard that includes the calculation of weekly student contact hours, which could improve utilization. The calculation of utilization for noncredit courses, college events, and community use should also be explored, even if reported separate from utilization for credit instruction. The Division of Florida Colleges must consider the additional effort from colleges and the Division required by an alternative more accurate formula, perhaps including generating weekly student contact hours at the course level.

NON-VOCATIONAL TEACHING AND OPEN LABORATORIES

Like classrooms, teaching and open laboratories are mission critical in providing an educational experience and delivering academic programs. They are critical to delivery of degree and certificate programs in high demand fields related to STEM and health professions. Non-vocational (or academic) laboratories are those that are classified for use in advanced and professional academic programs. Examples include architecture, biological and physical sciences, engineering, health professions, fine and applied art, education, business, and social sciences.

The non-vocational laboratory space category includes multiple room use codes:

- 210 and 215 Class Laboratory and Class Laboratory Service
- 220 and 225 Open Laboratory and Open Laboratory Service
- 240 and 245— Student Computer Terminal Room and Service
- 570 and 575 Animal Facilities and Animal Facilities Service
- 580 and 585 Greenhouse and Greenhouse Service

For Florida College System institutions, class laboratory and class laboratory service space make up the majority of nonvocational laboratory NSF. Open laboratory and open laboratory service facilities represent approximately eight percent (8%) of the total NSF in the non-vocational laboratory category, while animal and greenhouse facilities represent less than one percent. The Florida College System uses two metrics for utilization expectations and space needs. The Florida College System uses the SREF for determining non-vocational laboratory student stations. Calculations use annualized COFTE based on projected enrollments from credit hours; not contact hours. There are two formulas:

- For the first calculation, using utilization expectations of 30 weekly room hours at 80% station occupancy and six (6) weekly student hours per COFTE, a laboratory utilization index is calculated to determine capacity or the number of nonvocational laboratory stations.
 - To determine the number of non-vocational COFTE students the resulting number of laboratory stations will
 accommodate use the non-vocational laboratory utilization index of 4.0, multiplied by a given number of nonvocational laboratory student stations.
 - To determine the number of laboratory student stations needed to accommodate a prescribed level of COFTE, use the non-vocational laboratory utilization index reciprocal of 0.25, multiplied by a given number of non-vocational COFTE students, indicates.

The following graph notes the number of existing stations as compared to the standard.



NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES EXISTING AND SREF GUIDELINE NSF BY COLLEGE

2. The second metric is a formula that generates space needs for non-vocational laboratories. Following the SREF, the Florida College System uses a single factor of 13.75 NSF per non-vocational COFTE to determine the approximate amount of NSF for non-vocational laboratories at the campus, center, and site level.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES NSF PER NON-VOCATIONAL FTE BY COLLEGE SIZE Von-Vocational Labs NSF per Non-Vocational FTE 25 20 15 Average = 12.41 Avg. Non-Vocational NSF/Non-Vocational FTE 10 5 Hillsborough Eastern Florida Florida Gateway St. Petersburg Polk Daytona Pensacola State College FL South Florida **Vorth Florida** Pasco-Hernando Broward ²alm Beach State Valencia Seminole State Santa Fe St. Johns River **Central Florida** Chipola Northwest FL -ake-Sumter Florida Keys FL SouthWestern Miami Dade Gulf Coast Indian River FL SC at Jax Tallahassee

The following graph notes NSF per 2018–19 FTE at the college-level.

An analysis of the existing conditions noted a wide range in NSF/FTE for non-vocational laboratories. Existing non-vocational spaces ranged from 6 to 28 NSF/FTE with a system average of 9.6 NSF/FTE. Similar to other space types, one source of variability for this wide range is the omission of non-credit course use of non-vocational laboratories from available data.⁴ In general, the following can be noted:

- Colleges with high non-vocational laboratory NSF/FTE values (18 NSF/FTE or higher) may have higher NSF per station parameters, a greater number of open laboratories, or lower utilization rates, suggesting that the college may be overbuilt in non-vocational laboratory space.
- Colleges with low values (less than 10 NSF/FTE) may have programs with minimal open laboratory needs, less NSF per Station. or higher utilization rates, suggesting that the college may be underbuilt.
- It is difficult to determine with a high degree of accuracy whether colleges are underbuilt or overbuilt in non-vocational laboratory space as facility coding is inconsistent in this category. The discrepancy is within three room use code categories. To validate the outcomes of the alternative analyses, SmithGroup reviewed facility inventory data of several colleges and found coding errors that are impacting space needs in this category. The following are noted:
 - RUC 240/245 Student Computer Terminal Room & Service: Division of Florida Colleges documentation defines this as a space or separate area equipped with computer terminals used by individual students for the purpose of studying. It includes open areas, enclosed rooms, booths, and carrels. Such spaces may be in libraries, learning centers, academic buildings, or student services centers. The room or area is not scheduled either formally or informally, regularly or irregularly, but is intended to be available for students to study at their convenience. It is noted that this Room-Use Code (when used with all ICS codes) aggregates to the library/study space category.

⁴ For example, the Florida Public Safety Institute (FPSI) at Tallahassee Community College has 173,271 NSF of non-vocational laboratories, with approximately 170,500 NSF of that total dedicated to outdoor firing ranges that support non-credit courses. The extensiveness of facilities at the FPSI combined with the lack of completeness of scheduling data overestimate NSF per FTE metrics for Tallahassee Community College.

220/225 Open Laboratory & Service: The Division of Florida Colleges documentation defines open laboratories with equipment that serves the needs of a particular discipline or discipline group for individual or group instruction where 1) use of the room is not formally or regularly scheduled, or 2) access is limited to specific groups of students. An open laboratory is a secondary laboratory which programmatically supports and is assigned to the primary 210 class laboratory. Included in this category are rooms such as botany greenhouses, music ensemble and practice rooms, special language laboratories, photography studios, criminal justice courtrooms, emergency medical telemetry operations, and computer laboratories involving specialized restrictive software or where access is limited to specific types of students.

At Daytona College, SmithGroup noted 59,274 NSF of RUC 240/245 (Student Computer Terminal Room & Service) space in their facility inventory to document academic support/learning centers, computer commons, open computer laboratories, math, reading, English, and writing laboratories. These spaces (regardless of ICS code) should be placed in the Library/Study space Category. Room use code 220/225 is not used in the college's space inventory.

At Valencia College, staff coded two spaces (1,756 NSF) with RUC 240/245. SmithGroup noted 16,065 NSF in the RUC 220/225 open laboratory codes to document open computer instruction rooms, learning laboratories, tutoring rooms, math and writing centers, and testing rooms. These spaces would be classified in the non-vocational laboratory space generation category as they serve academic units.

These two examples suggest that similar spaces (learning laboratories, math, reading and writing centers) are being interpreted and coded differently. Upon further examination, these coding inconsistencies exist among all 28 Florida College System institutions. Lack of consistency is detrimental to NSF per COFTE space standards that are generating space based on well-defined room use code assumptions.

Related Instruction Classroom, Room-Use Code 212: A related instruction classroom RUC 212, is a service area or support space directly related to certain vocational program laboratories. Only some vocational laboratories can have a related instruction classroom. Non-vocational laboratories are never eligible to have these laboratories. Each eligible vocational laboratory is entitled to only one related classroom. Every related instruction classroom, RUC 212, must be attached to a vocational laboratory; they cannot exist alone. Despite related instruction classrooms being assigned to only vocational laboratories, 13 colleges have coded 32 laboratories with non-vocational ICS or department codes. As an example. Polk College classified 5,145 NSF of related instruction classroom space for non-vocational programs.
The SREF NSF per non-vocational COFTE formula is also problematic because it calculates laboratory space needs for the college regardless of the mix of programs that its offers. CEFPI and other state systems recognize that teaching laboratories are discipline-specific and space needs vary greatly by those disciplines. For example, a computer laboratory might be functional with 30 NSF/Station, while a biology laboratory needs 65 NSF/Station.

Thus, the profile of teaching laboratory space needs will vary from college to college, depending upon the distribution of non-vocational and vocational programs and the related instructional classroom needs. Total and non-vocational annualized FTE for the 2018-19 academic year is noted in the graph. On average, Florida College System institutions generate 78% of their FTE in non-vocational programs. However, non-vocational laboratories represent 43% of the total Florida College System teaching and open laboratory space.



Applying SREF non-vocational laboratory space needs standard of 13.75 NSF to Actual 2018-2019 FTE yields a systemwide space need of 3,428,466 NSF of space, per the table entitled *Non-vocational laboratory Space Needs Analysis Using SREF Standards*. Relative to the SREF standard, 19 (68%) of the colleges have a deficit of non-vocational laboratory space. Using SREF standards, the top five colleges with the largest FTE (Miami Dade College, Valencia College, Broward College, Palm Beach State College, and Hillsborough Community College) all generated deficits of space. Together, the five averaged 23,961 non-vocational FTE with a total non-vocational laboratory space deficit of 812,106 NSF. As a comparison, the five colleges with the lowest non-vocational FTE (The College of the Florida Keys, North Florida College, Chipola College, South Florida State College, and Florida Gateway College) averaged 1,144 non-vocational FTE with a combined space surplus of 17,199 NSF. On average, NSF per FTE formulas tend to overestimate space needs for non-vocational laboratories at colleges generating 10,000 FTE or greater.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORY SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING SREF STANDARDS					
College	2018-19 Non- Vocational COFTE	Existing Non- Vocational Lab NSF (A)	SREF Non- Vocational Lab Guideline NSF (B)	SREF Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-B)	
Broward	20,388	119,785	280,335	(160,550)	
Chipola	1,091	16,611	15,001	1,610	
Central Florida	3,692	45,369	50,765	(5,396)	
Florida Keys	431	10,073	5,926	4,147	
Daytona	7,748	93,312	106,535	(13,223)	
Eastern Florida	8,395	70,285	115,431	(45,146)	
Florida Gateway	1,622	14,084	22,303	(8,219)	
FL SouthWestern	10,393	66,345	142,904	(76,559)	
FL SC at Jax	12,749	157,031	175,299	(18,268)	
Gulf Coast	2,562	24,039	35,228	(11,189)	
Hillsborough	15,092	144,071	207,515	(63,444)	
Indian River	9,166	97,067	126,033	(28,966)	
Lake-Sumter	2,741	50,618	37,689	12,929	
Miami Dade	41,822	281,993	575,053	(293,060)	
North Florida	618	13,951	8,498	5,454	
Northwest FL	3,112	50,504	42,790	7,714	
Palm Beach State	18,091	109,286	248,751	(139,465)	
Pasco-Hernando	5,200	28,434	71,500	(43,066)	
Pensacola	5,270	74,368	72,463	1,906	
Polk	4,913	52,702	67,554	(14,852)	
St. Johns River	3,594	42,799	49,418	(6,619)	
St. Petersburg	13,563	140,642	186,491	(45,849)	
Santa Fe	8,002	79,118	110,028	(30,910)	
Seminole State	8,898	76,845	122,348	(45,503)	
South Florida	1,956	41,102	26,895	14,207	
State College FL	6,119	94,400	84,136	10,264	
Tallahassee	7,703	218,119	105,916	112,203	
Valencia	24,412	180,078	335,665	(155,587)	
SYSTEM	249,343	2,393,031	3,428,466	(1,035,435)	

A more accurate approach is to assign non-vocational laboratory space per the specific space requirements of the nonvocational programs that each college offers or intends to offer. SmithGroup calculated the non-vocational laboratory space needs for each college based on Fall 2018 course data, assigning laboratory space amounts based on the specific needs of each discipline or program and adding a supplemental factor for open laboratories. Non-vocational teaching laboratory utilization metrics factor into the space needs guideline by the same CEFPI formula as described for classrooms: (NSF/ Station)/(SSO x WRH). Factors for the variation in student station size for different programs were applied. SmithGroup incorporated the SREF utilization expectation of 30 hours per week with 80% student station occupancy and then added 1.5 NSF per non-vocational FTE to accommodate open laboratories. The outcomes are noted in the table entitled *Non-Vocational Laboratory Space Needs Analysis Using Alternative Guidelines*.

College	Existing Non- Vocational Lab NSF (A)	Non-Vocational Alternative Lab Guideline NSF (C)	Alternative Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-C)	Difference SREF Guideline to Alternative Guideline NSF (B-C)
Broward	119,785	111,218	8,567	169,117
Chipola	16,611	7,066	9,546	7,936
Central Florida	45,369	21,081	24,288	29,684
Florida Keys	10,073	2,489	7,585	3,438
Daytona	93,312	78,801	14,511	27,734
Eastern Florida	70,285	65,598	4,688	49,834
Florida Gateway	14,084	12,607	1,477	9,696
FL SouthWestern	66,345	74,907	(8,562)	67,997
FL SC at Jax	157,031	88,857	68,175	86,442
Gulf Coast	24,039	22,797	1,242	12,431
Hillsborough	144,071	119,675	24,396	87,840
Indian River	97,067	67,010	30,057	59,023
Lake-Sumter	50,618	15,480	35,139	22,209
Miami Dade	281,993	211,872	70,121	363,181
North Florida	13,951	7,569	6,382	929
Northwest FL	50,504	25,894	24,610	16,896
Palm Beach State	109,286	103,969	5,318	144,783
Pasco-Hernando	28,434	25,792	2,642	45,708
Pensacola	74,368	47,193	27,175	25,270
Polk	52,702	34,304	18,399	33,250
St. Johns River	42,799	25,756	17,043	23,662
St. Petersburg	140,642	70,999	69,644	115,493
Santa Fe	79,118	60,354	18,764	49,674
Seminole State	76,845	99,352	(22,507)	22,996
South Florida	41,102	19,845	21,257	7,050
State College FL	94,400	49,383	45,018	34,754
Tallahassee	218,119	24,845	193,275	81,072
Valencia	180,078	123,625	56,453	212,040
SYSTEM	2,393,031	1,618,333	774,699	1,810,134

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORY SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING ALTERNATIVE GUIDELINES

The alternative guideline using weekly student contact hours and utilization standards generated a systemwide need for 1,618,333 NSF, which is a surplus of 774,699 NSF based on existing space. The SREF NSF per FTE standard over generated non-vocational laboratory space need at each college as compared to the alternative approach. In total, the combined NSF difference between the SREF standard and the weekly student contact hours guideline was 1,810,134 NSF. The over generation of non-vocational laboratory space is demonstrated by lower utilization rates, as analyzed in Chapter 6, and errors in the coding of these spaces.

The current SREF space factor of 13.75 NSF/COFTE is acceptable for the majority of colleges but should be reduced for larger FTE colleges and augmented for smaller FTE colleges. Open laboratories (RUC 220/225) are problematic in terms of lack of consistency in room use coding and departmental designations, leading to inaccuracies. **SmithGroup recommends that room use codes for open laboratories and assignment practices should be reviewed and modified.** From a policy perspective, the additional effort expended by the Division of Florida Colleges to generate space needs from alternative space guidelines may not justify the greater level of accuracy. A greater level of accuracy could be obtained in this category if coding errors are addressed and corrected.

VOCATIONAL TEACHING AND OPEN LABORATORIES

Like classrooms, teaching and open laboratories are mission critical in providing an educational experience and delivering vocational programs. Vocational laboratories are those that are classified for use in vocational and technical programs. Examples include agriculture, health occupations, trade and industrial, and public service.

The vocational laboratory space category includes multiple room use codes:

- 210 and 215 Class Laboratory and Class Laboratory Service
- 212 Related Instruction Classroom
- 220 and 225 Open Laboratory and Open Laboratory Service
- 240 and 245 Student Computer Terminal Room and Service
- 570 and 575 Animal Facilities and Animal Facilities Service
- 580 and 585 Greenhouse and Greenhouse Service

For Florida College System institutions, total NSF in RUC 212 (Related Classroom Instruction) was calculated at approximately 11% of total vocational laboratory NSF. Teaching laboratory service space represents approximately 26% while open laboratory and open laboratory service facilities represent approximately four (4) percent of the total NSF in the vocational laboratory category. The total NSF in animal and greenhouse facilities with vocational laboratories represents less than 0.5 percent of the total NSF.

The Florida College System uses two metrics for utilization expectations and space needs. The Florida College System uses the SREF for determining vocational laboratory student stations. Calculations use annualized COFTE based on projected enrollments from credit hours; not contact hours. There are two formulas:

- For the first calculation, using utilization expectations of 30 weekly room hours at 80% station occupancy and twelve (12) weekly student hours per COFTE, a laboratory utilization index is calculated to determine capacity or the number of laboratory stations.
 - To determine the number of vocational COFTE students the resulting number of laboratory stations will accommodate use the vocational laboratory utilization index of 2.0, multiplied by a given number of vocational laboratory student stations.
 - To determine the number of laboratory student stations needed to accommodate that number of COFTE, use the vocational laboratory utilization index reciprocal of 0.5, multiplied by a given number of vocational COFTE students.

Using the vocational laboratory index metrics, the following graph notes the number of existing stations as compared to the SREF standard.



2. The second metric is a formula that generates space needs for vocational laboratories. Following the SREF, the Florida College System uses a single factor of 68.5 NSF per vocational COFTE to determine the approximate amount of NSF for vocational laboratories at the campus, center, and site level.

The following graph notes NSF per 2018-19 FTE for each college.



VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES NSF PER VOCATIONAL FTE BY COLLEGE SIZE

An analysis of the existing conditions noted a wide range in NSF/FTE for vocational laboratories. Existing vocational NSF per FTE ranged from 18 (Valencia College) to 203 (South Florida State College) with a system average of 64 NSF/FTE. South Florida College has many space intensive programs (i.e., Automotive, Fire Science, Engineering Technology, Industrial Management, HVAC, Cosmetology) but do not generate substantial vocational FTE. Similar to other space types, one source of variability for this wide range is the omission of non-credit course use of vocational laboratories from available data.⁵

In general, the following can be noted:

- Colleges with high vocational laboratory NSF/FTE values (100 NSF/FTE or higher) may have higher NSF per station parameters, more student stations than needed, a greater number of related instruction classrooms, or lower utilization rates, suggesting that the college may be overbuilt in vocational laboratory space
- Colleges with low values (35 NSF/FTE or lower) may have programs with minimal open laboratory or related classroom needs, less NSF per Station. or higher utilization rates, suggesting that the college may be underbuilt.

The SREF NSF per vocational COFTE formula is problematic because it calculates vocational laboratory space needs for each college regardless of the mix of programs that its offers. CEFPI and other state systems recognize that vocational laboratories are discipline-specific and space needs vary greatly by those programs. For example, a computer laboratory might be functional with 30 NSF/Station while an Automotive Technician laboratory needs 180 NSF/Station. The profile of vocational laboratory space needs will also vary from college to college, depending upon the distribution of vocational programs and related instructional classroom needs.

⁵ For example, the Florida Public Safety Institute (FPSI) at Tallahassee Community College includes 28,080 NSF of vocational laboratories that contain space for outdoor firing ranges that support non-credit courses.

Applying SREF vocational laboratory space needs standard of 68.5 NSF to Actual 2018-2019 FTE yields a systemwide space need of 4,860,692 NSF of space, per the table entitled *Vocational Laboratory Space Needs Analysis using SREF Standards*. Relative to the SREF standard, 20 (71%) of the colleges have a deficit of vocational laboratory space.

Using SREF standards, the top five colleges with the largest vocational FTE (Valencia College, Broward College, Miami Dade College, Hillsborough Community College, St. Petersburg College) all generated large deficits of space. Together, the five averaged 6,423 vocational FTE with a large total vocational laboratory space deficit of 1,324,267 NSF. As a comparison, the five colleges with the lowest non-vocational FTE (North Florida College, The College of the Florida Keys, Chipola College, South Florida State College, and Lake-Sumter State College) averaged 363 vocational FTE with a combined space surplus of 75,454 NSF. On average, NSF per FTE formulas are overestimating space needs for vocational laboratories at colleges generating 5,000 vocational FTE or greater.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORY SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING SREF STANDARDS					
College	2018–19 Annualized Vocational COFTE	Existing Vocational Lab NSF (A)	SREF Vocational Lab Guideline NSF (B)	SREF Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-B)	
Broward	7,947	220,107	544,370	(324,263)	
Chipola	383	55,466	26,236	29,231	
Central Florida	1,453	32,486	99,531	(67,045)	
Florida Keys	277	12,962	18,975	(6,013)	
Daytona	3,369	187,914	230,777	(42,863)	
Eastern Florida	2,400	179,017	164,400	14,617	
Florida Gateway	792	69,565	54,252	15,313	
FL SouthWestern	722	70,744	49,457	21,287	
FL SC at Jax	4,159	320,381	284,892	35,490	
Gulf Coast	721	88,054	49,389	38,666	
Hillsborough	5,375	153,506	368,188	(214,682)	
Indian River	3,620	189,511	247,970	(58,459)	
Lake-Sumter	509	19,336	34,867	(15,531)	
Miami Dade	5,664	200,288	387,984	(187,696)	
North Florida	229	27,468	15,687	11,782	
Northwest FL	717	42,505	49,115	(6,610)	
Palm Beach State	3,040	169,122	208,240	(39,118)	
Pasco-Hernando	2,379	112,504	162,962	(50,458)	
Pensacola	1,988	118,060	136,178	(18,118)	
Polk	1,692	86,775	115,902	(29,127)	
St. Johns River	995	42,885	68,158	(25,273)	
St. Petersburg	5,038	156,875	345,103	(188,228)	
Santa Fe	3,083	130,895	211,186	(80,291)	
Seminole State	3,960	127,676	271,260	(143,584)	
South Florida	416	84,481	28,496	55,985	
State College FL	565	31,184	38,703	(7,519)	
Tallahassee	1,376	87,849	94,256	(6,407)	
Valencia	8,090	144,766	554,165	(409,399)	
SYSTEM	70,959	3,162,382	4,860,692	(1,698,310)	

A more accurate approach is to assign vocational laboratory space per the specific space requirements of the vocational courses that college offers or intends to offer. SmithGroup calculated the vocational laboratory space needs for each college based on their Fall 2018 course data, assigning laboratory space amounts based on the specific needs of each program. Vocational teaching laboratory utilization metrics factor into the space needs guideline by the same CEFPI formula as described for classrooms: (NSF/Station)/(SSO x WRH). SmithGroup incorporated the SREF utilization expectations of 30 hours per week at 80% student station occupancy, with NSF per station guidelines based on each program. This guideline also considered the impact of related classrooms (RUC 212) on certain vocational laboratories, per the SREF. SmithGroup added 1.75 NSF per vocational FTE to accommodate open laboratory space needs. The outcomes are noted in the table entitled *Vocational Laboratory Space Needs Analysis Using Alternative Guideline*.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORY SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING ALTERNATIVE GUIDELINES					
College	Existing Vocational Lab NSF (A)	Alternative Vocational Lab Guideline NSF (C)	Alternative Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-C)	Difference SREF Guideline to Alternative Guideline NSF (B-C)	
Broward	220,107	329,955	(109,848)	214,414	
Chipola	55,466	55,793	(327)	(29,558)	
Central Florida	32,486	47,278	(14,792)	52,253	
Florida Keys	12,962	7,267	5,695	11,708	
Daytona	187,914	226,295	(38,381)	4,482	
Eastern Florida	179,017	102,172	76,845	62,228	
Florida Gateway	69,565	66,025	3,540	(11,773)	
FL SouthWestern	70,744	49,302	21,443	156	
FL SC at Jax	320,381	153,297	167,084	131,594	
Gulf Coast	88,054	47,484	40,570	1,905	
Hillsborough	153,506	171,474	(17,968)	196,713	
Indian River	189,511	139,912	49,599	108,058	
Lake-Sumter	19,336	16,813	2,523	18,054	
Miami Dade	200,288	149,388	50,900	238,596	
North Florida	27,468	39,344	(11,876)	(23,657)	
Northwest FL	42,505	31,030	11,475	18,085	
Palm Beach State	169,122	238,213	(69,091)	(29,973)	
Pasco-Hernando	112,504	104,304	8,200	58,657	
Pensacola	118,060	145,585	(27,525)	(9,407)	
Polk	86,775	53,510	33,265	62,392	
St. Johns River	42,885	37,814	5,071	30,343	
St. Petersburg	156,875	139,467	17,409	205,637	
Santa Fe	130,895	149,632	(18,737)	61,553	
Seminole State	127,676	152,066	(24,390)	119,194	
South Florida	84,481	59,641	24,840	(31,145)	
State College FL	31,184	31,401	(217)	7,302	
Tallahassee	87,849	18,167	69,682	76,089	
Valencia	144,766	297,751	(152,985)	256,415	
SYSTEM	3,162,382	3,060,378	102,004	1,800,314	

The alternative guideline using WSCH and utilization standards generated a systemwide need for 3,060,378 NSF, which is a surplus of 102,004 NSF based on existing space. The SREF NSF per FTE standard over generated vocational laboratory space need at multiple colleges as compared to the alternative approach. The combined NSF difference between the two approaches was 1,800,314 NSF. The overgeneration of vocational laboratory space is demonstrated by lower utilization rates, as analyzed in Chapter 6, and errors in the coding of these spaces.

The current SREF space factor of 68.5 NSF/COFTE is unacceptable, especially for larger FTE colleges and for smaller FTE colleges. Open laboratories (RUC 220/225) and related instructional classrooms (RUC 212) are problematic in terms of lack of consistency in room use coding and departmental designations, leading to inaccuracies. SmithGroup recommends that room use codes for open laboratories and departmental assignment practices should be reviewed and modified. From a policy perspective, the additional effort expended by the Division of Florida Colleges to generate space needs from alternative space guidelines may not justify the greater level of accuracy. A greater level of accuracy could be obtained in this category if coding errors are addressed and corrected.

OFFICES

Offices represent the largest instructional support space type for every Florida College System institution. The office space category includes four room use codes:

- 310 and 315 Office and office service
- 350 and 355 Conference room and conference room service

The Florida College System uses the SREF for determining office space needs for each site. Calculations use annualized COFTE based on projected enrollments from credit hours. The SREF guideline of 15.5 ASF is the sum of two components:

- 1. A space standard of 12.5 NSF per site COFTE is used to calculate office space needs to accommodate faculty, staff, and administration at each campus, center, or special purpose site.
- 2. For districtwide administration, a space standard of 3.0 NSF per collegewide COFTE is used to calculate office space needs for districtwide administration and staff located at a central district location.

The following table notes existing office NSF per 2018-19 FTE, including the district offices. The outcomes noted a wide range of space need generation from approximately 10 NSF/Student FTE to 46 NSF/Student FTE. Of the 28 colleges, 18 (64%) exceeded the prescribed SREF standard. Similar to other space types, one source of variability for this wide range is the omission of non-credit course use of offices from available data.⁶



OFFICE NSF PER FTE BY COLLEGE

6 For example, the Florida Public Safety Institute (FPSI) at Tallahassee Community College includes 18,999 NSF of office space used to support non-credit courses.

Applying SREF office space needs standard of 15.5 NSF to Actual 2018-2019 FTE yields a systemwide office space need of NSF of space, per the table entitled *Office Space Needs Analysis using SREF Standards*. Relative to the SREF standard, 9 (32%) of the colleges have a deficit of office space. The SREF standards yields a total systemwide space need of 4,964,712 NSF of office space based on 2018-2019 FTE, a surplus of 163,487 NSF when compared to existing space.

OFFICE SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING SREF STANDARDS					
College	2018-19 Total Existing Office SREF O Annualized NSF Standar COFTE (A) (B)		SREF Office Standard NSF (B)	SREF Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) (A-B)	
Broward	28,335	335,532	439,193	(103,661)	
Chipola	1,475	40,155	22,863	17,293	
Central Florida	5,145	89,712	79,748	9,965	
Florida Keys	708	32,737	10,974	21,763	
Daytona	11,118	232,365	172,329	60,036	
Eastern Florida	10,796	215,899	167,338	48,561	
Florida Gateway	2,415	52,159	37,433	14,727	
FL SouthWestern	11,115	163,288	172,283	(8,995)	
FL SC at Jax	16,908	365,107	262,074	103,033	
Gulf Coast	3,284	100,931	50,902	50,029	
Hillsborough	20,466	255,616	317,223	(61,607)	
Indian River	12,786	246,654	198,183	48,471	
Lake-Sumter	3,250	73,750	50,375	23,375	
Miami Dade	47,486	625,357	736,033	(110,676)	
North Florida	846	34,302	13,113	21,189	
Northwest FL	3,829	100,293	59,350	40,944	
Palm Beach State	21,131	246,858	327,531	(80,673)	
Pasco-Hernando	7,580	98,092	117,490	(19,398)	
Pensacola	7,258	145,995	112,499	33,496	
Polk	6,605	122,126	102,378	19,749	
St. Johns River	4,589	71,965	71,130	836	
St. Petersburg	18,601	432,596	288,316	144,281	
Santa Fe	11,084	153,498	171,802	(18,304)	
Seminole State	12,858	196,831	199,299	(2,468)	
South Florida	2,371	72,152	36,751	35,402	
State College FL	6,684	107,966	103,602	4,364	
Tallahassee	9,079	194,954	140,725	54,230	
Valencia	32,502	321,309	503,781	(182,472)	
SYSTEM	320,304	5,128,199	4,964,712	163,487	

Using SREF standards. the top five colleges with the largest FTE (Miami Dade College, Valencia College, Broward College, Palm Beach State College, and Hillsborough Community College) all generated deficits of space. Together, the five averaged 29,984 FTE with a total office space deficit of 539,089 NSF. As a comparison, the five colleges with the lowest FTE (The College of the Florida Keys, North Florida College, Chipola College, South Florida State College, and Florida Gateway College) averaged 1,563 FTE with a combined space surplus of 110,374 NSF. On average, NSF per FTE formulas tend to overestimate space needs for colleges generating greater than 12,000 FTE and underestimate space needs for colleges with 2,500 FTE or less.

Among the 28 colleges there is a strong correlation (r²=0.89) between existing office NSF and annualized FTE, suggesting that most colleges are using similar office space standards in the design and renovation of facilities.



The use of NSF per COFTE to generate office space is problematic on multiple fronts.

 Relative office need increases for smaller colleges. While the office NSF per FTE for the Florida College System averages the standard of 15.5 NSF per FTE, the average office NSF per FTE increases as college FTE declines. As noted in the table, Existing Office NSF per FTE By College Size, campuses with 12,000 annualized FTE or greater averaged 14.3 NSF per FTE while colleges with less than 2,500 annualized FTE averaged 33.2 office NSF per FTE.

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM – OFFICE ANALYSIS Existing Office NSF per FTE by College Size						
College	Actual 2018-19 FTE	Existing Office NSF per FTE				
FTE 12,000-48,000						
Miami Dade	47,486	13.2				
Valencia	32,502	9.9				
Broward	28,335	11.8				
Palm Beach State	21,131	11.7				
Hillsborough	20,466	12.5				
St. Petersburg	18,601	13.7				
FL SC at Jax	16,908	21.6				
Seminole State	12,858	15.3				
Indian River	12,786	19.3				
Average	23,453	14.3				
FTE 6,000-12,000						
Daytona	11,118	20.9				
FL Southwestern	11,115	14.7				
Santa Fe	11,084	13.8				
Eastern Florida	10,796	20.0				
Tallahassee	9,079	21.5				
Pasco-Hernando	7,580	12.9				
Pensacola	7,258	20.1				
State College FL	6,684	16.2				
Polk	6,605	18.5				
Average	9,035	17.6				
FTE 3,000-6,000						
Central Florida	5,145	17.4				
St. Johns River	4,589	15.7				
Northwest FL	3,829	26.2				
Gulf Coast	3,284	30.7				
Lake-Sumter	3,250	22.7				
Average	4,019	22.5				
FTE 700-3,000						
Florida Gateway	2,415	21.6				
South Florida	2,371	30.4				
Chipola	1,475	27.2				
North Florida	846	40.5				
Florida Keys	708	46.2				
Average	1,563	33.2				
SYSTEM Average	320,304	15.5				

2. Wide variation of employee type and thus office need. An office NSF per student FTE standard fails to consider the working status of employees. In two-year colleges, the number of faculty that are adjunct or part-time faculty can fluctuate widely between colleges. Academic tutors, work-study students, and some student services staff may also be employed part-time. Unlike full-time faculty and staff, adjuncts and part-time employees may share offices or be provided with hoteling offices that are shared among numerous employees.

During interviews, college representatives noted the disparity of full-and part-time employees within Florida College System institutions and the potential impact on office space needs. To investigate this concern, SmithGroup analyzed staffing data for each college, sourced from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for the 2018 academic year. SmithGroup analyzed the total number of employees by work status for each college. The chart, Percent Full-Time Employees by College Size notes the percent of full-time employees by college. The percent of full-time employees by college varies from a high of 81% at North Florida Community College to a low of 28% at Miami Dade College, with a systemwide average of 45% full-time employees.



PERCENT FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES BY COLLEGE SIZE

The SREF use of NSF/COFTE standards to generate office space needs deviates from most national methodologies established by CEFPI and from the practices of other states surveyed. The predominant and more accurate metric is NSF per Employee (Faculty and Staff) FTE, which recognizes that employees, not students, are the primary users of office space and therefore drive space needs. The NSF per employee metric may include office service (file rooms, break rooms, office supplies, vaults) and conference rooms or an NSF per FTE allocation is added to each employee type. Of the other state systems surveyed, office space standards ranged from 160-220 NSF per employee (Faculty and Staff) FTE. SmithGroup calculated alternative office space need for each college using widely accepted NSF per employee (Faculty and Staff) guidelines. Using employee data provided by the Division of Florida Colleges staff, space allocation guidelines per title were applied to all positions requiring office space, plus additional allocations for office service (RUC 315) and conference space (RUC 350, 355). The results are noted in the *Office Space Needs Using Alternative Guidelines* table. In general, the alternative NSF per employee approach generated a systemwide office space need for 4,470,665 NSF, which is a surplus of 657,534 NSF. The alternative guideline reduces the overgeneration of office space for large campuses and generates additional space on small campuses when compared to the SREF standards. There was a 494,047 NSF combined difference between the SREF standards and the alternative guideline.

OFFICE SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING ALTERNATIVE GUIDELINES					
College	Existing Office NSF (A) Alternative Office Guideline NSF (C)		Alternative Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-C)	Difference SREF Guideline to Alternative Guideline NSF (B-C)	
Broward	335,532	332,725	2,807	106,468	
Chipola	40,155	34,905	5,250	(12,043)	
Central Florida	89,712	73,700	16,012	6,048	
Florida Keys	32,737	25,020	7,717	(14,046)	
Daytona	232,365	129,495	102,870	42,834	
Eastern Florida	215,899	164,660	51,239	2,678	
Florida Gateway	52,159	50,805	1,354	(13,373)	
FL SouthWestern	163,288	148,270	15,018	24,013	
FL SC at Jax	365,107	269,920	95,187	(7,846)	
Gulf Coast	100,931	83,990	16,941	(33,088)	
Hillsborough	255,616	222,340	33,276	94,883	
Indian River	246,654	223,575	23,079	(25,392)	
Lake-Sumter	73,750	51,625	22,125	(1,250)	
Miami Dade	625,357	712,690	(87,333)	23,343	
North Florida	34,302	19,820	14,482	(6,707)	
Northwest FL	100,293	75,830	24,463	(16,481)	
Palm Beach State	246,858	279,595	(32,737)	47,936	
Pasco-Hernando	98,092	93,250	4,842	24,240	
Pensacola	145,995	98,635	47,360	13,864	
Polk	122,126	112,970	9,156	(10,593)	
St. Johns River	71,965	59,170	12,795	11,960	
St. Petersburg	432,596	268,380	164,216	19,936	
Santa Fe	153,498	165,125	(11,627)	6,677	
Seminole State	196,831	185,655	11,176	13,644	
South Florida	72,152	51,895	20,257	(15,145)	
State College FL	107,966	87,350	20,616	16,252	
Tallahassee	194,954	51,200	143,754	89,525	
Valencia	321,309	398,070	(76,761)	105,711	
SYSTEM	5,128,199	4,470,665	657,534	494,047	

SmithGroup recommends a more accurate office space needs approach that is calculated using NSF per employee

(Faculty and Staff) FTE. At a higher policy level, many states have developed guidelines that use one space factor for full time employees and one for part-time employees to generate space needs in this category.

A more accurate methodology will require Division of Florida College staff to collect employee data and establish NSF per employee space standards. Some of this data is already being collected. The greater accuracy of the NSF per Employee FTE standard must be weighed against the additional time and effort required to acquire unit-level staffing data and calculate space needs by employee type.

LIBRARY/STUDY SPACES

Library and study spaces have undergone dramatic change over the last seven to ten years as digital volumes have increased and research linking social and study space to student success has emerged. The traditional approach to campus study space of locating all reader stations and group study rooms in the library has been superseded on most campuses by distributing study and informal learning space across campus. This strategy provides students greater opportunity to interact with faculty after class in space adjacent to the classroom, space for informal learning before and after class, and space to meet on group projects or work on presentations in locations convenient to where students are at any time of day.

This recognition of collaborative learning outside of the classroom has also led to a need for increased overall study space on campus. Therefore, study spaces should be created proximate to instructional space for academic building renovations or new construction. Study space can also be created by reducing stack space from more traditional libraries and converting the vacated floor space to student study stations.

The library/study space category in SREF includes seven room use codes:

- 410 Study Space
- 420 Stack Space
- 430 Open Stack Study Room
- 440 Processing Room
- 445 Study Service

Documentation acknowledges the distribution of study space across campus in its SREF room classification system. Study Space is defined in the SREF as a space or area used by individuals to study at their convenience including study or reading rooms located in libraries, residential facilities, academic, or student service facilities. Study rooms equipped with computers for student study purposes are also included in this category. The Division of Florida Colleges uses the SREF for determining library/study space needs for each site in the Educational Plant Survey. Calculations use annualized COFTE based on projected enrollments from credit hours and location designation. These space needs formulas are viable metrics when compared to other state guidelines.

- A campus or center with 1,000 or less COFTE is allotted a minimum of 2,100 NSF plus 10 NSF for each COFTE.
- A campus or center with more than 1,000 COFTE is allocated a minimum 12,100 NSF. Plus 11 NSF for each COFTE greater than 1,000.
- A special purpose center is allotted 10 NSF per COFTE with no minimum allowance.

The existing library/study NSF per FTE varies from 3 NSF per FTE at Valencia College to 19 NSF per FTE at Lake-Sumter, with an Florida College System average of 8.3 NSF per FTE.



LIBRARY/STUDY NSF PER STUDENT FTE

Unlike the other SREF standards discussed in this report, the library/study standard is generated for each campus, center or special purpose site. For ease of analysis and understanding, these data have been consolidated at the college-level. While SREF guideline for library/study space yields an allocation of 11 to 12 NSF at the college-level, the 28 colleges averaged 8.3 NSF per COFTE.

It is difficult to determine whether colleges are underbuilt or overbuilt on library/study space as facility coding is inconsistent in this category. The discrepancy is within two room use code categories. These include:

RUC 240/245 STUDENT COMPUTER TERMINAL ROOM & SERVICE

Division of Florida Colleges documentation defines this as a space or separate area equipped with computer terminals used by individual students for the purpose of studying. It includes open areas, enclosed rooms, booths, and carrels. Such spaces may be in libraries, learning centers, academic buildings, or student services centers. The room or area is not scheduled either formally or informally, regularly or irregularly, but is intended to be available for students to study at their convenience. It is noted that this room use code (when used with all ICS codes) aggregates to the library/study space category.

220/225 OPEN LABORATORY & SERVICE

The Division of Florida Colleges documentation defines open laboratories with equipment that serves the needs of a particular discipline or discipline group for individual or group instruction where 1) use of the room is not formally or regularly scheduled, or 2) access is limited to specific groups of students. An open laboratory is a secondary laboratory which programmatically supports and is assigned to the primary 210 class laboratory. Included in this category are rooms such as botany greenhouses, music ensemble and practice rooms, special language laboratories, photography studios, criminal justice courtrooms, emergency medical telemetry operations, and computer laboratories involving specialized restrictive software or where access is limited to specific types of students.

At Daytona College, SmithGroup noted 59,274 NSF of RUC 240/245 (Student Computer Terminal Room & Service) space in their facility inventory to document academic support/learning centers, computer commons, open computer laboratories, math, reading, English, and writing laboratories. These spaces (regardless of ICS code) should be placed in the Library/Study space Category. Room use code 220/225 is not used in the college's space inventory.

At Valencia College, staff coded two spaces (1,756 NSF) with RUC 240/245. SmithGroup noted 16,065 NSF in the RUC 220/225 open laboratory codes to document open computer instruction rooms, learning laboratories, tutoring rooms, math and writing centers, and testing rooms. These spaces would be classified in the non-vocational or vocational laboratory space generation category.

These two examples suggest that similar spaces (learning centers, tutoring rooms, math/writing centers) are being interpreted and coded differently. Upon further examination, these coding inconsistencies exist among all 28 Florida College System institutions. Lack of consistency is detrimental to NSF per COFTE space standards that are generating space based on well-defined room use code assumptions.

Applying SREF library/study space needs standards of 11 to 12 NSF to Actual 2018-2019 FTE yields a systemwide library/study space need of 3,585,851 NSF of space, per the table entitled *Library/Study Space Needs Analysis using SREF Standards*. This is a 1,590,797 NSF deficit when compared to existing space. Relative to the SREF standard, 23 (82%) of the colleges have a deficit of library/study space. Only Chipola College and Lake-Sumter State College exceed current SREF standards. Several colleges in the system have significant deficits in this space category using the SREF standard. Miami Dade has a 200% deficit while Valencia has a library/study space deficit of 300% as the 240/245 room use code is not widely used.

Using SREF standards. the top five colleges with the largest FTE (Miami Dade College, Valencia College, Broward College, Palm Beach State College, and Hillsborough Community College) all generated large deficits of library/study space. Together, the five averaged 29,984 FTE with a total combined library/study space deficit of 998,755 NSF. As a comparison, the five colleges with the lowest FTE (The College of the Florida Keys, North Florida, College, Chipola College, South Florida State College, and Florida Gateway) averaged 1,563 FTE with a combined space deficit of 4,727 NSF. On average, NSF per FTE formulas tend to overestimate space needs for colleges generating greater than 20,000 FTE and underestimate space needs for colleges with 4,000 FTE or less.

LIBRARY/STUDY SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING SREF STANDARDS					
College	2018–19 Total Annualized COFTE	Existing Library/Study NSF (A)	SREF Library/ Study Guideline NSF (B)	SREF Guideline Space Surplus or (Deficit) NSF (A-B)	
Broward	28,335	193,244	308,852	(115,608)	
Chipola	1,475 21,6		17,258	4,392	
Central Florida	5,145	28,741	55,052	(26,311)	
Florida Keys	708	10,789	8,708	2,081	
Daytona	11,118	75,716	126,745	(51,029)	
Eastern Florida	10,796	108,013	123,074	(15,061)	
Florida Gateway	2,415	22,175	27,773	(5,598)	
FL SouthWestern	11,115	59,381	124,488	(65,107)	
FL SC at Jax	16,908	135,116	184,297	(49,181)	
Gulf Coast	3,284	26,882	37,109	(10,227)	
Hillsborough	20,466	85,442	231,266	(145,824)	
Indian River	12,786	89,062	143,203	(54,141)	
Lake-Sumter	3,250	63,989	37,375	26,614	
Miami Dade	47,486	215,272	531,843	(316,571)	
North Florida	846	13,007	10,067	2,940	
Northwest FL	3,829	46,760	42,119	4,641	
Palm Beach State	21,131	98,239	238,780	(140,541)	
Pasco-Hernando	7,580	56,030	87,170	(31,140)	
Pensacola	7,258	68,115	82,015	(13,900)	
Polk	6,605	52,046	74,637	(22,591)	
St. Johns River	4,589	28,201	53,232	(25,031)	
St. Petersburg	18,601	151,239	204,611	(53,372)	
Santa Fe	11,084	47,467	124,141	(76,674)	
Seminole State	12,858	66,249	144,010	(77,761)	
South Florida	2,371	18,487	27,029	(8,542)	
State College FL	6,684	63,196	76,198	(13,002)	
Tallahassee	9,079	66,736	100,777	(34,041)	
Valencia	32,502	83,811	364,022	(280,211)	
SYSTEM	320,304	1,995,054	3,585,851	(1,590,797)	

Source: Florida College System Facilities/Capital Outlay Database 2018–19 Reporting Year Section II: Appendix A Version 24.00 80 July 1, 2018

To determine whether the SREF space needs formula for library/study space accurately reflects the need for library/study space, SmithGroup analyzed an alternative approach to determining library/study space need. As the library or learning commons of today is a central hub of learning activity, students use these spaces to acquire relevant instructional resources through online and print sources. Students also bring their own devices and connect to the college's network or local wireless system. The library/learning commons also contains space for individual and group study rooms that provide presentation systems and other electronic ways for students to engage in academic course content.

Due to these transitions, several statewide planning models do not include guideline factors for the library. States that have established guidelines for library space utilize one set of factors for collections, another for reader stations, and a third for service space and staff. Most volume conversions used are originally from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) standards. For this study. SmithGroup obtained the number of books, serials, unbound serials, and audio/visual materials from IPEDS online database for 2018.

For library collections, a guideline of **0.10 ASF per volume** for collection space was established based on statewide norms. Study station space generation is based on 25% percent of total FTE with 25 NSF per study station. Service space was calculated on a percent of the total collection and reader station space. The guideline used was 12% of the total collection and reader station space for service and staff space as digital content has replaced some of the need for acquisitions and technical processing. To account for RUC 240/245 Student Computer Terminal Room & Service spaces, a guideline of 3 NSF per FTE was used to accommodate open computer laboratories and student success centers, including math, writing, and tutoring laboratories. This method of space need generation is more accurate but also more data intensive and would require colleges to report library collection data by campus or site. The results are noted in the Library/Study Space Needs Using Alternative Guidelines table. In general, the alternative NSF approach generated a systemwide space need for 2,622,836 NSF, which is a deficit of 627,782 NSF when compared to existing space. This alternative guideline reduces the overgeneration of library/study space for large campuses and stabilizes space on small campuses when compared to the SREF standards.

With a combined 963,015 NSF, the differences between the SREF standards and the alternative guidelines may not be significant enough to consider changing the SREF NSF/COFTE formula for an alternative approach that requires more labor-intensive data tracking and reporting. Correcting discrepancies in room use coding will also impact space needs outcomes for each college.

LIBRARY/STUDY SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS USING ALTERNATIVE GUIDELINES					
College	Existing Library/Study NSF (A)	Total Alternative Guideline NSF (C)	Alternative Guideline Space Surplus (Deficit) NSF (A-C)	Difference SREF Guideline to Alternative Guideline NSF (B-C)	
Broward	193,244	308,349	(115,105)	503	
Chipola	21,649	13,334	8,315	3,924	
Central Florida	28,741	43,805	(15,064)	11,246	
Florida Keys	10,789	8,534	2,255	174	
Daytona	75,716	92,322	(16,606)	34,423	
Eastern Florida	108,013	94,907	13,106	28,167	
Florida Gateway	22,175	19,994	2,181	7,778	
FL SouthWestern	59,381	82,871	(23,490)	41,617	
FL SC at Jax	135,116	133,802	1,314	50,495	
Gulf Coast	26,882	26,346	536	10,764	
Hillsborough	85,442	156,964	(71,522)	74,301	
Indian River	89,062	99,835 (10,773)		43,368	
Lake-Sumter	63,989	28,952	35,037	8,423	
Miami Dade	215,272	354,996	(139,724)	176,847	
North Florida	13,007	9,402	3,605	665	
Northwest FL	46,760	36,674	10,086	5,445	
Palm Beach State	98,239	167,427	(69,188)	71,353	
Pasco-Hernando	56,030	63,484	(7,454)	23,686	
Pensacola	68,115	61,683	6,432	20,332	
Polk	52,046	55,254	(3,208)	19,382	
St. Johns River	28,201	39,962	(11,761)	13,271	
St. Petersburg	151,239	141,177	10,062	63,434	
Santa Fe	47,467	87,442	(39,975)	36,699	
Seminole State	66,249	101,101	(34,852)	42,908	
South Florida	18,487	20,431	(1,944)	6,599	
State College FL	63,196	53,042	10,154	23,155	
Tallahassee	66,736	73,021	(6,285)	27,756	
Valencia	83,811	247,725	(163,914)	116,297	
SYSTEM	1,995,054	2,622,836	(627,782)	963,015	

OTHER SPACE NEEDS GENERATION CONSIDERATIONS

The Florida College System calculates the need for classrooms, non-vocational and vocational teaching and open laboratories, offices, and library/study space by a one-size-fits-all NSF/COFTE approach. The current Florida College System space needs formulas consider only the quantity of space. The generation of actual space needs is often more complicated and factors such as the age, functionality, and suitability of buildings and spaces should also be considered.

Age and Functionality: It is noteworthy that a significant portion of the Florida College System space assets are more than 25 years old. This is significant because of the deferred maintenance backlog for these buildings; the useful life of many building systems ends after 25 to 30 years. The age of a college's buildings is represented in two ways. The first is the Florida Department of Education's original inspection date, which is assumed to be the date the building was constructed. In some instances this may be the date an existing building was acquired by the college. The second is the date of last inspection, which is assumed to be when the building was substantially upgraded, effectively changing its age for deferred maintenance assessments.



- Suitability: National organizations such as APPA (the leading association of higher education facility managers) and NACUBO (National Association of College and University Business Offices) have published extensively on the insufficiency of considering only space needs. They advocate for a process to not only inventory space and assess facility conditions, but to also consider the suitability of the buildings to serve programmatic needs. For example, a 1960's building may function adequately, but it may not be sufficiently flexible to deliver pedagogy and academic programs for 21st Century learning. A traditional 32-seat classroom with fixed seats cannot be used effectively for students working in teams or group activity, such as breaking the class into five-student groups.
- Outdated Space Categories: The Audio Visual (Room Use Code 530 and 535) category of space is largely outdated, since projector rooms and other support space have largely been replaced by digital media. As advances in digital media continue, the focus is shifting to more integration with information technology and computer systems. Distance learning studios and support space may still be needed, but for simplification, it is recommended that any space needs for this category be combined with Central Computer and Telecommunications space (Room Use Code 710–715).
- Classroom and laboratory utilization standards are used to determine capacity and student stations for classrooms and laboratories in the Educational Plant Survey. As an example of SREF formulas, using 40 weekly room hours, 60% station occupancy and 12 student hours per COFTE, a classroom utilization index can be calculated to determine capacity or the number of classroom stations.
 - To determine the number of COFTE students the classroom inventory can accommodate, use the classroom utilization index of 2.0, multiplied by a given number of classroom student stations.
 - To determine the number of classroom student stations needed to accommodate the COFTE, use the classroom utilization index reciprocal of 0.50, multiplied by a given number of COFTE students.

Average weekly student hours per COFTE (WSH/COFTE) are noted in the SREF and sum to 30 hours per year.

- Classrooms: 12 WSH/COFTE or 40%
- Non-Vocational Laboratories: 6 WSH/COFTE or 20%
- Vocational Laboratories: 12 WSH/COFTE or 40%

Stated differently, the assumption is that each student FTE is generated by 12 hours in classrooms, 6 hours in non-vocational laboratories and 12 hours in vocational laboratories over the course of an academic year.

As the composition of students and the types of courses and programs offered at Florida College System institutions has changed dramatically over the years, SmithGroup investigated the viability of these ratios. The following table, *Weekly Room Hours by Instructional Category*, delineates the outcomes for the Fall 2018 term.

WEEKLY ROOM HOURS BY INSTRUCTIONAL CATEGORY (FALL 2018)							
Institution	Classroom Weekly Room Hours	% of Total Hours	Non-Vocational Labs Weekly Room Hours	% of Total Hours	Vocational Labs Weekly Room Hours	% of Total Hours	Total Weekly Room Hours
Hillsborough	6,150	68%	1,639	18%	1,136	14%	8,925
Santa Fe	788	37%	336	16%	991	47%	2,115
Daytona	2,021	39%	2,140	42%	955	19%	5,116
State College FL	1,494	59%	803	32%	237	9%	2,534
Average		51%		27%		22%	

Weekly room hours are the actual number of hours students spend in each of the three instructional space types. Based on Fall 2018 course data, SmithGroup calculated weekly room hours totals for four colleges. These colleges were randomly selected based on different levels of FTE. The results vary greatly between colleges in the percent of time students spend in classrooms and laboratories. These colleges do not follow the SREF standard of 40% classroom, 20% non-vocational laboratory, and 40% vocational laboratory. Current SREF formulas may be misrepresenting COFTE and student stations in the Educational Plant Survey and should be reviewed and modified based on current instructional patterns.

SECTION 5.3 CONCLUSIONS

Florida College System institutions rigorously follow the SREF space guidelines because SREF space standards are required by State Statutes. SREF's NSF per COFTE guidelines provide a high-level snapshot of met and unmet space needs in critical space categories. The continued use of SREF for space needs formulas and utilization factors has several benefits:

- Simplicity. The space needs for all analyzed space categories (classrooms, non-vocational laboratories, vocational laboratories, offices, and library/study) are calculated in the same manner projected enrollment (COFTE) multiplied by a factor. Only one data input is necessary.
- **Consistency**. The SREF standards have been used for many years with minor adjustments. Comparisons of current and past years is possible, and relatively little training is required for college staff.

Yet the strengths of the continued use of SREF for space needs formulas and utilization factors are also its weaknesses and the cause of its inaccuracies.

- SREF standards are too simplistic. The SREF space formulas are too simplistic to accurately assess space needs at the campus level. All space factors are multiplied against COFTE, which is an appropriate approach for classrooms, nonvocational and vocational laboratories, and library/study spaces. Best practices indicate alternative ways to calculate office space needs, using data that is readily available to colleges. The one-size-fits-all straight-line NSF per COFTE formulas over-generating space for larger FTE colleges and under-generating space for smaller FTE colleges.
- SREF standards are one-size-fits-all, but colleges are diverse. Colleges have a wide variety of community needs and college program mixes. SREF space formulas do not account for the diversity or mix of programs, especially in vocational laboratories. The current methodology for projecting space needs uses a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to consider differences in individual institutions mission, strategic goals, and varying needs according to the mix of programs or community needs. For example, a college that strategically wants to improve student success may need to schedule smaller class sizes, create more active learning classrooms, hire additional full-time faculty, and/or enhance academic success tutoring spaces. These strategies would have impacts on the assessment of space needs, but they are difficult to account for in current SREF space factors or the Educational Plant Survey process. The disconnect between the specific needs of colleges and one-size-fits-all space needs formulas and utilization factors means that space factors cannot justify the distinct spaces that some colleges would use most effectively.
- SREF standards are one-size-fits-all, but space needs varies based on FTE size. Colleges become more efficient as FTE increases, a trend that is true for colleges both in and out of Florida, but most SREF space needs generation standards are straight-line NSF per COFTE formulas regardless of COFTE level. SREF guidelines underestimate the need for space at small FTE colleges and overestimates it at large FTE colleges. The chart entitled Florida Colleges NSF/FTE by 2018-19 Annualized FTE notes the same trend. Each data-point represents a Florida College System institution.



- SREF standards are unchanging, but new space types are necessary. Since colleges and the Division of Florida Colleges must use SREF, there is no further effort to refine space needs to reflect strategic initiatives or academic areas that are growing or adding new programs or student service areas that are making changes to enhance student success. Because SREF space categories have been consistent for years, it does not adequately capture new kinds of space that are necessary for student academic success. For example, SREF does not adequately differentiate different types of open laboratories. Open laboratories are used primarily for individuals and groups and are informally scheduled, unscheduled, or open. For many statewide systems, there are multiple types of open laboratories. Because SREF has not adapted to address modern college space demands, colleges are not consistently tracking it and SREF does not accurately indicate the space need. SREF considers all of the following types of open laboratories as part of non-vocational laboratories or vocational laboratories:
 - Discipline Specific Open Laboratories (RUC 220) These are open laboratories that are designed for or furnished with equipment that serves the need of a particular discipline or program. Examples include music practice rooms, engineering maker spaces, language laboratories, and computer laboratories with restrictive software.
 - Testing Open Laboratories (RUC 220) These are open laboratories used for placement testing, make-up testing or certification testing. Students on each campus may be required to take Florida's Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (PERT). The test is designed to determine placement based on academic preparation. Open laboratories to administer the test are usually part of a student service function. There is no clear delineation in the SREF of how these laboratories should be coded. Multiple campuses are categorizing these laboratories as student computer terminal rooms in study areas with a room use code of RUC 240.
 - Open Computer Laboratories (RUC 240) These are open laboratories with generic software that are used for individual students to study, complete assignments, or receive assistance with courses. As the focus is on studying, these laboratories are often located in libraries, study centers, or student service centers and managed by academic support units. The SREF designates these laboratories as Student Computer Terminal Room with a 240 room use code.
 - Academic Success Laboratories (RUC 220) As colleges focus on student completion and success, there has been an expansion of academic success laboratories. These laboratories include tutoring areas in learning support centers, math centers or emporiums, writing and reading centers, and science resource centers.

As an example, Valencia College's 5,840 NSF Math Center on the West Campus provides learning support services for all levels of mathematics. Students seeking to improve their skills in mathematics have access to a variety of resources within the Math Center, including interactive software, calculators for check-out, and instructional videos. The Math Center houses the Tutoring Center, where walk-in tutoring is available for mathematics courses. The Math Open Laboratory is where students complete their required laboratories for Developmental Math I, Developmental Math II, Developmental Math Combined, and Intermediate Algebra. A hands-on math classroom for active learning of math skills and concepts as well as group study rooms are also available to all students, staff, and faculty members.

Depending on the campus, these centers are managed by administrative academic support units or specific disciplines, such as Valencia College's Math Center. However, at many colleges, tutoring functions or academic success centers support multiple disciplines, making it difficult to assign this space to one discipline or program. If these laboratories are not departmentally based, there is no clear delineation in the SREF of how these laboratories should be coded. As these laboratories can account for thousands of NSF, coding these laboratories in the non-vocational or vocational class laboratory space or the library/study space categories can distort space needs outcomes.

- SREF classroom standards do not address modern classroom demands. A large majority of colleges do not have effective classrooms, as measured by NSF/student. A low amount of space per student is efficient but not necessarily effective. Research in the emerging field of learning science has shown that active learning produces better student outcomes than traditional lecture. SREF standards mix traditional and computer classrooms, which makes it difficult to calculate the amount of space per student station (seat) since computer classrooms could inflate NSF per station metrics. SmithGroup's visual observation and interviews with campus constituents suggest that most classrooms are traditional and highly inflexible. For example, a sloped, 1970's era lecture hall with 120 seats might be very efficient at delivering science and psychology lectures, but three 40-seat sections held in a flexible classroom with space for working in groups may be more successful in producing effective learning outcomes.
- SREF does not consider quality of space. The SREF formulas do not address space quality. While facility inventory data notes the condition of the space (satisfactory, unsatisfactory, remodel), many colleges do not keep these codes updated. The SREF space factors do not take into account the quality of space and therefore do not provide a complete picture of space needs. Leading national organizations such as NACUBO and APPA have focused attention on the negative impact of deferred maintenance on the condition of facilities in higher education. They advocate for assessing both the facility condition and the suitability of buildings to accommodate the programmatic needs. Older facilities may not meet current standards for climate control or ADA access, and they may also be obsolete for 21st century teaching and learning. Mid-century buildings are often purpose-built and inflexible for accommodating more effective learning and program delivery. Suitability of the space to effectively deliver programs for 21st century education should be considered. The condition, suitability and configuration, and overall quality of existing space can be more important to colleges achieving strategic goals than quantity of space.

The Legislature could authorize the Florida Department of Education to make the capital planning process more accurate by updating and expanding the SREF standards.

More flexibility in space standards would result in more effective space. Changing the SREF space formulas and utilization factors would result in more effective use of space. Evaluations of effectiveness rely on the fit of the space assets to their use, that is, how they are being utilized. The Florida College System model to assess space needs is one dimensional in that it looks at only the quantity of space needs, with a one-size-fits-all approach. The data shows a wide range of conditions related to college size, number of programs, and mission. More tailored space formulas and utilization factors would result in building programs that more accurately reflect the need of colleges, and thus would be more effectively used.

Alternative space factors and methodologies are not only more accurate but also more complex and time-consuming than the current SREF space formulas and methodologies. The balance between accuracy and simplicity should be carefully considered.

More flexibility in space standards would not result in higher utilized space. Changing the SREF space formulas and utilization factors would not result in more efficient use of space. Target utilization rates for classrooms and teaching laboratories published in the SREF are in line with national practices and standards of other surveyed state systems. As demonstrated in Chapter 6, colleges have difficulty meeting utilization targets for the assessed space types. The impact of distance learning, population density/location, and non-credit and community use are not currently factored into utilization factors but can have an impact on utilization rates.

- Accurate space needs formulas require accurate facilities data. Current room use code designations are often inconsistent. The existing process for validating and maintaining space inventories is managed by college personnel. Division of Florida Colleges staff no longer perform facility inventory audits and there is no peer review. Several colleges reported not having space management software to correctly maintain space data. More complex space needs models are dependent on accurate records, and further accuracy will require additional resources at the college-level.
- Accuracy requires greater complexity. Due to the range of diversity of institutional roles, program mix, student academic levels, and community needs, greater accuracy requires more sophisticated space models with a greater number of variables and inputs. This in turn requires greater effort and accuracy with data collection, with potentially diminishing returns. The administrative processes and the resources required, which are used to develop space models, should align with the capital investments being made. It can be argued that large investments merit greater accountability than small ones. More refined space models may be better situated with master planning efforts. At a system or policy level of capital project planning, it may be enough to have moderately complex space models combined with other prioritization metrics which evaluate utilization and space management practices. Tennessee prioritizes projects with a rubric that weights 24% of the scoring on space need and another 20% on utilization. Texas, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia all include utilization in reporting requirements.

For the alternative space modeling in this report, SmithGroup used the following space planning guidelines.

			1	
Space Category	Site-based SREF Standard	Existing SREF Standard	SmithGroup Alternative Guideline	
Classrooms	Νο	13.5 NSF per COFTE	A space factor of 28 NSF/(36 WRH x 67% SSO) was applied to actual student contact hours as measured from the individual course files from each institution.	
Non-Vocational Laboratories	No	13.75 NSF per COFTE	A space factor of NSF per station based on discipline/(30 WRH x 80% SSO), multiplied by non-vocational Weekly Student Contract Hours. 1.5 NSF per non-vocational FTE for open labs. Station sizes ranged from 35 NSF per station to 200 NSF per station.	
Vocational Laboratories	No	68.5 ASF per Vocational COFTE	A space factor of NSF per station based on discipline/(30 WRH x 80% SSO), multiplied by vocational weekly student contract hours, 1.75 NSF per vocational FTE for open labs. Station sizes ranged from 35 NSF per station to 300 NSF per station.	
Offices	No	12.5 NSF per COFTE plus 3 NSF per COFTE for District Office	NSF per employee based on unit staffing data plus allocation for office service and conference rooms.	
	Campus or Center with less than 1,000 COFTE	2,100 NSF plus 10 NSF per COFTE	0.10 NSF per library equivalent volume based on IPEDS Library Data, 25% of FTE for student	
Library/Study	Campus or Center with more than 1,000 COFTE	12,100 NSF plus 11 NSF per COFTE	stations at 25 NSF per station, 12% of total collection and reader stations for technical processing, and 3 NSF per FTE for open	
	Special Purpose Center	10 NSF per COFTE	computer terminal labs.	

COMPARISON OF SREF STANDARDS AND ALTERNATIVE GUIDELINES

SECTION 5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

SmithGroup identified opportunities for improvement and recommends the following process changes to the strengthen space planning and current capital outlay processes:

• The Division of Florida Colleges should revise its space needs formulas and utilization factors to better model actual space needs. The Division of Florida Colleges should establish more effective space needs guidelines than those found in SREF. The Division of Florida Colleges should consider forming a systemwide study group to evaluate alternative space needs metrics that seek the right balance between complexity and accuracy, that better reflect the needs of each diverse college at the campus, center, and site levels, and that generate more flexibility in meeting utilization standards.

The study group should investigate what other states recommend and modify best practices for Florida to adopt more effective and progressive space needs standards that promote flexibility, multi-purpose, and shared-use as well as activitybased design principles. Models include the FUSION system as part of the California Community Colleges System and space planning metrics from the University System of Georgia.

The Division of Florida Colleges study group should craft space needs formulas and utilization factors that reflect the diversity of the colleges. The study group should conduct a detailed space study based on site/location, impact of distance learning, and non-credit activity before crafting new space needs formulas and utilization factors. NSF per COFTE among the various campuses, centers, and special purpose sites varies greatly. The diversity of colleges with differing roles, program mix, locations, student profiles, and strategic goals are not well served by a single set of space factors. Formulas and factors characteristic of each type of site would provide the most accurate space needs assessment.

The study group should consider the best practice of using a single utilization metric of weekly seat hours to provide some flexibility to achieve optimum utilization. When considering new space needs formulas and utilizations factors, it should consider:

- Classrooms The Division of Florida Colleges study group should consider modifying the classroom space factor to more accurately reflect the need for classroom flexibility. The current SREF space factor of 13.5 NSF/COFTE is a simple approach and is acceptable for the majority of colleges if the space need is reduced for larger FTE colleges and augmented for smaller FTE colleges. The Division of Florida Colleges study group should consider the more complex best practice of utilization metrics of 36 weekly room hours and 67% station occupancy rate and 28 NSF per station to generate a space factor of 1.16 NSF per weekly student contact hour, as measured from individual course files currently used to develop room utilization reports.
- Non-vocational Laboratories The room use codes in this category should be limited to non-vocational academic teaching laboratories (RUC 210/215) include multiple programs (i.e., Biology, Physical Sciences, Health, Fine and Applied Arts) that have similar utilization and NSF per station metrics. The non-discipline-specific open laboratories should be considered in a new Open Laboratories space category. The current SREF space factor of 13.75 NSF/COFTE is acceptable for the majority of colleges if the space need is reduced for larger FTE colleges and augmented for smaller FTE colleges.
- Vocational Laboratories There is wide variability in the number and types of vocational programs across colleges. The NSF per station also varies significantly among laboratory types (RUC 210/215). The related instruction classroom (RUC 212) is problematic in terms of accurate coding and scheduling. The current SREF space factor of 68.5 NSF/ COFTE is a simple approach and is acceptable for the majority of colleges if the space need is reduced for larger FTE colleges and augmented for smaller FTE colleges. The Division of Florida Colleges study group should consider the more complex best practice of utilization metrics of 30 weekly room hours and 80% station occupancy rate, with NSF per station based on discipline allocations to generate a space factor per weekly student contact hour. Data could be secured from course files currently used to develop room utilization reports.

- Open Laboratories SmithGroup recommends establishing a new space category for non-discipline-specific open laboratories that are critical for student success and completion. The Division of Florida Colleges study group should analyze Testing Open Laboratories (RUC 220), Academic Success Laboratories (RUC 220/225), and Open Computer Laboratories (RUC 240) to determine if these laboratories should continue to be included in the Non-vocational Laboratories and Vocational Laboratories guideline or migrated to a new space category. This new guideline should accommodate the diversity of colleges and should consider factors such as the level of developmental education (FTE) and key population factors related to underrepresented students in each college's district.
- Offices The current SREF space standard is based on NSF/COFTE, but there is variability in the number of full-time and part-time employees across colleges. SmithGroup recommends that the Division of Florida Colleges study group consider a change to an NSF per FTE employee standard that more accurately captures the components that drive office needs and office support needs.
- Library/Study The SREF standard is moderately simple and is acceptable for the majority of colleges if the space need is reduced for larger FTE colleges and augmented for smaller FTE colleges. The Division of Florida Colleges study group should consider an updated NSF per COFTE guideline that more accurately reflects the changing role of the library to a learning commons and the need for informal collaboration spaces across campus.
- Create a more flexible space needs assessment process. A simpler alternative to developing a graduated and more complex space model would be to create a more flexible process similar to those being used in Texas and Georgia, which would allow Florida College System institutions to exercise professional judgment to consider exceptions or mitigating conditions if so justified by campus leadership.
- Establish Room Use Codes for Non-Discipline-Specific Open Laboratories. The inclusion of open laboratories (RUC 220/225) in the Non-vocational and Vocational Laboratories categories is problematic in terms of lack of consistency in room use coding and departmental designation, leading to inaccuracies in space needs reporting and underestimation of the actual need for non-discipline specific laboratories critical for student success and completion. SmithGroup recommends that the Division of Florida Colleges study group review and modify room use codes for open laboratories and assignment practices, and the Division of Florida Colleges staff guide colleges to properly code non-discipline-specific open laboratories. The recoding could occur during space audits that are recommended elsewhere.
- Validate room use codes more frequently. Given room use coding issues and the large number of classrooms and laboratories without utilization (Chapter 6), there is a need for external audits to validate that colleges are correctly coding space and assigning proper departmental units. Policy should suggest more frequent facility inventory validations than the five-year process that many colleges use as part of the Educational Plant Survey.
- Augment training for college participants. Employee turnover, lack of adequate human resources, and the need for ongoing training regarding the coding of space and the updating of the facility inventory, as well as knowledge issues with completion of the Educational Plant Survey, are jeopardizing the accuracy of the data and processes. The knowledge level of current employees at several colleges needs to be assessed and a robust training program implemented for new hires. SmithGroup recommends online digital training materials that can be viewed by new employees or act a refresher courses for existing employees. This could be outsourced to a media production firm but will require additional funding.
- Consider beyond space needs. When prioritizing capital requests, the Division of Florida Colleges should consider other factors beyond space needs. To evaluate efficiency and effectiveness, the evaluation of space needs and practices should be expanded to consider other factors such as utilization rates, efficiency measures, and space management practices. Therefore, the colleges should collect, monitor, and report data on the age, condition, and suitability of facilities. Such efforts would require additional resources for this expanded college function. Examples include Space Usage Efficiency measures, as reported by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Nevada System of Higher Education's funding model. The new funding model is based upon the premise that state funding must be equitable to all institutions, simpler and more transparent than the previous formula, aligned with the goals of the State, and based upon national best practices in higher education financing.



Chapter 6 | Space Utilization

CHAPTER 6: Space utilization

The purpose of this chapter is to assess the extent to which each college efficiently and effectively utilizes classrooms and teaching laboratories (vocational and non-vocational).

Florida College System institutions are increasingly focused on space management practices and are working hard to use their scheduled teaching space more effectively. However, there is room for improvement while acknowledging that unique circumstances related to individual college missions and campus locations can influence which strategies will be most successful.

The Florida College System approach to utilization does not address an opportunity to vary the utilization expectations among different types of campuses, and to analyze weekly room hours separately from student station occupancy. For example, a small college may meet the expectation in student station occupancy for a specialized teaching laboratory, but not the weekly room hours due to an enrollment that does not justify multiple course sections.

The Florida College System approach to utilization considers only the primary mission of the colleges, which, per Florida Statute "is responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and career degree education" thus only for-credit courses offered by the college are included in Division of Florida Colleges space utilization. Yet the colleges' secondary role of offering programs in community services, adult education, and economic development also requires use of the college's classrooms, teaching laboratories, offices, and meeting spaces. Colleges regularly offer courses provided by workforce programs, partnerships, or use of space by other college and universities.

SECTION 6.1: INSTITUTIONS' SPACE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Section 6.1 reviews space management processes used by the colleges. Information was gathered from campus surveys and interviews with each college. Topics included: college classroom and teaching laboratory scheduling practices, who schedules teaching space on campus, strategies the colleges are using to increase utilization and impediments to optimal scheduling.

SPACE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND STRUCTURE

Consistent space management practices ensure good stewardship of space assets by providing accountability for efficient and effective utilization. The act of managing space requires not only an accurate knowledge of existing space as documented in the space inventory process, but also an analysis of how it is being utilized. Only by understanding how a space is being used can opportunities for improvement be achieved. The latter requires both data and resources to accomplish. Standards and best practices can help inform and shape capital improvements at the earliest stages of planning, when they will have the most impact for the lowest cost.

Based on the outcomes of a college survey and SmithGroup interviews with each college, Florida College System institutions are becoming more focused on space management policies and procedures, but there is still a long way to go. As noted in the following table, only 10 of the 28 colleges stated that they had formal policies or practices related to space assignment.

Six colleges schedule all classrooms campuswide through a central scheduler, typically the registrar. At 10 colleges, classrooms are assigned to individual departments and scheduled by the department. Twelve colleges use a combination, with some classrooms centrally scheduled and some departmentally scheduled. **SmithGroup** has found that central scheduling of classrooms improves utilization.

CLASSROOM SCHEDULING PRACTICES							
College	Existing Classroom Square Feet per FTE	Classroom Scheduling	Policies Related to Space Assignment	Technological Tools for Scheduling and Monitoring Space Use			
Broward	8.66	Both	No	Yes			
Central Florida	9.70	Both	No	Yes			
FL SC at Jax	17.79	Both	No	Yes			
Hillsborough	10.69	Both	No	Yes			
Northwest FL	20.38	Both	No	Yes			
Palm Beach State	11.57	Both	No	Yes			
Pensacola	18.32	Both	No	No			
Polk	19.29	Both	No	Yes			
FL SouthWestern	11.44	Both	Yes	Yes			
State College FL	15.28	Both	Yes	Yes			
Santa Fe	12.13	Both	Yes	Yes			
Valencia	12.66	Both	Yes	Yes			
	13.99	Average					
Miami Dade	10.38	Centralized	No	Yes			
North Florida	9.43	Centralized	No	Yes			
Seminole State	11.76	Centralized	No	Yes			
South Florida	28.75	Centralized	No	No			
Lake-Sumter	11.59	Centralized	Yes	Yes			
Tallahassee	21.14	Centralized	Yes	Yes			
	15.51	Average					
Chipola	14.56	Decentralized	Yes	No			
Daytona	13.37	Decentralized	Yes	Yes			
Eastern Florida	16.50	Decentralized	Yes	Yes			
Florida Gateway	10.78	Decentralized	No	No			
Florida Keys	31.59	Decentralized	No	Yes			
Gulf Coast	14.98	Decentralized	No	Yes			
Indian River	12.82	Decentralized	No	No			
Pasco Hernando	11.26	Decentralized	No	Yes			
St. Johns River	13.29	Decentralized	Yes	Yes			
St. Petersburg	14.08	Decentralized	No	No			
	15.32	Average					

Surveys and research conducted by SmithGroup of two-year colleges, as well as other studies of space management practices, indicate that there is not a single ideal model of space management. Rather, there are many components to effective space management which contribute to optimizing space on college campuses. The survey of the 28 Florida colleges indicate that many colleges report having various elements of a space management structure, as illustrated in the graph below.



SPACE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES USED AT FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS - SYSTEMWIDE

All 28 colleges surveyed reported use of various elements of space management processes and components. As delineated in the graph, 19 (68%) of the 28 colleges noted the use of space standards. None of the colleges reported having more specific space standards than prescribed in the State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF, 2014). Fourteen (50%) of the 28 colleges have a space manager.

Seventeen (61%) of the colleges reported have a planning office, while only three colleges (11%) make use of a space or classroom committee. Based upon the interviews, colleges appear to use their space committees and planning offices to respond reactively to requests for space. Most do not engage in proactively identifying opportunities for optimizing the use of existing space.

While colleges are increasingly focused on management of space assets, many noted the lack of resources dedicated to space management due to budgetary concerns. Larger colleges tend to have more resources available, but there are concerns about encompassing large numbers of campuses or sites. While there is no silver bullet for space management, practices do vary widely throughout system colleges.

A wide variety of software applications were reported to be in use for scheduling classrooms and laboratories. Examples included Ad Astra, Ellucian 25 live, CollegeNet, Jenzabar, and Banner. Only 12 (43%) of the colleges reported using Computer Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) software. During interviews, colleges without CAFM software noted the use of Excel or Access or they relied on EFIS, an integrated database of facility functions used by the Division of Florida Colleges.

When colleges were surveyed about their agreement in using current utilization rates in the development of each college's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), 20 or 77% of the respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement that "Current utilization rates must be considered in the development of each college's Capital Improvement Plan." Despite their agreement or disagreement with this statement, each capital project in the college's Capital Improvement Plan is evaluated based on space utilization. As part of the CIP 3C Scoring Worksheet, space utilization is based on the number of hours a student station is occupied per week. Reported classroom and laboratory space utilization percentages for the most recent fall semester are averaged for each college. The colleges utilization number is converted to a 10-point scale with points designated based on utilization rates.

CLASSROOM AND LABORATORY SCHEDULING PRACTICES

CLASSROOM SCHEDULING

Regarding classrooms, of the 28 colleges, only six (21%) indicated that the Registrar centrally schedules all classrooms. Ten (36%) colleges schedule all classrooms at the department or unit level. At twelve (43%), some classrooms are centrally scheduled and some are controlled by departments or units. For general purpose classrooms, those scheduled teaching spaces used for instruction that does not require special equipment and can, therefore, be used by multiple disciplines, higher utilization is typically achieved with central scheduling.



TEACHING LABORATORIES SCHEDULING

Regarding teaching laboratories, those spaces used for instruction that requires special equipment such as biology or welding laboratories, department or unit scheduling is more typical at higher education institutions. This is not the pattern at Florida College System institutions, with only one additional college in the decentralized scheduling category and one fewer in the centralized category. Centralized scheduling of these spaces typically does not improve utilization as they are frequently suitable for a limited range of course sections.



SCHEDULING PRACTICES

There are a variety of best practices that can be employed to increase space utilization efficiency. Classroom scheduling practices being used by Florida College System institutions to improve their utilization rate are highlighted in the chart below. Widely accepted strategies include establishing common start and stop times (21 colleges, 75%) and priority scheduling for credit courses (20 colleges, 71%). Scheduling credit courses at non-peak times and surveying students to determine which course sections they are most likely to enroll in based upon their schedule preferences are also popular strategies. Setting utilization targets is not widely accepted with three colleges setting specific utilization goals as part of strategic planning and only one establishing minimum scheduling targets for non-peak times.



CLASSROOM SCHEDULING PRACTICE USED AT INSTITUTIONS

Number of Institutions

The 28 colleges described a variety of conditions that are impacting room effectiveness and adequacy for instruction. They noted that these conditions can be a factor in reduced room utilization rates at their college. Several colleges indicated environmental problems such as lighting and temperature and issues with room location or access. Most colleges indicated issues with accommodation of current teaching pedagogy including the lack of technology that supports the needs of faculty, inflexible learning environments that do not accommodate multiple modalities such as active learning and classroom sizes mismatched with ideal course section sizes.



Classrooms are used for more than credit instruction on most of the college campuses. At small campuses classrooms are brought into service for all types of campus meetings, from faculty meetings to student groups. These campuses frequently do not have adequate conference and student space to accommodate these groups. In rural areas, the local college typically has the most desired (or only) community meeting spaces for all types and sizes of gatherings. While non-credit, continuing education, and workforce program space use is frequently not acknowledged in utilization metrics, those activities also need a space, which typically is the local college classroom.



SECTION 6.1 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the strong association between space management and utilization, the conclusions and recommendations for Sections 6.1 and 6.2 have been combined and are located at the end of this chapter.
SECTION 6.2: EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF SPACE

Section 6.2 provides analyses to determine whether each college's utilization of its current space is efficient and/or effective. The Florida Division of Colleges analyzes teaching space utilization and determines the percentage of the utilization expectation each college achieves with respect to classrooms and teaching laboratories. SmithGroup calculated space use frequency by time of day and day of the week to determine opportunities for improvement.

UTILIZATION

The Division of Florida Colleges assesses the utilization of scheduled teaching space for all of the state colleges, applying the SREF expectations of classroom utilization of 40 hours per week with 60% of the student stations occupied and laboratory utilization of 30 hours per week with 80% of the student stations occupied. This yields an expectation of 24 hours of use on average for every student station on campus. The chart summarizes the percent of the utilization expectation the colleges collectively and individually meet. For example, at Broward College, classroom seats are occupied on average 28 hours per week, 116.2% of the expected 24 hours per week utilization. At Chipola College, classrooms seats are occupied on average 12 hours per week, 51.4% of the expected utilization.

Systemwide the 28 colleges meet 80.3% of the classroom utilization expectation. Five (18%) of the colleges exceed expectations for classroom utilization: Broward College, Miami Dade College, Palm Beach State College, Santa Fe College, and Valencia College. Note that these colleges exceed the utilization expectation but do not exceed their classroom capacity.

Teaching laboratory utilization systemwide is 84.4%. Laboratory stations are occupied 20 hours per week on average. Seven colleges exceed the utilization expectation, with Broward College indicating the greatest utilization.

Trends in other states indicate that the utilization of classrooms and teaching laboratories is higher at larger, urban campuses, and lower at smaller, rural campuses For example, a full specialized teaching laboratory is required to offer an academic program, whether that program has high enrollment or low enrollment. In interviews with college administrators, it was reported that this trend is present with Florida colleges. A college may have several sites, each of which vary in their size and their character as rural, suburban, or urban. SmithGroup did not complete a comparison analysis of rural, suburban, and urban sites because their designations have not been established. The Division of Florida Colleges calculates teaching space utilization at the site level for every college after every term. It could request that colleges designate the character of each site as rural, suburban, or urban and determine the existing utilization rates as influenced by site character and size.

PERCENT OF CLASSROOM AND TEACHING LABORATORIES UTILIZATION GOAL MET – SYSTEMWIDE

College	Classroom Utilization	Teaching Laboratory Utilization
Broward	116.2%	269.8%
Chipola	51.4%	46.4%
Central Florida	52.9%	84.0%
Florida Keys	30.5%	30.6%
Daytona	52.9%	100.3%
Eastern Florida	57.5%	65.2%
Florida Gateway	42.8%	95.5%
FL SouthWestern	95.7%	96.5%
FL SC at Jax	44.1%	54.0%
Gulf Coast	38.2%	49.1%
Hillsborough	94.2%	100.0%
Indian River	52.7%	63.0%
Lake-Sumter	75.5%	34.4%
Miami Dade	114.9%	63.9%
North Florida	46.3%	128.3%
Northwest FL	49.9%	67.8%
Palm Beach State	115.8%	91.7%
Pasco-Hernando	83.6%	102.0%
Pensacola	45.9%	90.6%
Polk	43.3%	40.1%
St. Johns River	68.8%	63.9%
St. Petersburg	54.9%	59.1%
Santa Fe	128.8%	152.6%
Seminole State	79.6%	109.3%
South Florida	31.8%	68.3%
State College FL	63.2%	53.4%
Tallahassee	59.4%	13.0%
Valencia	118.8%	106.0%
SYSTEM	80.3%	84.4%

It is typical to separate weekly room hours and student station occupancy utilization metrics and evaluate each separately. SmithGroup obtained course files from the Division of Florida Colleges and linked them to the facility files. From this data SmithGroup analyzed the weekly room hours and student station occupancy for each of the colleges and for the system as a whole.

It should be noted that in the following analyses the number of rooms indicated is the quantity of rooms in each college facilities inventory coded as scheduled teaching space. The National Center for Education Statistics Postsecondary Education Facilities Inventory and Classification Manual (FICM) defines parameters for classifying all space on a college campus, including classrooms and teaching laboratories. Courses taught in rooms not classified as scheduled teaching spaces are excluded from the analysis. The Florida College System facility inventories and course files include classrooms and teaching laboratories with no scheduled courses and courses scheduled in classroom support space, laboratory support space, and open laboratories. The inaccuracy of this data impacts the accuracy of the analysis.

The following charts indicate the average weekly room hours a teaching space is scheduled, percentage of student station occupancy when a room is scheduled (SSO%), and average weekly seat hours (WSH) a student station is occupied for classrooms, vocational laboratories, and non-vocational laboratories.

As illustrated in the next two classroom charts, the average weekly room hours in scheduled classrooms at Florida colleges is 18.9 and average weekly seat hours is 11.8. When a room is in use, on average 59% of the seats are occupied. weekly room hours range from 8.3 at South Florida State College to 30.9 at Palm Beach State College. Weekly seat hours range from 5.0 to 21.6. It should be noted that while Palm Beach State College has the highest weekly seat hours, it does not have the highest student station occupancy, indicating that the college offers more sections with lower enrollments than North Florida College which has the highest student station occupancy percentage. **CLASSROOM WEEKLY SEAT HOUR UTILIZATION BY COLLEGE**

College	Number of Rooms	Average WRH	Average SSO %	Average WSH
Broward	310	23.0	70%	19.8
Chipola	32	13.1	48%	9.0
Central Florida	87	14.5	58%	11.0
Florida Keys	40	10.8	38%	5.4
Daytona	181	9.9	61%	7.5
Eastern Florida	233	16.2	52%	10.2
Florida Gateway	29	13.7	39%	6.8
FL SouthWestern	147	20.1	64%	16.2
FL SC at Jax	344	15.1	53%	8.8
Gulf Coast	75	9.3	41%	6.1
Hillsborough	264	23.3	67%	17.3
Indian River	164	16.4	53%	10.1
Lake-Sumter	43	14.6	77%	13.0
Miami Dade	608	26.0	68%	20.3
North Florida	12	9.8	78%	8.3
Northwest FL	95	15.5	59%	9.8
Palm Beach State	248	30.9	66%	21.6
Pasco-Hernando	94	18.5	77%	14.9
Pensacola	149	15.0	46%	8.3
Polk	149	14.0	47%	9.4
St. Johns River	71	19.1	60%	13.1
St. Petersburg	276	15.2	51%	9.6
Santa Fe	191	18.9	77%	17.1
Seminole State	159	19.5	55%	13.6
South Florida	88	8.3	36%	5.0
State College FL	113	13.0	52%	9.4
Tallahassee	188	14.1	58%	12.4
Valencia	444	22.2	58%	17.1
SYSTEM	4,834	18.9	59%	11.8



CLASSROOM WEEKLY SEAT HOUR UTILIZATION BY COLLEGE

As illustrated in the next two vocational laboratory charts, the average weekly room hours in vocational laboratories at Florida colleges is 12.9 and average weekly seat hours is 17.1. When a room is in use, on average 89% of the seats are occupied. Weekly room hours range from 3.5 at Tallahassee Community College to 20.7 at South Florida State College. Weekly seat hours range from 2.7 to 46.5. It is typical for student station occupancy to be higher in laboratory courses as reflected in the Division of Florida Colleges student station occupancy expectation of 80% for laboratories as opposed to 60% for classrooms. The broad range in utilization results is a result of the different missions of the various colleges and facility inventory room classification inconsistencies between colleges.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORY WEEKLY SEAT HOUR UTILIZATION BY COLLEGE

College	Number of Rooms	Average WRH	Average SSO %	Average WSH
Broward	109	16.8	66%	13.8
Chipola	26	8.4	89%	11.9
Central Florida	15	16.0	169%	28.3
Florida Keys	8	5.1	47%	6.1
Daytona	95	14.4	117%	18.0
Eastern Florida	85	13.5	66%	12.8
Florida Gateway	27	17.6	118%	22.7
FL SouthWestern	40	11.6	132%	17.6
FL SC at Jax	101	8.4	47%	7.1
Gulf Coast	59	6.4	75%	8.3
Hillsborough	67	15.4	83%	16.8
Indian River	90	13.5	83%	15.9
Lake-Sumter	9	5.0	108%	6.3
Miami Dade	98	12.6	96%	17.7
North Florida	15	19.0	150%	46.5
Northwest FL	21	10.2	73%	16.1
Palm Beach State	57	19.2	92%	20.6
Pasco-Hernando	53	19.6	133%	27.2
Pensacola	64	18.6	121%	26.8
Polk	41	4.9	38%	6.7
St. Johns River	26	14.6	140%	24.3
St. Petersburg	82	10.0	108%	15.0
Santa Fe	70	13.8	112%	25.3
Seminole State	65	12.9	119%	21.8
South Florida	29	20.7	66%	17.5
State College FL	23	8.9	124%	16.2
Tallahassee	32	3.5	15%	2.7
Valencia	83	8.3	42%	8.7
SYSTEM	1,490	12.9	89%	17.1



VOCATIONAL LABORATORY WEEKLY SEAT HOUR UTILIZATION BY COLLEGE

As illustrated in the next two non-vocational laboratory charts, the average weekly room hours in non-vocational laboratories at Florida colleges is 14.7 and average weekly seat hours is 11.7. When a room is in use, on average 68% of the seats are occupied. weekly room hours range from 5.4 at The College of the Florida Keys to 21.7 at Hillsborough Community College. Weekly seat hours range from 4.7 to 20.6.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORY WEEKLY SEAT HOUR UTILIZATION BY COLLEGE

College	Number of Rooms	Average WRH	Average SSO %	Average WSH
Broward	82	18.3	61%	14.4
Chipola	12	7.7	68%	7.0
Central Florida	43	7.4	52%	7.0
Florida Keys	8	5.4	34%	4.7
Daytona	90	13.7	99%	20.6
Eastern Florida	45	18.5	64%	13.4
Florida Gateway	10	9.6	40%	10.0
FL SouthWestern	44	18.0	70%	16.6
FL SC at Jax	92	12.7	65%	10.7
Gulf Coast	27	12.0	67%	10.3
Hillsborough	75	21.7	86%	19.1
Indian River	34	14.0	67%	10.4
Lake-Sumter	34	5.7	58%	5.2
Miami Dade	167	13.2	57%	10.8
North Florida	10	11.7	79%	12.7
Northwest FL	24	15.8	73%	10.9
Palm Beach State	71	20.6	71%	16.2
Pasco-Hernando	18	8.8	76%	7.7
Pensacola	45	12.8	76%	11.5
Polk	34	13.4	59%	11.1
St. Johns River	34	11.8	64%	8.5
St. Petersburg	93	12.1	67%	9.7
Santa Fe	47	21.3	89%	19.8
Seminole State	65	18.1	85%	19.6
South Florida	35	5.7	50%	4.7
State College FL	68	10.6	54%	8.0
Tallahassee	29	10.6	56%	7.8
Valencia	99	20.7	65%	18.5
SYSTEM	1,435	14.7	68%	11.7



NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORY WEEKLY SEAT HOUR UTILIZATION BY COLLEGE

The following charts highlight the time of day when classrooms, vocational laboratories, and non-vocational laboratories are most heavily scheduled systemwide. Similar charts for the individual colleges are included in the College Snapshots in Chapter 7.

There is significant use of classrooms mid to late morning and opportunity to improve overall utilization by scheduling at other times. Systemwide the greatest percentage of classrooms in use at any time is 66% at 11:00 AM on Tuesday. Of the total 4,537 classrooms at the 28 colleges 2,990 rooms are scheduled at this time. Approximately two-thirds of the systemwide classrooms are in use between 9:00 AM and 1:00 PM Monday through Thursday.

This classroom utilization is typical for many institutions nationwide. Factors can include:

- The desire of students to have classes grouped together so that they can limit their time on campus and thereby accommodate other needs such as work schedules. However, this argument can also support course groupings late afternoon and evening.
- The scheduling of classroom based course sections in the morning to accommodate laboratory based sections in the afternoon. However, Florida colleges scheduling of laboratories does not support this argument.
- The preference of faculty to teach only four days per week or during morning hours.
- The desire to hold classes during morning hours to reserve time in the afternoon for athletic practice.

		SCHEDULE	ED CLASSROOM USE	BY DAY AND TIME		
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	1,537 34%	1,574 35%	1,565 34%	1,558 34%	602 13%	324 7%
9:00 AM	2,747 61%	2,860 63%	2,778 61%	2,821 62%	990 22%	555 12%
10:00 AM	2,870 63%	2,970 65%	2,893 64%	2,903 64%	1,059 23%	588 13%
11:00 AM	2,789 61%	2,990 66%	2,804 62%	2,904 64%	977 22%	525 12%
12:00 PM	2,513 55%	2,932 65%	2,515 55%	2,867 63%	602 13%	388 9%
1:00 PM	2,097 46%	2,017 44%	2,119 47%	1,944 43%	462 10%	265 6%
2:00 PM	1,744 38%	1,746 38%	1,771 39%	1,683 37%	373 8%	176 4%
3:00 PM	1,399 31%	1,510 33%	1,410 31%	1,452 32%	283 6%	125 3%
4:00 PM	773 17%	931 21%	774 17%	876 19%	166 4%	65 1%
5:00 PM	1,264 28%	1,367 30%	1,291 28%	1,262 28%	118 3%	29 1%
6:00 PM	1,979 44%	2,076 46%	2,017 44%	1,846 41%	152 3%	22 0%
7:00 PM	1,867 41%	1,946 43%	1,894 42%	1,696 37%	150 3%	15 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Scheduled vocational laboratory use is more evenly distributed than classrooms. However, the greatest percentage in use at any one time is 39% at 10:00 AM on Tuesday, when 555 of the 1,433 laboratories in the system are scheduled.

		SCHEDULED VOC	ATIONAL LABORATORY	USE BY DAY AND TI	ME	
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	324 23%	340 24%	325 23%	326 23%	171 12%	61 4%
9:00 AM	511 36%	545 38%	518 36%	521 36%	242 17%	87 6%
10:00 AM	517 36%	555 39%	530 37%	533 37%	241 17%	91 6%
11:00 AM	494 34%	546 38%	502 35%	518 36%	225 16%	91 6%
12:00 PM	439 31%	499 35%	453 32%	461 32%	185 13%	78 5%
1:00 PM	453 32%	483 34%	456 32%	431 30%	191 13%	69 5%
2:00 PM	430 30%	462 32%	421 29%	422 29%	182 13%	60 4%
3:00 PM	343 24%	375 26%	353 25%	348 24%	133 9%	50 3%
4:00 PM	258 18%	295 21%	259 18%	267 19%	85 6%	34 2%
5:00 PM	255 18%	289 20%	265 18%	261 18%	48 3%	14 1%
6:00 PM	381 27%	436 30%	403 28%	376 26%	52 4%	5 0%
7:00 PM	357 25%	421 29%	380 27%	366 26%	50 3%	4 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Non-vocational laboratory use is also more evenly distributed throughout the day than are classrooms. Highest use is at 12:00 PM on Tuesday when 44%, or 616 of the 1,398 laboratories are scheduled.

SCHEDULED NON	-VOCATIONAL US	E BY DAY	AND TIME
---------------	----------------	----------	----------

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	211 15%	250 18%	247 18%	248 18%	109 8%	28 2%
9:00 AM	449 32%	529 38%	501 36%	518 37%	194 14%	63 5%
10:00 AM	537 38%	582 42%	585 42%	577 41%	228 16%	72 5%
11:00 AM	549 39%	602 43%	589 42%	587 42%	211 15%	84 6%
12:00 PM	547 39%	616 44%	582 42%	591 42%	168 12%	76 5%
1:00 PM	483 35%	485 35%	517 37%	454 32%	112 8%	60 4%
2:00 PM	498 36%	550 39%	520 37%	507 36%	89 6%	40 3%
3:00 PM	423 30%	485 35%	445 32%	443 32%	62 4%	21 2%
4:00 PM	292 21%	350 25%	320 23%	321 23%	50 4%	7 1%
5:00 PM	248 18%	297 21%	270 19%	271 19%	36 3%	4 0%
6:00 PM	342 24%	389 28%	374 27%	344 25%	32 2%	3 0%
7:00 PM	378 27%	433 31%	426 30%	372 27%	29 2%	2 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

SECTION 6.1/6.2 CONCLUSIONS

Florida College System institutions are increasingly focused on space management practices and are working hard to use their scheduled teaching space more effectively. However, there is room for improvement while acknowledging that unique circumstances related to individual college missions and campus locations can influence which strategies will be most successful.

The Florida College System approach to utilization does not address an opportunity to vary the utilization expectations among different types of campuses, and to analyze weekly room hours separately from student station occupancy. For example, a small college may meet the expectation in student station occupancy for a specialized teaching laboratory, but not the weekly room hours due to an enrollment that does not justify multiple course sections.

The Florida College System approach to utilization considers only the primary mission of the colleges, which, per Florida Statute is "responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and career degree education" thus only for-credit courses offered by the college are included in Division of Florida Colleges space utilization. Yet the colleges' secondary role of offering programs in community services, adult education, and economic development also requires use of the college's classrooms, teaching laboratories, offices, and meeting spaces. Colleges regularly offer courses provided by workforce programs, partnerships, or use of space by other college and universities. There are many examples of classrooms, vocational and non-vocational laboratories that had no official utilization for the Fall 2018 semester, but instead were used by:

- Polk State Lakeland Collegiate High School, a charter high school housed within Polk State College's Lakeland Campus.
- Florida Public Safety Center at Tallahassee Community College, a 420,000 NSF facility (24 classrooms and numerous vocational and non-vocational laboratories) that trains police, fire and emergency staff from three states (Florida, Georgia, and Alabama).
- Workforce development courses, high schools, business partnerships or spaces dedicated to other colleges and universities at many other colleges.

SECTION 6.1/6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

SmithGroup recommends the following process changes to strengthen the current capital outlay process:

- Expand the space utilization model. Consideration should be given to expanding the space utilization model to account for courses provided by workforce programs, partnerships, or use of space by other college and universities. If course records are difficult to obtain, consideration should be given to removing dedicated rooms used by others from the Division of Florida Colleges' utilization analyses.
- Recognize in policy that space is an asset. Colleges should adopt space policies and procedures that value instructional space as an asset to be allocated according to strategic priorities.
- Encourage the optimization of existing space. The Division of Florida Colleges should help colleges focus on optimizing existing space by continuing to perform utilization analyses.
- Promulgate space management best practices. Best practices regarding space management should be explored and disseminated. The Division of Florida Colleges should facilitate semi-yearly statewide conferences or workshops with all 28 colleges focused on sharing best practices for space optimization and assisting colleges in developing policies and procedures related to instructional utilization. Topics should include strategies to accommodate the space need of new and rapidly growing programs and by facilitating the sharing of best practices and trends.
- Promote space management software. All colleges should employ a space management software application to schedule and monitor space use. The software chosen should be specific to the needs of the college, rather than consistent across the system. All colleges should manage space resources and analyze utilization with software that best supports the parameters particular to the college. The Division of Florida Colleges should establish minimum data points to be included. Colleges should assess what additional data they want to collect and maintain. Data collection and maintenance methods and the usefulness of the data should be shared and discussed at the best practices meetings.
- Promote central scheduling of classrooms. Classrooms should be centrally scheduled by the Registrar, with possible first right of refusal by departments for classroom space to optimize use of instructional space. Discipline-specific teaching laboratories should be scheduled independently; due to their single purpose, central scheduling does not typically increase utilization.
- Establish customized utilization expectations. The Division of Florida Colleges should acknowledge that the 28 colleges vary greatly in size and have different ways of operationalizing their missions, frequently related to their geographic location in the state, and should establish different utilization expectations that address those differences. The differentiated utilization expectations should be adjusted based on the size of the college, institutional mission, or location. Factors include whether the campus has a large or small student FTE and focuses on university transfer or work force development programs.
- **Require minimum utilization in project prioritization.** The Division of Florida Colleges should require minimum utilization rates in addition to space needs when prioritizing capital outlay projects.
- Conduct facility audits. The Division of Florida Colleges should audit the college facility inventories in step with the fiveyear Educational Plant Survey cycle to maintain consistency and accuracy. Additional resources would be required for this expanded function.

Chapter 6 | Space Utilization



ABBREVIATIONS

CIP	Capital Improvement Plan
DFC	Division of Florida Colleges
EPS	Educational Plant Survey
FCS	Florida College System
FDOE	Florida Department of Education
LBR	Legislative Budget Request
PECO	Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service (PECO) Trust Fund
SACS	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math

ACADEMIC SPACE PLANNING

ASF	Assignable Square Feet
NSF	Net Square Feet
GSF	Gross Square Feet
CAFM	Computer Aided Facilities Management
CEFPI	Council of Educational Facility Planners International
COFTE	Capital Outlay Full-Time Equivalent
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
ICS	International Classification Standards
SREF	State Requirements for Educational Facilities (2014)
SS	Student Station
SSO	Student Station Occupancy
WRH	Weekly Room Hour
WSCH	Weekly Student Credit/Contact Hour
WSH	Weekly Seat Hour

CHAPTER 7 COLLEGE SNAPSHOTS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a brief snapshot of each Florida College System institution and how it compares to other colleges in the system. Information includes:

- Background Data including size and location
- Unique Characteristics
- Number of college locations
- Enrollment compared to other Florida colleges
- Age of college buildings

- Comparison of existing space, Florida Department of Education calculated space needs, and an alternative space needs generation approach
- Utilization of classroom and laboratory spaces by day and time

Unique Characteristics were derived from campus websites and SmithGroup interviews with college representatives.

Since a primary purpose of the snapshots is to highlight the differences between the institutions, the characteristics they have in common are not repeated in every snapshot. For example:

- IPEDS (The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) categorizes all of the institutions except Hillsborough Community College as "Degree-granting, not primarily baccalaureate or above".
- All of the institutions participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs.
- All of the institutions except Hillsborough Community College offer less than one year certificate programs, at least oneyear but less than two-year certificate programs, associate degrees, and bachelor degrees. Additional program offerings are indicated as unique characteristics in the individual snapshots.
- All of the institutions use the semester system academic calendar.

The enrollment, building age, facilities inventory, and staffing data for space needs and utilization analyses was provided by the Florida Department of Education.

SPECIFIC DATA SOURCES:

- Job Placement Rate: 2015–16 data from the Florida College System. Percentage of graduates employed or continuing their education within one year of graduation.
- Number of Credit Students: 2018-19 FTE-3 data from the Bureau of Community College and Technical Center Management Information Systems (CCTCMIS) for Upper Division, Lower Division, and Alternative/Distance Learning students.
- Percentage of Non-White Students: 2018 IPEDS or as revised by the college.
- Certificate and Degree Completers for Bachelors, Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, and Certificate Programs: 2017-18 data from the 2019 Florida College System Fact Book, Table 5.3T, as verified or revised by the college.
- Retention Rate: 2015–16 data from the Florida College System. Percentage of first-time in college students who are enrolled in two consecutive fall terms.
- Completion Rate: Fall 2014 data from the Florida College System. Percentage of first-time in college students who graduate within 150% of expected time.

Aspen Ranking is the designation by The Aspen Institute in the bi-annual Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence. Included are:

2011 through 2019 Winner

- 2019 Top Ten Finalist
- 2011 through 2019 Finalist With Distinction
- 2021 Top 150 (eligible for an award in 2021)

2011 through 2019 Finalist

The age of a college's buildings is the Florida Department of Education's original inspection date, which is assumed to be the date the building was constructed. In some instances this may be the date an existing building was acquired. Many Florida college buildings have received significant renovations since they were constructed, effectively changing their age for deferred maintenance and educational adequacy assessments. SmithGroup discovered inconsistencies between the colleges in how this information is reported and effective age is not included in the college snapshots.

Space needs calculations are defined in Chapter 5. Florida Department of Education uses an NSF per COFTE to calculate the space needed by a college to fulfill its mission. The alternative space needs analysis approach included in each snapshot calculates classroom, vocational laboratory, and non-vocational laboratory space need based on actual course enrollments in Fall 2018 combined with SREF utilization expectation and space factors. It should be noted that none of the colleges meet the 24 hours per week of student station occupancy expectation for classrooms or non-vocational laboratories, and only five meet this expectation for vocational laboratories. Since this utilization metric is factored into the alternative space needs analysis it can have a significant impact on space need. Office space is based on SREF space guidelines applied to college staffing files. Library/ Study space includes an allocation for the existing library collection, library service, and study stations for 25% of the COFTE.

Florida Department of Education calculates classroom and laboratory space utilization as a percentage of meeting the 24 hours per week of expected student station occupancy. The use by day and time analysis indicates when that use takes place and when opportunities may exist to increase scheduled use.

The space needs analysis for each college includes the existing net square feet from the facilities inventory, the space need generated using the SREF NSF/COFTE approach and the space need generated using the alternative analysis approach. This comparison highlights the differences in the space needs generated using the two approaches.

- The SREF approach always generates a greater classroom space need than the alternative approach using actual course enrollments. Using SREF, 14 colleges have classroom space deficits, 12 colleges have classroom space surpluses, and 2 colleges have a balance between existing classroom space and need. Using the alternative approach, 27 colleges have surpluses and 1 has a balance between existing space and space need. It should be noted that the alternative approach takes into account only scheduled credit course activity. Many colleges indicated during interviews with SmithGroup that classrooms are also used for a variety of other activities due to a lack of adequate meeting space on campus or in the community.
- The SREF approach always generates a greater or the same non-vocational laboratory space need than the alternative approach. This results in a space deficit in this category per SREF for 19 colleges as opposed to 4 using the alternative approach. Since there is less variation in the size of non-vocational student stations, this difference is primarily due to low utilization factors at many colleges.
- The SREF approach generates greater vocational laboratory space need than the alternative approach in 18 analyses, less space in 6 analyses, and the same space need in four analyses. This is primarily due to the extreme variation in student station size for different vocational programs and the variety of vocational programs offered by each college. This variation is accounted for in the alternative approach which factors a unique station size into each course as opposed to one factor applied per vocational COFTE.
- There is a general deficit in library/study space at Florida College System institutions, resulting in a deficit at a majority of colleges using either space needs analysis approach.
- The SREF approach generates more office space than the alternative approach at 13 colleges, less at 10 colleges, and the same at 5. The SREF approach bases office space on student COFTE. The alternative approach determines the office space need based upon the employees on campus. The SREF approach does not account for the differential student/staff ratios on various sizes and types of college campuses.

Application of the same NSF per student FTE metric for office space to all colleges in the Florida College System does not account for typical staffing differentials between various size institutions. Smaller colleges tend to have higher employee to student ratios. A single metric tends to over generate office space needs at larger institutions and under generate the need at smaller institutions. Basing office space needs on actual staffing can be more accurate.

Existing average office size can influence the overall office space need, particularly if campus culture is individual private work space and the allocation per position is greater or less than the applied guidelines. For example, if existing offices are larger than the guideline it is not possible to combine the extra space in each office to create a new office. Conversely, existing offices that are below the guideline size cannot easily be made larger. The analysis could indicate that there is adequate total office space on campus and there be a deficit or surplus in the number of workstations.

The chart below indicates the total net square feet systemwide in each of the five space categories: existing space, the space need generated by the SREF approach, and the space need generated by the alternative approach. A similar chart for each college is included in the college snapshot. It should be noted that while this systemwide analysis provides an overview of statewide needs it does not account for the surpluses and deficits at the various colleges which are highlighted in the individual snapshots.



FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM – EXISTING NSF VS. FLORIDA DEPT. OF EDUCATION SPACE NEEDS CALCULATION VS. ALTERNATIVE SPACE NEEDS FORMULAS CALCULATION

Existing space data used in the analysis is that reported by the colleges to the Florida Department of Education. During SmithGroup discussions with the colleges it was learned that there is inconsistency in the interpretation of the various classifications by the colleges. For example, campus meeting space and central storage space is sometimes included in the office space category. Exterior space may be included in a laboratory category. There is also not consensus between the colleges as to how to classify informal learning space outside of the library and student support open laboratories. These findings reinforce the SmithGroup recommendation for periodic facilities inventory audits.

The colleges had the opportunity to review their individual Snapshot. All of the colleges responded.

Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

BROWARD College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1960
Local District	Broward County
Aspen Ranking	Top 10 Finalist in 2019 2017 Finalist with Distinction 2013 Finalist 2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	10
Percentage of Non-White Students	75%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Allied Health Professions, Computer Information Systems
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, Archibus

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)					
Upper Division	1,287.7				
Lower Division	27,047.2				
Total (Upper and Lower)	28,334.9				
Alternative/Distance Learning	6,017.3				

Number of Employees (2018)	
Full-time	1,276
Part-time	1,839
Total	3,115

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)		
Bachelors	613	
Associate of Arts	5,385	
Associate of Science	1,292	
Certificate Programs	4,825	
Retention Rate	65%	
Completion Rate	50%	

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized		
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized		
Primary Scheduler	Currently, the Business Dean's office on each campus oversee all scheduling for the campus although at a more granular level the academic associate deans schedule their courses.		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Centralized facilities operation
- Cuban coffee is a popular offering on campus
- Shares parking with Florida Atlantic University and Florida International University

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)





PERCENT OF FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM FTE ENROLLMENT



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Central Campus	32	1,428,507	44
Cypress Creek Administrative Center	1	73,280	9
Downtown Center	1	148,753	19
Miramar Town Center	1	22,214	12
Miramar West Center	1	89,300	6
North Campus	15	551,635	40
Pines Center	1	33,065	19
South Campus	15	483,096	21
Tigertail Lake Center	3	7,403	26
Weston Center	1	22,000	15
Total	71	2,859,253	35

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages mirror the system averages with the exception of library/study space. Based on the original inspection date, 57% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories, with the exception of library/study space, where the same space need is identified. SREF standards generate a space need in all categories. Both approaches generate a deficit in vocational laboratory and library/study space. The alternative analysis approach yields a balance in office space and surpluses in classrooms and non-vocational laboratories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	106 35%	105 34%	111 36%	107 35%	42 14%	25 8%
9:00 AM	199 65%	199 65%	198 64%	203 66%	73 24%	56 18%
10:00 AM	197 64%	192 63%	192 63%	198 64%	76 25%	59 19%
11:00 AM	204 66%	214 70%	198 64%	216 70%	75 24%	48 16%
12:00 PM	219 71%	217 71%	212 69%	216 70%	66 21%	33 11%
1:00 PM	173 56%	171 56%	173 56%	169 55%	52 17%	23 7%
2:00 PM	119 39%	113 37%	123 40%	115 37%	33 11%	14 5%
3:00 PM	116 38%	121 39%	118 38%	116 38%	32 10%	6 2%
4:00 PM	59 19%	70 23%	61 20%	65 21%	14 5%	3 1%
5:00 PM	55 18%	66 21%	59 19%	61 20%	5 2%	0 0%
6:00 PM	161 52%	165 54%	173 56%	161 52%	14 5%	0 0%
7:00 PM	158 51%	158 51%	164 53%	157 51%	14 5%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled most often late morning with significant use in the evening Monday through Thursday. Friday use is fifth highest in the system and Saturday use fourth highest. Since the greatest number of rooms in use at any one time is 71% of the total, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Broward College has 8.7 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, smallest in the system and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 19.8 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEL	JULED NON-VUCAIIU	NAL LABORATORIES U	SE BY DAY AND TIME	: FALL 2018	
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	12 15%	21 26%	19 23%	22 27%	5 6%	3 4%
9:00 AM	30 37%	37 46%	34 42%	37 46%	16 20%	7 9%
10:00 AM	30 37%	38 47%	32 40%	37 46%	17 21%	10 12%
11:00 AM	34 42%	40 49%	38 47%	39 48%	15 19%	12 15%
12:00 PM	42 52%	44 54%	44 54%	41 51%	14 17%	10 12%
1:00 PM	35 43%	33 41%	39 48%	28 35%	6 7%	7 9%
2:00 PM	28 35%	39 48%	32 40%	38 47%	4 5%	3 4%
3:00 PM	26 32%	37 46%	26 32%	37 46%	3 4%	1 1%
4:00 PM	17 21%	25 31%	13 16%	24 30%	2 2%	0 0%
5:00 PM	12 15%	16 20%	11 14%	10 12%	2 2%	0 0%
6:00 PM	30 37%	32 40%	32 40%	25 31%	2 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	31 38%	30 37%	31 38%	25 31%	3 4%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled most often at noon Monday through Thursday. Saturday use is fourth highest in the system. Since the greatest number of rooms in use at any one time is 54% of the total, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 14.4 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	24 22%	32 29%	30 28%	34 31%	20 18%	1 1%
9:00 AM	48 44%	49 45%	43 39%	50 46%	32 29%	8 7%
10:00 AM	47 43%	48 44%	43 39%	47 43%	31 28%	9 8%
11:00 AM	50 46%	52 48%	45 41%	53 49%	30 28%	10 9%
12:00 PM	40 37%	53 49%	47 43%	46 42%	24 22%	10 9%
1:00 PM	40 37%	43 39%	35 32%	36 33%	24 22%	7 6%
2:00 PM	37 34%	34 31%	26 24%	31 28%	22 20%	5 5%
3:00 PM	29 27%	26 24%	22 20%	26 24%	17 16%	3 3%
4:00 PM	23 21%	23 21%	22 20%	26 24%	13 12%	0 0%
5:00 PM	17 16%	20 18%	17 16%	18 17%	4 4%	0 0%
6:00 PM	45 41%	49 45%	45 41%	46 42%	6 6%	0 0%
7:00 PM	41 38%	46 42%	41 38%	44 40%	5 5%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often late morning and evening Monday through Thursday. Since there are never more than half of the rooms scheduled there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 13.8 hour per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



Broward College has 6.8 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Broward College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is below the system average. Average office size is slightly above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

CHIPOLA College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1947
Local District	Calhoun County Holmes County Jackson County Liberty County Washington County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	92%
Number of Locations	2
Percentage of Non-White Students	24%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Teacher Education Grade Specific, Business Administration & Management, General Engineering Technology
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)		
Upper Division	135.3	
Lower Division	1,339.3	
Total (Upper and Lower)	1,474.6	
Alternative/Distance Learning	360.5	

Number of Employees (2018)	
Full-time	152
Part-time	272
Total	424

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)		
Bachelors	63	
Associate of Arts	252	
Associate of Science	74	
Certificate Programs	131	
Retention Rate	68%	
Completion Rate	65%	

Scheduling Procedures		
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)	
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)	
Primary Scheduler	Academic Deans and Departments	

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two but less than four years of study
- Third smallest college in the state
- Serves 5 counties
- Students hang out on campus all day for Internet access

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Main Campus	40	558,718	33
Reddoch Center	9	15,094	19
Total	49	573,812	30

204 State of Florida - OPPAGA 🔹 Review of the Capital Outlay Facilities Space of Florida's State College System

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)







SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages as a result of a concentration in vocational programs such as welding, automotive technology, and fire-fighting that have significant space needs. Based on the original inspection date, 53% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)


SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories. SREF standards generate a space need in all categories. Both approaches generate a deficit in vocational laboratory and library/study space. The alternative analysis approach yields a balance in office space and surpluses in classrooms and non-vocational laboratories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE - 3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	7 30%	7 30%	7 30%	8 35%	1 4%	0 0%
9:00 AM	16 70%	14 61%	16 70%	15 65%	2 9%	0 0%
10:00 AM	21 91%	19 83%	21 91%	20 87%	2 9%	0 0%
11:00 AM	18 78%	13 57%	18 78%	12 52%	2 9%	0 0%
12:00 PM	11 48%	9 39%	9 39%	11 48%	2 9%	0 0%
1:00 PM	14 61%	13 57%	13 57%	13 57%	1 4%	0 0%
2:00 PM	10 43%	10 43%	10 43%	8 35%	1 4%	0 0%
3:00 PM	3 13%	3 13%	5 22%	1 4%	1 4%	0 0%
4:00 PM	1 4%	2 9%	2 9%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	9 39%	9 39%	2 9%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	9 39%	9 39%	1 4%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	9 39%	9 39%	1 4%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled most often mid-morning. Since 91% of the total is in use Monday and Wednesday at 10:00 AM there could be a perceived shortage which can be remedied by increased scheduling at other times. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Chipola College has 14.6 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, at the system average and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 9 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHED	ULED NON-VUCATIO	NAL LABORATORIES U	SE BY DAY AND TIME	FALL 2018	
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	0 0%	1 8%	1 8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
9:00 AM	2 17%	5 42%	3 25%	3 25%	0 0%	0 0%
10:00 AM	2 17%	4 33%	2 17%	3 25%	0 0%	0 0%
11:00 AM	1 8%	2 17%	1 8%	3 25%	0 0%	0 0%
12:00 PM	0 0%	3 25%	0 0%	2 17%	0 0%	0 0%
1:00 PM	4 33%	5 42%	2 17%	6 50%	0 0%	0 0%
2:00 PM	5 42%	6 50%	2 17%	7 58%	0 0%	0 0%
3:00 PM	2 17%	5 42%	3 25%	3 25%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	1 8%	3 25%	3 25%	1 8%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	0 0%	2 17%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	0 0%	2 17%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	0 0%	1 8%	1 8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled most often early afternoon. Chipola is one of only two colleges that have no Saturday use of non-vocational laboratories. Since the greatest number of rooms in use at any one time is 58% of the total, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 7 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	8 31%	7 27%	8 31%	5 19%	4 15%	0 0%
9:00 AM	10 38%	10 38%	11 42%	8 31%	3 12%	0 0%
10:00 AM	10 38%	10 38%	11 42%	8 31%	3 12%	0 0%
11:00 AM	10 38%	9 35%	11 42%	8 31%	3 12%	0 0%
12:00 PM	9 35%	8 31%	9 35%	6 23%	3 12%	0 0%
1:00 PM	10 38%	10 38%	10 38%	8 31%	3 12%	0 0%
2:00 PM	8 31%	10 38%	9 35%	8 31%	3 12%	0 0%
3:00 PM	8 31%	7 27%	8 31%	6 23%	3 12%	0 0%
4:00 PM	6 23%	5 19%	6 23%	4 15%	3 12%	0 0%
5:00 PM	4 15%	3 12%	4 15%	2 8%	2 8%	0 0%
6:00 PM	4 15%	3 12%	4 15%	2 8%	2 8%	0 0%
7:00 PM	4 15%	3 12%	4 15%	2 8%	2 8%	0 0%
	0%	,			100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently through the day Monday through Thursday. The greatest percentage scheduled is 42% on Wednesday mornings. The space deficit generated in this category by the alternative space guideline is due to accounting for the size of student stations in the types of programs offered, not the frequency of use.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 11.9 hour per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Chipola College has 14.7 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, fourth highest in the system and significantly above the system average. This corresponds with the surplus in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Chipola College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is fourth lowest in the system, significantly below the system average. Average office size is slightly below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

COLLEGE OF Central Florida



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1957
Local District	Citrus County Levy County Marion County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	7
Percentage of Non-White Students	36%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Teacher Education Grade Specific, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, Ad Astra

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)					
Upper Division	338.5				
Lower Division	4,806.3				
Total (Upper and Lower)	5,144.8				
Alternative/Distance Learning	1,729.9				

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	399			
Part-time	389			
Total	788			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)					
Bachelors	199				
Associate of Arts	915				
Associate of Science	264				
Certificate Programs	957				
Retention Rate	68%				
Completion Rate	51%				

Scheduling Procedures					
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized				
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)				
Primary Scheduler	Vice President of Instructional Affairs				

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Located in agricultural zone
- College farm for agri-business program
- Significant equine industry in the region

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Airport	1	1,421	25
Appleton Cultural Center	4	95,352	34
CF Vintage Farm Campus	6	18,712	9
Citrus County Campus	7	95,689	19
Hampton Campus	2	23,639	16
Levy-Fanning Springs Campus	3	58,071	7
Ocala Campus	49	654,212	38
Total	72	947,096	32

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)



FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)



SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage of total teaching laboratory space on campus is similar to the system averages, with the exception that non-vocational and vocational are reversed. There is more existing office than the average and less classroom space. Based on the original inspection date, 62% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in all space categories except offices. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in classrooms, non-vocational laboratories, and offices, and a deficit in vocational laboratories and library/study space.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	15 19%	21 27%	17 22%	21 27%	2 3%	1 1%
9:00 AM	37 47%	46 59%	45 58%	45 58%	12 15%	4 5%
10:00 AM	36 46%	44 56%	44 56%	42 54%	12 15%	4 5%
11:00 AM	39 50%	41 53%	48 62%	39 50%	12 15%	0 0%
12:00 PM	37 47%	44 56%	45 58%	41 53%	11 14%	0 0%
1:00 PM	2 3%	23 29%	3 4%	21 27%	3 4%	0 0%
2:00 PM	31 40%	34 44%	29 37%	34 44%	3 4%	0 0%
3:00 PM	35 45%	38 49%	32 41%	36 46%	2 3%	0 0%
4:00 PM	11 14%	17 22%	9 12%	16 21%	2 3%	0 0%
5:00 PM	21 27%	30 38%	23 29%	28 36%	2 3%	0 0%
6:00 PM	27 35%	30 38%	27 35%	29 37%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	21 27%	22 28%	21 27%	20 26%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%	,			100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest on Wednesday at 11:00 AM, when 62% are in use. Mornings are scheduled more than afternoon or evenings, Monday through Thursday, with very little use on Friday. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

The College of Central Florida has 9.7 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 11 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHED	ULED NON-VOCATIO	NAL LABORATORIES U	ISE BY DAY AND TIME	FALL 2018	
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	0 0%	2 7%	4 14%	1 3%	1 3%	0 0%
9:00 AM	7 24%	9 31%	8 28%	7 24%	1 3%	0 0%
10:00 AM	8 28%	9 31%	7 24%	8 28%	2 7%	0 0%
11:00 AM	9 31%	12 41%	5 17%	10 34%	2 7%	0 0%
12:00 PM	6 21%	12 41%	5 17%	11 38%	3 10%	0 0%
1:00 PM	1 3%	9 31%	2 7%	11 38%	3 10%	0 0%
2:00 PM	8 28%	10 34%	9 31%	10 34%	5 17%	0 0%
3:00 PM	11 38%	11 38%	9 31%	9 31%	3 10%	0 0%
4:00 PM	11 38%	7 24%	7 24%	5 17%	2 7%	0 0%
5:00 PM	6 21%	5 17%	6 21%	5 17%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	6 21%	4 14%	8 28%	5 17%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	5 17%	4 14%	10 34%	5 17%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled sporadically throughout the week, with heavier use on Tuesday and Thursday morning and early afternoon, Monday early afternoon, and Wednesday evening. Since the greatest number of rooms in use at any one time is 41% of the total, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 7 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	5 33%	3 20%	3 20%	3 20%	0 0%	1 7%
9:00 AM	5 33%	6 40%	8 53%	5 33%	4 27%	1 7%
10:00 AM	5 33%	6 40%	8 53%	5 33%	5 33%	2 13%
11:00 AM	4 27%	8 53%	9 60%	6 40%	3 20%	2 13%
12:00 PM	4 27%	8 53%	8 53%	5 33%	2 13%	1 7%
1:00 PM	1 7%	6 40%	2 13%	3 20%	1 7%	0 0%
2:00 PM	1 7%	6 40%	4 27%	3 20%	1 7%	0 0%
3:00 PM	1 7%	6 40%	5 33%	3 20%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	4 27%	6 40%	6 40%	3 20%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	5 33%	7 47%	7 47%	4 27%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	5 33%	5 33%	7 47%	4 27%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	4 27%	5 33%	7 47%	4 27%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often on Tuesday and Wednesday morning. The greatest percentage scheduled is 60% on Wednesday morning at 11:00 AM. Friday use is third highest in the system and Saturday use is second highest.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 28.3 hour per week, second highest in the system. This high utilization is greater than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation and generates the space need in this category.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

The College of Central Florida has 5.6 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

College of Central Florida office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is below the system average. Average office size is at the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

THE COLLEGE OF The florida keys



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1965
Local District	Monroe County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	90%
Number of Locations	3
Percentage of Non-White Students	42%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Wildlife Management, Vehicle Maintenance & Repair, Marine Transportation
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)				
Upper Division	13.3			
Lower Division	694.8			
Total (Upper and Lower)	708.1			
Alternative/Distance Learning	172.5			

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	93			
Part-time	100			
Total	193			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	NA			
Associate of Arts	95			
Associate of Science	81			
Certificate Programs	207			
Retention Rate	58%			
Completion Rate	53%			

Scheduling Procedures				
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)			
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)			
Primary Scheduler	Each academic affairs section schedules their own space.			

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Smallest college in the system
- Highest cost of living area in the state, high cost of construction
- Constructing new facility in Upper Keys

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites							
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building				
Coral Shores Court	3	11,520	40				
Main Campus (Key West)	15	273,199	24				
Marathon JT Use	1	6,596	40				
Total	19	291,315	27				

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage of campus space that is office is greater than the system average, and laboratory space is less than the average. Classroom and library/study space mirror the average. Based on the original inspection date, 32% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in vocational laboratories and a surplus in all other categories. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in all space categories. Vocational laboratories at The College of the Florida Keys have extremely low utilization due to low enrollment.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	4 11%	2 6%	4 11%	2 6%	2 6%	0 0%
9:00 AM	15 43%	15 43%	14 40%	13 37%	3 9%	2 6%
10:00 AM	15 43%	14 40%	14 40%	12 34%	3 9%	2 6%
11:00 AM	16 46%	13 37%	16 46%	11 31%	3 9%	2 6%
12:00 PM	14 40%	12 34%	14 40%	10 29%	2 6%	2 6%
1:00 PM	2 6%	4 11%	3 9%	4 11%	2 6%	4 11%
2:00 PM	12 34%	14 40%	14 40%	13 37%	3 9%	4 11%
3:00 PM	13 37%	12 34%	15 43%	13 37%	3 9%	4 11%
4:00 PM	7 20%	11 31%	9 26%	12 34%	2 6%	4 11%
5:00 PM	13 37%	13 37%	12 34%	14 40%	2 6%	2 6%
6:00 PM	17 49%	13 37%	16 46%	12 34%	2 6%	2 6%
7:00 PM	13 37%	10 29%	14 40%	9 26%	2 6%	2 6%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled fairly consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The greatest percentage in use at any one time is 49% at 6:00 PM Monday evening. This pattern is unique in that most colleges experience highest use in the late morning and lower use in the afternoons and evenings. It is also unusual for a college to have more rooms in use on Saturday than on Friday. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

The College of the Florida Keys has 31.6 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, highest in the system and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 5.4 hours per week, second lowest in the system.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	1 13%	0 0%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
9:00 AM	1 13%	1 13%	3 38%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%
10:00 AM	0 0%	1 13%	3 38%	1 13%	1 13%	0 0%
11:00 AM	0 0%	1 13%	3 38%	1 13%	1 13%	0 0%
12:00 PM	0 0%	1 13%	3 38%	1 13%	1 13%	0 0%
1:00 PM	0 0%	0 0%	2 25%	0 0%	1 13%	0 0%
2:00 PM	1 13%	1 13%	2 25%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%
3:00 PM	1 13%	2 25%	2 25%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	1 13%	1 13%	2 25%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	1 13%	1 13%	2 25%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	0 0%	1 13%	2 25%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	0 0%	0 0%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled most heavily on Wednesday morning. It is unusual that there is no utilization on Monday morning. Since the greatest number of rooms in use at any one time is 38% of the total, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 4.7 hours per week, second lowest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018							
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	
8:00 AM	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	
9:00 AM	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
10:00 AM	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
11:00 AM	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
12:00 PM	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
1:00 PM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	
2:00 PM	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
3:00 PM	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
4:00 PM	1 14%	1 14%	1 14%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
5:00 PM	1 14%	1 14%	1 14%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	
6:00 PM	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	0 0%	
7:00 PM	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	0 0%	
	0%						

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often on Monday and Wednesday from 9:00_{AM} to 4:00_{PM}, when 29% are in use. It is very unusual for there to be scheduled use on Friday evening, particularly when there is no other scheduled use on Friday.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 6.1 hour per week, second lowest in the system.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

The College of the Florida Keys has 15.2 NSF of library/ study space per student FTE, third highest in the system and significantly above the system average. This corresponds with the surplus in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.
OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

The College of the Florida Keys office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is fourth highest in the system, above the system average. Average office size is second largest in the system, significantly above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

DAYTONA State College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1957
Local District	Flagler County Volusia County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	6
Percentage of Non-White Students	36%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Allied Health Professions, Teacher Education Grade Specific
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)			
Upper Division	13.3		
Lower Division	694.8		
Total (Upper and Lower)	708.1		
Alternative/Distance Learning 172.5			

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	93	
Part-time	100	
Total	193	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	437			
Associate of Arts	1,835			
Associate of Science	674			
Certificate Programs	1,132			
Retention Rate	67%			
Completion Rate	58%			

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Primary Scheduler	Campus solutions software allows for a decentralized means of scheduling space.		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Offers high percentage of vocational programs
- Designated vocational/technical provider for the counties

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites						
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building			
Advanced Technology College	1	160,452	19			
Daytona Beach Campus	38	1,302,402	30			
Deltona Center	8	52,030	13			
Flagler/Palm Coast Campus	8	74,047	16			
South Campus	2	44,385	29			
West Campus	17	141,146	29			
Total	74	1,774,462	26			

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages. There is less classroom and library/study space than the average and more teaching laboratory space. Based on the original inspection date, 58% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space surplus in office space, a balance in classroom space and a deficit in all other categories. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in classrooms, non-vocational laboratories, and offices and a deficit in vocational laboratories and library/study space.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	48 29%	46 27%	46 27%	47 28%	25 15%	4 2%
9:00 AM	109 65%	95 57%	103 61%	98 58%	37 22%	5 3%
10:00 AM	97 58%	87 52%	94 56%	88 52%	27 16%	5 3%
11:00 AM	85 51%	89 53%	88 52%	90 54%	25 15%	4 2%
12:00 PM	91 54%	91 54%	94 56%	92 55%	21 13%	4 2%
1:00 PM	58 35%	59 35%	61 36%	56 33%	13 8%	4 2%
2:00 PM	20 12%	24 14%	22 13%	22 13%	11 7%	4 2%
3:00 PM	19 11%	21 13%	20 12%	21 13%	11 7%	4 2%
4:00 PM	13 8%	13 8%	13 8%	13 8%	11 7%	4 2%
5:00 PM	24 14%	28 17%	26 15%	25 15%	3 2%	2 1%
6:00 PM	32 19%	33 20%	35 21%	29 17%	4 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	24 14%	18 11%	26 15%	16 10%	4 2%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, with very little utilization afternoons and evenings. Greatest use is Monday morning at 9:00 AM. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Daytona State College has 13.4 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, slightly below the system average and at the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 7.5 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	28 31%	27 30%	30 33%	29 32%	26 29%	0 0%
9:00 AM	34 38%	40 44%	36 40%	40 44%	28 31%	1 1%
10:00 AM	34 38%	40 44%	36 40%	40 44%	28 31%	1 1%
11:00 AM	34 38%	36 40%	38 42%	36 40%	26 29%	1 1%
12:00 PM	31 34%	35 39%	36 40%	35 39%	25 28%	0 0%
1:00 PM	7 8%	11 12%	10 11%	9 10%	2 2%	0 0%
2:00 PM	17 19%	22 24%	18 20%	19 21%	2 2%	0 0%
3:00 PM	16 18%	22 24%	18 20%	19 21%	1 1%	0 0%
4:00 PM	15 17%	23 26%	18 20%	20 22%	1 1%	0 0%
5:00 PM	2 2%	3 3%	2 2%	3 3%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	23 26%	22 24%	25 28%	20 22%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	26 29%	32 36%	30 33%	26 29%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest in the morning Monday through Thursday. There is greater use Friday mornings and evenings Monday through Thursday than is typical at most colleges and across the Florida College System. Friday use is highest in the system.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 20.6 hours per week, highest in the system, but still below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours per week.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	20 21%	24 25%	27 28%	19 20%	11 12%	5 5%
9:00 AM	35 37%	38 40%	41 43%	34 36%	18 19%	5 5%
10:00 AM	35 37%	39 41%	43 45%	36 38%	19 20%	5 5%
11:00 AM	35 37%	40 42%	43 45%	39 41%	19 20%	5 5%
12:00 PM	26 27%	34 36%	30 32%	29 31%	14 15%	4 4%
1:00 PM	28 29%	39 41%	31 33%	25 26%	14 15%	4 4%
2:00 PM	26 27%	42 44%	30 32%	30 32%	14 15%	4 4%
3:00 PM	19 20%	34 36%	28 29%	24 25%	9 9%	4 4%
4:00 PM	20 21%	35 37%	27 28%	27 28%	6 6%	4 4%
5:00 PM	20 21%	27 28%	23 24%	23 24%	7 7%	3 3%
6:00 PM	24 25%	27 28%	27 28%	23 24%	7 7%	0 0%
7:00 PM	22 23%	26 27%	24 25%	22 23%	6 6%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday with greater than typical use on Friday morning. Highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is Wednesday morning, when 45% are in use, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 18 hours per week, above the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

Daytona State College

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Daytona State College has 6.8 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Daytona State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is above the system average. Average office size is third smallest in the system. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

EASTERN FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1960
Local District	Brevard County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Тор 150
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	5
Percentage of Non-White Students	33%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Computer Information Systems, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)			
Upper Division	838.8		
Lower Division	9,956.8		
Total (Upper and Lower)	10,795.6		
Alternative/Distance Learning 3,522.7			

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	763	
Part-time	885	
Total	1,648	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	297		
Associate of Arts	2,129		
Associate of Science	514		
Certificate Programs	1,370		
Retention Rate	67%		
Completion Rate	58%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Primary Scheduler	The departmental administrative assistants are primarily responsible for scheduling.		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two but less than four years of study
- Located in the "Space Coast"
- Internship opportunities available with Lockheed Martin
- Focus in Advanced Manufacturing
- High school dual enrollment is 20% of total

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Cocoa Campus	22	801,555	43
Golf Teaching Facility	2	3,120	31
Melbourne Campus	16	668,619	30
Palm Bay Campus	6	288,743	22
Titusville Campus	5	177,766	30
Total	51	1,939,803	35

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages, with the exception of a different distribution between vocational and non-vocational teaching laboratories. There is a higher percentage of vocational laboratory space. Based on the original inspection date, 83% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in nonvocational laboratories and library/study space and a surplus in classrooms, vocational laboratories and office space. The need identified in non-vocational laboratories is a result of the lower than system average existing space in this category. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in all space categories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	70 31%	62 28%	70 31%	61 27%	12 5%	2 1%
9:00 AM	134 60%	126 56%	135 60%	125 56%	9 4%	3 1%
10:00 AM	154 68%	148 66%	158 70%	149 66%	9 4%	3 1%
11:00 AM	133 59%	130 58%	137 61%	134 60%	7 3%	3 1%
12:00 PM	142 63%	142 63%	142 63%	142 63%	7 3%	3 1%
1:00 PM	111 49%	112 50%	104 46%	106 47%	5 2%	3 1%
2:00 PM	74 33%	74 33%	69 31%	67 30%	5 2%	3 1%
3:00 PM	62 28%	53 24%	56 25%	49 22%	5 2%	2 1%
4:00 PM	40 18%	37 16%	35 16%	35 16%	5 2%	2 1%
5:00 PM	37 16%	34 15%	40 18%	25 11%	4 2%	1 0%
6:00 PM	83 37%	82 36%	88 39%	61 27%	1 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	76 34%	84 37%	83 37%	60 27%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, with lower utilization afternoons and moderate evening use. Greatest use is Wednesday morning at 10:00 AM. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Eastern Florida State College has 16.5 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, slightly above the system average and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 10.2 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	9 20%	12 27%	10 22%	10 22%	1 2%	0 0%
9:00 AM	19 42%	25 56%	19 42%	22 49%	3 7%	2 4%
10:00 AM	26 58%	24 53%	27 60%	21 47%	2 4%	1 2%
11:00 AM	22 49%	26 58%	22 49%	19 42%	2 4%	1 2%
12:00 PM	30 67%	27 60%	30 67%	24 53%	0 0%	1 2%
1:00 PM	29 64%	27 60%	31 69%	23 51%	1 2%	1 2%
2:00 PM	26 58%	20 44%	25 56%	17 38%	0 0%	0 0%
3:00 PM	21 47%	18 40%	19 42%	13 29%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	17 38%	15 33%	16 36%	10 22%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	15 33%	15 33%	16 36%	11 24%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	17 38%	16 36%	23 51%	15 33%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	20 44%	18 40%	22 49%	15 33%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%	5			100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest mid-day, particularly Monday and Wednesday. This is an unusual scheduling pattern as most institution's laboratory sections are offered before or after lunch. There is generally higher scheduled use than at most colleges across the Florida College System.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 13.4 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	14 16%	17 20%	15 18%	15 18%	4 5%	0 0%
9:00 AM	27 32%	34 40%	30 35%	34 40%	6 7%	1 1%
10:00 AM	33 39%	36 42%	34 40%	36 42%	5 6%	1 1%
11:00 AM	31 36%	35 41%	32 38%	34 40%	4 5%	1 1%
12:00 PM	30 35%	32 38%	29 34%	29 34%	2 2%	1 1%
1:00 PM	29 34%	30 35%	30 35%	25 29%	3 4%	1 1%
2:00 PM	22 26%	22 26%	23 27%	20 24%	3 4%	1 1%
3:00 PM	21 25%	17 20%	24 28%	18 21%	2 2%	1 1%
4:00 PM	16 19%	12 14%	14 16%	14 16%	1 1%	1 1%
5:00 PM	16 19%	14 16%	15 18%	13 15%	1 1%	0 0%
6:00 PM	31 36%	28 33%	27 32%	19 22%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	29 34%	28 33%	28 33%	18 21%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday with slightly higher use in the morning. There is very little use on Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is Tuesday and Thursday morning, when 42% are in use, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 12.8 hours per week, below the system average and confirming that there is excess space in this category.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Eastern Florida State College has 10.0 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly above the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Eastern Florida State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is at the system average. Average office size is slightly above the system average.

Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

FLORIDA Gateway College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1947
Local District	Baker County Columbia County Dixie County Gilchrist County Union County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	4
Percentage of Non-White Students	24%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Allied Health & Medical Assisting Services, Teacher Education Grade Specific, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)			
Upper Division	82.6		
Lower Division	2,332.1		
Total (Upper and Lower) 2,414.7			
Alternative/Distance Learning	1,197.0		

Number of Employees (2018)	
Full-time	206
Part-time	166
Total	372

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	32		
Associate of Arts	371		
Associate of Science	175		
Certificate Programs	399		
Retention Rate	60%		
Completion Rate	69%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Primary Scheduler	The Academic Departments.		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Students use library and centers for online courses
- Community uses facilities for performing arts, science fairs, and Internet
- STEM and vocational programs prioritized

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Dixie County Center	1	2,380	
Gilchrist Center	1	5,008	14
Main Campus	52	427,673	39
Olustee Site	9	43,791	36
Total	63	478,852	38

SUMMARY NOTE:

The snapshot timeframe is Fall 2018. During 2019 the college demolished three buildings on the Main Campus totaling 28,539 GSF. This reduces the Main Campus gross square feet to 399,134 and the total for the college to 450,313 GSF. The college noted that with this reduction in space the remaining space is more efficiently used.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages as a result of a concentration in vocational programs such as health care and agriculture that have significant space needs. Based on the original inspection date, 85% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space surplus in vocational laboratories and office space and a deficit in classrooms, non-vocational laboratories and library/ study space. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in classroom space and close to a balance in all other space categories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	
8:00 AM	10 45%	8 36%	9 41%	8 36%	1 5%	2 9%	
9:00 AM	12 55%	11 50%	13 59%	12 55%	4 18%	2 9%	
10:00 AM	14 64%	17 77%	16 73%	18 82%	4 18%	2 9%	
11:00 AM	16 73%	19 86%	18 82%	20 91%	4 18%	2 9%	
12:00 PM	11 50%	10 45%	12 55%	11 50%	3 14%	2 9%	
1:00 PM	11 50%	11 50%	13 59%	12 55%	1 5%	2 9%	
2:00 PM	14 64%	14 64%	16 73%	15 68%	3 14%	2 9%	
3:00 PM	4 18%	7 32%	7 32%	8 36%	3 14%	2 9%	
4:00 PM	2 9%	4 18%	5 23%	5 23%	3 14%	2 9%	
5:00 PM	6 27%	8 36%	7 32%	9 41%	3 14%	1 5%	
6:00 PM	5 23%	6 27%	5 23%	8 36%	1 5%	0 0%	
7:00 PM	2 9%	6 27%	2 9%	9 41%	1 5%	0 0%	
	0%				100%		

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest mid-day. Greatest use is Thursday morning at 11:00AM. Although 91% of the rooms are scheduled at this time, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.
CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida Gateway College has 10.8 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 6.8 hours per week, less than the system average and fourth lowest in the system. This low utilization yields the surplus in classroom space on campus.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NUN-VUCATIUNAL LABURATURIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	2 20%	2 20%	2 20%	2 20%	2 20%	0 0%
9:00 AM	2 20%	2 20%	2 20%	2 20%	2 20%	0 0%
10:00 AM	3 30%	4 40%	3 30%	4 40%	2 20%	0 0%
11:00 AM	3 30%	4 40%	3 30%	4 40%	2 20%	0 0%
12:00 PM	2 20%	1 10%	2 20%	1 10%	1 10%	0 0%
1:00 PM	1 10%	3 30%	1 10%	3 30%	1 10%	0 0%
2:00 PM	2 20%	3 30%	2 20%	3 30%	1 10%	0 0%
3:00 PM	2 20%	2 20%	2 20%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	1 10%	1 10%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	1 10%	3 30%	1 10%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	2 20%	2 20%	1 10%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	3 30%	2 20%	2 20%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest Tuesday and Thursday late morning. In general there is moderate to low use of this space type.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 10 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	10 37%	10 37%	9 33%	11 41%	3 11%	1 4%
9:00 AM	11 41%	11 41%	10 37%	12 44%	3 11%	1 4%
10:00 AM	10 37%	11 41%	9 33%	12 44%	3 11%	1 4%
11:00 AM	11 41%	13 48%	10 37%	14 52%	3 11%	1 4%
12:00 PM	11 41%	9 33%	9 33%	10 37%	3 11%	1 4%
1:00 PM	13 48%	12 44%	11 41%	13 48%	3 11%	1 4%
2:00 PM	13 48%	14 52%	11 41%	14 52%	3 11%	1 4%
3:00 PM	11 41%	10 37%	11 41%	10 37%	3 11%	1 4%
4:00 PM	6 22%	7 26%	8 30%	7 26%	2 7%	0 0%
5:00 PM	7 26%	8 30%	9 33%	8 30%	2 7%	0 0%
6:00 PM	7 26%	8 30%	9 33%	7 26%	3 11%	0 0%
7:00 PM	7 26%	8 30%	9 33%	6 22%	3 11%	0 0%
	0%	5			100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday. There is very little use on Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 52%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 22.7 hours per week, above the system average but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours per week.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida Gateway College has 9.2 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly above the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida Gateway College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is slightly above the system average. Average office size is below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

FLORIDA SOUTHWESTERN STATE COLLEGE



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1962
Local District	Charlotte County Collier County Glades County Hendry County Lee County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	5
Percentage of Non-White Students	48%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Allied Health Professions, Teacher Education Grade Specific
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, Archibus and Maintenance Connection

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)						
Upper Division	586.0					
Lower Division	10,529.4					
Total (Upper and Lower)	11,115.4					
Alternative/Distance Learning	2,859.2					

Number of Employees (2018)						
Full-time	548					
Part-time	736					
Total	1,284					

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)						
Bachelors	276					
Associate of Arts	1,496					
Associate of Science	363					
Certificate Programs	179					
Retention Rate	66%					
Completion Rate	53%					

Scheduling Procedures							
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized						
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized						
Primary Scheduler	Registrar, Academic Departments and their Deans, Master Scheduler, and Events Services.						

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Offers hybrid courses/programs
- Two high schools on campus

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites								
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building					
Charlotte Campus	13	154,775	23					
Collier Campus	13	209,999	24					
Hendry/Glades Curtis Center	2	27,091	15					
Thomas Edison Campus	27	861,890	35					
Total	55	1,253,755	29					

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus mirrors the system averages. Based on the original inspection date, 51% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

Both the SREF space standards and the alternative space needs analysis approach yield a surplus in vocational laboratory space and a deficit in non-vocational laboratories and library/study space. The SREF space standards yield a deficit in classroom space and office space, while the alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus, based upon actual course enrollments and staffing data.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	28 22%	45 35%	28 22%	42 32%	4 3%	0 0%
9:00 AM	80 62%	89 68%	81 62%	86 66%	12 9%	11 8%
10:00 AM	81 62%	88 68%	82 63%	84 65%	13 10%	11 8%
11:00 AM	92 71%	107 82%	92 71%	104 80%	14 11%	11 8%
12:00 PM	94 72%	109 84%	93 72%	108 83%	8 6%	7 5%
1:00 PM	72 55%	87 67%	73 56%	85 65%	3 2%	0 0%
2:00 PM	74 57%	73 56%	77 59%	70 54%	2 2%	0 0%
3:00 PM	69 53%	65 50%	72 55%	63 48%	2 2%	0 0%
4:00 PM	33 25%	43 33%	38 29%	42 32%	1 1%	0 0%
5:00 PM	37 28%	43 33%	37 28%	43 33%	1 1%	0 0%
6:00 PM	68 52%	75 58%	71 55%	64 49%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	68 52%	74 57%	70 54%	64 49%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled fairly consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The greatest percentage in use at any one time is 84% at 12:00 PM on Tuesday.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida SouthWestern State College has 11.4 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 16.2 hours per week, more than the system average, but lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours, yielding the space surplus.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Manday	Tuesday	Wedneedeu	Thursday	Friday	Caturday
8:00 AM	8 18%	8 18%	9 20%	8 18%	5 11%	1 2%
9:00 AM	19 43%	17 39%	21 48%	16 36%	6 14%	3 7%
10:00 AM	24 55%	21 48%	24 55%	19 43%	6 14%	3 7%
11:00 AM	25 57%	20 45%	25 57%	20 45%	7 16%	3 7%
12:00 PM	23 52%	19 43%	22 50%	23 52%	8 18%	3 7%
1:00 PM	20 45%	21 48%	19 43%	22 50%	7 16%	1 2%
2:00 PM	24 55%	22 50%	21 48%	22 50%	6 14%	0 0%
3:00 PM	20 45%	23 52%	18 41%	23 52%	6 14%	0 0%
4:00 PM	7 16%	13 30%	9 20%	14 32%	6 14%	0 0%
5:00 PM	9 20%	12 27%	10 23%	8 18%	5 11%	0 0%
6:00 PM	11 25%	16 36%	14 32%	13 30%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	9 20%	15 34%	14 32%	12 27%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest Monday and Wednesday morning with moderate use consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 16.6 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	6 15%	6 15%	10 26%	5 13%	3 8%	1 3%
9:00 AM	11 28%	12 31%	15 38%	10 26%	5 13%	1 3%
10:00 AM	12 31%	12 31%	15 38%	10 26%	5 13%	1 3%
11:00 AM	8 21%	13 33%	11 28%	11 28%	4 10%	1 3%
12:00 PM	9 23%	13 33%	13 33%	9 23%	4 10%	1 3%
1:00 PM	9 23%	9 23%	12 31%	7 18%	2 5%	2 5%
2:00 PM	9 23%	11 28%	10 26%	9 23%	3 8%	2 5%
3:00 PM	8 21%	7 18%	6 15%	7 18%	3 8%	2 5%
4:00 PM	6 15%	4 10%	4 10%	5 13%	1 3%	1 3%
5:00 PM	4 10%	5 13%	5 13%	4 10%	1 3%	0 0%
6:00 PM	12 31%	12 31%	12 31%	8 21%	1 3%	0 0%
7:00 PM	11 28%	11 28%	10 26%	7 18%	1 3%	0 0%
	0%	6			100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often in the morning and evening Monday through Thursday, with highest use Wednesday morning when 38% are in use. Since there are never more than half of the rooms scheduled there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 17.6 hours per week, at the system average but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours per week.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida SouthWestern State College has 5.3 NSF of library/ study space per student FTE, seventh lowest in the system and below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida SouthWestern State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is slightly below the system average. Average office size is also below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE



Florida State College at Jacksonville

BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1965
Local District	Duval County Nassau County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	9
Percentage of Non-White Students	47%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Information Technology, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, School Dude

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)				
Upper Division	1,687.8			
Lower Division	15,220.1			
Total (Upper and Lower)	16,907.9			
Alternative/Distance Learning	4,973.0			

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	1,293			
Part-time	761			
Total	2,054			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	819			
Associate of Arts	2,402			
Associate of Science	833			
Certificate Programs	2,017			
Retention Rate	63%			
Completion Rate	55%			

Scheduling Procedures					
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized				
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized				
Primary Scheduler	Academic Operations				

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two but less than four years of study
- 50/50 split between transfer students and workforce programs
- High school dual enrollment on campus is 10%
- Large number of partner agencies are housed on campus
- Programs are tied to campuses due to space needs, not student convenience

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites						
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building			
Administrative Office	1	82,853	38			
Cecil Center	6	251,366	14			
Deerwood Center	2	516,385	20			
Downtown Campus	7	526,035	33			
Kent Campus	8	414,011	37			
Main Street Buildings	4	70,903	37			
Nassau Center	19	127,009	25			
North Campus	22	463,728	34			
South Campus	34	648,348	38			
Total	103	3,100,638	32			

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)



FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)



SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus mirrors the system averages, with the exception of slightly more vocational laboratory space. Based on the original inspection date, 66% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in nonvocational laboratories and library/study space and a surplus in classrooms, vocational laboratories, and office space. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a balance in library/study space and a surplus in all other space categories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	87 26%	89 26%	97 29%	78 23%	20 6%	20 6%
9:00 AM	174 51%	183 54%	186 55%	168 50%	40 12%	42 12%
10:00 AM	181 54%	188 56%	185 55%	167 49%	45 13%	44 13%
11:00 AM	179 53%	190 56%	189 56%	171 51%	42 12%	38 11%
12:00 PM	157 46%	171 51%	174 51%	164 49%	27 8%	29 9%
1:00 PM	149 44%	163 48%	153 45%	141 42%	28 8%	23 7%
2:00 PM	108 32%	114 34%	119 35%	101 30%	25 7%	21 6%
3:00 PM	59 17%	62 18%	69 20%	55 16%	20 6%	11 3%
4:00 PM	34 10%	37 11%	40 12%	33 10%	15 4%	8 2%
5:00 PM	55 16%	71 21%	77 23%	62 18%	5 1%	1 0%
6:00 PM	143 42%	155 46%	156 46%	118 35%	5 1%	1 0%
7:00 PM	142 42%	148 44%	148 44%	112 33%	3 1%	1 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 56%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida State College at Jacksonville has 17.8 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, above the system average and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 8.8 hours per week, less than the system average, and lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	9 10%	8 9%	11 12%	9 10%	5 5%	4 4%
9:00 AM	23 25%	28 30%	27 29%	26 28%	11 12%	5 5%
10:00 AM	29 32%	33 36%	34 37%	31 34%	13 14%	5 5%
11:00 AM	31 34%	38 41%	36 39%	35 38%	14 15%	5 5%
12:00 PM	23 25%	32 35%	33 36%	30 33%	9 10%	6 7%
1:00 PM	36 39%	35 38%	39 42%	33 36%	4 4%	5 5%
2:00 PM	27 29%	38 41%	28 30%	31 34%	1 1%	4 4%
3:00 PM	18 20%	29 32%	20 22%	19 21%	0 0%	4 4%
4:00 PM	6 7%	15 16%	9 10%	12 13%	0 0%	1 1%
5:00 PM	13 14%	17 18%	18 20%	17 18%	1 1%	0 0%
6:00 PM	22 24%	29 32%	28 30%	24 26%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	21 23%	33 36%	31 34%	24 26%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest on Wednesday at 1:00 pm to 2:00 pm, when 42% are in use.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 10.7 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and less than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018							
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	
8:00 AM	16 16%	18 18%	13 13%	17 17%	6 6%	4 4%	
9:00 AM	19 19%	24 24%	18 18%	22 22%	8 8%	6 6%	
10:00 AM	20 20%	25 25%	19 19%	23 23%	8 8%	6 6%	
11:00 AM	21 21%	24 24%	22 22%	22 22%	9 9%	6 6%	
12:00 PM	15 15%	19 19%	18 18%	19 19%	2 2%	4 4%	
1:00 PM	18 18%	22 22%	19 19%	22 22%	6 6%	5 5%	
2:00 PM	14 14%	17 17%	13 13%	17 17%	6 6%	5 5%	
3:00 PM	15 15%	16 16%	14 14%	17 17%	5 5%	4 4%	
4:00 PM	11 11%	12 12%	13 13%	13 13%	3 3%	3 3%	
5:00 PM	16 16%	23 23%	20 20%	23 23%	4 4%	0 0%	
6:00 PM	16 16%	29 29%	22 22%	28 28%	6 6%	0 0%	
7:00 PM	18 18%	29 29%	22 22%	28 28%	6 6%	0 0%	
	0%						

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

The highest percentage of vocational laboratories in use at any one time is 29% on Tuesday evening. Scheduled use is consistent throughout the day Monday through Thursday, although light, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 7.1 hours per week, fifth lowest in the system.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida State College at Jacksonville has 8.0 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly below the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Florida State College at Jacksonville office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is third highest in the system, significantly above the system average. Average office size is slightly above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots
GULF COAST State College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1957
Local District	Bay County Franklin County Gulf County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	4
Percentage of Non-White Students	25%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Information Technology, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, Ad Astra for room scheduling.

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)				
Upper Division	130.7			
Lower Division	3,153.0			
Total (Upper and Lower)	3,283.7			
Alternative/Distance Learning	996.1			

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	372	
Part-time	294	
Total	666	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	67			
Associate of Arts	541			
Associate of Science	307			
Certificate Programs	316			
Retention Rate	62%			
Completion Rate	53%			

Scheduling Procedures				
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)			
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)			
Primary Scheduler	The Vice President of Academic Affairs sets the prioritization of instructional space, and our Office of Community Engagement coordinates all non- instructional related use.			

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Seventh smallest college in the system, region has not grown as fast as other parts of the state
- College facilities are the best and biggest in the three counties the college serves and are used frequently by the local communities
- College hosts continuity of operations plans after hurricanes

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Gulf/Franklin Campus	4	21,802	22
Main Campus	27	642,639	32
North Bay Campus	6	78,753	21
Total	37	743,194	29

Note: Gulf Coast State College uses office space and two classrooms at Tyndall Air Force Base at no cost to the college.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with more office and vocational laboratory space and less classroom, non-vocational laboratory, and library/study space. Based on the original inspection date, 38% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in non-vocational laboratories and library/study space and a surplus in classrooms, vocational laboratories and office space. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a balance in library/study and nonvocational laboratory space and a surplus in all other space categories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

				· · · · ·		
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	19 29%	17 26%	24 36%	16 24%	0 0%	8 12%
9:00 AM	34 52%	36 55%	37 56%	35 53%	3 5%	9 14%
10:00 AM	34 52%	32 48%	36 55%	31 47%	4 6%	9 14%
11:00 AM	36 55%	32 48%	38 58%	31 47%	3 5%	9 14%
12:00 PM	39 59%	31 47%	39 59%	32 48%	2 3%	9 14%
1:00 PM	21 32%	6 9%	22 33%	6 9%	2 3%	9 14%
2:00 PM	23 35%	13 20%	23 35%	14 21%	4 6%	9 14%
3:00 PM	15 23%	12 18%	18 27%	15 23%	3 5%	7 11%
4:00 PM	4 6%	8 12%	7 11%	10 15%	4 6%	1 2%
5:00 PM	11 17%	10 15%	10 15%	13 20%	3 5%	0 0%
6:00 PM	13 20%	16 24%	14 21%	14 21%	3 5%	0 0%
7:00 PM	7 11%	13 20%	9 14%	10 15%	3 5%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. It is unusual for there to be higher scheduled use on Saturday than on Friday. Saturday use is fourth highest in the system. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 59%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Gulf Coast State College has 15.0 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, at the system average and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 6.1 hours per week, third lowest in the system.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	2 7%	4 15%	3 11%	4 15%	5 19%	2 7%
9:00 AM	10 37%	9 33%	10 37%	10 37%	6 22%	2 7%
10:00 AM	11 41%	11 41%	11 41%	11 41%	6 22%	2 7%
11:00 AM	13 48%	12 44%	13 48%	12 44%	2 7%	2 7%
12:00 PM	12 44%	10 37%	13 48%	12 44%	2 7%	2 7%
1:00 PM	6 22%	2 7%	4 15%	5 19%	5 19%	2 7%
2:00 PM	11 41%	8 30%	8 30%	10 37%	6 22%	0 0%
3:00 PM	11 41%	7 26%	8 30%	9 33%	6 22%	0 0%
4:00 PM	4 15%	5 19%	5 19%	5 19%	3 11%	0 0%
5:00 PM	6 22%	10 37%	7 26%	10 37%	2 7%	0 0%
6:00 PM	8 30%	9 33%	8 30%	8 30%	1 4%	0 0%
7:00 PM	6 22%	7 26%	5 19%	6 22%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 48%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 10.3 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and less than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	19 32%	15 25%	13 22%	12 20%	8 14%	4 7%
9:00 AM	23 39%	17 29%	16 27%	14 24%	8 14%	5 8%
10:00 AM	22 37%	19 32%	16 27%	16 27%	8 14%	5 8%
11:00 AM	20 34%	17 29%	14 24%	14 24%	7 12%	5 8%
12:00 PM	19 32%	17 29%	12 20%	12 20%	7 12%	4 7%
1:00 PM	19 32%	19 32%	16 27%	16 27%	6 10%	4 7%
2:00 PM	19 32%	18 31%	15 25%	13 22%	6 10%	4 7%
3:00 PM	15 25%	16 27%	13 22%	13 22%	6 10%	2 3%
4:00 PM	15 25%	16 27%	10 17%	12 20%	5 8%	2 3%
5:00 PM	12 20%	12 20%	10 17%	8 14%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	16 27%	13 22%	16 27%	9 15%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	13 22%	13 22%	13 22%	10 17%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday. There is very little use on Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 39%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment, and generating a surplus in this space category.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 8.3 hours per week, sixth lowest in the system.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Gulf Coast State College has 8.2 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, at the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Gulf Coast State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is above the system average. Average office size is slightly below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

HILLSBOROUGH Community College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1968
Local District	Hillsborough County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	9
Percentage of Non-White Students	60%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Criminal Justice & Corrections, Allied Health Professions, Business Administration & Management
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, CollegeNet 25Live Scheduling Software

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)			
Upper Division	-		
Lower Division	20,466.3		
Total (Upper and Lower)	20,466.3		
Alternative/Distance Learning	5,990.1		

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	950	
Part-time	1,372	
Total	2,322	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	67		
Associate of Arts	541		
Associate of Science	307		
Certificate Programs	316		
Retention Rate	62%		
Completion Rate	53%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized		
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized		
Primary Scheduler	Students Services and Deans		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- IPEDS category is "Degree-granting, associates and certificates"
- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Offers online courses
- Large number of homeless students

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)





PERCENT OF FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM FTE ENROLLMENT



Campuses Centers Sites					
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building		
Brandon Campus	10	254,282	25		
Dale Mabry Campus	17	632,955	29		
District Administration Center	3	132,834	41		
English Creek Center	2	5,146	25		
HCC @ The Regent	1	32,085	10		
Plant City Campus	12	182,869	29		
SouthShore Campus	15	109,115	9		
Ybor City Campus	9	359,148	51		
Ybor City Campus Training Center	10	92,885	23		
Total	79	1,801,319	26		

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus mirrors the system averages. Based on the original inspection date, 63% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories. SREF standards generate a space need in all categories. Both approaches generate a deficit in vocational laboratory and library/study space. The alternative analysis approach yields surpluses in classrooms and nonvocational laboratories and office space.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	90 36%	81 32%	91 36%	80 32%	12 5%	8 3%
9:00 AM	191 76%	203 81%	185 73%	199 79%	29 12%	26 10%
10:00 AM	190 75%	198 79%	183 73%	193 77%	36 14%	27 11%
11:00 AM	178 71%	190 75%	175 69%	184 73%	38 15%	23 9%
12:00 PM	190 75%	203 81%	188 75%	193 77%	33 13%	14 6%
1:00 PM	160 63%	165 65%	160 63%	154 61%	19 8%	8 3%
2:00 PM	126 50%	133 53%	126 50%	127 50%	21 8%	4 2%
3:00 PM	97 38%	102 40%	98 39%	94 37%	21 8%	2 1%
4:00 PM	45 18%	50 20%	45 18%	47 19%	13 5%	2 1%
5:00 PM	87 35%	99 39%	82 33%	91 36%	3 1%	1 0%
6:00 PM	128 51%	128 51%	123 49%	119 47%	2 1%	1 0%
7:00 PM	132 52%	114 45%	122 48%	106 42%	2 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since 81% of the total is in use Tuesday at 9:00 AM and 12:00 PM there could be a perceived shortage which can be remedied by increased scheduling at other times. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Hillsborough Community College has 10.7 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, fifth smallest in the system and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/ FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 17.4 hours per week, fourth highest in the system, but still below the 24 hours expectation of the Division of Florida Colleges.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	18 24%	22 29%	17 23%	21 28%	2 3%	2 3%
9:00 AM	38 51%	46 61%	42 56%	44 59%	11 15%	8 11%
10:00 AM	39 52%	47 63%	43 57%	45 60%	12 16%	9 12%
11:00 AM	46 61%	53 71%	48 64%	51 68%	14 19%	8 11%
12:00 PM	46 61%	54 72%	51 68%	49 65%	12 16%	8 11%
1:00 PM	43 57%	47 63%	41 55%	44 59%	11 15%	8 11%
2:00 PM	39 52%	37 49%	34 45%	37 49%	7 9%	6 8%
3:00 PM	30 40%	25 33%	28 37%	29 39%	2 3%	2 3%
4:00 PM	16 21%	15 20%	19 25%	15 20%	1 1%	2 3%
5:00 PM	18 24%	20 27%	20 27%	15 20%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	23 31%	22 29%	24 32%	19 25%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	29 39%	29 39%	30 40%	27 36%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest Tuesday morning with moderate use consistently throughout the day and evening Monday through Thursday. Saturday scheduled use is fourth highest in the system.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 19.1 hours per week, fourth highest in the system, but still less than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	18 27%	15 22%	15 22%	12 18%	10 15%	2 3%
9:00 AM	31 46%	28 42%	29 43%	24 36%	12 18%	6 9%
10:00 AM	29 43%	30 45%	27 40%	26 39%	12 18%	6 9%
11:00 AM	26 39%	34 51%	27 40%	30 45%	10 15%	6 9%
12:00 PM	26 39%	33 49%	28 42%	30 45%	9 13%	4 6%
1:00 PM	23 34%	29 43%	23 34%	27 40%	7 10%	1 1%
2:00 PM	20 30%	21 31%	17 25%	18 27%	7 10%	1 1%
3:00 PM	16 24%	18 27%	15 22%	17 25%	7 10%	1 1%
4:00 PM	15 22%	17 25%	10 15%	16 24%	5 7%	0 0%
5:00 PM	11 16%	14 21%	11 16%	12 18%	2 3%	0 0%
6:00 PM	11 16%	18 27%	14 21%	16 24%	2 3%	0 0%
7:00 PM	9 13%	19 28%	12 18%	18 27%	2 3%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often in the morning Monday through Thursday. More than 50% are in use Tuesday morning at 11:00. There is moderate use afternoons and evenings.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 16.8 hours per week, the system average.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Hillsborough Community College has 4.2 NSF of library/ study space per student FTE, second lowest in the system and significantly below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Hillsborough Community College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is below the system average. Average office size is the largest in the system, significantly above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

INDIAN RIVER STATE COLLEGE



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1959
Local District	Indian River County Martin County Okeechobee County St. Lucie County
Aspen Ranking	2019 Winner 2017 Finalist with Distinction 2015 Finalist
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	7
Percentage of Non-White Students	46%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Criminal Justice & Corrections
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, School Dude and Workday

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)			
Upper Division	1,524.7		
Lower Division	11,261.1		
Total (Upper and Lower)	12,785.8		
Alternative/Distance Learning	3,219.7		

Number of Employees (2018)	
Full-time	800
Part-time	903
Total	1,703

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	774		
Associate of Arts	2,283		
Associate of Science	735		
Certificate Programs	1,555		
Retention Rate	67%		
Completion Rate	54%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Teaching	Decentralized		
Laboratories	(i.e., Department or unit level)		
Primary	President's Cabinet, Campus		
Scheduler	Administrators, Academic Deans		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- IPEDS category is "Degree-granting, associates and certificates"
- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Offers online courses
- Large number of homeless students

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites					
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building		
Chastain Campus	6	110,448	25		
Dixon Hendry Campus	4	44,018	23		
Human Development Research Center	1	22,696	12		
Main Campus	54	1,024,826	27		
Marine Science Center	1	5,500	43		
Mueller Campus	8	126,262	28		
Pruitt Campus	14	285,448	16		
Total	88	1,619,198	25		

344 State of Florida - OPPAGA 🛛 Review of the Capital Outlay Facilities Space of Florida's State College System

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages, with slightly less classroom space and more vocational laboratory space. Based on the original inspection date, 41% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in all categories with the exception of office space. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a space surplus in all space categories with the exception of library/study space.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018									
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday			
8:00 AM	40 25%	48 30%	38 23%	47 29%	5 3%	3 2%			
9:00 AM	97 60%	104 64%	98 60%	102 63%	17 10%	4 2%			
10:00 AM	91 56%	99 61%	93 57%	97 60%	20 12%	7 4%			
11:00 AM	80 49%	94 58%	78 48%	92 57%	17 10%	5 3%			
12:00 PM	85 52%	95 59%	85 52%	90 56%	9 6%	2 1%			
1:00 PM	47 29%	43 27%	44 27%	41 25%	8 5%	0 0%			
2:00 PM	28 17%	33 20%	28 17%	27 17%	8 5%	0 0%			
3:00 PM	22 14%	26 16%	22 14%	20 12%	6 4%	0 0%			
4:00 PM	34 21%	41 25%	29 18%	24 15%	2 1%	0 0%			
5:00 PM	52 32%	57 35%	48 30%	49 30%	1 1%	0 0%			
6:00 PM	75 46%	84 52%	76 47%	74 46%	1 1%	0 0%			
7:00 PM	68 42%	77 48%	69 43%	63 39%	1 1%	0 0%			
	0%				100%				

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 64%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Indian River State College has 12.8 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 10.1 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018									
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday			
8:00 AM	3 9%	1 3%	4 12%	1 3%	3 9%	0 0%			
9:00 AM	6 18%	4 12%	7 21%	4 12%	3 9%	0 0%			
10:00 AM	7 21%	3 9%	9 26%	3 9%	4 12%	0 0%			
11:00 AM	8 24%	6 18%	12 35%	5 15%	4 12%	0 0%			
12:00 PM	11 32%	15 44%	16 47%	14 41%	1 3%	0 0%			
1:00 PM	11 32%	17 50%	18 53%	16 47%	1 3%	0 0%			
2:00 PM	11 32%	19 56%	16 47%	17 50%	0 0%	0 0%			
3:00 PM	9 26%	13 38%	10 29%	11 32%	0 0%	0 0%			
4:00 PM	11 32%	14 41%	9 26%	12 35%	0 0%	0 0%			
5:00 PM	9 26%	15 44%	13 38%	14 41%	0 0%	0 0%			
6:00 PM	10 29%	12 35%	14 41%	12 35%	0 0%	0 0%			
7:00 PM	9 26%	10 29%	14 41%	11 32%	0 0%	0 0%			
	0%				100%				

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest early afternoon Tuesday through Thursday. There is very little scheduled use Tuesday and Thursday mornings and Friday.
NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 10.4 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and less than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	14 16%	22 24%	14 16%	19 21%	8 9%	8 9%
9:00 AM	35 39%	42 47%	34 38%	39 43%	12 13%	9 10%
10:00 AM	34 38%	38 42%	34 38%	36 40%	13 14%	8 9%
11:00 AM	31 34%	33 37%	30 33%	32 36%	13 14%	8 9%
12:00 PM	31 34%	29 32%	28 31%	33 37%	13 14%	8 9%
1:00 PM	25 28%	25 28%	23 26%	25 28%	11 12%	8 9%
2:00 PM	23 26%	22 24%	21 23%	20 22%	11 12%	6 7%
3:00 PM	20 22%	16 18%	16 18%	13 14%	11 12%	5 6%
4:00 PM	23 26%	18 20%	18 20%	12 13%	7 8%	3 3%
5:00 PM	25 28%	28 31%	24 27%	21 23%	2 2%	0 0%
6:00 PM	30 33%	39 43%	33 37%	27 30%	2 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	26 29%	34 38%	29 32%	25 28%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday. There is very little use on Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 47%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment. Indian River is tied with one other college for fourth highest Saturday use.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 15.9 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and less than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Indian River State College has 7.0 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Indian River State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is slightly above the system average. Average office size is also slightly above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

LAKE-SUMTER STATE COLLEGE



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1962
Local District	Lake County Sumter County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	3
Percentage of Non-White Students	39%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Computer Information Systems, General Engineering Technology
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)					
Upper Division	56.1				
Lower Division	3,193.8				
Total (Upper and Lower)	3,249.9				
Alternative/Distance Learning	1,125.3				

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	251			
Part-time	128			
Total	379			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	32			
Associate of Arts	635			
Associate of Science	127			
Certificate Programs	74			
Retention Rate	65%			
Completion Rate	63%			

Scheduling Procedures				
Classrooms	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)			
Teaching Laboratories	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)			
Primary Scheduler	The Executive Vice President is responsible for scheduling space, but Academic Affairs creates the academic schedule that essentially assigns classroom and laboratory space.			

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Focuses on leveraging partnerships with local organizations
- Articulation agreements and shares space with local technical college
- Businesses are located on college campus, involved in academic instruction
- County Library is located on the college campus, serves the entire county

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites							
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building				
Leesburg Campus	35	317,449	42				
South Lake Campus	7	219,742	13				
Sumter Center	8	30,607	19				
Total	50	567,798	33				

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM - AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (ACCORDING TO ORIGINAL INSPECTION DATE) (ACCORDING TO ORIGINAL INSPECTION DATE) Less than **0.5%** Age Unknown 9% 14% 16% 27% Under 10 Years 10 to 24 Years 25 to 49 Years 32% Over 50 Years 8% 37% 56% Age Unknown

SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with less classroom and vocational laboratory space, more non-vocational laboratory space and significantly more library/study space. Based on the original inspection date, 35% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in classroom and vocational laboratory space, and a space surplus in non-vocational laboratory, library/study, and office space. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a space surplus in all space categories. Both approaches yield a significant surplus in library/ study and office space. The additional existing library/ study space could be due to the county library being located on campus.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	16 41%	10 26%	17 44%	10 26%	1 3%	1 3%
9:00 AM	28 72%	27 69%	31 79%	24 62%	2 5%	1 3%
10:00 AM	22 56%	25 64%	24 62%	22 56%	1 3%	1 3%
11:00 AM	22 56%	19 49%	21 54%	13 33%	1 3%	1 3%
12:00 PM	29 74%	25 64%	27 69%	21 54%	1 3%	1 3%
1:00 PM	17 44%	19 49%	14 36%	14 36%	1 3%	1 3%
2:00 PM	10 26%	12 31%	12 31%	10 26%	1 3%	1 3%
3:00 PM	10 26%	13 33%	10 26%	11 28%	1 3%	1 3%
4:00 PM	4 10%	6 15%	2 5%	5 13%	1 3%	1 3%
5:00 PM	10 26%	14 36%	6 15%	11 28%	1 3%	0 0%
6:00 PM	12 31%	19 49%	10 26%	15 38%	1 3%	0 0%
7:00 PM	11 28%	16 41%	9 23%	11 28%	1 3%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since 79% of the total is in use Wednesday at 9:00 AM there could be a perceived shortage which can be remedied by increased scheduling at other times. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Lake-Sumter State College has 11.6 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 13 hours per week, slightly more than the system average, but lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED NUN-VUCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	1 3%	2 6%	1 3%	3 9%	2 6%	0 0%
9:00 AM	5 15%	5 15%	4 12%	5 15%	2 6%	0 0%
10:00 AM	5 15%	4 12%	5 15%	4 12%	2 6%	0 0%
11:00 AM	8 24%	8 24%	5 15%	8 24%	1 3%	0 0%
12:00 PM	7 21%	10 30%	5 15%	10 30%	0 0%	0 0%
1:00 PM	7 21%	5 15%	5 15%	7 21%	0 0%	0 0%
2:00 PM	6 18%	6 18%	5 15%	6 18%	0 0%	0 0%
3:00 PM	7 21%	6 18%	5 15%	6 18%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	5 15%	3 9%	4 12%	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	2 6%	2 6%	4 12%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	2 6%	2 6%	2 6%	2 6%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	2 6%	3 9%	3 9%	4 12%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory scheduled use does not exceed 30% at any time during the week. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 5.2 hours per week, third lowest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	1 11%	1 11%	1 11%	2 22%	1 11%	0 0%
9:00 AM	1 11%	2 22%	3 33%	2 22%	1 11%	0 0%
10:00 AM	0 0%	1 11%	2 22%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
11:00 AM	0 0%	1 11%	1 11%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
12:00 PM	0 0%	1 11%	1 11%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
1:00 PM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
2:00 PM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
3:00 PM	1 11%	1 11%	1 11%	2 22%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	2 22%	2 22%	2 22%	2 22%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	1 11%	2 22%	1 11%	1 11%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	1 11%	2 22%	1 11%	1 11%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	1 11%	2 22%	1 11%	1 11%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory scheduled use is highest on Wednesday morning at 9:00 when one-third of the rooms are in use. Scheduled use is highest early morning and late afternoon Monday through Thursday. This is unusual. Mid-day use is typically highest.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 6.3 hours per week, third lowest in the system.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Lake-Sumter State College has 19.7 NSF of library/ study space per student FTE, highest in the system and significantly above the system average. This could be due to the county library being located on campus.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Lake-Sumter State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is second highest in the system, significantly above the system average. Average office size is below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

MIAMI DADE College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1960
Local District	Miami-Dade County
Aspen Ranking	2019 Winner 2011 Finalist with Distinction
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	11
Percentage of Non-White Students	85%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Allied Health Professions, Computer Information Systems
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, TMA currently and the college is implementing FMI by FM Systems

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)					
Upper Division	1,897.4				
Lower Division	45,588.5				
Total (Upper and Lower)	47,485.9				
Alternative/Distance Learning 4,934.5					

Number of Employees (2018)	
Full-time	2,514
Part-time	6,598
Total	9,112

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)		
Bachelors	1,160	
Associate of Arts	8,222	
Associate of Science	1,449	
Certificate Programs	1,296	
Retention Rate	66%	
Completion Rate	45%	

Scheduling Procedures		
Classrooms	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)	
Teaching Laboratories	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)	
Primary Scheduler	Academic Scheduling, an office under District Academic Affairs	

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Most populous county in the state, 34 municipalities with different needs
- Southeast Florida has unique building codes, impacts construction costs
- Partners with local municipalities in driving the community visions
- Students are from all walks of life, need to provide specific education they need

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)





PERCENT OF FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM FTE ENROLLMENT



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center	1	31,652	31
Hialeah Campus	4	554,558	17
Homestead Campus	6	237,146	28
Kendall Campus	48	1,591,121	38
MDC Aviation Center	1	9,976	12
Medical Campus	4	855,238	19
Miami Executive Airport	1	10,276	
North Campus	41	1,158,485	40
Eduardo J. Padrón Campus	10	783,742	42
West Campus	3	984,235	12
Wolfson Campus	11	2,174,401	34
Total	130	8,390,830	36

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



Under 10 Years

10 to 24 Years 25 to 49 Years

Over 50 Years

Age Unknown

INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)



FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)



SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages, with slightly more classroom and office space and less vocational laboratory space. Based on the original inspection date, 45% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories. SREF standards generate a space need in all categories. Both approaches generate a deficit in library/study and office space. The alternative analysis approach yields a space balance in classrooms and surpluses in non-vocational and vocational laboratory space.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	333 57%	395 68%	329 57%	394 68%	281 48%	177 30%
9:00 AM	417 72%	464 80%	411 71%	455 78%	342 59%	243 42%
10:00 AM	428 74%	464 80%	418 72%	449 77%	336 58%	256 44%
11:00 AM	353 61%	468 81%	339 58%	455 78%	265 46%	215 37%
12:00 PM	82 14%	437 75%	66 11%	425 73%	47 8%	170 29%
1:00 PM	220 38%	332 57%	222 38%	320 55%	96 17%	119 20%
2:00 PM	200 34%	203 35%	207 36%	199 34%	66 11%	51 9%
3:00 PM	128 22%	166 29%	138 24%	161 28%	49 8%	41 7%
4:00 PM	63 11%	100 17%	69 12%	100 17%	21 4%	14 2%
5:00 PM	299 51%	286 49%	318 55%	270 46%	42 7%	7 1%
6:00 PM	384 66%	392 67%	402 69%	362 62%	66 11%	13 2%
7:00 PM	365 63%	392 67%	385 66%	355 61%	71 12%	8 1%

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

100%

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning and evening, Monday through Thursday. Since 81% of the total is in use Tuesday at 11:00 AM there may be a perceived shortage which could be remedied by increased scheduling in the afternoons. Friday scheduled use is second highest in the system. Miami Dade is first in the system with respect to scheduled Saturday use of classrooms.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Miami Dade College has 10.4 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, fourth smallest in the system and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 20.3 hours per week, second highest in the system, but still below the 24 hours expectation of the Division of Florida Colleges.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	26 16%	36 22%	38 23%	35 21%	18 11%	4 2%
9:00 AM	52 32%	61 37%	58 36%	62 38%	31 19%	14 9%
10:00 AM	56 34%	57 35%	67 41%	60 37%	42 26%	15 9%
11:00 AM	44 27%	51 31%	49 30%	48 29%	35 21%	21 13%
12:00 PM	29 18%	48 29%	14 9%	41 25%	23 14%	21 13%
1:00 PM	42 26%	59 36%	47 29%	55 34%	25 15%	18 11%
2:00 PM	33 20%	51 31%	40 25%	44 27%	19 12%	11 7%
3:00 PM	35 21%	41 25%	46 28%	35 21%	15 9%	5 3%
4:00 PM	28 17%	29 18%	37 23%	25 15%	14 9%	1 1%
5:00 PM	40 25%	41 25%	41 25%	37 23%	15 9%	3 2%
6:00 PM	42 26%	44 27%	45 28%	42 26%	15 9%	2 1%
7:00 PM	43 26%	51 31%	46 28%	48 29%	14 9%	2 1%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational scheduled use on Friday is second highest in the system. Saturday use is fourth highest.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 10.8 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCI	IEDULED VOCATIONA	L LABORATORIES USE	BY DAY AND TIME	FALL 2018	
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	25 26%	25 26%	22 23%	25 26%	11 11%	13 13%
9:00 AM	30 31%	33 34%	30 31%	33 34%	20 21%	14 14%
10:00 AM	27 28%	34 35%	29 30%	35 36%	19 20%	15 15%
11:00 AM	27 28%	39 40%	25 26%	37 38%	16 16%	14 14%
12:00 PM	14 14%	35 36%	18 19%	31 32%	12 12%	14 14%
1:00 PM	30 31%	29 30%	29 30%	23 24%	11 11%	11 11%
2:00 PM	30 31%	27 28%	30 31%	23 24%	10 10%	8 8%
3:00 PM	20 21%	19 20%	19 20%	19 20%	8 8%	5 5%
4:00 PM	14 14%	10 10%	13 13%	12 12%	4 4%	3 3%
5:00 PM	27 28%	19 20%	26 27%	25 26%	7 7%	2 2%
6:00 PM	39 40%	38 39%	35 36%	38 39%	9 9%	2 2%
7:00 PM	33 34%	29 30%	32 33%	26 27%	11 11%	2 2%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently through the day Monday through Thursday. The greatest percentage scheduled is 40%, Monday evening at 6:00 PM and Tuesday morning at 11:00 AM. Scheduled Saturday use is highest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 17.7 hours per week, the system average.

Miami Dade College

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Miami Dade College has 4.5 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, fourth lowest in the system and significantly below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Miami Dade College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is lowest in the system, significantly below the system average. Average office size is above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

NORTH Florida College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1958
Local District	Hamilton County Jefferson County Lafayette County Madison County Suwannee County Taylor County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	94%
Number of Locations	1
Percentage of Non-White Students	30%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Allied Health Professions, Business Administration & Management, Computer Software & Applications
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)		
Upper Division	16.0	
Lower Division	830.4	
Total (Upper and Lower)	846.4	
Alternative/Distance Learning	314.4	

Number of Employees (2018)	
Full-time	117
Part-time	27
Total	144

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)		
Bachelors	NA	
Associate of Arts	160	
Associate of Science	46	
Certificate Programs	170	
Retention Rate	63%	
Completion Rate	58%	

Scheduling Procedures		
Classrooms	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)	
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized	
Primary Scheduler	Office of Academic Affairs	

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Most students are low income
- Significant counseling and TRIO support for first generation students
- Student center is highly used for community meetings
- Only large auditorium in the area

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Main Campus	30	216,413	37
Total	30	216,413	37
EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM - AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (ACCORDING TO ORIGINAL INSPECTION DATE) (ACCORDING TO ORIGINAL INSPECTION DATE) Less than **0.5%** Age Unknown 15% 14% 16% Under 10 Years 10 to 24 Years 13% 25 to 49 Years 32% Over 50 Years 72% 37% Age Unknown

SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with significantly less classroom space and more vocational laboratory space as a result of a concentration in vocational programs that have higher space needs. Based on the original inspection date, 85% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in classroom space and a space surplus in all other categories. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a deficit in vocational laboratory space and a surplus in all other space categories. This deficit/surplus difference for classrooms and vocational laboratories is the result of analysis based on NSF/COFTE versus course enrollments. The college noted that they have classified 7,353 NSF of meeting and central storage space as office space. Removing this space from the office inventory revises the existing office NSF to 26,850.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	
8:00 AM	8 67%	4 33%	8 67%	4 33%	0 0%	0 0%	
9:00 AM	10 83%	8 67%	10 83%	8 67%	0 0%	0 0%	
10:00 AM	6 50%	5 42%	6 50%	6 50%	0 0%	0 0%	
11:00 AM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 17%	0 0%	0 0%	
12:00 PM	6 50%	3 25%	7 58%	4 33%	0 0%	0 0%	
1:00 PM	7 58%	4 33%	7 58%	5 42%	0 0%	0 0%	
2:00 PM	3 25%	2 17%	3 25%	2 17%	0 0%	0 0%	
3:00 PM	1 8%	1 8%	1 8%	1 8%	0 0%	0 0%	
4:00 PM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	
5:00 PM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	
6:00 PM	1 8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	
7:00 PM	1 8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	
	0%				100%		

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest early morning with very little use after 2:00 PM. North Florida is the only college in the system with no scheduled classroom use on Friday.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

North Florida College has 9.4 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, second smallest in the system and significantly below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 8.3 hours per week, less than the system average, and lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	3 30%	4 40%	3 30%	4 40%	1 10%	0 0%
9:00 AM	6 60%	5 50%	6 60%	5 50%	2 20%	0 0%
10:00 AM	5 50%	4 40%	5 50%	4 40%	1 10%	0 0%
11:00 AM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 20%	0 0%	0 0%
12:00 PM	4 40%	2 20%	6 60%	2 20%	1 10%	0 0%
1:00 PM	4 40%	4 40%	5 50%	4 40%	1 10%	0 0%
2:00 PM	3 30%	5 50%	4 40%	4 40%	1 10%	0 0%
3:00 PM	3 30%	2 20%	4 40%	2 20%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	2 20%	1 10%	3 30%	2 20%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	0 0%	1 10%	2 20%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	1 10%	1 10%	2 20%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	1 10%	1 10%	2 20%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 60%.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 12.7 hours per week, slightly more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	6 40%	7 47%	7 47%	7 47%	3 20%	0 0%
9:00 AM	7 47%	7 47%	7 47%	7 47%	3 20%	0 0%
10:00 AM	7 47%	6 40%	7 47%	6 40%	3 20%	0 0%
11:00 AM	6 40%	6 40%	6 40%	6 40%	4 27%	0 0%
12:00 PM	7 47%	5 33%	7 47%	6 40%	4 27%	0 0%
1:00 PM	7 47%	5 33%	7 47%	6 40%	3 20%	0 0%
2:00 PM	6 40%	5 33%	6 40%	6 40%	3 20%	0 0%
3:00 PM	6 40%	5 33%	6 40%	6 40%	3 20%	0 0%
4:00 PM	3 20%	2 13%	3 20%	3 20%	1 7%	0 0%
5:00 PM	0 0%	1 7%	1 7%	1 7%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	3 20%	4 27%	5 33%	4 27%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	3 20%	4 27%	4 27%	4 27%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday. There is modest use on Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 47%. The college noted that one building currently houses the majority of vocational programs. These programs often utilize shared laboratory space with like courses being taught concurrently. Other laboratory spaces are scheduled to allow maximum usage from multiple programs.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 46.5 hours per week, highest in the system and significantly above the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

North Florida College has 15.4 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, second highest in the system and significantly above the system average. This corresponds with the surplus in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

North Florida College has the highest reported office space per total faculty and staff FTE in the system. However, according to college administrators, office square feet as reported to the system includes meeting and central storage space not typically in this space category. Average office size is below the system average.

Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

NORTHWEST FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1963
Local District	Okaloosa County Walton County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	94%
Number of Locations	5
Percentage of Non-White Students	26%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Teacher Education Grade Specific, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)					
Upper Division	325.4				
Lower Division	3,503.2				
Total (Upper and Lower)	3,828.6				
Alternative/Distance Learning	1,300.0				

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	290			
Part-time	315			
Total	605			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)					
Bachelors	146				
Associate of Arts	988				
Associate of Science	197				
Certificate Programs	282				
Retention Rate	64%				
Completion Rate	49%				

Scheduling Procedures					
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized				
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized				
Primary Scheduler	Teaching and Learning				

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Eglin Air Force Base provides military and dependent students
- Very active Veterans Success Center
- Dog Training Program

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites							
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building				
Chautauqua Center	2	26,724	37				
Niceville Campus	46	825,249	31				
NWFSC/UWF Campus	8	131,553	28				
Robert L. F. Sikes Education Center	1	20,466	26				
South Walton Center	2	15,153	10				
Total	59	1,019,145	30				

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus mirrors the system averages. Based on the original inspection date, 63% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in vocational laboratory space and a space surplus in all other categories. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in all space categories. SREF space standards generate more space than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all categories except office space. The alternative approach yields a greater space need in this category due to analysis based on college staffing rather than NSF/COFTE.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	29 31%	20 22%	30 32%	17 18%	8 9%	4 4%
9:00 AM	57 61%	49 53%	59 63%	45 48%	12 13%	4 4%
10:00 AM	56 60%	50 54%	58 62%	46 49%	9 10%	4 4%
11:00 AM	43 46%	53 57%	45 48%	50 54%	8 9%	4 4%
12:00 PM	50 54%	49 53%	52 56%	48 52%	4 4%	2 2%
1:00 PM	39 42%	27 29%	43 46%	25 27%	5 5%	4 4%
2:00 PM	24 26%	19 20%	22 24%	15 16%	5 5%	4 4%
3:00 PM	20 22%	17 18%	16 17%	14 15%	4 4%	3 3%
4:00 PM	13 14%	15 16%	13 14%	12 13%	2 2%	2 2%
5:00 PM	20 22%	27 29%	19 20%	25 27%	2 2%	1 1%
6:00 PM	36 39%	49 53%	33 35%	40 43%	2 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	29 31%	36 39%	29 31%	27 29%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning and evening, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 63%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Northwest Florida State College has 20.4 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, fourth highest in the system and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 9.8 hours per week, less than the system average, and lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

	SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	8 33%	6 25%	8 33%	6 25%	2 8%	0 0%
9:00 AM	9 38%	12 50%	10 42%	12 50%	3 13%	0 0%
10:00 AM	11 46%	16 67%	12 50%	16 67%	4 17%	0 0%
11:00 AM	9 38%	14 58%	9 38%	14 58%	4 17%	0 0%
12:00 PM	12 50%	14 58%	13 54%	14 58%	2 8%	0 0%
1:00 PM	9 38%	13 54%	9 38%	13 54%	2 8%	0 0%
2:00 PM	9 38%	10 42%	10 42%	10 42%	2 8%	0 0%
3:00 PM	5 21%	6 25%	7 29%	6 25%	1 4%	0 0%
4:00 PM	4 17%	4 17%	6 25%	4 17%	1 4%	0 0%
5:00 PM	4 17%	5 21%	7 29%	4 17%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	3 13%	6 25%	5 21%	4 17%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	1 4%	3 13%	3 13%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE: Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest Tuesday and Thursday morning.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 10.9 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Manday	Tuesday	Wedneedey	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	4 19%	6 29%	2 10%	4 19%	1 5%	0 0%
9:00 AM	5 24%	7 33%	3 14%	5 24%	1 5%	0 0%
10:00 AM	5 24%	6 29%	3 14%	5 24%	1 5%	0 0%
11:00 AM	5 24%	6 29%	2 10%	3 14%	1 5%	0 0%
12:00 PM	4 19%	6 29%	3 14%	4 19%	1 5%	0 0%
1:00 PM	5 24%	7 33%	4 19%	5 24%	2 10%	0 0%
2:00 PM	3 14%	6 29%	4 19%	5 24%	2 10%	0 0%
3:00 PM	2 10%	5 24%	3 14%	4 19%	2 10%	0 0%
4:00 PM	0 0%	4 19%	1 5%	3 14%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	2 10%	3 14%	2 10%	3 14%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	2 10%	2 10%	1 5%	2 10%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	2 10%	2 10%	1 5%	2 10%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest on Tuesday at 9:00 AM and 1:00 PM when 33% of the rooms are in use. Since there are never more than one-third of the rooms scheduled there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 16.1 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Northwest Florida State College has 12.2 NSF of library/ study space per student FTE, fifth highest in the system and above the system average. This corresponds with the surplus in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Northwest Florida State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is above the system average. Average office size is slightly above the system average.

Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

PALM BEACH State College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1933
Local District	Palm Beach County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	5
Percentage of Non-White Students	63%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Allied Health Professions, Teacher Education Grade Specific
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, CollegeNet: Series 25Live

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)				
Upper Division	807.0			
Lower Division	20,323.6			
Total (Upper and Lower)	21,130.6			
Alternative/Distance Learning	4,234.3			

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	1,200			
Part-time	1,401			
Total	2,601			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	353			
Associate of Arts	3,622			
Associate of Science	681			
Certificate Programs	1,935			
Retention Rate	67%			
Completion Rate	58%			

Scheduling Procedures				
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized			
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized			
Primary Scheduler	Campus Academic site administrator			

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Service area includes both the wealthiest and poorest areas in the state
- Oldest public college in Florida

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites							
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building				
Belle Glade Campus	9	101,229	25				
Boca Raton Campus	13	217,525	29				
Lake Worth Campus	61	967,461	41				
Loxahatchee Groves Campus	1	47,958	3				
Palm Beach Gardens Campus	21	379,223	21				
Total	105	1,713,396	34				

414 State of Florida - OPPAGA 🔹 Review of the Capital Outlay Facilities Space of Florida's State College System

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages, with slight percentage deviations. Based on the original inspection date, 56% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in all space categories. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a space deficit in vocational laboratory, library/study, and office space. This approach yields a slight surplus in classroom space and a space balance in non-vocational laboratory space.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	104 42%	91 37%	110 45%	95 38%	21 9%	18 7%
9:00 AM	192 78%	188 76%	198 80%	189 77%	53 21%	57 23%
10:00 AM	184 74%	188 76%	191 77%	188 76%	55 22%	58 23%
11:00 AM	192 78%	201 81%	196 79%	195 79%	55 22%	60 24%
12:00 PM	195 79%	202 82%	196 79%	196 79%	47 19%	48 19%
1:00 PM	166 67%	172 70%	170 69%	171 69%	31 13%	27 11%
2:00 PM	156 63%	160 65%	162 66%	161 65%	23 9%	24 10%
3:00 PM	148 60%	151 61%	147 60%	150 61%	21 9%	18 7%
4:00 PM	88 36%	91 37%	87 35%	91 37%	18 7%	11 4%
5:00 PM	88 36%	94 38%	90 36%	95 38%	13 5%	4 2%
6:00 PM	185 75%	185 75%	190 77%	183 74%	19 8%	0 0%
7:00 PM	185 75%	177 72%	186 75%	174 70%	20 8%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms have heavy schedule use Monday through Thursday. Friday use is less, but above average. Saturday use exceeds Friday, which is unusual. The college noted that the typical student is likely to also be employed and balancing life and work schedules does not always allow the option of taking a course at any time of the day or week. Regardless, the utilization remains consistently high Monday through Thursday.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Palm Beach State College has 11.6 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 21.6 hours per week, highest in the system, but still below the 24 hours expectation of the Division of Florida Colleges. This accounts for the small space surplus in this space category using the alternative space needs approach.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	8 11%	12 17%	11 15%	12 17%	3 4%	2 3%
9:00 AM	23 32%	30 42%	29 41%	30 42%	11 15%	6 8%
10:00 AM	28 39%	29 41%	32 45%	29 41%	11 15%	6 8%
11:00 AM	34 48%	34 48%	36 51%	33 46%	10 14%	5 7%
12:00 PM	33 46%	44 62%	39 55%	43 61%	9 13%	5 7%
1:00 PM	28 39%	36 51%	33 46%	35 49%	7 10%	2 3%
2:00 PM	28 39%	36 51%	32 45%	30 42%	6 8%	1 1%
3:00 PM	33 46%	40 56%	31 44%	35 49%	8 11%	1 1%
4:00 PM	22 31%	30 42%	20 28%	28 39%	7 10%	0 0%
5:00 PM	20 28%	19 27%	19 27%	23 32%	4 6%	0 0%
6:00 PM	32 45%	36 51%	33 46%	32 45%	6 8%	0 0%
7:00 PM	29 41%	33 46%	33 46%	25 35%	6 8%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 62%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 17.2 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	22 39%	23 41%	21 38%	23 41%	18 32%	3 5%
9:00 AM	29 52%	30 54%	29 52%	29 52%	20 36%	4 7%
10:00 AM	29 52%	30 54%	28 50%	28 50%	20 36%	4 7%
11:00 AM	28 50%	28 50%	25 45%	27 48%	19 34%	4 7%
12:00 PM	17 30%	20 36%	17 30%	19 34%	8 14%	4 7%
1:00 PM	27 48%	29 52%	26 46%	27 48%	17 30%	3 5%
2:00 PM	27 48%	28 50%	25 45%	25 45%	17 30%	2 4%
3:00 PM	13 23%	17 30%	13 23%	13 23%	6 11%	2 4%
4:00 PM	8 14%	12 21%	9 16%	10 18%	3 5%	1 2%
5:00 PM	12 21%	16 29%	14 25%	14 25%	1 2%	1 2%
6:00 PM	23 41%	24 43%	26 46%	24 43%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	23 41%	25 45%	26 46%	25 45%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday with greater than typical use on Friday morning. Highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is Tuesday morning from 9:00 to 11:00, when 54% are in use.
VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 20.6 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Palm Beach State College has 4.6 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, fifth lowest in the system and significantly below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Palm Beach State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is fifth lowest in the system, significantly below the system average. Average office size is slightly below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

PASCO-HERNANDO STATE COLLEGE



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1967
Local District	Hernando County Pasco County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	94%
Number of Locations	6
Percentage of Non-White Students	34%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Allied Health Professions, Information Technology
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)			
Upper Division	367.0		
Lower Division	7,212.6		
Total (Upper and Lower)	7,579.6		
Alternative/Distance Learning	2,258.5		

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	485	
Part-time	360	
Total	845	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	150		
Associate of Arts	1,250		
Associate of Science	367		
Certificate Programs	644		
Retention Rate	66%		
Completion Rate	45%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)		
Primary Scheduler	Academic Affairs		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Highest rated Licensed Practical nurse program in the state
- Large dual enrollment population

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
East Campus (Dade City)	15	180,471	22
North Campus	12	121,534	21
Porter Campus	7	362,086	6
Spring Hill Campus	13	116,969	10
West Campus	37	351,374	30
Total	84	1,132,434	22

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages. There is a higher percentage of vocational laboratory space and a lower percentage of non-vocational laboratory space. Based on the original inspection date, 39% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in all space categories. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a space deficit in library/study space, a space surplus in classrooms, and a balance of space in all other space categories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	12 13%	10 11%	10 11%	10 11%	4 4%	0 0%
9:00 AM	45 48%	42 45%	47 50%	44 47%	14 15%	1 1%
10:00 AM	43 46%	43 46%	44 47%	45 48%	15 16%	1 1%
11:00 AM	55 59%	54 57%	57 61%	56 60%	12 13%	1 1%
12:00 PM	57 61%	64 68%	60 64%	67 71%	13 14%	0 0%
1:00 PM	37 39%	33 35%	39 41%	37 39%	10 11%	1 1%
2:00 PM	42 45%	41 44%	45 48%	44 47%	12 13%	1 1%
3:00 PM	37 39%	44 47%	39 41%	47 50%	7 7%	0 0%
4:00 PM	19 20%	35 37%	20 21%	33 35%	2 2%	0 0%
5:00 PM	37 39%	50 53%	36 38%	42 45%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	39 41%	50 53%	35 37%	43 46%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	33 35%	32 34%	27 29%	25 27%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest late morning and Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 71%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Pasco-Hernando State College has 11.3 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 14.9 hours per week, more than the system average, but lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	0 0%	1 6%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
9:00 AM	2 11%	2 11%	2 11%	1 6%	0 0%	0 0%
10:00 AM	3 17%	4 22%	2 11%	4 22%	0 0%	0 0%
11:00 AM	4 22%	6 33%	5 28%	7 39%	0 0%	0 0%
12:00 PM	6 33%	7 39%	8 44%	7 39%	0 0%	0 0%
1:00 PM	5 28%	4 22%	6 33%	3 17%	0 0%	0 0%
2:00 PM	6 33%	4 22%	7 39%	2 11%	0 0%	0 0%
3:00 PM	4 22%	3 17%	4 22%	5 28%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	2 11%	3 17%	2 11%	6 33%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	0 0%	2 11%	1 6%	6 33%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	0 0%	1 6%	0 0%	1 6%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	4 22%	8 44%	3 17%	4 22%	0 0%	0 0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Pasco-Hernando is one of only two colleges in the system with no scheduled Friday use of non-vocational laboratories. Heaviest use is Wednesday at 12:00 pm and Tuesday at 7:00 pm. High use of non-vocational laboratories in the evening is unusual.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 7.7 hours per week, sixth lowest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	15 28%	13 25%	14 26%	12 23%	8 15%	2 4%
9:00 AM	22 42%	24 45%	21 40%	24 45%	13 25%	2 4%
10:00 AM	23 43%	24 45%	21 40%	25 47%	13 25%	2 4%
11:00 AM	22 42%	26 49%	21 40%	27 51%	15 28%	2 4%
12:00 PM	21 40%	26 49%	22 42%	27 51%	11 21%	0 0%
1:00 PM	21 40%	22 42%	24 45%	22 42%	11 21%	2 4%
2:00 PM	26 49%	27 51%	28 53%	30 57%	11 21%	2 4%
3:00 PM	25 47%	25 47%	26 49%	29 55%	8 15%	2 4%
4:00 PM	19 36%	18 34%	21 40%	21 40%	6 11%	2 4%
5:00 PM	21 40%	19 36%	19 36%	20 38%	4 8%	1 2%
6:00 PM	23 43%	18 34%	21 40%	19 36%	1 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	17 32%	17 32%	17 32%	20 38%	1 2%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday. There is modest use on Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 57%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 27.2 hours per week, third highest in the system, and above the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Pasco-Hernando State College has 7.4 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly below the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Pasco-Hernando State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is below the system average. Average office size is also below the system average.

Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

PENSACOLA State College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1948
Local District	Escambia County Santa Rosa County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	91%
Number of Locations	6 Active, 1 Unused
Percentage of Non-White Students	32%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes, athletes only
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)		
Upper Division	411.2	
Lower Division	6,846.8	
Total (Upper and Lower)	7,258.0	
Alternative/Distance Learning	1,961.4	

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	589	
Part-time	322	
Total	911	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	153		
Associate of Arts	1,145		
Associate of Science	435		
Certificate Programs	537		
Retention Rate	62%		
Completion Rate	43%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized		
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized		
Primary Scheduler	Academic and Student Affairs		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Uses a skid pad at the Navy Base for truck driving courses
- Significant percentage of differently abled and military students
- Has the oldest educational buildings in the system

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites						
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building			
Century Center	3	30,530	17			
College Center	2	24,768	53			
Downtown Center	1	29,803	65			
Milton Campus	12	127,281	31			
Pensacola Campus	33	845,712	47			
South Santa Rosa Center	1	34,727	9			
Warrington Campus	8	209,441	39			
Total	60	1,302,262	41			

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages. There is a slightly higher percentage of vocational laboratory space and a slightly lower percentage of office space. Based on the original inspection date, 87% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in vocational laboratory and library/study space and a space surplus in classroom and office space. Non-vocational laboratory space is balanced. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a deficit in vocational laboratory space and a surplus in all other categories. SREF space standards generate more space than the alternative approach in all categories except vocational laboratory space. The alternative approach yields a greater space need in this category due to analysis based on course enrollments rather than NSF/COFTE.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	44 32%	42 30%	44 32%	42 30%	13 9%	2 1%
9:00 AM	80 58%	82 59%	79 57%	84 60%	17 12%	3 2%
10:00 AM	78 56%	80 58%	78 56%	81 58%	18 13%	3 2%
11:00 AM	70 50%	71 51%	70 50%	71 51%	18 13%	3 2%
12:00 PM	73 53%	80 58%	74 53%	79 57%	13 9%	2 1%
1:00 PM	47 34%	56 40%	51 37%	54 39%	7 5%	1 1%
2:00 PM	21 15%	29 21%	23 17%	27 19%	6 4%	1 1%
3:00 PM	9 6%	20 14%	11 8%	19 14%	0 0%	1 1%
4:00 PM	3 2%	13 9%	5 4%	12 9%	1 1%	1 1%
5:00 PM	12 9%	14 10%	10 7%	12 9%	1 1%	1 1%
6:00 PM	42 30%	43 31%	36 26%	32 23%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	38 27%	42 30%	32 23%	28 20%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 60%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Pensacola State College has 18.3 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, above the system average and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 8.6 hours per week, less than the system average, and lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

8:00 AM		•	weanesday	Inursday	Friday	Saturday
	11 24%	9 20%	11 24%	9 20%	4 9%	0 0%
9:00 AM	14 31%	16 36%	16 36%	16 36%	5 11%	0 0%
10:00 AM	13 29%	16 36%	15 33%	15 33%	5 11%	0 0%
11:00 AM	17 38%	16 36%	19 42%	14 31%	5 11%	0 0%
12:00 PM	20 44%	19 42%	22 49%	17 38%	4 9%	0 0%
1:00 PM	21 47%	19 42%	18 40%	16 36%	2 4%	0 0%
2:00 PM	21 47%	20 44%	19 42%	13 29%	2 4%	0 0%
3:00 PM	11 24%	12 27%	14 31%	6 13%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	7 16%	8 18%	7 16%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	2 4%	3 7%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	8 18%	8 18%	7 16%	8 18%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	12 27%	9 20%	10 22%	12 27%	0 0%	0 0%

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 49%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 11.5 hours per week, the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	13 21%	17 28%	16 26%	17 28%	6 10%	0 0%
9:00 AM	25 41%	31 51%	27 44%	31 51%	10 16%	0 0%
10:00 AM	25 41%	32 52%	27 44%	32 52%	8 13%	0 0%
11:00 AM	24 39%	25 41%	26 43%	25 41%	6 10%	0 0%
12:00 PM	26 43%	24 39%	25 41%	24 39%	7 11%	0 0%
1:00 PM	27 44%	31 51%	26 43%	28 46%	8 13%	1 2%
2:00 PM	22 36%	27 44%	21 34%	26 43%	6 10%	1 2%
3:00 PM	16 26%	21 34%	18 30%	18 30%	4 7%	1 2%
4:00 PM	7 11%	14 23%	9 15%	13 21%	2 3%	1 2%
5:00 PM	11 18%	16 26%	14 23%	15 25%	2 3%	0 0%
6:00 PM	19 31%	25 41%	20 33%	19 31%	4 7%	0 0%
7:00 PM	21 34%	26 43%	19 31%	21 34%	3 5%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently through the day and evening Monday through Thursday. Highest scheduled use is at 10:00 AM Monday and Thursday when 52% are scheduled. The percentage of use in late afternoon is higher than typical.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 26.8 hours per week, fourth highest in the system, and above the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Pensacola State College has 9.4 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly above the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Pensacola State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is above the system average. Average office size is smallest in the system, significantly below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

POLK STATE College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1964
Local District	Polk County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	97%
Number of Locations	6
Percentage of Non-White Students	51%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Business Administration & Management, Nursing, Criminal Justice & Corrections, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)		
Upper Division	761.0	
Lower Division	5,844.4	
Total (Upper and Lower)	6,605.4	
Alternative/Distance Learning	2,331.7	

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	491	
Part-time	569	
Total	1,060	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	450		
Associate of Arts	1,314		
Associate of Science	425		
Certificate Programs	370		
Retention Rate	62%		
Completion Rate	29%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized		
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized		
Primary Scheduler	Classrooms and Teaching Laboratories for credit and non-credit academic programs are scheduled by the academic departments and the Academic Deans. Non-Academic facility scheduling (events, community meetings, etc.) are scheduled by the Facilities Department.		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Charter school on campus
- Foundation focuses on funding scholarships
- Typical student enrollment is eight credit hours

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites					
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building		
Airside Lakeland Center	2	44,015			
Clear Springs Adv. Technology Center	1	47,125	8		
Lake Wales	1	16,143	92		
Lakeland Campus	11	330,459	17		
Winter Haven Campus	21	511,457	19		
Total	36	949,199	34		

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus is similar to the system averages. There is a higher percentage of classroom space and a slightly lower percentage of office space. Based on the original inspection date, 50% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)


SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in vocational laboratory, non-vocational laboratory, and library/study space. Classroom and office space is in surplus. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in all space categories, with the exception of library/study space which is balanced.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE - 3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	22 15%	31 22%	24 17%	30 21%	4 3%	1 1%
9:00 AM	56 39%	63 44%	61 42%	62 43%	13 9%	9 6%
10:00 AM	74 51%	78 54%	79 55%	77 53%	13 9%	9 6%
11:00 AM	61 42%	67 47%	63 44%	64 44%	13 9%	8 6%
12:00 PM	61 42%	58 40%	62 43%	57 40%	5 3%	2 1%
1:00 PM	64 44%	66 46%	66 46%	66 46%	4 3%	3 2%
2:00 PM	32 22%	37 26%	37 26%	39 27%	4 3%	3 2%
3:00 PM	26 18%	27 19%	31 22%	29 20%	4 3%	3 2%
4:00 PM	25 17%	25 17%	28 19%	26 18%	4 3%	1 1%
5:00 PM	20 14%	21 15%	25 17%	23 16%	2 1%	1 1%
6:00 PM	52 36%	55 38%	59 41%	45 31%	1 1%	1 1%
7:00 PM	52 36%	52 36%	55 38%	43 30%	1 1%	1 1%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest at 10:00 AM, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 55%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Polk State College has 19.3 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, above the system average and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 9.4 hours per week, less than the system average, and lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	4 12%	6 18%	4 12%	5 15%	0 0%	1 3%
9:00 AM	10 29%	8 24%	10 29%	8 24%	2 6%	1 3%
10:00 AM	18 53%	15 44%	18 53%	12 35%	4 12%	1 3%
11:00 AM	14 41%	15 44%	14 41%	12 35%	4 12%	1 3%
12:00 PM	11 32%	12 35%	13 38%	10 29%	7 21%	0 0%
1:00 PM	16 47%	15 44%	18 53%	13 38%	6 18%	0 0%
2:00 PM	12 35%	14 41%	14 41%	10 29%	4 12%	0 0%
3:00 PM	9 26%	13 38%	10 29%	9 26%	3 9%	0 0%
4:00 PM	7 21%	9 26%	8 24%	6 18%	2 6%	0 0%
5:00 PM	4 12%	3 9%	5 15%	3 9%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	7 21%	6 18%	6 18%	5 15%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	9 26%	8 24%	6 18%	7 21%	0 0%	0 0%

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory use is heaviest mid-morning through early afternoon, a typical college use pattern.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 11.1 hours per week, close to the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	
8:00 AM	6 19%	2 6%	6 19%	2 6%	1 3%	3 9%	
9:00 AM	7 22%	7 22%	8 25%	7 22%	1 3%	3 9%	
10:00 AM	7 22%	8 25%	8 25%	8 25%	1 3%	3 9%	
11:00 AM	6 19%	6 19%	7 22%	6 19%	1 3%	3 9%	
12:00 PM	5 16%	5 16%	6 19%	5 16%	1 3%	3 9%	
1:00 PM	4 13%	7 22%	5 16%	6 19%	1 3%	3 9%	
2:00 PM	4 13%	5 16%	6 19%	5 16%	1 3%	3 9%	
3:00 PM	3 9%	4 13%	5 16%	3 9%	1 3%	3 9%	
4:00 PM	3 9%	3 9%	5 16%	2 6%	1 3%	1 3%	
5:00 PM	3 9%	3 9%	4 13%	2 6%	0 0%	0 0%	
6:00 PM	3 9%	6 19%	5 16%	4 13%	0 0%	0 0%	
7:00 PM	2 6%	5 16%	4 13%	4 13%	0 0%	0 0%	
	0%				100%		

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often in the morning Monday through Thursday. With highest scheduled use at 25%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 6.7 hours per week, fourth lowest in the system.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Polk State College has 7.9 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly below the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Polk State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is below the system average. Average office size is slightly above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

ST. JOHNS RIVER State College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1958
Local District	Clay County Putnam County St. Johns County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	4
Percentage of Non-White Students	27%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Allied Health Professions, Drama & Theater Arts
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)					
Upper Division	213.4				
Lower Division	4,375.7				
Total (Upper and Lower)	4,589.1				
Alternative/Distance Learning	1,540.0				

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	346			
Part-time	379			
Total	725			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)					
Bachelors	104				
Associate of Arts	704				
Associate of Science	268				
Certificate Programs	306				
Retention Rate	63%				
Completion Rate	59%				

Scheduling Procedures						
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)					
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)					
Primary Scheduler	Academic Affairs					

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Three campuses which are very different and in effect three very small colleges
- Provides only community meeting spaces in Putnam/Clay counties
- Florida School of the Arts program is the only one in the state college system

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites									
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building						
Orange Park Campus	14	217,991	21						
Palatka Campus	25	248,334	34						
St. Augustine Campus	12	118,378	17						
Workforce Training Campus	6	38,019	1						
Total	57	622,722	24						

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus mirrors the system averages. Based on the original inspection date, 57% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in all space categories with the exception of office space, which is balanced. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a surplus in all space categories, with the exception of library/study space. The difference between the two approaches with respect to classroom and laboratory space is due to analysis based on course enrollments in the alternative approach rather than NSF/ COFTE in the SREF standards approach.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	15 21%	10 14%	15 21%	11 16%	14 20%	0 0%
9:00 AM	32 46%	48 69%	33 47%	47 67%	30 43%	0 0%
10:00 AM	43 61%	59 84%	42 60%	58 83%	36 51%	0 0%
11:00 AM	54 77%	47 67%	52 74%	45 64%	47 67%	0 0%
12:00 PM	38 54%	54 77%	38 54%	52 74%	15 21%	0 0%
1:00 PM	37 53%	46 66%	38 54%	42 60%	2 3%	0 0%
2:00 PM	16 23%	22 31%	16 23%	19 27%	2 3%	0 0%
3:00 PM	6 9%	13 19%	8 11%	11 16%	2 3%	0 0%
4:00 PM	7 10%	11 16%	9 13%	11 16%	2 3%	0 0%
5:00 PM	4 6%	6 9%	5 7%	5 7%	1 1%	0 0%
6:00 PM	28 40%	38 54%	34 49%	35 50%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	28 40%	38 54%	34 49%	35 50%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classroom scheduled use is heaviest on Tuesday morning at 10:00 AM when 84% of the rooms are in use. There is high utilization in the morning, which could be perceived as a deficit of classroom space. However, there is opportunity in the afternoon to increase utilization. Friday use is highest in the system.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

St. Johns River State College has 13.3 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and at the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 13.1 hours per week, more than the system average, but lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME | FALL 2018

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	1 3%	2 6%	1 3%	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%
9:00 AM	5 15%	10 29%	6 18%	9 26%	3 9%	0 0%
10:00 AM	11 32%	15 44%	11 32%	15 44%	8 24%	0 0%
11:00 AM	6 18%	13 38%	6 18%	14 41%	6 18%	0 0%
12:00 PM	15 44%	19 56%	16 47%	16 47%	4 12%	0 0%
1:00 PM	19 56%	18 53%	19 56%	16 47%	1 3%	0 0%
2:00 PM	17 50%	17 50%	20 59%	17 50%	2 6%	0 0%
3:00 PM	11 32%	10 29%	10 29%	11 32%	1 3%	0 0%
4:00 PM	5 15%	5 15%	5 15%	7 21%	0 0%	1 3%
5:00 PM	6 18%	4 12%	6 18%	4 12%	0 0%	1 3%
6:00 PM	6 18%	5 15%	6 18%	4 12%	0 0%	1 3%
7:00 PM	7 21%	5 15%	6 18%	3 9%	0 0%	0 0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest in the early afternoon. This is not typical college scheduling, but pairs well with heavy morning classroom use for student schedules. St. Johns River is tied with one other college for third highest Friday use.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 8.5 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	
8:00 AM	4 16%	4 16%	5 20%	2 8%	3 12%	0 0%	
9:00 AM	10 40%	11 44%	11 44%	9 36%	6 24%	2 8%	
10:00 AM	11 44%	14 56%	13 52%	12 48%	7 28%	2 8%	
11:00 AM	11 44%	13 52%	15 60%	11 44%	9 36%	2 8%	
12:00 PM	12 48%	10 40%	10 40%	8 32%	7 28%	2 8%	
1:00 PM	12 48%	11 44%	11 44%	9 36%	5 20%	2 8%	
2:00 PM	15 60%	12 48%	14 56%	11 44%	4 16%	2 8%	
3:00 PM	12 48%	12 48%	12 48%	12 48%	4 16%	2 8%	
4:00 PM	6 24%	9 36%	7 28%	9 36%	1 4%	2 8%	
5:00 PM	2 8%	2 8%	1 4%	3 12%	0 0%	2 8%	
6:00 PM	2 8%	7 28%	3 12%	8 32%	0 0%	1 4%	
7:00 PM	1 4%	7 28%	2 8%	8 32%	0 0%	0 0%	
	0%				100%		

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently through the day Monday through Thursday, and also Tuesday and Thursday evenings. The greatest percentage of rooms scheduled is 60% on Wednesday morning and Monday afternoon. Scheduled use on Friday is second highest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 24.3 hours per week, sixth highest in the system, and above the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

St. Johns River State College has 6.1 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

St. Johns River State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is below the system average. Average office size is second smallest in the system, significantly below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

ST. PETERSBURG College





BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1927
Local District	Pinellas County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	95%
Number of Locations	12
Percentage of Non-White Students	38.9%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Information Technology, Allied Health & Medical Assisting Services
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)				
Upper Division	2,712.9			
Lower Division	15,888.2			
Total (Upper and Lower)	18,601.1			
Alternative/Distance Learning	8,965.0			

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	1,324			
Part-time	1,498			
Total	2,822			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	1,347			
Associate of Arts	3,687			
Associate of Science	1,108			
Certificate Programs	1,369			
Retention Rate	66%			
Completion Rate	48%			

Scheduling Procedures				
Classrooms	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)			
Teaching Laboratories	Decentralized (i.e., Department or unit level)			
Primary Scheduler	Deans			

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Provides space for two partners in health education, as well as The Pinellas County Economic Development, Pinellas Career Source, Juvenile Welfare Board, and The Florida Orchestra and American Stage
- Long wait list for nursing program

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Allstate Center	12	172,170	25
Bay Pines STEM Center	1	12,569	3
Clearwater Campus	20	360,384	33
Downtown Center	2	287,956	53
EpiCenter	4	299,935	21
Fire Training Center	7	20,608	21
Health Education Center	13	253,811	32
Midtown Center	3	76,352	20
Seminole Campus	15	250,333	14
St Petersburg Gibbs Campus	22	469,573	41
Tarpon Springs Campus	21	315,231	32
Veterinary Technology Center	1	32,514	9
Total	122	2,551,436	29

484 State of Florida - OPPAGA 🔹 Review of the Capital Outlay Facilities Space of Florida's State College System

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with more office space and less vocational lab space. Based on the original inspection date, 56% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories. SREF standards generate a space need in vocational laboratory, non-vocational laboratory, and library/study space. Both approaches generate a surplus in classroom and office space, with the alternative approach generating a surplus in all space categories.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	62 24%	66 26%	63 24%	70 27%	14 5%	11 4%
9:00 AM	142 55%	155 60%	144 56%	153 59%	38 15%	15 6%
10:00 AM	132 51%	148 57%	137 53%	147 57%	40 16%	16 6%
11:00 AM	139 54%	156 60%	144 56%	149 58%	39 15%	17 7%
12:00 PM	152 59%	134 52%	158 61%	127 49%	27 10%	15 6%
1:00 PM	99 38%	19 7%	102 40%	23 9%	17 7%	12 5%
2:00 PM	91 35%	100 39%	88 34%	98 38%	17 7%	11 4%
3:00 PM	90 35%	107 41%	84 33%	106 41%	19 7%	9 3%
4:00 PM	48 19%	49 19%	39 15%	52 20%	17 7%	6 2%
5:00 PM	67 26%	71 28%	62 24%	71 28%	10 4%	5 2%
6:00 PM	82 32%	82 32%	85 33%	77 30%	7 3%	4 2%
7:00 PM	79 31%	82 32%	85 33%	76 29%	6 2%	3 1%
	0%	6			100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 61%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

St. Petersburg College has 14.1 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, slightly below the system average and slightly above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 9.6 hours per week, less than the system average, and lower than the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	11 12%	13 15%	12 13%	13 15%	2 2%	3 3%
9:00 AM	28 31%	32 36%	32 36%	35 39%	5 6%	3 3%
10:00 AM	29 33%	31 35%	32 36%	36 40%	5 6%	4 4%
11:00 AM	30 34%	29 33%	34 38%	31 35%	6 7%	3 3%
12:00 PM	30 34%	25 28%	31 35%	25 28%	6 7%	3 3%
1:00 PM	27 30%	7 8%	29 33%	4 4%	4 4%	3 3%
2:00 PM	35 39%	33 37%	34 38%	32 36%	3 3%	3 3%
3:00 PM	35 39%	34 38%	32 36%	34 38%	2 2%	3 3%
4:00 PM	24 27%	29 33%	23 26%	30 34%	3 3%	2 2%
5:00 PM	13 15%	16 18%	11 12%	15 17%	1 1%	0 0%
6:00 PM	19 21%	19 21%	14 16%	19 21%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	30 34%	27 30%	24 27%	21 24%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 40%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 9.7 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	20 24%	19 23%	21 26%	22 27%	10 12%	8 10%
9:00 AM	27 33%	26 32%	29 35%	27 33%	12 15%	8 10%
10:00 AM	24 29%	24 29%	30 37%	28 34%	13 16%	8 10%
11:00 AM	22 27%	26 32%	24 29%	24 29%	12 15%	8 10%
12:00 PM	19 23%	20 24%	23 28%	23 28%	11 13%	8 10%
1:00 PM	23 28%	15 18%	22 27%	18 22%	10 12%	7 9%
2:00 PM	23 28%	17 21%	18 22%	17 21%	10 12%	7 9%
3:00 PM	23 28%	22 27%	19 23%	21 26%	10 12%	7 9%
4:00 PM	18 22%	19 23%	13 16%	14 17%	8 10%	6 7%
5:00 PM	13 16%	16 20%	8 10%	13 16%	3 4%	3 4%
6:00 PM	13 16%	20 24%	14 17%	19 23%	3 4%	1 1%
7:00 PM	17 21%	23 28%	15 18%	18 22%	3 4%	1 1%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 37% on Wednesday morning at 10:00 AM. St. Petersburg is tied with one other college for third highest scheduled use of vocational laboratories on Saturday.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 15 hours per week, slightly less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

St. Petersburg College

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE: St. Petersburg College has 8.1 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, at the system average.
OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

St. Petersburg College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is third lowest in the system, significantly below the system average. Average office size is third largest in the system, significantly above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

SANTA FE College

S_F Santa Fe College

BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1966
Local District	Alachua County Bradford County
Aspen Ranking	2015 Winner 2013 Finalist
Job Placement Rate	97%
Number of Locations	7
Percentage of Non-White Students	40%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Allied Health Professions, Business Administration & Management, Health & Medical Administrative Services
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)		
Upper Division	472.0	
Lower Division	10,612.3	
Total (Upper and Lower)	11,084.3	
Alternative/Distance Learning	2,619.6	

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	714	
Part-time	503	
Total	1,217	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	228		
Associate of Arts	2,301		
Associate of Science	554		
Certificate Programs	351		
Retention Rate	70%		
Completion Rate	70%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized		
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized		
Primary Scheduler	Institutional Research—Coordinator of Curriculum and Scheduling		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Has an on-campus teaching zoo, accredited by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, in support of the zoo animal technology program
- Provides developmental education to University of Florida athletes on University of Florida campus
- University transfer programs draw half of enrollment from outside district

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
Andrews Center	3	26,188	27
Blount Center	3	38,354	47
Davis Center	1	10,000	17
Kirkpatrick Institute	6	54,829	25
Northwest Campus	51	980,845	33
Perry Center for Emerging Technologies	1	29,708	10
Watson Center	2	20,000	15
Total	67	1,159,924	32

SUMMARY NOTE:

The Andrews Center Main and Cultural Buildings are over 100 years old. The date indicated is the date of acquisition. A significant number of buildings on the Northwest Campus are over 40 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with more laboratory space and less office and library/study space. Based on the original inspection date, 68% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories. SREF standards generate a space need in all space categories. The alternative approach yields a surplus in classroom and non-vocational laboratory space and a deficit in the other categories. The difference between the two approaches with respect to classroom and laboratory space is due to analysis based on course enrollments in the alternative approach rather than NSF/ COFTE in the SREF standards approach.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	48 25%	61 32%	48 25%	59 31%	20 11%	0 0%
9:00 AM	108 57%	124 65%	108 57%	124 65%	29 15%	2 1%
10:00 AM	123 65%	124 65%	123 65%	123 65%	38 20%	2 1%
11:00 AM	122 64%	120 63%	121 64%	118 62%	37 19%	2 1%
12:00 PM	109 57%	119 63%	109 57%	118 62%	32 17%	2 1%
1:00 PM	97 51%	110 58%	96 51%	110 58%	22 12%	4 2%
2:00 PM	76 40%	88 46%	78 41%	87 46%	8 4%	4 2%
3:00 PM	78 41%	87 46%	79 42%	82 43%	5 3%	4 2%
4:00 PM	36 19%	39 21%	39 21%	36 19%	1 1%	1 1%
5:00 PM	35 18%	45 24%	40 21%	36 19%	0 0%	1 1%
6:00 PM	61 32%	69 36%	61 32%	52 27%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	44 23%	51 27%	42 22%	38 20%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms collegewide are scheduled heaviest in the morning. The highest scheduled use at any one time is 65%. The college noted that there is a lack of availability during peak times at their central locations due to the small size of some rooms. Outlying education centers have more availability.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Santa Fe College has 12.1 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 17.1 hours per week, fifth highest in the system, but still below the 24 hours expectation of the Division of Florida Colleges.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	8 17%	8 17%	10 21%	7 15%	2 4%	0 0%
9:00 AM	23 49%	30 64%	23 49%	29 62%	7 15%	0 0%
10:00 AM	26 55%	31 66%	25 53%	29 62%	7 15%	1 2%
11:00 AM	27 57%	33 70%	27 57%	31 66%	6 13%	1 2%
12:00 PM	29 62%	35 74%	29 62%	32 68%	5 11%	1 2%
1:00 PM	27 57%	28 60%	28 60%	24 51%	5 11%	1 2%
2:00 PM	31 66%	28 60%	32 68%	25 53%	4 9%	1 2%
3:00 PM	26 55%	31 66%	28 60%	27 57%	3 6%	1 2%
4:00 PM	16 34%	18 38%	20 43%	16 34%	2 4%	0 0%
5:00 PM	9 19%	11 23%	10 21%	11 23%	1 2%	0 0%
6:00 PM	10 21%	16 34%	11 23%	16 34%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	11 23%	13 28%	13 28%	13 28%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled heaviest morning through mid-afternoon Monday through Thursday, a typical college pattern.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 19.8 hours per week, second highest in the system, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCH	IEDULED VOCATIONAI	L LABORATORIES USE	BY DAY AND TIME F	ALL 2018	
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	19 27%	19 27%	17 24%	19 27%	9 13%	1 1%
9:00 AM	32 46%	32 46%	31 44%	30 43%	12 17%	1 1%
10:00 AM	31 44%	33 47%	31 44%	28 40%	11 16%	1 1%
11:00 AM	34 49%	32 46%	32 46%	26 37%	12 17%	1 1%
12:00 PM	30 43%	31 44%	26 37%	23 33%	10 14%	1 1%
1:00 PM	25 36%	27 39%	26 37%	23 33%	11 16%	1 1%
2:00 PM	23 33%	22 31%	24 34%	20 29%	7 10%	1 1%
3:00 PM	19 27%	20 29%	20 29%	18 26%	5 7%	1 1%
4:00 PM	9 13%	11 16%	9 13%	8 11%	4 6%	1 1%
5:00 PM	6 9%	6 9%	7 10%	4 6%	1 1%	0 0%
6:00 PM	14 20%	17 24%	14 20%	14 20%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	13 19%	17 24%	14 20%	14 20%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM with moderate use in the evening. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled is Monday at 11:00, when 49% are in use. Since there are never more than half of the rooms scheduled there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 25.3 hours per week, more than the system average, and above the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Santa Fe College has 4.3 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, third lowest in the system and significantly below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Santa Fe College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is slightly below the system average. Average office size is also below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

SEMINOLE State College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1965
Local District	Seminole County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	6
Percentage of Non-White Students	49%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Management Information Systems, Computer Information Systems, Design & Applied Arts, Construction Management
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, we have a internally developed system for room assignment called TIM. We also use a large Excel workbook.

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)		
Upper Division	970.2	
Lower Division	11,887.9	
Total (Upper and Lower)	12,858.1	
Alternative/Distance Learning	4,331.1	

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	709	
Part-time	879	
Total	1,588	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	364		
Associate of Arts	2,126		
Associate of Science	722		
Certificate Programs	2,485		
Retention Rate	69%		
Completion Rate	61%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)		
Teaching Laboratories	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)		
Primary Scheduler	Our Facilities Department has the primary responsibility for space allocation and the Course & Curriculum Development Department is responsible for the efficient scheduling of courses.		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Program requirements are distributed across four campuses, which requires students to commute between sites
- Offers Mechatronics in collaboration with Universal Studios
- Offers shuttle service between four campuses

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites					
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building		
Altamonte Springs Campus	5	204,158	10		
Geneva Center	4	5,524	20		
Heathrow Campus	1	65,791	13		
Lee Campus @ Oviedo	6	131,836	19		
Port of Sanford	1	10,500	22		
Sanford/Lake Mary Campus	33	1,020,339	30		
Total	50	1,438,148	25		

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





SUMMARY NOTE:

The percentage by space type on campus mirrors the system averages. Based on the original inspection date, 47% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories. SREF standards generate a space need in all space categories, with office space close to balanced. The alternative approach yields a surplus in classroom and office space and a deficit in the other categories. The difference between the two approaches with respect to classroom and laboratory space is due to analysis based on course enrollments in the alternative approach rather than NSF/COFTE in the SREF standards approach.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	39 25%	36 23%	39 25%	34 22%	5 3%	2 1%
9:00 AM	99 63%	98 62%	100 64%	96 61%	34 22%	9 6%
10:00 AM	97 62%	99 63%	98 62%	96 61%	35 22%	9 6%
11:00 AM	101 64%	93 59%	101 64%	90 57%	35 22%	9 6%
12:00 PM	104 66%	93 59%	102 65%	90 57%	21 13%	5 3%
1:00 PM	67 43%	63 40%	66 42%	59 38%	10 6%	2 1%
2:00 PM	67 43%	64 41%	61 39%	62 39%	9 6%	2 1%
3:00 PM	56 36%	54 34%	51 32%	53 34%	8 5%	1 1%
4:00 PM	33 21%	28 18%	29 18%	29 18%	6 4%	1 1%
5:00 PM	19 12%	18 11%	19 12%	17 11%	1 1%	0 0%
6:00 PM	70 45%	67 43%	68 43%	62 39%	3 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	69 44%	66 42%	68 43%	59 38%	3 2%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 66%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Seminole State College has 11.8 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 13.6 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	10 15%	14 22%	10 15%	14 22%	1 2%	0 0%
9:00 AM	33 51%	36 55%	37 57%	36 55%	10 15%	4 6%
10:00 AM	37 57%	39 60%	42 65%	39 60%	10 15%	4 6%
11:00 AM	41 63%	42 65%	46 71%	42 65%	10 15%	4 6%
12:00 PM	40 62%	43 66%	45 69%	42 65%	6 9%	2 3%
1:00 PM	20 31%	23 35%	17 26%	24 37%	2 3%	0 0%
2:00 PM	22 34%	20 31%	21 32%	18 28%	1 2%	0 0%
3:00 PM	19 29%	20 31%	18 28%	18 28%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	12 18%	15 23%	14 22%	12 18%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	7 11%	9 14%	6 9%	6 9%	1 2%	0 0%
6:00 PM	19 29%	23 35%	20 31%	18 28%	3 5%	0 0%
7:00 PM	19 29%	24 37%	20 31%	18 28%	3 5%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory use of 71% on Wednesday at 11:00 am is higher than typical for many colleges in the system.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 19.6 hours per week, third highest in the system, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	11 17%	8 12%	10 15%	9 14%	2 3%	2 3%
9:00 AM	24 37%	23 35%	25 38%	25 38%	6 9%	4 6%
10:00 AM	28 43%	24 37%	28 43%	26 40%	6 9%	4 6%
11:00 AM	25 38%	27 42%	26 40%	26 40%	6 9%	4 6%
12:00 PM	26 40%	23 35%	24 37%	26 40%	4 6%	3 5%
1:00 PM	22 34%	24 37%	24 37%	23 35%	6 9%	3 5%
2:00 PM	23 35%	26 40%	24 37%	25 38%	6 9%	3 5%
3:00 PM	19 29%	21 32%	23 35%	18 28%	6 9%	2 3%
4:00 PM	10 15%	13 20%	14 22%	10 15%	2 3%	2 3%
5:00 PM	5 8%	8 12%	5 8%	6 9%	2 3%	1 2%
6:00 PM	19 29%	22 34%	21 32%	16 25%	1 2%	1 2%
7:00 PM	17 26%	21 32%	22 34%	16 25%	1 2%	1 2%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the day and evening Monday through Thursday. Highest scheduled use is at 10:00 AM Monday and Wednesday when 43% of the rooms are in use. Since there are never more than half of the rooms scheduled there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 21.8 hours per week, more than the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Seminole State College has 5.2 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, sixth lowest in the system and significantly below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Seminole State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is slightly below the system average. Average office size is also slightly below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

SOUTH FLORIDA State College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1965
Local District	DeSoto County Hardee County Highlands County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	6
Percentage of Non-White Students	52%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes, through Foundation
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Teacher Education Grade Specific, Allied Health Professions
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)			
Upper Division	114.9		
Lower Division	2,256.4		
Total (Upper and Lower) 2,371.3			
Alternative/Distance Learning	456.8		

Number of Employees (2018)		
Full-time	261	
Part-time	205	
Total	466	

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)			
Bachelors	63		
Associate of Arts	303		
Associate of Science	98		
Certificate Programs	348		
Retention Rate	71%		
Completion Rate	75%		

Scheduling Procedures			
Classrooms	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)		
Teaching Laboratories	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)		
Primary Scheduler	Registrar		

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Rural location impedes ability to have large course section sizes
- Consistently in the Aspen Institute Recognition Top 50
- Major community internet provider due to rural location
- Partnership with Florida Polytechnic requires high level low enrollment courses

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
DeSoto Campus	2	33,337	16
Hardee Campus	3	36,509	16
Highlands Campus	54	501,893	37
Hotel Jacaranda	1	10,010	93
Lake Placid Center	5	65,055	60
Teacherage	1	2,730	75
Total	66	649,534	38

526 State of Florida - OPPAGA 🛛 Review of the Capital Outlay Facilities Space of Florida's State College System

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)



Less than **0.5%** Age Unknown



SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with more vocational laboratory space, and less office and library/study space. Based on the original inspection date, 67% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

Both the SREF space standards and the alternative space needs analysis approach generate space surpluses in all categories except library/study space.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	10 13%	11 14%	10 13%	10 13%	4 5%	2 3%
9:00 AM	22 29%	25 32%	22 29%	25 32%	9 12%	2 3%
10:00 AM	22 29%	25 32%	21 27%	24 31%	9 12%	2 3%
11:00 AM	21 27%	20 26%	20 26%	18 23%	9 12%	2 3%
12:00 PM	24 31%	22 29%	22 29%	22 29%	12 16%	2 3%
1:00 PM	15 19%	18 23%	14 18%	18 23%	5 6%	0 0%
2:00 PM	20 26%	21 27%	19 25%	21 27%	6 8%	0 0%
3:00 PM	16 21%	9 12%	15 19%	10 13%	4 5%	0 0%
4:00 PM	7 9%	5 6%	9 12%	3 4%	1 1%	0 0%
5:00 PM	18 23%	10 13%	19 25%	13 17%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	16 21%	15 19%	21 27%	16 21%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	14 18%	18 23%	20 26%	18 23%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled fairly consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. However, scheduled classroom use is low. The greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 32%. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.
CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

South Florida State College has 28.8 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, second highest in the system and significantly above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 5 hours per week, lowest in the system.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHED	ULED NON-VOCATIO	NAL LABORATORIES U	ISE BY DAY AND TIME	FALL 2018	
	Mondov	Tuesday	Wedneedey	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
0.00.444	Monday	luesday	wednesday	nursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	2 6%	1 3%	1 3%	010%	010%	010%
9:00 AM	5 14%	5 14%	4 11%	5 14%	1 3%	0 0%
10:00 AM	5 14%	5 14%	3 9%	5 14%	1 3%	0 0%
11:00 AM	4 11%	5 14%	2 6%	4 11%	1 3%	0 0%
12:00 PM	5 14%	4 11%	3 9%	3 9%	2 6%	0 0%
1:00 PM	8 23%	9 26%	8 23%	7 20%	1 3%	0 0%
2:00 PM	8 23%	11 31%	8 23%	11 31%	1 3%	0 0%
3:00 PM	2 6%	7 20%	2 6%	6 17%	1 3%	0 0%
4:00 PM	5 14%	8 23%	3 9%	7 20%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	4 11%	5 14%	1 3%	5 14%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	3 9%	6 17%	0 0%	4 11%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	5 14%	7 20%	3 9%	5 14%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory scheduled use is consistent throughout the day and evening Monday through Thursday, but never exceeds 31% of the rooms.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 4.7 hours per week, lowest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	
8:00 AM	14 52%	16 59%	15 56%	16 59%	15 56%	0 0%	
9:00 AM	15 56%	18 67%	15 56%	18 67%	16 59%	2 7%	
10:00 AM	15 56%	16 59%	15 56%	16 59%	16 59%	2 7%	
11:00 AM	6 22%	6 22%	7 26%	7 26%	7 26%	2 7%	
12:00 PM	14 52%	16 59%	15 56%	15 56%	17 63%	2 7%	
1:00 PM	15 56%	18 67%	17 63%	17 63%	16 59%	1 4%	
2:00 PM	15 56%	17 63%	17 63%	16 59%	16 59%	0 0%	
3:00 PM	5 19%	7 26%	6 22%	7 26%	4 15%	0 0%	
4:00 PM	3 11%	3 11%	3 11%	3 11%	2 7%	0 0%	
5:00 PM	3 11%	2 7%	2 7%	3 11%	0 0%	0 0%	
6:00 PM	4 15%	4 15%	3 11%	5 19%	2 7%	0 0%	
7:00 PM	4 15%	4 15%	3 11%	5 19%	2 7%	0 0%	
	0%	0%					

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 67%. Friday use consistent with the remainder of the week is unusual. It is typically much lower, but at South Florida State the vocational laboratory use is the highest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 17.5 hours per week, the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

South Florida State College has 7.8 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly below the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

South Florida State College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is above the system average. Average office size is also above the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

STATE COLLEGE OF FLORIDA, MANATEE-SARASOTA



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1957
Local District	Manatee County Sarasota County
Aspen Ranking	NA
Job Placement Rate	96%
Number of Locations	3
Percentage of Non-White Students	32%
On-Campus Housing Offered	No
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Allied Health & Medical Assisting Services, Computer Information Systems, Health & Medical Administrative Services
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, SchoolDude, Ad Astra (in negotiation)

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)						
Upper Division	431.8					
Lower Division	6,252.0					
Total (Upper and Lower)	6,683.8					
Alternative/Distance Learning	2,524.1					

Number of Employees (2018)					
Full-time	459				
Part-time	367				
Total 826					

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)						
Bachelors	277					
Associate of Arts	1,192					
Associate of Science	306					
Certificate Programs	90					
Retention Rate	67%					
Completion Rate	50%					

Scheduling Procedures						
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized					
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized					
Primary Scheduler	Academic Affairs					

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Very strong military and veteran presence
- Reorganizing to collegewide departmental system

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites			
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building
SCF Bradenton Campus	39	628,012	31
SCF Lakewood Ranch Campus	4	80,561	12
SCF Venice Campus	18	166,456	27
Total	61	875,029	29

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM - AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (ACCORDING TO ORIGINAL INSPECTION DATE) (ACCORDING TO ORIGINAL INSPECTION DATE) Less than **0.5%** Age Unknown 14% 16% 16% 23% Under 10 Years 10 to 24 Years 20% 25 to 49 Years 32% Over 50 Years 37% 41% Age Unknown

SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with more non-vocational and less vocational laboratory space and more library/study space. Based on the original inspection date, 64% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF standards generate a deficit in vocational laboratory and library/study space and a surplus in the other categories. The alternative approach generates a surplus in all categories except vocational laboratories, which are balanced.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

	SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	25 26%	21 21%	25 26%	21 21%	14 14%	1 1%
9:00 AM	46 47%	60 61%	47 48%	62 63%	23 23%	6 6%
10:00 AM	53 54%	56 57%	54 55%	59 60%	21 21%	5 5%
11:00 AM	56 57%	63 64%	57 58%	60 61%	18 18%	7 7%
12:00 PM	55 56%	65 66%	53 54%	62 63%	10 10%	4 4%
1:00 PM	42 43%	38 39%	39 40%	37 38%	8 8%	1 1%
2:00 PM	15 15%	27 28%	15 15%	26 27%	2 2%	1 1%
3:00 PM	10 10%	20 20%	10 10%	18 18%	2 2%	1 1%
4:00 PM	8 8%	7 7%	6 6%	6 6%	0 0%	1 1%
5:00 PM	28 29%	28 29%	23 23%	26 27%	0 0%	1 1%
6:00 PM	32 33%	31 32%	26 27%	27 28%	2 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	29 30%	26 27%	27 28%	22 22%	2 2%	0 0%
	0%	6			100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning, Monday through Thursday. Since the greatest percentage of rooms in use at any one time is 66%, there is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota has 15.3 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, slightly above the system average and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 9.4 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHED	ULED NON-VOCATIO	NAL LABORATORIES U	ISE BY DAY AND TIME	FALL 2018	
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	3 4%	3 4%	2 3%	4 6%	2 3%	0 0%
9:00 AM	15 22%	20 29%	18 26%	20 29%	4 6%	1 1%
10:00 AM	20 29%	20 29%	23 34%	19 28%	8 12%	1 1%
11:00 AM	20 29%	23 34%	24 35%	21 31%	8 12%	1 1%
12:00 PM	17 25%	27 40%	17 25%	27 40%	5 7%	2 3%
1:00 PM	10 15%	15 22%	16 24%	16 24%	2 3%	2 3%
2:00 PM	14 21%	22 32%	18 26%	22 32%	1 1%	2 3%
3:00 PM	14 21%	20 29%	19 28%	19 28%	0 0%	2 3%
4:00 PM	15 22%	16 24%	17 25%	17 25%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	7 10%	11 16%	9 13%	13 19%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	6 9%	14 21%	9 13%	11 16%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	13 19%	17 25%	16 24%	13 19%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 40%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.







SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 8 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	4 17%	2 9%	3 13%	2 9%	3 13%	0 0%
9:00 AM	7 30%	6 26%	6 26%	5 22%	5 22%	0 0%
10:00 AM	5 22%	7 30%	5 22%	6 26%	4 17%	0 0%
11:00 AM	5 22%	5 22%	5 22%	6 26%	5 22%	0 0%
12:00 PM	5 22%	5 22%	4 17%	5 22%	5 22%	0 0%
1:00 PM	5 22%	6 26%	5 22%	7 30%	7 30%	0 0%
2:00 PM	4 17%	6 26%	4 17%	8 35%	7 30%	0 0%
3:00 PM	3 13%	6 26%	4 17%	4 17%	2 9%	0 0%
4:00 PM	3 13%	6 26%	2 9%	3 13%	1 4%	0 0%
5:00 PM	4 17%	4 17%	3 13%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	2 9%	3 13%	2 9%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	2 9%	1 4%	2 9%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%	5			100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled most often from 9:00AM to 3:00PM Monday through Friday, with later afternoon use on Tuesday. Highest use is 35% on Thursday at 2:00PM. Scheduled use on Friday is the fourth highest in the system.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 16.2 hours per week, close to the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota has 9.5 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly above the system average.





SUMMARY NOTE:

State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is at the system average. Average office size is below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots

TALLAHASSEE Community College



BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1966
Local District	Gadsden County Leon County Wakulla County
Aspen Ranking	2021 Top 150
Job Placement Rate	97%
Number of Locations	12
Percentage of Non-White Students	49%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Teacher Education Grade Specific, Allied Health Professions, Dental Support Services
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	Yes, AutoCAD and AIM

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)				
Upper Division	16.5			
Lower Division	9,062.1			
Total (Upper and Lower)	9,078.6			
Alternative/Distance Learning	2,659.8			

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	746			
Part-time	792			
Total	1,538			

Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)				
Bachelors	NA			
Associate of Arts	2,445			
Associate of Science	254			
Certificate Programs	512			
Retention Rate	67%			
Completion Rate	58%			

Scheduling Procedures				
Classrooms	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)			
Teaching Laboratories	Centralized (i.e., Registrar or scheduler)			
Primary Scheduler	Academic Affairs			

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Also offers certificate programs that require more than two years but less than four years of study
- Has unique space for firing range and driving track
- Significant number of students from out of district
- Significant number of students concurrently enrolled in programs at Florida State University and Florida A&M University
- Public Safety Institute drives need for more non-vocational laboratory space compared to other colleges in the system

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites						
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building			
Florida Public Safety Institute	35	501,505	13			
Gadsden Service Center	2	7,663	19			
Ghazvini Center for Healthcare Education	1	123,237	9			
Main Campus	49	1,592,289	27			
TCC Center For Innovation	1	46,500	17			
Wakulla Environmental Institute	2	20,401	6			
Total	90	2,291,595	20			

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE





FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM - AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF

SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with double the non-vocational laboratory space and less vocational laboratory, library/study, and office space. 80% of the non-vocational laboratory space is located at the Florida Public Safety Institute site. Based on the original inspection date, 31% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis in all space categories.

The significant difference between existing NSF and the guideline generated space need is attributable to the Florida Public Safety Institute. The facility is included in the existing college space, but the programs at the Institute are not included in the college course files and, therefore, do not generate a space need. Removing this facility from the inventory reduces existing classroom space to 165,864 NSF, non-vocational laboratory space to 44,848 NSF, and vocational laboratory space to 59,769 NSF.

Tallahassee Community College administrators noted that since Fall 2018, the snapshot time frame, they have made several space reclassifications that impact space needs calculations.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	41 28%	40 27%	43 29%	38 26%	33 23%	0 0%
9:00 AM	83 57%	94 64%	84 58%	89 61%	58 40%	0 0%
10:00 AM	96 66%	99 68%	97 66%	92 63%	74 51%	0 0%
11:00 AM	104 71%	108 74%	106 73%	103 71%	71 49%	0 0%
12:00 PM	108 74%	113 77%	110 75%	118 81%	83 57%	0 0%
1:00 PM	91 62%	87 60%	96 66%	87 60%	66 45%	0 0%
2:00 PM	68 47%	58 40%	70 48%	55 38%	48 33%	0 0%
3:00 PM	38 26%	56 38%	40 27%	54 37%	14 10%	0 0%
4:00 PM	16 11%	23 16%	16 11%	22 15%	3 2%	0 0%
5:00 PM	35 24%	32 22%	37 25%	33 23%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	37 25%	37 25%	36 25%	37 25%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	19 13%	24 16%	19 13%	24 16%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%	,			100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning Monday through Thursday. Since 81% of the total is in use Thursday at 12:00 PM there may be a perceived shortage which could be remedied by increased scheduling in the afternoons and evenings. Friday use is third highest in the system. There is existing capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Tallahassee Community College has 21.1 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, third highest in the system and above the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 12.4 hours per week, close to the system average, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VUCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	2 7%	3 11%	3 11%	7 25%	5 18%	0 0%
9:00 AM	6 21%	8 29%	9 32%	11 39%	6 21%	0 0%
10:00 AM	8 29%	8 29%	10 36%	13 46%	6 21%	0 0%
11:00 AM	10 36%	7 25%	11 39%	12 43%	5 18%	0 0%
12:00 PM	8 29%	7 25%	10 36%	7 25%	2 7%	0 0%
1:00 PM	7 25%	6 21%	9 32%	5 18%	1 4%	0 0%
2:00 PM	5 18%	8 29%	10 36%	9 32%	1 4%	0 0%
3:00 PM	2 7%	6 21%	7 25%	9 32%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	3 11%	6 21%	8 29%	8 29%	1 4%	0 0%
5:00 PM	4 14%	8 29%	7 25%	9 32%	1 4%	0 0%
6:00 PM	2 7%	7 25%	5 18%	6 21%	1 4%	0 0%
7:00 PM	2 7%	5 18%	6 21%	3 11%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the day Monday through Thursday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 46%, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 7.8 hours per week, which is less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours. High NSF per student FTE is attributable to 173,271 NSF of non-vocational laboratory space at the Florida Public Safety Institute. Removing this space from the analysis yields 5.8 NSF per student FTE in this space category, moving Tallahassee Community College from the highest quantity of non-vocational laboratory space per student FTE in the system to one of the lowest.

VOCATIONAL LABS

	SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	1 4%	1 4%	1 4%	2 9%	1 4%	0 0%
9:00 AM	4 17%	4 17%	4 17%	3 13%	2 9%	0 0%
10:00 AM	4 17%	4 17%	3 13%	3 13%	2 9%	0 0%
11:00 AM	4 17%	3 13%	3 13%	3 13%	2 9%	0 0%
12:00 PM	2 9%	3 13%	2 9%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
1:00 PM	3 13%	4 17%	3 13%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
2:00 PM	2 9%	4 17%	3 13%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
3:00 PM	1 4%	2 9%	1 4%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
4:00 PM	0 0%	2 9%	1 4%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
5:00 PM	0 0%	2 9%	1 4%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%
6:00 PM	1 4%	1 4%	2 9%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
7:00 PM	1 4%	1 4%	2 9%	2 9%	0 0%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory scheduled use is light throughout the week. Highest use is 17% Monday through Wednesday morning and Tuesday afternoon, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment.

VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 2.7 hours per week, lowest in the system. Removing Florida Public Safety Institute vocational laboratories from the analysis reduces the NSF per student FTE to 43.4.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Tallahassee Community College has 7.4 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, slightly below the system average.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Tallahassee Community College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is slightly below the system average. Average office size is also slightly below the system average. Chapter 7 | College Snapshots
VALENCIA College

BACKGROUND DATA

General	
Founded	1967
Local District	Orange County Osceola County
Aspen Ranking	2011 Winner
Job Placement Rate	97%
Number of Locations	9
Percentage of Non-White Students	57%
On-Campus Housing Offered	Yes
Popular Majors	Liberal Arts General Studies, Nursing, Business Administration & Management, Information Technology, Allied Health & Medical Assisting Services
Uses Computer Aided Facilities Management Software	No

Number of Credit Students (2018–19 FTE-3)				
Upper Division	457.3			
Lower Division	32,044.9			
Total (Upper and Lower)	32,502.2			
Alternative/Distance Learning	10,068.3			

Number of Employees (2018)				
Full-time	1,938			
Part-time	2,294			
Total	4,232			



Certificate and Degree Program Completers (2017–18)					
Bachelors	89				
Associate of Arts	6,585				
Associate of Science	1,451				
Certificate Programs	5,178				
Retention Rate	70%				
Completion Rate	60%				

Scheduling Procedures				
Classrooms	Both centralized and decentralized			
Teaching Laboratories	Both centralized and decentralized			
Primary Scheduler	Campus leadership			

UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

- Offers online courses
- Underutilized gyms converted to classrooms
- Culinary program located in downtown lease space

BACKGROUND DATA (CONT.)



Campuses Centers Sites						
Location Name	Number of Buildings	Gross Square Feet	Average Age of Building			
Downtown Campus	3	143,800				
East Campus	16	682,897	23			
McCoy Center	1	13,444	67			
Osceola Campus	17	425,122	16			
Poinciana Campus	3	83,042	3			
School of Public Safety	1	77,325	14			
Southeast Lake Nona Campus	2	94,634	8			
West Campus	19	958,697	29			
Winter Park Campus	1	51,079	22			
Total	63	2,530,040	22			

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE



INSTITUTION – AGE OF BUILDINGS BY GSF (According to original inspection date)

37%



Less than **0.5%** Age Unknown





SUMMARY NOTE:

The space type percentages vary considerably from the system averages with more classroom space, and less vocational laboratory and library/study space. Based on the original inspection date, 38% of the college's gross square feet is over 24 years old.

EXISTING SPACE PROFILE (CONT.)



SPACE NEEDS



SUMMARY NOTE:

The SREF space standards yield a space deficit in all space categories. The alternative space needs analysis approach yields a space deficit in vocational laboratory, library/study, and office space. A surplus is generated in classroom and non-vocational laboratory space. The SREF space standards generate more space need than the alternative space needs analysis approach in all space categories. The difference between the two approaches with respect to classroom and laboratory space is due to analysis based on course enrollments in the alternative approach rather than NSF/ COFTE in the SREF standards approach.

Data Source: Existing ASF 3-Term FTE Calculation Fall 2018 FTE-3.

CLASSROOMS

SCHEDULED CLASSROOM USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	205 53%	195 51%	208 54%	196 51%	40 10%	32 8%
9:00 AM	232 60%	212 55%	233 60%	213 55%	75 19%	39 10%
10:00 AM	302 78%	301 78%	305 79%	291 75%	108 28%	49 13%
11:00 AM	320 83%	318 82%	317 82%	311 81%	107 28%	51 13%
12:00 PM	280 73%	280 73%	272 70%	271 70%	81 21%	30 8%
1:00 PM	232 60%	70 18%	234 61%	68 18%	41 11%	14 4%
2:00 PM	264 68%	214 55%	257 67%	205 53%	45 12%	12 3%
3:00 PM	212 55%	203 53%	198 51%	195 51%	34 9%	5 1%
4:00 PM	120 31%	151 39%	110 28%	135 35%	15 4%	0 0%
5:00 PM	165 43%	183 47%	159 41%	160 41%	13 3%	0 0%
6:00 PM	141 37%	148 38%	136 35%	128 33%	13 3%	0 0%
7:00 PM	151 39%	161 42%	147 38%	133 34%	11 3%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Classrooms are scheduled heaviest in the morning and early afternoon Monday through Thursday. Since 83% of the total is in use Monday at 11:00 AM there may be a perceived shortage which could be remedied by increased scheduling in the afternoons and evenings. Friday use is fourth highest in the system. There is limited capacity to increase enrollment.

CLASSROOMS (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Valencia College has 12.7 NSF of classroom space per student FTE, below the system average and below the system standard of 13.5 NSF/FTE. Classroom seats are occupied 17.1 hours per week, sixth highest in the system, but still below the 24 hours expectation of the Division of Florida Colleges.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	21 24%	22 25%	21 24%	21 24%	12 14%	6 7%
9:00 AM	22 25%	26 30%	25 29%	22 25%	15 17%	6 7%
10:00 AM	49 56%	53 61%	52 60%	54 62%	21 24%	9 10%
11:00 AM	55 63%	56 64%	58 67%	59 68%	21 24%	16 18%
12:00 PM	55 63%	47 54%	56 64%	52 60%	16 18%	12 14%
1:00 PM	40 46%	14 16%	42 48%	12 14%	11 13%	10 11%
2:00 PM	49 56%	40 46%	49 56%	42 48%	10 11%	9 10%
3:00 PM	40 46%	40 46%	45 52%	41 47%	7 8%	2 2%
4:00 PM	28 32%	29 33%	32 37%	32 37%	5 6%	0 0%
5:00 PM	34 39%	38 44%	34 39%	40 46%	3 3%	0 0%
6:00 PM	30 34%	28 32%	30 34%	29 33%	1 1%	0 0%
7:00 PM	31 36%	38 44%	41 47%	42 48%	1 1%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently throughout the week. Valencia is tied with one other college for third highest use on Friday. Saturday use is the highest in the system.

NON-VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES (CONT.)





SUMMARY NOTE:

Non-vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 18.5 hours per week, fifth highest in the system, but below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

VOCATIONAL LABS

SCHEDULED VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES USE BY DAY AND TIME FALL 2018						
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00 AM	4 7%	8 15%	6 11%	10 19%	2 4%	2 4%
9:00 AM	9 17%	12 22%	12 22%	13 24%	3 6%	4 7%
10:00 AM	17 31%	17 31%	19 35%	19 35%	5 9%	6 11%
11:00 AM	20 37%	18 33%	21 39%	20 37%	5 9%	6 11%
12:00 PM	15 28%	13 24%	17 31%	14 26%	4 7%	3 6%
1:00 PM	12 22%	4 7%	15 28%	8 15%	3 6%	2 4%
2:00 PM	13 24%	15 28%	16 30%	19 35%	3 6%	2 4%
3:00 PM	10 19%	14 26%	13 24%	17 31%	4 7%	2 4%
4:00 PM	7 13%	11 20%	8 15%	12 22%	4 7%	1 2%
5:00 PM	7 13%	8 15%	11 20%	8 15%	3 6%	1 2%
6:00 PM	11 20%	12 22%	13 24%	9 17%	1 2%	0 0%
7:00 PM	15 28%	15 28%	16 30%	14 26%	1 2%	0 0%
	0%				100%	

0%

Percent of Rooms in Use

Data Source: Florida Department of Education.

SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratories are scheduled consistently Monday through Thursday. There is very little use on Friday. The highest percentage of rooms scheduled at any one time is 39% on Wednesday at 11:00 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{AM}}$, indicating existing capacity to increase enrollment. It is unusual for Saturday scheduled use to be greater than Friday use.





SUMMARY NOTE:

Vocational laboratory student stations are occupied 8.7 hours per week, less than the system average, and below the Division of Florida Colleges expectation of 24 hours.

LIBRARY/STUDY



SUMMARY NOTE:

Valencia College has 2.6 NSF of library/study space per student FTE, lowest in the system and significantly below the system average. This corresponds with the deficit in library/study space shown in the Space Needs chart.

OFFICES





SUMMARY NOTE:

Valencia College office space NSF per total faculty and staff FTE is second lowest in the system, significantly below the system average. Average office size is above the system average.

Design a Better Future



smithgroup.com 303.832.3272 899 Logan Street Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203