#### DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 097 EF 003 859

AUTHOR MORIN, LLOYD

TITLE FACILITIES INVENTORY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER

EDUCATION IN GREGON.

INSTITUTION OREGON STATE ELUCATIONAL COOFDINATING COUNCIL, SALEM.

REFORT NO ECC-6-69
PUE DAIL MAR 69
NOTE 21P.

AVAILABLE FECK STATE OF OFEGON EDUCATIONAL COORLINATING COUNCIL,

647 UNION STREET, N.E., SALEM, ORIGON 97310

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS COLLEGE BUILDINGS, \*COLLEGE PLANNING, \*FACILITY

INVENTORY, FACILITY UTILIZATION RESEARCH, \*HIGHER

EDUCATION, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, \*PFOPERTY ACCOUNTING

ABSTRACT

THE DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTCRY PROCEDURE EMPHASIZES THE EACKGROUND OF THE FACILITIES INVENTORY, THE CONDUCT OF THE INVENTORY, AND UPDATING PROCEDURES. THE FINDINGS ARE PRESENTED IN TERMS OF SUMMARIES OF AREAS AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS. MUCH OF THE DATA ARE ORGANIZED IN TABULAR FORM. (FS)



STAFF REPORT

# FACILITIES INVENTORY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN OREGON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

March 1969

F 603 859

ERIC

Full Text Provided by ERIC

#### COUNCIL MEMBERS

Richard L. Rosenberg, Chairman
Earl H. Adams
Edward Branchfield
John Howard
Harry Jacoby
R. E. Lieuallen
Mrs. Collis P. Moore
Dale Parnell
Cleighton Penwell

#### COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director - Ben Lawrence
Associate Director - Floyd Stearns
Assistant Director for Federal
Programs - George L. Mitton
Executive Assistant - Dale E. Ward
Administrative Intern - Lloyd Morin



# FACILITIES INVENTORY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN OREGON

A Staff Report to the
Educational Coordinating Council
Prepared by
Lloyd Morin, Administrative Intern

State of Oregon
Educational Coordinating Council
647 Union St., N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

March 1969



#### PREFACE

The Council is grateful for the climate of cooperation which has made possible this first effort at a statewide inventory of higher educational facilities in Oregon.

The institutions have contributed facilities inventory data in good faith, and they have the right to expect that these data will be used responsibly. It is incumbent upon the user that he be able to justify the uses to which he puts these data, particularly as relative values may be assigned to the various information elements.



#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

															Pa	age
PREFACE						•		•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	i
THE INVENTORY F	ROCEDURE .			• •	•	•	9 •	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
Conductin HEGIS Fac	nd to the Fa ng the Inver cilities Inv Procedure	ntory vento	/ • ory l	• • Repo	rt .	• •		•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1 2 4 4
FINDINGS		• •			•	• •			•		•	•	•	•	•	5
Precautio	of Areas . ons in Data cion Costs	Inte	erpre	etat	ion	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	5 8 9
CTIMMADV																10



#### LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Areas of Independent Institutions	12
2	Areas of State Four-Year Institutions	13
3	Areas of Public Community Colleges	14
4	Construction Costs per Square Foot, 1965-1968	1.9



#### THE INVENTORY PROCEDURE

#### Background to the Facilities Inventory

The continued increase in enrollments in higher education over the past fifteen years has brought about an unprecedented need for new construction over the same period of time. With this increased growth have come strong pressures from governmental agencies at the local, state and national levels to ensure that physical facilities are being used efficiently. Realizing the difficult financial problems that both public and private colleges face in providing buildings for these growing enrollments, the Congress of 1963 passed the Higher Education Facilities Act. As one of its criteria in awarding grant funds under this Act, the U. S. Office of Education wished to determine the size, type and utilization of existing facilities of the applicant institutions. It became apparent that the definitions of space used by institutions throughout the United States were not compatible and, thus, comparative analyses were almost impossible. Therefore, projections of space needs and comparisons of these needs lacked accuracy.

In 1966, Congress asked that a careful study be undertaken of facility requirements, and appropriated funds in the form of a Higher Education Comprehensive Planning Grant Program for a tri-level venture involving: (1) the U. S. Office of Education, (2) all states, and (3) all colleges and universities.

The U. S. Office of Education worked jointly with some twenty individuals representing state agencies and institutions of higher education in developing standard definitions and procedures. The resultant



work was a draft of a manual entitled <u>Facilities Classifications and</u>
Inventory Procedures for Institutions and State Agencies.

The Oregon Educational Coordinating Council, upon the recommendation of its Facilities Planning Committee, gave high priority for the use of Oregon's grant money in making a comprehensive inventory of existing facilities at all institutions of higher education within the State. A portion of the grant money was used for the preparation of an inventory manual which combines many of the useful features of the U. S. Office of Education manual and gives effect also to characteristics unique to the state of Oregon. The definitions and procedures set forth in the inventory manual provide a uniform methodology for the reporting of higher education facilities, which makes possible comparisons of data in establishing priority needs by the Educational Coordinating Council. In addition to assisting in state planning of facilities needs, the inventory manual has also provided a functional instrument for the maintenance of a current inventory by each participating institution.

#### Conducting the Inventory

All institutions of higher education in the State were requested to submit a detailed inventory of facilities on their campuses as of December 1967, employing definitions and procedures provided in the State of Oregon Facilities Inventory Classification System Manual.

Institutions within the State Department of Higher Education submitted inventory reports directly to their Facilities Planning Office in the Chancellor's office, and summary reports were provided to the Educational Coordinating Council. Most of the State institutions had



space analysts on the staff with some experience in reporting facilities data using similar definitions and procedures.

Independent colleges and community colleges submitted inventory reports directly to the Educational Coordinating Council office. For these institutions the definitions and procedures in the manual were new, and only rarely were staff personnel available who had experience working with this type of classification system. Because of the size of the task, the complexity of the data, and the relative inexperience of many space analysts, the collecting, reporting, and editing of inventory data took more time than was originally estimated. However, as a result of much perseverance and cooperation, an inventory was prepared for each institution.

All data submitted by independent and community colleges were processed, along with those of the State four-year institutions, by contractual arrangement with the State Department of Higher Education Facilities Planning Division. The computer output provided for each institution:

- 1. A detailed room-by-room inventory (Program No. 04440).
- 2. An institution summary (gross and net areas) by building (Program No. 04445).
- 3. Six summary reports (including additional sub-classification summaries) as requested by the U. S. Office of Education (Program Nos. 04470 to 04480).

Each participating institution received one bound copy of these reports, and duplicate copies are on file in the Educational Coordinating Council office.

#### HECIS Facilities Inventory Report

The U. S. Office of Education requests a summary statement of facilities (the Higher Education General Information Survey -- Facilities Inventory Report, Form OE 2300-7) from each institution of higher education in the State. In order to provide data within the classification systems on this report form, it was necessary to prepare an additional computer program. Therefore, in January 1969, a new summary report was prepared for each institution based upon the data stored on the master tape at that time. These reports were forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education by the Coordinating Council office, thus relieving the institutions of this task.

These summary data are used as the data base for the tables presented in this report.

#### Updating Procedure

In December 1968, a revised inventory manual was distributed to each institution. Although this manual contained no substantive changes, some definitions and codings were clarified, some extraneous material removed, a thumb-index was provided, and a section "Revisions to Inventory" was added. Accompanying memos requested that updating information be submitted to the Educational Coordinating Council office by February 1, 1969 to reflect the facilities situation on each campus as of January 1, 1969.

At the time of this report, updated facilities data are being received and processed. As these are incorporated, an improved inventory record will be made available which corrects previous coding errors and reports changes in facilities since the initial inventory.

#### FINDINGS

#### Summary of Areas

Tables 1, 2, and 3 present summary data for independent institutions, State four-year institutions, and community colleges respectively. In each table, Column (1) gives the code number used to identify the institution, and Column (2) shows the FTE enrollment for the fall of 1968.

Gross Areas. Column (3) reports the total gross area of each institution. Because some independent institutions did not report completely their residential facilities, an additional row is provided at the bottom of Table 1 which excludes these institutions, thus providing more comparable data in Columns (3), (4) and (5). Column (3) totals in Tables 1, 2, and 3 indicate the following comparisons in gross areas by type of institution:

Independent Colleges ----- 405.5 sq.ft./FTE State Four-Year Institutions -- 247.3 sq.ft./FTE Community Colleges ---- 78.6 sq.ft./FTE

Net Area of Total Facility. Column (4) presents the net area of the total facilities (including residential) on each campus, including such "nonassignable" spaces as circulation, mechanical—electrical or custodial areas. The following table presents Oregon's total by type of institution (from Column 4) and some comparable statistics from other states:



NET AREA OF TOTAL FACILITY IN SQ.FT./FTE

Independent Colleges
State 4-Year Institutions
Community Colleges

Oregon	Colorado	Virginia
347•7	402.7	
213.8	248.9	
64.8	172.9*	ana ana
199.6	250.0	262.0

Net Assignable Areas. Column (5) excludes the "nonassignable" areas to provide an indication of net assignable areas including residential and supporting facilities. The following table presents the totals for the three types of institutions in Oregon with some comparable data calculated from the recent Colorado study.

# NET ASSIGNABLE AREAS OF TOTAL FACILITY IN SQ.FT./FTE

	<u> Oregon - 1968</u>	Colorado - 1968
Independent Colleges	267.0	313.6
State Four-Year Institutions	160.1	1.86.7
Community Colleges	52.4	137.4

In 1957, the U. S. Office of Education reported the following national averages for "mean assignable area per student FTE." Because of the time elapsed since these data were compiled and because of possible variations in definitions of assignable area, their comparability to Oregon data may be limited; however, they are the only national estimates presently available.



All Institutions

<sup>\*</sup>Based upon a combination of 3 state and 7 district colleges

### U. S. NATIONAL ESTIMATES OF MEAN ASSIGNABLE AREA IN SQ.FT./FTE

"Basic" Educational Areas. Column (10) in Tables 1, 2, and 3 combines those areas which might be considered the "basic essentials" of an educational institution -- classrooms, laboratories, offices, and study areas. A comparison of the three tables reveals the following variations among the different types of institutions in the State in these "basic" areas.

Independent Colleges ----- 89.7 sq.ft./FTE State Four-Year Institutions --- 72.7 sq.ft./FTE Community Colleges ----- 40.6 sq.ft./FTE

The Colorado study reports comparative data for "total educational and general space per FTE student." These data are not precisely comparable to those presented in Column (10) of Tables 1, 2, and 3 because the Colorado study is summarized by "Functional Use" rather than by "Type of Space." Thus, some athletic facilities, for example, are included in the figures below which are not included in Column (10).

#### TOTAL EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL SPACE IN SQ.FT./FTE

	Oklahoma 1963	Virginia 1967	Arkansas 1967	Colorado 1968
Independent Colleges	90.0	142.9	<b>1000</b> PARK	148.9
State 4-Yr. Institutions	124.3	101.0	83.7	92.1
State 2-Yr. Institutions	161.1	43.7		77.3
All Institutions Combined	125.1	108.4		94.1



Net Assignable Space (excluding residential, etc.) Because some institutions are essentially commuter colleges while others accommodate large numbers of "nonresidents" in dormitories, there is one other comparison of interest. Column (12) represents a reasonable comparison of net assignable space EXCLUDING residential, noninstitutional and nonassignable spaces.

```
Independent Colleges provide ---- 163.5 sq.ft./FTE State 4-Yr. Institutions provide --- 129.9 sq.ft./FTE Community Colleges provide ---- 50.6 sq.ft./FTE
```

The 1957 U.S. National Report listed mean assignable areas, excluding residential space as follows:

## U.S. NATIONAL ESTIMATES OF MEAN ASSIGNABLE AREA IN SQ.FT./FTE

(Excluding Residential Space)

All Public Institutions .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	103.0	sq.	ft.
Public Universities										
Public Liberal Arts Colleges										
Public Junior Colleges*										
Public Technical Institutes .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	100.0	sq.	ft.
All Private Institutions	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	102.7	sq.	ft.

<sup>\*</sup>These data refer primarily to 2-year liberal arts institutions rather than to comprehensive liberal arts-technical-vocational institutions.

#### Precautions in Data Interpretation

The validity of any selected area figure in this report could be challenged on the basis of the possibility of error in coding or in interpretation of classification systems. In addition, there is a problem in collecting facilities data and enrollment statistics which coincide at one point in time to provide a precise "area per FTE" statistic within



an institution or within a type of institution. Fall 1968 enrollments are selected as being the closest reasonable estimates for the facilities data used.

Although there is a tendency to seize upon comparisons among institutions or classes of institutions, one must exercise considerable restraint. More detailed analysis — including factors of differential utilization ratios based on type of program — are basic to valid interinstitutional comparisons.

The comparability of data from other states may also be challenged. Although compatibility of basic inputs has been enhanced by the use of the U. S. Office of Education manual, variations may remain in interpretation of codes and in procedures for summarizing and reporting data. Also, because some states have not achieved total participation by all institutions and because grouping of types of institutions vary from state to state, summary data may not always yield meaningful comparisons. For example, Colorado's data for independent institutions is based upon only four colleges, and the data for two-year colleges is analyzed separately for state-controlled and district-controlled institutions.

However, these data are presented as representing the most accurate facilities information available in the State. They should be considered workable data for persons faced with the necessity of planning.

#### Construction Costs

As educators, legislators and taxpayers become increasingly aware of the need for new facilities — both to accommodate expanding enrollments and new curricula and to replace obsolete facilities — the question of cost factors becomes paramount.



As part of the recent inventory procedure, institutions in the State have reported their capital construction costs over recent years. 

These data are presented in Table 4, classified according to type of structure. The inadequacies of this classification are apparent since most buildings include more than one type of space and since a wide variety of building types exists within a classification. For example, "laboratories" include such diverse facilities as "Meats Laba," "Forest-Products Laba" and "Computer Center." Also, because of the effect of time and location variables on construction costs, caution should be exercised in drawing generalizations and making applications from these data. However, such cost data will become relevant as they are combined with enrollment projections, detailed space utilization analyses, projections of replacement needs, and land acquisition and development costs, to project needed revenues (in 1968 dollars) for the next decade.

#### SUMMARY

The physical facilities inventory cannot be presented as a <u>fait</u> accompli. It is presented as an ongoing process which will be continuously refined in procedure and updated with new input. The present situation may be summarized as follows:

1. The inventory as presently on file is believed to be a reasonably accurate representation of physical facilities on the campuses of higher education in the State.



Instructions in the manual: "Report all direct construction costs of the building, including general work, mechanical work, electrical work, and built-in equipment. Exclude other costs such as site acquisition, professional service fees, movable equipment, legal and administrative, etc."

The detailed analysis of "use" and "department occupying" may not yet be completely accurate. Residential facilities have not been reported in full by <a href="mailto:some">some</a> independent colleges.

- 2. The accuracy of classifications of spaces will increase as institutions are able to maintain continuity of staff responsible for the inventory. Expertise can best be developed through experience with the facilities inventory instrument.
- 3. The procedures appear to have been accepted by the institutions in the State. Personnel at each campus have been most cooperative in submitting initial data and in supplying corrected or updated information upon request.
- 4. The analyses by "Type of Space" in this report indicate that among the three classifications of higher education institutions, independent colleges in Oregon presently have the greatest amount of space per FTE student, and the community colleges have the least amount of space per FTE student. Few valued judgments can be placed on these differences, pending additional information regarding program function and its implication for intrainstitutional organization and space utilization.
- 5. On the basis of very limited comparable data, it would appear that Oregon <u>public</u> institutions both four-year and two-year have somewhat less space per FTE than their counterparts in some other states, while private institutions are approximately comparable to other states.



TABLE 1

AREAS OF INCEPEDENT INSTITUTIONS

																Total		Auxiliary Spaces	Speces	Merical Section (Excluding	NET CAMPUS (Excluding Residential.
j	Fall 1966 FIE Prolleent	Green Area	404	Net Area of Total Facility	Area of Facility	Total Area	200 200	Classroom	pi	Laboratory (All Types)	b (8	Office (Admin. & Fa (8)	Office in. & Faculty) (8)	Study (9)	dy O		Lab udy	(Special, General Supporting, Med.) (11)	General. 5. Med.)	Non Assignable Sum of (10) & (12)	Arigable) of (10) k (11) (12)
3	(2)		Last 19	, i	Area Per FIE	Not Area	Area Per FTE		Area Per FTE	. —	Area Per FIE	Net Area	Area Per FTE	Net Area	Area Per FIE	Net Area	Area Per FIE	let Area	Area Per FTE	Net Area	Area Per FIE
٤	300	195.588	1.955.8	154.141	1,541.4	111,627		676.4	43.5	7,124	71.2	10,709	107.1	5,850	58.5	28.032	280.3	34.675	26.8	62,707	627.1
3   8	£ £	049.64 040	237.5	英,丰	212.3	36,212	175-3	2,224	10.6	1,872	6.0	2,400	11.5	5.359	16.1	9.855	47.2	36,036	76.7	25,891	123.9
8	133	116.003	872.2	512.79	731.4	116,0%	533.2	5.532	41.6	2,393	18.0	2,207	57.9	3,358	25.2	18,990	142.8	24,841	186.8	45,831	329.6
E	· g	82.598	27.9	הנ,ה	187.8•	61.702	162.8	15,007	39.6	8,962	23.6	7.276	19.2	11,322	29.1	42,267	311.5	19,435	51.3	61,702	162.8
8	113	85,128	70.2	75,550	657.0	580,19	531.1	\$.506	39.2	2,022	17.6	3,066	26.7	2,192	19.1	11.786	102.5	37,014	321.8	48,800	424.3
8	1	105.537	312.4	492,212	273.5	360,618	200.3	28,158	15.6	21.274	11.8	39,616	22.0	119'19	₹.2	150,692	83.6	108,899	60.5	259,591	144.1
3 8	1.169	419.350	\$65.0	866,404	352.5	319,618	278.2	48,233	42.0	611,92	22.7	53,009	20.02	16,305	14.2	113,666	6*86	91,862	79.9	205,528	178.8
8	724	27,223	587.3	252,653	535.3	188,238	398.8	9,455	20.02	15,610	33.1	15,638	33.1	7,023	14.9	47,726	101-1	43,226	91.6	90,952	192.7
8	7	164,140	481.3	130,355	382.3	36,431	282.8	11,733	#. ** <b>.</b>	7,864	23.1	11,373	33.4	2,093	20.8	38,063	7.111	29,387	36.2	67,450	197.9
8	250	132,532	241.0	66,278	120.5	49,177	89.4°	23,826	43.3	5,310	6.7	6.753	12.3	4,779	8.7	40,668	24.0	8,509	15.5	49,177	89.5
=	416	42,997	103.4*	35.481	85.3	30,503	73.3°	6,847	23.7	1,836	4.4	5,338	12.8	9,012	21.7	26,033	62.6	024.4	10.7	30,503	73.3
21	1,312	415,133	314.9	241,491	260•3	269.491	205.4	21,051	16.0	15,514	11.8	25,197	19.2	74.991	26.7	96,753	73.7	86,950	66.3	183,703	140.0
23	1,347	318,050	236.1*	301,469	223.8*	234,853*	174.4	17,257	12.3	57,220	42.5	26,711	19.8	X.7:	24.3	133.893	7.68	130,022	74.3	233,915	173.7
#	1,683	662,527	393.7	516,122	306.7	6651.0€	234.4	26,430	15.7	40.04	74.3	40,393	C•#≥	26,054	15.5	155,824	ئې.	115,463	43.6	249,287	148.1
2	355	115,214	324.5	98,371	278.5	95.360	267.8	13,358	39.0	887	1.4	11.365	33.4	5,373	16.5	32,014	¥.1	€64,15	£.5	53,496	150.6
97	1,543	675,377	4-37.7	595,048	385.6	455,798	295.4	39,079	25.3	29,456	19.1	42,524	27.6	32.938 t	21.3	184,020	93.3	15,3%	7 4%	2%,071	181.5
Total	13,904	4,311,801	362.2	3,677,479	308.9	2,835,920	238.2*	280,545	23.5	244,011	20.5	579,675	23.5	264.078	25.2	1,068,379	FB.7	374,295	77.3	1,946,604	163-5
Btel	Totals For Instituti		ig Besident	ons Reporting Residential Facilities:	18:																
	9,212	3,735,624	405.5	3,203.080	7-7-2	2,459,685	267.0														

9,212 3,735,624 405.5

"Not including Residential Facilities

Note: Becmuse Huseus Art School is now occupying tesporary quarters it is omitted from this inventory analysis. (117 FIE were registered in Fall 1968).



TABLE 2

AREAS OF STATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

	_	i.	_	_	T-	_	-	Ţ	<del>-</del>		
NET CAMPUTE Extluding Residential From Assignable Com of (17) % (11,	Area Per FTE	7	7,131			2 2	7 505	7 S.K	24.72	7-6#	,
NET CAMPUT Excluding Resident For Assignable	Net Area	134, 267	28.1%	74. F.20	2 445 246	215 157	1 4.76 RDc	(m) 63	100 July 1	572 183	1.14C
Spaces energi, Med.	Area Per FA	€7.2	25.5	7.47	( 29	<u> </u>	77.0	n A	7 3%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	200
Auxiliary Spaces Special, Seperal, Supporting, Med.	Net Area	122,580	38,942	112.961	373.64.2	140 087	5,5,012	37.74	7 7 7 K	574 5	17.
Lat., udy	Area Per FIE	4.39	111.5	41.7	35.7	5.44	65.5	1.	314.1	5 04	[72.77]
lassras., Lab., Office, Study	Xet Area	37.5.5	141,214	135,576	1,375,74	165.47	896.973	40,546	272.30	75.672	-
Study	Area Fer FIE	15.0	4.5	4.8	8.7	30.4	17.7	4.	X. 6	12.5	7.2.2
	Net Area	22,955	5,6%	27,422	18.33	38,244	243,179	72.3	22.34.	7.77.4.1	12. W
e Faculty)	Area Per FTS	14.6	14.5	14.4	28.3	13.6	₩	37.2	151.7	1	35.5
Office (Admi. & Facuity) (R)	Net Area	22,322	18.771	46,635	407,339	8,3	336,122	14,722	121,339	125,427	1,134,000
S)	Area Fer FTS	15.4	56.5	7.3	50.8	12.3	14.6	6.53	17.3	1:1	£.95
Laboratory (All Types)	Wet Area	28,113	109,509	23,874	729,378	46,292	201,175	₹.	19.31	%.C.2	1,34,38
	Area Fer FTE	12.4	5.7	11.6	7.9	6.2	B.7	15.0	15.9	5.4	4.5
Classtroom (6)	Net Area	13,374	7,264	57,633	113,594	29.483	113,577	7,154	15.787	CHZ*CS	404.511
	Area Per FIE	171.8	228.3	109.7	209.3	125.4	132.ć	238.€	575.3	30101	160.1
Potal Area Assignable (5)	Met Area	262,391	289,053	757,047	3,016,362	461.347	1,922,735	35.7 <u>1</u>	793,867	314.238	7,700,329
ea of cility	Area Per FIE	219.9	293.0	138.5	520.9	164.8	134.€	315.6	وْعِنْ ت	132.4	213.3
Net Area of Total Facility (4)	Net Area	354,408	370,885	451,826	3,895,143	616,227	2,536,055	126,805	776,321	1,191,2%	10,299,446
hrea	Area Per FIE	238.2	319.2	161.1	320.4	193-3	711.7	575.7	6-850	146.0	247.3
Gross Area	Total Area	854,458	121,404	524,380	4,604,876	722,941	2,907,688	149,524	917,044	1,313,938	000,606,11
Fall 1968 FTE Enrollment (2)		1,530	1,266	3,255	14,373	3,740	13,737	398	366	8,999	48,164
Inst.		or	18	R	Я	04	ያ	જ	8	8	Total



TABLE 3

AREAS OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

NET CAMPUS (Excluding Residential, Non fastignable) Sum of (10) & (11) (12)	Area Per FTE	111.6	25.4	105.4	)	22.2	22.2	6-म	36.6	85.5	50.7	90.5	53.4	50.6
NET CAMPUS (Excluding Reside Non Assignable) Sum of (10) & (12)	Net Area	869*48	27,346	69,582		512,41	44,102	253,072	34,885	73,151	36,027	73,431	59,813	770,579*
spaces eneral, elec.)	Area Per FTE	36.9	2.2	23.3		0.0	3.5	4.1	4.3	29.7	2.4	32.6	17.7	10.1
Auxiliary Spaces (Special, General Supporting, Med. (11)	Net Area	27,972	2,380	15,393		¢	6,981	23,001	4,079	25,413	1,679	26,463	19,874	153,235*
Lab., ndy	Area Per FIE	74.7	23.2	82.1		22.2	18.7	₽°°°	32.3	55.3	48.3	57.9	55-7	9.04
Total Classrms., Lab. Office, Study (10)	Net Area	56,726	34,966	54,189		512,41	57,121	230,031	30,80€	47,738	24.348	896,94	39,939	617、李44。
dy )	Area Per FTE	16.0	1.3	6*4		0.0	1.6	2.3	1.8	7.5	7.31	2.1	0.5	5.5 *
Study (9)	Net Area	25,175	Ott.I	इक्तंद		þ	3,086	12,832	1,581	6,215	7,613	1,685	565	₹05,52
aculty)	Area Per FTE	15.0	5.2	16.5		2.2	5.2	3.9	3.2	10.8	12.3	8.6	6-9	6.2
Office (Admin. & Faculty)	Net Area	11,402	3,390	10,870		1,448	10,335	21,701	5,093	9,275	8,730	066*9	7,736	*076,4¢
(Sa	Area Per FTB	56.9	12.8	45.4	lyzed	8.2	5.7	24.7	23.4	28.3	13.7	31.2	16.5	20.9*
Laboratory (All Types) (7)	Net Area	20,455	15,771	₹0,85	not yet ana	5,393	11,387	138,920	52,349	24,174	9,792	25,345	18,456	313,076
	Area Per FTS	16.8	5.9	18.3	ived but	2*11	6.2	0 <b>-</b> 01	3.9	<b>4.</b> 6	3.11	16.0	11.8	*I.GI
Glassroom (6)	Net Area	<del>169</del> '21	6,365	12,075	-Information received but not yet analyzed	7,671	12,313	56,578	3,683	8.07	8,213	32,948	13,182	155,794*
ಪ <b>ಲ</b>	Arez Per FEB	128.7	<b>‡</b> *\$2	4.511	Info	2*22	22.8	6*5*	9*9€	85.5	20.2	5*06	55-3	52.4*
Total Area Assignable (5)	Net Area	· 97,721	27,346	74,208		14,512	45,343	258,487	74,885	73,151	36,027	73,431	61,959	797,070*
ea of	Area Per FTE	151.2	25.9	155.0		25.4	54.9	58.5	44.8	108-5	57.6	9.411	6.89	64.8
Net Area of Total Facility (4)	Net Area	114,778	27,316	102,350	)	15,293	915,64	329,717	42,717	92,900	40,871	176,56	77,222	101,586
Area	Area Per FTE	163.0	된-9	175.9	107.9	30.6	26.8	65.3	47.1	4,151	64.2	117.9	77.5	78.6
Gross Area (3)	Total Area	123,716	74,271	116,118	386,824	900°02	53,384	₹69,694	516*#	103,946	45,605	75,557	458,854	066*844*1
Fall 1968 FTE Enrollment (2)		552	1,076	099	3,586	<del>1</del> 59	1,989	5,632	556	856	710	811	1,121	18,807
#3		ᅜ	52	53	太	55	Ж	57	28	59	19	62	£9	Total

\*These totals do not include College No. 54. Averages are based on total population of 15,221

Table 4

CONSTRUCTION COSTS PER SQ. FT.

1965 - 1968

Type of Institution	Classroom Buildings	Labs.	Libraries	Dorms.	Admin.	PE	Other
State Departme	nt nti an	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					•
		05					
1965	17.77 18.26	25.51 24.34				17.42	22.92
1966	•			16.56 19.10 19.60			
1967		21.52 27.53 19.43 22.12	19.06				
1968		21.83					
Community Colleges							
1965	18.29		16.26		20,76		17.51
1966	15.09 16.25 20.68				17.77		
1967	21.52	17.93 19.58 16.00	26.71	17.06		20.49	
1968		22.96 25.61 25.59 25.60 22.19 26.46			20.59	16.45	25.56
Independent Colleges							
1965							24.38
1966	18.83			15.45			17.97
1967	18.94 20.00 20.91	19.17	15.18	15.23 16.65 20.58 21.51			
1968			25.00	15.66	24.36		26.50
Range	15.09 to	16.00 to	15.18 to	15.23 to	17.77 to	16,45 to	17.51 to
	21.52	27.53	26.71	21.51	24.36	20.49	26.50
Median	18.83	22.19	19.06	16.85	20.67	17.42	23,65

<sup>\*</sup>NOTE: The cost per square foot is calculated by dividing the total investment for construction by the gross sq. ft. in the building.

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC