

# Renovating All E & G and Capacity of Ohio's State Funded Colleges and Universities

---

Master Capital Plan Summary  
May 19, 2006

# Background

- Capital funding for higher education is limited
- Policy makers and members of media often question whether Ohio is over-invested in its higher education facilities
- Regents have examined higher education needs via Cost to Renovate Report and the Capacity Study

# Scope and Assumptions: Cost to Renovate Report

- Report included owned buildings
- All buildings that had any E&G space were included (function codes 10 through 54)
- Cost to renovate presented as a range from low end \$3.9 billion to high end \$5.0 billion
- No infrastructure costs were included in cost to renovate

# Estimated Cost to Renovate: Buildings in 2004 Inventory

<b>Condition</b>	<b>Buildings with any E&amp;G Space</b>	<b>Square Footage assumed to be E &amp; G</b>	<b>Low End Estimated Cost to Renovate</b>	<b>High End Estimated Cost to Renovate</b>
Satisfactory	731	19,472,799	\$0	\$248,819,444
Minor Rehabilitation	536	18,391,942	\$881,399,381	\$1,101,749,226
Rehabilitation	265	10,377,987	\$1,081,053,439	\$1,351,316,799
Major Rehabilitation	239	7,527,986	\$1,583,475,422	\$1,979,344,278
Obsolete	62	882,195	\$314,893,737	\$314,893,737
	1,833	56,652,908	\$3,860,821,980	\$4,996,123,484

# Estimated Cost to Renovate: Buildings in 2005 Inventory

<b>Condition</b>	<b>Buildings with any E&amp;G Space</b>	<b>Square Footage assumed to be E &amp; G</b>	<b>Low End Estimated Cost to Renovate</b>	<b>High End Estimated Cost to Renovate</b>
Satisfactory	704	19,236,996	\$0	\$264,209,072
Minor Rehabilitation	565	16,865,144	\$838,229,046	\$1,047,786,307
Rehabilitation	292	12,109,329	\$1,306,576,825	\$1,633,221,031
Major Rehabilitation	255	7,815,147	\$1,657,503,071	\$2,071,878,839
Obsolete	68	1,220,437	\$385,170,981	\$385,170,981
	1,884	57,247,054	\$4,187,479,923	\$5,402,266,230

# Explanation of the Cost to Renovate Report

\* Buildings included are those with any square footage assigned to E & G Functions (10 - 54)

\* Square Footage assumed to be E & G is all with E & G Functions (10 through 54) plus the % of Non Assignable (Function Code 00) that is assumed to relate to E & G, based on the ratio of E & G to the sum of E & G plus non E & G Functions ( 61, 62, 63,70) square footage

\* Estimated Cost to Renovate is Replacement Value of the building times three %s:

1. An add on % that represents the "soft costs" that were not included in the Replacement Value reported in the Physical Facilities File.

2. The percent of Gross Square Footage that is assumed to be E & G

3. A percent related to the worst of Physical Condition and Functional Condition of the building:

0 % to 5% for Satisfactory

20% to 25%for Minor Renovation

40% to 50% for Renovation

80% to 100% for Major Renovation

110% for Obsolete

# Scope and Assumptions: Capacity Study

- Four categories of space examined: Classrooms, Classroom Labs, Offices, and Residence Halls (2003 Inventory)
- Only credit activity is measured in classroom and classroom lab calculations
- Study includes only facilities that are owned by the institution
- Capacity calculated using assumptions appropriate to each space category
- Considered space in two groupings: all space and space in satisfactory condition

# Capacity Study: Big Picture (2003)

- 358,943 FTE (updated 361,069)
- Residence Halls FULL
- Office Space FULL
- Classroom and Labs small amount of space (for additional 17,656 FTE)
- By 2006 will exceed capacity

# Classroom Capacity

	Estimated Student FTE Excess (+) or Shortfall (-)	% of Total FTE
All Space	13,633	3.8%
Satisfactory/ Minor Rehab Space Only	-86,448	-24.1%

# Classroom Lab Capacity

	Estimated Student FTE Excess (+) or Shortfall (-)	% of Total FTE
All Space	4,023	1.1%
Satisfactory/ Minor Rehab Space	-5,754	-1.6%

# Office Space Capacity

	Estimated Faculty/Staff FTE Excess (+) or Shortfall (-)	% of Total FTE
All Space	1,333	2.3%
Satisfactory/ Minor Rehab Space	-19,219	-32.5%

# Residence Hall Space

- Campuses with residence halls report that all residence halls are at or near 100% occupancy
- 57% of residence hall space needs replacement or rehabilitation at costs exceeding 25% of replacement value

# Presidents Survey: “How many more students can your campus accommodate without additional resources?”

- Most campuses are growing
- Most presidents say they can accommodate few if any additional enrollments (depending on program)
- Most mention need for additional technology resources
- Many mention need to update current facilities

# Survey Responses

- How are institutions dealing with capacity?
  - Place caps and wait lists on popular programs
  - Offer classes after preferred/popular hours
  - Expand distance education
  - Create partnerships with other institutions or campuses
  - Expand class size

# Conclusion

- Data analysis and presidents' survey responses agree:
  - Ohio does not appear to have a large surplus of higher education space
  - Enrollment projections indicate that campuses will "fill up" in the near future
  - Many facilities need to be renovated or replaced
- Presidents are seeking alternative ways to serve increasing number of students

# Appendix: Classroom and Class Laboratory Assumptions

## ■ Classrooms

- Assigned square feet per station = 20
- Maximum hours room available = 60
- Room use rate = 70%
- Station occupancy rate = 67%
- Contact hours per FTE: 15

## ■ Class Laboratories

- Assigned square feet per station = 50
- Maximum hours room available = 50
- Room use rate = 50%
- Station occupancy rate = 67%
- Contact hours per FTE: 30

# Appendix: Office Space Assumptions

- Includes all employees reported to HEI in 2002, excluding Auxiliary and Hospital employees
- Each full-time employee = 1 FTE
- Each full-time employee reported with Service/Maintenance Work Category =  $\frac{1}{2}$  FTE
- Each part-time employee and all Grad Assistants =  $\frac{1}{2}$  FTE
- Space needed per FTE (140 square feet for university main campuses and 100 square feet for all other sectors)