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Thank you Steve, and thanks to the Board for the opportunity to review Phase 2 of the Chancellor’s system space utilization initiative.

The Chancellor announced this initiative in September 2011, noting that our future challenges are less about growing capacity through big new buildings and more about finding ways to better use the space we have now.

In phase one we developed an approach to utilization analysis while we studied six diverse pilot institutions.

We learned a lot along the way, and last April we reported to the Board a number of lessons learned, the most important being that in most every case, our campuses have significant opportunities to get more out of their existing space, and we saw that campus leadership can set the stage for enhanced utilization and lower operating cost by promoting a culture of institutional space ownership and stewardship.

These opportunities were obvious when we saw how utilization varied much more than anticipated – and not just between institutions, but often between the campuses and buildings of a single institution, and among similar space types...

The need to invest in existing facilities was also clear. Some obsolete buildings can’t be managed for better utilization without real capital investment, which is also needed to enhance their the overall performance and function.

We also encountered data problems that made it difficult to do consistent and relevant analysis. As a result, we engaged our institutions to improve their data management while making best use of the data we had.

Finally, while this initiative is intended to support decision making at the System level, we learned early and often that the institutions have just as much - or even more - to gain.
Phase 2, which we are now completing, has been a massive undertaking, encompassing a total of 64 instructional sites, and every USG institution.

We continued to refine the Phase 1 approach, which is now also being used by the University of Texas system for their classroom analysis.

We looked at utilization across a wider variety of campus spaces, which required new and different data sets from multiple campus sources, and the assembly of a large new stakeholder network.

Phase 2 confirmed the lessons from Phase One and extended our understanding of the way our facilities support – or in some cases hinder – the pursuit of our mission.

And the effort is particularly timely since technology is creating opportunities for space efficiency - distance education reduces the demand for instructional rooms, and modern communication and information technology are transforming the way we use and perceive our work and study environments.
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So now I’d like to turn our focus to how we will use the study going forward.

From the beginning, the Chancellor has shared his expectation that “space utilization will play a major role in strategic decisions for capital planning and prioritization, and will inform budgeting decisions in the System”

In this study, we have produced data and metrics that help us better understand and prioritize the need for most of our potential facilities investment – be it new construction, renovation, acquisition, disposition, or demolition – and without regard to whether we are paying for it with state bonds, institution funds, or public private financing.

At the system office, we’ll use this new information to enhance the integrated review of capital proposals – including the Board’s annual capital budget and long term capital plan – as well as academic proposals that have a potential facility impact. The same information will help our institutions prepare better capital proposals and projects.
This chart shows the level of classroom utilization at each of our main campuses, and it is a good place to start if you want to answer a very common but expensive question: “does this campus need a new classroom building”?

As in Phase One, utilization varies widely, with the highest utilization campus on the left exceeding the lowest on the right by a factor of 5x.

This yellow band is our future target range for utilization, which we based on past utilization norms and the characteristics of the campuses that attain higher rates.

Operating above the band creates risk for student retention and progression, and enrollment can’t grow without additional capacity.

Campuses within the band are functioning at a high level, but should only need more space to accommodate significant enrollment growth.

And, generally speaking, below the band we are not likely to be needing many new classroom buildings anytime soon, although many of these campuses do need to renovate and repurpose space for better quality and suitability, and some will need new space to replace buildings that must be demolished.
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This study has reinforced the importance of better space management and allocation practices on campus while providing resources to help realize them.

While on the project side, we are far better prepared to reap benefits by focusing on utilization from the earliest conceptual stages all the way through space programming and design.

And like with capital prioritization, the campuses and the system office both have roles to play in these efforts.
For a few examples of how the study can inform these functions, let’s look at our main campus with the highest classroom utilization - which is Georgia Gwinnett College – you see it highlighted at the top of the chart I showed a moment ago.

Since each campus has different utilization characteristics, this chart only tells part of the story, so we developed a classroom graphic to provide additional detail.
In GGC’s classroom metric, you see in blue a picture of the weekly target capacity of the campus classroom inventory.
Then, we overlay in RED the actual scheduled use of classrooms to see a consistent pattern of extraordinarily high utilization, with rooms scheduled on average over 44 hours a week with nearly 70% of seats filled.

This simple picture provides a critical look at how the campus course schedule fits within the classroom inventory, and reveals opportunities to optimize utilization, whether you are managing for efficiency or programming a capital project.

In this case, GGC’s need for classrooms is confirmed, and while significant new classroom construction is years away, the data will inform efforts to reclaim existing space for classroom use.

And we have one of these graphics for every significant instructional site, which provides a view of utilization across the system – along with potential opportunities for the shared use of instructional space.
And we see such an opportunity when we look at the picture for the UGA Gwinnett campus five miles away from GGC.

Since this is a graduate campus, its 18 classrooms are used for credit courses on nights and weekends only.

While UGA also uses these rooms periodically for continuing education, it is possible that some could be shared with GGC for additional weekday peak instruction – much as UGA shared space at the Gwinnett University Center for several years prior to leasing this dedicated facility.

Shared and joint use of space is highly resourceful, and this is just one example among several opportunities that the study reveals across the system.
Our focus on Research space was new in Phase 2. The system has 3.6M ASF of Research laboratory space that is critical to our mission and the economic development of the state, and it supports hundreds of millions of dollars in sponsored research annually.

Our institutions are very independent in their pursuit of research - and we certainly don’t want to get in the way of that work – but because research labs are among the most specialized, least flexible, and most expensive spaces to build and operate, we did engage the R1 universities to begin building a more robust data set for this space.

And, as with so many of our efforts in this initiative, we learned that our data were neither complete nor consistent enough for meaningful analysis from a system perspective.

Going forward, we will work with our campus stakeholders to coordinate and enhance business practices and technology with the goal of producing data and metrics to guide capital investment and support the institutional management and allocation of research space.
As many of you know well, our system has a history of master planning, supported by the Board’s adoption of a template for master planning 16 years ago.

But a master plan can only be as good as its key element – the assessment of future campus facility needs – and in the past the traditional approach to needs assessment was too prone to inflate the need for large new building projects.

Going forward, we will use this study as a foundation for a new approach that will provide a lens for a more disciplined focus on the key strategic needs of the institution, and drive
investment to most effectively and realistically meet those needs.
Our next step will be to turn our focus to capital funding. We will be working with the institutions to prepare a preliminary multi-year capital plan in a new “short form” with limited information for Integrated Review, where we will use data from the utilization study to evaluate and refine the proposals, and then work with our institutions to prepare long-form documentation on the projects that best meet system and state needs.

From those projects, the Chancellor will prepare a recommendation for the FY15 capital budget for presentation at the August Board meeting.

Finally, beginning this fall, we will lead ongoing efforts to refine institutional capital plans with an appropriate focus on strategic facility needs and improving space and resource efficiency.
In phase 2 we were very fortunate to have the participation and support of a valuable and productive institutional working group, and I am pleased today to welcome three of our campus colleagues from that group to share their perspectives on the utilization study.

Today, you will hear from Phil Howard, the Vice President for Facilities at Georgia Regents University,

followed by Jayne Perkins-Brown, the Senior Associate VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management at Georgia Southern,

And we will conclude with Bob Scott, who wears many hats but is primarily known for his role as Associate Vice President for Research at UGA.