

OPERATIONAL

ASSESSMENTS AND

PLANNING METRICS



Introductions

- Jim Carruthers, Senior Project Manager
- Conducted Assessment Studies in CSU and other major public universities
- Managed A. S. and Student Union entities in CSU and UC
- Matthew Bohannon, Project Manager
- Manager of B&D's Southern California Office
- 6 years studying and planning auxiliary facilities

•CSULB, CPSLO, CPP, CSUSM, SDSU, SFSU, UCB, UCR, NMSU, EWU, UWT, GMU, UM, UTEP, UK, UNM, WSUV, UCM, UNCG, Marshall, Rutgers, Indiana, and Ohio University



Presentation Outline

- Goals and Outcomes
- Impediments to Success
- Strategies for Improvements
- California / National Trends
- Operational Metrics
- Case Studies
- Discussion



Goals and Objectives

Understand the importance of comprehensive planning.

- Recognize best practice planning methodologies.
- Outline evaluation and assessment criteria.
- Identify resources that attendees may use to assist with planning and assessment activities on their own campuses.



Impediments to Success

- Insufficient Will Power to Affect Meaningful Change
- What's left after all the low hanging fruit has been picked?
- Does it seem like we are just tinkering with the edges still, rather than addressing larger problems?
- Better financial performance may require significant changes to current practices and tough choices.
- Without executive support, initiatives will likely fail.
- Talk to colleagues, it can get lonesome when you are leading the effort.
- Too Many Ideas are Off the Table From the Beginning
- What really is essential to our mission?
- Programs, operations, or services sometimes become "untouchable" even though they are extraneous to the auxiliary's or university's mission.
- Limiting ideas from the outset constrains the options for success.



Impediments to Success

- Inadequate Planning Process
- How accurate are our data and analyses?
- Are our efforts enough to get the changes we need?
- Executive buy-in without reliable data and analysis is difficult or impossible.
- Trust the data, it is a tool with no agenda.
- Failure to Get the Decision Makers to Decide
- Can you convince them the idea is successful?
- How can they get to a decision point?
- Decision makers need to be involved and understand the aspects and details of any change.



Impediments to Success

- Focusing on Short–Term Fixes vs. Long–Term Solutions
- Are we just treating the symptoms of the problem?
- How can we craft a solution that addresses short-term problems and long-term financial stability?
- Band-aid approaches simply are not sufficient.



Strategies for Improvement

- Be Proactive
- Plan and act rather than wait for the solution to be delivered.
- Take advantage of opportunities.
- Tough times can motivate stakeholders.
- Possess Institutional Will
- Decisions to improve the bottom line may not make everyone happy.
- Effectively manage the trade-offs for stakeholders, if any (performance, services, etc.).
- Be confident moving forward with well thought out and analyzed ideas.



Strategies for Improvement

- Use Institutional Vision and Business Plans as Foundations
- Solid financial plans must be aligned and developed with mission-centric priorities, rather than across-the-board cuts.
- Know where you can leverage your assets for greatest value.
- Translate those assets into a detailed business plan.
- Have Effective Leadership
- Management needs to act effectively to plan, communicate, execute, and evaluate initiatives.



Strategies for Improvement

- Be Deliberate But Patient
- Keep in mind that short-term improvements may not be on a large scale, but long-term financial stability will happen.
- Don't underestimate the value making minor changes now will have on your bottom line five or ten years down the road.
- Allow for Flexibility
- We live in a dynamic environment.
- Plan some flexibility into initiatives to allow for growth and entrepreneurship moving forward.



California / National Trends

- Enrollment Pressure
- Reduced State Funding Limiting Enrollment Growth
- Direct Impact on Auxiliary Funding and Services
- Budget Cuts / Downsizing
- Furloughs
- Higher Expectations on Return to University
- Consolidation / Outsourcing
- Identification of Duplicated Services
- Less Expensive Off–Campus Alternatives
- Operational Assessments
- UC Berkeley Overall University Assessment
- Projected \$75M Savings in Year 1



- Metrics
- Comparative Measurements
- Established to Create a Standard Measure to help assess the Organizations Performance
- Inward thinking, external outcomes
- The Key is to Create Metrics That are Consistent With Goals and Priorities of the Organization

- Metrics
- Quantifying Results also Demonstrates Value
- Without the Ability To Quantify Value, it Becomes Difficult to Justify Existence
- Not Defensive Behavior, Rather Practical Methodology for Objective Measurement



Operational Metrics – Reality of Fees

					Instruction	Services &	Student	Student	
	Up to 6	Above 6	Health	Health	Related	Facilitis	Body	Body	
Campus	Units	Units	Facilitis	Services	Actiitis	Fee	Association	Center	TOTAL
1 Bakersfield	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$231	\$66	\$12	\$327	\$423	\$5,091
2 Channel Islands	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$120	\$200	\$70	\$124	\$320	\$4,866
3 Chico	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$240	\$248	\$4	\$116	\$696	\$5,336
4 Dominguez Hills	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$150	\$10	\$0	\$135	\$318	\$4,645
5 East Bay	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$225	\$138	\$3	\$129	\$165	\$4,692
6 Fresno	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$186	\$124	\$46	\$69	\$216	\$4,673
7 Fullerton	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$90	\$52	\$72	\$ 1 48	\$268	\$4,662
8 Humboldt	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$294	\$544	\$10	\$ 1 01	\$185	\$5,166
9 Long Beach	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$90	\$50	\$10	\$88	\$100	\$4,370
10 Los Angeles	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$165	\$114	\$0	\$54	\$275	\$4,640
11 Maritime Atademy	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$14	\$680	\$130	\$30	\$210	\$0	\$5,090
12 Monterey Bay	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$0	\$0	\$60	\$291	\$96	\$44	\$4,517
13 Northridge	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$108	\$30	\$145	\$156	\$330	\$4,801
14 Pomona	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$135	\$40	\$0	\$95	\$240	\$4,542
15 Sacramento	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$146	\$199	\$15	\$ 1 19	\$390	\$4,901
16 San Bernardino	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$39	\$167	\$140	\$15	\$81	\$372	\$4,840
17 San Diego	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$50	\$170	\$350	\$40	\$70	\$241	\$4,947
18 San Francisco	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$222	\$234	\$4	\$84	\$164	\$4,740
19 San José	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$66	\$155	\$198	\$30	\$147	\$432	\$5,054
20 San Luis Obispo	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$8	\$263	\$262	\$984	\$268	\$387	\$6,198
21 San Marcos	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$50	\$130	\$80	\$112	\$100	\$130	\$4,628
22 Sonoma	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$28	\$240	\$406	\$26	\$180	\$384	\$5,290
23 Stanislaus	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$8	\$209	\$177	\$187	\$ 1 05	\$128	\$4,840
Average	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$15	\$192	\$167	\$92	\$ 1 31	\$270	\$4,893
Maximum	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$66	\$680	\$544	\$984	\$327	\$696	\$6,198
Minimum	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$0	\$0	\$10	\$0	\$54	\$0	\$4,370
Median	\$2,334	\$4,026	\$6	\$167	\$138	\$26	\$116	\$268	\$4,840

	Student	Student		
	Body	Body		Campus
Campus	Association	Center	TOTAL	Enrollment
1 Chico	\$116	\$696	\$812	16,934
2 Bakersfield	\$327	\$423	\$750	8,003
3 San Luis Obispo	\$268	\$387	\$655	19,325
4 San José	\$147	\$432	\$579	31,280
5 Sonoma	\$180	\$384	\$564	8,546
6 Sacramento	\$119	\$390	\$509	29,241
7 Northridge	\$156	\$330	\$486	35,198
8 Dominguez Hills	\$135	\$318	\$453	14,477
9 San Bernardino	\$81	\$372	\$453	17,852
10 Channel Islands	\$124	\$320	\$444	3,862
11 Fullerton	\$148	\$268	\$416	36,262
12 Pomona	\$95	\$240	\$335	22,273
13 Los Angeles	\$54	\$275	\$329	20,619
14 San Diego	\$70	\$241	\$311	33,790
15 East Bay	\$129	\$165	\$294	14,749
16 Humboldt	\$101	\$185	\$286	7,954
17 Fresno	\$69	\$216	\$285	21,500
18 San Francisco	\$84	\$164	\$248	30,469
19 Stanislaus	\$105	\$128	\$233	8,586
20 San Marcos	\$100	\$130	\$230	9,767
21 Maritime Atademy	\$210	\$0	\$210	823
22 Long Beach	\$88	\$100	\$188	35,557
23 Monterey Bay	\$96	\$44	\$140	4,688
Average	\$131	\$270	\$400	18,772
Maximum	\$327	\$696	\$812	36,262
Minimum	\$54	\$0	\$140	823
Median	\$116	\$268	\$335	17,852



- AOA Metrics
- Position and Salary Data-2006 (last update?)
- Insurance & Workers Comp.
 - Data Collection Ongoing?
 - Pooled purchasing
- CSU Budget Office
 - Mandatory Fee Data
- Operational Data
 - Anecdotal or Documented?
 - Agree upon metrics that can be quantified and shared
 - Size of data base is significant



- AOA Metrics
- The Power of Databases

Functional Areas	All Unions (n=83) Ave Enrollment = 18,129		West / SW Unions (n=8) Ave Enrollment = 29,601		Large Univ. (n=10) Ave Enrollment = 41,861			San Diego State Univ. Enrollment = 35,832				
	ASF	%-Ttl ASF	ASF/Stdnt	ASF	%-Ttl ASF	ASF/Stdnt	ASF	%-Ttl ASF	ASF/Stdnt	ASF	%-Ttl ASF	ASF/Stdnt
Group 1: Food Service	26,727	23.2%	1.5	28,987	22.6%	1.0	37,321	0.0%	0.9	22,313	18.1%	0.6
Group 2: Ballroom Facilities	10,487	9.1%	0.6	12,236	9.5%	0.4	16,586	0.0%	0.4	20,520	16.7%	0.6
Group 3: Conference/Meeting Rooms	10,591	9.2%	0.6	13,194	10.3%	0.4	19,478	0.0%	0.5	11,648	9.5%	0.3
Group 4: Bookstore	12,837	11.1%	0.7	20,351	15.9%	0.7	10,512	0.0%	0.3	0	0.0%	0.0
Group 5: Additional Retail Services	5,405	4.7%	0.3	5,782	4.5%	0.2	7,027	0.0%	0.2	8,203	6.7%	0.2
Group 6: Theater/Auditorium	5,287	4.6%	0.3	5,289	4.1%	0.2	6,702	0.0%	0.2	6,000	4.9%	0.2
Group 7: Recreation/Entertainment	6,637	5.8%	0.4	7,400	5.8%	0.2	14,804	0.0%	0.4	17,900	14.5%	0.5
Group 8: Lounge Space	7,313	6.4%	0.4	9,453	7.4%	0.3	15,031	0.0%	0.4	7,957	6.5%	0.2
Group 9: Academic Related	1,945	1.7%	0.1	407	0.3%	0.0	3,150	0.0%	0.1	0	0.0%	0.0
Group 10: Student Organizations	9,003	7.8%	0.5	12,239	9.5%	0.4	12,186	0.0%	0.3	10,592	8.6%	0.3
Group 11: Administrative Offices	10,930	9.5%	0.6	8,453	6.6%	0.3	18,905	0.0%	0.5	10,178	8.3%	0.3
Group 12: Multicultural Centers	1,908	1.7%	0.1	2,746	2.1%	0.1	3,741	0.0%	0.1	1,572	1.3%	0.0
Group 13: Special/Misc. Components	6,090	5.3%	0.3	1,623	1.3%	0.1	25,272	0.0%	0.6	6,342	5.1%	0.2
Total Assignable Sq. Footage	115,149			128,268			188,417			123,225		
Total Gross Sq. Footage	179,194			196,417			291,362			174,980		
Gross/Net Ratio (Grossing Factor)	1.54			1.53			1.59			1.42		
Efficiency Factor (% ASF/GSF)	65%			65%			63%			70%		



- AOA Metrics
- Revenues & Expenses
- Full Time Employees
- Per Student Costs
- Important Ratios
- Cal Poly Pomona Initial Benchmark
- 2008–2009 Budget Year
- Fall 2008 Enrollment: 20,660
 - Residents: 1,800 (9%)
 - Commuters: 18,800



Big Picture Metrics



Cal Poly Pomona T&F Breakdown





- Student Body Association Fee
- 1 FTE per 78 Resident Students
- 1 FTE per 810 Commuter Students
- 1.09 FTE per \$100K Revenue
- 1 FTE per \$46,500 Programming Expense
- \$52 per Student Programming Expense
- 1.07 Student Employees per FTE





Student Body Center Fee



Student Body Center Fee

	Cost / GSF	% of Budget
Administratie	\$19.19	51%
Programming	\$9.96	26%
Meeting / Conference Services	\$1.91	5%
Custodial	\$2.80	7%
Maintenance	\$1.77	5%
Utlities	\$2.01	5%
	\$37.65	100%

- Student Body Center Fee
- 1 FTE per 70 Resident Students
- 1 FTE per 729 Commuter Students
- 1.55 FTE per \$100K Revenue
- 1 FTE per \$47,800 Programming Expense
- \$60 per Student Programming Expense
- 4.07 Student Employees per FTE
- 41,000 GSF per Custodial FTE
- 123,000 GSF per Maintenance FTE

• AS / Union

Cal Poly Pomona	AS	Union
FTE per Resident Student	78	70
FTE per Commuter Student	810	729
FTE per \$100K Revenue	1.09	1.55
Programming Expense per FTE	\$46,500	\$47,800
Programming Expense per Student	\$52	\$60
Student Employee to FTE Ratio	1.07:1	4.07:1



Discussion

- Do We Have The Right Metrics?
- Should We Develop This Database Further?
- Present Data in January at AOA?



Discussion





Matthew Bohannon mbohannon@facilityplanners.com (949) 861-8340

> 1 Park Plaza, Suite 370 Irvine, CA 92614 www.facilityplanners.com



Discussion

<u>Remember To:</u>

- Challenge your assumptions
- Reassess / realign with mission statements
- Be resourceful

