

DOCUMENT RESUME

05931 - [B1446499] (Restricted)

[Analysis of the University of the District of Columbia's Consolidated Master Plan Development]. GGD-78-77; B-118638. May 15, 1978. 3 pp. + 2 enclosures (26 pp.).

Report to Sen. Patrick J. Leahy, Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations: District of Columbia Subcommittee; by Robert F. Keller, Acting Comptroller General.

Issue Area: Facilities and Material Management: New Versus Existing Federal Facilities (705).

Contact: General Government Div.

Budget Function: Revenue Sharing and General Purpose Fiscal Assistance: Other General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (852).

Organization Concerned: District of Columbia; University of the District of Columbia.

Congressional Relevance: Senate Committee on Appropriations: District of Columbia Subcommittee. Sen. Patrick J. Leahy.

Representatives of the University of the District of Columbia are convinced of the necessity for two campuses because further expansion is not practical at the Van Ness campus. They also asserted that it is essential for students attending the Colleges of Liberal and Fine Arts and Business and Public Management to have access to cultural resources, government agencies, and the business community in the downtown area. Greater emphasis will be placed on the graduate program, and officials felt that, with increased effort and new programs, a higher percentage of graduate students will be achieved. Preliminary results of a telephone survey were used to demonstrate that there is a sizable number of potential new enrollees in the city, and it was estimated that the university could attain an enrollment ranging from 12,000 to 22,000 full-time equivalent students. Since uncertainty exists regarding future enrollments, further facility development activity should be deferred pending completion of the university's master plan and reevaluation of its enrollment prospects. In preparing its master plan, the university should demonstrate that its proposed construction program cannot be modified to include renovation of existing owned facilities and provide for construction of new facilities at the Mount Vernon Square campus tailored to meet enrollment requirements not met by the Van Ness campus or existing facilities. (RRS)

6499

RESTRICTED



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-118638
GG8-134

MAY 15 1978

The Honorable Patrick J. Leahy
Chairman, Subcommittee on the
District of Columbia
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your letter of May 3, 1978, requested that we provide you with the results of our self-initiated study of University of the District of Columbia's consolidated master plan development by May 15, 1978. You asked that we summarize to the fullest extent possible our findings, conclusions, and judgments, if a full report cannot be completed by that time.

We have met your target date, but the time constraint imposed has not allowed us to obtain written comments from the University on the matters discussed in our study, which is contained in enclosure I. The issues covered in the study, however, were discussed with University officials on May 10, 1978. Documents presented by the University at the briefing are contained in enclosure II.

University representatives stated they are convinced of the necessity for two campuses--Van Ness and Mount Vernon Square--because further expansion is not practical at the Van Ness campus. Also, they said that it is essential that students attending their College of Liberal and Fine Arts and the College of Business and Public Management have access to the libraries and cultural resources in the downtown vicinity and the government agencies and business community.

They emphasized that our estimates of graduate enrollment did not adequately reflect the growth potential of the graduate studies which will be offered by the University. The graduate program is still in its infancy and they plan to put greater emphasis on these programs in the future. With the increased effort and new master's programs to be offered, they assert that it will be easy to achieve a much higher percentage (15 percent or more) of graduates to undergraduates.

GGD-76-77
(42805)

B-118638
GG8-134

The preliminary results of a telephone survey conducted in the District were presented to demonstrate there is a sizable number of potential new enrollees living in the city. Using this data, they estimated that the University could possibly attain an enrollment ranging from 12,057 to 22,977 full-time equivalent (FTE) students.

In closing, they stressed that our estimate of 10,000 FTE was unrealistically low and that they could see no risk in building facilities for 13,000 FTE. New buildings are needed to replace the old outmoded facilities which UDC owns or leases. The new facilities would improve the University's image and enable it to attract students who now seek an education outside the District.

With increased emphasis on graduate programs the University could conceivably achieve its enrollment objectives. However, for the reasons set forth in the enclosures, we believe that much uncertainty exists regarding future enrollments. Therefore, we endorse the decision to defer further facility development activity, pending completion of the University's master plan and reevaluation of its enrollment prospects.

We believe, further, that in preparing its master plan, the University should clearly demonstrate that its proposed construction program cannot be modified to

- include renovation of existing-owned facilities such as its Wilson and Miner buildings; and
- provide for incremental construction of new facilities at the Mount Vernon Square campus, tailored to meet enrollment requirements not met by its Van Ness campus, existing-owned buildings, and outreach facilities owned by the district.

Also, evidence should be provided showing to what extent existing public schools and other outreach facilities are to be used for such programs as continuing and adult education, cooperative extension service or other community outreach programs.

B-118638
GG8-134

We are sending copies of this study to the Chairman, Board of Trustees, University of the District of Columbia; Council and Mayor of the District of Columbia; and the cognizant legislative and appropriation committees for their use.

Sincerely yours,


ACTING Comptroller General
of the United States

ANALYSIS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S CONSOLIDATED
MASTER PLAN DEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND

The residents of the District of Columbia, like those of the 50 States, deserve access to public-supported institutions offering quality and a wide range of postsecondary educational opportunities. To meet this educational need, Congress authorized the establishment of a public land-grant university through the reorganization of the existing local institutions of public postsecondary education in the District of Columbia-- D.C. Teachers College, Federal City College, and the Washington Technical Institute.

In establishing the University of the District of Columbia (UDC), the Council of the District of Columbia specified that it "provide a range of programs, studies and degrees designed to reach the widest possible number of citizens and residents of the District of Columbia including career and technological education, liberal arts, sciences, teacher education, and associate, graduate, post graduate, and professional degrees and studies." The act creating the University (D.C. Law 1-36) directed the Board of Trustees to prepare a long-range plan for the development of the University including the type and scope of programs offered and envisioned. Also, the plan was to include the development, expansion, integration, coordination, and efficient use of the facilities, physical plant, curricula, and standards of public postsecondary education.

The administrative consolidation of the existing local institutions occurred on August 1, 1977. UDC presented its August 24, 1977, unified facilities plan to the Senate Committee on Appropriations in September 1977 to support the construction of two campuses costing approximately \$140 million. On completion of the campuses, the University will be able to serve 13,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students. Presently UDC is in the process of formulating its long-range plan for development of the University.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations has expressed concern "that the University is being overbuilt and that current planning includes an undesirable amount of duplication." The University is required to provide the Committee with an updated consolidated master plan (academic and facilities) for the continued development of UDC.

Since the academic planning process is not scheduled for completion until May 1979, we examined the soundness of the student enrollment forecast supporting the facilities plan. Our study results were based on discussions with officials of UDC; D.C. Government; General Services Administration; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; other colleges and universities in the District; and analysis of data obtained from these officials.

SHOULD UDC BE BUILT AS PLANNED?

There is much uncertainty at present regarding the effects of upgraded educational opportunities on future student enrollment and how well the planned educational programs will meet the needs of District citizens. The University's projection of enrollment appears overly optimistic and its long-range plan is in its early stages of completion. Except for its academic structure, which consists of six colleges and four components, the long-range direction of the University is not clearly defined. For example, its academic planning process will include a community needs assessment to address such concerns as: D.C. demographic characteristics, sources of potential students, labor needs, employment opportunities, admission policies, cost, quality, reputation, and university's role in the Washington Metropolitan Consortium of Colleges and Universities, and a review of current degree and non-degree programs and requirements.

In addition, UDC's completed long-range plan will reassess such elements as (1) alternative actions to meet educational demand, (2) resource requirements (human, physical, and fiscal), (3) status of higher education in D.C., (4) student interest in higher education in D.C., (5) enrollment projections, and (6) projected educational needs of the community.

Given the above uncertainties and the need to complete its long-range assessment and academic plan, it follows that the University is not in a position to accurately project its physical plant requirements. The importance of student enrollment in estimating space needs is obvious. Similarly, the space requirements of the University's various colleges remain uncertain in the absence of soundly-derived estimates of this attendance mix--even with a good estimate of overall enrollment.

FACTORS THAT RAISE QUESTIONS ON
UDC'S FUTURE ABILITY TO ATTAIN
PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

UDC projects its student body headcount will increase by 44 percent between school year 1977-78 and 1985-86. Its FTE student forecast will increase by 48 percent during the same time period. Various factors exist which make these projections suspect.

1. Constraint of D.C.'s population which has been dropping significantly since 1970. (See chart 1.)
2. D.C.'s declining school-age population. (See charts 2 and 3.)
3. Declining number of graduating students who will be attending colleges or universities. (See chart 4.)
4. Decline already experienced in enrollment at UDC and its predecessor institutions, both in total enrollment and first-time enrollees. (See charts 5 and 6.)
5. Tightened academic standards and placement of more students on probation, which results in a reduced student workload and a corresponding reduction in full-time equivalent students.
6. The current estimate runs significantly counter to national conditions and expectations. (See chart 7.)
7. Increasing competition from other local colleges and universities that expect to enroll larger numbers of D.C. residents and high school graduates.

UDC's Forecasting Methodology

Projecting how many students will attend a college or university is essential to effective planning of campus development. Instructional workloads, required number of faculty, and the physical plant and land requirements of an institution

clearly are affected by the size of the student body and by the mission of the institution.

UDC provided GAO with enrollment projections using several different techniques through 1985. Among the methods considered and adopted by UDC was the Cohort Forecast method, which contained two projections--(1) for low emphasis on graduate programs which projected 15,200 headcount students by 1985, and (2) for normal emphasis on graduate programs which projected 19,200 headcount students by 1985. UDC believes that projecting enrollments based on a normal emphasis is reasonable.

UDC cited other generally accepted projection methods besides the Cohort Forecast. These include: (1) A Potential Demand method--ratio of college eligible in D.C. attending public higher education, (2) Urban Ratio method--percent of total population in urban cities who attended public higher education, and (3) Linear Regression Trend Analysis--trend of past years. Using these varied techniques, UDC predicted that its future headcount enrollment could range from 9,080 to 42,600.

According to UDC, the wide dispersion in projected enrollment could be narrowed considerably through the selection of a methodology that takes into account school-age enrollment, projected decline in the total population of the District of Columbia (if relevant), and also local demand for instruction. UDC believes the Cohort forecast meets this need since it falls at the lower end of the comparability scale.

UDC is expecting an overall annual growth of 5 to 6 percent through 1985-86 school term.

	Headcount		Annual rate of growth
	<u>Fall 1977</u>	<u>Fall 1985</u>	
Undergraduate	12,859	14,492	1.6%
Graduate	<u>502</u>	<u>4,753</u>	101.4%
Total	13,361	19,245 <u>a/</u>	5.3%
	*****	*****	

a/ Converts to 12,934 FTE.

It is evident that UDC anticipates significant growth in its graduate programs. If UDC's graduate program materializes, the graduate/undergraduate ratio will be 32.8 percent. Presently, UDC's graduate/undergraduate ratio is about 4 percent.

The March 7 1977, draft tuition rate proposal assumed "very aggressive activity * * * to stimulate accelerated growth of graduate programs" to achieve this 32.8 percent. Enrollment in UDC's graduate program, principally in education, business, and library science, has declined by about 33 percent since 1975. UDC, therefore, will have to quickly reverse this trend to attain its 1985-86 goal. For UDC to achieve its overall projection of 12,934 FTE students by 1985-86, a turnabout must also occur in its undergraduate enrollment.

GAO's Estimate of Future Student Enrollment

We computed enrollment projections using three methods and compared our results with UDC's Cohort forecast--normal emphasis on graduate programs. Our methods were (a) the urban ratio, (b) a trend analysis based on forecasted rates of growth in higher education as compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics, and (c) Cohort analysis with low emphasis on graduate programs, computed by UDC. (See charts 8, 9, and 10.)

Our analysis shows significant variances between our and UDC's methods. We project that UDC's total headcount enrollment may reach 14,550 using the urban ratio, and 14,844 using trend analysis. UDC estimated 15,200 headcount students with low graduate program emphasis. These amounts compare with UDC's forecast of 19,245 for normal graduate program emphasis. In terms of FTE comparison, the variance ranges between 3,100 and 3,500. The average of our three methods would result in an FTE of about 9,600 or 3,300 less than UDC's forecast. (See chart 11.)

The results of our analysis show that UDC's forecasted enrollment growth may be optimistic and difficult to achieve.

IS UDC OVERBUILDING?

In the final analysis, there is a great deal of uncertainty about UDC's 1985 student enrollment forecast and its facility space needs. The expected enrollments and space needs do not correspond. For example, UDC is projecting an undergraduate headcount of 14,492, but its August 24, 1977, unified facilities plan shows that space will be constructed to accommodate 17,422 undergraduates. Although UDC is forecasting that its graduate headcount will expand from its current level of 502 to 4,753 in just 8 years, its August facilities plan only provides space for 1,781 graduate students.

The following table shows the amount of overbuilding that may occur under three situations: (1) UDC's enrollment growth parallels the national norms for undergraduates and graduates; (2) percentage of District population attending UDC in the fall of 1977 remains constant for the next 8 years; or (3) UDC's growth in undergraduate enrollment exceeds the national norms, but its graduate enrollment rises to a level where the graduate/undergraduate ratio is 15 percent and exceeds space requirements as indicated in its facilities plan.

POTENTIAL EXCESS FTE CAPACITY

	<u>Headcount</u>		<u>FTE</u>		
	<u>GAO</u>	<u>UDC</u>	<u>situation 1</u>	<u>situation 2</u>	<u>situation 3</u>
Fall 1985 enrollment forecasts:					
NCES: a/					
Undergraduate	14,306		9,299		
Graduate	538		282		
	<u>14,844</u>		<u>9,581</u>		
Urban ratio: b/					
Graduate/under-graduate	14,550			9,500	
University of District of Columbia:					
Undergraduate		14,492 c/			9,420
Graduate		2,174 d/			1,140
		<u>16,666</u>			<u>10,560</u>
FTE capacity:					
Van Ness--	7,307				
National Airport--	40 e/				
Mount Vernon Square--	5,627				
				<u>12,974</u>	
Excess FTE capacity under different assumptions			3,393	3,474	2,414
			=====	=====	=====

a/ See chart 8.

b/ See chart 9.

c/ Projection based on UDC's tuition rate proposal, FTE conversion factor of .33.

d/ Projected space needs for graduate program assuming a graduate/undergraduate ratio of 15 percent; FTE conversion factor of .325.

e/ Instruction for Aerospace Technology will be conducted in facilities at Washington National Airport.

Even under the most optimistic of the above situations-- accelerated growth in graduate enrollment to 2,174 headcount-- UDC could be building in excess of its needs. To avoid building excess space, UDC will have to reverse the downward trend over the past 3-year period for graduate enrollment and annually exceed the national norm for public graduate enrollment over the next 8 years by 41 percent. With the many uncertainties surrounding its enrollment forecasts, UDC should proceed with caution.

On May 11, 1978, Senate and House conferees decided to hold up construction of the Mount Vernon Square campus until Congress receives UDC's master plan and revised estimates of future enrollment. In view of the uncertainties clouding the size and program composition of its future student enrollment, GAO believes UDC should present to Congress, along with its consolidated master plan, evidence that its proposed construction program cannot be modified to

- include renovation of existing-owned facilities prior to any new construction. We understand that the facilities at the former D.C. Teachers College can serve about 1,700 FTE students.
- provide for incremental construction of new facilities at Mount Vernon Square campus tailored to meet requirements not filled by Van Ness campus (7,300 FTE), renovated facilities (1,700 FTE), and outreach facilities.

Also, evidence should be provided showing to what extent existing public schools and other outreach facilities are to be used for such programs as continuing and adult education, cooperative extension service, or other community outreach programs. These facilities could also serve other graduate and undergraduate needs. UDC's facilities plan allocated over 600 FTE spaces for adult and continuing education programs.

The needs of about 9,600 FTE can be served using the above approach to a construction program. This coincides with the average of our three forecasts (charts 8, 9, and 10). If our projection proves valid, coupled with the uncertainties of the effects of upgraded educational opportunities and how well the planned educational programs will meet the community needs, there is a question of any need for new construction at this time. We believe that renovation of existing-owned facilities is a viable alternative since it affords many of the same

ENCLOSURE I

ENCLOSURE I

advantages cited for the Mount Vernon Square campus, such as the accessibility to cultural, business and social activities in the downtown vicinity. Students would be within easy reach of these activities by using metro.

ENCLOSURE I

ENCLOSURE I
CHART 1

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POPULATION
ESTIMATES - MUNICIPAL PLANNING OFFICE

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
1970	756,500
1971	753,600
1972	752,600
1973	739,600
1974	729,100
1975	721,800
1976	707,900
1977	690,000 <u>a/</u>

PROJECTION

1985	750,000
------	---------

a/ Provisional estimate of the U.S. Census Bureau.

ENCLOSURE I

ENCLOSURE I

CHART 2

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT 1/

<u>ACTUAL</u>		
<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	
1973	136,532	
1974	132,306	AVERAGE ANNUAL LOSS
1975	130,685	
1976	126,587	2.9%
1977	120,672	
<u>PROJECTED</u>		
1978	115,800	AVERAGE ANNUAL LOSS
1979	109,300	
1980	103,300	4.8%
1981	97,600	

1/ Pre-kindergarten through Senior High.

SOURCE: Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

<u>School year</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Graduates</u>
1970-71	22,017	4,801
1973-74	24,527	5,529
1976-77	25,667	5,460
1977-78	25,475	-

<u>School term</u>	<u>PROJECTED</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Graduates a/</u>
1977	-	5,554
1978	25,000	5,450
1979	23,200	5,058
1980	21,900	4,774
1981	20,800	4,534

a/ Based on the average annual number of graduates during the period 1970 to 1976 as computed by GAO.

SOURCE: Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

CHART 4

PROJECTED NUMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SENIOR HIGH GRADUATES WHO WILL ATTEND COLLEGE

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>SENIOR GRADUATES</u>	<u>PROJECTED STUDENTS a/</u>
1978	5,450	2,998
1979	5,058	2,782
1980	4,774	2,626
1981	4,534	2,494

a/ GAO assumed 55% will attend 2- or 4-year colleges. Public School Graduate Survey showed that 52 percent attended 2- or 4-year colleges.

SOURCE: U.S. General Accounting Office projection.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA ENROLLMENT DATA

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Enrollment</u>		<u>Undergraduate</u>		<u>Graduate</u>	
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Full-time equivalent</u>	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Full-time equivalent a/</u>	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Full-time equivalent b/</u>
1975	15,022	9,672	14,268	9,276	754	396
1976	13,935	8,802	13,303	8,470	632	332
1977	13,361	8,725	12,860	8,462	501	263

a/ Difference between total full-time equivalent and full-time equivalent graduate students.

b/ Conversion factor of 52.5 percent.

NOTE: The average headcount/full-time equivalent undergraduate conversion factor for 1975-77 is 65 percent.

SOURCE: The University of the District of Columbia.

ENCLOSURE I

ENCLOSURE I

CHART 6

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FRESHMAN ENROLLMENT - HEADCOUNT

<u>Year</u>	<u>First-time</u>	<u>Continuing</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent decline</u>
1975	3,537	4,885	8,422	-
1976	3,344	4,706	8,050	4.4
1977	2,910	4,785	7,695	4.4

SOURCE: The University of the District of Columbia.

CHART 7

COMPARISON OF TRENDS, NATIONAL AND THE
UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
(1977-78 through 1985-86)

<u>Higher Education</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>UDC</u> a/
Undergraduate headcount	1.7%	1.6%
Two-year institutions	3.6%	
Four-year institutions	.2%	
Graduate headcount	.9%	101.4%
First-time enrollment headcount	(1.3%)	(8.9%) b/
Two-year institutions	(1.1%)	
Four-year institutions	(1.5%)	
Full-time equivalents	1.1% c/	6.0%

a/ Some data relates to UDC's predecessor institutions.

b/ Average actual annual decline since Fall 1975 to Fall 1977.

c/ Four-year degree/credit institutions.

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics, HEW
and the University of the District of Columbia.

CHART 8

GAO STUDENT FORECAST

(Anticipated National Trends)

	<u>Fall 1977 current headcount</u>	<u>Growth percentage a/</u>	<u>Fall 1985 projected headcount</u>	<u>Conversion factor b/</u>	<u>Fall 1985 projected Full-time equivalent</u>
2-year	4,455	29.1	5,751	.65	3,738
4-year	8,404	1.8	8,555	.65	5,561
Graduate	<u>502</u>	7.2	<u>538</u>	.525	<u>282</u>
	<u>13,361</u> *****		<u>14,844</u> *****		<u>9,581</u> *****

a/ National Center for Education Statistics, NEW, data.

b/ The University of the District of Columbia data.

CHART 9

GAO STUDENT FORECASTDistrict of Columbia Population
and Future UDC Enrollment

(Urban Ratio)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Full-time equivalent</u>
1977	690,000	13,361	8,725
1985	750,000	14,550	9,500

NOTE: Projected data assumes UDC maintains the 1977 relationship between total population and headcount/full-time equivalent students.

CHART 10

GAO STUDENT FORECAST(COHORT - Low Emphasis)

	<u>Fall 1985 headcount</u> a/	<u>Conversion factor</u>	<u>Fall 1985 full-time equivalent</u>
Undergraduate	14,662	.65	9,530
Graduate	<u>538</u>	.525	<u>284</u>
Total	<u>15,200</u> b/ *****		<u>9,814</u> *****

a/ Undergraduate/graduate breakout was derived by using our projected graduate enrollment as the initial basis (see chart 8).

b/ Calculated by UDC and presented to Congress during its FY 78 hearings.

ENCLOSURE I

ENCLOSURE I

CHART 11

COMPARISON OF UDC/GAO STUDENT FORECAST

(Fall 1985)

	<u>UDC</u> (a)	<u>Urban</u> (b)	<u>GAO</u>		<u>Difference</u>		
			<u>NCES</u> (c)	<u>Cohort</u> (d)	(a - b)	(a - c)	(a - d)
HC	19,245	14,550	14,844	15,200	4,695	4,401	4,045
FTE	12,934	9,500	9,581	9,814	3,434	3,353	3,120

DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENTS PRESENTED
BY UDC ON MAY 10, 1978

Page

- 1 Preliminary results of a random telephone survey conducted in the District of Columbia to determine the: potential number of new enrollees (head of household) who may attend the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) during the next 2 years or beyond; type of educational program preferred by respondents; features which would attract a potential student to UDC; and reasons potential students would select institutions other than UDC for postsecondary education.
- 2 & 3 Information showing the changes that have taken place in the full-time equivalent (FTE) student capacity of the Van Ness campus and the proposed Mount Vernon Square campus since preparation of its August 24, 1977, facilities plan.
- 4 UDC's "worst" and "best" projection of student enrollment using the preliminary results obtained from the telephone survey (enclosure II, page 1).
- 5 Letter from the General Services Administration emphasizing that past and possible future slippage in Mount Vernon Square campus development, coupled with the escalation in construction costs, UDC will have to reduce its space program from 714,515 to 630,000 gross square feet.
- 6 Schedule comparing the amount of gross square feet (GSF) in UDC's current facilities inventory with the GSF it will occupy at the completion of its current capital improvements program.

Chart A: Impact of Needs Assessment Survey on Prospects for Enrollment at the University of the District of Columbia

Group	Market		Market		Market		Market		Preference/Attraction
	Next 2 years	Sometime Beyond Next 2 years	Next 2 years	Sometime Beyond Next 2 years	Next 2 years	Sometime Beyond Next 2 years	Next 2 years	Sometime Beyond Next 2 years	
Head of Household	Race a 21.8	Age 33.9 ^b	Race c 10.3	Age 11.6 ^d	Race 32.1	Age 45.5	Recognized at Survey Date	Potential	Program Preference/Attraction
									Preference: Technical programs for specific jobs; 1-2 years duration Attraction: Program selection - Low cost Close to home, convenient class schedules Percent Lost (74) Reasons: Programs not available. Deter academic reputation elsewhere Percent Lost (67) Reasons: Do not know.
Other Family Member	2.5	Not asked	2.5	2.5					Preference: H.A. Attraction: H.A. Percent Lost - N.A. Reasons: H.A.
Total	24.3	36.4	10.3	11.6	34.6	48.0			Preference: Not asked Attraction: Primary selection Percent Lost (85) Reasons: Better reputation elsewhere Program desired not available

^aSurvey conducted by Academy for Education Development and Opinion Research Corporation - Preliminary Reports, 5/9/78.
^bNon-white 6.2%, white .9%, 95% confidence interval 16.4-27.5.
^cAge groups 15-24 (10-24), 7.9% (35-49), 7.2% (25-34), 2.9% (60 and over 95% confidence interval 15.3-52.9).
^dNon-white 2.6%, white .5%, Black, Hispanic, Oriental, other.
 Age groups 6.5% (25-34), 2.9% (35-49), 2.2% (18-24).

ENCLOSURE II

ENCLOSURE II

Consolidated Master Plan Report, August 24, 1977

Van Ness Campus	7,307 FTE Students
Mount Vernon Square Campus	5,627 FTE Students

FCC Master Plan, 1975

Phase I Construction Request:

- \$54.3 Million for Construction
- 712,700 GSF of Space (Average Cost \$76.19/GSF)
- Cost Estimate Based on Mid-Point of Construction June 1979

Current Student Split MVSC/VNC, as of March 1978

Van Ness Campus	6,796 FTE
Mount Vernon Square Campus (Based on 712,700 GSF of Space)	6,537 FTE

GSA Request: That We Reduce MVSC Space Program to 630,000 GSF

$$\frac{6,537}{712,700} = \frac{x}{630,000}$$

x = 5,778 FTE, MVSC

6,796 FTE, VNC

12,574 FTE Total

Consolidated Master Plan Report, August 24, 1977

Van Ness Campus	7,307 FTE Students
Mount Vernon Square Campus	5,627 FTE Students

FCC Master Plan, 1975

Phase I Construction Request:

- \$54.3 Million for Construction
- 712,700 GSF of Space (Average Cost \$76.19/GSF)
- Cost Estimate Prepared December 1975 Based on Mid-Point of Construction June 1979

Mount Vernon Square Campus Master Plan Update, 1977-78

- Estimated Mid-Point of Construction September 1980 (15 Months Later Than 1975 Estimate)
- Reduction in Square Footage Due to Delays in Funding:

Construction Cost Escalation-- $.75\%$ /Month

$.75\% * 15 \text{ Months} = 11.25\%$

Average Cost ($\$76.19/\text{GSF}$) * $1.11 = \$84.57/\text{GSF}$

$\$54.3 \text{ Million} \div \$84.57 = \underline{642,071 \text{ GSF}}$

Current Student Split MVSC/VNC, as of March 1978

Van Ness Campus	6,796 FTE
Mount Vernon Square Campus (Based on 712,700 GSF of Space)	6,537 FTE

GSA Has Requested That We Reduce MVSC Space Program to 630,000 GSF

Memoranda attached.

$$\frac{6,537}{712,700} = \frac{x}{630,000}$$

$$x = 5,778 \text{ FTE, MVSC}$$

$$\quad \quad \quad 6,796 \text{ FTE, VNC}$$

$$\quad \quad \quad \underline{12,574 \text{ FTE Total}}$$

Enrollment Based on "Worst" Projections

13,292 HC Current Enrollment
 7,650 HC Additional Students,
 Based on Community
 Needs Assessment

$$[(13,292 * .82) + 7,650] * .65 = \underline{12,057 \text{ FTE}}$$

Based on "Worst" Projections:

1. Current UDC Enrollment
2. Lowest Community Needs Assessment Forecast

Enrollment Based on "Best" Projections

13,292 HC Current Enrollment
 24,450 HC Additional Students,
 Based on Community
 Needs Assessment

$$[(13,292 * .82) + 24,450] * .65 = \underline{22,977 \text{ FTE}}$$

Based on "Best" Projections:

1. Current UDC Enrollment
2. Highest Community Needs Assessment Forecast

Recommendation D(2), GAO Report, P. 22

Two Major Campuses--Van Ness and Mount Vernon--with the size of Mount Vernon tailored to fill requirements not met by Van Ness, with provision for appropriate outreach facilities.

Our current Facilities Development program parallels this recommendation.

ENCLOSURE II

ENCLOSURE II



General
Services Administration Public
Buildings Service Washington, DC 20405

May 9, 1978

Mr. Claude A. Ford
Vice President for
Institutional Advancement
UDC, Van Ness Campus
4200 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Dear Mr. Ford:

With the resumption of our Master Plan update efforts for the Mount Vernon Campus, UDC, it is essential that we again focus our attention of the need to reduce the University's space program. The latest delay of approximately 4 months due to the University's reprogramming exercise coupled with indications of a possible return to double digit escalation rates in the near future, only serves to reemphasize that we will be unable to complete the UDC-MVC facilities, as delineated in the 1975 Master Plan, within our construction budget of \$46,000,000.

Prior to the latest delay our projections indicated the need to cut the MVC space program from 714,515 GSF to 620-650,000 GSF. In view of our current position and considering the possibility of future slippage, I believe it would be wise if we set the upper limit for the campus space program at approximately 630,000 GSF. Since the A/E is currently developing zoning schemes for the campus, it is essential that we immediately advise him as to where the program reductions are to occur.

Your immediate response will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

MARVIN I. SIEWLER
Acting Project Manager
University of the District of Columbia

<u>Current Facilities Inventory (GSF)</u>		<u>Projected Facilities Inventory (GSF)</u>	
Mount Vernon Square Campus ¹	732,245	Van Ness Campus Phase I	260,000
Georgia Avenue/Harvard Street Campus	123,187	Van Ness Campus Phase II ³	505,646
Van Ness Campus ²	419,970	National Airport	32,969
Total	1,271,402 GSF	Coop. Ext. Service (1351 Nicholson Street)	10,946
		Mount Vernon Square Campus Phase I ⁴	505,996
		D.C. Public Library ⁵	43,063
		Total	1,359,420 GSF

Net 88,018 GSF

Current Enrollment = 8,725 FTE
 1,271,402 GSF ÷ 8,725 FTE = 146 GSF/FTE

Based on 12,574 FTE
 1,359,420 GSF ÷ 12,574 FTE = 108 GSF/FTE

- ¹Excludes: D.C. Public Library, Brookland School
- ²Includes: Leased Facilities, Temporaries (Buildings 6 & 7), National Airport, Phase I Facilities
- ³Excludes: Parking Garage, Power Plant
- ⁴Excludes: Parking Garage, Power Plant
- ⁵Excludes: Community Meeting Rooms