This policy was developed pursuant to Act 758 of 2006, in consultation with the Board of Regents, and is subject to approval of the Division of Administration Office of Facility Planning and Control.

**Post-Secondary Educational Institutions**

Act 758 of 2006 (R. S. 17:3361 (A)(2)) requires each higher education management board to adopt, subject to approval by the Division of Administration, Office of Facility Planning and Control, and in consultation with the Board of Regents, proposed space standards and quality standards and exceptions thereto on or before January 1, 2007 for construction of improvements on college or university leased property. This document will serve as a preliminary set of standards for use by the management boards as agreed at a joint meeting facilitated by the Board of Regents’ staff. Thereafter, each management board may choose to make modifications to address their particular facility needs.

Since 1991, the first year for the 3rd party process as a means to provide facilities, there have been eighty-five projects encompassing fifteen types of facilities. Since a wide variety of types of facilities can be built using the 3rd party process, standards are needed for essentially all types of facilities needed by post-secondary educational institutions.

**Space Standards**

Many factors influence the space requirements for an institution. Different types of institutions with different role, scope, and missions have different needs. Student count, in terms of student contact or clock hours (SCH) or full time equivalent students (FTE), is often the prime factor. Sometimes, projected student count must be considered, as when starting a new campus. Other factors include the funding available for a project and its source. Accrediting agencies also set minimums for space if an institution or its programs are to be accredited, which is often necessary from an academic perspective. Facilities for institutions such as medical or agricultural centers cannot be based on enrollment alone, nor do they have in-state peer institutions against
which space needs can be compared. Athletic facilities are based on public appeal and attendance. Some institutions must accommodate in their public service role people that do not show up in headcount or FTE numbers. The fact that some students must work impacts community colleges more than four-year institutions, as do non-traditional students who are often parents as well as students. Latitude for exceptions on a case by case basis as anticipated by Act 758 will allow for facilities to meet the unique needs and circumstances for individual institutions.

Most, but not all, 3rd party projects use self-generated funding and are proposed only after a feasibility study and market research has been performed that may include student polls, surveys, or even referenda in which students elect to self-impose fees to accomplish a project. Often, space is determined by how much money can be raised or is otherwise available, not by specific FTE or headcount numbers or related numerical relationships arbitrarily set in advance. In such projects the Board of Regents’ Facilities Policy requires a business plan with cash flow proforma to assure the financial viability of the project.

In requesting space needs for 3rd party projects, reporting requirements for eCorts can serve as a model. That documentation calls for type of space needed, numbers and types of occupants, and net area per occupant to derive total net area. Total net area is then adjusted by an appropriate “burden factor” to determine total gross area for the proposed facility. Cost figures are then determined based on net and burden areas. However, no standards are established and no published standards identified, leaving it to reviewers to apply their intuition to the process.

Years ago, the Board of Regents adopted space standards promulgated by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). Those standards, developed in 1971, defined only classroom and laboratory utilization. Briefly stated, in classrooms, each student station was to have 15 SF, rooms were to be used 30 hours per week, and when in use, a room was to be 60% occupied. For labs, 40 SF was provided per station, rooms were to be used 20 hours per week, and when in use, a room was to be 80% occupied. Those numbers provided a reasonable average for that era, even though differences in classroom or laboratory use were not specified. That is, observation of actual use of facilities demonstrates a tendency to have rooms very crowded when in use, but in use fewer hours per week. Moreover, modern teaching practices have increased those numbers somewhat.

Establishing classroom and laboratory use, as those statistics do, begins to get into academic or educational decisions that are the sole purview of the Board of Regents and the management boards. Hours and times to teach as well as student to professor ratios are decisions must be left to the educational community.

By the same token, it is inappropriate for those outside the educational community to make academic decisions regarding office sizes to be assigned to certain academic titles. A “dean” can require much different space at a major research institution as contrasted with his/her counterpart at a community college. Space assignments can legitimately be made on a desire to attract and retain as much as for the functional necessities of the work to be performed therein. Often, the functional necessities of the person occupying a space is not conveyed by their title alone. Some offices are required by the federal government to maintain records in a secure manner,
precluding cubicles. In other instances, maintaining the privacy of conversations with students precludes the use of shared space. These considerations impact space needs and can only evolve as the design professional gets into the specifics of his/her work through the interview process.

Space related statistics can provide an overview, but often fail to adequately portray that available space is not configured for the functional necessities of the institution. Therefore, an institution can be short of a specific type or kind of space even when it appears statistically to have all the space it needs based on student count or other benchmarks.

Categories of space for post-secondary education were developed in 1972 by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) through WICHE and is promulgated by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). For each of the following categories of space type, the indicated space standards are proposed:

**100 Classroom Facilities** - typically teaching space not equipped for a specific use.
110 Classroom - Requests for classrooms will be submitted as a required number of small, medium, and large classrooms accommodating a stated number of persons each, with 18 NSF per student station.

*Classrooms with demonstration/conference areas – 25 NSF*
Conference Rooms (Educational) - 25 NSF per occupant
Seminar Rooms (Educational) - 25 NSF per occupant
Lecture Halls - 15 NSF per student station
Lecture Halls (fixed seating) - 12 NSF per student station

**200 Laboratory Facilities** - typically basic wet labs, but the category also includes P-Tech labs, art and fine arts studios, music practice areas, and specialized and research labs. Relative to special and research labs, until the occupant, his research area, possible grants relating to the research and space are known, sizing such space on predetermined numbers is futile.

210 Class Laboratory - Requests for class labs will be submitted as a required number of small, medium, and large labs accommodating a stated number of persons each, with 40 NSF per student station.

215 Class Laboratory Service - 10 % of the relevant lab(s) served
220 Special Class Laboratory - 40 NSF per student station
225 Special Class Laboratory Service - 10 % of the relevant lab(s) served
230 Individual Study Laboratory - as required on a case by case basis
235 Individual Study Laboratory Service - as required on a case by case basis
250 Non-Class Laboratory - as required on a case by case basis
255 Non-Class Laboratory Service - as required on a case by case basis
260 Research Laboratory - as required on a case by case basis
265 Research Laboratory Service - as required on a case by case basis
270 Computer Labs - often a function of grants or other funding for computers. Size as required on a case by case basis.

**300 Office Facilities**
310 Office (Faculty) - Requests for faculty offices will be submitted as a required number of
very small (100 NSF), small (125 NSF), medium small (150 NSF), medium (175 NSF),
medium large (200 NSF), and large (225 NSF) offices similar to that of eCorts
submitals.
The assignment of such offices will remain an academic decision.
Office (Administrative) - Same as for faculty offices, with exception of (250 large)
Open Space Cubicle - based on a 8’ x 8’ module = 64 NSF.
Open Space Shared Cubicle - 100 NSF
Shared Office - 160 NSF
Suite - as required on a case by case basis. Suites will serve departmental, college, or
institutional administration’s offices and will include reception and waiting, secretarial
pool areas, department, college, or institution head’s office, other offices, ancillary
facilities as necessary and appropriate, and conference room(s). Special Offices - unique
circumstances do occur where a particularly large or well appointed office is justified.
These must be considered on a case by case basis.
350 Conference Room (Office Related) - small (150 NSF), medium (250 NSF) and large (350
NSF)

400 Study Facilities - libraries, study halls, study facilities, Libraries will be sized based on
ACRL accrediting standards.
410 Reading/Study Room
420 Stack
430 Open Stack Study Room
440 Processing Room

Space needs for all types of space in categories 500, 600, 700, and 800 will be
programmed in submittals on a case by case basis with the stipulation that a thorough
analysis and/or feasibility study including space analysis/needs will have been performed
and the provisions in the Board of Regents’ Facilities Policy relative to business plans
and economic proformas will have been met, and presented and approved by the
management board and the Board of Regents.

500 Special Use Facilities - stadia, playing fields, assembly centers, natatoriums, weight
rooms, bell towers, day care facilities, band and choir halls, recital halls,
510 Armory
520 Athletic/Physical Education
523 Athletic/Spectator Seating
530 Audio/Visual, Radio, TV
540 Clinic (Non-health Professionals)
550 Demonstration
560 Field Building
570 Animal Quarters
580 Greenhouse
590 Other

600 General Use Facilities - bookstores, student rec. centers, alumni centers, faculty club,
hotels, conference centers, continuing education facilities, museums, art galleries, union,
theaters,
610 Assembly
620 Exhibition
Supporting Facilities - parking garages, central facility services, central utility plant, printing, supply receiving, motor pool, campus security/police station. In technical institutions, shop areas include carpentry, welding, automotive, and other trade training areas.

Health Care Facilities - infirmaries.

Residential Facilities

Unclassified Facilities

Unclassified facilities are typically existing facilities that should be renovated into useful space. Space standards for new construction would be based on the standards listed
herein for the type of space proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Inactive Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>Alteration or Conversion Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>Unfinished Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality Standards**

Act 758 of 2006 calls for quality standards to be established. There are two levels of quality that are legitimate concerns: too low, and too high. Facility Planning and Control has expressed concern that the state will inherit 3rd party projects at some point in time, and they will, because of inferior quality when constructed, become a financial burden to the state. Some are concerned that overly high levels of quality are inconsistent with, or are perceived as being inconsistent with the public purpose.

There is a reluctance for agencies of the state to establish quality standards because doing so tends to relieve design professionals and contractors of responsibility for failed building components. For management boards to set minimum or maximum quality standards, a very thick specification book listing every possible building component would be required, with specific acceptable products and perhaps unacceptable products listed. Such a book would require almost constant updating as available products become obsolete, or new products are added.

Levels of quality are not called for when eCorts is submitted for traditional capital projects. Levels of quality are conveyed to design professionals on a case by case basis. Often, the environment into which the new facility will go sets the expectation of quality. The established AFC (Available For Construction) and building space program also establish the quality level. As a design develops, a delicate balance is kept between space needs and cost, which is a direct reflection of quality.

Post-secondary education has put in place the means to alleviate concerns that 3rd party projects will ever become a burden to the state. First, the Board of Regents’ Facilities Policy requires a Maintenance Reserve Account (MRA) be established and maintained for the life of 3rd party projects where appropriate. Based on facility type, up to10% of the cost of construction up front, or 1-1/2% annually from income generating projects, is set aside in an actuarially sound account for the maintenance of major facility components over the anticipated life of the facility. Secondly, most projects include provisions for demolition at the end of the financing term.

Accordingly, each project proposal shall include its size, type of facility, and the per square foot cost for construction. **Those three data set the level of quality.** Facility Planning and Control may, based on its historical data and experience for similar facilities in comparable locales, evaluate the level of quality and either approve it or not. As design and specifications are developed thereafter, gold plated faucets will not be affordable, but in some instances, stainless may supplant galvanized, to paraphrase the most common points of comparison.