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Preface

Welcome to another expanded Web-based Facilities Performance Indicators Report (FPI). APPA's Information and Research Committee's goal for this year was to enhance the survey and report tools by making them both more navigable, user-friendly, and accurate. We have made significant progress with all of these initiatives. APPA also automated many of the internal processes for the survey and report, which resulted in a better quality product that can be delivered faster and with more accuracy. APPA will continue to make improvements based on participant feedback, and we welcome any thoughts or comments you would like to provide.

2008-09 Report Innovations

The 2008-09 FPI encompasses many major programming achievements:

- APPA has updated the look and feel of the report by eliminating duplication of pages and streamlining navigation links. The new charting software is far more legible, dynamic, and flexible.

- APPA released the unpublished Report as a beta version for all participants to view and to help APPA ensure that all data sets submitted were accurate.

- Trending for all charts and graphs has been extended from 3 years to 5 years.

- Participants have the flexibility to choose any number of trending years (up to 5) to show on all graphs and charts.

- Canadian and U.S. conversions for the following measures [Dollar/Canadian Dollar, Gross Square Feet (GSF)/Gross Square Meters (GSM), Acres/Hectares] have been automated by clicking a radial button to convert all U.S. to Canadian or vice versa.

- Main menu options have been condensed to eliminate duplication of report pages. The previous Cohort Group Report menu option has now become the former Detailed Report option. In addition, the restriction of selecting only 3 institutions in this report has been lifted, you may now opt to view up to 100 participants.

- The former Preferences menu option has now been integrated with the Executive Level Presentation and the Executive Level Dashboard as well as the Detailed Reports. This change will allow participants to select unique institutions and sort criteria among the different reports.

- The Executive Level Presentation that we debuted last year has much more functionality this year, including the ability to tab easily through all 7 survey
modules and change data point selections easily and without having to leave the landing page. All participants can opt to select between 1 to 5 years of trending. The charts can be exported to PowerPoint or Word programs.

- The original Dashboards have been upgraded with new software that will enable participants to more easily and clearly view their data in the dials.

- This year we are debuting our new Executive Level Dashboard feature, which will provide all Chief Business Officers and Senior Facilities Officers with quick and easy metrics that highlight the data sets most relevant for that target group. The charting software is dynamic, and participants can choose to view up to 24 institutions at a time. Data can be sorted by several important criteria including Carnegie, Auxiliary Service, Enrollment Range, and more.

- Raw survey data files are now part of the main menu options. These files represent a convenient and flexible way to customize the data beyond the confines of the standard reports. The data populates into a delimited file that can be easily cut, pasted, and exported to Excel or any other spreadsheet or database.

These enhancements, on top of the potent report capabilities delivered in the 2008-09 FPI Report, make it a flexible, sophisticated, and powerful tool for analyzing, planning, reporting, and managing your facilities operation. No other professional education organization provides such an essential instrument as a membership benefit.

We congratulate the institutions that elected to participate in the 2008-09 FPI Survey, and we celebrate meeting our goals to deliver this superior 2008-09 FPI Report to the APPA membership and other interested parties.

The 2008–09 Facilities Performance Indicators report reflects some APPA members’ desire for confidentiality. The only institutional list of participants is contained in Appendix A of this text form of the Report.

Participant institutional studies are available to participants who indicate a willingness to share their identity with other participants. These institutions have an abundant amount of information at hand. APPA encourages institutions that have not done so to join those who participated in the Facilities Performance Indicators Survey so that they can also profit from this data discovery process and receive the new Participant Summary Reports.

All others view the non-participant report in which institution names are coded. Those using the confidential Report are advised to examine the institutional listing in the Preferences area, which shows the general statistics about the participants in the survey. This general campus information is provided so that users of this report can evaluate the institutions that have contributed statistics to the averages reflected in the summaries.
The *Facilities Performance Indicators Report* is designed for survey participants, interested professionals, and serious researchers who want to mine the data. The Report includes the following features, among others:

- a comparison of any or all within a cohort group;
- simultaneous display of significant data and ratios and measures for all selected institutions and overall and group averages;
- the capability to read and/or print out the whole range of 2008–09 reports contained in the *Facilities Performance Indicators Report*, including institution-by-institution tables;
- the capability to view all numeric report figures in chart form.
- the ability to export the calculated information and survey entries to Microsoft Excel or other software for additional studies.

Participating institutions from outside the United States were given the option of entering their financial information in their national currency instead of U.S. dollars, size entries in gross square meters instead of gross square feet, and hectares instead of acres. All report entries are available to view in both Metric and Standard. This is the first year that APPA allows all participants to choose how they would like all information contained in charts, graphs, and reports to be displayed as either Metric or Standard.

APPA’s Information and Research Committee provided leadership and direction in the development of the Facilities Performance Indicators Survey as well as the innovative new methods used for the data storage, retrieval, and analysis that was constructed under the committee’s watch. The 2009-10 Information and Research Committee consists of the following members:

**Chair/Vice President for Information and Research Committee:**
Randolph Hare, Washington & Lee University

**Committee Members**
CAPPA: Jeff Brown, University of North Texas  
ERAPPA: Norman Young, University of Hartford  
MAPPA: Jeri Ripley King, University of Iowa  
PCAPPA: Richard Storlie, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
RMA: Greg Wiens, Athabasca University  
SRAPPA: Mike Sherrell, University of Tennessee/Knoxville  
Member At-Large: Darryl Boyce, Carleton University  
Member At-Large: Maggie Kinnaman, APPA Fellow, Past APPA President  
Staff Liaison: Steve Glazner, APPA Director of Knowledge Management  
FPI Project Manager: Christina Hills, APPA Research Specialist

APPA thanks Heather Lukes of Digital Wise Inc., who supports the APPA website and all programming related to the FPI survey and report. Finally, we thank the many institutions and APPA members who responded once again to our survey and whose participation makes the report both informative and functional.
Interpreting This Report

The purpose of APPA’s *Facilities Performance Indicators* is to provide a representative set of statistics about facilities in educational institutions. The 2008-09 iteration of the Web-based Facilities Performance Indicators Survey was posted and available to facilities professionals at more than 3,000 institutions in the Fall of 2009.

Data analysis and cleanup are performed in three phases of report processing:

- The instant reports provided at the completion of certain survey modules are tools for participants to audit their entries and make corrections.
- Survey audits are used to alert participants to data inconsistencies during the survey input period.
- After the survey is closed and measures are calculated, out-of-range numbers are questioned. New tools were developed to select and sort survey entries and calculate report fields.
- Additional errors are discovered during the report beta review period in which participants review their data output.

The report has rare instances in which an entry was correct but was so radical that it was not useful to other institutions. They remain in the database but are excluded from Overall and grouping summaries.

Organization of the Tables

The statistics contained in this report are summarized according to the following categories:

1. **Funding Source**
   - a. Private
   - b. Public

2. **Carnegie Classification**
   - a. Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive
   - b. Doctoral/Research Universities—Intensive
   - c. Master’s Colleges and Universities
   - d. Baccalaureate Colleges
   - e. Associate’s Colleges
   - f. Specialized Institutions
   - g. K–12

3. **Canadian (faux) Carnegie Classification**
   - a. Doctoral/Research
   - b. Research Universities—High
   - c. Research Universities—Very High
   - d. Master’s Colleges and Universities
   - e. Baccalaureate Colleges

4. **Region**
   - a. CAPPA (Central)
   - b. ERAPPA (Eastern)
   - c. MAPPA (Midwest)
   - d. PCAPPA (Pacific Coast)
   - e. RMA (Rocky Mountain)
   - f. SRAPPA (Southeastern)

5. **Student Full-Time-Equivalent Enrollment Range**
   - a. 0 to 999
   - b. 1,000 to 1,999
   - c. 2,000 to 2,999
   - d. 3,000 to 4,999
   - e. 5,000 to 11,999
   - f. 12,000 to 19,999
   - g. 20,000+

6. **Auxiliary Services**
   - a. Included in Entries
   - b. Excluded from Entries

7. **Percent Dollars Contracted**
   - a. Less than 1%
   - b. 1% to 19.9%
c. 20% to 49.9%
d. 50%+

8. Building’s Average Age (used selectively)
a. Less than 20 years
b. 20 to 29 years
c. 30 to 39 years
d. 40 to 49 years
e. 50+ years

9. Cogeneration (used with Energy and Utilities)
a. No
b. Yes

10. District Utility System (used with Energy and Utilities)
a. No
b. Yes

11. Custodial Service Level (used with Custodial Services)
a. State-of-the-Art-Maintenance
b. High-level Maintenance
c. Moderate-level Maintenance
d. Moderately Low-level Maintenance
e. Minimum-level Maintenance

12. Grounds Service Level
a. Orderly Spotlessness
b. Ordinary Tidiness
c. Casual Inattention
d. Moderate Dinginess
e. Unkempt Neglect

13. Maintenance Level
a. Showpiece Facility
b. Comprehensive Stewardship
c. Managed Care
d. Reactive Management
e. Crisis Response

14. Customer Overall Satisfaction
a. 3 Satisfied
b. 4 Very Satisfied
c. 5 Extremely Satisfied

15. Employee Overall Satisfaction
a. 2 Very Dissatisfied
b. 3 Satisfied
c. 4 Very Satisfied

a. 1. Copper No Program
b. 2. Bronze Beginning Program
c. 3. Silver Mature Program
d. 4. Gold Stretch Goal
e. 5. Platinum Flawless Program

17. Cohort Average (Seen if public)
a. Canadian Universities
b. California State University System
c. University of North Carolina System
Funding, Carnegie classification, and student enrollment were audited against IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) records, and an APPA region was assigned according to the state or province in the institution’s address. Institutions designated K–12 are in an artificial “K–12” Carnegie classification. Non-U.S. institutions participating in the survey were given self-assigned Carnegie classifications based on the current classification definitions.

Comments on Three of the Detailed FPI Reports

Participant Demographics/General Data

Participant Demographics/General data is a new Report Section that provides the user of the 2008–09 Facilities Performance Indicators Report a perspective on the type of institutions that are included in the statistical pool.

Operating Costs Report

The Operating Costs Report consists of a series of reports on operational expenses (in-house labor, in-house nonlabor, and contract costs). The measures include FTE from Personnel Data and Costs by survey module compared to GSF/GSM. These costs, FTE, and GSF/GSM per acres/hectares are broken down into six functions performed by facilities operations: administration, construction/renovation/architecture and engineering, custodial services, energy/utilities, landscaping/groundskeeping, and maintenance/trades.

Some things to be aware of when looking at the Operating Costs Report are:

1. The information about contracted services was improved by new data captures in Operating Costs and in Personnel Data and Costs sections of the survey. GSF/GSM completely serviced by a contractor and contractor FTE performing work otherwise done by in-house labor are the new data points. These new data points make the FTE per GSF/GSM and the FTE per Student FTE measure by function more accurate.

2. The GSF/GSM reported for the Construction A&E function was limited to the footage under planning, bid, award and/or construction during the 2008-09 fiscal year. In 2008-09, participants were given two choices: footage under planning, bid, award, and construction; or total campus GSF/GSM. The cost per GSF/GSM is reported both ways.
Strategic Financial Measures Report

The Strategic Financial Measures are highly dependent on the Current Replacement Value (CRV) estimates since CRV is the divisor in formulas for most of its measures. CRV estimates become more realistic with each survey. However, before you select a campus as a comparison cohort for strategic measures, check its gross CRV estimate value per GSF/GSM. The two components for this calculation are in the Significant Supporting Data line (Total campus GSF/GSM w/Aux and Current Replacement Value). CRV/GSF/GSM averages are to include infrastructure and reflect current construction costs. You probably would not want to compare your performance against a campus that has a CRV/GSF/GSM value that is significantly different from yours.

Report Characteristics

Several characteristics of the way the survey is computed should be kept in mind, because these techniques tend to bias the averages in the report.

- Blanks and zeros were not included in computations except in a few cases where there was no question that zero was a legitimate entry. The data collection system does not distinguish between no entry and no cost. (Respondents may enter only the information that was of interest to their campus.) Statistics do not include zero or null entries. This statistical method affects almost every portion of the report.

- No summary averages are computed as averages of averages, because that is not valid. Summary averages are the sum of all entries divided by the count of all entries.

- The data generally do not conform to a standardized bell curve. Typically, data are clustered at the low end of a range rather than being symmetrical around the mean. As a result, the median figures are typically somewhat lower than the average figures that are reported.

- A summary that breaks groups down into many categories will produce some small counts, and counts vary from measure to measure since respondents do not answer all survey questions. The average for a small count should be used with caution. Please activate the “Count” button on the Detailed Report data summaries line before evaluating the grouping statistics. This Web-based Facilities Performance Indicators Report includes counts for all group averages.

- Look at historical bar charts to identify those group averages that appear to be stable statistics and those that have large fluctuations. A small sample size typically produces fluctuations from year-to-year.
Despite these disclaimers, the statistics are generally representative, and therefore valid, as substantiated by consistent data that are illustrated in historical charts. Where the statistics are historically different, the validity of the data can be substantiated by identifying the sources of data differences, such as the influence of non-traditional specialized institutions in the participant pool. This is a general caution and should not be viewed as a shortcoming of APPA’s current Facilities Performance Indicators Survey. Biases, reporting consistency, and other concerns are always present when evaluating statistical information, and it is always important to know how to make valid comparisons. Keeping this in mind is the best way to ensure that this report is used effectively.

**FY 2008-09 Respondents and Participation Trends**

There are 392 participants in the 2008-09 Report. There have been two spikes with survey participation in the past: in 1994, 516 institutions responded when APPA made a concerted effort to survey community colleges; and in 2000, the first time the survey could be completed online on the APPA website, 248 institutions took part. In other years, about 200 institutions—plus or minus 10 percent—participated in the survey. This year there was a significant increase in the number of participants – a near doubling of the participants.

Up until 2003, about 30 percent of the participant pool consistently came from institutions that had private sources of funding, and 70 percent came from those that had public sources.

- In 2004 the representation by the private sector increased to 40 percent by a larger participation of private K–12 institutions.
- In 2005, private institutions were 30 percent of the total.
- They dropped to 23 percent of the participants in 2006 and retained that ratio in 2007.
- 2008 had a slight increase to 27 percent for the private institutions.
- 2009 has a decrease of 19 percent compared to last year for private institutions. This is due to the 75 percent increase in total number of institutions participating. The actual number of participating private schools was more than last year but the percentage was lower.
All APPA regions are represented in the report, with the largest number of respondents coming from the Midwestern region (MAPPA), Southeastern region (SRAPPA), the Centeral region (CAPPA), and the Eastern region (ERAPPA). There were no International participants this year. (APPA had a spike in the MAPPA region this year due to its partnership with MHEC (Midwestern Higher Education Compact) whose members are all located in the MAPPA region).

Participating institutions’ enrollment ranges—which start at 0 and go up to 20,000-plus—has been rather consistent over the last seven survey cycles. The bar chart below shows that the enrollment range distribution in 2009 follows the normal experience levels.
The representation of institutions as categorized by the Carnegie classifications has been generally consistent. The change in Carnegie classifications for the doctoral and research institutions changed from two categories into three in 2006. APPA decided to couple Doctoral/Research Intensive to Doctoral Research and Doctoral/Research Extensive to Research Very High. That left Research High as a lone new category. The trend over the past few years is growth in participation in the Masters Carnegie class.

Specialized institutions are shown as one category in the chart. The FPI shows this Carnegie classification as Specialized (count 5) and Specialized Medical (count 7).

While the counts are small when this division is made, the Medical Centers need to make comparisons within their own group and not a mixture of medical and other types of specialized institutions.
Carnegie Classifications

The following are descriptions of the primary institutional classifications as defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:

**Doctorate-granting Universities:** Includes institutions that award at least 20 doctoral degrees per year (excluding doctoral-level degrees that qualify recipients for entry into professional practice, such as the JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.). Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges.

- Research Universities Very High Research Activity
- Research Universities High Research Activity
- Doctoral/Research Universities

**Master’s Colleges and Universities:** Includes institutions that award at least 50 master’s degrees per year. Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal colleges.

**Baccalaureate Colleges:** Includes institutions where baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10 percent of all undergraduate degrees and that award fewer than 50 master’s degrees or fewer than 20 doctoral degrees per year. Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges.

**Associate’s Colleges:** Includes institutions where all degrees are at the associate’s level or where bachelor’s degrees account for less than 10 percent of all undergraduate degrees. Excludes institutions eligible for classification as Tribal Colleges or Special Focus Institutions.

**Special focus Institutions:** Institutions awarding baccalaureate or higher-level degrees where a high concentration of degrees is in a single field or set of related fields. Excludes Tribal Colleges.

- Specialized
- Specialized/Medical Medical schools and medical centers

**K–12:** This includes schools and school districts focusing on primary and secondary education. It is not a Carnegie Classification, but one assigned for the purposes of the FPI Report.
APPA Regions

APPA’s six geographical regions function independently of APPA and offer their own educational programs, annual meetings, scholarships, and other benefits. Each region maintains its own set of officers, committees, and activities to serve member institutions within the region. Regions determine their own membership requirements, dues, structure, and services.

Regions work with APPA to ensure that international programs address concerns of interest to all members. To maintain strong links among all regions, each region is represented on the APPA Board of Directors and on APPA committees.

APPA chapters are general city-wide or state-wide organizations of members who meet periodically to share information and discuss issues of local or state interest.

Institutions from outside the United States of America and Canada are put into an “International” region for the purpose of this FPI Report. A concentration of institutions from any one foreign region will be recognized in future FPI Reports.

Up-to-date information about the APPA regions—including conference dates, contact information, and links to the regional websites—are available on APPA’s website at http://www.appa.org/regions/index.cfm.
Participant Demographics/General Data

Information in this section is provided to assist you in your evaluation of information contained in the 2008-09 Facilities Performance Indicators Report.

- The count of institutions in each group pool used in report statistical summaries.
- Characteristics of the institutions that make up each grouping’s statistical pool.

The charts and tables in Participant Demographics shows whether the distribution within a grouping could be considered significant for your purposes.

- Funding source includes counts of 75 private and 317 public institutions. Both of these are ample samplings.
- The grouping according to Carnegie classification has low counts for Specialized (6), Specialized/Medical (7), K-12 (4), and Doctoral/Research (22).
- The breakdown by APPA region shows ample counts except for RMA, the least populated region, which had 22 institutions in this study.
- Several enrollment ranges had ample samplings.
- The grouping on auxiliary services has 187 including auxiliaries and 205 excluding auxiliaries.
- The <20 years building age range count is 25. The other building age ranges have counts between 53 and 152.
- The summaries for the various levels of service, customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and the performance self-evaluations will have low counts on the low and high extremes of the scales.
Tables in this report show counts for all entries. Some participants completed only a few of the modules, some erroneous entries have been eliminated, and participants sometimes did not answer every question within a module.

Consequently, the counts on most tables throughout this report can be expected to be lower than those shown in the Participant Demographics charts and tables. Noting the counts on statistical tables can help the user decide whether or not the statistics are useful to a particular operation’s purposes. This report has not produced cross-tab tables between two groupings, because many entries in such tables would have low counts. Below are counts of participants by survey module.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About Facilities</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Facilities</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV Worksheet</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Funding</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcomes - Op Costs Staffing Ratios Administration</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcomes - Op Costs Staffing Ratios Construction/Renovation/AE</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcomes - Op Costs Staffing Ratios Custodial</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcomes - Op Costs Staffing Ratios Building Maintenance</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcomes - Op Costs Staffing Ratios Energy/Utilities</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcomes - Op Costs Staffing Ratios Other Operations</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcomes - Business Practices</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMBTU Worksheet</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Investments</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining Excellence</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

2008-09 Facilities Performance Indicators Participants

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College
Albany State University
Alexandria Technical Institute
Angelo State University
Anoka Technical College
Anoka-Ramsey Community College
Anoka-Ramsey Community College/Cambridge Campus
Appalachian State University
Arizona State University
Arkansas State University
Armstrong Atlantic State University
Atlanta Metropolitan College
Augusta State University
Aurora University
Avila University
Babson College
Bainbridge College
Barry University
Baylor College of Medicine
Bemidji State University
Black Hills State University
Blackhawk Technical College/Airport
Blackhawk Technical College/Janesville
Blackhawk Technical College/Monroe
Blackhawk Technical College/Transportation Center
Bowling Green State University
Brigham Young University/Idaho
Brigham Young University/Utah
Butler University
California Maritime Academy
California Polytechnic State University
California Polytechnic State University/Pomona
California State University/Bakersfield
California State University/Chico
California State University/Dominguez Hills
California State University/East Bay
California State University/Fresno
California State University/Fullerton
California State University/Long Beach
California State University/Los Angeles
California State University/Monterey Bay
California State University/Northridge
California State University/Sacramento
California State University/San Bernardino
California State University/San Marcos
California State University/Stanislaus
Camosun College
Carleton College
Carleton University
Carrington College
Casper Community College
Central Lakes College
Central Lakes College/Staples
Century College
Chippewa Valley Technical College/Chippewa Falls
Chippewa Valley Technical College/Eau Claire
Chippewa Valley Technical College/Menomonie
Chippewa Valley Technical College/River Falls
Cincinnati State Tec & Community College
The Citadel
City Colleges of Chicago
Clark University
Clayton State University
Coastal Georgia Community College
College of the Desert
College of Wooster
Colorado State University/Pueblo
Columbia University Medical Center
Columbus State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State College-Southeast Technical/Winona Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State Community &amp; Technical College/Detroit Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State Community &amp; Technical College/Fergus Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State Community &amp; Technical College/Moorhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State Community &amp; Technical College/Wadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University/Mankato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota West Comm/Tech College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota West Community &amp; Technical College/Granite Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota West Community &amp; Technical College/Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota West Community &amp; Technical College/Pipestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri University of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraine Park Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraine Park Technical College/Beaver Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraine Park Technical College/West Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Allison University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosho County Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolet Area Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolet Area Technical College/Minocqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandale Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State College of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hennepin Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcentral Technical College/Antigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcentral Technical College/Wausau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Wisconsin Tech College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Wisconsin Technical College/Marinette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Wisconsin Technical College/Oconto Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Wisconsin Technical College/Shawano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Wisconsin Technical College/Sturgeon Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Wyoming Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland Community &amp; Technical College/EGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland Community &amp; Technical College/TRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Missouri State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Technical College/Bemidji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern College/Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University/Stillwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivet Nazarene University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health and Science University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Atlantic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec University in Trois-Rivieres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy River Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgewater College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgewater College/Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverland Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverland Community College/Albert Lea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Wesleyan College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester City School District/New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Cloud State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Cloud Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary's University/Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolcraft College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University - Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidaway Institute of Oceanography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soka University of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central College/Faribault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska/Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada/Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina/Asheville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina/Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina/Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Prince Edward Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas/El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin/Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha County Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waycross College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Technical College/Black River Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Technical College/Mauston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Technical College/Tomah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Washington University
Wilfrid Laurier University
William Mitchell College of Law
Williamson County School Board
Winona State University
Winston-Salem State University
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College/Ashland
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College/New Richmond
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College/Rice Lake
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College/Superior
Wisconsin Lutheran College
Xavier University
York University
APPENDIX B

Background

History of the Facilities Performance Indicators Survey and Report

The facilities professionals at colleges, universities, K–12 schools, and districts work to achieve excellence through the constant improvement of the services they contribute in support of missions and goals of their institutions.

The goals of APPA’s Information and Research Committee include providing facilities professionals with an integrated set of tools and information that they need to improve their organizations’ financial performance and the effectiveness of their primary processes, facilities employees’ readiness to embrace the future, and the facilities department’s ability to satisfy its customers.

The Information and Research Committee is constructing an integrated research information database for educational facilities. The structure of the new Facilities Performance Indicators Survey was redesigned and the survey’s first tool for developing statistical files on educational facilities—the new Web-based modular Facilities Performance Indicator Survey—debuted in March 2005 and collected data from the fiscal year 2003-04. The survey was administered each Fall from 2005 through 2009. Depending on participation and prior report purchases, APPA provides Report users access to an unlimited rolling set of Web-based FPI reports.

Programming the FPI report for the Internet changed it from a static publication to a dynamic tool for user-driven comparisons. It is evolving into an instrument to depict statistics in three views: statistical reports, bar charts, and dashboard dials. Each of the past years’ programming broadened the capabilities of these views. The 2005-06 report introduced the first phase of the view of data on Dashboards. The 2006-07 FPI Report contained expanded Dashboard capabilities. The 2006-07 Report also introduced a new set of Participant Summary Charts that replaced the limited Bonus Reports provided in the past. The 2008-09 Report provides the updated Cohort Report, more preference capabilities, new Report Dashboard dials and charting software as well as enhanced capabilities for the Executive Level Presentation and the debut of the new Executive Level Dashboards.
The Facilities Performance Indicators Survey (FPI) supersedes and builds upon the two major surveys APPA conducted in the past: the Comparative Costs and Staffing (CCAS) survey and the Strategic Assessment Model (SAM). The FPI covers all the materials and data collected in CCAS and SAM, along with some select new data points, indicators, and improved survey tools. This new “combo” survey first introduced in 2005 includes the following features:

- a modular structure, which offers flexibility that allows an institution to decide which aspects of operations to measure and evaluate each year;
- one-time capture of general campus information in the first survey module, which alleviates the need to record the same statistics for each APPA survey taken;
- automated worksheets, which enable users to step through the calculation of current replacement value (CRV) and British thermal units (BTUs) - exercises that have proved difficult for many survey respondents in the past; and
- instant reports that are generated upon the completion of a number of the modules, thereby providing immediate calculations that allow users to evaluate the accuracy of their data points and receive immediate feedback on their operations.

This Web-based 2008-09 Facilities Performance Indicators Report consists of the following sections:

- **Preferences**: A new Report capability in 2008-09 whereby you set default institutions for comparisons, your preferred group summary, and chart design options.
- **Participant Demographics/General Reports**: New Report sections in 2008-09 containing demographics, and general data on participant campuses that can be viewed at a single glance.
- **Participant Summary Reports**: A new Report section in 2008-09 (replacing the former, limited Bonus Reports) that showcases participant scores in an essential set of measures against the participant’s cohort groups and any two other participating institutions. This section is built around the Essential Question Set and includes the capability of producing a desk top executive level presentation of FPI measurements.
- **Detailed FPI Reports**: The detailed FPI Reports of the past were organized in memory of the historic APPA reports so that one set addressed operating costs, another set addressed personnel data and costs, etc. In 2008-09, the detail reports are reorganized around the Essential Set Questions. The preponderance of report screens fall under Question 4, *Are the operating funds that my facilities department receives being spent in a manner that supports desired outcomes?*
These reports now are pulled together by core facilities functions. Each core function has a group of three report screens that show summary and drill-down detail information:
  - Operating Costs and Staffing Ratios
  - Personnel FTE and Salaries (drill-down detail)
  - FTE & Salaries Ratios and Measures
This grouping makes it much easier to build a total picture of performance from cost, efficiency, salary levels, and staffing perspectives. This is also the section wherein the detailed FPI Reports are viewed through the perspective of a cohort grouping. Cohort screens can show all institutions within the group, or any one or more of the group members.

- **Executive Level Dashboard:** This year we are debuting our new Executive Level Dashboard feature, which will provide all Chief Business Officers and Senior Facilities Officers with quick and easy metrics that highlight the data sets most relevant for that target group. The charting software is dynamic and participants can choose to view up to 24 institutions at a time. Data can be sorted by several important criteria including Carnegie, Auxiliary Service, Enrollment Range, and more.

- **Executive Level Presentation:** The Executive Level Presentation that we debuted last year has much more functionality this year, including the ability to tab easily through all 7 survey modules and change data point selections easily without having to leave the landing page. All participants can opt to select between 1 to 5 years of trending. The charts can be saved for future review and/or exported to PowerPoint or Word programs.

- **Report Dashboards:** An updated set of dials was incorporated into the FPI so that transportation among Report sections and dashboards was greatly simplified. The dashboards overlay an institution’s measurement scores on to dials with visual comparisons to overall averages. Goals can be inserted to show the future desired performance positions. The 2008-09 dials include a new Tab for the Essential Set Questions.

- **Raw Survey Data files:** Raw survey data files are now part of the main menu options. These files represent a convenient and flexible way to customize the data beyond the confines of the standard reports. The data populates into a delimited file that can be easily cut, pasted, and exported to Excel or any other spreadsheet or database.

- **Monetary Conversion**
  The 2006 Canadian Dollar conversion factor used was $1.00 CAD = $0.86 USD. The 2007 and 2008 FPI Reports have no Canadian Dollar conversion. The 2009 FPI Report used the Canadian Dollar conversion factor of $1.00 CAD = $0.95 USD.
The range of information contained in the Web-based *Facilities Performance Indicators Reports* is much broader than what has been covered in any APPA survey summary before 2005. The organization and approach of the report has been redesigned as well. The Report contains all of the bar charts and statistical tables that APPA members have grown to expect and more. The Report also includes sections that introduce new methods for organizing data displays.

- A string of ratios and measures for each Essential Question/core function provides a variety of measurement perspectives.
- Significant supporting data shows the base information used in most of the ratio calculations.

In 2005, APPA broke new ground in its reporting scope with the *Building and Space Report*. The 2008-09 FPI report has placed most of these reports in the Participant Demographics/General Reports section of the *FPI Report*. Outside of the FPI reports, the space data is being used for studies on energy consumption. APPA continues to explore ways to improve the energy/utilities function information with a special energy survey based on a select set of FPI survey questions launched in February 2009. There are opposing interests for keeping data entry simple for the non-engineer and for providing meaningful and normalized energy/utility statistics.