



**THE IMPACT OF JOINT-USE FACILITIES  
ON THE DELIVERY OF POSTSECONDARY  
EDUCATION IN FLORIDA**

---

**Report and Recommendations by the  
Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission**

---

**December 1999**

**POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION**

*The Impact Of Joint-Use Facilities On The  
Delivery Of Postsecondary Education In Florida*

Prepared in Response to Specific Appropriations 171 through 176  
of the 1999 General Appropriations Act  
Chapter 99-226, Laws of Florida

December 1999



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	i
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. A NATIONAL REVIEW OF JOINT-USE FACILITIES.....	7
A. Review of the Literature .....	7
B. Survey Of State Higher Education Agencies.....	9
III. POSTSECONDARY JOINT-USE FACILITIES IN FLORIDA .....	15
A. Cocoa Campus - Brevard Community College/ University of Central Florida .....	16
B. Daytona Beach Campus - Daytona Beach Community College/ University of Central Florida .....	18
C. Davie Campus - Broward Community College/Florida Atlantic University/Florida International University .....	19
D. Askew Tower - Broward Community College/Florida Atlantic University/Florida International University .....	20
E. Lakeland Campus - Polk Community College/University of South Florida .....	21
F. Ft. Walton Beach Campus - Okaloosa Walton Community College/ University of West Florida .....	22
IV. DEMOGRAPHIC REVIEW OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN JOINT-USE FACILITIES .....	25
A. Headcount Enrollment .....	25
B. Highest Degree Level.....	27
C. Average Age.....	30

<b>D.</b>	<b>Gender Distribution .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>E.</b>	<b>Ethnicity .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>F.</b>	<b>Student Majors .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>G.</b>	<b>Average Number of Credits .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Joint-Use Facilities As a Response to High Enrollment Projections .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Effective Joint-Use Facilities .....</b>	<b>41</b>
	<i>Best Practices .....</i>	<i>41</i>
<b>C.</b>	<b>Student Activity And Service Fees At Joint-Use Facilities .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>The Instructional Space Utilization Reporting Process For Joint-Use Facilities.....</b>	<b>45</b>

## APPENDICES

<b>A</b>	Florida Postsecondary Institutions
<b>B</b>	Florida Statutes and Rules
<b>C</b>	National Survey of State Higher Education Executive Officers
<b>D</b>	Survey of Florida Community Colleges' Partnerships for Baccalaureate Education

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriations 171 through 176 in the 1999 General Appropriations Act directed the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to:

*Examine campuses with joint or concurrent use facilities, involving both a community college and a state university, and assess the impact of this arrangement on the delivery of quality postsecondary education. The study shall focus on both instruction and support services including, but not limited to, registration, advisement, library access, time-to-degree and student attainment of educational objectives. A report and recommendations shall be submitted to the Legislature and the State Board of Education on or before December 30, 1999.*

A postsecondary joint-use facility is an educational facility that is cooperatively developed and utilized by two or more educational entities, typically a community college and a university. Such facilities have been established in Florida to increase access for students to baccalaureate degree programs and to allow for maximum utilization of the existing educational infrastructure. To analyze the impact and efficiency of Florida postsecondary joint-use facilities, the Commission interviewed students and administrators at joint-use campuses, reviewed joint-use programs in other states and analyzed student enrollment data and campus information from six existing joint-use partnerships.

The Commission analyzed demographic statistics for over 9,000 students enrolled at the selected six joint-use facilities during 1998-99. This analysis found that the clientele primarily consists of older, white female students who are enrolled part-time at the campus in concert with employment schedules, financial constraints or family obligations. Accordingly, traditional high school graduates are primarily not the students who are choosing to enroll at joint-use campuses. Key findings of this analysis are:

Average age: 33 years – all students; 31 years – undergraduates.

Gender distribution: females – 65%, males – 35%.

Ethnicity distribution: White – 72%, Black – 13%, Hispanic – 9%.

Average course load: 7.4 credit hours per semester.

Primary academic majors: Business & Finance – 21%, Education – 21%.

The expansion of joint-use facilities as a priority strategy to address postsecondary access has been supported in the Commission's Master Plan and in the strategic plans of the sector boards. These educational sites remain a valuable component of the state's educational delivery system. Following a review of the enrollment patterns of the current joint-use facilities and the analysis of the student clientele at these sites, however, the Commission concluded that new joint-use facilities should not be established in Florida as the primary method to accommodate the state's projected postsecondary enrollment demand.

The Commission identified the importance of institution mission in joint-use partnerships and reviewed the differentiated missions for state universities that were established by the Board of Regents in its Strategic Plan. The Commission believes that as the branch campuses of Research I

and Research II universities continue to grow and expand, they will need to compete more forcibly for resources with the graduate education and research components of the main university campuses. The allocation of funds and other resources by these universities to graduate education, research programs and branch campus operations will be increasingly difficult. The Commission recommends that the state's comprehensive universities should be the primary partners with community colleges in new joint-use agreements.

The Commission also reviewed issues pertaining to the use of student activity fees at joint-use facilities and the state instructional space utilization reporting process for these educational sites. Recommendations are offered to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of joint-use facilities and to enable these educational sites to provide greater access to postsecondary education for Floridians.

***Recommendations:***

- 1. Postsecondary joint-use facilities should be established in response to local and/or regional educational and workforce needs and should be included as one of several responses that will be needed to meet the projected demand in the State for access to postsecondary education.***
- 2. Institution mission should be a major consideration in state-level planning for the establishment and location of new postsecondary joint-use facilities. The "comprehensive universities" of the State University System, as designated by the Board of Regents, should be the primary partners with community colleges in new joint-use agreements designed to increase undergraduate access to needed areas of the State.***
- 3. The Commission's "Best Practices" should be utilized by planners and developers of future postsecondary joint-use facilities and collaborative programming in Florida.***
- 4. The Board of Regents should review the student activity and service fee policies at state university joint-use and branch campuses for consistency and equity across the State University System. This review should examine the policies and procedures at each campus for the determination, collection and allocation of these fees, and the role of students at each campus in these processes.***
- 5. The State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents should cooperatively convene an ad-hoc task force in order to review the space utilization reporting process as it relates to postsecondary joint-use facilities and to consider the development of a separate reporting category for educational activity in joint-use facilities.***

The Commission found that the most successful joint-use facilities are developed at the local and/or regional level through collaborative partnerships that first, identify specific workforce needs and then, offer the educational programs to meet the needs. Key components that highlight the "Best Practices" for joint-use facilities follow:

### **Governance/Administration**

- ◆ *A joint-use facility, established by two or more postsecondary institutions, should be congruent with and reflect the mission of each partner institution.*
- ◆ *The administration/supervision of a joint-use campus, whether by one individual or a coordinated staff team, should maintain a direct and open line of communication to the leadership of both institutions. The main university/college administrative team should make regular visits to the joint-use campus to meet with administrators, faculty and students.*
- ◆ *Formal, written agreements should be executed on all shared administrative and academic responsibilities.*
- ◆ *All institutions involved in the joint-use arrangement should ensure that joint-use facilities are funded at the same level as central campus facilities for all operational and infrastructure components.*
- ◆ *The scheduling of classroom and laboratory space each semester and the assignment of office space at the joint-use facility should occur collaboratively by administrators and faculty of the joint-use partner institutions.*
- ◆ *The partner institutions should implement unified admissions procedures for the joint-use facility, so that students who enroll in the community college are given provisional admission to the university in anticipation of an associate in arts degree completion. Uniform policies and procedures should exist for all academic transactions, including class registration, drop & add, payment of fees and bills, financial aid services, etc.*
- ◆ *The administration of each joint-use facility should maintain an active student recruitment and marketing program to attract to the campus the traditional high school graduates in the region.*

### **Academic Affairs**

- ◆ *The university partner should continue to assess student demand for degree programs and strive to offer the broadest array of complete baccalaureate degree programs at the branch campus as there are available resources.*
- ◆ *The joint-use partners should collaborate to publish one, joint academic class schedule and degree program guide for the joint-use campus.*
- ◆ *All required academic courses for each degree program that is offered at the joint-use campus should be available on site. Students should not have to travel to the main university campus in order to complete degree requirements.*
- ◆ *Each academic department at the branch campus should be fully integrated into the department at the main campus. Faculty at the joint-use campus should function identical to faculty at the main university campus. Tenure requirements and review procedures, class load and schedules and other assignments should be identical at both sites.*

- ◆ *At a joint-use facility, the individual academic departments at each partner institution, community college and university, should maintain a close working relationship that supports a seamless articulation for students from the associate's degree program to the baccalaureate degree program.*
- ◆ *The joint-use partner institutions should implement, with limited restrictions, dual enrollment provisions that allow community college students to enroll in university courses and university students to enroll in community college courses.*
- ◆ *University academic departments should continue to monitor joint-use campus enrollments in specific degree programs, in comparison to main campus enrollments. For large and fully enrolled degree programs at the branch campus, the department should consider relocating the main department office to the branch campus.*

### **Student Affairs**

- ◆ *All Student Activity and Service Fees that are generated by students at joint-use facilities should be allocated to those campuses for use by the enrolled students.*
- ◆ *Students enrolled at joint-use facilities should have access to the full array of student and academic services at a level that is comparable to the main university campus, including advising and counseling services, library services, financial assistance, recreational opportunities, food service and bookstore services.*
- ◆ *Students enrolled at joint-use facilities should have full, open access to all student and academic services that are provided at the campus by the partner institutions. Student identification cards should be interchangeable among the institutions.*
- ◆ *The administration of the joint-use facility should promote a student government at the campus. Regular opportunities should be provided for students to provide input on existing student and academic policies, procedures and services.*
- ◆ *The main university student government should provide for full representation of the students enrolled at joint-use campuses.*





## I. INTRODUCTION

### Legislative Charge

Proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriations 171 through 176 in the 1999 General Appropriations Act directs the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to:

*Examine campuses with joint or concurrent use facilities, involving both a community college and a state university, and assess the impact of this arrangement on the delivery of quality postsecondary education. The study shall focus on both instruction and support services including, but not limited to, registration, advisement, library access, time-to-degree and student attainment of educational objectives. A report and recommendations shall be submitted to the Legislature and the State Board of Education on or before December 30, 1999.*

### Overview

Florida provides for its citizens a broad and diverse delivery system for postsecondary education, consisting of 10 state universities, 28 community colleges and a significant number of independent colleges and universities. Appendix A identifies on a map of Florida the location of the state's public and private postsecondary institutions. Students enrolled at these institutions are served through a complex system of main campuses, branch campuses and centers, joint-use facilities involving a state university and community college and distance learning technologies.

The existing delivery system continues to be grounded by the Articulation Agreement, which provides the framework for student access, matriculation and degree completion. This agreement promotes student access within the existing educational structure by providing for the smooth movement of students who seek postsecondary education from secondary school through the community college system and into the State University System. State articulation statutes, rules and policies promote the recognition and utilization of the public community colleges as the primary point of entry for postsecondary education and the statewide Articulation Agreement guarantees public community college transfers with the associate in arts degree entry to the State University System. See Appendix B. Figure 1 displays the primary paths that are available to Florida high school graduates to pursue a baccalaureate degree. The establishment of joint-use facilities in Florida has further enhanced the articulation agreement and has facilitated the smooth movement of students into a baccalaureate degree program.

A postsecondary joint-use facility is an educational facility that is cooperatively developed and utilized by two or more educational entities, typically a community college and a university, and that may be located at another institution's campus. Such facilities have been established in Florida primarily to increase access for students to baccalaureate degree programs and to allow for maximum utilization of the existing educational infrastructure. These types of agreements between institutions at different levels provide expanded access to students, often with reduced state expenditures for building construction.

Sharing a facility among institutions usually costs less than funding and maintaining separate facilities, and shared facilities can provide postsecondary access to a valuable location that is otherwise inaccessible or unavailable. They also can provide access to special physical resource needs such as adequate parking or expensive recreational facilities or libraries. In addition to instructional space, shared facilities, such as a library, cafeteria or bookstore, can ensure a full complement of services for students who would otherwise find the need to visit two or more different facilities. Although joint-use facilities can allow colleges to use resources more effectively, they can be difficult to manage. The cost of the time involved in coordinating the facility's management must be considered.

**Figure 1**

**Postsecondary Paths to the Baccalaureate Degree**

PLEASE CHECK EXCEL FILE NAME: SHEEO JOINT USE.XLS

Joint-use arrangements possess many characteristics that are highly desirable in light of the rapidity of the change in workforce needs and may provide additional flexibility in the state's efforts to increase access to baccalaureate degree programs. The nature of a joint-use agreement makes it possible to meet current programmatic needs, while providing flexibility in situations where a particular local or regional need may not be sustained. For example, a nursing shortage in a particular area may warrant the need for greater access to baccalaureate nursing programs. If the shortage were to abate, however, joint-use partners would have the flexibility to change their program offerings, depending on the supply of students and the demand for graduates.

**Commission Perspectives**

The Commission has studied the use of joint-use facilities as it relates to postsecondary access, both in the Commission's state master planning work every fifth year and in specific reports requested annually by the Legislature. Below are past Commission activities and findings on this topic.

In all of the Commission's past work on state-level coordination, access to postsecondary education for Floridians has been a steadfast priority. A primary point of emphasis in the original 1982 ***Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education*** was to build a more unified, cooperative and coordinated postsecondary system with effective linkages among the various segments. The Commission recommended that new educational sites:

*should fully utilize joint programs and joint facilities between state universities, community colleges and independent institutions whenever possible. Such joint approaches should improve student transfer between the two institutions and should result in decreased capital expenditures.*

In 1985, the Commission initially examined ***Joint Use Facilities for Postsecondary Education in Florida***. This report included an inventory of joint-use facilities and "cooperative operations" in use at the time. Structured interviews were conducted with fiscal analysts from the Legislature, Governor's Office and educational sectors to gather information on the capital outlay and operational funding of the facilities. This study recommended continued support for joint-use facilities "*as a cost-effective, cooperative means of providing postsecondary education services to Florida citizens, when constructed in lieu of unnecessary duplicative facilities.*" The report recommended amendments to procedures that govern funding for both the construction and operation of these facilities. In addition, the report called on the Commission to review all joint-use proposals and forward recommendations to the State Board of Education.

In 1987, the Commission conducted: ***A Study of the Courses, Programs and Facilities at the Okaloosa-Walton Junior College/University of West Florida Joint Center in Fort Walton Beach***. The Joint Center was established by the 1983 Legislature to provide additional access to postsecondary education in the Panhandle region. The two institutions initially shared a vacated elementary school under a lease agreement with the School Board of Okaloosa County. An assessment of need conducted at the time found that additional courses and programs were warranted. The facility was utilized to capacity and other sites, including a local high school, were used to handle the student overflow. The elementary and secondary school population in the region had also grown to the extent that the school board had voted to reconsider the use of the vacated elementary school for K-12 students in Okaloosa County. As result of this study, the Commission recommended further development of joint programming between Okaloosa-Walton Junior College and the University of West Florida, the coordination of proposals for new programs among the sectors and the use of educational technology to meet the educational needs of the region.

In 1988, the Commission conducted: ***A Study of Operating Costs of Branch Campuses and Centers at State Universities and Community Colleges***. The Commission found that branch campuses and centers, when compared to their main campuses, tend to be less expensive per student credit hour and headcount student for library services and plant operations and maintenance, more expensive for institutional support and student services, and roughly comparable for instruction. Branch campuses and centers in stand-alone facilities and those in joint-use facilities exhibited a wide range of cost behavior. In a comparison of median values for the two groups, the branch campuses and centers in joint-use facilities had lower expenditures per student credit hour in the areas of library services and plant operations and maintenance. Instructional costs per weighted student credit hour were somewhat higher at joint-use facilities. The Commission recommended alternatives to reduce cost of coordination, restrictions on the nature and extent of curriculum and minimum

enrollment targets. To avoid duplication, greater coordination of campus support services was recommended.

In *Challenges and Choices: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education*, the Commission provided an update of the condition of Florida postsecondary education. A primary focus of the 1998 *Plan* is on ACCESS to postsecondary education, with emphasis on accommodating growing student demand and improving undergraduate degree attainment. The *Plan* concluded that the state must increase opportunities to higher education and includes a number of responses to meet the future postsecondary needs of the state, including “*increase the number of joint-use facilities at community colleges and state universities.*”

In its 1998 study, *Evaluation of Florida’s Two-Plus-Two Articulation System*, the Commission evaluated the effectiveness and efficiency of the Two-Plus-Two system through a review of admissions issues, articulation/transfer issues and access issues. The study confirmed that “*the state’s postsecondary delivery system must be extended to provide greater flexibility to greater numbers of students*” and “*there is an urgent need for the State to increase access for its citizens to higher levels of educational attainment.*” The report did not recommend major structural changes in the system and stated: “*at this time, the Commission supports the expansion of joint or concurrent programs and facilities involving two and four year public and independent institutions as the priority strategy to address postsecondary access.*”

As a result of the Commission’s master plan, access issues were a major focus of the strategic plans adopted by the Board of Regents and State Board of Community Colleges. In their respective plans, the sector boards recognized the urgency to increase access, both access into the postsecondary system and access to postsecondary degree completion. The Commission provided a greater examination of access issues in its 1999 report: *Challenges and Choices: ACCESS, Supplement #1 to the 1998 Master Plan*. In a discussion of *Facilities Capacity and Use*, the Commission recommended that “*joint or concurrent programming involving two and four-year public and independent institutions should be the priority strategy for assuring postsecondary access for the immediate future.*”

### The Current Context

In the past two years, there has been a significant increase in partnerships among postsecondary institutions involving educational facilities and programs. As a result, rules and guidelines are being developed to monitor inter-institutional agreements to assure that standards are maintained. Appendix D lists active partnerships for the delivery of baccalaureate education that have been reported to the Commission by Florida’s community colleges. These agreements are between the community colleges and public and private colleges and universities, both in and out of Florida.

Throughout the State, the Florida Distance Learning Library Initiative continues to develop and expand. The Initiative is a significant statewide partnership between the state’s community colleges and universities, as well as public libraries in the State. The cooperative program provides access to a comprehensive array of electronic resources, a reference center, library training, document delivery and library borrowing privileges at any of the 38 public postsecondary institutions.

The use of joint-use facilities to address the increased demand for postsecondary access has been a major interest of the education leadership in the Legislature during this period and major initiatives, including both programs and appropriations, have been adopted in the State to encourage inter-institutional collaboration. The 1998 Legislature appropriated \$15 million from Public Education Capital Outlay (PECO) funds as incentive grants to encourage development of joint-use facilities by community colleges and universities. Proviso language required a joint submission by the Board of Regents and State Board of Community Colleges of recommended projects to the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and the Legislature. This initiative attempted to address three educational issues related to increased demand for baccalaureate degrees in Florida:

- The anticipated increase of secondary school graduates;
- The demand for greater access to the baccalaureate degree by place-bound citizens;
- The need to have a college-trained workforce for greater economic development.

The two sector boards initially submitted two separate lists of projects, but a common and agreed-upon list was submitted to the Commission in January 1999. Following review and approval by the Commission, state funds were released for the following joint-use projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Partners</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>
Charter Technical School	Daytona Beach CC, Flagler School District Volusia School District	\$5,003,610
Joint-Use Multi-Partner Project (Ocala Campus) St. Leo College	Central Florida CC, UCF, FSU, FAMU, Webster University,	\$4,200,000
Joint-Use Partnership (Palm Bay Campus)	Brevard CC, UCF	\$1,596,390
Environmental Science & Criminal Justice Programs	Miami-Dade CC, FIU	<u>\$4,200,000</u>

**TOTAL: \$15,000,000**

In addition to providing support for joint-use projects, the 1999 Legislature created a site-determined baccalaureate degree access program and authorized categorical funding for the program. The program allows community colleges to enter into agreements with four-year postsecondary institutions to deliver high demand baccalaureate programs on their campuses. The Governor, however, vetoed the \$2 million appropriation for this program, as well as other joint-use appropriations because they “circumvent established funding procedures and priorities.” At its August 1999 meeting, the Commission approved a process for the review of proposals by community colleges to offer access to baccalaureate degree programs through cooperative arrangements with public and independent four-year institutions in Florida. The process involves a determination of need for the baccalaureate program, the selection of a partner four-year institution(s) and a detailed agreement among the institutions that describes the program, academic, facility and funding requirements, student enrollment and demand by employers for program graduates.

In early 1999, a statewide task force on joint-use facilities was established, including presidents of state universities and community colleges and the Commission, to develop a collaborative plan to offer more baccalaureate degrees to more Florida citizens through a concurrent-use campus network, as recommended by the Commission. The goals of the task force are to establish concurrent-use campuses that mirror a four-year college experience and to assure that Florida's residents have access to needed baccalaureate programs within their own communities. The work of this task force is expected to continue during the 1999-2000 academic year.

### **Commission Study Activities**

To direct this study, the Commission chairman appointed a Program/Planning Committee under the leadership of Mr. George Smith that included Dr. Mary Bennett, Dr. Bob Bryan, Mr. Jim Kirk and Mrs. Connie Kone.

During this study, the Commission received input from sector representatives, joint-use campus administrators and from students enrolled at joint-use educational sites. Particular appreciation is warranted for the hospitality of the campus administrators and for the technical support provided by the staffs of the Board of Regents and State Board of Community Colleges who accessed and compiled the student record data for the selected joint-use facilities. Education consultants MGT of America, Inc. assisted the Commission in the display and analysis of the student data for the joint-use sites.

Recommendations in Chapter V are offered to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of joint-use facilities and to enable these educational sites to provide greater access to postsecondary education for Floridians.

## II. A NATIONAL REVIEW OF JOINT-USE FACILITIES

### Review Of The Literature

Educational institutions in many states are increasingly willing to act collaboratively to achieve expressed and/or common goals. These collaborative relationships can provide, for all participating institutions, enlarged resource bases through increasing benefits and decreasing costs to the individual organizations (Kanter, 1994; California Commission on Innovation, 1992). Taber (1995) notes that there are numerous collaborative strategies in which community colleges may participate with other institutions. Due to increased demand for facilities space and library resources, community colleges are finding it beneficial to share the cost of information storage and dissemination with other organizations, such as public library systems or even other community colleges. Further, these partnerships can lead to greater expansion of resources through the participation in networked electronic systems as well as shared physical facilities.

Higher education complexes provide similar advantages to community colleges and universities, as well as the communities they serve, by providing educational opportunities in one central location. “Consortia of community colleges and universities appear to be one of the best vehicles that community colleges can use to meet the challenges placed before them and to establish and maintain their proper place in the educational community” (May & Smith, 1992, p. 63; Jadallah, 1994). Likewise, in a report to the California State Chancellor’s Office, the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit noted that the capital outlay need in the California community college system “far exceeds the resources currently available” and that a “...major feature of collaborative facilities projects will be cost savings or cost avoidance...” (1999, p. 26). Taber (1994) states:

*When carefully planned and developed, higher education centers can provide economical access to a full range of college and university education opportunities. Students have local access to higher education programs, from those offered by community colleges through graduate programs. This enables them to remain employed full-time or in their residence with family members. This can be especially helpful in less populated areas where opportunities for higher education are limited. Faculty at higher education centers have reported enhanced professional experiences due to opportunities for scholarly exchanges and comparisons of teaching methods. Staff found that articulation between institutions might be vastly improved due to their proximity and their increased understanding of each institution’s requirements.*  
(p. 77)

Below are examples of joint-use activities in other states that have been reviewed in the literature.

Colorado - Fort Range Community College approached the city of Westminster in Colorado with the idea of establishing a joint-use library facility to help accommodate their shrinking budget and increasing demands for library access. The City agreed that a collaborate facility, which pooled the resources of the public library system and the community college, would be beneficial. By sharing the construction costs, each partner gained substantial amounts of space as well as funding for books and necessary equipment, which would not have been available had each organization provided separate facilities.

Illinois - In Lake County, Illinois, a new University Center has been conceived and constructed as a cooperative institution to help meet educational demand arising primarily from working adults who live in “burgeoning suburban and rural areas.” The University Center is the product of an initiative to “improve access to educationally underserved areas in the state.” (SIBOE, 1998, p. 1). The facility is to support the needs of the county, but does not award degrees or employ faculty, as these are responsibilities of member institutions. Instruction will be focused upon place-bound students and working adults with a schedule of courses constructed to accommodate their schedules.

Michigan - Until recently, Macomb County, Michigan had no four-year college within its borders, although it is one of the 75 largest counties in the nation. In the 1980s, only 11 percent of adults living in Macomb County held a bachelor’s degree. In 1988, a University Center was founded through Macomb Community College and a “Bachelor Degree Partnership Program” was established. The Center now houses eight colleges and universities and offers 29 bachelor’s and master’s degrees to its residents. By bringing partner colleges and universities to the University Center, the State of Michigan and its resident taxpayers have avoided the costly process of establishing another state institution of higher learning in Macomb County. The University Center opened its doors in the fall of 1991 with 936 students, and four years later had almost doubled its enrollment (Macomb Community College, 1996).

New York - The State University System of New York has made similar recommendations regarding collaborative relationships in a Board of Regents 1995 report called: *Rethinking SUNY*. The report notes that it is key to the economic health of the State of New York that community colleges play a large role in workforce development and encourages community colleges to collaborate with other educational institutions and business entities to meet regional needs for specialized programs. The report suggests the use of strategic alliances as a means to this end. As the SUNY system is made up of many relatively small campuses, this structure has the advantages of local access for students, regional employment and widely distributed economic impact across the state. To encourage fiscal efficiency, the report suggests strategic alliances that will link together some smaller campuses and will develop partnerships with the private sector.

Oklahoma - Oklahoma is developing a statewide plan to increase baccalaureate program access on the basis of local and regional need. In a status report on higher education in Oklahoma (1998), numerous updates to earlier recommendations are stated, particularly with regard to baccalaureate program access. The Oklahoma Electronic Campus represents almost 600 courses being offered by state colleges and universities in a variety of electronic formats. The number of these courses, as well as traditionally provided courses that seamlessly transfer, has increased and a cooperative curriculum development project was approved. This project assembled faculty in 11 discipline areas to evaluate and recommend multimedia course materials for electronic offerings in early 1998. Further, a Learning Site Initiative has addressed access issues in Oklahoma and a teacher education supply and demand survey was conducted to address the state shortage of qualified instructors.

The Oklahoma State Regents approved a consortium of four community colleges to exchange low enrollment and specialized courses via electronic media in late 1997. The Regents also endorsed a proposal for a consortium of five institutions to provide cooperative instructional services including electronic delivery of courses and programs. The status report also called for the improvement of quality and efficiency in the system, with collaboration, coordination and mergers of functions across campuses.

In August 1999, the Oklahoma State Regents entered into three workforce development partnerships, which are designed to help advance the state's economic growth. The partnerships with the US Navy and two private businesses are the first of their kind between Oklahoma's system of higher education and business and military organizations. Typically, these agreements have been developed between the outside party and individual institutions, not the system as a whole. Similarly, the Regents awarded an economic development grant to the Center for Aging Systems and Infrastructure to support engineering research for the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center at Tinker Air Force base. The partnerships are coordinated and administered through the Oklahoma Higher Education Office of System Advancement and Economic Development, a newly created department designed to coordinate economic development activities between the state's higher education system and outside entities. Under the partnerships, the State Regents coordinate resources provided by Oklahoma colleges and universities to meet specific workforce needs.

Texas – A multi-university facility has been established at North Harris Montgomery Community College. This facility enables six public universities to work together to offer 21 unduplicated bachelor's and 24 master's degree programs. These programs, although offered by six different four-year institutions, share a single admissions process and financial aid application process. It is reported that course work is easily transferred among institutions. Technology is an integral part of this partnership and the facility has an extensive technology infrastructure, as 40 percent of the University Center's instruction is delivered via interactive distance learning.

The University of Texas at Brownsville, in cooperation with Texas Southmost College, serves over 10,000 students at its campus located in Brownsville, Texas. In partnership with Southmost College, the University offers a wide range of courses from associate and baccalaureate degrees through graduate degrees. The mission of this partnership is to provide accessible, affordable postsecondary education of high quality. The mission further encompasses the pursuit of scholarly research and the presentation of programs of continuing education, public service and cultural value to meet the needs of the surrounding community. This partnership combines the strengths of the four-year institution and community college to increase student access and eliminate inter-institutional barriers while fulfilling the distinctive responsibilities of each respective institution. Interestingly, this partnership represents one of only a handful in the state of Texas.

Virginia - The Commonwealth of Virginia has seen a significant increase in the number of joint-use facilities and collaborative partnerships in recent years. According to the Division of Facilities Planning for the Virginia Board of Community Colleges, virtually every four-year university in the state makes use of a facility in conjunction with a community college. Because the community colleges are widely distributed and are situated within driving distance of any citizen of the state, they represent a solid opportunity for colleges to increase student access and reduce duplication of programs and services. It is reported that distance learning programs are particularly popular and well suited for wide distribution in the State.

### **Survey Of State Higher Education Agencies**

The Commission conducted a survey of member states of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) regarding joint-use facilities and the policies and procedures of the respective states. See Appendix C. The survey requested information regarding: (1) Whether the individual

state utilizes joint-use facilities, (2) the type of entity creating the facilities (legislature, state governing board, inter-institutional agreements), (3) the number of facilities in the state and total 1998-99 headcount, (4) the year the initial facility was established, (5) reasons why joint-use facilities were established and how they are governed and administered, (7) whether there is a separate annual appropriation in the state budget for the operation of the facility, (8) the number of complete degree programs and academic courses available, (9) the types of student support services available, and (10) whether any facilities ceased operation or had their status changed to a four-year institution.

Twenty-five states responded and nineteen of these respondents indicated that they do have joint-use facilities in their states. The survey revealed that the majority of joint-use facilities have been created by state governing boards and/or through regional inter-institutional agreements. Other methods cited were state legislative mandates alone or mandates coupled with inter-institutional agreements and state board input.

Of the respondents, Wisconsin, Utah, and Texas have the most joint-use facilities in place, followed by Kentucky, Oklahoma, Mississippi, and Virginia. Enrollments in programs offered at these facilities range from 1,000 students at one facility in South Dakota to 33,000 students at one facility in Colorado.

In Oklahoma, the 25 public colleges and universities and the two higher education centers have been officially designated as learning sites. These sites provide geographic access to nearly all residents of the state. Therefore, rather than seeking development of new sites, the State Board of Regents focuses attention on ensuring that these sites function effectively. Planning occurs at both the state and institutional level. The State Board is responsible for identifying and prioritizing the highest unmet education needs in the state and the new educational assets needed to serve these needs. In addition, an annual review of priorities and progress made to respond to the needs is conducted. According to the planning documents, each institution is to incorporate into its program review and academic planning the programmatic area(s) that the institution has the capacity to deliver at off-campus sites, to identify areas where the institution can collaborate with others to develop joint programs or courses, to identify areas where the institution can "import" programs and to identify courses for redesign. Each learning site receives an annual grant to be used in creation and maintenance of the basic infrastructure.

In Arizona, two of the three universities primarily operate in metropolitan areas of the state, although most of Arizona has a low population density. The majority of collaborative programs has been provided through "partnerships" with community colleges. Other agreements have included paying the community colleges for use of surplus classroom and office space and arranging for students' use of auxiliary services. For the most part, the facilities had been in place, but were not cooperatively developed. Northern Arizona University has constructed its first off-campus facility, jointly planned and utilized by the University and the Community College.

The states that utilize joint-use facilities employ varying methods for administration and governance:

- South Carolina - The university center has a director and staff but program offerings and degrees are approved first by the center's board (made up of the presidents of the participating institutions) and then by CHE. The facility director is hired by the university center board, which consists of representatives of the participating institutions.
- Nebraska - Facilities are governed by a private board and administered by one administrator

appointed by a private board. The Education Center is an off-campus branch entity of a public institution or a cooperative of either public or public and private postsecondary education institution that offers instructional programs to students and is governed by the Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education of Nebraska.

- Utah - The “host” institutions are given administrative oversight for the area education centers, with the “providing” institution in control of the curriculum and the faculty.
- Kentucky - Facility management is generally agreed upon by a team of representatives of the institutions involved in the delivery of programming at the facility. Management of the facility is usually the responsibility of a single institution. However, that institution generally includes representatives from the other institutions in any major decisions regarding the assignment of the space in the facility.
- Tennessee - Facilities are operated by an administrative team led by campus officials of participating institutions.

In Idaho, the mission of the ISU/UI Center for Higher Education in Idaho Falls is to offer high quality academic programs, provide joint student services, and to share facilities and management responsibility. Degrees at the undergraduate and graduate level are offered and include general education, professional development, and cultural enrichment courses that are delivered on-site and via advanced technology. The program is shaped to take full advantage of inter-institutional cooperation. The two institutions have differing areas of specialization. Degrees conferred are collaborative and carry the names of both institutions. Additionally, either institution can confer degrees independently through stand-alone programs and courses. The University Place Oversight Council (UPOC) is responsible for all major policy issues regarding the management and operation of the University Place campus and the delivery of education programs by the institutions. The Council meets twice each year, or more frequently as needed and is composed of members of both institutions. The Local Operations Committee (LOC) is established in support of the on-site management for the campus and is the first level of institutional partnership. Employees from both institutions will staff the combined Student Services Office. Management of the Student Services Office is a shared responsibility.

In South Dakota, the Center for Public Higher Education in Sioux Falls serves as an off-campus center for the public universities in the state. The organizational structure includes center personnel and administration from each of the participating universities. A different public university serves as the lead institution each year with the Center Director reporting to that University’s president. The lead university’s president chairs the Executive Committee chair, which is a two-year appointment and rotates among the three presidents.

Wisconsin established joint-use facilities because of the desire of the postsecondary sector to reach out to its residents. Thirteen facilities compose the University of Wisconsin Colleges, a separate entity within the UW system, governed by the Board of Regents. The UW Colleges group has a Chancellor like all of the other UW system institutions with an institutional administrative staff based in Madison. Each campus has a Dean who is the local campus executive officer. All campus personnel (business manager, student services director, etc.) report to the Dean.

All states utilizing joint-use facilities cited increased access as the primary reason for the establishment of the facility, and a majority of survey respondents noted the ability to offer additional educational programs in the state. The majority of the facilities are governed by joint boards, state

boards, the local college or university, or a combination of these structures. Other states responded that sites are governed either by inter-institutional agreements, the presidents or directors of the facilities or private boards. All survey respondents indicated that their joint-use facilities have extensive student-support services available, including course registration, academic advising, counseling, library, study areas, computer labs, social lounges, food services, and often financial aid services.

### SHEEO SURVEY ON JOINT-USE FACILITIES

State	Joint-Use Facilities	Creating Entity*	Number of Facilities	1998-99 Headcount	Initial Establish.	Reason for Establishment		Separate Appropriation	Governance	Number of Programs	Number of Courses	Instnl Closures	Change to 4-year
						Incr. Access	Add. Prog.						
Arizona	Yes	SB, IIA	5	12,629	1997	Yes	Yes	Yes	Joint Board	110	500	No	No
Colorado	Yes	L	1	33,000	1976	Yes	No	No	Joint Board	194	6224	No	No
FLORIDA	Yes	L, IIA	6	9,200	1972	Yes	Yes	Yes	Local college	12	NA	No	No
Hawaii	Yes	IIA	3	2,626	1996	Yes	Yes	No	Local college	25	195	No	No
Idaho	Yes	SB	2	2,600	NA	Yes	Yes	No	SB/Presdts.	50	500	No	No
Illinois	Yes	SB	3	NA	1969	Yes	Yes	No	Joint Board	NA	NA	No	No
Kentucky	Yes	L	6	NA	NA	Yes	No	No	Local college	NA	NA	No	No
Massachusetts	No												
Mississippi	Yes	SB, IIA	6	3,000	1966	Yes	Yes	No	SB, Local	NA	NA	No	No
Nebraska	Yes	SB	2	NA	1993	Yes	NA	No	Private Board	NA	NA	No	No
Nevada	No												
New Jersey	Yes	IIA	1	NA	1995	Yes	Yes	No	IIA	17	NA	No	No
North Carolina	No												
Ohio	Yes	IIA	1	983	1996	Yes	Yes	No	Local college	17	104	No	No
Oklahoma	Yes	L,SB,IIA	6	NA	1974	Yes	No	No	Local, Board	NA	NA	No	Yes (1)
Oregon	Yes	SB, IIA	NA	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	No	IIA	23	NA	No	No
Pennsylvania	No												
Rhode Island	No												
South Carolina	Yes	IIA	1	1,400	1987	Yes	Yes	Yes	S.B./Local	45	600	Yes (1)	No
South Dakota	Yes	SB	1	1,000	1992	Yes	No	No	Presidents/Dir	24	NA	No	No
Tennessee	Yes	SB, IIA	4	2,735	NA	Yes	No	No	SB	NA	NA	No	No
Texas	Yes	L,SB,IIA	8	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes & No	Situational	NA	NA	No	Yes
Utah	Yes	SB	8	NA	1980's	Yes	Yes	No	SB	NA	NA	No	No
Virginia	Yes	L	6	NA	1991	Yes	Yes	Yes	Joint Board	NA	NA	No	No
West Virginia	No												
Wisconsin	Yes	SB	13	9,843	1960's	Yes	Yes	No	SB	1 (2+2)	NA	Yes-1982	Yes-1960

L=Legislature

SB=State Board

IIA=Inter-Institutional Agreement

With regard to funding, only three of the 20 states employing joint-use facilities have a separate annual legislative appropriation in the state budget for operation of the facilities. In Ohio, there is no separate annual appropriation in the state budget. Participating universities share some of their revenues with the community college pursuant to agreements they have made. Public universities receive funding from the state based on their enrollments, including enrollments in programs at the Lorain County Community College University Center. The facility itself was largely funded by the community college with proceeds from a local levy. The state provided a modest appropriation.

South Carolina and Wisconsin were the only states to report institutional closures, and Oklahoma, Texas, and Wisconsin reported that they have converted a joint-use facility into a distinctive four-year institution.

**In summary**, joint-use facilities are established by states to increase access of their residents to postsecondary education and, specifically, to a greater variety of academic degree programs. The most successful joint-use sites are developed at the local and/or regional level through collaborative partnerships that first identify specific workforce needs and then offer the educational programs to meet the needs.

Additional key findings of the survey responses follow:

- Eighty-five percent of responding facilities were created by state governing boards, inter-institutional agreements, or combinations of the two.
- All respondents cited increased access as a reason for the establishment of joint-use facilities.
- Methods for administration and governance of facilities vary widely from state to state. The majority of facilities are governed by Joint Boards, State Boards, the Local College or University, or a combination of the three.
- Extensive student support services, including registration, advising, counseling, financial assistance, library facilities, study areas, computer labs, social lounges, and food service are available on-site.
- Only a small minority of states has a separate annual legislative appropriation in the state budget for operation of joint-use facilities.
- Institutional closures or transformations into an independent four-year facility are rare.



### III. POSTSECONDARY JOINT-USE FACILITIES IN FLORIDA

There are currently a number of successful joint-use facilities in Florida that are cooperatively operated by state universities and community colleges across the State. The nature of each joint-use agreement varies from institution to institution. For arrangements that focus on increasing access to baccalaureate education, most upper division (baccalaureate level) courses are offered on the community college campus in buildings that are owned by the participating community college. The bachelor’s degree in the selected program is granted by the participating four-year institution. The baccalaureate degree programs that are most often offered and are identified by institutional leadership as being most in demand are: Elementary Education, Business, Allied Health—primarily Nursing, Criminal Justice, Computer Science and Psychology. There are also agreements that allow students to have access to limited graduate degree programs.

There are joint-use sites that simply involve the co-location of facilities and educational agreements such as the Panama City site (FSU and Gulf Coast CC), the St. Petersburg site (USF and St. Petersburg JC) and sites in Dade County and Lake County. In addition, numerous other educational partnerships exist among colleges and universities around the State that involve the delivery of specific courses or degree programs to meet the needs of the community and its residents. See Appendix D. While most joint-use arrangements are established between institutions in the same geographic region, there are institutions that offer specialized degrees at sites throughout the state (University of Florida—Institute of Food & Agricultural Science and Pensacola Junior College).

Several independent postsecondary institutions are significantly involved in the delivery of baccalaureate degree programs on community college sites, with St. Leo University being the most active participant. In general, private institutions have the ability to respond quickly to a community’s need for degree programs. They have indicated a willingness to go to community college campuses to deliver degree programs and to offer programs involving a small student cohort or market. In addition, non-Florida institutions are becoming increasingly involved in providing baccalaureate education through agreements with Florida colleges.

Responding to the legislative proviso for this study, the staffs of the Board of Regents and State Board of Community Colleges identified the following joint-use facilities for review in this study:

<u>Joint-Use Facility</u>	<u>Community College</u>	<u>State University</u>
Cocoa	Brevard Community College	University of Central Florida
Daytona Beach	Daytona Beach Community College	University of Central Florida
Davie	Broward Community College	Florida Atlantic University Florida International University
Downtown Tower Ft. Lauderdale	Broward Community College	Florida Atlantic University Florida International University
Lakeland	Polk Community College	University of South Florida
Ft. Walton Beach	Okaloosa-Walton Community College	University of West Florida

There are other joint-use facilities in the State that are in various stages of planning and development (such as the sites identified on page 5). Due to their newness, these sites will not be used for this study in the Commission's analysis of programs and student data.

A descriptive review of these joint-use sites, compiled from written responses to questions, campus visits and institution catalogs appears below:

***A. Cocoa Campus – Brevard Community College / University Of Central Florida***

The Brevard Campus of the University of Central Florida operates in partnership with the Brevard Community College District System. Although the Brevard Campus is housed primarily at the BCC Cocoa Campus, UCF-Brevard faculty at the BCC Melbourne and Palm Bay campuses also deliver programs and courses. The UCF Brevard Campus forms part of the "Circle of Science and Technology," a complex of buildings encompassing the world-class BCC Planetarium, the state-of-the-art BCC/UCF Joint-Use Library and the laboratories and facilities of the Florida Solar Energy Center (FSEC), a UCF research division.

This partnership began in 1968 when the University (then Florida Technological University) and Brevard Community College established a Center for Continuing Education on the Brevard campus. These state institutions became the first in Florida to fully implement the 2 + 2 system of articulation. Facilities were provided by the College and faculty, staff and supplies were provided by the University. Planning for a joint-use facility, a Lifelong Learning Center, began in 1976 by the two institution presidents, along with support from local civic and legislative leaders. The facility opened in 1982.

A working agreement among the two institutions permits the sharing of other college facilities and services, including library, food service, bookstore, parking, maintenance, custodial and security. At least 11 formal agreements exist between UCF and Brevard Community College for programs and services. These agreements define and/or describe specific areas of operation of the campus, including:

- joint-use classroom building;
- joint-use library facility;
- joint director for distance learning;
- joint distance learning support;
- joint admissions & records center;
- joint marketing/news print and television (including a joint master schedule);
- bookstore/book ordering;
- cashiering agreement;
- study skills agreement;
- joint-use computer laboratory/management;
- joint admissions agreement;
- child care agreement.

The UCF Brevard Campus now offers upper division (junior, senior) and graduate courses in 16 undergraduate and eight graduate degree programs through the five UCF Colleges. All five UCF colleges have faculty and administrative offices at the Brevard Campus and over 30 resident faculty positions have been established.

In a new initiative, staff from UCF and BCC has co-located in the Student Center to provide a “one-stop center” for undergraduate admissions, registration, record updates, cashiering and evening childcare. Students have access to a joint-use computer lab and the BCC Computer Aided Instruction Lab offers students of both institutions remedial classes, writing skills assistance and tutoring.

The two institutions have developed a joint-admission program whereby Brevard Community College first-time-in-college students are granted provisional admission to the University at the time they enroll in the College. They are guaranteed admission status to the University and may register for upper division classes upon completion of the AA degree at the College. UCF students in good standing may be admitted to BCC as “transient” students to take courses for transfer back to the University.

A Commission review team, including a member of the Commission and staff, visited the campus and interviewed administrators, faculty and staff. The joint-use campus is administered by a chief executive officer who reports to the vice provost of the university. It was emphasized that the administration of a joint-use campus must remain more flexible than at the central campus and remain sensitive to the needs of the clientele, which primarily consists of non-traditional, part-time students.

Each academic department at the campus has a program coordinator that serves as a link to the main campus department. The faculty discussed the challenge of maintaining integration with the academic department at the main campus. They also recognized the need to establish and maintain a working relationship with the community college faculty in their discipline. The campus faculty reported that, up to this point, all provisional faculty assigned to the joint-use facility have received tenure through the established process at the main campus.

Students enrolled at the Brevard campus expressed to the review team their desire to pursue higher education at the site and their need to remain in the Cocoa area. The students reaffirmed the accessibility of the campus to where they live and work, the value of small size of classes and the high level of interaction with faculty. The students also identified a number of concerns at the campus:

The bookstore inventory is inadequate for a number of university courses.

Campus student activity fees are forwarded to the main campus; Student Government Association allocates partial funds back to the campus. There are difficulties with getting adequate and timely allocations back from the central campus.

Student health fees for the campus require that the students use the health facilities at the main campus, which is 60 miles away.

Services for students with disabilities are very limited at the joint-use facility; the community college services are much more extensive and comprehensive.

***B. Daytona Beach Campus – Daytona Beach Community College / University Of Central Florida***

The University of Central Florida Daytona Beach campus offers upper division and graduate level courses to residents of Volusia and Flagler Counties. The University operates two buildings on the Daytona Beach Community College campus and utilizes one floor of a College building. UCF opened a facility in 1968 to allow DBCC students to complete various degree programs without leaving Volusia / Flagler counties. The state's 2 + 2 system is enhanced as students are able to earn an associate of arts degree from DBCC and a baccalaureate degree at UCF. Web-based courses are also offered. An expansive higher education facility opened in 1987 and houses classrooms, labs and office space. A second building, completed in 1991, houses more classrooms and faculty offices as well as a 130-seat auditorium and conference center.

A broad range of services is offered for Daytona Beach students including admissions, registration, financial aid, student clubs and organizations, disability services, veteran affairs, career resources and others. Registration periods at Daytona Beach correspond to the schedules at the main campus in Orlando.

Commission staff visited the campus and learned that a joint-use campus administrator for UCF serves as chief executive officer for the campus. He reports to the UCF Vice Provost. UCF developed service contracts with the community college to eliminate the duplication of services and to save costs. These contracts support the joint-use facilities, particularly the shared resources of the library, learning center, computer lab, security, janitorial service and food service.

Regarding student admissions, it was learned that a community college student may apply for admission to the university following the completion of 45 credit hours and a university student may enroll in college classes as a transient student. Full undergraduate degree programs are offered in Criminal Justice, Elementary Education, Exceptional Education, General Business Administration, Legal Studies, Liberal Studies, Nursing, Psychology and Social Sciences. Partial degree programs are offered in Accounting, Economics, Engineering, Finance, Management and Marketing.

UCF has 25 resident faculty on permanent assignment at the joint-use campus. The individual departments at the main campus hire the faculty, although the joint-use campus administration has veto authority over the faculty hires for the campus. The joint campus faculty have the same teaching load as the main campus faculty. There are no joint faculty appointments although qualified faculty at one institution are able to serve as adjunct faculty at the other institution.

The campus enrolls approximately 1,200 students, 70 percent of which are female with an average age of 32 years. Sixty percent of the enrollment are part-time, evening students. Student services at the campus are provided by a single "director" who is a full-time staff supplied by the main campus. These services include: career services, disabled student services, clubs, veteran affairs, international student services, student transfer orientation and testing services.

During the campus visit, a group of students was interviewed and identified the following issues.

Small class sizes and significant interaction with faculty are major assets of the campus. Core courses are not always offered when needed; a wider variety of major courses should be offered each semester.

More degree programs should be offered.

It is difficult to obtain UCF textbooks at the bookstore.

UCF students do not have access to all DBCC facilities (fitness center).

Campus student activity fees are forwarded to the main campus; SGA allocates partial funds back to the campus.

***C. Davie Campus – Broward Community College / Florida Atlantic University / Florida International University***

Designated by the State Legislature as the lead public institution of higher education in Broward County, Florida Atlantic University offers complete undergraduate and graduate degree programs at the Davie Campus, located on Broward Community College's Central Campus in Davie. The Legislature provides a separate annual appropriation for FAU Broward for the purpose of establishing a complete university presence in Broward County. Section 240.528, Florida Statutes, states: *"The Board of Regents and Florida Atlantic University shall consult Broward Community College and Florida International University in coordinating course offerings at the postsecondary level in Broward County."* FAU and BCC have been cooperating to deliver academic programs since 1974 in order to provide baccalaureate degree programs to the residents of Broward County. The two institutions maintain an umbrella agreement under which specific annual contracts exist for utilities, security and other services.

The Davie Campus includes approximately 17 acres of space that FAU has leased from Broward Community College. The joint-use operation is a large, complex program, with nearly 15,000 BCC students and 6,000 FAU students. The Campus is administered by a Campus Provost appointed by BCC and a Vice President for Broward Campuses appointed by FAU. Campus student surveys found that 80 percent of Davie students selected FAU due to its location, 40 percent live in their own home and over 80 percent of students work; one-third work at least 40 hours per week. It is reported that currently 50 percent of BCC graduates attend FAU and 25 percent of BCC graduates attend FIU.

Students can enter BCC as freshmen and graduate from FAU with undergraduate degrees in business, education, liberal arts and the social sciences. The College of Liberal Arts, FAU Broward's newest college, is headquartered on the Davie Campus and offers degrees in arts, humanities, sciences and social sciences. Undergraduate degrees are also offered through the College of Business, Education, Engineering and Architecture, Urban and Public Affairs. Both the College of Education and the College of Nursing offer graduate programs at the Davie Campus. There are no joint faculty appointments, but a few positions are jointly funded by the two institutions.

A 100,000 square foot Liberal Arts Building opened in 1994 and a \$14.5 million shared-use FAU/BCC library opened in 1995. The library ranks among the most technologically sophisticated libraries in South Florida. A Joint Policy Board oversees the operation of the library and BCC and FAU students use a common library card for the joint-use library. A new Education and Science Building, which contains state-of-the-art research and teaching labs for Biology, Psychology and other science courses, opened in January 1999.

At the present time, each institution has its own admissions and registrations process. A Joint Committee is currently reviewing many of these administrative procedures. The staffs of the two

institutions recently completed a joint academic catalog, a *Four-Year Program Guide*, that identifies the nearly 50 undergraduate degree programs that are available through the FAU/BCC partnership. The *Guide* includes an academic checklist, a semester-by-semester course schedule for the available degree programs and a “frequently asked questions” section on joint policies and procedures. BCC and FAU share some, but not all, student activities and recreational facilities. BCC are unable to attend FAU activities that are sponsored with FAU student activity fees. Most student service functions, like financial aid, career testing and disability services, remain distinctive for each institution. A joint day care facility is now operational for all students. Institutional student satisfaction surveys revealed the following:

Items rated - High Satisfaction:

Class size;  
Out-of-class faculty availability;  
Telephone registration;  
Condition of facilities;  
Counseling Services;  
University Center.

Items rated - Low Satisfaction:

Variety & availability of courses;  
Financial aid & fee payment process;  
Day care;  
Campus bookstore;  
Food Service;  
Student Parking.

FIU also offers undergraduate degree programs at the BCC Davie Campus as part of a 2 + 2 cooperative agreement with BCC and provides academic advisement, admissions and registration services at the Broward site. Currently, there are approximately 1,000 FIU students at this campus.

***D. Askew Tower – Broward Community College / Florida Atlantic University / Florida International University***

The Askew Tower, located in downtown Ft. Lauderdale, is headquarters for the Florida Atlantic University College of Architecture, Urban and Public Affairs as well as the Graduate School of Business. The Askew Tower also houses the Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems, the Stuart-James Research Center, the Florida Center for Electronic Communication, the International Business Center and the Center for Entrepreneurship.

Campus student surveys found that 60 percent of Tower students are male and two-thirds are master’s degree students. Sixty percent of the survey respondents indicated that they transferred from a four-year college and two-thirds of the students are working at least 40 hours a week.

Items rated - High Satisfaction:

Honors program;  
Class size;  
Attitude of faculty;  
Telephone registration;  
Usefulness of catalogs;  
Security & safety.

Items rated - Low Satisfaction:

Variety & availability of courses;  
Designated study and classroom facilities;  
Parking;  
Career development services.

FIU also offers masters and doctoral programs and maintains research programs at the Askew Tower and provides administrative offices and student services at the site. Broward Community College is coordinating the planning for a new 13 story joint-use tower for use by the educational partners.

***E. Lakeland Campus – Polk Community College / University Of South Florida***

The University of South Florida at Lakeland extends access to baccalaureate degree programs into central portions of the state in the counties of Polk, Highlands and Hardee. The joint-use facility at the Lakeland Campus opened in 1988 in an innovative facility built for the combined use of Polk Community College and the University. The initial agreement targeted the need for baccalaureate programs in business, education and engineering. The Campus has played an important role in the attraction of new industries to the region and the retention of existing companies. Area residents now have the opportunity to complete a bachelor’s degree in their community.

Both the College and the University operate the joint-use facility, but each institution provides independent leadership for their campus functions. PCC employs a Dean of Instruction, Dean of Workforce Development and an Assistant Director of Student Services. The University appoints a Campus Dean with administrative staff. The College handles the fiscal administration of the campus with the University providing a proportional share of the costs of agreed-upon services (security, library, utilities and classroom utilization). The College handles all plant operations, including maintenance. There are strong agreements for the operation of the campus bookstore and the library. The classroom facilities are administered separately and there are few rooms that are jointly used. The administrations work closely to meet the classroom needs for the academic programs.

There are now two academic quadrangles at the site. PCC offers freshman and sophomore courses, while USF provides junior, senior and graduate courses in selected academic disciplines. The Lakeland Campus offers undergraduate degree programs in Business, Criminology, Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, Education and Engineering. Students can take advantage of specific articulation agreements at the Lakeland campus in programs such as Criminology, Nursing, Education, Engineering, Business, Accounting and Computer Sciences. College students are also able to dual-enroll in USF courses at the site. Graduate programs are offered in Education, Engineering, Criminology and Public Administration. The Campus has television receiving and transmitting classrooms and labs for individualized computer instruction. Through these technologies, students have access to USF faculty through two-way video and audio communication.

There are currently approximately 3,000 PCC students and 1,000 USF students at the Lakeland Campus. Data provided by the Campus reveals a flat enrollment level during the past five years.

**USF Lakeland Campus**

	<b><u>Student Headcount</u></b>	<b><u>Degrees Awarded</u></b>
1995	1002	153
1996	945	182
1997	1010	172
1998	868	192
1999	851	166

Joint academic advising services are now available to students and are coordinated by staff and faculty at both institutions. A computerized advising program enables students and advisors to track academic progress and remain aware of degree requirements and needed courses. The Uni-

versity provides student services that support admissions, registration, advising and financial aid functions. Recent student satisfaction surveys found favorable comments regarding class size and staff attitudes and dissatisfaction with textbook prices, financial aid information and the size of the library collection.

***F. Ft. Walton Beach Campus – Okaloosa-Walton Community College / University Of West Florida***

Okaloosa-Walton Community College and the University of West Florida began a unique 2+2 program in 1982 in a response to a demand for educational programs by the military staff and families in the region. The original site for the joint programs was an old elementary school. A permanent site for the partnership was established in 1989 at the Ft. Walton Beach campus. The Ft. Walton Beach Chamber of Commerce and area employers were active partners in the planning and development of the campus. The Ft. Walton Beach campus opened in 1992 and is approximately 20 minutes from the main campus of OWCC. It is the only stand-alone, joint-use facility in the State.

OWCC serves as host partner, with operational responsibility for the administration of the facilities and grounds. UWF pays OWCC an annual fee to defray the operational costs of the campus. The campus is administered by a OWCC Provost and a UWF Campus Director. The campus is administered by a OWCC Provost and a UWF Campus Director. The Campus Director reports to the University Provost and is a member of the Deans Council. These two administrators also coordinate the activities of a Joint Articulation Committee for the campus. There are 12 “memos of understanding” between the two institutions that guide the operation of the campus.

The 156-acre campus now offers a fully integrated program from the freshman year through graduate school and annually serves a combined enrollment of 7,500 students. The Campus operates eight buildings, including administration and student services buildings, two classroom buildings, science and technology buildings, a library, fitness center and auditorium. The Campus also houses OWCC’s various economic development programs, including: the Economic Development Council of Okaloosa County, the Technology Coast Manufacturing & Engineering Network, the Gulf Coast Alliance for Technology Transfer, the Quality Institute, the Northwest Florida Manufacturing Technology Center and the Institute for Professional Development. The Campus has state-of-the-art computer laboratories and also houses the college’s distance learning program.

A Commission review team, consisting of a Commission member, Commission staff and the study consultant, visited the joint-use campus. It was learned that the academic course schedule for the campus is jointly developed. The College initiates course offerings based on the degree programs that the University makes available at the campus. Currently, 17 baccalaureate programs and 15 masters degree programs are offered. Undergraduate degree programs include: business, education, communication, computer science, psychology and interdisciplinary humanities and social sciences. Graduate programs include: accounting, business, computer science, education, psychology and public administration. It was reported that negotiations are underway to relocate the UWF engineering programs, formerly a joint degree program with the University of Florida, to the joint-use facility in the coming years.

Data provided by the College and by the University reveal a flat enrollment level during the past five years:

<u>OWCC</u>	<u>1994-95</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Unduplicated Headcount	6,957	6,409
FTE Enrollments	1,080	1,034

  

<u>UWF</u>	<u>1995-96</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Enrollment (Ft. Walton B)	223 (full-time)	167 (full-time)
	686 (part-time)	633 (part-time)
Fundable Student Cr. Hrs.	15,452	14,380

Faculty are permanently assigned to the joint-use campus and have the same teaching loads and tenure process as faculty at the main campus. It was reported that all OWCC faculty teach at least one course at the joint-use site.

The review team interviewed students enrolled at the joint-use campus and learned that “most students drive onto campus, take their classes and leave campus to go to work or return home.” A student profile provided by the campus reveals the following: average age - 34 years; gender - 59 % female; students employed – 90 %; average course load – nine semester hours. Community college students are able to take up to 15 hours of university courses as a special student without the formal admissions process. Additionally, student identification cards of both institutions are interchangeable.

The students reported that they enjoy the small classes and accessibility of the campus. A small student government association works to plan activities for the campus. In addition to parking problems, the students expressed concerns regarding inaccuracies and/or miscommunication of academic policies and requirements. It was reported that certain degree programs have narrow programs of study which make it difficult to take all of the required courses at the campus. One student said that there are one or two required courses in his degree program that he will have to take at the main campus because the university faculty will not teach the courses at the Ft. Walton Beach campus.



**IV. DEMOGRAPHIC REVIEW OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN JOINT-USE FACILITIES: SUMMER 1998 – SPRING 1999**

This chapter presents an overview of demographic statistics for students enrolled at the six joint-use facilities identified in this report. The data used in these analyses come primarily from the State University System’s student and instructional course data files. Supplemental data were provided by the Division of Community Colleges. The data were collected and compiled by the staffs of the Board of Regents and State Board of Community Colleges. The display and analysis of the data in this chapter was completed by MGT of America, Inc., consultant for this study.

The data are examined over a three-semester period, ranging from Summer 1998 to Spring 1999, for the following categories:

- overall enrollment and the proportion of students enrolled at joint-use facilities from partner community colleges;
- highest degree level held by enrolled students;
- age;
- ethnicity;
- student majors; and,
- the average number of credits taken by students enrolled at joint-use facilities during these three semesters.

**Headcount Enrollment**

Data on upper-division enrollment at the six sites are presented in Exhibit 1 below:

**EXHIBIT 1**

**HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES**

Joint-Use Facility	Total Enrollment		
	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999
UWF - OWCC	632	847	828
USF - PCC	798	740	713
UCF - DBCC	727	1,286	1,315
UCF - Brevard CC	687	1,309	1,284
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	3,078	4,171	4,285
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	602	758	744
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>6,524</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,169</b>

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

As indicated, approximately 6,500 students were enrolled in the six joint-use facilities in summer of 1998 and 9,100–9,200 in the fall and spring semesters. The most noticeable pattern in the data is the large overall increase in enrollment between the summer and fall semesters, a change of 2,587 students, or 39.7 percent. This change is due to the influx of new students coupled with the return

of those students opting not to take classes during the summer semester. The exception to this trend is the USF – PCC facility, which actually exhibits a 7.3% decrease in enrollment between these two semesters. There is little change in enrollment between the fall and spring semesters at any of the facilities.

In addition to these patterns, one other characteristic that stands out is the relative size of the FIU/FAU – Broward CC (Davie) joint-use facility's enrollment. Enrollment at this facility comprises almost one-half of the total for the six joint-use facilities. As a result, any study-wide statistics, if weighted for the number of students, become somewhat biased towards the characteristics of this particular joint-use facility in further analyses. For this reason, it is important that the data for the individual facilities is properly accounted for before any aggregate assessments can be made.

One question that this analysis explores is whether or not the joint-use facilities are fulfilling their intended role of expanding access to baccalaureate degrees for Floridians. It is therefore necessary to determine the present status of the enrolled students to see whether or not they could potentially be seeking a bachelor's degree. In an attempt to capture this information, Exhibit 2, listed below, presents the headcount enrollment for those students classified as upper and lower division undergraduates, thereby excluding graduate students and others not necessarily compatible with this analysis.

## EXHIBIT 2

### HEADCOUNT UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES

Joint-Use Facility	Total Enrollment		
	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999
UWF - OWCC	296	361	352
USF - PCC	473	445	433
UCF - DBCC	498	923	975
UCF - Brevard CC	512	924	920
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	2,222	3,065	3,085
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	93	120	92
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>4,094</b>	<b>5,838</b>	<b>5,857</b>

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

When compared with Exhibit 1, we see that about two-thirds of the students enrolled in these facilities are classified as undergraduates, with fairly similar distributions of students across the schools and terms as to that of the aggregate student population. One item that does distinguish itself from the previous table is the FIU/FAU – Broward CC (Tower) facility’s small number of undergraduate students. This may be due to a heavier emphasis on graduate studies at this particular institution. Also of note is the fact that FIU/FAU Broward CC (Davie) encompasses an even larger percentage of enrollments when the scope of the analysis is limited to undergraduates alone.

A related issue for this study is the extent to which students from the five “partner” community colleges associated with these joint-use facilities ultimately enroll at their local facility. Exhibit 3 below compares the total number of students enrolled in the six joint-use facilities during the three semesters who had either attended or received a degree/certificate from their partner community college during the previous six years. As indicated, students who had attended the partner community colleges comprised more than one-half of total joint-use facility enrollment overall, and those who had actually received a degree or certificate comprised almost one-third of total enrollment overall.

**EXHIBIT 3**

**STUDENTS ENROLLED AT A JOINT-USE FACILITY IN SUMMER 1998, FALL 1998, OR SPRING 1999 WHO HAD ATTENDED AND/OR RECEIVED A DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE FROM A PARTNER COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999
<b>Total Joint Use Facility Enrollment</b>	<b>6,524</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,169</b>
Number of Joint Use Facility Students Who Attended a Partner Community College During the Period 1993-94 to 1998-99 <sup>1</sup>	3,306	5,006	5,011
<i>% of Joint Use Facility Enrollment</i>	<i>50.7%</i>	<i>54.9%</i>	<i>54.7%</i>
Number of Joint Use Facility Students Who Received a Degree or Certificate from a Partner Community College During the Period 1993-94 to 1998-99 <sup>1,2</sup>	1,819	2,815	2,849
<i>% of Joint Use Facility Enrollment</i>	<i>27.9%</i>	<i>30.9%</i>	<i>31.1%</i>

Sources: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files and Florida Community College System student data files.

<sup>1</sup>"Partner community colleges" include: Brevard, Broward, Daytona Beach, Polk, and Okaloosa-Walton.

<sup>2</sup>Includes Associate in Arts degree, Associate in Science degree, and any certificate awarded by a community college.

**Highest Degree Level Held**

The next item to be examined is the highest degree held by the students attending the joint-use facilities. These data are presented in Exhibit 4 below, and reveal that the largest percentage of

students enrolled in the joint-use facilities have associate's degrees. It should be noted that this number includes students who have received an associate degree from any community college and not just a "partner" community college.

#### EXHIBIT 4

#### HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY STUDENTS ENROLLED AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES

Joint-Use Facility	Distribution of Highest Degree Held (% of total)					
	Summer 1998					
	HS	Assoc.	Bach.	Mast.	Doct.	Other <sup>1</sup>
UWF - OWCC	24.7	32.7	30.4	9.5	0.2	2.5
USF - PCC	7.6	36.4	20.2	2.8	0.4	32.6
UCF - DBCC	12.1	55.5	25.0	1.8	0.4	5.2
UCF - Brevard CC	9.9	62.0	23.1	2.9	0.1	2.0
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	7.1	38.0	14.0	2.8	0.1	38.0
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	1.5	5.7	63.8	17.8	0.5	10.7
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>24.0</b>
	Fall 1998					
	HS	Assoc.	Bach.	Mast.	Doct.	Other <sup>1</sup>
UWF - OWCC	23.0	33.0	30.7	10.2	0.1	3.0
USF - PCC	2.8	40.6	20.7	3.0	0.1	32.8
UCF - DBCC	13.1	58.7	21.2	2.3	0.4	4.3
UCF - Brevard CC	8.3	58.5	26.9	3.6	-	2.7
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	6.5	39.6	16.0	2.8	0.1	35.0
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	0.4	5.5	60.7	18.6	0.7	14.1
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>21.1</b>
	Spring 1999					
	HS	Assoc.	Bach.	Mast.	Doct.	Other <sup>1</sup>
UWF - OWCC	24.9	31.1	31.6	10.0	0.1	2.3
USF - PCC	3.4	43.1	18.4	3.8	0.1	31.2
UCF - DBCC	12.2	59.8	21.1	1.7	0.2	5.0
UCF - Brevard CC	9.2	57.6	26.9	3.5	-	2.8
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	7.3	38.4	16.9	3.1	0.2	34.1
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	0.7	5.6	62.1	20.2	0.4	11.0
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>20.6</b>
<sup>1</sup> "Other" includes students with no degree, as well as those with GEDs, professional degrees (e.g., law), and educational specialists.						
Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.						

The exception to this is the FIU/FAU – Broward CC (Tower) facility, where a majority of the enrolled students hold a bachelor's degree. As mentioned, one possible factor contributing to this is the presence of a graduate school of business at that site. In addition to those students holding associate's and bachelor's degrees, there are also a small number of students with high school diplomas, master's degrees, and doctoral degrees. Interestingly, the "other" category represents one-fourth of the overall total (primarily due to the influence of FIU/FAU – Broward at Davie). This category is primarily composed of those students with no previous degree.

As previously stated, undergraduate students are an important focus of these analyses. As depicted below in Exhibit 5, the undergraduate population consists of substantially differing proportions than that of the student population as a whole. Of most significance, we see that the proportion of students holding associate’s degrees comprises close to sixty percent of undergraduates, suggesting that the majority of undergraduates, have come to these joint-use facilities from community colleges.

**EXHIBIT 5**

**HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ENROLLED AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES**

Distribution of Highest Degree Held (% of total)						
Summer 1998						
Joint-Use Facility	HS	Assoc.	Bach.	Mast.	Doct.	Other <sup>1</sup>
UWF - OWCC	28.0	64.5	6.8	0.3	-	0.3
USF - PCC	10.1	59.0	6.3	0.2	-	24.3
UCF - DBCC	15.3	80.1	4.0	-	0.2	0.4
UCF - Brevard CC	12.7	83.2	3.3	-	-	0.8
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	9.0	51.5	7.4	0.8	0.0	31.2
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	8.6	33.3	33.3	-	-	24.7
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>60.3</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>20.5</b>
Fall 1998						
Joint-Use Facility	HS	Assoc.	Bach.	Mast.	Doct.	Other <sup>1</sup>
UWF - OWCC	24.1	70.5	3.6	0.8	-	1.0
USF - PCC	3.6	65.4	6.3	0.4	-	24.3
UCF - DBCC	17.2	78.1	3.6	0.4	-	0.7
UCF - Brevard CC	11.3	82.4	5.8	-	-	0.5
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	8.6	52.9	6.7	0.6	0.0	31.2
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	2.5	34.1	33.3	1.7	-	28.4
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>63.2</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>19.1</b>
Spring 1999						
Joint-Use Facility	HS	Assoc.	Bach.	Mast.	Doct.	Other <sup>1</sup>
UWF - OWCC	24.7	68.4	5.4	1.4	-	0.1
USF - PCC	4.6	69.1	5.1	0.5	-	20.7
UCF - DBCC	16.0	79.3	3.7	0.2	-	0.8
UCF - Brevard CC	12.4	80.4	6.2	-	-	1.0
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	9.6	52.5	6.7	0.5	0.1	30.6
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	4.3	45.6	25.0	2.2	-	22.9
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>63.4</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>18.3</b>

<sup>1</sup>"Other" includes students with no degree, as well as those with GEDs, professional degrees (e.g., law), and educational specialists.

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

### Average Age

The data on the age of students taking courses at these facilities demonstrates fairly consistent patterns and characteristics, as can be seen in Exhibit 6 below. Across the six facilities, the average age ranges from approximately 31 to 35, with an overall average of 32 to 33, depending on the semester. This is significantly higher than the State University System (SUS) as a whole. According to the SUS 1997-98 Fact Book, the median age for students enrolled in the SUS was only 23 years of age, approximately 10 years younger than that of students at the joint-use facilities.

This age gap is clearly related to the nature of these facilities. One aspect of the design of these schools is to attract students who would not necessarily have sought a bachelor's degree if an institution had not been located near their homes and places of employment. Due to this extension of state university services to a broader market, older individuals who may be placebound due to work and/or family circumstances are granted an opportunity to expand their educational qualifications by seeking higher degrees of certification.

### EXHIBIT 6

#### AVERAGE AGE OF STUDENTS ENROLLED AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES

Joint-Use Facility	Average Age		
	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999
UWF - OWCC	34.8	34.7	35.5
USF - PCC	32.9	34.1	35.1
UCF - DBCC	33.0	32.7	32.9
UCF - Brevard CC	31.9	32.7	33.5
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	31.1	31.3	32.1
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	34.6	34.4	35.2
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>33.2</b>

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

The undergraduate population, when isolated, exhibited similar characteristics to the overall student body, as shown in Exhibit 7:

**EXHIBIT 7****AVERAGE AGE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ENROLLED AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES**

Joint-Use Facility	Average Age		
	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999
UWF - OWCC	31.2	30.0	31.0
USF - PCC	31.1	31.7	32.3
UCF - DBCC	31.0	31.1	31.2
UCF - Brevard CC	31.3	31.6	32.4
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	29.9	29.6	30.4
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	30.1	30.3	32.4
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	30.4	30.4	31.1

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

Although slightly younger than the total student population presented in Exhibit 6, the average age of these students still lies far above that of the SUS as a whole. However, if we delve further into the SUS figures, we find that these statistics are heavily weighted towards the compositions of Florida State University and the University of Florida. If we look only at those universities affiliated with the joint-use facilities (UWF, USF, UCF, FIU, & FAU), we find that the average age of students is slightly higher than that of the entire SUS population. For lower division undergraduates at the five universities, average ages range from 19 to 21 years old, and for upper division undergraduates, 24 to 26. These upper division undergraduates represent students who have completed at least two years of college, and thus also include students who have attained associate's degrees. Even in the context of this rather conservative comparison group, we see that the average age of undergraduate students at these joint-use facilities remains well above that of students at other institutions. This further bolsters the conclusions reached from the data including all students, as we see that this contrast in age is evident across any comparison group.

**Gender Distribution**

The next category to be analyzed is the gender distribution of students, as depicted in Exhibit 8. In all cases but one, we see a consistent distribution of females and males at a ratio of approximately two to one. Contrary to the other schools, the gender distribution at FIU/FAU – Broward (Tower) nearly approaches an even distribution. The SUS reports in its 1997-98 Fact Book that, in the fall of 1997, the gender distribution among all state university students was approximately fifty-five percent female students to forty-five percent male students, almost identical to that of FIU/FAU – Broward (Tower).

## EXHIBIT 8

## GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ENROLLED AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES

Joint-Use Facility	Gender Distribution (% of total)					
	Summer 1998		Fall 1998		Spring 1999	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
UWF - OWCC	33.7	66.3	37.9	62.1	37.4	62.6
USF - PCC	35.0	65.0	34.3	65.5	38.4	61.6
UCF - DBCC	35.6	64.4	34.3	65.7	32.2	67.8
UCF - Brevard CC	31.9	68.1	35.8	64.2	34.8	65.2
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	33.8	66.2	31.6	68.4	31.5	68.5
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	46.8	53.2	47.4	52.6	45.4	54.6
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>35.1</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>34.7</b>	<b>65.3</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>65.7</b>

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity distributions also varied somewhat when compared to the SUS as a whole. Exhibit 9 shows that White/Caucasian students comprise over seventy percent of total enrollments in the joint-use facilities, while the state university average was five percent less than this.

## EXHIBIT 9

## ETHNICITY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ENROLLED AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES

Joint-Use Facility	Ethnicity Distribution (% of total)											
	Summer 1998				Fall 1998				Spring 1999			
	W	B	H	Oth	W	B	H	Oth	W	B	H	Oth
UWF - OWCC	88.1	6.2	2.5	3.2	84.8	8.7	2.7	3.8	83.7	8.7	3.0	4.6
USF - PCC	78.4	12.3	5.4	3.9	83.2	9.3	4.6	2.9	81.5	10.9	3.6	4.0
UCF - DBCC	87.8	4.8	3.6	3.8	86.4	5.8	3.8	4.0	86.2	5.9	4.4	3.5
UCF - Brevard CC	85.2	5.7	5.5	3.6	83.3	6.5	5.3	4.9	83.0	5.6	5.7	5.7
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	63.1	17.5	13.5	5.9	61.0	18.1	14.0	6.9	60.4	18.7	14.1	6.8
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	66.3	15.4	10.6	7.7	63.3	16.9	11.5	8.3	64.2	15.5	12.2	8.1
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>72.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>71.3</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>5.8</b>

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

It should be emphasized that the overall joint-use facility average is heavily influenced by the FIU/FAU – Broward CC (Davie) facility, at which approximately sixty-three percent of students are White/Caucasian. At four of the other five schools in the study, we see these levels ranging from 78 to 88 percent, a great deal higher than the state average. Accordingly, we see smaller percentages of minority students, particularly Hispanic Americans, than compared to statewide averages. The Florida Regents 1997-98 Fact Book lists both Hispanic and African-American students each as comprising over thirteen percent of student populations.

The proportions of minority students varies dramatically across the different facilities, as we can see that both of the FIU/FAU facilities have levels comparable to this statewide average, while most of the other schools have a great deal fewer minority students. This variance in minority student population can probably be attributed to local population demographics. One slight trend is also evident concerning the ethnic distribution of students: a slow increase in the proportion of minority students is apparent across the three-semester period of the study. Again, this trend may be explained by broader changes in local populations, as most students attending these schools are native to their respective areas.

**Student Majors**

Student choice of major was similar to that of the entire state, according to the programs offered by the joint-use facilities. The 1996-97 SUS Fact Book states that the top three majors across the state university system were business, education, and engineering, each accounting for 17.0, 12.0, and 7.8 percent of student populations, respectively. Exhibit 9 displays the top three majors and the corresponding percentage of students at each of the six joint-use facilities, as well as the study-wide totals. The data reveals that, in accordance with statewide averages, the business and education fields are the top two student disciplines for the sum of the joint-use facilities examined in the study. Furthermore, this statistic is consistent across each individual school, with the exception of FIU/FAU Broward (Tower), which does not offer a program in education. Otherwise, it appears that the statistics closely correlate with the statewide averages.

**EXHIBIT 10**

**TOP THREE STUDENT MAJORS AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES: FALL 1998**

Joint-Use Facility	Top Majors		
	1st (% of total)	2nd (% of total)	3rd (% of total)
UWF - OWCC	Education (39.6)	Business & Finance (24.8)	Computer Science (16.9)
USF - PCC	Education (19.2)	Business & Finance (18.9)	Social Sciences (10.4)
UCF - DBCC	Business & Finance (24.1)	Education (22.7)	Liberal Arts (18.7)
UCF - Brevard CC	Business & Finance (22.5)	Education (16.9)	Liberal Arts (12.2)
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	Education (20.2)	Business & Finance (20.2)	Psychology (6.3)
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	Pub. Adm. & Sci. Wk. (25.7)	Business & Finance (20.1)	Arch./Urban/Rgnl. Plng. (15.7)
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	<b>Business &amp; Finance (21.4)</b>	<b>Education (21.1)</b>	<b>Psychology (6.7)</b>

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

Further examination reveals that the proportion of students involved in business and education at the joint-use facilities is actually higher than that of the state university system. This is most likely a result of the more limited scope of degree programs available at joint-use facilities. Beyond the two primary focuses of business and education, there is a large gap in the study-wide totals. The data indicate a wide variety of programs at the other schools, representing varying increments of student populations.

### Average Number Of Credits

The final topic to be examined is the course loads of students enrolled in the schools analyzed in this study. The Florida State Board of Regents reports in its 1997-98 annual Fact Book that the average course load for undergraduate students enrolled at state universities is approximately 12 hours. Exhibit 11, shown below, reports these credit loads for the joint-use facilities. The major pattern in these data is a decline in average course loads during the summer semester, amounting to a 28.4 percent decrease in average credit hours taken across the study group. Though this trend might be typical for all universities, the data clearly demonstrates certain characteristics unique to these joint-use facilities. Relative to the statewide average of twelve hours per semester, a distinct deficit in average course loads exists for these institutions. Such deficits are expected at the joint-use facilities as a result of the unique composition of the students attending these institutions. Many lower-income students work longer hours, and thus take lighter course loads, in order to finance their education and general living expenses. As these institutions were commissioned in order to “increase access for students to baccalaureate degree programs” (Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, *The Impact of Joint-Use Facilities on the Delivery of Postsecondary Education in Florida*), this figure is indicative of the success of the program. By extending these programs to these various communities, the cost of attaining baccalaureate degrees is decreased and thus made attainable by lower-income students that are economically bound to a certain community.

#### EXHIBIT 11

#### AVERAGE CREDITS TAKEN BY STUDENTS ATTENDING JOINT-USE FACILITIES

Joint-Use Facility	Average Credits Taken		
	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999
UWF - OWCC	5.5	6.5	6.7
USF - PCC	6.2	6.8	6.9
UCF - DBCC	5.7	7.7	8.2
UCF - Brevard CC	5.6	7.7	7.6
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Davie)	5.8	7.7	7.7
FIU/FAU - Broward CC (Tower)	5.2	6.3	6.8
<b>All Joint-Use Facilities</b>	5.8	7.4	7.5

Source: Prepared by MGT from State University System instructional and student data files.

## V. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The legislative proviso for this study directs the Commission to focus its examination of joint-use facilities on campus instruction and support services, including registration, advisement, library access, time-to-degree and student attainment of educational objectives. To analyze the impact and efficiency of joint-use educational sites, the Commission examined the following topics and issues: joint-use utilization by students, joint-use operation and program efficiency.

### ISSUE A: JOINT-USE FACILITIES AS A RESPONSE TO HIGH ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

#### Postsecondary Enrollment Projections

Since the 1950s, Florida has been one of the nation's high growth states. Beginning in 1990 and ending in 2010, the Bureau of Economic and Business Research has projected an increase of nearly five million residents. The Department of Education's Office of Strategy Planning projects that the total number of annual high school graduates will climb to 110,000 in the year 2000 and to 136,000 in 2011, while the total number of standard-diploma graduates is projected to reach 103,300 in 2000 and 123,300 in 2011.

The Commission has spent considerable time during the past five years assessing the future demand in Florida for postsecondary education. A primary focus of the 1998 Master Plan: *Challenges and Choices: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education* is on ACCESS to postsecondary education, with emphasis on accommodating growing student demand and improving undergraduate degree attainment. The *Plan* projected that total headcount enrollment in Florida's public and independent colleges and universities in the year 2010 would be 888,141, an increase of 258,746 (+41 percent) over 1995 levels.

Addressing enrollment growth, the public sector boards made the following projections in their strategic plans:

*In the State University System's 1998-2003 Strategic Plan, the Board of Regents stated that it conservatively anticipates at least 70,000 new students during this period, which would be an average increase of nearly 6,000 students per year, or about the same level of growth experienced during the previous seven years.*

*In the Community College System's Strategic Plan for the Millennium 1998-2003, the State Board of Community Colleges, using a ratio methodology, projected an increase in the community college system out to the year 2010 of 98,000 students (65,000 credit students and 33,000 non-credit students). The Plan states that: an increase in headcount of 2 % per year is projected between now and the year 2010.*

In subsequent analysis done by the Commission, in conjunction with the sector boards and the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, the estimated growth in the state's public and private postsecondary sectors was reduced, largely based on lower high school graduate projections, to an increase of approximately 196,000 during the period up to the year 2010.

### The Role of Joint-Use Facilities

During state-level deliberations on providing access to postsecondary education, the utilization of joint-use facilities has remained a primary point of discussion in efforts to design an optimal delivery system for future enrollment growth.

The Commission's 1998 *Master Plan* concluded that the state must increase opportunities to higher education and identified a number of responses to meet the future postsecondary needs of the state, including "increase the number of joint-use facilities at community colleges and state universities." In its 1998 study: *Evaluation of Florida's Two-Plus-Two Articulation System*, the Commission did not recommend major structural changes in the state's postsecondary delivery system and stated: "at this time, the Commission supports the expansion of joint or concurrent programs and facilities involving two and four year public and independent institutions as the priority strategy to address postsecondary access." The Commission provided a greater examination of access issues in its 1999 report: *Challenges and Choices: ACCESS*, Supplement #1 to the 1998 *Master Plan*. In a discussion of *Facilities Capacity and Use*, the Commission recommended that "joint or concurrent programming involving two and four-year public and independent institutions should be the priority strategy for assuring postsecondary access for the immediate future."

In support of the Commission's focus on access, the State University System's *1998-2003 Strategic Plan*, the Board of Regents stated:

*Undergraduate growth will be directed, to the largest degree possible, toward branch campuses located near areas of population growth, and whenever practical, co-located with community colleges. Experience with such joint use facilities in locations such as Broward, Brevard and other counties have shown this model could be a very cost-effective way to achieve increased baccalaureate degree production. This model has shown that students in such joint-use environments can operate in a seamless, coherent fashion which may approach the degree production effectiveness of traditional four-year environments while retaining the cost-effectiveness of the current two-plus-two system.*

In the Florida Community College System's *Strategic Plan for the Millennium 1998-2003*, the State Board of Community Colleges identified the following *Objective*:

*The Community College System will continue to work with the SUS in developing joint programs, joint facilities, concurrent use campuses and other appropriate responses to meet the need to increase access to postsecondary education programs.*

A review of the enrollment patterns of the current joint-use facilities and the analysis in Chapter IV of the student clientele at these sites, however, has called to question the impact that additional joint-use facilities would have on meeting the increasing demand for postsecondary education from the projected steady annual growth in high school graduates.

During the past 20 years, the state universities have grown under the direction of the Board of Regents and the Legislature, as each institution operates its admissions policies annually under a calculated enrollment plan, which provides funding for limited, specified full-time-equivalent (FTE)

enrollment growth. As a result, the main campuses have experienced steady, planned growth over the years. Table 1 shows that UCF and FIU have experienced the most rapid growth during the past five years.

**TABLE 1**

**ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT GROWTH  
1994-1998 MAIN CAMPUSES OF SELECTED STATE UNIVERSITIES**

<b>Main Campus</b>	<b><u>1994-95</u></b>	<b><u>1995-96</u></b>	<b><u>1996-97</u></b>	<b><u>1997-98</u></b>	<b>Total 4-Year Change</b>	<b>Total 4-Year Percent</b>
USF- Tampa	14,889	14,963	15,164	15,215	326	2 %
FAU- Boca Raton	6,927	6,976	7,149	7,366	439	6 %
UWF- Pensacola	3,915	4,062	3,997	4,091	176	4 %
UCF- Orlando	13,431	14,019	14,705	14,829	1,398	10 %
FIU- Univ. Park	11,413	11,946	12,015	12,638	1,225	11%

Source: State University System Fact Books

Table 2 displays FTE enrollment growth at the joint-use facilities over a five-year period. It shows that enrollment growth at these campuses is not directly related to growth at the main campus. For two universities, however, the enrollment growth at the joint-use campuses mirrors their main campus growth.

TABLE 2

**ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT GROWTH  
BY JOINT USE CAMPUS  
1994-1999**

<u>University Site</u>		<u>1994-95</u>	<u>1995-96</u>	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99*</u>	<u>Total 5-Year Change</u>	<u>Total 5-Year Percentage</u>
UCF	Brevard	535	592	585	557	603	68	13%
UCF	Daytona	460	520	523	518	615	155	34%
FIU	BCC/Davie	198	234	212	232	197	-1	-1%
FAU	BCC/Davie	1415	1692	1777	1858	1967	552	39%
FIU	Tower	176	175	203	158	155	-21	-12%
FAU	Tower	176	198	246	229	230	54	31%
USF	Lakeland	399	417	399	413	355	-44	-11%
UWF	Ft. Walton	406	414	395	396	390	-16	-4%

\*Preliminary estimates

Source: State University System Enrollment Reports

Table 2 shows that only three of the university's joint-use facilities have experienced enrollment growth during the past five years and four joint-use programs have experienced steady or declining FTE enrollment levels during the period. The enrollment patterns at these sites do not parallel Florida's growth in general population, high school graduates and postsecondary enrollments during the same period.

The Commission's analysis of over 9,000 students enrolled in the state's six primary joint-use facilities during 1998-99 (see Chapter IV) found that the clientele consists of older students who are not able to travel to a university campus, and who enroll part-time in concert with employment schedules, financial constraints or family obligations. This analysis produced the following profile of these students.

### *Student Profile*

#### **Students Enrolled at Six Florida Joint-Use Facilities 1998-99**

Average age: 33 years – all students; 31 years – undergraduates.  
Gender distribution: Females – 65 %; Males – 35 %.  
Ethnicity distribution: White – 72 %; Black – 13 %; Hispanic – 9.3 %.  
Primary academic majors: Business & Finance – 21 %; Education – 21 %.  
Average course load: 7.4 credit hours per semester.  
2/3 were undergraduate students; 1/3 were graduate students.  
55 % attended a partner community college, within the last five years.  
31 % received a degree from a partner community college, within the last five years.  
63 % of undergraduates held an associate degree.

Joint-use facilities in Florida are a valuable component to the state's education delivery system. They provide postsecondary access to Floridians who, for a variety of reasons, are unable or unwilling to relocate or commute to one of the state's public universities for baccalaureate education. The above *Student Profile*, however, reveals that students who are enrolling at joint-use facilities tend to be older, white, female students who are employed and enrolled part-time at the campus. This profile was verified through the Commission's national research and confirmed through interviews with students enrolled at joint-use sites in the State. While there is a wide age distribution at the Florida joint-use campuses, traditional high school graduates are primarily not the students who are choosing to enroll at these sites. In light of the increasing number of high school graduates that is projected for the coming decade, new joint-use facilities should not be established in Florida as the primary method to accommodate the projected postsecondary enrollment demand.

#### ***Recommendation 1:***

***Postsecondary joint-use facilities should be established in response to local and/or regional educational and workforce needs and should be included as one of several responses that will be needed to meet the projected demand in the State for access to postsecondary education.***

#### **Institution Mission**

The Commission believes that the groundwork for an effective joint-use facility is established through the expressed mission of each partner institution. In its 1998 **Master Plan**, the Commission called on postsecondary institutions to focus on their individual strengths and recommended that:

*Each institution with appropriate direction from governing and coordinating boards, should identify its distinctive mission and focus its resources on its strengths and priorities. The roles of different institutions should be coordinated so that, taken together, they meet important state needs and reflect a cost-effective use of state resources.*

In its 1998 **Strategic Plan**, the Board of Regents emphasized the need to provide strategic direction to the State University System through the clarification of university missions. The **Strategic Plan** established the University of South Florida as a Research I institution on the basis of the following Association of American Universities (AAU) factors: the number of doctoral degrees granted, the amount of federally sponsored research won, the presence of recognized leaders in research on the faculty and extensive research libraries. The **Plan** recognized the University of Central Florida, Florida Atlantic University and Florida International University as Research II universities, and stated that they “*are rapidly emerging as providers of quality graduate education and research, as well as undergraduate education.*” These institutions will be developed “*to be distinguished as doctoral-granting or emerging research universities.*”

One component of the Board’s plan to develop an educational site delivery platform strategy is the “*establishment of centers of undergraduate teaching excellence at branch campuses and co-located facilities.*” The **Plan** also called for no increase in undergraduate enrollment at SUS Research I universities (the University of Florida, Florida State University and the University of South Florida), and stated that “*undergraduate enrollment growth at Research II universities will be based on university plans approved by the Board of Regents.*” According to the **Plan**, “*comprehensive universities*” (Florida Gulf Coast University, the University of West Florida, Florida A & M University and the University of North Florida) “*focus their missions primarily on the provision of quality undergraduate, master’s level and selected doctoral education.*” The **Plan** states:

*Comprehensive universities, in accord with their missions, will be free to expand undergraduate enrollment during the period of this plan and, along with branch campuses and concurrent-use facilities developed with community colleges in accordance with university plans, will provide the primary, cost-effective SUS response to increased demand for undergraduate access.*

Currently, the two universities with the most active participation in joint-use partnerships are the University of Central Florida and Florida Atlantic University, both of whom are Research II universities. The University of South Florida, a Research I institution, has branch campuses at St. Petersburg, Sarasota and an active joint-use facility of Lakeland. The joint-use facilities at UCF and FAU are thriving and are providing significant postsecondary access to their communities. However, as the branch campuses of these universities continue to grow and expand, they will need to compete more forcibly for resources with the graduate education and research components of the main university campuses. The Board of Regents and the leadership of these universities will face increasingly difficult funding decisions regarding the allocation of resources among graduate education, research programs and branch campus operations.

### **Recommendation 2:**

*Institution mission should be a major consideration in state-level planning for the establishment and location of new postsecondary joint-use facilities. The “comprehensive universities” of the State University System, as designated by the Board of Regents, should be the primary partners with community colleges in new joint-use agreements designed to increase undergraduate access to needed areas of the State.*

## **ISSUE B: EFFECTIVE JOINT-USE FACILITIES**

A national survey conducted by the Commission confirmed that joint-use facilities are established by states to increase access of their residents to postsecondary education and, specifically, to a greater variety of academic degree programs. Joint-use educational sites provide access to residents who desire to pursue a general postsecondary education or who need a specific degree or certificate credential. They continue to enable universities to offer educational opportunities to Florida citizens in outlying areas distant from a main university campus.

Inter-institutional collaboration is an effective means of meeting regional educational needs efficiently. The most successful joint-use sites are developed at the local and/or regional level through collaborative partnerships that first, identify specific workforce needs and then, offer the educational programs to meet the needs. This remains an important consideration for certain areas of Florida where new industries are demanding an educated and skilled workforce in order to locate in the area.

In addition to their distinctive clientele, joint-use facilities operate under a unique set of circumstances. The effectiveness and efficiency of a joint-use facility is ultimately dependent upon its relationship with the main university campus. Joint-use facilities can either thrive in an open, trusting relationship where all involved are committed to success, or it can exist with little direction, commitment of resources or day-to-day support. To operate effectively, there must be enhanced coordination, communication and information transmission between the main campus and the area campuses.

The Commission learned that the viability of the academic degree and course offerings at a joint-use campus is chiefly determined by the commitment to the site made by the academic departments at the main university campus. These departments primarily determine what degree programs will be offered, when the courses will be offered and who will teach the courses.

An additional ingredient to this structure is the extent of student-faculty interaction that is provided. In most instances, the academic department exists at the main campus and resident faculty are assigned to the joint-use site. A program coordinator for the department may be assigned to the campus to serve as a liaison for students to the department chair and other administrators. Most student dissatisfaction at joint-use facilities arises from concerns with these academic relationships.

### **Best Practices**

As a result of the analysis of campus information on existing joint-use partnerships, student enrollment data, interviews with students and administrators at joint-use campuses and the review of joint-use programs in other states, the Commission has identified key components that highlight the “*Best Practices*” for joint-use facilities.

#### **Governance/Administration**

- ◆ *A joint-use facility, established by two or more postsecondary institutions, should be congruent with and reflect the mission of each partner institution.*
- ◆ *The administration/supervision of a joint-use campus, whether by one individual or a coordinated staff team, should maintain a direct and open line of communication to the leadership of both*

*institutions. The main university/college administrative team should make regular visits to the joint-use campus to meet with administrators, faculty and students.*

- ◆ *Formal, written agreements should be executed on all shared administrative and academic responsibilities.*
- ◆ *All institutions involved in the joint-use arrangement should ensure that joint-use facilities are funded at the same level as central campus facilities for all operational and infrastructure components.*
- ◆ *The scheduling of classroom and laboratory space each semester and the assignment of office space at the joint-use facility should occur collaboratively by administrators and faculty of the joint-use partner institutions.*
- ◆ *The partner institutions should implement unified admissions procedures for the joint-use facility, so that students who enroll in the community college are given provisional admission to the university in anticipation of an associate in arts degree completion. Uniform policies and procedures should exist for all academic transactions, including class registration, drop & add, payment of fees and bills, financial aid services, etc.*
- ◆ *The administration of each joint-use facility should maintain an active student recruitment and marketing program to attract to the campus the traditional high school graduates in the region.*

### **Academic Affairs**

- ◆ *The university partner should continue to assess student demand for degree programs and strive to offer the broadest array of complete baccalaureate degree programs at the branch campus as there are available resources.*
- ◆ *The joint-use partners should collaborate to publish one, joint academic class schedule and degree program guide for the joint-use campus.*
- ◆ *All required academic courses for each degree program that is offered at the joint-use campus should be available on site. Students should not have to travel to the main university campus in order to complete degree requirements.*
- ◆ *Each academic department at the branch campus should be fully integrated into the department at the main campus. Faculty at the joint-use campus should function identical to faculty at the main university campus. Tenure requirements and review procedures, class load and schedules and other assignments should be identical at both sites.*
- ◆ *At a joint-use facility, the individual academic departments at each partner institution, community college and university, should maintain a close working relationship that supports a seamless articulation for students from the associate's degree program to the baccalaureate degree program.*
- ◆ *The joint-use partner institutions should implement, with limited restrictions, dual enrollment*

*provisions that allow community college students to enroll in university courses and university students to enroll in community college courses.*

- ◆ *University academic departments should continue to monitor joint-use campus enrollments in specific degree programs, in comparison to main campus enrollments. For large and fully enrolled degree programs at the branch campus, the department should consider relocating the main department office to the branch campus.*

### **Student Affairs**

- ◆ *All Student Activity and Service Fees that are generated by students at joint-use facilities should be allocated to those campuses for use by the enrolled students.*
- ◆ *Students enrolled at joint-use facilities should have access to the full array of student and academic services at a level that is comparable to the main university campus, including advising and counseling services, library services, financial assistance, recreational opportunities, food service and bookstore services.*
- ◆ *Students enrolled at joint-use facilities should have full, open access to all student and academic services that are provided at the campus by the partner institutions. Student identification cards should be interchangeable among the institutions.*
- ◆ *The administration of the joint-use facility should promote a student government at the campus. Regular opportunities should be provided for students to provide input on existing student and academic policies, procedures and services.*
- ◆ *The main university student government should provide for full representation of the students enrolled at joint-use campuses.*

### ***Recommendation 3:***

***The Commission’s “Best Practices” should be utilized by planners and developers of future postsecondary joint-use facilities and collaborative programming in Florida.***

### **ISSUE C: STUDENT ACTIVITY AND SERVICE FEES AT JOINT-USE FACILITIES**

During Commission interviews with students enrolled at joint-use campuses, concerns were raised regarding university policies and procedures for student activity and service fees collected from students enrolled at the joint-use sites. Students who were interviewed at the Cocoa and Daytona Beach joint-use sites were generally dissatisfied.

A State University System Chancellor’s Memorandum, CM-D-24.00, states that activity and service fees are to be expended for purposes to benefit the student body in general, including student publications, intramural programs and grants to student organizations. These fees are set at each institution, as are the level of appropriation to each branch campus. Section 240.235 (1)(a), Florida

Statutes, states the following:

*Each university president shall establish a student activity and service fee on the main campus of the university. The university president may also establish a student activity and service fee on any branch campus or center. Any subsequent increase in the activity and service fee must be recommended by an activity and service fee committee, at least one-half of whom are students appointed by the student body president.*

This statute also states that the president may establish a student health fee and a separate athletic fee for any branch campus or center. Section(2)(a) states that “the allocation and expenditure of the fund shall be determined by the student government association of the university, except that the president of the university may veto any line item or portion thereof within the budget...”

Student leaders at the joint-use campuses informed the Commission that their activity fees are sent to the main campus. The student government representatives of the branch campus submit a budget request to the main campus SGA. The SGA of each main campus determines a percentage of the total fees that will serve as the branch campus budget for the academic year and these funds are appropriated back to the branch campus.

Below are results of a limited telephone survey of selected universities regarding policies and procedures for student activity fees at branch campuses:

University of Central Florida – Student activity and service fees are collected for all students. Each branch campus, as well as most student organizations, submits a budget request to the University Student Government Association during a Spring Semester budgeting cycle for the following academic year. An SGA Allocation Committee allocates an amount of funds back to the area campus for the academic year. This amount is based on the branch campus’s budget request, but may be less than the amount that was generated by the campus’s students. During the year, a Student Senate Working Fund of the SGA exists to fund supplemental requests for funds that are requested by an branch campus, (or by any student organization).

Florida Atlantic University – Each branch campus has its own student representatives to the main campus Student Government Association. Based on a needs assessment that is conducted by the SGA and advisors, the SGA approves budget requests and allocates funds back to the branch campuses. This process includes a loose proration of funds based on the enrollment and generation of fees at the branch campus. Every student pays a health fee and the fees are prorated. Students can procure health care at any FAU campus, and the campus at which the student is enrolled becomes the source for the reimbursement of the service.

University of South Florida – Student activity fees are determined and controlled by the students at each branch campus and are not centrally administered. The number of students at each campus determines the amount of activity fees that are collected and a needs assessment on each campus determines the amount of funds that are allocated to the campus. Health fees for students vary by campus. Each area campus determines its own healthcare provisions and fees vary according to the campus. The UCF-Lakeland campus has no health fee.

Florida International University – Student activity and service fees are the same for all students at all university campuses. The main campus SGA allocates a budget to each campus that is loosely based on a proration of enrollment. Health fees are the same for all students at all university campuses. The university’s two main campuses have full health care facilities on site.

University of West Florida – Student activity and service fees are allocated back to the branch campus. Students at the branch campus do not pay health fees.

Florida State University – The branch campus, through a campus committee of students and administrators, determines and allocates student activity and service fees for the campus. All funds remain at the branch campus.

Students enrolled at joint-use campuses informed the Commission that individual activities that are planned by the branch campus students are often dependent upon receiving an appropriation from the main campus SGA. Elections are held without sufficient notice. Main SGA meetings on the main campus that require branch campus representation are often held during late at night – requiring a long drive both ways.

This issue has gained relevance in light of the current review by the US Supreme Court of a free speech dispute in which students at the University of Wisconsin are challenging their institution’s mandatory student fee policies that support certain political or ideological student groups. The Court’s decision may significantly change how mandatory student fees are used to finance student organizations and how state universities and colleges support and regulate student organizations.

***Recommendation 4:***

***The Board of Regents should review the student activity and service fee policies at state university joint-use and branch campuses for consistency and equity across the State University System. This review should examine the policies and procedures at each campus for the determination, collection and allocation of these fees, and the role of students at each campus in these processes.***

**ISSUE D: THE INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE UTILIZATION REPORTING PROCESS FOR JOINT-USE FACILITIES**

The Commission received testimony from campus administrators that when a community college and a state university share facilities, as at a joint-use site, there is no recognition of this classroom and/or laboratory activity through the state room utilization reporting process. This process is designed to account for all educational activity in state-owned buildings.

For State University System facility utilization reporting, instructional space is coded as either classroom space or teaching laboratory space. The Board of Regents measures scheduled activity in all classrooms, regardless of who is utilizing the room. To measure the activity, staff review the scheduled activity from the Instructional Activity File and match it to the Physical Facilities Space File. The summary report for the State University System summarizes main campuses only.

Most community colleges enter into numerous kinds of inter-institutional agreements with

neighboring postsecondary institutions, and room usage in joint-use arrangements varies and may be totally split or shared with other institutions. Community college administrators report that they only report their own usage of the space.

The Division of Community Colleges facilities staff report that the state-level space utilization reporting formula excludes facilities not owned by the college and does not identify college activity at other institutions. Further, these reports include only activity in permanent buildings, not temporary or portable buildings.

The Division of Community Colleges continues to work with the colleges to link their computerized reporting systems to the state reporting standards. The reporting process, however, is a complicated one. Each joint-use facility has distinctive agreements, usage standards and operational functioning, and there are joint-use buildings that are owned by either a university or a college and there are buildings that are jointly and fully operated by both partnering institutions. Space utilization activity changes each semester throughout the system and the scheduling of day and night classes at most sites further complicates the reporting process.

To make the educational space utilization reporting process more meaningful and to ensure that the data collected for classroom and/or laboratory usage is both accurate and identified for the appropriate institution, the creation of a separate reporting category for joint-use facilities may be warranted.

***Recommendation 5:***

***The State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents should cooperatively convene an ad-hoc task force in order to review the space utilization reporting process as it relates to postsecondary joint-use facilities and to consider the development of a separate reporting category for educational activity in joint-use facilities.***

## REFERENCES

Beckman, B. (1996). How To Do More With Less: Community College Innovations to Increase Efficiency and Reduce Costs. Denver: Alliance for Community College Innovation.

California Commission on Innovation. (1992). Cutting the Cost of New Community College Facilities: Joint Use Strategies: Policy Discussion Paper #2. Sacramento: Commission on Innovation.

Citizens' Commission on the Future of Oklahoma Higher Education. (1998). Status Report on Implementation of Recommendations.

Jadallah, E. (1994). The community education center: A model for school-university partnerships. American Secondary Education, 22 (4), 23-27.

Kanter, R.M. (1994). Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. Harvard Business Review, 72 (4), 96-108.

Macomb Community College. (1996). A Commitment Made...A Promise Delivered. Community Report. Macomb Community College Board of Trustees, Warren Michigan.

May, G., & Smith, A. (1992). Gaining stature through community college-university consortia. New Directions for Community Colleges, 20 (78), 63-75.

State of California Community College Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit. (1999, February 23). Report on Collaborative Facilities Projects.

State of Illinois Board of Higher Education. (1998). An Implementation Plan for the University Center of Lake County: A Committee Report.

State University System of New York Board of Trustees. (1995). Rethinking SUNY.

Taber, L.S. (1995). ERIC Review: Collaboration as a vehicle for community college facilities development. Community College Review, 23 (3), 73-87.



## **APPENDICES**

The appendices are not available in download format. Hard copies of this report, including the appendices, may be requested from PEPC.