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Survey Objectives

2. Aggregate traditional field demographics with scope, staffing, and utilization data.
3. Provide a framework for customary, comparative practices across the whole of the field.
4. Assist ACHA in quantifying the overall contribution that college health makes to higher education.
Survey Responders (YTD 2-18-09)

- Overall Responder Statistics:
  - N = 114
  - 47% Public 4-yr
  - 43% Private 4-yr
  - 10% 2-yr

- “Adequate Space” Responder (ASR) Statistics:
  - N = 44
  - 45.5% Public 4-yr
  - 45.5% Private 4-yr
  - 9% 2-yr
Response By ACHA Region

- Pacific College Health Association - 21
- New England College Health Association - 4
- New York State College Health Association - 8
- Mid-Atlantic College Health Association - 13
- Ohio College Health Association - 6
- Mid-America College Health Association - 8
- Rocky Mountain College Health Association - 3
- Central College Health Association - 5
- North Central College Health Association - 13
- Southern College Health Association - 14
- Southwest College Association - 16
“Adequate Space”: Average Sq Ft Per Student

Average Sq Ft Per Student:
- Gross: 1.266
- Net: 0.904
"Adequate Space": Average Sq Ft Per Visit

- Gross - Without Mental Health: 0.821
- Gross - With Mental Health: 0.680
- Net - Without Mental Health: 0.532
- Net - With Mental Health: 0.439
“Adequate Space”: Average Sq Ft Per Staff FTE

Gross, 720

Net, 515

Average Sq. Ft. Per Total FTE
“Adequate Space”: Facility Construction Dates

- 1898
- 1900, 1900
- 1927
- 1945, 1945
“Adequate Space” vs. Overall: Facility Construction Dates

Facilities Constructed

- Adequate Space Responders
- All Responders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Adequate Space</th>
<th>All Responders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall vs. ASR: Average Sq Ft Per Enrolled Student or Eligible Person

- Net Assignable Sq. Ft. Per Student
  - All Responders: 1.46
  - Adequate Space Responders: 0.715

- Net Assignable Sq. Ft. Per Eligible Person
  - All Responders: 1.37
  - Adequate Space Responders: 0.669

- Gross Sq. Ft. Per Student
  - All Responders: 1.97
  - Adequate Space Responders: 1.11

- Gross Sq. Ft. Per Eligible Person
  - All Responders: 1.86
  - Adequate Space Responders: 1.05
Overall vs. ASR: Average Sq Ft Per Patient Visit or Total Utilization

- Net Assignable Sq. Ft. Per Patient Visit:
  - All Responders: 0.685
  - Adequate Space Responders: 0.550

- Net Assignable Sq. Ft. Per Total Utilization:
  - All Responders: 0.470
  - Adequate Space Responders: 0.426

- Gross Sq. Ft. Per Patient Visit:
  - All Responders: 0.750
  - Adequate Space Responders: 0.784

- Gross Sq. Ft. Per Total Utilization:
  - All Responders: 0.505
  - Adequate Space Responders: 0.590
Overall vs. ASR: Average Sq Ft Per FTE or Headcount

- Net Assignable Sq. Ft. Per FTE:
  - All Responders: 553
  - Adequate Space Responders: 515

- Net Assignable Sq. Ft. Per Headcount:
  - All Responders: 473
  - Adequate Space Responders: 407

- Gross Sq. Ft. Per FTE:
  - All Responders: 725
  - Adequate Space Responders: 720

- Gross Sq. Ft. Per Headcount:
  - All Responders: 623
  - Adequate Space Responders: 574
Overall: Average Gross Sq Ft Per Eligible Person

Avg. = 1.73
Overall: Average Gross Sq Ft Per Patient Visit

Avg. = .72
## "Adequate" vs. Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Adequate Space&quot; Response</th>
<th>Overall Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>84%</strong> hosp w/in 5 miles</td>
<td><strong>81%</strong> hosp w/in 5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48%</strong> facilities constructed for current use</td>
<td><strong>44%</strong> facilities constructed for current use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25%</strong> planning for diff or new facility</td>
<td><strong>54%</strong> planning for diff or new facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39%</strong> in free-standing bldg</td>
<td><strong>38%</strong> in free-standing bldg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43%</strong> on-campus residents</td>
<td><strong>35%</strong> on-campus residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Thoughts

1. Limited responses, lots of missing data, question results, opportunity to refine analysis.
2. Size of facility dependent on a variety of technical, environmental, and cultural variables.
3. Notion of “adequacy” is subjective.
4. Arrangement as well as amount may be the important factors.
5. We need to continue standardizing counts (inflation decreases benchmarks).
Final Thoughts

6. Consider benchmarking service modules with our data.
7. Consider other professional health care facility benchmarking resources (AIA, MGMA, AHA, etc.).
8. Continue to refine survey instrument (with Sections and CSP etc.) and encourage response.
9. Welcome your feedback.
Questions or Comments?