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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the summer of 2013, Washington State University engaged Brailsford & Dunlavey and Opsis Architecture to conduct a Development Plan for University Recreation to identify the recreational needs of the WSU community and to address viability of potential campus improvements. This Study was completed to provide WSU and University Recreation with the necessary information to proceed with improving campus recreational and wellness elements.

CURRENT SITUATION

Washington State University’s Pullman campus currently enrolls approximately 19,500 students and employs 4,100 staff and faculty. University Recreation provides fitness and wellness services for the Pullman campus population in a variety of campus spaces, and has been based in the 165,000 gross square feet Student Recreation Center (“SRC”) since its construction in 2001. University Recreation also has access to an additional 200,000 gross square feet of indoor space shared with Athletics and the College of Education. Upon opening of the Student Recreation Center, 23.4 GSF per student of recreational space was provided which has decreased to 17.8 currently due to enrollment increases and loss of space (Figure 1.1).

Additionally, the impact on recreational spaces is compounded by a 34% increase in number of SRC participants and an 8% decrease in hours available in shared spaces. This impacting of space is limiting access to fitness and wellness pursuits, restricting program offerings, and negatively effecting the student experience.
experience. Any additional enrollment increases or loss of space, or time available to access space, will further negatively impact University Recreation and the campus community.

WORK PLAN

The Project Team’s approach required an active working relationship with WSU students and staff to develop an understanding of the institution’s mission, relevant stakeholders, customer groups, and strategic project objectives which best serve that mission. The work plan included:

- A strategic visioning session to identify how potential developments would improve WSU and University Recreation’s educational outcomes, campus community, enrollment management, and financial performance;
- A series of stakeholder meetings and focus groups to qualitatively assess impressions of recreation and wellness opportunities at WSU;
- A peer benchmarking analysis to understand WSU’s competitive market position against similar recreation programs;
- A campus wide survey to quantify preferences and priorities of students, faculty, and staff;
- A demand analysis to quantify space demand for the current campus population’s needs;
- A series of project concepts were developed to address the space needs for WSU;
- A series of campus outreach efforts including open forums, concept refinement focus groups, and stakeholder meetings to refine the analysis and project concepts; and,
- A financial analysis of the potential concepts to project capital and operating expenses.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

B&D’s outreach efforts for the Development Plan included over 150 focus group and stakeholder participants and over 2,400 survey responses. Overall, the WSU campus community strongly valued the programs and services offered by University Recreation and aligned with key strategic drivers identified in stakeholder meetings. University Recreation facilities and programs will be inclusive; available to all participants irrespective of current ability or attitude, and be able to focus on integrating holistic wellbeing into programs and services. Sufficient space should be provided within facilities for all drop-in recreational activities to minimize excessive waiting periods to access equipment. Stress mitigation, professional development, and leadership development are important educational outcomes of the University Recreation. Most importantly, Washington State University is a premier institution of higher education with a strong residential campus environment. University Recreation will connect to the residential environment to assist with the transition to college life and establish lifelong wellbeing attitudes within freshman and beyond. Therefore, proximity to existing and future housing communities is important to connect to students and central campus locations are critical to engage faculty and staff.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROGRAM DEMAND

Space demand projections were developed utilizing the campus survey responses as well as analysis of current University Recreation program usage and national fitness and wellness trends. The analysis concluded that the current space available to University Recreation on campus is insufficient to meet the needs of the WSU campus community (Figure 1.2). Key spaces that require expansion include weight and fitness, group fitness studios / multipurpose rooms, gymnasium courts, indoor field space, and programmatic support for intramurals, sports clubs, and Adventure Programs. The further reduction of shared spaces would increase demand across nearly all activity types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Demand Projections</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Weight and Fitness</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>32,100 to 36,600</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>(12,900) to (17,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Group Fitness / Instruction</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>18,700 to 22,300</td>
<td>17,462</td>
<td>(1,238) to (4,838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Recreational Swimming</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>9,891 to 12,380</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(4,891) to (7,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lap Swimming</td>
<td>Lanes</td>
<td>3 to 7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gymnasium Courts</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(3) to (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MAC Courts</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Outdoor Tennis</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Racquetball</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Squash</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Indoor Fields</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Outdoor Fields</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>2 to 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ice Sheets</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1) to (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Indoor Driving Range</td>
<td>Bays</td>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(15) to (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Indoor Rock Wall</td>
<td>Linear Ft.</td>
<td>29 to 36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31 to 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Outdoor Rock Wall</td>
<td>Linear Ft.</td>
<td>3 to 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3) to (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Surplus / (Deficit)

FIGURE 1.2: SPACE RECONCILIATION OF DEMAND TO ALL DEDICATED AND SHARED UNIVERSITY RECREATION ACCESSIBLE SPACES

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT

Brailsford & Dunlavey and Opsis Architecture developed project concepts based on the strategic asset value analysis, demand based-programming, stakeholder and focus group interviews, operational requirements, and capital costs. The concepts developed are based on two strategies to address demand and UREC program needs:

- Address current program shortfalls by creating enough space to meet WSU community demand, accommodate UREC programs and activities, and provide permanent locations for programs in temporary facilities, or
Address potential future space needs if core campus facilities (Smith Gym, Physical Education Building, Bohler Gym, Hollingbery Fieldhouse, etc.) are no longer available for University Recreation or student use.

The Project Team analyzed the existing campus layout as well as the WSU Master Plan to provide insight on potential locations for future improvements to campus recreation and wellness (Figure 1.3). Although multiple zones were analyzed across the WSU campus, four areas were selected as the best opportunities for growth in University Recreation programs as they met criteria related to:

- Master Plan identification of potential student life, recreation, or athletic facilities,
- Proximity to a critical mass of an underserved population, and / or
- Available sites with capacity to accommodate program components.

**Concepts Addressing Current Needs**

B&D focused on two key projects which would address the current needs of University Recreation and the WSU community: the South Campus Satellite (“SC1”) and the Adventure and Sports Center (“ASC”).
The South Campus Satellite Phase I facility would be located in the South part of WSU’s campus to accommodate current shortfalls of space for programmed and self-directed recreational pursuits. The facility would be geared to operate as a true satellite facility with many similar program elements as found within the Student Recreation Center, complementing the SRC’s offerings and relieving overcrowding in the existing facility. The large residential population located in this part of the campus would be the primary user of this satellite facility. Key destination elements and programs such as the climbing wall and pool would remain housed within the SRC Zone. The SC1 is envisioned as a multi-story building of approximately 53,000 gross square feet. Program elements within the building include:

- 10,000 square feet of weight & fitness,
- Three group fitness studios,
- Two-court gymnasium,
- Wellness lab,
- Locker rooms,
- Administrative office, and
- Support spaces.

The Adventure & Sports Center facility would be located in close proximity or connected to the Student Recreation Center and expand upon the destination qualities of the existing facility. The ASC would support overall campus demands for space as well as create a permanent home for many UREC programs which are housed in temporary spaces or currently underserved. The ASC is envisioned as a multi-story building of approximately 62,000 gross square feet. Program elements within this building include:

- Program and support space for Adventure Programs including the Outdoor Recreation Center ("ORC") rental and resource shop, ORC storage, bouldering and climbing wall, bike rental and workshop, instructional kitchen, and meeting space for groups.
- Program and support space for sports clubs and intramurals including conditioning room, meeting space, and storage lockers.
- Group meeting and activity space with two multipurpose rooms / group fitness studios and a large event space with a turf or multi-use floor surface.
- Locker rooms, administrative, and support spaces.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

Brailsford & Dunlavey conducted a financial analysis of the existing University Recreation and SRC operations as well as an assessment of potential project costs for future improvements. The analysis evaluated student fee revenue, elective memberships, speculative revenue, personnel, and non-personnel costs for each project concept. Development budgets outlining projected capital costs were created in consultation with University staff. The financial modeling anticipates student fees as the main revenue for operations and debt service and would commence upon completion of the individual project (Figure 1.4). It is important to note that fundraising and other capital gift would significantly reduce student fees for the projects.
B&D recommends that the University continue to refine and implement the first two projects, the South Campus Satellite and the Adventure & Sports Center, to address the current needs of the WSU community and mitigate future programmatic shortfalls related to enrollment growth.

**NEXT STEPS**

As WSU continues with the development of the housing and mixed-use projects, the following next steps should be considered:

- WSU should continue to engage the student community regarding the initial projects outlined. As student fees are a key aspect of funding the project, the support of the student community is needed.
- The University should develop space plans and needs assessments for the programs sharing space with University Recreation to better understand future needs and impact on those spaces.
- The project concepts developed should be integrated into the University’s capital campaign to identify gift potential.
- Detailed conversations on specific sites should occur to identify the ideal locations on campus and potential impact on campus infrastructure.
- Detailed program documents for the concepts should be developed to further refine the requirements of each space within the facility.
STRATEGIC ASSET VALUE ANALYSIS

OBJECTIVE

Nationwide, colleges and universities are realizing the critical role that student life facilities play in the enhancement of campus life. On many campuses, student recreational sports centers and related facilities are used as strategic assets. In order to help achieve enrollment goals and address other priorities related to student recruitment and retention, the university can use recreational centers and related facilities to develop a comprehensive campus community that raises and maintains student satisfaction.

Recreational sports and wellness facilities assist in recruiting quality faculty and staff in today’s competitive market for qualified professionals. Ideally, these facilities help to achieve academic and learning outcomes for both students and faculty through partnerships, wellness programs, research, and individual user experiences. Although many factors impact the University’s ability to meet institutional goals, the following report provides evidence that carefully planned recreation and other “quality of life” facilities are important components of the overall strategy. As a result, B&D identified Washington State University’s strategic goals with the Project Committee and reviewed the University’s and Campus Recreation’s unique missions, and the existing recreation facilities to contribute to the realization of these objectives.

METHODOLOGY

Brailsford & Dunlavey used a “Strategic Asset Value” (“SAV”) approach to facility development in order to assure that the new building projects respond to the University’s strategic objectives in the most economical manner possible. More specifically, B&D proceeds with the understanding that:

“All of the project objectives must be expressed in specific terms that demonstrate their relevance to furthering the school’s mission, reinforce campus values, respond to institutional commitments and responsibilities, and improve the school’s competitive position in the market.”

B&D’s approach required cooperation with the University Recreation stakeholders to develop a detailed understanding of the institution’s mission and vision for the future campus developments. The process included interviews, working sessions, and a review of relevant documents.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

B&D assembled the outcomes of the strategic value asset into the SAV story comprised of four parts: the priority order of facilities and project concept, the target market and facility location, the architectural and construction quality, and the institutional will.
PRIORITY ORDER OF FACILITIES AND PROJECT CONCEPT

- University Recreation facilities and programs will be inclusive; available to all participants irrespective of current ability or attitude.
- Facility improvements will focus on integrating holistic focus / wellbeing into programs and services.
- Improvements will minimize or eliminate actual and perceived barriers to wellbeing and recreational fitness.
- Sufficient space should be provided within the facility for all drop-in recreational activities to minimize excessive waiting periods to access equipment.
- Stress mitigation, professional development, and leadership development are important educational outcomes of the facility.
- University Recreation should not proceed in isolation with the development of facilities, programs, and services. Full University support and integration into the enhancement of student experience, academic success, and lifelong healthy habits is required.

TARGET MARKET AND FACILITY LOCATION

- Although the primary market of University Recreation is students, facilities and services should embrace and support the entire campus community.
- Washington State University is a premier institution of higher education with a strong residential campus environment. University Recreation will connect to the residential environment to assist with the transition to college life and establish lifelong wellbeing attitudes within freshman and beyond.
- Proximity to existing and future housing communities is important to connect to students. Central campus locations are critical to engage faculty and staff. Opportunities to expand or locate satellite facilities should be driven by these critical adjacencies.
- Opportunities to showcase University Recreation programs for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff should be marketed.
- Direct duplication of program elements is to be avoided. Improvements should focus on meeting the needs of the campus population with complimentary spaces.
- Use and partnerships with the City of Pullman are encouraged when not directly impacting use of space by students.

ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION QUALITY

- Any renovation and expansion must meet existing campus construction standards including the integration of sustainable design elements.
Retention is a greater priority than recruiting students. While the aesthetics of the existing SRC should be utilized, significant funds for non-functional design elements should be minimized and instead use for greater amounts of useable activity space. Existing “wow” spaces can be intimidating to the student population and opportunities to highlight programs and services as “wow” elements will be integrated.

Flexibility of space is critical to long-term success of recreational spaces. This flexibility will accommodate transition of recreational trends and different user groups.

INSTITUTIONAL WILL

Students are the primary revenue source through student fees, therefore they should not be assessed multiple fees for basic services. Only premium level services should require additional fees.

Impact to student fees will be minimized through investigation of potential partnerships with the campus, Pullman community, and philanthropic gifts.
FOCUS GROUP REPORT

OBJECTIVE

The purpose of our focus groups and intercept interviews was to engage a variety of individuals in dynamic conversation about their experiences with recreation and preferences for improved fitness facilities. B&D focused on understanding ways that recreational spaces can be repurposed, renovated, or expanded to meet current students’ preferences, as well as assess the potential for future recreational facilities at WSU. The focus groups are intended to yield qualitative data for the researchers, identifying sensitivities and previously unconsidered issues, as well as discover students’ preferences in new campus recreation facilities.

METHODOLOGY

With the assistance of University staff, B&D held focus groups to obtain a diverse mix of feedback from a wide range of WSU students, faculty, and staff. Approximately 70 individuals participated in ten separate focus groups on September 3rd and 4th, 2013, along with several intercept interviews in and around the WSU campus.

A moderator from Brailsford & Dunlavey led each of the focus group sessions and guided the conversation to address issues relating to recreation and campus life. The moderator presented a series of open-ended questions and permitted individuals to discuss tangential issues and engage in dynamic dialogue. While the moderator was predisposed to obtaining answers to the questions asked, he or she also paid close attention to participant-generated issues raised during the discussion.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

WHY DID YOU CHOOSE TO ATTEND WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY?

Students’ decision to attend Washington State University was primarily based on the strong sense of community they felt while visiting the campus, something that was absent from other universities. Responses from staff and faculty indicated that the quality of life and vibrant community were the core reasons they have stayed in Pullman. In addition, focus group participants also gave the following reasons for attending WSU:

- Their family members attended or were affiliated with WSU,
- The student’s major of interest was available,
- The reputation of the school’s academic programs,
- Had visited the campus for a football game, conference or campus tour, and
- Availability of competitive tuition prices.

WHAT ARE YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF UNIVERSITY RECREATION AND HOW HAS IT MET YOUR EXPECTATIONS AS A STUDENT, FACULTY, OR STAFF MEMBER?

- Overall, participants stated that the WSU recreation facilities had met or exceeded their expectations at all levels; additionally, faculty and staff participants mentioned that university recreation was a convenient means of maintaining their “physical, psychological, and social hygiene.”
- Some participants observed that the variety of recreational amenities was an important aspect of the Student Recreation Center’s success. Further, the ability to access all of the recreational opportunities in one location made the facility much more convenient.
- Specifically, student participants stated that their expectation were met through:
  - Friendly customer-service,
  - The proximity of the athletic fields to the Student Recreation Center,
  - Cleanliness of the facility,
  - The Student Recreation Center pool, and
  - The large size of the facility.
- Student participants living on the southern end of campus commonly expressed their frustration with the location of the Student Recreation Center relative to their housing. This excuse was given as a potential reason for the lack of participation by non-users.
- Participants often explained that the recreation facility was frequently over-occupied and required rescheduling use of the SRC to before or after the late afternoon rush.
Additionally, students and faculty members spoke to the intimidation they felt due to their unfamiliarity with the weight room. Some participants welcomed the prospect of a smaller, separate weight room.

Faculty and staff participants described the central campus shared facilities as being very convenient to their needs, while the facilities in the north campus, the SRC, were too far away.

Faculty expressed a greater need for institutional support to afford them the time to use the facilities, especially during lunch breaks. Given the pressure to make tenure, some faculty members don’t feel they have the freedom to use the gym during lunch.

Faculty and staff members said their enjoyment of the recreation facilities would increase if the following areas were addressed:
- Greater schedule flexibility during their lunch break,
- Access to the climbing wall through a certain allotment of free visits to the SRC,
- Better marketing efforts to raise awareness among other faculty,
- Physical Education majors offering personal training in exchange for course credit, and
- Incorporation of a dietary component.

**HOW MUCH OF AN IMPACT WOULD NOT USING CENTRAL CAMPUS FACILITIES BE?**
**WOULD YOU BE MORE INTERESTED IN SATELLITE FACILITIES?**

- In general, student participants did not feel the central campus facilities would be a great loss because of the impression that they were not allowed to use the facilities. Additionally, a majority of students supported the possibility of satellite facilities because of the distance they have to travel to access the SRC.
- Student participants felt that the only real benefit of the central campus facilities is the opportunity to play intramural sports. While participants admitted that the loss of that facility would be unfortunate, “its (limited) access does not warrant its continued use.”
- Alternatively, faculty and staff participants felt that the loss of these facilities would be very detrimental to their ability to maintain a healthy balance of work and exercise.
- Student support for satellite facilities was attributed to the sentiment that the SRC is too far away, especially for those students living on the south side of campus. As well, students were in favor of facilities that would allow them to get in a quick workout regardless of where they were on campus.
- The minority of students that were not in favor of satellite facilities felt that it would be more convenient to the campus if all amenities were in one location. Additionally, respondents felt there would be a “loss of community” if recreation facilities were spread out.
HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE INTRAMURAL AND OUTDOOR RECREATION PROGRAMS?

- On the whole, participants responded that the intramural program at WSU was one of the most popular recreational opportunities the school had to offer. Further, participants either responded positively to their experiences with outdoor recreation center (ORC) or were hoping to try ORC for the first time.
- Participants felt the intramural and ORC marketing efforts were ineffective in attracting students that were non-users and did a poor job of updating them about changes to the programs and schedules.
- Some participants had been very intrigued to take advantage of the outdoor recreation opportunities, but were hesitant to sign up because of price.
- Students said one aspect of intramurals they were frustrated with was the timing conflicts that arose between evening activities and intramural games. These students indicated the 7 P.M. to 9 P.M. slot was the most desired time period among participants.
- In addition, students felt that the referees responsible for supervising the games were doing a poor job and needed better training.

WHAT WOULD YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE SUCCESSES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF CAMPUS RECREATION? ARE THERE ANY FACILITIES OR SERVICES MISSING?

- Overall, participants felt the biggest shortcoming was the lack of information available either through marketing recreational opportunities or information on how to best utilize the gym. As well, the biggest overall success has been intramural sports.
- Participants identified the proximity of the SRC as being a major shortcoming. Those participants not living in north campus felt the facility was more of a destination than a convenience, especially in the winter.
- Other areas that participants felt the recreational centers had shortcomings in were:
  - Lack of capacity during times of higher traffic,
  - Poor configuration of the weight room,
  - Lack of parking, especially during times of high traffic,
  - Need for better cleaning of facilities, and
  - Poor air ventilation.
- Elements that student participants identified as missing or capable of improving the recreational experience were:
  - Classes teaching a holistic approach to healthy living; specifically, cooking and nutrition classes,
  - Extended hours for late night users,
  - Increased marketing of events taking place at the recreation facilities, and
- Increase in cardio machines and free weights, which are the most impacted during periods of high traffic.

- Elements that faculty and staff participants identified as missing or capable of improving the recreational experience were:
  - Better access to the climbing wall,
  - Better airflow throughout the facility,
  - Greater capacity at class meeting spaces,
  - More welcoming customer service,
  - Better access to the gym on weekends and evening hours,
  - Greater schedule flexibility to access the facilities during the lunch hour, and
  - Better marketing of current offerings and happenings at the facility.
OBJECTIVE

Brailsford and Dunlavey conducted an analysis of peer institutions across the country for Washington State University. The analysis of these peer institutions was conducted to profile aspects of campus recreation spaces for each of the surveyed schools. It was B&D’s intent to evaluate WSU’s competitive position against other institutions and identify opportunities for improvements or additions to its existing recreation facilities. The information collected yielded a thorough understanding of WSU’s current position in the higher education market. Ultimately, this information will help the University improve its student recruitment and retention strategies.

METHODOLOGY

With the support of WSU’s recreation department, 11 schools were selected based on their presence in the PAC-12 conference and Association of American Universities. These universities were also benchmark institutions as part of the campus’ master plan efforts and are seen as having aspirant recreational facilities. The following is a list of the 11 institutions that were used for this analysis:

- Boston University
- Ohio State University
- Oregon State University
- University of California, Los Angeles
- University of Colorado, Boulder
- University of Florida
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
- University of Oregon
- University of Texas at Austin
- University of Washington

Data is based on fall 2013 figures and was collected primarily through the institutions’ websites and conversations with university recreation officials/administrators. Secondary sources included the common data sets of all universities involved.

A detailed Peer Institution Benchmark matrix can be found in Exhibit A of this report.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ENROLLMENT

Among the peer institutions studied, demographic figures varied widely when evaluating total, undergraduate, and graduate enrollment figures. As well, peer universities showed a more balanced ratio when it came to full- and part-time students.

- In this analysis, WSU’s total enrollment of 19,446 students was found to be significantly lower than the peer average of 41,371 students. As well, WSU’s undergraduate (16,783) and graduate (2,663) enrollments were similarly lower than its peer levels of undergraduate (29,753) and graduate (11,618) students.
- Between the 2002/2003 and 2007/2008 academic year, enrollment at peer universities rose 8% as compared to the 6% increase at WSU. However, between the 2007/2008 and 2012/2013 academic year, peer universities grew by 9% while WSU increased by 10%.
- The top three schools in terms of total enrollment were the following: Ohio State (57,466), University of Texas at Austin (52,186), and the University of Minnesota: Twin Cities (51,853). The University of Oregon had the lowest enrollment with 24,518 students.
- Finally, peer universities had a balance of 86% full-time students and 14% part-time students. However, WSU was more weighted toward full-time students (95%) than part-time students (5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>Variance (#)</th>
<th>Variance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>41,371</td>
<td>19,446</td>
<td>-21,925</td>
<td>-113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td>29,753</td>
<td>16,783</td>
<td>-12,970</td>
<td>-77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Enrollment</td>
<td>11,618</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>-8,955</td>
<td>-336%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Enrollment</td>
<td>35,719</td>
<td>18,496</td>
<td>-17,223</td>
<td>-93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Enrollment</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>-4,703</td>
<td>-495%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Enrollment (as % of Total)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Enrollment (as % of Total)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-185%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2012/2013 & 2013/2014 Common Data Sets for peers

FIGURE 4.1: ENROLLMENT

COST OF ATTENDANCE

Overall, WSU is a less expensive university when compared to the average of its peers’ total cost of attendance.

- When comparing in-state tuitions, WSU students are paying 7% less than the average of its peers for the total cost of attendance and 16% less for undergraduate tuition.
Room costs at WSU ($6,930) were 23% less than the average of the peer institutions ($8,527). As well, WSU's board costs were only slightly lower (4%) than its peers at a difference of $170.

Similarly, current undergraduate fees at WSU ($1,453) were 30% less than the average fees at peer universities ($1,885).

![FIGURE 4.2: COST OF ATTENDANCE - IN-STATE](image.png)

Out-of-state students pay 13% less at WSU for their total cost of attendance and 20% less for undergraduate tuition than at peer universities.

The average room, board, and fee rates for out-of-state students at WSU and its peer universities were the same as those paid by in-state students.

![FIGURE 4.3: COST OF ATTENDANCE - OUT-OF-STATE](image.png)

Overall, total fees paid by WSU students were 42% less than the average of the peer universities.

However, the WSU student recreation fee ($300) was 27% more than what students were paying at peer universities ($220). The recreation fee at WSU is higher due to its smaller enrollment size relative to the peer universities, causing a higher per student cost.

Recreation fees at peer universities made by 16% of their total fees, while recreation fees at WSU accounted for 21% of total student fees.
CAMPUS RECREATION

Peer universities offered a wide range of recreational amenities to its students in both indoor and outdoor settings. Peer institutions in this analysis had an average of three recreation centers and 328,036 total gross square feet (GSF). WSU offers two recreation facilities and 365,000 GSF which is 10% higher than its peers. As well, peer institutions were able to provide an average of 9 GSF per student while WSU was able to offer just under 19 GSF per student. WSU’s two main recreation spaces include the Student Recreation Center (165,000 GSF) and Core Campus (200,000 GSF)\(^1\). Only counting the SRC reduces the GSF per student for WSU to 8.

To better understand WSU’s current gaps and surpluses among certain spaces, a variety of these areas were compared with peer universities. As well, square footage was evaluated from a per student basis to understand how well these spaces provided for the needs of the campus based on national standards. While many of the areas available to WSU students are dedicated to them, some of these spaces have been made smaller or taken away due to the need to accommodate athletics and the College of Education. Finally, the average year that peer universities were built and renovated was 1987 and 2007, respectively.

Group Fitness Rooms

WSU currently has one more group fitness space/hardwood studios (7) than the peer average of six spaces. The trend among national institutions is moving towards 0.6 to 0.75 ASF per student. The University of Minnesota offers the most group fitness spaces with nine multipurpose rooms followed by the University of Illinois (8). Demand for group fitness space has grown across the country as exercises related to mind/body, martial arts, and dance have become more popular. As well, there has been an increase in demand for studios with mirrors and hardwood floors among students interested in dance. This trend will continue to grow as universities accommodate a growing number of international students.

\(^1\) This figure represents the amount of GSF that University Recreation has access to among PEB, Smith, Bohler, and the Fieldhouse.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Fee Breakdown</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>Variance (#)</th>
<th>Variance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees</td>
<td>$2,068</td>
<td>$1,453</td>
<td>-$615</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Rec Fee(s)</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rec Fee(s)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
2012/2013 & 2013/2014 Common Data Sets for peers and information from school websites

FIGURE 4.4: STUDENT FEES
Weight and Fitness

WSU currently offers the second most assignable square feet per student of all peers with a weight and fitness square foot total of 19,200. The University of Washington is able to offer the most in weight and fitness space at 49,861 square feet. National weight and fitness spaces are showing a trend towards one assignable square foot (ASF) per student due to the increasing popularity of this space among men and women. WSU is much closer to this standard of one ASF per student at 0.99 ASF than the average of its peers (0.7 ASF). As well, the recent increase in demand from women for weight and fitness spaces has put pressure on older recreation centers to adjust their designs to be more accommodating.
**Multi-Activity Courts**

Multi-activity courts have also grown in popularity among students that desire flexible space that allows for multiple uses. Its softer surface allows students to play indoor soccer, volleyball, badminton, and basketball games. The peer average of multi-activity courts is two with WSU just behind its peers at one.

![FIGURE 4.7: MULTI-ACTIVITY COURTS](image)

**Gymnasium Courts**

Gymnasium courts continue to be one of the more popular spaces at campuses due to their ability to host basketball, volleyball, and badminton games. The addition of court spaces has increased as drop-in use has become more popular among students across the country. WSU has only one less court space (9) than the average of its peers (10). The spectrum of court spaces among peer universities is wide with Ohio State University (20) and the University of Illinois (15) at the top and the University of Colorado (3) and Boston University (4) at the bottom of the spectrum.
The use of racquetball courts has been trending downwards as newer generations of students have found them less popular. Based on feedback from focus groups, these spaces were not as popular among students as they were with faculty and staff. Currently, peer institutions have an average of ten courts, while WSU has one more at 11.
Squash Courts

The peer average for squash courts is three while WSU has just one court. Similar to the trend in racquetball, newer recreation centers are designing fewer squash courts and older facilities are repurposing these areas.

![Squash Courts Table]

FIGURE 4.10: SQUASH COURTS

Tennis Courts

WSU has a total of 12 tennis courts, which is five less than the peer average of 17. This average is weighted upward by warm weather schools such as the University of Texas (40), the University of Florida (32), and UCLA (20). Those peer institutes in colder areas have the fewest tennis courts as the University of Minnesota (4), the University of Illinois (6), and Boston University (8) were restricted by their climates when developing tennis facilities.
Pool Lap Lanes

Total pool lap lanes at peer universities is 17, matching the total at WSU. This total is made up of both outdoor and indoor pools with the average at peer universities being 13 lanes in indoor pools and seven at outdoor pools. On average, peer universities had three indoor pools and one outdoor pool. The number of outdoor pool lanes were much higher among those universities with warmer year-round climates. Current trends show that newer facilities are designing pools with fewer lanes and building recreation swimming areas in their place, in addition to expanding deck space.
RECREATION OPERATIONS

The difference in average annual revenue figures between WSU and its peers was a result of only three of the nine peer universities receiving contributions from student bond fees. While WSU had a much lower incidental student fee, the addition of the student bond fee gave it a higher annual revenue than most of its peers. Every peer university except one university had a greater contribution from its incidental student fees than WSU.

- Total revenue was 12% higher for WSU recreation ($9.1 million) when compared to the average of its peer institutions ($8.0 million).
- WSU’s recreation department received 15% of its total revenue from incidental student fees ($1.3 million) as compared to its peers which had a 66% contribution to its total revenue come from incidental fees. Those peer universities that received a student bond fee only received 35% of their revenue from student incidental fees.
- While not all of the peer universities received a general fund contribution (OSU, UW, UF, UI, and UM), WSU had a higher contribution than all of its peers that did receive one. WSU received $796,000 from general fund contributions, which was 63% more that the average of the peer institutions ($297,000).
- While speculative revenue varied greatly among peer universities, the average amount received ($2.6 million) was over $1.3 million more than what WSU received ($1.3 million). On average, speculative revenue made up 32% of peer institutions total revenue and 14% of WSU’s total revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Revenue</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>Variance (#)</th>
<th>Variance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student / Incidental Fee</td>
<td>$5,244,179</td>
<td>$1,341,000</td>
<td>-$3,903,179</td>
<td>-291%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ / General Fund Contribution</td>
<td>$297,388</td>
<td>$796,000</td>
<td>$498,612</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speculative Revenue</td>
<td>$2,557,215</td>
<td>$1,248,000</td>
<td>-$1,309,215</td>
<td>-105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student / Bond Fee Collection</td>
<td>$5,489,416</td>
<td>$5,713,000</td>
<td>$223,584</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$7,988,273</td>
<td>$9,098,000</td>
<td>$1,109,727</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Gathered from phone/email correspondence with student recreation directors
Information from the University of Colorado, Boulder and Ohio State University was not provided

FIGURE 4.13: ANNUAL REVENUE

Overall, WSU had a lower annual expense to University Recreation than the average of its peers. The greatest differences between WSU and its peers was its lower expenses to non-personnel and part-time personnel.
Overall, total annual expenses for WSU’s recreation facilities were 14% less than the average of its peers ($10.1 million) at just under $8.9 million.

The total amount of expenses for full-time personnel is 23% higher for WSU when compared to its peers. Expenses for full-time personnel is $61,400 per employee at WSU, which was higher than the $53,000 spent per person at peer institutions.

WSU spent 33% less on part-time personnel compared to its peers. However, this amounted to just under $3,700 per part-time employee as compared to the peer average of almost $3,000 per part-time employee.

Finally, debt service for WSU’s recreation facility ($3.1 million) was 8% less than the average of its peers at $3.3 million.

### Annual Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Expenses</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>Variance (#)</th>
<th>Variance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Personnel</td>
<td>$2,317,287</td>
<td>$3,009,000</td>
<td>$691,713</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Personnel</td>
<td>$1,715,435</td>
<td>$1,293,000</td>
<td>-$422,435</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel</td>
<td>$3,190,251</td>
<td>$1,494,000</td>
<td>-$1,696,251</td>
<td>-114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>$3,325,645</td>
<td>$3,089,675</td>
<td>-$235,970</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities R&amp;M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$10,102,407</td>
<td>$8,885,675</td>
<td>-$1,216,732</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4.14: ANNUAL EXPENSES**

### ADMINISTRATION

Among the nine universities that provided feedback on their administration, seven noted having a recreation board. The number of members on these boards ranged from 10 to 20 with an average of just over 13 members. The composition of these boards was a mixture of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, alumni, and civil service employees. The authority these recreation departments reported to was mainly made up of offices and personal related to student affairs with Boston University being the only exception, as they reported to auxiliary services. All of the peer universities indicated that the University owned the recreation facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Recreation Board (Y/N)</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Composition (# of students, staff, faculty, etc.)</th>
<th>Who owns facility?</th>
<th>Who does recreation report to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Los Angeles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 to 12</td>
<td>Undergrads, Grads, Faculty, Staff, and Alumni</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(7) Students &amp; (5) Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Student Affairs - Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(10) Students &amp; (1) Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Boulder</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(13) Students &amp; (7) faculty/staff</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(8) Students/ (2) Faculty / (2) Civil Service Employess</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Office of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Auxiliary Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(8) Students &amp; (4) faculty/staff</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Yes (Advisory)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(9) Faculty/Staff &amp; (3) Students</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>VP - Division of Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(11) Students, (4) faculty/staff, &amp; (1) alum</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Student Affairs and Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Gathered from phone/email correspondence with student recreation directors. Information from the University of Colorado, Boulder and Ohio State University was not provided.

**FIGURE 4.14: ADMINISTRATION**
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SURVEY ANALYSIS

OBJECTIVES

Brailsford and Dunlavey conducted an electronic survey via the Internet to test the recreation patterns of Washington State University faculty, staff, and students. The data collected was useful to B&D in determining the recreation preferences of survey respondents, which helped to inform our project recommendations.

Survey questions were designed to assess current recreation and utilization patterns, preferences related to new/improved facilities, and willingness to support expansion of WSU's University Recreation facilities. Response options were organized to better predict the most desired characteristics and preferences that would potentially be implemented at any new or improved recreation facilities provided at WSU. Survey data collected regarding student demographics allowed B&D to better organize student feedback and analyze demand based on the characteristics of the student population.

METHODOLOGY

MARGIN OF ERROR (CONFIDENCE INTERVAL) AND CONFIDENCE LEVEL

Margin of error, also known as the confidence interval, is a standard statistical metric for describing the precision, or accuracy, of data revealed by the survey. It predicts the data variance that would be expected if the same study with the same sample size (but not necessarily with the same respondents) and population was replicated. Margin of error is expressed as a pair of +/- values.

The margin of error is contingent upon the survey’s sample size (total number of persons eligible to take the survey), as well as upon the confidence level. Confidence level determines the certainty with which one should view the survey results and margin of error is expressed as a percentage. For statistical analysis of survey results, the confidence level is typically set at 95%, although it may be set at any percentage. The meaning of the 95% confidence level used for analysis of this survey indicates that any replication of the survey should yield results falling within the stated margin of error 95% of the time. A higher confidence level would yield a wider margin of error, while a lower confidence level would yield a smaller margin of error.

STATISTICAL VALIDITY

During the period from November 2nd to November 14th, a sample of 2,400 students, faculty, and staff were sent a survey via an on-line link to their campus e-mail, generating 814 respondents (34% response
rate) from the sample population. Student respondents in the sample population included 438 undergraduate (55%) and 220 graduate (28%) students among all classifications surveyed. The survey was then made available to the rest of the campus from November 14th to November 25th, in which 1,593 responses (8% response rate) from students, faculty, and staff were collected.

As a result, the statistical validity of the survey responses was high, with a margin of error of less than 5% at a 95% confidence level for both the sample and campus populations (Figure 5.1).

FIGURE 5.1: MARGIN OF ERROR SPECTRUM

SURVEY DEMOGRAPHICS

The survey provides information on a range of demographic characteristics which allows for a comparison of respondents that took the survey with the actual University population. This comparison allows for a greater understanding of how representative the survey sample was to the entire University and ensures that the results accurately depict the entire campus. One demographic characteristic obtained through the survey was the academic classification of student respondents. Figure 5.2 illustrates the academic classification of the sample and public respondents with the actual demographics of the University.
The permanent residence of respondents was an added demographic question drawn from the survey. When compared with the University’s population, respondents from the sample group overrepresented out-of-state and international students and underrepresented Washington state students. Similarly, the public population overrepresented those students from out-of-state and underrepresented those in-state, however its international population was in-line with the WSU campus.

An added demographic feature pulled from the sample and public groups was the gender of survey participants. As shown in Figure 5.4, the gender breakdown of the sample population was similar to the University’s gender composition. In the case of the public population, female respondents had a greater
representation relative to WSU, which is a common occurrence in B&D's public surveys at other universities.

FIGURE 5.4: WHAT IS YOUR GENDER?

DETAILED FINDINGS - RECREATION

FACILITY SATISFACTION AND UTILIZATION

The results from the survey provided valuable feedback regarding all respondents’ satisfaction and utilization patterns of current facilities at WSU. Based on survey results, participants overwhelmingly expressed that the current recreation facilities at WSU were either meeting or exceeding their expectations. Respondents from the sample (61%) and public (62%) populations indicated that campus facilities were either “much better” or “a little better” than what they had expected (Figure 5.5).
FIGURE 5.5: OVERALL, HOW WELL HAVE ALL CAMPUS RECREATION FACILITIES MET YOUR EXPECTATIONS AT WSU?

Given that respondents had shown high levels of satisfaction toward university recreation as a whole, supplemental questions were asked to better understand which particular facilities were actually being utilized. Based on feedback of every facility, the Student Recreation Center ("SRC") was indicated by sample (55%) and public (72%) respondents as being the most utilized facility. The utilization of other facilities was much smaller when compared to the SRC. The Outdoor Recreation – Rental Shop was shown to be utilized the least, as only 3% of the sample and 5% of the public populations indicated using it.

FIGURE 5.6: HOW OFTEN DO YOU UTILIZE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING FACILITIES FOR YOUR RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES (ONCE/WEEK, 2-4X/WEEK, OR 5X/WEEK)?

To better understand why utilization rates differed among WSU’s recreation facilities, the survey asked respondents to rate how satisfied they were with various aspects of the facilities. However, in the case of every facility other than the SRC, a majority of students indicated they were “unfamiliar” with the aspects of these facilities. These results are similar to those given in focus groups in which students stated that they weren’t using some facilities due to a lack of awareness.
FIGURE 5.7: STUDENTS FAMILIARITY WITH VARIOUS ASPECTS OF WSU FACILITIES

The survey then asked respondents to rate how satisfied they were with various facilities based on a series of factors. To gain a better understanding of students’ experiences, those students that indicated that they were not familiar with the facility were filtered out of the results in Figure 5.8. Overall, of those students that have experienced the facilities at WSU, a majority indicated that they were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” These results may indicate that the lack of utilization is not a result of respondents finding them deficient, as it is a result of their lack of familiarity with them.

FIGURE 5.8: HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS AT WSU’S FACILITIES?

The results of the survey revealed that equipment availability (54%), facilities being more conveniently located (48%), greater variety (43%), and greater availability of parking (40%) were the top four improvements to increase satisfaction with recreational programs. These results were consistent with focus group feedback, which indicated that availability issues existed due to the facility being highly impacted during the hours of 4pm to 9pm. As well, convenience issues were a result of students on the south side of campus being located too far from the SRC. Finally, in regard to students indicating a need for greater variety, this may be a result of their unfamiliarity with the breadth of facilities offered by University Recreation.
FIGURE 5.9: HOW MUCH MORE WOULD YOU USE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ON CAMPUS IF THE IMPROVEMENTS LISTED WERE MADE (PERCENTAGES REFLECT “A LOT MORE” OR “MORE” RESPONSES)?

To better clarify why the availability of recreation facilities was an issue, the survey asked respondents to indicate at which times during the day they preferred to participate in 28 different fitness activities. As shown in Figure 5.10, students overwhelmingly indicated a strong preference to use campus recreation between the hours of 4pm and 9pm. Due to the strong demand for fitness activities among respondents during the same time period, a bottleneck effect is created that makes the availability of workout equipment and activities limited.

FIGURE 5.10: BASED ON YOUR CURRENT OR DESIRED RECREATIONAL PREFERENCES, DURING WHICH TIME PERIOD WOULD YOU (DO YOU) PARTICIPATE IN THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES?
FACULTY/STAFF RECREATION PREFERENCES

As part of our analysis, the survey asked faculty and staff respondents to answer a series of questions related to their experiences with the faculty/staff fitness program. Overall, faculty and staff respondents indicated that they were not members of the program specifically designed for them. Survey results showed that 90% of participants were not members of the program. Further, 60% of respondents indicated that they were not members despite being familiar with the program.

![Bar Chart](image)

**FIGURE 5.11: ARE YOU CURRENTLY A MEMBER OR PARTICIPANT IN THE FACULTY/STAFF FITNESS PROGRAM?**

For those respondents that indicated they were not members of the faculty/staff fitness program, they were asked if they would be interested in joining the program for $199 per year. Of the sample population, 66% of respondents indicated that they were either "uninterested" or "very uninterested." Of the public population that responded, 58% indicated a disinterest in joining the program.
Considering the low levels of interest by faculty and staff participants in the fitness program, the analysis focused on the main reasons for their disinterest in the program. Overall, the top three reasons for not joining the fitness program by the sample population related to availability, affordability, and proximity to campus facilities. Of the public population, the top three reasons for turning down the program related to the inconvenience of facility operating hours, affordability, and proximity.

Survey participants that indicated they were members of the faculty/staff fitness program were asked a separate question to indicate how satisfied they were with various aspects of the program. Respondents from the sample population indicated that they were most satisfied with the facility’s location, condition, and wayfinding. This data reinforces feedback from focus groups, when faculty and staff indicated that the central location of their facility was the most important aspect of the program.
When considering improvements to the faculty and staff program, the elements that were the most important to faculty and staff were affordability, proximity, and added weight and fitness space. This information signifies the sensitivity of this group toward financial and time constraints, as well as the need for any new expansion to focus on the growth of the faculty/staff program’s weight and fitness areas.

**FIGURE 5.15: PLEASE SELECT THE MOST CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO CONSIDER WHEN LOOKING TO IMPROVE THE FACULTY & STAFF PROGRAM?**

**INTRAMURALS, CLUBS, CLASSES, AND OUTDOOR RECREATION**

In order to understand the utilization of organized fitness programs, student participants were asked if they regularly participate in intramurals, sports clubs, or fitness and activity classes. Almost half of the sample population (46%) and over a third of the public population (36%) indicated they had not participated in these programs. Those students that did utilize these programs indicated that they most regularly participated in the fitness/activity classes with 37% of the sample population and 47% of the public population regularly attending these classes. The least regularly attended program was sports clubs with a participation rate of 9% of the sample population and 12% of the public population.
To better understand why some students were not participating in WSU's various programs, students were asked to select from a series of reasons to explain why they had not. The most commonly cited reasons for not participating were time availability, schedule conflicts, cost, and awareness. While the first three reasons related to time and cost are common among students with tight budgets and impacted schedules, the lack of awareness suggests more students would participate in these programs if marketing efforts were stronger. Of added importance, only a very small group of respondents indicated that the condition of the facilities or quality of instructors were inhibiting their use of the programs. This information suggests that the current operation of the programs is meeting the expectations of program users.
B&D looked at responses to questions related to which sports students have participated in and which they were interested in to identify any potential gaps. Overall, the sports with greater participation matched those sports with higher interest levels with the exception of badminton. While only four percent of students in the sample and public populations indicated participating in badminton, 24% of the sample population and 28% of the public population expressed interest in the sport. Badminton may represent a sport that has unmet demand among students at WSU.

### Figure 5.17: Why do you not participate in these programs (select all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have the time available to participate</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My schedule conflicts with times offered</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of programs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not aware of what programs are available</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends do not participate in these activities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My recreational needs are met through other activities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am intimidated by other participants</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of activities is not convenient</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current offerings do not interest me</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have the requisite skills</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality instructors</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of the facilities are poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5.18: WHICH INTRAMURALS DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN AS COMPARED TO THOSE YOU ARE INTERESTED IN (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRAMURALS</th>
<th>Sample Participation</th>
<th>Sample Interest</th>
<th>Public Participation</th>
<th>Public Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flag Football</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Soccer</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Basketball</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Volleyball</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Soccer</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodgeball</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Disc</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartan Games</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Triathlon</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE RECREATION FACILITIES

To gain a preliminary understanding of campus support for future recreation facilities, the survey asked participants to what extent improvements in recreation would impact the campus and their lives. Survey participants indicated overwhelmingly that improvements to on-campus recreation would have a positive impact. Participants in both the sample and public populations felt that stress relief, healthier lifestyles, and an improved quality of life would be “significantly impacted” or “moderately impacted” by the renovation of recreation facilities. Only a small number of impacts were indicated by less than 50% of the sample (3) and public (1) populations as being positively impacted by improvements to recreation. This data suggests that students see the value of recreation and would potentially support its expansion.
FIGURE 5.19: TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU FEEL IMPROVEMENTS TO ON-CAMPUS RECREATION FACILITIES WOULD HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE FOLLOWING?

Other improvements to campus recreation that were asked related to the quality and amount of green space and bike trails on campus. While participants from the sample and public populations indicated that they were satisfied with the amount and quality of green space on campus, they showed a lower level of satisfaction toward bicycle trails. This dissatisfaction with the amount and quality of bicycle trails on campus was supported in the comments section of the survey, in which students felt that mobility on campus was in need of improvement.
Participants were then asked to indicate how important new recreational sports and fitness facilities should be for WSU. Support for the new facilities was strong with 42% of the sample and 49% of the public populations indicating the new facilities were a “very high” or “high” priority. Of equal importance, only 20% of the sample and 14% of the public populations indicated that expansion was a “very low” or “low” priority. While the large group that felt expansion was a “medium” priority did not oppose the project, their support has been shown to waiver at other universities when asked to vote “yes” or “no” to support a project.

**FIGURE 5.20:** HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENITIES (VERY SATISFIED OR SATISFIED)?

**FIGURE 5.21:** HOW HIGH OF A PRIORITY DO YOU FEEL NEW RECREATIONAL SPORTS AND FITNESS FACILITIES SHOULD BE FOR WSU?
Participants that indicated new recreation facilities as a “very low” or “low” priority were then asked to select a reason for their choice. The greatest response by this group indicated that WSU already had more pressing priorities. Survey participants may have come to this conclusion as a result of campus recreation facilities already being of high quality. This data may also indicate that they trust University Recreation to use their fees efficiently to produce a facility that is of high quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WSU has more pressing priorities</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not work out and am therefore not personally interested</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work out off campus and am therefore not personally interested</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 5.22:** WHY DID YOU SELECT A PRIORITY OF “LOW” OR “VERY LOW”?
DEMAND ANALYSIS

OBJECTIVE

Brailsford & Dunlavey’s Demand-Based Programming (“DBP”) process utilizes a proprietary model to translate survey-measured demand for a variety of typical recreational facilities into recommended space accommodations. The model’s space recommendations are based on certain assumptions of space allocated per user and average activity duration, and on survey-defined measures of prioritization.

The output of the model is not intended to be a final facility program, but rather another tool to be used to develop the final program, along with the rest of the market analysis and the input and judgment of the consulting team, students, and other user groups, and University decision makers.

METHODOLOGY

The input for the Demand-Based Programming process is obtained from questions 113 through 168 of the survey. This question asked respondents to indicate how frequently and at what time of day they would typically use a variety of spaces that are or could be provided by University Recreation.

Spaces and activities tested included free weights, weight machines, cardio equipment, group fitness, strength & conditioning classes, Crossfit classes, mind-body instructional classes, martial arts, indoor jogging / walking, basketball volleyball indoor rock wall, indoor soccer, badminton, racquetball, squash, water aerobics, lap swimming, recreational swimming, outdoor rock wall, high ropes course, ice hockey, recreational ice skating, outdoor tennis, indoor field, outdoor field, and indoor driving range. The frequency of use for each space included “5 or more times per week,” “2 to 4 times per week,” “once per week,” “less than once per week,” and “never.” Time of day response options included “Before 8 am,” “8 am to Noon,” “Noon to 1 pm,” “1 pm to 4 pm,” “4 pm to 6 pm,” “6 pm to 9 pm,” “After 9 pm,” and “never.”

The various activity spaces tested with this analysis are those spaces that are programmed based on the number of potential users and the distribution of usage over the course of a typical day. Certain spaces cannot be analyzed using this type of information because their usage/patronage is not based on being open and available for campus-wide use but is instead based on scheduled usage by defined user groups. The DBP model includes assumptions related to each space being tested, including assumptions for the amount of space allocated per user and the average amount of time each user will spend within the space during each use.
In addition to these space utilization assumptions, another global assumption incorporated in the DBP model is a demand discount factor applied to all survey responses to account for the overstatement of usage inherent in a survey process. This discount factor is based on B&D's twenty years' experience using this model and comparisons of projected versus actual facility utilization in built projects. For recreational facilities, B&D has found that space usage data should be discounted to 75% of the levels indicated on the survey. This discount factor is applied to the survey data from all sample populations prior to all calculations of space demand.

The DBP model uses survey data and the above assumptions to determine the amount of space required to meet the usage demand by the campus population during each of the tested time periods. To do this, the model calculates the number of people projected to be using the space at any given time during each of the different combinations of frequency and time-of-day options. This calculation is based on numerical factors called “activity frequency,” “turnover factor,” and “intensity factor.”

The turnover factor is based on the average activity duration related to the space and the length of time for each of the tested time periods. The calculation is the reciprocal of the number of times the space can be “turned over” during the given time period, or the activity duration in hours, divided by the length of the tested time period in hours.

The intensity factor is the product of the activity frequency and turnover factor. For each combination of tested frequency and time, the model determines the total number of projected users by applying the actual percentage of survey response for that particular combination to the campus population. The total number of people who would be in that space at any given point in time during the tested time period, is determined for each of the different combinations of tested frequency and time by multiplying the total number of users by the intensity factor.

The “demand projection” for each combination of frequency and time is totaled by the model for each time period to determine the usage pattern of the space over the course of a typical day based on a projection of the number of people likely to be using the space at any given point in time during each time period. By applying the space allocation for each of the tested areas, the amount of space required to accommodate the number of people projected to be using the space during each time period can be determined.

The table below is taken directly from the DBP model and illustrates the calculation of usage projections and space allocations for one of the tested activity spaces among the student population.
FIGURE 6.1: DEMAND BASED PROGRAMMING TABLE – STUDENT POPULATION

The final space recommendations of the Demand-Based Programming model are not simply a summation of the space demand as determined by the above calculations but are also dependent on a prioritization of the spaces based on the usage patterns indicated by the survey responses for the frequency of use of each
space. Spaces that are used more frequently and/or by larger numbers of people are given a higher priority than less frequently used and less popular spaces. Higher priority spaces are accommodated at higher percentages of their peak space demand in the model’s final recommendation.

The prioritization of space demand is based on two related demand calculations: “depth” and “breadth” of demand. The depth of demand for each tested space is determined by the percentage of respondents who indicated that they would use the space at least twice per week. Spaces with a high depth of demand are very important to potential users and the facility must accommodate as much space for these activities as possible. Activities with lower depth of demand are accommodated at lower levels in the final program recommendation. The breadth of demand for each space is based on the percentage of survey respondents who indicated that they would use the space at any frequency. The breadth of demand therefore gives equal weight to infrequent usage. Activities with a particularly high breadth of demand may require a higher prioritization than indicated by their depth of demand to account for a high number of infrequent users.

The Demand-Based Programming model assigns a priority (in this case, “first” through “fifth”) to each activity space based on its depth and breadth of demand. The maximum amount of space required to satisfy the highest level of daily demand for each space is then adjusted according to its priority level to form the final recommendation of the best combination of spaces to satisfy the market demand. First priority spaces are accommodated at 75% to 85% of peak demand, second priority spaces at 55% to 65% of peak demand, third priority spaces at 40% to 50% of peak demand, fourth priority spaces at 25% to 35% of peak demand, and fifth priority spaces at 10% to 20% of peak demand.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The following were the square footage results for total campus demand for the determined spaces and the depth and breadth of demand for those spaces that were tested on the survey:
### Figure 6.2: Demand Projections and Space Reconciliation – Student Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Priority Category</th>
<th>Accommodation Type</th>
<th>Demand Based on Prioritization of Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1C Cardiac Equipment</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>7,500 to 8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Free Weights</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>11,400 to 12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weight Machines</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>9,300 to 10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indoor Jogging/Walking</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>5,300 to 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mind-Body Instructional Classes</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>4,200 to 4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Group Fitness</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>4,900 to 5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Strength &amp; Conditioning</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>3,500 to 4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Basketball</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>10 to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Crossfit Classes</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2,900 to 3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Indoor Rock Wall</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>Linear Feet</td>
<td>27 to 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Indoor Driving Range</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>Bays</td>
<td>15 to 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Lap Swimming</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>Lanes</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Martial Arts</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>900 to 1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Outdoor Field</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>2 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Recreational Swimming</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1,300 to 1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Indoor Soccer</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Recreational Ice Skating</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Badminton</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Volleyball</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Racquetball</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Outdoor Rock Wall</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Linear Feet</td>
<td>3 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Outdoor Tennis</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Water Aerobics</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>300 to 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ice Hockey</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Indoor Field</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 High Ropes Course</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>400 to 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Squash</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COMBINED 1: Weight and Fitness Space | 37,700 | 28,200 to 32,100 |
| COMBINED 2: Group Fitness Space    | 31,800 | 16,400 to 19,600 |
**FIGURE 6.3: DEMAND PROJECTIONS AND SPACE RECONCILIATION – FACULTY STAFF POPULATION**

B&D compared the demand projections against the existing recreational space inventory across the WSU campus. The existing spaces include the Student Recreation Center and all other facilities used such as Smith / PEB, Hollingbery Fieldhouse, and outdoor fields. Space shortfalls are identified in many areas (Figure 6.4) especially weight and fitness, group fitness, recreational swimming, and gymnasium courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Priority Category</th>
<th>Space Accommodation</th>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Peak Demand</th>
<th>Space Allocation Based on Prioritization of Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cardio Equipment</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>75% to 85%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,100 to 1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Weight Machines</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>75% to 85%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,400 to 1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Free Weights</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>75% to 85%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1,400 to 1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indoor Jogging / Walking</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>75% to 85%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>665 to 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mind-Body Instructional Classes</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>55% to 65%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>700 to 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Group Fitness</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>55% to 65%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>600 to 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Strength &amp; Conditioning Classes</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>55% to 65%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>439 to 519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Crossfit Classes</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>55% to 65%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>424 to 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Lap Swimming</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>55% to 65%</td>
<td>Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Recreational Swimming</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>55% to 65%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>491 to 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Racquetball</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>40% to 50%</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Indoor Rock Wall</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>40% to 50%</td>
<td>Linear Feet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Martial Arts</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>40% to 50%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>126 to 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Volleyball</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>40% to 50%</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Basketball</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>25% to 35%</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Indoor Field</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>25% to 35%</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Outdoor Tennis</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>25% to 35%</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Water Aerobics</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>25% to 35%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>158 to 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Badminton</td>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>25% to 35%</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Ice Hockey</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Outdoor Rock Wall</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Linear Feet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Recreational Ice Skating</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 High Ropes Course</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13 to 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Indoor Driving Range</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Bays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Indoor Soccer</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Outdoor Field</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Squash</td>
<td>fifth</td>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 COMBINED 1: Weight and Fitness Space         | 5,300             | 3,900               | to 4,500   |
2 COMBINED 2: Group Fitness Space              | 4,200             | 2,300               | to 2,700   |
FIGURE 6.4: DEMAND PROJECTIONS AND EXISTING RECREATIONAL SPACE – ALL CAMPUS SPACES

If University Recreation only has access to spaces directly managed by the program such as the SRC and loses space within the core campus, space shortfalls increase across nearly every category (Figure 6.5). The greatest shortfalls occur in weight and fitness, groups fitness, and gymnasium court spaces.

FIGURE 6.4: DEMAND PROJECTIONS AND EXISTING RECREATIONAL SPACE – UREC/SRC SPACES ONLY
These quantities of spaces would accommodate total campus demand within the user-defined priorities for each space. However, the final program recommendations will take into account such factors as the cost of accommodating certain activity spaces, opportunities to share space though scheduling, providing multi-use space, qualitative, focus group, and interview data, and the consulting team’s professional judgment. These factors may result in space program adjustments relative to the demand-based quantities in order to insure that the concept will fully realize the facility's mission as well as respond to campus demand.
SECTION 7
Brailsford & Dunlavey and Opsis Architecture developed project concepts based on the strategic asset value analysis, demand based-programming, stakeholder and focus group interviews, operational requirements, and capital costs. The concepts developed are based on two strategies to address demand and UREC program needs:

- Address current program shortfalls by creating enough space to meet WSU community demand, accommodate UREC programs and activities, and provide permanent locations for programs in temporary facilities, or
- Address potential future space needs if core campus facilities (Smith Gym, Physical Education Building, Bohler Gym, Hollingbery Fieldhouse, etc.) are no longer available for University Recreation or student use.

Six project concepts were developed and tested with the campus community over a series of workshops in December 2013 and January 2014. The Project Team sought insight and participation from students, faculty, and staff to refine the concepts and insure they meet the needs of the WSU community.

The six concepts developed (outline programs can be found in Exhibit H) include:

- South Campus Satellite (current needs)
- Adventure and Sports Center (current needs)
- Fieldhouse Complex (future needs)
- South Campus Satellite Phase II (future needs)
- Central Campus Satellite (future needs)
- Ice and Field Complex (future needs)
CAMPUS LOCATION

The Project Team analyzed the existing campus layout as well as the WSU Master Plan to provide insight on potential locations for future improvements to campus recreation and wellness. Although multiple zones were analyzed across the WSU campus, four areas were selected as the best opportunities for growth in University Recreation programs as they met criteria related to:

- Master Plan identification of potential student life, recreation, or athletic facilities,
- Proximity to a critical mass of an underserved population, and / or
- Available sites with capacity to accommodate program components.

**FIGURE 7.3: ZONE OVERLAY ON WSU MASTER PLAN**
CONCEPTS TO MEET CURRENT NEEDS

SOUTH CAMPUS SATELLITE (PHASE I)

The South Campus Satellite Phase I ("SC1") facility would be located in the South part of WSU’s campus to accommodate current shortfalls of space for programmed and self-directed recreational pursuits. The facility would be geared to operate as a true satellite facility with many similar program elements as found within the Student Recreation Center, complementing the SRC’s offerings and relieving overcrowding in the existing facility. The large residential population located in this part of the campus would be the primary user of this satellite facility. Key destination elements and programs such as the climbing wall, pool, and intramurals would remain housed within the SRC.

The SC1 is envisioned as a multi-story building of approximately 53,000 gross square feet. Program elements within the building include:

- 10,000 square feet of weight & fitness,
- Three group fitness studios,
- Two-court gymnasium,
- Wellness lab,
- Locker rooms,
- Administrative office, and
- Support spaces.

Key considerations for siting this facility include accessibility to the surrounding residential population, a small parking lot, adjacency to outdoor recreational space (fields, bicycle trails, and playground area), access to a campus loop road identified in the campus master plan, adjacency to south core campus and adjacent land to accommodate a future expansion.

ADVENTURE & SPORTS CENTER

The Adventure & Sports Center ("ASC") facility would be located in close proximity or connected to the Student Recreation Center and expand upon the destination qualities of the existing facility. The ASC would support overall campus demands for space as well as create a permanent home for many UREC programs which are housed in temporary spaces or currently underserved.

The ASC is envisioned as a multi-story building of approximately 62,000 gross square feet. Program elements within this building include:

- Program and support space for Adventure Programs including the Outdoor Recreation Center ("ORC") rental and resource shop, ORC storage, bouldering and climbing wall, bike rental and workshop, instructional kitchen, and meeting space for groups.
- Program and support space for sports clubs and intramurals including conditioning room, meeting space, and storage lockers.
- Group meeting and activity space with two multipurpose rooms / group fitness studios and a large event space with a turf or multi-use floor surface.
- Locker rooms, administrative, and support spaces.

Key considerations for siting this facility include accessibility to the high ropes challenge course, exterior spaces for maintaining, washing, cleaning, and storing ORC equipment, loading and drop-off zone for renters, connections to bicycle trails, access and shared use opportunities with the existing SRC, and building zoning to allow for parts of the facility to remain open while other elements are closed.

CONCEPTS TO MEET FUTURE NEEDS

FIELDHOUSE COMPLEX

The Fieldhouse Complex (“FHC”) facility would be located in the same zone as the Student Recreation Center and provide large volume elements to accommodate practice and competition spaces for intramurals, sports clubs, and student activities. This facility would be required if the gymnasium elements and large indoor spaces in the core campus are no longer available for use.

The FHC is envisioned as a mainly single-story building of approximately 107,000 gross square feet. Program elements within this building include:

- Four-court gymnasium with indoor jogging track,
- Large indoor turf zone of comparable size to the gymnasium,
- Two multipurpose rooms
- Locker rooms, administrative office, and support spaces.

Key considerations for siting this facility include proximity to exterior field space, parking for participants and visiting teams, and large vehicle access / loading to support large events which may occur within the building.

SOUTH CAMPUS SATELLITE PHASE II

The second phase of the South Campus Satellite (“SC2”) would be required to replace fitness and wellness spaces in the core campus if they are no longer useable by University Recreation. The expansion would build upon the existing satellite, expanding upon existing spaces and adding breadth of services.
The SC2 is envisioned as a multi-story building of approximately 34,000 gross square feet. Program elements within this building include:

- 5,000 square feet of weight and fitness,
- Two group fitness studios,
- Four racquetball courts,
- Two squash courts, and
- Multi-Activity Court ("MAC") gymnasium.

CENTRAL CAMPUS SATELLITE

The Central Campus Satellite ("CCS") would be located near the core campus as a centrally located fitness center for campus residents and the faculty & staff community. This facility would replace the fitness and wellness spaces found within the core campus facilities, therefore, it is an alternate option to expanding the South Campus Satellite.

The CCS is envisioned as a multi-story building of approximately 43,000 gross square feet. Program elements within this building include:

- 5,000 square feet of weight & fitness,
- One multi-purpose room,
- 4 racquetball courts,
- 2 squash courts,
- One-court gymnasium,
- Six-lane lap pool,
- Fitness testing lab, and
- Locker rooms, administrative offices, and support spaces.

The location of this satellite facility would be critical to the success of the faculty / staff wellness program. Proximity and accessibility to central campus academic buildings is paramount to ensure participation in the program and use of the facility by the faculty and staff community. Limited connection to other recreational spaces is needed.

ICE & FIELD COMPLEX

The Ice & Field Complex ("IFC") facility would be located in the northeast corner of campus on undeveloped land. This complex would serve as a regional destination for local communities and expand the services offered by University Recreation. It is anticipated that this complex would require a multi-entity partnership to fund and operate including WSU, University of Idaho, Pullman, and Moscow.

The IFC is envisioned as a single-story building of approximately 56,000 gross square feet containing an ice rink and associated support spaces. Additional exterior elements include outdoor fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, and parking. Significant site costs may be incurred to develop this Complex. Vehicular accessibility to WSU and local communities should be considered in the development of this project.
ADDITIONAL UNIVERSITY RECREATION COMPONENTS

Several smaller components of UREC programs may shift locations or be replaced with new elements including outdoor tennis and Crossfit. New outdoor tennis courts may be constructed along with any of the concepts outlined to support UREC programs. After the construction of the Adventure & Sports Center, the temporary ORC building will be available to repurpose. Several options exist to improve group fitness programming on campus which include the relocation of Crossfit from Smith 21 and / or the relocation of hot yoga from the tennis clubhouse.

Although the focus of the Development Plan was on space at the Pullman campus, University Recreation also utilizes a boathouse for sports clubs such as Crew, Wakeboard/Waterski Clubs, and Outdoor Recreation programs on the Snake River. This space is currently shared with athletics and constrained for growth. The shared boathouse currently does not provide sufficient space for all UREC programs on the Snake River which impacts the quality of the program and potential growth.
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the financial analysis is to model the financial performance of the existing Student Recreation Center fund and potential improvements to University Recreation at WSU. The model projects operating revenues, expenses, and the needed student fee increase to support debt service and operations.

METHODOLOGY

The project programs, development budgets and income statements are inputs within the model, thereby allowing any changes in assumptions within one of these components to automatically force a corresponding adjustment throughout the model. This approach maintains internal consistency and mitigates the need to undergo difficult project scope and cost reconciliation during the design process. B&D’s use of conservative assumptions throughout the analysis allows the University to proceed with the knowledge that detail-related decisions can be made within the established financial parameters without compromising the projects’ scope or quality. Due to variations in national and global economic and legal conditions, actual project costs, revenues and demand projections may vary and these variations could be substantial.

The financial models can be found in Exhibit I.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The financial modeling for the Development Plan was based on the existing SRC and UREC budgets provided by the University. These baseline assumptions for revenue and expenses guided the modeling of future projects within the Development Plan.

REVENUES

The financial model accounts for several types of revenue: student fees, elective memberships, and speculative revenue. In total, the SRC collected $7 million in revenue for the 2012/2013 academic year. Student fees are currently assessed at $150 per student per semester to fund the operations and debt of the SRC. It is assumed for modeling purposes that this student fee approach would also fund future projects. Revenue from student fees was based on the current capture rate and enrollment projections. B&D projected that enrollment would increase at 1% annually and an additional 1% increase in the student fee would be achieved to offset inflationary costs. These increases result in a net 2% in fee revenue for the SRC on an annual basis. Elective memberships are available for faculty, staff, and alumni who wish to
purchase a membership at the SRC. B&D modeled three kinds of elective memberships including faculty/staff SRC memberships (for the entire SRC portfolio), alumni memberships (for the entire SRC portfolio), and building specific memberships (Figure 8.1). These membership rates are projected to increase at 1% annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student SRC Fee Per Semester</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer SRC Fee</td>
<td>$89.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni SRC Fee Per Semester</td>
<td>$251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni SRC Fee Summer</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff SRC Fee Per Semester</td>
<td>$196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff SRC Summer Fee</td>
<td>$108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff Bldg Membership Per Semester</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff Bldg Membership Summer Fee</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 8.1: MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES 2013/2014**

Other speculative revenue including programs, goods for sale, day passes, and rental fees total $190,000 in 2012/2013. It is assumed that these revenues would increase 1% annually and be included in future projects at a proportional revenue per square foot.

**EXPENSES**

The operations of the SRC totaled $3.5 million in 2012/2013, approximately $23 per square foot. Expenses for the SRC program are divided into personnel and non-personnel costs. The non-personnel costs for the project concepts was based on current costs at the SRC. Personnel costs are based on project specific staffing levels for professional and student part-time labor. In total, expenses costs are between $12 and $19 per square foot in the projected concepts.

**DEBT SERVICE**

The SRC is currently contributes $2.7 million annually to amortize debt for construction. These debt service payments are schedule to finish in 2031/2032. B&D anticipates that all new projects will be debt financed and modeled a 5.0% interest rate and a 30 year term for the projects. It is also anticipated that a target 1.20:1.00 debt coverage ratio will be established to ensure debt service payments can be fully funded. A debt coverage ratio is the ratio at which net operating income is greater than total debt service.
NEW CONSTRUCTION

Construction costs for the new concepts is estimated to be between $275 and $325 per square foot depending on project. A development budget was created for each concept in coordination with Facilities Services, Capital Projects to understand the total project cost. The detailed assumptions for each project’s development budget can be found within the financial model.

It is assumed that construction costs will escalate at 3% annually.

PROJECT CONCEPT SUMMARY

Based on the assumptions outlines within this report, B&D developed operating and capital costs for each project concept, and the necessary fee revenue per student to support the projects (Figure 8.2). Variables such as project timeline, enrollment increases, rate increases, and construction inflation are outside of B&D’s control and may alter these projections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Campus Satellite Phase I</th>
<th>Adventure &amp; Sports Center</th>
<th>Fieldhouse Complex</th>
<th>South Campus Satellite Phase II</th>
<th>Central Campus Satellite</th>
<th>Ice &amp; Field Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor GSF</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost Per SF (2014)</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Opening Fall Project Budget at Opening</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$29M to $31M</td>
<td>$39M to $41M</td>
<td>$60M to $65M</td>
<td>$25M to $30M</td>
<td>$38M to $43M</td>
<td>$95M to $100M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Fee Per Semester At Opening</td>
<td>$80 to $90</td>
<td>$85 to $95</td>
<td>$175 to $185</td>
<td>$55 to $65</td>
<td>$90 to $100</td>
<td>$170 to $180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 8.2: PROJECT CONCEPT COSTS