

**THE PROJECT**

The Columbia University academic study consisted of two parts. The first part was a peer comparison that benchmarked the amount of space assigned to each of forty-six academic departments or schools in the University against the top five departments nationally. The second part of the study described forces of change in higher education relative to Columbia's situation.

**CHALLENGE**

The first challenge of this study was to collect meaningful data and process it in a way that will be helpful as the University manages its space and projects future space needs of academic departments. A second challenge was to identify significant trends at other universities that are effecting change in higher education, as well as in academic facility planning and construction.



Unit (National Ranking)	Inputs						Out puts				
	Faculty	Grads	UG Maj	UG Svd	Res \$	Bas NASF	NASF/ Fac	NASF/ Grad	NASF/ UG Maj	NASF/ UG Svd	Res \$/ NASF
Columbia University (13)	17	599	33	0	96,842	40,295	2,370	67	1,221	na	2.4
Peer Means (5.2)	46	249	335	1,264	1,423,695	85,258	2,029	380	503	104	14
(Columbia/Peers) x 100%	37%	241%	10%	0%	7%	47%	117%	18%	243%	na	17%

Peers (National Ranking)	
Cornell University	1
Georgia Institute of Technology	5
University of Michigan	5
Iowa State University	7
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	8

PEER ANALYSIS

**SOLUTION**

A survey was sent to 346 corresponding departments and schools, ranked top nationally, at 65 different institutions. The peer data that was collected provided the basis for comparing and analyzing Columbia's academic units in terms of amount of space assigned per faculty, graduate student, undergraduate major, undergraduate served, and research dollar. Concurrently, trends and new centers and institutes were identified.

\*Project completed under previous name: Dober, Lidsky, Craig and Associates, Inc.

**RESULTS**

A space profile was prepared for each of the academic units in the study. Conclusions were drawn relating to sufficiency of space in terms of numbers of faculty, staff, students, and research dollars. A unique set of benchmarks was tracked for athletic facilities.

Trends were described in terms of types of institutions of higher education; types of funding available; ways institutional identity is being established; facility design trends; and new methods of learning using such technology as the Internet. A listing of relevant centers and institutes was also included.

**REFERENCE**

Marian Matheson  
Director of Institutional Research, Amherst College  
413 542 5187  
mfmatheson@amherst.edu  
(Formerly Associate Provost at Columbia)

**PRINCIPAL IN-CHARGE**

Arthur J. Lidsky, AICP  
Study Director  
  
George G. Mathey, AICP  
Study Coordinator

