Managing the university campus opportunities of a crisis

Alexandra den Heijer, MSc PhD
Faculty of Architecture, TU Delft, Netherlands

CONTENT
1. PROCESS AFTER THE FIRE
2. RETHINKING & IMPLEMENTING CONCEPTS (< 6 months)
3. CAMPUS → CORPORATE REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT

Emergency management
< 3 days after the fire

http://managingtheuniversitycampus.nl
Found a ‘new’ building within 10 days

sustainable  = re-use

ASSIGNMENT: relocate 3300 students and > 800 employees
DEADLINE: renovate 32,000 m2 < 6 months
+ new construction 4,000 m2 < next 6 months
1. professors & professionals
2. all parties have studied or worked at faculty

Project group representing:
- policy makers:
- board of executives
- dean
- controllers
- users
- architects that have known the faculty for years

What we started with in June 2008:

Facts:
- 150 participating companies
- 25 consultancy / architecture firms
- 350 construction workers on site
- 800 orders
- 15 km sprinkler / 5500 sprinklers
- 30,000 litres paint
- 220 km data cables
- 5200 wall outlets

http://managingtheuniversitycampus.nl
Managing the university campus

CONTENT

PROCESS AFTER THE FIRE
1. Recognize the teamwork between policy makers, controllers, users, architekts, and their representatives required for campus management.

RETHINKING & IMPLEMENTING CONCEPTS (< 6 months)
2. Illustrate evidence-based design guidelines for the changing academic workplace, from the traditional territorial, cellular office towards activity-related, non-territorial concepts.

Cellular office space in old building – average occupancy rate 15%
Design the building as a city
– reduce footprint (-15%), more shared / public space

GOALS ORGANISATION
1. Community building
2. More effective support of education, research & management
3. Creating the place to meet
4. Stimulate social interaction & intellectual interaction
5. Flexible use of facilities
6. Sustainable
Campus of the future: - sustainable solutions
- CO₂ neutral campus
(photo: Wageningen)

Campus of the future: - lecture halls – only to share
(photo: VU Amsterdam)

Campus of the future:
- transparency, shared facilities
(photo: UvA Amsterdam)

Campus of the future:
- creating the place to meet
(photo: Delft)
Campus of the future:
- more quality, less quantity
- new life for old buildings
- increased benefits / m² to cover high maintenance cost / m²
- users accept more defects of meaningful, historic buildings

Reducing m², but improving...
Quality of place (interior design)

Reducing m², but improving...
Quality of place (cultural heritage)

Reducing m², but improving...
Quality of life (campus & city)

the academic workplace
place  building  city

one territorial office workplace  many non-territorial places


http://managingtheuniversitycampus.nl
FUNCTION MIX – campus of the future

2011: “To share or not to be…”

Appendix I
Dutch university campuses

http://managingtheuniversitycampus.nl
1. Studio space

- student back at the faculty
- 6 m² usable per workplace
  ➔ became less after decision process
- tables are assigned to groups of students per semester (no permanent territory)
- smart use of space (by smart scheduling)

2. Office space

- no individual territory
- 12 m² usable per fte
  ➔ became more after design process
- activity related concept
Zone for one department

3. Lecture halls
- more shared use of large halls
- more small spaces locally
- flexible floor plan
- differentiation of quality also used for seminars / conferences

4. Library
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9. Public functions

Public space, like in a city

9. Public space

- usable space in corridors for informal meetings and work

10. Storage

- including digital storage

BK City Slim

*Transform BK City to an energy / CO2 neutral building
Reduce footprint: more users / m2*
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PROCESS AFTER THE FIRE
1. Recognize the teamwork between policy makers, controllers, users, architects, and their representatives required for campus management.

RETHINKING & IMPLEMENTING CONCEPTS (< 6 months)
2. Illustrate evidence-based design guidelines for the changing academic workplace, from the traditional territorial, cellular office towards activity-related, non-territorial concepts.

CAMPUS → CORPORATE REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT [CREM]
3. Applying insights from practice to the CREM theory.

“If you think education is expensive, try ignorance”

Derek Bok, former Harvard president

[I used this quote in the first sentence of my book]

performance criteria university

2 scenarios:
1. Invest in campus → high capital costs → at cost of resources education & research
2. Neglect backlog maintenance → productivity loss → lower profitability → lower rank

impact of campus on ‘financial sustainability’

Managing the university campus

focus on university

strategic
policy makers

financial
controllers

focus on real estate

users

functional

technical

managers

physical
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Campus management is about four different perspectives

- Strategic: focusing on university users
- Financial: focusing on real estate controllers and technical physical managers
- Functional: changing the management environment working user activities between different higher quality of the higher productivity
- Physical: reducing costs, benefits, location, quality m2, condition.

Competitive advantage

- through functional goals
- through strategic goals

Changing the academic workplace

- **Strategic goals:**
  - Increase competitive advantage (image)
  - Stimulate collaboration between different user groups
  - Change culture

- **Financial goals:**
  - Reduce risks
  - Reduce costs
  - Increase value

- **Functional goals:**
  - Higher productivity
  - Better match for user activities
  - Higher quality of the working environment

- **Physical goals:**
  - Reduce the footprint
  - Reduce CO2 emission

Performance criteria university

- Competitive advantage
- Profitability
- Productivity
- Sustainable development

Economic base

- Space, infrastructure: cafes and restaurants
- Quality of place: cultural, sports, carbon footprint per user
- Project: economic base

Sustainable development

- Reducing footprint
- Controlling risks
- Increasing value of university as employer

Adding value

- Attractiveness city for businesses
- Space, infrastructure: cafes and restaurants
- Quality of place: cultural, sports, carbon footprint per user
- Project: economic base

---
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CREM framework

Campus management is improved as real estate decisions are explained with more strategic, financial, functional and physical data to policy makers, controllers, users and technical managers, referring to their key performance indicators.

Strategic choices, linked to stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>accommodate &quot;exclusive&quot; and &quot;closed&quot;</th>
<th>accommodate &quot;shared&quot; and &quot;open&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low % of resources spent on the campus</td>
<td>high % of resources spent on the campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only public funding</td>
<td>allow private funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low space use per student or employee</td>
<td>high space use per student or employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on individual needs</td>
<td>focus on collective needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accept % buildings in bad condition</td>
<td>all buildings at least reasonable condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small(er) ecological footprint</td>
<td>large(er) ecological footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow me on Twitter:
@alexandra_dh

More about case BK city & book "Managing the university campus":
http://managingtheuniversitycampus.nl