

**THE  
FURTHER  
EDUCATION  
FUNDING  
COUNCIL**

**Guidance on  
Floorspace  
Management in  
Further Education  
Colleges**

---

**Supplement to  
Circular 97/37**



---

# GUIDANCE ON FLOORSPACE MANAGEMENT IN FURTHER EDUCATION COLLEGES

## PURPOSE

1 This guidance suggests how each college may use its ISR data to assess more effectively the utilisation of its floorspace. It supersedes earlier guidance on space (floorspace) management contained in Circular 93/17.

## BACKGROUND

2 The FEFC issued guidance to colleges on assessing floorspace utilisation in the supplement to Circular 93/17, *Guidance on Estate Management*. In that guidance, three methods of assessing floorspace utilisation were described:

- method A – calculating gross floorspace available and comparing it to gross floorspace required using space full-time equivalents (SFTEs) and gross area per SFTE for the three categories of teaching activity in use at that time
- method B – calculating the number of available workplaces and comparing it with the number of enrolled SFTEs using the space standards given in DfEE design note 37
- workplace utilisation studies – calculating the total number of hours during which all workplaces are used and comparing it with the number of available workplace hours.

3 There are now 10 FEFC programme areas as opposed to the original three and, since 1994-95, information on guided learning hours (GLH) has been collected through the ISR. Since SFTEs are no longer a useful guide to attendance because the hours of 'full-time' attendance vary so widely, a more resilient method of assessment has been designed. This new guidance is contained in this supplement to Circular 97/37.

4 It is now proposed to introduce a revised method of assessing floorspace utilisation based on levels of floorspace efficiency already achieved in colleges and incorporating ISR data. This system will replace and supersede methods A and B described in paragraph 2. The assessment of room

capacity and utilisation recommended in the supplement to Circular 97/19, *Guidance on Accommodation Strategies*, remains an essential component of this process and should be used with the new ISR method described below.

5 This revised method applies to nearly all further education colleges except the specialist designated colleges. Buildings used for farming, horticultural and equestrian purposes should be disregarded when determining floorspace utilisation at colleges of agriculture and horticulture. Colleges should also disregard any residential accommodation in the calculations.

6 This new guidance will help colleges to respond to the changing circumstances created by:

- a. the level of funding available to the sector which assumes efficiency gains, thereby encouraging colleges to use their premises more cost-effectively;
- b. colleges' aspirations to improve:
  - student facilities resulting from changes in teaching and learning techniques (more learning, less teaching) and the increasing use of information technology
  - the match between the timetabled need for specific types of workplace and the available workplaces of that type
  - the quality and fitness for purpose of the teaching environment (usually to provide better facilities in a reduced, more effective area).

7 Key questions answered in this guidance are:

- a. what is the definition of workplace utilisation? (paragraph 11) What is the definition of the minimum number of workplaces (MNW)? (paragraph 13) How can workplace utilisation be calculated? (paragraph 13);
- b. given the number of workplaces in the college, how efficiently are they being used? How does this compare with other colleges? (paragraph 15);
- c. what floorspace is the college using to deliver a standard number of GLH? (paragraph 15) How does this compare with that of other colleges? (paragraph 20) What is the cost of floorspace over-provision? (paragraph 16) How might the need for floorspace fall further as GLH per student reduce? (paragraph 18);

- d. what are the floorspace requirements and area per workplace for different kinds of teaching? How do these areas compare with the theoretical area allowances for workplaces developed by the DfEE in design note 37? (paragraphs 23 and 24);
- e. what is the level of workplace utilisation in different parts of the college? (paragraph 25);
- f. does the number of teaching rooms exceed the number of teaching groups? Is the mismatch within acceptable limits? (paragraph 27);
- g. how well do the class sizes match the number of classroom workplaces? (paragraph 28);
- h. what proportion of the college's floorspace is used for learning resource centres (LRCs)? How does that percentage compare with the recommendations in DfEE design notes 33, 37 and 50? (paragraph 29);
- i. what is the distribution of floorspace use in the college between teaching, learning, and support floorspaces? How does this distribution compare with the theoretical percentages in DfEE design notes 33, 37 and 50? (paragraph 30);
- j. how much is obsolete or over-provided floorspace costing the college? (paragraphs 31 to 33).

8 This guidance can assist managers in assessing how the college estate can be more efficiently managed to contribute to the improvement of facilities and finances. This should assist those colleges experiencing financial difficulties where recovery or risk management plans are required.

## SCOPE

9 The governors and management of each college are expected to keep their college's estate under constant review with the aim of improving its effectiveness, its efficiency and its economy, and this guidance has been produced to help achieve these aims. Each further education college is free to retain the amount and quality of student and staff facilities it can afford to maintain in the long term.

10 This guidance is not mandatory, but it is intended to provide college managers with a 'tool kit' which allows them to compare:

- the utilisation of workplaces in the college with the target level of such utilisation (paragraphs 11 to 15)

- the average area/MNW used in the college (or the area used to deliver a workplace-year) with the comparable area in other colleges (paragraphs 16 to 21)
- the average floor area used to provide workplaces for various kinds of teaching activity in the college with the comparable area given in DfEE guidance (paragraphs 21 to 24)
- the allocation of floorspace to various kinds of college activity with the allocation of floorspace suggested in DfEE design notes 37 and 50 for that kind of activity (paragraphs 29 and 30); and
- the cost of over-provision of floorspace and the benefits of reduced but more effectively employed floorspace (paragraphs 31 to 33). In due course, when data from the sector are available, it will be possible to compare:
  - floorspace utilisation in the college with published data on the distribution of floorspace utilisation in the sector and in the same type of colleges; and
  - the area of the college's LRC with a recommended range of areas for LRCs, and with published data on the area of LRCs in the same type of college.

## METHODS

### Definitions

11 The workplace utilisation of a college can be defined as the total annual daytime hours the college's workplaces are in use expressed as a percentage of the hours for which these workplaces are available. The calculation of this measure is as follows:

$$\text{Workplace utilisation} = \frac{\text{total annual daytime on-site GLH} \times 100}{\text{workplaces} \times \text{hours available in year}}$$

12 The college's ISR can be used to determine an estimate of daytime, on-site GLH. If the standard teaching calendar is taken to consist of a 40-hour week and a 36-week year, then there would be 1,440 hours available for learning each year. The formula above can also, therefore, be expressed as:

$$\frac{\text{total annual daytime on-site GLH}}{1,440} \times \frac{100}{\text{workplaces}}$$

Note that some parts of the ISR return (for example the aggregate return and the ISRFRANIN form) do not request the GLH of the individual student. A methodology for estimating the on-site daytime GLH of these students has been developed by the Council, and is described in annex A.

13 The expression on the left of the above formula is the calculation of the minimum number of workplaces (MNW), defined as **the number of workplaces a college would need if workplace scheduling were 100 per cent efficient**. The maximum number of hours a workplace can provide is 1,440 a year. The total annual on-site daytime GLH gives the demand for workplace-hours during a year: hence this number divided by 1,440 gives the MNW. The formula for workplace utilisation then becomes:

$$\text{Workplace utilisation} = \frac{\text{MNW} \times 100}{\text{workplaces}}$$

#### Use of the ISR

14 The ISR can, through the use of recorded GLH, be used to give an estimate of the overall level of workplace efficiency of a college, through the comparison of the minimum number and the actual number of workplaces. It is appreciated that many colleges provide education in the evenings and at weekends, but such provision is usually less intensive than daytime use, which is used to determine the need for accommodation.

15 Two complementary methods can be used to assess floorspace utilisation in a college. These are the scheduled workplace utilisation in the college, and the average area per MNW. These can be calculated as follows

#### *a. The Scheduled Workplace Utilisation in the College*

**Number of workplaces:** Each college can count the number of workplaces provided in teaching rooms by visual inspection. In most classrooms, laboratories and art studios, the number of workplaces is equal to the number of seats provided for students. The number of workplaces becomes more difficult to assess in teaching locations where seating can be absent (for example workshops, drama areas) but in every case, from the areas set aside for each student, an assessment can be made.

Where GLH are provided to small groups learning under active assistance in LRCs, a count of the number of private study cubicles in an LRC can be made.

The scheduled workplace utilisation of a college can be found as indicated in paragraphs 11 and 12 above.

The calculation can also be used to assess the number of workplaces that would be required, assuming different levels of workplace utilisation. The MNW can either be divided by the target level of required workplace utilisation expressed as a decimal (for example, 0.40 not 40 if the target were 50 per cent), or multiplied by the reciprocal of the target utilisation required. The formula is:

$$\text{Workplaces required} = \text{MNW} / \text{target utilisation}$$

This formula is presented in table 1.

**Table 1. Calculation of workplaces needed from target utilisation**

<i>Target workplace utilisation (%)</i>	<i>Workplaces required</i>
70	MNW x 1.43
65	MNW x 1.54
60	MNW x 1.67
55	MNW x 1.82
50	MNW x 2.00
45	MNW x 2.22
40	MNW x 2.50
35	MNW x 2.86
30	MNW x 3.33
25	MNW x 4.00

When calculated on this basis, some colleges have reached 40 per cent scheduled workplace utilisation and the most efficient 50 per cent or more. Absence levels may reduce the scheduled workplace utilisation by up to 30 per cent. Colleges should plan to provide sufficient workplaces for all students recorded on the ISR.

## **b. Actual Average Gross Area per MNW**

**Definition:** *The gross internal area of a college is equal to the total area of all buildings given by the area enclosed by the internal face of the external wall.*

*(Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.)*

The actual average gross area per MNW is given by:

$$\frac{\text{Gross internal area of the college in m}^2}{\text{MNW}}$$

This gross internal area per MNW is a measure of the area the college is using to deliver a workplace year, or 1,440 hours of daytime on-site GLH. It can be used as an index of the floorspace efficiency of college delivery, based on historical data (for example, the 1995-96 ISR) and the latest gross internal area of the college.

## **MATTERS AFFECTING COMPARISON WITH OTHER COLLEGES**

### **Floorspace is not Free**

16 The provision of floorspace can be expensive. The annual running cost of college premises (energy, on-site security and maintenance) appears to range from £19.24 to £64.85 per m<sup>2</sup> (see annex B to Circular 97/19) with an average, for general further education colleges, of about £50 per m<sup>2</sup>. Some colleges are using much more floorspace, and hence incurring higher costs, to deliver the same number of GLH as their counterparts.

### **Floorspace Use and GLH**

17 Some colleges appear to have high workplace utilisation because they deliver more average daytime GLH for each full-time student. This can lead to a false conclusion that the college is efficient in its use of space.

### **Reductions in GLH per Full-time Student**

18 During the last few years, most colleges have cut the average on-site daytime GLH for full-time students. Despite the overall growth in student numbers, the need for floorspace has fallen more rapidly than it can be eliminated. This presents an opportunity for rationalisation and floorspace reduction. Informal consultation with the sector suggests that the process of making reductions in GLH may not yet be at an end.

19 Each college may wish to consider not only the area and workplaces required by the current level of daytime on-site GLH but also the area and workplaces required in the college due to future planned cuts in GLH. This can be calculated by reducing the on-site daytime GLH by the amount given by:

$$(\text{average future GLH per FT student} - \text{average current GLH per FT student}) \times \text{number of FT students}$$

The planned reduction in GLH may allow college managers to forecast future floorspace requirements. A worked example is given in annex B.

## **Comparative Data**

20 In 1995-96 the average area for each MNW in colleges varied from 5.25m<sup>2</sup> to 53.00m<sup>2</sup>, with an average of about 15.9m<sup>2</sup>. The average of the top 25 per cent of the distribution is about 11.5m<sup>2</sup> per MNW. These data, and all the figures below, are based on the 1995-96 ISR average of 684 hours per full-time student. Table 2 gives medians and averages for three categories of floorspace utilisation.

**Table 2. The median average and range for three groups of college floorspace use**

<i>Utilisation</i>	<i>m<sup>2</sup> per MNW</i>		
	<i>median</i>	<i>average</i>	<i>range</i>
Highest third	12.46	12.06	5.25 to 14.07 m <sup>2</sup> per MNW
Central third	15.86	15.89	14.13 to 18.10 m <sup>2</sup> per MNW
Lowest third	21.46	23.66	18.15 to 53 m <sup>2</sup> per MNW

## **Assessment of Floorspace Needs**

21 College managers are invited to note into which category their college falls and to judge for themselves how they might wish to target improvements in the college's future utilisation efficiency. (These figures do not take account of programme area mix. The original DfEE design note 37 space standards for colleges ranged from 7m<sup>2</sup> to 13m<sup>2</sup> total area per SFTE. So the most extreme limits between humanities colleges and colleges of science and technology lay within 10m<sup>2</sup> plus or minus 30 per cent. Differences in the mix of curriculum programmes offered by colleges now usually produce a range of plus or minus 15 per cent

---

at most. The large observed differences in college area per MNW cannot be explained by programme mix alone.)

22 The ISR can give the total GLH within a college. By analysing the college timetables (which should be completely consistent with the ISR), the total daytime on-site GLH can be classified by the type of teaching accommodation used, and the subtotals of MNW calculated for each type of teaching floorspace (see table 1 in annex C).

23 The total area used in the college for each category of teaching floorspace can be calculated. Using these figures the average areas per workplace for each category of teaching floorspace can be calculated, as shown in table 2 in annex C.

24 These average areas for each kind of workplace can be directly compared with those given for a workplace in general or specialist teaching of that type, as listed in annex D of the supplement to Circular 97/19. These calculations will enable the average area per workplace in the college to be compared with sector norms and best practice as expressed in the appropriate theoretical standards for that type of teaching floorspace. This exercise can demonstrate whether crowding (the use of smaller workplaces than the norm) or spreading (the use of larger workplaces than the norm) is taking place, and if so, to what extent and in what kind of teaching.

#### **Assessment of Workplace Utilisation by Type**

25 The number of workplaces in each type of teaching floorspace can be multiplied by 1,440 and compared with the timetabled hours in that area during the year. This calculation provides the workplace utilisation of the observed workplaces by teaching type (see table 3 in annex C).

26 The Council's *Guidance on Accommodation Strategies* recommends that a survey of actual workplace utilisation is carried out annually. This exercise will inevitably show lower levels of attendance than those timetabled and scheduled. Discrepancies of more than 10 per cent should be investigated.

#### **Floorspace Fit and Mismatch Studies**

27 One quick check is to count the number of teaching groups and compare that number with the total number of teaching floorspaces. If the number of teaching floorspaces exceeds that of the groups by

a significant margin, the college may have an overcapacity problem, for even if every teaching group was in the college at the same time on the same day, some teaching floorspaces would still be unused. Given that the average teaching group may only attend for about half of the daytime, in practice the total number of teaching floorspaces should be about 60 to 70 per cent of the number of taught groups if efficient scheduling is to be possible.

28 Using data obtained during floorspace utilisation surveys, it is possible to compare the sizes of teaching groups with the capacity of the rooms they occupy. The appropriate procedure is laid out in DfEE design note 50, paragraphs 70 to 73. Rooms can be ranked by their teaching use (for example, lecture room, laboratory, and so on) and in descending order of size. The class sizes and hours required can be similarly ranked. On the assumption that each room is available for 40 hours a week, the histogram of room availability can be compared with that of classes to be accommodated. Such studies can demonstrate the differences between the need for a particular size of floorspace and its supply.

#### **Learning Resource Centres and Non-teaching Floorspace**

29 Education in the sector has evolved over the last few decades and there is now more emphasis on learning and less on traditional teaching. According to DfEE design notes 33 and 50, learning resource centres (LRCs) could account for between 10 and 20 per cent of the total college area. There are, however, still many colleges operating at a much lower level.

30 Following the recommendations of DfEE design notes 33 and 50, it is suggested that the area allocated to support floorspace should amount to around 40 per cent of the total area of the college. This could comprise 15 per cent administration, catering and communal areas and so on, and 25 per cent for balance (corridors, foyers, WCs, central storage and so on). The area of LRCs should comprise at least 10 per cent of total college area (and could be much more if there was a proven need) and should include computer resources which may be flexibly used for teaching or learning. Table 3 gives a rough assessment of how these areas might break down, and what many colleges may have at the moment, but further work is needed to obtain reliable information for the whole sector.

**Table 3. Types of accommodation and associated areas**

<b>Accommodation type</b>	<b>Theoretical %</b>		<b>Actual %</b>
	<b>design note 33</b>	<b>design note 50</b>	
Teaching	50	50-40	40-50
Learning	10	10-20*	3-10
Other	40	40	57-40

*\* if all rooms equipped with computer facilities are considered as LRC areas when they are not in teaching use, the 'blurring' between teaching and learning suggested in design note 50 may occur, and the areas of LRCs increased due to the computerisation of classrooms*

**Economics of Rationalisation and Estate Improvement**

31 The running costs (energy, on-site security and maintenance) of an older building are reported by colleges to be currently around £50 per m<sup>2</sup> a year (see paragraph 16). Any reduction in the area of the estate will, all things being equal, result in lower running costs.

32 New buildings can usually be operated at running costs of £25 to £35 per m<sup>2</sup>. It is possible to calculate the advantages of operating in a smaller area, and in newer buildings, and also how rationalisation may reduce total running costs.

33 The purpose of the convergence process is to equalise the finance available to a college from the FEFC for each student on the same course. Each college has a choice in how it allocates these funds between the running costs of property and its other costs (of which by far the largest is salaries). If the college's estate is larger and more expensive to run than necessary, then there will be fewer funds for teaching.

**Fitness for Purpose and Quality**

34 This guidance refers mainly to the amount of floorspace a college uses and requires. A key component of floorspace use is, however, the quality and fitness for purpose of that floorspace, which is assessed by college management in the college's accommodation strategy and by FEFC inspectors during inspection. Quality and fitness for purpose cannot be easily quantified, but are nonetheless important issues in considering the amount of floorspace a college may require.

**Operating Opportunities and Constraints**

35 Some colleges have inherited valuable assets which may be sold to provide the funding for an improved estate. Other colleges have inherited assets which fall some way short of ideal teaching and learning floorspaces. For example, some colleges have listed buildings, while others may have one overlarge building, and others may have a dispersed estate serving a large rural area. In general, rationalising the over-provision of floorspace from the past can save money and finance improved facilities for students. Whatever the inheritance, each college has to look for imaginative and optimal solutions.

36 Inevitably, the availability of finance acts as an operating constraint on the scale and nature of the estate a college can comfortably maintain. Financial considerations may therefore set an affordability limit on the rate and extent of any changes.

**CONCLUSIONS**

37 The majority of colleges appear to be able to improve the cost-efficiency of their estates and reduce the scale of their floorspace, so generating the funds to improve part of their remaining assets.

38 As this guidance indicates, the theoretical area of a college can be calculated from:

- timetabled hours in each type of teaching accommodation (based on timetables linked to on-site daytime GLH)
- utilisation levels expected in each type of teaching accommodation
- area per workplace in each type of teaching accommodation
- areas required for scheduled learning and non-teaching/learning activities.

A form for this assessment is shown at table 4 in annex C.

39 Each college can plan only within the constraints of its own particular circumstances, which may include inflexible and inefficient buildings in the wrong location. However, all possibilities for reducing costs through rationalisation and more efficient floorspace utilisation should be considered, thus freeing funds for remodelling and thereby enabling the provision of more effective facilities.



## DERIVING TOTAL GUIDED LEARNING HOURS FROM THE ISR

- 1 The information that makes up the ISR is recorded on three returns:
- the ISR disk return, which contains detailed information on students and qualification aims
  - the ISR aggregate return, which colleges can use to record non-Council funded students studying fewer than 60 GLH a year or studying unspecified qualification aims
  - the ISRFRANIN form, which colleges use to record outward collaborative provision.

### ISR Disk Return

2 For students recorded on the ISR disk return, detailed information is available for each qualification aim being studied. Information is recorded showing the mode of attendance and franchising-out arrangements for each qualification aim. Using this information, provision delivered as evening only or distance learning courses and off-site provision have been excluded from the three files. The remaining qualification aims have been aggregated to student level to produce a figure for total daytime on-site GLH for each student for 1994-95. The GLH for each student have been rounded to the nearest whole number, and the students have then been allocated to the appropriate loadband.

3 For each college, the daytime on-site student numbers calculated using this method have been compared to the total student numbers which include evening and off-site provision. For 53 colleges (comprising 51 sixth form colleges and two art, design and performing arts colleges) there is no difference in the numbers. An analysis of the remaining 389 colleges shows that:

- for 46 colleges, students solely on evening or off-site provision account for 50 per cent or more of all provision
- for 30 colleges, over 6,000 students are solely on evening or off-site provision
- 20 of the colleges mentioned above fall into both categories.

### ISR Aggregate Return

4 For students recorded on the aggregate return, information on GLH is not available. Student numbers are recorded on the aggregate return using four broad loadbands as follows:

- fewer than 60 GLH (includes students in loadband 1 and students with fewer than 9 GLH)
- 60-119 GLH (loadband 2)
- 120-449 GLH (loadbands 3, 4, and 5)
- full-time (over 450 GLH, loadband 6).

5 Student numbers are recorded separately for evening and daytime students. Evening students have been excluded from the figures shown in the three files. The remaining students have been allocated to loadbands and added to the figures for the ISR disk return. The method used to allocate the students to loadbands is as follows:

- students in loadbands 2 and 6 remain in those loadbands
- students with fewer than 60 GLH have been allocated to either loadband 1 or the loadband for students with fewer than 9 GLH. For each college, the distribution of students on the ISR disk return between loadband 1 and the loadband for students with fewer than 9 GLH has been used to distribute the students recorded on the aggregate return between the two loadbands. This method assumes that the distribution between these two loadbands is the same for students recorded on the ISR aggregate return
- students with 120-449 GLH have been allocated to loadbands 3, 4 and 5. For each college, the distribution of students on the ISR disk return between loadbands 3, 4 and 5 has been used to distribute the students recorded on the aggregate return between these three loadbands. This method assumes that the distribution between the three loadbands is the same for students recorded on the ISR disk return and students recorded on the ISR aggregate return.

6 Of the 377,000 students recorded on the aggregate return across the sector for 1994-95, fewer than 6,000 are studying during the daytime.

7 GLH have been estimated for students recorded on the aggregate return by multiplying the student numbers derived above by the average GLH per student for that college. This method assumes that the average GLH per student for each loadband is the same for students recorded on the ISR disk return and students recorded on the ISR aggregate return.

#### **ISRFRANIN Form**

8 For students recorded on the ISRFRANIN form, information on GLH is not available. Student numbers are recorded on the ISRFRANIN form by mode of attendance, programme area and level. The ISRFRANIN form has no facility for recording evening provision separately. It has been assumed that all provision recorded on the form is delivered during the daytime.

9 GLH have been estimated for students on outward collaborative provision by multiplying the student numbers by the average GLH per student for full-time and part-time students. The average GLH for full-time and part-time students have been calculated using the figures from the ISR disk return. This method assumes that the average GLH per student for each loadband is the same for students recorded on the ISR disk return and students recorded on the ISRFRANIN form.

#### **Total GLH**

10 For each college for which data are available, a figure for the total GLH has been calculated by summing the following:

- total daytime on-site GLH from the ISR disk return
- estimated daytime on-site GLH from the ISR aggregate return
- estimated daytime on-site GLH from the ISRFRANIN form.

---

## **WORKED EXAMPLE OF ISR HOURS RELATED TO AREA**

College A has 2,500,000 total GLH a year.

There are 2,000,000 on-site, daytime GLH, which equates to 1,389 minimum number of workplaces (MNW). The college has 2,000 full-time students attending for an average of 750 hours a year, so 75 per cent of the on-site daytime GLH are accounted for by full-time students (1,500,000 hours out of 2,000,000).

The gross internal area of the college is 26,500m<sup>2</sup>. This is about 19.1m<sup>2</sup> per MNW. If the college proposed to improve its use of floorspace to the average levels attained by the theoretically most efficient 20 per cent of the sector (about 11m<sup>2</sup>/MNW), it would need to operate within 15,280m<sup>2</sup> (=11m<sup>2</sup> x 1,389).

But the college is proposing to reduce GLH for the average full-time student to 500. This will reduce on-site daytime GLH by (250 x 2,000) or 500,000 to about 1,500,000 GLH. Dividing that figure by 1,440, the number of MNW required in future would be 1,042. At 11m<sup>2</sup> per MNW, the future area requirement would be about 11,500m<sup>2</sup>.

The college could therefore reduce its area by between 10,000m<sup>2</sup> to 15,000m<sup>2</sup>. At £50 per m<sup>2</sup> running costs, potential savings lie between £500,000 and £750,000 a year. Half of these minimum savings, (£250,000), could support an investment programme financed by a loan of £2.5 million to improve the residual estate, and the rest could go into the college's revenue account.

## FORM TO ASSIST IN THE CALCULATIONS USED IN FLOORSPACE ASSESSMENT

**Table 1. MNW in each teaching area from timetabled hours analysis**

	<i>(a)</i> <i>Timetabled hours</i>	<i>(b)</i> <i>MNW (=hours/1,440)</i>
<b>General teaching</b>		
1 Lecture theatre (or close seating arrangements)		
2 Teaching in informal groups		
3 Teaching with demonstration facilities		
<b>Specialised teaching</b>		
4 Commerce and business (computer terminal rooms)		
5 Science and technology (laboratories)		
6 Art and design studios (other than for large-scale work) and drawing offices		
7 Crafts, large-scale art and design, home economics, dress-making, carpentry, plumbing (workshops with benches)		
8 Catering and hairdressing		
9 Welding, motor vehicle work, installation trades (with large machines)		
Total (equal to total ISR hours in year)		
<b>Total MNW</b>		

**Table 2. Workplace availability in the college**

	<i>Area (m<sup>2</sup>)</i>	<i>Number of workplaces</i>	<i>Area per workplace</i>
<b>Teaching</b>			
1	Lecture theatre (or close seating arrangements)		
2	Teaching in informal groups		
3	Teaching with demonstration facilities		
<b>Specialised teaching</b>			
4	Commerce and business (computer terminal rooms)		
5	Science and technology (laboratories)		
6	Art and design studios (other than for large-scale work) and drawing offices		
7	Crafts, large-scale art and design, home economics, dress-making, carpentry, plumbing (workshops with benches)		
8	Catering and hairdressing		
9	Welding, motor vehicle work, installation trades (with large machines)		
<b>Subtotals</b>			
	Total area		
	Total workplaces		
	Average area per workplace		
<b>Learning</b>			
	Library and LRC		
<b>Totals</b>			
	Total area		
	Total workplaces		
	Average area per workplace		

**Table 3. Workplace utilisation in different teaching areas**

	<i>(a)</i> <b>Number of workplace hours per year</b>	<i>(b)</i> <b>Timetabled hours per year</b>	<i>(c)</i> <b>Workplace utilisation (b)/(a)</b>
<b>Teaching</b>			
1	Lecture theatre (or close seating arrangements)		
2	Teaching in informal groups		
3	Teaching with demonstration facilities		
<b>Specialised teaching</b>			
4	Commerce and business (computer terminal rooms)		
5	Science and technology (laboratories)		
6	Art and design studios (other than for large-scale work) and drawing offices		
7	Crafts, large-scale art and design, home economics, dress-making, carpentry, plumbing (workshops with benches)		
8	Catering and hairdressing		
9	Welding, motor vehicle work, installation trades (with large machines)		
<b>Totals</b>			

**Table 4. Theoretical area of college**

	<i>(a)</i> <b>Timetabled hours per year</b>	<i>(b)</i> <b>MNWs per workplace = (a)/ (1,440* efficiency)</b>	<i>(c)</i> <b>Area per workplace m<sup>2</sup></b>	<i>(d)</i> <b>Total area m<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>Teaching</b>				
1	Lecture theatre (or close seating arrangements)			
2	Teaching in informal groups			
3	Teaching with demonstration facilities			
<b>Specialised teaching</b>				
4	Commerce and business (computer terminal rooms)			
5	Science and technology (laboratories)			
6	Art and design studios (other than for large-scale work) and drawing offices			
7	Crafts, large-scale art and design, home economics, dress-making, carpentry, plumbing (workshops with benches)			
8	Catering and hairdressing			
9	Welding, motor vehicle work, installation trades (with large machines)			
<b>Subtotal (Total teaching area)</b>				
Plus:				
Learning floorspace (20% of teaching area)				
Administration (10% of teaching area)				
Teaching preparation areas				
Large floorspaces (assembly halls, sports halls, theatres, art galleries)				
Catering and communal (restaurants, student union)				
Balance areas (circulation, foyers, toilets)				
<b>Total area</b>				

Published by the  
Further Education Funding Council  
November 1997