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1. Purpose, background and relevancy

**Purpose:** Develop a methodology for Value Adding Space Optimisation in educational facilities – particularly Danish gymnasiums

**Background and relevancy:** In 2007 Danish gymnasiums went from being state owned to self-governing = greater focus on cost related to maintaining and operating their buildings
2. Space Optimisation

- Qualitative Space Optimisation
- Value Adding Space Optimisation
- Quantitative Space Optimisation
2. Space Optimisation

**NOT QUESTIONABLE**

Quantitative Space Optimisation
- **Fact based**
  - Amount of square meters
  - Space utilisation
  - Costs

**QUESTIONABLE**

Qualitative Space Optimisation
- **Based on perceptions**
  - Depends on stakeholders
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3. Methodology - POE

Developed in the 1960’s in USA and is today the most well-known method used to evaluate buildings.

According to Preiser et al. (1988, Blakstad et al., 2010) POE is: “[…] the process of evaluating buildings in a systematic and rigorous manner after they have been built and occupied for some time.”

Several POE methods have been developed - in this study a version published by the Higher Education Funding Council for England has been used.

POE is general divided into: Process, Functional Performance and Technical Performance – this study has focused solely on the Functional Performance.
3. Methodology - USEtool

1. Define purpose and extent
   - Information on the organisation
   - Planning the process
   (FOR WHAT)

2. Collect facts – Mapping
   - Conduct structured group interview(s)
   - Analyze and sum up data
   - Define focus / topics for further evaluation
   (WHAT?)

3. WALK THROUGH
   - Define and elaborate topic / focus
   - Define participants
   - Define stops
   (WHERE AND WHO?)

4. Select participants – workshop organisation
   - Present results step 1-3
   - Discuss the results in relation to objectives
   - Structure and systemize arguments
   (WHY?)

5. Evaluation report / action plan
   - Improvements existing building
   - New knowledge
   - Input to briefing new buildings
   (HOW?)

Phases in USEtool (Hansen et al., 2011)
4. The Case Studies

**Herlev Gymnasium**
Built 1975 – Concrete block
800 students & 110 staff

**Falkonergården**
Built 1955 – Several connected buildings
1,000 students & 100 staff
4. The Case Studies

The process

1. Interview with the head of school and the facilities manager

2. Walkthrough with the head of school and facilities manager at Herlev Gymnasium and the facilities manager at Falkonergården

3. Observation of space usage at the two gymnasiums

4. Interviews with selected teachers and the chairman of the student council at Herlev Gymnasium

5. Questionnaire given to selected classes at the two gymnasiums

Limitations: Missing workshops and focus groups
5. Findings and results – Case Studies

Lack of integration between space utilisation and the institutions overall strategic goals

Important to pay attention to the specific conditions applicable to the organisation in question as well as the less concrete facts such as culture and habits of the users

The research resulted in 11 proposals for space optimisation at Herlev Gymnasium and 7 at Falkonergården

Several similarities were identified despite that the purpose of the space optimisation at the two institutions and the layout of the buildings are very different

- A lack of physical development from when the buildings were built until now despite a radical change in the teaching methods
- Limited and insufficient areas for the teachers to prepare
- The possibilities to implement quantitative space optimisation are limited

Limitations: Results are based solely on two gymnasiums, however the mentioned conditions is assumed to apply to other older gymnasiums in Denmark
## 5. Findings and results – New Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clarification of purpose and success criteria Identifying stakeholders Preparing project plan and clarify resources Collection of data about the organisation, the buildings and space challenges</td>
<td>Interview with the head of school and the facilities manager Walk-through with the head of school and the facilities manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collection of data about use of space</td>
<td>Observations and interviews Analyse space utilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Discussion about the existing use of space</td>
<td>Focus groups with the primary stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clarify which space solutions work well and not well – generally and related to specific aspects of the analysis</td>
<td>Walk-through with the primary stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Involvement of a large group of stakeholders</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preparation of proposals for space optimisation and implementation plan</td>
<td>Workshop with the primary stakeholders, the head of school and the facilities manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Implementation of space optimisation initiatives</td>
<td>Chums, rebuilding etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Conclusion

Space optimisation is complex – no standard procedure nor one right solution

The organisation subject to the space optimisation needs to be involved and the organisations specific conditions needs to be clarified and aligned with the space optimisation procedure

Consider the long term impact – cost reduction vs. reduction in user efficiency

POE and USEtool comprise a valuable combination for the development of a new value adding space optimisation methodology

Our results can be projected to other older gymnasiums in Denmark