107094

DOCUMENT RESUME

07094 - [B2687753] (Restricted)

[Analysis of the Consolidated Master Plan for the University of the District of Columbia]. GGD-78-115; GG-8-335; B-118638. September 20, 1978. 10 pp.

Report to Sen. Patrick J. Leahy, Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations: District of Columbia Subcommittee; by Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General.

Issue Area: Facilities and Material Management: New Versus Existing Federal Facilities (705).
Contact: General Government Div.
Budget Function: Revenue Sharing and General Purpose Fiscal Assistance: Other General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (852).
Organization Concerned: District of Columbia; University of the District of Columbia.
Congressional Relevance: Sen. Patrick J. Leahy.
Authority: D. C. Appropriations Act [of] 1978 (P.L. 95-288).

A previous report expressed concern about the uncertainties of the University of the District of Columbia's (UDC's) enrollment projections and its resulting space requirements. The initial projections were based on three different methods of calculating future enrollments and resulted in estimates ranging from 9,500 to 9,800 as compared with UDC's enrollment projection of 12,974. UDC's revised master plan now provides for incremental construction, but the new plan still presents a target enrollment of about 13,000 full-time students. Because of problems noted in the survey design and methodology, the plan may not provide an adequate basis for making enrollment projections. The prior report concluded that UDC could be planning to construct facilities in excess of its needs; that situation may still exist. The revised plan does not discuss what consideration has been given to use of existing-owned and public school facilities in lieu of new construction and leaves as uncertain the space to be constructed at the Mt. Vernon Square campus. UDC has projected space requirements without complete information on which to estimate enrollment by program or department. Its space needs could probably be satisfied at less cost through use of existing-owned and public school facilities. On the other hand, noneconomic benefits would probably accrue through the construction of new facilities at Mt. Vernon Square. (RBS)

87753

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

7753

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval by the Office of Congressional Relations.

B-118638
GG8-335

SEPTEMBER 20, 1978

The Honorable Patrick J. Leahy
Chairman, Subcommittee on the
District of Columbia
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your letter of August 17, 1978, requested that we assist the Subcommittee in analyzing the Consolidated Master Plan for the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) that was forwarded to the Committee for approval as required by the D.C. Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1978 (P.L. 95-288). You asked that we describe the extent to which

--the new plan accommodates the several concerns raised by our May 15, 1978, report on the proposed capital construction program, and

--enrollment projections and other factors support the City's request to build a second campus for UDC at Mt. Vernon Square.

Because of the time constraint for reporting to you, it was not possible to evaluate all of the data submitted by UDC in response to our inquiries and to obtain UDC's comments on this report. Some issues were discussed with UDC officials on September 11 and 12 and their comments have been considered. Also, UDC presented us with additional information at the close of business, September 18, 1978. The material represents UDC's response to certain recommendations we made at a May 10, 1978, briefing on our prior report and some of the other questions raised recently by us. The portion of that information relating to matters discussed in this report is enclosed.

In our earlier report, we expressed concern about the uncertainties in UDC's enrollment projections and facility

space requirements. We pointed out that projections derived using three methods of calculating future enrollments produced estimates of 1985 full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment ranging from 9,500 to 9,800, averaging about 9,600. This was compared to UDC's enrollment projection of 12,974. Accordingly, we recommended that UDC provide evidence showing why alternative courses of action could not be taken to modify the plans for new construction.

UDC's plan now provides for the incremental construction approach we suggested as one option. However, the new plan still presents a target enrollment of about 13,000 FTE students. In support of the enrollment projection, the plan introduces some new information, including the results of a telephone survey of 869 adult D.C. residents. Because of problems we found in the survey design and methodology, however, we do not believe that it provides an adequate basis for making enrollment projections. Also, the plan does not discuss what consideration was given to the use of renovated existing facilities and public schools and other outreach facilities in lieu of new construction to accommodate students, as we recommended.

The new plan proposes to reprogram $5 million from the recently appropriated funds for the Mt. Vernon campus to the Van Ness campus. This change would reduce construction at Mt. Vernon Square and the number of students that would be accommodated there. The facilities at both campuses would initially accommodate 9,600 FTE students with an expansion capability to 11,200 FTE students, without additional construction. However, because of inconsistencies in UDC's space figures, the extent of the reduction in construction that would occur cannot be ascertained from the plan.

FACTORS RAISING QUESTIONS ON UDC'S ABILITY TO ATTAIN PROJECTED ENROLLMENT STILL EXIST

UDC's new plan presents a FTE enrollment of 13,333 students by 1983 (including those in off-campus facilities) as compared to the earlier projection of 12,974. The following table shows the changes in the two plans.

	UDC FTE Projections		
	Master Plan Update (8/77)	Master Consolidation Plan (7/78)	Change
Enrollment at Mt. Vernon Square and Van Ness Campuses	12,934	12,773	-161
Continuing education enrollment at off-campus facilities	- *	520 **	520
Aerospace enrollment--Washington Airport	40	40	-
Total	12,974	13,333	359

*The continuing education program was shown as being housed at the Van Ness campus.

**UDC officials stated that current figures were used because continuing education enrollment was not projected.

In our earlier report, we pointed out that projections derived using three methods of calculating future enrollments produced estimates of 1985 FTE student enrollment ranging from 9,500 to 9,800, averaging about 9,600. Factors discussed in our prior report which raised questions on UDC's ability to attain its target enrollment still exist.

1. The declining number of District school-age individuals and graduating students who will be attending college, and increasing competition from other local colleges and universities which expect to enroll larger number of District residents and high school graduates.

According to the plan, about 37 percent of D.C. public school graduates continue their education at colleges and post-secondary institutions inside the District. Based on that percentage and UDC high school graduate projections, the number of graduates continuing their education in D.C. could decline from 2,197 in 1979 to 1,471 in 1985.

The plan acknowledges the decline in high school graduates but states that with an aggressive recruitment program, the number of UDC students from among recent District public school graduates will increase substantially. The plan does not describe exactly how this will be done, however, nor does it state how UDC will overcome competition from other local institutions for the available students. UDC officials stated that although there is no specific strategy for competing with other schools, the low tuition at UDC is expected to be a major drawing factor, assuming UDC's image improves.

2. Constraint of the District's population which has been dropping since 1970. The population decreased from 756,000 in 1970 to an estimated 690,000 in 1977. Resident student enrollment at UDC and its predecessor institutions averaged about 1.8 percent of the total population during that period.

The plan recognizes the decline, but points to new District residents as a major expanding market for higher education. This assertion is made on the basis of reported statistics which show that the majority of new residents moving to the District in 1974 fell within UDC's primary student age group (15-34). However, the plan fails to mention that in 1974, 76 percent of the newcomer household heads had some college education, and 57 percent had 4 or more years of college. Also, 80 percent of the newcomer households from 1970 to 1974 had no children under 18. 1/ UDC officials said they were aware of these facts, but expect to attract individuals seeking additional knowledge in specific areas or degrees in different fields.

Based on the results of a telephone survey of 869 adult D.C. residents, UDC projects that a large number of adults will enroll each year. Because of the problems found in our review of the survey design and methodology, we do not believe the survey provides an adequate basis upon which to forecast

---

1/Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Trends Alert, 1974, and George Grier, et al, Movers to the City, May 1977.

future enrollment. Specific problems we identified include the following.

--It is not very likely that the response rate or the proportion of people answering the survey was large enough to meet the minimum standards used for professional or government surveys. The Office of Management and Budget, GAO, and many professional survey organizations require a minimum response rate of 75 percent. Although UDC has not firmly established the survey's response rate, we were told that it was about 40 percent.

--The survey did not indicate what proportion of those people who said they might consider attendance at UDC will actually attend UDC. Various measures of the respondent's interest or commitment could have been used for this purpose.

--The design of the questionnaire used in the survey provides an opportunity for substantial respondent bias. This bias, if present, would result in overreporting of the number of people considering attendance at UDC.

Further validation of the survey results might allow UDC to make an estimate of future higher education aspirations of the population surveyed. It is doubtful, however, that this can be translated into an expected enrollment.

3. Decline already experienced in FTE enrollment at UDC and its predecessor institutions; (17.4 percent for period 1975-78) and tightened academic standards and placement of more students on probation which results in reduced student workload and a corresponding reduction in FTE students.

Although the 1978 headcount enrollment shows an increase over 1977, the FTE enrollment has again declined (see enclosure). The plan states that with a dropout prevention program, UDC could effectively reduce its attrition rate from 18 to 3 percent. The plan does not state how quickly this reduction

would occur. But more importantly, the plan acknowledges that the effectiveness of the program would be partially influenced by factors outside UDC's control, such as the D.C. Public School's ability to adjust its programs.

UDC officials stated that a study has not been done to determine the factors contributing to UDC's attrition rate. They stated, however, that UDC's university college will help to insure retention and success. Incoming students will now be tested and if remedial work is needed, the individual will be placed in the university college. There the student will receive the necessary reinforcement to be able to take on college-level work. As shown in the enclosure, UDC considers its latest decline in FTE enrollment due to tightened academic standards to be temporary. UDC officials expect that attrition can be reduced 1 percent each year.

POSSIBLE EXCESS FACILITIES SPACE PLANNED

In our prior report, we showed that UDC could be planning to construct facilities in excess of needs. That situation may still exist.

--The plan does not discuss what consideration was given to use of existing-owned and public school facilities and other outreach facilities in lieu of new construction.

--The new plan leaves uncertain the space to be constructed at the Mt. Vernon Square campus.

--UDC has projected space requirements without complete information on which to estimate enrollment by program or department.

Use of existing space and outreach facilities not discussed

In our prior report, we recommended that UDC provide Congress with evidence why the proposed construction program could not be modified to

--include renovation of existing UDC-owned facilities prior to any new construction (we understand that the

facilities at the former D.C. Teachers College can serve about 1,700 FTE students); and

--provide for incremental construction of new facilities at Mt. Vernon Square tailored to meet requirements not filled by the Van Ness campus, renovated facilities, and outreach facilities.

We also recommended that UDC provide information showing to what extent existing public schools and other outreach facilities are to be used for such programs as continuing and adult education, cooperative extension service, or other community outreach programs. It was our opinion that these facilities could also serve other graduate and undergraduate needs.

The plan does not discuss renovation of existing facilities, but states only that the ultimate disposition of the D.C. Teachers College facilities is being considered. UDC officials stated that the idea for renovation of those facilities was rejected because it would be too costly and result in a fragmented campus. The facilities may be used for continuing education and off-campus programs. In support of the contention that renovation is too costly, UDC states that the estimated cost to renovate existing facilities would be $50 per gross square foot (see enclosure). A UDC official stated that the estimated construction cost for the Mt. Vernon Square campus is $67 per gross square foot.

Currently, the plan shows 1.7 million gross square feet (GSF) of space to accommodate 12,800 FTE students at the two campuses. The space would be reduced under a proposal to reprogram $5 million from the Mt. Vernon Square campus to the Van Ness campus. The reprogramming is considered necessary to modify facilities at Van Ness to house programs formerly planned for Mt. Vernon Square. With the reprogramming, the plan states that the facilities would accommodate 9,600 FTE students (4,500 - Mt. Vernon, 5,100 - Van Ness) with an expansion capability to 11,200. A UDC official told us that all of the expansion room would be at the Van Ness campus.

Under its proposal, UDC officials stated that the Mt. Vernon campus will be constructed on an incremental basis. The core and support space would be constructed for 6,100 FTE students. The academic space would be designed for 4,500 FTE

students, with space for 1,600 FTE added when the enrollment warrants it. According to a UDC official, if the reprogramming request is denied, the space at Mt. Vernon Square will not be reduced and space for the full 12,800 FTE student enrollment will be constructed at the two campuses.

Regarding the use of off-campus facilities, the plan provides for only continuing education (520 FTE students) and aerospace programs (40 FTE students) to be conducted either in facilities located off campus or in campus facilities at "non-scheduled" times. UDC officials stated that D.C. public schools will not be used to house some of the classes now planned for the two campuses because the public schools do not have the necessary facilities and equipment. The officials also stated that it would be easier for students to travel to the two campuses because of the subway. UDC has not made an assessment of the number of students who would prefer to attend off-campus facilities.

Failure to specify amount of space to be constructed

Although the plan discusses several facilities space requirements, it does not clearly show what UDC intends to build at Mt. Vernon Square.

According to UDC officials, the space reductions made thus far at the Mt. Vernon Square campus (to 630,000 GSF) have been necessitated by rising costs. The plan contains conflicting statements as to the additional reductions that would occur under the proposed reprogramming. In one place the plan states that the adjusted space would be 572,000 GSF including a 92,000 GSF parking garage; in two other places, the 572,000 GSF is said to exclude the parking garage. Furthermore, UDC officials said that neither figure is correct and that the adjusted space will be 555,000 GSF including the garage.

Space requirements projected with incomplete information

The plan states that UDC's community needs assessment, which will address such concerns as D.C. demographic characteristics, employment opportunities, and admission policies,

will not be completed until spring 1979. UDC acknowledges in the plan that the results of the assessment will have a multiple impact on instructional programs. Because UDC's space projection method relies partially on the number of FTE students by department, UDC will be in a better position to accurately project its space requirements after the assessment is completed.

UDC officials agreed that the outcome of the assessment may have some impact on the number of FTE students by department. However, they stated that the current FTE estimates are reasonable and that the outcome of the assessment would have little effect on overall space needs.

- - - -

There are still uncertainties regarding the size and composition of UDC's future enrollment and, consequently, also uncertainties regarding future facilities requirements. These should be addressed before proceeding with the construction program as currently planned. To reduce these uncertainties, UDC needs to complete its community needs assessment and fully analyze and document its ability to meet the competition of local schools and reduce student attrition.

In any event, we believe that UDC could satisfy its space needs at less cost through use of existing-owned and public school facilities. On the other hand, it also is likely that there would be non-economic benefits associated with construction of new facilities at the Mt. Vernon Square campus. These potential non-economic benefits include (1) upgrading the Mt. Vernon Square area which was severely affected by the 1968 riots, (2) increasing the attractiveness of the University to potential students by offering new and upgraded facilities, and (3) increasing the accessibility of the University by reason of the campus' central location. The trade-offs cannot be measured by simple quantification of the relative costs. There is a policy question here that the Congress must decide.

B-118638
GG8-335

As arranged with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days from the date of the report. At that time we will send copies to interested parties and make copies available to others upon request.

Sincerely yours,

Comptroller General
of the United States

Enclosure

ENCLOSURE

University of the District of Columbia

VAN NESS CAMPUS
4200 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

September 18, 1978

Mr. Frank Medico
Assistant Director
General Government Division
U. S. General Accounting Office
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20548

Dear Mr. Medico:

Following the Senate's FY'79 review of the University's Capital Budget request for funding for the Mount Vernon Square Campus, the General Accounting Office prepared a series of recommendations regarding alternatives to campus development. Subsequently, a Master Consolidation Plan was prepared which addressed many of the recommendations.

On August 25th, you requested additional information regarding the consolidated master plan and the University building inventory. A number of these issues have already been addressed. On September 12th, you and members of your staff met with University staff and a representative of the Academy for Educational Development to discuss additional concerns. As agreed at that meeting, you will find attached our responses to your earlier recommendations and your more recent questions.

We will be pleased to provide whatever additional information you may require.

Sincerely,

Claude A. Ford

Claude A. Ford
Acting Executive Vice President

Enc.

RESPONSES TO GAO RECOMMENDATIONS

GAO RECOMMENDATION — Defer all facility development other than Phase Two at the Van Ness Campus pending completion of the community needs assessment.

UDC RESPONSE — Facility development was deferred until the completion of the Master Consolidation Plan which included the significant initial components of the community needs assessment. Copies of the Master Consolidation Plan have been transmitted to the General Accounting Office.

GAO RECOMMENDATION — Drawing on the needs assessment, redefine UDC's estimate of future student enrollment, recognizing the uncertainties involved, and express this estimate in terms of a range from the "worst possible" to "best possible" situations.

UDC RESPONSE — Volume I of the Master Consolidation Plan details the enrollment range for the University.

GAO RECOMMENDATION — Restructure UDC's construction program to provide for incremental facility additions, based initially on the "worst possible" enrollment forecast.

UDC RESPONSE — This has been addressed in the Master Consolidation Plan. Based on a 5,100 student enrollment at the Van Ness Campus and a 4,500 student enrollment at the Mount Vernon Square Campus, the combined enrollment for the two-campus University will be 9,600 FTE students. The community needs assessment identified a potential pool of students far greater than the 9,600 FTE Mount Vernon Square and Van Ness facilities development program.

GAO RECOMMENDATION — In restructuring UDC's construction, consider the various alternatives and seek out the lowest cost, optimal solution to meet its needs. These alternatives include:

(1) One major campus at Van Ness with conveniently located outreach facilities scattered around the City and/or suburbs in existing and new space.

UDC RESPONSE — Responses to GAO questions previously raised concerning outreach and satellite facilities have indicated

UDC Response (Cont.) that the use of scattered facilities around the City defeats the purpose of the University. The D. C. Department of General Services has furnished us with an estimate (attached) indicating that an average cost of $50 per gross square foot would be required to renovate public school facilities. Based on a current gross square feet-to-FTE student ratio of 146 (Exhibit 11, Volume 1, Master Consolidation Plan), coupled with a projected Mount Vernon Square Campus enrollment figure of 4,500 FTE students, the projected cost to renovate outreach facilities would run approximately $33 million (4,500 FTE x 146 GSF/FTE x $50/GSF = $32,850,000). Coupled with this figure would be costs for equipment and architectural design services. The combined costs would approach the estimated capital request for construction of the Mount Vernon Square Campus ($57 million).

GAO RECOMMENDATION (2) Two major campuses--Van Ness and Mount Vernon Square--with the size of Mount Vernon Square tailored to fill requirements not met by Van Ness, with provisions for appropriate outreach facilities.

UDC RESPONSE The provisions proposed in this recommendation are in keeping with our facilities development program proposed in the Master Consolidation Plan. Based on a projected student enrollment of 9,600 FTE students, the Van Ness Campus will accommodate 5,100 FTE and the remaining students (4,500 FTE) would be accommodated in new facilities at the Mount Vernon Square Campus. Outreach facilities will be provided for Continuing Education and Cooperative Extension Service programs.

GAO RECOMMENDATION (3) One major campus at Van Ness Campus, renovation of one or both of the D. C. Teachers College buildings, with appropriate outreach facilities.

UDC RESPONSE This question is a variation of Question #1 above. As opposed to making total use of outreach facilities scattered around the City, Question #3 proposes renovating D. C. Teachers College buildings and community outreach facilities. As stated in the response to Question #1, the cost of renovating these facilities would approach the projected construction cost for the Mount Vernon Square Campus.

Responses to GAO Recommendations

GAO RECOMMENDATION

(4) One major campus at Van Ness, renovation of the Wilson Building of D. C. Teachers College, reduced construction at Mount Vernon, with appropriate outreach facilities.

UDC RESPONSE

This question is also a variation of Question #1. The cost to renovate the Wilson Building appears to be prohibitive ($50/GSF). The construction of new campus facilities without renovation to either the Wilson, Miner, or public school facilities will enable the University to operate more efficiently and more economically both in terms of capital construction cost and operating expenses.

GAO QUESTIONS

GAO QUESTION

Based on a $5 million reduction in the Mount Vernon Square Campus construction budget, identify the amount of space that will be reduced from each portion of the MVSC "Space Summary".

UDC ANSWER

Attached is a summary estimate indicating anticipated space reductions in the Mount Vernon Square Campus based on a $5 million reallocation in the Mount Vernon Square Campus construction budget. Please note that this $5 million reduction amounts to a reduction of approximately 75,000 GSF of building space. This estimate is based on an estimated building cost of $38,954,000. The exact reduction of square footage will depend on the type of facilities deferred from the Mount Vernon project. If extensive laboratory facilities are reduced from the space program, the cost per square foot will be high, thus requiring us to reduce a small quantity of square footage. If the majority of space reduced from the program is classroom and academic space types, then the cost per square foot will be low, resulting in a greater quantity of square footage that will have to be reduced from the space program.

Please note that a reduction has not been made in the support service facilities category.

GAO QUESTION

Provide a comparison of Van Ness Campus Space Summary Master Plan Update (8/77) versus Master Consolidation Plan (7/78).

GAO QUESTION

What are the enrollment statistics for fall 1978?

UDC ANSWER

Fall registration at UDC produced an increase over the previous year in the total number of people enrolled at the District's public land grant University. The registration data, when analyzed, indicate that there has been a drop in the number of full-time equivalent students (FTEs).

By actual head count, fall registration produced 13,647 students. While this figure represents an increase of 355 students over the count for the previous year, the total generated an FTE of 7985, which is a decrease in the FTE count compared to last year. The decrease can be attributed, in part, to the tougher requirements for achieving academic good standing.

The implementation this year of a new University policy requiring academic standards that are higher than ever before contributed to 3117 students being placed on academic probation. A student on probation is restricted to a maximum of nine (9) credit hours of course work, instead of twelve (12) credit hours--the minimum credit hour load for a full-time student. The drop in FTEs reflects a decrease of 14,556 student credit hours. If these credit hours were converted to FTEs on the basis of a 12-hour full-time minimum load, they would generate 1,213 FTEs.

The actual number of credit hours taken by students in this probation category averaged 7.33 per student. If all students restricted to nine hours had actually taken all nine, the FTE count could have been increased by 350 over the current figure. The decrease is temporary. As students move off probation and achieve academic good standing, restrictions on credit hour load are dropped. The additional credit hours such students can take will revert to normal. This, coupled with increased student retention under the University College concept, will stabilize the enrollment at targeted levels.

Other factors which may have contributed to the drop in FTEs appear to fall in two categories; viz., (1) policy and procedural changes; (2) publicity with regard to policy and procedural changes. Academic consolidation was not achieved until June 1978; admissions procedures existing on predecessor campuses (Mount Vernon and Georgia/Harvard) precluded sending letters of acceptance to applicants until after

UDC ANSWER (Cont.) receipt of final transcript(s) from the high schools. With regard to publicity, there has not been a college catalog since 1975; class schedules were not printed until mid-August 1978; there has been no significant publicity relative to program offerings, and the admissions office relocated without sufficient public notice.

September 15, 1978

Mr. Claude A. Ford, Acting
Executive Vice President
University of the District
of Columbia
Van Ness Campus
4200 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Dear Mr. Ford:

You have requested me to give you a budget estimate for the cost of renovating the Wilson and Miner Buildings. The shortage of time prevents me from completing our normal budget estimate which involves an evaluation of each renovation category you have listed in your scope. However, I can supply you an approximate cost per square foot for the project.

We are presently developing contract documents for the extenciv renovation of a number of senior high schools. The scope of renovation work for these schools is analogous to the scope you have indicated for your buildings. Based on our cost estimates for the high schools, I would estimate that the cost of renovation of the Wilson and Miner buildings would be in the range of $45 to $55 per square foot.

I trust this provides the information you need.

Sincerely yours,

Sam D. Starobin
Director of General Services

UNIVERSITY OF DC PAGE 000 DATED 09/17/79

STUDENT PROFILE FALL 78-79

STUDENT PROFILE SUMMARY

	TOTAL	MALE	FMALE	UNK	FULL	PART	DAY	EVEN	DAYEVE	FRSH	SOPH	JUNR	SENR	GRAD	OTHR	NEW-S	DC-RSD	NON-RSD	CRDT	FTE
ZV SHAND	TOTAL	13647	5918	7504	225	1372	12275	6030	4233	3386	7622	2274	1474	1542	337	398	2985	12555	1068	119274	7985

- CLASSIFICATION IS BASED ON PASSING GRADE OF 12 & INCLUDING THIS TERM. DOB FULL-PART TIME IS BASED ON THIS TERM LOAD
- FTE IS COMPUTED AS FOLLOWS: GRAD-STUDENT 12 (REGARDLESS COURSE-LVL) + UNDERGRAD & SPECIAL STDNT / 15
- AND FTE COMPUTATION FOR TOTALING LEVELS IS BASED ON CREDITS TOTALING
- THIS INFORMATION EXCLUDES DROP OUTS FOR THIS TERM
- NEW-STUDENT 1 IS ANY STUDENT THAT DID TAKE ANY CLASS IN ANY PREVIOUS TERM AT UDC
- THE BIOGRAPHY INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE MASTER NAME FILE WHEN THIS STAT-FILE WAS GENERATED
- STUDENT TOTAL OF UNSPECIFIED RESIDENCE IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GRAND-TOTAL MINUS DC & NON-DC RESIDENTS
- THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE THE WITHDREWL AND DROPED STUDENTS IF ANY

University of the
District of Columbia

VAN NESS CAMPUS
4200 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

September 19, 1978

Mr. Frank Medico
Assistant Director
General Government Division
U. S. General Accounting Office
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20548

Dear Mr. Medico:

Yesterday I sent you a letter containing the University's responses to a number of GAO's questions. The two attached tables were mistakenly omitted. The table headed "Areas to be reduced by $5 million reduction" should follow page 3 of the letter and the table headed "Incorrect Calculation of Data..." should follow page 4.

I have further noted an inaccuracy on page 5. In the third paragraph the last sentence should read "If these credit hours were converted to FTEs on the basis of a 15-hour full time load, they would generate 970 FTEs.

I regret any inconvenience these omissons may have caused you.

I will be pleased to provide whatever additional information you may require.

Sincerely,

Claude A. Ford
Acting Executive Vice President

Attachments