



Economic Impact Analysis

of the Florida Small Business Development Center – Final Report

Prepared for: The Florida Small Business Development Center Network

Contracted by: Michael W. Myhre CEO & Network State Director Univ. of West Florida Florida SBDC Network

By: The Center for Economic Forecasting and Analyses Florida State University

Vassiki Sanogo, Ph.D. Julie Harrington, Ph.D.

June, 2017





Table of Contents

| Executive Summary | 1 |
|--|---|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Literature Review | 7 |
| Study Data and Methodology | 3 |
| Established Businesses17 | 7 |
| Quality Assessment of Counseling Services17 | 7 |
| Financing Obtained | 9 |
| Survey Methodology19 | 9 |
| Economic Impact Analysis | 1 |
| Economic Impact Analysis Methodology31 | 1 |
| Economic Impact Model Input Data31 | 1 |
| Economic Impact and Statewide Results32 | 2 |
| Economic Impact Analysis and Regional Results | 3 |
| Summary of Fiscal Impacts for 201637 | 7 |
| Conclusions | B |
| Summary of Economic Impact Results | 9 |
| References | 0 |
| Appendices | 2 |
| Appendix A. Copy of the SBDC Survey Questionnaire43 | 3 |
| Appendix B. The Florida SBDC Network List of Regional Identification Codes | 8 |
| Appendix C. The Number of Jobs by Industry, by Region for 2016 | 9 |

Executive Summary

The Florida Small Business Development Center (SBDC), over the last 40 years, has been one of the pioneers in assisting small business' creation and development, and providing counseling to small businesses across the state of Florida. The SBDC network has promoted a statewide partnership between Florida's higher education institutions and economic development organizations, including pre-venture and established businesses. The SBDC network is dedicated to provide expert counseling to support emerging and established business owners. SBDCs counseling comes in term of management and technical assistance, from the development of the business plan to securing Federal and State Government agencies' funding. The mission of the Florida SBDC network is to enable the overall economic growth and to increase businesses profitability and economic prosperity in Florida.

The Florida SBDC network is engaged in several activities to attain the objectives of its mission. In order to do so, it has split its activities into three major programs, including; the SBDC core program, the procurement and technical assistance program, and the growth acceleration program. Each one of these programs includes specific counseling. In 2016, Florida SBDCs served nearly 18,532 Pre-venture and established small businesses through consulting and training. The direct effects of these counseling services on Florida's economy were 14,696 jobs created and 7,620 jobs retained or saved (at a cost of \$258 per job), hence a total of 22,313 jobs. In addition, there was estimated to be over \$3.7 billion in capital obtained.¹

In 2016, approximately 225,676 counseling hours were provided to clients via the SBDC network. Of these, the Pre-venture businesses received 30,148 hours of counseling (13.4 percent of total hours), and the longer-term established business clients received 195,528 hours of assistance (or 86.4 percent of total hours) from the SBDC network.

The Florida State University Center for Economic Forecasting and Analysis (FSU CEFA) was contracted in May 2017 to conduct a study on the economic impacts of the Florida SBDC's activities. The impacts included an estimation of jobs creation and retention/saved, and the direct, indirect and induced effects specific to output or sales/revenues, jobs, income, and value-added (GRP). Following a multi-level economic modeling approach consistent with previous economic impact studies conducted for the SBDC, FSU CEFA estimated that about 35,106 jobs were generated, with over \$4 billion in output or sales/revenues, nearly \$1.5 billion in labor income and nearly \$2.12 billion in value added or Gross

¹ Estimates based on a sample of survey respondents

Regional Product (GRP), as a result of the Florida SBDC's counseling services to small established businesses (SME's) and Start-Ups. Based on the survey results, the research team also analyzed whether the SBDC counseling services were perceived as beneficial by the served clients, in terms of a quality assessment. FSU CEFA based its economic methodology on the previous studies conducted by the UWF HAAS Center "Impact of SBDC Business Development Activities on the Florida Economy" and Dr. James J. Chrisman's report on the "Economic Impact of Small Business Development Center Counseling Activities in Florida: 2010-2011", and on other studies conducted for the SBDC's and commissioned by the Association of Small Business Development Centers. Regarding the overall goals of the present report conducted by FSU CEFA, the SBDC Network requested that the study design include a comparative analysis between 2015 and 2016 using the IMPLAN® software's model to estimate the economic impacts including direct, indirect, and induced impacts as a result of the SBDC network's consultancy services. FSU CEFA used the survey results to estimate input data metrics for each industry sector, and by region in terms of employment, sales, and value added. Each of the ten SBDC regions has been analyzed using the same data preparation and modeling methodology. The economic impacts of the SBDC in 2015-2016 are summarized in the following Table ES1, and include the total output or sales/revenues, the total jobs created and retained/saved, total labor income (wages), and the total value added (GRP).

| Table ES.1: Impact of FSBDC Activities in 2016 | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Type of Impact* Statewide Impact | | | | | | | |
| Sales/Output | \$4,032,648,250 | | | | | | |
| Total Jobs | 35,106 | | | | | | |
| Labor Income | \$1,465,256,513 | | | | | | |
| Value Added/GRP \$2,115,057,361 | | | | | | | |

*The total economic impacts include direct, indirect and induced impacts

Introduction



In March 2017, the Small Business Development Center (SBDC)² contracted the Florida State University Center for Economic Forecasting and Analysis (FSU CEFA)³ to conduct an economic impact analysis of the SBDC programs' impact on Florida's economy. The economic impact study is based on client survey data collected by the SBDC, covering its' ten regions.⁴ The survey data collected was provided to FSU CEFA in May 2017, by the SBDC's Network Headquarters.

Established in 1976, the Florida SBDC's are the only statewide provider of entrepreneurial and business development services in Florida. They play a vital role in Florida's economic development, by assisting entrepreneurs in every stage of the business life cycle. According to the SBDC website, they have assisted hundreds of thousands of emerging and growing businesses by providing professional expertise, tools, and information, as a means to make sound business decisions in a complex and ever-changing marketplace. Over the last 40 years, the SBDC's have provided assistances to over 1.1 million businesses in Florida. A sample of business clients may be found on the SBDC website,⁵ where targeted businesses range from Industries (e.g., construction, manufacturing, other retail, service and wholesale) to Service Types (e.g., business continuation and research, consulting, government consulting, growth acceleration, international trade, and training).

The SBDC Network is obliged to report on its cost-effectiveness (economic impact) on an annual basis. In the most recent annual report (2015) the SBDC reported to have delivered over 113,000 business consulting hours, to over 12,000 clients/business owners. As a result, SBDC created and retained/saved 32,398 jobs, increased sales by \$4.8 billion, acquired \$301 million in government contract awards, facilitated \$277 million investments in capital outlays, and started over 400 new businesses.⁶

² Florida Small Business Development Network (Florida SBDC), see: <u>http://floridasbdc.org/</u>

³ FSU Center for Economic Forecasting and Analysis (FSU CEFA), see: <u>http://www.cefa.fsu.edu</u>

⁴ or 35 satellite centers

⁵ See: <u>http://floridasbdc.org/success-stories/</u>

⁶ See: <u>http://floridasbdc.org/Reports/2016-Annual-Report/</u>

The purpose of this FSU CEFA economic impact study was to provide an economic impact analysis of SBDC's activities in Florida, in 2016. The impacts were to be associated with the consulting services offered in the three primary programs of Florida's SBDC Network: The Small Business Development Center (SBDC) core program, the Procurement and Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) program, and the Growth Acceleration Program (GAP). FSU CEFA based its economic analysis methodology on the methodology used in prior reports, which began in 2010-2011 with a report by Dr. James Chrisman of Mississippi State University, and where reporting was continued by the HAAS Center, thereafter. FSU CEFA maintained a similar format and methodological approach as the previous studies, and applied methodological improvements, where appropriate.

FSU CEFA received data from a survey conducted by the FSBDC network. The survey tallied 3,217 responses to the survey questionnaire (a 17.4 percent response rate).⁷ It was assumed that the results received of clients responding represented the entire population of clients, which was defined by all clients whom received at least one hour or more of the SBDC counseling services in 2016. For the purpose of this report, the employment changes occurring in this sample of SBDC clients were compared to changes in employment of all businesses in Florida using the annual report of the Economic Modeling Specialists, Inc. (EMSI).⁸ The resulting incremental growth was assumed to reflect the sample's performance due to SBDC's activities. These results were then further extrapolated to the client population of the SBDC. By doing so, the research team was able to estimate tax revenues generated due to SBDC counseling. The tax revenues generated by clients were subsequently compared to the total cost of the Florida SBDC network for 2016 as a measure of cost-effectiveness.

FSU CEFA estimated the jobs created and retained/saved due to the counseling services provided to SBDC's clientele. The subset of Pre-venture was not analyzed due to insufficient survey data from the respondents.⁹ However, the financial data obtained by the established served clients (SME's and Start-Ups), as a direct result of SBDC network assistance, was analyzed. The SBDC counseled 18,532 clients during 2016, including 5,445 Pre-ventures and 13,087 existing businesses. Overall, more than 85 percent of the respondents stated that the SBDC counseling services were beneficial.

⁷ The survey was distributed to a total of 18,532 SBDC clients in Florida.

⁸ EMSI 2016 data was provided by the UWF HAAS Center on June 2, 2017.

⁹ It is noted that Pre-venture clients were surveyed for qualitative information only, as their financial data is unavailable.

The Florida Small Business Development Center (SBDC) Programs

The SBDC assists businesses through different programs, with each program having a unique mission to assist in development and growth of businesses, to secure funding and contracts, and to potentially expand into the international market. These programs are designed to provide assistance to small businesses and aspiring entrepreneurs throughout the state of Florida. The SBDC's are hosted by leading universities and other economic development partners in the state, and the programs are funded in part through a partnership with the National Small Business Administration (SBA).

The Core Program

The SBDC consultants assist Pre-venture clients to gain entrepreneurial knowledge and with preparation of business plans. The SBDC also assists Pre-venture and established businesses to meet with bankers and ultimately secure financing in terms of loans. Many clients reported that this program helped them create and expand their businesses at reduced costs. To prepare businesses to face challenges in the dynamic marketplace, the SBDC network supports businesses to improve their efficiency through their core program.

The Procurement and Technical Assistance Center Program

Under the procurement and assistance program, the SBDC helps small businesses to secure Federal contracts and funding. This program operates through varied activities, including outreach activities to promote the mission of the SBDC for the procurement program. In 2015, Florida had the seventh highest federal contract total spending by state, at a value of \$13.6 billion.¹⁰ The Florida SBDC, with an investment of \$9.1 million (in 2016) was able to acquire nearly \$7.2 million in Federal funding for the current counseling period. In May 2017, the Florida SBDC network celebrated the National Small Business Federal Contracting week by highlighting innovative businesses from across the state of Florida. Specifically, they celebrated those clients who were awarded Federal and/or State Government contracts and whom are contributing to Florida's economic development.

The Growth Acceleration Program

Through the Growth Acceleration Program, the SBDC network is assisting businesses to export their products or services onto the international markets. This program operates by helping businesses in planning for successful entry into foreign markets and by supporting businesses to find proper and effective

¹⁰ See: <u>http://floridasbdc.org/Reports/2016-State-of-Small-</u>

Business/State of Small Business Florida 2016 FINAL web.pdf

markets. The SBDC assists these businesses to meet their individual goals based on their business plans. The SBDC International Trade Specialists provide their clients with partner networking, including networking with Enterprise Florida, Inc. and the U.S. Commercial Service, for providing training in exports. As a result of this program, some clients have been granted with a single standalone Gold Key by the U.S. Commercial Service. The direct implication for one of these businesses obtaining a Gold Key designation has been an estimated \$1.37 million in additional export sales worldwide.

Literature Review

Origin and Mission of the Small Business Development Centers

Since the late 1970's, business incubator growth has continued to grow in the United States. As result of this growth, there has been an interest to conduct economic studies evaluating these incubators' impacts (Allen and Weinberg 1988; Campbell and Allen 1987; Campbell 1988; Baumol and Strom, 2007; David Summers, 2015). Various studies have assessed incubators' performances based on: 1) the impact on economic development, specifically on job creation, 2) the businesses' successes, 3) the increase in employment and sales, and 4) the retention of firms in the local area after leaving the incubator (Deborah M. Markley and Kevin T. McNamara 1996). One difficulty in comparing the results of these impact evaluations arises from the fact that both public and private entities have established incubators, but with different objectives. The incubators are sometimes linked with job-training programs and designed to provide job opportunities for unemployed individuals. On the other hand, incubators can also be linked with universities, with incentives for product development, commercialization, and employment of highly skilled graduates. Other incubators may have restrictions on the type of firm that may participate. Hence, the success of each incubator must be evaluated respective of its' objectives and operating restrictions.

Concerning the Small Business Development Center (SBDC) programs, the United States Congress established the program in 1980 as part of Chapter 21 of the Small Business Act, after the successes of a three states-pilot effort, including the state of Florida. The SBDC program's mission is to help strengthen existing and prospective small businesses. In other words, the mission of America's nationwide network of SBDC's is to help new entrepreneurs realize the dream of establishing and owning a business. In addition, SBDCs assist existing businesses to remain competitive in the complex marketplace of an ever-changing global economy.

In order to implement these goals, the SBDC programs triangulate, or link, their firms/clients with the knowledge and resources of the Federal, State and local governments, and the academic community,

through services delivered by a state-wide, nationwide network of SBDC's. The Congress envisioned that small businesses would start, grow and prosper, have access to capital and other resources, improve their market competitiveness, and contribute to the improvement of state and local economies through job creation. However, as the SBDC programs are funded by the public sector, there exists an understandable demand for a quantitative, economically based, impact study. Therefore, the SBDC Act of 1979 (Title II of P.L. 96 - 302) requires an annual economic impact study be conducted for each State SBDC program. The results of the economic impact analyses assist in continuing to build effective programs, and provide a useful fundraising or leveraging tool at both State and Federal levels. The impact results could also be a valuable management tool for State SBDC directors in estimating the performance of individual centers, if data is available and categorized at the center-level. The national evaluation results should be made available on a regular cost-effectiveness basis by aggregating the individual centers and standardized statewide methodologies (John B. Elstrott et al., 1987). The need for a standardized evaluation model is straightforward. The purpose of the evaluation model is to allow for consistent and accurate performance comparisons across years and between States, which would prove very useful for national evaluation and funding purposes. Per John B. Elstrott (1987), the best approach would be a mix-design method (i.e., a combination of both qualitative and quantitative programs).

Small Business Development Current Literature

In 2015, David Summers reported that many involved in economic development strongly believe that encouraging entrepreneurship and small business activity is key to economic growth (Ahlstrom, 2010; Baumol and Strom, 2007; Holcombe, 2003; World Economic Forum, 2014; Small Business Administration, 2014). Furthermore, numerous recent studies have stated that it is important to highlight and include the current small business concerns in the further development of economic impact studies of SBDC programs. Realistic expectations are important to guide economic development as the nation's economy rebounds from a recession. A need to address faulty expectations is critical. How to best address the issues? It is through a thorough examination and evaluation of current data and trends in new business Start-Ups, job creation, family income, among other factors, to establish a realistic assessment of the impact of entrepreneurship and small business activity. According to David Summers, the expectation is that economic development activities may best be focused on supporting a small number of high-growth employer firms rather than on encouraging mass business Start-Ups. The largest return on investment from economic development resources are likely to come from growth of high-growth firms.

Other concerns raised by researchers include cognitive biases. Jeffrey Overall (2016) reported that a significant concern among entrepreneurs is the high failure rates associated with new venture Start-Ups.

These failures are often the result of cognitive biases that cause entrepreneurs to misperceive the risks associated with their ventures. Cognitive biases do not directly lead to risky entrepreneurial behaviors, but rather indirectly. Through neutralization techniques, entrepreneurs convince themselves (and others) that their actions are in fact not risky (Peretti-Watel, 2003). These techniques impact each stage of a decision-making process. This approach is based on theories of planned behavior and reasoned action. Ronald Kuntze and Erika Matulich (2016) emphasize the challenges of cognitive biases, a known cause of the high rate of failure for Start-Ups, reported from their in-depth interviews with expert counselors of SBDC's.

Lastly, the focus of recent literature has been more oriented towards identifying factors of entrepreneurial success, in lieu of identifying entrepreneurial candidates with high likelihood of failure (e.g., Chaterjee and Das, 2015; Kumar and Sihag, 2012). Several studies have examined the factors associated with smaller business failures among Start-Ups. These studies have analyzed a list of factors believed to impact failure, including previous business experience; education, financial capital, and age (Lussier and Pfeifer, 2001). Other studies have reported that older, less educated owners with low managerial competence, little financial capital, and inadequate use of accounting expertise show higher failure rates (e.g., Gaskill, Van Auken, and Manning, 1993). Researchers are also starting to identify other sources of entrepreneurial failures related to cognitive biases. Von and Bresseler (2011) for example, acknowledge that entrepreneurial optimism is an important characteristic of successful entrepreneurs, but that excessive optimism can lead to business failure. Cognitive processes', including passion, has been researched by Envick (2014). He concludes that a focus on "passion" development and training are important components of entrepreneurial intelligence.

Relevant Economic Impact Studies on the SBDC Programs

The early methodological approaches concerning SBDC economic impact studies fell short on several points, although there have been some successes as well. The drive to improve upon the standardized evaluation methodology concerning SBDC's economic impacts, has led to a long-standing debate between Dr. James J. Chrisman, the author of the first empirical economic impact study for SBDC's, and Dr. William C. Wood, since his published article: "Primary Benefits, Secondary Benefits, and Evaluation of Small Business Assistance Programs" (1994).

Dr. Wood, an economist, has been critical of the methodologies used to evaluate the performance of the SBDC programs; particularly regarding Dr. Chrisman's approach to the estimation of the economic impacts of the SBDC programs. It is important to highlight the divergence between the theoretical paradigms of

these two authors. Dr. Wood's concern is based on the demand side. He states that Dr. Chrisman has systematically underestimated the primary, or direct, benefits while overestimating the secondary, or indirect, benefits. Dr. Wood suggested two alternative methods; the Travel Cost Method and/or the Contingent Valuation Method.

In response, Dr. Chrisman, et al. (1996) argued that Dr. Wood's view is static and does not consider that the dynamic nature of economic growth. Dr. Chrisman and co-authors, contend that Dr. Wood's alternative methods are not empirically realistic, since it is costly and time consuming to collect data on Wood's suggested measurements. However, Chrisman et al. (2002) acknowledged some of the criticism brought by Wood (1999), therefore leading them to focus more attention to the "secondary or indirect" benefits. Overall, Dr. Chrisman's methodology is the most standardized nationwide. The FSU CEFA team determined that his latest study, conducted for the Florida Small Business Association in 2012, provided the most comprehensive methodological framework for the economic impact estimation of the Florida Small Business Development Center programs.

Overview of Dr. Chrisman's of the SBDCs Report 2010-2011

Dr. Chrisman emphasized that in the case of Florida, his study was designed to assess the economic impact of the long-term counseling activities of the Florida Small Business Development Center (SBDC) program. As defined by Dr. Chrisman "Long-term clients are those who received a minimum of five hours of counseling assistance from the SBDC." The economic impact of counseling activities was analyzed by comparing clients' sales and employment changes for the period pre- and post-counseling SBDC activities, compared with average changes for all Florida businesses. Growth in sales and employment (that exceeded statewide averages) was used to calculate the incremental, or marginal, federal and state tax revenues, as well as job growth, generated in the year after counseling assistance was provided. In order to determine cost-effectiveness, the tax revenues generated by SBDCs' clients (based on growth differentials) were then compared to the cost of the services provided. In addition, clients were asked to indicate the amount of debt and equity financing they obtained as a result of counseling received from the SBDC. The incremental growth rates were then converted to dollar and employment numbers, and as appropriate extrapolated to the entire population of longer-term SBDC clients served. Downward adjustments in these numbers were made in line with the evaluation of the benefits of the service on behalf of clients. The incremental or marginal increases in sales and employment for one year only were then translated to tax revenues by multiplying the respective amounts by the sales tax rate, and federal median income taxes paid per return. Dr. Chrisman did not impute impact to clients who did not believe they received value from the SBDC.

Thus, only those who indicated that its services were beneficial are used to calculate incremental growth rates.

The performance of Pre-venture clients is calculated in much the same way except that the raw sales and employment figures are used since these clients start with a base of zero (before the SBDC counseling there were neither sales nor employment). In addition, other adjustments were made to account for clients who didn't go into business, or who enter into business, but fail.

The benefits of the services provided by the SBDC were compared to the total costs of providing these services. In order to calculate cost-effectiveness, the SBDC's total operating budget was used. This should also be a conservative approach since only part of the SBDC's budget was spent on counseling assistance. Thus, to obtain further resolution on impacts, one should compare the tax revenues generated by clients with the cost of counseling activities (in total, and separately for the longer-term established and Pre-venture clients). The cost of longer-term counseling was estimated based on the proportion of the total counseling hours devoted to those clients, per data supplied by the SBDC.

To gauge the quality of counseling services, clients were asked whether the services provided by the SBDC were beneficial. This question was used to determine whether clients' performance improvements were affected by the SBDC counseling provided. Clients were also asked to assess the knowledge and expertise of counselors assigned to their cases, as well as their working relationship with the counselors. These questions provide further evidence of the quality of the counseling services.

Regarding revenue and job retention, the established business clients were asked to estimate the number of full- and part-time jobs that were saved because of the assistance received from the SBDC. Clients were also asked to estimate the amount of sales revenue generated as a result of the SBDC's assistance. The average surveyed responses were then extrapolated to the population of established business clients.

Concerning financing, the established business and Pre-venture clients were asked to estimate the amount of SBA-guaranteed loans, other loans, and equity financing obtained directly due to SBDC counseling activities. For conservative estimates, only those clients who indicated that the SBDC assisted them in the preparation of financing, were used for this analysis. An extrapolation to the entire client population was made after adjusting for the proportion of clients who indicated that the SBDC assisted them raise capital.

The result was a conservative estimate of the impact of the program. Thus, the benefit side of the costeffectiveness estimate does not consider:

- The impact of counseling provided to short-term clients;
- The impacts of other programs the SBDC offers;
- Any incremental tax revenues generated after the year of analysis;
- The failures and job losses that SBDC assistance helped prevent among established business clients;
- The Pre-venture entrepreneurs with infeasible ideas that were discouraged from starting a business with a low probability of success;
- Other tax revenue sources such as corporate income taxes, unemployment taxes, and social security payments, or;
- Any multiplier effects that accrued from a healthier small business sector.

Overview of the 2014-15 HAAS Center Report Methodology

The SBDC Network requested a comparative economic impact study using the IMPLAN® model to estimate the economic impacts of the SBDC-network activities on: Employment, Sales, Income and Value Added (GRP). The Haas Center's report provided these outcome measures as Direct, Indirect, and Induced economic impacts. The report did not consider the impact of Pre-ventures.¹¹ The Haas Center highlighted three basic elements regarding data collection, namely: 1) the survey respondents reporting on two years of employment; 2) the survey respondents report how many jobs were retained by their business as a consequence of SBDC consulting activities; 3) the survey respondents reporting on the total value of capital or government contracts that were successfully acquired based on SBDCs assistance. The Haas Center excluded Pre-venture, as well as capital and contract dollars from their overall impact estimation.

The Haas Center assumptions have been further summarized:

- Any negative job growth calculated by their formula have been zeroed out;
- Used the self-reported jobs-retained numbers to calculate the SBDC impact in terms of total jobs retained across the Florida economy;
- The survey's respondents who participated do not differ significantly from those who did not participate.

The businesses are classified into five high-level industry categories, including: Construction, Manufacturing, Retail, Professional Services, and Wholesale Trade. The HAAS Center computed the total

¹¹ Pre-ventures, as in this current study, were not able to provide financial data given they are in the inception stage of their respective business.

numbers of jobs created and jobs retained/saved for established firms in each of these industry categories. The total economic impacts of the SBDC activities were estimated by the Haas Center using the IMPLAN® software tool. The researchers analyzed the data at the finer level of NAICS code, with impacts including the direct, indirect, and induced economic impacts, across a variety of categories, including; employment, income, value added, and total economic output.

Study Data and Methodology

The survey and economic analysis consisted of a two-pronged methodology. First, the direct employment impact levels were estimated using the survey data provided to FSU CEFA by the SBDC administration. The second prong encompassed an economic impact assessment of the SBDC network activities based on the direct impacts, through estimation of the Indirect, and Induced effects of the SBDC's activities using the IMPLAN® software tool.

Survey Methodology

For this study, data collection was conducted through a 30-questionnaire survey on a sample of Florida SBDC's clients.¹² A total of 18,532 clients were served by the SBDC during 2015-16, of which 13,087 owned an existing small business, and 5,445 were Pre-venture clients. The SBDC's provided a total of 225,676 hours of counseling services, to both established businesses (195,528 hours) and Pre-venture clients (30,148 hours). The SBDC reported that 1,923 surveys questionnaires returned undeliverable, hence, a total of 16,609 clients successfully received the survey. For this analysis, the research team assumed the client population to be the number of clients which were reached by the survey. In total, 3,217 survey responses were returned, including about 22 percent with missing key data responses, leaving 2,516 viable survey responses. Based on the returned survey responses, the research team decided to drop three outliers: two businesses with over 1,000 employees (neither of which created new jobs), and a Start-Up with 2,400 new employees, as neither of the three was deemed representative of the population across all regions, sectors and industries. Based on the survey data, the research team evaluated the changes in employment, the jobs created and retained/saved, the financing obtained, and the gains in term of tax revenues.

The survey elicited information concerning the Florida SBDC counseling clients': e.g., demographic background, business status, business industry, business employment for 2015 and 2016, employment

¹² Survey was distributed to 18,532 SBDC clients (based on the total number of clients served with one hour or more of counseling in 2015-16). See Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

saved, business revenue, business financing, government contracts acquired, customer satisfaction, among others. The Florida SBDC conducted the survey using a third-party contractor.

The FSU CEFA research team did not discuss the accuracy of the translation of the survey raw data nor the reliability of the survey data with the SBDC. The responses revealed insufficient data on the Pre-ventures, although a few Pre-venture clients addressed the survey questionnaire especially the customers' satisfaction questions. The research team thus focused the analyses on established business clients only (Start-Ups and Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs)) of the Florida SBDC.

Survey Measures

The survey data included different types of data: discrete, continuous and categorical. The employment in 2015 and 2016 consisted of full-time and part-time employment, as well as full-time and part-time independent contractors. These were designed to ask the respondents to indicate the number of employed in their business. To calculate the employment for each year, the research team assumed that two part-time employees equaled one full-time employee (ibid for independent contractors).

To assess the quality of Florida SBDCs counseling, four subjective questions were designed. Two questions were used to measure the counselors' levels of knowledge and working relationship. The other two were used to measure clients' satisfaction. For the former two questions, clients were asked to scale knowledge and relationship according to five options: poor, below average, average, above average, and excellent. These options were translated to a scale where poor was equated to 1, and excellent was equated to 5. Hence, scores could be estimated for these attributes. A similar method was used for the satisfaction questions where clients' satisfaction was measured in term of whether the SBDC's counseling was beneficial and whether SBDC is recommended, or recommendable. To acquire an overall service quality assessment, the research team tested the correlation between the counselors' levels of knowledge and working relationship with the clients' satisfaction.

To measure financing, clients were asked a couple of questions including whether the Florida SBDC assisted in securing financing, and if so, to indicate the amount of financing obtained as a result of the Florida SBDC counseling services.

Descriptive Analysis of the Survey Data

Through further examination of the survey data, it was found that 15 percent of the SBDC clients were Preventure clients, and 85 percent were established businesses (see Figure 1). Given the characteristics of the Pre-venture, further data analyses were not possible due to insufficient financial data. The FSU CEFA research team thus focused on established businesses (Start-Ups and Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs)) only. Of these, 55 percent of established businesses were owned by males, and 45 percent were owned by females. Similarly, of the established businesses, 74 percent were owned by whites, while the other 26 percent were owned by other ethnic groups.



Figure 1. Classification of SBDC Survey Respondents: Pre-venture and Established Businesses

By focusing on established businesses only, Figure 2 presents the breakout percentages of the SBDC's clients who received at least one hour or more counseling services, by specific industry sector.



Figure 2. The Industrial Sector Breakouts of the SBDCs Survey Respondents

Established Businesses

The established businesses represented approximately 85 percent of the SBDC's client base. The efforts of the SBDC to log the served clients according to the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes were mostly successful. More than 93 percent of the survey respondents provided a NAICS code associated with their business. The SBDC established business clients were classified into two categories: Start-Ups and Small Medium Enterprises (SME's).

Quality Assessment of Counseling Services

Due to a lack of information relating to the survey data collection methodology, the research team did not statistically test the validity and reliability of the survey sample for potential bias. However, the research team examined the quality of the services offered by the SBDC. This was conducted by testing the correlation between the survey question(s) relating to the clients' opinion on whether the SBDC's counseling services were beneficial, and the evaluation of the service quality of the SBDC's experts. The metrics of service quality assessment were analyzed in terms of the level of knowledge and the working relationship of the SBDC's counselors. The survey revealed that more than 80 percent of the clients gave a score of 4 (out of 5), on a 1 to 5 Likert scale. If "one" was selected, the quality was poor, and if "five" was selected, the quality was excellent. The research team performed a correlation analyses between, and within, industries, which are presented in the following Figures 3 and 4.



Figure 3. Knowledge and Working Relationship Assessment



Figure 4. Whether the SBDC Services were Beneficial and Recommended

Overall, the service quality evaluations revealed that the sample of client respondents were satisfied with the services provided by the SBDC. The same clients would recommend the SBDC services to others. The positive partial correlation between the respondents' satisfaction levels and their assessment of SBDC's service quality, is evidence of best practices provided by the Florida SBDC. The SBDC received a nearly 90 percent favorability rating. As a result of the clients' satisfaction, the service industry sector recommended the SBDC's counseling both within the parent industry (at more than 90 percent) and between peer firms in other industry sectors (at more than 60%).¹³ Next, the retail and manufacturing industries recognized a good working relationship and technical expertise of the SBDC's counselors. Similar to the service industry, the manufacturing industry sectors. The construction and the wholesale industries have only asserted the excellent service quality.

¹³ "Within industry" represents the firm interactions realized inside a specific industry sector. "Between industry" represents the firm interactions which have occurred between firms of different industry sectors.

Financing Obtained

The most challenging issue for SBDC's clients is access to capital, in order to secure financing.¹⁴ In the efforts to fulfill its mission in helping businesses set-up and grow, the Florida SBDC Network assist businesses to face this challenge. Based on the survey data, 90 percent of the established clients received financial preparation assistance from the SBDC between 2015 and 2016. The research team estimated that financing raised on behalf of the SBDC's clients was approximately: \$216 million in SBA loans, \$556 million in other sources of loans (both public and private), and \$2.9 billion in equity financing. Overall, a total of \$3.7 billion in financing was obtained by SBDC's counseling.

Survey Methodology

Pertaining to the survey responses, about 85 percent of the survey data were related to established businesses (SME's and Start-Ups). Pre-venture businesses did not generate revenues during 2015-16, thus the research team was unable to perform further economic analyses. Therefore, all analyses were based on the established businesses (SMEs and Start-Ups). The sample data were categorized in different subgroups of businesses, by:

- Region (one of the ten activity regions of the SBDC);
- Market segment (Start-Up or SME), and;
- Industrial sector category (Retail, Services, Wholesale, Manufacturing, and Construction).

Table 1 shows the absolute survey frequencies by market segment (SME and Start-Up), by industry and by region. The shading shows higher frequencies in tan and lower frequencies in blue. In the total columns and rows, the higher frequencies are shaded in green. The black cells represent "No Data Available". As can be surmised from the table, only a few fields contain sufficient data to obtain a high level of confidence per subset (Industry or Region). As a result of the smaller subsets, the reported region and industry total jobs created were recalibrated, or redistributed, to each cell using a double weighting methodology, across both region and industry sector frequencies. The recalibrated survey results are provided in Table 2 for both years 2015 (to the left) and 2016 (to the right), respectively. Shading is provided showing higher employment numbers in tan, and lower numbers in blue. Relating to the total columns and rows, the higher employment numbers are shaded in green.

¹⁴ Report on Employer Firms, Federal Reserve Banks of Atlanta, New York, Boston, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Richmond, and St. Louis (2015)

| Table 1. Survey F | Frequencies: by | Market Segment, | by Region and | Industry, for | Years 2015- |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| 16 | | | | | |

| SME | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 17 | 85 | 4 | 16 | 20 | 142 |
| FAMU | 9 | 39 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 56 |
| UNF | 29 | 156 | 7 | 31 | 20 | 243 |
| UCF | 28 | 189 | 15 | 47 | 34 | 313 |
| USF | 37 | 135 | 9 | 36 | 26 | 243 |
| IRSC | 8 | 25 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 46 |
| FGCU | 17 | 92 | 5 | 16 | 11 | 141 |
| PBSC | 12 | 38 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 68 |
| BRC | 3 | 50 | 14 | 16 | 6 | 89 |
| FIU | 16 | 99 | 25 | 17 | 8 | 165 |
| Total | 176 | 908 | 83 | 200 | 139 | 1,506 |

| Start-Up | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 11 | 61 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 91 |
| FAMU | 4 | 27 | | 4 | 2 | 37 |
| UNF | 16 | 102 | 4 | 15 | 10 | 147 |
| UCF | 25 | 151 | 4 | 34 | 11 | 225 |
| USF | 20 | 124 | 4 | 18 | 6 | 172 |
| IRSC | 2 | 20 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 31 |
| FGCU | 15 | 59 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 88 |
| PBSC | 10 | 37 | 3 | | 2 | 52 |
| BRC | 5 | 38 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 58 |
| FIU | 10 | 68 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 106 |
| Total | 118 | 687 | 41 | 108 | 53 | 1,007 |

| Total | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 28 | 146 | 8 | 21 | 30 | 233 |
| FAMU | 13 | 66 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 93 |
| UNF | 45 | 258 | 11 | 46 | 30 | 390 |
| UCF | 53 | 340 | 19 | 81 | 45 | 538 |
| USF | 57 | 259 | 13 | 54 | 32 | 415 |
| IRSC | 10 | 45 | 3 | 16 | 3 | 77 |
| FGCU | 32 | 151 | 7 | 24 | 15 | 229 |
| PBSC | 22 | 75 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 120 |
| BRC | 8 | 88 | 17 | 26 | 8 | 147 |
| FIU | 26 | 167 | 41 | 24 | 13 | 271 |
| Total | 294 | 1,595 | 124 | 308 | 192 | 2,513 |

* Data may not add up exactly due to rounding
** Black shaded cells indicates no data
^ Shading shows higher employment numbers in tan, and lower numbers in blue. Relating to the total columns and rows, the higher employment numbers are shaded in green.

Table 2. Estimated Total Employees: by Market Segment, by Region and by Industry, forYears 2015-16

| | | | 201 | 15 | | | | | |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|---|
| SME | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total | SME | Retail | ŝ |
| UWF | 123 | 902 | 114 | 230 | 181 | 1,378 | UWF | 137 | Γ |
| FAMU | 97 | 965 | 64 | 241 | 174 | 546 | FAMU | 110 | |
| UNF | 179 | 854 | 189 | 258 | 227 | 2,247 | UNF | 194 | |
| UCF | 293 | 861 | 328 | 356 | 343 | 3,884 | UCF | 334 | |
| USF | 242 | 876 | 269 | 317 | 295 | 3,304 | USF | 250 | |
| IRSC | 96 | 974 | 61 | 247 | 178 | 448 | IRSC | 108 | |
| FGCU | 126 | 903 | 118 | 233 | 184 | 1,441 | FGCU | 130 | |
| PBSC | 110 | 957 | 88 | 247 | 186 | 1,086 | PBSC | 124 | |
| BRC | 95 | 936 | 69 | 224 | 162 | 664 | BRC | 106 | |
| FIU | 146 | 892 | 146 | 244 | 202 | 1,803 | FIU | 162 | |
| Total | 1,073 | 9,999 | 680 | 2,869 | 2,178 | 16,799 | Total | 1,208 | |

| | 2016 | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|--|--|--|
| SME | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total | | | |
| UWF | 137 | 969 | 125 | 254 | 192 | 1,512 | | | |
| FAMU | 110 | 1,037 | 72 | 268 | 183 | 657 | | | |
| UNF | 194 | 917 | 202 | 281 | 240 | 2,403 | | | |
| UCF | 334 | 932 | 373 | 402 | 384 | 4,426 | | | |
| USF | 250 | 937 | 274 | 334 | 301 | 3,346 | | | |
| IRSC | 108 | 1,046 | 67 | 273 | 185 | 502 | | | |
| FGCU | 130 | 968 | 115 | 248 | 184 | 1,361 | | | |
| PBSC | 124 | 1,029 | 97 | 274 | 195 | 1,219 | | | |
| BRC | 106 | 1,005 | 73 | 247 | 168 | 703 | | | |
| FIU | 162 | 959 | 160 | 269 | 215 | 1,985 | | | |
| Total | 1,208 | 10,741 | 737 | 3,177 | 2,250 | 18,111 | | | |

| Start-Up | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 20 | 186 | 18 | 25 | 20 | 217 |
| FAMU | 16 | 197 | 9 | 22 | 13 | 52 |
| UNF | 28 | 177 | 29 | 32 | 30 | 351 |
| UCF | 49 | 172 | 56 | 53 | 55 | 664 |
| USF | 35 | 175 | 40 | 39 | 40 | 478 |
| IRSC | 17 | 199 | 10 | 24 | 14 | 78 |
| FGCU | 19 | 186 | 16 | 24 | 18 | 188 |
| PBSC | 23 | 195 | 23 | 29 | 24 | 321 |
| BRC | 18 | 192 | 13 | 23 | 15 | 136 |
| FIU | 31 | 186 | 35 | 36 | 35 | 458 |
| Total | 203 | 2,140 | 122 | 292 | 184 | 2,940 |

| Start-Up | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 26 | 250 | 22 | 32 | 25 | 277 |
| FAMU | 21 | 265 | 10 | 29 | 16 | 71 |
| UNF | 35 | 238 | 37 | 41 | 38 | 458 |
| UCF | 79 | 237 | 93 | 85 | 92 | 1,128 |
| USF | 46 | 235 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 627 |
| IRSC | 22 | 267 | 12 | 30 | 18 | 97 |
| FGCU | 25 | 250 | 21 | 31 | 24 | 257 |
| PBSC | 25 | 261 | 21 | 33 | 25 | 280 |
| BRC | 22 | 259 | 15 | 29 | 19 | 167 |
| FIU | 39 | 249 | 43 | 45 | 44 | 573 |
| Total | 260 | 2,919 | 139 | 378 | 237 | 3,933 |

| Total | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|
| UWF | 144 | 1,087 | 132 | 255 | 201 | 1,595 |
| FAMU | 113 | 1,162 | 72 | 263 | 187 | 597 |
| UNF | 207 | 1,030 | 218 | 290 | 256 | 2,598 |
| UCF | 342 | 1,033 | 384 | 409 | 398 | 4,547 |
| USF | 277 | 1,051 | 309 | 357 | 335 | 3,782 |
| IRSC | 113 | 1,172 | 71 | 270 | 192 | 526 |
| FGCU | 145 | 1,089 | 134 | 256 | 202 | 1,628 |
| PBSC | 133 | 1,152 | 111 | 276 | 210 | 1,407 |
| BRC | 113 | 1,128 | 81 | 247 | 177 | 800 |
| FIU | 177 | 1,078 | 181 | 280 | 237 | 2,261 |
| Total | 1,276 | 12,139 | 802 | 3,161 | 2,362 | 19,738 |

| Total | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|
| UWF | 163 | 1,219 | 148 | 286 | 217 | 1,789 |
| FAMU | 130 | 1,302 | 82 | 297 | 199 | 727 |
| UNF | 229 | 1,155 | 239 | 322 | 278 | 2,861 |
| UCF | 413 | 1,168 | 466 | 487 | 475 | 5,554 |
| USF | 296 | 1,173 | 325 | 385 | 352 | 3,972 |
| IRSC | 130 | 1,314 | 78 | 304 | 203 | 599 |
| FGCU | 155 | 1,218 | 136 | 279 | 208 | 1,618 |
| PBSC | 149 | 1,290 | 118 | 307 | 220 | 1,499 |
| BRC | 128 | 1,264 | 88 | 276 | 187 | 869 |
| FIU | 201 | 1,208 | 203 | 315 | 259 | 2,557 |
| Total | 1,468 | 13,659 | 876 | 3,555 | 2,487 | 22,044 |

*Data may not add up exactly due to rounding

^ Shading shows higher employment numbers in tan, and lower numbers in blue. Relating to the total columns and rows, the higher employment numbers are shaded in green.

Similar to the methodology used in the previous HAAS Center report, the research team then compared the employment and associated changes of the sample clients for 2015, with those of 2016, in order to estimate the number of jobs created (i.e. the difference between the 2015 and 2016 data points in Table 2). The jobs created by the established businesses were expressed in relative growths per segment, region and industry. Next, the growth was benchmarked against the specific region and industry sector in Florida. In other words, the rates of employment growth, with the surveyed clients, for each subgroup, were compared with the growth of all businesses under normal conditions, in the region. This was done by comparisons with the Economic Modeling Specialists, Inc. (EMSI)-produced industry jobs reports for 2016. Only the differential growth was attributed to the SBDC assistance. Table 3 provides the EMSI-relative growth of all businesses, per region and Industry, under normal conditions, and used for the comparative analyses, for 2015-16.

| Region | Retail | Services | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction |
|--------|--------|----------|-----------|---------------|--------------|
| UWF | 1.0% | 1.9% | 3.7% | 2.4% | 4.7% |
| FAMU | 0.0% | 3.1% | 1.2% | 2.2% | 5.4% |
| UNF | 1.6% | 3.2% | 3.3% | 1.4% | 6.0% |
| UCF | 1.7% | 3.6% | 1.0% | 3.5% | 7.0% |
| USF | 2.2% | 2.1% | 0.6% | 2.8% | 5.2% |
| IRSC | 1.6% | 2.9% | 3.3% | 1.7% | 7.7% |
| FGCU | 1.6% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 4.8% | 8.9% |
| PBSC | 0.7% | 2.4% | -1.2% | 8.1% | 6.6% |
| BRC | 1.2% | 1.5% | 1.3% | -0.5% | 4.9% |
| FIU | -0.3% | 0.5% | -0.1% | 3.3% | 5.5% |

 Table 3. EMSI Growth Rates by Region and by Industry Sector for Years 2015-16

As stated, the actual survey-derived business growth minus the EMSI-derived expected "normal" growth is defined as the growth attributed to the SBDC-specific activities. This net, or incremental growth, was transposed or scaled to the population level as total jobs created, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Estimated Total Jobs Created: by Market Segment, by Region, and by Industry, **Attributed to SBDC Activities**

| SME | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 90 | 430 | 68 | 155 | 62 | 804 |
| FAMU | 87 | 449 | 53 | 174 | 47 | 810 |
| UNF | 97 | 393 | 83 | 149 | 72 | 793 |
| UCF | 263 | 437 | 295 | 293 | 245 | 1,533 |
| USF | 50 | 385 | 30 | 101 | 21 | 586 |
| IRSC | 78 | 453 | 36 | 172 | 32 | 771 |
| FGCU | 25 | 398 | (23) | 89 | (19) | 469 |
| PBSC | 90 | 452 | 63 | 159 | 50 | 814 |
| BRC | 68 | 447 | 31 | 154 | 32 | 732 |
| FIU | 107 | 440 | 95 | 162 | 78 | 882 |
| Total | 955 | 4,283 | 730 | 1,608 | 620 | 8,195 |

| Start-Up | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 35 | 420 | 27 | 44 | 34 | 560 |
| FAMU | 29 | 445 | 18 | 41 | 23 | 556 |
| UNF | 51 | 397 | 52 | 59 | 55 | 613 |
| UCF | 200 | 422 | 245 | 210 | 235 | 1,312 |
| USF | 66 | 394 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 683 |
| IRSC | 29 | 449 | 10 | 43 | 23 | 554 |
| FGCU | 37 | 419 | 31 | 47 | 37 | 572 |
| PBSC | 15 | 434 | (11) | 32 | 1 | 471 |
| BRC | 29 | 436 | 14 | 40 | 24 | 544 |
| FIU | 51 | 419 | 52 | 59 | 55 | 636 |
| Total | 542 | 4,234 | 513 | 650 | 561 | 6,501 |

| Total | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|
| UWF | 125 | 850 | 95 | 199 | 96 | 1,364 |
| FAMU | 116 | 893 | 70 | 216 | 70 | 1,366 |
| UNF | 148 | 789 | 135 | 208 | 126 | 1,406 |
| UCF | 463 | 860 | 539 | 503 | 481 | 2,845 |
| USF | 116 | 778 | 104 | 175 | 95 | 1,269 |
| IRSC | 108 | 901 | 46 | 215 | 56 | 1,325 |
| FGCU | 62 | 817 | 8 | 136 | 18 | 1,041 |
| PBSC | 105 | 887 | 52 | 191 | 51 | 1,285 |
| BRC | 97 | 883 | 46 | 194 | 56 | 1,276 |
| FIU | 158 | 859 | 147 | 221 | 133 | 1,519 |
| Total | 1,497 | 8,517 | 1,243 | 2,258 | 1,181 | 14,696 |

*Data may not add up exactly due to rounding ^ Shading shows higher employment numbers in tan, and lower numbers in blue. Relating to the total columns and rows, the higher employment numbers are shaded in green.

A similar procedure, as outlined above, was applied to the calculation of retained/saved jobs, due to the SBDC activities. The actual outcomes were recalibrated by a double weighting methodology across both region and industry sector frequencies. The full-time and part-time jobs retained/saved were added and expressed as a ratio (or markup), relative to the survey recalibrated-employment estimates in 2015 (from Table 2). These jobs were not corrected for the EMSI growth rates as they were not part of the employment growth. The markup ratios are shown in Table 5, and the estimated total retained/saved jobs attributed to SBDC activities are provided in Table 6.

 Table 5. Estimated Employment Retained/Saved Ratios: by Market Segment, by Region, and by Industry, for Years 2015-16

| SME | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction |
|------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|
| UWF | 0.24 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
| FAMU | 0.23 | 0.36 | 0.39 | 0.17 | 0.11 |
| UNF | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.52 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| UCF | 0.23 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.20 | 0.18 |
| USF | 0.23 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
| IRSC | 0.25 | 0.37 | 0.43 | 0.18 | 0.13 |
| FGCU | 0.22 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.17 | 0.13 |
| PBSC | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.61 | 0.30 | 0.28 |
| BRC | 0.20 | 0.35 | 0.30 | 0.14 | 0.09 |
| FIU | 0.32 | 0.38 | 0.43 | 0.26 | 0.25 |

| Start-Up | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|
| UWF | 0.65 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.60 | 0.68 |
| FAMU | 2.62 | 1.28 | 5.02 | 3.00 | 4.15 |
| UNF | 0.49 | 0.78 | 0.59 | 0.43 | 0.46 |
| UCF | 0.68 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.66 | 0.71 |
| USF | 0.41 | 0.74 | 0.47 | 0.35 | 0.36 |
| IRSC | 0.57 | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.48 | 0.58 |
| FGCU | 0.47 | 0.79 | 0.59 | 0.39 | 0.42 |
| PBSC | 0.48 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.39 | 0.43 |
| BRC | 0.64 | 0.85 | 0.95 | 0.58 | 0.69 |
| FIU | 0.53 | 0.80 | 0.67 | 0.46 | 0.51 |

*Data may not add up exactly due to rounding

** Shading shows higher averages in tan, and lower averages in blue.

 Table 6. Estimated Total Employment Retained/Saved: by Market Segment, by Region, and by Industry, Attributed to SBDC Activities

| SME | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 30 | 322 | 39 | 44 | 28 | 462 |
| FAMU | 22 | 352 | 25 | 40 | 19 | 457 |
| UNF | 72 | 347 | 98 | 92 | 81 | 690 |
| UCF | 69 | 291 | 95 | 72 | 62 | 587 |
| USF | 55 | 300 | 78 | 60 | 48 | 541 |
| IRSC | 24 | 361 | 26 | 45 | 23 | 479 |
| FGCU | 27 | 316 | 36 | 39 | 24 | 442 |
| PBSC | 41 | 382 | 54 | 74 | 53 | 604 |
| BRC | 19 | 329 | 21 | 32 | 14 | 415 |
| FIU | 46 | 337 | 63 | 64 | 50 | 561 |
| Total | 406 | 3,337 | 535 | 562 | 401 | 5,240 |

| Start-Up | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 13 | 156 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 213 |
| FAMU | 42 | 253 | 43 | 67 | 52 | 457 |
| UNF | 13 | 137 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 195 |
| UCF | 34 | 143 | 46 | 35 | 40 | 296 |
| USF | 15 | 130 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 191 |
| IRSC | 10 | 167 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 206 |
| FGCU | 9 | 147 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 182 |
| PBSC | 11 | 158 | 15 | 11 | 10 | 206 |
| BRC | 11 | 163 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 210 |
| FIU | 16 | 149 | 24 | 17 | 18 | 224 |
| Total | 175 | 1,602 | 211 | 206 | 188 | 2,381 |

| Total | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 43 | 478 | 55 | 59 | 42 | 676 |
| FAMU | 65 | 605 | 68 | 107 | 71 | 915 |
| UNF | 86 | 484 | 115 | 106 | 95 | 885 |
| UCF | 102 | 433 | 141 | 106 | 102 | 884 |
| USF | 69 | 429 | 97 | 74 | 63 | 732 |
| IRSC | 34 | 528 | 35 | 56 | 31 | 685 |
| FGCU | 36 | 463 | 46 | 48 | 31 | 625 |
| PBSC | 53 | 541 | 69 | 85 | 63 | 810 |
| BRC | 30 | 492 | 33 | 45 | 25 | 625 |
| FIU | 63 | 486 | 87 | 81 | 68 | 784 |
| Total | 581 | 4,939 | 745 | 767 | 588 | 7,620 |

* Data may not add up exactly due to rounding

**Shading shows higher averages in tan, and lower averages in blue. Relating to the total columns and rows, the higher averages are shaded in green.

In total, the final estimates for created and retained/saved employment, attributed to SBDC-specific activities, are provided in Table 7.

 Table 7. Estimated Total Created and Retained/Saved Employment: by Market Segment,

 by Region, and by Industry, Attributed to SBDC Activities

| SME | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|
| UWF | 120 | 752 | 107 | 198 | 90 | 1,267 |
| FAMU | 110 | 801 | 77 | 214 | 66 | 1,267 |
| UNF | 169 | 739 | 181 | 241 | 152 | 1,483 |
| UCF | 331 | 728 | 389 | 364 | 307 | 2,120 |
| USF | 105 | 684 | 108 | 161 | 69 | 1,128 |
| IRSC | 103 | 814 | 62 | 217 | 55 | 1,251 |
| FGCU | 52 | 713 | 13 | 128 | 5 | 911 |
| PBSC | 131 | 835 | 116 | 233 | 103 | 1,418 |
| BRC | 87 | 776 | 52 | 186 | 47 | 1,147 |
| FIU | 153 | 778 | 158 | 226 | 128 | 1,443 |
| Total | 1,361 | 7,620 | 1,265 | 2,169 | 1,020 | 13,435 |

| Start-Up | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| UWF | 48 | 575 | 43 | 59 | 47 | 773 |
| FAMU | 71 | 697 | 61 | 108 | 75 | 1,013 |
| UNF | 64 | 534 | 69 | 73 | 68 | 808 |
| UCF | 233 | 565 | 291 | 244 | 275 | 1,608 |
| USF | 81 | 523 | 93 | 88 | 89 | 873 |
| IRSC | 39 | 616 | 19 | 54 | 32 | 760 |
| FGCU | 46 | 566 | 41 | 56 | 44 | 754 |
| PBSC | 26 | 593 | 4 | 43 | 11 | 678 |
| BRC | 40 | 599 | 27 | 54 | 35 | 754 |
| FIU | 67 | 568 | 76 | 76 | 73 | 860 |
| Total | 717 | 5,836 | 724 | 856 | 749 | 8,881 |

| Total | Retail | Service | Wholesale | Manufacturing | Construction | Total |
|-------|--------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|
| UWF | 168 | 1,327 | 150 | 257 | 137 | 2,040 |
| FAMU | 181 | 1,498 | 138 | 322 | 141 | 2,280 |
| UNF | 234 | 1,273 | 250 | 314 | 221 | 2,291 |
| UCF | 565 | 1,293 | 680 | 609 | 582 | 3,729 |
| USF | 186 | 1,208 | 201 | 249 | 158 | 2,001 |
| IRSC | 142 | 1,429 | 82 | 271 | 86 | 2,010 |
| FGCU | 98 | 1,280 | 54 | 184 | 49 | 1,665 |
| PBSC | 158 | 1,427 | 120 | 276 | 114 | 2,096 |
| BRC | 127 | 1,375 | 79 | 240 | 81 | 1,901 |
| FIU | 220 | 1,346 | 234 | 302 | 200 | 2,303 |
| Total | 2,078 | 13,456 | 1,988 | 3,025 | 1,769 | 22,316 |

* Data may not add up exactly due to rounding

**Shading shows higher averages in tan, and lower averages in blue. Relating to the total columns and rows, the higher averages are shaded in green.

The results are further summarized in Tables 8 and 9. The employment was allocated to each one of the five industry sectors (Table 8) in term of jobs created and retained/saved, by industry sector. Next, the employment results, by industry sector and by the corresponding ten SBDC regions, are shown in Table 9. Table 9 also provides further detail of the industry performances by regions.

| 2016 Total Jobs Created and Retained/Saved, by Industry Sector, in Florida | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------|
| Industry | SBDC Employment Growth | Florida Employment Growth | Incremental Growth | Jobs Created | Jobs Retained | Total Jobs |
| Retail | 13.0% | 1.3% | 11.8% | 1,497 | 581 | 2,078 |
| Professional Services | 12.1% | 2.5% | 9.6% | 8,517 | 4,939 | 13,456 |
| Wholesale Trade | 11.3% | 1.5% | 9.8% | 1,243 | 745 | 1,988 |
| Manufacturing | 12.2% | 3.0% | 9.2% | 2,258 | 767 | 3,025 |
| Construction | 8.4% | 6.2% | 2.2% | 1,181 | 588 | 1,769 |
| Total | - | - | - | 14,696 | 7,620 | 22,316 |

Table 8. The Total Jobs Created and Retained/Saved, by Industry Sector, in Florida for 2016

The jobs created and retained/saved reflect the incremental change due to the Florida SBDC-specific activities relating to job growth, exceeding, or not exceeding¹⁵, the overall state standard. As mentioned earlier, the industry sector-specific Florida employment growth rates for 2015-16 were obtained using the EMSI annual reports for the 2015-16 employment in Florida. According to Table 8, the leading industry sector for the SBDC-specific industries is the Retail sector, with nearly 13 percent in jobs growth, in comparison with the 1.3 percent statewide. At the regional level, the retail firms had the highest job growth in six SBDC regions, namely: UWF, FAMU, IRSC, PBSC, BRC, and FIU. Next, both Retail and Services figure prominently relating to job growth. Retail created 1,497 jobs, and retained 581 jobs, due to the counseling services provided by the SBDC. Based on the survey data, and related to jobs created or retained/saved analyses, the top performing region was Region 4: University of Central Florida, with a record number of 2,845 jobs created and 884 jobs retained/saved, as a result of the SBDC activities in 2016. In sum, a total of 14,696 jobs were created and 7,620 retained/saved, for a total direct impact of 22,316 SBDC-related jobs as a result of SBDC-specific activities between 2015 and 2016.

¹⁵ Not exceeding refers to negative job growth

Table 9. Total Jobs Created and Retained/Saved, by Region and Industry, in Florida,for 2015-16

| Region | Industry | SBDC Employment Growth | Florida Employment Growth | Incremental Growth | Jobs Created | Jobs Retained | Total Jobs |
|------------------|---------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------|
| | Retail | 13.30% | 0.95% | 12.34% | 125 | 43 | 168 |
| Destan | Service | 12.12% | 1.95% | 10.17% | 850 | 478 | 1,327 |
| 1: UWF | Wholesale | 11.39% | 3.67% | 7.72% | 95 | 55 | 150 |
| | Manufacturing | 12.17% | 2.36% | 9.82% | 199 | 59 | 257 |
| | Construction | 7.91% | 4.66% | 3.25% | 96 | 42 | 137 |
| Total Reg | ion 1 | - | - | - | 1,364 | 676 | 2,040 |
| | Retail | 15.59% | 0.01% | 15.58% | 116 | 65 | 181 |
| Region | Service | 12.11% | 3.11% | 8.99% | 893 | 605 | 1,498 |
| 2: | Wholesale | 13.36% | 1.19% | 12.17% | 70 | 68 | 138 |
| FAMU | Manufacturing | 12.72% | 2.16% | 10.56% | 216 | 107 | 322 |
| | Construction | 6.49% | 5.40% | 1.09% | 70 | 71 | 141 |
| Total Reg | ion 2 | - | - | - | 1,366 | 915 | 2,280 |
| | Retail | 11.06% | 1.62% | 9.44% | 148 | 86 | 234 |
| | Service | 12.07% | 3.15% | 8.92% | 789 | 484 | 1,273 |
| Region 3: UNF | Wholesale | 9.85% | 3.27% | 6.58% | 135 | 115 | 250 |
| | Manufacturing | 11.08% | 1.38% | 9.70% | 208 | 106 | 314 |
| | Construction | 8.35% | 6.03% | 2.32% | 126 | 95 | 221 |
| Total Reg | ion 3 | - | - | - | 1,406 | 885 | 2,291 |
| | Retail | 20.72% | 1.68% | 19.04% | 463 | 102 | 565 |
| | Service | 13.14% | 3.63% | 9.52% | 860 | 433 | 1,293 |
| Region 4: UCF | Wholesale | 21.40% | 1.02% | 20.39% | 539 | 141 | 680 |
| | Manufacturing | 19.14% | 3.52% | 15.62% | 503 | 106 | 609 |
| | Construction | 19.32% | 7.01% | 12.30% | 481 | 102 | 582 |
| Total Reg | ion 4 | - | - | - | 2,845 | 884 | 3,729 |
| | Retail | 6.68% | 2.21% | 4.47% | 116 | 69 | 186 |
| _ . | Service | 11.52% | 2.13% | 9.39% | 778 | 429 | 1,208 |
| Region 5: USF | Wholesale | 5.19% | 0.55% | 4.64% | 104 | 97 | 201 |
| | Manufacturing | 7.87% | 2.84% | 5.03% | 175 | 74 | 249 |
| | Construction | 5.08% | 5.24% | -0.16% | 95 | 63 | 158 |
| Total Reg | ion 5 | - | - | - | 1,269 | 732 | 2,001 |

Table 9. Total Jobs Created and Retained/Saved: by Region and Industry, in Florida,for 2015-16, Cont.

| Region (R) | Industry | SBDC Employment Growth | Florida Employment Growth | Incremental Growth | Jobs Created | Jobs Retained | Total Jobs |
|-------------------|---------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Retail | 14.59% | 1.60% | 12.98% | 108 | 34 | 142 |
| | Service | 12.07% | 2.93% | 9.14% | 901 | 528 | 1,429 |
| Region 6: IRSC | Wholesale | 10.32% | 3.26% | 7.06% | 46 | 35 | 82 |
| mbe | Manufacturing | 12.30% | 1.70% | 10.60% | 215 | 56 | 271 |
| | Construction | 5.54% | 7.74% | -2.20% | 56 | 31 | 86 |
| Total Region | n 6 | - | - | - | 1,325 | 685 | 2,010 |
| | Retail | 6.72% | 1.63% | 5.09% | 62 | 36 | 98 |
| | Service | 11.87% | 3.44% | 8.42% | 817 | 463 | 1,280 |
| Region 7: FGCU | Wholesale | 1.42% | 3.26% | -1.84% | 8 | 46 | 54 |
| 1000 | Manufacturing | 8.74% | 4.76% | 3.99% | 136 | 48 | 184 |
| | Construction | 2.68% | 8.91% | -6.23% | 18 | 31 | 49 |
| Total Region | n 7 | - | - | - | 1,041 | 625 | 1,665 |
| | Retail | 12.05% | 0.71% | 11.35% | 105 | 53 | 158 |
| | Service | 12.00% | 2.35% | 9.65% | 887 | 541 | 1,427 |
| Region 8: PBSC | Wholesale | 6.88% | -1.17% | 8.05% | 52 | 69 | 120 |
| 1250 | Manufacturing | 11.23% | 8.06% | 3.17% | 191 | 85 | 276 |
| | Construction | 4.66% | 6.61% | -1.95% | 51 | 63 | 114 |
| Total Region | 18 | - | - | - | 1,285 | 810 | 2,096 |
| | Retail | 13.17% | 1.25% | 11.93% | 97 | 30 | 127 |
| . | Service | 12.07% | 1.54% | 10.54% | 883 | 492 | 1,375 |
| Region 9: BRC | Wholesale | 8.77% | 1.35% | 7.43% | 46 | 33 | 79 |
| | Manufacturing | 11.84% | -0.46% | 12.30% | 194 | 45 | 240 |
| | Construction | 5.55% | 4.89% | 0.67% | 56 | 25 | 81 |
| Total Regior | 19 | - | - | - | 1,276 | 625 | 1,901 |
| | Retail | 13.45% | -0.33% | 13.78% | 158 | 63 | 220 |
| D 1 10 | Service | 12.15% | 0.55% | 11.60% | 859 | 486 | 1,346 |
| FIU | Wholesale | 12.31% | -0.14% | 12.45% | 147 | 87 | 234 |
| - | Manufacturing | 12.46% | 3.31% | 9.15% | 221 | 81 | 302 |
| | Construction | 9.31% | 5.53% | 3.78% | 133 | 68 | 200 |
| Total Region | n 10 | - | - | - | 1,519 | 784 | 2,303 |
| Total Statewide | | - | - | - | 14,696 | 7,620 | 22,316 |

Methodological Similarities and Differences

The following bullet points provided a brief description of the similarities and differences of the survey and economic analysis methodology conducted by the FSU CEFA research team.

Similarities with Previous Studies

- Based on using a survey tool and self-reporting;
- Survey results provided by the SBDC;
- Pre-venture businesses and capital and contract dollars were excluded from the analysis;
- Main focus of the analysis was on jobs created and retained/saved;
- Based on job growth differentials;
- Assumption that one PTE equals 0.5 FTE;
- Assumption that respondents who participated in the survey did not significantly differ from the non-respondents;
- Use of data on two market segments, five industry categories, ten regions (i.e. 100 grid points), and;
- The IMPLAN® model was used to estimation of Indirect and Induced impacts.

FSU CEFA Differences/Improvements

- Any negative job growth is kept (not zeroed out) and assumed to be part of the SBDC activity results as well;
- All responses were used (except for three outliers);
- Region, Market segment and Industry sector totals (i.e. 10 region totals x 5 industry sectors x 2 segments, or a total of 30 data categories) were used for the analyses, instead of the individual grid data points (10 regions x 5 industry sectors x 2 segments, or a total of 100 data categories), providing much larger (and robust) sub-sample sizes;
- Individual matrix or grid points were estimated via a double weighted (re)distribution on the job totals;
- Region, Market segment and Industrial sector total employment data were used for further analyses instead of averages, hence retaining additive properties of the economic impact analyses over the market segments, and;

• Retained/Saved jobs as a subset were estimated based on Region, Market segment and Industrial sector totals (also double weighted (re)distributed), and expressed or related to total employment of the previous year, through use of ratios.

Economic Impact Analysis

Economic Impact Analysis Methodology

The total economic impacts of SBDC-related spending were estimated with multipliers generated using a regional economic input-output model for the state of Florida constructed by the IMPLAN® economic impact modeling system (IMPLAN Group, LLC, 2015). IMPLAN® is a widely accepted integrated input-output model, used extensively by state and local government agencies to measure impacts proposed legislative and other program and policy economic impacts across private and public sectors. There are several advantages to using IMPLAN®:

- It is calibrated to local conditions using a relatively large amount of local county level and state of Florida specific data;
- It is based on a strong theoretical foundation, and;
- It uses a well-researched and accepted applied economics impact assessment methodology supported by many years of use across all regions of the U.S.

The economic impact model used for this analysis is developed for the counties of Florida, and includes 536 business sectors (based on the North American Industrial Classification System, or NAICS) and the latest datasets – year 2015 data. IMPLAN®'s principal advantage is that it may be used to estimate direct, indirect and induced economic impacts for any static (point-in-time) economic stimulus. Through the estimation of economic multipliers, the "ripple" effects of supply chain spending for input purchases are captured (indirect effects), and household spending by employees (induced effects) for new final demand to the regional economy, as well as direct spending and employment. Economic multipliers for each business sector and household income category are used to estimate the following economic impacts: economic output or revenue, employment (fulltime and part-time jobs), value added (GRP), labor-income, among other economic impacts.

Economic Impact Model Input Data

The input data used for the economic modeling analysis included the estimated direct jobs created and retained/saved due to SBDC activities for 2016. The total of the direct jobs created and retained were assigned to appropriate industry sectors, or NAICS, codes. These data were further translated into IMPLAN®-specific industry sectors for the economic impact modeling analysis. Initially, there were 20

separate economic models generated; representing the market segments (SME or Start-Up), for each of the ten regions. The economic impact results, in terms of output, employment, labor income and value-added (or GRP) were then compiled and presented in the following Tables.

Economic Impact and Statewide Results

The economic impact results are presented in Table 10 for the market segments statewide impacts, and in Tables 11 and 12 relating to the regional impacts. The summation of the two market segment estimates provided the total economic impacts for the SBDC network in Florida. The statewide economic impact of the SBDC services reflected by 22,316 direct jobs created and retained/saved by the SMEs and Start-Ups, have generated an additional 6,467 indirect jobs and 6,326 induced jobs; for a total of 35,106 jobs. For 2016, the 22,316 direct jobs attributed to both SME's and Start-Ups generated nearly \$1.5 billion in labor income. In addition, they produced more than \$4 billion of output (sales/revenues), and contributed nearly \$2.12 billion in value-added, or Gross Regional Product (GRP), to the Florida economy.

| | Table 10. 2016 Statewide Economic Impact | | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| Impact Type | Output | Employment | Labor Income | GRP/Value Added | |
| | Job | os Created/Retai | ined SMEs | | |
| Direct Effect | \$1,521,245,595 | 13,434 | \$540,721,725 | \$696,757,143 | |
| Indirect Effect | \$538,499,987 | 3,925 | \$191,288,898 | \$300,832,278 | |
| Induced Effect | \$518,490,327 | 3,846 | \$163,917,277 | \$297,131,413 | |
| Total Effect | \$2,578,235,909 | 21,205 | \$895,927,900 | \$1,294,720,834 | |
| | Jobs | Created/Retain | ed Start-Ups | | |
| Direct Effect | \$946,474,262 | 8,879 | \$343,212,687 | \$438,466,451 | |
| Indirect Effect | \$340,583,791 | 2,542 | \$120,713,238 | \$190,539,286 | |
| Induced Effect | \$333,928,146 | 2,480 | \$105,402,688 | \$191,330,790 | |
| Total Effect | \$1,620,986,199 | 13,901 | \$569,328,613 | \$820,336,527 | |
| | Jobs Created/Retained SMEs and Start-Ups | | | | |
| Direct Effect | \$2,467,719,857 | 22,313 | \$883,934,412 | \$1,135,223,594 | |
| Indirect Effect | \$879,083,778 | 6,467 | \$312,002,136 | \$491,371,564 | |
| Induced Effect | \$852,418,473 | 6,326 | \$269,319,965 | \$488,462,203 | |
| Total Effect | \$4,199,222,108 | 35,106 | \$1,465,256,513 | \$2,115,057,361 | |

|--|

*Data may not add up exactly due to rounding

Economic Impact Analysis and Regional Results

The Florida SBDC's are supported at a regional level, by their higher education institution partners. These institutions represent a vital resource to the Florida SBDC network. The Florida SBDC's are divided into 10 regional areas across the state (For more detail, see Appendix B). The Florida SBDC Network Headquarters is located in Escambia County in Region 1 represented by the University of West Florida.



Figure 5. The Florida SBDC Network Regions

As one measure of effectiveness, Figure 6 shows the direct employment (created and retained/saved) by segment (SME and Start-Ups) expressed as a ratio over Regional SBDC total staff (Support Staff plus Professional Staff/ Consultants).¹⁶ It shows that Region 6 (IRSC) is most effective in jobs created and retained/saved, with SMEs and in total. Region 2 (FAMU) is most effective in jobs created and retained/saved, with Start-Ups.



Figure 6. Direct Employment by Market Segment and Total, per Region Staff

¹⁶ Staff numbers per region as provided by the SBDC as of June 2017

The regional economic direct, indirect, and induced impacts of the Florida SBDC network were presented in terms of jobs created and retained/saved within the established business; SMEs and Start-Ups (see Tables 11 and 12). Table 11 depicts the economic impact results for the SME's, and Table 12 represents the economic impact results for the Start-Ups. Relating to the regional economic impacts of the SME's, there was evidence of variations between regions. For example, in Region 4, there were 2,119 direct jobs created or retained/saved, and 3,785 total job impacts (direct, indirect and induced impacts). Other high performing regions, included: Region 3, Region 7, and Region 10, which demonstrated employment growth of 11.5 percent, 10.2, and 10.9 percent, respectively. The patterns in the created and retained/saved jobs data generally reflected the sales and value-added impact results. As mentioned in the methodology narrative, given that the multipliers were different across the various regions, it's expected that the regional economic impacts were also different.

| Region | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | Induced Effect | Total Effect | % 01 |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------|------|
| | | Economic Output | ut (Sales) in US \$ | | |
| Region 1: UWF | \$128,007,560 | \$41,043,285 | \$37,420,595 | \$206,471,440 | 8.0 |
| Region 2: FAMU | \$122,905,419 | \$38,451,429 | \$38,767,394 | \$200,124,242 | 7.7 |
| Region 3: UNF | \$171,021,705 | \$71,230,708 | \$58,530,681 | \$300,783,094 | 11. |
| Region 4: UCF | \$320,198,602 | \$119,577,219 | \$110,934,934 | \$550,710,755 | 21. |
| Region 5: USF | \$134,083,813 | \$47,903,083 | \$64,545,024 | \$246,531,920 | 9.5 |
| Region 6: IRSC | \$116,493,109 | \$36,910,921 | \$33,082,031 | \$186,486,061 | 7.2 |
| Region 7: FGCU | \$67,762,039 | \$22,936,832 | \$22,076,347 | \$112,775,218 | 4.3 |
| Region 8: PBSC | \$172,046,236 | \$57,143,888 | \$50,870,652 | \$280,060,776 | 10. |
| Region 9: BRC | \$107,548,901 | \$39,023,590 | \$43,174,144 | \$189,746,635 | 7.3 |
| Region 10: FIU | \$181,178,211 | \$64,279,032 | \$59,088,525 | \$304,545,768 | 11. |
| | | Emplo | oyment | | |
| Region 1: UWF | 1,267 | 323 | 295 | 1,885 | 8.8 |
| Region 2: FAMU | 1,268 | 328 | 315 | 1,911 | 9.0 |
| Region 3: UNF | 1,482 | 519 | 438 | 2,439 | 11. |
| Region 4: UCF | 2,119 | 857 | 809 | 3,785 | 17. |
| Region 5: USF | 1,127 | 326 | 463 | 1,916 | 9.0 |
| Region 6: IRSC | 1,251 | 309 | 269 | 1,829 | 8.6 |
| Region 7: FGCU | 911 | 172 | 165 | 1,248 | 5.8 |
| Region 8: PBSC | 1,418 | 377 | 357 | 2,152 | 10. |
| Region 9: BRC | 1,148 | 268 | 315 | 1,731 | 8.1 |
| Region 10: FIU | 1,443 | 446 | 420 | 2,309 | 10. |
| | | Labor Inco | ome in US \$ | | |
| Region 1: UWF | \$41,080,221 | \$12,873,131 | \$11,049,798 | \$65,003,150 | 7.2 |
| Region 2: FAMU | \$44,569,395 | \$13,642,749 | \$11,547,982 | \$69,760,126 | 7.7 |
| Region 3: UNF | \$46,692,703 | \$24,328,346 | \$18,125,477 | \$89,146,526 | 9.9 |
| Region 4: UCF | \$93,696,723 | \$42,451,883 | \$35,365,318 | \$171,513,924 | 19. |
| Region 5: USF | \$58,937,991 | \$17,267,159 | \$20,576,110 | \$96,781,260 | 10. |
| Region 6: IRSC | \$42,008,234 | \$11,871,303 | \$9,998,558 | \$63,878,095 | 7.1 |
| Region 7: FGCU | \$29,267,495 | \$8,349,488 | \$7,044,843 | \$44,661,826 | 4.9 |
| Region 8: PBSC | \$71,199,384 | \$22,327,780 | \$17,208,003 | \$110,735,167 | 12. |
| Region 9: BRC | \$42,467,280 | \$14,437,537 | \$13,654,846 | \$70,559,663 | 7.8 |
| Region 10: FIU | \$70,802,299 | \$23,739,522 | \$19,346,342 | \$113,888,163 | 12. |
| | | Value Added (Gros | s Regional Product) | | |
| Region 1: UWF | \$52,754,876 | \$21,311,289 | \$20,773,465 | \$94,839,630 | 7.3 |
| Region 2: FAMU | \$53,242,060 | \$20,560,905 | \$21,814,811 | \$95,617,776 | 7.3 |
| Region 3: UNF | \$69,217,708 | \$38,783,095 | \$32,838,947 | \$140,839,750 | 10. |
| Region 4: UCF | \$147,283,633 | \$67,738,559 | \$64,355,677 | \$279,377,869 | 21. |
| Region 5: USF | \$69,728,813 | \$27,078,185 | \$36,729,212 | \$133,536,210 | 10. |
| Region 6: IRSC | \$50,280,606 | \$18,924,304 | \$18,243,872 | \$87,448,782 | 6.7 |
| Region 7: FGCU | \$30,883,434 | \$12,625,731 | \$12,795,377 | \$56,304,542 | 4.3 |
| Region 8: PBSC | \$86,764,790 | \$34,358,187 | \$30,444,580 | \$151,567,557 | 11. |
| Region 9: BRC | \$48,504,034 | \$22,647,612 | \$24,833,528 | \$95,985,174 | 7.4 |
| Region 10: FIU | \$88,097,189 | \$36,804,411 | \$34,301,944 | \$159,203,544 | 12. |

Table 11. The Economic Impacts of SMES, by SBDC Region, in 2017 Dollars

| Region | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | Induced Effect | Total Effect | % of |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|------|
| | | Economic Outp | out (Sales) in US \$ | | |
| Region 1: UWF | \$66,150,782 | \$21,679,332 | \$20,941,400 | \$108,771,514 | 6.7 |
| Region 2: FAMU | \$96,464,885 | \$31,203,573 | \$29,923,085 | \$157,591,543 | 9.7 |
| Region 3: UNF | \$78,255,551 | \$33,167,894 | \$28,572,218 | \$139,995,663 | 8.6 |
| Region 4: UCF | \$250,485,051 | \$94,497,141 | \$84,713,296 | \$429,695,488 | 26. |
| Region 5: USF | \$111,028,610 | \$41,140,964 | \$50,850,563 | \$203,020,137 | 12. |
| Region 6: IRSC | \$57,584,222 | \$19,509,625 | \$17,209,743 | \$94,303,590 | 5.8 |
| Region 7: FGCU | \$68,518,111 | \$23,262,960 | \$20,045,595 | \$111,826,666 | 6.9 |
| Region 8: PBSC | \$54,667,015 | \$17,659,322 | \$20,109,587 | \$92,435,923 | 5.7 |
| Region 9: BRC | \$65,104,346 | \$23,700,818 | \$27,966,652 | \$116,771,816 | 7.2 |
| Region 10: FIU | \$98,215,689 | \$34,762,162 | \$33,596,007 | \$166,573,858 | 10. |
| | | Empl | loyment | | |
| Region 1: UWF | 772 | 175 | 165 | 1,112 | 8.0 |
| Region 2: FAMU | 1,012 | 269 | 244 | 1,525 | 10. |
| Region 3: UNF | 808 | 246 | 214 | 1,268 | 9.1 |
| Region 4: UCF | 1,608 | 685 | 618 | 2,911 | 20. |
| Region 5: USF | 874 | 286 | 365 | 1,525 | 10. |
| Region 6: IRSC | 760 | 170 | 140 | 1,070 | 7.7 |
| Region 7: FGCU | 753 | 181 | 150 | 1,084 | 7.8 |
| Region 8: PBSC | 677 | 118 | 141 | 936 | 6.7 |
| Region 9: BRC | 755 | 167 | 204 | 1,126 | 8.1 |
| Region 10: FIU | 860 | 245 | 239 | 1,344 | 9.6 |
| | | Labor Inc | come in US \$ | | |
| Region 1: UWF | \$23,362,621 | \$6,837,172 | \$6,182,998 | \$36,382,791 | 6.3 |
| Region 2: FAMU | \$34,022,925 | \$10,907,738 | \$8,912,369 | \$53,843,032 | 9.4 |
| Region 3: UNF | \$23,297,744 | \$11,376,537 | \$8,847,494 | \$43,521,775 | 7.6 |
| Region 4: UCF | \$70,393,155 | \$33,582,060 | \$27,005,724 | \$130,980,939 | 23. |
| Region 5: USF | \$45,282,715 | \$14,759,676 | \$16,210,466 | \$76,252,857 | 13. |
| Region 6: IRSC | \$21,917,383 | \$6,271,504 | \$5,200,481 | \$33,389,368 | 5.8 |
| Region 7: FGCU | \$25,717,863 | \$8,384,485 | \$6,396,914 | \$40,499,262 | 7.1 |
| Region 8: PBSC | \$30,272,790 | \$6,956,171 | \$6,801,504 | \$44,030,465 | 7.7 |
| Region 9: BRC | \$28,095,865 | \$8,796,046 | \$8,845,365 | \$45,737,276 | 8.0 |
| Region 10: FIU | \$40,849,626 | \$12,841,849 | \$10,999,373 | \$64,690,848 | 11. |
| | | Value Added (Gro | ss Regional Product) | | |
| Region 1: UWF | \$28,104,384 | \$11,358,586 | \$11,628,132 | \$51,091,102 | 6.2 |
| Region 2: FAMU | \$41,192,810 | \$16,765,362 | \$16,839,936 | \$74,798,108 | 9.1 |
| Region 3: UNF | \$32,214,606 | \$18,160,886 | \$16,033,358 | \$66,408,850 | 8.1 |
| Region 4: UCF | \$113,293,482 | \$53,569,640 | \$49,145,426 | \$216,008,548 | 26. |
| Region 5: USF | \$56,210,247 | \$23,189,084 | \$28,936,821 | \$108,336,152 | 13. |
| Region 6: IRSC | \$24,893,477 | \$10,035,585 | \$9,495,838 | \$44,424,900 | 5.4 |
| Region 7: FGCU | \$31,934,684 | \$12,828,686 | \$11,616,387 | \$56,379,757 | 6.8 |
| Region 8: PBSC | \$30,249,354 | \$10,779,319 | \$12,038,703 | \$53,067,376 | 6.4 |
| Region 9: BRC | \$31,307,703 | \$13,864,771 | \$16,088,323 | \$61,260,797 | 7.4 |

Table 12. The Economic Impacts of Start-Ups, by SBDC Region, in 2017 Dollars

Summary of Fiscal Impacts for 2016

Lastly, the FSU CEFA research team analyzed the fiscal impacts of the Florida SBDC's. In 2016, the SBDC Network received funding from a variety of sources, including: Federal Government agencies, the state of Florida, other local and regional match investment provided by host partner institutions of higher education, and public and private sector organizations. The 2016 annual cost of the Florida SBDC advising/consulting activities was \$16.6 million. Of that amount, the Florida SBDC was able to leverage \$9.06 million in host partner and state investment as a means to secure \$7.7 million in federal expenditures for further financing of the SBDC's activities. The research team assumed that the total cost of the Florida SBDC network operations was \$9.06 million. The IMPLAN® model was used to estimate the fiscal impacts associated with SBDC's activities. The research team calculated the tax impacts by region for SMEs and Start-Ups across the 10 regions (see Table 13). The tax impacts included the federal, state & local impacts, by the following types: employee compensation, production and import taxes, household taxes, and corporate taxes. The sum of all types of tax collections by region, and market segment, were reported in the following Table. Across the various categories, the data indicate that the SBDC was responsible for generating nearly \$515.2 million in tax revenues (in \$2017). Finally, the cost-effectiveness, (or Return on Investment) was \$57 in taxes generated for every \$1 in state investment.¹⁷

| Region | SMEs | Start-Ups | TOTAL |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Region 1: UWF | \$24,390,500 | \$12,644,969 | \$37,035,469 |
| Region 2: FAMU | \$23,149,437 | \$17,949,848 | \$41,099,285 |
| Region 3: UNF | \$36,312,959 | \$16,601,305 | \$52,914,264 |
| Region 4: UCF | \$70,650,935 | \$54,128,181 | \$124,779,116 |
| Region 5: USF | \$32,798,186 | \$26,555,818 | \$59,354,004 |
| Region 6: IRSC | \$21,558,404 | \$10,496,889 | \$32,055,293 |
| Region 7: FGCU | \$12,621,469 | \$12,872,066 | \$25,493,535 |
| Region 8: PBSC | \$34,575,222 | \$11,449,189 | \$46,024,411 |
| Region 9: BRC | \$22,721,534 | \$14,175,896 | \$36,897,430 |
| Region 10: FIU | \$38,569,381 | \$20,950,827 | \$59,520,208 |
| Total | \$317,348,027 | \$197,824,988 | \$515,173,015 |

Table 13. The SBDC Fiscal (Federal, State & Local) Impacts, in 2017 Dollars

¹⁷ Calculated by: Total taxes generated (\$550 million) /state investment or cost (\$9 million)

Conclusions

The Florida Small Business Development Center (SBDC), over the last 40 years, has been one of the pioneers in assisting small business' creation and development, and providing counseling to small businesses across the state of Florida. The SBDC network has promoted a statewide partnership between Florida's high education institutions and economic development organizations, including pre-venture and established businesses. The SBDC network is dedicated to provide expert counseling to support emerging and established business owners. SBDCs counseling comes in term of management and technical assistance, from the development of the business plan to securing Federal and State Government agencies' funding. The mission of the Florida SBDC network is to enable the overall economic growth and to increase businesses profitability and economic prosperity in Florida.

The Florida SBDC network is engaged in several activities to attain the objectives of its mission. In order to do so, it has split its activities into three major programs, including; the SBDC core program, the procurement and technical assistance program, and the growth acceleration program. Each one of these programs includes specific counseling. In 2016, Florida SBDCs served nearly 18,532 Pre-venture and established small businesses through consulting and training. The direct effects of these counseling services on Florida's economy are 14,696 jobs created and 7,620 jobs retained or saved (at a cost of \$258 per job), hence a total of 22,313 jobs. In addition, there was over \$3.7 billion in capital obtained.

In 2016, approximately 225,676 counseling hours were provided to clients via the SBDC network. Of these, the Pre-venture businesses received 30,148 hours of counseling (13.4% of total hours), and the longer-term established business clients received 195,528 hours of assistance (or 86.4% of total hours) from the SBDC network.

The Florida State University Center for Economic Forecasting and Analysis (FSU CEFA) was contracted in May 2017 to conduct a study on the economic impacts of the Florida SBDC's activities. The impacts included an estimation of jobs creation and retention/saved, and direct, indirect and induced impacts of output or sales/revenues, jobs, income, and value-added (GRP) and jobs. Following a multi-level economic modeling approach consistent with previous economic impact studies conducted for the SBDC, FSU CEFA estimated that about 35,106 jobs were generated, with over \$4 billion in output or sales/revenues, \$1.4 billion in labor income and nearly \$2.12 billion in value added or Gross Regional Product (GRP), as a result of the SBDC's counseling services to small established businesses (SME's and Start-Ups). Based on the survey results, the research team also analyzed whether the SBDC counseling services were perceived as beneficial by the served clients, in terms of a quality assessment. FSU CEFA based its economic methodology on the previous studies conducted by the UWF HAAS Center "Impact of SBDC Business Development Activities on the Florida Economy" and Dr. James J. Chrisman's report on the "Economic Impact of Small Business Development Center Counseling Activities in Florida: 2010-2011", and on other studies conducted for the SBDC's and commissioned by the Association of Small Business Development Centers. Regarding the overall goals of the present report conducted by FSU CEFA, the SBDC Network requested that the study design include a comparative analysis between 2015 and 2016 using the IMPLAN® software's model to estimate the economic impacts including direct, indirect, and induced impacts as a result of the SBDC's consultancy services. FSU CEFA used the survey results to estimate input data metrics for each industry sector, by region in terms of employment, sales, income, and value added. Each of the ten SBDC regions were analyzed using the same data preparation and modeling methodology. The economic impacts of the SBDC in 2015-16 are summarized in the following Table 14, and include the total output or sales/revenues, the total jobs created and retained/saved, total labor income (wages), and the total value added (GRP).

Summary of Economic Impact Results

| Type of Impact* | 2016 Statewide Impact |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| | |
| Employment | 35,106 |
| Labor Income | \$1,465,256,513 |
| Economic Output (Sales) | \$4,199,222,108 |
| Value Added (GRP) | \$2,115,057,361 |

Table 14. Total Economic Impacts of the SBDC, in 2017 Dollars

*The total economic impacts include direct, indirect and induced impacts

References

Ahlstrom, David. "Innovation and growth: How business contributes to society." *The Academy of Management Perspectives* 24.3 (2010): 11-24.

Allen, David N., and Mark L. Weinberg. "State investment in business incubators." *Public Administration Quarterly* (1988): 196-215.

Campbell, Candace, and David N. Allen. "The small business incubator industry: micro-level economic development." *Economic Development Quarterly* 1.2 (1987): 178-191.

Chatterjee, Namrata, and Niladri Das. "Key psychological factors as predictors of entrepreneurial success: A conceptual framework." *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal* 21.1 (2015): 102.

Chrisman, James J., et al. "The impact of SBDC consulting activities." Journal of Small Business Management (pre-1986) 23.000003 (1985): 1.

Chrisman, James J., and W. McMullan. "Static economic theory, empirical evidence, and the evaluation of small business assistance programs." *Journal of Small Business Management* 34.2 (1996): 56.

Chrisman, James J., Jess H. Chua, and Lloyd P. Steier. "The influence of national culture and family involvement on entrepreneurial perceptions and performance at the state level." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 26.4 (2002): 113-131.

Chrisman, James J., and Weds McMullan. "Outsider assistance as a knowledge resource for new venture survival." *Journal of Small Business Management* 42.3 (2004): 229-244.

Chrisman, James J., Elizabeth Gatewood, and Leo B. Donlevy. "A note on the efficiency and effectiveness of outsider assistance programs in rural versus non-rural states." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 26.3 (2002): 67-81.

Chrisman James J. "Economic Impact of Small Business Development Center Counseling Activities in Florida: 2010-2011" report for the Florida Association of Small Business Development Centers

Elstrott, John B., et al. "Procedure for Improving the Evaluation of SBDC Consulting." *Journal of Small Business Management* 25.1 (1987): 67.

Envick, Brooke R. "Achieving Entrepreneurial Success through Passion, Vision & Courage: A Cognitive Model for Developing Entrepreneurial Intelligence." *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal* 20.1 (2014): 55.

Gaskill, LuAnn Ricketts, Howard E. Van Auken, and Ronald A. Manning. "A factor analytic study of the perceived causes of small business failure." *Journal of small business management* 31.4 (1993): 18.

Henrekson, Magnus, and Tino Sanandaji. "Small business activity does not measure entrepreneurship." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111.5 (2014): 1760-1765.

Holcombe, Randall G. "The origins of entrepreneurial opportunities." *The Review of Austrian Economics* 16.1 (2003): 25-43.

Harrington J., M. Niekus, N. James and J. Alvarez. "GAP Analyses: Florida College System Council of Presidents" (2017).

Klein, Natalie. ed. *Litigating International Law Disputes: Weighing the Options*. Cambridge University Press (2014).

Kuntze, Ronald, and Erika Matulich. "Exploring Cognitive Bias in Entrepreneurial Start-Up Failure." *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal* 22.2 (2016): 54.

Kumar, Anil, and Suresh Sihag. "Traits of Entrepreneurs of Small-Scale Sector." *IUP Journal of Entrepreneurship Development* 9.2 (2012): 61.

Kruger, Roy Otis. "The Small Business Development Center program: from a small business growth stage and adult learning perspective." (1991).

Lussier, Robert N., and Sanja Pfeifer. "A cross-national prediction model for business success." *Journal of Small Business Management* 39.3 (2001): 228-239.

Markley, Deborah M., and Kevin T. McNamara. "Local economic and State fiscal impacts of business incubators." *State & Local Government Review* (1996): 17-27.

McMullan, W. Ed, James J. Chrisman, and Karl H. Vesper. "Lessons from successful innovations in entrepreneurial support programming." *Innovation and entrepreneurship in western Canada: From family businesses to multinationals* (2002): 207-223.

Peretti-Watel, Patrick. "Neutralization theory and the denial of risk: Some evidence from cannabis use among French adolescents." *The British Journal of Sociology* 54.1 (2003): 21-42.

Rathmell, James P., et al. "Safeguards to Prevent Neurologic Complications after Epidural Steroid Injections Consensus Opinions from a Multidisciplinary Working Group and National Organizations." *The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists* 122.5 (2015): 974-984.

Schwab, Klaus. "World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report, 2014-2015." (2015).

Sheshinski, Eytan, Robert J. Strom, and William J. Baumol. *Entrepreneurship, innovation, and the growth mechanism of the free-enterprise economies*. Princeton University Press, 2007.

Van Auken, Howard E., and Lynn Neeley. "Evidence of bootstrap financing among small start-up firms." *The Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance* 5.3 (1996): 235.

Von Bergen, C. W., and Martin S. Bressler. "Too much positive thinking hinders entrepreneur success." *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*23.1 (2011): 30.

Wood, William C. "Primary benefits, secondary benefits, and the evaluation of small business assistance programs." *Journal of Small Business Management* 32.3 (1994): 65.

Wood, William C. "Benefit measurement for small business assistance: A further note on research and data collection." *Journal of Small Business Management* 37.1 (1999): 75.

Appendices

Appendix A. Copy of the SBDC Survey Questionnaire



Default Question Block

Thank you for your participation in this important assessment of the Florida Small Business Development Center (SBDC) Network and our services.

As a past or present customer, your complete and accurate response to the following questionnaire will assist us in our continuous effort to enhance our business services. It will also assist us in providing our funding partners with an accurate calculation of their return on investment. It is their investment that allows us to offer you our services at no cost. All individual responses will be kept strictly confidential.

Thanks for your time and support.

Michael W. Myhre, CEO Florida SBDC Network

Was the service you received from the SBDC beneficial?

○ No ○ Yes

Overall, how satisfied were you with the consulting and/or training you received from your local SBDC?

Very Dissatisfied

- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Very Satisfied

How would you rate the knowledge and expertise of your SBDC consultant or trainer?

- O Poor
- Below Average
- Average
- Above Average
- Excellent

How would you describe your overall working relationship with your SBDC consultant?

- O Poor
- Below Average
- O Average
- Above Average
- Excellent

Would you recommend the SBDC to a friend or business associate?

| No |
|-----|
| Yes |

Did you own a business in 2015 and/or 2016?

YES if any of the following occurred:

1) Made sales of a product or service

OR

2) Paid employee(s) or independent contractor(s)

OR

3) Incurred deductable business expenses

No - Never Started

O No - Closed Business

Yes - I Own and Operate an Active Business

What YEAR was the business originally ESTABLISHED? (YYYY)

What business type best describes your business?

- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting
- Mining
- Utilities
- Construction
- Manufacturing
- Wholesale Trade
- Retail Trade
- Transportation and Warehousing
- Information
- Finance and Insurance
- Real Estate and Rental and Leasing
- Professional, Scientific, Technical Services
- Management of Companies and Enterprises
- Administrative and Support
- O Educational Services
- Health Care and Social Assistance
- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
- Accommodation and Food Service

COUNTING WORKING OWNERS,

please estimate how many full-time employees (35 or more hours per week), part-time employees (less than 35 hours per week) and/or independent contractors you employed at the end of each year?

YEAR ENDED 2015 Include working owners, all employees and independent contractors:

If none or you were not in business, please enter "0" (zero) in the appropriate blank(s).

Employee - Full

Employees -Part

Independent Contractors (1099s)

YEAR ENDED 2016

Include working owners, all employees and independent contractors:

If none or you were not in business, please enter "0" (zero) in the appropriate blank(s).

Employee - Full

Employees -Part

Independent Contractors (1099s)

SBDCs help businesses save jobs. As a result of, or in part due to the assistance you received from the SBDC, please estimate the number of JOBS SAVED in 2016.

Jobs Saved - number of jobs that were at possible risk of loss that were saved or retained as a result of SBDC assistance.

NUMBER OF JOBS SAVED OR RETAINED: If none, please enter "0" (zero) in the appropriate blank.

Full-Time Jobs

Part-Time Jobs

Independent Contractors (1099s)

What were your TOTAL GROSS REVENUES (before expenses and taxes) for each of the following years?

TOTAL GROSS REVENUES:

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

2015:

2016:

SBDCs help businesses access capital for business investment. As a result of, or in part due to the assistance you received from the SBDC, please estimate the TOTAL AMOUNT of DEBT FINANCING (loans) or OWNER EQUITY INVESTMENT your business obtained or made in 2016? **BUSINESS LOANS (\$)** -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Value of Commercial Bank Loan(s) Obtained:

Value of SBA Loan(s) Obtained:

OWNER OR OTHER EQUITY INVESTMENTS (\$) -Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter"0" (zero) if none. Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Value of Owner Equity Investment, e.g. cash, credit cards, property:

Value of Other Equity Investment, e.g. venture capital, stock, grant:

SBDCs help businesses acquire government contracts. As a result of, or in part due to the assistance you received from the SBDC, did your consultant assist you in acquiring or securing a GOVERNMENT CONTRACT?

🔿 No

Yes

What was the total number and value of GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS acquired in 2016?

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOD PRIME Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOD

SUB Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

Other FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PRIME Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

Other FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SUB Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

STATE GOVERNMENT PRIME Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

STATE GOVERNMENT SUB Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PRIME Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUB Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

PRIVATE SECTOR Contracts -

Use whole number only; no \$, commas, decimal or negative numbers. Enter "0" (zero) if none.

Number of Contracts (#)

Value of Contracts (\$)

Florida SBDCs, and our network of partners and professionals, strive to provide highquality professional business consulting and training services that have meaningful results for its business clients. Our funding partners that allow us to make our consulting services available at no-cost would like to hear what you have to say about your experience.

Please provide a TESTIMONIAL about <u>the your</u> experience and the impact your SBDC professional had on your business. (Optional)

May the Florida SBDC have your PERMISSION TO USE your testimonial statement in marketing and stakeholder correspondence?



In 2017, what are the TOP THREE issues, challenges or barriers facing your businesses growth?

TOP BUSINESS CHALLENGES

Top Challenge

- Accessing Business Intelligence and Information (professional advisors, research resources, competitive intelligence)
- Accessing Capital or Financing (identifying sources of capital, applying or qualifying for credit)
- Economic Uncertainty (political or economic instability, unknown, uncontrollable economic factors)
- Financial Management (understanding financial statements, financial analysis, cash-flow management)
- Workforce and Human Resources (managing, recruiting, retaining qualified workers)
- Market Growth Development (expanding new or existing markets, doing business internationally or with government)
- Operations Management (process and workflow management)
- Regulations/Taxes (health car reform, changes in taxes/regulation, permits and licenses)
- Strategic Planning (long-term strategy development, exit strategy, succession planning)
- Technology (make the most of technology in your business, utilizing social media)

Second Challenge

- Accessing Business Intelligence and Information (professional advisors, research resources, competitive intelligence)
- Accessing Capital or Financing (identifying sources of capital, applying or qualifying for credit)
- Economic Uncertainty (political or economic instability, unknown, uncontrollable economic factors)
- Financial Management (understanding financial statements, financial analysis, <u>cash-flow</u> management)
- Workforce and Human Resources (managing, recruiting, retaining qualified workers)

- Market Growth Development (expanding new or existing markets, doing business internationally or with government)
- Operations Management (process and workflow management)
- Regulations/Taxes (health car reform, changes in taxes/regulation, permits and licenses)
- Strategic Planning (long-term strategy development, exit strategy, succession planning)
- Technology (make the most of technology in your business, utilizing social media)

Third Challenge

- Accessing Business Intelligence and Information (professional advisors, research resources, competitive intelligence)
- Accessing Capital or Financing (identifying sources of capital, applying or qualifying for credit)
- Economic Uncertainty (political or economic instability, unknown, uncontrollable economic factors)
- Financial Management (understanding financial statements, financial analysis, <u>cash-flow</u> management)
- Workforce and Human Resources (managing, recruiting, retaining qualified workers)
- Market Growth Development (expanding new or existing markets, doing business internationally or with government)
- Operations Management (process and workflow management)
- Regulations/Taxes (health car reform, changes in taxes/regulation, permits and licenses)
- Strategic Planning (long-term strategy development, exit strategy, succession planning)
- Technology (make the most of technology in your business, utilizing social media)

In 2017, do you plan to increase, decrease or maintain the same number of EMPLOYEES?

- Decrease substantially
- Decrease moderately
- Stay the same
- Increase moderately
- Increase substantially

In 2017, do you expect your total SALES REVENUES to increase,

decrease or stay the same?

- Decrease substantially
- O Decrease moderately
- Stay the same
- Increase moderately
- Increase substantially

In 2017, do you expect your INTERNATIONAL SALES REVENUES to increase, decrease or stay the same?

| — | | | |
|------|---------|---------|--------|
| () U | ecrease | substan | tially |

- Decrease moderately
- Stay the same
- Increase moderately
- Increase substantially

Would you like assistance in helping expand your business internationally?

| No |
|-----|
| Yes |

In 2016, was your ability to access the capital you needed harder easier or as expected to aquire?

- More difficult than expected
- Less difficult than expected
- As expected

In 2017, if needed, do you expect to find it harder, easier or about the same to obtain the financing you need to grow or support your business?

Harder

Easier
 About the same

Florida SBDC personnel are strictly prohibited from making a personal investment in client businesses, or soliciting outside paid consultant agreements which may result in personal gain from our customers.

Did your SBDC consultant ask that you contract for <u>personal</u> or professional services with him or her on a fee-for-service basis?

🔿 No

Yes

If "Yes", please explain the offer of assistance made.

Have you ever attended or graduated from a State University in Florida?

🔿 No

Yes

University

- Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU)
- Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU)

- Florida Polytechnic University
- New College of Florida
- University of Florida (UF)
- University of South Florida (USF)
- Florida Atlantic University (FAU)
- Florida International University (FIU)
- Florida State University (FSU)
- O University of Central Florida (UCF)
- University of North Florida (UNF)
- University of West Florida (UWF)

Do you have other suggestions that will assist us to improve our services?

Powered by Qualtrics

| Appendix B: Florida SBDC Network Regional Identification | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------|--|--------|-------------------|-------------|--|
| Number | University/Colleg | Country | | Number | University/Colleg | Country | |
| County | e | County | | County | e | County | |
| 1 | | Escambia | | 37 | | Orange | |
| 2 | | Okaloosa | | 38 | | Brevard | |
| 3 | | Santa Rosa | | 39 | | Seminole | |
| 4 | | Walton | | 40 | U | Volusia | |
| 5 | T | Bay | | 41 | С | Lake | |
| 6 | U W | Jackson | | 42 | F | Osceola | |
| 7 | ۷۷ F | Washingto | | 43 | | Flagler | |
| | Ľ | n | | | | | |
| 8 | | Holmes | | 44 | | Sumter | |
| 9 | | Gulf | | 45 | | Hillsboroug | |
| | | | | | | h | |
| 10 | | Calhoun | | 46 | | Pinellas | |
| 11 | | Leon | | 47 | | Sarasota | |
| 12 | | Gadsden | | 48 | U | Polk | |
| 13 | F | Wakulla | | 49 | S | Pasco | |
| 14 | Α | Franklin | | 50 | F | Manatee | |
| 15 | Μ | Taylor | | 51 | | Hernando | |
| 16 | U | Jefferson | | 52 | | Highlands | |
| 17 | | Madison | | 53 | | Desoto | |
| 18 | | Liberty | | 54 | | Hardee | |
| 19 | | Duval | | 55 | Ι | St. Lucie | |
| 20 | | Marion | | 56 | R | Martin | |
| 21 | | Alachua | | 57 | S | Indian | |
| | | | | | С | River | |
| 22 | | St. Johns | | 58 | | Okeechobee | |
| 23 | | Clay | | 59 | F | Lee | |
| 24 | | Citrus | | 60 | G | Collier | |
| 25 | | Nassau | | 61 | Č | Charlotte | |
| 26 | U | Putnam | | 62 | Ŭ | Hendry | |
| 27 | Ν | Columbia | | 63 | - | Glades | |
| 28 | F | Levy | | 64 | PBSC | Palm Beach | |
| 29 | | Suwannee | | 65 | BRC | Broward | |
| 30 | | Bradford | | 66 | F | Miami-Dade | |
| 31 | | Baker | | 67 | I | Monroe | |
| 32 | | Gilchrist | | | U | | |
| 33 | | Dixie | | | | | |
| 34 | | Hamilton | | | | | |
| 35 | | Union | | | | | |
| 36 | | Lafayette | | | | | |

Appendix B. The Florida SBDC Network List of Regional Identification Codes

| Appendix C: 2016 Regional IMPLAN® Inputs | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|------------------|-------|--|
| | | | Sectorial | IMPLAN® Input ** | | |
| REGION | SECTOR | of which (NAICS 3-digit): | Employment Change* | Created | Saved | |
| | Retail | | | 125 | 43 | |
| Region 1: | | Electronics and Appliance Stores (443) | 24 | | | |
| UWF | Services | | | 850 | 478 | |
| | | Administrative and support services (561) | 2,458 | | | |
| | | Professional and technical services (541) | 30.5 | | | |
| | Wholesales | | | 95 | 55 | |
| | Manufacturing | | | 199 | 59 | |
| | Construction | | | 96 | 42 | |
| | | Construction of buildings (236) | 21.5 | | | |
| Pegion 2. | Retail | | | 116 | 65 | |
| FAMU | Services | | | 893 | 605 | |
| _ | Wholesales | | | 70 | 68 | |
| | Manufacturing | | | 216 | 107 | |
| | Construction | | | /0 | /1 | |
| Region 3: | Retail | | | 148 | 86 | |
| UNF | Services | Administrative and evenent convince (FC1) | | 789 | 484 | |
| | | Administrative and support services (561) | 45.5 | | | |
| | Whalasalas | Food services and drinking places (722) | 29.0 | 125 | 445 | |
| | Monufacturing | | | 100 | 115 | |
| | Construction | | | 126 | 95 | |
| | Retail | | | /63 | | |
| Region 4: | Services | | | 860 | 433 | |
| UCF | OCIVICES | Professional and technical services (541) | 369.5 | 000 | 400 | |
| | | Administrative and support services (561) | 194.5 | | | |
| | | Real estate (531) | 55.5 | | | |
| | Wholesales | | | 539 | 141 | |
| | Manufacturing | | | 503 | 106 | |
| | , i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | Miscellaneous manufacturing (339) | 47.5 | | | |
| | | Plastics and rubber products manufacturing | 29.0 | | | |
| | Construction | | | 481 | 102 | |
| | | Construction of buildings (236) | 61.5 | | | |
| | | Specialty trade contractors (238) | 56.5 | | | |
| Region 5: USF | Retail | | | 116 | 69 | |
| | Services | | | 778 | 429 | |
| | | Administrative and support services (561) | 65 | | | |
| | | Professional and technical services (541) | 64.5 | | | |
| | | Real estate (531) | 45.5 | | | |
| | | Insurance carriers and related activities | -153.5 | | | |
| | Wholesales | | | 104 | 97 | |
| | Manufacturing | Transmentation and increase transmentation is | | 175 | 74 | |
| | | i ransportation equipment manufacturing | 41 | | | |
| | Construction | Chemical manufacturing (325) | 20 | 05 | | |
| 1 | Construction | | | 95 | 63 | |

Appendix C. The Number of Jobs by Industry, by Region for 2016

| | | Heavy and civil engineering construction | -52.5 | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| REGION | SECTOR | Appendix C: 2016 Regional IMPLAN of which (NAICS 3-digit): | Inputs (Cont.) Sectorial Employment | IMPLAN® Input ** | | | |
| | | | Change * | Created | Saved | | |
| De site a Co | Retail | | | 108 | 34 | | |
| IRSC | Services | | | 901 | 528 | | |
| | | Educational services (611) | 37.5 | | | | |
| | Wholesales | | | 46 | 35 | | |
| | Manufacturing | | | 215 | 56 | | |
| | Construction | | | 56 | 31 | | |
| Pogion 7: | Retail | | | 62 | 36 | | |
| FGCU | Services | | | 817 | 463 | | |
| | | Educational services (611) | 22.5 | | | | |
| | | Professional and technical services (541) | -130 | | | | |
| | Wholesales | | <u> </u> | 8 | 46 | | |
| | Manufacturing | | | 136 | 48 | | |
| | Construction | | | 18 | 31 | | |
| Region 8. | Retail | | | 105 | 53 | | |
| PBSC | Services | Desfersional and tasksisal and issue (E44) | 400 F | 887 | 541 | | |
| | | Professional and technical services (541) | 109.5 | | | | |
| | | Ambulatory health care services (621) | 102 | | | | |
| | | Food services and drinking places (722) | -58.5 | | | | |
| | Wholeselee | Real estate (551) | -101 | 5 2 | 60 | | |
| | Manufacturing | | | | 85 | | |
| | Construction | | | 51 | 63 | | |
| | Retail | | | 97 | 30 | | |
| Region 9: BRC | Services | | | 883 | 492 | | |
| | 00111003 | Professional and technical services (541) | -36 | 000 | 452 | | |
| | Wholesales | | 00 | 46 | 33 | | |
| | Manufacturing | | | 194 | 45 | | |
| | j | Chemical manufacturing (325) | 35.5 | | | | |
| | Construction | | | 56 | 25 | | |
| | Retail | | | 158 | 63 | | |
| Region 10. | Services | | | 859 | 486 | | |
| FIU | | Truck transportation (484) | 94 | | | | |
| | | Educational services (611) | 26 | | | | |
| | | Performing arts and spectator sports (711) | 21.5 | | | | |
| | Wholesales | | | 147 | 87 | | |
| | | Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods (424) | 67.5 | | | | |
| | Manufacturing | | | 221 | 81 | | |
| | Construction | | | 133 | 68 | | |
| | ÷ | | | 1/ 696 | 7 620 | | |

*Sectorial Employment Change is based on the raw survey data, region UWF Including the three outliers (e.g., 2,400 employment Start-Up in the Services sector, and the two that had zero created jobs). NAICS codes were selected based on an outside bound of 20 +/- employees.

** IMPLAN® input data is the double weighted redistributed data based on the row-/column-totals.