II. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Organizational Charts

1. Provide organizational charts for the institution, which describe the place of the construction educational unit within the institution's administrative structure.

The University and Provost's organizational charts are presented below and the College of Architecture and Environmental Design's organizational chart is presented on the next page.
College of Architecture and Environmental Design
Administrative / Academic Organization

Diagram showing the organization structure of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, including positions such as Dean, Associate Dean, Department Heads, and various support roles.
2. **Indicate the names of incumbents in positions directly related to the construction unit.**

Christine Theodoropoulos, AIA, PE, Dean, College of Architecture and Environmental Design

K. Richard Zweifel, FSLA, Associate Dean

Vacant - Director of Development

Allen C. Estes, PhD, Department Head, Architectural Engineering

Margot McDonald, Interim Department Head, Architecture

Hemalata C. Dandekar Ph.D., Department Head, City and Regional Planning

Joseph Ragsdale, ASLA FAAR, Department Head, Landscape Architecture

---

**B. Construction Educational Unit Administration**

1. **Administrator of the construction educational unit:**

   Name of incumbent: Allan J. Hauck, Ph.D., CPC

   Title: Department Head

**Describe the administrative procedures of the construction educational unit and, if pertinent, the next higher administrative unit with regard to:**

**a. Curriculum: Development of curriculum objectives; development, implementation and revision of the curriculum; selection of courses to be offered.**

In recognition of faculty governance, the establishment of learning objectives and curriculum development and implementation are the central roles of the departmental faculty as a whole. There is nothing more critical to the success of the department and its graduates than the maintenance of a curriculum that is rigorous, current with professional practice, and compliant with ACCE curriculum requirements. Because of this importance, all departmental faculty participate vigorously in curricular discussions; fundamental changes to course offerings and requirements reflect the input from all faculty members. While faculty committees and the department head expedite the process of curriculum change and course scheduling, all faculty are asked for input into required learning objectives and the curriculum updating process.

This faculty input starts at the regularly scheduled faculty meetings attended by all full-time faculty and many part-time lecturers. Curriculum direction and policy are established at these meetings. The Outcomes Assessment Committee – presently chaired by Prof. Greg Starzyk – is responsible for establishing and maintaining the current list of learning objectives for all CM
courses. The Curriculum Committee—currently chaired by Prof. Philip Barlow—along with other ad hoc committees of interested faculty and the department head, work on details of curriculum proposals resulting from faculty input. All proposals are brought back to the entire faculty for discussion and approval. The department head analyzes all proposals in view of compliance with ACCE’s and Cal Poly’s curriculum requirements and ensures that all standards are met.

Once every two years, the university completes a major curriculum revision cycle in anticipation of publishing the new university catalog. We are currently on the 2013-2015 catalog and major proposals to be implemented with the 2015-2017 catalog will start being considered by departmental committees during the 2013-2014 academic year. These proposals—finalized by the departmental Curriculum Committee and approved by the faculty acting as a committee of the whole—will be submitted to the College of Architecture and Environmental Design Curriculum Committee late in the academic year for approval at the college level. With the dean’s approval, all college proposals are forwarded to the University Academic Senate and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval and implementation during the next catalog cycle.

At the department level, a key consideration is that the curriculum responds to and supports the mission and goals established for the CM Department (see Section I.C.2). In view of the impact on the budget, the selection of courses to be offered each quarter is primarily the responsibility of the department head in consultation with the faculty. Nearly all courses required for graduation and from one to three elective courses representing specific faculty interests are offered every quarter.

To ensure academic integrity and quality, the department has established a system of “course champions” for each class. This faculty member is responsible for maintaining the objectives for a specific course and creating appropriate course content. Regardless of which full-time or part-time instructor is assigned a course for a particular quarter, the “course champion” will provide oversight of the course, support the teaching effort by sharing course material with the assigned instructor, and generally monitor the success of the instruction. While faculty can exercise the academic freedom to accomplish the established course objectives in a variety of ways, no new faculty member should have to start “from scratch” when assigned to teach an existing course. Departmental faculty members generally feel that this is a successful solution to balancing unique teaching styles with the faculty governance responsibilities for curricular content.

b. Faculty: Recruitment and hiring; assignment of teaching loads.

The recruitment and hiring of new faculty must be completed in conformance with mandated state and university personnel policies and procedures. When the need for a new faculty position has been determined, the department head
justifies this need and seeks approval to begin the search process from the Dean of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. When authorized by the dean, the department head appoints the chair and members of a Faculty Search Committee. Working with this Committee and the department head, administrative staff advertises the approved position and all faculty help to identify potential candidates. The Search Committee reviews applicant files and recommends a list of candidates to be interviewed to the department head who then arranges for on-campus visits. After interviews are complete, all faculty provide input to the Search Committee, which makes an appointment recommendation to the department head. The department head then meets with the dean to discuss the Search Committee’s recommendation and make his own formal request for an appointment offer. With the dean’s approval, an offer is made and, if accepted, the formal letter of offer is issued by the dean and signed by the faculty candidate.

The assignment of teaching loads, within the established policies of the university and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA), is the responsibility of the department head. This is done in consultation with individual faculty members to balance teaching loads with the attainment of faculty goals, such as, completion of doctoral coursework, work on research grants, release time for administrative assignments, and conformance with individual faculty interest areas. After considering all of these individual faculty goals and well before the start of any quarter, the department head publishes a draft schedule of teaching assignments for review by faculty members. Following this round of faculty review, the department head makes final adjustments to teaching loads and publishes the final teaching schedule for student planning.

The department Appointment, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (ARPT) document is being rewritten to align with a major rewriting of the College level ARPT document. The current departmental ARPT document – approved in 2004 – has been provided for reference in Appendix C. At the time of the site visit, the Visiting Team will be provided copies of the most recent drafts of both the College and the Department ARPT documents noting the state of their review and approval at that time.

The current, detailed procedures and process for appointments are provided in Part I, Section 2 of the departmental ARPT document in Appendix C. It is not anticipated that this process will be significantly modified during the rewriting that is now taking place.

c. Facilities: Assignment of rooms; class size limits; management of assigned space.

The major portion of the facilities used by the CM department is assigned to us by the college for the exclusive use of the department. Currently, that includes nine labs at around 1900 SF each and individual faculty offices for
each of our faculty members (see the detailed analysis of departmental facilities in Section VI of this self-study). If classrooms cannot be found in any college-controlled spaces, the department also has the option of contacting the central University Scheduling office to be assigned available lecture rooms on campus.

Class size limits are determined by the capacity of the assigned spaces and the pedagogical needs of each course. Most departmental classes are taught in a lab format requiring a smaller class size. Currently, lab and activity courses are limited to 24 students and lecture courses are limited to 32 students. Enrollments larger than this are typically at the discretion of the faculty member assigned to teach the course. Actual enrollments for all courses taught during the most recent academic year are listed in Sections III.J.1 and III.J.2.

The management of the department assigned spaces is primarily left to the department administration. The department determines the arrangement of lab furnishings, the provision of instructional technology, and the use of storage spaces within the labs. University custodial services provide a baseline of cleaning services, but this support has been declining in recent years as state budgets have been reduced. The department has supplemented the university services with student assistants.

In addition to the nine labs, we share the use of the 7000 SF Simpson Strong-Tie Materials Demonstration Lab which is part of the Construction Innovations Center and an 840 SF Concrete Lab in the adjacent Engineering West Building. These facilities are controlled and scheduled at the College level and are available for use by all departments in the College. See Section VI of this self-study for a detailed description of all of the facilities used by the department.

d. Budget: Allocation of funds; determination of salaries; control of expenditures.

There are four sources of funds available to the department.

1) California State General Fund
   The majority of funds come from the California State General Fund. This includes all monies allocated to the university from tuition, fees, and tax dollars and are distributed to each college according to past budget practices and student credit unit (SCU) production.

   Allocation of funds to the university is determined by a complex CSU process. A budget allocation is made by the CSU System’s Chancellor’s Office to the University, which in turn reallocates money to the colleges and divisions within the university. Each dean chooses how to manage his/her College General Funds. Within the College of Architecture and
Environmental Design, funds are then dispersed to the departments. The College of Architecture and Environmental Design Dean and the department heads meet at the beginning of each budget year to discuss available funds to college and department cost centers based upon a variety of factors including, but not limited to, enrollment and faculty work load.

Determination of salaries is according to the limits set by the CSU salary scales (see Section IV.D). The dean, in consultation with the department head, has control over the initial hiring salary within the salary scale of the CSU system. Once a faculty appointment is made, salary increases occur through promotions and periodic salary step increases which are clearly explained in the union contract. Additional salary increases may occur through equity or post-promotion increases if those funds have been negotiated in the current union contract. The current faculty agreement between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the CSU Chancellor’s Office expires on June 30, 2014. Bargaining is now underway for the new faculty contract to replace the present agreement. As salary increases have been absent or minimal during the past six years, this will be a major point of discussion during these bargaining talks.

2) Student Fees

In 2002, students approved adding a mandatory college based fee of $200 per quarter with the assurance that any money thus raised would be allocated to and spent by the department in which the student was enrolled. This fee continues to increase each year to keep pace with inflation. These funds support student and faculty initiatives for equipment and furniture, sponsorship of students to major conferences, salaries for staff and faculty, funding for the college support facilities, and other similar student related expenses that the department incurs. Income from these College Based Fees (CBF) is substantial, totaling $228,232 in the 2012-2013 academic year. Due to a declining budget base available from other State funds, CBF funds have increasingly been spent on supporting the core teaching mission of the department.

Students on the campus also have approved fees to support Instructionally Related Activities (IRA). These funds are handled at the University level and applications are made each year to a university committee that determines the use of the funds for the following academic year. The department consistently has received one or more of these mini-grants per year to support student travel to competitions. In 2012-2013, the department was awarded IRA funding to support student travel to three competitions: $15,500 for ASC Region 6 and 7, $3000 for ABC, and $1,500 for NAHB. As with past years, these funds are supplemented substantially with private support from alumni and corporate supporters.
In 2012, following a supporting vote by the students, a Student Success Fee was implemented. The purpose of the Student Success Fee is to increase access to classes and labs, help fund initiatives to increase graduation rates, help fund targeted and intentional efforts that will improve the graduation and retention rates of all of our students, and to help fund interdisciplinary learn by doing experiences. These funds are controlled at the University level, but every department and college on campus receives a direct allocation of these funds. The use of the funds is directed by the Student Success Fee Allocation Advisory Committee. During the first year of implementation in 2012-2013, the fee was responsible for funding an additional 279 sections of courses generating 10,338 seats in classes that would not have been possible without the fee, added additional supplemental workshops in science and math, created the Academic Success Center, and supported many diversity initiatives. The income from this fee has quickly become an important replacement for State General Funds that have been declining in recent years.

3) Gifts

The need for external support to supplement state-funded instructional activities has grown in the past 15 years. To assist the university with the handling of external finances, the State of California originally organized and chartered under the laws of the State of California a separate, nonprofit corporation. The Cal Poly Corporation (CPC), by law and charter, serves only the university.

Originally, the role of the Cal Poly Corporation in support of the university's educational mission was to operate student support services on campus (food services, etc.), provide fiscal administration for grants and contracts, and to manage private gifts to the University.

In 2006, the Cal Poly Foundation was created with the express purpose of receiving and managing private gifts to the University, thereby allowing the Cal Poly Corporation to focus on support services and research grants. Since the creation of this new entity, the department now deals with both the Corporation and the Foundation when soliciting and administering private funds. If the purpose of the funds is research or if the funds are tied to contract deliverables, they are handled through the Cal Poly Corporation. If the funds are donated and the donor expects nothing in return for the gift, then the funds are managed and distributed by the Cal Poly Foundation.

While the procedures and policies of these two entities vary somewhat because of the core mission of each, there is usually a clear distinction between the uses of funds held by each. Adding the auxiliary organization with the sole purpose of soliciting and managing privately donated funds and endowments has helped to promote private fundraising on this campus.
The department has been a leader in the college and the university in active capital fund raising from the private sector, primarily in support of the new CM building, furnishings for that building, and for travel related to both faculty and student professional development. The department currently maintains 15 Foundation accounts from multiple sources which can be used by the department for the donor designated purposes. The largest of these accounts is the Department Discretionary Fund. Typically, the total running balance in all of the Foundation accounts controlled by the department is about $250,000. The Foundation also manages 14 Endowment accounts in the name of the department which annually feed other Foundation accounts that can be accessed for department needs, primarily the Discretionary Fund and annual scholarships. The current principal balance in all of these endowments is just under $1,000,000. Typically, about $45,000 transfers to the department each year from these endowments.

4) Grants and Sponsored Programs

Cal Poly faculty often are awarded external financial support in the form of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements from agencies in the public and private sectors. The Cal Poly Corporation, via the Sponsored Programs Office, assists the university by entering into these agreements with project sponsors on the university's behalf and by providing post award fiscal and administrative support for the term of the agreement.

The Sponsored Programs Office serves the university in the following ways:

1. Administration of grants and contracts for university research, educational, and other sponsored projects.

2. Administration of Institutes and Centers.

The department currently has five accounts in support of departmental activities, the California Center for Construction Education (CCCE), and various grants awarded to the faculty. Typically, the total running balance in all of the Corporation accounts controlled by the department is about $100,000, but this can vary widely depending upon faculty research activity.

e. Evaluation: Evaluation of program effectiveness.

In February 2007, former President Baker approved the university learning objectives that had been developed in the Academic Senate as stated below.
CAL POLY LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The learning objectives for all students who complete an undergraduate or graduate program at Cal Poly are to:

- Think critically and creatively
- Communicate effectively
- Demonstrate expertise in a scholarly discipline and understand that discipline in relation to the larger world of the arts, sciences, and technology
- Work productively as individuals and in groups
- Use their knowledge and skills to make a positive contribution to society
- Make reasoned decisions based on an understanding of ethics, a respect for diversity, and an awareness of issues relating to sustainability
- Engage in lifelong learning

Institutional level assessment, in combination with program level assessment, provides measures of student attainment of these objectives. The development of effective systems for assessment, at all levels of the university, is ongoing.

Cal Poly as a university is committed to developing a campus wide awareness and enhancement of the quality of our academic programs. The institution is accredited by WASC, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. An internal Academic Program Review process has been established to address the needs of programs in each stage of the assessment development, showcase good program practices, and share the benefits of practices at Cal Poly.

The department, in addition to ongoing reviews of program effectiveness completed by departmental faculty, staff, and the Industry Advisory Committee, has three primary sources of external evaluations: 1) the Departmental Outcomes Assessment Program, 2) the institutional Academic Program Review, and 3) the reaccreditation process of ACCE. While all three of these processes work in concert, they each play their own role in the evaluation of program effectiveness.

The Departmental Outcomes Assessment Program is reviewed in detail in Section IX of this self-study and includes regular input from current students, graduating seniors, alumni, and employers. Departmental program and course outcomes are measured against the stated mission and goals for the department (see Section I.C.2) and the specific learning objectives stated for every course in the curriculum (see Appendix B for all objectives listed in course syllabi). The goal of the Outcomes Assessment Program is to report
regularly on how well the department and the students are achieving the stated goals and objectives.

The University’s Academic Program Review is completed every six years and has been designed to parallel and work in tandem with the accreditation review for those professional programs that are subject to external accreditation. This review – including an internal faculty reviewer – is overseen by the office of the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs who will be available for interview at the time of the ACCE site visit.

Lastly, the department has undergone a thorough evaluation of program effectiveness through the ACCE accreditation process every three to six years since the time of initial accreditation in 1978. The actions taken to address the results of the last reaccreditation visit in 2008 are included in Section IX.D of this self-study.

2. **Describe the administrative procedure of the construction educational unit with regard to how the administration and faculty periodically review operations and curriculum offerings for improvement opportunities through sound experimentation and innovation.**

Departmental faculty and administration participate in one to two day retreats at the beginning and the end of each academic year. In addition, they participate in several faculty meetings each quarter. These meetings typically are the genesis of ideas to improve departmental operations and curriculum offerings. For example, these meetings led to many innovative curriculum changes including the integrated curriculum structure currently in place. More recent discussions in these meetings resulted in the introduction of new approaches to Senior Projects and the refinements to the curriculum being implemented in the current academic year. These refinements included the introduction of “Topics Courses” enabling faculty members to quickly develop and teach courses in their areas of interest and specialization. Previous experimental courses have been taught in construction materials, polymers in construction, LEED, preparation for the California Contractors’ Licensing Exam, Service Learning, and other topic areas. At the college level, the dean has made available the Innovations in Teaching awards to support experimentation in teaching methodologies. These grants have been made to several of our faculty members.

C. Related Programs

1. **Describe intra-campus and multi-campus relationships with allied disciplines.**

The primary interdisciplinary relationships on campus are within the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED). The college is unique with its combination of five departments: Construction Management, Architecture,
Architectural Engineering, Landscape Architecture, and City and Regional Planning. The five department heads, the dean, and the associate dean work extremely well together and jointly promote interdisciplinary and college initiatives.

In addition to key support courses taught by other departments – especially Architectural Engineering – many students from other departments complete the minor in Construction Management. The CM Department co-sponsors an interdisciplinary minor Real Property Development. Interdisciplinary teams of students from the college have participated at the regional ASC competitions in Reno, the DBIA Student Competition at the DBIA Annual Convention, the Solar Decathlon in Washington, DC, and the Bank of America’s Low Income Housing Challenge in San Francisco.

Beyond the college, the CM Department has a good working relationship with other departments which teach support classes for our majors. These departments include Business, BioResource and Agricultural Engineering (which teaches Surveying), English, Math, and Physics.

The department stays in regular contact with the other CM programs in the state located at the following CSU campuses: Chico, Sacramento, Fresno, Northridge, East Bay, Pomona, Long Beach, and San Diego. Faculty meet at regional and national ASC meetings and department heads additionally have collaborated at meetings of the California AGC, the California State Licensing Board, and Construction Employers’ Association.

2. **Describe provisions that have been established for interfacing with related programs and for the interaction of the faculty with those in other disciplines.**

At the administrative level, the college department heads and deans meet biweekly to discuss budget and space considerations, upcoming initiatives, and requirements for interdisciplinary and support courses. Staff and department heads in all five departments interact freely to solve administrative problems as they occur.

At the faculty level, all CM faculty have served on interdisciplinary committees established by the dean’s office and several have taught cross-disciplinary courses with faculty in other departments. They also have served on university-wide and Academic Senate committees. However, these structured interfaces are probably less important than the personal interactions among individual CM faculty and their counterparts in other related departments.

**D. Split (Dual) Campus Program**

This is not applicable to the program at Cal Poly.
E. Construction Educational Unit Budget

1. Indicate the approximate amount and percentage of the sources of recurring operating revenue for the construction educational unit for the prior fiscal year.

**Fig. 1: Construction Educational Unit Operating Revenue for the Prior Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional General Funds</td>
<td>$1,142,139.73</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Based Fees (CBF)</td>
<td>$228,232.42</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Fees (SSF)</td>
<td>$115,732.80</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructionally Related Activities (IRA)</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,506,104.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Indicate the approximate amount and percentage of the expenditures for the construction educational unit for the prior fiscal year.

**Fig. 2: Construction Educational Unit Expenditures for the Prior Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty salaries</td>
<td>$1,290,406.82</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other salaries and wages</td>
<td>$221,729.05</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$167,577.88</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td>$37,668.63</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and Hosting</td>
<td>$26,240.49</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Furniture</td>
<td>$23,028.30</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$9,888.96</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fees and Memberships</td>
<td>$8,312.83</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Dues</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Donations</td>
<td>$2,784.51</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,792,637.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Describe the nature of, the approximate amount, and the use of nonrecurring funds for the preceding year.

The difference between recurring State fund revenue reported in Figure 1 above and expenditures reported in Figure 2 is $286,532.52. Figure 2 reports on all expenditures regardless of the source of funds. As with every fiscal year, the Construction Management Department paid for these additional expenditures with nonrecurring privately donated funds and endowment income. As reported in Section II.B.1.d.3) above, the department holds these funds in several accounts with the Cal Poly Foundation and these accounts are dedicated to the enhancement of student education and faculty development. While State and other recurring funds continue to cover the basic teaching mission of the department, enhancements such as student competitions, classroom equipment, materials, and maintenance of faculty currency would only be possible with the use of these private funds.

For example, in 2012-2013, the approximate breakdown of the major categories of expenditures using these funds was as follows:

- Travel for Faculty - $78,515
- Travel for Students - $71,145
- Salaries (including release time for CCCE Director) - $73,850
- Equipment and Furniture - $16,350
- Events and Hosting - $13,800
- Publications - $8,500
- Supplies and Services - $5,100
- Gifts/Donations - $2,700
- Department Dues - $2,500

Included in this breakdown was the cost to finance student participation in eight different competitions or conferences involving over 150 students – 96 students competing on 12 different teams traveling to the ASC Competitions in Reno alone. Also, about 200 students participated during the year in 11 different field trips and site visits funded in this way. These trips were out of the area and are in addition to field trip participation scheduled during lab meetings. While not covering much of the core teaching mission of the department, these private funds have become a major contributor to student success in the department.

4. Indicate how the budget is sufficient to enable the educational (degree) program to realize its mission and goals.

State budget support for the California State University system and for Cal Poly has declined precipitously over the past six years. State support today is around
$80 million as compared with about $150 million at the beginning of the period. Much of that support has been replaced by increased student tuition and student fees. While overall funding per capita at Cal Poly remains below historical levels, the CAED has fared better than others on a per capita basis due to reductions in College enrollments.

In response, the University and the department have taken many steps to increase efficiencies and decrease total costs. This has resulted in fewer total units being taught, increasing class sizes, and an insistence on full enrollment for any courses being offered. Within these parameters, the department has continued to be able to cover nearly all of the costs for teaching the core curriculum requirements with recurring State dollars. If the department were to rely only on this State funding, however, it would not be able to achieve its stated mission and goals.

The department has benefited from the support of an active network of alumni and industry contacts who value the enhancements to basic education that their support provides. With that additional support to the base budget, the department does well in achieving its mission and goals. It is through the efforts of dedicated faculty and friends that this department continues to be strong and effective. We do not see this level of support declining in the near future.

F. Comparable Educational Unit and Educational (Degree) Program Budgets

Institutional support by the administration of the construction educational unit should accord status within the institution comparable to that of other academic units of similar size and function with regard to finances. Indicate the amount and percentage of operating revenue and expenditures for units on the campus that are comparable to the construction educational unit.

**Fig. 3: Comparable Unit Operating Revenue for the Prior Fiscal Year**
(Includes chart for all comparable units.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount CM</th>
<th>Amount ARCE</th>
<th>Amount ARCH</th>
<th>Amount CRP</th>
<th>Amount LA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional General Funds¹</td>
<td>$1,151,756.78</td>
<td>$1,739,629.57</td>
<td>$3,158,867.80</td>
<td>$1,397,939.92</td>
<td>$991,447.66</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Based Fee (CBF)</td>
<td>$228,232.42</td>
<td>$239,766.64</td>
<td>$445,058.09</td>
<td>$105,641.97</td>
<td>$162,723.54</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Fee (SSF)</td>
<td>$115,732.80</td>
<td>$198,104.04</td>
<td>$314,939.40</td>
<td>$106,030.38</td>
<td>$126,988.50</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue²</td>
<td>$1,495,722.00</td>
<td>$2,177,500.25</td>
<td>$3,918,865.29</td>
<td>$1,609,612.27</td>
<td>$1,281,159.70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25
Comparable unit is defined for this example as other units within the College of Architecture and Environmental Design.

1 Includes nonrecurring State funds.

2 Does not include IRA funds reported in Figure 1.

**Fig. 4: Comparable Unit Expenditures for the Prior Fiscal Year**  
(Includes all State General Fund and College Based Fees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount CM</th>
<th>Amount ARCE</th>
<th>Amount ARCH</th>
<th>Amount CRP</th>
<th>Amount LA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>$1,216,189.16</td>
<td>$1,784,094.00</td>
<td>$3,481,703.00</td>
<td>$1,423,010.00</td>
<td>$1,088,138.00</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>$221,729.05</td>
<td>$298,569.00</td>
<td>$273,596.00</td>
<td>$127,932.00</td>
<td>$104,529.00</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O &amp; E Expenses</td>
<td>$57,803.79</td>
<td>$92,413.00</td>
<td>$41,066.00+</td>
<td>$95,169.00</td>
<td>$26,720.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$1,495,722.00</td>
<td>$2,175,076.00</td>
<td>$3,796,365.00</td>
<td>$1,646,111.00</td>
<td>$1,219,387.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students Enrolled in Fall 2012</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students Enrolled in Fall 2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUs in Fall 2012²</td>
<td>1461.00</td>
<td>2245.70</td>
<td>7167.90</td>
<td>2015.10</td>
<td>2024.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocation of institutional funds and total revenue for comparable units is reported from figures received from the office of the Dean of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. Allocation for the CM Department is reported from internal accounting.

1 Research Funds are not allocated through state funds. Research is funded through grants and activities of the faculty themselves and funds for the CM Department are reported in Section VII.D.1.

2 Includes both undergraduate and graduate Student Credit Units (SCUs) taught.