

NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION



Responses to LCB Questions from Formula Funding Subcommittee Meeting June 25, 2012

NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

BOARD OF REGENTS

Dr. Jason Geddes, Chair
Mr. Kevin J. Page, Vice Chair

Mr. Mark Alden
Mr. Robert Blakely
Dr. Mark W. Doubrava
Mr. James Dean Leavitt
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield

Dr. Andrea Anderson
Mr. Cedric Crear
Mr. Ron Knecht
Mr. Kevin C. Melcher
Mr. Rick Trachok

Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Mr. Scott Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents

OFFICERS OF THE NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor
Nevada System of Higher Education

Dr. Marc Johnson, President
University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. Neal J. Smatresk, President
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Dr. Michael D. Richards, President
College of Southern Nevada

Dr. Mark A. Curtis, President
Great Basin College

Dr. Maria Sheehan, President
Truckee Meadows Community College

Dr. Carol A. Lucey, President
Western Nevada College

Dr. Stephen G. Wells, President
Desert Research Institute

Mr. Bart Patterson, President
Nevada State College

function for the 2011-2013 biennium are the product of institutional decision making based upon funding levels.

Under the NSHE proposed alternative funding formula, support for O&M as well as the other functional categories will be included in dollar per weighted student credit hour and each NSHE institution will determine the appropriate expenditure level for each functional category base upon availability of funds.

(See Appendix D for all worksheets submitted for the response to question 6)

QUESTION 7

Mission Differentiation: *Please provide clarification as to how the alternative funding formula incorporates the concept of mission differentiation, both between tiers as well as among tiers. Additionally, please provide the data which was used in creating the matrix of discipline clusters and weights prepared by the National Center for Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) used as the basis for the weighting, for cost, of student credit hours.*

Each institution within the Nevada System of Higher Education has a different mission statement that has been approved by the Board of Regents. But there is a framework for these mission statements reflective of the type of institutions, a framework that creates three instructional tiers: community colleges, state college, and universities.

For community colleges, its mission includes two key tracks: academic, including transfer to four-year institutions, and technical degrees. The academic courses are supported with the same discipline clusters and weighting as all institutions since all lower division courses are the same within NSHE, regardless of where they are taught. Within the discipline clusters and weighting system, technical and allied health fields are given additional weighting, recognizing the importance and cost of these areas, even at the lower-division level. Remedial courses are included within the student credit hours funded for community colleges. Additionally, the smallest community colleges are given additional funding, recognizing their missions and size. Within the performance funding model, the community colleges are given clear recognition of their missions with the inclusion of outcome measures related to success of remedial students, 1 and 2 year certificates, in addition to degrees, success of transfer students, and additional weight to workforce-recognized certificates granted and low-income graduates, degrees granted in fields related to state economic priorities.

For the state college, its mission is primarily the award of baccalaureate degrees, both through open admission for freshmen and through transfer of community college students. Thus the basic funding is supported by the discipline clusters and weighting for lower and upper division courses. It receives additional weighting of student credit hours for courses in professional degrees, such as education and nursing. Within the performance funding model, Nevada State College also receives recognition of its mission through bachelor's degrees, additional weight for low income graduates, additional weight for graduates in STEM and Allied Health, outcome

measures related to success of remedial students, and successful transfer in by students from community colleges.

The two universities provide educational opportunities from bachelor's to master's to doctoral degrees for students who can meet higher standards for admission that demonstrate a student's readiness for college-level work. Each is designated as a research institution. They receive no funding for remedial courses. They do receive funding for lower and upper division, master's, and doctoral student credit hours. In the proposed NSHE formula, master's and doctoral level courses are weighted significantly higher by discipline than lower division and upper division courses. Additionally, as support for research, all upper division, master's, and doctoral level students credit hours are augmented by ten percent automatically. Within the performance funding model, universities receive recognition of their institutional missions through the outcomes of all degrees at all levels, still with more focus on bachelor's degrees, transfer students, and additional weight for low income graduates and graduates in STEM and health fields. Also, included in the performance pool are sponsored/external research expenditures each year.

The information above describes mission differentiation with the proposed funding model between tiers to recognize mission differentiation. The only recognition of mission differentiation among tiers at present is the small community college factor, although undoubtedly within each tier each institution will benefit differentially from the model due to their mix of courses and students, as well as student success. There is currently discussion of an institution-unique factor to be added to the performance funding model. If this is added, it would give institutions an opportunity within tiers to recognize unique problems and goals.

In the NSHE response to Fiscal Analysis Division request for information dated April 4, 2012, Question 1, the process used by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) to create the matrix of discipline clusters and weights is outlined. It specifies the states which have conducted cost studies, the basic architecture based on the Texas model, and the philosophical underpinnings. The relationships among various academic fields and class levels are remarkably similar across states. Thus, NCHEMS recommended a particular model and values. NSHE reviewed that model and found it to be consistent with the values within the existing formula for fields of study. We do not have particular data beyond the information already provided.

QUESTION 8

Unrolled Weighted Student Credit Hour and Teaching Data: To the extent that data is available, for each institution, please provide the following breakouts (unrolled data) for the year for which the most current data is available.

- a) ***The weighted student credit hours by the discipline clusters and course types which comprise the discipline cluster/course weighting matrix identified as Appendix A of the alternative funding formula proposal.***