Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education

January 2001

Legislative Counsel Bureau
Bulletin No. 01-4

BULLETIN 01-4

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE FUNDING OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN NEVADA

S.B. 443 – 1999 Session

Voting Members

Senator William J. Raggio, Chairman
Senator Dina Titus
Senator Randolph J. Townsend
Assemblyman Bob Beers
Assembly Speaker Joseph E. Dini, Jr.
Assemblyman Richard Perkins
Dr. Jill Derby, Chair, UCCSN Board of Regents
Dixie May, UNR Foundation President
Doug Seastrand, UCCSN Regent
Steve Sisolak, UCCSN Regent
Don Snyder, UNLV Foundation President
Dr. James Richardson, Nevada Faculty Alliance

Non-Voting Members

John P. Comeaux, Director, Department of Administration
Dr. Joseph N. Crowley, President, UNR
Dr. Carol C. Harter, President, UNLV
Dr. Richard Moore, Founding President, Nevada State College

Staff Contacts

Fiscal Analysis Division:
Brian M. Burke, Senior Program Analyst
Mark W. Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Joi Davis, Office Manager
(684-6821)

Legal Division:
Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel
William B.R. Daines, Deputy Legislative Counsel
(684-6830)

Table of Contents

Page

I. Report of the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education in Nevada to the Members of the Legislative Commission…… 1

II. Senate Bill 443 of the 70th Session of the Nevada Legislature 3

III Consultant Report – State Appropriations Comparisons 5

IV. Consultant Report – State Formula Comparisons 15

V. Formula Funding Recommendations 39

VI. Savings Incentives Report 77

VII. Consultant Report – Peer Comparison Data 83

Tables

Table I : State Comparison of Support for Higher Education, Sorted by Appropriation per FTE 7

Table II: State Comparison of Support for Higher Education, Sorted by Net Appropriation and Tuition per FTE 8

Table III: State Comparison of Support for Higher Education, Sorted by Tuition per FTE 9

Table IV: State General Fund Support for Public Higher Education 10

Table V: Comparison of Current Formulas to Committee Recommendations 60

Table VI: Percentage Changes – New Formulas vs. Existing Formulas 66

Table VII: Comparison of Historical vs. Projected Costs Summarized at the Institutional Level (19.5% General Fund Scenario) 67

Table VIII: Comparison of Historical vs. Projected Costs Summarized at the Institutional Level (20.0% General Fund Scenario) 68

Table IX: Estimated Hold Harmless Cost (19.5% G.F. Scenario) 69

Table X: Estimated Hold Harmless Cost (20.0% G.F. Scenario) 70

Table XI: Historical vs Projected Costs with Functional Detail by Institution 71

Appendices

Appendix A: Final Peer Comparison Report 85

Appendix B: Preliminary Peer Comparison Report 103

Appendix C: Comparative Library Data Report 191

SECTION I

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE FUNDING OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

I. Report of the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education to the Members of the Legislative Commission

This report is being submitted in compliance with Senate Bill 443 (S.B. 443) of the 70th session of the Nevada Legislature. S.B. 443 established the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education in Nevada and appropriated $150,000 to conduct the study. The Committee comprised twelve voting members and four non-voting members:

Voting Members

Senator William J. Raggio, Chairman
Senator Dina Titus
Senator Randolph Townsend
Assembly Speaker Joseph Dini
Assemblyman Richard Perkins
Assemblyman Bob Beers
Dr. Jill Derby, Chair, UCCSN Board of Regents
Steve Sisolak, UCCSN Regent
Doug Seastrand, UCCSN Regent
Dixie May, UNR Foundation President
Don Snyder, UNLV Foundation President
Dr. Jim Richardson, Nevada Faculty Alliance

Non-Voting Members

John P. Comeaux, Director, Department of Administration
Dr. Joseph Crowley, President, UNR
Dr. Carol Harter, President, UNLV
Dr. Richard Moore, Founding President, Nevada State College

Higher education funding formulas developed in 1986 served their purpose well. However, as witnessed by the spirited debate during the 1999 legislative session, the 1986 funding methodologies did not adapt well to the explosive growth experienced on several of the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN) campuses. The UCCSN-commissioned equity funding study completed in April 1999, reported funding inequities among the campuses.

The Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education was tasked with comparing the existing method of funding higher education in Nevada with the methods used in other states and determining whether those methods would be appropriate and useful in Nevada. The Committee built upon the results of the previous equity study and redefined the funding formulas necessary to guide UCCSN in the future. The Committee worked to ensure that new formulas are both flexible and equitable to all institutions involved.

The formulas recommended by the Committee focus on the equitable distribution of available funding. During several meetings, it was noted that UCCSN's share of general fund appropriations for the most recent ten (10) biennial legislative sessions ranged from approximately 18 to 20 percent. The Chairman stated that the study was not intended to increase the percentage of general fund appropriations to the UCCSN relative to other state needs. Taken in context, the new funding formulas approved by the Committee have no fiscal impact. However, if fully funded for the 2001-2007 time period, using the new formulas would result in an additional 1.5 to 4.0 percent above the amounts suggested by the 1986 formulas.

The Committee met seven times with the first meeting occurring on October 27, 1999 and the final meeting on June 21, 2000. Much activity occurred in this brief time span. The Committee hired two independent consultants and also assigned a working group of the UCCSN, the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) and Budget Division staff to provide analytical and data gathering support.

The first consultant, Dr. William Pickens, gathered data on higher education funding formulas used by other states. Dr. Pickens provided executive summaries and comprehensive explanations of formula methodologies used in 30 formula states. Using Dr. Pickens' report, with the assistance of the working group, the Committee considered formulas that may be suitable for the State of Nevada. As a secondary task, Dr. Pickens completed and presented a nationwide comparative analysis of state and local appropriations for higher education.

The second consultant, Dr. Larry Leslie, identified a group of peers for the seven UCCSN institutions. Dr. Leslie located comparable institutions from states and local communities whose ability to support public higher education, and whose economies and populations are relatively similar. The primary basis for comparison was similarity in program responsibilities. The Committee accepted the peer comparison report with the understanding the UCCSN institutions could make use of the information in developing their budget requests, and that the Committee could utilize the report where appropriate.

Concurrent with the work of the consultants, the staff working group independently prepared reports of savings incentives plans, comparative library data, and formula modification recommendations. The UCCSN provided the Committee with new formula recommendations using the voluminous materials assembled by the working group and the consultants. The Committee deliberated several times prior to final approval of the formula recommendations.

This report is transmitted to the members of the Legislative Commission prior to the commencement of the 71st session of the Legislature as required by Senate Bill 443, *(Chapter 505, Statutes of Nevada 1999).* The Chairman would like to thank the Committee members, the working group, and the consultants for their efforts in completing this study.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Raggio, Chairman
Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education

SECTION II

SENATE BILL 443 OF THE 70TH

SESSION OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Senate Bill No. 443–Committee on Finance

CHAPTER.....

AN ACT relating to education; creating a committee to study the methods of funding higher education in this state; providing for its organization, powers and duties; making an appropriation; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. 1. The Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education, consisting of 12 voting members and 4 nonvoting members, is hereby created.

2. The following persons shall serve as voting members of the Committee:

(a) Three members of the Senate, appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

(b) Three members of the Assembly, appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly;

(c) Three members of the Board of Regents, appointed by the Chairman of that board; and

(d) Three members appointed by the Governor.

3. The Governor shall appoint the following persons to serve as the nonvoting members of the Committee:

(a) One person who is employed in the Budget Division of the Department of Administration; and

(b) Three persons who are employed by the University and Community College System of Nevada.

4. The Chairman of the Legislative Commission shall designate one of the members as Chairman of the Committee.

5. The Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau shall provide the necessary professional staff and a secretary for the Committee.

6. For each day or portion of a day during which they attend a meeting of the Committee or are otherwise engaged in the business of the Committee:

(a) The voting members of the Committee who are Legislators are entitled to receive the compensation provided for a majority of the members of the Legislature during the first 60 days of the preceding regular session plus the per diem allowance provided for state officers and employees generally and the travel expenses provided pursuant to NRS 218.2207.

(b) The voting members of the Committee who are members of the Board of Regents are entitled to receive travel expenses and a per diem allowance at the rates established in NRS 396.070.

(c) The voting members of the Committee appointed by the Governor are entitled to receive the per diem allowance and travel expenses provided for state officers and employees generally.

Sec. 2. The Committee shall:

1. Compare the existing method of funding higher education in Nevada with the methods used in other states; and
2. Determine whether the other methods would be appropriate and useful in Nevada.

Sec. 3. The Committee may hold public hearings at such times and places as it deems necessary to afford the general public and representatives of governmental agencies and of organizations interested in higher education an opportunity to present relevant information and recommendations.

Sec. 4. The Committee may employ such educational and financial consultants as it deems necessary for this study.

Sec. 5. The Committee may accept and use all gifts and grants which it receives to further its work.

Sec. 6. 1. There is hereby appropriated from the state general fund to the Legislative Commission the sum of $150,000 for the purpose of conducting a study of the funding of higher education as provided in this act.

2. Any remaining balance of the appropriation made by subsection 1 must not be committed for expenditure after December 31, 2000, and reverts to the state general fund as soon as all payments of money committed have been made.

Sec. 7. The Committee shall submit to the Legislative Commission a report of its findings and recommendations for legislation before the commencement of the 71st session of the Legislature.

Sec. 8. This act becomes effective on July 1, 1999, and expires by limitation on January 1, 2001.

~

SECTION III

CONSULTANT REPORT –

STATE APPROPRIATIONS COMPARISONS

III. Consultant Report – State Appropriation Comparison

During several meetings, the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education remarked that the study was not intended to increase general fund appropriations for the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN) relative to other state needs. Rather, it was the goal of the Committee to develop formulas that equitably distribute available funding.

During the October 27, 1999 Committee meeting, it was noted that the UCCSN's share of general fund appropriations for the most recent ten (10) biennial legislative sessions ranged from approximately 18 to 20 percent. A breakdown of the UCCSN's share of general fund appropriations from the 1981-83 biennium through the 1999-2001 biennium is as follows:

1981 – 83:	17.6%
1983 – 85:	18.9%
1985 – 87:	20.1%
1987 – 89:	19.4%
1989 – 91:	19.3%
1991 – 93:	20.0%
1993 – 95:	18.3%
1995 – 97:	18.6%
1997 – 99:	19.7%
1999 – 2001:	19.4%

At the October 27, 1999 meeting, the Committee reviewed information from the UCCSN-commissioned equity funding study, which revealed Nevada provides the 7th highest net appropriations per FTE in the nation in support of public higher education. Furthermore, Nevada ranks 47th in tuition per FTE student. Tables I, II, and III provide state-by-state rankings.

To expand upon these data, the Committee contracted with Dr. William Pickens to provide a state-by-state comparison of percentages of state general fund appropriations allocated to public higher education. The Committee also asked Dr. Pickens to report the amount of local support or other governmental support provided to public institutions of higher education. Dr. Pickens' report is provided in Table IV.

In the footnotes to Table IV, Dr. Pickens provides guidance on how to use and interpret the data. Dr. Pickens notes that Column V (Percent of Total State and Local Tax Revenues to Higher Education), "provides an additional measure of state effort in supporting higher education. Total State General Funds alone, however, is not always an adequate measure of each state's effort to support higher education. This is so because several states use large amounts of local property taxes to fund some government activities which are supported by state general funds in others. For instance, some fund their schools primarily with local revenues and their colleges exclusively with state general funds. Others provide a large proportion of support for their two-year colleges through property taxes. So their state general fund appropriations are considerably lower than other states which do not use this revenue source. Some states rely on high tuition to lower their appropriations while maintaining the expenditure levels of their public institutions."

Dr. Pickens continues, "So, some finance experts use broader measures of state support than simply 'general funds' to produce rankings in support for higher education. The nation's foremost annual report on higher education finance, 'State Profiles of Financing Public Higher Education' published by Research Associates, includes local tax revenue in its state appropriations calculation." Column V, then, "provides another measure of 'state support' beyond 'general funds' by dividing total state and local tax revenues by state and local expenditures for higher education. With this measure, the variation among states in support for higher education diminishes considerably.

Generally, the UCCSN equity data together with the Pickens report reveal that, in Nevada, funding at the state level, for higher education, as a percentage of total appropriations, is strong relative to other states. Likewise, tuition rates are low compared to other states thus enhancing access to Nevada's citizens.

Comparison of Nevada to Other States on Per Student Support of Public Higher Education, FY 1998
Sorted in Descending Order by Appropriation per FTE

Table I

	State	Net Appropriations Per FTE	Net Appropriations and Tuition Per FTE	Tuition Per FTE
1	Alaska	$9,071	$11,297	$2,226
2	Connecticut	$8,380	$12,385	$4,005
3	Massachusetts	$7,235	$10,070	$2,835
4	Hawaii	$6,725	$8,695	$1,970
5	Georgia	$6,607	$8,628	$2,021
6	North Carolina	$6,502	$8,057	$1,555
7	**Nevada**	**$6,346**	**$7,812**	**$1,466**
8	Wyoming	$6,030	$8,208	$2,178
9	Minnesota	$6,003	$8,556	$2,553
10	Maine	$5,893	$9,523	$3,630
11	Rhode Island	$5,689	$10,163	$4,474
12	Missouri	$5,580	$9,340	$3,760
13	New Jersey	$5,458	$8,819	$3,361
14	Idaho	$5,398	$6,860	$1,462
15	Iowa	$5,393	$8,245	$2,852
16	Oklahoma	$5,300	$7,352	$2,052
17	Delaware	$5,219	$12,036	$6,817
18	Utah	$5,209	$7,021	$1,812
19	Indiana	$5,091	$8,418	$3,327
20	Pennsylvania	$5,077	$10,125	$5,048
21	Washington	$5,027	$6,782	$1,755
22	Michigan	$4,994	$9,565	$4,571
23	Florida	$4,935	$6,360	$1,425
24	Arkansas	$4,897	$7,259	$2,362
25	New Mexico	$4,873	$6,354	$1,481
26	Wisconsin	$4,719	$7,292	$2,573
27	North Dakota	$4,597	$6,734	$2,137
28	Texas	$4,553	$6,703	$2,150
29	Tennessee	$4,507	$6,749	$2,242
30	New York	$4,487	$7,139	$2,652
31	Ohio	$4,487	$7,965	$3,478
32	South Dakota	$4,479	$7,850	$3,371
33	Kentucky	$4,478	$6,816	$2,338
34	Illinois	$4,449	$5,949	$1,500
35	Virginia	$4,449	$7,573	$3,124
36	California	$4,319	$5,320	$1,001
37	Nebraska	$4,202	$6,133	$1,931
38	South Carolina	$4,095	$7,161	$3,066
39	Mississippi	$4,083	$6,209	$2,126
40	Maryland	$4,026	$7,370	$3,344
41	Kansas	$4,025	$6,360	$2,335
42	Lousiana	$3,963	$6,436	$2,473
43	Oregon	$3,912	$6,592	$2,680
44	Alabama	$3,783	$6,386	$2,603
45	Colorado	$3,755	$7,096	$3,341
46	Arizona	$3,684	$5,701	$2,017
47	Montana	$3,440	$6,204	$2,764
48	West Virginia	$3,321	$5,967	$2,646
49	New Hampshire	$3,241	$9,716	$6,475
50	Vermont	$3,187	$11,470	$8,283

Comparison of Nevada to Other States on Per Student Support of Public Higher Education, FY 1998
Sorted in Descending Order by Net Appropriation and Tuition per FTE

Table II

	State	Net Appropriations Per FTE	Net Appropriations and Tuition Per FTE	Tuition Per FTE
1	Connecticut	$8,380	$12,385	$4,005
2	Delaware	$5,219	$12,036	$6,817
3	Vermont	$3,187	$11,470	$8,283
4	Alaska	$9,071	$11,297	$2,226
5	Rhode Island	$5,689	$10,163	$4,474
6	Pennsylvania	$5,077	$10,125	$5,048
7	Massachusetts	$7,235	$10,070	$2,835
8	New Hampshire	$3,241	$9,716	$6,475
9	Michigan	$4,994	$9,565	$4,571
10	Maine	$5,893	$9,523	$3,630
11	Missouri	$5,580	$9,340	$3,760
12	New Jersey	$5,458	$8,819	$3,361
13	Hawaii	$6,725	$8,695	$1,970
14	Georgia	$6,607	$8,628	$2,021
15	Minnesota	$6,003	$8,556	$2,553
16	Indiana	$5,091	$8,418	$3,327
17	Iowa	$5,393	$8,245	$2,852
18	Wyoming	$6,030	$8,208	$2,178
19	North Carolina	$6,502	$8,057	$1,555
20	Ohio	$4,487	$7,965	$3,478
21	South Dakota	$4,479	$7,850	$3,371
22	**Nevada**	**$6,346**	**$7,812**	**$1,466**
23	Virginia	$4,449	$7,573	$3,124
24	Maryland	$4,026	$7,370	$3,344
25	Oklahoma	$5,300	$7,352	$2,052
26	Wisconsin	$4,719	$7,292	$2,573
27	Arkansas	$4,897	$7,259	$2,362
28	South Carolina	$4,095	$7,161	$3,066
29	New York	$4,487	$7,139	$2,652
30	Colorado	$3,755	$7,096	$3,341
31	Utah	$5,209	$7,021	$1,812
32	Idaho	$5,398	$6,860	$1,462
33	Kentucky	$4,478	$6,816	$2,338
34	Washington	$5,027	$6,782	$1,755
35	Tennessee	$4,507	$6,749	$2,242
36	North Dakota	$4,597	$6,734	$2,137
37	Texas	$4,553	$6,703	$2,150
38	Oregon	$3,912	$6,592	$2,680
39	Lousiana	$3,963	$6,436	$2,473
40	Alabama	$3,783	$6,386	$2,603
41	Florida	$4,935	$6,360	$1,425
42	Kansas	$4,025	$6,360	$2,335
43	New Mexico	$4,873	$6,354	$1,481
44	Mississippi	$4,083	$6,209	$2,126
45	Montana	$3,440	$6,204	$2,764
46	Nebraska	$4,202	$6,133	$1,931
47	West Virginia	$3,321	$5,967	$2,646
48	Illinois	$4,449	$5,949	$1,500
49	Arizona	$3,684	$5,701	$2,017
50	California	$4,319	$5,320	$1,001

Comparison of Nevada to Other States on Per Student Support of Public Higher Education, FY 1998
Sorted in Descending Order by Tuition per FTE

Table III

	State	Net Appropriations Per FTE	Net Appropriations and Tuition Per FTE	Tuition Per FTE
1	Vermont	$3,187	$11,470	$8,283
2	Delaware	$5,219	$12,036	$6,817
3	New Hampshire	$3,241	$9,716	$6,475
4	Pennsylvania	$5,077	$10,125	$5,048
5	Michigan	$4,994	$9,565	$4,571
6	Rhode Island	$5,689	$10,163	$4,474
7	Connecticut	$8,380	$12,385	$4,005
8	Missouri	$5,580	$9,340	$3,760
9	Maine	$5,893	$9,523	$3,630
10	Ohio	$4,487	$7,965	$3,478
11	South Dakota	$4,479	$7,850	$3,371
12	New Jersey	$5,458	$8,819	$3,361
13	Maryland	$4,026	$7,370	$3,344
14	Colorado	$3,755	$7,096	$3,341
15	Indiana	$5,091	$8,418	$3,327
16	Virginia	$4,449	$7,573	$3,124
17	South Carolina	$4,095	$7,161	$3,066
18	Iowa	$5,393	$8,245	$2,852
19	Massachusetts	$7,235	$10,070	$2,835
20	Montana	$3,440	$6,204	$2,764
21	Oregon	$3,912	$6,592	$2,680
22	New York	$4,487	$7,139	$2,652
23	West Virginia	$3,321	$5,967	$2,646
24	Alabama	$3,783	$6,386	$2,603
25	Wisconsin	$4,719	$7,292	$2,573
26	Minnesota	$6,003	$8,556	$2,553
27	Lousiana	$3,963	$6,436	$2,473
28	Arkansas	$4,897	$7,259	$2,362
29	Kentucky	$4,478	$6,816	$2,338
30	Kansas	$4,025	$6,360	$2,335
31	Tennessee	$4,507	$6,749	$2,242
32	Alaska	$9,071	$11,297	$2,226
33	Wyoming	$6,030	$8,208	$2,178
34	Texas	$4,553	$6,703	$2,150
35	North Dakota	$4,597	$6,734	$2,137
36	Mississippi	$4,083	$6,209	$2,126
37	Oklahoma	$5,300	$7,352	$2,052
38	Georgia	$6,607	$8,628	$2,021
39	Arizona	$3,684	$5,701	$2,017
40	Hawaii	$6,725	$8,695	$1,970
41	Nebraska	$4,202	$6,133	$1,931
42	Utah	$5,209	$7,021	$1,812
43	Washington	$5,027	$6,782	$1,755
44	North Carolina	$6,502	$8,057	$1,555
45	Illinois	$4,449	$5,949	$1,500
46	New Mexico	$4,873	$6,354	$1,481
47	**Nevada**	**$6,346**	**$7,812**	**$1,466**
48	Idaho	$5,398	$6,860	$1,462
49	Florida	$4,935	$6,360	$1,425
50	California	$4,319	$5,320	$1,001

STATE GENERAL FUND SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Revised Following Committee Hearing of January 27, 2000

Compiled by William Pickens

Consultant for the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education

Nevada State Legislature

See Notes on Sources and Explanations of Information Within Each Column

State	I. Total State General Fund Expenditures Reported by NASBO/NGA 1997-98	II. State General Fund Appropriations to Public Higher Education Reported by NASBO/NGA 1997-98	III. Percent of State General Fund Appropriations to Public Higher Ed. NASBO/NGA 1997-98	IV. Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education Reported by ISU "Grapevine" 1997-98	V. Percent of Total State & Local Tax Revenues to Higher Ed. Reported in State Profiles 1997-98	VI. Local Government Appropriations for Higher Ed. Reported by "Grapevine" 1998-99
Alabama	$4,695,000,000	$979,000,000	20.9%	$976,904,000	7.9%	$11,003,000
Alaska	$2,298,000,000	$173,000,000	7.5%	$168,614,000	5.6%	$0
Arizona	$5,275,000,000	$815,000,000	15.5%	$680,909,000	7.7%	$263,000,000
Arkansas	$2,841,000,000	$451,000,000	15.9%	$516,675,000	7.6%	$0
California	$53,344,000,000	$7,332,000,000	13.7%	$6,325,119,000	8.4%	$1,448,744,000
Colorado	$4,728,000,000	$816,000,000	17.3%	$652,263,000	5.3%	$21,936,000
Connecticut	$9,650,000,000	$459,000,000	4.8%	$581,906,000	3.5%	$0
Delaware	$1,900,000,000	$175,000,000	9.2%	$155,128,000	6.6%	$0
Florida	$17,031,000,000	$2,598,000,000	15.3%	$2,285,868,000	5.5%	$0
Georgia	$11,151,000,000	$1,729,000,000	15.5%	$1,383,858,000	8.0%	$0
Hawaii	$3,214,000,000	$353,000,000	11.0%	$351,630,000	5.3%	$0
Idaho	$1,447,000,000	$227,000,000	15.7%	$248,249,000	8.0%	$9,876,000
Illinois	$14,496,000,000	$2,068,000,000	14.3%	$2,248,187,000	5.9%	$477,200,000
Indiana	$6,498,000,000	$1,240,000,000	19.1%	$1,091,732,000	6.0%	$0
Iowa	$4,378,000,000	$822,000,000	18.8%	$748,502,000	7.8%	$27,285,000
Kansas	$3,801,000,000	$579,000,000	15.2%	$566,353,000	7.7%	$130,922,000
Kentucky	$5,617,000,000	$807,000,000	14.4%	$768,008,000	5.4%	$0
Louisiana	$5,572,000,000	$835,000,000	15.0%	$722,389,000	6.2%	$0
Maine	$1,898,000,000	$175,000,000	9.2%	$186,112,000	5.1%	$0
Maryland	$7,878,000,000	$877,000,000	11.1%	$877,412,000	5.0%	$0
Massachusetts	$14,256,000,000	$897,000,000	6.3%	$910,745,000	4.0%	$0
Michigan	$8,648,000,000	$1,864,000,000	21.6%	$1,827,908,000	7.5%	$305,000,000
Minnesota	$10,392,000,000	$1,644,000,000	15.8%	$1,180,519,000	6.0%	$0
Mississippi	$2,844,000,000	$558,000,000	19.6%	$728,174,000	8.3%	$0
Missouri	$6,657,000,000	$758,000,000	11.4%	$840,938,000	5.5%	$80,228,000
Montana	$1,021,000,000	$114,000,000	11.2%	$127,135,000	5.8%	$16,758,000
Nebraska	$1,932,000,000	$431,000,000	22.3%	$415,099,000	7.4%	$49,684,000
Nevada*	$1,425,815,932	$291,678,025	20.5%	$291,721,000	5.4%	$0
New Hampshire	$902,000,000	$81,000,000	9.0%	$88,813,000	3.3%	$0
New Jersey	$16,604,000,000	$1,430,000,000	8.6%	$1,387,728,000	4.0%	$160,000,000
New Mexico	$2,997,000,000	$494,000,000	16.5%	$486,159,000	9.4%	$45,155,000

State	I. Total State General Fund Expenditures Reported by NASBO/NGA 1997-98	II. State General Fund Appropriations to Public Higher Education Reported by NASBO/NGA 1997-98	III. Percent of State General Fund Appropriations to Public Higher Ed. NASBO/NGA 1997-98	IV. Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education Reported by ISU "Grapevine" 1997-98	V. Percent of Total State & Local Tax Revenues to Higher Ed. Reported in State Profiles 1997-98	VI. Local Government Appropriations for Higher Ed. Reported by "Grapevine" 1998-99
New York	$31,444,000,000	$2,479,000,000	7.9%	$2,851,604,000	3.0%	$291,180,000
North Carolina	$11,436,000,000	$2,191,000,000	19.2%	$2,007,092,000	9.0%	$102,766,000
North Dakota	$709,000,000	$147,000,000	20.7%	$173,107,000	8.6%	$0
Ohio	$17,087,000,000	$2,209,000,000	12.9%	$1,870,934,000	5.0%	$77,248,000
Oklahoma	$4,087,000,000	$784,000,000	19.2%	$666,024,000	8.7%	$22,128,000
Oregon	$4,193,000,000	$549,000,000	13.1%	$555,334,000	6.0%	$76,042,000
Pennsylvania	$17,230,000,000	$1,573,000,000	9.1%	$1,714,868,000	4.5%	$87,144,000
Rhode Island	$1,771,000,000	$152,000,000	8.6%	$132,545,000	4.9%	$0
South Carolina	$4,969,000,000	$703,000,000	14.1%	$744,495,000	7.0%	$26,745,000
South Dakota	$700,000,000	$112,000,000	16.0%	$120,649,000	5.7%	$0
Tennessee	$6,203,000,000	$911,000,000	14.7%	$909,845,000	7.1%	$0
Texas	$26,616,000,000	$4,860,000,000	18.3%	$3,558,936,000	7.5%	$384,000,000
Utah	$3,042,000,000	$479,000,000	15.7%	$469,938,000	8.7%	$0
Vermont	$733,000,000	$56,000,000	7.6%	$56,992,000	3.1%	$0
Virginia	$8,504,000,000	$1,174,000,000	13.8%	$1,152,783,000	5.7%	$4,200,000
Washington	$9,268,000,000	$1,072,000,000	11.6%	$1,108,246,000	5.7%	$0
West Virginia	$2,014,000,000	$373,000,000	18.5%	$352,763,000	5.1%	$0
Wisconsin	$9,695,000,000	$1,076,000,000	11.1%	$1,001,525,000	6.6%	$327,163,000
Wyoming	$518,000,000	$130,000,000	25.1%	$135,034,000	11.8%	$14,604,000

*The NASBO/NGA report does not contain information from Nevada for 1997-98. The state general fund appropriations and support for higher education were obtained from staff in the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

NOTES ON SOURCES

"State General Fund appropriations" is an unusual measure for state finance data. As a result, there is no universally accepted, national data base for state "general fund appropriations" which is timely, accurate, and uniformly consistent for each state. The best sources for state-by-state expenditure information are the Council of State Governments (CSG), *Book of the States*, 1998-99 edition (Lexington, Kentucky) 1998, and the National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO) expenditure report, which is compiled annually from a voluntary survey.

This table uses the NASBO data for state funds rather than the CSG *Book of the States* since NASBO specifically identifies "state general funds" as a separate category. NASBO also identifies "state general funds" for higher education as one of the six components of total state general fund expenditures.
In addition to the NASBO data, this table includes data from two other sources which are devoted exclusively to higher education.

The first is from the "Grapevine" reports, a publication of Illinois State University which, for forty years, has provided information on state appropriations for higher education, including tax-supported appropriations for universities, colleges, community colleges, and state higher education agencies. "Grapevine" provides information only on general fund appropriations for annual operating expenses (it excludes capital outlay projects, debt service, federal sources, student fees, auxiliary enterprises and other non-tax sources). "Grapevine" includes sums appropriated for state scholarships or other state-supported student financial aid and appropriations directed to private institutions.

The second is from Research Associates of Washington DC, *State Profiles: Financing Public Higher Education Trend Data* (21st edition, September 1998). This database is used primarily for analytical comparisons among the states, with special attention to the interrelationships of the fundamental factors governing the financing of public higher education in each state and interstate comparisons and trend analysis. The state appropriations information includes only sums appropriated for current operating expenses at state public institutions (*State Profiles* excludes sums to private institutions, tuition or student fees, or appropriations for capital outlay and debt retirement). It includes appropriations for student financial aid grants and all activities and support elements of higher education including non-credit instruction, medical schools and centers and teaching hospitals, research institutes and laboratories, agricultural experiment stations, cooperative extension service, public television, inter-collegiate athletics, centrally administered system support programs, board of regents, coordinating commissions, fringe benefits, etc.

For local appropriations to higher education, this table relies on data publishes in the annual survey conducted by the School of Education at Illinois State University, which publishes "The Grapevine" (available on the website www.coe.ilstu.edu/grapevine/table8.html). A more comprehensive measure of all local support for higher education, including appropriations, contracts, grants, etc. appears in National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics, 1998. Washington: US Department of Education, 1999.

NOTES ON THE DATA IN EACH COLUMN OF THIS TABLE

I. Total State General Fund Expenditures come from "The 1998 State Expenditure Report, published by the National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO), June 1999, page 6. This is the most recent edition of The Fiscal Survey of the States, a report published jointly by NASBO and the National Governor's Association (NGA). The most recent year for actual numbers is Fiscal Year 1998. The survey presents aggregate and individual data on each state's general fund receipts, expenditures, and balances. NASBO defines the "General Fund" as "the predominant fund for financing a state's operations. Revenues are received from broad-based state taxes" (p. 136). Data include employer contributions to current employees' pensions and to employee health benefits. Capital spending is included to the extent that projects were funded with "State General Funds" (see pp. 135-36).

II. State General Fund appropriations for higher education are the actual expenditures for 1997-98 reported in NASBO's "1998 State Expenditure Report" (p. 34). Tuition and Fees are included for those states where they are deposited into the General Fund (p. 37). In addition, twenty-five states partially or wholly excluded university research grants and eighteen partially or wholly excluded assistance to private colleges and universities. Capital projects are included to the extent they were from state general fund appropriations (see pages 33, 36-7).

III. Percent of State General Fund Appropriations to Higher Education is computed by dividing Column I by Column II. When obtaining a percentage, this unadjusted measure is best to use with the NASBO/NGA report because all of the items included in the report on total state general funds are also included in the report on state general fund appropriations for higher education.

IV. Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education are from the nation's leading authority on state support data for higher education, Illinois State University's "Grapevine" publication.

V. Percent of Total State and Local Tax Revenues to Higher Education provides an additional measure of state effort in supporting higher education. Total State General Funds alone, however, is not always an adequate measure of each state's effort to support higher education. This is so because several states use large amounts of local property taxes to fund some government activities which are supported by state general funds in others. For instance, some fund their schools primarily with local revenues and their colleges exclusively with state general funds. Others provide a large proportion of support for their two-year colleges through property taxes, so their state general fund appropriations are considerably lower than other states which do not use this revenue source. Some states rely on high tuition to lower their appropriations while maintaining the expenditure levels of their public institutions.

So, some finance experts use broader measures of state support than simply "general funds" to produce rankings in support for higher education. The nation's foremost annual report on higher education finance, State Profiles of Financing Public Higher Education published by Research Associates, includes local tax revenue in its state appropriations calculation. Column IV, then, provides another measure of "state support" beyond "general funds" by dividing total state and local tax revenues by state and local expenditures for higher education. With this measure, the variation among states in support for higher education diminishes considerably.

VI. This column provides "Local Appropriates for Operating Expenses of Higher Education." Figures in this column come from the annual survey of state higher education finance officers, conducted by the school of education, Illinois State University. With few exceptions, these appropriations are used for the education and general expenses of higher education plus some for capital outlay.

SECTION IV

CONSULTANT REPORT –

STATE FORMULA COMPARISONS

IV. Consultant Report – State Formula Comparison

The Committee contracted with Dr. William Pickens to gather data and prepare reports on higher education funding formulas used by other states. Dr. Pickens' efforts culminated in the preparation of a 465-page report entitled, *"An Intensive Study of the State Appropriations Formulas for the Support of Higher Education in Thirty States."*

Included in this section is "*A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches"* which is a short version of Dr. Pickens' report and a guide through the vast information contained in his full report. An executive summary is also provided. Copies of Dr. Pickens' entire report are available upon request to the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Fiscal Analysis Division.

As part of his efforts, Dr. Pickens analyzed the following areas:

(1) Instruction and related areas, such as faculty and instructional support staff including:

- (a) Student to faculty ratios used in the other states;
- (b) Factors accounting for program and discipline differences;
- (c) Factors accounting for level of instruction (lower division, upper division, graduate, doctoral) differences;
- (d) Letters of appointment and graduate assistant funding determinations; and
- (e) Methods used to determine proportions of faculty positions that may be funded at less than full-time levels (such as a requirement that a certain percentage of positions be funded at a "part-time rate").

(2) Salaries, including a description of:

- (a) How salaries for new faculty and classified positions are determined;
- (b) How salaries for existing faculty and classified positions are determined on an ongoing basis;
- (c) How merit awards are calculated; and
- (d) How equity pay adjustments are calculated.

(3) Technology, including a description of:

- (a) How academic (instruction, research and public service) computing needs are funded;
- (b) How administrative computing needs are funded; and
- (c) How technology for distance education or off-campus education is funded.

(4) Facilities, including a description of:

(a) How the age of a facility is factored into determining the formula for funding;
(b) How the types of programs and levels of discipline supported determines the formula for funding;
(c) How the number of students using a facility determines the operation and maintenance of the facility;
(d) How the hours of use of a facility affects operation and maintenance of the facility and affects the funding for such operation and maintenance;
(e) How the formulas account for grounds maintenance;
(f) How the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act affect the formula for funding;
(g) How the formulas account for federal regulatory mandates; and
(h) How the formulas support research space.

(5) Equipment, including a description of:

(a) The funding for new equipment;
(b) The funding for equipment that needs to be replaced; and
(c) The funding for maintenance of equipment.

(6) Libraries, including a description of:

(a) The funding of books, periodicals, monographs and other materials;
(b) The manner in which funding is determined for library automation;
(c) The manner in which needs for library facilities are determined;
(d) Any methods for reducing costs from resource sharing and automation; and
(e) The manner in which electronic media (periodicals, journals and others) is funded.

(7) Academic support, research and public services, including a description of:

(a) Academic administration;
(b) Audiovisual services;
(c) Learning resource centers; and
(d) Academic operation.

(8) Student services, including a description of:

(a) Admissions;
(b) Financial aid offices;
(c) Student counseling services;
(d) Student health services;
(e) Career planning services; and
(f) Students with specials needs, such as disabled, veteran, minority and older students.

(9) Institutional support, including a description of:

(a) Alumni affairs;
(b) Campus security;
(c) The cost of the budget office;
(d) Purchasing;
(e) Publications;
(f) The offices of the President and Vice President of the institutions;
(g) Human resources;
(h) Development activities;
(i) The controller's office;
(j) Public relations; and
(k) Any other activities with the primary purpose of providing operational support for the daily functioning of the institution;

(10) The manner in which funding is determined for:

(a) Public service;
(b) Scholarships;
(c) Athletics;
(d) Hazardous materials;
(e) Workforce development;
(f) Multi-campus operations; and
(g) Childcare.

(11) Research, including a description of the methodology used to determine:

(a) Grants versus formula based funding;
(b) Research administrative support; and
(c) Return of indirect costs to the state.

(12) The methodology used to fund higher education on the basis of full-time equivalent student counts (including the definition of full-time equivalent student).

Dr. Pickens initially presented a list of 30 formula states to the Committee; however, approximately ten of those states have either abandoned the formulas or are no longer considered formula-funding states. Although Dr. Pickens included information on those ten states, the 20 states remaining as formula funding states comprise the primary focus of Dr. Pickens' report.

Dr. Pickens used the following methodology in completing his report:

- Qualify states as using a formula approach;

- Contact state finance officers;

- Collect official written documents. Dr. Pickens said that legislative work and formula funding was often done in an "ad hoc" or "oral" fashion and many times agreements did not get reduced to writing. His efforts focused on the written agreements, the statutes, and the official descriptions. The documents used in the study are listed at the beginning of each section of each state; and

- Search the Internet.

Dr. Pickens related that there were more changes in the financing of higher education in the last five years then there have been the past thirty years entirely. In fact, many states (at least half) have made major, fundamental changes in the overall approach in the last five to ten years. In consideration of those changes, Dr. Pickens reported that the conceptually different approaches that states were following should be categorized as follows:

- Cost-based approach – The state creates a set of formulas that reflect a cost study and then the formulas are adjusted on an annual basis by cost-of-living adjustments, salary increases and additional programs. Classic examples of states that use a cost-based approach are Texas, New Mexico and Florida.

- Benchmarking & Peer-based approach – A number of states abandoned the cost-based approach several years ago and went to a peer-based approach whereby a large number or small number of peers are identified and then costs are computed on an average basis, salary basis, library peers, etc. These states started with a peer-based approach then established a benchmark. Classic examples of states that use a peer-based benchmark approach are Maryland, Oklahoma and Louisiana.

- Performance-based approach – In his report to the Committee, Dr. Pickens indicated there were approximately 25-30 states that had some form of performance-based approaches in funding. The classic examples are South Carolina and Tennessee. Dr. Pickens noted that Tennessee had the most experience with performance-based formula funding, whereby South Carolina has the most elaborate performance/incentive approach. Many other states have various measures of performance, i.e., graduation rates to full-time faculty measures. In the State of Kansas, for example, the smaller the administration, the more points awarded. Other states tailor incentives to more specific aspects of the state.

Many states use a combination of all approaches, such as the California Community College system.

Dr. Pickens informed the Committee that his report attempted to identify states that have done the best job, as a whole, of providing adequate resources, while still showing concern for equity and setting up a process of review for the formulas. Dr. Pickens noted eight states whose approach to financing higher education was most notable: Maryland, Texas, South Carolina, Tennessee, California Community Colleges, Illinois, New Mexico, Kentucky. These states have the most interesting formulas for categories such as libraries and student services. Regarding special needs, Texas has a new formula approach to providing additional resources for

disadvantaged students and California has an elaborate approach to providing resources for disabled students and re-entry students.

Dr. Pickens said there were four fundamental ideas or "lessons" that the consultants learned in reviewing the formal, written documents of each state and talking with system staff and finance directors from other states about their approaches to formulas:

- Structure the formula to accomplish broad public objectives**:** Many of the formulas, especially cost-based formulas, have primarily one objective: To provide adequate resources for the institutions to fulfill the mission. However, other public objectives have been developed such as, increasing the college-going rate, increasing the diversity of institutions, increasing the cooperation among institutions, and encouraging institutions to use technology in cost-effective ways.

- Blend the cost, peer and performance approaches of formula funding: Dr. Pickens related that there were distinct advantages and disadvantages to each of the above approaches. For instance, the cost-based approach had the advantage of being sensitive to costs that needed to be met but had the disadvantage of looking in the past. A peer-based approach had the disadvantage of almost turning decisions over to other states and other institutions. So a pure peer approach needed careful evaluation to disaggregate the activities of the peers. Performance-based approaches can result in a complicated, paper-intensive process, but the institutions quickly learn how to manipulate the system. Unfortunately, it is not as easy as setting performance objectives then tying dollars to those objectives. The goals and incentives need to be constantly monitored. Dr. Pickens concluded that blending the above three approaches appeared to be the best method.

- Identify special needs and circumstances to the State: Dr. Pickens said his brief contact with the State of Nevada has revealed three special needs for the state: 1) Growth: Nevada is in a growth mode and that needs to be taken into account. Enrollment growth profoundly changes the institutions. Formulas need to specifically address how resources are provided over the long-term and short-term. 2) Equity: As institutions change and grow, ensuring that equitable resources are distributed is difficult in a non-growth mode, but becomes increasingly difficult in a growth mode as major programs, different schools and colleges are developed. 3) Special Populations: There are special populations that need outreach, retention, and special services. It is difficult to create an incentive structure to encourage institutions to address the needs of special populations while still fulfilling their mission.

- Establish a credible, ongoing process to evaluate and change the formulas: Dr. Pickens stated that Maryland and Texas had the best process to review formulas in their states. This included the public, institution and the business community evaluating the formulas on a regular basis to ensure that the formulas were working effectively. Dr. Pickens opined that Texas has done the best job in this respect.

Using Dr. Pickens' report, with the assistance of the working group, the Committee considered formulas that may be suitable for the State of Nevada.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

"An Intensive Study of the State Appropriations Formulas for the Support of Higher Education in Thirty States

Overview of the Study

Diversity is the great hallmark of higher education institutions in America, and nowhere is it more apparent than in how the various states finance their colleges and universities. Approaches range from a single appropriation adjusted modestly for inflation to elaborate calculations into which pour thousands of numbers and variables. Most states, of course, fall somewhere along that spectrum.

For years, many states have financed their public institutions through "formula funding" which is generally defined as "a mathematical means of relating the workload of a public institution to its State appropriation." Formula funding is reputed to be a good way of providing appropriations based on an assessment of adequate resources, concern for equity of finance among different institutions, and sensitivity to the costs of actual college operations.

The first step was to identify those states that used formulas to determine their appropriations. This proved to be no small challenge. In December, 1999, we reviewed all the recent reviews of "formula funding" in the United States and identified thirty states which, at least initially, seemed to meet our definition of "formula funding." In fact, after contacting all these states and reviewing their materials, we found that a number had officially abandoned their formulas, several others maintained the formulas but did not use them in practice, and others had substantially transformed their entire approach to finance even if they maintained some framework of formula funding. Nevertheless, if we were able to obtain the information, we summarized all formulas that met our definition, whether or not they are currently being used.

Before turning to the results of our work and its uses for the Committee, it is important to define the purposes and limitations of this study. The financing of public higher education involves a very complex set of processes which begin with budget proposals, proceed through general or categorical state appropriations, continue with system and campus disbursement of funds, proceed with thousands of actual allocations, and end with a final accounting of revenues and expenditures according to the requirements of various institutional, state, and national authorities.

No study could hope to describe in detail that entire process for thirty states. So, the scope of this study from the beginning was limited to the funding methodologies (including cost factors) contained in the official, written documents which determine or explain the bases *for state appropriations of operating revenues* among public higher education institutions. The study does not include much information about the internal allocations or actual expenditure decisions within higher education systems or on their campuses unless those aspects are essential to understanding the state formulas.

A Guide for Using this Study

This study presents one of the most comprehensive and detailed examinations of existing formulas ever written. The sheer volume of information and complexity of description, however, suggests that some index or highlights might be useful to those seeking certain subjects. Therefore, we developed the following list of selected states of particular interest and an identification of specific formula components among all states.

States Whose Approach to Higher Education Finance is Most Notable

Maryland: A strong statement about increasing resources to higher education and an ambitious program to move beyond average support and quality.

Texas: The longest standing attention to formulas—their basis, sensitivity to costs, and incentives. Major change recently to simplify the formula approach for universities while adding special purpose formulas, such as an incentive to enroll disadvantaged students.

South Carolina: Commitment to "Performance Funding" is carried furthest in this state. Interesting interaction between traditional measurements of resource needs and an elaborate template for awarding "success."

Tennessee: The longest history of providing additional funds for "performance." Unlike numerous states which adopted "performance funding" during the 1990s, "outcomes" funding in this state is a well-accepted and stable part of its financing approach.

California Community Colleges: Very elaborate formula with many factors and add-ons, serving a postsecondary system with a very broad mission. Formula heavily dependent upon enrollments along with numerous state priorities and incentives funded through a formula, with much regulation and intervention

from the Legislature. Complicated interaction of credit, non-credit and categorical funding.

Illinois: Recently-revised budget process which has explicit resource goals and more direct links between strategic goals and budget development.

New Mexico: The classic, traditional approach to formula funding.

Kentucky: Radical change away from enrollment-driven formulas to an "Incentive Trust Funds" approach.

Portions of State Formulas of Particular Interest

Differentiated Instructional Formulas: Most states, which use formulas at all, have differentiated their instructional allocations to recognize at least the different levels of instruction. Many differentiate funding by institutional mission.

Funding New Enrollments: Some states use "forward funding" of enrollments, based on projections. Some (California Community Colleges) base enrollment caps on external factors such as the growth in adult population. Many states, such as Alabama, use a three year, rolling average of past enrollments to fund the current year. The coordinating Board in Washington is recommending that the formula process be restructured in accordance with a ten-year commitment to fund growth. Arizona is also a state with a long-standing formula for funding growth.

Technical College Funding: Alabama is most interesting (see pages AL-3 and AL-4).

Taking size of institution into account. The most detailed approach is found in the formula for the California Community Colleges.

Mission Support Factors: Those states which have the most differentiation in this regard are Connecticut (see pages CT-4 and CT-5), Georgia (see pages GA-2 and GA-3), Oklahoma (see page OK-2), and Pennsylvania (see pages PA-2 thru PA-4).

Detailed Weighting of Instructional Programs. The best examples in this regard Louisiana (see page LA-9), New Mexico (see NM Attachment 1), the Texas Community Colleges (see pages TX-3 and TX-4), and Tennessee (see page TN-4).

The States with the Most Elaborate Use of Peer Institutions: Louisiana (see page LA-6), Maryland (see page MD-4), and Oklahoma (see page OK-2) are in this group.

Funding Non-credit Instruction: The California Community Colleges (see page CA-22) and the community education formula in Georgia (see page GA-14) are the best examples.

Instructional Operating Expenses. The most prominent states with detailed formulas in this area are Georgia (see page GA-6) and Louisiana (see page LA-11).

Detailed Factors Affecting Appropriations for the Physical Plant: The states which have the most formulaic approach to facilities maintenance are Alabama (using the Cushing Phillips Formula) (see page AL-9), Connecticut (weighting factors by activity and a detailed formula for grounds maintenance) (see pages CT-8 thru CT-12), Florida (different kinds of facilities distinguished and intensity of use) (see pages FL-5 thru FL-8}, and Pennsylvania (see pages PA-5 thru PA-7).

Equipment: Examples of states with formulas which explicitly take equipment, including electronics, into account include the Illinois Community Colleges (virtual instruction technology) (see pages IL-7 and IL-14), and Missouri ("Investment Funding") (see page MO-4).

Libraries: Those states with the most detailed approaches for libraries are Alabama (differentiates among institutions with different missions) (see page AL-11), Florida (weights by student level) (see pages FL-9 thru FL-11), the Illinois Community Colleges (library space differentiated) (see pages IL-3 and IL-4), and Pennsylvania (see pages PA-8 and PA-9).

Performance Funding: Many states have some component in their formula which is called "performance," but Colorado (see pages CO-2 thru CO-4), Georgia (see pages GA-13 and GA-14), Missouri (see pages MO-2, MO-10 and MO-11), South Carolina (see pages SC-2 thru SC-5), and Tennessee (see pages TN-14 thru TN-16) have the most interesting examples.

Provisions for Students with special needs: The best examples are the Illinois Community Colleges (see pages IL-10 and IL-11) and the categorical funding provided for the California Community Colleges (see page CA-10).

Student Services in general: Alabama (see page AL-13) differentiates by headcount for different sized institutions. The California Community Colleges (see pages CA-16 and CA-17) differentiate between funding for new and continuing students by headcount.

Research: The Florida University system (see pages FL-13 and FL-14) expects a campus match. Georgia (see page GA-13) bases its organized research funding on graduate instruction expenditures. West Virginia (see pages WV-2 and WV-3) has a specific factor for research and public service by institutional tier.

Scholarships: Many states have separate student aid appropriations but few are contained within the formula itself. The most prominent examples of those that do are Alabama (see pages AL-15 and AL-16), with a calculation of tuition deduction based on weighted credit hours, and the California Community Colleges (see pages CA-19 and CA-20) which provides a fixed percent of projected fees for as waivers.

State policies for Part time and full time faculty: The California Community Colleges (see pages CA-11 and CA-12) and Connecticut (see page CT-5) are the only states which have a portion of their formula or state law dealing with this issue.

Multiple ways of counting students for budgeting purposes: The best examples are the California Community Colleges (see pages CA-21 and CA-22) and Maryland (see pages MD-17 and MD-18).

Organization and Presentation of this Study

This study is organized into thirty sections, one for each state. Each section includes an executive summary and supporting detail. For all states which both have formulas and which provided sufficient materials, a full template about their formulas was completed, including some background on the size, governance, and finance of higher education in that state. For all other states, we have provided summaries of their finance approach and some printed materials if they are directly relevant to understanding their state finance.

In addition to simply presenting formula details, we paid particular attention to describing the basis, rationale or purpose of those formulas that generate the largest share of state appropriations. We also describe the reasons for states revising or replacing their formulas. We paid special attention to those elements in formulas that are at the cutting-edge of higher education finance:

- those related to outcomes measures or quality improvements;
- those which specifically seek to enhance productivity;
- those where the Legislature has stated a clear purpose; and
- those which deal with funding additional enrollments in creative ways.

We believe that this approach ensures that, beyond just raw data, the study will provide helpful information to the Committee in its evaluation of Nevada's current finance approach.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Instruction and Instructionally-Related Areas	Technology	Facilities	Equipment	Libraries
Alabama	Funded using a three-year average of on-campus weighted semester credit hours applied to an instructional multiplier.	Funded through the instructional budget.	Total gross square feet multiplied by a fixed dollar amount.	Equipment not calculated separately. Part of regular instructional formula.	Support is computed using actual on-campus unweighted semester credit hours corresponding to the weighted credit hour value multiplied by cost factors for UG, Grad I, Grad II and Law.
Arizona	The formula provides one more (or less) FTE faculty position for every increase (or decrease) of 22 FTE students.	Funded from within the instructional formula. Operating support at $9,900 per faculty and $7,000 for all others.	Not funded by formula.	Funded at a fixed dollar rate per new FTE (faculty, secretarial, and support staff ($5,200 in FY 2000).	Not funded by formula.
California Community Colleges	The statewide standard student/faculty ratio is 25:1. No differentiation by discipline.	Funded through program-based funding under "Instructional Services" and some categorical funding. Funding based on FTES.	Total square footage is funded in the growth formula which is 16.55 percent of additional per FTES revenues.	Equipment not calculated separately. Categorical funding for equipment replacement.	Funded under "instructional services" which is based on a fixed per FTES revenue. Some categorical funding.
Colorado	Colorado does not now use a "formula" to appropriate state funds. Of most interest is the state's set of measurements for quality standards, on which the Commission on Higher Education based its recommendations for additional funding in FY 2000.				
Connecticut	FTE enrollment by discipline and level are divided by their corresponding S/F ratio; multiply this by mission support factor; and multiply the sum by fixed dollar amount for faculty salaries. The State uses eleven categories of instructional programs, organized by lower, upper division, masters and doctoral levels.	Not funded by formula per se. Contained within the instruction budget for the most part.	Custodial Services are determined by persons per adjusted square feet at an hourly wage plus 10% for supplies. Building Maintenance is determined by adding together current year maintenance and deferred maintenance, which are determined by multiplying replacement cost by a fixed factor. Grounds Maintenance is determined by persons per total grounds at an hourly wage plus 10% for supplies.	Equipment for physical plant is determined by adding together equipment replacement and equipment maintenance costs, which are determined by multiplying replacement cost by a fixed factor.	The formula is a "multi-model" approach based on mission, size, student profile and programs. Funding is incremental and accomplished through 5 and 10-year funding plans.
Florida State University System	Instructional expenditures split into under-graduate and all the rest--separate cost factors developed for each campus.	Dollars for technology incorporated into "Instructional and Support" formula based on prior year expenditures per FTES.	Formulas based on six classes which de energy consumption class codes and int intensity of use.	Dollars for equipment incorporated into "Instructional and Support" formula based on prior year expenditures per FTES.	Weights established for different levels of students and one for faculty FTE. Uses library resources groups as well.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Academic Support including Research and Public Service	Student Services	Institutional Support	Other Areas	Research
Alabama	Funding for Academic Support as a whole is 5% of the amount generated for instruction.	Student Services are funded based on single calculation that multiplies a fixed dollar amount by the total approved campus headcount enrollment.	Funding for Institutional Support is calculated at 14% of the total amount generated by instruction, academic support, research, public service, library support, general administration and student services, and maintenance of physical plant.	Funding for Public Service is 2% of combined amounts for instruction and academic support. A major source of Scholarships are provided through a tuition adjustment.	Funding for Organized Research is 2% of combined amounts for instruction and academic support plus 5% of sponsored research in a designated base year.
Arizona	For each new faculty position, the formula generates a request for a quarter-time direct support secretary position and half time indirect support staff position.	Not funded by formula.	Not funded by formula but is included in the "all funds budget allocation" submitted by each university campus to the central office.	Not funded by formula.	Not funded by formula.
California Community Colleges	Funded as a part of "instructional services" at a set amount per credit FTES.	Funded at a set amount per headcount student, using different amounts for new students and continuing students.	Funded within "Institutional Support" which is a fixed function of total funds available (16.55%).	These areas are either included within the regular appropriations or are categorically funded, such as scholarships.	Community colleges do not receive appropriations for research.
Colorado					
Connecticut	An interim model was developed which provides one technical support position for every 14 FTE faculty positions generated in the Instruction Formula. One administrative support staff position is generated for every 6 FTE faculty in the Instruction Formula.	Not funded by formula.	Not funded by formula.	Support for Public Service is generated in the instructional formula.	Not funded by formula.
Florida State University System	All areas are incorporated into undifferentiated "Instructional and Support Formula. Total based on prior year expenditures, plus inflation, times planned campus FTES.	All areas are incorporated into undifferentiated "Instructional and Support Formula. Total based on prior year expenditures, plus inflation, times planned campus FTES.	All areas are incorporated into undifferentiated "Instructional and Support Formula. Total based on prior year expenditures, plus inflation, times planned campus FTES. State matches gifts above certain thresholds.	All areas are incorporated into undifferentiated "Instructional and Support Formula. Total based on prior year expenditures, plus inflation, times planned campus FTES.	Base amount built into general formula System office expects research universities to generate three sponsored research dollars for each state dollar.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Instruction and Instructionally-Related Areas	Technology	Facilities	Equipment	Libraries
Georgia	Instructional programs are clustered into "groups" which have different weights for generating faculty positions based on differentiations by student level.	The instructional groups have different expense ratios which generate different amounts of operating expense based on differentiations by student level.	Factors in the facilities formula are mai use age, current replacement value, square feet, and fixed factors to generate funding.	Equipment is purchased from the Instructional Operating expense formula.	Funding for libraries comes from the formula for "Academic Support" which is equal to 17.7 percent of the "total funding base" for each institution. Library facilities have special factors.
Illinois Community Colleges	Funded through base operating grants adjusted for cost increases on an annual basis.	a) Equipment grants are allocated on the basis of business, technical, and health occupational credit hours; b) Technology Support grants are based on a basic allocation plus an additional allocation based on district size, number of telecommunication market service areas and annual headcount; and c) Skills Enhancement grants are based on number of FTE faculty and staff at each district.	O & M of buildings is funded by the base operating grants allocated by square footage. Districts with square footage above the state average per student receiving funding for only one half above the state average.	Funding is accommodated in the base operating grants and supplemented through strategic statewide and campus initiatives.	Funded through base operating grants adjusted for cost increases on an annual basis.
Illinois Universities	Funding is determined through three basic components - strategic goals requests, base funding requests, and tuition and fee projections - based on four input factors - statewide strategic goals, program review, institutional analytical studies, and institutional tuition and fee analyses.	Accommodated in the base allocation (see instruction).	Total gross square feet multiplied by a fixed dollar amount.	Accommodated in the base allocation (see instruction).	Funded through base operating grants adjusted for cost increases on an annual basis.
Kansas	This state now uses incremental budgeting based on a lump sum appropriation. State appropriations for the community colleges are based on a certain percentage of state funds spent per FTE lower division at regional institutions. Performance funding has been implemented, equaling 2% of the amount of the state operating grant for each community colleges. Recent legislation establishes a formula for appropriating additional funds for faculty salaries.				
Kentucky	This state no longer uses formulas to fund its postsecondary institutions, following a major reorganization and reconstitution of higher education in 1997. The act eliminated enrollment-driven formulas and replaced it with an approach which uses national benchmark institutions for each institution and the creation of "Incentive Trust Funds."				

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Academic Support Including Research and Public Service	Student Services	Institutional Support	Other Areas	Research
Georgia	Academic administration is generated from the Instruction and Research formula using fixed expense ratios differentiated by instructional groups.	Student services are funded within the Student Services and Institutional Support formula which is 23.1% of the total funding base for the institution.	Institutional support is funded within t Student Services and Institutional Supp formula which is 23.1% of the total funding base for the institution.	All these areas are funded within one o the general formulas.	State funded appropriations for research are based on an amount equivalent to total graduate instructional expenditures.
Illinois Community Colleges	Funding is accommodated in the base operating grants.	Funding is accommodated in the base operating grants.	Funding is accommodated in the base operating grants.	Funding is accommodated in the base operating grants.	Not applicable.
Illinois Universities	Accommodated in the base allocation (see instruction).	Accommodated in the base allocation (see instruction).	Accommodated in the base allocation (see instruction).	Public Service is accommodated in the base allocation (see instruction).	Not funded by formula.
Kansas					
Kentucky					

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Instruction and Instructionally-Related Areas	Technology	Facilities	Equipment	Libraries
Louisiana	Instructional activities are funded by taking program and discipline differenc into account and by identifying an SREB SREB category and then assigning a LA. institution to that category. The Texas weighting system of programs and student levels is used.	Technology needs are funded within the Core formula which uses a "Funding Target" approach that compares LA. institutions with the average of southern institution of equal size and mission.	There is no separate formula for facilities. The impact of programs and student level, however, does affect appropriations since the "funding target" for each campus is mission-based and uses the Texas-weight adjustments.	Funded within the "Core" formula based on "funding targets" of institutions for each LA. Campus. Some funding in the "Quality" category.	Funded within the "Core" formula which based on "funding targets" of institutions for each LA. Campus. Some funding in the "Quality" category.
Maryland	A list of peer institutions was developed for each MD. campus. Financial characteristics were then derived in order to determine a funding average per FTES. Each home campus also developed a list of "aspirational peers." There is no separate state formula for instructional areas.	To the extent that activities in this area are funded better among the "peers," then MD. institutions will receive increases.	The formula does not take facilities into account but "rolls them up" into the average funding appropriated to ea campus based on the peer methodology.	The formula does not take equipment into account but "rolls up" funding into the average funding appropriated to each campus based on the peer methodology.	The formula does not take libraries into specific account. To the extent that activities involving libraries are better funded in the "peer institutions," then MD institutions will receive increases.
Mississippi	Until 1997, virtually all of the state's appropriations to senior institutions were generated by formulas. This formula approach was abandoned because it was enormously complex, cumbersome to calculate and the results were never fully funded by the Legislature. The current approach begins with peer group comparisons based on core support revenues, appropriations, average tuition and required fees, enrollments, expenditures, and other factors. From these comparisons are derived a series of tables that identify the relationship between each MI institution and its set of peers. The funding model has these components: priorities of the institutions of higher learning, built-ins, salary adjustments, and continuation funding.				
Missouri	Funded through a core appropriation adjusted for inflation.	Funded through an "investment funding" initiative which consists of both one-time and multi-year appropriations.	Four-year institutions are funded through an earmark of 1.25% of the most current facility replacement value. Community Colleges are funded through a core appropriation plus a specified increase not to exceed 10%.	Funded through a core appropriation adjusted for inflation.	Funded through a core appropriation adjusted for inflation.
Nevada	Student/Faculty ratios are used for each of the campuses in non-engineering fields (two campuses have higher ratios). Developmental programs have a lower ratio. Graduate assistants for the research universities have a separate ratio.	Funding for high tech programs and distance education comes from the regular support provided through other portions of the formula.	Formula factors include square footage of buildings and the number of acres of grounds on campus. There is a factor that takes campus size into account as well.	The formula provides 5 percent annually of the UCCSN year-end equipment inventory, adjusted by the Capital Equipment index to fund replacement.	For universities, acquisitions are based on the updated Clapp Jordan formula, using a set number of library volumes based on numbers of faculty, students, and their level. Community Colleges use Learning Resource Center standards for college libraries.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Academic Support Including Research and Public Service	Student Services	Institutional Support	Other Areas	Research
Louisiana	Funded within the "Core" formula based on "funding targets" of institutions for each LA,. Campus. Some funding in the "Quality/Campus Improvement/ and State Priorities categories.	Funded within the "Core" formula which based on "funding targets" of institutions for each LA. Campus. Some funding in the "Quality/Campus Improvement categories.	To the extent that expenditures change among the "target funding" institutions, then Institutional Support changes for each LA. institution	On-going public service and other expenditures in these areas are support in the Core formula which uses "target institutions for each LA. campus.	The Legislature periodically provides special grants for research as line items. Otherwise, support comes from the Core funding.
Maryland	The formula does not take academic support into specific account. To the extent that these activities are better funded in the "peer institutions," then MD institutions will receive increases.	The formula does not take student services into specific account. To the extent that these activities are better funded in the "peer institutions," then MD institutions will receive increases.	The formula does not take student services into specific account. To the extent that these activities are better funded in the "peer institutions," then MD institutions will receive increases.	To the extent that expenditures in all these areas are "Education and General Expenditures" among the peer institutions, MD. appropriations will be changed.	To the extent that expenditures for research are for Education and General Expenditures" among the peer institutions, MD appropriations will be changed.
Mississippi					
Missouri	Funded through a core appropriation adjusted for inflation.	Funded through a core appropriation adjusted for inflation.	Funded through a core appropriation adjusted for inflation.	Funded through a core appropriation adjusted for inflation; and "funding incentives" for performance such as degree productivity.	Not funded by formula.
Nevada	The formula contains different factors for universities and community colleges based on certain ratios between support positions and other factors. Community colleges have an academic support formula equal to 20% of the instructional budget on each campus.	The formula contains various ratios which link positions to the number of students and salaries and salaries paid.	Funding is based on a percentage of the operating budgets administered by each campus plus an amount prorated for each institution's share of the operation of the business centers. Economies of scale are recognized.	Most areas not specifically part of the regular formulas are funded from within the calculations generated by them.	There is no separate formula to support research as a distinct activity within state general appropriations.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Instruction and Instructionally-Related Areas	Technology	Facilities	Equipment	Libraries
New Mexico	The formula uses average cost data from each institution and calculates faculty salaries per student contact hour. Differential costs per SCH (some 110 in universities and 7 in the community college formulas) are used to determine the funding. Differentials for the size of institution, level of instruction, and summer instruction are provided.	The formula does not contain a separate provision for high tech equipment or distance education. Funded from regular formula.	The formula uses factors such as gross square footage of eligible space and different FTES measurements for two and four-year institutions. Utility calculations use a base year and encouragement for energy conservation. Base is always adjusted for additions of eligible space.	The formula does not contain a separate provision for equipment purchases or replacement. Funded from regular formula.	Library volume replacement allowance equals 5% of the ACRL standards and uses differentiations based on student level.
North Dakota	It is difficult to say whether this state truly has a formula funding system or not. Officially, North Dakota has five functional formulas which were developed in the 1970s and 1980s, but they have never been fully funded and have not even been used for preparing budget requests for the past six years. The "base" budget, however, is carried forward with some measure of continuity from these formulas which include instruction, support services, physical plant, equipment, and capital equipment. Budgeting is incremental. This state is studying a different approach and will likely move to a "peer funding, benchmark model."				
Oklahoma	Funding for each functional area is driven by the Budget Needs formula. This formula is made up of 4 basic processes. I) Development of budget needs for each tier group of institutions; II) Development of program cost base; III) Allocation of budget need to each institution based on program cost and productivity; and IV) Allocation of state dollars.				
Oregon	Starting in 1999, the Legislature appropriates most of the State System's budget as a lump sum, which begins with a "base" that is general funds per FTE student for the past biennium. This is an equal amount among all campuses to which are added line item revenues that recognize various distinctions such as size. This base budget is then adjusted by a Current Service Level (CSL) factor which consists of salary increases required in contracts, a state-determined inflation index for supplies and other services, and additional enrollments put forward as "policy packages" or sets of options. Across-the-board policies, such as the Legislature's recent decision to establish a minimum funding increase of 2% above the CSL for all campuses, are common.				
Pennsylvania	FTE enrollment by level is divided by their corresponding S/F ratio and then multiplied by a basic cost plus a quality enhancement factor.	Accommodated in the instruction or "primary mission" formula.	Funded through a core appropriation plus a variable funding allowance by square footage plus 2.5% of life cycle replacement for capital renewal.	Accommodated in the instruction or "primary mission" formula.	Funded through a core appropriation plus a quality enhancement component to raise funding to 4.5% of total E&G budgets.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Academic Support Including Research and Public Service	Student Services	Institutional Support	Other Areas	Research
New Mexico	The formula provides separate allocations for academic administration and libraries and each is differentiated by two-year four-year institutional status. Academic administration equals 19% of instructional budget. Levels are different for branch campuses.	Formulas provide a core level of support, with additional funding based on the previous fall term's headcount enrollment, according to certain enrollment thresholds.	The four-year institution formula uses factors that recognize economies of scale. The two-year formula provides a 10 percent growth factor for all institutions.	Scholarships are calculated by multiplying three percent of the previous fall term's headcount enrollment by the current annual tuition levels for each institution.	There is no separate formula to support research as a distinct activity within state appropriations.
North Dakota					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					Departmental research is funded at a rate between 2 and 3 percent of faculty salaries plus 4% of the total value of sponsored research.
Pennsylvania	Funded through a core appropriation plus a variable rate per FTE student.	Accommodated in the academic support or "support programs" formula.	Accommodated in the academic support or "support programs" formula.	Public Service is accommodated in the instruction or "primary mission" formula.	Not funded by formula.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Instruction and Instructionally-Related Areas	Technology	Facilities	Equipment	Libraries
South Carolina	Using student-faculty ratios at peer schools, fall student FTE's are converted to total FTE faculty required, by discipline. Total for faculty salaries calculated by multiplying by-discipline FTE faculty required by average faculty comp. at peer schools, by discipline. Instruct.-related areas funded at varying % of faculty salaries.	Technology not calculated separately.	Multivariate calculation based upon FTE students, number of employees, sq. ft., estimated replacement costs, type of construction, campus acreage, bldg. perimeters, workload factors, and average wages published by U.S. Dept. of Labor. Utility funding set by varying base amounts, adjusted annually for inflation.	Equipment not calculated separately.	Calculated by multiplying fall student FTE by an amount that varies by school and/or "Sector".
South Dakota	In 1999, this state abandoned its enrollment-driven formula. Currently, South Dakota uses an approach that separates the calculation into 95% "base" funding and 5% "performance funding." Five factors are contained in the "performance" model: growth in resident enrollment; the extent of collaboration between universities in the state system; academic improvement on student proficiency examinations; raising external funds for the support of the university; and growth in economic development programs.				
Tennessee	Using student-faculty ratios at peer schools, fall student FTE's are converted to total FTE faculty required. Total FTE faculty is multiplied by average faculty comp. at peer schools to produce a total for faculty salaries. Instruct.-related areas funded at .27 of faculty salaries.	Technology not calculated separately.	(a)Permanent space is funded at $2.33/g.sq.ft.; (b)Portable space funded at $1.10/g.sq.ft. Intensity factor, based on enrollment, applied to sum of (a) and (b). Space older than 20 years receives added $.25/ g.sq.ft. (c) utility funding based on estimate.	Equipment not calculated separately.	Total fall student FTE multiplied by average funding per student FTE at peer schools.
Texas Community and Technical Colleges	The formula accounts for program and discipline differences based on a study to determine the amounts actually expended on 17 different academic areas and 36 different vocational/ technical areas.	Technology needs are funded from resources generated in the general formula. Currently, a 10 percent "bonus" is added to rates for courses that are on a list of priority technologies.	Physical plant costs are not supported from state appropriations.	All equipment is funded from resources generated through the general appropriations formulas.	Funding for libraries are considered a campus-wide cost and so expenditures are "spread" over the 17 academic and 36 vocational areas.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Academic Support Including Research and Public Service	Student Services	Institutional Support	Other Areas	Research
South Carolina	Academic Support not calculated separately. Funding included in Instruction and Institutional Support portions of the formula.	Calculated by multiplying student headcount by an amount that varies by school and/or "Sector".	Calculated by multiplying sum of formula amount for Instruction, Research, Libraries, Student Services, and Physical Plant by .25.	Public Service is funded at .25 of non-state actual public services expenditures for FY97-98. The funding that a school receives is impacted (up to approximately 10%) by its score on a set of performance indicators.	Funded at .30 of non-state actual research expenditures for FY97-98.
South Dakota					
Tennessee	Funding based on % of Instruction. % varies by type of school: .03 for research; .17 for regional; .008 for community colleges.	Funded at $177 per fall student headcount.	(a)$150,000 base amount for each school; plus (b)varying %'s of total E&G budget added to base amount. (c).06/g.sq.ft. added for safety, plus intensity factor for urban schools.	Base amount of $35,000 plus varying % of Instruction. A school can earn up to 5.45% over their formula-driven operating budget based upon its score on a set of performance standards.	.05 of actual prior-yr. exp. for research plus share of statewide pool, based on pro rata share of external research funds.
Texas Community and Technical Colleges	Funding for this area is considered a campus-wide cost and so expenditures are "spread" over the 17 academic and 36 vocational areas.	Student services that are not provided by instructional divisions are considered a campus-wide cost and so their expenditures are "spread" over the 17 academic and 36 vocational areas.	Each campus is asked to report general administrative costs for the cost study and these are then "spread" over the 16 academic and 36 vocational areas.	To the extent that any of these areas are funded, they either draw from the general state revenues generated by other formulas or, more often, from local property taxes or student fees.	Community colleges are not funded to conduct research.

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Instruction and Instructionally-Related Areas	Technology	Facilities	Equipment	Libraries
Texas Four-Year Colleges and Universities	The formula provides for instruction, academic support, public service, research enhancement, student services and institutional support based on a weighted semester credit hour basis. The formula calculates a "base period" SCH and multiplies this by a factor which differentiates program and instructional levels. This is called the "Instruction and Operations" formula. A supplement is provided for classes taught by tenure or tenure track faculty.	Support for technology is provided within the general "Instruction and Operations" formula.	The Infrastructure Support Formula is driven by the square feet needed for each university's general activities times a fixed rate. To this is added the average statewide utility rate, adjusted to take into account differences among the regions in energy costs	Support for equipment is provided within the general "Instruction and Operations" formula.	The formula does not directly address library volumes but overall funding levels are heavily influenced by the mix of programs and credit levels on each campus. Library facilities are part of the Infrastructure Support Formula
Washington	This state does not use a "formula" per se as the basis of state appropriations. Each biennium, the "base" budget for institutions is carried forward and additional amounts are appropriated in three categories: Critical Support Areas, Essential Support Areas, and Other Institutional Priorities. The one area that could be considered formulaic is funding for new enrollments. This funding is derived from a cost of instruction study conducted by the higher education institutions every four years.				
West Virginia	The State of West Virginia does not allocate funds to campuses by program, but rather by lump sum appropriation directly to campuses. The lump sum is calculated by multiplying fall student FTE by the average appropriation per student FTE at peer institutions in the Southern Regional Education Board. Additionally, there are allocations for public service and research made to the "Central Office" of West Virginia higher education. These funds are allocated to the campuses in accordance with system guidelines.				

An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States

A Summary of Formula Factors and Approaches

STATES	Academic Support Including Research and Public Service	Student Services	Institutional Support	Other Areas	Research
Texas Four-Year Colleges and Universities	Support for thee areas is provided within the Instruction and Operations formula.	Support for student services is provided within the Instruction and Operations formula. A supplement is provided for "economically disadvantaged students."	Funding for institutional support is provided within the Instruction and Operations formula.	Support for all these areas, if funded at all, is provided from within the Instruction and Operations formula.	Support for research is provided within the Instruction and Operations formula. To the extent, however, that universities enroll more graduate-level students, they receive substantially larger appropriations.
Washington					
West Virginia					

SECTION V

FORMULA FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

V. FORMULA FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary focus of the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education in Nevada was to develop funding formulas that would address the equitable distribution of funds for institutions within the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN). The following document outlines the issues, concepts, and formula constructs that were approved by the Committee. The Committee relied heavily upon *An Intensive Study of State Appropriations Formulas for the Operations of Public Colleges and Universities in Thirty States*, compiled by Dr. William Pickens at the direction of the Committee.

The Committee recognized that it is unlikely the State of Nevada will be able to fully fund the amounts recommended by the new formulas. For each functional formula recommendation, the Committee approved the following language: "Uniform application of this formula to each institution, regardless of the percentage funded, will result in equitable distribution of available funding. Full funding of the formula should be viewed as a goal to be achieved over a period of time to be implemented dependent on available funding each biennium."

When institutions are funded at less than 100 percent of the formulae, the Committee recommends inclusion of a hold harmless clause. The hold harmless provision allows individual institutions to retain their base funding levels when the formula recommendations fall below the base amount. When equal funding percentages are achieved, the institutions will move forward at the same pace. The hold harmless provision is recommended for a period not to exceed more than two biennia.

Similarly, the Committee recommends expenditure flexibility when the formulas are not fully funded. The UCCSN assured the Committee that steps will be taken to ensure that flexibility does not result in salary inequities nor imbalances in position counts.

The Committee also recommends that all new positions for Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services, and Operation and Maintenance of the Physical Plant for the two universities, Nevada State College (NSC) and the community colleges be funded equally in their respective groups, (e.g., salaries and operating budgets per positions). As part of the budget process, UCCSN institutions will provide data on average salary levels for new professional positions.

The Committee approved the following salary equity language: "To address salary equity, the Committee concurs with UCCSN's recommendation to equally fund starting salary amounts for new positions for each formula function. However, the Committee encourages the UCCSN to develop and implement a uniform salary policy at the system level to prevent individual institutions from perpetuating salary inequities. Further, as part of the biennial budget process, for each institution, UCCSN should gather data and report on the actual starting and existing salaries paid for each function each biennium. The Budget Division, and the Legislature, may use this information to adjust the budgeted starting salary levels as necessary."

The Committee recognized that Great Basin College (GBC) and Nevada State College (NSC), and new campus sites for existing institutions are currently in the beginning process of offering and developing associate and/or baccalaureate programs. Until such time as the formulas adequately address the funding required for start-up, additional funding may be required. Once

the new programs are established over the next two biennia, and they have an established mix of upper and lower division FTE, GBC and NSC should be considered for inclusion in the formulas that apply to baccalaureate programs at the universities with appropriate factors applied for each institution.

Values for operating and equipment included in the formulas should be adjusted by "CPI plus 1" each biennium similar to current Board of Regents approved policy for tuition and fees.

PERFORMANCE FUNDING

The Committee concurred with UCCSN's recommendation to establish a pool not to exceed 2 percent of the total UCCSN appropriation from available one-time funding. The funding would be distributed by the System to the UCCSN units based upon their achievement of specified performance goals. Performance funding is currently used in about 30 states nationwide. Examples of performance measures used to develop appropriations in other states include:

- Graduation Rates
- Percentage of lower division courses taught by tenured/tenure track faculty
- Freshman Retention
- Lower Division class Size
- Amount of Public/Private Sector Grants
- Achievement Rates of Graduates
- High School Capture Rate
- Work Force Development

Typically, the funds appropriated on the basis of performance funding are in addition to the funding determined through the formula calculations. Funding received as part of the performance-funding component would not become part of the base for an institution. Performance funding would be one-time in nature, and would be distributed each biennium based upon the relative performance of the institutions. Actual performance measures, as well as the process for allocating funds, will be developed biennially in consultation with representatives of the UCCSN, Legislature, and the Governor's Office.

INSTRUCTION

The instruction function provides support for all activities related to the institution's instruction program including academic, vocational, technical, and remedial courses.

Current Formula

For the universities, the Instruction budget is currently funded on the basis of the following student to faculty ratios:

Enrollment Area	Ratio
Engineering & Related Disciplines:	15:1
Nursing:	7.5:1
Regular Enrollment:	21:1

The Community Colleges employ the following student to faculty ratios:

Enrollment Area:	Ratio CCSN/TMCC	Ratio GBC/WNCC
Regular Enrollment	23:1	21:1
Vocational/Technical	18:1	18:1
Rural	12:1	12:1
Nursing	7.5:1	7.5:1
Dental Hygiene (CCSN only)	6:1	N/A
Dental/Rad. Tech (TMCC only)	14:1	N/A
Development	18:1	18:1

For the Universities and the Community Colleges, a Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) student is currently defined as 30 student credit hours per year (15 credit hours per semester) for undergraduate students and 16 student credit hours per year (8 credit hours per semester) for graduate students.

Recommended Revisions to the University and NSC Instruction Formulae

1. Student Credit Hours: The Committee recommends using 30 student credit hours (SCH) as the definition of an FTE for both lower and upper division credit hours. Masters and Doctoral level student FTE should be determined on the basis of 24 SCH and 18 SCH respectively.

2. Student-to-Faculty Ratios: The Committee recommends different student to faculty ratios for the four levels of instruction and for the four levels of discipline. The result is a matrix of four columns and four rows resulting in 16 student to faculty ratios. Higher levels of instruction and higher discipline costs would result in lower student to faculty ratios. The recommended ratios, by discipline and level, are described below. A separate matrix is used for the universities and Nevada State College to reflect the lower cost of providing instruction at NSC:

Recommended Student Faculty Ratios for the Universities

	Lower Div	Upper Div	Masters	Doctoral
Clinical	8	8	8	8
High Cost	18	13	10	8
Medium Cost	21	16	13	8
Low Cost	26	22	16	8

Recommended Student Faculty Ratios for Nevada State College

	Lower Div	Upper Div	Masters
Clinical	8	8	8
High Cost	18	15	12
Medium Cost	21	18	15
Low Cost	26	24	18

3. Enrollment Projections: FTE enrollment projections used in the formula should be based upon a weighted three-year rolling average. The previous three years' actual FTE enrollment growth should be used to determine the rate of FTE growth for formula calculations. The most recent year should be given 50 percent weight, the second year 30 percent weight, and the earliest year 20 percent weight. The growth rate determined as a result of this calculation would be used to project enrollments forward for the next biennium. An adjustment factor to recognize unique circumstances may be proposed (millennium scholarships, etc.). If the institution's actual projected enrollment is less than the calculated enrollment, the actual will be used.

4. Salary Equity Pool: The Committee recommends establishing a Salary Equity Pool exclusively for UNLV. The purpose of the pool is to provide a source of funding that would, over time, eliminate the inequity in faculty salaries that currently exists between UNR and UNLV. A pool should be established to provide funding for approximately 90 positions at a rate of $5,200 per position. The 90 positions approximate the annual faculty turnover rate for UNLV, and the $5,200 represents the current difference in the all-ranks average salary for the two institutions. If the proposal is adopted, UNLV could draw on funds from the Salary Equity Pool each time it fills an existing faculty vacancy at a salary higher than the current budget for the position. It is expected that the salary equity pool would be funded for a period of three biennia at which time it is projected that faculty salaries for both institutions will be equal. The salary equity pool will not continue beyond five biennia.

5. Starting Faculty Salaries: New faculty positions should be funded for the two universities at the same rate, the mid-point of Quartile 1 and Quartile 2 salary range for Associate Professor (currently $55,858 plus fringe benefits). New positions at Nevada State College should also be funded at the mid-point of Quartile 1 and Quartile 2 of the salary range for an Associate Professor, based upon Board-approved salary schedules for the college.

   To address salary equity, the Committee concurs with UCCSN's recommendation to equally fund starting salary amounts for new positions for each formula function. However, the Committee encourages the UCCSN to develop and implement a uniform salary policy at the system level to prevent individual institutions from perpetuating salary inequities. Further, as part of the biennial budget process, for each institution, UCCSN should gather data and report on the actual starting and existing salaries paid for each function each biennium. The Budget Division, and the Legislature, may use this information to adjust the budgeted starting salary levels as necessary.

6. Classified Positions: The ratio of professional to classified positions should remain at 5 to 1. The classified positions act as clerical support and laboratory technicians. New classified positions should be funded at grade 27 step 1, currently $25,808 plus fringe benefits.

7. New Position Equipment: New professional and classified positions should receive one-time equipment appropriations as defined by the State Budget Division. Currently, the state provides approximately $6,000 for new full-time faculty positions and $4,000 for new classified positions.

8. Operating and Wage Costs: Operating/wage costs should be funded at $6,000 per faculty and $2,300 per classified FTE positions. Nevada State College should receive $5,000 and $2,300 for its faculty and classified FTE respectively.

9. Ongoing Technology/Equipment: Equipment funding should be included in the instructional budget and funded on a continuing basis. On-going equipment would be funded at a rate of $5,200 per existing faculty position. The equipment funds would be used for faculty workstation replacement, faculty start-up packages, and instructional equipment replacement. An additional $1,000 per existing classified FTE for workstation replacement should also be provided. Nevada State College should receive $4,500 per faculty FTE for on-going equipment funding. An additional $1,000 per existing classified FTE for workstation replacement should also be provided.

Recommended Revisions to the College Instruction Formula:

1. Student Credit Hours: The Committee recommends using 30 student credit hours (SCH) as the definition of an FTE for both lower and upper division credit hours.

2. Student-to-Faculty Ratios: The community colleges offer a variety of instructional programs from general education to vocational, distance education, and allied health concentrations. Due to the complexity of programs a three-tiered matrix (high, medium and low cost) for faculty student ratios is recommended based on level of cost for programs. The following are the recommended faculty/student ratios to be utilized for the funding of community college faculty FTE:

Discipline	TMCC & CCSN	WNCC	GBC Lower Division	GBC Upper Division
High Cost Programs	14:1	12:1	12:1	12:1
Medium Cost Programs	21:1	21:1	21:1	16:1
Low Cost Programs	26:1	26:1	23:1	22:1

Once GBC and WNCC reach a budgeted FTE level of 3,000, lower division funding ratios will be consistent with those of CCSN and TMCC. Upon GBC and WNCC reaching the targeted level of consistent funding ratios with CCSN and TMCC, a hold harmless period not to exceed two biennia shall exist.

Examples of the classifications are as follows:

High Costs: Nursing, Dental Hygiene, Practicums, Distance Education/Rural Education, Automotive Technologies, Welding, Computing Technologies.

Medium Costs: 200-level coursework for programs such as, Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics) and all developmental programs.

Low Costs: 100-level and 200-level course work for general educational programs such as English, History, Sciences (100-level), Math, etc.

3. Enrollment Projections: FTE enrollment projections used in the formula should be based upon a weighted three-year rolling average. The previous three years' actual FTE enrollment growth should be used to determine the rate of FTE growth for formula calculations. The most recent year should be given 50 percent weight, the second year 30 percent weight, and the earliest year 20 percent weight. The growth rate determined as a result of this calculation would be used to project enrollments forward for the next biennium. An adjustment factor to recognize unique circumstances may be proposed (millennium scholarships, etc.). If the institution's actual projected enrollment is less than the calculated enrollment, the actual will be used.

4. Funding Ratio: The funding formula of 70:30 full-time/part-time faculty ratio should be revised to 60:40. The 60:40 ratio would provide the required full-time faculty to support the growing institutions.

5. Starting Faculty Salaries: New full-time faculty positions should be funded at the mid-point of the community college salary schedule. Funding would be provided equal to a rank 4, step 10 salary (currently $42,158) plus associated fringe benefits. The goal of this recommendation is to fund positions at the midpoint of the faculty salary schedule. New part-time faculty positions would be funded at a salary equal to 60 percent of the base salary for full-time faculty plus associated fringe benefits.

   To address salary equity, the Committee concurs with UCCSN's recommendation to equally fund starting salary amounts for new positions for each formula function. However, the Committee encourages the UCCSN to develop and implement a uniform salary policy at the system level to prevent individual institutions from perpetuating salary inequities. Further, as part of the biennial budget process, for each institution, UCCSN should gather data and report on the actual starting and existing salaries paid for each function each biennium. The Budget Division and the Legislature may use this information to adjust the budgeted starting salary levels as necessary.

6. Teaching Assistants (TA's): Teaching assistants provide critical support within the Instructional Function for high maintenance operations such as laboratories. Equal funding should be provided for teaching assistants for all institutions - the Committee recommends $1,000 per faculty FTE (combined full-time and part-time faculty positions) plus associated fringe benefits. There is no formula currently for teaching assistants at the community colleges.

7. Classified Positions: The ratio of professional to classified positions should remain at 5 to 1. New positions should be funded at grade 27 step 1 (currently $25,808 plus fringe benefits).

8. Operating/Wage Costs: Operating and wage costs should be funded at a weighted average rate per faculty FTE and classified FTE positions. The colleges should receive $4,600 per faculty FTE (combined full-time and part-time faculty positions) and $2,300 for classified FTE respectively.

9. New Position Equipment: New professional and classified positions should receive one-time equipment appropriations as defined by the State Budget Division. Currently, the state provides approximately $6,000 for new full-time faculty positions and $4,000 for new classified positions.

10. Ongoing Technology/Equipment: Equipment funding should be included in the instructional budget and funded on a continuing basis. On-going equipment would be funded at a rate of $3,500 per existing faculty FTE position. The equipment funds would be used for faculty workstation replacement, instructional start-up packages, and instructional equipment replacement. An additional $1,000 per existing classified FTE for workstation replacement should also be provided.

SUPPORT FUNCTIONS
ACADEMIC SUPPORT

Academic support encompasses services that directly assist the instructional or academic functions of an institution such as libraries, museums, media services, and academic administration including deans but not department chairman.

Current Formula

For the universities, the academic support formula consists of three components that recognize the number of colleges/schools at each university, the size of the libraries and number of volumes held by each, and the relationship of the remaining academic support budget areas to their respective instruction budgets:

1. Using an average compensation figure, two professional positions and one classified position are provided for the office of the vice president for academic affairs. One professional and one classified position are provided for each college or school.

2. Using the number of volumes in a library, positions and their budget support is generated on the basis of:

   0 to 500,000 volumes..... 50 positions
   For every additional 16,000 volumes.....1 position

3. The remaining academic support function is funded by applying a rate of 6.5 percent to the instruction budget for each university.

For the community colleges, the existing funding formula is calculated based on a fixed percentage of the Instructional budget. The following percentiles are utilized for the Academic Support formula:

CCSN, TMCC, and WNCC …….. 20% of instruction
GBC ……... 25% of instruction

Academic Support Revision Recommendations – Universities and NSC

1. Vice President of Academic Affairs: Equity in funding for professional and classified positions in the vice president for academic affairs office and in the schools and colleges for the two universities can be accomplished by adding a mechanism to the current formula that would reflect additional needs associated with larger faculties. The Committee recommends continuing base funding of 2 professional and 1 classified position for the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Additional positions should be added to the Vice Presidents' Offices based upon the size of the faculty. The incremental increases in faculty necessary to generate additional positions are larger at each step in recognition of economies of scale.

200 – 499 Faculty FTE:	1 additional professional and 1 additional classified position
>500 Faculty FTE:	2 additional professional and 2 additional classified positions

2. Schools and Colleges: Schools and Colleges should receive positions in a manner similar to the Vice President's office. Each school or college should continue to receive 1 professional and 1 classified position. Additional professional and classified positions would be added based upon the number of faculty positions in the school or college.

50 – 174 Faculty FTE:	1 additional professional and 1 additional classified position
>175 Faculty FTE:	2 additional professional and 2 additional classified positions

3. Starting Academic Support Faculty Salaries: New professional positions should be added at the Quartile 1 of the salary schedule for rank 4 ("A" contract, currently $85,794, plus fringe benefits). New classified positions should be added at grade 27, step 1.

   To address salary equity, the Committee concurs with UCCSN's recommendation to equally fund starting salary amounts for new positions for each formula function. However, the Committee encourages the UCCSN to develop and implement a uniform salary policy at the system level to prevent individual institutions from perpetuating salary inequities. Further, as part of the biennial budget process, for each institution, UCCSN should gather data and report on the actual starting and existing salaries paid for each function each biennium. The Budget Division and the Legislature may use this information to adjust the budgeted starting salary levels as necessary.

4. Library Staffing: No change is recommended to the methodology in calculating Library Staffing. Using the number of volumes in a library, positions are generated on the basis of:

0 to 500,000 volumes	50 positions
For every additional 16,000 volumes	1 position

New positions generated as a result of this formula should be added at a 40:60 professional to classified ratio.

5. Starting Library Professional Salaries: For the universities, new library professional positions should be added at the mid-point of Quartile 1 and Quartile 2 of the university salary schedule for Assistant Professor (currently $55,838 plus fringe benefits). New positions at Nevada State College should also be funded at the mid-point of Quartile 1 and Quartile 2 of the board approved salary schedule for Assistant Professor.

6. Classified Positions: New classified positions should be added at grade 27, step 1, currently $25,808 plus fringe benefits, for the universities and Nevada State College.

7. Operating/Wage Costs: Operating and wage costs for the universities should be funded at $5,500 per full-time equivalent position (all positions). Nevada State College should receive $4,000 per position for library operating/wage support.

8. Academic Support Add-On: At the universities, the Committee recommends that the last element of Academic Support, that is 6.5 percent of the Instruction budget, should be increased to 9.5 percent to address needs that are not currently funded, e.g., academic advisement, technology and assessment. The add-on at Nevada State College should be established at the current 6.5 percent level.

9. New Position Equipment: New professional and classified positions should receive one-time equipment appropriations as defined by the State Budget Division. Current new employee equipment amounts are approximately $6,000 per professional position and $4,000 per classified position.

10. Workstation Replacement: Workstation replacement should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE.

Academic Support Revision Recommendations – Community Colleges

Due to the significant funding required through the Academic Support function for technology support personnel and operating, the Committee recommends the following adjustments to the Academic Support formula for the community colleges:

Instructional Budget	CCSN, WNCC TMCC	GBC
1st ----- $7,500,000	N/A	30%
Amount of instructional budget	22%	25%

The Committee recommends a tiered funding structure due to the size of Great Basin College (GBC). For GBC, the formula recommendation provides for a factor of 30 percent times the first $7.5 million of the Instructional budget and 25 percent for any funding beyond the $7.5 million amount. The formula for CCSN, WNCC and TMCC should be funded at a factor of 22 percent of the instructional budget.

Once GBC reaches an FTE level of 3,000, funding percentages should be consistent with those of CCSN, TMCC and WNCC. Upon GBC reaching the targeted level of consistent funding ratios with CCSN, TMCC and WNCC a hold harmless period not to exceed two biennia should exist.

STUDENT SERVICES

Student Services includes the offices for recruitment, admissions, registration, counseling, career guidance, student aid, and any activities whose primary purpose is to contribute to the student's intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the formal instruction program.

Current Formula

For the universities, the number of positions for student services is calculated as follows:

> Combined headcount and FTE enrollment, up to 10,000, is divided by 300. Combined headcount and FTE enrollment over 10,000, is divided by 400. The number of resident students (i.e., on-campus students) is divided by 100.

For the community colleges, the current formula for the Student Services function calculates the number of positions based on the combined student headcount (HC) and student full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollments divided by 400 for CCSN, TMCC and WNCC or divided by 375 for GBC.

Funding is determined by the number of existing positions divided by the total Student Services base budget to determine a per FTE cost. The number of new positions is then multiplied by the per FTE cost to determine the required enhancement funding.

Student Services Revision Recommendations – Universities and NSC

1. Position Calculation: To finance under-funded services in the Student Services function, the Committee recommends reducing the drivers (divisor) from the current amounts as follows:

    a. Combined headcount and FTE enrollment at or below 10,000: Divide by 200;

    b. Combined headcount and FTE enrollment above 10,000: Divide by 350.

    At Nevada State College, the drivers should be established at 275 and 375 respectively yielding the following calculations:

    c. Combined headcount and FTE enrollment at or below 10,000: Divide by 275;

    d. Combined headcount and FTE enrollment above 10,000: Divide by 375.

    The third driver of 100 for resident (on-campus) students would remain intact for the universities and NSC. This calculation will determine the total formula positions for the student services function.

The existing FTE should be subtracted from the formula positions to determine the number of new positions. New positions should be distributed at a 60:40 professional to classified ratio. New professional positions should be funded at the mid-point of range 2 of the appropriate salary schedules (currently $50,400). New classified positions should be funded at grade 27, step 1 (currently $25,808).

To address salary equity, the Committee concurs with UCCSN's recommendation to equally fund starting salary amounts for new positions for each formula function. However, the Committee encourages the UCCSN to develop and implement a uniform salary policy at the system level to prevent individual institutions from perpetuating salary inequities. Further, as part of the biennial budget process, for each institution, UCCSN should gather data and report on the actual starting and existing salaries paid for each function each biennium. The Budget Division and the Legislature may use this information to adjust the budgeted starting salary levels as necessary.

2. Operating & Wage Costs: Operating and wage costs for all positions should be funded at $10,500 per position at the universities and $8,250 per position at Nevada State College.

3. New Position Equipment: New professional and classified positions should receive one-time equipment appropriations as defined by the State Budget Division. Current new employee equipment amounts are approximately $6,000 per professional position and $4,000 per classified position.

4. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): Additional resources should be provided to cover costs of compliance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Institutions should receive $1,000 per student for each student with a documented disability.

5. Workstation Replacement: Workstation replacement should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE.

Student Services Revision Recommendation – Community Colleges:

1. Position Calculation: The Committee recommends expanding the range of drivers used in calculating student services to recognize economies of scale at the various institutions. Instead of a single driver of 400 for CCSN, TMCC and WNCC, the following drivers should be used:

   a. Combined FTE and headcount enrollment at or below 10,000: Divide by 350;

   b. Combined headcount and FTE enrollment above 10,000: Divide by 400.

   Recognizing Great Basin College's unique rural nature and the addition of baccalaureate programs at the college, the following drivers are recommended for GBC:

   c. Combined FTE and headcount enrollment at or below 4,500: Divide by 210.

d. Combined FTE and headcount enrollment between 4,501 to 10,000: Divide by 275;

e. Combined FTE and headcount enrollment between 10,001 and 25,000: Divide by 375;

f. Combined headcount and FTE enrollment above 25,000: Divide by 425.

New positions should be distributed on a 60:40 professional to classified ratio. New professional positions should be funded equal to a rank 4, step 10 salary annualized (currently $50,590 + fringe benefits). Classified positions should be funded at grade 27 step 1 (currently $25,808) plus associated fringe benefits. The rank and step funding may require adjustment based on the yet to be approved community college faculty salary schedule. Positions should be funded at the mid-point of the faculty salary schedule.

To address salary equity, the Committee concurs with UCCSN's recommendation to equally fund starting salary amounts for new positions for each formula function. However, the Committee encourages the UCCSN to develop and implement a uniform salary policy at the system level to prevent individual institutions from perpetuating salary inequities. Further, as part of the biennial budget process, for each institution, UCCSN should gather data and report on the actual starting and existing salaries paid for each function each biennium. The Budget Division and the Legislature may use this information to adjust the budgeted starting salary levels as necessary.

2. Operating and Wage Costs: Operating and wages costs for all positions at the community colleges should be funded at $6,000 per position.

3. New Position Equipment: New professional and classified positions should receive one-time equipment appropriations as defined by the State Budget Division. Current new employee equipment amounts are approximately $6,000 per professional position and $4,000 per classified position.

4. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): Additional resources should be provided to cover costs of compliance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Institutions should receive $1,000 per student for each student with a documented disability.

5. Workstation Replacement: Workstation replacement should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Institutional support provides funding for central executive-level activities concerned with management and long-range planning of the entire institution such as the president's office, fiscal operations, logistical activities including procurement, storeroom, safety, security, printing support services to faculty and staff, and activities concerned with community and alumni relations including development and fund raising.

Current Formula

For the universities, the formula for institutional support is based upon a percentage of each institution's operating budgets, after subtracting the cost of institutional support and prorating an additional amount for the support of the business centers. As operating budgets increase, the percentage will decrease.

Total Operating Budget
1st ------ $0 to $15 million 15%
2nd ----- $15 to $30 million 10%
Over $30 million 6.5%

For the community colleges, the current Institutional Support formula allocates funding as a percentage of the total operating budgets less the Institutional Support function. Currently the Business Center's budget is calculated based on a proportional relationship of the college's total institutional budgets to the total budgets of the business centers. The funding percentages are as follows:

Total Operating Budget	CCSN, TMCC & WNCC	GBC
1st ----- $15 million	15%	20%
2nd ---- $15 million	10%	10%
Over $30 million	5%	5%

Institutional Support Revision Recommendations – Universities and NSC

At the universities, the amounts for the operating budget dollar drivers should be adjusted to reflect inflation from the 1986 higher education funding study. The last percentage driver of 6.5 percent should be increased to 7.5 percent to address campus security and other needs. Institutional support should be funded at the following percentages of the total operating budgets (less the institution support function):

Total Operating Budgets
1st --- $25 million 15%
2nd --- $25 million 10%
Over $50 million 7.5%

For Nevada State College, the following drivers should be established to reflect the lower cost of NSC relative to the universities:

Total Operating Budgets
1st --- $20 million 15%
2nd --- $20 million 10%
Over $40 million 7.5%

Workstation replacement should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE.

Institutional Support Revision Recommendations – Community Colleges

At the community colleges, the amounts for the operating budget dollar drivers should be adjusted to reflect inflation from the last higher education funding study. The percentage drivers are modified to address campus security and other needs. Recognizing Great Basin and Western Nevada Colleges' unique rural nature, driver recommendations at GBC and WNCC are more generous than the other community colleges. Institutional support should be funded at the following percentages of the total operating budgets (less the institution support function):

Total Operating Budget	CCSN & TMCC	GBC & WNCC
1st ----- $17.5 million	15%	17%
2nd ---- $17.5 million	10%	10%
Over $35 million	7.5%	7.5%

Once GBC and WNCC reach an FTE level of 3,000, funding percentages should be consistent with those of CCSN and TMCC. Once GBC and WNCC reach the targeted level of consistent funding ratios with CCSN and TMCC a hold harmless period not to exceed two biennia shall exist.

Workstation replacement should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT

Operation and Maintenance (O&M) of Plant includes custodial, building maintenance, grounds maintenance, supervisory activities, property insurance and similar items. Utilities are not included in the formula.

Current Formula

At the universities and community colleges, the formula for operation and maintenance of plant is applied to custodial, building maintenance, grounds maintenance and supervisory activities. Utilities, insurance and rent/lease costs are budgeted separately and adjustments are based upon consumption, rate changes, contractual agreements and the addition of any new or modified facilities.

The formula provides custodial, building maintenance and supervision positions on the basis of one position for every 12,000 square feet (for campuses with fewer than 12,000 students) or one position for every 10,500 square feet (for campuses with 12,000 or more, students). For grounds maintenance, the formula is based upon the maintenance of improved acreage and one position is budgeted for every 4.5 improved acres. Operating support is provided through an existing cost per position allocation adjusted over time for inflation.

O&M Plant Recommendations for Revision of Universities, NSC, Colleges and DRI

The Committee recommends that the Desert Research Institute should receive the same consideration for its state-run facilities as do the universities and colleges. Thus they should

participate in the O&M formulas as recommended. The revised formula consists of four components: Custodial, Building and Grounds Maintenance and Utility Services, Hazardous Materials, and Administrative Positions.

New positions for the four funding components, except for grounds maintenance, should be determined by providing one position for every 10,500 maintained square feet.

The total new positions generated from the maintained square feet calculation should be distributed in the following manner:

Custodial 3
Building Maintenance and Services.....3
Professional/Technical.....1

New custodial positions should be added at grade 21, step 1 (currently $20,442); new maintenance and service positions at grade 31, step 1 (currently $30,442); and new administrative positions at the mid-point of range 2 on the appropriate salary schedules.

A ten percent adjustment to the maintenance and services positions should be added to provide additional funding to reflect increased personnel and operating costs due to age of facilities (25 years or older).

The rank and step funding for administrative positions may require adjustment based on the yet to be approved community college faculty salary schedule. New administrative positions should be funded at the mid-point of the faculty salary schedule.

To address salary equity, the Committee concurs with UCCSN's recommendation to equally fund starting salary amounts for new positions for each formula function. However, the Committee encourages the UCCSN to develop and implement a uniform salary policy at the system level to prevent individual institutions from perpetuating salary inequities. Further, as part of the biennial budget process, for each institution, UCCSN should gather data and report on the actual starting and existing salaries paid for each function each biennium. The Budget Division, and the Legislature, may use this information to adjust the budgeted starting salary levels as necessary.

Grounds Maintenance Formula

The current formula for grounds maintenance positions should remain intact (one position is budgeted for every 4.5 improved acres). New grounds positions should be added at grade 22, step 1 (currently $21,214).

General O&M Operating

For the universities and colleges, determine general O&M operating funding by multiplying gross maintained square feet by an average cost per square foot (estimated at $0.90 per sq. ft). Buildings older than 25 years should be funded at an increased rate (approximately 25 percent greater than the average cost to reflect increased operating costs associated with age of facilities).

Utilities, Insurance and Rental

Allocations for utilities, insurance and rental costs should be funded based on institutional projections. Projections should be adjusted to include any legislatively approved inflationary factors and allocations for new space.

Equipment

New professional and classified positions should receive one-time equipment appropriations as defined by the State Budget Division. Current new employee equipment amounts are roughly $6,000 per professional position and $4,000 per classified position except for custodians.

Workstation replacement should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE. Workstation replacement funds would not be provided for custodial or grounds positions.

GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

Current Formula

In assessing the need in Nevada for graduate assistants (both for teaching and research assignments) and opportunities for graduate student employment, the number for graduate assistants is generated by allocating one assistantship for every five graduate student FTE. Doctoral-level graduate students require greater support than do other graduate students and, thus, one graduate assistantship is provided for every 3.33 FTE doctoral-level students.

Graduate assistantships at UNR and UNLV, which normally are based on a half-time workload, are funded at a level substantially lower than the minimum salary paid an instructor. Many graduate students possess credentials comparable to some first-time instructors. The assistantships should, therefore, be funded at a rate equal to half of that of a beginning instructor.

Recommendations for Revision – Universities and NSC

1. The committee recommends one graduate assistantship per 8 master student FTEs.

2. The committee also recommends one graduate assistantship per 3.33 doctoral students.

Assistantships should be funded at one-half the cost of an instructor position plus fringe benefits (currently $13,515).

EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT

Current Formula

The existing formula adopts an approach that funds the replacement of equipment by an amount equal to a percentage of an institution's price-adjusted, year-end inventory. A standard five percent rate is established and the year-end inventory is adjusted by the Producer Price Index (Capital Equipment Index). The university annually reviews its physical inventory to assure that all obsolete equipment items are removed from its inventory base.

Revision Recommendation

The Committee recommends deleting the current equipment replacement formula. The functional formula recommendations address ongoing equipment needs, technology equipment needs and workstation replacement. Equipment needs for non-formula budgets should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE.

EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE

The Committee recommends deleting the current equipment maintenance formula. Equipment maintenance should be covered from operating allocations.

LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS

Current Formula

For the universities, the current library acquisition formula applies an updated version of the Clapp-Jordan formula to generate a combined request for UNR and UNLV, which is then shared equally. Library acquisition calculations use a set number of library volumes based on the number of faculty, number of students and number of master and doctoral programs offered. The following is an example of how the current formula is applied:

Formula Rate	FTE/Degree	Formula Calc
Base Number of Volumes @ 85,000		85,000
Volumes Per Faculty @ 125	713	89,125
Volumes Per FTE Student @ 20	9,604	192,080
Volumes Per Baccalaureate or Associate Degree @ 610	79	48,190
Volumes Per Masters with no Doctoral Program @ 10,000	47	470,000
Volumes Per Masters with Doctoral Program @ 3,750	27	101,250
Volumes Per Doctoral Program @ 31,250	40	1,250,000
	Total Number of Volumes:	2,235,645
	Annual Acquisition Rate:	5%
	Annual Acquisitions:	111,782
	Estimated Acquisition Cost:	$ 78
	Annual Acquisition Request:	$8,718,996

Funding is determined by multiplying the calculated annual acquisitions times the estimated acquisition cost. The book acquisition formula is applied to both UNR and UNLV. Total funding generated by the formula is equally divided between the two campuses.

For the community colleges, library acquisition funding is calculated using the Learning Resource Center Standards for college libraries. Each college's collection size is determined by the number of FTE students. The collection size is multiplied by an acquisition rate and an

average cost per volume to determine the library acquisition funding. The following examples illustrate the application of the college library acquisition formula:

Formula Calculation

	Written Materials		Recorded Materials			
FTE Enrollment	Periodical Subscript	Printed Material	Films & Video	Other Recorded Material	Other Materials	Total Collection Size
Under 1,000	300	30,000	125	1,350	350	32,125
1,000-3,000	500	50,000	350	3,200	1,200	55,250
3,000-5,000	700	70,000	700	5,350	2,350	79,100
5,000-7,000	800	85,000	1,250	8,500	4,500	100,100
Each 1,000 over 7,000	30	12,000	150	405	305	12,890

Formula Application Example

Campus	Budgeted FTE Enrollment	Collection Size	Annual Acquisition Rate @ 5%	Average Cost	Formula Acquisition Request
CCSN	15,021	203,220	10,161	$78	$792,558
GBC	1,311	55,250	2,763	$78	$215,514
TMCC	5,001	100,100	5,005	$78	$390,390
WNCC	2,171	55,250	2,763	$78	$215,514

Library Acquisition Revision Recommendations – Universities and NSC

The Committee recommends continuing the use of modified the Clapp-Jordan formula. Programs should be counted in a consistent and comparable manner for the two universities. Separate budgets should be developed for each institution. The current practice of averaging the library acquisition budgets of the two universities should be discontinued.

Library Acquisition rates should be reduced from 5.0 percent to 4.3 percent. It is important to note that the Committee contemplated adjusting the rate to 3.5 percent. However, to eliminate concerns with indirect cost recovery distributions, the Committee amended the amount to 4.3 percent (see the Research section for further information).

The following is an example of the new formula:

Formula Rate	FTE/Degree	Formula Calc
Base Number of Volumes @ 85,000		85,000
Volumes Per Faculty @ 125	713	89,125
Volumes Per FTE Student @ 20	9,604	192,080
Volumes Per Baccalaureate or Associate Degree @ 610	79	48,190
Volumes Per Masters with no Doctoral Program @ 10,000	47	470,000
Volumes Per Masters with Doctoral Program @ 3,750	27	101,250
Volumes Per Doctoral Program @ 31,250	40	1,250,000
	Total Number of Volumes:	2,235,645
	Annual Acquisition Rate:	4.3%
	Annual Acquisitions:	96,133
	Estimated Acquisition Cost:	$ 78
	Annual Acquisition Request:	$7,498,374

Library Acquisition Recommended Revision – Community Colleges

No change is recommended to the current formula. Library acquisition funding should continue to be calculated using the Learning Resource Center Standards for college libraries. Each college's collection size should be determined by the number of FTE students. The collection size should be multiplied by an acquisition rate and an average cost per volume to determine the library acquisition funding. The following examples illustrate the application of the college library acquisition formula:

Formula Calculation

	Written Materials		Recorded Materials			
FTE Enrollment	Periodical Subscript	Printed Material	Films & Video	Other Recorded Material	Other Materials	Total Collection Size
Under 1,000	300	30,000	125	1,350	350	32,125
1,000-3,000	500	50,000	350	3,200	1,200	55,250
3,000-5,000	700	70,000	700	5,350	2,350	79,100
5,000-7,000	800	85,000	1,250	8,500	4,500	100,100
Each 1,000 over 7,000	30	12,000	150	405	305	12,890

Formula Application Example

Campus	Budgeted FTE Enrollment	Collection Size	Annual Acquisition Rate @ 5%	Average Cost	Formula Acquisition Request
CCSN	15,021	203,220	10,161	$78	$792,558
GBC	1,311	55,250	2,763	$78	$215,514
TMCC	5,001	100,100	5,005	$78	$390,390
WNCC	2,171	55,250	2,763	$78	$215,514

RESEARCH

Current Formula:

The Research function is currently funded on an incremental basis. The State allocates 25 percent of the campuses' Indirect Cost Recovery Collection as a revenue source for the operating budget.

Recommended Revision:

The Committee suggests no changes to the research funding methodology. During several meetings, UCCSN suggested that the State return 100 percent of the Indirect Cost Recovery Collection to the campuses to stimulate research and increase the level of externally funded grants and contracts. The Committee did not concur with this recommendation and chose instead to adjust the library acquisition funding percentage to address the indirect cost recovery concern.

The Committee recommends that a review of the status of indirect cost recoveries occur at the next session of the Legislature.

SUMMARIES AND COMPARISONS

The following tables and charts provide narrative and numerical summaries and comparisons of the new formula recommendations compared to the formulas approved in 1986:

Table V provides a function-by-function comparison of the 1986 formulas to the Committee formula revisions.

Table VI illustrates the dollar and percentage differences between the new formulas and those recommended by the Committee. This table also displays the percentage splits between the universities and community colleges and demonstrates how the formula recommendations affect the distributions.

Table VII provides a comparison of historical versus projected costs using the new formula summarized at the institutional level. This table indicates the estimated percentage of the formulas that could be funded if UCCSN's share of state general fund appropriations is 19.5 percent.

Table VIII provides a comparison of historical versus projected costs using the new formula summarized at the institutional level. This table indicates the estimated percentage of the formulas that could be funded if UCCSN's share of state general fund appropriations is 20.0 percent.

Table IX reveals the estimated cost of the hold harmless provision assuming UCCSN's share of state general fund appropriations is 19.5 percent. As noted earlier, when institutions are funded at less than 100 percent of the formulae, the Committee recommends inclusion of a hold harmless clause. The hold harmless provision allows individual institutions to retain their base funding levels when the formula recommendations fall below the base amount. When equal funding percentages are achieved, the institutions will move forward at the same pace. The hold harmless provision is recommended for a period not to exceed more than two biennia.

Table X reveals the estimated cost of the hold harmless provision assuming UCCSN's share of state general fund appropriations is 20.0 percent.

Table XI provides a comparison of historical versus projected costs using the new formula with functional detail by institution.

Comparison of Current Formulas to Committee Recommendations

Function	1986 Formula	Committee Formula Revisions
Instruction Student Credit Hour FTE enrollment conversion	Undergraduate: Total SCH/30 = FTE Students Graduate: Total SCH/16 = FTE Students	Community Colleges: Total SCH/30 = FTE Students Undergraduate (Lower Div): Total SCH/30 = FTE Students Undergraduate (Upper Div): Total SCH/30 = FTE Students Graduate/Masters: Total SCH/24 = FTE Students Graduate/Doctoral: Total SCH/18 = FTE Students FTE enrollment projections are based upon a weighted 3-year rolling average.
Instruction Student to Faculty Ratios	Universities: Regular: 21:1 Engineering: 15:1 Community Colleges: Regular (TMCC, CCSN): 23:1 Regular (GBC, WNCC): 21:1 Vocational/Technical/Eng: 18:1 Dental Asst & Radiology: 14:1 Dental Hygiene: 6:1 Rural: 12:1 Nursing 7.5:1 at university & college	The Committee recommends using a matrix modeled after Connecticut's methodology. The matrix consists of four rows (high medium and low cost and clinical) and six columns by level of discipline (GBC/WNCC, TMCC/CCSN, university lower division, university upper division, graduate masters, graduate doctoral). Ratios vary by cell within the matrix.
Instruction – New positions	New faculty are funded at the average salary cost at each institution.	New faculty should be funded at the same rate at the two universities (Associate Professor, mid-point of Q1 and Q2 - $55,858). At the colleges, the faculty rate should be equal to a rank 4, step 10 (currently $42,158). NSC positions should also be funded at the midpoint of Q1 and Q2 of the salary range for an Associate Professor (based upon board-approved schedules).
Instructional equipment	Equipment replacement and maintenance is currently funded globally (all functions) through the following formulas: Replacement: 5 percent of inventory; Maintenance: 6 percent of previous biennium appropriation.	a. Provide $5,200 annually for each existing full-time university faculty position (workstation & instructional replacement, & start-up). NSC faculty should receive $4,500 per FTE. The community colleges should receive $3,500 for each full-time faculty position. b. Provide $1,000 per existing classified

Comparison of Current Formulas to Committee Recommendations

Function	1986 Formula	Committee Formula Revisions
Instructional equipment (continued)		FTE for workstation replacement.
Instructional Classified Positions	Classified positions are calculated on a 5:1 ratio (professional to classified). New salaries are calculated using base averages.	Retain the 5:1 ratio. Positions should be funded at grade 27, step 1 (currently $25,808).
Instructional Salary Equity Pool	None	Establish a salary equity pool exclusively for UNLV. The pool comprises the current all-ranks salary difference ($5,200) times the number of vacant positions.
Instructional Operating/Wages	Instructional operating funding is based on the prior years' average costs per faculty per institution.	Faculty and classified operating & wage rates are recommended as follows: a. Universities:$6,000 & $2,300; b. NSC: $5,000 and $2,300; c. Colleges: $4,600 and $2,300.
Instructional – CC Full-Time/Part-Time Ratios	The 1986 study recommends a 70:30 ratio. During the 1999 session, the Legislature funded a 60:40 ratio and added an estate tax supplement to improve the ratio.	Formalize the full-time to part-time ratio at 60:40. New faculty should be funded at a salary equal to 60 percent of the base salary for full-time faculty (approximately $25,295).
Instructional – CC Teaching Assistant	None	Add $1,000 per faculty FTE for teaching assistants.
Academic Support –Universities & NSC	a. Two professional and one classified position for the vice president of academic affairs. b. One professional and one classified position for each college/school. c. An additional 6.5% of the instruction budget.	a. Same base as current formula. b. Additional professional & classified positions should be added based on the number of faculty positions. Professional salaries should be set at Q1 of rank 4 ($85,794). c. At the universities, increase the add-on to 9.5% for technology and academic advisement. At NSC, establish the add-on at 6.5%.
Academic Support –Community Colleges	Academic support funding is provided based upon the following percentages of instructional funding: CCSN, TMCC, WNCC: 20% Great Basin College: 25%	The Committee recommends the following increases to recognize high-tech centers, technology equipment and staffing, and operating and wages: 1st $7.5 mil – GBC: 30% Over $7.5 mill – GBC: 25% CCSN/TMCC/WNCC: 22%

Comparison of Current Formulas to Committee Recommendations

Function	1986 Formula	Committee Formula Revisions
Library Support – Universities & NSC	Library positions are generated based upon the number of volumes: 0-500,000 volumes: 50 positions For every additional 16,000 + volumes: 1 position	a. Positions should be generated using the same ratios. b. New positions should be added at a 40:60 professional to classified ratio. c. Fund professional positions at the mid-point of Q1 and Q2, salary range 2 ($55,838 plus fringe). d. Fund classified at grade 27, step 1. e. Fund Library operating/wages of $5,500 per FTE at the universities $4,000 at NSC. f. Fund Workstation replacement of $1,000 per existing FTE.
Library Acquisitions	Universities: An updated version of the Clapp-Jordan formula is applied to generate a combined request for UNR and UNLV which is then shared equally. Colleges: Acquisition funding uses Learning Resource Center standards for college libraries. Volumes are based upon FTE students and average volume price.	Universities: Continue using the Clapp-Jordan formula. Develop separate budgets for each institution. Reduce the library acquisition rate from 5 percent to 4.3 percent Colleges: No change – use the existing library acquisition formula.
Student Services	a. Universities: The combined headcount and FTE enrollment (up to 10,000) are divided by 300. Over 10,000 by 400. Resident (on-campus) students are divided by 100. b. Community Colleges: The FTE & combined headcount enrollment) are divided by 300 at GBC and by 400 at the other colleges. c. FTE salary = existing positions divided into the Student Svcs base.	a. For the universities, reduce the drivers of 300 to 200 and 400 to 350. For NSC, establish the drivers at 275 and 375 respectively. For CCSN, TMCC, and WNCC, revise the 400 driver to a range of drivers (350 and 400) depending upon combined FTE and headcount. At GBC, revise the 375 driver to a range of drivers (210, 275, 375 and 425) depending upon combined FTE and headcount. b. Distribute new positions at a 60:40 professional to classified ratio. c. Fund new professional university positions at the mid-point of range 2. Fund college positions at rank 4, step 10, annualized. Fund classified positions at a grade 27, step 1. d. Fund university operating and wages at $10,500, $8,250 at NSC, and $6,000 for the Colleges.

Comparison of Current Formulas to Committee Recommendations

Function	1986 Formula	Committee Formula Revisions
Student Services (Continued)		e. Add an ADA allowance of $1,000 per disabled student at the colleges and universities. f. Add $1,000 per FTE for workstation replacement.
Institutional Support	Funding for institutional support is based on a percentage of the operating budgets administered by each campus: $0 to $15 mil: 15% (20% for GBC) $15 to $30 mil: 10% Over $30 mil: 6.5% for Universities 5.0% for Colleges	Adjust the drivers to reflect inflation: At the universities, use the following drivers: $0 to $25 mil: 15% $25 to $50 mil: 10% Over $50 mil: 7.5% At NSC, use the following drivers: $0 to $20 mil: 15% $20 to $40 mil: 10% Over $40 mil: 7.5% At the community colleges, use the following drivers: $0 to $17.5 mil: 15% at CCSN & TMCC, 17% at WNCC & GBC $17.5 to $35 mil: 10% Over $35 mil: 7.5% If GBC and WNCC reach 3,000 FTE, funding percentages would match TMCC and CCSN. Add $1,000 per FTE for workstation replacement.

Comparison of Current Formulas to Committee Recommendations

Function	1986 Formula	UCCSN Formula Recommendations
O&M of Plant	a. For campuses with over 12,000 headcount students, the number of positions = total bldg sq. ft. divided by 10,500 sq. ft. b. For campuses with under 12,000 headcount students, the number of positions = total bldg sq. ft. divided by 12,000 sq. ft. c. For grounds maintenance, the number of positions = total improved acreage divided by 4.5 acres.	a. The 12,000 headcount and 12,000 sq. ft. factors are eliminated. b. Add one position for every 10,500 maintained sq.ft. c. Distribute new positions as follows: 3 custodial, 3 maintenance and services, and 1 administration. d. An adjustment of 10% should be added to maintenance & service positions to reflect increased personnel costs due to age of facilities (25 years or older). e. The grounds formula (1 position per 4.5 improved acres) remains intact. f. Add $1,000 per FTE for workstation replacement. g. For the universities and colleges, O&M operating funding is determined by multiplying gross maintained sq.ft. by an average cost per sq.ft (est. at $0.90 per sq. Buildings older than 25 years should be funded at an increased rate (approx. 25%). h. Treat DRI similarly.

Comparison of Current Formulas to Committee Recommendations

Function	1986 Formula	UCCSN Formula Recommendations
Graduate Assistants	University Only Masters: 1 graduate assistant for every 5 FTE graduate students. Doctoral: 1 graduate assistant for every 3.33 doctoral students.	University Only Masters: 1 graduate assistant for every 8 FTE graduate students. Doctoral: 1 graduate assistant for every 3.33 doctoral students. Assistantships funded at $13,515.
Equipment Replacement	The current formula calls for replacement of 5% of the existing inventory annually.	Delete the global formula. Equipment needs are addressed in individual functions. Non-formula workstation replacement should be funded at $1,000 per existing professional and classified FTE.
Equipment Maintenance	The current formula calls for maintenance funding of 6% of the previous biennium's new equipment appropriation.	Delete this formula.
Equipment for New Positions	Equipment for new positions is funded according to the amounts established each biennium in the budget instructions.	New faculty and staff should receive one-time equipment funding at the rates used by the Budget Division to prepare the biennial budget instructions. The current amounts are approximately $6,000 and $4,000 respectively.
Research	None – state currently retains 25 percent of indirect cost recovery.	No change however the Committee suggest further review of the status of indirect cost recoveries during the next session.
Performance Funding	None	The Committee recommends a pool not-to-exceed 2 percent of the total appropriation be established and appropriated based upon achievement of specified performance goals.

UCCSN
FY 2001 - 2007 Formula Summaries
Percentage Changes

Institution	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
UNR							
Existing	128,517,273	131,562,256	137,624,558	143,521,382	149,830,708	156,450,145	163,140,665
New	130,030,373	132,390,244	138,562,238	145,181,858	151,612,076	157,679,294	163,854,624
% Change	1.18%	0.63%	0.68%	1.16%	1.19%	0.79%	0.44%
UNLV							
Existing	157,195,470	172,022,443	186,887,792	203,000,280	218,641,017	235,744,967	254,193,176
New	164,260,486	176,318,553	189,893,988	205,229,170	221,928,831	239,197,267	257,588,268
% Change	4.49%	2.50%	1.61%	1.10%	1.50%	1.46%	1.34%
Total University							
Existing	285,712,743	303,584,699	324,512,350	346,521,662	368,471,725	392,195,112	417,333,841
New	294,290,859	308,708,797	328,456,226	350,411,028	373,540,907	396,876,561	421,442,892
$ Change - Old vs new formula	**8,578,116**	**5,124,098**	**3,943,876**	**3,889,366**	**5,069,182**	**4,681,449**	**4,109,051**
% Change	**3.00%**	**1.69%**	**1.22%**	**1.12%**	**1.38%**	**1.19%**	**0.98%**
Existing % of Total	**66.20%**	**66.01%**	**65.48%**	**64.82%**	**64.03%**	**63.25%**	**62.42%**
New % of Total	**65.53%**	**65.52%**	**65.09%**	**64.51%**	**63.64%**	**62.80%**	**61.91%**
Difference	**-0.67%**	**-0.49%**	**-0.39%**	**-0.31%**	**-0.39%**	**-0.45%**	**-0.51%**
CCSN							
Existing	84,613,224	94,195,914	104,969,525	117,162,552	130,970,637	146,618,930	164,360,026
New	87,807,728	94,519,888	104,347,560	116,734,595	130,920,243	147,253,261	165,365,396
% Change	3.78%	0.34%	-0.59%	-0.37%	-0.04%	0.43%	0.61%
GBC							
Existing	12,130,268	11,695,067	12,651,727	13,598,867	14,636,217	15,734,281	16,968,258
New	13,210,845	12,726,142	13,627,930	14,305,123	16,094,314	16,886,395	18,380,263
% Change	8.91%	8.82%	7.72%	5.19%	9.96%	7.32%	8.32%
TMCC							
Existing	30,936,386	32,089,483	34,145,247	36,892,917	39,665,472	42,872,479	46,152,884
New	34,589,836	35,546,230	37,607,972	40,091,957	43,497,635	46,676,946	50,468,837
% Change	11.81%	10.77%	10.14%	8.67%	9.66%	8.87%	9.35%
WNCC							
Existing	18,224,337	18,313,304	19,290,407	20,387,022	21,690,330	22,631,332	23,722,271
New	19,197,781	19,633,311	20,579,403	21,658,108	22,905,833	24,268,121	25,047,063
% Change	5.34%	7.21%	6.68%	6.23%	5.60%	7.23%	5.58%
Colleges %							
Existing	145,904,215	156,293,768	171,056,906	188,041,358	206,962,656	227,857,022	251,203,439
New	154,806,190	162,425,571	176,162,865	192,789,783	213,418,025	235,084,723	259,261,559
$ Change - Old vs new formula	**8,901,975**	**6,131,803**	**5,105,959**	**4,748,425**	**6,455,369**	**7,227,701**	**8,058,120**
% Change	**6.10%**	**3.92%**	**2.98%**	**2.53%**	**3.12%**	**3.17%**	**3.21%**
Existing % of Total	**33.80%**	**33.99%**	**34.52%**	**35.18%**	**35.97%**	**36.75%**	**37.58%**
New % of Total	**34.47%**	**34.48%**	**34.91%**	**35.49%**	**36.36%**	**37.20%**	**38.09%**
Difference	**0.67%**	**0.49%**	**0.39%**	**0.31%**	**0.39%**	**0.45%**	**0.51%**
UCCSN							
Existing	431,616,958	459,878,467	495,569,256	534,563,020	575,434,381	620,052,134	668,537,280
New	449,097,049	471,134,368	504,619,091	543,200,811	586,958,932	631,961,284	680,704,451
% Change	**4.05%**	**2.45%**	**1.83%**	**1.62%**	**2.00%**	**1.92%**	**1.82%**

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Summaries
Historical and Projected Formula Costs
Existing and Recommended Formulas
Scenario #1- General Fund Share of 19.5%

	FY 98			FY 99			FY 00			FY 01			FY 02		
	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	New	
Area/Formula	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request
FORMULA BUDGETS															
UNR	114,147,457	99,492,287	114,776,578	114,421,670	98,467,195	115,627,939	121,683,556	102,087,517	123,966,013	128,517,273	105,951,240	130,030,373	131,562,256	132,390,244	104,173,825
UNLV	124,478,861	110,337,053	133,030,350	132,443,763	111,967,446	143,903,594	146,422,391	123,555,454	155,738,387	157,195,470	130,166,379	164,260,486	172,022,443	176,318,553	138,739,665
CCSN	57,809,780	49,351,497	68,041,628	58,699,836	52,072,679	69,328,921	70,448,375	61,162,230	80,255,759	84,613,224	66,345,093	87,807,728	94,195,914	94,519,888	74,374,802
GBC	8,655,142	8,101,633	10,124,056	8,937,242	8,100,221	10,719,714	10,489,820	9,682,379	11,533,949	12,130,268	10,513,398	13,210,845	11,695,067	12,726,142	10,013,811
TMCC	25,015,418	22,983,413	32,936,270	24,449,258	23,069,657	33,589,459	28,997,698	26,365,120	32,728,433	30,936,386	28,412,130	34,589,836	32,089,483	35,546,230	27,970,239
WNCC	13,270,782	12,997,564	17,056,972	13,859,260	13,244,396	17,844,525	16,057,695	14,851,535	17,444,377	18,224,337	15,581,434	19,197,781	18,313,304	19,633,311	15,448,851
NSC			-			-			-					-	-
DRI														2,186,302	1,720,334
BCS	69,572	13,914	-	102,260	20,452	-	91,910	-	-	132,669	-	-	135,986	-	-
BCN	231,211	46,242	-	240,532	48,106	-	60,388	-	-	111,076	-	-	113,853	-	-
OTHER	1,456,928	364,732	-	1,458,928	364,732	-	1,043,198	-	-	1,043,198	-	-	1,069,278	-	-
Formula Budgets Total	345,137,151	303,688,315	375,965,854	354,612,749	307,354,884	391,014,152	395,495,031	337,704,235	421,666,918	432,903,901	356,969,674	449,097,049	461,197,584	473,320,670	372,441,527
Formula Funding %		87.99%			86.67%			85.39%			82.46%				78.69%
NON-FORM BDGTS	82,484,416	82,424,260	79,599,548	84,229,487	84,160,929	81,160,893	96,493,377	96,493,377	96,493,377	101,580,703	101,580,703	101,580,703	107,675,545	107,675,545	105,967,628
UCCSN TOTAL	427,621,567	386,112,575	455,565,402	438,842,236	391,515,813	472,175,045	491,988,408	434,197,612	518,160,295	534,484,604	458,550,377	550,677,752	568,873,129	580,996,215	478,409,155
State GF Revenue		1,425,815,932			1,527,843,541			1,567,370,528			1,639,014,901				1,741,900,000
UCCSN GF Revenue		291,678,025			290,279,533			305,982,984			316,610,775				339,670,500
% UCCSN GF Revenue		20.46%			19.00%			19.52%			19.32%				19.50%
Calc UCCSN GF Rev															339,670,500
% UCCSN GF to Budget		75.54%			74.14%			70.47%			69.05%				71.00%

	FY 03			FY 04			FY 05			FY 06			FY 07		
	Existing	New		Existing	New		Existing	New		Existing	New		Existing	New	
	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request
FORMULA BUDGETS															
UNR	137,624,558	138,562,238	104,417,432	143,521,382	145,181,858	105,475,090	149,830,708	151,612,076	105,457,273	156,450,145	157,679,294	104,903,787	163,140,665	163,854,624	104,686,374
UNLV	166,887,792	169,893,988	143,099,902	203,000,280	205,229,170	149,099,657	218,641,017	221,928,831	154,367,713	235,744,967	239,197,267	159,137,566	254,193,176	257,588,268	164,572,602
CCSN	104,969,525	104,347,560	78,634,009	117,162,552	116,734,595	84,808,061	130,970,637	130,920,243	91,064,592	146,618,930	147,253,261	97,967,363	164,360,026	165,365,396	105,651,603
GBC	12,651,727	13,627,930	10,269,706	13,598,867	14,305,123	10,392,718	14,636,217	16,094,314	11,194,771	15,734,281	16,886,395	11,234,492	16,968,258	18,380,263	11,743,112
TMCC	34,145,247	37,607,972	28,340,534	36,892,917	40,091,957	29,126,937	39,665,472	43,497,635	30,255,783	42,872,479	46,676,946	31,054,099	46,152,884	50,468,837	32,244,434
WNCC	19,290,407	20,579,403	15,508,182	20,387,022	21,658,108	15,734,686	21,690,330	21,905,833	15,237,107	22,631,332	24,268,121	16,145,543	23,722,271	25,047,063	16,002,516
NSC		6,805,674	6,635,761		12,263,120	8,909,196		18,916,890	13,158,079		25,924,356	17,247,433		32,231,787	20,592,821
DRI		2,256,294	1,700,293		2,331,929	1,694,154		2,407,219	1,674,397		2,485,277	1,653,451		2,566,211	1,639,547
BCS	139,385	-		142,870	-		146,442	-		150,103	-		153,855	-	
BCN	116,699	-		119,617	-		122,607	-		125,672	-		128,814	-	
OTHER	1,096,010	-		1,123,410	-		1,151,495	-		1,180,283	-		1,209,790	-	
Formula Budgets Total	496,921,350	515,681,058	388,605,819	535,948,917	557,795,861	405,240,500	576,854,925	607,283,042	422,409,714	621,508,192	660,370,918	439,343,734	670,029,739	715,502,450	457,133,007
Formula Funding %			75.36%			72.65%			69.56%			66.53%			63.89%
NON-FORM BDGTS	112,995,222	112,995,222	110,566,717	118,556,331	118,556,331	115,299,641	124,393,280	124,393,280	120,184,652	130,519,805	130,519,805	125,002,745	136,950,327	136,950,327	130,064,176
UCCSN TOTAL	609,916,572	628,676,280	499,172,535	654,505,248	676,352,192	520,540,141	701,248,205	731,676,322	542,594,366	752,027,997	790,890,722	564,346,479	806,980,066	852,452,777	587,197,183
State GF Revenue			1,817,500,000			1,895,300,000			1,975,600,000			2,054,800,000			2,138,000,000
UCCSN GF Revenue			354,412,500			369,583,500			385,242,000			400,686,000			416,910,000
% UCCSN GF Revenue			19.50%			19.50%			19.50%			19.50%			19.50%
Calc UCCSN GF Rev			354,412,500			369,583,500			385,242,000			400,686,000			416,910,000
% UCCSN GF to Budget			71.00%			71.00%			71.00%			71.00%			71.00%

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Summaries
Historical and Projected Formula Costs
Existing and Recommended Formulas
Scenario #2- General Fund Share of 20.0%

Area/Formula	FY 98 Existing @ 100%	FY 98 Leg. Appr.	FY 98 New @ 100%	FY 99 Existing @ 100%	FY 99 Leg. Appr.	FY 99 New @ 100%	FY 00 Existing @ 100%	FY 00 Leg. Appr.	FY 00 New @ 100%	FY 01 Existing @ 100%	FY 01 Leg. Appr.	FY 01 New @ 100%	FY 02 Existing @ 100%	FY 02 New @ 100%	FY 02 Request
FORMULA BUDGETS															
UNR	114,147,457	99,492,267	114,776,578	114,421,670	98,467,195	115,627,939	121,883,556	102,087,517	123,966,013	128,517,273	105,951,240	130,030,373	131,562,256	132,390,244	106,844,949
UNLV	124,478,861	110,337,053	133,030,350	132,443,763	111,967,446	143,903,594	146,422,391	123,555,454	155,736,387	157,195,470	130,166,379	164,260,486	172,022,443	176,318,553	142,297,092
CCSN	57,809,780	49,351,497	68,041,628	58,699,836	52,072,679	69,328,921	70,448,375	61,162,230	80,255,759	84,613,224	66,345,093	87,807,728	94,195,914	94,519,888	76,281,849
GBC	8,655,142	8,101,633	10,124,056	8,937,242	8,100,221	10,719,714	10,489,820	9,682,379	11,533,949	12,130,268	10,513,398	13,210,845	11,695,067	12,726,142	10,270,576
TMCC	25,015,418	22,983,413	32,936,270	24,449,258	23,069,657	33,589,459	28,997,698	26,365,120	32,728,433	30,936,386	28,412,130	34,589,836	32,089,483	35,546,230	28,687,425
WNCC	13,270,782	12,997,564	17,056,972	13,859,260	13,244,396	17,844,525	16,057,695	14,851,535	17,444,377	18,224,337	15,581,434	19,197,781	18,313,304	19,633,311	15,844,975
NSC			-			-			-					-	-
DRI														2,186,302	1,764,445
BCS	69,572	13,914	-	102,260	20,452	-	91,910	-	-	132,669	-	-	135,986	-	-
BCN	231,211	46,242	-	240,532	48,106	-	60,388	-	-	111,076	-	-	113,853	-	-
OTHER	1,458,928	364,732	-	1,458,928	364,732	-	1,043,198	-	-	1,043,198	-	-	1,069,276	-	-
Formula Budgets Total	345,137,151	303,688,315	375,965,854	354,612,749	307,354,884	391,014,152	395,495,031	337,704,235	421,666,918	432,903,901	356,969,674	449,097,049	461,197,584	473,320,670	381,991,310
Formula Funding %		87.99%			86.67%			85.39%			82.46%				80.70%
NON-FORM BDGTS	82,484,416	82,424,260	79,599,548	84,229,487	84,160,929	81,160,893	96,493,377	96,493,377	96,493,377	101,580,703	101,580,703	101,580,703	107,675,545	107,675,545	108,684,746
UCCSN TOTAL	427,621,567	386,112,575	455,565,402	438,842,236	391,515,813	472,175,045	491,988,408	434,197,612	518,160,295	534,484,604	458,550,377	550,677,752	568,873,129	580,996,215	490,676,056
State GF Revenue		1,425,815,932			1,527,843,541			1,567,370,528			1,639,014,901				1,741,900,000
UCCSN GF Revenue		281,678,025			290,279,533			305,982,984			316,610,775				348,380,000
% UCCSN GF Revenue		20.46%			19.00%			19.52%			19.32%				20.00%
Calc UCCSN GF Rev															348,380,000
% UCCSN GF to Budget		75.54%			74.14%			70.47%			69.05%				71.00%

Area/Formula	FY 03 Existing @ 100%	FY 03 New @ 100%	FY 03 Request	FY 04 Existing @ 100%	FY 04 New @ 100%	FY 04 Request	FY 05 Existing @ 100%	FY 05 New @ 100%	FY 05 Request	FY 06 Existing @ 100%	FY 06 New @ 100%	FY 06 Request	FY 07 Existing @ 100%	FY 07 New @ 100%	FY 07 Request
FORMULA BUDGETS															
UNR	137,624,556	136,562,238	107,094,802	143,521,382	145,181,858	108,179,580	149,830,708	151,612,076	108,161,306	156,450,145	157,679,294	107,593,627	163,140,665	163,854,624	107,370,640
UNLV	186,887,792	189,893,988	146,769,130	203,000,280	205,229,170	152,922,725	218,641,017	221,928,831	158,325,859	235,744,967	239,197,267	163,218,016	254,193,176	257,588,268	168,792,412
CCSN	104,969,525	104,347,560	80,650,265	117,162,552	116,734,595	86,982,627	130,970,637	130,920,243	93,399,581	146,618,930	147,253,261	100,479,347	164,360,026	165,365,396	108,360,618
GBC	12,651,727	13,627,930	10,533,032	13,598,867	14,305,123	10,659,198	14,636,217	16,094,314	11,481,817	15,734,281	16,886,395	11,522,556	16,968,258	18,380,263	12,044,217
TMCC	34,145,247	37,607,972	29,067,214	36,892,917	40,091,957	29,873,761	39,665,472	43,497,635	31,031,572	42,872,479	48,676,946	31,850,358	46,152,864	50,468,837	33,071,214
WNCC	19,290,407	20,579,403	15,905,828	20,387,022	21,658,108	16,138,139	21,690,330	21,905,833	15,627,802	22,631,332	24,268,121	16,559,531	23,722,271	25,047,063	16,412,836
NSC		6,805,674	6,805,909		12,263,120	9,137,637		18,916,890	13,495,465		25,924,356	17,689,675		32,231,787	21,120,842
DRI		2,256,294	1,743,890		2,331,929	1,737,594		2,407,219	1,717,330		2,485,277	1,695,847		2,566,211	1,681,586
BCS	139,385	-		142,870	-		146,442	-		150,103	-		153,855	-	
BCN	116,699	-		119,617	-		122,607	-		125,672	-		128,814	-	
OTHER	1,096,010	-		1,123,410	-		1,151,495	-		1,180,283	-		1,209,790	-	
Formula Budgets Total	496,921,350	515,681,058	398,570,070	535,948,917	557,795,861	415,631,282	576,654,925	607,283,042	433,240,732	621,508,192	660,370,918	450,608,958	670,029,739	715,502,450	468,854,366
Formula Funding %			77.29%			74.51%			71.34%			68.24%			65.53%
NON-FORM BDGTS	112,995,222	112,995,222	113,401,761	118,556,331	118,556,331	118,258,042	124,393,280	124,393,280	123,266,310	130,519,805	130,519,805	128,207,944	136,950,327	136,950,327	133,399,155
UCCSN TOTAL	609,916,572	628,676,280	511,971,831	654,505,248	676,352,192	533,887,324	701,248,205	731,676,322	556,507,042	752,027,997	790,890,722	578,816,901	806,980,066	852,452,777	602,253,521
State GF Revenue			1,817,500,000			1,895,300,000			1,975,600,000			2,054,800,000			2,138,000,000
UCCSN GF Revenue			363,500,000			379,060,000			395,120,000			410,960,000			427,600,000
% UCCSN GF Revenue			20.00%			20.00%			20.00%			20.00%			20.00%
Calc UCCSN GF Rev			363,500,000			379,060,000			395,120,000			410,960,000			427,600,000
% UCCSN GF to Budget			71.00%			71.00%			71.00%			71.00%			71.00%

UCCSN
Formula Summaries
Hold Harmless Scenario #1 - General Fund Share of 19.5%

	FY 01			FY 02					FY 03				
	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	New		Hold Harmless	Hold Harmless	Existing	New		Hold Harmless	Hold Harmless
Area/Formula	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	Amount	Difference	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	Amount	Difference
FORMULA BUDGETS													
UNR	126,517,273	105,951,240	130,030,373	131,562,256	132,390,244	104,173,825	105,951,240	1,777,415	137,624,558	138,562,238	104,417,432	105,951,240	1,533,808
UNLV	157,195,470	130,166,379	164,260,486	172,022,443	176,318,553	138,739,665	138,739,665	-	186,887,792	189,893,988	143,099,901	143,099,901	-
CCSN	84,613,224	66,345,093	87,807,728	94,195,914	94,519,888	74,374,803	74,374,803	-	104,969,525	104,347,560	78,834,009	78,834,009	-
GBC	12,130,268	10,513,398	13,210,845	11,695,067	12,726,142	10,013,811	10,513,398	499,587	12,651,727	13,627,930	10,269,706	10,513,398	243,692
TMCC	30,936,386	28,412,130	34,589,836	32,089,483	35,546,230	27,970,239	28,412,130	441,891	34,145,247	37,607,972	28,340,534	28,412,130	71,596
WNCC	18,224,337	15,581,434	19,197,781	18,313,304	19,633,311	15,448,851	15,581,434	132,583	19,290,407	20,579,403	15,508,182	15,581,434	73,252
NSC					-	-	-			8,805,674	6,635,761	6,635,761	
DRI					2,186,302	1,720,334	1,720,334	-		2,256,294	1,700,293	1,720,334	20,041
BCS	132,669	-	-	135,986	-	-			139,385	-			
BCN	111,076	-	-	113,853	-	-			116,699	-			
OTHER	1,043,198	-	-	1,069,278	-	-			1,096,010	-			
Formula Budgets Total	432,903,901	356,969,674	449,097,049	461,197,584	473,320,670	372,441,527	375,293,004	2,851,476	496,921,350	515,681,059	388,605,819	390,548,207	1,942,388
Formula Funding %		82.46%				78.69%					75.36%		
NON-FORM BDGTS	102,623,901	102,623,901	102,623,901	108,781,335	108,781,335	105,967,628			112,995,222	112,995,222	110,566,717		
UCCSN TOTAL	535,527,802	459,593,575	551,720,950	569,978,919	582,102,005	478,409,155			609,916,572	628,676,281	499,172,535		
State GF Revenue		1,639,014,901				1,741,900,000					1,817,500,000		
UCCSN GF Revenue		316,610,775				339,670,500					354,412,500		
% UCCSN GF Revenue		19.32%				19.50%					19.50%		
Calc UCCSN GF Rev						339,670,500					354,412,500		
% UCCSN GF to Budget		68.69%				71.00%					71.00%		

UCCSN
Formula Summaries
Hold Harmless Scenario #3 - General Fund Share of 20.0%

	FY 01			FY 02					FY 03				
	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	New		Hold Harmless	Hold Harmless	Existing	New		Hold Harmless	Hold Harmless
Area/Formula	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	Amount	Difference	@ 100%	@ 100%	Request	Amount	Difference
FORMULA BUDGETS													
UNR	128,517,273	105,951,240	130,030,373	131,562,256	132,390,244	106,844,949	106,844,949	-	137,624,558	138,562,238	107,094,802	107,094,802	-
UNLV	157,195,470	130,166,379	164,260,488	172,022,443	176,318,553	142,297,092	142,297,092	-	186,887,792	189,893,988	146,769,130	146,769,130	-
CCSN	84,613,224	66,345,093	87,807,728	94,195,914	94,519,888	76,281,849	76,281,849	-	104,969,525	104,347,560	80,650,268	80,650,268	-
GBC	12,130,268	10,513,398	13,210,845	11,695,067	12,726,142	10,270,575	10,513,398	242,823	12,651,727	13,627,930	10,533,032	10,533,032	-
TMCC	30,936,386	28,412,130	34,589,836	32,089,483	35,546,230	28,687,424	28,687,424	-	34,145,247	37,607,972	29,067,215	29,067,215	-
WNCC	18,224,337	15,581,434	19,197,781	18,313,304	19,633,311	15,844,975	15,844,975	-	19,290,407	20,579,403	15,905,828	15,905,828	-
NSC					-	-	-			8,805,674	6,805,909	6,805,909	
DRI					2,186,302	1,764,445	1,764,445	-		2,258,294	1,743,890	1,766,384	22,494
BCS	132,669	-	-	135,986	-	-			139,385	-			
BCN	111,076	-	-	113,853	-	-			116,699	-			
OTHER	1,043,198	-	-	1,069,278	-	-			1,096,010	-			
Formula Budgets Total	432,903,901	356,969,674	449,097,049	461,197,584	473,320,670	381,991,310	382,234,132	242,823	496,921,350	515,681,059	398,570,070	398,592,564	22,494
Formula Funding %		82.46%				80.70%					77.29%		
NON-FORM BDGTS	102,623,901	102,623,901	102,623,901	108,781,335	108,781,335	108,684,746			112,995,222	112,995,222	113,401,761		
UCCSN TOTAL	535,527,802	459,593,575	551,720,950	569,978,919	582,102,005	490,676,056			609,916,572	628,676,281	511,971,831		
State GF Revenue		1,639,014,901				1,741,900,000					1,817,500,000		
UCCSN GF Revenue		316,610,775				348,380,000					363,500,000		
% UCCSN GF Revenue		19.32%				20.00%					20.00%		
Calc UCCSN GF Rev						348,380,000					363,500,000		
% UCCSN GF to Budget		68.89%				71.00%					71.00%		

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Summaries
Historical and Projected Formula Costs
Existing and Recommended Formulas

	FY 98			FY 99			FY 00			FY 01		
	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New
Area/Formula	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%
UNR												
Instruction	42,813,784	48,922,506	43,667,332	44,676,450	47,974,189	45,424,409	48,506,998	48,814,365	50,707,528	50,489,914	49,931,927	51,964,455
Academic Support	8,221,737	13,873,279	11,134,043	8,507,989	13,873,322	11,946,412	10,133,344	14,227,103	12,904,081	10,518,190	14,152,715	13,544,131
Student Services	4,826,361	5,422,188	5,675,359	4,906,512	5,396,920	5,691,756	4,862,663	5,515,772	6,300,742	5,089,810	5,590,377	6,682,426
Institutional Support	8,417,300	9,375,707	11,620,837	8,542,744	9,571,892	11,915,557	9,942,359	10,197,763	13,192,018	10,032,914	9,856,625	13,329,216
O & M of Plant	19,794,967	19,248,508	19,190,845	19,811,921	19,383,394	19,262,012	22,943,011	21,080,228	23,074,533	23,606,037	19,673,071	23,525,216
Equip. Replacement	3,545,167			3,545,167			3,265,799			3,265,799		
Equip. Maintenance	363,000			363,000			348,000			348,000		
Library	7,022,406		6,567,105	7,451,767		6,961,487	8,747,232		7,461,299	9,454,872		8,057,967
Graduate Assistants	6,783,752		4,562,074	6,955,274		4,765,460	7,772,909		4,964,571	7,834,930		5,004,456
Research	45,447	45,447	45,447	47,929	47,929	47,929	53,519	53,519	53,519	49,013	49,013	54,857
Public Service	95,981	95,981	95,981	92,035	92,035	92,035	131,489	131,489	131,489	94,921	94,921	134,776
Scholarships	3,524,075	3,524,075	3,524,075	3,160,075	3,160,075	3,160,075	3,272,515	3,272,515	3,272,515	3,354,328	3,160,075	3,354,328
Reserves	(1,015,424)	(1,015,424)	(1,015,424)	(1,032,561)	(1,032,561)	(1,032,561)	(1,205,237)	(1,205,237)	(1,205,237)	(1,236,169)	(1,236,169)	(1,236,169)
IDR-COL-PM-Maint-NFE	9,708,904		9,708,904	7,393,368		7,393,368	3,108,955		3,108,955	5,614,714	4,678,685	5,614,714
Sub-Total	114,147,457	99,492,267	114,776,578	114,421,670	98,467,195	115,627,939	121,883,556	102,087,517	123,966,013	128,517,273	105,951,240	130,030,373
UNLV												
Instruction	62,401,712	62,556,929	68,839,655	68,190,565	67,291,338	75,921,682	73,349,725	72,716,304	80,449,298	80,184,101	66,668,541	85,308,001
Academic Support	10,841,612	12,655,784	14,758,205	10,929,747	13,447,281	15,712,188	12,608,565	13,851,813	16,949,169	13,332,323	13,661,861	17,774,777
Student Services	5,218,957	6,217,959	7,832,367	5,461,427	5,876,099	8,660,880	6,273,740	6,252,610	9,155,737	6,740,092	6,075,141	9,554,947
Institutional Support	9,977,376	10,900,753	11,842,198	10,709,888	9,773,571	12,811,632	12,366,439	10,817,065	13,876,332	13,205,201	9,994,818	14,553,346
O & M of Plant	15,641,739	14,836,632	16,155,338	16,032,533	16,079,452	16,910,037	18,903,245	17,313,113	19,817,011	19,802,791	16,451,914	20,872,997
Equip. Replacement	3,164,205			3,164,205			2,908,481			2,908,481		
Equip. Maintenance	333,000			333,000			312,000			312,000		
Library	5,588,134		5,308,356	5,913,728		5,355,939	6,279,449		5,415,402	6,709,852		5,777,806
Graduate Assistants	7,328,295		4,312,400	7,716,803		4,539,369	8,123,592		4,778,283	8,694,927		5,112,910
Research	8,502	8,502	8,502	182,541	182,541	182,541	190,290	190,290	190,290	195,047	189,375	195,047
Public Service				143,997	143,997	143,997	151,588	151,588	151,588	155,378	149,241	155,378
Scholarships	3,975,329	3,975,329	3,975,329	3,665,329	3,665,329	3,665,329	4,955,277	3,665,329	4,955,277	4,955,277	3,665,329	4,955,277
Reserves		(814,835)			(4,492,162)			(1,402,658)			(1,438,003)	
Indirect Cost Adjustmt			-			-			-		14,748,162	-
Sub-Total	124,478,861	110,337,053	133,030,350	132,443,763	111,967,446	143,903,594	146,422,391	123,555,454	155,738,387	157,195,470	130,166,379	164,260,486
CCSN												
Instruction	27,830,901	28,809,431	31,357,260	30,445,147	31,928,453	34,429,797	38,804,426	37,775,430	40,451,876	46,758,140	33,625,159	46,614,208
Academic Support	5,860,984	4,332,104	7,839,315	6,534,726	4,633,447	8,607,449	7,807,752	5,828,989	10,112,969	9,351,628	4,885,247	10,255,126
Student Services	5,049,950	3,287,268	7,615,842	5,665,643	3,772,517	8,147,261	6,822,515	3,974,947	9,178,196	7,876,114	4,033,056	10,006,833
Institutional Support	4,076,709	3,962,386	4,894,589	4,266,674	4,359,742	4,894,589	4,938,104	4,819,456	6,922,175	6,208,561	4,507,564	7,622,881
O & M of Plant	5,902,997	5,711,209	8,255,196	5,989,394	6,728,818	8,460,390	7,908,262	8,107,794	10,516,812	9,394,287	7,597,341	9,377,771
Equip. Replacement	879,813			879,817			937,585			937,585		
Equip. Maintenance	129,000			129,000			156,000			156,000		
Library	478,791		478,791	553,559		553,559	656,528		656,528	742,326		742,326
Public Service	60,769	60,769	60,769	63,372	63,372	63,372	67,284	67,284	67,284	67,986	67,986	67,986
Scholarships	588,330	588,330	588,330	586,330	586,330	586,330	588,330	588,330	588,330	588,330	588,330	588,330
Reserves	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000							(717,175)	(717,175)	(717,175)
COL, PM, Maint., NFE	4,351,536		4,351,536	3,586,174		3,586,174	1,761,589		1,761,589	3,249,442	11,757,585	3,249,442
Sub-Total	57,809,780	49,351,497	68,041,628	58,699,836	52,072,679	69,328,921	70,448,375	61,162,230	80,255,759	84,613,224	66,345,093	87,807,728

TABLE XI

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Sun
Historical and Projected
Existing and Recommen

Area/Formula	FY 02 Existing @ 100%	FY 02 New @ 100%	FY 03 Existing @ 100%	FY 03 New @ 100%	FY 04 Existing @ 100%	FY 04 New @ 100%	FY 05 Existing @ 100%	FY 05 New @ 100%	FY 06 Existing @ 100%	FY 06 New @ 100%	FY 07 Existing @ 100%	FY 07 New @ 100%
UNR												
Instruction	56,196,066	55,588,626	59,606,441	59,687,996	62,887,813	64,083,839	66,366,046	68,406,284	70,014,743	72,572,416	73,835,050	76,625,631
Academic Support	11,289,747	14,483,074	12,045,832	15,169,570	12,835,872	16,093,265	13,684,873	16,899,442	14,594,963	17,669,049	15,570,525	18,455,205
Student Services	5,446,441	6,962,807	5,818,169	7,309,325	6,159,038	7,551,724	6,529,989	7,730,280	6,925,092	7,960,538	7,345,719	8,218,553
Institutional Support	12,367,296	14,483,074	12,773,040	14,907,104	13,118,887	15,352,401	13,557,571	15,784,170	14,016,564	16,268,003	14,481,314	16,704,637
O & M of Plant	24,365,734	24,016,753	25,117,806	24,395,193	25,893,878	24,756,969	26,695,291	25,195,985	27,522,704	25,360,396	28,376,816	25,745,725
Equip. Replacement	3,331,115		3,397,737		3,465,692		3,535,006		3,605,706		3,677,820	
Equip. Maintenance	354,960		362,059		369,300		376,686		384,220		391,884	
Library	7,531,085	8,093,853	7,565,823	8,130,174	7,589,630	8,166,588	7,614,039	8,199,899	7,639,124	8,229,100	7,664,763	8,256,387
Graduate Assistants	7,047,252	5,129,497	7,214,277	5,239,502	7,384,814	5,360,614	7,559,337	5,484,146	7,737,362	5,610,125	7,686,866	5,738,578
Research	56,228	56,228	57,634	57,634	59,075	59,075	60,552	60,552	62,066	62,066	63,617	63,617
Public Service	138,146	138,146	141,599	141,599	145,139	145,139	148,768	148,768	152,487	152,487	156,299	156,299
Scholarships	3,438,186	3,438,186	3,524,141	3,524,141	3,612,244	3,612,244	3,702,550	3,702,550	3,795,114	3,795,114	3,889,992	3,889,992
Reserves												
IDR-COL-PM-Maint-NFE		-		-		-		-		-		-
Sub-Total	131,562,256	132,390,244	137,624,558	138,562,238	143,521,382	145,181,858	149,830,708	151,612,076	156,450,145	157,679,294	163,140,665	163,854,624
UNLV												
Instruction	89,416,360	92,791,269	99,296,063	101,560,179	110,046,116	111,613,570	120,398,832	122,763,604	131,793,383	134,084,317	144,113,045	146,105,283
Academic Support	15,068,580	18,859,769	16,235,704	20,101,818	17,495,954	21,484,863	18,747,298	22,986,163	20,108,331	24,524,551	21,572,636	26,298,365
Student Services	7,591,565	10,562,749	8,285,688	11,441,268	9,050,712	12,426,613	9,801,681	13,436,289	10,625,734	14,502,479	11,526,577	15,638,189
Institutional Support	14,431,027	15,580,657	15,555,009	16,608,776	16,773,298	17,766,386	17,966,584	19,026,781	19,270,528	20,334,857	20,677,553	21,729,916
O & M of Plant	20,297,861	21,441,093	20,805,307	22,071,383	21,325,440	22,725,447	21,858,576	23,407,054	22,405,041	24,267,479	22,965,167	25,073,491
Equip. Replacement	2,981,193		3,055,723		3,132,116		3,210,419		3,290,679		3,372,946	
Equip. Maintenance	319,800		327,795		335,990		344,390		352,999		361,824	
Library	7,199,265	6,188,774	7,730,258	6,641,013	8,309,755	7,137,853	8,908,191	7,659,351	9,562,185	8,225,133	10,274,742	8,839,490
Graduate Assistants	9,278,448	5,455,898	10,021,941	5,895,247	10,817,238	6,360,777	11,548,543	6,793,086	12,333,172	7,255,536	13,175,699	7,750,547
Research	199,923	199,923	204,922	204,922	210,045	210,045	215,296	215,296	220,678	220,678	226,195	226,195
Public Service	159,262	159,262	163,244	163,244	167,325	167,325	171,508	171,508	175,796	175,796	180,190	180,190
Scholarships	5,079,159	5,079,159	5,206,138	5,206,138	5,336,291	5,336,291	5,469,699	5,469,699	5,606,441	5,606,441	5,746,602	5,746,602
Reserves												
Indirect Cost Adjustmt		-		-		-		-		-		-
Sub-Total	172,022,443	176,318,553	186,887,792	189,893,988	203,000,280	205,229,170	218,641,017	221,928,831	235,744,967	239,197,267	254,193,176	257,588,268
CCSN												
Instruction	54,962,268	53,308,045	62,207,114	59,980,205	70,413,845	68,157,849	79,716,227	77,398,123	90,267,922	87,951,502	102,236,584	99,859,340
Academic Support	10,992,454	11,727,770	12,441,423	13,195,645	14,082,769	14,994,727	15,943,245	17,027,587	18,053,584	19,349,330	20,447,317	21,969,055
Student Services	9,365,173	10,502,001	10,717,638	11,394,795	12,265,417	12,816,322	14,036,586	14,492,451	16,063,702	16,373,356	18,383,561	18,436,358
Institutional Support	6,729,131	7,983,369	7,191,318	8,581,335	7,714,977	9,338,277	8,308,663	10,198,625	8,982,298	11,180,174	9,746,641	12,284,972
O & M of Plant	9,592,356	9,583,653	9,795,378	9,763,712	10,003,474	9,980,099	10,216,774	10,201,939	10,435,405	10,429,371	10,659,503	10,662,535
Equip. Replacement	961,025		985,050		1,009,676		1,034,918		1,060,791		1,087,311	
Equip. Maintenance	159,900		163,898		167,995		172,195		176,500		180,912	
Library	760,884	742,326	779,906	742,326	799,404	742,326	819,389	878,899	839,874	1,228,844	860,871	1,395,810
Public Service	69,686	69,686	69,686	71,428	71,428	71,428	73,213	73,213	73,213	75,043	75,044	75,044
Scholarships	603,038	603,038	618,114	618,114	633,567	633,567	649,406	649,406	665,641	665,641	682,282	682,282
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	94,195,914	94,519,888	104,969,524	104,347,560	117,162,552	116,734,595	130,970,636	130,920,243	146,618,930	147,253,261	164,360,026	165,365,396

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Summaries
Historical and Projected Formula Costs
Existing and Recommended Formulas

Area/Formula	FY 98 Existing @ 100%	FY 98 Leg. Appr.	FY 98 New @ 100%	FY 99 Existing @ 100%	FY 99 Leg. Appr.	FY 99 New @ 100%	FY 00 Existing @ 100%	FY 00 Leg. Appr.	FY 00 New @ 100%	FY 01 Existing @ 100%	FY 01 Leg. Appr.	FY 01 New @ 100%
GBC												
Instruction	3,409,863	3,483,417	4,060,235	3,579,018	3,425,687	4,387,888	4,174,423	4,464,150	4,785,051	4,818,280	3,556,315	5,263,223
Academic Support	867,054	907,611	1,218,071	920,743	1,044,938	1,316,366	1,189,574	1,312,907	1,435,515	1,204,570	1,077,919	1,578,967
Student Services	590,314	745,081	864,819	624,346	869,474	906,491	794,397	919,233	1,084,620	690,646	882,888	1,079,309
Institutional Support	1,250,770	1,602,871	1,214,172	1,306,902	1,254,208	1,316,985	1,636,108	1,437,776	1,456,908	1,807,216	1,284,531	1,746,507
O & M of Plant	1,502,036	1,409,169	1,859,135	1,527,253	1,466,024	1,940,485	1,595,539	1,643,272	1,785,836	1,981,452	1,508,125	2,028,495
Equip. Replacement	106,481			106,481			86,760			86,760		
Equip. Maintenance	21,000			21,000			27,000			27,000		
Library	190,647		190,647	201,699		201,699	204,462		204,462	215,514		215,514
Public Service												
Scholarships	42,371	42,371	42,371	39,890	39,890	39,890	39,890	39,890	39,890	39,890	39,890	39,890
Reserves	(88,887)	(88,887)	(88,887)				(134,849)	(134,849)	(134,849)	(138,152)	(138,152)	(138,152)
COL, PM, Maint., NFE	763,493		763,493	609,910		609,910	876,516		876,516	1,397,092	2,301,882	1,397,092
Sub-Total	8,655,142	8,101,633	10,124,056	8,937,242	8,100,221	10,719,714	10,489,820	9,682,379	11,533,949	12,130,268	10,513,398	13,210,845
TMCC												
Instruction	10,520,072	10,740,684	13,855,857	10,841,053	11,061,665	14,597,678	13,867,440	13,694,608	15,425,388	15,508,077	11,624,042	16,725,699
Academic Support	2,163,969	2,349,679	3,463,964	2,271,177	2,550,296	3,641,900	2,991,271	2,632,415	3,856,347	3,101,615	2,637,320	3,679,654
Student Services	1,845,085	2,297,944	2,496,373	1,942,802	2,431,780	2,970,694	2,695,542	2,543,492	2,829,058	2,438,923	2,550,991	3,067,402
Institutional Support	2,524,107	2,776,071	4,898,383	2,594,591	3,178,758	4,901,571	3,182,790	3,389,713	4,913,823	3,576,472	3,197,898	3,917,737
O & M of Plant	4,003,490	3,592,595	4,655,701	4,046,502	3,514,021	5,117,186	4,623,037	3,771,755	4,396,181	4,232,762	3,634,988	5,450,789
Equip. Replacement	320,703			320,703			257,982			257,982		
Equip. Maintenance	72,000			72,000			72,000			72,000		
Library	272,895		272,895	288,715		288,715	292,670		292,670	390,390		390,390
Public Service												
Scholarships	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137	333,137
Reserves	893,303	893,303	893,303							(319,828)	(319,828)	(319,828)
COL, PM, Maint., NFE	2,066,657		2,066,657	1,738,578		1,738,578	681,829		681,829	1,344,856	4,753,582	1,344,856
Sub-Total	25,015,418	22,983,413	32,936,270	24,449,258	23,069,657	33,589,459	28,997,698	26,365,120	32,728,433	30,936,386	28,412,130	34,589,836
WNCC												
Instruction	6,290,576	6,848,651	7,835,906	6,520,995	6,943,524	8,174,758	7,902,745	8,007,041	8,566,967	9,044,027	7,065,092	8,886,164
Academic Support	1,263,135	1,526,153	1,958,976	1,331,758	1,495,296	2,043,690	1,674,160	1,500,195	2,141,742	1,808,805	1,519,942	1,954,956
Student Services	924,563	1,057,490	1,150,734	972,286	1,003,661	1,535,680	1,148,351	1,033,534	1,202,645	1,161,285	1,037,845	1,529,679
Institutional Support	1,503,433	1,688,708	2,026,929	1,598,790	1,733,138	2,227,606	1,984,839	1,835,887	2,300,611	2,323,055	1,794,895	2,699,014
O & M of Plant	1,602,000	1,804,673	2,651,497	2,013,148	2,066,065	2,694,653	2,496,806	2,397,444	2,579,947	2,739,988	2,075,391	3,179,120
Equip. Replacement	215,145			215,145			156,329			156,329		
Equip. Maintenance	39,000			39,000			42,000			42,000		
Library	190,647		190,647	201,699		201,699	204,462		204,462	215,514		215,514
Public Service												
Scholarships	205,198	205,198	205,198	215,698	215,698	215,698	215,698	215,698	215,698	215,698	215,698	215,698
Reserves	(133,509)	(133,509)	(133,509)	(212,986)	(212,986)	(212,986)	(138,264)	(138,264)	(138,264)	(175,747)	(175,747)	(175,747)
COL, PM, Maint., NFE	1,170,594		1,170,594	963,727		963,727	370,569		370,569	693,383	2,048,318	693,383
Sub-Total	13,270,782	12,997,564	17,056,972	13,859,260	13,244,396	17,844,525	16,057,695	14,851,535	17,444,377	18,224,337	15,581,434	19,197,781

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Sun
Historical and Projected
Existing and Recommen

Area/Formula	FY 02 Existing @ 100%	FY 02 New @ 100%	FY 03 Existing @ 100%	FY 03 New @ 100%	FY 04 Existing @ 100%	FY 04 New @ 100%	FY 05 Existing @ 100%	FY 05 New @ 100%	FY 06 Existing @ 100%	FY 06 New @ 100%	FY 07 Existing @ 100%	FY 07 New @ 100%
GBC												
Instruction	5,301,967	5,612,012	5,788,790	6,076,596	6,334,464	6,428,290	6,926,280	7,295,138	7,570,209	7,746,429	8,281,643	8,457,519
Academic Support	1,325,492	1,683,604	1,447,197	1,823,579	1,583,616	1,928,487	1,731,570	2,188,541	1,892,552	2,311,607	2,070,411	2,489,380
Student Services	733,151	1,244,934	884,594	1,398,412	953,457	1,479,881	1,039,436	1,838,456	1,110,251	1,896,304	1,209,849	2,043,570
Institutional Support	1,931,178	1,850,016	2,073,888	1,969,774	2,214,743	2,056,534	2,369,632	2,304,489	2,533,840	2,407,174	2,719,343	2,611,425
O & M of Plant	2,024,886	2,073,787	2,069,405	2,089,235	2,115,038	2,136,889	2,161,811	2,185,772	2,209,754	2,235,915	2,258,895	2,482,179
Equip. Replacement	88,929		91,152		93,431		95,767		98,161		100,615	
Equip. Maintenance	27,675		28,367		29,076		29,803		30,548		31,312	
Library	220,902	220,902	226,424	226,424	232,085	232,085	237,887	237,887	243,834	243,834	249,930	249,930
Public Service												
Scholarships	40,887	40,887	41,909	41,909	42,957	42,957	44,031	44,031	45,132	45,132	46,260	46,260
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	11,695,067	12,726,142	12,651,727	13,627,930	13,598,867	14,305,123	14,636,217	16,094,314	15,734,281	16,886,395	16,968,258	18,380,263
TMCC												
Instruction	16,945,022	17,948,024	18,297,617	19,300,257	20,130,822	20,841,292	21,977,154	23,021,477	24,123,093	25,051,015	26,314,503	27,489,264
Academic Support	3,389,004	3,948,565	3,659,523	4,246,057	4,026,164	4,585,084	4,395,431	5,064,725	4,824,619	5,511,223	5,262,901	6,047,638
Student Services	2,612,676	3,254,885	2,843,034	3,503,463	3,154,737	3,763,611	3,471,721	4,138,976	3,841,268	4,484,179	4,223,478	4,897,135
Institutional Support	3,742,125	4,083,260	3,827,173	4,251,945	3,943,118	4,451,265	4,059,910	4,673,513	4,195,984	4,879,458	4,335,071	5,127,613
O & M of Plant	4,320,809	5,569,881	4,411,057	5,546,094	4,503,562	5,671,546	4,598,379	5,800,306	4,695,566	5,932,467	4,795,184	6,068,118
Equip. Replacement	264,432		271,042		277,818		284,764		291,883		299,180	
Equip. Maintenance	73,800		75,645		77,536		79,475		81,461		83,498	
Library	400,150	400,150	410,153	410,153	420,407	420,407	430,918	430,918	441,690	441,690	452,733	452,733
Public Service												
Scholarships	341,465	341,465	350,002	350,002	358,752	358,752	367,721	367,721	376,914	376,914	386,337	386,337
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	32,089,483	35,546,230	34,145,247	37,607,972	36,892,917	40,091,957	39,665,472	43,497,635	42,872,479	46,676,946	46,152,885	50,468,837
WNCC												
Instruction	9,413,287	9,450,867	10,026,636	10,090,161	10,721,575	10,736,538	11,557,962	11,540,284	12,135,899	12,358,364	12,814,192	12,808,570
Academic Support	1,882,657	2,079,191	2,005,327	2,219,835	2,144,315	2,362,038	2,311,592	2,519,062	2,427,180	2,718,840	2,562,838	2,817,885
Student Services	1,196,073	1,589,753	1,276,154	1,699,555	1,365,703	1,798,929	1,472,538	1,906,160	1,556,375	2,042,244	1,654,836	2,122,914
Institutional Support	2,369,891	2,824,198	2,446,981	2,945,578	2,534,109	3,053,272	2,638,757	2,147,818	2,712,031	3,268,807	2,797,933	3,328,238
O & M of Plant	2,806,116	3,247,310	2,873,897	3,171,232	2,943,373	3,242,963	3,014,586	3,316,532	3,087,579	3,391,989	3,162,397	3,469,382
Equip. Replacement	160,237		164,243		168,349		172,558		176,872		181,294	
Equip. Maintenance	43,050		44,126		45,229		46,360		47,519		48,707	
Library	220,902	220,902	226,424	226,424	232,085	232,085	237,887	237,887	243,834	243,834	249,930	249,930
Public Service												
Scholarships	221,090	221,090	226,618	226,618	232,283	232,283	238,090	238,090	244,042	244,042	250,144	250,144
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	18,313,304	19,633,311	19,290,407	20,579,403	20,387,022	21,658,108	21,690,330	21,905,833	22,631,332	24,268,121	23,722,271	25,047,063

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Summaries
Historical and Projected Formula Costs
Existing and Recommended Formulas

	FY 98			FY 99			FY 00			FY 01		
	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New	Existing	Leg. Appr.	New
Area/Formula	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%	@ 100%		@ 100%
Nevada State College												
Instruction												
Academic Support												
Student Services												
Institutional Support												
O & M of Plant												
Equip. Replacement												
Equip. Maintenance												
Library												
Graduate Assistants												
Scholarships												
Desert Research Inst												
O & M of Plant									-			-
BCS												
Institutional Support	69,572	13,914		102,260	20,452		91,910			132,669		
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	69,572	13,914	-	102,260	20,452	-	91,910	-	-	132,669	-	-
BCN												
Institutional Support	231,211	46,242		240,532	48,106		60,388			111,076		
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	231,211	46,242	-	240,532	48,106	-	60,388	-	-	111,076	-	-
OTHER												
Equipment Replacement	1,206,928	301,732		1,206,928	301,732		886,298			886,298		
Equipment Maintenance	252,000	63,000		252,000	63,000		156,900			156,900		
Sub-Total	1,458,928	364,732	-	1,458,928	364,732	-	1,043,198	-	-	1,043,198	-	-
Formula Budgets Total	345,137,151	303,688,315	375,965,854	354,612,749	307,354,884	391,014,152	395,495,031	337,704,235	421,666,918	432,903,901	356,969,674	449,097,049

UCCSN
FY 1998-07 Formula Sun
Historical and Projected
Existing and Recommen

Area/Formula	FY 02 Existing @ 100%	FY 02 New @ 100%	FY 03 Existing @ 100%	FY 03 New @ 100%	FY 04 Existing @ 100%	FY 04 New @ 100%	FY 05 Existing @ 100%	FY 05 New @ 100%	FY 06 Existing @ 100%	FY 06 New @ 100%	FY 07 Existing @ 100%	FY 07 New @ 100%
Nevada State College				4,482,490		6,938,105		10,655,524		15,594,322		19,332,777
Instruction				1,273,196		1,433,682		2,044,281		2,396,750		2,885,935
Academic Support				669,290		984,832		1,439,192		1,927,965		2,366,426
Student Services				1,148,566		1,599,537		2,467,420		3,265,851		3,839,253
Institutional Support				869,837		936,836		1,734,385		1,743,402		2,649,232
O & M of Plant												
Equip. Replacement												
Equip. Maintenance				90,295		98,128		152,044		115,891		125,945
Library								152,044		608,175		760,219
Graduate Assistants								272,000		272,000		272,000
Scholarships				272,000		272,000						
				8,805,674	-	12,263,120	-	18,916,890	-	25,924,356	-	32,231,787
Desert Research Inst												
O & M of Plant		2,186,302		2,256,294		2,331,929		2,407,219		2,485,277		2,566,211
		2,186,302		2,256,294		2,331,929		2,407,219		2,485,277		2,566,211
BCS												
Institutional Support	135,986		139,385		142,870		146,442		150,103		153,855	
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	135,986	-	139,385	-	142,870	-	146,442	-	150,103	-	153,855	-
BCN												
Institutional Support	113,853		116,699		119,617		122,607		125,672		128,814	
Reserves												
COL, PM, Maint., NFE												
Sub-Total	113,853	-	116,699	-	119,617	-	122,607	-	125,672	-	128,814	-
OTHER												
Equipment Replacement	908,455		931,167		954,446		978,307		1,002,765		1,027,834	
Equipment Maintenance	160,823		164,843		168,964		173,188		177,518		181,956	
Sub-Total	1,069,278	-	1,096,010	-	1,123,410	-	1,151,495	-	1,180,283	-	1,209,790	-
Formula Budgets Total	461,197,583	473,320,670	496,921,349	515,681,058	535,948,917	557,795,861	576,854,925	607,283,042	621,508,192	660,370,918	670,029,740	715,502,450

SECTION VI

SAVINGS INCENTIVES REPORT

VI. Savings Incentive Report

The Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education in Nevada, wrote to the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) and the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) to solicit information on states that offer savings incentives to their public universities and colleges. The Committee discussed the lack of incentives for the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN) to save and revert general fund appropriations. UCCSN generally cannot carry forward general fund appropriations between fiscal years. Unexpended appropriations revert to the general fund at the end of a fiscal year. The incentive for UCCSN is to spend their entire appropriation rather than revert.

The Committee requested information regarding how other states approach the "use or lose" funding philosophy. SHEEO and NCSL were asked for information on savings incentives plans used in other states relative to higher education appropriations. The responses to the working group queries are provided below. The Committee approved the report but made no savings incentives recommendations.

Alaska

Jim Lynch, Vice President of Finance, University of Alaska, reports that the State of Alaska allows the University of Alaska (not state agencies) to carry forward University Receipts (general program receipts e.g., tuition, fees, charges, and miscellaneous revenues) for one year. For current unrestricted funds the university follows a practice of assuming that state general funds are the first dollars spent, therefore any excess funds are university receipts that are carried forward.

Arkansas

Barbara Anderson, Arkansas Department of Higher Education, reports that Arkansas currently allows any unexpended funding balances to carry forward into the next fiscal year. However, appropriation authority expires.

Arizona

Gale Tebeau, Assistant Executive Director for Financial Affairs and Human Resources reports that in Arizona, the universities are not subject to lapsing appropriations and are able to carry forward unspent appropriations. Below is the specific language of the Arizona Revised Statute (35-190) that pertains to lapsing appropriations at fiscal year end:

> *Nothing in this section shall be construed to require reversion to the general fund of any balance derived wholly or partly from federal grants, earnings or other sources, and remaining in any special revenue, endowment, interest, redemption or suspense agency fund at the close of the fiscal year unless expressly so provided by law, or to require reversion to the general fund of any balance of fiscal year appropriations made for state institutions under the control of the Arizona board of regents.*

Delaware

Marilyn B. Quinn, Executive Director of the Delaware Higher Education Commission reports that Delaware does not have an incentive plan to encourage institutions not to spend their entire state appropriation. However, two of Delaware's three institutions are allowed to transfer state funds to their other accounts and therefore never have to account for, or return, funds that remain unexpended at the end of the fiscal year. The third institution only has to revert unused salary funds. So Delaware's institutions are allowed to retain nearly all their state appropriations, without incentive.

Florida

Jen Grooters, Policy Associate, National Conference of State Legislatures prepared the following summary of information dated January 5, 1997, from a report by the Florida Office of Program Policy and Analysis and Government Accountability:

> *In Florida, statutory provision enables the Executive Office of the Governor to make recommendations on incentives (and disincentives) for agency performance. The incentives may include additional flexibility for the agency in budget management, additional flexibility in salary rate and position management, retention of up to 50 percent of unexpended and unencumbered balances of agency appropriations and additional lump-sum funds to be used for purposes such as employee bonuses or employee training.*
>
> Ms. Grooters notes that *according to Claude Hendon, Coordinator of Performance-based Program Budgeting in the Florida Legislature, recommendations for agency rewards (incentives) under this provision were first made by a legislative committee three years ago. The recommendations were rejected on the grounds that some of the performance data were lacking reliability. Last year, no recommendations were made. Then in the '97 legislative session, several recommendations were made to reward the Department of Law for undertaking various budget reform initiatives.*

Patrick Dallet, Assistant Executive Director, Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission reports that Florida institutions are allowed to carry forward funds.

Georgia

Jen Grooters, Policy Associate, National Conference of State Legislatures prepared the following summary of Georgia's savings incentives dated January 5, 1997:

> *In Georgia, Code Section 13 in the attached legislation charges the office of planning and budget with assisting agencies to identify and implement measures that save public funds or improve services at no extra cost. The legislation states that agencies will be allowed to keep up to half the money they save so long as the initiative does not create an ongoing funding commitment and is consistent with the agency's approved strategic plan. If savings will accrue over a number of years, the agency may keep up to half of the money they save each year for the*

first three years. If the cost savings are one-time in nature, the agency may keep up to half the money saved in the first year only. If the initiative requires additional spending in future years, the proposal is to be approved first by the legislature.

Ms. Grooters notes that *according to Judith Brown, Principal Management Consultant with the Office of Planning and Budget, Code Section 13 has not yet been implemented. Currently, the state is in the first year of a "Results-based" Budgeting Program which is running parallel to the regular budget package. The aim of the results-based program is to establish agency outcome measures to gauge the impact of programs on their service populations. At this point, financial incentives are not a part of this program.*

Hawaii

According to Rodney Sakaguchi, Director, Budget Office, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Hawaii's legislature authorized the carry forward of up to five percent of state general fund appropriations for the University of Hawaii and Hawaii's state public school system. The law had a sunset provision. When the state public school system carried forward savings at the end of the first year the law went into effect, the state budget department used that as a basis for recommending reductions to the following year's appropriation for the department. The University of Hawaii took a more cautious approach and did not opt to carry forward any savings even though authorized to do so. Instead the University sought and obtained exemptions from state accounting and allotment requirements to better manage year-end spending. Hawaii did not seek to extend the law authorizing carry forward of appropriations when the law came up for automatic repeal.

Indiana

Bob Ruble, Associate Commissioner for Facilities and Financial Affairs, Indiana Commission for Higher Education reports that in Indiana, each institution keeps 100 percent of its appropriation, whether or not it is spent by July 1.

Kentucky

Ken Walker, Vice President for Finance, Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, reports that Kentucky's statutes provide that unused state general fund appropriations lapse at the end of each fiscal year. The institutions may carry forward fund balances in agency funds -- primarily tuition and fees.

Louisiana

Marvin Roubique, Deputy Commissioner for Finance and Facilities, Louisiana Board of Regents, reports that in 1985, Louisiana passed legislation that allowed the institutions to retain any unexpended or unencumbered balance at the end of the fiscal year, provided that at least 50 percent of the funds would be spent on preventive maintenance programs and the remainder on non recurring items. This statute was amended approximately three years ago, to limit the amount retained to no more than two percent of the appropriation. Mr. Roubique reports this plan has been very beneficial to the institutions and that the current administration is considering similar legislation for other state agencies.

Massachusetts

Debbie Hattery, Fiscal Policy, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, reports that Massachusetts does not have a savings incentive plan for its state appropriations. Ms. Hattery indicates that Massachusetts' Governor is trying to implement a tax cut and his fiscal affairs division "grabs" available reversions. Ms. Hattery notes that this practice unfortunately often encourages campuses to spend every dollar they can so they don't lose funds and they maintain their funding base.

Minnesota

Jen Grooters, Policy Associate, National Conference of State Legislatures prepared the following summary of Minnesota's savings incentives dated January 5, 1997:

> *In Minnesota, Dave Buelow, a Fiscal Analyst with the Higher Education Budget Division in the Fiscal Policy Analysis Office, reports that the state has operated a financial incentives program for higher education institutions since 1979. A statutory provision allows all Minnesota colleges and universities to carry forward the unspent balance of annual appropriations to the subsequent fiscal year. Dave reported that there are no requirements that an institution meet specific performance targets in order to carry forward the funds.*

Mississippi

Jen Grooters, Policy Associate, National Conference of State Legislatures prepared the following summary of Mississippi's savings incentives dated January 5, 1997:

> *In Mississippi, the department of finance is charged with establishing an incentive program to encourage agencies to develop and implement cost saving measures. The department is responsible for developing criteria by which cost savings results can be evaluated and compared with those of other agencies. The department is charged with making recommendations for monetary reward and public commendation for any deserving agencies on or before January 1 of each year. The provision states the department's recommendations include 3 components: proposed award recipients, proposed award amount and proposed manner in which the monetary reward should be made available to the recipient.*

Montana

Rod Sundsted, Associate Commissioner for Fiscal Affairs, Montana University System reports the Montana Legislature passed a bill in 1989 that allows reversions from the university units to be collected in a reversion account controlled by the Board of Regents. Funds in this account can be carried forward from year-to-year and must be used for deferred maintenance and/or long-term assets. Each campus submits a plan for use of the funds and the regents allocate it back out to the campuses. According to Mr. Sundsted, the intent was to prevent the "spend it or lose it" mentality at the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Sundsted believes the intent of the bill was met and opines the Legislature concurs. The original bill had a sunset provision to expire in 1993. The 1993 legislature made the provision a part of permanent statute. The statute is located at 17-7-304, Montana Code Annotated.

New Jersey

Robert K. Goertz, Director, Fiscal Policy, New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, reports that in New Jersey, all appropriations to public colleges are essentially grants to autonomous third parties, not appropriations to state agencies, and the institutions get and retain the full amount (subject to occasional recisions). Mr. Goertz notes the institutions also collect and retain tuition and fees. According to Mr. Goertz, the four-year public institutions have all been treated this way for the past decade; the county colleges are creatures of the counties, not of the state.

Ohio

Matt Filipic, Senior Vice Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents, reports that since 1965, Ohio has had a policy that permits colleges and universities to retain all unspent operating appropriations indefinitely. Campuses are expected to accumulate balances to protect themselves from the consequences of financial shocks, such as budget cuts, enrollment losses, etc.

Rich Petrick, Vice Chancellor for Finance, Ohio Board of Regents, adds that Ohio's public colleges and universities are self-governing, and their Boards of Trustees control their treasuries. They retain any and all carryovers of state funds, and are also responsible for year-end deficits. A fiscal responsibility law (SB 6) requires that all maintain a fund balance at a certain level to ensure fiscal health.

Pennsylvania

Greig Mitchell, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, reports that in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education, all unspent funds are retained by the System and do not revert to the Commonwealth.

Texas

Roger W. Elliott, Assistant Commissioner of Finance, Campus Planning, and Research, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, reports that in Texas, universities have to use their general revenue appropriation. However, Mr. Elliot notes the universities have so much money outside the general appropriation that "use it or lose it" isn't an issue. They can carry forward all of their local funds such as tuition and fees.

Washington State

Dan Keller, Associate Director, Fiscal and Policy, Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), reports that higher education institutions are allowed to spend state appropriated funds before tuition funds. The tuition funds reside in non-appropriated accounts at each institution. State funds and tuition funding are fungible at the institution level. The result is that all state appropriated funding would be used and any under-expending that would occur would be from the tuition accounts. Therefore, savings would occur to the tuition accounts and carry over from one period to the next in those locally held accounts.

Mr. Keller notes that complicating matters is a state statute that provides that one-half of any unexpended appropriation will be deposited in a state controlled incentive account for the agency involved and can only be used for non-recurring activities that work to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the agency's operation. Given the mixed funding arrangement for higher-education institutions described above, this latter statute is not expected to come into play for higher education institutions.

Wyoming

William H. Lovejoy, Dean of Information, Planning, and Policy Analysis, Wyoming Community College Commission reports that for the community college system in Wyoming, statute allows for a three percent carry forward from one biennium to the next. Mr. Lovejoy indicates the effect in the past four biennia is that the colleges have not had to revert state appropriations. The 3 percent cannot be cumulative, so any carry forwards have to be expended as one-time funds in the subsequent biennium.

SECTION VII

CONSULTANT REPORT –

PEER COMPARISON DATA

VII. Consultant Report - Peer Comparison Data

The Committee contracted with Dr. Larry Leslie to identify a group of peers for the seven UCCSN institutions. Dr. Leslie located comparable institutions from states and local communities whose ability to support public higher education, and whose economies and populations are relatively similar. The primary basis for comparison was similarity in program responsibilities.

In comparing institutions, Dr. Leslie considered similarity of enrollment measures and other institutional characteristics, including the emphasis of the institutions on instruction, research and public service. Dr. Leslie collected data concerning characteristics of the institutions related to finances, instruction and facilities to establish the proper benchmarks for equitable funding parameters. The data collected and reported by Dr. Leslie is point in time, generated primarily from Fiscal Year 1997 Instructional Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) data. The IPEDS information was supplemented with data collected through telephone surveys and various published reports.

Dr. Leslie presented his preliminary peer report to the Committee on March 2, 2000. His final report was presented at the May 11, 2000, Committee meeting. Because the final report builds upon much of the work contained in the preliminary report, both versions are provided in the Committee report (see Appendices A and B). Using the peer information generated by Dr. Leslie, the working group prepared a report on comparative library data for UNR and UNLV. A copy of the report is provided in Appendix C.

The Committee noted one necessary modification: During the May 11, 2000, meeting, Dr. Leslie acknowledged that UNR should be classified as a Doctoral/Research I institution for the peer analysis. Dr. Leslie initially classified UNR as a Doctoral/Research II institution under the Carnegie 2000 classification system.

The Committee accepted the final peer comparison report with the understanding the UCCSN institutions could make use of the information in developing their budget requests, and that the Committee could utilize the report where appropriate.

APPENDIX A

FINAL PEER COMPARISON REPORT

PREPARED BY

DR. LARRY LESLIE

Final Report
Peer Groups for Nevada Colleges and Universities
April 24, 2000
Larry L. Leslie

This document constitutes the final report of efforts to identify peers for Nevada colleges and universities (Part C of the contract). The completed work follows directly from the terms of the contract, as modified through mutual agreement between the State and the Contractor. Part C of the Contract reads as follows:

> "(C) Larry L. Leslie agrees to identify a group of peer institutions for each of the institutions included in the University and Community College System of Nevada ("UCCSN") using a pure peer analysis and to provide this analysis on or before March 31, 2000. In developing this analysis, Larry L. Leslie agrees to locate comparable institutions from states and local communities whose ability to support public higher education, whose higher education patterns, economies and populations are relatively similar. The primary basis for comparison will be similarity in program responsibilities. In comparing institutions, Larry L. Leslie will consider similarity of enrollment measures and other institutional characteristics, including the emphasis of the institutions on instruction, research and public service. Larry L. Leslie further agrees that as part of the pure peer analysis it (sic) will collect data concerning characteristics of the institutions related to finances, instruction, and facilities to establish the proper benchmarks for equitable funding parameters. The methods to collect peer institution data must include on-site visits to the institutions. Before conducting the on-site visits, Larry L. Leslie agrees to provide a list of 5 potential peers for each institution within the UCCSN, including, without limitations, the Desert Research Institute. Upon approval of the list by the Committee, Larry L. Leslie will conduct the on-site visits of the potential peers accompanied by representatives of the UCCSN who are appointed by the Committee."

Given the specifications in the above paragraph, Contractor is confident that, *taken as a set*, the 5 peers identified for each Nevada institution are very likely the best peers presently extant in the United States.

This is not to say that the peer selections are without contention. For example, during the March meeting of the Committee, each of three Nevada colleges pointed out that one of their "alternate" peers was more similar to them than were the primary peers. Upon reconsideration, in one case Contractor agreed with the college position because the change resulted in a superior peer set; however, in the other two cases the primary peers were retained (at that time) because they contributed to balance in the peer *set,* even though the alternate was indeed more similar to the Nevada institution than was the primary peer choice.

Principles and Approach. The most difficult task in any effort to construct peer groups is in making decisions regarding conflicting variables; it is in deciding how to weigh conflicting considerations. Put in its simplest form it is easy to select a peer if only two or three variables are considered, but with each variable added the likelihood of variable conflict increases substantially.

Part C of the contract specified a substantial number of variables, thus greatly increasing the task complexity due to variable conflict. As the peer sets were constructed for Nevada, often a potential peer was a good match for an institution on one variable and a poor match on another. Most often the matter was one of degree. Usually, an institution was quite a good match on a two or three variables, was moderately good on others, less good on still others and was really not a very good match at all on the remainder. Of course, in examining its proposed peers, each institution was inclined to focus attention on traits for which it differed from its peers; however, all seemed to recognize the complexity of the task and to be more-or-less satisfied with their peer sets.

The State was wise to identify its priorities by specifying program responsibilities and (implicitly) enrollments as most important and variables related to instruction, research and service as next most important. In Part C finances and other variables were mentioned as well. These State priorities were essential for the Contractor to be able to make decisions when conflicts among variables occurred, and Contractor believes that the peer sets identified most closely conform with those State priorities as listed in Part C.

Nevertheless, one must recognize that peer selection is not a precise task. For example, the analyst is faced with many choices, many decisions, and reasonable persons may disagree with those decisions, in particular if one's institutional interests are at stake. Also likely, when the results (peer selections) from a set of priorities are examined, the State policy maker may conclude that perhaps what had seemed to be an overriding consideration originally really was not very important after all. Or, new variables may have been identified as the task proceeded. Another uncertainty is the use to which the peer sets may be put in the future. The analyst invariably asks, "Peers for what purposes." In the end the selection of peers is the State's, not the Contractor's, prerogative. The Contractor can only make recommendations.

The Contractor's response to these uncertainties was to compose peer sets based upon his best sense of the State's considerations, but then to array all the data so that the State could consider alternatives. Further, additional data were collected, perhaps most significantly the data collected in the follow-up stage of the project.[1] Although in this Final Report the Contractor suggests only two changes in the primary peers, based upon these new data the State may wish to make additional changes.

Work Subsequent to March Meeting. Some minor corrections were made in the data provided to the State for the March meeting in Carson City.[2] What was been added for this final report was the result of additional data collection, an effort that focused on obtaining most recent

---

[1]At considerable cost savings, the State and the Contractor agreed to substitute additional and updated data collection for the on-site visits initially agreed to.

[2]For example, the statement of the DRI scope of work was expanded, as was the DRI presence in southern as well as northern Nevada.

information about all the institutions and on collecting some new information for the community colleges. (See Attachment A.)

Contractor was unusually successful in obtaining the additional data from the institutions. Whereas he had estimated an 80% return rate, all 30 primary peers eventually responded, almost always with the data requested.[3] In only two or three cases, was it necessary to accept estimates. The excellent response rate was a result of follow up e-mails and telephone calls amounting to from three to more than a dozen contacts per institution.

The updated and supplementary data are contained in Tables S1-6. For all Nevada Universities and their primary peers, information about new programs and enrollments was obtained. Collected additionally for the Nevada Community Colleges, were service area size, number of teaching sites, proximity to urban areas, offering of baccalaureate degrees and distance learning.[4]

Before proceeding to examine the current and added data by institution, a caution about the enrollment data is advised. In obtaining the new enrollment data for the community college peers, in some cases we experienced difficulty in obtaining data that clearly were consistent with the IPEDS data used to construct the peer groups. In about five or six cases, the new data provided reflected enrollment changes so extreme that we discussed the data at length with the institutions involved. In two or three of these cases, the institutions simply were unable to reconcile completely disparities in the reported data. In these cases, working with the institutions, we composed the best estimates that we could. For important details the reader is advised to read carefully the footnotes in the new tables (Tables S-1-6).

UNLV. (Table S-1) During this academic year and last, UNLV has been roughly as active as its peers in initiating new programs. In Academic Years (AY) 1998-1999 and 1999-2000,UNLV began three new academic programs and took actions to begin a fourth; enrollments were substantial in two of these programs. Among its five peers, one began six programs; one started four; one began three; one began one program and one did not start any. (New program enrollments were not available for the peers.) Regarding enrollments, it is probably best to view the changes over the entire two-year time period.[5] UNLV's FTE enrollments were about 1,000 higher (about 7.9% more) than its peers in the Fall of 1997; by the Fall of 1999 those enrollments were almost 2,000 higher (about 13.8%). There were no cases of the FTE enrollments of any of the peers changing at a greatly

---

[3]We did not seek to obtain additional data from the DRI peers as the issues raised were not relevant to the DRI.

[4]Each of these was not specified in the contract agreed to after the March meeting; however, Contractor collected the information as a courtesy to the Community Colleges.

[5]Again, the enrollment change data should be viewed cautiously. We were not able to verify that the institutions defined their enrollment data consistently across time. The reported FTE changes between Fall 1997 and Fall 1998 are the most problematic albeit only for a few institutions.

disparate rate, vis-a-vis, UNLV. Although the enrollment growth for UNLV was usually greater than for its peers, in the view of the Consultant the differences were not so large as to override the peer selections, when all variables were considered.

UNR. (Table S-2) UNR was a bit more active in starting new programs than was its peers. In AY 1998-99 and 1999-2000, UNR began seven new programs although three of these could be said to be in the "start-up" phase, as indicated by negligible enrollments. Comparatively, UNR peers began an average of just over four new programs; where program enrollment data were available, enrollments in the peers' new programs paralleled those of UNR. UNR enrollments were about 5,000 less than its peers in the Fall of 1997 and about 4,700 less in the Fall of 1999. Obviously, the enrollment changes, on average, were very similar for UNR and its peers; however, the enrollment instability among some peers is worrisome. Although no change in the peers is recommended at this time, the State is advised to monitor enrollment changes in particular.

GBC. (Table S-3) While GBC began one new program over the most two recent years, its peers added an average of more than three programs. FTE enrollments for GBC and its peers (on average) essentially were unchanged since the Fall of 1997. Individually, there were some notable FTE enrollment shifts among the peers: Over the two years, FTE enrollment increased substantially at one peer, declined substantially at two peers, and increased modestly in one peer and declined modestly in the other.

The uniqueness of Nevada Community Colleges is nowhere more clear than in the sizes of their service areas. This is an issue that bears special consideration by the State. In the case of Great Basin College, the service area is some 45,000 square miles; only two GBE peers have services areas even close to half that size whereas the services areas of the remaining three are still much less. This difference is manifest in GBC's maintenance of three primary teaching sites (with associated costs), whereas two of its peers have two sites and the remaining three have only one site each. Relatedly, GBC maintains a total of 18 teaching sites, compared to a mean of only 7 for its peers. GBC and all of its peers offer the B.A. Degree; however, unlike GBC, its peers all offer this degree through a university. Finally, GBC and all but one of its peers provide instruction through distance learning.

The enrollment declines for two of GBC's peers are disconcerting as are the differences in service areas and numbers of teaching sites. Especially the former bears watching closely, in particular if the peer groups are used for making State funding decisions. In regard to the service area and site differences, unfortunately, although a few other community colleges do have very large service areas, none of these is very similar to GBC on other dimensions. Because the maintenance of many sites over a broad area is a costly venture, the Contractor recommends that the State give special consideration to this factor, not only for GBC, but for its other community colleges as well. All-in-all, the changes in enrollment plus the differences between GBC and its proposed peers lead to the Contractor recommending substitution of Rogue Community College for Treasure Valley Community College (both in Oregon) as a primary peer.[6] Although by no means a "clear call," this change should constitute a better peer set, particularly when financial considerations are involved.

---

[6]Rogue Community College was GBC's preferred peer.

CCSN. (Table S-4) While CCSN reported beginning no new programs for the most recent two years, the contrary was the case for three of its peers. One peer started 18 new programs; another began 12; and the third initiated 5. Clearly, there were differences between CCSN and its peers on this variable. CCSN FTE enrollment patterns also differed sharply with the patters of its peers. In the Fall of 1997, CCSN enrollments were about 450 FTE less than the average of its peers; by the Fall of 1999, the gap had increased to 5,000 FTE. Further, and notwithstanding data problems (see Table S-4 footnotes), enrollment declines were large among two peers and were significant for another. The patterns among individual peers in regard to enrollments varied widely.[7]

Although CCSN maintains about the same number of primary teaching sites as its peers, its service area is much larger, as is its total number of teaching sites. CCSN and all of its peers are in urban areas; CCSN does not offer the B.A. whereas two of its peers do offer the B.A. in conjunction with universities; and CCSN and all of its peers maintain distance learning efforts.

On balance the picture is clouded at CCSN. Although CCSN already had accepted the proposed peers, the differing enrollment patterns in particular are worrisome. FTE enrollments at one peer (North Harris Montgomery, Texas) are now less than one-half of that at CCSN, and a substitution seems warranted. The most promising alternate is Tarrant County Junior College, also in Texas. TCJC had an enrollment of 14,070 in the Fall of 1997 and its programmatic and financial characteristics appeared to be compatible with CCSN's. If no important changes have occurred at TCJC since 1997, the Consultant recommends this substitution.[8]

TMCC. (Table S-5) Truckee Meadows Community College added approximately 15 new programs over the most recent two academic years; one of its peers report adding 30 new programs; one report adding 4, one adding 1 and two did not add new programs. In the Fall of 1997, TMCC FTE enrollments were about 400 less than the average of its peers; in the Fall of 1999, the difference was approximately 200. In short the relationship was stable, on average. On a case by case basis, stability among the peers also was the rule.[9]

TMCC's service area, though not as large as that of other Nevada Community Colleges, comparatively was about equally larger than that of its peers. Its total number of teaching sites (47) was much larger than its peers although two peers had 20 and 17 such sites, respectively. TMCC's four reported primary sites compared with two sites each for three peers and one site each for two peers. On B. A. programs and distance learning, TMCC and its peers were the same. No change is TMCC peers is recommended.

---

[7]Inter-year reporting differences again are suspected.

[8]CCSN representatives had expressed moderate other concerns about North Harris as a peer.

[9]Although one institution *appeared* to have experienced a major increase, data inconsistencies required the Consultant to make FTE estimates for Fall 1998 and 1999.

WNCC. (Table S-6) Over the past two years, WNCC began one successful program (enrollment 104); two of its peers began more programs than WNCC; one began one new program; and two peers did not initiate new efforts. WNCC began AY 1997-98 with about 200 FTEs more than its peers; it began AY 1999-2000 with about 150 more. The mean enrollment growth for WNCC and its peers in the Fall of 1999 were about the same although three of the peers had a greater percentage FTE growth and two declined declined.

Like all Nevada Community Colleges, WNCC's service area is much larger than its peers; however, WWNC's number of primary and total teaching sites is not as disparate: Whereas WWNC lists three primary sites, one of its peers lists six; whereas WWNC lists 14 total number of sites, one peer lists 30 and another lists 12. (Averages are fairly close.) Two WNCC peers offer the B.A. (one on its own); WNCC does not offer a B.A. WNCC and all of its peers engage in distance learning. No change in WNCC peers is recommended.

Attachment A: Questionnaire
Additional Data Collection in Lieu of Site Visits

1. Has your institution added or dropped any academic programs since Academic Year 1997-1998? Please specify.

   a. What are their present, respective enrollments?

2. What was your FALL 1998 ENROLLMENT in FTE, Headcount, and Part time?

3. What was your FALL 1999 ENROLLMENT in FTE, Headcount, and Part time?

4. Approximately what is the size of your service area in square miles?

5. How many PRIMARY teaching sites does your institution possess? (As you would define the term, "primary.")

6. How many SECONDARY teaching sites does your institution possess? (As you would define the term, "secondary.")

7. Does your campus offer BA degrees, jointly with another institution or separately? Please be specific.

8. Does your institution offer distance learning courses/programs?

Table S-1: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data UNLV and Peers,
1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	New Programs?	Number of New Programs	Descriptions of New Programs (Enrollments, if available, in parentheses)	Fall 1997 FTE	Fall 1998 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1997	Fall 1999 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1998	Fall 1997 Headcount	Fall 1998 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fiscal Year 1998	Fall 1999 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fall 1998
University of Nevada, Las Vegas		Yes	4	B.S., Health Sciences (1); B.S., Nutritulion Sciences (11); B.F.A., Dance (0); M.ed, Health Promotion (52)	13,364	14,366	+7%	15,208	+6%	19,249	21,312	+11%	23,337	+10%
	Florida Atlantic University	Yes	4	Ph.D., Comparative Studies; BA & MA, Graphic Design; MA, Environmental Science	12,206	13,647	+12%	12,830	-6%	18,823	19,666	+4%	20,313	+3%
	University of New Orleans	Yes	1	Ph.D., Environmental Biology	11,588	11,359	-2%	11,722	+3%	15,833	15,534	-2%	15,820	+2%
	University of North Carolina, Greensboro	No	0		10,016	10,265	+2%	10,648	+4%	12,535	12,700	+1%	13,098	+3%
	Portland State University	Yes	3	MA, Conflict Resolution; MA, Systems Engineering; MA, Software Engineering	11,232	10,627	-5%	13,458	+27%	16,997	15,230	-10%	16,041	+5%
	George Mason University	Yes	6	B.A., Geography, B.A., Computer Engineering; B.A., Health Sciences; M.A., Forensic Bioscience; M.A., Bioinformation/Biotechnology; M.A., Health System Management	15,882	15,941	<+1%	16,294	+2%	23,826	24,010	+1%	24,180	+1%
	MEANS				12,381	12,701		13,360		17,877	18,075		18,798	

Table S-2: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data UNR and Peers,
1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	New Programs?	Number of New Programs	Descriptions of New Programs (Enrollments, if available, in parentheses)	Fall 1997 FTE	Fall 1998 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1997	Fall 1999 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1998	Fall 1997 Headcount	Fall 1998 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fiscal Year 1998	Fall 1999 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fall 1998
University of Nevada, Reno		Yes	7	B.S., Health Ecology (197); B.S., Environmental Engineering (5); M.S., Computer Engineering (7); Ph.D., Computer Engineering (5); B.S., Early Childhood Education (0); M.S., Health Ecology (1); Ph.D., Geo-Engineering (0)	9,086	9,054	<-1%	9,414	+4%	12,442	12,303	-1%	12,532	+2%
	Oklahoma State University	Yes	7	M.S., International Studies; M.S., Engineering Technology Management; M.S., Management Information Systems/Accounting Information Systems; M.S., Controlled Systems Engineering; B.A., American Studies; M.A., Arts Management; M.S., Fire and Emergency Management and Administration	16,465	17,450	+6%	18,072	+4%	19,332	20,466	+6%	21,087	+3%
	Mississippi State University	Yes	3	Ph.D., Cognitive Science (2); Ph.D., Environmental Toxicology (0); M.S., Workforce Analysis (0)	13,535	9,601	-29%	10,848	+13%	15,628	11,271	-28%	12,622	+12%
	University of Missouri, Kansas City	Yes	2	B.I.T., Bachelor of Information Technology(153); M.S., Social Work (53)	7,423	8,498	+14%	7,901	-7%	10,444	10,610	+2%	11,518	+9%
	Auburn University	Yes	3	Ph.D., Integrated Textile and Apparel Science; M.S., Integrated Textile and Apparel Science; M.L. Arch., Master of Landscape Architecture	19,575	19,860	+1%	20,220	+2%	21,505	21,775	+1%	22,120	+2%
	Washington State University	Yes	6	B.A., Human Development (36 Majors); B.A.,Business Administration (distance) (4 majors); B.A., Criminal Justice (9majors); M.S., Technology Management (1 in program); B.S., in Agriculture (1 major); B.A., Computer Science (n/a)	17,939	18,592	+4%	18,503	<-1%	20,243	20,960	+4%	21,185	+1
	MEANS				14,004	13,843		14,160		16,599	16,231		16,844	

Table S-3: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Great Basin Community College and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	New Programs?	Number of New Programs	Descriptions of New Programs (Enrollments, if available, in parentheses)	Fall 1997 FTE	Fall 1998 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1997	Fall 1999 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1998	Fall 1997 Headcount	Fall 1998 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fiscal Year 1998	Fall 1999 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fall 1998
Great Basin Community College[2]		Yes	1	B.A., Elementary Education (47)	1,229	1,276*	+4%	1,242*	-3%	2,793	2,900	+4%	2,822	-3%
	Colorado Northwestern Community College	No	0		1,011	859	-15%	846	-2%	2,060	1,800	-13%	1,700	-6%
	Southwestern Michigan Community College	Yes	5	A.A., Graphic Arts; A.A.S. & A.A., Early Childhood Development; A.A. & A.S., Criminal Justice	1,600	1,666	+4%	1,652	<-1%	2,802	3,019	+8%	3,131	+4%
	Central Oregon Community College	Yes	7	A.S., Addictions Studies; A.S., Computer and Information Systems (80); A.S. Cultural Resource Management; A.S., Early Childhood Education (33);A.S., Dietary Management (4); A.S., Horticulture (5); A.S., Recreation Leadership	2,079	2,274	+9%	2,335	+3%	3,545	4,112	+16%	4,173	+1%
	Treasure Valley Community College[1]	Yes	2	A.A. & A.S., Elementary Childhood Education	1,058	952*	-10%	857*	-10%	1,580	1,422	-10%	1,280	-10%
	Western Wyoming Community College	Yes	2	A.S., Computer Science; A.S., Outdoor Recreation/Leadership	1,615	1,543	-4%	1,518	-2%	2,824	2,648	-6%	2,559	-3%
	MEANS				1,432	1,428		1,408		2,601	2,650		2,611	

"*" indicates the specific data to which footnotes pertain.

1. Treasure Valley Community College did not provide verifiable enrollment data. TVCC officials estimated that their enrollment, in both FTE and headcount, had been declining at a rate of roughly 10 percent per year since fall 1997.

2. GBCC was unable to provide part time data for fall 1998 & fall 1999; therefore, their fall 1998 & fall 1999 FTE were estimated by multiplying their respective headcount enrollments by the 1997 FTE/headcount ratio.

Table S-3: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Great Basin Community College and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	Size of Service Area	Number of Primary Teaching Sites	Total Number of Teaching Sites	Proximity to an Urban Area	Offer BA Program?	If BA, with whom?	Distance learning?
Great Basin Community College		45,000sqmi	3	18	289mi.	Yes	Self	Yes
	Colorado Northwestern Community College	9,145sqmi	2	5	88mi.	Yes	Franklin University	Yes
	Southwestern Michigan Community College	3,762sqmi	2	7	26mi.	Yes	Ferris State	No
	Central Oregon Community College	7,779sqmi	1	8	129mi	Yes	Eastern Oregon (BA), University of Oregon (BA-finance), Lewis & Clark (courses only)	Yes
	Treasure Valley Community College	20,023sqmi	1	3	55mi.	Yes	Eastern Oregon	Yes
	Western Wyoming Community College	25,000sqmi	1	12	185mi.	Yes	University of Wyoming, Utah State, Regis University, Great Falls Governor's State University	Yes
	MEANS		1.67	8.83				

Table S-4: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Community College of Southern Nevada and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	New Programs?	Number of New Programs	Descriptions of New Programs	Fall 1997 FTE	Fall 1998 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1997	Fall 1999 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1998	Fall 1997 Headcount	Fall 1998 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fiscal Year 1998	Fall 1999 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fall 1998
Community College of Southern Nevada		No	0		10,847	14,476	+33%	16,489	+14%	24,728	30,440	+23%	35,297	+16%
	Broward County Community College	Yes	18	A.S., Recreation Technology, Certificate, Medical Secretary,Certificate, Administrative Assistant; Certificate, Office Supervision; A.S. Computer Programming and Applications - Software Development Option; A.S., Computer Information Technology - Networking/Novell CNE Track; Certificate, Computer Data Processing - Computer Applications and Internet Technology; Certificate, Computer Information Technology - Networking/Novell CNE Track; A.S. Graphics Design Technology, Certificate, Massage Therapy; Certificate, Multimedia Web Development; A.S. & Certificate, Networking Services Technology - Microsoft MCSE; Certificate, Basic Correctional Probation Office; A.S. & Certificate, Computer Information Technology - Oracle Database Administrator, A.S. & Certificate, Computer Systems and Analysis - Oracle Application Developer Option.	13,927	11,841	-15%	11,467	-3%	26,472	24,881	-6%	24,430	-2%
	Portland Community College	Yes	12	A.S., Aviation Science; Certificate, Building Science; Certificate, Building Inspection; A.S. & Certificate , Facilities Maintenance; A.S. & Certificate, Gerontology; A.S. & Certificate, Emergency Medical Technician; Certificate, Multimedia, A.S. & Certificate, E-Commerce	11,580	10,816	-7%	11,206	+4%	23,782	21,353	-10%	22,401	+5%
	North Harris Community College	No	0		11,697	6,941	-41%	7,333	+6%	21,044	22,018	+5%	23,809	+8%
	Salt Lake Community College[1]	Yes	5	A.A., Environmental Geology; A.S., Mechanical Engineering Technology; A.S., Business Desktop Publishing, A.S., Information and Computer Media; A.S., Software Technology	12,949*	10,028	-23%	11,357	+13%	23,590*	18,453	-22%	20,583	+12%
	Tidewater Community College	No	0		9,502	10,647	+12%	10,722	+1%	17,907	19,084	+7%	19,847	+4%
	MEANS				11,750	10,792		11,429		18,989	22,705		24,395	

*** indicates the specific data to which footnotes pertain.

1. SLCC fall 1997 FTE and headcount enrollment figures are inflated due to the inclusion of high school concurrent enrollees.

Table S-4: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Community College of Southern Nevada and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	Size of Service Area	Number of Primary Teaching Sites	Total Number of Teaching Sites	Offer BA Program?	If BA, with whom?	Distance learning?
Community College of Southern Nevada		44,000sqmi	3	27	No		Yes
	Broward County Community College	800sqmi	3	4	Yes	Florida Atlantic University	Yes
	Portland Community College	1,500sqmi	3	7	No		Yes
	North Harris Community College[1]	1,400sqmi	4	9	No		Yes
	Salt Lake Community College	7,687sqmi.	2	10	Yes	University of Utah	Yes
	Tidewater Community College	676sqmi	4	5	No		Yes
	MEANS		3.17	10.33			

Table S-5: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Truckee Meadows Community College and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	New Programs?	Number of New Programs	Descriptions of New Programs (Enrollments, if available, in parentheses)	Fall 1997 FTE	Fall 1998 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1997	Fall 1999 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1998	Fall 1997 Headcount	Fall 1998 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fiscal Year 1998	Fall 1999 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fall 1998
Truckee Meadows Community College		Yes	17	A.A.S., Mental Health Science (7.47 FTE); A.A.S., Dental Hygiene (12 FTE); A.A., Elementary and Secondary Education (61.67 FTE); A.A.S., Dietetic Technician; A.A.S., Golf Course Management; A.A., Business; A.A. & Certificate Theater; A.A., Applied Anthropology; A.A.S. & Certificate, Accounting Technology, A.A., Pre-Engineering; Certificate Diversity; A.A. & Certificate Music; A.A. & Certificate Criminal Justice	4,103	3,724	-9%	4,577	+23%	9,133	9,450	+3%	9,987	+6%
	College of Marin[1]	Yes	1	A.S., Multimedia (481 duplicated hc)	4,190	3,904	-7%	3,851	-1%	8,939	8,589	-4%	8,294	-4%
	Manatee Community College	Yes	4	A.S., Electrical Engineering Technology (8), A.S., Network Services Technology (23), A.S., Industrial Technology (2), A.S., Dental Hygiene (13)	4,695	4,126	-12%	4,106	<-1%	7,263	7,219	<-1%	7,085	-2%
	Kalamazoo Valley Community College[2]	No	0		4,591	6,520*	+42%	6,487*	-1%	8,655	12,292	+42%	12,230	-1%
	Laredo Community College	No	0		4,672	4,724	+1%	4,502	-5%	7,446	7,463	<+1%	7,457	N.C.
	Green River Community College[3]	Yes	30		4,835	4,871	+1%	4,946	+2%	7,189	6,364	-11%	6,309	-1%
	MEANS				4,514	4,645		4,745		8,104	8,563		8,560	

"*" Indicates the specific data to which footnotes pertain.

1. Service Area estimated as land area in square miles of Marin County.
2. Kalmazoo Community College did not provide part-time enrollment data; therefore, fall 1998 & fall 1999 FTE were estimated by multiplying their respective headcounts by KVCC's fall 1997 FTE/headcount ratio.
3. Estimated service area; equal to 1/2 of total land area of King County, Washington

Table S-5: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Truckee Meadows Community College and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	Size of Service Area	Number of Primary Teaching Sites	Total Number of Teaching Sites	Proximity to an Urban Area	Offer BA Program?	If BA, with whom?	Distance learning?
Truckee Meadows Community College		6,600sqmi	4	47	0	No		Yes
	College of Marin[1]	520sqmi*	2	3	18mi.	No		Yes
	Manatee Community College	1,300sqmi	2	20	46mi.	No		Yes
	Kalamazoo Valley Community College[2]	400sqmi	2	17	52mi.	No		Yes
	Laredo Community College	1,403sqmi	1	1	156mi.	No		Yes
	Green River Community College[3]	1,063sqmi*	1	1	28mi.	No		Yes
	MEANS		2	14.83				

Table S-6: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Western Nevada Community College and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	New Programs?	Number of New Programs	Descriptions of New Programs (Enrollments in parentheses)	Fall 1997 FTE	Fall 1998 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1997	Fall 1999 FTE	FTE Change From Fall 1998	Fall 1997 Headcount	Fall 1998 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fiscal Year 1998	Fall 1999 Headcount	Headcount Change From Fall 1998
Western Nevada Community College		Yes	1	A.S., Construction Technology (104)	2,098	2,172	+4%	2,211	+2%	4,964	5,572	+12%	5,574	N.C.
	Mendocino Community College	No	0		1,682	1,797	+7%	1,943	+8%	3,507	3,700	+6%	4,100	+11%
	Dalton Community College	Yes	6	3 B.S.A. (30,50); A.A.S., Manufacturing Technology (fl 2000); A.A.S., Radiologic Technology (15); A.A.S., Computer Networking Technology (75); dropped: Horticulture & Automotive Collision Repair.	2,003	1,825	-9%	1,870	+2%	3,052	2,967	-3%	3,049	+3%
	Central Carolina Community College[1]	Yes	2	A.S., Bioprocess Manufacturing, A.S., Information Systems Technology: Network Administration and Support	1,998	2,133*	+7%	2,396*	+12%	3,085	3,293	+7%	3,700	+12%
	Lower Columbia Community College	Yes	1	A.S., Heating, Ventilation, and Refrigeration	2,129	2,393	+12%	2,512	+5%	3,024	3,414	+13%	3,634	+6%
	Hill College	No	0		1,552	1,442	-7%	1,463	+1%	2,695	2,422	-10%	2,448	+1%
	MEANS				1,910	1,960		2,066		3,388	3,561		3,751	

"*" indicates the specific data to which footnotes pertain.

1. Central Carolina Community College does not disaggregate enrollment data as number full-time and part-time; therefore, fall 1998 and fall 1999 FTE figures were estimated by multiplying their respective enrollments by CCCC's fall 1997 FTE/headcount ratio.

Table S-6: Most-Recent and Supplementary Data Western Nevada Community College and Peers, 1999 - 2000

Institution	Peers	Size of Service Area	Number of Primary Teaching Sites	Total Number of Teaching Sites	Proximity to an Urban Area	Offer BA Program?	If BA, with whom?	Distance learning?
Western Nevada Community College		18,000sqmi	3	14	33mi.	No		Yes
	Mendocino Community College	3,700sqmi	3	8	115mi.	No		Yes
	Dalton Community College	2,700sqmi	1	4	31mi.	Yes	Self	Yes
	Central Carolina Community College'	1,535sqmi	6	12	41mi.	No		Yes
	Lower Columbia Community College	1,403sqmi	1	2	52mi.	Yes	Washington State University	Yes
	Hill College	3,290sqmi	2	30	51mi.	No		Yes
	MEANS		2.67	11.67				

APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY PEER COMPARISON REPORT

PREPARED BY

DR. LARRY LESLIE

Overview of Changes Based Upon Responses to First Peer Set
Larry L. Leslie

Preface: This is a summary statement of responses to comments offered by the Committee following our presentation of the first iteration of the peer sets and to questions and issues posed later by the Working Group. We have considered each comment, question, and issue and we have responded to each. In all cases the peer groups offered in the attached reflect these considerations.

Universities

UNLV: During the Committee meeting, several issues were raised in regard to the UNLV peers and their comparability. The strongest case was made for equity in choosing UNLV and UNR peers. Specifically, whereas we found adequate numbers of peers for UNLV in its 1994 Carnegie Classification category, in order to obtain adequate numbers for UNR we had added institutions in "higher" Carnegie categories. The result was that UNLV was at a relative disadvantage in the first peer sets. Related matters were the urban setting and rapid enrollment growth of UNLV: UNLV's 1994 Carnegie category contained limited numbers of urban institutions demonstrating substantial enrollment growth. These problems were remedied in the present iteration of the peer groups largely by utilizing the more current, Carnegie 2000 classification system, whose criteria result in the categorization of both UNLV and UNR as Research Universities. This yielded potential peers that satisfied many of the issues raised at the Committee meeting and subsequently in the Working Group meeting.

Some of the other UNLV issues were addressed *partially* by employment of Carnegie 2000 and partially by other strategies. For example, within the new, potential peer group were many institutions that possessed the professional programs that were new to UNLV; further, we used program similarity as a primary screen. The new peers also were much more likely to offer multiple doctoral degrees and to have more substantial research expenditures and endowments.

UNR: As UNR observes, selecting peers is a matter of tradeoffs. We agree that there is a strong case for selecting peers that are land grant institutions; however, there are not many (relatively) small land-grant institutions with medical schools, so the choices are limited. Utilizing the Carnegie 2000 classification we did succeed in identifying several, potential land-grant peers. Although most of these peers were larger than UNR, they were otherwise quite good fits. Only one of UNR's peer institutions (proposed as an alternate) is not a land-grant school. We could not identify another land-grant institution that had comparable traits.

Community Colleges

Great Basin College: Although GBC spokespersons were satisfied with their peers, they raised two questions. One was related to the GBC plan to offer baccalaureate degrees, the other to its large service area. Regarding the former, virtually every promising peer offering baccalaureate degrees was a branch campus of a state university. We concluded that the disadvantage of the GBC dissimilarity with branch campuses outweighed the baccalaureate-

granting consideration. Regarding service areas, we were not able to locate a source providing data on this subject. Also, although the GBC point about its service area is a provocative one, we know of no empiricism supporting the assumption that large service areas results in higher costs, *ceteris paribus*. Community colleges with numerous, small sites tend to operate those sites on a full-cost-recovery basis. Regardless of whether this is true for GBC, we do not know whether it is true for potential peers; therefore, selecting peers on this basis is not feasible.

CCSN: CCSN was satisfied with its peers. When we met with them, they indicated that they thought that one of their peers had experience recent enrollment decline and for that reason was a questionable choice. A telephone call to the Registrar of that institution, Broward Community College, revealed that "enrollments have been very flat for several years after a period of some decline"; therefore, the institution was retained as a peer.

TMCC: TMCC's request to substitute a California institution for one of the Florida community colleges is a good idea. The California peer chosen was at least as good a fit as was one of the Florida institutions, which was moved to the list of alternates.

WNCC: We spent much of our time attempting to respond to the WNCC set of six questions. Our efforts to respond to WNCC's points 1, 2,4, 5 and 6 (large service area/rural focus, proximity to urban areas, economic growth, cost of living, enrollment change) tended to yield peers that were judged to be less satisfactory on more basic criteria (e.g., funding pattern, size, program structure) than our original set of peers. Regarding point 3, as noted above, evidence that multiple sites in remote areas are costly to the "parent" institution is lacking although intuitively the argument has appeal. Regarding point 6, generally growing institutions are in more, not less, favorable financial positions than are stable or declining institutions although indeed this may not be the case for WNCC. Our resulting peer institutions for WNCC reflects consideration of the WNCC points.

DRI: (See attachment A.) Generally, we fared better than we anticipated in identifying peers for the DRI although the uniqueness of the DRI resulted in a short list of potential peers. The most common dissimilarity between the DRI and its proposed peers was that the latter reported to a campus rather than to a system office. We do not believe that this incompatibility is of major consequences, however, *because the chosen peers report to high-quality institutions* (with perhaps one exception). That is, DRI's quality standards and excellent organizational culture, which it rightfully values so highly, exist in the parent organizations of its peers. Like the DRI most of the chosen peers focus on environmental research, are funded similarly, and are generally of the same scale as the DRI.

We found only four good peers for the DRI. Due to its uniqueness, we offer the usual two alternates, but also two "backups." The primary reasons for relegation of the Forest Research Laboratory and the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute to alternate status were as follows: The former is limited to forestry; the latter deals more with biotechnological than with environmental research. The bases of the back-up status are as follows: Scripps is quite a good peer for the DRI but is much larger; the Institute of Marine Science is limited to basic oceanography and is located in Alaska.

ATTACHMENT A
Special Discussion of the DRI

It is important to state that the quality of peer groups can be judged only in reference to some outcome: "Peers for what purposes?" is the basic question in peer work. Like individuals, institutions of higher education (IHE) may be similar on one trait and very different on another. For example if one were interested in grouping students on just two traits, e.g., academic and athletic ability, no one would not suggest that a single group of "peers" would suffice. Similarly, no knowledgeable analyst would suggest that a good peer group for allocating state funds would suffice for determining some very different purpose.

Fortunately, one purpose common to virtually all peer group work is the financial one. In the peer group work for Nevada, we assume that although other purposes may be served by the peer groups, financial considerations will be viewed as important by the State and as paramount by the institutions.

The most difficult case among Nevada institutions is the DRI, largely because the State role in financing is small. This small role is important. Let us assume–probably safely–that the major purposes of the peer groups is to create a more rational (Nevada) resource allocation system, which logically would be measured by relative organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Would it be reasonable to expect that the efficiency and effectiveness of the DRI would be impacted primarily, or even terribly importantly, by 15% of its budget? Or would it be more likely that such outcomes would be more a function of the remaining 85% of funding and that the State money would serve primarily as the organizational base? If so, what do we learn from peers who are financed from the state at this level? This is a difficult question to answer, but an important one because it speaks to what we are trying to learn from peers in the case of the DRI.

This difficulty aside, we identified four overriding bases for DRI-peer group formation, which, for reasons that hopefully will be clear, are *not* listed in order of importance:

1. "Program," (i.e., research, specifically in environmental areas)
2. Resource base (i.e., heavily externally supported; modest state role)
3. Scale (i.e., size of budget and number of personnel)
4. Organizational "location" (i.e., to whom does the organization report?)

The DRI is a research unit dealing primarily in environmental areas. After a careful examination of the DRI, we concluded that peer organizations should at least primarily conduct research on environmental issues.

First, a bit of background. *Ceteris paribus,* some of the closest DRI "fits" were in biomedical areas, which differ substantially as to purpose, and in relative funding of individual research

projects.[1] These units were rejected. A very important corollary issue is to whether the potential peer has an instructional function. It seems clear that a unit whose primary mission is teaching is not a good match with the DRI, whose mission is almost exclusively research; thus, we reduced to "secondary status" units that had a significant instructional component in their missions.

Regarding the financing base, organizations that received some, but only minor, funding from the state were considered as most appropriate peers. Those that received either much more or much less of their funding from the state than does the DRI were considered as second-most appropriate peers. Those that received some, but only minor state funding from some *other state agency* were considered as third most appropriate peers. Those that received no state funding were considered as least-appropriate peers.[2]

Regarding "scale," we eliminated organizations whose budgets were less that $10 million (present DRI funding is about $22 million).[3] Although the importance of scale economies has not been demonstrated empirically for research units, we were uncomfortable in comparing very small research units to the DRI. Since number of personnel employed is directly correlated with budget, this variable was not a particularly useful discriminator; i.e., it was not of much marginal utility in selecting peers.

Organizations that reported to state higher education agencies were considered as best fits for the DRI. Those that reported to a university CEO were considered as second-most appropriate peers. Those that reported to some *other state agency* were considered as third most appropriate peers. All others were considered as the least appropriate peers. This variable caused considerable consternation to us, as the DRI made an extremely convincing case that their elite status in the competition for research personnel and thus research grants was greatly enhanced by their institutional independence. We believe that the DRI is correct in this opinion; however, we do not necessarily believe that this factor would impact state financing. For example, it is highly possible that if the DRI were within a prestigious university it would retain its favorable competitive position. If this is true, than good peers for the DRI might be found in organized research units of prestigious universities.

Before accepting our peers, we wish to strongly encourage the State to reflect carefully on its purposes for forming DRI peers. What does the State wish to achieve? It is very possible, perhaps even plausible, that the creation of DRI peers could do more harm to the State than good.

---

[1]We began by discussing the DRI with approximately 10, mostly local (U of AZ) colleagues who were knowledgeable about the DRI. We askedg them go identify facsimile organizations . Next we interviewed DRI personnel.

[2]After we had culled the list of potential peers, we conducted telephone interviews with potential peers.

[3]Using the *Research Centers Directory*.

Desert Research Institute Peer List

	Organization	Location		Year Founded	Program/Research Mission			Sources of Revenue			Personnel		To Whom Does Organization Report?
		City	State		Primarily Environmental?	Areas	Instruction[1]	Estimated Total Budget	% Revenue State	% Revenue Federal	Total	Research	
	Desert Research Institute	Reno & Las Vegas	Nevada	1959	Yes	Atmospheric, hydrolic, earth & ecosystem sciences	2	$23,837,000	14%	67%	350	121	University and Community College System of Nevada
P[2]	Center for Environmental Science	Cambridge	Maryland	1925	Yes	Fisheries and Wildlife Ecology, Environmental Toxicology, Aquaculture, Resource Management, Landscape and Watershed Ecology, Environmental Policy, Marine Sciences	3	$25,000,000	40%	60%	423	75	University System of Maryland
P	Hatfield Marine Science Center	Newport	Oregon	1965	Yes	Marine Pathology, Shore Ecology, Parisitology, Invertebrate Zoology, Aquaculture, Toxicology	3	$21,200,000	11%	89%	201	50	University
P	Center for Coastal, Energy, and Environmental Resources	Baton Rouge	Louisiana	1991	Yes	Oceanography, Ecology, Law, Socioeconomics	3	$13,400,000	30%	70%	122	100	Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies
P	Natural Resources Research Institute	Duluth	Minnesota	1983	Yes	"Economic development of the state's natural resources in an environmentally sound manner"	1	$12,000,000	10%	90%	157	53	University of Minnesota, Duluth
A	Forest Research Laboratory	Corvallis	Oregon	1941	No	Forestry	1	$17,500,000	24%	76%	200	200	Provost
A	University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute	College Park	Maryland	1985	No	Biotechnology, Marine Biotechnology, Medical Biotechnology, Human Virology, Agriculture Biotechnology	2	$29,900,000	50%	30%	168	125	University System of Maryland
B	Scripps Institution of Oceanography	La Jolla	California	1903	Yes	Biology, Chemistry, Geography, Geophysics, Geochemistry, Taxonomy, Physiology.	4	$100,000,000	14%	86%	1300	400	President of University of California, San Diego
B	Institute of Marine Science	Fairbanks	Alaska	1987	No	Basic Oceanography	4	$20,000,000	20%	80%	97	22	Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

1 Stated values represent the primacy of instruction/education to each organization according to their official, stated mission; instruction scale = 1 - 5: 1 = no instruction, 2 = minor role, 3 = roughly 1/2 of mission; 4 = >1/2 of mission, 5 = principal.
2 P = Peer; A = Alternate; B = Backup.

UNLV Peer Recommendations

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT LAS VEGAS
PEER GROUP SCREENS

SUMMARY TABLE

ST	NAME	PRIMARY SCREENING VARIABLES											
						WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION				
		Carn 2000	Medical	Locale*	FTE Enroll	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Land-grant
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS**	**RESEARCH**	**NO**	**Urban fringe of large city**	**13,364**	**4**	**34**	**63**	**29**	**41**	**31**	**7**	**NO**
FL	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON	RESEARCH	NO	Mid-size city	12,206	7	35	58	36	36	29	47	NO
GA	*GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY*	*RESEARCH*	*NO*	*Large city*	*17,172*	*10*	*48*	*42*	*31*	*41*	*27*	*4*	*NO*
LA	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	RESEARCH	NO	Large city	11,588	7	42	50	30	41	30	3	NO
NC	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBO	RESEARCH	NO	Mid-size city	10,016	16	37	47	27	43	30	-3	NO
OR	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY	RESEARCH	NO	Large city	11,232	7	42	51	29	43	29	0	NO
TX	*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON*	*RESEARCH*	*NO*	*Large city*	*13,854*	*13*	*40*	*46*	*34*	*41*	*25*	*-22*	*NO*
VA	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	RESEARCH	NO	Urban fringe of large city	15,882	12	45	42	29	42	29	17	NO
	HIGH (excluding UNLV)				17,172	16	48	58	36	43	30	47	
	AVERAGE (excluding UNLV)				13,136	10	41	48	31	41	28	7	
	LOW (excluding UNLV)				10,016	7	35	42	27	36	25	-22	
	UNLV % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE				2%	-64%	-18%	30%	-7%	0%	8%	7%	
	UNLV RANK (among all of above)				4	8	8	1	6	6	1	3	

ALTERNATES IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 1
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT LAS VEGAS
PEER GROUP INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	CITY	Locale Type	% 91-98 State Growth	Carn 2000	ENROLLMENT							
						Total Enroll	90-98 Enroll Growth	FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Black	% Am. Indian	% Asian / Pac. Isl.	% Hisp.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS**	**LAS VEGAS**	**Urban fringe of large city**	**51**	**RESEARCH**	**19,249**	**13,364**	**13,364**	**38**	**6**	**1**	**7**	**7**
FL	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON	BOCA RATON	Mid-size city	17	RESEARCH	18,823	12,206	12,206	48	11	0	4	10
GA	*GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY*	*ATLANTA*	*Large city*	*20*	*RESEARCH*	*24,276*	*17,172*	*17,172*	*43*	*23*	*0*	*6*	*2*
LA	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	NEW ORLEANS	Large city	4	RESEARCH	15,833	11,588	11,588	31	17	0	4	5
NC	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO	GREENSBORO	Mid-size city	15	RESEARCH	12,535	10,016	10,016	20	13	0	2	1
OR	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY	PORTLAND	Large city	17	RESEARCH	16,997	11,232	11,232	42	2	1	8	3
TX	*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON*	*ARLINGTON*	*Large city*	*18*	*RESEARCH*	*19,286*	*13,854*	*13,854*	*39*	*9*	*1*	*10*	*8*
VA	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	FAIRFAX	Urban fringe of large city	11	RESEARCH	23,826	15,882	15,882	28	8	0	12	5
	HIGH (excluding UNLV)			20		24,276	17,172	17,172	48	23	1	12	10
	AVERAGE (excluding UNLV)			15		18,797	13,136	13,136	36	12	0	7	5
	LOW (excluding UNLV)			4		12,535	10,016	10,016	20	2	0	2	1
	UNLV % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE			248%		2%	2%	2%	5%	-49%	250%	7%	44%
	UNLV RANK (among all of above)			1		4	4	4	5	7	1	4	3

ALTERNATES IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 2
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT LAS VEGAS
PEER GROUP PROGRAM AND FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			FACULTY			
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	FT Faculty	% Tenure Elig.	% with Tenure	FTE Stu: FT Fac
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS**	**13,364**	**38**	**4**	**34**	**63**	**29**	**41**	**31**	**612**	**85**	**62**	**22**
FL	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON	12,206	48	7	35	58	36	36	29	575	88	61	21
GA	*GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,172*	*43*	*10*	*48*	*42*	*31*	*41*	*27*	*845*	*84*	*56*	*20*
LA	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	11,588	31	7	42	50	30	41	30	495	86	68	23
NC	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO	10,016	20	16	37	47	27	43	30	565	78	56	18
OR	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY	11,232	42	7	42	51	29	43	29	468	87	70	24
TX	*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON*	*13,854*	*39*	*13*	*40*	*46*	*34*	*41*	*25*	*618*	*87*	*67*	*22*
VA	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	15,882	28	12	45	42	29	42	29	748	78	64	21
	HIGH (excluding UNLV)	17,172	48	16	48	58	36	43	30	845	88	70	24
	AVERAGE (excluding UNLV)	13,136	36	10	41	48	31	41	28	616	84	63	21
	LOW (excluding UNLV)	10,016	20	7	35	42	27	36	25	468	78	56	18
	UNLV % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	2%	5%	-64%	-18%	30%	-7%	0%	8%	-1%	1%	-1%	2%
	UNLV RANK (among all of above)	4	5	8	8	1	6	6	1	4	5	5	4

ALTERNATES IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 3
UNIVERSITY OF LAS VEGAS AT NEVADA
PEER GROUP COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS**	**13,364**	**38**	**5,220**	**520**	**1,526**	**1,015**	**8,282**	**925**	**313**	**1,367**	**1,206**	**12,093**
FL	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON	12,206	48	6,583	904	1,742	3,251	12,480	1,095	134	1,429	828	15,967
GA	*GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,172*	*43*	*5,878*	*1,046*	*1,655*	*1,889*	*10,468*	*2,440*	*579*	*1,557*	*1,160*	*16,204*
LA	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	11,588	31	4,454	539	995	1,009	6,997	1,606	510	962	706	10,780
NC	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENS	10,016	20	5,581	887	1,849	911	9,227	1,106	339	1,755	884	13,311
OR	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY	11,232	42	5,584	444	1,778	1,107	8,913	803	521	1,031	683	11,952
TX	*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON*	*13,854*	*39*	*4,548*	*528*	*996*	*1,150*	*7,222*	*1,261*	*561*	*1,395*	*1,029*	*11,469*
VA	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	15,882	28	5,876	509	1,219	944	8,548	1,237	118	1,403	773	12,078
	HIGH (excluding UNLV)	17,172	48	6,583	1,046	1,849	3,251	12,480	2,440	579	1,755	1,160	16,204
	AVERAGE (excluding UNLV)	13,136	36	5,500	694	1,462	1,466	9,122	1,364	395	1,362	866	13,109
	LOW (excluding UNLV)	10,016	20	4,454	444	995	911	6,997	803	118	962	683	10,780
	UNLV % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	2%	5%	-5%	-25%	4%	-31%	-9%	-32%	-21%	0%	39%	-8%
	UNLV RANK (among all of above)	4	5	6	6	5	5	6	7	6	6	1	4

ALTERNATES IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 4
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT LAS VEGAS
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS**	**13,364**	**38**	**43**	**4**	**13**	**8**	**68**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**10**	**100**
FL	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON	12,206	48	41	6	11	20	78	7	1	9	5	100
GA	*GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,172*	*43*	*36*	*6*	*10*	*12*	*65*	*15*	*4*	*10*	*7*	*100*
LA	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	11,588	31	41	5	9	9	65	15	5	9	7	100
NC	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENS	10,016	20	42	7	14	7	69	8	3	13	7	100
OR	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY	11,232	42	47	4	15	9	75	7	4	9	6	100
TX	*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON*	*13,854*	*39*	*40*	*5*	*9*	*10*	*63*	*11*	*5*	*12*	*9*	*100*
VA	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	15,882	28	49	4	10	8	71	10	1	12	6	100
	HIGH (excluding UNLV)	17,172	48	49	7	15	20	78	15	5	13	9	100
	AVERAGE (excluding UNLV)	13,136	36	42	5	11	11	69	10	3	10	7	100
	LOW (excluding UNLV)	10,016	20	36	4	9	7	63	7	1	9	5	100
	UNLV % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	2%	5%	2%	-17%	13%	-22%	-1%	-27%	-17%	8%	50%	0%
	UNLV RANK (among all of above)	4	5	3	6	3	6	5	6	5	4	1	4

ALTERNATES IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 5
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT LAS VEGAS
PEER GROUP COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS**	**13,364**	**38**	**3,094**	**1,179**	**6,701**	**10**	**821**	**80**	**435**	**3,223**	**288**	**15,831**
FL	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON	12,206	48	2,663	1,604	8,843	0	2,737	0	27	1,600	139	17,613
GA	*GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,172*	*43*	*4,194*	*1,417*	*9,764*	*16*	*551*	*3*	*324*	*961*	*347*	*17,577*
LA	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	11,588	31	3,808	1,854	4,066	71	437	22	27	954	566	11,806
NC	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO	10,016	20	2,911	1,673	7,588	14	356	282	510	2,881	229	16,443
OR	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY	11,232	42	4,846	1,919	4,299	75	393	3	454	1,447	66	13,501
TX	*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON*	*13,854*	*39*	*4,021*	*1,680*	*5,726*	*5*	*374*	*72*	*388*	*979*	*563*	*13,808*
VA	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	15,882	28	4,732	1,247	4,880	85	732	69	10	3,289	251	15,295
	HIGH (excluding UNLV)	17,172	48	4,846	1,919	9,764	85	2,737	282	510	3,289	566	17,613
	AVERAGE (excluding UNLV)	13,164	36	3,784	1,572	6,483	34	800	66	272	1,917	306	15,234
	LOW (excluding UNLV)	10,016	20	2,663	1,179	4,066	0	356	0	10	954	66	11,806
	UNLV % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	2%	4%	-18%	-25%	3%	-72%	3%	20%	60%	68%	-6%	4%
	UNLV RANK (among all of above)	4	5	6	8	4	6	2	2	3	2	4	4

ALTERNATES IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 6
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT LAS VEGAS
PEER GROUP COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS**	**13,364**	**38**	**20**	**7**	**42**	**0**	**5**	**1**	**3**	**20**	**2**	**100**
FL	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON	12,206	48	15	9	50	0	16	0	0	9	1	100
GA	*GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,172*	*43*	*24*	*8*	*56*	*0*	*3*	*0*	*2*	*5*	*2*	*100*
LA	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	11,588	31	32	16	34	1	4	0	0	8	5	100
NC	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO	10,016	20	18	10	46	0	2	2	3	18	1	100
OR	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY	11,232	42	36	14	32	1	3	0	3	11	0	100
TX	*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON*	*13,854*	*39*	*29*	*12*	*41*	*0*	*3*	*1*	*3*	*7*	*4*	*100*
VA	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	15,882	28	31	8	32	1	5	0	0	22	2	100
	HIGH (excluding UNLV)	17,172	48	36	16	56	1	16	2	3	22	5	100
	AVERAGE (excluding UNLV)	13,164	36	26	11	42	0	5	0	2	12	2	100
	LOW (excluding UNLV)	10,016	20	15	7	32	0	2	0	0	5	0	100
	UNLV % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	2%	4%	-24%	-30%	1%	-76%	3%	18%	71%	63%	-14%	
	UNLV RANK (among all of above)	4	5	6	8	4	6	2	3	1	2	4	

ALTERNATES IN ITALICS ABOVE

DEFINITIONS OF COLUMN HEADINGS
(sorted alpabetically)

Column Heading	Definition of variable
% 90-98 County Growth	Percentage change in county population between 1990 and 1998.
% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Percentage change in student headcount betwee the years 1990/91 and fiscal 1998.
% Am. Indian	Percentage of student body American Indian or Alaskan Native
% Asian/Pac. Isl.	Percentage of student body Asian or Pacific Islander in fiscal 1998
% Black	Percentage of student body African-American in fiscal 1998
% Hisp	Percentage of student body Hispanic in fiscal 1998
% Part-time	Percentage of student FTE attending part-time in fiscal 1998.
% Tenure Elig.	Percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured or tenure-tracked in fiscal 1998.
% with tenure	Percentage of full-time faculty tenured in fiscal 1998.
Acad. Support	Total academic support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Auxil	Total current fund revenue derived from auxiliary services divided by FTE enrollment.
Carn 2000	Proposed Carnegie Classification for the year 2000.
Endow	Total current fund revenue derived from endowment earnings divided by FTE enrollment.
Federal	Total current fund revenue derived from the federal government divided by FTE enrollment.
FT Faculty	Number of full-time faculty at institution in fiscal 1998.
FTE Enroll	Student FTE enrollment for the fiscal 1998
FTE Stu:FT Fac	Ratio of FTE Students to full-time faculty.
FULL INSTR	Full cost of instruction (inclusive of direct instructional costs, academic support, student services, and financial aid) divided by FTE enrollment.
Funded Rsrch	Total expenditures on research divided by FTE enrollment.
Gifts Cont	Total current fund revenue derived from private gifts and contracts divided by FTE enrollment.
Instit. Support	Total institutional support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Instruct	Total instructional expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Local	Total current fund revenue derived from the local government divided by FTE enrollment.
Locale	Degree of urbanization based on 1990 Census.
Oper & Maint	Total plant operations and maintenance expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Other	Total current fund revenue derived from other sources divided by FTE enrollment.
Public Service	Total public service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Sales	Total current fund revenue derived from sales and services divided by FTE enrollment.
State	Total current fund revenue derived from the state government divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Aid	Total student aid expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Serv.	Total student service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Total Enroll	Student headcount enrollment in fiscal 1998.
TOTAL EXP	Total expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
TOTAL REV	Total current fund revenue divided by FTE enrollment.
Tuition & Fees	Total current fund revenue derived from tuition and fees divided by FTE enrollment.
Unweighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X.
Weighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X and weighted by the number of program graduates in fiscal 1998.

4-YEAR SCHOOL PROGRAM COST CLASSIFICATIONS

DOCTORAL HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
EDUCATION.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
MATHEMATICS.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

MASTERS HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

BACHELORS HIGH COST
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.

PROFESSIONAL HIGH COST
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

DOCTORAL MID-COST: NONE

MASTERS MID_COST
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.

BACHELORS MID-COST
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
CONSTRUCTION TRADES.
MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS.
PRECISION PRODUCTION TRADES.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

PROFESSIONAL MID-COST
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.

DOCTORAL LOW COST: NONE

MASTERS LOW COST: NONE

BACHELORS LOW COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

This table summarizes the substantive changes planned for the 2000 edition of the **Carnegie Classification.**

1994 edition	2000 edition
Research Universities I	Doctoral/Research Universities I
50 or more doctorates per year, and $40-million or more per year in federal support	50 or more doctorates per year across at least 15 disciplines
Research Universities II	Doctoral/Research Universities II
50 or more doctorates per year, and $15.5-million to $40-million or more per year in federal support	10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all
Doctoral Universities I	[included in above categories]
40 or more doctorates per year across at least 5 disciplines	
Doctoral Universities II	[included in above categories]
10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all	
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I	Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I
40 per cent or more of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, and restrictive in admissions*	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and at least half of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields
Baccalaureate Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges II
Less than 40 per cent of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, or less restrictive in admissions*	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and less than half of those in liberal-arts fields
Associate of Arts Colleges	Associate's Colleges
[no explicit distinction from Baccalaureate Colleges]	Less than half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees

SOURCE: CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

UNR Peer Recommendations

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP SCREENS

SUMMARY TABLE

ST	NAME	PRIMARY SCREENING VARIABLES											
						WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			% 91-98	
		Carn 2000	Medical	Locale*	FTE Enroll	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	Enroll Growth	Land-grant
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**RESEARCH**	**YES**	**Mid-size city**	**9,086**	**16**	**35**	**49**	**37**	**35**	**28**	**8**	**YES**
IN	*INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY-IND.*	*RESEARCH*	*YES*	*Large city*	*18,285*	*17*	*44*	*39*	*19*	*40*	*42*	*-2*	*NO*
KS	*KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY*	*RESEARCH*	*YES*	*Large town*	*17,497*	*16*	*35*	*49*	*37*	*35*	*27*	*-4*	*YES*
OK	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS	RESEARCH	YES	Large town	16,465	20	31	49	43	33	24	-3	YES
MS	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	RESEARCH	YES	Rural	13,535	15	33	52	43	30	27	9	YES
MO	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	RESEARCH	YES	Large city	7,423	18	48	34	28	40	33	-7	YES
AL	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	RESEARCH	YES		19,575	16	36	48	43	29	28	0	YES
WA	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	RESEARCH	YES	Small town	17,939	16	30	54	43	32	25	10	YES

HIGH (excluding UNR)	19,575	20	48	54	43	40	42	10	
AVERAGE (excluding UNR)	15,817	17	37	46	36	34	29	0	
LOW (excluding UNR)	7,423	15	30	34	19	29	24	-7	
UNR % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-43%	-8%	-4%	6%	2%	3%	-5%		
UNR RANK (among all of above)	7	7	4	3	6	4	3	3	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 1
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	CITY	Locale Type	% 90-98 State Growth	Carn 2000	ENROLLMENT							
						Total Enroll	% 91-98 Enroll Growth	FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Black	% Am. Indian	% Asian / Pac. Isl.	% Hisp.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**RENO**	**Mid-size city**	**51**	**RESEARCH**	**12,442**	**8**	**9,086**	**33**	**2**	**1**	**5**	**5**
IN	*INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY-IND.*	*INDIANAPOLIS*	*Large city*	*7*	*RESEARCH*	*27,036*	*-2*	*18,285*	*46*	*9*	*0*	*3*	*1*
KS	*KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY*	*MANHATTAN*	*Large town*	*7*	*RESEARCH*	*20,306*	*-4*	*17,497*	*15*	*3*	*1*	*2*	*2*
AL	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	AUBURN UNIVERSITY		8	RESEARCH	21,505	0	19,575	8	6	0	1	1
MS	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	MISSISSIPPI STATE	Rural	7	RESEARCH	15,628	9	13,535	13	15	0	1	1
MO	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	KANSAS CITY	Large city	7	RESEARCH	10,444	-7	7,423	36	8	1	5	3
OK	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS	STILLWATER	Large town	7	RESEARCH	19,332	-3	16,465	10	3	6	2	2
WA	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	PULLMAN	Small town	18	RESEARCH	20,243	10	17,939	14	2	2	5	3
	HIGH (excluding UNR)			18		27,036	10	19,575	46	15	6	5	3
	AVERAGE (excluding UNR)			9		19,213	0	15,817	20	7	1	3	2
	LOW (excluding UNR)			7		10,444	-7	7,423	8	2	0	1	1
	UNR % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE			471%		-35%		-43%	60%	-70%	-30%	84%	169%
	UNR RANK (among all of above)			1		7	3	7	3	7	3	1	1

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 2
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP PROGRAM AND FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			FACULTY			
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	FT Faculty	% Tenure Elig.	% with Tenure	FTE Stu: FT Fac
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**16**	**35**	**49**	**37**	**35**	**28**	**430**	**87**	**66**	**21**
IN	*INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY-IND.*	*18,285*	*46*	*17*	*44*	*39*	*19*	*40*	*42*	*705*	*83*	*55*	*26*
KS	*KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,497*	*15*	*16*	*35*	*49*	*37*	*35*	*27*	*862*	*88*	*68*	*20*
AL	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	19,575	8	16	36	48	43	29	28	1,145	92	75	17
MS	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	13,535	13	15	33	52	43	30	27	822	83	57	16
MO	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	7,423	36	18	48	34	28	40	33	468	91	71	16
OK	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS	16,465	10	20	31	49	43	33	24	913	97	77	18
WA	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	17,939	14	16	30	54	43	32	25	1,000	84	61	18
	HIGH (excluding UNR)	19,575	46	20	48	54	43	40	42	1,145	97	77	26
	AVERAGE (excluding UNR)	15,817	20	17	37	46	36	34	29	845	88	66	19
	LOW (excluding UNR)	7,423	8	15	30	34	19	29	24	468	83	55	16
	UNR % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-43%	60%	-8%	-4%	6%	2%	3%	-5%	-49%	-2%	0%	12%
	UNR RANK (among all of above)	7	3	7	4	3	6	4	3	8	5	5	2

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 3
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**10,616**	**848**	**2,386**	**952**	**14,801**	**3,584**	**3,904**	**1,928**	**1,754**	**25,972**
IN	*INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY-IND.*	*18,285*	*46*	*11,243*	*483*	*4,799*	*1,059*	*17,585*	*4,402*	*2,819*	*1,260*	*2,050*	*28,116*
KS	*KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,497*	*15*	*5,413*	*841*	*1,229*	*653*	*8,136*	*4,354*	*2,228*	*817*	*1,224*	*16,759*
AL	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	19,575	8	5,073	435	1,334	1,132	7,974	3,521	2,779	963	1,236	16,473
MS	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	13,535	13	4,750	599	1,349	1,661	8,359	6,426	3,420	1,573	1,211	20,990
MO	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	7,423	36	11,598	1,601	2,399	2,616	18,213	1,404	1,571	1,699	1,639	24,526
OK	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS	16,465	10	5,161	555	1,860	1,981	9,556	3,610	2,221	677	1,332	17,396
WA	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	17,939	14	7,216	778	3,279	2,090	13,362	3,626	1,834	1,598	1,589	22,008
	HIGH (excluding UNR)	19,575	46	11,598	1,601	4,799	2,616	18,213	6,426	3,420	1,699	2,050	28,116
	AVERAGE (excluding UNR)	15,817	20	7,208	756	2,321	1,599	11,884	3,906	2,410	1,227	1,469	20,896
	LOW (excluding UNR)	7,423	8	4,750	435	1,229	653	7,974	1,404	1,571	677	1,211	16,473
	UNR % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-43%	60%	47%	12%	3%	-40%	25%	-8%	62%	57%	19%	24%
	UNR RANK (among all of above)	7	3	3	2	4	7	3	6	1	1	2	2

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 4
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT								
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**41**	**3**	**9**	**4**	**57**	**14**	**15**	**7**	**7**	**100**
IN	*INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY-IND.*	*18,285*	*46*	*40*	*2*	*17*	*4*	*63*	*16*	*10*	*4*	*7*	*100*
KS	*KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,497*	*15*	*32*	*5*	*7*	*4*	*49*	*26*	*13*	*5*	*7*	*100*
AL	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	19,575	8	31	3	8	7	48	21	17	6	8	100
MS	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	13,535	13	23	3	6	8	40	31	16	7	6	100
MO	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	7,423	36	47	7	10	11	74	6	6	7	7	100
OK	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS	16,465	10	30	3	11	11	55	21	13	4	8	100
WA	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	17,939	14	33	4	15	9	61	16	8	7	7	100
	HIGH (excluding UNR)	19,575	46	47	7	17	11	74	31	17	7	8	100
	AVERAGE (excluding UNR)	15,817	20	34	4	11	8	56	20	12	6	7	100
	LOW (excluding UNR)	7,423	8	23	2	6	4	40	6	6	4	6	100
	UNR % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-43%	60%	22%	-10%	-13%	-52%	2%	-29%	25%	27%	-4%	0%
	UNR RANK (among all of above)	7	3	2	4	5	8	4	7	3	2	6	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 5
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**3,776**	**4,369**	**13,268**	**894**	**2,338**	**165**	**1,435**	**2,539**	**316**	**29,099**
IN	*INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY-IND.*	*18,285*	*46*	*5,381*	*4,810*	*10,010*	*0*	*2,549*	*13*	*1,152*	*5,697*	*5,708*	*35,321*
KS	*KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,497*	*15*	*2,889*	*2,502*	*8,909*	*5*	*890*	*6*	*1,539*	*1,216*	*212*	*18,168*
AL	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	19,575	8	4,078	2,553	8,299	86	935	343	786	2,554	741	20,375
MS	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	13,535	13	3,839	5,075	9,734	264	1,006	24	1,052	1,856	914	23,765
MO	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	7,423	36	9,419	1,702	10,015	0	2,293	318	822	1,175	762	26,507
OK	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS	16,465	10	3,159	2,306	10,285	0	1,199	0	148	4,493	758	22,348
WA	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	17,939	14	5,086	3,683	10,818	0	1,281	271	495	3,086	690	25,410
	HIGH (excluding UNR)	19,575	46	9,419	5,075	13,268	894	2,549	343	1,539	5,697	5,708	35,321
	AVERAGE (excluding UNR)	14,976	22	4,703	3,375	10,167	156	1,562	142	929	2,827	1,263	25,124
	LOW (excluding UNR)	7,423	8	2,889	1,702	8,299	0	890	0	148	1,175	212	18,168
	UNR % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-39%	49%	-20%	29%	30%	472%	50%	16%	54%	-10%	-75%	16%
	UNR RANK (among all of above)	7	3	6	3	1	1	2	4	2	5	7	2

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 6
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**13**	**15**	**46**	**3**	**8**	**1**	**5**	**9**	**1**	**100**
IN	*INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY-IND.*	*18,285*	*46*	*15*	*14*	*28*	*0*	*7*	*0*	*3*	*16*	*16*	*100*
KS	*KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY*	*17,497*	*15*	*16*	*14*	*49*	*0*	*5*	*0*	*8*	*7*	*1*	*100*
AL	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	19,575	8	20	13	41	0	5	2	4	13	4	100
MS	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	13,535	13	16	21	41	1	4	0	4	8	4	100
MO	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	7,423	36	36	6	38	0	9	1	3	4	3	100
OK	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS	16,465	10	14	10	46	0	5	0	1	20	3	100
WA	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	17,939	14	20	14	43	0	5	1	2	12	3	100
	HIGH (excluding UNR)	19,575	46	36	21	49	3	9	2	8	20	16	
	AVERAGE (excluding UNR)	14,976	22	19	13	41	1	6	1	4	11	4	
	LOW (excluding UNR)	7,423	8	13	6	28	0	4	0	1	4	1	
	UNR % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-39%	49%	-31%	12%	10%	430%	34%	-3%	29%	-21%	-75%	
	UNR RANK (among all of above)	7	3	8	2	3	1	2	4	2	5	8	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

UNR – NORTH DAKOTA SUPPLEMENTAL PEER INFORMATION

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP SCREENS

SUMMARY TABLE

ST	NAME	PRIMARY SCREENING VARIABLES											
						WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST				
		Carn 2000	Medical	Locale*	FTE Enroll	% Progs Hi-Cst	Progs Mid-Cst	Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	Progs Mid-Cst	Progs Low Cst	% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Land-grant
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**RESEARCH**	**YES**	**Mid-size city**	**9,086**	**16**	**35**	**49**	**37**	**35**	**28**	**8**	**YES**
ND	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA-MAIN CAMPUS	RESEARCH	YES	Mid-size city	9,192	13	47	40	29	43	29	-11	NO

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 1
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	CITY	Locale Type	% 90-98 State Growth	Carn 2000	ENROLLMENT Total Enroll	% 91-98 Enroll Growth	FTE Enroll	% Part time	% Black	% Am. Indian	Asian / Pac. Isl.	% Hisp.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**RENO**	**Mid-size city**	**51**	**RESEARCH**	**12,442**	**8**	**9,086**	**33**	**2**	**1**	**5**	**5**
ND	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA-MAIN CAMPUS	GRAND FORKS	Mid-size city	-1	RESEARCH	10,363	-11	9,192	11	1	3	1	1

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 2
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP PROGRAM AND FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			FACULTY			
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	FT Faculty	% Tenure Elig.	% with Tenure	FTE Stu: FT Fac
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**16**	**35**	**49**	**37**	**35**	**28**	**430**	**87**	**66**	**21**
ND	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA-MAIN CAMPUS	9,192	11	13	47	40	29	43	29	457	79	55	20

TABLE 3
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**10,616**	**848**	**2,386**	**952**	**14,801**	**3,584**	**3,904**	**1,928**	**1,754**	**25,972**
ND	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA-MAIN CAMPUS	9,192	11	8,138	753	1,739	1,196	11,827	2,051	793	1,610	2,811	19,091

TABLE 4
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT								
		FTE Enroll	% Part time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**41**	**3**	**9**	**4**	**57**	**14**	**15**	**7**	**7**	**100**
ND	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA-MAIN CAMPUS	9,192	11	43	4	9	6	62	11	4	8	15	100

TABLE 5
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**3,776**	**4,369**	**13,268**	**894**	**2,338**	**165**	**1,435**	**2,539**	**316**	**29,099**
ND	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA-MAIN CAMPUS	9,192	11	4,075	4,764	6,316	0	1,528	70	2,749	3,317	0	22,820

TABLE 6
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA AT RENO
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO**	**9,086**	**33**	**13**	**15**	**46**	**3**	**8**	**1**	**5**	**9**	**1**	**100**
ND	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA-MAIN CAMPUS	9,192	11	18	21	28	0	7	0	12	15	0	100

DEFINITIONS OF COLUMN HEADINGS
(sorted alpabetically)

Column Heading	Definition of variable
% 90-98 County Growth	Percentage change in county population between 1990 and 1998.
% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Percentage change in student headcount betwee the years 1990/91 and fiscal 1998.
% Am. Indian	Percentage of student body American Indian or Alaskan Native
% Asian/Pac. Isl.	Percentage of student body Asian or Pacific Islander in fiscal 1998
% Black	Percentage of student body African-American in fiscal 1998
% Hisp	Percentage of student body Hispanic in fiscal 1998
% Part-time	Percentage of student FTE attending part-time in fiscal 1998.
% Tenure Elig.	Percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured or tenure-tracked in fiscal 1998.
% with tenure	Percentage of full-time faculty tenured in fiscal 1998.
Acad. Support	Total academic support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Auxil	Total current fund revenue derived from auxiliary services divided by FTE enrollment.
Carn 2000	Proposed Carnegie Classification for the year 2000.
Endow	Total current fund revenue derived from endowment earnings divided by FTE enrollment.
Federal	Total current fund revenue derived from the federal government divided by FTE enrollment.
FT Faculty	Number of full-time faculty at institution in fiscal 1998.
FTE Enroll	Student FTE enrollment for the fiscal 1998
FTE Stu:FT Fac	Ratio of FTE Students to full-time faculty.
FULL INSTR	Full cost of instruction (inclusive of direct instructional costs, academic support, student services, and financial aid) divided by FTE enrollment.
Funded Rsrch	Total expenditures on research divided by FTE enrollment.
Gifts Cont	Total current fund revenue derived from private gifts and contracts divided by FTE enrollment.
Instit. Support	Total institutional support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Instruct	Total instructional expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Local	Total current fund revenue derived from the local government divided by FTE enrollment.
Locale	Degree of urbanization based on 1990 Census.
Oper & Maint	Total plant operations and maintenance expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Other	Total current fund revenue derived from other sources divided by FTE enrollment.
Public Service	Total public service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Sales	Total current fund revenue derived from sales and services divided by FTE enrollment.
State	Total current fund revenue derived from the state government divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Aid	Total student aid expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Serv.	Total student service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Total Enroll	Student headcount enrollment in fiscal 1998.
TOTAL EXP	Total expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
TOTAL REV	Total current fund revenue divided by FTE enrollment.
Tuition & Fees	Total current fund revenue derived from tuition and fees divided by FTE enrollment.
Unweighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X.
Weighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X and weighted by the number of program graduates in fiscal 1998.

DOCTORAL HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
EDUCATION.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
MATHEMATICS.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

MASTERS HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

BACHELORS HIGH COST
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.

PROFESSIONAL HIGH COST
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

DOCTORAL MID-COST: NONE

MASTERS MID_COST
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.

BACHELORS MID-COST
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
CONSTRUCTION TRADES.
MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS.
PRECISION PRODUCTION TRADES.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

PROFESSIONAL MID-COST
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.

DOCTORAL LOW COST: NONE

MASTERS LOW COST: NONE

BACHELORS LOW COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

This table summarizes the substantive changes planned for the 2000 edition of the **Carnegie Classification.**

1994 edition	2000 edition
Research Universities I	Doctoral/Research Universities I
50 or more doctorates per year, and $40-million or more per year in federal support	50 or more doctorates per year across at least 15 disciplines
Research Universities II	Doctoral/Research Universities II
50 or more doctorates per year, and $15.5-million to $40-million or more per year in federal support	10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all
Doctoral Universities I	[included in above categories]
40 or more doctorates per year across at least 5 disciplines	
Doctoral Universities II	[included in above categories]
10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all	
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I	Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I
40 per cent or more of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, and restrictive in admissions*	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and at least half of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields
Baccalaureate Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges II
Less than 40 per cent of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, or less restrictive in admissions*	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and less than half of those in liberal-arts fields
Associate of Arts Colleges	Associate's Colleges
[no explicit distinction from Baccalaureate Colleges]	Less than half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees

SOURCE: CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

UNR – LAND GRANT/MEDICAL SCHOOL DISCUSSION

Apparently, IPEDS does not distinguish between medical schools and veterinary schools. The result is that several of the universities we identified as having medical schools in fact do not. In order to provide the Committee with information about the implications of this discovery, we examined the web sites of the proposed peers, and we communicated with several representatives of the pertinent units on those campuses. From these inquiries we offer the following.

In the past several years, the predominant organizational model for medical schools and their associated medical centers has come to be full or "effective" autonomy from their parent institutions. One of the accompanying traits of this autonomy is full or nearly-full financial independence and separate financial reports for medical units. These organizational arrangements raise the question of how medical schools should be treated when peer sets are developed. Where these units exist on a separate campus (usually in a major, state population center), they and their associated medical centers have come to be completely autonomous, and they should not be considered in establishing peers for the "home university." Where these units exist on a "regular" university campus, whether one should include medical schools in composing peers is less clear. On the one hand, one could argue that medical school autonomy or near-autonomy on a campus suggests exclusion of these units from peer group consideration; on the other hand, even if completely independent, the existence of a medical school on a campus is extremely relevant to the curriculum, research activities, cost structure, and even prestige of the university. For example, basic sciences and their associated research projects typically impact and are impacted importantly by the existence of a medical school. Perhaps most importantly, the research and education conducted by the medical school greatly enhance the image of the entire university, as well as the ability to attract research and other dollars in other areas. Our conclusion is that it would be a mistake to ignore or exclude the UNR medical school in the formation of UNR peers.

In considering the proposed UNR peer set, several points are noteworthy. First, three of the proposed peers and alternates do contain medical schools: Oklahoma State; Missouri-Kansas City; and Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis (IU-PUI) although the degree of medical school autonomy varies among these universities.[1] (Also, IU-PUI is not a land-grant institution.) The remaining four institutions possess veterinary schools; at least two also contain schools of nursing and pharmacy; one of the remaining has a pre-med and a biomed program.

The presence of veterinary schools in the proposed peers is especially important because the cost structures of medical schools and veterinary schools are fairly similar. Also, the number of students admitted to each in the peer institutions also roughly the same. (Nursing and Pharmacy schools also are high-cost units.) For example, the Washington State vet school enrolls about 340 students and has a total budget of approximately $26 million. Auburn University's vet

[1]For example, the IU-PUI medical school was originally a unit of Indiana University. When IU-PUI was established, technically the medical school became part of the institution although it maintained its IU identity. To a considerable degree the University could be described as having "grown up around the Medical Center.. Two years ago the Medical Center became largely independent of IU-PUI.

school enrolls 404 students, with a budget of roughly $30 million. Kansas State's vet school enrolls approximately 400 students; it's budget *exclusive of* foundation and sponsored research is $22 million. Comparably, UNR's medical school enrolls about 200 students, and its budget is approximately $50 million. (Of course UNR also has a vet school.) The result is that although the four proposed peers without medical schools are by no means strictly comparable to UNR, their veterinary, nursing, and pharmacy schools contribute to comparability.

What of alternatives? We conducted a state-by-state examination of universities with medical schools among the western, midwestern, and most of the southeastern states. We found no *new*, good peers for UNR, or at least none that we would identify as "better" peers than those already proposed . Previously, we had identified the University of North Dakota and had considered the University of South Dakota. The former, especially, appears to have excellent potential as a peer. Both are land grant and have medical schools. The major reasons for the exclusion of others are 1) virtually all such universities are much larger than UNR, and 2) most are not land-grant universities. (See attachment.)

Attachment: Universities with Medical Schools and Their Comparability with UNR

Arizona: At U of AZ; med school has separate financial reports and is semi-authonomous; U AZ has 35,000 students

Washington: not land grant. Medical school is at U W. A very large and very high-ranking research university.

Oregon: U O has med school, but is in Portland; OSU is land-grant.

Idaho: Pocatello has an allied health college with dentistry, pharmacy, etc., but is probably not a good match for UNR. Also, it is not a land-grant school.

California: I will leave this one alone.

Montana: From web-sites, MT does not have a med school.

Utah: University of Utah. Not land-grant. Renowned for medical research; very large medical research budget.

Colorado: CO Health Sciences Center is in Denver and is an independent institution; Colorado State is land-grant.

Wyoming: U Wyoming is the land grant; does not have a med school, *per se*.

New Mexico: UNM has the med school; it is not land grant; enrollment is 17,000

Texas: An independent med center in Dallas;; Texas A&m is land grant, also is large, has vet med and med school.

Nebraska: NE medical center is an independent unit of UN and is located in Omaha.

North Dakota: (Grand Forks) UND examined earlier; land grant, does have med school. UND remains a possibility as a peer. 9200 students. (Expenditures/FTE relatively low [$19000/FTE])

So Dak: Vermillion, land-grant, has med school; uses other sites for medicine (Sioux Falls, Rapid City). Has possibilities as a peer, but probably not as good as UND. Enrollment 6500.

Missouri: In addition to UMO, KC, U Mo-Colombia has med school.

Minnesota: Medical school is at U MN, which is a huge institution of 50,000+ . St. Paul campus is the land grant; Mpls campus has med school

Wisconsin: very top research university with med school; land grant. Poor match.
Iowa: ISU has the vet school and is land-grant; U Iowa has the med center, which is in Iowa City.

Illinois: UI, the land-grant school does have a medical school. Enrollment is 35,000. UI is a top-ranked research university.

Ohio: Ohio State is huge, does have medical school. University is not a good fit with UNR.

Michigan: MSU, the land-grant is huge; research funding is very large; has a "College of Human medicine"

Arkansas: Med center is a separate "campus" of U Ark and is in Little Rock; U ARK is land-grant.

Louisiana: Separate unit located in New Orleans

Alabama: U of Alabama, Birmingham, has a med school; also U South AL. Neither is not a land-grant.

Georgia: In GA medical centers have an unusual structure, are not affiliated directly with universities, according to websites. U GA is the land-grant.

U Kansas Med Center is in KC, Kansas and is separate.

North Carolina: UNC (NC State is the land-grant) has the med school; university is not good match for UNR.

South Carolina: USC has the med school; Clemson is the land-grant school.

Tennessee: U TN is the land-grant, has med school, but is in Memphis, not Knoxville..

Kentucky: U KY is the land-grant, has the medical school. 31,000 students.

Mississippi: U M has the med school.

Great Basin Peer Recommendations

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PEER GROUP SCREENS

SUMMARY TABLE

ST	NAME	PRIMARY SCREENING VARIABLES									
					WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			
		Carn 2000	Locale*	FTE Enroll	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% 91-98 Enroll Growth
NV	**GREAT BASIN COLLEGE**	**AA**	**Small Town**	**1,229**	**21**	**17**	**62**	**22**	**44**	**33**	**7**
CO	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Rural area	1,011	19	20	62	29	43	29	43
MI	*NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Small town*	*1,080*	*23*	*8*	*69*	*25*	*38*	*38*	*-1*
MI	SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	AA	Small town	1,600	23	18	59	27	27	45	10
OR	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Small town	2,079	22	12	66	38	38	25	17
OR	*ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Small town*	*1,871*	*22*	*15*	*63*	*25*	*50*	*25*	*51*
OR	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Small town	1,058	19	15	66	27	33	40	-48
WY	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Small town	1,615	24	20	56	12	35	53	13
	HIGH (excluding GBC)			2,079	24	20	69	38	50	53	51
	AVERAGE (excluding GBC)			1,474	22	15	63	26	38	36	13
	LOW (excluding GBC)			1,011	19	8	56	12	27	25	-48
	GBC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE			-17%	-4%	9%	-1%	-14%	18%	-8%	-46%
	GBC RANK (among all of above)			5	6	4	5	7	2	5	6

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 1
GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PEER GROUP INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	CITY	Locale*	% 90-98 County Growth	Carn 2000	ENROLLMENT Total Enroll	% 91-98 Enroll Growth	FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Black	% Am. Indian	% Asian / Pac. Isl.	% Hisp.
NV	**GREAT BASIN COLLEGE**	**ELKO**	**Small Town**	**38**	**AA**	**2,793**	**7**	**1,229**	**84**	**0**	**5**	**1**	**4**
CO	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	RANGELY	Rural area	4	AA	2,060	43	1,011	76	1	1	0	3
MI	*NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE*	*PETOSKEY*	*Small town*	*15*	*AA*	*2,011*	*4*	*1,080*	*69*	*0*	*3*	*0*	*1*
MI	SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	DOWAGIAC	Small town	0	AA	2,802	10	1,600	64	8	1	1	2
OR	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BEND	Small town	41	AA	3,545	17	2,079	62	0	3	1	2
OR	*ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*GRANTS PASS*	*Small town*	*19*	*AA*	*3,484*	*51*	*1,871*	*69*	*0*	*2*	*2*	*3*
OR	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ONTARIO	Small town	10	AA	1,580	-48	1,058	50	1	1	2	9
WY	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ROCK SPRINGS	Small town	3	AA	2,824	13	1,615	64	1	1	1	6
	HIGH (excluding GBC)			41		3,545	51	2,079	76	8	3	2	9
	AVERAGE (excluding GBC)			13		2,615	13	1,474	65	2	2	1	4
	LOW (excluding GBC)			0		1,580	-48	1,011	50	0	1	0	1
	GBC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE			193%		7%	-46%	-17%	29%	-100%	192%	0%	8%
	GBC RANK (among all of above)			2		5	6	5	1	5	1	3	3

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

- Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
  Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
  Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
  Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
  Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
  Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
  Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 2
GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PEER GROUP PROGRAM AND FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			FACULTY			
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	FT Faculty	% Tenure Elig.	% with Tenure	FTE Stu: FT Fac
NV	**GREAT BASIN COLLEGE**	**1,229**	**84**	**21**	**17**	**62**	**22**	**44**	**33**	**39**	**79**	**46**	**32**
CO	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,011	76	19	20	62	29	43	29	37	100	86	27
MI	*NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE*	*1,080*	*69*	*23*	*8*	*69*	*25*	*38*	*38*	*28*	*100*	*86*	*39*
MI	SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	1,600	64	23	18	59	27	27	45	45	0	0	36
OR	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2,079	62	22	12	66	38	38	25	82	95	68	25
OR	*ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*1,871*	*69*	*22*	*15*	*63*	*25*	*50*	*25*	*94*	*96*	*62*	*20*
OR	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,058	50	19	15	66	27	33	40	52	85	69	20
WY	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,615	64	24	20	56	12	35	53	61	0	0	26
	HIGH (excluding GBC)	2,079	76	24	20	69	38	50	53	94	100	86	39
	AVERAGE (excluding GBC)	1,474	65	22	15	63	26	38	36	57	68	53	28
	LOW (excluding GBC)	1,011	50	19	8	56	12	27	25	28	0	0	20
	GBC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-17%	29%	-4%	9%	-1%	-14%	18%	-8%	-32%	17%	-13%	14%
	GBC RANK (among all of above)	5	1	6	4	5	7	2	5	6	6	6	3

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 3
GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**GREAT BASIN COLLEGE**	**1,229**	**84**	**4,741**	**648**	**847**	**410**	**6,646**	**0**	**98**	**1,199**	**1,171**	**9,114**
CO	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,011	76	3,384	873	568	1,138	5,964	216	0	1,987	1,016	9,183
MI	*NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE*	*1,080*	*69*	*3,408*	*893*	*936*	*1,075*	*6,313*	*0*	*0*	*1,173*	*448*	*7,933*
MI	SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	1,600	64	3,368	953	816	810	5,947	0	273	1,128	689	8,037
OR	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2,079	62	3,809	615	732	971	6,127	0	1,589	1,853	725	10,295
OR	*ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*1,871*	*69*	*5,094*	*1,490*	*1,410*	*1,500*	*9,494*	*0*	*90*	*1,995*	*600*	*12,179*
OR	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,058	50	3,940	870	813	1,159	6,782	0	824	1,480	1,372	10,459
WY	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,615	64	3,099	1,192	656	929	5,876	0	23	1,183	1,332	8,413
	HIGH (excluding GBC)	2,079	76	5,094	1,490	1,410	1,500	9,494	216	1,589	1,995	1,372	12,179
	AVERAGE (excluding GBC)	1,474	65	3,729	984	847	1,083	6,643	31	400	1,543	883	9,500
	LOW (excluding GBC)	1,011	50	3,099	615	568	810	5,876	0	0	1,128	448	7,933
	GBC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-17%	29%	27%	-34%	0%	-62%	0%	-100%	-75%	-22%	33%	-4%
	GBC RANK (among all of above)	5	1	2	7	3	8	3	2	4	5	3	5

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 4
GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**GREAT BASIN COLLEGE**	**1,229**	**84**	**52**	**7**	**9**	**4**	**73**	**0**	**1**	**13**	**13**	**100**
CO	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,011	76	37	10	6	12	65	2	0	22	11	100
MI	*NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE*	*1,080*	*69*	*43*	*11*	*12*	*14*	*80*	*0*	*0*	*15*	*6*	*100*
MI	SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	1,600	64	42	12	10	10	74	0	3	14	9	100
OR	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2,079	62	37	6	7	9	60	0	15	18	7	100
OR	*ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*1,871*	*69*	*42*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*78*	*0*	*1*	*16*	*5*	*100*
OR	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,058	50	38	8	8	11	65	0	8	14	13	100
WY	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,615	64	37	14	8	11	70	0	0	14	16	100
	HIGH (excluding GBC)	2,079	76	43	14	12	14	80	2	15	22	16	100
	AVERAGE (excluding GBC)	1,474	65	39	10	9	11	70	0	4	16	9	100
	LOW (excluding GBC)	1,011	50	37	6	6	9	60	0	0	14	5	100
	GBC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-17%	29%	32%	-32%	4%	-61%	4%	-100%	-73%	-19%	36%	0%
	GBC RANK (among all of above)	5	1	1	7	4	8	4	2	4	8	3	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 5
GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**GREAT BASIN COLLEGE**	**1,229**	**84**	**1,165**	**948**	**5,954**	**0**	**485**	**0**	**305**	**0**	**90**	**8,948**
CO	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,011	76	1,103	445	1,799	5,919	0	0	0	1,272	0	10,538
MI	*NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE*	*1,080*	*69*	*1,772*	*3,484*	*354*	*2,611*	*90*	*25*	*0*	*918*	*402*	*9,656*
MI	SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	1,600	64	2,347	778	4,283	2,036	190	0	4	556	264	10,458
OR	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2,079	62	1,665	1,595	3,677	3,375	90	0	17	1,948	218	12,586
OR	*ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*1,871*	*69*	*1,930*	*1,733*	*5,646*	*2,959*	*70*	*0*	*0*	*790*	*663*	*13,790*
OR	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,058	50	2,155	1,150	6,189	1,061	9	0	0	753	651	11,969
WY	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,615	64	1,222	561	2,717	3,592	0	0	0	1,499	451	10,043
	HIGH (excluding GBC)	2,079	84	2,347	3,484	6,189	5,919	485	25	305	1,948	663	13,790
	AVERAGE (excluding GBC)	1,443	67	1,670	1,337	3,827	2,694	117	3	41	967	343	10,999
	LOW (excluding GBC)	1,011	50	1,103	445	354	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,948
	GBC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-15%	25%	-30%	-29%	56%	-100%	315%	-100%	649%	-100%	-74%	-19%
	GBC RANK (among all of above)	5	1	7	5	2	8	1	2	1	8	7	8

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 6
GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**GREAT BASIN COLLEGE**	**1,229**	**84**	**13**	**11**	**67**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**100**
CO	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,011	76	10	4	17	56	0	0	0	12	0	100
MI	*NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE*	*1,080*	*69*	*18*	*36*	*4*	*27*	*1*	*0*	*0*	*10*	*4*	*100*
MI	SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	1,600	64	22	7	41	19	2	0	0	5	3	100
OR	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2,079	62	13	13	29	27	1	0	0	15	2	100
OR	*ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*1,871*	*69*	*14*	*13*	*41*	*21*	*1*	*0*	*0*	*6*	*5*	*100*
OR	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,058	50	18	10	52	9	0	0	0	6	5	100
WY	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,615	64	12	6	27	36	0	0	0	15	4	100
	HIGH (excluding GBC)	2,079	84	22	36	67	56	5	0	3	15	5	100
	AVERAGE (excluding GBC)	1,443	67	15	12	35	24	1	0	0	9	3	100
	LOW (excluding GBC)	1,011	50	10	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
	GBC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-15%	25%	-14%	-14%	92%	-100%	358%	-100%	662%	-100%	-67%	0%
	GBC RANK (among all of above)	5	1	6	4	1	8	1	2	1	8	7	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

DEFINITIONS OF COLUMN HEADINGS
(sorted alpabetically)

Column Heading	Definition of variable
% 90-98 County Growth	Percentage change in county population between 1990 and 1998.
% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Percentage change in student headcount betwee the years 1990/91 and fiscal 1998.
% Am. Indian	Percentage of student body American Indian or Alaskan Native
% Asian/Pac. Isl.	Percentage of student body Asian or Pacific Islander in fiscal 1998
% Black	Percentage of student body African-American in fiscal 1998
% Hisp	Percentage of student body Hispanic in fiscal 1998
% Part-time	Percentage of student FTE attending part-time in fiscal 1998.
% Tenure Elig.	Percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured or tenure-tracked in fiscal 1998.
% with tenure	Percentage of full-time faculty tenured in fiscal 1998.
Acad. Support	Total academic support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Auxil	Total current fund revenue derived from auxiliary services divided by FTE enrollment.
Carn 2000	Proposed Carnegie Classification for the year 2000.
Endow	Total current fund revenue derived from endowment earnings divided by FTE enrollment.
Federal	Total current fund revenue derived from the federal government divided by FTE enrollment.
FT Faculty	Number of full-time faculty at institution in fiscal 1998.
FTE Enroll	Student FTE enrollment for the fiscal 1998
FTE Stu:FT Fac	Ratio of FTE Students to full-time faculty.
FULL INSTR	Full cost of instruction (inclusive of direct instructional costs, academic support, student services, and financial aid) divided by FTE enrollment.
Funded Rsrch	Total expenditures on research divided by FTE enrollment.
Gifts Cont	Total current fund revenue derived from private gifts and contracts divided by FTE enrollment.
Instit. Support	Total institutional support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Instruct	Total instructional expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Local	Total current fund revenue derived from the local government divided by FTE enrollment.
Locale	Degree of urbanization based on 1990 Census.
Oper & Maint	Total plant operations and maintenance expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Other	Total current fund revenue derived from other sources divided by FTE enrollment.
Public Service	Total public service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Sales	Total current fund revenue derived from sales and services divided by FTE enrollment.
State	Total current fund revenue derived from the state government divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Aid	Total student aid expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Serv.	Total student service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Total Enroll	Student headcount enrollment in fiscal 1998.
TOTAL EXP	Total expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
TOTAL REV	Total current fund revenue divided by FTE enrollment.
Tuition & Fees	Total current fund revenue derived from tuition and fees divided by FTE enrollment.
Unweighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X.
Weighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X and weighted by the number of program graduates in fiscal 1998.

AA-HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

AA-MID COST
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
CONSTRUCTION TRADES.
MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS.
PRECISION PRODUCTION TRADES.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.

AA-LOW COST
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

This table summarizes the substantive changes planned for the 2000 edition of the **Carnegie Classification.**

1994 edition	2000 edition
Research Universities I	Doctoral/Research Universities I
50 or more doctorates per year, and $40-million or more per year in federal support	50 or more doctorates per year across at least 15 disciplines
Research Universities II	Doctoral/Research Universities II
50 or more doctorates per year, and $15.5-million to $40-million or more per year in federal support	10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all
Doctoral Universities I	[included in above categories]
40 or more doctorates per year across at least 5 disciplines	
Doctoral Universities II	[included in above categories]
10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all	
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I	Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I
40 per cent or more of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, and restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and at least half of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields
Baccalaureate Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges II
Less than 40 per cent of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, or less restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and less than half of those in liberal-arts fields
Associate of Arts Colleges	Associate's Colleges
[no explicit distinction from Baccalaureate Colleges]	Less than half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees

SOURCE: CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

CCSN Peer Recommendations

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
PEER GROUP SCREENS

SUMMARY TABLE

ST	NAME	PRIMARY SCREENING VARIABLES			WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			
		Carn 2000	Locale*	FTE Enroll	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	98 Enroll Growth
NV	**COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**	**AA**	**Urban fringe of large city**	**10,847**	**24**	**12**	**64**	**27**	**33**	**40**	**75**
CA	*PASADENA CITY COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Mid-size city*	*12,509*	*28*	*19*	*52*	*24*	*34*	*41*	*17*
FL	BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Mid-size city	13,927	28	4	68	40	30	30	22
OR	PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Large city	11,580	22	12	66	20	53	27	9
TX	NORTH HARRIS MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Large city	11,697	26	11	64	29	50	21	34
TX	*TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Large city*	*14,070*	*26*	*7*	*66*	*36*	*36*	*29*	*8*
UT	SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Mid-size city	12,949	24	17	60	19	52	29	77
VA	TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Large city	9,502	25	9	66	36	36	29	1
	HIGH (excluding CCSN)			14,070	28	19	68	40	53	41	77
	AVERAGE (excluding CCSN)			12,319	26	11	63	29	42	29	22
	LOW (excluding CCSN)			9,502	22	4	52	19	30	21	-8
	CCSN % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE			-12%	-6%	8%	1%	-8%	-20%	36%	245%
	CCSN RANK (among all of above)			7	6	3	5	5	7	2	2

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 1
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
PEER GROUP INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	CITY	Locale*	% 90-98 County Growth	Carn 2000	ENROLLMENT							
						Total Enroll	91-98 Enroll Growth	FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Black	% Am. Indian	Asian / Pac. Isl.	% Hisp.
NV	**COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**	**LAS VEGAS**	**Urban fringe of large city**	**57**	**AA**	**24,728**	**75**	**10,847**	**84**	**10**	**1**	**7**	**12**
CA	*PASADENA CITY COLLEGE*	*PASADENA*	*Mid-size city*	*-1*	*AA*	*22,990*	*17*	*12,509*	*68*	*8*	*1*	*28*	*29*
FL	BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	FT LAUDERDALE	Mid-size city	20	AA	26,472	22	13,927	71	21	1	3	17
OR	PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	PORTLAND	Large city	8	AA	23,782	9	11,580	77	3	1	8	3
TX	NORTH HARRIS MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	HOUSTON	Large city	14	AA	21,044	34	11,697	67	8	1	5	12
TX	*TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE*	*FT WORTH*	*Large city*	*16*	*AA*	*25,856*	*-8*	*14,070*	*68*	*10*	*1*	*5*	*10*
UT	SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SALT LAKE CITY	Mid-size city	17	AA	23,590	77	12,949	68	1	1	3	5
VA	TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	NORFOLK	Large city	4	AA	17,907	1	9,502	70	20	1	6	3
	HIGH (excluding CCSN)					26,472	77	14,070	77	21	1	28	29
	AVERAGE (excluding CCSN)					23,092	22	12,319	70	10	1	8	11
	LOW (excluding CCSN)					17,907	-8	9,502	67	1	1	3	3
	CCSN % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE					7%	245%	-12%	20%	-1%	0%	-16%	6%
	CCSN RANK (among all of above)					3	2	7	1	3	1	3	3

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

February 12, 2000

TABLE 2
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
PEER GROUP PROGRAM AND FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			FACULTY			
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	FT Faculty	% Tenure Elig.	% with Tenure	FTE Stu: FT Fac
NV	**COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**	**10,847**	**84**	**24**	**12**	**64**	**27**	**33**	**40**	**305**	**88**	**51**	**36**
CA	*PASADENA CITY COLLEGE*	*12,509*	*68*	*28*	*19*	*52*	*24*	*34*	*41*	*316*	*100*	*82*	*40*
FL	BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13,927	71	28	4	68	40	30	30	333	83	74	42
OR	PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	11,580	77	22	12	66	20	53	27	398	96	75	29
TX	NORTH HARRIS MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEC	11,697	67	26	11	64	29	50	21	350	0	0	33
TX	*TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE*	*14,070*	*68*	*26*	*7*	*66*	*36*	*36*	*29*	*450*	*99*	*60*	*31*
UT	SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	12,949	68	24	17	60	19	52	29	313	90	44	41
VA	TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	9,502	70	25	9	66	36	36	29	259	2	2	37
	HIGH (excluding CCSN)	14,070	77	28	19	68	40	53	41	450	100	82	42
	AVERAGE (excluding CCSN)	12,319	70	26	11	63	29	42	29	346	67	48	36
	LOW (excluding CCSN)	9,502	67	22	4	52	19	30	21	259	0	0	29
	CCSN % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-12%	20%	-6%	8%	1%	-8%	-20%	36%	-12%	31%	5%	-2%
	CCSN RANK (among all of above)	7	1	6	3	5	5	7	2	7	5	5	5

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 3
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**	**10,847**	**84**	**3,433**	**387**	**422**	**429**	**4,671**	**0**	**16**	**499**	**466**	**5,652**
CA	*PASADENA CITY COLLEGE*	*12,509*	*68*	*2,976*	*648*	*763*	*617*	*5,005*	*0*	*230*	*873*	*584*	*6,692*
FL	BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13,927	71	2,778	628	552	906	4,864	0	124	974	644	6,606
OR	PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	11,580	77	4,458	681	1,070	620	6,829	0	10	1,415	790	9,044
TX	NORTH HARRIS MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEC	11,697	67	3,065	641	738	640	5,084	0	104	854	437	6,480
TX	*TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE*	*14,070*	*68*	*3,229*	*561*	*294*	*611*	*4,695*	*0*	*377*	*773*	*862*	*6,708*
UT	SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	12,949	68	2,947	723	365	606	4,641	0	118	824	657	6,240
VA	TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	9,502	70	2,817	568	407	1,067	4,859	0	38	1,159	435	6,490
	HIGH (excluding CCSN)	14,070	77	4,458	723	1,070	1,067	6,829	0	377	1,415	862	9,044
	AVERAGE (excluding CCSN)	12,319	70	3,182	636	599	724	5,140	0	143	982	630	6,894
	LOW (excluding CCSN)	9,502	67	2,778	561	294	606	4,641	0	10	773	435	6,240
	CCSN % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-12%	20%	8%	-39%	-30%	-41%	-9%	-100%	-89%	-49%	-26%	-18%
	CCSN RANK (among all of above)	7	1	2	8	5	8	7	2	7	8	6	8

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 4
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT								
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**	**10,847**	**84**	**61**	**7**	**7**	**8**	**83**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**8**	**100**
CA	*PASADENA CITY COLLEGE*	*12,509*	*68*	*44*	*10*	*11*	*9*	*75*	*0*	*3*	*13*	*9*	*100*
FL	BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13,927	71	42	10	8	14	74	0	2	15	10	100
OR	PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	11,580	77	49	8	12	7	76	0	0	16	9	100
TX	NORTH HARRIS MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEC	11,697	67	47	10	11	10	78	0	2	13	7	100
TX	*TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE*	*14,070*	*68*	*48*	*8*	*4*	*9*	*70*	*0*	*6*	*12*	*13*	*100*
UT	SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	12,949	68	47	12	6	10	74	0	2	13	11	100
VA	TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	9,502	70	43	9	6	16	75	0	1	18	7	100
	HIGH (excluding CCSN)	14,070	77	49	12	12	16	78	0	6	18	13	100
	AVERAGE (excluding CCSN)	12,319	70	46	9	9	11	75	0	2	14	9	100
	LOW (excluding CCSN)	9,502	67	42	8	4	7	70	0	0	12	7	100
	CCSN % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-12%	20%	32%	-27%	-12%	-29%	11%	-100%	-87%	-38%	-10%	0%
	CCSN RANK (among all of above)	7	1	1	8	5	7	1	2	7	8	6	1

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 5
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA	10,847	84	1,391	403	3,970	2	12	4	144	27	144	6,098
CA	*PASADENA CITY COLLEGE*	*12,509*	*68*	*910*	*761*	*3,271*	*1,968*	*9*	*0*	*5*	*0*	*115*	*7,342*
FL	BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13,927	71	1,802	851	3,502	13	166	0	62	646	116	7,160
OR	PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	11,580	77	1,740	849	4,345	1,680	298	0	34	732	342	10,020
TX	NORTH HARRIS MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEC	11,697	67	1,688	766	2,816	1,396	0	0	4	154	168	6,993
TX	*TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE*	*14,070*	*68*	*1,559*	*662*	*2,939*	*1,453*	*41*	*0*	*0*	*482*	*178*	*7,313*
UT	SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	12,949	68	2,022	634	3,615	27	44	6	38	741	237	7,364
VA	TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	9,502	70	2,010	1,024	3,303	23	49	0	0	126	85	6,621
	HIGH (excluding CCSN)	14,070	84	2,022	1,024	4,345	1,968	298	6	144	741	415	10,020
	AVERAGE (excluding CCSN)	12,135	72	1,640	744	3,470	820	77	1	36	364	211	7,364
	LOW (excluding CCSN)	9,502	67	910	403	2,816	2	0	0	0	0	85	6,098
	CCSN % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-11%	17%	-15%	-46%	14%	-100%	-84%	202%	300%	-92%	-31%	-17%
	CCSN RANK (among all of above)	7	1	7	8	2	8	6	2	1	7	6	8

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 6
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**	**10,847**	**84**	**23**	**7**	**65**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**100**
CA	*PASADENA CITY COLLEGE*	*12,509*	*68*	*13*	*10*	*45*	*22*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*6*	*100*
FL	BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13,927	71	25	12	49	0	2	0	1	9	2	100
OR	PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	11,580	77	17	8	43	17	3	0	0	7	3	100
TX	NORTH HARRIS MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEC	11,697	67	24	11	40	20	0	0	0	2	2	100
TX	*TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE*	*14,070*	*68*	*21*	*9*	*40*	*20*	*1*	*0*	*0*	*7*	*2*	*100*
UT	SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	12,949	68	27	9	49	0	1	0	1	10	3	100
VA	TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	9,502	70	30	15	50	0	1	0	0	2	1	100
	HIGH (excluding CCSN)	14,070	84	30	15	65	27	3	0	2	10	6	
	AVERAGE (excluding CCSN)	12,135	72	23	10	48	11	1	0	1	5	3	
	LOW (excluding CCSN)	9,502	67	12	7	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	CCSN % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-11%	17%	1%	-35%	37%	-100%	-78%	238%	347%	-90%	-15%	
	CCSN RANK (among all of above)	7	1	5	8	1	8	6	2	1	7	6	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

DEFINITIONS OF COLUMN HEADINGS
(sorted alpabetically)

Column Heading	Definition of variable
% 90-98 County Growth	Percentage change in county population between 1990 and 1998.
% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Percentage change in student headcount betwee the years 1990/91 and fiscal 1998.
% Am. Indian	Percentage of student body American Indian or Alaskan Native
% Asian/Pac. Isl.	Percentage of student body Asian or Pacific Islander in fiscal 1998
% Black	Percentage of student body African-American in fiscal 1998
% Hisp	Percentage of student body Hispanic in fiscal 1998
% Part-time	Percentage of student FTE attending part-time in fiscal 1998.
% Tenure Elig.	Percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured or tenure-tracked in fiscal 1998.
% with tenure	Percentage of full-time faculty tenured in fiscal 1998.
Acad. Support	Total academic support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Auxil	Total current fund revenue derived from auxiliary services divided by FTE enrollment.
Carn 2000	Proposed Carnegie Classification for the year 2000.
Endow	Total current fund revenue derived from endowment earnings divided by FTE enrollment.
Federal	Total current fund revenue derived from the federal government divided by FTE enrollment.
FT Faculty	Number of full-time faculty at institution in fiscal 1998.
FTE Enroll	Student FTE enrollment for the fiscal 1998
FTE Stu:FT Fac	Ratio of FTE Students to full-time faculty.
FULL INSTR	Full cost of instruction (inclusive of direct instructional costs, academic support, student services, and financial aid) divided by FTE enrollment.
Funded Rsrch	Total expenditures on research divided by FTE enrollment.
Gifts Cont	Total current fund revenue derived from private gifts and contracts divided by FTE enrollment.
Instit. Support	Total institutional support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Instruct	Total instructional expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Local	Total current fund revenue derived from the local government divided by FTE enrollment.
Locale	Degree of urbanization based on 1990 Census.
Oper & Maint	Total plant operations and maintenance expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Other	Total current fund revenue derived from other sources divided by FTE enrollment.
Public Service	Total public service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Sales	Total current fund revenue derived from sales and services divided by FTE enrollment.
State	Total current fund revenue derived from the state government divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Aid	Total student aid expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Serv.	Total student service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Total Enroll	Student headcount enrollment in fiscal 1998.
TOTAL EXP	Total expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
TOTAL REV	Total current fund revenue divided by FTE enrollment.
Tuition & Fees	Total current fund revenue derived from tuition and fees divided by FTE enrollment.
Unweighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X.
Weighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X and weighted by the number of program graduates in fiscal 1998.

AA-HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

AA-MID COST
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
CONSTRUCTION TRADES.
MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS.
PRECISION PRODUCTION TRADES.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.

AA-LOW COST
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

This table summarizes the substantive changes planned for the 2000 edition of the **Carnegie Classification.**

1994 edition	2000 edition
Research Universities I	Doctoral/Research Universities I
50 or more doctorates per year, and $40-million or more per year in federal support	50 or more doctorates per year across at least 15 disciplines
Research Universities II	Doctoral/Research Universities II
50 or more doctorates per year, and $15.5-million to $40-million or more per year in federal support	10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all
Doctoral Universities I	[included in above categories]
40 or more doctorates per year across at least 5 disciplines	
Doctoral Universities II	[included in above categories]
10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all	
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I	Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I
40 per cent or more of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, and restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and at least half of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields
Baccalaureate Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges II
Less than 40 per cent of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, or less restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and less than half of those in liberal-arts fields
Associate of Arts Colleges	Associate's Colleges
[no explicit distinction from Baccalaureate Colleges]	Less than half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees

SOURCE: CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

TMCC Peer Recommendations

TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP SCREENs

SUMMARY TABLE

ST	NAME	Carn 2000	Locale*	FTE Enroll	WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION % Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION % Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% 91-98 Enroll Growth
NV	**TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**AA**	**Mid-size city**	**4,103**	**18**	**14**	**68**	**27**	**55**	**18**	**-6**
CA	COLLEGE OF MARIN	AA	Urban fringe of large city	4,190	17	18	65	26	26	47	-9
FL	*CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Mid-size city*	*3,472*	*18*	*6*	*76*	*27*	*45*	*27*	*49*
FL	MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Mid-size city	4,695	19	3	78	20	50	30	-8
MI	KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Mid-size city	4,591	18	11	71	27	45	27	-18
TX	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Mid-size city	4,672	19	18	63	25	38	38	45
WA	GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Urban fringe of large city	4,835	16	10	74	36	43	21	22
WA	*SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Mid-size city*	*2,844*	*18*	*8*	*74*	*31*	*38*	*31*	*9*

HIGH (excluding TMCC)	4,835	19	18	78	36	50	47	49
AVERAGE (excluding TMCC)	4,186	18	10	72	27	41	32	13
LOW (excluding TMCC)	2,844	16	3	63	20	26	21	-18
TMCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-2%	-1%	34%	-5%	-1%	33%	-43%	-147%
TMCC RANK (among all of above)	6	6	3	6	3	1	8	5

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 1
TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	CITY	Locale Type	% 90-98 County Growth	Carn 2000	ENROLLMENT							
						Total Enroll	% 91-98 Enroll Growth	FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Black	% Am. Indian	% Asian / Pac. Isl.	% Hisp.
NV	**TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**RENO**	**Mid-size city**	**23**	**AA**	**9,133**	**-6**	**4,103**	**83**	**2**	**3**	**5**	**6**
CA	COLLEGE OF MARIN	KENTFIELD	Urban fringe of large city	24	AA	8,939	-9	4,190	80	3	1	7	8
FL	*CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*OCALA*	*Mid-size city*	*13*	*AA*	*5,965*	*49*	*3,472*	*63*	*10*	*1*	*1*	*4*
FL	MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BRADENTON	Mid-size city	3	AA	7,263	-8	4,695	53	6	1	1	3
MI	KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	KALAMAZOO	Mid-size city	41	AA	8,655	-18	4,591	70	8	1	1	2
TX	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	LAREDO	Mid-size city	10	AA	7,446	45	4,672	56	0	0	0	94
WA	GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AUBURN	Urban fringe of large city	3	AA	7,189	22	4,835	49	2	1	4	3
WA	*SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*OLYMPIA*	*Mid-size city*	*25*	*AA*	*4,355*	*9*	*2,844*	*52*	*2*	*2*	*7*	*3*
	HIGH (excluding TMCC)			41		8,939	49	4,835	80	10	2	7	94
	AVERAGE (excluding TMCC)			17		7,116	13	4,186	60	4	1	3	17
	LOW (excluding TMCC)			3		4,355	-18	2,844	49	0	0	0	2
	TMCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE			36%		28%	-147%	-2%	37%	-55%	200%	67%	-64%
	TMCC RANK (among all of above)			4		1	5	6	1	5	1	3	3

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

- Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
  Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
  Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
  Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
  Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
  Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
  Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 2
TRUCKEEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP PROGRAM AND FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			FACULTY			
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	FT Faculty	% Tenure Elig.	% with Tenure	FTE Stu: FT Fac
NV	**TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**4,103**	**83**	**18**	**14**	**68**	**27**	**55**	**18**	**117**	**85**	**58**	**35**
CA	COLLEGE OF MARIN	4,190	80	17	18	65	26	26	47	131	100	88	32
FL	*CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*3,472*	*63*	*18*	*6*	*76*	*27*	*45*	*27*	*93*	*88*	*65*	*37*
FL	MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,695	53	19	3	78	20	50	30	130	100	85	36
MI	KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,591	70	18	11	71	27	45	27	110	98	88	42
TX	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,672	56	19	18	63	25	38	38	196	92	60	24
WA	GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,835	49	16	10	74	36	43	21	105	91	68	46
WA	*SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*2,844*	*52*	*18*	*8*	*74*	*31*	*38*	*31*	*78*	*100*	*73*	*36*
	HIGH (excluding TMCC)	4,835	80	19	18	78	36	50	47	196	100	88	46
	AVERAGE (excluding TMCC)	4,186	60	18	10	72	27	41	32	120	96	75	36
	LOW (excluding TMCC)	2,844	49	16	3	63	20	26	21	78	88	60	24
	TMCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-2%	37%	-1%	34%	-5%	-1%	33%	-43%	-3%	-11%	-23%	-3%
	TMCC RANK (among all of above)	6	1	6	3	6	3	1	8	4	8	8	6

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 3
TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**4,103**	**83**	**3,452**	**804**	**570**	**464**	**5,290**	**0**	**2**	**1,143**	**709**	**7,144**
CA	COLLEGE OF MARIN	4,190	80	3,713	894	567	355	5,529	0	217	1,246	728	7,720
FL	*CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*3,472*	*63*	*3,500*	*673*	*514*	*2,342*	*7,029*	*0*	*106*	*1,185*	*687*	*9,007*
FL	MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,695	53	2,955	891	367	793	5,006	0	0	975	557	6,539
MI	KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,591	70	2,809	828	693	601	4,931	0	378	787	565	6,661
TX	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,672	56	3,668	783	356	1,828	6,635	31	0	973	551	8,190
WA	GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,835	49	3,895	563	469	527	5,454	0	0	780	465	6,699
WA	*SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*2,844*	*52*	*3,304*	*629*	*182*	*2,241*	*6,356*	*0*	*0*	*813*	*559*	*7,728*
	HIGH (excluding TMCC)	4,835	80	3,895	894	693	2,342	7,029	31	378	1,246	728	9,007
	AVERAGE (excluding TMCC)	4,186	60	3,406	752	450	1,241	5,849	4	100	966	588	7,506
	LOW (excluding TMCC)	2,844	49	2,809	563	182	355	4,931	0	0	780	465	6,539
	TMCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-2%	37%	1%	7%	27%	-63%	-10%	-100%	-98%	18%	21%	-5%
	TMCC RANK (among all of above)	6	1	5	4	2	7	6	2	4	3	2	5

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 4
TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**4,103**	**83**	**48**	**11**	**8**	**6**	**74**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**10**	**100**
CA	COLLEGE OF MARIN	4,190	80	48	12	7	5	72	0	3	16	9	100
FL	*CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*3,472*	*63*	*39*	*7*	*6*	*26*	*78*	*0*	*1*	*13*	*8*	*100*
FL	MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,695	53	45	14	6	12	77	0	0	15	9	100
MI	KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,591	70	42	12	10	9	74	0	6	12	8	100
TX	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,672	56	45	10	4	22	81	0	0	12	7	100
WA	GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,835	49	58	8	7	8	81	0	0	12	7	100
WA	*SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*2,844*	*52*	*43*	*8*	*2*	*29*	*82*	*0*	*0*	*11*	*7*	*100*
	HIGH (excluding TMCC)	4,835	80	58	14	10	29	82	0	6	16	9	100
	AVERAGE (excluding TMCC)	4,186	60	46	10	6	16	78	0	1	13	8	100
	LOW (excluding TMCC)	2,844	49	39	7	2	5	72	0	0	11	7	100
	TMCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-2%	37%	6%	11%	31%	-59%	-5%	-100%	-98%	24%	26%	0%
	TMCC RANK (among all of above)	6	1	2	4	2	7	6	2	4	2	1	4

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 5
TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**4,103**	**83**	**1,728**	**613**	**4,774**	**0**	**45**	**32**	**122**	**0**	**300**	**7,613**
CA	COLLEGE OF MARIN	4,190	80	836	419	1,018	5,164	19	11	8	103	243	7,821
FL	*CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*3,472*	*63*	*1,831*	*2,389*	*4,734*	*54*	*121*	*0*	*112*	*92*	*49*	*9,381*
FL	MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,695	53	1,526	1,123	3,425	0	116	0	12	574	187	6,964
MI	KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,591	70	1,648	585	2,199	2,515	77	0	0	453	407	7,886
TX	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,672	56	1,314	2,371	3,297	1,429	30	0	0	127	97	8,665
WA	GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,835	49	2,093	542	3,479	271	545	0	106	681	121	7,839
WA	*SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*2,844*	*52*	*1,808*	*1,755*	*4,379*	*322*	*48*	*0*	*103*	*842*	*186*	*9,442*
	HIGH (excluding TMCC)	4,835	83	2,093	2,389	4,774	5,164	545	32	122	842	407	9,442
	AVERAGE (excluding TMCC)	4,175	63	1,598	1,225	3,413	1,219	125	5	58	359	199	8,201
	LOW (excluding TMCC)	2,844	49	836	419	1,018	0	19	0	0	0	49	6,964
	TMCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-2%	31%	8%	-50%	40%	-100%	-64%	495%	112%	-100%	51%	-7%
	TMCC RANK (among all of above)	6	1	4	5	1	7	6	1	1	8	2	7

TABLE 6
TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**4,103**	**83**	**23**	**8**	**63**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**100**
CA	COLLEGE OF MARIN	4,190	80	11	5	13	66	0	0	0	1	3	100
FL	*CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*3,472*	*63*	*20*	*25*	*50*	*1*	*1*	*0*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*100*
FL	MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,695	53	22	16	49	0	2	0	0	8	3	100
MI	KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,591	70	21	7	28	32	1	0	0	6	5	100
TX	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,672	56	15	27	38	16	0	0	0	1	1	100
WA	GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4,835	49	27	7	44	3	7	0	1	9	2	100
WA	*SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	*2,844*	*52*	*19*	*19*	*46*	*3*	*1*	*0*	*1*	*9*	*2*	*100*
	HIGH (excluding TMCC)	4,835	83	27	27	63	66	7	0	2	9	5	100
	AVERAGE (excluding TMCC)	4,175	63	20	14	42	15	2	0	1	4	3	100
	LOW (excluding TMCC)	2,844	49	11	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
	TMCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	-2%	31%	16%	-44%	51%	-100%	-63%	499%	133%	-100%	57%	
	TMCC RANK (among all of above)	6	1	2	5	1	7	5	1	1	8	2	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

DEFINITIONS OF COLUMN HEADINGS
(sorted alpabetically)

Column Heading	Definition of variable
% 90-98 County Growth	Percentage change in county population between 1990 and 1998.
% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Percentage change in student headcount betwee the years 1990/91 and fiscal 1998.
% Am. Indian	Percentage of student body American Indian or Alaskan Native
% Asian/Pac. Isl.	Percentage of student body Asian or Pacific Islander in fiscal 1998
% Black	Percentage of student body African-American in fiscal 1998
% Hisp	Percentage of student body Hispanic in fiscal 1998
% Part-time	Percentage of student FTE attending part-time in fiscal 1998.
% Tenure Elig.	Percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured or tenure-tracked in fiscal 1998.
% with tenure	Percentage of full-time faculty tenured in fiscal 1998.
Acad. Support	Total academic support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Auxil	Total current fund revenue derived from auxiliary services divided by FTE enrollment.
Carn 2000	Proposed Carnegie Classification for the year 2000.
Endow	Total current fund revenue derived from endowment earnings divided by FTE enrollment.
Federal	Total current fund revenue derived from the federal government divided by FTE enrollment.
FT Faculty	Number of full-time faculty at institution in fiscal 1998.
FTE Enroll	Student FTE enrollment for the fiscal 1998
FTE Stu:FT Fac	Ratio of FTE Students to full-time faculty.
FULL INSTR	Full cost of instruction (inclusive of direct instructional costs, academic support, student services, and financial aid) divided by FTE enrollment.
Funded Rsrch	Total expenditures on research divided by FTE enrollment.
Gifts Cont	Total current fund revenue derived from private gifts and contracts divided by FTE enrollment.
Instit. Support	Total institutional support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Instruct	Total instructional expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Local	Total current fund revenue derived from the local government divided by FTE enrollment.
Locale	Degree of urbanization based on 1990 Census.
Oper & Maint	Total plant operations and maintenance expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Other	Total current fund revenue derived from other sources divided by FTE enrollment.
Public Service	Total public service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Sales	Total current fund revenue derived from sales and services divided by FTE enrollment.
State	Total current fund revenue derived from the state government divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Aid	Total student aid expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Serv.	Total student service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Total Enroll	Student headcount enrollment in fiscal 1998.
TOTAL EXP	Total expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
TOTAL REV	Total current fund revenue divided by FTE enrollment.
Tuition & Fees	Total current fund revenue derived from tuition and fees divided by FTE enrollment.
Unweighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X.
Weighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X and weighted by the number of program graduates in fiscal 1998.

2-YEAR SCHOOL PROGRAM COST CLASSIFICATIONS

AA-HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

AA-MID COST
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
CONSTRUCTION TRADES.
MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS.
PRECISION PRODUCTION TRADES.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.

AA-LOW COST
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

This table summarizes the substantive changes planned for the 2000 edition of the **Carnegie Classification.**

1994 edition	2000 edition
Research Universities I	Doctoral/Research Universities I
50 or more doctorates per year, and $40-million or more per year in federal support	50 or more doctorates per year across at least 15 disciplines
Research Universities II	Doctoral/Research Universities II
50 or more doctorates per year, and $15.5-million to $40-million or more per year in federal support	10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all
Doctoral Universities I	[included in above categories]
40 or more doctorates per year across at least 5 disciplines	
Doctoral Universities II	[included in above categories]
10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all	
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I	Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I
40 per cent or more of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, and restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and at least half of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields
Baccalaureate Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges II
Less than 40 per cent of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, or less restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and less than half of those in liberal-arts fields
Associate of Arts Colleges	Associate's Colleges
[no explicit distinction from Baccalaureate Colleges]	Less than half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees

SOURCE: CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

WNCC Peer Recommendations

WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP SCREENS

SUMMARY TABLE

ST	NAME	PRIMARY SCREENING VARIABLES									
					WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			
		Carn 2000	Locale*	FTE Enroll	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% 91-98 Enroll Growth
NV	**WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**AA**	**Large town**	**2,098**	**15**	**11**	**74**	**31**	**38**	**31**	**-7**
CA	*IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Small town*	*2,965*	*15*	*17*	*68*	*18*	*32*	*50*	51
CA	MENDOCINO COLLEGE	AA	Small town	1,682	13	16	72	22	39	39	2
GA	DALTON COLLEGE	AA	Small town	2,003	23	4	74	33	33	33	40
NC	CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AA	Small town	1,998	37	14	49	27	36	36	65
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE	AA	Large town	2,129	19	13	68	36	36	27	-11
TX	HILL COLLEGE	AA	Small town	1,552	18	21	62	35	24	41	65
WA	*PENINSULA COLLEGE*	*AA*	*Small town*	*2,226*	*14*	*12*	*74*	*44*	*33*	*22*	*32*
	HIGH (excluding WNCC)			2,965	37	21	74	44	39	50	65
	AVERAGE (excluding WNCC)			2,079	20	14	67	31	33	36	32
	LOW (excluding WNCC)			1,552	13	4	49	18	24	22	-11
	WNCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE			1%	-23%	-19%	11%	-1%	15%	-14%	59%
	WNCC RANK (among all of above)			4	6	7	2	5	2	6	3

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 1
WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	CITY	Locale Type	90-98 County Growth	Carn 2000	ENROLLMENT Total Enroll	90-98 Instit Growth	FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Black	% Am. Indian	% Asian / Pac. Isl.	% Hisp.
NV	**WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**CARSON CITY**	**Large town**		**AA**	**4,964**	**-7**	**2,098**	**87**	**1**	**4**	**2**	**6**
CA	*IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE*	*IMPERIAL*	*Small town*		*AA*	*5,678*	*51*	*2,965*	*72*	*0*	*0*	*2*	*81*
CA	MENDOCINO COLLEGE	UKIAH	Small town		AA	3,507	2	1,682	78	2	4	2	9
GA	DALTON COLLEGE	DALTON	Small town		AA	3,052	40	2,003	52	1	0	0	1
NC	CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SANFORD	Small town		AA	3,085	65	1,998	53	23	1	1	2
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE	LONGVIEW	Large town		AA	3,024	-11	2,129	44	1	3	3	2
TX	HILL COLLEGE	HILLSBORO	Small town		AA	2,695	65	1,552	64	4	1	1	7
WA	*PENINSULA COLLEGE*	*PORT ANGELES*	*Small town*		*AA*	*3,579*	*32*	*2,226*	*57*	*2*	*3*	*1*	*1*
	HIGH (excluding WNCC)					5,678	65	2,965	78	23	4	3	81
	AVERAGE (excluding WNCC)					3,517	35	2,079	60	5	2	1	15
	LOW (excluding WNCC)					2,695	-11	1,552	44	0	0	0	1
	WNCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE					41%	-120%	1%	45%	-79%	133%	40%	-59%
	WNCC RANK (among all of above)					2	7	4	1	5	1	2	4

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

* Large City: A central city of a CMSA or MSA with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
Mid-size City - A central city of a CMSA or MSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.
Urban Fringe of Large City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a Large City of a Mid-size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau
Large Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Small Town - An incorporated place or CDP with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
Rural - Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.

TABLE 2
WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP PROGRAM AND FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		WEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			UNWEIGHTED PROGRAM COST DISTRIBUTION			FACULTY			
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	% Progs Hi-Cst	% Progs Mid-Cst	% Progs Low Cst	FT Faculty	% Tenure Elig.	% with Tenure	FTE Stu: FT Fac
NV	**WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**2,098**	**87**	**15**	**11**	**74**	**31**	**38**	**31**	**86**	**81**	**64**	**24**
CA	*IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE*	*2,965*	*72*	*15*	*17*	*68*	*18*	*32*	*50*	*76*	*95*	*82*	*39*
CA	MENDOCINO COLLEGE	1,682	78	13	16	72	22	39	39	38	100	92	44
GA	DALTON COLLEGE	2,003	52	23	4	74	33	33	33	101	86	42	20
NC	CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,998	53	37	14	49	27	36	36	117	0	0	17
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE	2,129	44	19	13	68	36	36	27	74	95	88	29
TX	HILL COLLEGE	1,552	64	18	21	62	35	24	41	61	23	23	25
WA	*PENINSULA COLLEGE*	*2,226*	*57*	*14*	*12*	*74*	*44*	*33*	*22*	*69*	*59*	*42*	*32*
	HIGH (excluding WNCC)	2,965	78	37	21	74	44	39	50	117	100	92	44
	AVERAGE (excluding WNCC)	2,079	60	20	14	67	31	33	36	77	65	53	30
	LOW (excluding WNCC)	1,552	44	13	4	49	18	24	22	38	0	0	17
	WNCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	1%	45%	-23%	-19%	11%	-1%	15%	-14%	12%	24%	22%	-17%
	WNCC RANK (among all of above)	4	1	6	7	2	5	2	6	3	5	4	6

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 3
WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**2,098**	**87**	**4,470**	**540**	**712**	**614**	**6,336**	**0**	**0**	**860**	**799**	**7,995**
CA	*IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE*	*2,965*	*72*	*2,719*	*1,630*	*1,026*	*1,915*	*7,291*	*0*	*0*	*871*	*687*	*8,849*
CA	MENDOCINO COLLEGE	1,682	78	3,156	1,051	705	1,043	5,955	0	90	1,059	934	8,038
GA	DALTON COLLEGE	2,003	52	4,209	675	506	1,435	6,825	0	2	1,209	580	8,615
NC	CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,998	53	5,366	449	294	670	6,778	0	161	922	641	8,503
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE	2,129	44	3,262	1,920	506	1,359	7,047	0	0	1,197	743	8,988
TX	HILL COLLEGE	1,552	64	2,334	641	738	1,290	5,004	0	4	804	713	6,525
WA	*PENINSULA COLLEGE*	*2,226*	*57*	*4,544*	*383*	*377*	*1,064*	*6,369*	*0*	*0*	*585*	*376*	*7,330*
	HIGH (excluding WNCC)	2,965	78	5,366	1,920	1,026	1,915	7,291	0	161	1,209	934	8,988
	AVERAGE (excluding WNCC)	2,079	60	3,656	964	593	1,254	6,467	0	37	950	668	8,121
	LOW (excluding WNCC)	1,552	44	2,334	383	294	670	5,004	0	0	585	376	6,525
	WNCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	1%	45%	22%	-44%	20%	-51%	-2%		-100%	-9%	20%	-2%
	WNCC RANK (among all of above)	4	1	3	6	3	8	6	1	5	6	2	6

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 4
WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Instruct	Student Serv.	Acad. Support	Student Aid	FULL INSTR	Funded Rsrch.	Public Service	Instit. Support	Oper. & Maint.	TOTAL EXP.
NV	**WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**2,098**	**87**	**56**	**7**	**9**	**8**	**79**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**10**	**100**
CA	*IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE*	*2,965*	*72*	*31*	*18*	*12*	*22*	*82*	*0*	*0*	*10*	*8*	*100*
CA	MENDOCINO COLLEGE	1,682	78	39	13	9	13	74	0	1	13	12	100
GA	DALTON COLLEGE	2,003	52	49	8	6	17	79	0	0	14	7	100
NC	CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,998	53	63	5	3	8	80	0	2	11	8	100
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE	2,129	44	36	21	6	15	78	0	0	13	8	100
TX	HILL COLLEGE	1,552	64	36	10	11	20	77	0	0	12	11	100
WA	*PENINSULA COLLEGE*	*2,226*	*57*	*62*	*5*	*5*	*15*	*87*	*0*	*0*	*8*	*5*	*100*
	HIGH (excluding WNCC)	2,965	78	63	21	12	22	87	0	2	14	12	100
	AVERAGE (excluding WNCC)	2,079	60	45	12	7	16	80	0	0	12	8	100
	LOW (excluding WNCC)	1,552	44	31	5	3	8	74	0	0	8	5	100
	WNCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	1%	45%	24%	-42%	20%	-50%	0%		-100%	-8%	21%	0%
	WNCC RANK (among all of above)	4	1	3	6	3	8	4	1	5	6	3	8

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 5
WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**2,098**	**87**	**1,307**	**438**	**6,233**	**57**	**0**	**0**	**91**	**207**	**41**	**8,373**
CA	*IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE*	*2,965*	*72*	*277*	*2,531*	*4,557*	*2,086*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*163*	*0*	*9,614*
CA	MENDOCINO COLLEGE	1,682	78	318	1,209	4,413	2,254	56	19	0	378	284	8,931
GA	DALTON COLLEGE	2,003	52	1,555	966	5,645	0	218	0	219	562	23	9,188
NC	CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,998	53	722	836	6,095	803	5	0	40	521	106	9,126
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE	2,129	44	1,941	1,512	4,474	228	473	14	61	770	134	9,606
TX	HILL COLLEGE	1,552	64	1,163	943	3,783	357	398	0	0	886	82	7,611
WA	*PENINSULA COLLEGE*	*2,226*	*57*	*1,288*	*535*	*6,139*	*327*	*371*	*0*	*103*	*596*	*37*	*9,397*
	HIGH (excluding WNCC)	2,965	87	1,941	2,531	6,233	2,254	473	19	219	886	284	9,614
	AVERAGE (excluding WNCC)	2,082	63	1,071	1,121	5,167	764	190	4	64	510	88	8,981
	LOW (excluding WNCC)	1,552	44	277	438	3,783	0	0	0	0	163	0	7,611
	WNCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	1%	37%	22%	-61%	21%	-93%	-100%	-100%	42%	-59%	-54%	-7%
	WNCC RANK (among all of above)	4	1	3	8	1	7	7	4	3	7	5	7

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

TABLE 6
WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PEER GROUP REVENUE COMPARISONS, PER FTE STUDENT
FISCAL YEAR 1998
Percent Distribution

ST	NAME	ENROLLMENT		REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT									
		FTE Enroll	% Part-time	Tuition & Fees	Federal	State	Local	Gifts Cont	Endow.	Sales	Auxil.	Other	TOTAL REV
NV	**WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**	**2,098**	**87**	**16**	**5**	**74**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**100**
CA	*IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE*	*2,965*	*72*	*3*	*26*	*47*	*22*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*2*	*0*	*100*
CA	MENDOCINO COLLEGE	1,682	78	4	14	49	25	1	0	0	4	3	100
GA	DALTON COLLEGE	2,003	52	17	11	61	0	2	0	2	6	0	0
NC	CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,998	53	8	9	67	9	0	0	0	6	1	0
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE	2,129	44	20	16	47	2	5	0	1	8	1	0
TX	HILL COLLEGE	1,552	64	15	12	50	5	5	0	0	12	1	100
WA	*PENINSULA COLLEGE*	*2,226*	*57*	*14*	*6*	*65*	*3*	*4*	*0*	*1*	*6*	*0*	*100*
	HIGH (excluding WNCC)	2,965	87	20	26	74	25	5	0	2	12	3	100
	AVERAGE (excluding WNCC)	2,082	63	12	12	58	8	2	0	1	6	1	100
	LOW (excluding WNCC)	1,552	44	3	5	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	100
	WNCC % DIFF FROM EXCLUDED AVERAGE	1%	37%	30%	-58%	29%	-92%	-100%	-100%	54%	-57%	-51%	
	WNCC RANK (among all of above)	4	1	3	8	1	7	7	4	3	7	5	

ALTERNATE PEERS IN ITALICS ABOVE

DEFINITIONS OF COLUMN HEADINGS
(sorted alpabetically)

Column Heading	Definition of variable
% 90-96 County Growth	Percentage change in county population between 1990 and 1998.
% 91-98 Enroll Growth	Percentage change in student headcount betwee the years 1990/91 and fiscal 1998.
% Am. Indian	Percentage of student body American Indian or Alaskan Native
% Asian/Pac. Isl.	Percentage of student body Asian or Pacific Islander in fiscal 1998
% Black	Percentage of student body African-American in fiscal 1998
% Hisp	Percentage of student body Hispanic in fiscal 1998
% Part-time	Percentage of student FTE attending part-time in fiscal 1998.
% Tenure Elig.	Percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured or tenure-tracked in fiscal 1998.
% with tenure	Percentage of full-time faculty tenured in fiscal 1998.
Acad. Support	Total academic support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Auxil	Total current fund revenue derived from auxiliary services divided by FTE enrollment.
Carn 2000	Proposed Carnegie Classification for the year 2000.
Endow	Total current fund revenue derived from endowment earnings divided by FTE enrollment.
Federal	Total current fund revenue derived from the federal government divided by FTE enrollment.
FT Faculty	Number of full-time faculty at institution in fiscal 1998.
FTE Enroll	Student FTE enrollment for the fiscal 1998
FTE Stu:FT Fac	Ratio of FTE Students to full-time faculty.
FULL INSTR	Full cost of instruction (inclusive of direct instructional costs, academic support, student services, and financial aid) divided by FTE enrollment.
Funded Rsrch	Total expenditures on research divided by FTE enrollment.
Gifts Cont	Total current fund revenue derived from private gifts and contracts divided by FTE enrollment.
Instit. Support	Total institutional support expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Instruct	Total instructional expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Local	Total current fund revenue derived from the local government divided by FTE enrollment.
Locale	Degree of urbanization based on 1990 Census.
Oper & Maint	Total plant operations and maintenance expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Other	Total current fund revenue derived from other sources divided by FTE enrollment.
Public Service	Total public service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Sales	Total current fund revenue derived from sales and services divided by FTE enrollment.
State	Total current fund revenue derived from the state government divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Aid	Total student aid expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Student Serv.	Total student service expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
Total Enroll	Student headcount enrollment in fiscal 1998.
TOTAL EXP	Total expenditures divided by FTE enrollment.
TOTAL REV	Total current fund revenue divided by FTE enrollment.
Tuition & Fees	Total current fund revenue derived from tuition and fees divided by FTE enrollment.
Unweighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X.
Weighted Program Cost Distribution	The distribution of the institution's program costs as determined by appendix X and weighted by the number of program graduates in fiscal 1998.

AA-HIGH COST
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND PRODUCTION.
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.
CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES
ARCHITECTURE AND RELATED PROGRAMS.
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES.
ENGINEERING.
ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.
MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES.
PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE AND FITNESS STUDIES.
HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED SCIENCES.

AA-MID COST
PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES
HOME ECONOMICS, GENERAL.
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES/LIFE SCIENCES.
PHYSICAL SCIENCES.
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES.
PSYCHOLOGY.
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES.
CONSTRUCTION TRADES.
MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS.
PRECISION PRODUCTION TRADES.
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIALS MOVING WORKERS.
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS.

AA-LOW COST
AREA, ETHNIC AND CULTURAL STUDIES.
MARKETING OPERATIONS/MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION.
COMMUNICATIONS.
EDUCATION.
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES.
LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE/LETTERS.
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES AND HUMANITIES.
LIBRARY SCIENCE.
MATHEMATICS.
MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS.
PSYCHOLOGY.
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY.
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

This table summarizes the substantive changes planned for the 2000 edition of the **Carnegie Classification.**

1994 edition	2000 edition
Research Universities I	Doctoral/Research Universities I
50 or more doctorates per year, and $40-million or more per year in federal support	50 or more doctorates per year across at least 15 disciplines
Research Universities II	Doctoral/Research Universities II
50 or more doctorates per year, and $15.5-million to $40-million or more per year in federal support	10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all
Doctoral Universities I	[included in above categories]
40 or more doctorates per year across at least 5 disciplines	
Doctoral Universities II	[included in above categories]
10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year over all	
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I	Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I
40 per cent or more of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, and restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and at least half of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields
Baccalaureate Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges II
Less than 40 per cent of bachelor's degrees in liberal-arts fields, or less restrictive in admissions	At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and less than half of those in liberal-arts fields
Associate of Arts Colleges	Associate's Colleges
[no explicit distinction from Baccalaureate Colleges]	Less than half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees

SOURCE: CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

APPENDIX C

COMPARATIVE LIBRARY DATA REPORT

PEER DATA ON ACADEMIC LIBRARIES (FROM IPEDS SURVEY - FY 1996)

Institution Name	City	State	Sector	Level	Locale	Hospital	Medical Degree	Highest Degree Offered	# Bacc Degrees Granted	# Mast Degrees Granted	# Doct Degrees Granted	# F/P Degrees Granted
UNR & PEERS												
Oklahoma State	Stillwater	OK	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Lg Town	.	Yes	Doct & F/P	2,303	568	169	64
U. of Missouri	Kansas City	MO	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Lg City	.	Yes	Doct & F/P	973	789	41	318
Auburn U. - Main	Auburn University	AL	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	N/A	Yes	Yes	Doct & F/P	3,586	721	151	99
Mississippi State	Mississippi State	MS	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Rural	.	Yes	Doct & F/P	2,092	593	109	46
Washington State	Pullman	WA	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Sm Town	.	Yes	Doct & F/P	3,783	694	151	99
UNR	**Reno**	**NV**	**Public 4Yr>**	**Bacc >**	**Mid City**	.	**Yes**	**Doct & F/P**	**1,307**	**384**	**56**	**55**
UNLV & PEERS												
Florida Atlantic	Boca Raton	FL	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Mid City	.	.	Doct	2,602	635	50	-
U. of New Orleans	New Orleans	LA	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Lg City	.	.	Doct	1,343	509	49	-
U. of No. Carolina	Greensboro	NC	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Mid City	.	.	Doct	1,662	663	78	-
Portland State	Portland	OR	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Lg City	.	.	Doct	2,446	902	35	-
George Mason	Fairfax	VA	Public 4Yr>	Bacc >	Urb Fringe- Lg	.	.	Doct & F/P	2,771	1,766	97	194
UNLV	**Las Vegas**	**NV**	**Public 4Yr>**	**Bacc >**	**Urb Frin- Lg**	.	.	**Doct ***	**2,054**	**583**	**20**	-

(> = and above)

* UNLV has since added a First-Prof degree (Law)

(F/P = First-Professional)

LIBRARY COLLECTIONS - FY 1996

Institution Name	Books and Other Print Materials * # Volumes Added During F/Y	Books and Other Print Materials * # Volumes Held at End F/Y	Misc. Other Government Documents * # Units Added During F/Y	Misc. Other Government Documents * # Units Held at End F/Y	Current Serials * # Subscrip. Added During F/Y	Current Serials * # Subscrip. Held at End F/Y	Microforms (All Types) # Units Added During F/Y	Microforms (All Types) # Units Held at End F/Y
UNR & PEERS								
Oklahoma State	64,613	1,823,489	15,192	15,192	322	17,595	144,630	3,267,109
U. of Missouri	23,649	981,149	48,367	769,870	136	8,787	33,289	1,841,946
Auburn U. - Main	108,987	2,401,321	-	391,818	65	19,193	40,865	2,289,346
Mississippi State	13,701	873,003	41,154	499,003	12	7,527	40,501	2,107,709
Washington State	36,287	1,833,749	-	-	472	25,166	46,493	3,072,829
UNR	**29,463**	**929,950**	**24,689**	**1,291,763**	**47**	**17,722**	**106,942**	**3,075,672**
UNLV & PEERS								
Florida Atlantic	25,238	662,269	45,430	667,865	230	4,171	51,226	1,281,435
U. of New Orleans	15,792	630,272	4,192	326,070	53	6,079	73,468	2,143,328
U. of No. Carolina	25,832	894,016	26,147	639,412	65	5,342	28,334	866,706
Portland State								
George Mason	32,608	486,642	9,455	286,744	621	6,314	96,522	1,193,700
UNLV	**29,077**	**781,734**	**9,590**	**337,302**	**250**	**7,500**	**135,652**	**1,527,532**

* Books, serial backfiles, govt documents accessible through catalog, excluding current serials.

* Not reported elsewhere.

* Incl. Periodicals, newspapers & govt. documents

LIBRARY COLLECTIONS, FY 1996 (Cont.)

Institution Name	Manuscripts and Archives		Cartographic Materials		Graphic Mat'ls		Sound Recordings		Film and Video Materials	
	# Linear Ft. Added During F/Y	# Linear Ft. Held at End F/Y	# Units Added During F/Y	# Units Held at End F/Y	# Units Added During F/Y	# Units Held at End F/Y	# Units Added During F/Y	# Units Held at End F/Y	# Units Added During F/Y	# Units Held at End F/Y
UNR & PEERS										
Oklahoma State	60	5,278	2,266	263,365	438	61,922	38	4,557	52	5,221
U. of Missouri	-	6	-	75	7,312	155,520	34,445	321,186	386	3,712
Auburn U. - Main	431	7,510	844	136,184	51,058	379,728	727	15,944	134	5,412
Mississippi State	294	294	1	9,694	4	27,917	50	8,327	234	3,161
Washington State	750	15,010	-	716	-	268,950	-	-	-	-
UNR	**393**	**7,063**	**2,925**	**137,814**	**806**	**200,102**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
UNLV & PEERS										
Florida Atlantic	15	316	1,007	32,147	-	118	7	467	536	6,240
U. of New Orleans	1,100	14,853	764	31,802	-	179,904	-	-	-	-
U. of No. Carolina	154	1,783	363	16,334	-	10,280	28	9,393	1	46
Portland State										
George Mason	471	4,984	1,047	213,759	-	211	526	10,258	1,643	6,219
UNLV	**500**	**5,000**	**2,564**	**24,556**	**4,811**	**72,273**	**555**	**15,909**	**511**	**5,977**

LIBRARY COLLECTIONS, FY 1996 (Cont.)

Institution Name	Computer Files # Units Added During F/Y	Computer Files # Units Held at End F/Y	Miscellaneous Other Mat'ls # Units Added During F/Y	Miscellaneous Other Mat'ls # Units Held at End F/Y	TOTAL COLLECTION-RELATED OP'G EXPENDITURES * F/Y 1996
UNR & PEERS					
Oklahoma State	784	4,784	32	1,354	3,371,802
U. of Missouri	359	1,355	10	269	1,622,162
Auburn U. - Main	382	861	-	-	3,781,996
Mississippi State	54	438	1	113	2,239,760
Washington State	-	-	-	-	3,642,091
UNR	-	-	**337**	**31,311**	**3,080,131**
UNLV & PEERS					
Florida Atlantic	18	170	367	16,490	1,625,439
U. of New Orleans	52	1,124	-	-	1,386,266
U. of No. Carolina	326	922	25	195	1,851,712
Portland State					-
George Mason	730	1,682	-	-	3,025,430
UNLV	**322**	**1,440**	**34**	**2,067**	**3,124,951**

* EXCLUDES:
Furniture
Computer equipment
Salaries and Wages
Fringe benefits