

In addition, Mrs. Gansert noted that Texas did not use different weights for different types of institutions, for example, community colleges versus universities, or state colleges. Rather, all of the tiers were given the same relative weight.

Mrs. Gansert said, because Texas is a subset of the NCHEMS data, it might be interesting to compare the average weights. This might not be possible due to the limited amount of time available, and the scope of the SRI contract.

Mr. Page noted that the Texas matrix included outliers such as veterinary science, pharmacy and optometry that did not apply, because NSHE had none of those programs.

Dr. Stephen said the work of SRI was at its outer limits in terms of time and resources. He said the actual CIP codes for the four institutions should be mapped.

Chairman Horsford requested that SRI and NSHE identify the CIP codes in the NCHEMS information, determine how the codes differ from the codes used by Texas, and average the two weights.

Mrs. Gansert clarified that she was not suggesting averaging the NCHEMS and Texas weights, rather, she was suggesting averaging the weights used by the State of Texas within the categories.

Dr. Stephen said CIP code information was available for all of the states, because they were required to be reported to the federal government. He understood Mrs. Gansert to say that one state alone was not necessarily a reliable guide, and perhaps averaging across four states would provide better results. He did not know whether there was time to collect and process data for all four states before the meeting of the Committee on August 29, 2012; however, there was time to look at the discipline clusters used by other states, and compare them to the ones in the alternative proposed model.

Chairman Horsford said the weights should be data driven. He had hoped to have information from NCHEMS to explain the data the weights for the programs were based on.

Dr. Stephen said did not know whether that kind of information was available. He said, NCHEMS was the expert on this topic, and he would defer to them.

Chancellor Klaich agreed with Dr. Stephen that NCHEMS was expert resource for information about higher education funding in the United States.

Chairman Horsford said he would not relegate his decision as to how the higher education funding would work in Nevada to NCHEMS. He believed that the alternative proposal did that. He noted that there was no discussion among the Board of Regents as to whether the weights provided by NCHEMS were appropriate to the priorities of NSHE.