----- Forwarded message ------From: Dennis Jones <<u>Dennis@nchems.org</u>> Date: Thu, Aug 16, 2012 at 6:55 AM Subject: Materials I promised To: "Daniel Klaich (<u>daniel\_klaich@nshe.nevada.edu</u>)" <<u>daniel\_klaich@nshe.nevada.edu</u>>

## Dan

Hope the day brings you a little more sunshine after yesterday's thunderstorm. As promised I'm sending you some materials. They include

The matrices for FL, IL, and OH

My long bio--shows a LOT of finance related work

An excerpt from a proposal we just sent off to MS. Pardon the unnecessary parts that go along with it, but my secretary is out dealing with a family tragedy. But this shows a very long organizational history in this business--and I've been a part of the organization throughout the period.

I don't know what more I can tell you about weights in the matrix, but remember that

1. All cost analyses reflect an accumulation of historical choices and accidents. There's nothing that makes any one analysis yield "truth".

2. You're likely to get a better perspective when you look across states than when you look within a single state--because part of the history is the overlay of state policy and the way things work in a state (things like civil service rules, are some costs borne by other state agencies, etc).

3. There is always negotiation in the analytic process whether it's after the numbers are run or, more likely, in setting the ground rules by which costs are calculated. One of the huge ones in the latter category is the almost universal decision to treat research that isn't separately funded as an instructional cost (the costs are buried in the matrix) which is one of the factors that makes upper division and graduate education typically more expensive.

4. At the end, there is judgment involved. I feel that 40 years of experience in this gives me a pretty good basis for making informed judgments.

Hope something in this pile of stuff helps. I'm out of here shortly, but will be in touch.

Hang in !!!!

DPJ

1

ľ

i F<sub>185</sub>as