

College of Southern Nevada  
Report on the Multi-Campus District Model

November 4, 2016

## Executive Summary

Clark County's population is expected to grow approximately 30 percent over the next 30 years. At the same time, local municipalities will develop their unique economic development plans and an estimated 62 percent of new jobs created will require a college degree by 2020 alone. Further complicating the matter, Nevada's P-20 system is a leaky pipeline with only 9.8 percent of ninth graders who graduate on time going directly to college. CSN will need to adapt significantly in the future to provide a far different workforce than the one the valley requires today.

After two months of intensive discussion, the CSN Multi-Campus District Study Committee has concluded that a transition from the College's current multi-campus single unit to a multi-campus district will enhance CSN's capacity to more nimbly respond to the changing needs of our diverse service area. This Committee has observed that such a change could ensure students experience consistent support, regardless of their location in the service area, and provide more autonomy to each campus in terms of decision making. This would allow each campus to develop into a reflection of its unique community's needs and increase access to postsecondary opportunities to local students as community colleges were designed just over 100 years ago to do. It would also enhance student success, whereas students will be engaged in a home campus experience, without having to travel to multiple campuses to accomplish certain tasks or for their general education curriculum.

There will be a costs to decentralize the select services necessary to provide consistency and autonomy. Increasing student support and general curriculum will comprise the bulk of this expense. More detail exists in appendix item B, however, it should be noted, the Committee was firm that this described budget be put forth as one potential model to allow for further exploration and research into the base level of student support to be provided at each campus and additional efficiencies.

## I. Study Process

During spring semester 2016, the Board authorized a study for CSN migrating to a multi-campus district model. See Appendix A for the charge. A Committee was formed over the summer, and it began its work Sept. 1, 2016.

This report is based on the Committee's work which included interviews with leaders from two multi-campus districts, one in Florida and one in Arizona; reviews of demographic information; and economic development plans from the three major municipalities CSN serves.

Three work teams explored deeper issues related to the student experience, faculty and curricular impacts and management. A review of the reason for the study was presented and discussed at the CSN Faculty Senate and at a meeting of CSN's extended leadership team (all CSN directors and above).

The charge included an analysis of pros and cons of a district model, a cost benefit analysis (See Appendix B) and recommendations for phasing.

## II. Principles and Values

- a. One set of college-wide policies and procedures, complementing the policies and procedures of the governing board. Campus policies and practices connect to the district;
- b. Transfer and articulation function college-wide; high school relations are a campus responsibility;
- c. Operation of the district and campuses is described as both a vertical and matrix management structure. Roles and assignments will be clearly defined. Communication through coordinating committees will minimize questions of authority and responsibility;
- d. The study may consider one campus administrator for two campuses and multiple centers, for example, or one campus and all centers;
- e. The College will operate with one regional accreditation, one curriculum, one budget, and one element of shared services available to all campuses and centers;
- f. High-cost, niche programs will generally remain on existing campuses. For example, diesel technology will remain at the North Las Vegas Campus and will not be duplicated elsewhere;

- g. District administration will focus on central functions (see below) and consistency of communication, standards, and services;
- h. A full complement of general education and entry-level curriculum should be deployed and staffed, with related “standard” student experience on each campus;
- i. The district model will foster community building and student success, encourage service learning in the communities served and student completion with public accountability; and
- j. Specific governance councils will facilitate collaboration and coordination.

### III. General Findings

The Committee came to a consensus that the guiding principle for any restructure must be the improvement of the student experience and that a multi-campus district model is a potential policy solution to the following problems as defined by these three themes:

- a. A need to strategically develop and/or promote accomplishments and achievements unique to each campus, e.g., Centers/Academies of Excellence in Health Sciences or Culinary Arts
- b. A need for a standard experience for students on each campus and the development of a base-level of services and academic opportunities to which students, regardless of campus, are entitled
- c. A need for enhanced contact and feedback from the communities CSN’s campuses serve and alignment with their unique needs

There was consensus that a new structure strategically designed to address these three themes and tailored to the unique needs of Southern Nevada’s diverse communities is required as the college evolves.

Additional key findings:

- A recognition that a decentralization of student services and decision making on behalf of students would be a positive change
- A recognition that current academic structures (e.g., lead faculty, department chairs) and deployment of the general education curriculum generally works well at CSN
- For its three main campuses, CSN should pursue “comprehensive entry level” with centers of excellence in designated, accredited specific disciplines.
- An appreciation that structural changes will be complicated and certain functions and services will move in alternate directions on compendium of

- decentralization, i.e. the multi-campus districts studied by the Committee regularly assess functions and services for further centralization or decentralization based on the needs of stakeholders
- A recognition that CSN is already structured and acting on a number of fronts like a multi-campus district in such areas as centralized and standardized guided pathways for students, the First Steps experience and other centralized support services. CSN is already decentralized in the successful establishment of localized programs and partnerships, such as JT3, and community relations. However, levels of services vary by campus, i.e. lack of dedicated student services staff at Henderson, the Veterans Educational Center at Charleston, the Multi-Cultural Center at North Las Vegas
  - A need for a campus administrator or steward with clearly defined responsibilities, including outreach responsibilities to work closely with the community and local government, the ability to advocate on behalf of that community, campus students, staff and faculty and corresponding satellite sites, and the collaborative skills to work with the other campus administrators and the district president to balance campus and college priorities
  - A need for a campus's environment and branding to reflect the communities and students it serves, increasing student engagement in these communities and creating a 'home campus' experience that helps students succeed
  - Any structural changes with meaningful impact to students will require additional revenue to fill student services and faculty positions necessary to create a shared experience among CSN students, regardless of their locality

## **VI. Addressing the Committee's Charges**

Over the past month and a half, the Committee has dedicated itself to undertaking the objectives specified in its charge.

### **Understand the services most needed in each part of the CSN service area:**

Through discussion with community leaders, including a review of each municipality's unique economic development plan as well as discussions conducted through the student experience workgroup, this Committee has found that the student experience varies at each campus based on available resources, number of students served, and quality.

For example, at Henderson, where student support staff based on other campuses will come for certain day(s) of the week, students have become accustomed to doing without, in

terms of many personnel-based student services. Specific curricula, particularly in science, are not available and there are few offices, making it difficult for Henderson-bound students to meet with key employees. While the Charleston Campus houses the Veterans Educational Center (the federal government recommends the location of the center be at the campus where the college president resides), the North Las Vegas Campus is closest to the VA Hospital and Nellis Air Force Base. Department supervisors are not equally available on each campus and the level of expertise of staff varies based on where the most veteran/effective employees are housed.

It was also noted that the array of programs offered at each campus does not necessarily reflect the related municipalities' economic development strategy, a fact which may not be helped but by costly duplication of programs. Creating and promoting Centers or Academies of Excellence in these location-based programs, such as healthcare or automotive, may mean students from one location in the valley commute to one farther away, but that this more distant campus should then become their home away from home, where all student services and academic opportunities for that program are accessible.

A key priority is to provide basic services and a consistent service level at each campus to eliminate the "run around" experience, aptly named to describe how students feel when trying to get paperwork completed or a decision made that requires input from multiple faculty or student services staff that reside on different campuses.

It also became clear that the communities need a champion for each campus to advance local needs. A key administrator that is responsible for promoting that campus in the community, creating student, faculty/staff and community engagement opportunities and leading the collaborative process to brand that campus to reflect its community was deemed important. Municipal economic development officers and leaders would benefit from having a campus president or administrator to meet with regarding businesses recruitment and workforce development. In addition, as each city adapts to the Clark County School District's new structure, including the creation of advisory councils, having a key campus administrator to work with the K-12 schools in their jurisdiction will become increasingly important.

**Survey peer institutions to determine the structure that most effectively and efficiently promotes delivery of those services:**

The Committee interviewed two campus leaders from Valencia College in Florida and Pima Community College in Arizona. The three separate work committees also surveyed peer institutions to develop their research. A great deal was learned from these institutions

but there was no perfect fit for CSN to model. The Committee discovered that other national models have local governance and financing that differ from the NSHE structure.

**Consider how a revised structure best fits within the NSHE framework:**

In its review of peer institutions, the Committee probed campus leaders about their institutions' relationships with four-year institutions. In the case of Pima Community College, Arizona's strong model of collaboration among its institutions was a product of the state's fiscal and governance models. Above all, it was noted that the college or district president must be the point person to address other institutions and intergovernmental relations. When both two-year and four-year institutional leaders placed a premium on a symbiotic relationship, cohesive articulation thrived. Market forces kept mission creep in check.

**Determine the structure that best serves students, faculty and the local community:**

The Committee came to a general consensus that as CSN grows, its centralized and vertical structure should decentralize to best meet student and community needs.

Yet, the culture of limited to diminishing resources is so pervasive at CSN, it frankly diminished this Committee's ability to execute the broader exercise of the charge to envision how CSN should be structured to best serve students, faculty and the local community. It should also be noted—and it is a matter addressed in the Phasing section below—that faculty leaders on the Committee are wary of how a multi-campus district model that increases the number of faculty and student support services and creates three new executive level positions will be funded and how this new structure will impact their autonomy, role in shared governance, professional development/evaluation and workload.

**Develop a cost analysis and phased approach for implementation:**

A separate cost analysis, including a pricing menu is attached as Appendix B.

**Consider online services, workforce development, and intra-institutional synergies under a new structure**

The Committee and its workgroups addressed these issues to the extent possible in their research of peer institutions. Faculty are at the forefront of developments and exploration in online learning and should remain key innovators in this area with centralized technical

and professional development support. Workforce training would remain centralized. Intra-institutional synergies would remain a priority for the CSN president.

## VII. **Proposed Central Functions**

Central functions may be managed centrally for greatest efficiency and effectiveness or in some cases centrally monitored and coordinated with programs and engagement occurring at the respective campuses.

- a. Human Resources and employee training
- b. Facilities Management
- c. Financial Services and Purchasing
- d. Budget
- e. CSN Foundation
- f. Police
- g. Emergency management
- h. Curriculum Development and Program Assessment
- i. Legal Services
- j. Marketing
- k. Government Relations
- l. Information Technology
- m. Distance Education and Online Support Services
- n. Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability
- o. Coordination of Advising, Counseling and First Year Experience
- p. Strategic Planning
- q. Resource allocation
- r. Sponsored (grants) projects
- s. Accreditation (regional and specialized)
- t. Classroom scheduling

Other functions would be centrally coordinated but decentralized for improved service:

- a. Financial Aid
- b. Diversity and Inclusion Services
- c. Instructional Design and Online Support Services
- d. Workforce and Economic Development
- e. Public Information/Communications

- f. Admissions
- g. Registrar

## VIII. **Proposed Campus Functions**

Reporting to the President of the college, campus administrators will have authority and responsibility for the following:

- Curriculum deployment and staffing recommendation (in coordination with deans and the Office of Academic Affairs)
- Student affairs and conduct (in coordination with the Office of Student Affairs)
- Campus safety, parking and security (in coordination with the office of Strategic Initiatives and Administration)
- Community relations (in coordination with the Office of the President)
- Community diversity, campus life programming
- Space scheduling
- Implementation of college policies
- Implementation of budget allocations for campus administration
- Single point of customer service and contact for the community
- Local coordination of financial aid and other services for students,
- Coordination of public relations/internal campus communications (in coordination with Office of the President)
- Local implementation of student advising, counseling and First-Year Experience
- Local diversity programming and initiatives (in coordination with Office of the President)
- Recruitment of students
- Point of contact for CCSD schools in the service area (with dual credit/concurrent programming centralized)

## IX. **Proposed Campus and Center Alignment**

Each learning center would be attached to a campus, and campus leadership would have authority and responsibility for optimal use of each center.

**Henderson Campus**  
Green Valley Center



[Southeast and southwest program and site development]

### **North Las Vegas Campus**

Mesquite Center

Moapa Center

Nellis AFB Center

### **Charleston Campus**

Centennial Hills Campus Development\*

Las Vegas City Hall

Palo Verde Center

West Sahara Center

Western Center

\*Once developed, the Board of Regents may change.

## **X. Study Discoveries**

Through the course of the study, the committee discovered a number of services and function that CSN was not delivering with consistency, meaning students are receiving different levels of service and support at different campuses. The proposal seeks to correct and improve on these shortcomings:

- a. Essential student services: The Henderson Campus and several of the learning centers receive intermitted and/or incomplete services for students attending at these locations. For instance, academic counselors from the various programs are permanently housed at the Charleston and North Las Vegas campuses and rotate intermittently to Henderson each week. Cost range: \$1-1.2 million.
- b. Alignment of local municipality needs: Each main campus and centers lack coordination with the unique economic development needs of the municipalities in which they reside. It was noted multiple times that a campus administrator would be needed to champion the community's needs and lead the process of campus integration within the community. Cost range: \$1-1.2 million.
- c. Faculty resources and curricular offerings: While the CSN Charleston and North Las Vegas campuses offer the full complement of general education courses (generally, the left side of a degree sheet) and provide the entry and upper division level courses (that make up, generally, the right side of a degree sheet) for the majority of

degree programs, the Henderson Campus is lacking in this area. The Henderson Campus has an adequate array of general course offerings, enough to allow a student to complete the left side of most degree programs. However, there are few degrees that CSN students can complete at that campus.

The proposal and its attended costs (illustrated in Appendix B) address the services and functions not being delivered with direct investments of funding and programming. Additional square footage will also be needed to address the course and service shortcomings

## **XI. Recommended Phasing**

### **Phase I**

Predicated on action by the Board of Regents and additional, legislatively appropriated resources, CSN will commence a phased implementation, including:

- Extended communication with internal and external constituent groups;
- Assessment of student services and deployment of a standard student experience at the three main campuses;
- Development of coordinating councils or committees;
- A long-term space solution in Henderson;
- Creation of the position requirements and job descriptions for campus administrators;
- Strategic designation of Centers of Excellence for targeted promotion on each campus and at each site

### **Phase II**

- Faculty and administrative talent hiring
- Development of uniform training and student affairs cross training
- Integration of the model into CSN strategic planning;
- Communication and training on the new model and coordination of engagement;
- Organizational chart revisions reflecting new model in matrix
- Assessment of the functionality of the new model and revising as needed.

## Appendix A

### Charge to the Committee

As it enters its fifth decade of service, the College of Southern Nevada has grown from a fledgling workforce college to the largest and most diverse Nevada higher education institution. It has embraced a comprehensive community college mission. The college's structure is a product of a primary focus on providing postsecondary access to the largest and fastest growing region, and CSN has evolved into a large, highly centralized complex multi-campus single college structure. Meanwhile, the majority of CSN's peers that have experienced similar growth over time have decentralized to district models that are closer to the diverse communities they serve. Although these models vary, they are more localized and horizontal in organizational structure. Therefore, it is an appropriate time to conduct an in-depth review of CSN's structure to achieve the following objectives:

- Understand the services most needed in each part of the CSN service area
- Survey peer institutions to determine the structure that most effectively and efficiently promotes delivery of those services
- Consider how a revised structure best fits within the NSHE framework
- Determine the structure that best serves students, faculty and the local community
- Develop a cost analysis and phased approach for implementation
- Consider online services, workforce development, and intra-institutional synergies under a new structure

Appendix B  
Outline for the Cost/Benefit Analysis, Multi-Campus District Study  
Committee

1. Purpose: Identify costs associated with a transition to comprehensive entry-level campuses and whether the benefits identified justify the costs.
2. Overview: Under the proposal, CSN would undergo a modification of its structure:
  - a. Three main campuses would deploy curriculum sufficient for students' degree/certificate completion, general education transfer and entry-level education into CSN fields of study;
  - b. Current CSN learning centers would align with one specified campus;
  - c. A standard student experience would be defined and supported at each of the main campuses and would be planned for the projected fourth campus;
  - d. Community constituencies would have more effective communication, and more assistance with economic development goals;
  - e. The proposed structure differs from similar national models that have local governance and local funding; and
  - f. Engaging the proposal, wholly or in phases, needs flexibility and consultation with internal and external constituent groups through shared governance.
3. Assessment of Need:
  - a) The proposal includes fixed costs and obligations that need to be met prior to the funding formula engaging.
  - b) To schedule sufficient curriculum for student degree completion, general education transfer, and entry-level education, CSN would need additional faculty.
  - c) Alignment of learning centers to a specific campus would allow greater space utilization and localized course delivery.
  - d) A baseline of student experience needs to be defined and implemented.
  - e) A designated administrator would take the lead on community relationships and identification of service levels.
4. Benefits:
  - a) Recurring benefit: Instructional curriculum of general education and entry-level classes at three main campuses for uniform student experience.
  - b) Value enhancement: Provides an administrative leader and clerical support for three campuses closer to the municipalities served.

- c) Value and operations enhancement: strategically develop and/or promote accomplishments and achievements unique to each campus, e.g., Centers/Academies of Excellence in Health Sciences or Culinary Arts
- d) Recurring benefit for students: standard experiences for students on each campus and the development of a base-level of services and academic opportunities to which students, regardless of campus, are entitled
- e) Value enhancement: Consistent contact and feedback from the communities CSN's campuses serve and improved alignment with their unique needs

5. Costs – A Potential Model

**Summary by function:**

<b>Campus:</b>	College of Southern Nevada		
<b>Initiative:</b>	Multi-Campus District		
	<b>FY 18 FTE</b>	<b>FY 18 Budget</b>	
Instruction	17	\$ 1,143,741	
Academic Support	-	-	
Student Support	15	1,070,205	
Institutional Support	6	1,140,777	
Operations & Maintenance	-	474,064	<sup>1</sup>
	38	\$ 3,828,787	
<sup>1</sup> Includes one time expense of \$340,000 for Start-up Allowance for new space.			

**Summary by classification:**

<b>Campus:</b>	College of Southern Nevada		
<b>Initiative:</b>	Multi-Campus District		
	<b>FY 18 FTE</b>	<b>FY 18 Budget</b>	
Professional Salaries	38	2,343,750	
Fringe Benefits	-	720,973	
Operating & O/M	-	764,064	<sup>1</sup>
	38	\$ 3,828,787	
<sup>1</sup> Includes one time expense of \$340,000 for Start-up Allowance for new space.			

COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA - MULTI-CAMPUS DISTRICT - PROJECTED BUDGET							
Expenditure Plan	Function		# of FTE	FY 2017-18			Total
				Salary	Fringe Benefits	Operating	
Additional faculty hires to support sections needed	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction	CC Instructor	1.00	58,500	19,868	-	78,368
	Instruction - Full-time		12.00	702,000	238,420	-	940,420
	Instruction	PT Faculty LOA	1	24,750	2,314		27,064
	Instruction	PT Faculty LOA	1	24,750	2,314		27,064
	Instruction	PT Faculty LOA	1	24,750	2,314		27,064
	Instruction	PT Faculty LOA	1	24,750	2,314		27,064
	Instruction	PT Faculty LOA	1	24,750	2,314		27,064
	Instruction - Part-time		5.00	123,750	11,571	-	135,321
Instruction: materials, supplies, & operating support for staff	Instruction		-	-	-	68,000	68,000
	Instruction - Operating		-	-	-	68,000	68,000
	<b>Total Instruction</b>		<b>17.00</b>	<b>825,750</b>	<b>249,991</b>	<b>68,000</b>	<b>1,143,741</b>
Academic Support: Library	Academic Support					-	-
Academic Support: other	Academic Support					-	-
	Academic Support - Operating		-	-	-	-	-
	<b>Total Academic Support</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
Student Support Services: Support activities for student success services testing, DRC and student life	Student Services	Advisor/Success Coach	1.00	45,000	17,370	-	62,370
	Student Services	Advisor/Success Coach	1.00	45,000	17,370	-	62,370
	Student Services	Advisor/Success Coach	1.00	45,000	17,370	-	62,370
	Student Services	Advisor/Success Coach	1.00	45,000	17,370	-	62,370
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Testing/DRC Senior Specialist	1.00	51,000	18,480	-	69,480
	Student Services	Student Life Coordinator	1.00	50,000	18,295	-	68,295
	Student Services	Student Life Coordinator	1.00	50,000	18,295	-	68,295
	Student Services	Student Life Coordinator	1.00	50,000	18,295	-	68,295
	Student Services - Student Support Services		15.00	738,000.00	272,205.00	-	1,010,205

Student Support Services: materials, supplies, & operating support for staff	Student Services		-	-	-	60,000	60,000
Student Services - Operating			-	-	-	60,000	60,000
	<b>Total Student Services</b>		<b>15.00</b>	<b>738,000</b>	<b>272,205</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>1,070,205</b>
Campus Administrator	Institutional Support	Campus Administrator	3.00	600,000	138,000	-	738,000
	Institutional Support	Executive Assistant	3.00	180,000	60,777	-	240,777
Institutional Support - Campus Administration			6.00	780,000	198,777	-	978,777
Institutional Support: materials, supplies, & operating support for staff	Institutional Support		-	-	-	24,000	24,000
Campus Administrator hosting, travel, professional development	Institutional Support		-	-	-	138,000	138,000
Institutional Support - Operating			-	-	-	162,000	162,000
	<b>Total Institutional Support</b>		<b>6.00</b>	<b>780,000</b>	<b>198,777</b>	<b>162,000</b>	<b>1,140,777</b>
Additional space - lease expense	Operations & Maint		-	-	-	134,064	134,064
Staffing - O&M	Operations & Maint	Custodial/Maintenance		-	-	-	-
Operations & Maintenance - lease & support			-	-	-	134,064	134,064
	<b>Total Operations &amp; Maintenance</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>134,064</b>	<b>134,064</b>
<b>Projected Total for On-going Need</b>			<b>38.00</b>	<b>2,343,750</b>	<b>720,973</b>	<b>424,064</b>	<b>3,488,787</b>
<b>One Time Start-Up for space</b>						340,000	340,000
<b>Projected Grand Total</b>						764,064	3,828,787