



Governance and Coordination of Public Higher Education in All 50 States: Executive Summary

by Carolyn Waller, Ran Coble, Joanne Scharer, and Susan Giamportone

The structure of higher education systems in the United States reflects the individuality of each of the 50 states. Each state has its own history and culture in higher education, its own political structure and leadership, and its own geography and demographics—all of which influence higher education governance. Over time, each state has forged its own path toward the common goals of public higher education—teaching, research, and public service. Further, each state is unique in how it chooses to combine or divide authority for the two principal responsibilities of higher education boards—the governance of individual public institutions and the statewide coordination of higher education policy and planning.

Despite these differences, states can learn a great deal from one another and from an examination of other states' systems and structures. With that premise in mind, this report by the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research (1) describes how each state structures its higher edu-

cation system and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of each structure; (2) surveys various state statistics relevant to higher education and reports this data (e.g., state population, number of public universities, and size of student enrollment) in conjunction with the type of higher education system found within each state; and (3) discusses the similarities and differences among the central boards in all 50 states.

The first section of the report discusses the three basic ways states structure their higher education systems. This information provides a comprehensive look at how each state attempts to provide public higher education opportunities to its citizens. As used in this report, the term "state higher education system" encompasses all the various boards, agencies, committees, etc. that *together* provide planning, coordination, and governance for the state's higher education sectors. The name of the system typically reflects the principal function of the central board within that system.

State Higher Education Structures

There are three state higher education structures in place throughout the country:

1. Consolidated Governing Board Systems: (24 states)

In these states, all public institutional governance is centralized in either one or two governing boards. There is either one statewide board whose primary duty is to *govern* all public postsecondary institutions in the state, or there are two multi-campus boards that divide

Editors note: This executive summary is taken from *Governance and Coordination of Public Higher Education in All 50 States*, published by the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research in October 2000. The report is the second of a four-part study on public university governance funded by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Mich.

The authors are: Carolyn Waller, a Raleigh attorney and former Center policy analyst; Center Executive Director Ran Coble; Joanne Scharer, a free-lance public policy consultant; and Susan Giamportone, a Raleigh attorney.

the governance of the state's public institutions between the two of them. Statewide *coordination* of higher education policy and planning may be the responsibility of this same consolidated governing board by statute or convention, or it may be the duty of a separate board or agency. Sometimes, a state has no formal board which carries out typical coordinating responsibilities.

2. Coordinating Board Systems—(a) Regulatory and (b) Advisory: (24 states)

In these states, central coordinating boards serve as liaisons between state government and the governing boards of individual institutions. These central coordinating boards have no governance authority. Instead, governance responsibilities are in the hands of institutional boards, three or more multi-campus boards, or a combination of institutional and multi-campus boards.

a. As part of their responsibility to coordinate higher education efforts throughout the state, **regulatory coordinating boards** generally have the authority to approve and eliminate academic programs at public institutions and to exercise some degree of regulatory power over the budgetary process. For instance, some regulatory boards present consolidated budgets, some may reject proposed budgets from individual campuses, and some review and submit individual campus budgets to the governor and the legislature (21 states).

b. **Advisory coordinating boards** have no real power *per se*, though their recommendations may be influential. They have the authority to review proposals to create new academic programs and to review existing programs, but their role is limited to providing advice to the state legislature, governor, or other higher education boards. The same holds true for their ability to influence university budgets (3 states).

3. Planning Agency Systems: (2 states)

In these states, there is no statewide board charged with higher education coordination or governance. There is only a planning agency that facilitates communication among institutions and education sectors and performs a voluntary planning function. Governance is the responsibility of institutional boards on each campus or multi-campus boards.

Why States Change Their Governance Systems

Alms C. McGuinness Jr. of the National Council for Higher Education Management Systems identifies eight recurrent concerns that may lead to reconsideration or restructuring of a state's higher education governance system, as follows: (1) actual or perceived duplication of high-cost graduate and professional programs; (2) conflict between the aspirations of institutions, often under separate governing boards, in the same geographic area; (3) legislative reaction to lobbying by individual campuses; (4) frustrations with barriers to student transfer; (5) proposals to close, merge, or change the missions of particular colleges or universities; (6) inadequate coordination among institutions offering one- and two-year vocational, technical, occupational, and transfer programs; (7) concerns about an existing state board's effectiveness; and (8) a proposal for a "superboard" to bring all of public higher education under one roof.¹

When concerns such as these are raised and changes are considered, it is natural that the decisionmakers look to other states to find examples of systems and structures that are working well. States initially may be tempted simply to copy higher education models that have worked successfully for another state. McGuinness cautions against this practice, stressing "[One state's] structure may be inappropriate for [another] state's unique needs and underlying political culture."² Instead, he suggests that states undertake a thorough evaluation of how well their existing policies and structures align with the state's agenda and public interest, and he offers the following guidelines:

1. The development of clear goals and objectives should precede reorganization. Reorganization is a means to an end, not an end in itself.
2. States should be explicit about the specific problems that were catalysts for the reorganization proposals.
3. States should ask if reorganization is the only or the most effective means for addressing the problems that have been identified.
4. States should weigh the costs of reorganization against its short- and long-term benefits.
5. States should recognize that a good system considers both state and societal needs, as well as the needs of colleges and universities.

Higher Education Structures in All 50 States

States with a Consolidated Governing Board Structure (24 States)	States with a Coordinating Board Structure (24 States)	States with a Planning Agency Structure (2 States)
	Regulatory (21) Advisory (3)	
Alaska ⁺	Alabama	California
Arizona	Arkansas	New Mexico
Florida ⁺	Colorado	Pennsylvania
Georgia	Connecticut	
Hawaii	Illinois	Delaware
Idaho	Indiana	Michigan
Iowa [*]	Kentucky	
Kansas	Louisiana	
Maine [*]	Maryland	
Minnesota ⁺	Massachusetts	
Mississippi ⁺	Missouri	
Montana	Nebraska	
Nevada	New Jersey	
New Hampshire ⁺	New York	
North Carolina[*]	Ohio	
North Dakota	Oklahoma	
Oregon	South Carolina	
Rhode Island	Tennessee	
South Dakota [*]	Texas	
Utah	Virginia	
Vermont ⁺	Washington	
West Virginia ^{*+@}		
Wisconsin [*]		
Wyoming ⁺		

* These states have no board with authority of any kind over both two- and four-year public higher education institutions. (Note: South Dakota has no two-year public institutions of higher education.)

+ Minnesota, Vermont, and West Virginia each have a consolidated governing board system of governance with two consolidated governing boards that govern a segment of the higher education institutions within their respective state. Florida also has an advisory coordinating board that supplements the work of Florida's State Board of Regents, the state's consolidated governing board. Alaska, Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Wyoming have planning agencies located in the states' consolidated governing board structure that supplement the work of the governing board.

@ In March 2000, the West Virginia Legislature passed a bill affecting the current governance structure of higher education in the state. Effective June 30, 2000, both the State College System Board of Directors and the University System Board of Trustees are abolished. A Higher Education Policy Commission will be created in July 2000 for policy development and other statewide issues. The Policy Commission is to employ a Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, Vice Chancellor for Administration, and Vice Chancellor for Community and Technical Colleges and Workforce Education. During the transition year of July 1, 2000, to June 30, 2001, a statewide interim governing board is the governing board for public higher education. Each institution in the state will have its own governing board which will assume governance authority on July 1, 2001.

McGuinness writes, "States often begin reorganization debates with either of two misconceptions—each of which has an element of truth. One is that the state's needs will be better met if state policy deliberately fosters the autonomy and performance of individual colleges and universities; in other words, the less state involvement the better. Alternatively, others will argue that the sum of institutional needs is not the same as the state's needs. They will argue that institutional needs can only be understood in the context of a public agenda framed in terms of the state's long-range education, social and economic priorities. If each college and university is able to pursue its mission without regard to this broader framework, the result will be unnecessary program duplication. Important statewide concerns such as minority access and achievement or student transfer and articulation between and among institutions will not be addressed. The danger is that debates will be shaped by the assumption that one but not the other of these two perspectives must rule: either institutional autonomy is an absolute good and state involvement must be kept at a minimum, or state priorities must rule and institutional autonomy must be constrained by those priorities."

6. States should distinguish between state coordination (concerned primarily with the state and system perspective) and institutional governance (the direction of individual universities or systems of institutions which takes place within the coordination framework) and avoid trying to solve coordination problems with governance alternatives or vice versa.
7. States should examine the total policy structure and process, including the roles of the governor, executive branch agencies, and the legislature, rather than focus exclusively on the formal postsecondary structure.³

Some of the concerns behind restructuring efforts in the 1990s are not new. They reflect peren-

nial concerns over such issues as institutional autonomy and political power. However, according to McGuinness, some new forces also have been at work during the last decade, including:

1. Changes in state government leadership (governors, legislators, and higher education policymakers);
2. An apparent weakening consensus about the basic purposes of postsecondary education;
3. Growing political involvement in state coordination and governance;
4. An increase in legislative mandates in areas traditionally handled by state postsecondary education boards and institutions;
5. A gap between external and internal definitions of quality and expectations for quality assurance;
6. A trend toward boards dominated by representatives of internal constituencies and a decline in lay membership;
7. The impact of an increasingly market-driven, technology intensive postsecondary education system; and
8. State postsecondary education structures which are ill-equipped to address increasingly important cross-cutting issues, such as transfer and articulation between two- and four-year institutions and collaboration among the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary sectors.⁴

According to McGuinness, "The real issue in reorganization is, in some respects, not higher education at all, but the broader shifts in political and economic power within a state."⁵

As part of the concern for operating a cost-effective system, many states grant their central boards the power to approve new academic programs or to terminate existing ones. For example, among the many duties performed by the UNC Board of Governors is the duty to approve new

"Of all the threats to the institution, the most dangerous come from within. Not the least among them is the smugness that believes the institution's value is so self-evident that it no longer needs explication, its mission so manifest that it no longer requires definition and articulation."

—A. BARTLETT GIAMATTI, FORMER PRESIDENT OF YALE UNIVERSITY
A FREE AND ORDERED SPACE: THE REAL WORLD OF THE UNIVERSITY



programs and to terminate existing academic programs at its 16 constituent four-year institutions. This power over both new and existing programs is found among both consolidated governing boards and regulatory coordinating boards across the country. Advisory coordinating boards and planning agencies may only make recommendations on new or existing programs.

Fiscal powers also are important in governing higher education. As in many states with a consolidated governing board structure, the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina develops a consolidated budget for all 16 constituent public universities and recommends this budget to the Governor, the Advisory Budget Commission, and the North Carolina General Assembly. The UNC Board also is authorized by statute to allocate certain lump-sum appropriations among the 16 constituent institutions.

In states with a regulatory coordinating board structure, the central board often reviews budgets from each constituent institution and then recommends a consolidated budget to the governor or state legislature. However, in some states with regulatory coordinating boards, the budgets are not consolidated. Instead, the board reviews the

individual budgets of the constituent institutions and presents a separate budget recommendation for each institution.

Advisory coordinating boards and planning agencies have no budgetary power beyond their ability to review and make recommendations on the budget requests of various institutions. In these states, the individual institutions or multi-campus systems present their budgets directly to the governor or state legislature. The advisory board or planning agency then will review the budget requests and submit its recommendations concerning the requests to the governor or legislature. In other words, unlike states with a consolidated governing board or regulatory coordinating board structure, the budget requests for all public universities do not come from one central board.

The second section of this report contains a comprehensive examination of state higher education structures, statistics, and statutes, often in a hierarchy or ranking from most to least. While this is not meant to imply any causal relationship between the reported statistics and the type of higher education system selected by any given state, this information provides important context and background concerning the environment in which a higher edu-

cation system operates. In addition, the tables provide an easy mechanism for identifying the states most similar to each other in terms of the measure being used and the type of higher education system.

Observations About Governance Structures and Other Factors

Among the observations made in this section are the following:

- Seven of the 10 most populous states have coordinating board structures (five regulatory and two advisory), while 11 of the 12 states having the smallest populations have consolidated governing board structures. However, among the seven most populous states with coordinating board structures, five are in states where governance is dominated by two or more multi-campus governing boards or by a combination of multi-campus governing boards and institutional governing boards, thus making their governance structure similar to that of the University of North Carolina. North Carolina, a state with a consolidated governing board, has the 11th largest population among the states.
- Thirty-five states have a central board responsible for coordinating statewide higher education policy and planning for all public postsecondary institutions, and another eight states have a central board with limited planning and administrative duties for all public postsecondary colleges and universities. Only seven states—including North Carolina—have no central board or agency charged with planning or coordinating higher education policy and planning for both the two-year and four-year public colleges and universities.
- Among the 10 largest higher education systems in the country, as measured by the total number of four-year and two-year public and private higher education institutions, North Carolina has the highest percentage of *public* institutions, 60.7%.
- California has the largest higher education total student enrollment in the United States at 1,900,099 and the largest *public* higher education enrollment at 1,625,021. North Carolina's higher education system has the 10th largest total student enrollment at 372,993 students. It is also among the top 10 states in terms of student enrollment in *public* higher education institutions, ranking ninth with 302,939 students.
- Nine of the top 10 states in terms of public higher education enrollment—including North Carolina—also appear in the top ten in terms of state funding for higher education operating expenses (i.e., state tax funds appropriated for higher education institutions, student aid, and governing and coordinating boards). North Carolina ranks sixth in the nation in total state funding for higher education with appropriations of more than \$2 billion per year.
- The average cost of tuition and fees for state residents at four-year public higher education institutions is lowest in Nevada (\$1,884) and North Carolina (\$1,895).⁶
- California has the highest average salary for full-time faculty members at public universities at \$76,814. The average salary for full-time faculty at North Carolina's four-year public universities is \$64,304, ninth highest in the nation.⁷
- Only in 14 states—California, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia—is the percentage of minorities enrolled in four-year public institutions larger than the percentage of minorities in the population as a whole.
- Alabama has the largest number of historically black colleges and universities with 13, two of which are four-year public institutions and four of which are two-year public institutions. There are 11 historically black colleges and universities in North Carolina, five of which are *public* higher education institutions and part of the University of North Carolina system.
- The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina is the largest central state-level governing board in the country. The UNC Board has 32 voting members and one non-voting student member, while most of the boards examined have a total of 10–14 members. Of those central boards, the nearest in size to the UNC board is the 27-member Board of Trustees of the University System of New Hampshire.
- Members of central higher education boards most commonly are appointed by state governors (43 boards), either with or without approval of the state senate. Alternatively, in five states, the governor or another public official appoints a portion of the board with the state

legislature electing the remaining board members. Only in North Carolina and New York is the entire membership of the central, state-level board *elected by the legislature*. Two other states are unusual in that they have chosen *election by the public* of the members of their central higher education boards.

- The state statutes of 37 higher education boards specifically define the composition of their central higher education boards, mandating representation according to such factors as age, gender, geographic representation, political party affiliation, race/ethnicity, or other criteria. Of those 37 boards in 35 states, 20 have coordinating board structures (19 regulatory, one advisory), and 17 have consolidated governing board structures. For example, in North Carolina, at least two of the 16 members of the UNC Board of Governors elected every two years must be women, at least two must be minorities, and at least two members must be from the largest minority political party in the N.C. General Assembly.
- Members of the central higher education boards in the vast majority of states serve four- or six-year staggered terms with members being limited to the number of terms they may serve. Across the country, terms range between three years (Delaware and Rhode Island) and 12 years (Mississippi). Members of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina serve four-year terms of office and can serve no more than three full four-year terms in succession.
- Forty-three boards have master planning duties in setting long-term goals for higher education—20 consolidated governing boards, 20 regulatory coordinating boards, two advisory coordinating boards, and one planning agency. Centralized master planning for higher education systems appears to be a primary reason states create higher education boards or agencies.
- The Utah Board of Regents and the UNC Board of Governors—both consolidated governing boards—have a similar relationship to their local campus boards of trustees in terms of delegation of powers. In both states, each senior public institution has its own board of trustees whose principal powers are delegated by the central state-level board. Only in North Carolina and Utah is this delegation of duties to local boards specifically listed among the responsibilities of the central governing board, and these

are the only two states where the amount of power given to campus boards is left to the sole discretion of the central board.

- Among the 50 states, Wisconsin's overall structure of higher education is most similar to the structure adopted in North Carolina. Both have a consolidated governing board with authority over the four-year public institutions and another consolidated governing board that oversees the technical and community colleges. However, unlike Wisconsin, North Carolina has local campus boards of trustees. Student enrollment in each state's public universities is comparable, and each state has approximately the same number of four-year public universities (Wisconsin has 13 and North Carolina has 16). In addition, both are among the small group of states with no central board or planning agency that oversees both the state's public two-year and four-year institutions.

Unique Features in Higher Education Governance

Ultimately, the most important factors influencing the structure of each state's higher education system are those that are unique to each state: its political and higher education culture, constitution, history, population, geography, economic development, and other factors. Unique constitutional provisions can be found in Michigan, North Dakota, and North Carolina. For example, Michigan, with a long history of guarding institutional autonomy embedded in its constitution, is one of only two states with a planning agency structure, electing to keep governing duties in the hands of each individual campus. North Dakota's constitution spells out the name, location, and mission of eight higher education institutions that the state must maintain, including a school of forestry at Bottineau. In 1998, North Dakota citizens voted on whether to remove references to specific institutions in a referendum amending the 1889 constitutional provision. The referendum did not pass. And, in North Carolina, the constitution mandates that "The General Assembly shall provide that the benefits of the University of North Carolina and other public institutions of higher education, as far as practicable, be extended to the people of the State free of expense,"⁸ which explains why the average tuition for state residents is consistently among the lowest in the nation.

The sheer size of the population of New York City probably has led to the higher education governance system chosen by the New York legislature, with the City University of New York (CUNY) governing all institutions within the five boroughs of New York City, and the State University of New York (SUNY) governing all other post-secondary institutions within the state. West Virginia, one of 19 southern states that once operated two separate educational systems—one for black students and one for white students—continues to operate a dual governance system (now completely integrated), with each system governed by its own consolidated governing board⁹ (currently, the historically black West Virginia State College has a student body that is approximately 13% black).¹⁰ California, the state with both the largest number of students enrolled in its public colleges and universities and the largest number of public institutions, has created a three-tiered system of governance—one for the nine research institutions, one for the state university's 22 campuses, and one for the two-year junior colleges. Other examples of how geography, economics, and culture can affect university governance can be found in the unique

charges to the Iowa State Board of Regents to use degradable foam packing material manufactured from grains and starches and to the Board of Regents for the University of Wisconsin System to study the reintroduction of elk into the northern part of the state.

While some higher education concerns are unique to a particular state, some problems and issues face all states. One goal of this report is to help each state identify other states similarly situated to themselves in order to foster dialogue across state boundaries. Richard T. Ingram, president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in Washington D.C., observes, "Higher education programs will be at the center of [federal budget] debates. . . Higher education also will be a critical item on the agenda of most state governors and legislators over the next several years. While the recovery of the economy will relieve some of the budgetary pressure most public colleges and universities have felt through the early 1990s, the ample concerns of these institutions will ensure that funding and productivity in higher education will remain hot topics." In addition, in the 21st century, emerging technology and



Karen Tan

distance education options are transforming higher education. In this environment, it is important that policymakers, higher education administrators, the media, and the public understand the choices that the 50 states have made in governing and coordinating institutions of higher education.

Trends in Governance, Accountability Measures, and Finances

Between 1950 and 1970, 47 states established either coordinating or governing boards for public higher education.¹¹ In the last few years, another wave of changes in governance has begun. In 1999, Kansas legislators centralized their governance structure and created a new Board of Regents to coordinate both public and private higher education and to govern all six public universities, 19 community colleges (though local governing boards are retained for the community colleges), five technical colleges, six technical schools, and a municipal university. Louisiana voters amended their constitution in 1998 to create a new 17-member board to oversee a system of 50 community colleges and trade schools. By contrast, Illinois decentralized and abolished its Board of Governors and Board of Regents in 1995 and gave seven universities their own governing boards. In 2000, West Virginia abolished its State College System Board of Directors and the University System Board of Trustees, giving each institution its own governing board, but the legislature also created a new Higher Education Policy Commission. The South Carolina General Assembly changed the composition of its Commission on Higher Education by requiring that some of its 14 members come from public university boards of trustees. Six other states have made changes over the last decade—Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Jersey, and Texas—and Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, and Tennessee also are contemplating changes to their governance systems.

At the same time, there is a new drive toward accountability in higher education. Governors have started demanding more accountability from public colleges and universities, and state legislators are linking additional money in higher education to “important state goals,” says Earl S. Mackey, vice chancellor for external relations of the Ohio Board of Regents. The lawmakers want assurances that colleges will be accountable to the public, he says. About 5 percent of the Ohio system’s budget is used to reward institutions for

keeping tuition low, obtaining outside support for economically important research, and producing skilled graduates in a timely manner.¹²

At least 10 other states have implemented new accountability measures. Some states—such as Kansas, New Jersey, and New Mexico—began linking only a small share of their higher education appropriations to performance. Others, such as Colorado’s Commission on Higher Education, will base at least 75 percent of its annual recommendations for *new* money for colleges on institutions’ performance on such factors as graduation rates, class sizes, and faculty productivity.¹³ South Carolina’s Commission on Higher Education is in the process of implementing a system to distribute 100 percent of its money based on 37 performance indicators in nine areas, including instructional quality, quality of faculty, administrative efficiency, graduates’ achievements, and institutional cooperation and collaboration.¹⁴ Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Louisiana, and Virginia also have implemented new accountability measures.

The drive toward accountability also showed up in a poll of 35 governors by the Education Commission of the States. “All of the governors believed colleges should be more accountable for meeting local, state, and regional needs, and nearly all thought that it was important for states to link spending on colleges to the institutions’ performance; to put more emphasis on faculty productivity; to give students incentives to pursue particular careers; and to reorganize the sectors of education into a seamless system covering kindergarten through the first two years of college.”¹⁵ The good news for public higher education is that only elementary and secondary education were given a higher priority than higher education when governors were asked where more state money should go. The priorities of governors are verified by recent figures compiled by the National Conference of State Legislatures, which show public elementary and secondary education was the only sector that outpaced higher education in the growth of its state support in fiscal year 2000. Higher education’s slice of state budget pies—its share of aggregate general fund appropriations—dropped from 13.7 percent in fiscal year 1986 to 12.3 percent in fiscal 1996.¹⁶ However, in subsequent years, most legislatures appropriated funds to public colleges and universities at a rate significantly ahead of inflation rates.¹⁷ In fiscal year 2000, nine states included double-digit percentage increases for higher education—Florida, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi,

Montana, Nebraska, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia.¹⁸

This cause for optimism among state higher education officials is tempered, however, by the predictions of the late Harold A. Hovey, who served as president of State Policy Research and as the top budget officer in Illinois and Ohio. Hovey estimated that 39 states will have deficits by 2006 if current economic assumptions hold. Hovey described higher education as "a balance wheel in state finance," which means it receives higher-than-average appropriations when times are good (as in the late 1990s) and lower-than-average appropriations when times are bad (as in the late 1980s and early 1990s). Consequently, if predictions of state deficits come to pass, the outlook for higher education is not very good, Hovey wrote.¹⁹

This report is the second report in a four-part series by the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research that examines key issues in the governance of higher education. The first report, *Reorganizing Higher Education in North Carolina: What History Tells Us About Our Future*, is a historical review of the N.C. General Assembly's decision in 1971 to restructure North Carolina's public university system. That report was released in June 1999. The third report will analyze the powers of the UNC Board of Governors and the system of election of the Board by the North Carolina legislature compared to the process of selection used by other states. The fourth report will examine how well the University of North Carolina governance system has fulfilled its multiple missions under the guidance of the UNC Board of Governors since its establishment in 1972.

This report does not make recommendations nor does it draw causal inferences. Rather, the information presented is intended to highlight various facts, statistics, and statutes relevant to higher education across the country in order to provide a broad perspective and basis of comparison. We hope it serves as a resource for policymakers, people in higher education, the media, and the public for years to come. ☐

FOOTNOTES

¹ Aims C. McGuinness Jr., "Essay," *1997 Postsecondary Education Structures Sourcebook: State Coordinating and Governing Boards*, Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO: 1997, pp. 31-33.

² *Ibid.* at p. 33.

³ *Ibid.* at pp. 38-40.

⁴ *Ibid.* at pp. 34-39.

⁵ Aims McGuinness Jr., as quoted by Barbara Solow in *Reorganizing Higher Education Governance: What History Tells Us About Our Future*, North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research, Raleigh, NC: 1999, p. 3.

⁶ In February 2000, the University of North Carolina Board of Governors approved tuition increases at five of the system's 16 universities. Likewise, in March 2000, they approved fee increases at these same schools. Thus, while North Carolina's average cost of tuition and fees will increase, its ranking will still be one of the lowest in the country.

⁷ In 1999, the University of North Carolina Board of Governors, at the request of the N.C. General Assembly, commissioned a private consultant to study faculty salaries. The consultant, MGT Inc., compared average salaries and benefits on UNC campuses for four professorial ranks, from instructors to full professors, with their respective peer institutions across the country. Using public universities as the comparison, the study concluded that UNC system schools need an extra \$28.3 million each year to raise average salaries into the top 20 percent range. But comparing UNC schools with both their public and private peer institutions added an additional \$13.8 million to the figure.

⁸ Constitution of North Carolina, Article IX, Section 9.

⁹ In March 2000, the West Virginia Legislature passed a bill affecting the current governance structure of higher education in the state. Effective June 30, 2000, both the State College System Board of Directors and the University System Board of Trustees are abolished. A Higher Education Policy Commission will be created in July 2000 for policy development and other statewide issues. The Policy Commission is to employ a Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, Vice Chancellor for Administration, and Vice Chancellor for Community and Technical Colleges and Workforce Education. During the transition year of July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001, a statewide interim governing board is the governing board for public higher education. Each institution in the state will have its own governing board which will assume governance authority on July 1, 2001.

¹⁰ *Miles To Go: A Report on Black Students and Postsecondary Education in the South*, Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, GA: 1998, p. 23.

¹¹ Education Commission of the States, *1997 State Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook*, Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1997, p. 20.

¹² As quoted in Peter Schmidt, "States Make Healthy Increases in Spending on Higher Education," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Washington, DC: June 25, 1999, p. A39.

¹³ Sara Hebel, "A New Governor's Approach Rankles Colleges in Colorado," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Washington, DC: October 29, 1999, p. A44.

¹⁴ Peter Schmidt, "Rancor and Confusion Greet a Change in South Carolina's Budgeting System," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Washington, DC: April 4, 1997, p. A26.

¹⁵ Peter Schmidt, "Governors Want Fundamental Changes in Colleges, Question Place of Tenure," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Washington, DC: June 19, 1998, p. A38.

¹⁶ Peter Schmidt, "More Money for Public Higher Education," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Washington, DC: June 12, 1998, p. A30.

¹⁷ Schmidt, note 12 above, p. A39.

¹⁸ "State Budget Actions 1999," National Conference of State Legislatures, Denver, CO: March 2000, pp. 22-23.

¹⁹ "What's Ahead for Higher Ed?," *State Policy Reports*, Vol. 17, Issue 6 (September 1999), Denver, CO, p. 22. State Policy Research prepared *State Spending for Higher Education in the Next Decade: The Battle to Sustain Current Support for the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education* in San Jose, California.