



Board of Regents

AGENDA - SPECIAL MEETING

10:00 a.m., Thursday, November 18, 2021

Conducted Via Remote Participation

Meeting will stream live at: <https://youtu.be/lxnBayT5KmU>

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call & Declaration of Quorum**
2. **Adoption of Agenda**
3. **Draft 2022 BOR Calendar** – Due to be adopted at December 16, 2021 BOR Meeting
4. **National Issues and Governance Challenges for Higher Education Systems**
Presented by Dr. Sally Johnstone and Aims McGuinness
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
5. **Adjourn**

Please note: There is no invitation for public comment at Special Meetings of the Board of Regents.



Board of Regents for Higher Education

2022 Meeting Schedule

Student Advisory Committee 10 am Fridays	Faculty Advisory Committee 1 pm Fridays	Academic and Student Affairs 9:30 am Fridays	Audit 10 am Tuesdays	HR & Administration 9:30 am Thursdays	Finance & Infrastructure 10 am Wednesdays	Executive Committee 10 am Thursdays	Board of Regents 10 am Thursdays
	January 21						
February 11	February 4	February 4		February 3	February 9		February 24
March 4	March 11	March 11			March 16	March 10	March 24
April 22	April 8	April 8		April 7			April 21
May 13	May 6	May 6	May 9		May 11		May 19
June 10	June 3	June 3		June 1	June 8	June 9	June 23
	July 15						
	August 19					August 25	
September 16	September 9	September 9		September 8	September 14		September 22
October 14	October 7	October 7		October 13	October 12		October 20
	November 18						
December 9	December 2	December 2	December 6	December 1	December 7	December 8	December 15

State Higher Education Structures and Institutional Accreditation

Background Information for Consideration of Alternatives for the Future

Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.
Senior Fellow
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
3035 Center Green Drive, Suite 150
Boulder, Colorado 80301-2251

March 2021

Purpose of paper

The purpose of this paper is to provide background information for accrediting organizations on the state structures and systems within which public institutions of higher education function.

Accreditation traditionally focuses on an “institution of higher education.” The model is a stand-alone college or university with the traditional structure of a governing board and chief executive officer, a single faculty, academic structure and other dimensions commonly found in a single institution. The single-institutional focus of accreditation stems from its origins as a process created by peer institutions voluntarily engaging in quality assurance.

The reality, however, is that most public institutions function within a framework of state governmental structure (e.g., the governor, state legislature, state budget office, and other state agencies), and statewide coordination and system governance. In fact, 60.1 percent of the 18 million students enrolled in public higher education attend institutions that are legally within the jurisdiction of system or multi-institutional governing bodies. Most of the remaining separately governed institutions are within the jurisdiction of a statewide or sector coordinating agency. In other words, 95 percent of the enrollment is within institutions within the coordinating and/or governing authority of an entity beyond the single institution.¹ These entities have legal authority and responsibility related to key domains relevant to accreditation: mission and purpose, governance, administrative structures, curriculum, teaching and learning resources, funding and budget, institutional or programmatic outcomes (e.g., student retention and graduation, further education, or job placement), and student learning outcomes.²

Accrediting commission standards recognize this reality of “multi-level” structures in various ways, most often by requiring an institution to describe the lines of authority and responsibility between the institution and its governing body.

However, there are extraordinary variations in higher education structures across the country. These structures are unique to each state and reflect unique histories and cultures. An attempt to generalize the experience of a single state or system to others can lead to serious misjudgments regarding authority and responsibility for the intended outcomes of accrediting standards.

There are also significant variations in how regional accrediting agencies accredit complex institutions with multiple campuses. Generally, a “system” or multiple campus university is more likely to be accredited as a single institution the more academically integrated the campuses are with a “main” campus and all campuses share a similar mission. However, several institutions are accredited as single universities despite the reality of great variation in mission and degree of independence among component campuses.

The future sustainability of most public colleges and universities will depend on their ability to achieve economies-of-scale in every dimension of their missions through collaboration with other institutions, and in particular, by taking advantage of being part of a public higher education system. Early in the development of multi-campus universities, the pattern was for branch campuses to devolve into independently accredited institutions with a degree of separation in mission, faculty governance, and academic programs from the main or “root” campus. Accreditors are facing an increasing number of proposals for system and institutional consolidation and for “single accreditation” of systems in which the component institutions previously had their own independent accreditation.

The intent of this paper is to give accreditation team members, most of whom come from an institutional perspective of academic officers, faculty, or other institutional positions, an introduction to the complexity of the “system” structure of public higher education.

Overview of state postsecondary education structures

Difference between coordinating boards and governing boards

In discussing state structures, it is important to distinguish between two basic types of entities.³

Governing boards

All states assign responsibility for governing public colleges and universities to one or more boards most often composed of a majority of lay citizens representing the public interest. The names of these boards vary, but "board of trustees" and "board of regents" are the most common. Common responsibilities of public governing boards include:⁴

Governing boards generally are responsible for a single corporate entity, including all the rights and responsibilities of that corporation as defined by state law and, if a system board, encompassing all institutions within a system. Individual institutions within the board's jurisdiction usually do not have separate corporate status. Governing boards are responsible for appointing, setting the compensation for, and evaluating both system and institutional chief executives, maintaining the institution's assets (human, programmatic and physical) and ensuring alignment of these assets with institutional mission. Within systems, the governing board may also award academic degrees and establish faculty and other personnel policies, including approving awarding of tenure and entering into collective bargaining agreements. Governing boards commonly approve new academic units and academic programs and require periodic program review/evaluation. Through the system and institutional chief executives, governing boards hold institutions accountability for performance (including, in many cases, student outcomes) in relationship to institutional mission.

Coordinating boards or agencies

Coordinating boards perform functions such as planning for the state's postsecondary system as a whole, regulating changes in institutional missions and proposals for new academic programs, administering state student financial aid programs, and regulating non-state institutions. Coordinating boards often hold institutions and or systems accountable for performance in relation to state goals regarding student and institutional outcomes. Many coordinating boards also review institutional budgets and make recommendations to the Governor and state legislature for operating and capital budgets or for formulas that allocate state appropriations among institutions. They coordinate multiple public institutions and/or systems each of which has a separate governing board. Coordinating boards do not govern institutions, in the sense defined above (e.g., appoint institutional chief executives or set faculty personnel policies). Coordinating boards/agencies generally do not have a corporate status independent of state government.

Variations in structures among states

Public institutions function in all fifty states function under the jurisdiction of a statewide coordinating board or a higher education system board, and in some cases, both kinds of entities. At the baccalaureate/graduate level, the only exception to this pattern is Michigan.

- In 21 states, a state coordinating board is responsible for statewide coordination of all higher education. Within this framework, public institutions are governed by boards responsible for multiple or single institutions.

- Most coordinating boards have responsibilities for statewide planning and the budgetary process.
- With only a few exceptions, coordinating boards must approve changes in public institutional missions and new academic programs. Several have authority to review existing academic programs.
- In 9 states, one board governs all public institutions.

In the remaining 20 states, there is no overarching coordinating entity. Within these states, with the exceptions of Delaware, Michigan, and Wyoming, most of the public institutions are governed by boards responsible for several institutions in a variety of configurations outlined in the following section of this paper. Appendix A displays the complexity of these relationships across the US.

State cultures for regulation and oversight

States vary in terms of the legal status of public colleges and universities and the extent to which institutions are subject to state budgetary and/or procedural controls. Figure 1 illustrates the range of oversight cultures from high regulatory control to low regulatory control. Two states’ public higher education structures may appear to be similar, but they may operate in entirely different state oversight contexts. The areas of direct state involvement tend to be in non-academic areas such as budget and appropriations, capital development, non-academic human resources, procurement, environmental protection, and health and safety (e.g., state mandates related to Covid-19).⁵ Examples of typical variations:

- Among states with governing board systems, most of them appropriate funds to the system governing board and that board has authority to allocate resources among institutions. In a few states, the state determines the allocation to each institution within the system and appropriates funds directly to those units. In these cases, the system governing board has limited authority regarding allocation of state funds among constituent institutions.
- Several states retain significant regulatory control of capital development (e.g., approval of construction of new state-funded facilities, selection of architects and contractors, and other details) that in other states are matters under the control of the system governing board.
- Several states grant the major public university greater procedural autonomy than other state universities, especially state universities that evolved from normal schools originally governed by the state board of education.

Figure 1. Levels of State Control and Institutional Legal Status: United States.

High Regulatory Control	A. Institution as State Agency	Tertiary education institutions are treated in a manner like other state agencies such as the transportation/highway department
	B. State-Controlled Institution	The distinctiveness of tertiary education institutions from other state agencies is recognized, but most of the budget and financing policies applied to other state agencies are also applied to tertiary education
	C. State-Aided Institution	Tertiary education institutions have a legal status according them substantial autonomy from state government. State provides base, categorical, and capital funding but with expectation of substantial non-state funding (tuition, private giving, etc.).

Low Regulatory Control	D. Corporate Model for Institutional Governance	As in model C, institutions have a legal status (e.g., public corporation) according them substantial autonomy. The expectation of state funding is less certain and may be allocated not in grants to the institution but in the form of vouchers or grants to students to offset tuition charges
-------------------------------	---	--

Source: McGuinness, A.C. Jr. (2006). A Conceptual and Analytical Framework for Review of National Regulatory Policies and Practices in Higher Education. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Education Committee, February 17, 2006 Educ/EC (3),

The varied structures for coordination and governance of community and technical colleges across the states adds another level of complexity to the national picture. Most of the literature regarding higher education systems focuses on systems of baccalaureate and graduate level institutions. As described in the following section, several member systems in the National Association of System Heads (NASHE) include community college campuses (see Appendix C); however, most are systems of university-level institutions or campuses.

Because of the need to understand the variations in both kinds of systems, this paper first discusses higher education systems that are composed primarily (but not exclusively) of university-level institutions, and then in the following section, describes the coordination and governance of community college and technical colleges.

Higher education systems at the baccalaureate and graduate level

The systems discussed in this section include primarily institutions at the baccalaureate and graduate levels; however, several also include colleges and two-year branches. NASHE defines a public higher education system as “a group of two or more colleges or universities, each having substantial autonomy and headed by a chief executive or operating officer, all under a single governing board which is served by a system chief executive officer.”⁶ NASHE membership includes 40 systems in 28 states. This paper broadens the scope of systems to include several other “systems” in which a single governing board is responsible for multiple public institutions, and campuses or branches. An understanding of these other “systems” is important for accreditors because they all involve to some degree the distribution of authority and responsibility in complex organizations under a single governing board for the key domains of accreditation.⁷

Governing systems vary significantly in the extent to which they grant academic, financial, organizational, and staffing autonomy to individual campuses. Some systems are composed of largely autonomous institutions with a system staff carrying out basic financial and legal functions necessary to support the system governing board. Other systems are highly integrated with the system leadership carrying out a broad range of functions that accreditors typically assume to be centered at the campus level: academic planning, systemwide information systems, finance and budgeting functions, and the operation of complex shared-services functions. Systems also vary in the extent to which academic staff/faculty are engaged in system-level decision-making. Some systems have strong traditions of shared governance (e.g., system-level faculty senates), while others engage faculty primarily at the campus-level. Several systems have systemwide collective bargaining for faculty and non-academic staff through which basic conditions for appointment, termination, salary-levels, and faculty workloads are negotiated at the system level, not at each individual campus.

Appendix B shows 68 multi-campus institutions/systems listed in the left column according to the degree to which the component campuses are treated as separate institutions under a single board

versus functioning as academically integrated universities (with multiple geographically dispersed campuses). The latter institutions deliberately do not use the term “system.” Nevertheless, they exhibit much of the same complexity as entities identified as “systems” in the division of responsibility and authority for various academic and non-academic functions.

The major variables used to distinguish among these entities are:

- The role of the system CEO. As detailed in the list, the role of the system CEO ranges from a being staff to the governing board to being the “line” officer between the component institutions or campuses and the governing board. In the entities at the bottom of the list, the CEO is the CEO of a single institution with multiple units.
- Origins of the entities. Various schemes have been used over the years to classify systems (e.g., “flagship” systems, consolidated systems, or segmental systems.)^{8,9} Appendix B uses a simplified classification to distinguish among systems in three ways:
 - Systems designated as “R” are ones that evolved from a single “root” campus. Some evolved from the state’s Land Grant or “flagship” campus (extension centers or branches that evolved into full scale campuses). Others evolved as branches of a state university. The reason why this origin is important is that these systems tend to have a structure which retains much of the characteristics of the founding institution in terms of the authority of the system CEO, the scope of the system office’s academic authority, and the “line” relationship between the system CEO and the campus CEOs.
 - Systems designated as “C” were formed through consolidation of several institutions or systems under a single board. In the history of these systems each component institution functioned with significant independence and identify. There was never a presumption of the system as a single, academically integrated entity.
 - Several systems designated as “R” are also designed as “C” because over the years states have merged other institutions or systems with the original “flagship” system. The most common pattern was for systems of state colleges/universities (former normal schools) to be consolidated with the flagship university “R” system. Examples include the merger of the former state colleges in Maine with the University of Maine to create the University of Maine System in 1968, and the merger of the Wisconsin State University System with the University of Wisconsin in 1973-75. More recent examples include the merger of multiple universities into Texas A&M University System and the University of Texas System, and several previously separately governed state universities and community colleges under either the University of Arkansas or Arkansas State University.
 - Systems designed as “S” evolved from “segmental” systems—systems composed of institutions with the same or similar missions (e.g., research universities, non-doctoral granting state universities, and community colleges). Clark Kerr used this designation to distinguish between the University of California, California State University, and the California Community Colleges. In Appendix B, the systems designated as “S” are primarily those that evolved from state normal schools to be state colleges and then, in most cases, state universities. In most states, these institutions were originally governed by the state board of education and then transferred to an independent governing board in the 1960s. While these institutions have similar missions and configuration of academic programs (education, business, health professions, and arts and sciences), each institution within a “segmental” system tends to function as an independent entity under a single governing board. There is no presumption of the “system” functioning as an integrated academic unit with significant sharing of academic programs and resources among component institutions. In the current and future environment, drawing these institutions

together to create a more integrated academic entity with multiple campuses may be the only option for sustainability.

- Table 1 lists the multi-campus institutions/systems beginning with those in which the component campuses are treated as separate institutions with limited academic integration and then listing multi-campus institutions according to the degree of structural and academic integration among multiple geographically dispersed campuses: Governing boards for several separate public universities; system CEOs are separate from institutional CEOs.
- Governing boards for several separate state colleges (historically former normal schools); system CEOs are separate from institutional CEOs.
- Statewide governing boards for several separate public universities consolidated under one board; the system CEO is separate from institutional CEOs.
- University systems that evolved either from the state's major (usually Land-Grant) university and/or through campuses added through consolidation.
- University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main ("flagship") campus.
- Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university executive vice president/provost
- Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus.
- Accreditation status. Appendix B indicates which commission is responsible for accrediting the system/entity and whether the system is accredited as a single entity or whether each campus is accredited separately.

Community and Technical College Governance

Evolution of colleges

The governance of community and technical colleges across the 50 states defies easy description or classification. Each state's colleges evolved from unique state circumstances. Examples of development include:

- Colleges that evolved, often as junior colleges, primarily through local initiative on the basis of school districts and the K-12 system with limited state oversight.
- Colleges that developed through state law that established a framework for both local governance and a statewide structure for community college development.
- Colleges that evolved from postsecondary vocational/technical systems—usually linked to the state board for vocational education.
- Colleges that evolved from branch campuses linked to state universities.

Some states experienced the proliferation of two or more of these developments resulting in highly fragmented networks of less-than-baccalaureate-level institutions. Many of the governance controversies in the 1970s through the 1990s revolved around rationalizing these networks.

Patterns of state and system governance

As a result of the unique state evolution, community colleges vary widely in the forms of state and local governance (see Appendix C)

The powers of state-level structures differ according to three categories:

- System governing boards have broad powers related to the governance of the colleges within their jurisdiction. A distinguishing power is the authority to appoint or to approve the appointment of college-level presidents.
- Statewide coordinating boards have powers to strategically plan, allocate resources, hold colleges accountable for performance, and provide central services. However, these boards do not have authority to appoint college presidents. Each college functions as a separate entity under its own governing board.
- State regulatory agencies regulate locally governed community colleges and play only limited system coordinating functions.

Patterns of state and local funding

Community and technical colleges are generally financed from state and local sources in either of two ways:

- Funding from a combination of local tax resources and state appropriations. Local tax resources commonly come from:
 - Mill levies set by community college taxing districts or local governments.
 - Contributions/assessments paid by local governments.
- Funding from state appropriations without funding from local tax resources

In approximately 25 states, community and technical colleges receive a portion of their funding from local tax sources. State appropriations and student tuition and fees are the other principal

revenue sources. In the other 25 states, community and technical colleges are funded primarily from state appropriations with limited, if any, funding from local tax sources.

Relationship of governance to resources of funding

The level of centralization in community and technical college governance is generally related to the primary sources of funding (see Appendix D).

- Colleges that have significant levels of funding from local tax resources are generally governed by local boards that operate within the framework of overall statewide coordination or regulation. The state-level boards do not have governing authority as described above.
- Colleges that receive most of their funding from state appropriations are commonly governed by a system board. In some cases, the individual colleges have local advisory boards with authority delegated by the system board. In three states (Florida, Washington, and West Virginia), the colleges have local boards with broad governing powers and function within the framework of overall statewide coordination.

Governance of technical college systems

Technical college systems in several states evolved from vocational/technical systems established under the requirements of federal vocational education laws dating back to the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. These federal laws required that federally funded vocational education programs be under the supervision of a designated sole state agency, the state boards for vocational education. The legacy of these federal requirements is that postsecondary technical institutes or colleges in several states continue to be centrally governed and funded. Their principal sources of funding are state appropriations and student tuition and fees. These state-funded institutions exist in several states (e.g., Kansas, Pennsylvania, and Texas) in which most of the community colleges are locally governed and funded partially from local tax resources.

Accreditation status of community and technical colleges

The accreditation status of community colleges in different governance arrangements is displayed in Appendices E. In summary:

- Most community and technical colleges in statewide governing systems are individually accredited (Appendix E1). The exceptions to this pattern are the colleges within the Indiana Ivy Tech Community Colleges and the Connecticut State Community College which is moving toward accreditation as a single entity. In some cases (North Carolina, for example), individual colleges have several branches or centers and each of these is accredited as part of the main college)
- The accreditation status of community college campuses linked to single universities varies. In some cases, the accreditation of these campuses is linked that of a main campus. In other cases, the community college campus is independently accredited (Appendix E2). As illustrated in Appendix A, campuses of Ohio institutions, many of which are two-year branches, are now accredited with the main campus. At one time (prior to 1987 in most cases), these campuses were independently accredited.
- The dominant pattern for large community college districts, especially in urban areas, is that they are accredited as single units (Appendix E3). Exceptions in the community colleges in the California Community College Districts, Seattle Community College District (now moving toward single accreditation), Maricopa College, City Colleges of Chicago. The pattern has been for districts (e.g., the college districts in Florida such as Miami-

Dade) to move to single accreditation. A recent example of this change is the Dallas Community College District in 2020.

Trends in community and technical college governance

Just as governance structures are unique to each state, the major changes in state-level community college governance over the past fifty years have similarly taken place because of particular state circumstances.

The major governance changes, clustered according to common themes and illustrated by an example/case, were:

- **Consolidating two-year institutions under a single community and technical college board.** North Carolina (1979), Washington State (1991), Connecticut (1992), Kentucky (1997), Louisiana (1998). In each of these cases, states consolidated networks of two-year university campuses, community colleges and postsecondary technical institutions to form statewide systems. West Virginia (2000) established a state community (and technical) college system under statewide coordinating board and established local governing boards for each college.
- **Establishment of a statewide governing board for community colleges separate from the state board of education (the state K-12 board).** Alabama (2015) removed the community colleges from the jurisdiction of the state board of education and established a new board with responsibility for the community college system, the Alabama Technology Network (ATN), workforce development, and adult education.
- **Consolidating oversight of locally governed community colleges and state technical institutions under a statewide university governing board.** Kansas (1999) moved the statewide oversight of the locally governed community colleges and the state technical institutions from the State Board of Education to the Board of Regents, the statewide governing board for universities. The community colleges, however, retained their local governing authority.
- **Consolidating of community and technical colleges and access-oriented state universities under a single governing board.** Minnesota (1995) and Connecticut (2011) consolidated previously independent state community and technical college boards under a state-wide board also responsible for governing state universities (but not the states' major flagship university). Local college boards exist in neither of these states. A variation on this change was the consolidation of community colleges (renamed community campuses) in Alaska with the three university campuses (Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Southeast). The Board of Regents of the University of Alaska System governs these three universities.
- **Removing state universities from a governing board to establish a state board solely responsible for community colleges.** Tennessee (2016) removed state universities from the governing jurisdiction of the Tennessee Board of Regents. The regents had previously had responsibility for these universities as well as the community colleges and Tennessee Colleges of Applied Technology (TCAT). The new board is responsible only for the community colleges and TCAT campuses.
- **Expanding the mission of an existing technical college system.** Indiana (2005), Maine (2003) and New Hampshire (1999) reconfigured technical college systems to ensure that the full range of community college services (including transfer programs) might be available in every region of the state.

- **Eliminating a state-level coordinating board for locally governed community colleges.** Arizona (2003), a state with local elected boards and financing that includes local tax support, state appropriations and tuition, abolished the state-level coordinating board for community colleges. Arizona has rejected efforts to re-establish this entity.

Summary Points

1. Almost two-thirds of the students in public higher education attend institutions that are within the legal jurisdiction of a system or multi-institutional governing structure. These structures do not fit the “stand-alone” model upon which accreditation standards are based. Most of the remaining “stand-alone” institutions function within the oversight of a statewide higher education or community/technical college coordinating entity.
2. System governing boards and CEOs have legal responsibility for key domains directly relevant to institutional accreditation: mission, institutional leadership, quality of faculty and other human resources, and above all, for each component institution’s quality and sustainability. The wording of the standards of some of the accrediting organizations appear to suggest that institutions should somehow have a high degree of “autonomy” from the system governing board and CEO; yet it is these system entities that have ultimate legal responsibility for the institution. Each institution within the system operates within the framework of system board policies.
3. The systems under which most public institutions are governed vary enormously in the extent to which responsibility for key functions historically viewed as being campus responsibilities are consolidated at the system level. Generalizations from one system to another could be seriously misleading.
4. There are significant variations in how accrediting agencies accredit complex institutions with multiple campuses. Generally, a “system” or multiple campus university is more likely to be accredited as a single institution the more academically integrated the campuses are with a “main” campus and all campuses share a similar mission. However, several institutions are accredited as single universities despite the reality of great variation in mission and degree of independence among component campuses.

The increasing need for a systems approach to the organization of public higher education will require a fundamental rethinking of the “stand-alone” institutional model not only in accreditation standards but also in federal law and regulations governing eligibility for federal aid. Accreditation standards will need to evolve to ensure they are not barriers to the changes in governance structures and organizational forms that are designed to better serve students and meet state needs.

Appendix A. Authority of State Boards and Agencies of Higher Education, 2020

Type of Board	Coordinating Boards/Agencies with Authority to Coordinate all Higher Education			System Governing Board for All Public Institutions	No Statewide Board for All Higher Education		Higher Education Service Agencies (student aid, private HEI licensure, data)	
	Multiple Governing Boards for Systems and Public Institutions and				Two or more System Governing Boards and Several Institutional Governing Boards	Boards for Each Public HEI		
Statewide Planning Authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No state-level entity charged with authority for statewide planning/public agenda for all higher education; planning only for individual systems or institutions		Planning only for each HEI	
Budget Role	Consolidated or Aggregated Budget –All Public HEIs ¹	Review / and Recommend —All Public HEIs ¹	Limited budget role	Yes for public system	Budget role only for governing systems and public HEIs under each board's jurisdiction		Budget role only for each HEI	No or limited authority for statewide planning or in budget process
	AL AR ² CO ² IL IN KY LA MA ^{3,2} MD MO NM ^{4,2} OH ² OK SC TN WV	NE OR ⁵ TX VA	WA ^{6,2}	AK HI ID ⁷ KS ⁸ MT ⁹ NV ND SD UT DC PR	AZ CA ^{10,11} CT ¹² DE FL ^{7,10} GA ¹⁵ IA ¹⁰ ME ^{13,14} MN MS NH ¹⁵ NJ RI ^{7,15}	NY NC ¹⁵ PA VT ¹⁶ WI ¹⁵ WY ¹⁰	MI ¹⁷	AK AZ CA CT DE FL ^{7,13} IA MN ² NH NJ ^{18,2} NY ⁷ PA ^{7,2} WI DC PR
Totals	16	4	1	9, DC and PR	12	6	1	14 DC and PR

¹ Coordinating boards commonly develop the formulas for allocation of state appropriations and/or make recommendations for overall system funding but do not review and/or make recommendations on individual institutional budgets.

² The Governor plays a direct role in the appointment of the executive officer.

³ The Massachusetts Board of Higher Education serves as the coordinating board for all public higher education; however, the University of Massachusetts Systems is granted greater autonomy on certain oversight areas than the other state universities and community colleges, each of which has a separate governing board., .

⁴The New Mexico entity is a cabinet-level department headed by a Secretary of Higher Education. The department has authority to review, adjust and approve public university budgets prior to submission to the department of finance and administration and limited authority primarily to review and study but not to take formal action to approve academic programs or other institutional decisions.

⁵ In June 2011, Oregon established a new Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission for planning and coordination of the whole postsecondary education sector, including the community colleges and the Oregon University System. New entity has authority to approve changes in missions but not approval of specific academic programs. In 2013, legislation was enacted strengthening the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, transferring responsibility for the community colleges to this Commission, and authorizing public universities previously under the Board of Higher Education to have their own governing boards (three as of July 1, 2014 and the remainder as of July 2015).

⁶ Washington State Achievement Council makes overall recommendations on finance policy and strategic budget but does not review and make recommendations on institutional budgets.

⁷ State has a board/agency responsible for coordination of all levels of education (P/K-16/20). State boards/agencies New York and Pennsylvania have limited coordinating, not governing authority for public institutions. The Idaho State Board of Education has governing authority for public institutions and coordinates locally governed community colleges. The Rhode Island Board of Education has planning and coordinating responsibility for the P-20 system. The Florida State Board of Education has responsibility for policy direction and coordination of state's education system, P-20. Constitutional amendment passed in November 2002 created a Board of Governors for Universities. The State Board of Education retains overall responsibility for policy coordination for all education.

⁸ Kansas Board of Regents is a consolidated governing board for universities and coordinating board for locally governed community colleges and Washburn University.

⁹ The Montana Board of Regents serves as the governing body for state universities and the coordinating body for three locally governed community colleges.

¹⁰ One statewide board is a statewide coordinating/regulatory body for locally governed community colleges and/or postsecondary technical institutions.

¹¹ Effective July 1, 2011, the former coordinating board, the Connecticut Board of Governors, was eliminated. The Board of Regents for Higher Education governing body for the community-technical college, the state universities formerly within the Connecticut State University System, and Charter Oak State College. The University of Connecticut retains its own governing board. The Office of Higher Education is a higher education service entity for student aid and regulatory functions.

¹² One statewide board is a statewide governing board for community colleges and/or technical institutions.

¹³ Maine Maritime Academy is the only public institution with its own governing board outside a system.

¹⁴ One of the boards is a statewide governing board for community colleges and/or technical institutions.

¹⁵ The Rhode Island Council on Postsecondary Education governs Rhode Island College and the Community College of Rhode Island and the University of Rhode Island has a separate governing board.

¹⁶ Vermont has no statutory planning/coordinating entity. Vermont Higher Education Council is voluntary.

¹⁷ Michigan State Board of Education has Constitutional authority for overall planning and coordination of the state's education system, but because of the Constitutional autonomy of the state universities and local governance of community colleges, the State Board does not function as a statewide higher education coordinating agency.

¹⁸ The Governor's reorganization plan in June 2011 eliminated the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education and transferred its authority and duties to a Secretary of Higher Education who is appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. The Governor's Higher Education Council serves as an advisory body to the Secretary and the Governor.

Appendix B. Higher Education Systems

Governing boards for several separate public universities consolidated under one board; system CEOs are separate from institutional CEOs	NASH Member	Origin ¹⁰ (see key in endnote)	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs reports to board; limited shared services	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs report to board through system CEO; limited shared services	System CEO leads system; institutional CEOs report to the system CEO; extensive shared services	University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main ("flagship") campus	Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university executive vice president or provost	Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus	Accreditation	Single accreditation	Each individually accredited
Rhode Island Council on Postsecondary Education	C	x							NEC	x	
Arizona Board of Regents	C	x							HLC	x	
Idaho Board of Education/Board of Regents	C								NW	x	
Iowa Board of Regents	C	x							HLC	x	
Kansas Board of Regents	C	x							HLC	x	
Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning	x	C	x						NW	x	
Montana University System	x	C	x						NW	x	

South Dakota Board of Regents	x	NASH Member C Origin ¹⁰ (see key in endnote) x	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs reports to board; limited shared services System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs report to board through system CEO; limited shared services System CEO leads system; institutional CEOs report to the system CEO; extensive shared services University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main (“flagship”) campus Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university exec vice president or provost Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus	HLC	x	Accreditation Single accreditation Each individually accredited
Governing boards for several separate state colleges (historically former normal schools); system CEOs are separate from institutional CEOs						
Nebraska State College System	x	S	x	HLC	x	
Vermont State Colleges		S	x	NEC	x	
University systems including several separate state universities; system CEOs are separate from institutional CEOs						
Southern Illinois System	x	R	x	HLC		
New Mexico State University System	x	R	x	HLC		
Texas State University System	x	C	x	SACS		

	NASH Member	Origin ¹⁰ (see key in endnote)	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs reports to board; limited shared services	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs report to board through system CEO; limited shared services	System CEO leads system; institutional CEOs report to the system CEO; extensive shared services	University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main (“flagship”) campus	Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university exec vice president or provost	Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus	Accreditation	Single accreditation	Each individually accredited
Texas Tech University System	x	C		x					SACS		
University System of New Hampshire	x	C		x					NEC	x	
University of North Texas System	x	R		x					SACS		
Connecticut Colleges and Universities		C			x				NEC	x ¹	
Utah System of Higher Education	x	C			x				NW CEO	x	
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education	x	S			x				MS	x	
Minnesota State University	x	C			x				HLC	x	

University systems that evolved either from the state’s major (usually Land-Grant) university and/or through campuses added through consolidation

¹ The Connecticut State Colleges and Universities is working toward single accreditation through NECHE for the Connecticut Community College.

	NASH Member	Origin ¹⁰ (see key in endnote)	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs reports to board; limited shared services	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs report to board through system CEO; limited shared services	System CEO leads system; institutional CEOs report to the system CEO; extensive shared services	University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main (“flagship”) campus	Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university exec vice president or provost	Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus	Accreditation	Single accreditation	Each individually accredited
University of Alaska	x	R			x				NW	x	
University of Alabama		R			x				SACS	x	
University of Arkansas		C			x				HLC	x	
	x	R			x				WAS	x	
University of California									C		
	x	S			x				WAS	x	
California State University ²									C		
	x	R		x					HLC		
Colorado State University		C									
University of Colorado	x	R			x				HLC	x	
University System of Florida		C			x				SACS	x	
University System of Georgia	x	C			x				SACS	x	
University of Illinois	x	R			x				HLC	x	

² California State University evolved from the state’s normal schools originally governed by the state board of education.

	NASH Member	Origin ¹⁰ (see key in endnote)	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs reports to board; limited shared services	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs report to board through system CEO; limited shared services	System CEO leads system; institutional CEOs report to the system CEO; extensive shared services	University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main (“flagship”) campus	Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university exec vice president or provost	Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus	Accreditation	Single accreditation
University of Maine System	x	R			x				NEC	x ³
University System of Maryland	x	C			x				MS	x
University of Massachusetts System	x	R			x				NEC	x
University of Nebraska	x	R			x				HLC	x
Nevada System of Higher Education	x	C			x				NW	x
City University of New York	x	C			x				MS	x
State University of New York	x	C			x				MS	x
University of North Carolina	x	C			x				SACS	x
	x	R			x				SACS	x
University of Tennessee System		C								
Texas A&M University System	x	C			x				SACS	x
University of Texas System	x	C			x				SACS	x

³ The University of Maine system is working toward single accreditation through NECHE.

	NASH Member	Origin ¹⁰ (see key in endnote)	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs reports to board; limited shared services	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs report to board through system CEO; limited shared services	System CEO leads system; institutional CEOs report to the system CEO; extensive shared services	University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main (“flagship”) campus	Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university exec vice president or provost	Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus	Accreditation	Single accreditation	Each individually accredited
University of Michigan	R							HLC	x		
University of Minnesota	R							HLC		x	
Rutgers University	R							MS	x		
	C										
University of Washington	R							NW	x		
University of South Carolina	R							SACS		x	
Indiana University	R							HLC	x	x ⁴	
Purdue University	R							HLC	x	x	

Single university geographically dispersed. Academically

⁴ Both Indiana University and Purdue University have unique “matrix” structures in which some of the campuses are independently accredited but academic programs from the main campuses (West Lafayette for Purdue and Bloomington and Indiana University Purdue University (IUPUI)) are delivered on other campuses, including some of the other university.

	NASH Member	Origin ¹⁰ (see key in endnote)	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs reports to board; limited shared services	System CEO primarily staff to board and leading system; Institutional CEOs report to board through system CEO; limited shared services	System CEO leads system; institutional CEOs report to the system CEO; extensive shared services	University Systems in which the system CEO also serves as CEO of main (“flagship”) campus	Universities with several campuses; campus CEOs report to the university exec vice president or provost	Single university geographically dispersed. Academically integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus	Accreditation	Single accreditation	Each individually accredited
integrated; programs at campuses linked to main campus											
University of Connecticut	R						x	NEC	x		
Pennsylvania State University	R						x	MS	x		
Washington State University	R						x	HLC	x		
							x	HLC	x		
West Virginia University	C										
University of New Mexico	R						x	HLC	x		
Kent State University	R						x	HLC	x		
Ohio State University	R						x	HLC	x		
Ohio University	R						x	HLC	x		
Bowling Green State University	R						x	HLC	x		
Miami University	R						x	HLC	x		
University of Akron	R						x	HLC	x		
Wright State University	R						x	HLC	x		
University of Pittsburgh	R						x	MS	x		
Troy State	R						x	SACS	x		
Auburn University	R						x	SACS		x	

Appendix C - Patterns of State Coordination and Governance of Community Colleges and Other Two-Year Institutions

State	State Board of Education <i>Coordinates and Regulates</i> Community Colleges	Consolidated Governing Board for Both Two- and Four-year institutions <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges	Coordinating Board for All Higher Education <i>Coordinates</i> Locally Governed Community Colleges	Independent State Board <i>Coordinates</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Independent State Board <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Four-year Institutions have Two-year Branches	Postsecondary Technical Institutes Organized Separately From Community Colleges	Some Four-year Institutions Offer Associate Degree Programs
Alabama					X			X
Alaska		X				X (2)		X (2)
Arizona								
Arkansas			X			X		X
California				X				
Colorado				X (3)	X (3)			
Connecticut		X						
Delaware					X			
Florida	X (4)			X (4)			X (4)	
Georgia		X			X(5)			
Hawaii		X						
Idaho	X (6)	X (6)					X (6)	X (6)
Illinois				X				
Indiana					X (7)			
Iowa	X							
Kansas		X (8)						X
Kentucky					X			X
Louisiana					X	X		X
Maine					X			X
Maryland			X					
Massachusetts			X					
Michigan	X (9)							X

State	State Board of Education <i>Coordinates and Regulates</i> Community Colleges	Consolidated Governing Board for Both Two- and Four-year institutions <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges	Coordinating Board for All Higher Education <i>Coordinates</i> Locally Governed Community Colleges	Independent State Board <i>Coordinates</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Independent State Board <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Four-year Institutions have Two-year Branches	Postsecondary Technical Institutes Organized Separately From Community Colleges	Some Four-year Institutions Offer Associate Degree Programs
Minnesota		X						
Mississippi				X				
Missouri			X				X	X
Montana		X (10)						
Nebraska			X (11)					
Nevada		X						
New Hampshire					X			
New Jersey			X				X (12)	
New Mexico			X (13)			X	X	X
New York		X (14)						
North Carolina					X			
North Dakota		X						X
Ohio			X			X	X	X
Oklahoma			X		X	X	X	
Oregon			X					
Pennsylvania			X			X	X	X
Rhode Island		X						
South Carolina					X (15)	X		X
South Dakota							X	X
Tennessee					X (16)			
Texas			X			X	X	X
Utah		X (17)						
Vermont		X					X	
Virginia					X			
Washington				X				
West Virginia					X			X
Wisconsin				X		X		

State	State Board of Education <i>Coordinates and Regulates</i> Community Colleges	Consolidated Governing Board for Both Two- and Four-year institutions <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges	Coordinating Board for All Higher Education <i>Coordinates</i> Locally Governed Community Colleges	Independent State Board <i>Coordinates</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Independent State Board <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Four-year Institutions have Two-year Branches	Postsecondary Technical Institutes Organized Separately From Community Colleges	Some Four-year Institutions Offer Associate Degree Programs
Wyoming				X				
Puerto Rico		X						
District of Columbia		X						

Notes:

- (1) Community Colleges and technical institutions are both under jurisdiction of the State Board of Education but organized separately.
- (2) Former community colleges have been integrated with three UA universities.
- (3) Colorado Board is a governing board for state-operated community colleges and coordinating board for locally governed colleges.
- (4) Florida State Board of Education's jurisdiction includes both the coordinating agency for community colleges and the administrative entity for technical institutions but these units function separately.
- (5) Technical College System of Georgia.
- (6) Idaho State Board is responsible for all levels of education, including coordinating two local governed community colleges, governing universities that have community college missions and the technical colleges.
- (7) Ivy Tech Community College Board of Trustees.
- (8) Kansas Board of Regents governs four-year institutions but coordinates locally governed community colleges.
- (9) Michigan Department of Education has limited authority to only approve certain career and technical programs as recommended by local community colleges
- (10) Montana Board of Regents has a coordinating responsibility for local community colleges. Former vocational/technical centers are now linked to one of the two universities.
- (11) In addition to the formal role of the Nebraska coordinating board, a state association performs a voluntary coordinating role for the locally governed community colleges.
- (12) New Jersey postsecondary vocational-technical institutions are under the authority of the Department of Education.
- (13) Statewide coordination by New Mexico Department of Higher Education
- (14) SUNY includes both community colleges that are partially financed at the county level, as well as five state-funded colleges of technology. CUNY includes several community colleges.
- (15) South Carolina State Board of Technical and Comprehensive Education.
- (16) Tennessee community colleges and technical institutes/colleges are both under the state Board of Regents but function separately.
- (17) Utah College of Applied Technology and community colleges are both governed by the State Board of Regents.

Appendix D -- Patterns of State and System Governance for Community and Technical Colleges Related to Level of Funding from Local Tax Sources

Most Community and Technical Colleges Receive a Percentage of Funding from Local Tax Sources (Total=25). Most colleges in these states have local governing boards Level of centralization: High to low, left to right					Most Community and Technical Colleges Receive Are State-Funded and Do <u>Not</u> Have Funding from Local Tax Sources (25) Except as noted, colleges in these states do not have local boards Level of centralization: High to low, left to right				
	Governing Board	Coordinating Board	Regulatory Agency	No state agency		Governing Board	Coordinating Board	Regulatory Agency	No state agency
Arizona				X	Alabama	X *			
Arkansas	X	X			Alaska	X			
California		X			Colorado	X *			
Idaho	X	X			Connecticut	X			
Iowa			X		Delaware	X			
Illinois		X			Florida		X		
Kansas		X			Georgia	X			
Maryland		X			Hawaii	X			
Michigan				X	Indiana	X			
Mississippi		X			Kentucky	X			
Missouri		X			Louisiana	X			
Montana	X	X			Maine	X			
Nebraska		X			Massachusetts	X *			
North Carolina	X				Minnesota	X			

Most Community and Technical Colleges Receive a Percentage of Funding from Local Tax Sources (Total=25). Most colleges in these states have local governing boards Level of centralization: High to low, left to right					Most Community and Technical Colleges Receive Are State-Funded and Do <u>Not</u> Have Funding from Local Tax Sources (25) Except as noted, colleges in these states do not have local boards Level of centralization: High to low, left to right				
	Governing Board	Coordinating Board	Regulatory Agency	No state agency		Governing Board	Coordinating Board	Regulatory Agency	No state agency
New Jersey		X			Nevada	X			
New Mexico		X			New Hampshire	X			
New York		X			North Dakota	X			
Ohio		X			Rhode Island	X			
Oklahoma		X			South Dakota	X			
Oregon		X			Tennessee	X			
Pennsylvania			X		Utah	X *			
South Carolina	X				Vermont	X			
Texas	X				Virginia	X *			
Wisconsin		X			Washington State		X		
Wyoming		X			West Virginia		X		

Notes: * States that have local advisory boards for community colleges with authority from system governing board

Aims McGuinness, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), September 2014

Appendix E (1) Accreditation of Community and Technical Colleges within Statewide University and/or Community or Technical College Governing Systems

State	Community or Technical College Governing Entity (State board, higher education system board, or district board)	Accreditation	Individual colleges accredited separately	System or district accredited as a whole	Notes
AR	Community colleges within the University of Arkansas or Arkansas State University Systems	HLC	x		
CT	Connecticut State College and University System New college will be called CT State CC	NE	x	See note	CSCU working with NECHE toward single accreditation for Connecticut State Community College as a unified entity
	Georgia Technical College System (associate degrees and certificates)	SACS	x		Each technical college accredited separately
HI	University of Hawaii System Community Colleges	ACCJC	x		
ID	Colleges of East Idaho, Southern Idaho, West Idaho, and North Idaho College	NW	x		
IN	Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana	HLC		x	Multiple campuses accredited as one entity
KY	Kentucky Community and Technical College System	SACS	x		
LA	Louisiana Community and Technical College System	SACS COE	x		

State	Community or Technical College Governing Entity (State board, higher education system board, or district board)	Accreditation	Individual colleges accredited separately	System or district accredited as a whole	Notes
	Two-Year campuses in the LSU and Southern University Systems	SACS	x		
ME	Maine Community College System	NE	x		
MN	All community college campuses of Minnesota State University	HLC	x		
MT	Board of Regents, Montana University System: All two-year colleges linked to Montana State University and University of Montana as well as community colleges within jurisdiction of Board of Regents	NW	x		All two-year (associate degrees and certificates) campuses and community colleges are independently accredited
NV	Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education, community college campuses	NW	x		
NH	Community College System of New Hampshire	NE	x		
NY	State University of New York (SUNY), Thirty (30) Community Colleges	MS	x		
	City University of New York (CUNY), Seven (7) Community Colleges	MS	x		
NC	State Board for Community Colleges	SACS	x	(see note)	All locations (branches or centers) of community colleges accredited as single college
ND	North Dakota University System: State Colleges offering associate degree and certificate programs (Bismarck, Lake	HLC	x		

State	Community or Technical College Governing Entity (State board, higher education system board, or district board)	Accreditation	Individual colleges accredited separately	System or district accredited as a whole	Notes
	Region, Dakota College at Bottineau, ND State College of Science, Williston State College)				
RI	Council on Postsecondary Education: Community College of Rhode Island	NE	x		
SC	South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education	SACS	x		
SD	South Dakota Department of Education: Four Technical Colleges: Lake Area, Mitchell, Southeast, and Western Dakota. Associate degrees and certificates	HLC	x		
TN	Tennessee Board of Regents: Community Colleges	SACS	x		
	Tennessee Board of Regents: Tennessee Colleges of Applied Technology	COE	x		
UT	Utah System of Higher Education	NW	x		
	Utah System of Higher Education Technical Colleges	COE	x		
VT	Vermont State Colleges: Community College of Vermont	NE		x (see note)	Single college with multiple delivery sites
VA	Virginia Community College System	SACS	x		

Appendix E (2) Accreditation of Community and Technical Colleges Campuses Linked to University

State	Community or Technical College Governing Entity (State board, higher education system board, or district board)		Individual colleges accredited separately	Accreditation linked to university campus	Notes
AK	University of Alaska System			x	Community campus accreditation linked to accreditation of UAF, UAA or UASE
DC	District of Columbia Community College of the University of District of Columbia			x	Accredited as part of University of DC
LA	Two-Year campuses in the LSU and Southern University Systems	SACS	x		
NM	New Mexico State: Three campuses (Alamogordo, Carlsbad and Dona Ana Community College) at associate degree and certificate level	HLC	x		
	University of New Mexico: Four campuses (Gallop, Los Alamos, Taos, Valencia) at associate degree and certificate level	HLC		x	
WI	University of Wisconsin Colleges	HLC		x	UW Colleges moved from accreditation as single entity to each college being linked (including accreditation) to one of the UW system campuses

Appendix E (3) Accreditation of Community and Technical Colleges within Multi-College Districts

State	Community College Districts		Individual colleges accredited separately	System or district accredited as a whole	Notes
AZ	Maricopa Community College	HLC	x		
	Pima Community College	HLC		x	
CA	California Community College System	ACJC	x		Community colleges within districts are each accredited separately
FL	28 Florida Colleges (e.g., Miami-Dade and Valencia Colleges) each organized as a district under a board of trustees with multiple campuses and locations	SACS		x	All campuses within a district (college) are covered by a single accreditation
IL	City Colleges of Chicago	HLC	x		Each college accredited separately
MD	Baltimore Community College	MS		x	All campuses moved from independent to single accreditation
MO	Metropolitan Community College, Kansas City	HLC		x	Moved from independent to single accreditation in 1986
	St. Louis Community College, St. Louis, MO			x	Moved from independent to single accreditation in 1986

State	Community College Districts		Individual colleges accredited separately	System or district accredited as a whole	Notes
OH	Multi-campus, multi-site community colleges (e.g., Cuyahoga Community College)	HLC		x	All multi-campus, multi-site community colleges have single accreditation
OR	Portland Community College: Four campuses and multiple centers	NW		x	
TX	Austin, Dallas, El Paso, Houston, Lone Star Districts (selected as examples of districts with multiple campuses and sites)	SACS		x	Dallas received SACS approval for single accreditation in June 2020
VT	Vermont State Colleges: Community College of Vermont	NE	x		Single college with multiple delivery sites
WA	Pierce College District: Two colleges	NW		x	
	Seattle Colleges District: Three colleges Community Colleges of Spokane	NW	x x		Single accreditation under development

Endnotes

¹NCHEMS calculations based on NCES, IPEDS Fall 2019 Directory Information File. NCES, IPEDS 2018-19 12-Month Unduplicated Headcount Enrollment File; effy2019 Provisional Release Data File

² Ewell, Peter T. (2015). **Transforming Institutional Accreditation in U.S. Higher Education.** NCHEMS, 2015.

³ Excerpts from McGuinness, A.C. Jr. Governance and Coordination: Definitions and Distinctions. Policy Brief. Education Commission of the States, 2011.

⁴ D. Bruce Johnstone, former chancellor of the State University of New York, defines the core functions of systems as: (1) develop the missions of the system as a whole and of the constituent campuses; (2) appoint and evaluate campus chief executives and dismiss them, if necessary; (3) act as an advocate to the member campuses on behalf of the public and to the governor, legislature and other leaders on behalf of postsecondary education; (4) allocate resources and services among campuses or recommend their allocation; (5) act as a buffer and as a liaison between political interests and institutions; (6) referee disputes and foster collaboration among campuses; (7) oversee the use of financial assets and other resources; and (8) coordinate such common services as legal counsel, telecommunications, financial audits and institutional research. D. Bruce Johnstone (1993), *Public Multicampus College and University Systems: Structures, Functions and Rationale*, Washington, D.C.: National Association of System Heads.

⁵ Robert O. Berdahl, author of one of the early comprehensive reviews of state higher education coordination distinguished between “substantive autonomy” and “procedural autonomy,” Substantive autonomy refers to the extent of the authority of institutions to determine their missions, goals, academic programs, and the students they intend to serve, and other “ends.” Procedural autonomy refers to the authority of institutions in essentially non-academic areas such as budgeting, financial management, non-academic staff, purchasing or entering into contracts. (Berdahl, R.O. (1971) *State Higher Education Coordination*. Washington: American Council on Education, pp. 10-12)

⁶ National Association of System Heads (NASH). <http://nashonline.org/about/>

⁷ Ewell, Peter T. (2015). *Transforming Institutional Accreditation in U.S. Higher Education.* NCHEMS, 2015.

⁸ Kerr, C. and Gade, M.L. (1989). *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, p. 116.

⁹ See: McGuinness, A.C. (2013) “History and Evolution of Higher Education Systems in the United States,” Lane, J.E., and Johnstone, D.B., eds. *Higher Education Systems 3.0.* Albany: SUNY Press.

¹⁰ Key to difference origins of systems (see text for greater detail): Systems designated as “R” are ones that evolved from a single “root” campus. Systems designated as “C” were formed through consolidation of several institutions or systems under a single board. Several systems designated as “R” are also designated as “C” because over the years states have merged other institutions or systems with the original “flagship” system. Systems designed as “S” evolved from “segmental” systems—systems composed of institutions with the same or similar missions (e.g., research universities, non-doctoral granting state universities, and community colleges).