### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 058

24

HF 001 925

State Boards Pesponsible for Higher Education --ሟታጥፒም

1970. Final Report.

Association of Governing Poards of Universities and TNSTTTUTTON

Colleges, Washington, r.C.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHFW), Mashington, D.C. Pureau

of Research.

BUREAU NO FR-9-0373 10T 70 PUB DATE

OEG-3-9-180373-0065 (010) GRANT

й Ол 12 16p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MP-\$0.25 HC-\$0.00

DESCRIPTORS Governance, \*Governing Boards, \*Higher Education,

\*Public Education, \*Pesponsibility, \*State Boards of

Fducation

ARST ACT

This report, a brief summary of a definitive study on the organizational, administrative, and operational patterns of 283 State Boards responsible for 1,268 institutional units of higher education, presents information on the types of boards in each State, the Pistrict of Columbia and U.S. territories and possessions, and classifies the types of institutional units for which these boards are responsible. The background and methods of the study, and a summary of the findings, analysis, conclusions and recommendations, precede the statistical information. (AF)



### FINAL REPORT Project No. 9-0373 Grant No. OEG-3-9-180373-0065 (010)

### STATE BOARDS RESPONSIBLE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION -- 1970

Mabel E. Rogers

J. L. Zwingle

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

Washington, D. C. 20036

April 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education Bureau of Research

U.S. OEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. EDUCATION

& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EOUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT MAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-



### CONTENTS

	Pag
Summary	1
ntroduction (background and methods)	2
Findings and Analysis	3
Conclusions and Recommendations	4
Appendices	
a. Total Institutional Units by Types of Boards (Appendix A)	
b. State-by-State Totals, Basic Reference Table (Appendix B)	



### **SUMMARY**

State Boards Responsible for Higher Education -- 1970 provides definitive information on the organizational, administrative, and operational patterns of 283 State boards responsible for 1,268 institutional units of public higher education. The study details the types of boards in each State, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and possessions, and classifies the types of institutional units for which these boards are responsible. Where possible, an indication is given of the extent of individual board involvement in educational planning at the State and regional levels.

In classifying the 283 State boards known to exist in late 1969-early 1970, the study reveals 129 governing boards (responsible for one institutional unit only); 66 multi-campus governing boards; 32 governing-coordinating boards; 37 coordinating boards; and 19 supervisory or "other" boards. (See Appendix A.\Of the 1,268 separate public institutional units under the jurisdiction of these boards, 129 are responsible to governing boards; 443 to multi-campus governing boards; 342 to governing-coordinating boards; 850 to coordinating boards; and 254 to supervisory or "other" boards. (Totals given exceed 100 percent because of multi-relationships of units to boards. See Appendix B.)

Types of public institutional units covered in the study show 50 separate professional schools, 80 State universities, 52 State universities and land-grant colleges combined, 19 land-grant college, 329 4-year (or more) colleges, and 738 2-year colleges. (The 2-year college figure may not be complete inasmuch as the primary purpose of the study has been to deal with State boards responsible for 4-year (or more) institutions and the 2-year institutions have been included only in those instances when reported by the State as a part of the total statewide system of public higher education.)

Further, the study reveals that 43 States have a board which is considered the statewide coordinating agency for public higher education. In 27 of these States, these are boards established for the sole purpose of coordination and planning; the remaining 16 States have boards with multiple responsibilities, including coordination, as in Kansas where one board governs and coordinates all higher education, or, as in Michigan, where the State department of education has been designated as the coordinating body for higher education. As indicated in the study, this awareness of the need for coordination and planning occurred at a time when the number of institutions of higher education and enrollments in these institutions were increasing at a pace heretofore unknown, and, consequently, the complexities of organization, administration, and operation of institutions of higher education were increasing at a similar pace.

As higher education entered the '70's, the study points up the need for further research into the many areas relating to the governance of higher education in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and possessions.



### INTRODUCTION

### Background for the Study

The study was undertaken to update the 1960 publication, State Boards Responsible for Higher Education, S. V. Martorana and Ernest V. Hollis, OE-53005, 1960, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The 1960 report identified 209 State boards whose specific responsibility at that time was with 748 public higher education institutional units. The 1960 report has been out of print since 1967, and, with the accelerated growth in the number of educational institutions and statewide coordinating boards, very much out of date. Questions come to the Office of Education and to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges for current information on many facets of povernance of higher education in the individual States and in the Nation. For at least five years, there has been no central source for up-to-date answers to these questions.

The primary objective of this study, then, has been to provide, in one volume, definitive, up-to-date information on the organizational, administrative, and operational patterns of State boards responsible for public higher education. In carrying out this objective, the study details the types of boards in each State, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and possessions, and classifies the types of institutional units for which each board is responsible. A secondary objective has been to indicate, where possible, the extent of individual board involvement in educational planning at the State and regional levels.

Because of limits imposed both by time and funds available, the decision was made to concentrate the study on State boards responsible for public institutions of higher education at the 4-year level and above, and to include boards relating to the 2-year units only as these units related to a particular senior-level institution or a statewide system.

### Methods

The study was carried out in three phases: data gathering, editing and writing, and reporting. To accomplish these tasks, a personal letter was sent to the executive officer of each governing and coordinating board responsible for all 4-year (or more) public institutions of higher education known to exist in each State, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and possessions. This letter discussed the objectives of the study, described the information needed, and requested assistance in updating, verifying, and/or supplying the necessary data. Included with the letters were the appropriate tearsheets from the 1960 study, sample tearsheets being included in those cases involving boards established since the 1960 publication. In addition, the letters to coordinating board executives enclosed listings of the State boards being studied in the respective States, and asked assistance in verifying and/or updating the listings. As this information was received,



an attempt was made to find answers to any questions still remaining and the material was put into its present form, checking back with individual boards as necessary. It is unfortunate that time did not permit a reading at the State level of the material on each State as it was prepared in final form for publication.

### FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The results of the study are presented in a 499-page manuscript prepared for printing by the U.S. Government Printing Office. Presented herein, therefore, is only a brief summary of these results.

Part I of the study consists of an overview presenting the (1) reasons for a study of State boards—its purposes, background, related research, scope and procedures, definition of terms, and organization of the report; (2) status of organization in public higher education—types of State boards and number of institutional units responsible to State boards, with comments on legal status and areas of responsibility; and (3) agencies related to State boards of higher education—regional and national compacts.

Part II presents the State-by-State organization of higher education in the United States, describing the boards and presenting an organizational chart for higher education in each State, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and possessions. The State charts show the relationship of each State board with other State boards, with institutional units, and with the public.

This part of the study indicates there are 283 separate State boards having some responsibility for 1,268 institutional units of higher education in the Nation. A further analysis reveals 129 governing boards responsible for 129 institutional units; 66 multi-campus governing boards responsible for 443 institutional units (a new classification replacing the governing-coordinating classification in those States having a statewide coordinating board); 32 governing-coordinating boards responsible for 342 institutional units; 37 coordinating boards responsible for a total of 850 institutional units, 223 of which have no relationship to any governing or "other" board at the State level; and 19 supervisory or "other" boards responsible in some way for 254 institutional units, 131 of which have no relationship to any governing or coordinating body at the State level.

The study leaves unanswered the question of the optimum number of units a specific board can govern or coordinate effectively. For example, in 1960 some governing-coordinating boards had direct governing responsibility for as few as 2 and as many as 46 (Board of Trustees, State University of New York) institutional units. In 1970 the range of units directly governed by a governing-coordinating board varies from 2 to 68 (again, the Board of Trustees, State University of New York). On the other hand, boards with coordinating responsibilities only have a range of units from 5 to 91. Actually, there exists in the United States no reliable guide to the limits of effective governing and/or coordinating functions. In fact,



at the onset of the 1970's no norms of effectiveness have been established by which a governing board or a statewide coordinating board can be appraised, a matter deserving serious attention.

In a State-by-State analysis of Part II, one finds reliance on the State board of education as the statewide governing board for all higher education continues to decrease. It can be determined, also, that governance of institutions of higher education as a function of the State board of education has shown a marked decrease since 1960.

A further look at the 283 State boards covered in this part of the study will show that, with the increase in statewide coordinating boards and boards governing multiple institutional units, staffing appears to be on the increase with more understanding by the public of the complexity and scope of the functions assigned to the central office personnel.

Part III, the final section, provides a basic reference table detailing by type each State board and the institutional unit(s) for which it is responsible as these exist in each of the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions. It contains also two appendices relating to governing-coordinating functions, included with the permission of the authors and the American Association of Higher Education for which the papers were prepared originally.

By using the basic reference table in conjunction with the State board descriptions and the organization chart of a State (or States), various comparisons can be made on the status of higher education in the Nation as it exists at the beginning of the decade 1970.

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

The basic purpose of the research was accomplished in the compilation of updated and verified information on the organization, administration, and operation of the State boards responsible for public higher education in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and possessions. This compilation of material has been presented in manuscript form for printing by the U.S. Government Printing Office (bound copy punched for a 3-ring binder for losse-leaf use where desired), a decision reached with the Office of Education in late March – early April 1970. The compilation includes, where possible, an indication of the extent of involvement by individual boards in educational planning at the State and regional levels, thereby accomplishing the secondary objective of the research.

As the project progressed, the project director and the consultants were sorry the original proposal had not included plans to complete more of the reference tables found in the original study. It was determined, also, that a more extensive



overview should have been planned for the publication.

Another step which should have been planned originally was an allotment of time for a reading at the State level of the finished material on each State before it was presented for publication. The project director tried to add this step but found the time schedule did not permit it.

A contagious illness on the part of the project director, coupled with the fact that adequate secretarial service was not available throughout the project (a mistake for which the project director takes full responsibility), necessitated the request that the project be extended for one month. Unfortunately, a recurrence of the same illness made it impossible to turn over the completed research on time, even with the month's extension. Although the study was completed and the manuscript typed by April 26, 1970, the director of the project was unable to complete a final review of the manuscript, final report, and fiscal forms at that time.

The completed research is presented, nevertheless, with the firm conviction that it will serve as a basic reference work for the many individuals and groups—local, State, regional, Federal, and national—concerned with the governance of, coordination of, and planning for public higher education.

### Recommendations

Many uses for the result of this study in further research can be foreseen. Two are recommended for high priority.

First, a similar format and similar procedures would be used as the basis for a study of the governing boards of private institutions of higher education in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and possessions. Such a study of private boards of governance has never been undertaken, to our knowledge, and the Office of Education could make a worthwhile investment by sponsoring research of this nature. Only when a similar study of the governing boards of private institutions of higher education is complete will the full story of governance be known. For several reasons, such a study of governing boards of private institutions of higher education would require perhaps two years and a budget of larger proportion than that required for the study of State hoards.

Second, and based to some extent on much of the information contained in Part II of this study, research should be undertaken to determine whether some norms of effectiveness can be established for evaluating all types of governing and coordinating boards in such areas as optimum size, structure, number of institutional units involved, staffing, requirements for board membership, characteristics of effective board members, areas of responsibility, legal status. Changes are occurring constantly in the many facets of governing and coordination and planning at all levels and in both the public and private sectors of higher education. A forward step will have been taken when some format for evaluation can begin to be developed for use as guidelines for achieving more effective procedures for governing,



coordinating, and planning higher education in this country.

As a final recommendation, but by no means last in importance, it is considered imperative that the study of State boards just completed be updated periodically if it is to be a valid reference work for any length of time. The Association is willing to undertake the responsibility for updating the study, perhaps at 6-month intervals, for a trial period of two to three years. Such an undertaking, however, would require funds beyond those currently available. If the Office of Education could foresee assisting with the cost of the updating, the Association will begin to collect information now on changes as they occur, looking forward to publication of the first updated sections in March 1970.

	marce Pagen
Contract Officer	Project Pirector
	angus 31, 1970
Date	O Date



# TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL UNITS BY TYPES OF BOARDS

	Alaska Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware Pistrict of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska	State
	51 14 14 14 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	Total Number
	5 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Governing Boards
	24 9 30 15 22 22 14 17 10 26 31 31	Multi-Campus Governing Boards
	15 28 36 7 28 9	Governing- Coordinating Boards
	30 122 22 22 22 23 17 17 18	Coordinating Boards
FRIC	112 113 114 117 9	Other Boards

# TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL UNITS BY TYPES OF BOARDS

	TOTALS	Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia Washington West Virginia Washington West Virginia Washington Guam Canal Zone Virgin Islands	State
	283	1111342822263181	Total Number of Boards
	129	10 10 10 11 10 11 11 11	Governing Boards
	443	10 10 11 11 11 12 13 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	Multi-Campus Governing Boards
	342	30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 3	Governing- Coordinating Boards
	850	5 26 114 25 25 27 29 30 8	Coordinating Boards
RIC	254	112 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	Other Boards

NOTE.—Total number of separate institutional units 1,268. This summary represents multi-relationships of these units with boards. Consequently, units shown exceed total number.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

BASIC REFERENCE TABLE
TOTALS BY STATE

State Boards Responsible for Public Higher Education and Names of Institutional Units for Which They Are Responsible, by Type

•	Florida	District of Columbia	Delaware	Connecticut	Colorado	California	Arkansas	Arizona	Alaska	Alabama			State, board, and institution
					2	4	٠,					2	Separate profes- sional school
	2			-	-	7		<b>—</b>		p.a.s		ယ	State uni- versity
_	<b>J-4</b>		1	<b>,</b>	,,,	2	1	,,	1	<b>,</b>		4	State university and land-grant college
	-	-	1							<b>,</b>		Ų,	Land- grant college only
	5	1		4	7	18	7	,	,	10		6	4-year or more college
_	27	<b>,</b> ,	` سو	17	11 .	91	4	w	7	17		7	2-year college
	เ	w	ω	22	16	31	12	6	·9	13		80	Total institutions under not ut State State baards board
_	23				6	91	2			17		85	Total institutions under not under State State boards boards
-	36	ω	ω	22	22	122	14	6	9	30		9	Total sublic institutions
_		-	2		-		5			6		•	၈ ၁
				43/	f.	ώ <sub>ν</sub>	ω			33/		õ	Type of NC
_	N.		24		`			. , <u>,</u>					Type of Board 1
RΪ	C			<b>,</b>		<u> </u>	20		~~~	۔۔ سال			C
- /	1bw EBIC				,		~		-		ſ	- 1	0 1.5

## BASIC REFERENCE TABLE

Ļ

TOTALS BY STATE

State Boards Responsible for Public Higher Education and Names of Institutional Units for Which They Are Responsible, by Type

Maine	Louisiana	entucky	Kansas'	Jowa	ndiana	Illinois	Idano	Hawaii	icorgia			\$:ate, board, and institution
2	2				H	· 🗝			2		2	Separate profes- sional school
	٠,	<b>-</b>	2	<b>,</b>	w	5			<b>,</b>		ω	State uni- versity
<b>,</b>	1	1	-	H	<b>,</b>	H	1	1	1		4	State university and land-grant college combined
	<b>,</b>	,				,	-		<b>,</b>		տ	Land- grant callege only
6	4	5	w	سو	6	<b>э</b>	2		n ii		٥	4-year or more college
<b>,</b>	4	13	19	12	6	43	2	6	12		7	2-year college
10	17	21	<u>_</u>	w	15	13	4	7	15		80	Total institutions under not State State boards boar
_	•	H	19	12	2	43	2		11	•	င္ဟ	Total institutions under not under State State boards boards
10	17	21	25	15	17	56	6	7	28		9	Total oublic institutions
		7			μ.							& 31
	Ν.	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>				4			٠٠٠-		10	G C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
h-1	<del></del>		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	-	w		-	<u>,</u>	)			C C C
·	-	. سر				23/				7		0
•			13	Æ!	سلا							o ' <sup>10</sup> .



BASIC REFERENCE TABLE TOTALS BY STATE

State Boards Responsible for Public Higher Education and Names of Institutional Units for Which They Are Responsible, by Type

	New Hampshire	.\evada	Cebraska	:.ontana : ,	Missouri	Mississippi	linnesota	Michigan	Nassachusetts	· Naryland		State, passe, and institution
		,,	1		<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>		,	2	H	2	Separate profes- sional school
					1	2		w			ω	State uni- versity
	<b>,</b>	н	ш	,,	1	<b>J-4</b>	1	<b></b>	<b>,</b>	1	4	State university and land-grant college combined
		_			<b>,</b>	-					5	Land- grant college only
	ω		5	4	σ.	4	<b>∞</b>	10	13	œ	٥	4-year or more college
	-		11	<b>ω</b>		17	22	29	12	14	7	2-year college
	У	4	12	6	12	9	31	 !A	28	11	80	Total institutions under no: State State boards boar
			6	ω	9	17		29		14	ဌာ	Total institutions under no: under State State boards boards
	<b>У</b>		18	9	21	26	31	44	28	25	9	Total oublic institutions
	<b>,</b>				00		· ·	10	2			C n
	<b>—</b>		بير		<b>–</b>		w	Ν.	73	Ν	16	0 % Boot 1/ce
,		<b>–</b>	e	-	· <u>-</u>		۰		•••	- <u>.</u> .	İ	C & O
				• • • •	<u>.                                  </u>		<del></del>	23/	,,,,	23/.1	<u> </u>	
					14	3.4.				<b>-</b> -		•

3,4



BASIC REFERENCE TABLE
TOTALS BY STATE

State Boards Responsible for Public Higher Education and Names of Institutional Units for Which They Are Responsible, by Type

•	Rhode Island	Pennsylvania	Cregon	∩klahoma	Chio	Corth Dakota	Corth Carolina	Yew York	ew exico	New Jerscy		-	State, board, and institution
_		1	2					6	,,	2		2	Separate profes- sional school
		ω		,	00	<b>,</b>	2	10	1			ω	State uni- versity
	<b>,</b> ,	'n	'n	1	-	<b>,</b> ,	<b>-</b>	2	,	,		4	State university and land-grant coliege combined
				<b>μ</b>			,					G	Land- grant college only
	,	16	ъ	9	10	6	12	19	ω,	11		0.	4-year or more college
	1	37	12	13	24	w	17	51	œ	12		7	2-year college
	w	44	9	19	43	10	20	32	14	13		80	Total institution uncer State boards
_	•	14	12	6		2	13	56		13		쯎	Total institutions uncer not under State State boards boards
	ω	58	21	25	43	12	33	88	14	26	,	9	Total oublic institutions
_		14		5	6		တ		4	10		•	ဂ ၁
			<b>—</b>	2	6		ω		ω			; i	Boggd G C C
	-	ω				-		2					0 0 0
			22	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>		<u>ک</u> س		J	-			0
		13						<b>p=4</b>		33			o <sup>1</sup> 0



BASIC REFERENCE TABLE
TOTALS BY STATE

State Boards Responsible for Public Higher Education and Names of Institutional Units for Which They Are Responsible, by Type

. Nyoming	Gisconsin	West Virginia	'ashington	Virginia	Vermont	Ctah	Texas	∵ennessee	South Dakota	South Carolina		State, board, and institution
_			-	<b>,</b>			10	<b>,</b>	<b>"</b>	<b>J6</b>	2	Separute profes- sional school
	-		<b>~</b>	ω	- <del>-</del>		6	<b>,</b>	<b>,</b>	-	ω	State uni- versity
-	,,	ų	<b>,,,</b>	pud	μ.	н	,,	H	H	H	44	State university and land-grant college combined
				1			-	-		1	5	Land- gront college only
	n	11	4	9	ω	2	18	œ	4.	w	٥	4-year or more college
1 7	23	5	22	17		5	40	11		۰,0	7	2-year college
-	33	17	6	19	4	9	36	12	7	16	80	Total institutions under not state State State boards boards
1 7	ω		22	13			40	11			88	Total institutions under not under State State boards boards
- -	35	17	28	32	7	9	76	23	7	16	9	Total oublic institutions
-			6	00	-		10			6		6 2
٠	2		~ <del>-</del>	w			4	4]		hq		S C S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
_		,			— 	2			<b>—</b>	· <del> (*- (*- (*-</del>		CCC
-		·	 23		·····		~~~			н	7	<u> </u>
12/	· · ·	14					7,1					0 10



### BASIC REFERENCE TABLE TOTALS BY STATE

State Boards Responsible for Public Higher Education and Names of Institutional Units for Which They Are Responsible, by Type

O'ADS BY 11FE	TOTALC PARTURE	Virgin Islands .	Canal Zone	Guan	Puerto Rico	1	State, board, and institution
	S .				1	2	Separate profes- sional school
	80				1	ဒ	State uni - versity
,	S					4	State university and land-grant college combined
	10			-		5	Land- grant college only
	300			H	1	6	4-year or more college
	738	,	.1	-	ω	7	2-year college
3	750	,,	<b>,</b>	<b>,</b>	. 9	80	Total institutions under not under State State boards board
• .	518					င္ဟ	Total institutions under not under State State boards boards
	768	,	<b>,</b>	<b>H</b>	6	9	Total oublic institutions
	129	1	-	-		•	G a
	66			<del></del>		ត	G C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
	32 37				1	ļ	000
							6 2.
	3	<b></b>					0 10

