



N.C. Release

**NORTH CAROLINA CENTER FOR
PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH INC.**

NEWS RELEASE

For release on Tuesday, October 3, 2000:
May be broadcast Tuesday a.m. and may
appear in Tuesday newspapers.

For more information, call Ran Coble
at N.C. Center for Public Policy Research
at (919) 832-2839.

N.C.'s GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAS UNIQUE FEATURES

In a 50-state study of how states govern their higher education institutions, the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research says North Carolina leads in some areas, lags in a few others, and has several features unique to this state. The state is among the top 10 states in student enrollment in public higher education institutions, state appropriations for higher education, and full-time faculty salaries. However, it has a lower college-going rate than other states, and it is one of only seven states with no central board or agency charged with planning or coordinating higher education policy for both two-year community colleges and four-year public colleges and universities. North Carolina is unique in having the first public university to open its doors to students and having a state Constitutional provision requiring the benefits of public universities, "as far as practicable," to be "free of expense." The Center's 236-page study is one of the most comprehensive studies ever undertaken on the higher education governance systems in all 50 states.

The Center also highlighted four key national trends in higher education governance. First, between 1950 and 1970, 47 states established either coordinating or governing boards for public higher education, but now another wave of changes in governance has begun. Second, the Center says 11 states have implemented new accountability measures for public colleges and universities, and governors and legislators are linking additional money for higher education to important state goals. Third, since 1996, most state legislatures -- including North Carolina's -- have been appropriating funds to colleges and universities at a rate significantly ahead of inflation rates. The fourth trend is a projected 19 percent increase nationally in college enrollment, with 48,000 more students expected in North Carolina's public universities by 2008.

"These national trends are likely to have a significant impact on North Carolina in the future," says Ran Coble, executive director of the Center and one of the report's authors. "The desire for increased accountability is likely to spread from the current public school reform efforts upward to higher education. And, the projected student enrollment boom over the next decade affects North Carolina more than most states, but it also is likely to increase competition for state funds between the university system and other state agencies in future budgets."

Where North Carolina Leads and Lags in Higher Education

The Center identified several areas where North Carolina leads in public higher education:

- * North Carolina's public higher education system of 16 public universities and 59 community colleges has the 9th largest student enrollment among the 50 states with more than 300,000 students.
- * North Carolina ranks 6th among the 50 states in total state funding for public universities and

community colleges with appropriations of approximately \$2.3 billion per year and ranks third in funding per capita.

- * The average salary for full-time faculty at North Carolina's four-year public universities is \$64,304, ninth highest in the nation.

- * North Carolina has the largest number of public, four-year, historically black colleges and universities, with five such institutions.

- * In comparing the total number of public and private colleges, universities, community colleges, and technical institutes, North Carolina has the 10th highest percentage (60.7%) of public institutions of any state in the country.

In some areas, North Carolina lags behind other states, as follows:

- * According to the 2000 National Education Goals Panel Report, North Carolina ranks 34th in college-going rates at 54%, as measured by the number of high school graduates going to college over a 12-month period. Massachusetts leads at 73%, Nevada is lowest at 40%, and the national average is 57%.

- * North Carolina is one of only seven states that have no central board or agency charged with planning or coordinating higher education policy for both the two-year and four-year public institutions. The university system is governed by the UNC Board of Governors, the community college system is governed by the State Board of Community Colleges, and the 36 private colleges and universities are independently governed by campus-level boards of trustees.

Unique Features of North Carolina's System of Governance of Higher Education

- * Many states have unique provisions in their Constitutions regarding higher education, but North Carolina is the only state to mandate that "The General Assembly shall provide that the benefits of the University of North Carolina and other public institutions of higher education, as far as practicable, be extended to the people of the State free of expense." This explains why the average tuition for state residents is second lowest among the states behind only Nevada.

- * The UNC Board of Governors is one of only two central, state-level governing boards whose members are elected by the legislature (New York is the other state). Members of 43 higher education boards in other states are appointed by governors.

- * The Board of Governors is also the largest central, state-level governing board in the country with 32 voting members. Most higher education boards have 10-14 members.

- * And, North Carolina is one of only two states where the amount of power given to campus boards of trustees is not spelled out in state statutes but left to the sole discretion of the UNC Board of Governors (Utah is the other state).

Trend #1: A Second Wave of Changes in Higher Education Governance

In the last few years, another wave of changes in higher education governance has begun, with changes in 11 states. In 1999, Kansas legislators centralized their governance structure and created a new Board of Regents to coordinate both public and private higher education and to govern all six public universities, 19 community colleges, five technical colleges, six technical schools, and a municipal university. In 2000, West Virginia abolished its State College System Board of Directors and the University System Board of Trustees, giving each institution its own governing board, but the legislature also created a new Higher Education Policy Commission. Nine other states have made changes over the last decade -- Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Jersey, South Carolina, and Texas -- and Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, and Tennessee also are contemplating changes to their governance systems.

Trend #2: More Accountability Demanded of Higher Education

At the same time, there is a new drive toward accountability in higher education. Governors have started demanding more accountability from public colleges and universities, and state legislators are linking additional money in higher education to “important state goals,” says Earl S. Mackey, vice chancellor for external relations of the Ohio Board of Regents. “As requests for new funds are made, legislators are raising important questions about outcomes, including the impact on the economy, competitiveness, workforce skills, and individual students,” Mackey says. “Over time, it is likely these questions will come to dominate the debate on higher education budgets.” About 5 percent of the Ohio system’s budget is used to reward institutions for keeping tuition low, obtaining outside support for economically important research, and producing skilled graduates in a timely manner.

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

The drive toward accountability also was highlighted in a 1998 poll of governors by the Education Commission of the States in Denver. Almost all of the 35 governors responding said they believed colleges should be more accountable for meeting local, state, and regional needs and that it was important for states to link spending on colleges to the institutions’ performance. The governors also want to put more emphasis on faculty productivity, to give students incentives to pursue particular careers, and to reorganize the sectors of education into a seamless system covering kindergarten through college.

Trend #3: Higher Education Budgets Are Higher Priority Now, But More Subject to Economic Swings

The good news for public higher education is that only elementary and secondary education were given a higher priority than higher education when governors were asked where more state money should go. And, recent figures compiled by the National Conference of State Legislatures in Denver show that public elementary and secondary education was the only sector that outpaced higher education in the growth of its state support in fiscal year 2000. Still, one area where state boards are trying to secure additional funding is for increasing faculty salaries, and this issue is often hard to sell. Legislators contend that “it is awfully hard to go home to districts, where farms are foreclosing every day, and argue that professors who make \$35,000, \$45,000, \$50,000 a year are not being paid enough,” says Laura J. Glatt, vice chancellor for administrative affairs in the Kansas University System.

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

Trend #4: Expected Enrollment Boom

The fourth trend affecting higher education governance is the projected boom in student enrollment. The U.S. Department of Education says full-time college enrollment has risen 11 percent nationwide since 1990 and will increase another 19 percent by 2010. In the 1960s and 1970s, North Carolina faced a record surge in enrollment from the post-World War II Baby Boom, which led state legislators to add 10 campuses to the then-existing six-university system in North Carolina. By 2008, the children of the Baby Boomers are expected to add 48,000 students to university enrollments. By 2010, the federal government estimates that North Carolina will rank fourth among the states in the percentage increase of high school graduates.

The Center's 236-page study contains a comprehensive review of all 50 states' statutes on governance and coordination of higher education. It includes 36 tables comparing all 50 states in funding for higher education, student enrollment, student tuition and fees, faculty salaries, and numbers of public and private universities and community colleges, among other factors. It also includes a description of the boards and agencies governing or coordinating higher education in each state and the advantages and disadvantages of each system. Finally, it compares the power of each of these boards in many areas, including the power to set budgets for public universities, the power to establish or terminate academic programs, and the power to make higher education policy.

About the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

The N.C. Center for Public Policy Research is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization created to study public policy issues facing North Carolina and to evaluate state government programs. The Center receives general operating support from the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation in Winston-Salem, with additional funding from 13 other foundations, 190 corporate contributors, and nearly 1,000 individuals and organizational members across the state. This is the second report in the Center's four-part study of public university governance supported by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan. The Kellogg Foundation targets its grants toward higher education, health, food systems and rural development, and philanthropy and volunteerism. In North Carolina, the Glaxo Wellcome Foundation, John Wesley and Anna Hodgkin Hanes Foundation, and James G. Hanes Memorial Fund also have made grants in support of this project.

In addition to this report on *Governance and Coordination of Public Higher Education in All 50 States*, the Center also has published *Reorganizing Higher Education In North Carolina: What History Tells Us About Our Future*, which chronicles the history of the 16-university system since its establishment by the N.C. General Assembly in 1971. Also, the Center publishes a citizens' guide to the legislature, *North Carolina Insight* magazine, a textbook for teachers of state and local government called *North Carolina Focus*, and other book-length research reports. The Center is currently conducting studies of state lotteries and North Carolina's record in sustaining public school reforms.

Copies of *Governance and Coordination of Public Higher Education in All 50 States* are available from the Center for \$25 each, including sales tax, postage, and handling. To order, write the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research at P.O. Box 430, Raleigh, N.C. 27602, call (919) 832-2839, fax (919) 832-2847, or order through the Center's Website at www.ncinsider.com/nccppr.

For more information, contact Ran Coble, the Center's executive director, at (919) 832-2839.

Higher Education Structures in All 50 States

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

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

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

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

Table 13.*Four-Year Public Higher Education Institutions: A Statistical Overview, by State*

State	Population* (and Rank) 1998	Number of Four-Year Public Institutions	Enrollment 1996-1997	Minority Students As a Percentage of Enrollment 1996-1997	Average Tuition and Fees, 1997-98	Average Salary of Full-Time Faculty at Public Universities 1997-1998	State Higher Education Structure
Alabama	4,352 (23)	18 ^A	122,796	23.8%	\$2,487	\$49,640	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Alaska	614 (48)	3	27,077	19.3	2,609	51,729	* Consolidated Governing Board
Arizona	4,669 (21)	5	102,501	20.9	2,058	59,949	* Consolidated Governing Board
Arkansas	2,538 (33)	10	62,094	18.8	2,451	50,511	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
California	32,667 (1)	33 ^A	504,803	51.1	2,709	76,814	Coordinating Board-Advisory
Colorado	3,971 (24)	14 ^A	132,293 ^B	16.5	2,622	60,326	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Connecticut	3,274 (29)	7	55,296	14.1	4,273	71,779	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Delaware	744 (45)	2	24,798	19.4	4,318	64,878	Planning Agency
Florida	14,916 (4)	10	211,178	32.0	1,909	59,093	* Consolidated Governing Board
Georgia	7,642 (10)	21	159,013	25.6	2,356	59,098	* Consolidated Governing Board
Hawaii	1,193 (41)	3	21,691	73.8	2,790	60,469	* Consolidated Governing Board
Idaho	1,229 (40)	4	41,344	7.2	2,201	48,792	* Consolidated Governing Board
Illinois	12,045 (5)	12	192,319	26.2	3,701	58,419	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Indiana	5,889 (14)	14	182,946	11.1	3,344	54,908	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Iowa	2,862 (30)	3	66,539	8.3	2,761	63,119	* Consolidated Governing Board
Kansas	2,629 (32)	11	85,934	11.3	2,311	51,657	* Consolidated Governing Board
Kentucky	3,936 (25)	8	104,317	9.5	2,328	56,089	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Louisiana	4,369 (22)	14	147,238	31.4	2,269	52,295	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Maine	1,244 (39)	8	30,979	3.5	3,880	50,678	* Consolidated Governing Board
Maryland	5,135 (19)	15	113,159	36.3	4,135	61,153	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Massachusetts	6,147 (13)	15	101,824	13.5	3,981	67,850	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Michigan	9,817 (8)	15	259,414	17.2	4,131	65,529	Planning Agency
Minnesota	4,725 (20)	11	117,846	9.5	3,776	69,602	* Consolidated Governing Board

—continued

Table 13.

CONTINUED

Four-Year Public Higher Education Institutions: A Statistical Overview, by State

State	Population* (and Rank) 1998	Number of Four-Year Public Institutions	Enrollment 1996-1997	Minority Students As a Percentage of Enrollment 1996-1997	Average Tuition and Fees, 1997-98	Average Salary of Full-Time Faculty at Public Universities 1997-1998	State Higher Education Structure
Mississippi	2,752 (31)	9	60,560	34.5%	\$2,568	\$46,464	* Consolidated Governing Board
Missouri	5,439 (16)	13	117,242	11.6	3,394	60,339	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Montana	880 (44)	6	31,697	5.8	2,607	47,069	* Consolidated Governing Board
Nebraska	1,663 (38)	7	57,266	7.0	2,414	56,256	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Nevada	1,747 (36)	2	30,988	19.9	1,884	61,035	* Consolidated Governing Board
New Hampshire	1,185 (42)	5	26,547	2.6	5,193	57,663	* Consolidated Governing Board
New Jersey	8,115 (9)	14 ^A	137,493	29.9	4,562	71,636	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
New Mexico	1,737 (37)	6	48,818	38.8	2,068	49,640	Coordinating Board-Advisory
New York	18,175 (3)	44	328,666	37.7	3,844	62,695	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
North Carolina	7,546 (11)	16	156,539	24.8	1,895	64,304	* Consolidated Governing Board
North Dakota	638 (47)	6	28,052	4.9	2,545	41,985	* Consolidated Governing Board
Ohio	11,209 (7)	28	258,417	13.5	4,009	58,064	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Oklahoma	3,347 (27)	14	93,778	21.4	2,054	52,236	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Oregon	3,282 (28)	8	64,413	14.2	3,496	50,810	* Consolidated Governing Board
Pennsylvania	12,001 (6)	45 ^A	232,223	13.1	5,188	64,039	Coordinating Board-Advisory
Rhode Island	988 (43)	2	22,251	9.8	4,013	61,573	* Consolidated Governing Board
South Carolina	3,836 (26)	12	87,344	21.2	3,414	55,456	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
South Dakota	738 (46)	8	28,367	9.1	2,900	39,469	* Consolidated Governing Board
Tennessee	5,431 (17)	10	115,508	18.9	2,296	56,213	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Texas	19,760 (2)	41	414,021	34.3	2,273	56,902	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
Utah	2,100 (34)	5	81,313	6.1	2,113	51,042	* Consolidated Governing Board
Vermont	591 (49)	5	15,578	3.7	6,492	51,399	* Consolidated Governing Board
Virginia	6,791 (12)	15	167,809	24.1	4,045	59,725	Coordinating Board-Regulatory

—continued

Table 13.

CONTINUED

Four-Year Public Higher Education Institutions: A Statistical Overview, by State

State	Population* (and Rank) 1998	Number of Four-Year Public Institutions	Enrollment 1996–1997	Minority Students As a Percentage of Enrollment 1996–1997	Average Tuition and Fees, 1997–98	Average Salary of Full-Time Faculty at Public Universities 1997–1998	State Higher Education Structure
Washington	5,689 (15)	8	87,304	19.5%	\$3,036	\$57,725	Coordinating Board–Regulatory
West Virginia ^C	1,811 (35)	13	68,036	6.2	2,168	51,374	* Consolidated Governing Board
Wisconsin	5,224 (18)	13	140,964	8.1	2,958	65,964	* Consolidated Governing Board
Wyoming	481 (50)	1	11,251	8.2	2,326	46,941	* Consolidated Governing Board

* Denotes states with a consolidated governing board structure.

† The 1998 population is reported in thousands.

FOOTNOTES

^A These states report that they use a different method of calculating the number of institutions in their states than does the U.S. Department of Education, whose statistics are reported here. Particularly for these states, the central boards should be consulted if the "official" state statistics are desired. The U.S. Department of Education statistics are compiled using the same method of calculation from state to state (and include degree-granting postsecondary institutions that are eligible to participate in Title IV federal financial-aid programs), however, and thus are employed in this report for consistency.

In this regard, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education reports that Alabama has 16 four-year public institutions, the California Postsecondary Education Commission reports that it has 31 four-year public institutions, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education reports that it has 13 four-year public institutions, and the Pennsylvania State Board of Education reports 18 public baccalaureate institutions. Peter Garland, the Pennsylvania Board's Executive Director, believes the large discrepancy is a result of how branch campuses of the state's public universities are categorized. In a letter to the Center, he notes, "Penn State, which has the most branches, is a single institution, with a single faculty and a single governing board and administration. The branches have no separate charter to operate or any statutory authority save that which comes from the single entity that is Penn State. This is also true for the University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, and Indiana University of Pennsylvania."

^B The Colorado Commission on Higher Education notes that a different method of calculation must be employed in compiling the U.S. Department of Education statistics than their state statistics, since their official count (not provided by the Commission) does not match the figures reported here.

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

Sources: 1998 population figures are from the Census Bureau (<http://www.census.gov>). Enrollment figures and the number of minorities as a percentage of enrollment are current as of 1996 and also come from the U.S. Department of Education (<http://www.ed.gov>). Numbers of public universities, average tuition and fees, and average salaries for full-time faculty are the most recent figures available from the U.S. Department of Education, and are for the 1997–98 academic year. All of these figures are as reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue*, August 27, 1999, The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc., Washington, DC: 1999, pp. 8–13.

Table 23.

*State Funds for Higher Education Operating Expenses, 1998-99,
Ranked by State*

Rank	State	State Funds for Higher Education Operating Expenses, 1998-99	Higher Education State Structure
1.	California	\$ 7,309,377,000	Coordinating Board-Advisory
2.	Texas	3,527,867,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
3.	New York	3,033,704,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
4.	Florida	2,498,665,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
5.	Illinois	2,410,004,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
6.	North Carolina	2,171,339,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
7.	Ohio	1,939,438,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
8.	Michigan	1,882,500,000	Planning Agency
9.	Pennsylvania	1,775,307,000	Coordinating Board-Advisory
10.	Georgia	1,483,818,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
11.	New Jersey	1,445,843,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
12.	Virginia	1,296,078,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
13.	Minnesota	1,239,394,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
14.	Indiana	1,147,816,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
15.	Washington	1,144,908,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
16.	Wisconsin	1,040,341,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
17.	Alabama	1,028,644,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
18.	Massachusetts	997,595,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
19.	Tennessee	944,435,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
20.	Maryland	940,073,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
21.	Missouri	919,548,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
22.	Kentucky	888,700,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
23.	Arizona	836,538,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
24.	Mississippi	786,969,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
25.	Iowa	785,230,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
26.	South Carolina	761,931,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
27.	Louisiana	747,821,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
28.	Oklahoma	723,051,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
29.	Colorado	682,210,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
30.	Connecticut	626,878,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
31.	Kansas	600,413,000	* Consolidated Governing Board

—continued

Table 23.

CONTINUED

*State Funds for Higher Education Operating Expenses, 1998–99,
Ranked by State*

Rank	State	State Funds for Higher Education Operating Expenses, 1998–99	Higher Education State Structure
32.	Oregon	\$565,462,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
33.	Arkansas	556,447,000	Coordinating Board–Regulatory
34.	New Mexico	517,247,000	Coordinating Board–Advisory
35.	Utah	492,035,000 [^]	* Consolidated Governing Board
36.	Nebraska	442,020,000	Coordinating Board–Regulatory
37.	West Virginia [^]	362,261,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
38.	Hawaii	319,421,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
39.	Nevada	290,363,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
40.	Idaho	265,708,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
41.	Maine	200,149,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
42.	North Dakota	171,690,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
43.	Alaska	170,403,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
44.	Delaware	168,601,000	Planning Agency
45.	Rhode Island	149,563,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
46.	Wyoming	139,711,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
47.	Montana	129,929,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
48.	South Dakota	125,882,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
49.	New Hampshire	91,837,000	* Consolidated Governing Board
50.	Vermont	59,173,000	* Consolidated Governing Board

* Denotes states with consolidated governing board structures.

[^] Utah reports that current state funding for higher education operating expenses is \$495,359,700.

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

Source: Edward R. Hines, Illinois State University (<http://coe.ilstu.edu/gravevine/>), as reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue*, August 27, 1999, The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc., Washington, DC: 1999, p. 13. "Note: Figures include state tax funds appropriated for colleges and universities, for student aid, and for governing and coordinating boards. They do not include funds for capital outlays and money from sources other than state taxes, such as student fees or appropriations from local governments." *Ibid.* at p. 132.