



National 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 the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research
at (919) 832-2839.

**REPORT FINDS KEY TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE, MORE
ACCOUNTABILITY, BUDGET SWINGS, AND ENROLLMENT BOOM**

In a new 50-state study, the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research highlights four key trends that affect how states will govern their higher education institutions in the future. First, the Center says state legislatures are beginning a second wave of changes in how public universities and community colleges are governed. In a second trend, at least 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 have been appropriating funds to colleges and universities at a rate significantly ahead of inflation, but the demographics of a fourth trend -- an enrollment boom over the next decade -- threaten to dilute this gain.

"More than two-thirds of the new jobs in the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. economy now require at least some college education," says Ran Coble, executive director of the Center and one of the report's authors. "Governors and state legislatures are looking to public universities for help on such issues as job training, teacher preparation, and research on key state issues, as well as undergraduate instruction. They seem willing to put more money into higher education, but they also are demanding increased accountability, just as they did in the drive for public school reform," says Coble.

Trend #1: Changes in Higher Education Governance

Between 1950 and 1970, 47 states established either coordinating or governing boards for public higher education. Now, a second wave of changes in higher education governance has begun, with changes in 11 states. In 1999, Kansas legislators 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. Louisiana voters amended their constitution in 1998 to create a new 17-member board to oversee a system of 50 community colleges and trade schools. By contrast, Illinois decentralized and abolished its Board of Governors and Board of Regents in 1995 and gave seven universities their own governing boards. In 2000, West Virginia abolished its State College System Board of Directors and the University System Board of Trustees, giving each institution its own governing board, but the legislature also created a new Higher Education Policy Commission. Seven other states have made changes over the last decade -- Kentucky, 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 on colleges' 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, Colorado. 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 is 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 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. Higher education's slice of state budget pies -- its share of aggregate general fund appropriations -- dropped from 13.7 percent in fiscal year 1986 to 12.3 percent in fiscal 1996. However, in subsequent years, most legislatures appropriated funds to public colleges and universities at a rate significantly ahead of inflation rates. In fiscal year 2000, nine states included double-digit percentage increases for higher education in their budgets -- Florida, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia. 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

Complicating state budgets for higher education is the projected boom in student enrollment over the next decade. 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. This Baby Boom Echo will create a demand for more classroom buildings, dormitories, and faculty. The states with the largest percentage increases in high school graduates are Nevada, Arizona, Florida, and North Carolina.

Types of Governance Structures in Higher Education

The Center's study identifies three types of higher education structures among the 50 states:

1. Consolidated Governing Board Systems

In 24 states, governance of all public higher education is centralized into either one or two governing boards. Usually, there is one statewide board whose primary duty is to govern all public postsecondary institutions in the state, or there are two multi-campus boards that divide the governance of the state's public institutions between them. In North Carolina, for example, the University of North Carolina Board of Governors oversees all 16 public universities in the state but not the state's 59 community colleges, while Georgia's Board of Regents governs all four-year and two-year institutions.

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

a. Twenty-one states have **regulatory** boards with the authority to approve and eliminate academic programs at public institutions and to exercise some degree of regulatory power over university budgets. For instance, some regulatory boards present consolidated budgets, some may reject proposed budgets from individual campuses, and some review and submit individual campus budgets to the governor and the legislature. In Alabama, for example, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education receives individual budget requests directly from each public postsecondary institution, creates a consolidated budget request based upon the information it receives, and presents this consolidated budget to the legislature.

b. Three states have **advisory** coordinating boards which have no real power, though their recommendations may be influential. They have the authority to review university budgets and proposals to create new academic programs and to review existing programs, but their role is limited to providing advice to the state legislature, governor, or other higher education boards. Quoting a former chairman of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, commission staffer Adam S. Krech says, "Being the head of a coordinating board is like standing between a dog and a tree."

3. Planning Agency Systems

In two states -- Michigan and Delaware -- there is no statewide board charged with higher education coordination or governance. There is only a planning agency that facilitates communication among institutions and education sectors and performs a voluntary planning function. Governance is the responsibility of institutional boards on each campus or of multi-campus boards. For example, in Michigan, the State Board of Education has limited power to coordinate higher education functions, but most responsibilities for governance are handled by campus-level boards for Michigan's 15 public universities, 29 two-year public institutions, and 66 private institutions.

Other Key Findings of the Study

Among the other findings in the Center's report are the following:

- * California has the largest total student enrollment among the 50 states and the largest number of higher education institutions (400), while Alaska has the lowest total enrollment and the smallest number of institutions (8).

- * The 10 states ranking highest in state funds for higher education operating expenses are California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, North Carolina, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Georgia.

- * Alabama has the largest number of historically black colleges and universities with 13, while North Carolina has the largest number of such public four-year institutions, with five.

- * Only in 14 states – California, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia – is the percentage of minorities enrolled in four-year public institutions larger than the percentage of minorities in the population as a whole.

- * The average cost of tuition and fees for state residents at four-year public higher education institutions is lowest in Nevada (\$1,884) and North Carolina (\$1,895).

- * Members of 43 central higher education boards are appointed by state governors, either with or without approval of the state senate. Alternatively, in five states, the governor or another public official appoints a portion of the board with the state legislature electing the remaining board members. Only in North Carolina and New York is the entire membership of the central, state-level board *elected by the legislature*. Two other states – Nevada and Michigan – are unusual in that they have chosen *election by the public* for the members of their central higher education boards.

Unique State Features in Higher Education Governance

The Center says the most important factors influencing the structure of each state's higher education system are those that are unique to each state: its political and higher education culture, constitution, history, population, geography, economic development, and other factors. Unique constitutional provisions can be found in Michigan, North Dakota, and North Carolina. For example, Michigan has a long history of guarding institutional autonomy embedded in its constitution and thus is one of only two states with a planning agency structure, electing to keep governing duties in the hands of each individual campus. North Dakota's constitution spells out the name, location, and mission of eight higher education institutions that the state must maintain, even including the location of a school of forestry. And, in North Carolina, the constitution mandates that "The General Assembly shall provide that the benefits of the University of North Carolina and other public institutions of higher education, as far as practicable, be extended to the people of the State free of expense," which explains why the average tuition for North Carolina residents is consistently among the lowest in the nation.

The sheer size of the population of New York City probably has led to the higher education governance system chosen by the New York legislature, with the City University of New York (CUNY) governing all institutions within the five boroughs of New York City and the State University of New York (SUNY) governing all other postsecondary institutions within the state. California, the state with both the largest number of students enrolled in its public colleges and universities and the largest number of public institutions, has created a three-tiered system of governance – one for the nine research institutions, one for the state university's 22 campuses, and one for the two-year junior colleges. Other examples of how geography, economics, and culture can affect university governance are found in the unique charge to the Iowa State Board of Regents to use degradable foam packing material manufactured from grains and starches and the charge to the Board of Regents for the University of Wisconsin System to study the reintroduction of elk into the northern part of the state.

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 North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research

The North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization created to study public policy issues and to evaluate 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 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, and other book-length research reports. The Center is currently conducting studies of all 38 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 North Carolina 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	21,798	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 ^A	* Consolidated Governing Board
36.	Nebraska	442,020,000	Coordinating Board-Regulatory
37.	West Virginia ^B	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.

^A 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.