

## HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE - COMPARISON OF GOVERNANCE TYPES

### HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNING AND COORDINATING BOARDS

#### Governing Board

A consolidated higher education governing board manages and controls certain public institutions of higher education. Some governing boards are constitutionally mandated while others are established statutorily. The duties of governing boards can vary and may include preparing budgets, allocating resources, establishing personnel policies, managing assets, approving programs, and hiring chief executives for institutions.

The following table prepared by the Ohio Board of Regents staff lists potential strengths and weaknesses of consolidated governing boards:

<b>Higher Education Governing Board Model</b>	
<b>Potential Strengths</b>	<b>Potential Weaknesses</b>
Engaged in statewide strategic planning	Central planning can cause a slow response to workforce and business needs
Responsive to state priorities	Can evolve into large and inefficient bureaucracies
Guards against duplication	Can have political influence on micro issues at the institution level
Ensures program quality through program approval methods	Often lacks necessary data to assess institutional performance
Is able to address articulation and transfer issues	Tense relationships can develop between professional leaders and state government May become weighed down with internal concerns

#### Coordinating Board

A higher education coordinating board is a single agency other than a governing board that has the responsibility for the statewide coordination of certain higher education policy areas. Coordinating boards generally do not manage institutions and are not

responsible for hiring or setting the compensation of institution chief executives. Coordinating boards typically focus more on the needs of the state rather than the needs of the institutions. Some coordinating boards do have the authority to regulate certain areas, such as approving new programs at institutions.

The following table prepared by the Ohio Board of Regents staff lists potential strengths and weaknesses of higher education coordinating boards:

<b>Higher Education Coordinating Board Model</b>	
<b>Potential Strengths</b>	<b>Potential Weaknesses</b>
Quick to respond to market needs	State priorities can be hindered by local lobbying efforts
Engaged in statewide strategic planning	May be perceived as powerless if consensus is not achieved
Generally responsive to state priorities	Statewide initiatives can be hindered without the voluntary cooperation of all institutions
Private sector usually a direct partner	Difficult to reverse enacted policies or make policy changes
Sensitive to consumer needs	Institutional decisions at the local level may be in direct conflict with views at the state level
Builds consensus to make change, particularly with budgeting, program review, and articulation	

### EXAMPLES OF HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN OTHER STATES

Information from the Education Commission of the States providing examples of postsecondary governance and coordinating models and an overview of higher education governance and coordinating boards in other states is attached as an [appendix](#).

ATTACH:1