

**Patterns of State Coordination and Governance of Community
and Technical Colleges and Other Less-than Baccalaureate
Institutions**

Background Information for the Nevada System of Higher Education

June 1, 2022

Aims McGuinness

Introduction

The patterns for organizing community and technical colleges across the fifty states defy easy classification. Each state has evolved different modes for delivering services commonly thought of as being within the purview of “community colleges”, differences that are based on the state’s unique demographic, economic, geographic context as well as the existing configuration of public institutions. Each state’s structure for governing, coordinating, regulating, and financing the provision of these services reflects the state’s unique legal structure and political culture. The purpose of this paper is to summarize key points to assist in understanding the differences among states and to outline how the structures have changed over the past few decades and are continuing to change to meet the realities of the current demographic, economic and educational environment.

Array of community college services

In conceptual terms, a comprehensive community college has the institutional capacity to provide a range of services to several different student or client groups within certain policy parameters related to accessibility, price, cost, and flexibility to meet client needs. These characteristics distinguish community colleges from most other providers:

- Open access and focus on student goal attainment
- Lower price (tuition and required fees) than university sectors made possible by higher share of state funding per student and a greater focus on the instruction function
- Cost-effectiveness
- Flexibility and responsiveness to client needs

Community colleges commonly serve four different client groups:

- In-school youth (students enrolled primarily in secondary education but also early intervention and services to students at the elementary and middle-school levels to ensure strong preparation for college-level work and, in some cases, vocational/technical skills for immediate employment or subsequent education/training at the postsecondary level). These students may enroll concurrently in high school and a community college.
- Recent high school graduates (typically students who graduated from high school within the previous six months to a year).
- Adults, including:
 - Young adults who left secondary education before obtaining a high school diploma who

are seeking adult basic education or preparation for the GED, or in some cases, an industry-based certification necessary for employment

- Young adults who obtained a high school diploma or equivalent and entered the workforce directly from high school, and who seek additional education/training for skills necessary for employment/career advancement
- Older adults with work experience and a wide range of prior learning, including adults with from less-than-high school education seeking adult basic education or preparation for the GED; and adults with one or more years of postsecondary education seeking further education or training for skills necessary for employment/career advancement
- Employers. This client group differs from the general adult population because the principal source of demand is the employer, not the adult – although adults are the clients served. Another distinguishing point is that the venue for service provision is often (but not necessarily) at the worksite, not on campus.

A community college must tailor its programs and services to the unique needs of each of its client groups. The principal programs and services are as follows:

- Learning support services for youth and adults who are less than college-ready
- General education
- Transfer preparation
- Career preparation: certificate and associate degree programs in occupational fields. An increasing number of colleges are also delivering bachelor's degrees in applied science (BAS) degrees in fields in which professional licensure and specialized accreditation standards require more preparation than students can accomplish within the traditional 60-hour associate degree framework.
- Customized training and rapid response workforce development
- Community service (non-credit and other services to the community)
- Brokering the services of, or and functioning as a delivery site for, other providers (e.g., four-year institutions offering upper-division baccalaureate programs on a community college campus)

What services community and technical colleges deliver and how varies significantly among the states and in some cases, within regions of the same state. In some states, comprehensive community colleges conduct most, if not all, these services. In other cases, different institutions provide portions of these services, e.g., technical colleges focused on career preparation and workforce training primarily for recent high school graduates, university branch campuses

focused primarily on transfer preparation, or workforce training centers focused on customized training and rapid-response workforce development for adults. Community/technical colleges often provide or coordinate rapid-response workforce training functions through a workforce unit separate from the college's academic (degree credit granting) structure and financed primarily through employer contracts and state workforce development sources.

Differences in how institutions are governed and financed

The manner in which institutions evolved determines to a considerable extent how they are governed. The following is a summary of the principal development patterns:

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

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

State-level governance, coordination, or regulation

Most states have a state-level structure for oversight of community and/or technical colleges. These state-level structures vary as widely as the origins and governing arrangements for community colleges. (See Appendix C). This report makes a careful distinction between three types of state function: *governing boards* have centralized responsibilities for appointing presidents, conducting other governing, administrative and back-office functions, and delegating powers to local colleges; *coordinating boards* have planning, budget and oversight responsibilities but governance of colleges is the responsibility of local college boards; *regulating agencies* carry out basic oversight functions but the governance of colleges is the responsibility of local college boards.

The main types of state-level structures as illustrated on Appendix C include

- A unit under the State board of education that is responsible primarily for K-12 education (Florida, Iowa, and Pennsylvania) *regulates* community colleges. Governance of community colleges (or community college districts) in these states is the responsibility of local

governing boards.

- A state-level board *governs* both universities and the community and/or technical colleges or other types of campuses mainly providing certificate and associate programs. These boards fulfill typical governing responsibilities as well as providing administrative and other back-office functions for both state universities and community/technical colleges. Despite this commonality, these systems differ significantly in the characteristics of their constituent institutions and in the authority and responsibility of the system board. In addition to the Nevada System of Higher Education, other states in this category include Alaska, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New York (CUNY), North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, and Vermont. There are nuances reflecting unique conditions in each of these states making comparisons problematic. Appendix A provides a brief profile of four of these systems that include research universities.
- A state-level governing board for state universities is also responsible for *coordinating* locally governed community colleges (Kansas and New York (State University of New York (SUNY))). Governance of community colleges (or community college districts) in these states is the responsibility of local boards. While the governance of SUNY community colleges is largely the responsibility of local boards, the SUNY Board of Trustees retains certain governing responsibilities including appointing college presidents.
- A coordinating board or agency for all higher education *coordinates* locally governed community colleges. In these states, there is no state-level agency dedicated explicitly to community colleges; however, the statewide community college association commonly plays an important coordinating and advocacy role for community colleges. Examples are the community college associations in Arkansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Texas.
- An independent state board *coordinates* locally governed community and/or technical colleges. These boards have coordinating and regulatory authority for locally governed institutions. Examples include the California Community College System, Illinois Community College Board, the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the West Virginia Community and Technical Colleges, and the Wisconsin Technical College System Board.
- An independent state board *governs* community and/or technical colleges. Examples include the Colorado, Kentucky Community and Technical College System, the Georgia Technical College System, Indiana Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana, Louisiana Community and Technical College System, the Maine Community College System, the Community College System of New Hampshire, the North Carolina Community College System, the South Carolina Technical College System, the College System of Tennessee (Tennessee Board of Regents), and the Virginia Community College System. The Kentucky, Louisiana, North

Carolina, and Tennessee systems resulted from consolidation of existing community colleges with technical institutions previously under the state's designated state board of vocational education. The systems in Georgia, Indiana, Maine, and New Hampshire evolved from previous postsecondary technical institution systems.

- The state has no state-level board or entity with authority over locally governed community colleges (Arizona and Michigan).
- Several states continue to have postsecondary technical schools linked to the secondary school system offering non-degree technical programs for immediate entry to the labor market following high school graduation. These schools are commonly linked to career and technical education division of the state education department.

Sources of financing and state and local structure

How community and technical colleges are governed relates to the extent to which they are financed by state appropriations or through local tax revenues. Appendix B shows the funding for community colleges in each state from state appropriations, tuition, and local appropriations). States are listed according to the level of local funding starting with those states in which community colleges receive no local funding. While there are some exceptions, most states that fund community colleges primarily through state appropriations organize their community colleges systems under statewide governing boards. These boards are either statewide governing boards for higher education systems such as Nevada, or statewide governing systems for community or technical colleges such as Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia. If local boards exist in these governing systems, they are only advisory and function within the legal authority of the statewide governing board.

Among states funded primarily by state appropriations and tuition revenue, only two are under the authority of a statewide *coordinating* board rather than governing board: Washington State and West Virginia. Colleges in each of these states have local governing boards appointed by the governor that operate within the oversight of a statewide coordinating board.

Most community colleges/technical colleges that are funded primarily from local appropriations have local governing boards. Most of these colleges also operate within the authority of a state coordinating/regulator agency responsible either for just the community college sector or for the overall public higher education system. Arizona, which eliminated its state community college entity in 2003, is an exception to this pattern. State agencies in several other states, such as the New Mexico Department of Higher Education, have a role limited primarily to developing and recommending state funding formulas for community colleges.

Trends in state-level system and community/technical college governance

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

The 1960s: Dramatic development

The extensive development of community colleges, postsecondary technical institutions, and two-year university branches occurred during the massive higher education enrollment growth period of the 1960's. Fueling the development were several forces: local leaders seeking new institutions to spur regional development, advocates of the emerging model of the comprehensive community college; the federal vocational education acts of 1963 and 1968 which provided funding for postsecondary career and technical education; and university leaders seeking to provide access to university programs and extend their institutions' political influence in regions away from the main campus.

A few states developed fairly coherent statewide systems in which career/technical programs were integrated with comprehensive community colleges and in which universities generally did not develop competing two-year branches (California, Illinois, Virginia, and Washington State, as examples). In several other states these developments resulted in highly fragmented, uncoordinated networks of institutions providing less-than-baccalaureate education linked to different statewide entities, each competing for state funding.

1970s: Growth of state coordinating and oversight entities

Beginning in the mid-1960s, numerous states faced with highly fragmented networks of public institutions developed statewide coordinating agencies intended to curb unnecessary duplication in programs and facilities. The need for better coordination of public, less-than-baccalaureate institutions, all serving the same region, was a major task of these new entities; their success in fulfilling this objective has varied significantly.

1980s and 1990s: Period of consolidation of community college and technical college systems

In an effort to achieve efficiencies, curb unnecessary duplication, promote improved student pathways, and enhance workforce responsiveness, several states enacted major consolidations under a single statewide governing board for community colleges, technical colleges, and other institutions. New statewide community and technical college systems were established in North Carolina (1979), Connecticut (1989 and 1992), Kentucky (1997), and Louisiana (1998). In each of these cases, reforms consolidated previously separate systems.

In Alaska and Montana, community colleges were linked to existing state universities. In Alaska, community colleges were integrated with the three university campuses and renamed community campuses. In Montana, the colleges became campuses of one of the universities while maintaining their missions as two-year campuses.

Two states, Minnesota (1991) and Connecticut (2011) went further and consolidated existing state university systems (not including the states' research universities) with community and technical college systems. Kansas (1999) consolidated oversight of locally governed community colleges under a statewide university governing board. Kansas (1999).

Meanwhile, several states (Georgia, Indiana, Maine, and New Hampshire) expanded the mission of existing statewide networks of postsecondary technical institutions to encompass elements of the broader community college mission (e.g., granting academic credit in applied associate degrees and, in some cases, transfer associate degrees) in addition to their traditional technical and workforce training missions. 2010 – 2020: Strengthening the link between higher education, future economy of the state, and the state governance of community and technical colleges

Both Tennessee and Utah illustrate new systemic strategies to link the state higher education system to the future of the state's economy and, within that strategy, to strengthen the role of community and technical colleges.

The Tennessee public higher education system includes the University of Tennessee System, the College System of Tennessee governed by the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR), and six state universities. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) is the overall coordinating body for the higher education system. Prior to 2010, TBR governed the six state universities, thirteen community colleges, and twenty-seven technology centers. In 2010, the Tennessee General Assembly enacted legislation to strengthen the existing community colleges as a system (the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010), and to enhance the role of the technology centers (renamed the Tennessee Colleges of Advanced Technology (TCATs) in 2013). In 2015, legislation was enacted granting the six universities their own governing boards and focusing the role of TBR on governing the community colleges and TACTs and leading the newly named College System of Tennessee.

The TCATS and community colleges have different but complementary missions. The community colleges serve most of the common functions of this sector including certificate and associate degrees programs for recent high school graduates and adults, dual enrollment for secondary school students, and workforce and community development for their regions. The TCATS emphasize state-of-the-art technical training for workers to obtain the technical skills and professional training linked to the needs of their region's business and industry. Training programs are based on clock hours, not academic credits, and are usually full-time for a specified period (in contrast to community college academic calendar). The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accredits the community colleges; the SACS Commission on Occupational Education accredits the TCATs.

Tennessee has sustained its position over the terms of three governors as a national leader in the efforts to align the higher education system with the state's economic competitiveness. The key is dynamic relationship among key entities: the Department of Economic and Community

Development, the Department of Labor and Workforce Development, the Tennessee Commission on Higher Education (THEC), the University of Tennessee, and the College System of Tennessee. (The THEC 2020 update of the Master Plan, *Tennessee: Enabling the Competitive Edge: Tennessee Higher Education in the New Economy*, Master Plan Update 2020 <https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/thec/bureau/research/other-research/master-plan/finalmp.pdf>)

Utah legislation enacted in 2020 (see Appendix A) consolidating sixteen institutions under the newly constituted Utah System of Higher Education: eight technical colleges, two community colleges, four regional universities, and two research universities. A key element of the change was the consolidation the former Utah College of Applied Technology with its multiple campuses into the new system and elevating their position parallel to, but coordinated with, the community colleges and other academic institutions. The intent of the new system is to:

- Allow for more comprehensive strategic planning that encompasses the full spectrum of higher education
- Increase accessible, affordable opportunities within higher education
- Create seamless education pathways from certificates to degrees
- Improve collaboration between institutions
- Meet the rapidly changing needs of a growing workforce (Landward, Geoffrey T. (2020). "The New University System of Higher Education," *Issue Brief*, May 2020 https://ushe.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdf/reports/issue_brief/2020/2020_New_Combined_System.pdf)

In contrast to the previous divided structure, the new system has a significant advantage as a coordinated means to engage the full scope of Utah higher education in the state's economic development strategies through the Governor's Unified Economic Opportunity Commission. The Commissioner of Higher Education serves on the Commission along with the leaders of the state's major departments: the superintendent of public instruction, agriculture and food, workforce services, transportation, natural resources, the superintendent of public instruction, and the Governor's offices of economic opportunity and planning and budget. Also, non-voting members include representatives of the state's major business organizations. <https://business.utah.gov/unified-economic-opportunity-commission/>

Pandemic and beyond: Increasing role of systems/" systemness"

Rapidly changing environment

The pandemic has only amplified trends that were already having a profound impact on higher education and is leading to rethinking how public institutions are governed and financed. Public

higher education is moving away from a highly decentralized network of separately governed institutions competing for students and limited public resources. What is emerging is a more systemic, integrated network of institutions in which the collective resources of several institutions are utilized to ensure student pathways toward goals and responsiveness to changing state and regional economic development and human resource priorities. The challenge for states will be to realign current structures and policies for governing and financing institutions to adapt to the dramatically changing environment.

- Recent data show that overall enrollment in higher education declined by 4.5% from Spring 2021 to Spring 2022. The decline was most pronounced in community colleges—7.8%. Among age groups, the decline was greatest (5.8%) among adults ages twenty-four and over, a population most often served by community colleges. (National Clearinghouse Research Center: *Current Term Enrollment Estimates, May 26, 2022. From Spring 2021 to Spring 2022* <https://nscresearchcenter.org/current-term-enrollment-estimates/>)

Community college enrollments frequently decline in periods of low unemployment. This time, however, the decline reflects deeper changes in where and how students gain access to postsecondary education and pursue paths to credentials and degrees:

- Students are gaining credits and competencies from multiple providers. Non-traditional providers, including employers, are granting an increasing complex array of credentials certifying specific skills and competencies: certificates, digital badges, and other micro-credentials.
- The pandemic has fundamentally changed where and how people work and learn. The model of students going to the source of instruction has given way to a new requirement that instruction be delivered to students wherever they may be. Student “swirl” among multiple institutions and new credentials and modes by which students gain competencies are making traditional policies regarding articulation and transfer among institutions obsolete. The challenge now is to develop policies and services that facilitate student pathways among multiple institutions and recognize competencies (e.g., through prior learning assessment (PLA) earned toward micro-credentials or other non-academic learning experiences).
- Colleges are facing serious budget challenges as loss of tuition revenue from enrollment decline. This is intensifying the competition for students among institutions, especially those serving the same geographic region. Community colleges are especially vulnerable as more selective universities in the same market area lower their requirements to attract students who otherwise would attend a community college. In some states, serious financial pressures are forcing community colleges, especially those in rural areas, to make serious budget cuts leading to termination of faculty and staff in critical higher-cost occupational and technical programs.

- Faced with skilled workforce shortages, employers are increasingly looking for sources of not only new skilled employees but also ways to retrain and upskill their current workforce. The emerging demand is for rapid-response workforce training and new, more flexible modes of delivery than is available in traditional higher education institutions.

Implications for governance and functions of state higher education systems

For states with existing statewide systems the new environment requires fundamental redesign of traditional functions and embracing new roles and functions internal and external to the system. States with highly fragmented and largely uncoordinated institutional networks will face an extraordinary challenge in developing the needed collaboration among institutions to ensure clear pathways for students toward learning and career goals, and to provide a coherent, coordinated link to external partners (e.g., business, industry, K-12 education, health care, and state economic and workforce development entities).

States established existing higher education systems when college enrollments were exploding, and new institutions were being built to respond to this increasing demand. While the specific issues varied among states, common rationales for the creation of systems were to:

- Provide a single point of accountability to the governor and state legislature for efficient and effective governance and administration of multiple public campuses.
- Mitigate regional competition and conflicts regarding the location of new institutions and high-cost programs (e.g., engineering and health sciences and doctoral programs) and removing these decisions from the political process.
- Reduce or prevent unnecessary duplication of programs; and gain efficiencies in the delivery of programs and the provision of back-office operations.

Most systems emphasized clear mission differentiation (e.g., between research universities, access-oriented state universities, and community/technical college or two-year campuses), as well as policies to eliminate barriers to student transfer and other basic inter-institutional relationships. Finance policies tended to foster inter-institutional competition rather than collaboration by rewarding enrollment growth or credit-hour production. Increasing reliance on tuition revenue further exacerbated competition and worked against collaboration.

Many of the traditional functions remain important. In the current economic environment, achieving economies-of-scale (albeit, with attention to needed reform and innovation) in functions such as budgeting and finance, legal, human resources, information/data systems, procurement, is increasingly important. However, systems must now pursue other critical *inward-facing* and *outward-facing* leadership roles. The following are examples.

Inward-facing roles:

- Using policy tools available to support inter-institutional collaboration and academic program and resource sharing. The goal should be that the system is “more than the sum of its parts” in providing clear student pathways toward career and learning goals and linking the assets of the entire system to regional and statewide priorities.
- Using finance and accountability policies are key means to incentivize collaboration and sharing. Important questions include: what barriers or disincentives exist in current policies? How could the system redesign existing policies to incentivize collaboration and resource sharing?
- Developing system-level policies to facilitate student career and learning pathways between and among institutions and multiple providers.
 - Systemwide standards for prior learning assessment (PLA) to integrate competencies reflected in new credentials (certificates, digital badges) and workplace learning into academic credit toward a degree.
 - System incentives to enhance student pathways such as technology assisted advising/guidance, stackable credentials: combining competencies developed through badges, certificates with academic programs.
- Using the system’s authority and responsibility for presidential appointment/evaluation not only to ensure a proper match with a specific institution’s mission and culture, but also to reward presidential initiative to develop collaborative relationships and support the president in leading campus-level change. Most needed changes will take place at the institutional/campus level. Without firm, consistent support (including training in change management) from system leadership, campus leaders will be hesitant to pursue needed changes, or worse, be forced out by campus resistance.

Outward-facing roles:

Public higher education systems have traditionally focused externally on advocating on behalf of their constituent institutions with the governor and state legislature for operating and capital budgets and other system priorities. Community and technical college systems generally have funding and oversight relationships with the state workforce agencies and state department responsible for career/technical education (e.g., Perkins V).

These traditional relationships continue to be important; however, systems are now playing the far more dynamic leadership role of serving as the link between the full range of system capacities from community colleges to research universities to the future competitiveness of the state’s economy and workforce. In this role, systems have a major responsibility to partner with the governor’s economic development office and key economic development, workforce,

education, and other state agencies as well as with the state's major business, industry, health care, and civic leaders.

How each state responds to these challenges will reflect its unique history, economy, culture, and current higher education structure. The states that have a systemwide structure in place have an advantage compared to those with highly fragmented, loosely coordinated higher education systems. The key, however, is for systems to realign their leadership roles and functions to meet the realities of the new demographic, economic, and educational environment. The cases of Tennessee and Utah illustrate how states are seeking to make this important transition.

In conclusion, systems will be increasingly important:

- To students to provide smooth, affordable pathways through and among the system's institutions toward their educational and career goals
- To employers for ensuring responsiveness to rapidly changing workforce needs from rapid-response training to preparation of highly skilled graduates
- To the state as a single point of contact for engaging all the system's institutions in the state's strategies for developing a competitive economy and workforce

Appendix A. University Systems including universities and community and technical college/two-year campuses

The following are brief profiles of systems that include universities (including research the state's major research universities) and community and technical college/two-year campuses.

University of Alaska System

In July 1987, the Alaska Board of Regents consolidated the university system's thirteen (13) formerly independently accredited community colleges (now called community campuses) into one of the three main independently accredited university campuses to create three multi-campus universities (identified as major administrative units (MAUs)): The University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), the system's original Land-Grant, doctoral-granting research university; the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA); and the University of Alaska Southeast in Juneau (UAS). As a result of the 1987 consolidation:

- All community college programs, faculty, and staff were integrated with UAF, UAA, and UAS.
- The community colleges, now called community campuses, no longer had independent accreditation.
- Each university established a school or college specifically for non-degree vocational-technical programs leading to certificates.
- While the community campuses have a few resident faculty, academic programs are delivered using distance technology across the campuses from the main campuses, and in some cases, from one community campus to others.
- The budgets and financing of the community campuses were integrated with the budgets of each of the three multi-campus universities (MAUs). Consequently, tuition rates for the former community colleges were increased to the level of those for the universities. Differential (lower) tuition rates for community college courses were eliminated. The Subsequent efforts to reinstitute lower tuition rates for community campuses were not successful in part because funding was not available to replace the revenue loss for the university as a whole.

The University of Alaska system office, "Statewide," conducts a full range of common system functions (e.g., academic affairs, facilities planning and construction, finance and budget, human resources). The system-level Office for Workforce Development serves as the coordinating point between the University of Alaska System and the state department of education and other agencies of state government regarding vocational technical education offered through the community campuses. <https://www.alaska.edu/alaska/>

University of Hawai'i System

The University of Hawai'i Community Colleges (UHCC) is a statewide system of seven separately accredited institutions which is part of the larger ten-campus University of Hawai'i System. Each college provides a range of general and pre-professional associate degree programs as well as certificate and associate degrees in career and technical education. Each college has a unit responsible for career and community education providing non-credit education and training to meet workforce and community needs. The community college chancellors report to the Vice President for Community Colleges who in turn reports to the University President. The system community college unit has academic and administrative functions (e.g., facilities planning, human resources, budget, planning and finance) focused on the community colleges. These functions are separate from but coordinated with similar functions for the overall university system (e.g., the Vice President for Administration). In contrast to most other states, the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai'i is the designated state board of vocational education for the purposes of federal law. Reporting to the Board of Regents is a State Board of Career and Technical Education (CTE) which is responsible for overall CTE in coordinating with the State Board of Education, administration of Perkins V funding, and coordinating CTE programs with the community colleges.

Montana University System

The Montana Board of Regents has constitutional authority to govern and coordinate all public higher education in Montana. The Board of Regents has governing authority for the three universities: the Montana State University, University of Montana, and Montana Technological University. The Board of Regents also has coordinating authority for three locally governed community colleges. Montana has six tribal colleges that provide community college services.

In 1994, the Board of Regents consolidated sixteen campuses under two university systems: Montana State University and the University of Montana (UM). In 2017, Montana Technological University was separated from the University of Montana system to report directly to the Board of Regents. Each university president is under the direction of and is responsible to the commissioner of higher education.

Nine campuses in the Montana University System that provide two-year educational opportunities common to the community college mission are linked to one of the three universities: four to Montana State University, four to the University of Montana and one to Montana Tech.

The division of responsibilities for the governance of the community colleges in Montana stems from article X, section 9, paragraph (2)(a) of the Montana constitution. "The government and control of the Montana university system is vested in a board of regents of higher education which shall have full power, responsibility, and authority to supervise, coordinate, manage and control the Montana university system and shall supervise and coordinate other public

educational institutions assigned by law."

Within the Office of Commissioner, a director of dual enrollment and career and technical education is within the unit headed by the deputy commissioner, academic, research, and student affairs. For federal Perkins V funding, the Board of Regents collaborates with the State Board of Education, the federally recognized state board for vocational education.

Utah System of Higher Education

The unified Utah System of Higher Education under the authority of the Utah Board of Higher Education, as established by legislation enacted in 2020, includes sixteen institutions, including eight technical colleges, two community colleges, four regional universities, and two research universities. Prior to the reorganization, the Board of Regents governed the community colleges, regional universities, and research universities. A board of trustees governed the Utah College of Applied Technology (UCAT), a system of eight regional applied technology college (ATC) campuses. The 2020 reorganization transferred the governance of the applied technology campuses, renamed technical colleges, to the reconstituted Board of Higher Education. The new system governing board has following duties and authorities:

- Governing the Utah System of Higher Education
- Establishing a statewide vision and goals
- Setting policies to achieve statewide goals
- Establishing performance metrics
- Collecting, analyzing, and coordinating System data
- Establishing and overseeing institutional roles
- Setting criteria for program approval
- Appointing and evaluating institutional presidents

(Landward, Geoffrey T. (2020). "The New University System of Higher Education," *Issue Brief*, May 2020 https://ushe.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdf/reports/issue_brief/2020/2020_New_Combined_System.pdf)

The legislation calls for the Board of Higher Education to establish two committees, one for technical education and the other for academic education. It further creates the positions of associate commissioner for academic education and associate commissioner for technical education. (S.B. 111, Higher Education Amendments 2020 General Session State of Utah).

Each institution in the Utah Higher Education System has a board of trustees that functions within the overall authority of the Board of Higher Education.

An *Issue Brief* describes the intended benefits of the changes:

- Merging the systems creates more benefits than just structural change, however; some prominent advantages include:
- Allowing for more comprehensive strategic planning that encompasses the full spectrum of higher education
- Increasing accessible, affordable opportunities within higher education
- Creating seamless education pathways from certificates to degrees
- Improving collaboration between institutions
- Meeting the rapidly changing needs of a growing workforce

To seize these advantages, the new System must embrace the view that technical and academic education are not mutually exclusive options for students, but are, in fact, educational opportunities that can complement and build on each other, can provide pathways to better access and outcomes for all students from all backgrounds, and can lead to partnerships within the System that will make higher education more efficient and effective for students moving forward. (Landward, Geoffrey T. (2020). "The New University System of Higher Education," Issue Brief, May 2020 https://ushe.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdf/reports/issue_brief/2020/2020_New_Combined_System.pdf)

The academic institutions and technical colleges are accredited by different organizations. The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accredits the academic institutions, and the Council on Occupational Education (COE) accredits the technical colleges.

About 25% of technical college students are high school-age students who spend part of their day learning technical skills at technical college campus. The other 75% of college students are adults who are seeking new skills to obtain employment or are upgrading their current employability skills. Technical college students who complete their training programs are awarded certificates that indicate the mastery of specific employability competencies in their area of study.

Another feature of the technical colleges is the customized training program, Custom Fit, which provides state-subsidized training to Utah businesses for incumbent workers. Companies partner with technical colleges and certain degree-granting institutions to design and/or arrange training opportunities to help Utah companies to grow, increase productivity, or gain a competitive edge. Utah System of Higher Education (2020). *Utah System of Technical Colleges 2020 Annual Report*. https://ushe.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdf/reports/general_report/2020/Utech_Annual_Report_2020.pdf

Appendix B. Funding by Revenue Source Community and Technical Colleges and Other 2-Year Institutions, 2019-20 Listed by Percent of Local Appropriations & Nonoperating Grant

State	Percent of Total Funding by Revenue Source ^{1, 2, 3}			Total Funding by Revenue Source			
	Net Tuition & Fees	State Appropriations & Nonoperating Grants	Local Appropriations and Nonoperating Grants	Net Tuition & Fees	State Appropriations & Nonoperating Grants	Local Appropriations and Nonoperating Grants	Total Funding (Net Tuition & Fees, State & Local Appropriations) per
Connecticut	24.9	75.1	0.0	\$3,429	\$10,330	\$0	\$13,759
Delaware	38.0	62.0	0.0	\$5,694	\$9,306	\$0	\$15,000
Hawaii	17.7	82.3	0.0	\$3,352	\$15,577	\$0	\$18,929
Indiana	30.2	69.8	0.0	\$2,510	\$5,809	\$0	\$8,318
Kentucky	29.5	70.5	0.0	\$2,120	\$5,057	\$0	\$7,177
Louisiana	48.5	51.5	0.0	\$2,894	\$3,068	\$0	\$5,961
Maine	21.2	78.8	0.0	\$1,685	\$6,251	\$0	\$7,936
Massachusetts	34.6	65.4	0.0	\$4,455	\$8,436	\$0	\$12,891
Minnesota	34.2	65.8	0.0	\$3,557	\$6,835	\$0	\$10,392
Nevada	32.8	67.2	0.0	\$2,686	\$5,491	\$0	\$8,177
North Dakota	39.3	60.7	0.0	\$4,070	\$6,282	\$0	\$10,352
Rhode Island	33.1	66.9	0.0	\$2,400	\$4,846	\$0	\$7,246
South Dakota	65.6	34.4	0.0	\$5,700	\$2,987	\$0	\$8,687
Utah	32.1	67.9	0.0	\$3,348	\$7,078	\$0	\$10,426
Vermont	72.9	27.1	0.0	\$9,566	\$3,561	\$0	\$13,126
Tennessee	22.2	77.8	0.0	\$2,030	\$7,132	\$0	\$9,162
New Hampshire	48.9	51.1	0.0	\$6,706	\$7,002	\$3	\$13,710
Georgia	38.5	61.2	0.3	\$2,725	\$4,331	\$22	\$7,078
Virginia	43.6	55.9	0.4	\$3,339	\$4,278	\$32	\$7,650
Alabama	30.1	69.4	0.5	\$2,561	\$5,913	\$41	\$8,514
West Virginia	27.7	71.8	0.5	\$2,035	\$5,276	\$36	\$7,348
Washington	36.0	63.1	0.8	\$3,451	\$6,042	\$80	\$9,572
Florida	28.1	70.2	1.7	\$1,814	\$4,531	\$106	\$6,451
Arkansas	22.6	66.5	10.9	\$2,138	\$6,303	\$1,036	\$9,478
Pennsylvania	44.4	38.9	16.7	\$4,543	\$3,984	\$1,712	\$10,239
Ohio	37.6	45.3	17.1	\$3,181	\$3,838	\$1,448	\$8,467
North Carolina	13.5	69.2	17.2	\$1,344	\$6,878	\$1,710	\$9,933
Mississippi	26.0	56.4	17.7	\$1,835	\$3,983	\$1,247	\$7,065

State	Percent of Total Funding by Revenue Source ^{1, 2, 3}			Total Funding by Revenue Source			
South Carolina	43.3	38.3	18.4	\$3,328	\$2,944	\$1,414	\$7,686
Oklahoma	28.6	50.8	20.6	\$2,372	\$4,217	\$1,706	\$8,294
Montana	29.3	50.1	20.6	\$3,103	\$5,318	\$2,186	\$10,606
Idaho	29.5	48.5	21.9	\$3,147	\$5,172	\$2,335	\$10,654
Colorado ⁴	54.5	21.5	24.1	\$5,577	\$2,197	\$2,463	\$10,237
Wyoming	18.2	57.3	24.5	\$3,349	\$10,543	\$4,504	\$18,395
Iowa	30.2	43.9	25.9	\$3,345	\$4,871	\$2,877	\$11,093
New Jersey	49.5	21.4	29.1	\$3,906	\$1,686	\$2,292	\$7,883
Oregon	24.4	45.3	30.3	\$4,560	\$8,458	\$5,655	\$18,673
Missouri	30.8	32.5	36.7	\$2,676	\$2,822	\$3,188	\$8,686
New York	26.4	34.8	38.8	\$3,220	\$4,232	\$4,725	\$12,177
Wisconsin	15.6	44.2	40.2	\$3,236	\$9,174	\$8,343	\$20,754
Maryland	27.7	30.6	41.6	\$4,363	\$4,825	\$6,555	\$15,744
Illinois	18.1	40.0	41.9	\$2,790	\$6,171	\$6,460	\$15,421
California	8.7	48.8	42.6	\$888	\$5,008	\$4,367	\$10,264
New Mexico	12.1	45.3	42.7	\$1,492	\$5,599	\$5,279	\$12,370
Michigan	30.2	26.8	43.1	\$3,961	\$3,515	\$5,656	\$13,131
Kansas	24.0	29.3	46.7	\$2,953	\$3,610	\$5,744	\$12,306
Texas	20.3	29.5	50.2	\$2,009	\$2,914	\$4,970	\$9,893
Nebraska	14.2	31.6	54.2	\$2,041	\$4,544	\$7,786	\$14,371
Arizona	19.2	7.9	72.9	\$2,022	\$834	\$7,692	\$10,548
Alaska ⁵	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
DC ⁶	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

¹ Net Tuition & Fees, State & Local Appropriations & Nonoperating Grants = 100%.

² Figures for Postsecondary Title IV Degree Granting Institutions.

³ This analysis treats institutions with $\geq 75\%$ of their awards at the sub-baccalaureate level to be two-year institutions. Therefore, community colleges and other two-year institutions that offer a limited number of baccalaureate degrees and may be classified by IPEDS as baccalaureate institutions are included in this analysis.

⁴ Colorado State & Local Appropriations includes State Operating Grants and Contracts to reflect student voucher-based appropriations.

⁵ Data for University of Alaska community campuses are not available because these are reported with data for the institution of which they are integrated: University of Alaska Anchorage, University of Alaska Fairbanks, or University of Alaska Southeast.

⁶ Data for the Community College are reported for the University of District of Columbia and not reported separately.

Appendix C: Patterns of State Coordinating of Community and Technical Colleges

State	State Board of Education <i>Coordinates and Regulates</i> Community Colleges	Consolidated Governing Board for both Two- and Four- year Institutions <i>Governs</i> Community	Coordinating Board for All Higher Education <i>Coordinates</i> Locally Governed Community Colleges	Independent State Board <i>Coordinates</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Independent State Board <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Four-year Institutions have Two-year Branches	Postsecondary Technical Institutes Organized Separately from Community Colleges	Some Four- year Institutions Offer Associate Degree Programs
Alabama					X		X	X
Alaska		X ¹				X		X
Arizona								
Arkansas			X ²		X	X		X
California				X				
Colorado				X ³	X			
Connecticut		X						
Delaware					X			
Florida	X ⁴						X	
Georgia		X ⁵			X			
Hawaii		X						
Idaho	X ⁶	X					X	X
Illinois				X				
Indiana					X	X		X
Iowa	X							
Kansas		X ⁷						X
Kentucky					X			X
Louisiana					X	X		X
Maine					X			X
Maryland			X					
Massachusetts		X						
Michigan	X ⁸							X
Minnesota		X						

State	State Board of Education <i>Coordinates and Regulates</i> Community Colleges	Consolidated Governing Board for both Two- and Four- year Institutions <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges	Coordinating Board for All Higher Education <i>Coordinates</i> Locally Governed Community Colleges	Independent State Board <i>Coordinates</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Independent State Board <i>Governs</i> Community Colleges and/or Technical Institutions	Four-year Institutions have Two-year Branches	Postsecondary Technical Institutes Organized Separately from Community Colleges	Some Four- year Institutions Offer Associate Degree Programs
Mississippi				X				
Missouri			X				X	X
Montana		X ⁹						
Nebraska			X					
Nevada		X						
New Hampshire					X			
New Jersey			X				X	
New Mexico			X			X	X	X
New York		X ¹⁰						
North Carolina					X			
North Dakota		X						X
Ohio			X			X	X	X
Oklahoma			X		X	X	X	
Oregon			X					
Pennsylvania	X					X	X	X
Rhode Island		X						
South Carolina					X	X		X
South Dakota							X	X
Tennessee					X			
Texas			X			X	X	X
Utah		X						
Vermont		X						
Virginia					X			
Washington				X				
West Virginia				X				X
Wisconsin					X	X		
Wyoming				X				
Puerto Rico		X						

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

¹ Community college campuses within the University of Alaska were integrated with three universities in 1987 and are now called community campuses.

² Some Arkansas community colleges are part of either the University of Arkansas System or the Arkansas State University System. Other community colleges have their own local boards of trustees.

³ The Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (SBCCOE) is the governing board for community colleges and the coordinating board for locally governed community colleges.

⁴ The Florida State Board of Education is the policy body for all public education. Governed locally by district boards of trustees, the community colleges (now called colleges) are under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education. Administratively, the Chancellor of the Florida College System reports to the Commissioner of Education who serves as the chief executive officer of the Department of Education. Florida also has several postsecondary technical schools that are overseen by another unit within the Department of Education.

⁵ Most of the former two-year campuses of the University System of Georgia have transitioned to institutions granting the majority of their degrees at the baccalaureate level. Only five of the colleges grant 75% or more of their degrees at the associate degree level. With few exceptions, most of these degrees are liberal arts transfer programs, and fields such as nursing, allied health, criminal justice, and business. The colleges in the Technical College Service of Georgia provide primarily certificate, applied associate degrees, and rapid-response workforce training.

⁶ The State Board also serves as the Board of Regents for the University of Idaho and as the Board of Trustees for Idaho State University, Boise State University, Lewis-Clark State College, and the State Board for Career Technical Education, the entity responsible for postsecondary technical colleges. Idaho's four community colleges are each governed by their own separate board of trustees.

⁷ The Kansas Board of Regents serves as the governing body for state universities and the coordinating entity for locally governed community colleges. The former technical institutes are now linked to state universities.

⁸ The Michigan Department of Education has limited authority only to approve certain career and technical programs as recommended by locally governed community colleges.

⁹ The Montana Board of Regents has constitutional authority to govern and coordinate all public higher education in Montana. The Board of Regents has governing authority for the three universities: the Montana State University, University of Montana, and Montana Technological University. Two-year campuses are linked to each of the universities. In addition, it has coordinating authority for three locally governed community colleges. There are six tribal colleges that provide community college services.

¹⁰ SUNY includes both community colleges that are partially financed at the county level, as well as five state-funded colleges of technology. CUNY includes several community colleges.