

participating in them. Some of these new initiatives -- "plight of young children" and "youth at risk" focus on education-related matters requiring Extension to coordinate with the Department of Human Resources (DHR), community colleges, and public schools. For example, in cooperative arrangements with DHR, CES is providing training and demonstrations in nutrition, food handling, child safety, and early childhood development to day care center operators. It also is becoming increasingly involved in school enrichment programs and after-school activities for which it uses 4-H club materials. It might be useful to consider how CES services augment, complement, or replicate similar services.

Recommendation

There is a single recommendation that corresponds to the single finding in the continuum of programs discussions.

Recommendation 1: **North Carolina should redesign its continuum of education programs and services for the 21st century.**

The new design should take into account issues raised in this study but should progress further. The process should include vigorous examination of all programs as if they were being created for the first time. For example, given contemporary family structure and employment trends, such as the fact that two-thirds of the mothers of young children are in the workforce, how should the State provide educational services to children of working mothers, including single mothers?

Second, the process should compare the existing structures, funding levels, and responsibilities of each system to the new design. Realignment of missions, changes in funding, or even the creation of a "fourth system" might result.

This kind of broad-based strategic planning or vision studies have been undertaken in North Carolina, but usually by or for each of the three education systems separately. Fortunately, because of the existence of many excellent studies, the work of bringing all of the ideas together, for education as whole, would be much easier. It would not be necessary to reinvent the entire wheel. A partial but illustrative list of major studies is provided as Appendix A.

The new strategic design for education can be developed in a number of ways. The General Assembly could appoint a small panel of educators and community leaders to develop the continuum. Alternatively, the General Assembly could mandate this task to the Governor and a new "education cabinet." Other possible methods exist.

For the sake of illustration, Exhibit 2 provides a simplified framework for a strategic analysis.

EXHIBIT 2 The State of North Carolina Design for Continuum of Education Programs					
Program/Need	Current Delivery System(s)	Desired Delivery System(s)	Intersystem Coordination Requirements & Methods	Current % of State Education Funding	Desired % of State Education Funding (e.g., in 5 years)
Core Instructional Programs (List)					
Research and Public Service Programs (List)					
Special Programs (List)					
Special Resources (List)					

A detailed array of the **desired** programs and services would need to be developed, and organized in relation to needs and goals. Also the required linkages between them would be defined. For Example:

Core Instructional Programs

Day Care & Child Devpt Centers
 Pre-School/Early Intervention
 Elementary Education – Basic
 Elementary Education – Special Education
 Middle School – Basic
 Middle School – Special Education
 High School – Academic Prep
 High School – "Tech-Prep" or Other Form of Basic Educ
 and General Workplace Preparation
 High School – Special Education
 Occupation-Oriented Vocational/Technical Education
 Undergraduate First-Professional Education
 Lower Division Undergraduate – General Baccalaureate
 Upper Division Undergraduate – General Baccalaureate
 Graduate – Master's
 Graduate – Doctoral
 Graduate – Postdoctoral
 Graduate – Professional

Research and Service Programs

Basic Research
 Applied Research
 Technology Commercialization
 Extension/Service Programs
 Economic Development Programs
 Business Development Support Programs

	Community Development Programs Cultural Institutions/Programs
Special Programs	Drop-out Prevention Adult Literacy Remediation for Entering College Students Adult/Senior Citizen Special Interest Courses Occupational Training/Retraining for Adults: Employer-Specific Occupational Training/Retraining for Adults: Non-Employer-Specific Apprenticeships Cooperative Education, and Other Forms of Experience-Based Education
Special Resources	Academic Computing Libraries Telecommunications and Advanced Technology Information Systems

The above would be expanded, refined, and grouped into more precise categories. In turn, this continuum, when developed, can be placed in context of an even broader continuum of State programs and services to infants, families, the elderly, the handicapped, and other special need groups, as the *North Carolina 2000* report structured its recommendations for human development around the theme of *people*. This vital link between education and other human services already is the subject of discussion in North Carolina and the specific focus of General Assembly study of "collaborative services" models, such as Kentucky's.

This is intended to be a strategic visioning exercise of the highest order. It should result in a strategic statement for what North Carolina wants to achieve in education; through which systems the different needs should be addressed; and at what approximate target level of funding each major element should be supported.

INTERSYSTEM GOVERNANCE

Background

North Carolina's three public education systems have very different governance structures and authority patterns (Exhibits 3 and 4). Differences in the three systems result from their different histories, statutes, and funding models.

Public Schools. The State Board of Education has 13 members, 11 of whom are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the General Assembly. Eight of the 11 are appointed from each of the educational districts; three are appointed at-large. The Lieutenant Governor and the State Treasurer are the remaining two members. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is responsible for implementing education policy as established by the State

Board. However, the State Superintendent does not report to the Board; he or she is elected by the public for a four-year term. The State Board has a staff of three. The State Superintendent manages and directs the Department of Public Instruction.

Local school boards govern local school districts. School board members are elected in local elections. Depending on the district, either local school boards or county commissioners appoint local superintendents.

The State is responsible for providing funds for programs while the local school districts provide the facilities. Ultimately, the State provides approximately 70 percent of the public instruction budget.

NCCCS. NCCCS is governed by the State Board of Community Colleges, which was formed by the General Assembly during the 1979 session to have sole governance responsibility for the community colleges. The State Board includes 20 members. The Governor appoints ten members, six of which represent six trustee regions and four of which are at-large. The two houses of the General Assembly elect four members each. The Lieutenant Governor and the State Treasurer also serve as *ex officio* members. The staff functions of the State Board are carried out by the Department of Community Colleges, headed by the President of NCCCS. The State Board elects the President of the System who serves at the pleasure of the Board.

Each of the 58 community colleges has a local board of trustees with 12 members. Local school boards and county boards of commissioners each elect four members; the Governor appoints the four remaining members. The elected head of the student body also serves as an *ex officio* member. Local boards select community college presidents, subject to approval of the State Board, and determine local policy.

The community colleges are county-owned, stated-aided institutions. The State assumes basic financial responsibility for costs of administration, instruction, and related equipment and funds capital facilities; counties assume primary responsibility for construction of some buildings and provides support for plant operations and maintenance. Each level of government may supplement whatever sums the other level provides in basic support.

UNC. UNC is governed by a Board of Governors with 32 members elected by the General Assembly. In addition, each campus has its own board of trustees, composed of 13 members, eight of which are elected by the Board of Governors and four of which are appointed by the Governor, with the elected president of the student body serving *ex officio*. The institution-level chief executive officers are chancellors, who are selected by the President of the University from a slate of candidates developed by the boards of trustees.

The staff functions of the Board of Governors are performed by UNC General Administration, the chief executive officer of which is the President of the University. The Board of Governors selects the President of the University.

EXHIBIT 3 State of North Carolina State Level Education Governance			
	Board	Chief Executive Officer	Board Staff Functions
Public Schools (K-12)	State Board of Education has 13 members: ●11 appointed by Governor and confirmed by General Assembly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 8 from education districts ■ 3 at large ●Lieutenant Governor ●State Treasurer	State Superintendent of Public Instruction is elected by voters at-large	Department of Public Instruction reports to State Superintendent, not to State Board of Education
NCCCS	State Board of Community Colleges has 20 members: ●10 appointed by Governor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 6 from districts ■ 4 at large ●4 elected by Senate ●4 Elected by House of Delegates ●Lieutenant Governor ●State Treasurer	President serves at pleasure of the State Board of Community Colleges	Department of Community College serves as Staff to State Board of Community College
UNC	Board of Governors has 32 members elected by General Assembly	President serves at pleasure of the Board of Governors	UNC General Administration serves as staff to Board of Governors

EXHIBIT 4 State of North Carolina Local Level Education Governance/Mix of State and Local Funding			
	Board	Chief Executive Officers	Public Funding Mix
Public Schools	District School Boards have members who are elected by voters in the county or district	Superintendents are elected by local Boards of Education	70% state/30% local State provides programs. Local districts provide facilities.
NCCCS	Boards of Trustees have 13 members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 4 elected by School Boards ● 4 elected by county boards of commissioners ● 4 appointed by Governor ● 1 is elected president of student body who serves <i>ex officio</i> 	Presidents are elected by local Boards of Trustees and confirmed by the State Board of Community Colleges	70% state/14% local/ 12% tuition/4 % other. State provides operating support. Counties provide facilities.
UNC	Boards of Trustees have 13 members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 8 elected by Board of Governors ● 4 are appointed by Governor ● 1 is elected president of student body who serves <i>ex officio</i> 	Chancellors are selected by the President of UNC from a slate developed by the Board of Trustees	100% state funded

The Board of Governors has comprehensive duties and powers for the control, supervision, management, and governance of all affairs of the 16 constituent institutions and develops, prepares, and presents a single, unified budget for all the constituent institutions. In recognition of the need for some decentralization of authority, the Board of Governors is authorized to delegate any of its powers to the institutional boards of trustees or, through the President, to the chancellors. The Board of Governors has delegated substantial authority to the institutional boards of trustees.

The institutions are wholly state-owned and receive little funding from local governments, with the exception of the counties' share of funding for the Cooperative Extension Service.

Findings

The following two findings summarize issues in intersystem governance.

Finding 2: Different organization structures, reporting relationships and location of authority limits opportunities for intersystem planning and decision making.

These three governance models are examples of very different centralized, decentralized, and mixed/balanced governance models.

DPI. The review of governance in public education found that there is split leadership and authority in the public education governance structure at the state level. This results in fragmented policy-making and management and creates the need, even under optimal conditions, to spend unnecessary time and effort on coordination. This split leadership results in inability to place accountability for performance at the state level.

NCCCS. Authority within NCCCS is, in practice, decentralized. Despite statutory language assigning responsibilities and authority for system planning and governance to the State Board of Community Colleges, decision-making authority, especially concerning programs, lies with the local community college presidents and boards. Presidents of local colleges report to the local boards and only indirectly to the President of NCCCS and the State Board. Interviewees report that the State Board of Community Colleges has been "unwilling or unable" to fully exercise its authority over the 58 community colleges. They observe that to fully implement any major policy "requires the approval of all 58 community college presidents."

UNC. The governance structure of UNC lies in the centralized-decentralized spectrum about mid-way between the other two system structures. It appears to be the most workable balance of North Carolina's three models between needs for central authority and local flexibility. The Board of Governors generally is inclined to review but support the President's decisions and the chancellors of the constituent institutions are responsive to the President and the Board of Governors, in addition to answering to their local boards of trustees.

Finding 3: Because there is no intersystem governance mechanism, the General Assembly serves as the sole coordinating body for education, but on an issue-by-issue basis.

General Assembly Initiatives. The need for intersystem solutions to educational issues has not escaped the attention of the General Assembly. From time to time, solutions are mandated for specific problems.

For example, as discussed above, during the 1989 session, the General Assembly mandated that the three systems, in consultation with private higher education institutions, develop a student information system that will enable the State to follow and report the progress of high school students who attend college.

In addition, during the 1988 session, the General Assembly mandated that the boards of the three systems meet annually. The mandated meetings have been held since 1989. In March 1990, the three boards produced a common goals statement which included the following goals:

- Increase dramatically the percentage of adults in North Carolina who hold a high school diploma
- Improve the State's postsecondary participation rate
- Expand tech prep articulation programs
- Increase transfers from NCCCS to UNC
- Promote the concept of education as a lifelong learning process
- Promote increased funding flexibility and accountability
- Maintain low tuition and fee rates
- Maintain education funding levels at nationally competitive levels

System-Level Initiatives. Not only has the General Assembly focused on coordination, but the three systems themselves are keenly aware of the fact that their efforts require collaboration. They have undertaken a number of voluntary initiatives to develop cross-system solutions to specific issues. A few of these are offered as examples.

Since 1978, the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education have undertaken joint initiatives to improve teacher education. These efforts included adopting concurrent resolutions directed toward improving teacher education, revising procedures for certifying public school teachers, and establishing a joint committee of the two boards to assist them in implementing the 1987 report of the Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers.

The President of UNC and the President of NCCCS established a Joint Advisory Committee to consider and make recommendations on matters that affect both systems. They also staff, with the private institutions, a Joint Committee of College Transfer Students. In the area of computer services, UNC provides NCCCS with data communication services. As of

March 1990, 30 community colleges were served by LINC NET and plans were to connect the balance of the institutions to the network.

Local Initiatives. Both UNC and NCCCS indicate that most forms of cooperation between NCCCS and UNC are largely voluntary and result from the initiatives of the individual institutions. Typically, a community college and a UNC institution enter into negotiated agreements for the delivery of instruction, joint development of curricula, faculty and staff development, and provision of various public service activities. For example, as stated above, NCCCS institutions contract with UNC institutions to provide general education courses. Community colleges, UNC institutions, and private colleges have created consortia which allow students to take courses at other colleges. As an example, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, UNC Greensboro, Guilford Technical Community College, and four private colleges have created the Greater Greensboro Consortium.

In a few instances, cooperation at the local or regional level has reached even beyond the three education systems. The Consortium for the Advancement of Public Education (CAPE) serves the southeastern part of the State and involves UNC-Wilmington, East Carolina University,, seven community colleges, 14 county school districts (an additional two participants are pending), four city school districts, the Camp Lejeune schools, and several area businesses. CAPE's purpose is to provide a mechanism for involving government, industry, and foundations to pursue "nontraditional" approaches to problems facing education.

Recommendations

Despite positive initiatives, voluntary, sporadic, and single-issue efforts may no longer suffice; some of the issues, including some described in this analysis, are so large and difficult to address that a top-level, top-down mandate is required to focus attention on them. The three systems of public education are co-dependent. UNC and NCCCS receive students from the public schools so they must be concerned with the public school performance. The public schools and NCCCS receive many teachers prepared by UNC. A more formal, operational mechanism is needed to address intersystem issues.

Recommendation 1: **The three system CEOs should be convened permanently as an "education cabinet" chaired by the Governor, to implement a strategic education design and resolve intersystem issues.**

With two-thirds of General Fund expenditures in education and most of the balance in related human resources, health, and other services for children, youth, and families, it would be an appropriate formal role for the Governor to serve as the State's "chief education officer" and convener/chairman of an education cabinet for purposes of planning, coordination and implementation of intersystem education issues. The cabinet would not be a voting body; its function would be operational. The Governor and the education cabinet would be the authority for resolution of intersystem issues, although each system CEO would still need to work with his/her Board, as before.

Representatives of private education should be invited to participate as adjunct members, either permanently or as issues arise that affect them. The Governor's staff, in coordination with staff of the three systems, could support the cabinet. The General Assembly, through legislative direction and budget authority, would continue to provide its policy framework.

The study team reviewed several other alternatives before deciding on the current recommendation. These included:

- Creating a secretary of education
- Creating a "super-board" over the three existing boards
- Combining the three boards into one, with three subcommittees, one for each system
- Continuing the present practice of having the General Assembly identify specific issues and apply solutions

Both the secretary of education and the super-board concepts would bring significant disadvantages, given North Carolina's current education structure. Both alternatives would weaken current system CEOs and boards, confuse lines of authority and accountability, and create another bureaucracy. Combining the three boards into one is an interesting concept but might be more disruptive and drastic a change than is needed. Also, it would not be an improvement for dealing with internal system issues. Continuing present practice is not optimal; it is unwieldy to attempt to manage entirely by legislation and budgeting.

The education cabinet idea, while not perfect either, maintains powers of existing CEOs and boards as they are with respect to internal system issues; requires minimal additional bureaucracy; and holds the Governor, as the elected chief executive officer of the State, directly accountable for operations of the State's education systems.

Recommendation 2: The Governor should convene the three boards or officers of the three boards as a State Education Commission.

This recommendation is designed to achieve some of the benefits of combining the three boards, but in a less disruptive way. The Governor should convene the currently required annual meetings of the three boards, and perhaps they might meet more often than annually. In the new arrangement, the agendas for these meetings would be framed by the education cabinet, for review and discussion. This is not envisioned to be a true governing body with statutory powers; rather it is proposed as a forum for airing proposals and engaging board-to-board dialogue about issues the education cabinet is addressing, as they eventually may require board actions. It also is possible that this change to the current practice would not be the last. In future, as experience evolves, this commission's status could be formalized further.

Two options for the State Education Commission are to (1) convene the entire board memberships, as is the practice now or (2) limit the Commission to board officers (chairs, vice chairs, and committee chairs of the three boards).

Recommendation 3: Modify the governance structures of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges to be more balanced between central authority and local flexibility.

The public schools governance model is highly centralized. The NCCCS model, in practice if not statutorily, is highly decentralized. While it is not at all necessary to design three identical governance structures, they should have more features in common, with exceptions that are appropriate to reflect their different missions. For example, methods of appointment of presidents/ chancellors for the two higher education systems could be the same, unless there is specific reason for them not to be.⁷ Changes in nomenclature should also be considered to make the systems more parallel. For example, community college CEOs could be called chancellors instead of presidents, to indicate, as UNC's model does, the difference between college-level CEOs and the system CEO.

Recommendation 4: Modify the appointment process of the State Board of Education and the UNC Board of Governors to provide balanced participation of both the General Assembly and the Governor.

As shown in Exhibit 3, the three boards are three different sizes and are appointed using different methods. As an alternative, the Governor and the General Assembly could each appoint half the members of all three boards. The Board that now balances influence of the Governor and General Assembly is the State Board of Community Colleges.

IMPLEMENTATION

Timing

If a continuum study is undertaken, in a form to be determined, it would take some time. In the interim, governance changes can begin to be implemented. After the strategic education design study is completed, the governance structure should be refined based on those recommendations and then the Education Cabinet would be charged with implementation. For example, if a panel or study recommends that North Carolina develop a comprehensive system of pre-school education and creates a new agency to administer it or assigns the responsibility to DHR, the Education Cabinet should be expanded to include a representative of this new function.

⁷Refer to the issue papers "Governance Structure for Public Education" and "Program and System Structure – The North Carolina Community College System" for more detailed recommendations concerning internal system governance.

IMPLICATIONS

From our cursory review, it is apparent that North Carolina has the potential to reallocate, realign, redeploy, and make more effective use of hundreds of millions of dollars. The future financial and human costs of not rationalizing the delivery of education services across the three systems are enormous. Each time a 16-year old drops out of high school, each time a student is discouraged from continuing his or her education because courses will not transfer, each time a community college trains someone in a skill area in which he/she cannot find a job, the State is not getting a proper return on its investments. The impact is that potentially a significant portion of the State's \$5 billion annual investment would achieve better results.

APPENDIX REFERENCES

"A Resolution by the North Carolina State Board of Education, the North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges, and the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina," March 1990

Enhancing Transfer from Community Colleges: An Idea Whose Time Has Come, MDC, Inc., August 1992

The Future of North Carolina: Goals and Recommendations for the Year 2000, Report of the Commission on the Future of North Carolina

Gaining the Competitive Edge: The Challenge to North Carolina's Community Colleges, MDC, Inc., February 1989

"General Assembly of North Carolina Session 1991 Ratified Bill, Chapter 880, Senate Bill 1028," July 1992

Greater Expectations: The South's Workforce is the South's Future, MDC, Inc., Chapel Hill, NC, September 1992

"Long-Range Planning, 1992-97," The University of North Carolina Board of Governors, October 1992

"Maryland Panel Urges Revamping of Teaching Degree," *The Washington Post*, 12-2-93, Metro Section, p. D-5

"Report to the General Assembly on Regional Cooperation Among and Between the Constituent Institutions of The University of North Carolina and the Component Institutions of The Community College System," March 1990

The Skills Crisis in the Workplace: A Strategic Response for Economic Development, The Report of the Governor's Commission on Workforce Preparedness, November 1990

"Vocational Education Study," Research Triangle Institute, November 1986

Workforce Development Inventory, Governor's Commission on Workforce Preparedness, July 1992