

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA:
A COMPARISON WITH OTHER GOVERNING BOARDS¹

INTRODUCTION

This article is a collection and analysis of information on selected characteristics of the governing boards of state-supported institutions of higher learning. It was prepared with a view to its possible relevance to certain aspects of the inquiry of the recently created state legislative Commission on the Study of the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina.² The scope of this research is selective and limited, both with respect to the number of boards reviewed and the type of board characteristics considered. As to the first limitation, consideration is restricted to twenty-two boards located in nineteen states. The majority of these boards, nineteen in number and including the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina, comprises the state-supported institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities. The other three boards, those of the Universities of Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee, are added because they are state-supported institutions within states adjacent to North Carolina.

The second limitation on scope is in the number of board characteristics examined. Six items are included in this limited study of institutional governing boards. All are characteristics basic to the board structure of the institutions in question. They are:

1. Method of selection of board members;
2. Total number of members;
3. Length and overlapping of terms;
4. Succession of term;
5. Special requirements for members specified by law; and
6. Legal status of boards.

These characteristics are obviously but a few of the considerations which could have been taken. For example, no inquiry was made as to removal of members, filling vacancies, compensation,³ or to the relationship of boards to either central state administrative agencies (i.e., budget, audit, purchasing, or personnel agencies) or to central, state-wide coordinating boards.⁴ The purpose of this examination was neither to raise questions nor to provide answers. The approach followed was to collect the facts, categorize them in tables found in the appendices, and then review them in the light of the existing commentary in the field of trusteeship. This review is found at the end of each section.

With respect to the appendices, a word of explanation is in order. The boards were divided, somewhat arbitrarily, into boards that are responsible for only one institutional unit and boards

¹ This article is by Robert E. Phay, an Assistant Director at the Institute of Government of the University of North Carolina, and is reprinted from *POPULAR GOVERNMENT*, May, 1966, by written permission.

² N.C. Sess. Laws 1965, Res. 73.

³ See A. BRUMBAUGH, *STATE-WIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION*.

⁴ See S. MARTORANA & E. HOLLIS, *STATE BOARDS RESPONSIBLE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION*. (U.S. Dept. of Education Circular OE-53005, 1960) for a discussion of all three of these problems.