

11 Comparative perspectives on systems of higher education in the US and India

Raquel M. Rall

As a result of transnational pressures and domestic exigencies, national systems of HE governance are—to a greater or lesser degree—being reshaped, transformed, modernized and in many cases ‘marketized’.

(Dobbins et al., 2011, p. 666)

Multicampus higher education systems are increasingly common worldwide (Nicolson, 2004; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Rall, 2020). Though they assume myriad forms, these systems were created with the common goal of maximizing efficiency, and pursuit of this effectiveness requires balancing multiple influences. Higher education systems lie at an intersection of internal and external worlds (Middlehurst, 1999); they are a graded mix of market competition, hierarchical state control, and academic self-rule (Niklasson, 1995). Several paths need to be investigated to discern how scholars can better identify and classify the usefulness and applicability of systems in a given context.

Although multicampus systems are prevalent in higher education, literature on this organizational form is limited in depth and scope (Nicolson, 2004). A standard description or definition for a multicampus system is nonexistent (Lewis, 2012). Because so many institutions are part of the systems, it is problematic that systems have not been the focus of extensive research (Perkins, 1972). This chapter considers the role of public higher education systems as higher education around the globe is dealing with profound changes (McGuinness, 2011). The goal of this inquiry is to understand critical issues that affect how education systems are organized today. This chapter introduces scholars to the basics of systemness¹ (Zimpher, 2012) and also attracts those scholars who are experienced in the intricacies of systemness so that they might extend the conversation.

I focus here on US higher education systems, recognizing that whatever strengths or weaknesses apply to these systems cannot be precisely applied outside the American context (Pifer et al., 1978). Yet, they carry implications for higher education in other nations. The US has the most diverse

higher education system in the world (Morphew, 2002). Accordingly, a focus on the US is of interest to and has implications for higher education systems around the world. Understanding systems of higher education in the US—their origins, challenges, and strengths—is integral to the global context not only for the large number of international students studying in the US but also for comparing higher education across countries.

In this review of the evolution of public higher education systems, I pay special attention to the formation and functioning of systems in the US and India and make connections between these two contexts. I lead with a brief overview of the study to introduce the use of commentary from various policy actors (past and present system heads, institution heads, policymakers, and faculty members with expertise in the form and function of higher education systems) to provide: (1) a description of systems, (2) the influence that systems have, (3) the challenges faced by systems, and (4) the benefits of systems. I end with why systems have and will continue to be a topic ripe for study in higher education.

Higher education systems in the US

For years, the US has been ranked as the best system of higher education globally (Agarwal, 2006; Selingo, 2011; Williams & Leahy, 2020), yet there is no one system of higher education in the country. The US was the first country to implement systems to organize its higher education institutions (Altbach, 2007) and various system typologies (e.g., Creswell et al., 1985) and levels of autonomy (Mills, 2007) exist. The system structures model various forms (Mills, 2007). Researchers have noted that no two higher education systems in the US are the same (Langenberg, 1994), and none produce the same results (Garland, 2009). These systems are numerous and nuanced.

Coordination was rarely mentioned over 60 years ago, and no systems existed in higher education (Eurich, 1981). Though funded by the states, higher education institutions enjoyed relative freedom to behave as they wanted until about 1950 (Graham, 1989). Institutions were freestanding with neither need nor obligation to arrange and work in concert with other institutions or coordinating entities (McGuinness, 1991). However, half-way through the 20th century, relations between institutions and the states took on a more formal role, and public higher education systems in the US emerged and adopted centralized governance patterns with strong state control over public postsecondary education (McLendon & Ness, 2003).

Although some statewide boards were established before 1950 (Hearn & Griswold, 1994), during the 1950s there was a revolutionary shift in higher education's governance from individual campuses to large, complex, multicampus systems (Lane, 2013). The 1960s saw the largest increase in multicampus systems (Lee & Bowen, 1971). By the 1970s, public colleges and universities in practically every state were part of statewide systems

of higher education (Corson, 1975). At present, the multicampus system, which is a grouping of individual campuses under common governance, is typical (Gade, 1993), while a freestanding campus that functions without a higher coordinating body is uncommon (Lee & Bowen, 1971).

Glenny (1959) reported that 17 states had formed either a statewide governing board or a state coordinating board for higher education. Creswell et al. (1985) reported that the 50 states had approximately 65 different systems with unique components and aspects. According to Berdahl and McConnell (1998), students were enrolled in 120 systems encompassing more than 1,000 campuses. More recently, the number of systems has been calculated at approximately 60 (Novak, 2009). Most postsecondary students in the US attend public institutions in multicampus systems (Gade, 1993); over three-quarters of all undergraduate students are enrolled in public institutions (Baum et al., 2012), and over 75 percent of these students are enrolled in institutions that are part of public multicampus systems (National Association of System Heads, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges [NASH, AASCU, & AGB], 2009; Szutz, 1999).

The numbers alone suggest that public higher education systems play a critical part in the education of today's students. Yet, the role and emergence of higher education systems remain primarily unexamined (Pifer et al., 1978). As the US attempts to stay competitive with other nations, a detailed investigation of state education systems offers insights into how systems are or are not meeting the needs of a more educated population. However, the challenges of systems are not relegated to the American context, and much can be learned from other large systems of higher education in the world.

Higher education systems in India

While policies related to higher education differ across countries based on their legal, cultural, political, structural, and historical realities (Goldman et al., 2008), there are similar considerations and challenges among the US and India. Such similarities could result from the collaboration between Indian and US governments to establish a new university model in India (Abrol, 2010). Much like the higher education systems in the US, the system of higher education in India faces decreasing funding support, comprises different types of universities and colleges, and was created at the time of rapid growth and expansion in the economy (Agarwal, 2006).

The higher education system in India is also not immune to calls for reforms in response to various challenges and crises (Chahal & Dar, 2015). Some have identified an urgent need for systemic change in Indian education (Heslop, 2014). Recognizing the state of disrepair of the Indian university system, former Prime Minister of India, Manmohan Singh, advocated in 2007:

We need to revamp the higher education system so that it walks on the two legs of access and excellence ... Such a quantum jump in our university system has to be well planned and well-funded ... The reform of our existing university system should ... be ... a priority for us.

His words suggest that the Indian system of education, considered to be one of the top three in the world next to China and the US (Joshi & Ahir, 2013), is facing challenges within the scope of higher education today such as those arising from technology, growth, globalization, quality assurance, credibility, inadequate state funding, misalignment with national purpose, and waste (Abrol, 2010). At the same time, India's higher education system is considered to be 'more-or-less' harmonized (Joshi & Ahir, 2013).

Indian's higher education system is the third largest in the world, has the greatest diversity of educational institutions in the world (Sharma & Sharma, 2015), and is also one of the largest exporters of international students (Yeravdekar & Tiwari, 2014). The Indian system involves and overlaps with various regulatory bodies and ministries (Joshi & Ahir, 2013) and has links with political and societal issues (Chahal & Dar, 2015). In India, higher education is the joint responsibility of the Center and the states (Ministry of Human Resource Development, n.d.). With a chronology similar to that of the US higher education system, in India, the University Grants Commission (UGC) was legally established in 1956. UGC is a statutory body responsible for coordinating, evaluating, and maintaining higher education standards at the undergraduate level and above in the country (Henry, 2017). UGC is just one component of India's highly bureaucratized higher education system (Pande & Pathak, 2017).

Much like the US, the expansion of higher education in India also seemed to be rapid and unstoppable after independence (Hoque, 2018). India started building its national education system in the late 1940s (Goldman et al., 2008) to respond to massification (Yeravdekar & Tiwari, 2014). India has the second-highest student enrollments in the world (Shaguri, 2013). Student enrollments went from 1 million in 1950 to 9 million by the end of the 20th century (Agarwal, 2009). The number of university-level institutions and colleges grew from 28 to 677 and 578 to 3,800, respectively, between 1951 and 2014 (Pande & Pathak, 2017). Today nearly 33,657 institutions—634 universities and 33,023 colleges—make the Indian system of higher education the largest in the world (Joshi & Ahir, 2013). Institutional growth has been driven by the promotion of the private sector (Sheikh, 2017). While the number of colleges and universities has increased, the caliber of institutions has not followed suit; some believe that India has failed to produce world-class universities (Sheikh, 2017).

Postsecondary student numbers coupled with an average institutional enrollment of approximately 500–600 students per year creates a highly fragmented and largely undifferentiated (Altbach, 2009) Indian system of higher education that complicates management (Agarwal, 2006). New

challenges coupled with enrollment growth mean a structural overhaul of higher education is needed (University Grants Commission, 2003). Greater quality (Hoque, 2018), transparency, and accountability are required (Sheikh, 2017). Like the US systems, governing bodies of Indian higher education systems are highly political (Sheikh, 2017). They need to be modern/advanced, liberal, and adapt to the varying demands of a changing society, economy, and world.

The study²

Many scholars have laid the foundation for higher education governance globally (e.g., Berdahl et al., 1971; Clark, 1983; Hunt et al., 2006). However, more can and needs to be learned about the complex design and management of higher education systems in today's higher education climate (Pifer et al., 1978). Despite scholars' views for or against the use of public systems, university governance is still caught in the middle of institutional autonomy and complete state accountability (McLendon, 2003). Major public universities and state governments have always had their differences, but never has their association been as strained as it is now (Stripling, 2011) due to the influence of declining enrollments, an aging population, limited availability of public dollars, and growing demands from employers and lawmakers to meet workforce needs.

Recognizing that at times it is less acceptable for outsiders to pose challenging questions (Callan, 2007), this chapter is a combination of the judgments of people having specialized knowledge and relevant direct experience with systems of higher education. The scholarship delineated in this chapter unpacks systemness (Zimpher, 2012) within higher education. Davies (2011) highlighted the importance of reporting findings to key leadership and underscored the need to solicit viewpoints from individuals with the experience to identify policies for better understanding the problems facing higher education systems. Accordingly, this work results from elite interviews with 17 individuals whose expertise and work histories as policy actors at the time of this writing covered 21 institutions, 15 systems, and 14 states. All participants had intimate knowledge of higher education systems (as ascertained by the number and significance of the articles, reports, or books they had published, current or past titles in agencies, institutions, systems, and word of mouth). In-depth interviews with key stakeholders 'at the forefront of what will come next' were used to study Indian and US systems of higher education (e.g., Heslop, 2014).

Method

The tradition of elite interviews is essential in social sciences like education (Kezar, 2003), yet the technique is underrepresented in literature (Ostrander, 1995). Elite interviews focus on the specialized knowledge of

the interviewees (Dexter, 1970), who are encouraged to give an individualized account of a given situation based on what is most relevant to them (Odendahl & Shaw, 2002). I was interested in ascertaining these leaders' attitudes, beliefs, and perspectives for examining the role of public systems in higher education in the US. I leveraged open-ended questions to allow interviewees to participate in wide-ranging discussions (Aberbach & Rockman, 2002). I identified system leaders (both in research and in practice), key individuals through word of mouth, governance literature, and press reports (Mills, 2007).

This study follows a qualitative approach to access the perspectives of system affiliates and how they viewed the system approach to governance. The inquiry draws attention to the stories of individual actors. It explores these individuals' relationships in dealing with the policy and politics of public systems of higher education in the US. For this, the narrative method lent itself to eliciting detailed accounts of an individual's experiences with systemic governance. This approach was conducive to understanding individuals' interactions with and perceptions of higher education systems in the US. I paid attention to the voices of the participants to allow major questions and topics to emerge.

The participants were selected based on the diverse vantage points they would potentially contribute to the discussion. Intentional sampling emphasizes information-rich cases that show a comprehensive understanding of the area of interest (Jones et al., 2006). I interviewed participants via phone (Johnson, 2013; Lechuga, 2012) using information from the research literature to create an interview protocol. The conversations were typically 45 minutes, and questions focused on involvement with, history of, the benefits/challenges, and the impact of higher education systems. Two interview participants were retired system heads. One was a current university president. The rest were faculty members, past university presidents, national organization heads, and policy leaders. Many performed more than one role. The individuals were of various ethnicities and ages. The commentary and questions posed in this study reflect the conversations with these individuals on their thoughts, past experiences, and future recommendations for systemic models of higher education. In the next section, I use interview data to highlight the particulars of higher education systems in the US.

What is a public system of higher education?

System definition

In the aggregate, public postsecondary schools in the US form a system that reflects the intricacies of the nation (Eurich, 1981). Public higher education systems emerged and adopted centralized governance patterns with strong state control over public postsecondary education midway through the 20th century (Rothchild, 2011). At an individual level, most states

had established planning structures by 1968 with a gradation of powers and organization. By the 1970s, nearly all public sector institutions were included in higher education systems in the US. However, it is essential to note that these planning accomplishments were confined to the state level and did not have a national scope (Eurich, 1981). Public multicampus systems are:

groups of public institutions, each with its own mission, academic and other programs, internal governing policies and procedures, and chief executive officer (either 'president' or 'chancellor'), but governed by a single board with a system-wide chief executive officer, generally called 'chancellor' or 'president'—whichever term is not used for the campus heads

(Johnstone, 1999, p. 3)

These systems transitioned to a governance structure with strong state control, where now multicampus systems are the prevailing form of governance in higher education.

Origin

A freestanding campus that functions without a higher coordinating body like a system is rare in US higher education (Lee & Bowen, 1971). Most states maintain some organizational authority in which the board plays an advisory or regulatory role (Westmeyer, 1985). The model has been upheld despite criticism of multicampus systems (Kerr et al., 1978). The first state structures comprised of a group of associations of higher education institutions that were organized to exchange perspectives about common problems (Perkins, 1972). Governors and state legislators were the first to suggest systems to implement the state's plans for education (Perkins, 1972).

The rationale for why higher education systems were formed and still dominate ranges from the general to the specific. For example, Perkins (1972) describes four broad impetuses for developing systems of higher education: (1) the need for coordinating specialized institutions, (2) increasing costs of academic enterprises, (3) increased reliance on public funding, and (4) heightened involvement of authorities outside the university. Perkins (1972) highlights the need for enhanced coherence to better address public priorities, reduce unproductive competition, foster more efficient use of resources, and create an economic and political environment that benefited diverse institutional types. Callan (1991) notes that system boards were established to help states address conflicting institutional and political interests and values and deal with the growth in higher education. One faculty member who is an expert in higher education governance talked about growth management. When asked about why systems were started, he said:

I think because in places like California, New York, and Georgia that have larger institutions ... they needed to organize higher education in a way that was more manageable. And ... that's why it became such a dominant part of the landscape ... it's just the politics of the time. These big systems were established when we were accommodating the baby boom. There was huge growth in a very short period of time. That is when the California Master Plan came into being. That's when SUNY and CUNY³ were organized. This was in response to huge growth during a certain time period.

The large systems that are in place today were created partially in response to rapid growth, but that was not the sole reason. A former faculty member and current leader in higher education policy shared an example of the California Master Plan to suggest that systems originated not merely for managing the numbers but also for enhancing cohesion among institutions to facilitate the logistical navigation of the higher education space:

You go back to the Master Plan ... [It] was really designed to bring about some clarity and coordination of ... higher education systems because I think there's a recognition that ... if all of these campuses kind of just worked autonomously and there weren't systems placed over them with a chancellor's office or a president's office or CPEC ... without that sort of coordination that the master plan imposed, you ended up with this very disconnected collection of educational institutions, which ... was too hard to navigate.

A second policy leader who consults for a national association focused on governance fused the growth and order rationales in her thoughts on the creation of systems of higher education:

I think it's historical. The rapid growth of higher education, particularly after WWII ... partly through the Truman Commission and the G.I. Bill⁴ ... even LBJ's great society programs.⁵ It was a way to ... logically manage the growth of an institution. If you go all the way back to the Great Depression in the 30s ... it was easier to create an institution ... under the system umbrella. Then institutions and growing communities didn't feel so isolated.

Graham (1989) credits two specific events for the move toward higher education systems: First, a combination of the 1972 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965, and second, the creation of a single consolidated governing board for all senior public institutions in North Carolina. The amendments of 1972 initiated the distribution of large amounts of federal aid directly to students instead of colleges. All states which received this aid were required to establish statewide planning bodies. While the consolidated

board in North Carolina is given credit for extending the use of higher education systems, Graham (1989) notes that three other states (Maine in 1968 and Utah and West Virginia in 1969) made extensive changes to their administrative structures. These changes included Maine and West Virginia changing directly to an intervening coordinating system⁶ and Utah replacing its coordinating board with a statewide governing board.

The origin and rationale behind the formation of systems are also related to the purpose that these systems serve. While being created for managing growth in higher education at a particular time, today, they serve specified functions within higher education.

Purpose

Presently, these systems address common problems and goals and the challenges and aspirations created by a unique state environment (student demographics, school types, and politics). The initial goal of most of the systems was preparing students to become professionals and create and put into practice the prominent goals of social criticism, community service, and the educational needs of adult learners (Kerr et al., 1978). This democratic ideal is at the core of the US' systems of higher education.

There are nine primary functions of public systems of higher education in the US, according to Johnstone (1999). To accomplish these goals, each system has a unique pattern of governance based on its own geographic, historical, cultural, and institutional context. Examining the purposes of higher education systems is critical because whether we opt to change them or leave them as they are, we first need to be clear on what the systems were earlier, what they are today, and the role they are supposed to play in higher education. Therefore, it is necessary to consider both the historical foundations and the current trends influencing higher education's governance (Dobbins et al., 2011).

System influences

Market forces

The influence of market forces on higher education is not new (Richardson et al., 1998) and will potentially carry more weight in the days ahead (Hansmann, 2012). The 'market' describes a wide variety of global influences and interests that impact higher education (Richardson et al., 1998). Higher education is facing a number of external challenges including financial pressures, technological growth, changing faculty roles, increased public scrutiny, changing student demographics, competing values, higher leadership turnover, deinstitutionalization of student learning, a global pandemic, and increased demand for college access (Tandberg & Anderson, 2012). These institutions also face specific national pulls to uphold and promote

'local cultural identity and independence' (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002, p. 282). These forces heavily influence higher education policy and push policy actors to consider alternatives for the governance structure presently in place (Mortimer & Sathre, 2007). At the same time, there is a global push for higher education to increase efficiency, self-sufficiency, and accountability (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002).

Challenges

Higher education systems have been widely criticized (Burke, 1999). They are thought to be more bureaucratic than a single institution, give the faculty-less influence, and are highly influenced by politics. Though intended to reduce the infiltration of politics, higher education systems are pieces of more extensive bureaucratic networks (Eurich, 1981). The relationship between universities and the industry may continue to deepen (Ernst & Young, 2012), so it is critical to think of the implications of this shift. Moreover, at what point does systemic governance become more of a hindrance than a help for institutions trying to develop strategies to remedy their economic and political limitations? Next, I present four areas affected by the politics of the higher education systems: (1) mission creep, (2) flagship institutions, (3) differentiation in the distribution of funds, and (4) determining the efficacy of the systems.

Mission creep

Across the various sectors of US higher education, regional teaching and comprehensive universities strive for the status of top research institutions (Gonzales, 2012). Examples of this phenomenon, coined 'mission creep', include liberal arts colleges aiming for prestigious research status (O'Meara & Bloomgarden, 2011) or women's colleges taking on co-educational admission policies (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2005). One of the ways the increasing demand for higher education was met was by expanding institutional missions. Mission creep, which has some traditional liberal arts colleges moving away from their historic missions, has the potential to undermine institutional identity and traditional roles and responsibilities on campus (Dugan, 2015). Mission creep was presented in the interviews both genuinely and sarcastically as a potential problem in higher education systems. Mission creep may be an attempt to avert the potential of differential treatment within systems. Not wanting to be limited in scope, some institutions take on roles typically filled by other institution types. Key institutional stakeholders want to be higher than they are in the academic pecking order. For example, some community colleges have added bachelor's degrees and dropped 'community' from their names or comprehensive teaching institutions offering doctoral degrees. A current university president opined that mission creep is merely an over-reaction to change:

It's just the boogie man's fear of mission creep ... and it's kind of like the money issue ... money isn't that important ... it's always the people with money telling you that. And it's the rich schools telling the poor schools that they don't need any more money, and they should have better management. So, it's the same thing as a boogie man fearing mission creep. The schools that are aspiring to meet demands are always told that they are engaged in mission creep by the schools who have all the authority to do everything even if they are not doing it ... The real question is, is the system allowing institutions to meet the demands of their regions and their areas? And if they are being constrained because of the mission creep boogie man then it's not working.

As this president's example shows, rigid structure or mission among systems have no priority over students' needs. As seen in what some of the participants said, institutions are doing their best to navigate their roles within the confines of the systems. Those institutions that are not flagships want more latitude to take on more, and those that are flagships do not want to lose their dominance. Flagship institutions are typically the paradigm that other institutions strive for within the systems, and non-flagship institutions desire the latitude to meet the needs of their constituents.

Flagship institutions

A 'flagship institution' is a term typically used to identify the original institution(s) from which the public higher education system was formed. These schools like the University of Texas or the University of California Berkeley are often the largest and best-resourced schools within the system. Considering the treatment of flagships within systems is crucial because often these institutions simultaneously carry the prestige of the systems and are most likely to attempt to break away from the systems.

Coordination and centralization have been sources of opposition or annoyance for flagship CEOs (Thelin, 2011). Flagships nationwide have demonstrated the desire to separate themselves from system control. Most of these changes stem from conflicts between institutions and the systems that resulted from numerous stressors, including resource constraints and clashes with campus or state leaders (McLendon, 2003). Some leaders of flagships question, 'Can a university of surpassing excellence maintain and advance its quality of performance under these conditions? Or can a first-rank university be built up in this situation?' (Chambers, 1961, p. 59).

In recent years, some US flagship universities have tried to separate themselves (at least in part) from the control of state higher education systems. Some have successfully transitioned to semi-private status (e.g., the University of Virginia), while others have unsuccessfully tried to remove themselves from the system (e.g., the University of Wisconsin–Madison).

Other institutions have proposed receiving less state funding in exchange for more administrative control (Gose, 2002).

Considering these attempts at adjustment, the changing environment of higher education, and the lack of evidence of non-flagship institutions pushing for the same kind and level of reforms, it is reasonable to conclude that the current system structures may not be working for many flagship institutions. State control and limits on institutional freedom may have made sense when the state provided a significant source of a university's revenue, but this may no longer be appropriate now that the decline in state support to higher education has caused many public institutions, especially flagships, to actively seek private funds. Public higher education systems may not be advantageous for flagship institutions that might better function at their maximum potential outside the system's constraints. As the circumstances that led to the decentralization of systems and state oversight continue, likely, the efforts of flagship research universities to secure greater independence too will continue.

In identifying the influence of public higher education systems on flagship universities, I found that most conversations about the future of flagship universities centered on the need for greater autonomy, too much bureaucracy, and misalignment of flagship institutions and the system's goals. As I engaged with higher education leaders on this topic, it was clear that individuals in top positions at the institutional and system levels were well aware of how governance by public systems of higher education can constrain flagship universities.

When asked about the potential disparity in the treatment of schools within a system, a former faculty member and present policy leader said:

I think some individual campuses, particularly the flagship ones, feel dragged down by the system ... it is a kind of the yin and the yang of being part of a system ... it is clear that there are ... some ways in which campuses are treated differently.

Maintaining that the utility of the systems depends on the vantage point of the institutions, a professor emeritus and a former system and institution head noted:

I think it depends on where you are in the system. It has probably been for the better for some institutions. It has probably been disadvantageous for others ... So there's no one answer that covers every institution or every system ... the smaller institutions may benefit from this, whereas the larger institutions, namely the flagship institutions, are probably suffocating ... it depends on where you stand.

Another national policy leader shared his thoughts on how favoring flagships could harm the entire system:

The sum of institutional self-interest does not equate to good public policy ... what's in the best interests of particular institutions, particularly flagships, isn't necessarily good public policy, and states ought to be thinking about the systems of higher education and not necessarily of the flagships which is what US News and World Report love.

A campus president highlighted the downside of the differential treatment and trying to break away from the systems:

The president of Oregon lost his job because of this issue. President Biddy Martin lost her job at Wisconsin because of this issue – because they tried to break away from the system to get special preferred treatment. Because they are so different from everybody else and they must be freed up ... to do things that the system has constrained them from doing. But they are the first to say that everybody else needs to stay in that system.

One faculty member who researches higher education system structures commented:

...of course, the other advantage is from a pure power perspective; all systems are really built around one or two key institutions. So, you know, if you're in the University of Texas System, it's a great thing to be Austin and not such a great thing to be in UT Tyler or some other place ... So I think there are some clear and obvious advantages to these.

Hence, no consensus exists as to who is advantaged in the systemic model; it depends on multiple factors.

Differentiation in the distribution of funds

Public higher education simultaneously deals with two highly influential factors—decreased funding and increased movement from matriculation to higher education. These factors are present both in India and in the US. Universities are being pushed to 'do more with less' (Gornitzka & Maassen, 2000). Public funding in the Indian higher education system has also not paralleled the pace of growth: Indian postsecondary education's governmental funding has receded (Shaguri, 2013); it has experienced a shortfall of about 40 percent (Agarwal, 2006). Accordingly, investigating the role of systems in educating students seems more necessary than before because fewer state dollars signal an increase in the role that outside interests and entities play in the provision of higher education.

Higher education institutions will need to learn how to thrive in environments where student demographics and size are changing, government

funding is limited, and revenue from non-governmental sources is becoming more competitive. One faculty member said:

I think one of the disadvantages of the system is that institutions that are not research universities can get shortchanged in terms of funding and other things and also, incentives are created for some of those institutions to move down the research path.

So, within a larger higher education environment already receiving less monetary support than in the past, certain institutions feel that they are not getting their fair share of the funds.

In addition to institutions receiving reduced funding, leaders working within the systems may also receive less compensation. One system head summarized some of his recent findings:

Here's another distinction that may eventually really hurt system-states versus non-system-states ... when I did this national study and looked at this issue, what I discovered was that the states with tightly controlled systems are the same states where the presidents' salaries are on the low end of national averages. States that do not have systems or do not have tightly controlled systems and have individual boards that run their universities are on the high end of the salaries.

Less funding for institutions to provide resources and opportunities for students and less funding to compete in the recruitment and retention of key personnel limit public systems and the institutions within them that other sectors of higher education may not face.

Determining the efficacy of the systems

At present, higher education systems across the globe are under pressure to improve (Carnoy & Dossani, 2012). To establish a functional and successful model that can be carved into the future, systems must define and address a host of challenges regardless of their current organization models (Ernst & Young, 2012). How their success will be determined is yet to be established. Entities like the US-based Middle States Commission and the Indian-based National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) were established to 'guarantee the quality of the programs and the higher education institutions' yet accreditation by these bodies is not compulsory (Nuffic, 2015, p. 18). In the future, it may be worthwhile to consider how voluntary accreditation will be able to hold systems of higher education to high standards of effectiveness and efficiency. One participant framed the idea of evaluation of systems thus:

So, the question is not whether you'll have some kind of a system or not, the question is how to make that system work effectively? And then

you know, any time you are going to spend ... taxpayers' money, you are going to want some accountability. Hence, you are going to need a system. The question is, what is the trade-off between having the system or local autonomy and flexibility?

When questioned about the efficacy of the systems, an institution's current president said:

It depends on where you are sitting and certainly ... knowing where you are sitting is very important ... There are big distinctions ... I can't tell you that one is better than the other. It really depends on the leaders. If you have a system, do you have a good board that is interested in the mission of the system and expanding the mission of the system? And are you in a state that is going to allow you to? ... This depends a lot ... The reason why it's really half and half in the country is because nobody can say which one works better.

A faculty member recommended a more comprehensive evaluation of the systems:

So, the idea of how do we get better, what mechanisms do we employ ourselves or the states employ, the answer to that is that there is a balance in the mechanisms and one of the mechanisms has to do with measurement. Measuring enrolment, access, and equity and also measuring completion and retention, and those sorts of things. I really think it is a balance in measuring accountability which measures inputs, outputs, and outcomes. Because nobody, for example, will care if you graduate a bunch of people but they can't get jobs. Graduation is an output. Getting a job in society's eyes is an outcome. We need a balance of inputs, outputs, and outcomes. The more we are able to do that internally for ourselves, the better off we'll be.

Before deciding whether states are better off with or without public systems of higher education, we must first know what standards we are holding these systems to. What are the best ways to evaluate the (in)efficacy of the systems? No need to change the model before we know what the goals are. Noting that both the styles and philosophies behind systemic governance have changed, a former system head commented, 'nevertheless, systems have become pretty much the way that states choose to support and manage and lead their higher education enterprises'. However, their being so prevalent does not mean that they are the best model.

System benefits

Who benefits?

Regarding the benefits of systems, a professor and policy leader said:

That's the question we come back to in this governance question: good for whom? Any time you organize, there are implications for different parties, and I think some believe that larger centralized systems are good for an institution's interests.

The question of whose systems are best is a pertinent yet unanswered one. While not everyone believes systems are the ideal governance structure for all higher education, there is some advantageous rationale behind their creation and use. That said, who benefits from this model? Students? The institutions? The system? Policy leaders? The government? Do these benefits still hold today and who is involved in controlling how the systems are governed?

The system

When policy is enacted to meet the needs of many rather than a few, universities become rational instruments working to meet national priorities (Dobbins et al., 2011). For example, one leader said:

I am less concerned about the campuses and more concerned about the needs of the state more broadly because, in my mind, public systems and campuses have a responsibility to serve the public and not just aggrandize themselves. I'm not that 'concerned' about fairness among different campuses. What I look at is, does the way the system is set up serve the mission that those universities have defined? ... I think a lot of times, serving the public's needs may be counter-purposed to being scrupulously fair to every individual campus.

However, another participant said that individual institutions could also be advantaged by being part of higher education systems.

Institutions

Suggesting that institutions within the systems can also benefit, a faculty member and policy leader noted:

That seems to me to be suggesting that ... it reinforces the view that higher education in those states is like an academic cartel. They are able to lobby for more money and they are able to charge higher levels for students to participate to justify the money that they get from the state. It's kind of a perverse incentive which is not possible perhaps under decentralized models ... It's the Wild West when you come to a decentralized environment. In a centralized system, you have the central board or one or two system boards in a state speaking on behalf of all the constituent institutions ... I can see how the larger, more

systematized approaches to governance on a statewide basis could be more beneficial to them financially.

There are distinct advantages for those involved with systems and a clear missing consideration—the advantages or disadvantages of the systems for students and the community.

Discussion

The integral role that higher education plays in a nation's future is apparent. The importance of higher education for economic and social development prompts further examination of higher education systems (Goldman et al., 2008). American and Indian higher education has seen an array of changes in structure to meet the call for higher levels of effectiveness. To succeed, higher education institutions will have to find a way to work within or outside the scope of systems of higher education because issues of governance are pressing both in the US and in countries like India (Kapur & Mehta, 2004). The interviews conducted for this chapter, though centered on higher education in the US, support the idea that current systemic models of higher education around the world are faced with new challenges and are, in many cases, bound by antiquated rationales and structures and deficient means of evaluation which need to be updated. While some participants favored removing systems or resigned that systems were undoubtedly here to stay, they all shared that there was room for improvement. Across the globe, enhanced approaches to the organization of higher education are needed.

Appropriate policy formation and effective implementation of systems within higher education are essential (Pande & Pathak, 2017). First, though, each nation must decide what it means to be a public higher education system. And, more particularly, what does this 'systemness' imply for the various parties affected by this organization? Second, what role do politics and individual, institutional priorities play in organizing and maintaining public systems? And third, how do (or should) nations determine the efficacy of the systems? These context-specific questions are primers to assessing the relevance or utility of systems in a given environment.

One theme that continued to manifest during this study is the lack of a strong, comprehensive, and agreed-upon definition for higher education systems. This ambiguity is not confined only to the US. Some would also argue that regardless of how decentralized higher education may be in a given nation, there will always be a system. So how do we define systems of higher education, and how and why did these systems come to dominate higher education? What are the differences between systems in the US and those that govern higher education institutions elsewhere? These questions warrant further investigation.

Second, it is clear that politics still permeate systems of higher education regardless of location. Recent political intrusions complicate the role,

purpose, and efficacy of higher education systems. For example, despite their inclusion in higher education systems, it is apparent that individual institutions are concerned with their campuses first and the system second. This sentiment reverberated regardless of flagship or small or new institutional status. No institution wanted to be shortchanged of benefits other institutions received, and all were foremost concerned with what was best for their institutions regardless of ramifications for other institutions. While efficiency is part of the core rationale for systems, prioritization of who that efficiency matters for and how collective efficiency may be detrimental to individual institutional success matters.

In large part, public systems of higher education were created to maximize economies of scale. There was an idea that schools could accomplish more and better serve their students and goals by working together. Today, higher education seems to be battling mission creep on various levels. Every school cannot (and should not) be a research university, and all schools cannot grant access to everyone. To meet the needs of the students and the states, higher education needs schools with diverse missions, but this should not mean that these missions cannot change if conditions in the state warrant such amendments. While many systems hinge on the authority, prestige, and history of the flagships in their states, many scholars believe that flagships are adversely affected by being a part of higher education systems. Are these schools being held back by the 'lesser' schools in their particular system and state? Do policies treat schools within a system differently? Further investigation of how individual institutions are affected because of their inclusion in higher education systems is necessary.

Third, we do not have a way to show if a system is effective or not. Growth and access were primary ways of assessing whether a system demonstrated its utility in the post-World War II era. However, just because a system is large, diverse, or has a long history does not mean that it is effective. Today, it appears that growth is not enough of an indicator of value. It is also important to (re)consider whether the system as a whole is meeting its goals and whether institutions are meeting their specific missions. Are evaluative measures for systems focused on outcomes, outputs, financial solvency, or other factors?

Despite the lingering questions, numerous participants in this study felt that public higher education systems will remain relatively unchanged from today's structure, while others saw change as imminent and inevitable. Hence, the answer appears to be inconclusive. It may be the case that heterogeneity is a defining feature of systems of higher education. One national policy leader and faculty member whose research centers on higher education's governance and policy phrased it best:

I think maybe the conditions have so changed and become so serious that ... if somehow we organize our systems differently we could achieve different results ... and I think that we just don't know enough

about that empirically ... to try to inform that question, which is what do we get out of these different models? What do we get for the different trade-offs? What do we get with the different approaches to governance in higher education?

However, higher education may already be informally transforming today's systems in ways large and small in response to a higher education environment. If that is true, caution is warranted as progress is likely to follow an unpredictable course (Heslop, 2014), and changes in systems need to be responsive to the distinctive contexts, history, and pressures of a given environment (Leslie & Novak, 2003).

Conclusion

Statewide planning ... has changed the governance structure of higher education. America's colleges and universities are no longer viewed as wholly independent institutions, and instead, they have become 'units' in a 'state-wide system'.

(Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982, p. 39)

Systems of higher education are an ongoing experiment that attempts to cope with the ebb and flow of environmental conditions (Mills, 2007). The idea and use of systems run deep in higher education, and many nations have become accustomed to this type of systemic control. Business as usual in higher education is largely dependent on public systems, but this does not mean that these systems are the right answer. The current systems of higher education in the US have produced some of the most prestigious universities in the world, and yet there is evidence that gaps remain in meeting key academic goals (Venezia et al., 2005). It may be that state systems of higher education have served their purpose. They were created, expanded, and replicated at a time when the US (and other nations) needed that form of control. Today's institutions, especially today's flagship institutions, may no longer require the same model. This is not to say that the public systems of higher education do not have any advantages, and there is 'no disservice to the earlier policy leaders to note areas where success eluded them or events have overtaken their solutions' (NCPPE, 2005, p. 4a). The time is right for nations and states to (re)consider the impact of their policies and procedures for public higher education (Abrol, 2010); it is important to understand the bidirectional influence of the global, political, and economic forces on systems of higher education and the national and cultural influences that higher education systems have on systems globally (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002).

This chapter highlights that there is no unique solution that can address the diverse histories and regional contexts of all systems (Lee & Bowen, 1971) because higher education institutions and systems are different in terms of organization, goals, governance, size, sources of financial support, and resources (Pifer et al., 1978). The variances between systems around the world have not been sufficiently explored (McDaniel, 1996). Accordingly, it is in higher education's best interest that researchers continue investigating the strengths and weaknesses of each system in the hope of figuring out an optimal governance strategy for each nation, region, and so on that serves the needs of the population in the given area. Comparing systems across nations may be useful for a better understanding of how systems can adapt to meet diverse needs.

Relatedly, though a consensus on the top systems of higher education within the US does not exist, researchers agree that higher education systems will have a lasting presence in the US (MacTaggart & Crist, 1996). The influence of systems is not limited to US borders, though. A number of paths need to be investigated when trying to discern how scholars can better identify and classify the usefulness and applicability of higher education systems across global contexts. More systematic empirical indicators within and across countries could benefit our understanding of higher education's organization and governance (Dobbins et al., 2011). For example, both India and the US must focus on equity of educational opportunities to reduce disparities between groups (Bastedo & Gumpert, 2003; Sheikh, 2017).

It is outside the scope of this chapter to offer suggestions for systemic reforms. I provided a snapshot of higher education systems in the US to provide a context for systems around the world today. I also presented several critical issues to be considered as higher education systems prepare to either hold their ground or make vital changes to address transformations in higher education. Scholars, decision-makers, universities, and systems concerned with the long-term well-being of the systems of higher education and their ability to meet the needs of diverse constituents will need to continually evaluate the questions and topics presented in this chapter to consider the role and relevance of systems now and in the future of higher education policy. Just as the establishment of higher education systems in the past greatly influences higher education today, any changes to the existing structure will have lasting implications for the future of higher education both in the US and in other countries.

Notes

- 1 In the State of the University Address on January 9, 2012, SUNY Chancellor, Nancy Zimpher, described *systemness* as 'the coordination of multiple components that, when working together, create a network of activity that is more powerful than any action of individual parts on their own'.

- 2 This study is part of a larger governance study for which I interviewed various policy actors (legislators, faculty, institution heads, system heads, public policy centers, etc.) about the role of public systems of higher education.
- 3 The State University of New York (SUNY) and the City University of New York (CUNY) are the largest and third largest public university systems in the US, respectively. SUNY has 64 campuses across the state while CUNY has 23 campuses in all the five boroughs.
- 4 The G.I. Bill (1944) was a law that provided a range of benefits to returning World War II veterans including tuition and living expenses to attend school, low-cost mortgages, and low-interest loans for starting businesses.
- 5 Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) became the 36th President of the US in 1963 after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. During his presidential term, LBJ championed numerous progressive reforms like Medicare, head start, the Voting Rights Act, and the Civil Rights Act.
- 6 A coordinating board is a single agency that has the responsibility for statewide coordination of many policy functions, for example, planning and policy leadership, program review and approval, and budget development and resource allocations.

References

- Aberbach, J. D., & Rockman, B.A. (2002). Conducting and coding elite interviews. *PS: A Political Science and Politics*, 35(4), 673–676.
- Abrol, D. (2010). Governance of Indian higher education: An alternate proposal. *Social Scientist*, 38(9/12), 143–177.
- Agarwal, P. (2006). 'Higher education in India: The need for change', New Delhi, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, Working paper No. 180. Available at: http://www.icrier.org/pdf/ICRIER_WP180__Higher_Education_in_India_.pdf
- Agarwal, P. (2009). *Indian Higher Education: Envisioning the Future*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Altbach, P.G. (2007). Peripheries and centres: Research universities in developing countries. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19(2), 111–134.
- Altbach, P.G. (2009). The giants awake: Higher education systems in China and India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(23), 39–51.
- Bastedo, M.N., & Gumpert, P.J. (2003). Access to what? Mission differentiation and academic stratification in US public higher education. *Higher Education*, 46(3), 341–359.
- Baum, S., Ma, J., & Payea, K. (2012). 'Trends in public higher education: enrollment, prices, student aid, revenues, and expenditures', Trends in higher education series. College Board Advocacy & Policy Center. Available at: <http://trends.collegeboard.org>.
- Berdahl, R. O., & McConnell, T.R. (1998). 'Autonomy and accountability: Who controls academe?' Altbach, P.G., Gumpert, P.J., & Berdahl, R.O. (eds), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 70–88). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Berdahl, R. O., Graham, J., & Piper, D.R. (1971). *Statewide coordination of higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Burke, J. C. (1999). 'Multicampus systems: The challenge of the nineties', in Gaither, G. (ed.), *The multicampus system: perspectives on practice and prospects* (pp. 40–81). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

- Callan, P. M. (1991). *Perspectives on the current status of and emerging issues for state coordinating boards*. AGB occasional paper No. 2. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
- Callan, P. (2007). Will higher education pass a test of leadership?: An interview with spellings commission chairman Charles Miller. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(1), 10–12.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1982). *The Control of the campus: A report on the governance of higher education*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Carnoy, M., & Dossani, R. (2012). Goals and governance of higher education in India. *Higher Education*, 65(5), 595–612.
- Chahal, N., & Dar, H. (2015). Higher education sector in India: Challenges of sustainability. *International Journal of Management Research and Reviews*, 5(3), 159.
- Chambers, M.M. (1961). *Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Clark, B. (1983). *The higher education system*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Corson, J. J. (1975). *The governance of colleges and universities: Modernizing structure and processes*. *The Carnegie Series in American Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Creswell, J. W., Roskens, R.W., & Henry, T.C. (1985). A typology of multicampus systems. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(1), 26–37.
- Davies, G. K. (2011). Perspectives: Changing roles of governing and coordinating boards. *Change*, 43(4), 45–48.
- Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resources Development, Government of India (n.d.). National Informatics Centre (NIC), Department of Electronics & Information Technology, Ministry of Communications & Information Technology, Government of India. Available at: <http://mhrd.gov.in/university-and-higher-education>
- Dexter, L. (1970). *Elite and specialized interviewing*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Dobbins, M., Knill, C., Vögtle, E.M. (2011). An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. *Higher Education*, 62(5), 665–683.
- Dugan, J. (2015). The liberal arts and organizational design: Cultivating for change. *Liberal Education*, 101, n1–2.
- Ernst & Young (2012). *University of the future: A thousand year old industry on the cusp of profound change*. Australia: Ernst & Young.
- Eurich, N. (1981). *Systems of higher education in twelve countries: a comparative view*. New York: Praeger.
- Gade, M. L. (1993). *Four multicampus systems: Some policies and practices that work*. AGB Special Report. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
- Garland, J. C. (2009). *Saving alma mater: A rescue plan for America's public universities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Glenny, L. A. (1959). *Autonomy of public colleges: The challenge of coordination*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Goldman, C.A., Kumar, K.B., & Liu, Y. (2008). *Education and the Asian surge: A comparison of the education systems in India and China*. Arlington, VA: Rand Corporation, National Security Research Division.
- Gonzales, L. D. (2012). Responding to mission creep: Faculty members as cosmopolitan agents. *Higher Education*, 64(3), 337–353.
- Gornitzka, Å., & Maassen, P. (2000). National policies concerning the economic role of higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 13(3), 225–230.
- Gose, B. (2002). The fall of the flagships, 5 July. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Available at: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Fall-of-the-Flagships/18095>
- Graham, H. D. (1989). Structure and governance in American higher education: Historical and comparative analysis in state policy. *Journal of Policy History*, 1(1), 80–107.
- Hansmann, H. (2012). The evolving economic structure of higher education. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 159–183.
- Hearn, J. C., & Griswold, C.P. (1994). State-level centralization and policy innovation in U.S. postsecondary education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16(2), 161–190.
- Henry, R. (2017). *History of higher education system in India and present state*. Available at: <http://www.ppcrc.in/blog/history-of-higher-education-system-sin-india-and-present-state/> Accessed October 29, 2017.
- Heslop, L. (2014). *Understanding India: The future of higher education and opportunities for international cooperation*. Manchester, UK: British Council.
- Hoque, J. (2018). Quality concern in higher education in India. *EDULIGHT Journal*, 7(13), 662–668.
- Hunt, J., Tierney, T., & Carruthers, G. (2006). American higher education: How does it measure up for the 21st century? National Center Report No. 06-02. National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 23.
- Johnson, A. T. (2013). Exploring the use of mobile technology in qualitative inquiry in Africa. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(43), 1–14.
- Johnstone, D. Bruce (1999). ‘Management and leadership challenges of multicampus systems’, in H. Gerald (ed.), *The multicampus system: Perspectives on practice and prospects* (pp. 3–20). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J.L. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Joshi, K. M., & Ahir, K. V. (2013). Indian higher education: Some reflections. *Intelektine Ekonomika*, 7(15), 42–53.
- Kapur, D., & Mehta, P.B. (2004). Indian higher education reform: From half-baked socialism to half-baked capitalism. *Center for international development working paper*, 103.
- Kerr, C., Millett, J. D., Clark, B. R., MacArthur, B., & Bowen, H.R. (1978). *12 Systems of Higher Education: 6 Decisive Issues*. New York: International Council for Educational Development.
- Kezar, A. (2003). Transformational elite interviews: Principles and problems. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(4), 1–21.
- Lane, J. E. (2013). ‘Adding value to states and institutions’, in Lane, J.E., & Johnstone, D.B. (eds), *Higher education systems 3.0. Harnessing Systemness*,

- Delivering Performance. SUNY Series: Critical Issues in Higher Education* (pp. 3–26). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Langenberg, D. N. (1994). Forum: Why a system? Understanding the costs and benefits of joining together. *Change*, 26(2), 8–9.
- Lechuga, V. M. (2012). Exploring culture from a distance: the utility of telephone interviews in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 25(3), 251–268.
- Lee, E. C., & Bowen, F.M. (1971). *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance*. Hightstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Leslie, D., & Novak, R. (2003). Substance versus politics: Through the dark mirror of governance reform. *Educational Policy*, 17, 98–120.
- Lewis, R. J. (2012). *The multicampus system's role in maintaining institutional diversity in Texas, public universities*. Arlington, TX: The University of Texas at Arlington.
- MacTaggart, T. J., & Crist, C.L. (1996). *Restructuring higher education: What works and what doesn't in reorganizing governing systems*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Marginson, S., & G. Rhoades (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43(3), 281–309.
- McDaniel, O.C. (1996). The paradigms of governance in higher education systems. *Higher Education Policy*, 9(2), 137–158.
- McGuinness, A. C. (1991). *Perspectives on the current status of and emerging policy issues for public multicampus higher education systems*. AGB Occasional Paper No. 3. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities.
- McGuinness, A. C. (2011). 'The states and higher education', in Altbach, P.G., Gumpert, P. J., & Berdahl, R. O. (eds), *American Higher Education in the 21st Century: Social Political and Economic Challenges* (pp. 139–169). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- McLendon, M. K. (2003). 'State governance reform of higher education: Patterns, trends, and theories of the public policy process', in *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 57–143). New York: Springer.
- McLendon, M. K., & Ness, E.C. (2003). The politics of state higher education governance reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78(4), 66–88.
- Middlehurst, R. (1999). New realities for leadership and governance in higher education? *Tertiary Education & Management*, 5(4), 307–329.
- Mills, M.R. (2007). Stories of politics and policy: Florida's higher education governance reorganization. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(2), 162–187.
- Ministry of Human Resources Development, Government of India (n.d.). Department of Higher Education. Available at: <https://mhrd.gov.in/university-and-higher-education> Accessed October 29, 2017.
- Morphew, C. C. (2002). 'A rose by any other name': Which colleges became universities? *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 207–223.
- Mortimer, K. P., & Sathre, C.O. (2007). *The Art and Politics of Academic Governance: Relations among boards, presidents, and faculty*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- NASH, AASCU, & AGB (2009). *The leadership dynamic in public college and university systems*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of

- Universities and Colleges, the National Association of System Heads, & the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (2005). *State Capacity for Higher Education Policy: A Supplement to National Crosstalk*. San Jose, CA: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Available at: <http://www.highereducation.org/crosstalk/ct0305/news0305-insert.pdf>. Accessed October 29, 2017.
- Nicolson, R. (2004). The management of multicampus systems: The practice of higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 18(2), 346–358.
- Niklasson, L. (1995). State, market, hierarchy in higher education-A typology and an outline of the debate. *Higher Education Management*, 7(3), 345–353.
- Novak, R.J. (2009). *An Overview of American Public Higher Education Governance*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
- Nuffic, The Organisation for Internationalisation in Education in the Netherlands (2015). *The Indian education system described and compared with the Dutch system*. Available at: <https://www.nuffic.nl/en/publications/find-a-publication/education-system-india.pdf> Accessed October 29, 2017.
- Odendahl, T., & Shaw, A.M. (2002). ‘Interviewing elites’, in Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (eds), *Handbook of Interview Research. Context & Method* (pp. 299–316). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- O’Meara, K., & Bloomgarden, A. (2011). The pursuit of prestige: The experience of institutional striving from a faculty perspective. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 4(1), 39–73.
- Ostrander, S. (1995). ‘Surely you’re not in this just to be helpful: Access, rapport, and interviews on three studies of elites’, in Hertz, R. & Imber, J. B. (eds), *Studying elites using qualitative methods* (pp. 133–150). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Pande, M.C., & Pathak, B. (2017). Higher education in India: Issues, challenges and suggestions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, 1(LVIII), 269–273.
- Perkins, J. A. (1972). *Higher education: From autonomy to systems*. New York: International Council for Educational Development.
- Pifer, A. J., Shea, J., Henry, D., & Glenny, L. (1978). *Systems of higher education*. New York: International Council for Educational Development.
- Pinheiro, R., & Nordstrand Berg, L. (2017). Categorizing and assessing multi-campus universities in contemporary higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 23(1), 5–22.
- Rall, R.M. (2020). ‘Boards of trustees, systems’, in David, M., & Amey, M. (eds), *The SAGE encyclopedia of higher education* (Vol. 1, pp. 166–170). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Richardson, R. C., Jr., Bracco, K.R., Callan, P.M., & Finney, J.E. (1998). *Higher Education Governance: Balancing Institutional and Market Influences*. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Rothchild, M. T. (2011). *Accountability Mechanisms in Public Multi-campus Systems of Higher Education*. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Selino, J. (2011). ‘The self-absorbed higher-education system’, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Available at: https://www.huffpost.com/entry/higher-education-system_b_999403

- Shaguri, O.R. (2013). 'Higher education in India access, equity, quality', in EAN World Congress Scholar (pp. 1–23). <https://docplayer.net/6311022-Higher-education-in-india-access-equity-quality-obadya-ray-shaguri.html>
- Sharma, S., & Sharma, P. (2015). Indian higher education system: Challenges and suggestions. *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education*, 3(4), 1–4.
- Sheikh, Y. A. (2017). Higher education in India: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1), 39–42.
- Singh, M. (2007). PM's address at the 150th anniversary function of University of Mumbai in free educational content, 22 June. Available at: <https://archivepmo.nic.in/drmanmohansingh/speech-details.php?nodeid=536> Accessed October 29, 2017.
- Stripling, J. (2011). Flagships just want to be alone. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A1–A4.
- Sutz, J. J. (1999). 'Higher education systems and strategic planning', in Gaither, G. (ed.), *The multicampus system: Perspectives on practice and prospects* (pp. 82–97). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Tandberg, D. A., & Anderson, C.K. (2012). Where politics is a blood sport restructuring state higher education governance in Massachusetts. *Educational Policy*, 26(4), 564–591.
- Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- University Grants Commission (2003). *Higher education in India: Issues, concerns and new directions*. New Delhi: University Grants Commission. Available at: <https://www.ugc.ac.in/oldpdf/pub/he/heindia.pdf>. Accessed October 29, 2017.
- Venezia, A., Callan, P.M., Finney, J.E., Kirst, M.W., & Usdan, M.D. (2005). *The Governance Divide: A report on a four-state study on improving college readiness and success*. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2005). 'Work and family perspectives from research university faculty', in Curtis, J. (ed.), *The challenge of balancing faculty careers and family work*, (pp. 67–80). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Westmeyer, Paul (1985). *A History of American Higher Education*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Williams, R., & Leahy, A. (2020). *U21 Ranking of National Higher Education Systems 2020*. Melbourne, Australia: Universitas 21, University of Melbourne. Available at: https://universitas21.com/sites/default/files/202004/U21_Rankings%20Report_0320_Final_LR%20Single.pdf Accessed October 29, 2017.
- Yeravdekar, V., & Tiwari, G. (2014). China's lead in higher education: Much to learn for India. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 157, 369–372.
- Zimpher, N. (2012). 'Getting down to business', in 2012 *State of the University Address*, SUNY. Albany, NY. Available at: <https://www.suny.edu/about/leadership/chancellor-nancy-zimpher/speeches/2012-sou/>. Accessed October 29, 2017.