UC Berkeley
Research and Occasional Papers Series

Title

Public University Systems and the Benefits of Scale

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1jr9j701

Author

Johnsen, James

Publication Date

2024-02-16

Peer reviewed

PUBLIC UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS AND THE BENEFITS OF SCALE

February 2024

James R. Johnsen
Center for Studies in Higher Education, UC Berkeley
and Greenwood Asher & Associates

ABSTRACT

Multi-campus public higher education governance systems exist in 44 of the 50 U.S. states. They include all the largest and most influential public colleges and universities in the United States, educating fully 75 percent of the nation's public sector students. Their impact is enormous. And yet, they are largely neglected and as a tool for improvement are underutilized. Meanwhile, many states continue to struggle achieving their goals for higher education attainment, social and economic mobility, workforce development, equitable access and affordability, technological innovation, and human and environmental health. The dearth of scholarly research on these systems and their more effective use is explored in a forthcoming volume edited by the author. This paper extracts from that volume a set of specific ways in which systems can leverage their unique ability to use scale in service to their mission.

Keywords: public university systems, higher education, governing boards, accreditation, collective bargaining, on-line education, change management and leadership, shared governance

Multi-campus public higher education governance systems exist in 44 of the 50 U.S. states. This includes all the largest and most influential public colleges and universities in the United States, educating fully 75 percent of the nation's public sector students. Their impact is enormous. And yet, they are largely neglected and as a tool for improvement and underutilized. Meanwhile, many states continue to struggle achieving their goals for higher education attainment, social and economic mobility, workforce development, equitable access and affordability, technological innovation, and human and environmental health.

The dearth of scholarly treatment of multicampus systems and their more effective use is being explored in part by a forthcoming volume.* This essay extracts from that volume a set of specific ways in which systems can leverage their unique ability to use scale in service to their mission, with the purpose of drawing the attention of scholars of higher education, policy makers, board members, and system leaders. But first, some important context.

---

* James Johnsen (Ed,) *University Systems: Leveraging Scale for Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, in press). Contributors: George Blumenthal, Wallace Boston**.** Joel Cutcher-Gershenfeld & Stakeholder Alignment Cooperative**,** Tristan Denley**,** Robert Dickeson**,** Peter Ewell**,** Darren Greeno**,** Mark Hagerott**,** Dennis Jones**,** Daniel Julius**,** Jason Lane**,** Paul Lingenfelter**,** Rebecca Martin**,** Aims McGuinness**,** Demaree Michelau**,** Steven Patin**,** Kevin Reilly**,** Jessica Schueller**,** Kahleel Seecharan**,** Allison Vaillancourt, and Nancy Zimpher. While I draw from their contributions to the book, all shortcomings in this paper are mine.

CONTEXT

American university systems are facing the confluence of numerous political, demographic, economic, technological, and social forces which were exacerbated by the global COVID pandemic. First, states and nations compete in an increasingly challenging global economy, one in which university educated talent contributes to increasing productivity and prosperity.

Second, the role of higher education in creating individual and societal goods is in question as alternative forms of certification are increasingly seen as more relevant both to workers and employers, not to mention more convenient and more affordable for students.

Third, the cost of paying for public higher education has not only increased but has shifted largely from states to students, increasing concerns about access, opportunity, and affordability.

Fourth, the rise of on-line courses, programs, and institutions has provided a wider range of options for students and, at the same time, put pressure on those institutions that relied on face-to-face instruction.

Fifth, the number of traditional age college going youth is declining across the country, resulting in large regional enrollment declines. This decline in enrollment is accompanied by a shift from traditionally prepared high school graduates to an increasing number of first-generation students from low socio-economic backgrounds who require additional supports to be successful.

Sixth, we have seen universities in general, and systems in particular, increasingly subject to partisan political influence in a variety of forms: cutting state funding by unprecedented amounts; banning degrees in politically divisive fields; removing governing board members and replacing them with political allies; prohibiting programs and policies that advance diversity, equity, and inclusion; constraining university reform efforts in response to political influence of faculty and staff unions and intervention by regional accreditors; and selecting system and institutional leaders more for their partisan political allegiances than their academic leadership capabilities.

Finally, all these factors have conjoined with increased societal recognition of racial inequities and forced public higher education systems to rethink how they carry out their missions more effectively in this increasingly complex and rapidly changing environment.

It is time to rethink the role of public university systems, to "get on the balcony," as leadership scholar Ron Heifetz recommends. This includes some tough adaptive leadership questions: What core aspects of the mission of university systems must be preserved and what aspects of university systems should be shed to create the capacity to innovate solutions in a fast-changing world?

Early work on public multicampus systems conducted under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation led by iconic higher education leader Clark Kerr half a century ago[1] and more recently the *Power of Systems* initiative[2] developed by the National Association of System Heads (NASH), recognized the powerful role played by systems. The studies conducted by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) have also provided practical solutions for system leaders and state policy makers over the years, contributing much to our understanding of the diversity of systems across the country as well as to their common features and best practices.

But compared to the research and reports on individual institutions, on broad policy issues, and studies of functional areas such as finance and student affairs, multi-campus systems, as noted previously, have not received the attention needed to advance the national and state goals for higher education. America's

public university multi-campus systems must take greater advantage of what we call their "systemness" by leveraging scale and innovation in ways not available to their institutions.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS
The prevailing organizational model for public four-year colleges and universities in the United States is a system, established on a state-by-state basis, of separately accredited institutions each with its own leadership governed by a single system board through a single chief executive. As noted previously, and according to the NASH, 44 of the 50 states have established at least one system for providing and governing public higher education sanctioned either in the state's constitution or by statute. Even in the remaining six states, while there is no system *per se*, multiple forms of formal and informal coordination have been established to capture at least some of the benefits of systemness in those states.

While there are commonalities among the nation's systems, it is also true that there is substantial variance based on history, culture, politics, the economy, demographics, and other factors. Playing off a famous statement attributed to Ronald Reagan when running for office in California in 1966, "when you have seen one redwood tree, you have seen them all." A nationally recognized expert on systems, Dennis Jones, has observed a different view relevant for our discussion here, "when you have seen one system, you have seen one system."

In several states there is a single system that includes all three traditional segments of higher education (community college, comprehensive, and doctoral/research). Examples are Alaska, Hawaii, and New York. In other states, there are multiple systems, some based on a similar mission (e.g., California and Minnesota) and others based on geography (e.g., Texas and Colorado).

As noted, fully 75 percent of the nation's public college and university students are enrolled at an institution in one of these systems. They include the nation's land grant universities with a long history of contribution to economic development and opportunity, research universities conducting path-breaking discoveries, academic medical centers providing health care to millions, comprehensive universities preparing professionals for careers in a wide range of professions, institutions with the nation's highest economic mobility rates, community colleges providing low cost access to higher education and training our technical workforce, and a large number of institutions whose primary mission is to serve students from diverse and minority backgrounds.

These public university systems bring several unique benefits of scale to their students and their states. Systems provide students access to programs and courses from campuses across a system and, in some cases, even across systems. This seamless access helps students progress at a faster rate and reduces the need for every campus in a system to replicate programs and courses already available elsewhere in the system. Systems provide accountability to their funders by delivering cost effective and compliant administrative services and well-coordinated and defined academic missions and student services. Systems advocate for resources and public support with a unified voice.

Systems ensure that the needs of individual states, such as workforce preparation, research and economic development, food security, civic engagement, health care are paramount in academic planning and decision making. Systems buffer their institutions from political intrusion and balance resources and support among institutions in the system. Systems support innovation and collaboration and then scale those benefits across the system and beyond.

As society seeks to address its many challenges in this increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous world, the nation's higher education systems are being called on to do more, to bring their full

weight—which system leaders and scholars have demonstrated is greater than the sum of their institutional parts—to the work. An example of this resurgence of interest is the *Power of Systems: Advancing the Nation's Prosperity* initiative led by NASH, as noted previously. NASH brought together hundreds of system leaders to develop a transformation agenda for the nation's systems which includes goals, imperatives, and measures.

The agenda is being advanced along three complementary paths: (1) application of improvement science to key processes, such as transfer, by system innovation teams; (2) development of baseline data on systems, a toolkit for effective system policies and practices, and an annual report on system performance; and (3) a new partnership between the states and the federal government, initially focused on Afghan and Ukrainian refugee resettlement as well as funding to improve timely completion in support of social equity and workforce development goals. In addition, NASH has sponsored national convenings, partnered with higher education foundations and sister associations, and taken steps to contribute to scholarship on higher education systems.

Included in that contribution to scholarship and, hopefully as well to the practice of leading our nation's public university systems is *Public University Systems: Leveraging Scale for Higher Education*, which addresses these compelling questions. How are systems organized and what functions do they perform? What are the major challenges faced by systems as they seek to use their leverage their ability to scale to provide even more value to society? What characteristics of systems make them especially well-suited to address major societal challenges and goals? What is possible for higher education and society if university systems more effectively leverage their scale?

These and other questions are explored in the book by a diverse set of contributors, all higher education experts on the topic they have chosen to explore. From the structure and functions of systems through to their leadership, the book offers substantive ideas for improvement and new ways of thinking about what's possible for higher education through increased systemness. Our intended audience is university system and campus leaders, board members, state and federal policy makers, and scholars of higher education as they take the opportunity to "get up on the balcony" to reassess how systems may be of even greater impact for good.

This essay is not a summary of the book. It is instead a series of suggestions extracted from the book for practical ways our America's public university systems can more effectively leverage their scale in service to their mission. Given the variety of the nation's 65 systems in terms of size, mission, state, and organizational culture, these strategies should be tailored to some degree to fit each individual system and the specific tensions between their system offices and constituent institutions. These tensions are inherent in all systems, with positive and negative aspects to both poles of the tension.

Former University of California systemwide provost C. Judson King suggests several helpful principles for managing the tension through allocation of administrative responsibilities. These include "subsidiarity," which holds that "administrative functions should be handled, and decisions made by the smallest, lowest, or least centralized authority capable of handling the matter effectively." Additional principles include:

> centralization of developing policies vs. decentralization of operations, basing system-wide decisions upon processes that involve the entire system, having a single channel to the state government as well as a single state budget, assuring that different bodies involved in governance have functions that correspond to one another, promoting academic quality and articulation, seeking budgetary and financial efficiencies, and recognizing that different aspects of some functions necessarily must be carried out at multiple levels of governance.[3]

STRATEGIES FOR SYSTEMS TO LEVERAGE THEIR SCALE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Implement Shared Services in Administration, Student Services, and Academics
Systems must evolve from the roles and functions that justified their creation to roles that will justify their continued existence. That evolution lies not in radical restructuring of systems, but rather in changes to how key administrative and academic functions are performed and in a shift in the system culture from a focus on regulating institutions to a focus on serving their clients. Systems should emphasize their dual role in relation to (1) the political, economic, and cultural environment outside the system and (2) to the institutions in the system, with a focus on rationalizing and streamlining internal functional effectiveness, reducing barriers to student access and success, and demonstrating accountability to their funders.

Expansion of shared services is a prime example of the value of scale on the administrative side of the house. Similar efficiencies can be achieved in selected student services such as registration, financial aid, and even advising. On the academic side, a particularly relevant example in this period of regional enrollment decline is to repurpose affected campuses from independent degree granting institutions with their own faculty and curricula to learning centers with academic staff who support students as they take courses developed in collaboration with faculty in the larger campuses in the system. So, while the structure does not change—there is still a campus providing both educational and economic value to the community—the function of that campus adapts to external conditions by serving local students with resources developed with others in the system.

Pool Specialized Expertise at the System Level to Support Institutional Accreditation
Systems have the potential to play an expanded role in the institutional accreditation process, the principal mechanism for promoting and signifying quality in higher education in the United States. While there are challenges associated with systems performing accreditation tasks normally associated with campuses, multi-institutional systems can bring advantages in discharging accountability and assessing student learning.

They can speak with a single voice that commands public attention, use the central authority of the governing board and system administration to gain efficiencies, coordinate the accreditation activities of constituent institutions, pool specialized expertise for data gathering and reporting, and combine weak programs in several campuses so they are of accreditable quality. Implementation of these suggestions would be aided by collaboration with the campuses and with accrediting agencies, whose board members overwhelmingly represent their campuses.[4]

Strengthen Collaboration in the Collective Bargaining Process at the System Level
Innovation and adaptation of systems could result from improvements in the collective bargaining process, since in most systems that process occurs at the system level. This will require looking beyond the status quo to adopt practices that reinforce evidence-based decision-making, reflect best practices, and demand benchmark measures of success. Adoption of these and other practices stands to benefit faculty, employees, and stakeholders, and better enable the university and systems to respond to changing expectations of students and society.

With greater emphasis on shared rather than particular interests, systems and their campuses may develop greater adaptability to market conditions, increased protection for freedom of expression, heightened productivity, and more clear distinctions between collective bargaining and shared governance. As well, unions have become very influential players in state capitols due in part to their system-wide status, providing additional support for state funding for higher education as well as a barrier to external efforts to implement policies they see as detrimental to the system and union members.

Address How We Pay for Higher Education Systems

This question prompts numerous others perennially facing legislators, governors, and the leaders of public systems: How much should postsecondary education cost? What is the role of student tuition and fees, and public, philanthropic, and investment capital in financing postsecondary education? What are the contributions and limitations of each source of funding? What about the financing of research and public service? Who should fund student aid? What public policies and institutional practices are needed to meet the needs of individuals and the broader society for effectiveness and efficiency in postsecondary education? Answers to these critical questions suggest that the public higher education funding should be aligned with state attainment goals and federal financial support, and should foster systemwide cost effectiveness, innovation, performance, accountability, and return on investment.

Among the benefits of such alignment among state, system, and campus levels would be increased more student ability to understand the costs of benefits of higher education and be able to manage the cost of higher education without the risk of burdensome debt. An important development in student finance policy is the state mandate of completion of the *Free Application for Federal Student Aid* as a condition for high school graduation. This requirement, especially with support from systems in those states, has resulted in a dramatic increase in both college going and federal support. Another interesting policy innovation for diversifying financial support to systems is state corporate income tax credits for contributions to higher education.

Generate Internal Resources by Prioritizing Services and Programs

"It is time for university systems to get serious about this fundamental reality: The most likely source for needed resources will come from reallocation of existing resources." Resource allocation is another key function of boards and system offices, and increasingly reallocation, considering downward pressure on revenue from government and declining enrollment and accompanying tuition revenue. While models for reallocation typically are applied at the campus level, there are both opportunities and risks of using those models at the system level for expense reduction in some areas to fund investment in others.

While seldom undertaken at the system level, and even more rarely including academic programs and services, reallocation will be necessary if higher education systems are to control costs to invest in new programs that advance innovation, spur economic growth, respond to workforce demand, and pursue other worthy social goals. The more politically expedient and oft-used option of across-the board cuts is much more commonly used, but it is based on the flawed assumption that all programs are equal in terms of their quality, cost effectiveness, and impact on the mission.

System led review of administrative services and academic programs should be of special interest to governing boards with a mandate to provide resources wisely in service to their mission in a dynamic market. Such reallocation decisions, if boards exercised the will to implement them, would not only focus scarce resources on high value programs and services, but those decisions would also communicate to policy makers, employers, and students that the system and its campuses are accountable stewards of resources, relevant in the eyes of the state's population, innovative leaders of beneficial change, and cost-effective agents of social and economic mobility.

Make University Systems Truly Student Centric

It is common to hear university officials say that student success is their top priority, but our own university structures continue to contribute to students' lack of success at scale. What can be done about those failings? In student centric systems credits transfer seamlessly and grading policies, calendars, learning management systems, and student financial aid and registration processes are aligned.

If innovations like those we have seen in Georgia and Tennessee—the Momentum Year, Nexus degree, course redesign, curricular pathways, and the use of predictive analytics and intrusive advising—were extended across more systems at scale, we would see increases in college completion rates and decreases in racial completion gaps. Imagine the improvement in student interest, faculty and staff morale, and public support for those campuses with low completion rates if they improved to the point of producing more graduates than dropouts.

Implement Lean Process Improvement

While "lean" principles have been applied widely with great effect in manufacturing, health care, and service sectors, and in a limited way in higher education at the institutional level, there is little evidence that systems have applied lean principles and practices to their administrative, academic, and student service processes. In lean organizations customers define value rather than producers; processes are continuously reviewed and improved; and waste is identified and reduced, if not eliminated altogether.

A lean university system would place primacy for determining value in the hands of students and consumers of university research and outreach; primacy for determining how best to maximize that value in the hands of the faculty and staff on the front line of delivering it; and primacy for allocating resources and leadership support for value creation with those in governing roles. To the extent lean has been applied to higher education, it has been largely confined to administrative processes, with untapped benefits yet to come if applied to academic and student service processes.

Develop On-Line Strategies at the System Level

While on-line education is hardly a new model, its growth has primarily been at the institutional level, without the advantages that could be gained with system leadership. There are many benefits to systems, institutions, and their stakeholders to be realized through standardized student services, collaboratively developed curriculum, shared faculty and staff resources, revenue and cost sharing, and system level leadership in building corporate partnerships.

An example would be the recent rise of a consortium of nearly 500 institutions, including an entire system, that uses a single course sharing platform that offers financial aid eligibility, transparent payment processes, ability to transfer grades and credits, and assurance that courses will be accepted and transcribed. System level initiatives like this can enable increased adaptability to changing market demand, production of the highest quality course content, more coordination and standardization of course offerings, and reduced administrative cost.

Large market segments of students not well served now by traditional institutions can be better served if they were provided convenient access to programs that are on-line, affordable, and relevant; coordinated at the system level with shared faculty, standardized general education requirements, and common learning management systems, academic calendars, grading policies, financial aid processes, and student services.

Engage With Formal Consortia and Systems of Systems

Substantial financial and other benefits have accrued to the states and their systems and students through participation in regional higher education compacts such as the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education. Those benefits include policy research, outreach to state government officials, workforce needs assessments, training for boards and university leaders, tuition reciprocity for students, and support for interstate authorization reciprocity.

Increased utilization of regional compacts and other "system of systems" model would enable students to gain access to programs not delivered in their own state and provide states the ability to provide student access to specialized and costly programs without the need to build those programs themselves. In addition, on such a foundation of system level collaboration, much more is possible, particularly regarding the enormous opportunity for collaborating systems to address—through their research, teaching, and service—those issues that transcend state boundaries, such as economic development, environmental protection, food security, energy, health care, immigration, pandemic response, national security, and transportation.

Experiment With New Consortia Models Within and Across Systems

New combinations of social and technical systems typically define an era, while prior sets of social and technical systems do not disappear. In the current digital era, the challenge for public higher education systems is whether to lead, adapt or fall behind as new institutional arrangements move to the foreground. Individual universities and systems are already deeply involved in the formation of smaller consortia, more agile and adaptive than traditional bureaucratic higher education systems? For example, what if systems encouraged intra- and inter- system collaboration on smaller, voluntary, and time bound projects that better meet the interests of specific stakeholders?

As an example, what if a group of Hispanic Serving Institutions worked together within and across systems on expanding digital infrastructure on their campuses, thus bringing the benefits of scale and network to a focused, time bound effort? Successful implementation of consortia models is based on several key practices: forging and sustaining a shared vision; fostering internal alignment for lateral alignment; staying agile with minimum viable structures; and establishing rules to change the rules.

Internationalize Systems

Systems are playing an increasing role in the internationalization of American higher education by providing international functions at the system level and by collaborating with systems abroad, through efforts like the *European Universities Initiative* and *Cross-National Regional Universities*. System led initiatives can reduce the cost and broaden access to the many well documented benefits of international programs for both American and international faculty, students, and employers whose operations and markets are global. This application of systemness is especially timely in the face of rising tensions across the globe and in light of the fact that many of the world's major problems—such as climate change, immigration, national security, pandemic response, and trade—transcend national boundaries.

Build Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for the System

In response to the heightened awareness of the need for increased coordination and effectiveness of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives in higher education, there is much to learn from new models and best practices for system level initiatives. Although higher education has become much more accessible to underrepresented segments of our population, outcome disparities persist. How can systems address these education disparities at scale across multiple campuses, utilizing systemness?

Experience in the University of Missouri system and the California Community College system has shown that progress can be made at scale through use of common data sets, evidence-based research into practices that work and extension of that research across the system, innovative outreach efforts to geographic areas and school districts with large numbers of students from lower socioeconomic status, and faculty and staff training programs that are consonant with institutional culture. In the ongoing debates over DEI, these and other efforts can replace ideological arguments with an empirical basis for the effectiveness of certain DEI initiatives in improving student outcomes and meeting state educational attainment goals.

Implement Cyber Resilient University Systems

Our economy, society, and higher education systems are moving from a period of relative equilibrium into a period of disequilibrium marked by the emergence of artificial intelligence as the underlying driver of disruption which will reshape education, our society, economy, and government. State university systems will be challenged to thrive, or in some cases, to even survive the disruption. But state systems have yet another calling: as a tool for society to navigate and thrive through this disruptive change.

System leaders should build resilience in the human, machine, and the cyberspace of software data while reliably meeting the day to day needs of students. As well, cyber insecurity may now be exceeding the response capabilities of individual campuses, and thus state university systems should play a key role helping those campuses and our states and larger society navigate this digital security challenge. But for some systems and states, it is also possible the scale of the problem may overwhelm their budgets and human capital resources, and that a larger, system of state systems effort may be in order.

Strengthen Faculty Governance at the System Level

While most faculty senates and similar shared governance organizations are organized at the campus level, there are significant advantages that can accrue to faculty, administration, and governing boards from a formal system level faculty governance role, including a system level in place of campus level senates. The benefits of shared governance with faculty at the system level include added resilience and capacity for evolution and adaptation when faculty voices are "at the table" with the system governing board and administrative leaders where the governing board is setting policies and priorities, approving new programs, closing programs, setting tuition, and distributing resources.

Additional benefits of systemness not available to faculty leaders solely at the institutional level include increasing faculty awareness of and opportunity to contribute to decisions at the system level, building intercampus relationships with other faculty, breaking down barriers to institutional collaboration in academic program delivery, expanding opportunities for faculty to conduct research and teach students across the system, and joining with the board and system administrators in advocacy for support from the public and government funders.

Shape the Future Through Enhanced Board Governance

Governing boards can play a heightened role in the face of accelerating trends affecting the future of American higher education by adopting tools, pursuing initiatives, and implementing incentives that help shape those trends for the public good. This will require boards to become more adept at playing that difficult dual role of insulating the system and its campuses from partisan political pressures while also ensuring system and institutional accountability and responsiveness to elected officials and the public. An example of a step boards can take is to insist upon clear system and institutional level goals, strategic plans, and budgets aligned with and in support of state level higher education goals.

Make Change Happen

Mastering the skills of change management is essential for successful implementation of lasting improvement. As leaders face the myriad pressures on higher education and seek to transcend the barriers to change, they should utilize the best practices of change management developed through scholarship and practice in numerous contexts, including higher education, business, and politics. Key elements of these change models include creating the demand for change through comparative data analysis and surfacing dissatisfaction with the status quo; building a leadership team to guide the change with enough time for study, listening, and reflection; engaging key stakeholders, including skeptics; communicating regularly about the rationale for change, providing opportunities for training in the new

processes, and celebrating wins along the way; and allowing for rest recovery between stages of the change process.

Adoption of such time-tested change management step enable leaders to avoid two critical and all too common strategic errors: (1) avoiding change and seeking the false comfort of stability at the expense of improvement, and (2) making ad hoc decisions based on raw political power, short term interests, political expediency, or reaction to the fears of a particular constituency.

Advance a National Agenda for University Systems
University systems possess the potential to address the many challenges higher education leaders face and, in so doing, to unleash innovation, advance social and economic mobility, and improve our quality of life. To realize their full potential, the future roles and functions of higher education systems need to be reshaped and leadership from system leaders is required for that to be accomplished. Strategies are being developed by the National Association of System Heads (NASH) together with system leaders from across the country under the auspices of the NASH *Power of Systems* project.

Realizing this compelling vision for university systems—to leverage fully their unique ability to scale improvement in service to America's higher education attainment goals—requires a call for strong yet adaptive leadership, adoption of compelling goals and measures, the use of tested and scalable initiatives within and across systems, and the full dedication of the collective human, intellectual, technological, financial, leadership, and cultural assets of our campuses toward those goals.

CONCLUSION
The recommendations in this essay touch a diverse array of topics, reflecting the importance, complexity, and potential impact of America's university systems. Despite the wide variance across the nation's university systems, they all share the need to adapt to changing conditions and to do so, they must answer the perennial question—in the face of a rapidly changing world with competing and contradicting demands, a world of adaptive challenges that require adaptive responses—what must university systems shed in order to create the capacity to adapt while continuing to serve their core purpose of delivering on their promise to society?

While there necessarily will be different responses to this question across the nation's many systems, by pursuing the suggestions in this paper and the adaptive strategies much more fully developed in the book on which this essay is based, we can advance the enormous potential of America's public university systems to fully realize their promise to the students, campuses, and states they serve.

ENDNOTES

[1] Eugene Lee & Bowen, F. M., *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971); Eugene Lee & Bowen, F. M., *Managing Multicampus Systems: Effective Administration in an Unsteady State*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).

[2] Marian Gade, *Four Multicampus Systems: Some Policies and Practices That Work* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1993); Jonathan Gagliardi & Lane, J.E. (Eds), *Higher Education Systems Redesigned: From Perpetuation to Innovation to Student Success* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2022); Gerald Gaither (Ed.). *The Multicampus System: Perspectives on Practice and Prospects* (Sterling, WV: Stylus Press, 1999); Jason Lane & Johnstone, D. B. (Eds). *Higher Education Systems 3.0: Harnessing Systemness: Delivering Performance.* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2013); Frank Richardson, Bracco, K., Callan, P. & Finney, J, *Designing State Higher Education Systems for a New Century* (Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1999); Rebecca Martin, Zimpher, N,, Lane, J. & Johnsen,

J. (2022) "Leveraging the Power of Systemness to Improve the Success of Students and Society," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 54:4, 38-44.

[3] C. Judson King, "On The Apportionment Of Administrative Governance Functions Within Multi-Campus Universities And University Systems." Center for Studies in Higher Education.16.13 (December 2013).

[4] By the author's count, as of 2023 one person out of 204 accrediting agency board members across the nation is employed by a system office.