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INTRODUCTION

With the passage of the FOCUS (Focus on College and University Success) Act on April 19, 2016, it is necessary to analyze the Act itself and the governance changes it legislates and make recommendations to administrators while informing the academic community about the Act itself. The legislation mandates the restructuring of Tennessee higher education by incorporating independent governing boards to oversee each of the state’s six public universities, which are: Austin Peay State University, East Tennessee State University, Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee State University, Tennessee Technological University, and the University of Memphis. These local, independent governing boards will ultimately report to the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). The Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) previously governed the six public universities as well as Tennessee’s 13 community colleges and 27 technical colleges. After the FOCUS Act is fully implemented, the TBR will only have jurisdiction over the community colleges and technical schools. These changes are part of Tennessee Governor Bill Haslam’s Drive to 55 Initiative, wherein the stated objective is to have 55 percent of the citizens of the state with completed collegiate education or training by 2025. As a part of this initiative, the Tennessee Promise ensures last dollar funding toward community college tuition, thereby making community college education essentially free for Tennesseans who qualify. Because of these higher education reforms and initiatives at the state level, a major revision of the state’s governance and system structure in higher education should not be altogether unexpected.

Currently, the TBR’s mission is varied and includes acting as the “responsible agency for purposes and proposals of the (TBR) System subject only to legislative mandated...
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The FOCUS Act is part of a larger statewide program that focuses on higher education, which is part of the larger initiative called the Academic Common Market (SREB, 2015). Another outlier to the non-compete and non-duplication policies, the FOCUS Act includes a provision for comprehensive and competition has been created. For instance, a student can take an online TIP course while maintaining enrollment at ETSU. There are over 500 degrees and certificates available as well as over 480 independent courses (Tennessee Campus). The tuition is capped separately, and the money is shared between the university and TBR. This program can be interpreted as direct competition between the six Tennessee universities and the TBR, because potential tuition money is lost to the program. It is unknown whether the Tennessee Campus will change when the FOCUS Act is implemented and boards are in place.

Another outlier to the non-compete and non-duplication policies is the TBR’s cooperation with a multi-state college program, which is overseen by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), a nonpartisan group that provides research, data, and recommendations to educational policymakers (SREB). The program allows students to enroll in programs at participating institutions throughout the Southeastern U.S. that are not offered in their home states at an in-state tuition rate. The program also includes various online courses and programs (SREB, Academic Common Markets), In the 2014 calendar year, 174 Tennessee students participated in the program (SREB, 2015). With the duplication that occurs through the Tennessee Campus and the Academic Common Market program, one may question whether there are quality differences among courses and programs based on location or students served. Tennessee’s higher education systems have been previously challenged on differences in institutional quality as well as diversity in Geier v. University of Tennessee.
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(1979), which was filed by a Tennessee State University (TSU) faculty member, Rita Sanders, who was eventually joined by other TSU professors Ray Richardson and H. Coleman McGinnis as co-plaintiffs (tnstate.edu/about_tsu/history.aspx). This is a significant case that led to the creation of the University of Tennessee-Nashville (UTN) with Tennessee State University (TSU), which offered many duplicate programs and were located less than five miles apart (Epstein, 1980; Geier v. University of Tennessee, 1979). TSU is a land grant university that was established in 1912 and is characterized as a historically black college and university (HBCU), while UTN, a primarily white school, was established in 1947 as a way for students in Nashville to be able to attend class with greater convenience. Although desegregation in Tennessee higher education occurred in 1960, at the time of Geier v. Tennessee, there had been little progress toward this end. Geier v. Tennessee challenged the higher education leadership by claiming that there was intentional segregation among the schools because they were offering duplicate programs to different populations that were not equal in quality (Geier v. University of Tennessee, 1979). Geier v. Tennessee sought an injunction to dismantle UT-N and to create a single governing board that could equalize facilities and educational opportunities for students at TSU and to prevent even unintended segregation among institutions, and eventually led to the merging of UT-N and TSU in 1971, which helped desegregate the institutions as well as close the quality gap that Geier detailed (Epstein, 1980). Geier v. Tennessee, argued for was not realized, the court required that THEC, the State Board of Regents (an early version of the TBR), and the UT Board create a long-term desegregation plan (Geier v. University of Tennessee, 1979).

Current TSU President Glenda Glover has expressed some concern about the FOCUS Act and the potential impacts of the act on TSU. In researching other institutions currently implementing a masters program in the direct market area of another state institution, the president of a medium-sized Tennessee university, a push to improve the higher education system in Tennessee, though not with same force that is being experienced with the FOCUS Act. In 1999 a group of business and community leaders across the state participated in the Governor’s Council for Higher Education. The group dealt with issues ranging from student retention to equitable salaries to governance. At this time, the Council recommended a stronger THEC which is coming to fruition with the FOCUS Act. The group recommended that THEC be responsible for several items that are also included in the FOCUS Act.

Current guidelines in the FOCUS Act are ambiguous about the exact role of the governing board and their relations to the executive team at the institution; in particular to the president. In researching other institutions currently localized governing boards, the investigators found that boards were as charged with oversight as they were for their boards, as well as functional, beneficial relationships with the university president. Though there are clear variances among the boards in relation to the institution’s expertise in higher education or a related field, there are several similarities among the committees, financial structures, and contract negotiations (Appendix 2). These governing boards traditionally appoint presidents and have a direct reporting structure for the position.

Appointment and Power of the Board

According to Section 19 of the FOCUS Act, appointment to the governing board will be a gubernatorial appointment. Of the ten board members, eight will be direct appointees of the governor and will be on a rotating term, with the ninth voting member being a faculty member that serves for a two year period, and the tenth member being a student who serves for one year term. It is recommended that the university president have the ability and opportunity to work closely with the governor to make recommendations, thus helping to avoid the potential for politically motivated appointments that can hamper the work of the board. It is further noted that the eight gubernatorial appointments be diverse in background and knowledge, with each member having one of the unique characteristics and background: professor, business expertise, or knowledge of higher education administration, policy expertise in higher education or a related field, business

Over the past 30 years, even after agreeing to the creation of THEC, the leadership of the University of Memphis (UM) has repeatedly attempted to gain independence in governance (Stockard, 2015). Although reasons are not always clearly documented in the news or in scholarly journals, there are clear indications as to why leaders at Memphis would request some autonomy in the wake of the Geier case. Memphis has expressed the idea that it has a reputation as a top tier research university, is categorized as having higher research activity by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, and is located in an urban setting, thus making its culture, population, and needs different than the other institutions previously governed by the TBR system.

According to the president of the TBR, the creation of the new board (Stinson, 2003, p. 82). Also of note is that Humphreys was selected to serve as the first chancellor for the SBR (Stinson, 2003, p. 83). In 1989, the school created the Board of Visitors, which was strongly in favor of an independent governance structure. The Board was founded by prominent business leader Robert Fogelman and was comprised of other wealthy and well-connected people in Memphis. Former Governor Phil Bredesen agreed that the university would be more appropriately governed by an independent board, but his acknowledgement never turned into serious action (Roberts, 2013). In the 2010 election for Tennessee governor, candidates from Memphis, Bill Gibbons and Jim Kyle, both pledged to remove UM from the TBR system.

There has been some disagreement among administrators, however. Interim President Brad Martin, who led the university before the current president, Dr. Mark Rudd, switched his position on the matter. In 2013, the Commercial Appeal ran an article about Martin’s dissatisfaction with the administrative lag in dealing with the TBR, but that he had brought his concern before the Board who agreed that the administrative processes should become more streamlined (Roberts, 2013). In light of that information, it was determined that the board be more self-sufficient and the board to voice support of autonomy. President Rudd has been a supporter of the FOCUS Act, however.

1999 Governor’s Council on Higher Education

Tennessee has made several changes to its higher education officials in the last few objectively, there it was seen as a way to more objectively process financial Tennesseee, not change the current funding formula which has been in place since 2010. The current formula for all institutions involves the allocation of funds through the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and is based on student performance and other outcome metrics. However, there is still concern over state funding for special projects which was formerly filtered through the TBR. House Majority Leader Gerald McCormick, R-Chattanooga, has expressed the hope that the independent governing structure could create unhealthy competition and an unfair advantage for some institutions (Shelzig, 2016). For now, Gov. Haslam has said that he is committed to preventing competing efforts (Shelzig, 2016).

According to the president of a medium-sized Tennessee public institution, the TBR has traditionally failed to maintain a level of control over competition in the state among the TBR institutions. Examples range from direct recruitment efforts for one institution in the campus area of a sister institution, to community colleges renting recruitment spaces near another state university, then leasing desk space back to that university for a transition counselor, to one state university implementing a masters program in the direct market area of another state university.

Historically, state regulating and coordinating agencies for higher education such as the TBR system have been the most consistent component of the independent governmental structure. One of the most common forms of state oversight is non-duplication policies such as TBR’s policy on program modifications and new academic programs. According to this policy, “if a university tries to develop a new program or modify an existing one, the university must notify the community college within the designated service area to ensure there is no unwarranted duplication” (Glover, 2016).

THEC was created in 1967 for several reasons, such as maintaining stronger oversight of the state’s universities as they were growing and becoming interested in awarding doctorate degrees. The University of Tennessee’s then president, Andy Holt, was concerned about the potential for funds to be diverted from the UT system. Other universities were in favor of the creation of THEC because it was seen as a way to more objectively process financial requests from institutions (Stinson, 2003), and so was viewed as a potential win-win for all the involved schools.
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In addition to the recommendations about board selection are recommendations about the governing practices of those boards. Common concerns among university presidents who will operate under the structures promulgated by the FOCUS Act center around the potential for overbearing board involvement. This ranges from dictating that classes such as constitutional law be mandatory for undergraduates in an effort to stem the tide of socialism among the student body, to wanting to be involved in the day to day operations of the university. Taking a “hands on, but fingers out” approach is most appropriate for the governing board. Amendment 1 of the FOCUS Act, which was proposed largely by TSU’s faculty senate and TSU President Brian Noland, proposed a non-interference clause, which essentially predicates a dividing line between those involved in the oversight of the institution, and being explicitly involved in or interfering with any employee, officer, or agent under the direction of the university president. It is recommended that the university president be the one and only employee of the localized governing board.

Potential issues can also arise between the governing board and the president if there is dissatisfaction from either party. Anne D. Neal, President of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni has said that presidents need to take responsibility for keeping their board members privy to the latest information on campus for board members to make the best decisions possible (Ryad, 2013).

“...if deemed necessary. Potential conflicts between this lay board and the president can arise in myriad ways. The board must leave the day to day operations of the university to the president and allow them to execute their position as they see best. The board is only mandated to meet four times each year. Within those meetings the board must be focused on the performance and outcome metrics of the institution and use these as the indicators to measure the performance of the president and the institution.”

Funding

In response to concerns about fair funding and proper representation, the legislators recently passed Amendment Four to the FOCUS Act, which says “each president from a state university in the state university and community college system, instead of just one such president, (will be assigned) to the THEC funding formula committee” (Tennessee General Assembly); an amendment that President Glenda Glover of TSU claims to have directly influenced as stated in a TSU FOCUS Act Update dated March 25, 2016 (http://www.tnstate.edu/president/documents/TSU_Focus_Update_2016_0325.pdf). Governor Haslam has also said that he would make it a priority to “consult with lawmakers to ensure strong boards would be appointed for each school and that he would work to avoid competing lobbying efforts by each institution for state dollars and construction projects” (Shelzig, 2016).

However, Gerald McCormick expressed concern about what could happen after Governor Haslam’s term is over in 2019 (Shelzig, 2016).

Autonomy and the Move toward a Corporation

Autonomy from THEC for these governing boards is crucial for their success. While oversight is necessary, the previous size of the TBR system is a testament to how a large system with too much oversight can weaken the overall system with bureaucracy. It is recommended that THEC avoid creating a “corporation” for higher education for the state of Tennessee as is practiced in such states as West Virginia and Kentucky. In this case the chancellor or another key THEC figure would represent the interests of the six institutions and their boards to the state legislature and governor. It is recommended that THEC not only increase in statute (as is proposed by the FOCUS Act), but that it also increase in practice. With this centralization in the state, it is important that each of the independent boards be allowed to operate with a level of autonomy that increases the interests of that institution. However, it is possible and a concern that with the increase in statute and practice, the same model that was just overturned by the legislature will be repeated as more regulation and oversight are promulgated by the newly empowered THEC.

Possible Future Directions and Conversations

A major interest of these boards will be financial. In other systems such as Virginia, these boards are referred to as “corporations.” If true autonomy is ultimately granted, conversations in the future should revolve around the ability of each institution to issue debt, giving the institution the ability to build, lease, and ultimately drive investment at the institution without the heavy hand of a board of regents and the cumbersome pace at which it moves. Becoming a “corporation” of sorts would allow the institutions to deal in real estate, issuing bonds to raise capital, and to manage and finance its own debt. Many universities use this structure currently by buying retail spaces that are then leased. The revenues from these real-estate investments are then used by the university to further the mission, offer scholarships, and to facilitate other institutional goals. According to one medium-sized university president, this is likely to be the conversation and debate that will ensue in the next 10 years within the state of Tennessee.

CONCLUSION

The true test of success for the FOCUS Act was not in the passage of the bill, which occurred in March and April 2016, but in the separation and restructuring of the Tennessee Board of Regents. As has been pointed out, THEC has been empowered beyond its current standing in statute, but in practice has yet to be seen. This is going to require a major organizational restructuring for THEC that may include the addition of staff members and departments. Though the necessity of additional personnel can be argued as many states, including neighboring Virginia, oversee many more students with less formalized structure at the state level. This may also promulgate the resurgence of a large, cumbersome system that delays and hinders the progress of the individual institution. In either case, the formal passage of power from TBR to THEC may take time as TBR has expressed concern and doubt over the transition.

Of particular note is the large loss of revenue that TBR will experience when its oversight of the four-year universities is officially dissolved. Currently the system receives a total of $8.6 million in fees from the 46 TBR institutions. Of that amount, $5.7 million comes from the six universities that will transition away from TBR. That is an incredible financial loss for the system, and transition away from those fees will likely take time. Currently the universities are paying TBR for access to software systems for finance and administration and for teaching and learning. Those relationships will likely continue, though independent boards are likely to find other software systems that complement the needs and resources of the individual institution better. In this instance, THEC may be able to leverage the purchasing power that was had through the TBR system.

This leaves further questions about what will happen with university contracts. Will contracts still be maintained by the TBR system, or will they transition to THEC or to the university? Will previous agreements be honored and maintained? All of these questions and issues must be dealt with in the years, months, and even weeks ahead since the passage of the Act.

Despite the conversations and debates that will undoubtedly follow, the Act has placed things in motion that will fundamentally change the landscape of higher education within the state of Tennessee, and possibly the nation. Tennessee has been on the forefront of change in higher education, and has been frequently placed on the national stage. These changes are likely the subject of conversation at higher administrative agencies, and will certainly be closely watched by other states.
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### APPENDIX 2

#### PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS AND BYLAWS MATRIX DIAGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>Under the General Assembly of the state, 14 voting board members (art. 1 §1)</td>
<td>Board sessions are open and may be attended by selected student constituents and the faculty senate president. Meetings occur 1x per year. Closed meetings are permitted for certain reasons. No voting is permitted unless a quorum is present.</td>
<td>The board annually elects a Rector to preside and Vice Rector if absent for a maximum of two one-year terms.</td>
<td>Responsible for the operation of the institution, and to write policy. Authority is delegated to the U. President. Responsible for capital improvement and care of property. Specific examples delineated below:</td>
<td>Executive, Nominating, Finance and Audit, Buildings and Grounds, Student Affairs and Athletics, Research</td>
<td>Must include agriculture, mechanic arts, military tactics, sciences and classes in conformity with institutional mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>17 members including officers (Rector, Vice Rector, and Secretary) are gubernatorial. Student and faculty representatives are included.</td>
<td>Meets 4x per year. A simple majority is required for a quorum to be present.</td>
<td>Rector, Vice Rector, and Secretary</td>
<td>Appoints President, Provost, and other key administrative positions.</td>
<td>Academic Affairs, Administration, Buildings and Grounds, Athletics, Audit and Compliance, Financial Affairs, Richard Bland College, Strategic Initiatives and New Ventures, Student Affairs, University Advancement. One or more board members appointed by Rector to be chair.</td>
<td>The Provost who reports to the board is responsible for curricular decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Supervised by the Higher Education Policy Commission. Made up of 17 members (including 1 faculty, 1 staff, and 1 student). The Chairperson of WVU Institute of Technology must hold a seat.</td>
<td>Must meet at least 6 times per year with at least 9 members present. The executive committee creates the agenda with consultation from the university president.</td>
<td>Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary, all of which serve one year terms. The Chair is selected from the laypersons serving on the Board. Officers can be removed at any time by majority vote.</td>
<td>Oversees financial, business and educational policy, appoints and evaluates the President; prepares budget requests; manages personnel matters; supervises fundraising; oversees contracts</td>
<td>Executive Committee; Strategic Plans and Initiatives Committee; Accreditation and Academic Affairs Committee; Health Sciences Committee; Finance Committee; Facilities and Revitalization Committee; Divisional Campus Committee; and Audit Committee.</td>
<td>Oversees educational policy; approves education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Supervised by the Higher Education Policy Commission. Made up of 17 members (including 1 faculty, 1 staff, and 1 student). The Chairperson of WVU Institute of Technology must hold a seat.</td>
<td>Meetings have varied from 4-12 over the last 7 years.</td>
<td>Board Chairperson, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Committee Chairs</td>
<td>&quot;Members...oversee the university's operations and establish its policies.&quot;</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Student Affairs and the Finance, Audit and Facilities Planning Committee.</td>
<td>Oversees multiple facets from faculty compensation to policy regarding textbooks and syllabi, and more but with no authority over course curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall University</td>
<td>16 Board members, including a faculty member, staff person, and student.</td>
<td>Meet at least once quarterly. A quorum is a majority.</td>
<td>President, Treasurer, General Counsel, Secretary and Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive and Audit; Academic and Student Affairs; Finance and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Currently, 15 serve on the board.</td>
<td>Meet at least once quarterly. A quorum is a majority.</td>
<td>President, Provost, Vice President for Finance &amp; Administration, General Counsel, and Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive, Governance, and Trusteeship Committee; Finance and Administration Committee; and Academic and Student Affairs Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>Currently, 14 serve on the board.</td>
<td>Meet at least once quarterly. A quorum is a majority.</td>
<td>President, Provost, Vice President for Finance &amp; Administration, General Counsel, and Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive, Governance, and Trusteeship Committee; Finance and Administration Committee; and Academic and Student Affairs Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 (Continued)
### Public and Private University Governance Systems and Bylaws Matrix Diagram

#### Private

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yale University | Board known as the "president and fellows of Yale College.
Made up of 19 members, including the Governor and Lt. Governor of CT.
There is no time limit for service. | Held 5 times per year. | Chair, two Vice Chairs, and the President of Duke. | Prudential (Executive), Finance, Audit, Investments, Educational Policy, Institutional Policies, Honorary Degrees, Buildings and Grounds, Development and Alumni Affairs, Compensation, Trusteeship, Investor Responsibility and School of Medicine. | Academic Affairs Committee: Audit, Risk, and Compliance Committee; Business and Finance Committee; Facilities and Environment Committee; Human Resources Committee; Institutional Advancement Committee; Medical Center Academic Affairs Committee; Undergraduate Education Committee | The Academic Affairs Committee oversees all activities that support the academic mission of the University, including the articulation of the academic mission of the University, enhancing the quality of the academic program, considering new academic programs, all matters relating to the graduate and professional student experience, promoting scholarly research, and overseeing strategic planning for the University and its constituent schools. |
| Duke University | The Board of Trustees has 37 members who are elected by the Student Government, Graduate and Professional Student Council, the Alumni Association, and the Duke Endowment. Two grad students observe. | 3 meeting per year, plus special meetings as necessary. A majority is necessary for quorum. | Chair, two Vice Chairs, and the President of Duke. | | | |
| Virginia Tech Board Responsibilities: | | | | | | |
| 1. Appointment of the President of the University. | | | | | | |
| 2. Approve appointments and fix salaries of the faculty, university staff, and other personnel. | | | | | | |
| 3. Establish fees, tuition, and other charges imposed by the University on students. | | | | | | |
| 4. Review and approval of the University’s budgets and overview of its financial management. | | | | | | |
| 5. Review and approval of proposed academic degree programs and the general overview of the academic programs of the University. | | | | | | |
| 6. Review and approval of the establishment of new colleges or departments. | | | | | | |
| 7. Ratification of appointments by the President or vice presidents. | | | | | | |
| 8. Representation of the University to citizens and officers of the Commonwealth of Virginia, especially in clarifying the purpose and mission of the University. | | | | | | |
| 9. Approval of promotions, grants of tenure, and employment of individuals. | | | | | | |
| 10. Review and approval of physical plant development of the campus. | | | | | | |
| 11. The naming of buildings and other major facilities on campus. | | | | | | |
| 12. Review and approval of grants of rights-of-way and easement on University property. | | | | | | |
| 13. Review and approval of real property transactions. | | | | | | |
| 14. Exercise of the power of eminent domain. | | | | | | |
| 15. Review and approval of personnel policies for the faculty and university staff. | | | | | | |
| 16. Subject to management agreement between the Commonwealth of Virginia and Virginia Tech, the Board has full responsibility for management of Virginia Tech. (§23-38.91, Code of Virginia, as amended). | | | | | | |

| West Virginia University Board Responsibilities | | | | | | |
| 1. The Board has the authority to control financial, business, and education policies. | | | | | | |
| 2. The board oversees the master plan and files it with the WV Education Policy Commission. | | | | | | |
| 3. The board prepared the budget request | | | | | | |
| 4. The board reviews academic programs at least every five years to ensure transferability, logical course sequence, etc. | | | | | | |
| 5. The board approves teacher education programs | | | | | | |
| 6. The board manages personnel matters, such as compensation, employment, and discipline | | | | | | |
| 7. The board supervises the fundraising arm (financial and in-kind) | | | | | | |
| 8. The board appoints the President as well as evaluates his/her performance | | | | | | |
| 9. The board oversees contracts/agreements with other schools of all types | | | | | | |
| 10. The board manages the transfer of funds/properties to other agencies or institutions | | | | | | |
| 11. The board has the right to delegate power to the President of other senior administrator in any case deemed necessary | | | | | | |
| 12. The board has authority of the computer/computer donation program | | | | | | |
| 13. The board decides where to concentrate attention and resources on state priorities | | | | | | |
| 14. The board will continue to provide certain administrative services to WVE-Parkersburg | | | | | | |
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Tennessee Higher Education Governance Structure after the FOCUS Act

Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC)
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* There are six individual Board of Trustees. Each university has its own Independent Board.