

2023 0105 PHE Task Force – Staff Notes

(Eastwood, M. Jacqueline will be out)
(Shannon Reed – Guest)
(Richard Gustafson – Guest)
(Christiana Thornton – Guest)

(0908 Call to Order)

S. Appleby – welcome, housekeeping and introductions / recognition of lunch courtesy of USNH
No online attendees, no public comment
Shared out staff notes (N. Marks notes from 12/21 meeting) and the group approved the posting of the staff notes to the Public Higher Education Task Force web page

Vote to approve minutes – Senator James Gray motion, Butch Locke seconded. Unanimously approved.

(time marker - 0917)

D. Luneau – suggestion of dedicated time for public comment as an additional or separate meeting time

S. Appleby – review of executive order will remain on the agenda
No public feedback / comments

Subcommittees – discussion

On one hand – large scope of work, on the other hand – potential rabbit holes

Time constraints – we want to be sure we're productive

Original discussion – 3 bullets in EO, 3 subcommittees (division by professional responsibilities)

Would subcommittee work predetermine an outcome?

Open to feedback

B. Locke – agreed regarding efficiency standpoint – BAE addresses problems in this manner

C. Provencher – what will we be able to deliver? In terms of the work to be done

(time marker – 0922)

C. Provencher – In the time we have, the work is a challenge

Review of the 3 bullets – should we focus on the sub-bullets (under 2)?

What is reasonable – comes back to time

S. Appleby – Success could be a list of recommendations / areas for further investigation with a wider group of stakeholders

N. Toumpas – Review of previous materials – baseline provided by CCSNH / USNH documents the problem fairly well

Suggestion – look from the outside in, from stakeholder perspective
In the next 3 to 5 years, what are they looking for HE to deliver?
Others' perspectives would be important – realignment, reimagining
The idea of looking forward

(time marker – 0927)

D. Luneau – Agree, but question to S. Appleby – what will happen between the meetings?
Bringing commentary to future meetings?

S. Appleby – We can do a lot internally – providing information – researching between meetings
If there are needs for info, we could undertake data / info collection
(but with the work occurring during the meetings – original idea for subcommittees)
Don't want to presuppose any conclusions

D. Luneau – Challenge – we have to be able to piece together – analysis to determine next steps is
important in between

C. Provencher – USNH can answer questions, but turnaround time between meetings could be
challenging – we need concise questions

G. Hansel – Hope we don't shy away providing some concrete recommendations

J. MacDonald – What would “from scratch” approach be – what is the timeline?
Beyond problems to be solved, what do we want?

N. Toumpas – Significant discussion re: CCSNH / USNH – pointed to other areas, other variables that are
feeders / options – takes us back to outside/in

Survey opportunities – feedback on key questions

(time marker – 0937)

J. Gray – No clear goal – seems to be about putting together CCSNH / USNH and we need to define a goal
to move forward

Looking at the EO from a project management standpoint

R. Lavers – Comments from Governor – focus on what the customer wants
Short window – the soliciting of input could take up entire time
Systems may already have done some of this work
We want to figure out what we can do better – responding to stakeholders

M. Rubinstein – Over the past 20 years – shift of college students from learning exploration to workforce
preparation

What problem(s) are we trying to solve?

Barriers to access, programs in the right place
Lessening cost via addressing redundancy

D. Luneau – Ties into design thinking approach – getting input would take time

S. Appleby – DOE could support, if we have a list of questions (with system help)

N. Toumpas – Opportunities – if we can get creative – we have a workforce issue but there are also people already in the WF who feel stuck

If we get the information, we can determine the goal – what makes sense from a design perspective

We need to do the assessment first

C. Provencher – EO section 1 – identify long-term changes – what does the future state look like?
Combination of systems? Other opportunities?

(time marker – 0948)

S. Appleby – What would a list of stakeholders be? Questions? We can move on this if we have a tangible list

C. Provencher – Brainstorm needs

D. Luneau – Figuring out what questions to ask, determine responses (UNH Carsey School) without putting a bias on USNH, CCSNH

S. Appleby – Yes – engage with policy experts, but no – short window of time

N. Toumpas – 15 minutes to go around, discuss future needs, then determine stakeholders – would this clarify next steps?

G. Hansel – 2 main questions – are we providing an education of value? For diverse learners?
Are we meeting workforce needs?

C. Provencher – Not just NH students, not just degree programs

S. Appleby – Adult learners also

Workforce is the most significant driver

Lifelong learning – journey that goes beyond degree – multiple careers, multiple points of entry in seeking education – learning landscape is larger than the 2 systems

(time marker – 0957)

G. Hansel – Who do we serve well, and who are we missing?

R. Ladd – We are at a point of financial crisis... what is causing us to be at the table?
Affordability, accessibility – we will need to make some decisions now

Need to address the issue of finances
Merger discussion came up previously, there's a long way to go
We can't offer everything to everyone

E. Smith – Struggling to identify stakeholders – how do we focus on the right ones?
Are we doing enough to communicate out opportunities?

G. Hansel – We need to be objective in our analysis... with data

R. Lavers – Speakers – looking at demand – good opportunity to look at occupational need/demand,
growth projections and layering over with looking at actual programs of study

Seeing where we are with meeting needs through pathway options – looking at themes
Brian Gottlieb – potential presentation

C. Provencher – USNH is seeking info on growth industries

(time marker – 1006)

D. Luneau – We don't want to be too far in the weeds – looking at pathways at a higher level

S. Appleby – There is a middle ground – a presentation of needs would be helpful

M. Rubinstein – CCSNH wants to know programs are meeting workforce needs, but how do we connect
students to the programs?

Areas of need in STEM, healthcare, and math proficiency challenges – another consideration
Students coming up through K-12 – overcoming previous education barriers

R. Ladd – Pathways – how do we know new pathways are needed? Would like more information on the
USNH / CCSNH process – surveying information

(time marker – 1013)

E. Smith – How can we get down to K-12 so they understand opportunities, options?

J. MacDonald – We do know our programs meet needs, but need more stakeholder awareness

C. Provencher – This is a future need... and how do we identify the others? Then look at how they
intersect

D. Luneau - K-12 is checking out, not understanding what is on the horizon – we need to consider
marketing (K-12), importance of math, ways to keep them engaged

(time marker – 1018)

S. Appleby – Merging the 2 systems – problematic – there is no blueprint for what works
Example – issue with merging GSC - not with CCSNH

Opportunity of merging CCSNH with K-12, moving to a K-14 system and then consolidating the USNH schools under 1 accreditation
CTE centers as a satellite campus for CCSNH... what would this mean for opportunity / access?
Discussion of merging the systems diverts the work from other opportunities
Is there any research on 4-year impact of funneling students into 2-year programs

C. Provencher – might be students who would never pursue a 4-year degree

N. Toumpas – We need to be talking about the role of the parents as well – parental support so they know here to go for options

Also – issue of geography – for example, the northern part of the state
In any merger discussion, culture is an important factor

(time marker - 1029)

R. Ladd – Concurrent/dual enrollment has been a significant push – need more K-12 support from K-12 leadership, and marketing help
(other issues in the K-12 environment) (student supports not related to education)

D. Luneau – We need to be sure we are getting feedback from economically challenged families

G. Hansel – Is K-12 outside the scope? Also, we need to keep in mind governance issues and competing interests of the systems

R. Ladd – Is there an opportunity for restructure, given board / leadership (governance) changes?

J. MacDonald – Regardless... we need to articulate what we're after

M. Rubinstein – Serving student needs – best done through dual enrollment, but brings back the questions of demand and capacity – how do we right size?

(time marker – 1041)

S. Appleby – EO last page regarding financial performance sums up a good portion of the goal(s) of the Task Force

M. Rubinstein – Uconn system has been going through a parallel discussion
CCSNH retreat

Afternoon of 1/18 – NHED discussion of K-12 (Edelblut)

Morning of 1/19 – B. Prescott – research – how are other states responding to similar questions

(break – 1046)

(reconvene – 1107)

S. Appleby – Stakeholder groups / questions – going around the room

Low-income households (D. Luneau)

- Core issues
 - Finding resources
 - K-12 performance correlation
 - Food insecurity
 - Housing
 - Transportation
- Engagement with low-income households is difficult – talking about today, not tomorrow

High School Families (R. Lavers)

- Getting an understanding of where families are at and getting information out to families on opportunities through counselors
- Perception of job opportunities and parents encouraging / discouraging
- Growth paths / opportunities

K-12 Guidance Counselors (C. Provencher)

- Working on identifying long-term needs, inquiring on their POV regarding:
 - Accessibility
 - Opportunities
- Do all guidance counselors have all the necessary information?
- What do guidance counselors find CCSNH / USNH could do better?
- What is the “friction” to getting in?
 - Application length, requirements
 - Hurdles to enrollment
- First time students from low-income households... and the supports needed
- (Percentage of first generation is on the rise, and so are the necessary supports)

Federal Government Partners, Decision-Makers (J. MacDonald)

- Incentivizing opportunities
- Competitively awarded dollars
 - In defense-relevant areas
 - Opportunity area

Students Going Out of State (B. Lavers)

- Why are they leaving? What is the impetus? Drivers?
- Could guidance counselors address / assist?
- Statewide organizations (eg Granite Edvance) could provide information on the conversations that are occurring and the connections occurring
- (J. Gray – mention of reluctance of counselors to bringing up vocations)

(time marker – 1140)

Instructors at CCSNH, USNH (R. Ladd)

- Important that instructors are having inter-institutional conversations
- Ties into marketing – going out into the communities, talking about opportunities

- Connecting with guidance counselors – giving them the complementary information to vocations (not just pushing 4-year degrees)
- (J. Gray – faculty assist / resist regarding change)
- (C. Provencher – shared governance is a real thing – would be beneficial for faculty to have an opportunity to voice opinions, concerns – to be included in the conversation)
- CBAs, national standards – we need to be mindful
- Tenure also
- (All questions undertone – how does this benefit students?)
- (S. Appleby – we will work on creating some faculty sessions)
- How long does it take for decisions to be made? At what level are faculty involved?

(time marker – 1152)

Students and Employers (G. Hansel)

- Conflicting priorities – not a clear understanding for collaboration opportunities
- How can we incentivize institutions to work together?
- Bring industry in, have them contribute / incentivize

Taxpayers (J. Gray)

- Goes to cost (with K-12 examples)
 - Manchester cost per student - \$15K
 - Newcastle - \$44K
 - Average of \$19,400 per student
- Legislature is responsible for ensuring needs are met – makes the cost go up
- In this case, our solution can't result in an increase in cost
- Need to look at shared resources, services to drive down cost – looking for efficiencies
- Have to take into consideration what the populus can pay for
- Equity is important also – lack of equity among districts – public schools are funded in an inverse equitable approach – funding model is outdated

The State Legislature (as an intermediary to taxpayers) (M. Rubinstein)

- Understanding the State's investment
- What is the State looking at as ROI? And what is the scope?
- Is the State looking to make targeted investments? In terms of workforce need?
- What is the value proposition the systems bring to the State?

(time marker – 1210)

Professional Organizations (E. Smith)

- Important we reach out, so they understand what we can do for them
- Dental program, auto dealers, etc. as past successes – some other organizations, the roots go deep
- Auto association has been able to mobilize funds for CTE centers – opportunity for more funding in development of programs
- Collaboration opportunities
- Other forces influence the view of public education

Healthcare – Primary Care, Behavioral Health, Long-Term Care (N. Toumpas)

- A number of initiatives around collaboration – an opportunity to make more systematic
- Getting this within particular regions to address shortages (eg nursing home shortages) and the domino effects created by said shortages
- How do we capitalize on this potential new revenue opportunity?

Adult Education Students (S. Appleby)

(Lunch break 1230)

(Reconvene 1248)

S. Appleby – we will condense comments down, develop questions – return info ASAP to Task Force

Next item – opinions on state needs (post-secondary, not K-12) – is there an opportunity for public systems?

N. Toumpas – Accessibility and affordability, relevance to state need, alignment of work to majors
Ability to think, to be part of a team
It is about being a good citizen

E. Smith – Providing resources for students so they are prepared for the workforce and for students who haven't been accessing the system
Our needs now are not what they were – education has transitioned, but how do we let everyone know?

M. Rubinstein – Access – learning, where needed, at the cost needed
With less focus on content since this continues to change/evolve

J. Gray – Fulfill the need of the “economic engine”

G. Hansel – Credentialing and training where they live – not needing relocation
Within 30 minutes of residence – accessibility and cost addressed
A “well-coordinated system”
Concern about different IHEs taking students out of their communities

R. Ladd – Higher education as the driver of state vitality – educational betterment
We are doing something right

B. Lavers – Providing a development vehicle for future NH taxpayers

J. MacDonald – Increase number and diversity of students matriculating into higher education in New Hampshire on a path to New Hampshire employment

(time marker – 1302)

C. Provencher – Benefits of an educated population

R. Lavers – Accessibility, relevant curriculum – for business for future jobs and to prepare lifelong

learners

- D. Luneau – Embedding in communities (K-12 example of being embedded)
A challenge has been that people don't have a connection from a community standpoint to IHEs
Being more connected to what colleges are doing
- N. Toumpas – What will happen in 3-5 years – we are in an era of accelerated change
Creating a mindset of adaptability
- R. Ladd – example of Alaska – fishing industry failure – retooling – we have the same expectation of
resources in this state

(time marker – 1308)

Questions from presentations, CCSNH / USNH reflections

- C. Provencher – Questions have been summarized – will put a package together
- G. Hansel – Can we present the assets visually? Footprint? Basic info – yes
- N. Toumpas – Salem desert – demand/need is there – a visual of the population and where our IHEs are
Reference made in prior meetings to report – making material available
Bills / legislation (including the 30 pathways)
- S. Appleby - We will add the resources to the page
- R. Ladd – Do we have a number (Salem desert) for attrition? (MR – no)
MA cost?
- M. Rubinstein – We are not necessarily at a cost disadvantage – more accessibility issue
Example – RVCC specific program accreditation, cost prohibition to accredit other schools but
faculty are available at other CCSNH campuses

(time marker 1320)

- B. Lavers – What is the contribution of credit versus non-credit?
- M. Rubinstein – Programs vary / depending on courses, curriculum
Growth opportunity in certificates, short training? Positives and negatives
How do we remove barriers? We don't want to create a caste system
- R. Lavers – Do credits / courses expire?
- M. Rubinstein – The concern is employer perception of relevance
- C. Provencher – Gets back to credit transfer (faculty get involved)
We don't want to see credits transfer in and having students not succeed because of lack of
alignment

- R. Ladd – Do we have a transfer credit tool for students?
- C. Provencher – Not a consistently effective one
- M. Rubinstein – There are many transfer conditions that result in a loss of credits
- S. Appleby – Accreditation at the program level can create transferability issues (barriers)
- C. Provencher – This is why the 1530 work is occurring, and why Provosts are collaborating
Course numbering would be a game-changer for alignment
- M. Rubinstein – We don't want to be creating future problems
- C. Provencher – Technology continues to be a barrier
- N. Toumpas – Culture changes in terms of what we do now and what we want to be able to do in the future – we can't underestimate the complexity
- S. Appleby – Question – having faculty on Zoom, other stakeholders... would having college presidents be useful? Those running the institutions?
- N. Toumpas – Salability – if we go through this and don't give them the opportunity to weigh in, our credibility is lessened
- R. Lavers – Agree, but we need to give them clear direction
- N. Toumpas – Discussion needs to be structured
- C. Provencher – Mark a future meeting time slot, and those who are available could attend to provide input – provide executive order, themes
- N. Toumpas – Want to make sure we have the geographical view, representation of unique geographic needs and perspectives
- S. Appleby – Wrapping up, 1/19 will be informational only
- B. Locke – Potential of subcommittees separated by topic?

(Adjourn 1350)