

2024 0223 PHE Task Force – Staff Notes

Logistics overview – Event Center space – facilities information

(0902 start)

Public comment will be open from 9am to 11am

Agenda will continue during the public comment period if no comment

C. Provencher – clarifying comments

Former chancellors – provided context/clarification via written comment

Timeline of USNH Board changes through the present (beginning with HB2 / 2021)

Review of information in memo – context / clarification

Issues with focus on GSC merger not being successful, prior governance issues

J. Gray – USNH board should not include presidents as voting members

What other structural changes would be appropriate for the board?

Deputy Chancellor? Representing PSU, KSC leadership?

G. Hansel – Issues need to be taken up by USNH board

Frozen in place with no good decisions to be made

Time is out there – governance needs to be addressed and the board expects this

J. Eastwood – Search committee – get the president of UNH in place, only as president
and address the Chancellor position separately / after

N. Toumpas – needs the documents in order to follow along

R. Ladd – T. Leach's #11 – suggestion of decision regarding combined chancellor across both systems or
separate chancellors – what will the system look like?

C. Provencher – List of functions the two systems may be able to share into the future

Much is administrative

Will take time

Opportunities for program delivery

Remaining as two systems will make sharing difficult

Analysis of merger needs to be undertaken

S. Appleby – concern at the onset – short time frame

Focus on the merger does not leave room for discussion of other items
that might be undertaken to reduce cost / drive enrollment

Merger needs to be examined separately, apart from task force work

Lack of evidence of successful mergers

Challenges with state government

“Leaping before we look” – merger needs a far more in-depth study

We need to deliberate on the extent to which info is included in the report and how in-depth

- G. Hansel – The current suggestions don't include the merger
Speaks to the need for separate study – we should set up the opportunity for a study
To be taken up by legislature
- S. Appleby – costs – contribution to the systems has increased, but the systems are not to blame for asking for more funding – the state doesn't have to continue to give money
Would force the systems to examine operations if there is less money
It is a political problem
- J. Gray – Needs to be a success that the champion can build on
Address administrative change through an individual contract, measure output
- M. Rubinstein – Unique board compositions, constituent representatives
How do we bring governance together to create a coherent mandate
Stakeholders not necessarily overlapping
- R. Ladd – not proposing merger, but concerned with items on the list
To be agile (example – transfer discussion, still not done)
Need to have some form of governance that is overseeing where we are with academics
Who is in charge, how do we bring it together? Need to be a 'quicker' system of governance
- R. Lavers – needs to be something to initiate the conversation
Cathy / Mark list is thoughtful – we can't come into the conversation and dictate the outcome but can create the spark
Make a stronger recommendation regarding combined governance, and push the merger discussion through separate legislative vehicle
Further how complementary the identities are to one another
- G. Hansel – Needs to also be a bottom up effort – incentives for collaboration would require economic incentive
Needs to support those on the ground – create buy-in
- E. Smith – Good responses, overlapping recommendations – gives us initiatives to get started with, based on what we've been discussing
- J. Eastwood – Executive order – we have created a list that speaks to the EO
K-12 should be a part of the discussion – critical that we work with the K-12 population
- SBE member J. Fricchione – agrees with the process (meeting observer)
- J. MacDonald – The "who" we are tasked with serving – governance structure is means to an end
Mergers are distributive – can be good or bad
Should center back on the executive order
- J. Eastman – Regarding public comment submission from R. DeRosa – last paragraph
Merger discussion – risk of losing educators

Review of minutes from 2/2 – J. Eastman motion to approve, seconded by J. Gray – correction to R, Gustafson designation on list to reflect CCSNH chancellorship – all in favor / approved by roll call vote

S. Appleby – recommendation – review of documents – short and long term recommendations
Anything we want to remove?

R. Ladd – Comments on HB 1450 – would require amending language by 3/21 – need to do something now

J. Gray – If the concepts are included in the bill, the senate can build on it – strengthened by report

G. Hansel – Makes sense to create a study committee / commission?

C. Provencher – Language in the bill includes some of the EO language

R. Ladd – Recommendation to move forward including committee / commission in bill

D. Luneau – Concord school board – pathways document provided to Task Force
Report from the department on K-12 who move forward – weave into considerations?
Eye-opening – disparity in the numbers, by district, who move on to higher education
Why are we seeing this?
Opportunity gaps exist

S. Appleby – adult education not included in report – the data is incomplete in this regard
Another market not captured by statistics

D. Luneau – Berlin as an example of underserved population – how do we encourage more enrollment at WMCC?

J. MacDonald – including goals as part of the report? Example – enrollment goals?
Could be a tactical way to move forward

S. Appleby – attaching enrollment / expense impact would be good to have as well
Would be time-consuming
Add goals as a component of the report – would be an option
Regarding district data - self-reported – not very reliable / accurate

R. Ladd – Average minimum salaries – also significant disparity

N. Toumpas – We spent 8 weeks discussing, acknowledging crisis – having a difficult time understanding the jump to a merger when there are crucial things to be investigated / addressed now
Take comments received, create a matrix of initiatives we could address right now
Something that could be acted upon
A merger would not save money

(1015 meeting break – relocate to 3rd floor board room)

(1030 resume)

- S. Appleby – if we come to agreement regarding the list, will incorporate the information into the report
Will discuss wording next week – tentative draft
- R. Ladd – Response 3 – co-locating would be a good idea
- C. Provencher – Meeting with NHTI on Wednesday – thinks \$750K / year savings
- S. Appleby – Londergan will function as swing space for the time being – off the table
For CCSNH and USNH
- G. Hansel – All seems fine on the surface – will be easier to review once we collect / sort them
- C. Provencher – Remove remark 5 regarding USNH professors
- R. Lavers – the list includes recommendations that could be added to Cathy and Marks’s list
Example – industry relations
- S. Appleby – much commonality between the lists
- J. MacDonald – have we sufficiently addressed the executive order?
- S. Appleby – we will create a crosswalk – we may be light in some areas but these may point to the bill
for future work
- C. Provencher – We may not be as light as we think
Duplication of programs, however, may need to be expanded upon
- R. Ladd – we have a framework for the regional initiatives based on DOL work already undertaken
Business / economic affairs
- G. Hansel – higher education – regional opportunities would be actionable
- C. Provencher – USNH started a year ago – campaign to get to local populations (rotaries, chambers) to
discuss what USNH brings to the state – grass roots effort
Right now the culture is not about system collaboration – but it could be
- R. Ladd – There are local opportunities that could bring the systems together – supporting communities,
and industry within communities
- C. Provencher – feels this is woven through the recommendations – needs to be an intentional effort
- M. Rubinstein – most of comment is regarding enrollment
Talking about the value of higher education
Previous commission – discussion about money – not helpful because it creates discussion on
financial issues – the dialogue needs to change – focus on quality, coherent support for talent in
the state

- C. Provencher – report shouldn't just be about how much money we should save
Shift focus to attainment, retention – benefits the entire state
- D. Luneau – these initiatives speak to other needs – affordable housing, and what we can do to keep people in the state
- S. Appleby – strong desire of teenagers to 'leave the nest' is not something we can address through marketing, but we see them come back either to finish or after finishing
- C. Provencher – not convinced this will continue with subsequent generations
What do we need to think about in the future?
- M. Rubinstein – Studies on how many don't complete have become less valuable / useful over time
Example – Lumina foundation
We do know we have the largest number of adults with no degree but they are employed at higher numbers
- D. Luneau – suggestion that we hold another dedicated public comment session
Suggestion we also provide a working draft
- E. Smith – legislative funding would require a timeline
- R. Ladd – could be taken up in HB
- J. Gray – would divert funds away from other initiatives, would have impact in other areas of fiscal need
Revenues are not as high over estimates, pointing to a lack of additional funds
- (1114 time marker)
- J. Eastwood – more discussion on changing behavior for those finishing K-12
How will they initially access higher education when there are non-education related needs
Housing
- J. Gray – there are money-saving things on the list, which can move things forward, give cover
Calculate savings
- D. Luneau – There are savings, but there are also customers we could go after
Where we could go in terms of top line
- J. Eastwood – good suggestion to recommend middle school / high school college opportunities, resources, and include the language in the report – a goal
- S. Appleby – Drift of school counselors away from college/career counseling to support services, mental health – a hole in our system, and an opportunity for potential synergy with Granite Edvance
- R. Ladd – we know we have a mental health problem, but counselors are aware of need... this isn't just a counselor's job – teachers are also involved in college/career advising
School counselor discussion misses the other resources being utilized, to be tapped into

- J. Eastwood – survey opportunity – we are hearing that teachers don't have sufficient bandwidth – we should seek input from the districts
- S. Appleby – automatic admission of students – catchment area could supplement the information high schools are providing (could also include information on Pell eligibility)
- M. Rubinstein – Most CCSNH programs are intended to be open admission
Work on pathways, roadmaps for students
There is a model we could develop that would address some of the gaps in information
Dual enrollment benefits are also financially significant
- R. Ladd – Recommendation in report that we fund dual enrollment at the amount originally requested
Money could provide more facility support
Schools don't have the revenue to be able to support these initiatives
CCSNH has the potential resources, if we can financially support the institutions
- S. Appleby – licensing issues are also prohibiting bringing in CCSNH faculty
Since some faculty may not qualify for licensure
- C. Provencher – Are dual enrollment participants aware of USNH opportunities also?
A more intentional partnership with CCSNH / USNH / Dual Enrollment
- R. Ladd – USNH backed out of previous discussions because of the tuition rate
- M. Rubinstein – Overwhelmingly, our dual enrollment students do not come to CCSNH but addressing capacity – could be built to facilitate pathways
- C. Provencher – Outreach center – may present an opportunity
- (1138 break for lunch)
(1208 reconvene)
- S. Appleby – additional short-term discussion – issues?
After consolidation – will be easier to review
- R. Ladd – Duplication of programs – are we looking at duplication of new programs?
- M. Rubinstein – happening, but challenging with system structure at CCSNH
Online development might also address this, with consolidated online efforts
- S. Appleby – an item for Cathy / Mark list?
- R. Lavers – looking at alignment of feeder programs for transferability
- R. Ladd – only so much money in the pot – if we encourage enrollment in multiple ed programs, it diverts resources from flagship programs – example – engineering at UNH, not offering at other schools

- C. Provencher – residential experience – we should offer programs at multiple USNH institutions owing to different campus-based experiences
- R. Ladd – we should be coordinating, for the sake of potential savings
- J. Gray – offer as much gen ed as possible everywhere, then provide transfer pathways with the understanding that programs might be unique to particular sites
- S. Appleby – current system initiatives – could we get a list of work already being done? Could be included in the report, and would inform a reader of what is currently going on – to be delivered in 2 weeks
- J. Eastwood – do we care about private IHEs?
- S. Appleby – career schools – regulation – formerly around 100, now around 50
We have a robust ecosystem, and there is cost differentiation
Competition at certain levels – a marketing opportunity
- J. Eastwood – is it a resource opportunity? Potential for collaboration?
- M. Rubinstein – low barrier of entry for inexpensive programs, creates a portfolio of programs that are low-margin
- S. Appleby – moving on to long-term
Timeline – rough draft for next Friday (3/1)
3/8 discussion of draft
3/15 delivery of report draft
Looking for ‘heartburn’ issues, areas of concern, other items
- C. Provencher – alignment of academic calendars could be tricky – USNH has aligned within the system, but could be a possibility
- D. Luneau – competition for a shifting pool of students – needs context (meeting the needs of all high school graduates) and expanding access to counter the shrinking pool – what do they need?
We are trying to provide higher education opportunity
- C. Provencher – in the current process / structure – where are the incentives to act as one?
- M. Rubinstein – we could do a better job of helping students understand what is different regarding campuses, programs
- J. Eastwood – Response 8E – K-14 – some discussion, but would hear more – should this be on the list?
- S. Appleby – 50K foot idea – significant number of districts with low numbers going on to higher education
CTE numbers, availability of programs
Regional comprehensive CTE high schools – CCSNH campuses, CTE campuses

More dual / concurrent enrollment – creating more linkages
Limited resources – closures make the outlook worse, in terms of regional impact
K-12 has its own problems, but we may be missing an opportunity
Duplicating, when we could combine – sets up geographic regions and collaboration solutions
involving all parties – to foster innovation

R. Ladd – Not enough CTEs, centers that exist beyond borders, not enough enrollment because of space issues, transporting 20% of students and calendars are not aligning – programs are at 100% occupancy – the formula needs work

S. Appleby – if we had a system that had capacity, would go a long way to solving the problem – utilizing CCSNH space, for example

J. Gray – industry partnership opportunities in this regard

R. Ladd – if we could house more students, we could encourage more enrollment and the need is there, in terms of interest

M. Rubinstein – Underutilized facilities, but renovation might be required because the physical structures aren't readily adaptable

C. Provencher – A 6 year plan, updated every 2 years – a good idea
10 years in some systems but 10 is too long in HE perhaps

S. Appleby – other business? Other topics?
Rough draft out on Thursday, to be reviewed Friday (3/1)

(1253 adjourn)