

2024 0315 PHE Task Force – Staff Notes

0907 Meeting Start

Review of 3/1 meeting minutes – motion by George Hansel to approve the minutes, seconded by Jackie Eastwood; Approved unanimously, abstention from R. Ladd

Executive Summary Review

C. Provencher – should be clear that we will work through the initiatives and recommendations but that there are financial impacts
Systems are committed to working, but there will be an evaluation and a need for investment

R. Ladd – acknowledgment of resource needs

D. Luneau – report doesn't reflect backdrop data / trends – findings become the underpinning for recommendations
Could also inform NHED data collection changes

S. Appleby – concern with reliability of data collected by NHED

D. Luneau – might not be reliable data but it is collected/available data that informs the conversation
State needs – K-12 is connected

S. Appleby – another section – recommendations/initiatives for the State as a whole?
Beyond the systems

R. Ladd – summary should include findings, but not get into the weeds
Should be an overview, reference to recommendations
Data in recommendation sections

S. Appleby – we need to be careful not to lose focus, or to bring up areas that are not central to the Executive Order charge
Policy and state recommendations section added?
Could bring in more data

D. Luneau – need more emphasis on finding to back up recommendations

J. MacDonald – audience – many are coming to this relatively fresh
What do we want the headline to be?
Mention previous activity, previous action but underline the fact that there is still urgency

M. Rubinstein – first paragraph – comment to be inserted

C. Provencher – comments on workforce development – revision to last sections of executive summary

R. Ladd – include CTE and the need for support / expansion / growth and adult education

S. Appleby – discussion of next steps - add in M. Rubinstein / R. Ladd comments
Second out draft tonight or Monday

J. MacDonald – could make more in executive summary about how invested the two systems are in making changes and how unified the Task Force is

J. Gray – boards haven't seen the report – need to be careful with wording – they need to weigh in

C. Provencher – USNH board was updated last week

J. Gray – regional / SW advisory groups are our best recommendations at this point

J. Eastwood – positive response to regional concept
Is funding included? Needs to be
Got ballpark estimates, including for ERP
Funding is the bold ask

C. Provencher – presidents are meeting next week regarding 3-year degree
Much of this is already underway

(0937 time marker)

S. Appleby – something 'bold' means ideas that might generate resistance, overshadow other recommendations

G. Hansel – headline question – there's not necessarily one headline / bold statement

M. Rubinstein – conversation regarding CCSNH changes to accreditation / alignment to be included in the future draft?

R. Ladd – in HB, title has been changed
When legislature looks at the report – will be looking at associated costs
Need to mention the need for more funding
Dual / concurrent enrollment – the need for funding is a finding
How do we underline this?
If we want CTE, we need to fund it

D. Luneau – important that funding impact across the 3 systems is responded to through budget requests

(0949 time marker)

R. Lavers – do we want a provision regarding investment, that the systems will report financial costs to the study committee?

S. Appleby – a new page of recommendations that will require investment? (eg joint payroll)
Including actual dollar amounts is a mistake

J. Eastwood – include estimates where possible

J. Garry recommendation to include funding

S. Appleby – does including funding hamstring the efforts?

R. Ladd – legislation needs to know amounts when possible

Looks to Chancellors to provide projections

C. Provencher – in order to act, investment is required – it is the ROI

B. Locke – what is most significant / moves the needle needs to be the focus

G. Hansel – perception is that the systems always ask for funding

Need to be careful of this perception

(1001 time marker)

M. Rubinstein – there is a middle ground – impact without large expenditures

R. Lavers – is there enough with the systems to continue the acceleration of the conversation?

Keeping the acceleration pace in the system work?

C. Provencher – uniquely positioned – transition, leadership changes

Concern with the short-term and long term perceptions

There is urgency, but not everything can be done right away

It is an ongoing process

R. Lavers – resources for oversight – we are asking a lot of people who are already busy

N. Toumpas – key challenges are taxing the systems – even without Task Force discussion there needs to be change

1 – student education attainment – access and compatibility

2 – economies of scale – ways to reduce infrastructure costs / administrative

3 – opportunities – segments of the population we have not targeted in an aggressive way

We can provide opportunities – there is a top line and we have to look at doing things differently

We are developing a blueprint, not a project plan

Documenting what has to happen, and over what period of time

(1013 time marker)

C. Provencher – press release paragraph should be drafted

S. Appleby – cost pieces – include or not?

Wording around HB... expectation that the committee will develop costs?

Call the items out

R. Lavers – list of items that will require investment, so we call them out specifically

C. Provencher – include in the HB section?

R. Ladd – need to reference support for CTE centers, students

(1025 break)

(1037 reconvene)

S. Appleby – additional suggestions – larger items
Change order of categories

D. Luneau – the categories N. Toumpas mentioned – making sure the 3 are represented
Doesn't seem higher education attainment is being addressed

R. Lavers – fewer buckets, with the current 5 sets of initiatives/recommendations fitting into the 3?
Some of the best ideas are within awareness / access but we need to lead with alignment

N. Toumpas – alignment is a means to an end – getting the systems aligned is a vehicle
Not specifically the goal

D. Luneau – the word 'alignment' is being used in different ways

M. Rubinstein – Venn diagrams – everything intersects, alignment transcends category structure

R. Ladd – we're trying to silo everything – falling into a trap

S. Appleby – paragraph that mentions the 3 buckets, and then get rid of categories and change to
uncategorized lists of short-term and long-term?

D. Luneau – 'findings' piece goes into the 3 categories? And the accompanying data?

R. Lavers – are we intentionally / unintentionally putting them in a prioritized order?

G. Hansel – is it ok to prioritize? Yes

S. Appleby – Task Force respond back to updated draft with ordering for the 3?

N. Toumpas – not losing sight of the community needs, state workforce solutions and keeping students
as the north star

S. Appleby – rephrase short-term and long-term to be more action-oriented
Example – "co-locate," "right-size"
Be more deliberate where / when possible – what are we really trying to do?
"Exploring"

(1103 time marker)

S. Appleby – placement of CCSNH / USNH indicators – relocate?

C. Provencher – appendices not needed

Don't include staff notes, minutes, recommendations

Move CCSNH and USNH to appendices

M. Rubinstein – concern with the mass of the message and how much information we are including in the report

S. Appleby – we will reorganize the report first, then evaluate whether it is too granular, and/or not focused enough

M. Rubinstein – it starts to feel like each item is an initiative

C. Provencher – concerns with the term “marketing” as an initiative – what do we mean?

Students aren't applying to the system, but to specific schools

(1131 time marker)

N. Toumpas – role of industry (example – loan repayment)

Can we call out specific roles of industry?

The other players that will benefit from the work being done?

Include state agencies (HHS, etc.)

(1133 lunch)

HB 1450 discussion

R. Ladd – placeholder at the start of Executive Order submitted to the House

“Consolidation” was originally noted

Could be interpreted a number of ways

Amending a different section of statute now

Germane in the Senate, but non-germane in the House

Next week – last week, a non-germane public hearing scheduled

Change – lines 3-6 – amendment of title to reflect Task Force work (and report)

Does not address report specifically

Language, down to 28, is the original; (g) is added (1530 work)

Page 2 line 6 – joint quarterly progress reports

HEC study committee – already in place by statute – can start immediately

Annually, reports submitted, or as requested by committee

November – regarding implementation of alignment strategies

Another amendment re: 3-year – current language

Specifies 2-year, 4-year; change language to include UG / GR (more general level designation)

This won't be taken up Monday – it is a placeholder, to go to the Senate for potential further modification

Doesn't want this to impact the current amendment that is going through

Issue with language specific to non-credit? We don't want the language to preclude anything

Any roadblocks? None anticipated at this time

R. Ladd – we need to be clear about the report findings, and the alignment of the reference to the findings

(1213 time marker)

R. Ladd – trying not to be too specific, to allow the chancellors to report out on identified initiatives
TF report is an action document, guiding the next part of the process

D. Luneau – may not be signed until August; June is the first reporting date – ok to proceed?

M. Rubinstein – the current language doesn't reference investment – raising the question

R. Ladd – we don't want to make any more changes right now, ideally

Motion by George Hansel to support the amendments to HB 1450, seconded by Jackie Eastwood;
approved unanimously

Monday, 9am – Task Force members are invited to attend, testify on behalf of the Task Force

S. Appleby – meeting on 3/22, will get draft out ASAP with an ask for feedback, to be reviewed at the
3/22 meeting, produce final draft – not anticipating a meeting 3/29 at this point, but holding the
time

N. Toumpas – who is the media contact?

S. Appleby – Governor's office will receive report, should be the contact

(1226 meeting adjourned)