

2024 0119 PHE Task Force - Staff Notes

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) Presentation

Brian Prescott – President

brian.prescott@nchems.org

Political connections to higher education issues are an ongoing concern (political impacts to higher education regulation)

Common challenges nationwide

High attainment of college education, and the translation to higher personal income (NH is middle tier)

Social, individual benefits of college education – impact to employment prospects

Bachelor's degrees – degree recipients had greater job retention during the recession; Associate degrees less so

Slide – employment outcomes (VA) program-based
Value of higher education – value of programs

State work is being done in data sharing – possible NH initiative – involvement in experimental data collection website

2.8M from 2011-12 – drop in 2-year national enrollment
In NH – sectors are down but CCSNH has held up better
Other states – capacity issues due to growth (in New England)
Impact of free college programs and the power of the word “free”

Northeast – lowest number of high school graduates, compared to national averages
New Hampshire is the largest percentage decline

Fluidity – state borders in New England – very different from Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE – western equivalent of NEBHE) (heavy public presence and less higher education choices overall)

There has been a 30+ year trend of growth in higher education – this has created standardized SOPs, initiatives and less of a dynamic nature over time

The 25-44 age demographic is seeing continued growth (addressable market for CCSNH) but a long-term population challenge will still have an impact – North Country is impacted most significantly

(Note – impact of including SNHU in data is problematic – they don't distinguish NH students from national/online)

Volatility in adult student (non-traditional) movement in higher education sectors

New Hampshire has the lowest rate of enrolling non-traditional students, nationally, in higher education

Correlation to unemployment rate – could contribute

Data not reflective of whether completers are staying

Low contributions in New Hampshire compared to national numbers

Share by sector – some improvement

More affordability – essential aspect of conversation – unpacking the “did not complete” population

State risk – dependence of the state systems on tuition (high risk owing to population change)

Nationally, concerns regarding long-term sustainability

Is tapping the non-traditional population the solution?

Dangers of complacency – call to action for New Hampshire – hard dialogue

- Failure to take action will result in closures (eg Vermont)

- Can't change the demographics

- Need more revenue or less expense – bottom line

- Not cutting is not a sustainable condition

- Kneejerk reactions (eg consolidation) can be problematic – some reactions aren't bad... but cautionary

Reforming governance is a distraction from the relevant issues

Co-locations – some conversations (eg SUNY) – not going well in VT (closures)

“System-ness” is a part of the conversation (a value-add)

- Private sector examples

- Academic delivery – course-sharing platforms (instructional design)

- Sharing program delivery – consortium options – common resources

- Consistency in PLA practices – would require CCSNH / USNH efforts

System-ness is necessary for the future (eg USNH efforts)

- Example – common ERP – administrative efficiencies and better student experience (but significant associated costs)

Measuring student satisfaction – Gallup surveys, but not specific to institutions

Alumni incentives for survey participation aren't rigorous – not a good (consistent) indicator – very limited data and not the population that needs to be surveyed (need drop data)

Identifying customer needs is also inclusive of employers

Wage record data connection to education program satisfaction?

(Danger of defining students as customers... fear of not wanting to lose “customers” is a slippery slope – devaluation of degrees over time)

Money – seeding innovation / transformation, new funding / pricing models

Annual reviews of how the allocation process is working – are the right decisions being made?

Transformation projects

Policy / implementation support – curriculum / strategy

- Institutional research, program review

- Increasing conversations – what can / should be offered

- Competition over programs in unproductive ways

 - Privates are also part of the conversation

- Investment in new programs that don't generate graduates – cost of development

Understand goals and motivations – conditions (and problems) differ significantly by state

“A crisis is a terrible thing to waste” – status quo is not an option for New Hampshire

Significant cost associated with campus closure

What is in the public's (constituents) best interests?

Collaboration – not necessarily consolidation – more expenditure over the short term

Identifying foundational costs – these costs should be covered by appropriations (in terms of prioritization of spending)

Slide – Adequacy and Equity Budgeting Framework – funding higher education in an unfavorable environment

- Provides context for where cuts should occur – understanding institutional costs

Panel Discussion – President John Maduko, CT State Community College & President Joyce Judy, Community College of Vermont

Challenges faced in other states – similar in many respects (New Hampshire is not unique)

Vermont – statewide community college – 1970 vision of 1 college, with 12 locations as 1 – 1 set of policies, 1 set of rules – transcripts do not denote specific locations or course modality

Taking education to Vermont locally

What works

- 100% part-time faculty – practitioners who teach - it is about access, not economics

- Communities are different – what needs to be consistent, and what needs to mirror the needs of

local communities? A healthy tension

Student mobility – 1 set of rules – a driver for moving to consistency

Student mix (attributes) consistent with New Hampshire

Average student age is 26

Veterans, refugee population – high percentage

Mission of access and affordability to all students

Challenges are similar, as is the audience

Diversity – rich/strong – contributor to the classroom

Program mix

2+2 students – making sure there are available transfer pathways, articulations

Workforce – working closely with businesses

Growing popularity of certificates – stackable credential preparation – thinking of the students' futures

Low unemployment is good... but significant workforce shortage

Not interested in non-credit training – desire for credit mobility

Meta major – provide broad base of courses for flexibility – transfer options, changes in major

Common courses – consistent across 2-year degree options

Pathways – Vermont State system – flow-through of credits

Early 2000s – system update, commitment to common database of courses

Common courses are not considered transfer courses

Good in theory, but bumps in the road – departmental decisions contribute to the challenges of establishing course equivalencies

Student-centered, student focused

University of Vermont and Vermont State College system – separate entities, separate student databases but clear pathways

CCV is a feeder for both – close conversations to ensure transfer

Pathways to privates (eg Saint Michaels) – there are relationships and traditional articulations but not significant transfer numbers

Champlain - more CCV transfers (example – gaming program)

Ensuring transfer students are adequately prepared – incentivizing staying at CCV to complete 2-year (data on 4-year completion success if 2-year completion)

Dual enrollment – robust (also early college programs) – want to be sure marginalized populations are supported – potential for college success

Part-time faculty are utilized – challenges with packaging courses for practitioners
Strict adherence to rigor – ensuring courses are college-level learning/outcomes

Dual enrollment students are advised by CCV advisors

No legislative requirement for part-time faculty versus full-time faculty – part-time faculty are unionized (7-8 years ago), but not staff

Lack of state support also means lack of state oversight

Governance – CCV does not have a Board of Trustees; State System / University does – presidents answer to the board (are hired by the board) and the board is overseen by a Chancellor

Pros / cons of 1 board – lack of disaggregation, but one singular voice

Challenges – most significant – value proposition

- “Learn while you earn” is essential

- Ensuring workforce is supported

- Our demographics are working against us – decline in K-12 and the pipeline impact

- High HS graduation rate – low conversion rate to higher education – important to make college an attractive option – “worth it” to this demographic

- Department of Corrections – support to work with population – providing hope / skills / knowledge to decrease recidivism (50% currently)

Online access – 1996 – introduction of online courses

- Most programs / courses can be delivered virtually

- Finding the right balance between online and classroom-based but keeping things accessible
40 to 45% online pre-COVID, 65 to 75% virtual today (includes synchronous, asynchronous, “flex” courses and hybrids – a function of market demand)

- Online education removes barriers (eg child care, transportation)

- Investment in faculty in online PD – required 1-credit course in online teaching

- Remote staffing to support online programs and encourage employee retention

- Physical impact of increase in online – monitoring (CCV owns 3 buildings, rents 9)

 - Don't want to pay for classrooms not being used, but also want to make sure facilities are available as needed (patterns post-COVID are unclear)

- Shorter-term leases – more flexibility

- Growth of facilities came about with shift from evening classes offered at HS / CTE facilities to day classes and the need for additional daytime classroom space