1. Welcome and Overview (P. Quigley)
   a. Charge of the SSC
      The original Student Success and Strategic Academic Action Committee white paper needs to be rewritten. Members of the Student Success Council will be called on for this task.

      The co-req initiative is linked to the UHCC Strategic Plan for improving time to degree. Currently our 2 levels below college level English and math is higher than the national rate. Tennessee validated co-req over pre-req for completion of gateway math. Perfection will not happen in a year. Reference: Complete College America Corequisite Remediation: Spanning the Completion Divide http://completecollege.org/spanningthedivide/
      All campuses are inside the bumper policy. Bernadine Fong complemented the co-req progress achieved.

   b. Decision making process
      SSC ad hoc committees provide recommendations to the AVPCC. AVPCC sends to VPCC. VPCC informs the Council of Chancellors and if appropriate to the Strategic Planning Committee and the Policy Review Committee. If approved, AVPCC sends adoption letter.

   c. Reminders of Nov. 24, 2015 recommendations and adoption *1
      Attachment 1 is the recommendation & adoption letter for Grading Options.

      The committee discussed and voted yes for this change to the Cognitive Placement recommendation. On page 4, under Assumptions, #2: “All scores valid for two years only” was rescinded due to present technical limitation in Banner.

   d. Sample Chancellor Richards Letter *2
      The committee voted yes and recommended that a similar letter supporting the co-req model be
signed by all Chancellors. Each Chancellor may then provide another letter that personalizes the decision for their campus.
Note: March 17, 2016 VPCC copied Chancellor’s letter and sent to campuses for distribution.

P. Quigley will discuss with VP Morton how to engage the faculty senate chairs.

2. SSC Ad hoc Committee Progress Reports*3 (S. Robinson, Conveners)
Attachment 3 provides updates to what has been accomplished and what needs to be done next. Purpose of ad hoc committees is to change the Dev Ed structure, not eliminate Dev Ed.

a. Evolution (merging and eliminating)*4
Attachment 4 provides evolution of the Ad Hoc Committees. It started with 13 committees. As of today, there are 9. Some were not needed: Facilities and Pre-Req Issues. Some merged: Assessment Options: Cognitive Options & Non-Cognitive Options, Case Management, and Support Services. This merged group then became the Student Support Services group.

Any questions regarding committee updates or the composition of the committees, please direct them to the ad hoc committee conveners.

b. English and Math Models*5
Attachment 5 provides a side by side view of the English and math models as of 3/3/16. Any changes to the models need to be sent to S. Robinson with a cc to R. Yee and G. Ishii.

English articulation update: Jeff Stearns is working on updating the English crosswalk.

c. March 9, 2016 Recommendations
English ad hoc committee*6
Committee voted yes and supported: 1) to use WritePlacer for a period of two years, 2) to use the same cut-off scores across the system (for consistency).

Math ad hoc committee*7
Committee voted yes and supported: 1) use Accuplacer for a period of two years, during which time the tool will be monitored and validated, 2) cross-walk current COMPASS cut-offs to Accuplacer scores (L. Pagotto will take lead for researching this), 3) support faculty’s construction of more customized options for math placement such as EdReady, MyMathTest, and/or ALEKS. (E. Matsuoka recommended EdReady as it is cost free.)

After discussion the committee voted “No” to: consider having all students take the Accuplacer test, including those who are able to provide information on the approved filters (ACT, SAT, high school GPA, etc). Students would still be placed by whatever means gets them into the highest level course, but it would allow us to calibrate cut-off scores. (This would result in double testing with students being biased based on test scores.)

Enrollment management ad hoc committee*8
Committee voted yes that following enrollment functions are integral to each of the campuses: Banner, financial aid, veteran’s benefits, and registration.
d. Campus Implementation Progress*9
Attachment 9 provides an update to the co-requisite implementation progress at each of the campuses.

e. HSI Q & A Revisions*10
Attachment 10 is a consolidation of the questions and answers that were used at the Co-Requisite Initiative presentation at HSI on Friday March 4, 2010. Any comments welcomed as follows:
1. Due: Friday, March 11, 2016

3. Budget (P. Quigley)
a. Budget Guidelines*11
Attachment 11 provides guidelines for co-requisite funding.
Co-req is not designed to reduce costs. The co-req initiative is a permanent initiative. Faculty workload varies by campus. Faculty count and cost may shift if lecturers move to tenured track faculty. These tenured track positions are G funds and not revenue money.

b. Campus Requests as of 2/19/16*12
Attachment 12 provides a summary of campus requests as of 2/19/16.

c. Budget Priorities—definitions
#1 Essential
#2 Desired, but not essential
# 3 Not essential, but important to note need

d. Budget Ranking Exercise with technology
http://goo.gl/forms/HNnwkz8
Survey results:
1. Professional Development, including but not limited, to consultants
2. Tutors
3. Conversion of faculty positions
4. Reassigned time

Based on these survey results, prioritize budget requests in attachment 12 and report back at the March 10, 2016 VCAA/AAA meeting.

P. Quigley will send full survey results out.

4. Data Elements (C. Chappell Long)
Based on results of the committee work, there are data pieces to work with. Campuses now have homework to provide data pieces.

5. External Support and Partners (P. Quigley)
P. Quigley shared a Labor Project PPT. This project attempts to align the economy, workforce and education. Foundation elements for the tool includes students, UH planners, DOE, DBEDT/DLIR, STAR, industry vetting, job placement LMI, and HBT & CEDS.
a. JFF—Student Success Center
   UHCC has been awarded a two-year, $500,000 award to create a Student Success Center.

b. CCA—Co-requisite Technical Support

c. USA Funds
   John Rand, Director of STEM education reported on the newly established STEM office located at 200 Vineyard Blvd. The STEM team includes Joshua Kaakua, STEM Diversity Specialist; Tiffany Tsang, STEM Educational Specialist; Jean Isip Schneider, STEM Workforce Specialist and Melissa Arakawa, STEM Admin and Fiscal Specialist.

d. Collaborative Economics (Francie Genz)
   Collaborative Economics has been engaged to help put together a convening of business leaders and university leaders to insure that there is alignment between economy, workforce and education.

e. Grants office is being established. Three positions will staff the office: director, grant writer and fiscal specialist.