Requested Memo Reflecting the Discussions and Outcomes of the SSC meet, April 28th, 2015

I. Background
The systemwide Student Success Council is a newly formed organization that has evolved out of our ATD initiative. This group builds on the spirit and practice of our ATD group but will be more focused on bringing successful practices to scale and making decisive change. To this end, the Council will work to research, recommend, and implement strategies to achieve the goals of the new Strategic Plan (2015-2021). To a large extent this Strategic Plan focuses on increasing student success, particularly around completion, time to completion, transfer, and STEM. A special emphasis will also be placed on maturing our ability to validate placement after graduation. A new tool is being created specifically for this Council that will provide a picture of the workforce needs of the state by sector and by region. This will allow us to more closely match our programs and the skill sets in those programs with state needs. The Council will make recommendations concerning policies to drive student success, as well as funding necessary to pursue innovations, to the Office of the Vice President of Community Colleges (OVPCC), as needed. The Council will also request specific IR analysis to better understand these issues as well as solution pathways.

The Council meets every other month and will be guided by a strict agenda associated with the goals in the Strategic Plan. Its membership includes all VCAAs, all VCSAs, a faculty member from each campus dedicated to the student success initiative, key IR personnel as well as the Director of IRAO, the STAR Director, the Director of STEM programs, and the president of the National Center for Inquiry and Improvement.

II. Current Issues
VP Morton spoke to the Council on April 28, 2015 and laid out an immediate series of strategic issues associated with the new strategic plan needing the attention of the Council.

These issues are quickly summarized in the following list:

1. **Co-Requisite Models**: A large scale, approach to accelerating students through college level Math and English. Students placing one-level below college level will now be put into college level math or English with a co-requisite activity. These students, therefore, will finish their college level course in ONE SEMESTER. Those students placing in the present system two or more levels below college level will have one year to both achieve college readiness status and to finish the college level course in English and math. The approach can either be co-requisite or prerequisite for these students. In sum, all students will be placed into a college level English or math course except those who test 2 or more levels below college level. These students will be given one semester to be ready to enter college level English or math.
2. **Pathways**: Create clear, structured pathways so students transferring to a 4-year degree are at or close to 3rd year status in a program. In addition, to course by course structured pathways, meta-majors could be established as a means to focus students into discipline areas. Also we will need to solve issues related to STAR’s role where STAR is a pathway guide, an advising tool, and registration tool as well.

3. **Just in Time Support**: Assess the realm of non-academic support executed at CUNY in New York, Leeward and Windward CCs, and other CC systems around the nation. Promote state and federal services that support students as they face potential barriers such as lack of dependable transportation, childcare issues, homelessness, etc.

4. **Transfer**: Assess data relative to the rather flat line in transfer numbers over last few years. Propose innovations and/or new practices to accelerate transfer to levels outlined in Strategic Plan.

### III. Steps Forward

The Council spent a planning day on the first and most urgent issue: a large-scale approach to accelerating students who are one level below college level Math and English. Much discussion occurred around our own system data and other models around the nation that have moved from a pre-requisite model to a co-requisite model. The results in Tennessee and North Carolina have been dramatic. The following chart reflects work in Tennessee:

![Chart](image)

The following consensus emerged from the Council at the 4/28/15 meeting:

1. The overall goal of the “one-level-down-initiative” is to see it as not a developmental education issue but as a degree pathway acceleration challenge. In other words, the right question here does not involve a focus on cut off scores; the right question here is, “How do we make more students successful in a shorter period of time to degree completion and/or transfer?”
2. The approach to the one-level-down initiative is to be unified and use one system wide approach. This systemwide approach is especially important around placement since the one-level-down cohort should be generated by the same process. If we don’t have a unified approach to identifying the one-level-down cohort, then an IR assessment may have less value when we measure success.

3. Campuses will have choices about the co-requisite models they implement, of course, but the options need to be taken from an agreed upon list, and the selected approach needs to be communicated to the Council and other campuses.

4. The Council wanted to explore a Just in Time support approach for students in the co-requisite activities.

5. The Council launched a policy group to start shaping policy in this area to help guide a system approach.

6. A task force will be selected to work on all relevant issues regarding this initiative. This group will work beginning immediately through the summer; for those on 9-month contracts compensation will be provided in the summer. Membership will be taken from the Council with additions from the field in needed subject areas (math, English, advising, etc).

Timeline:
Planning—Summer 2015 and Spring 2016
Implementation: Fall 2016

All Best

Peter Quigley
Assoc VP UHCC Community Colleges