

ICAS



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

**ICAS Minutes of Meeting
February 17, 2016
UC Sacramento Center, Sacramento, CA
<http://icas-ca.org/>**

In Attendance:

- CCC Senate: David Morse, President; Julie Bruno, Vice President; John Stankas, Secretary; Craig Rutan, Area D Representative; John Freitas, Area C Representative; Julie Adams, Executive Director
- CSU Senate: Steven Filling, Chair; Christine Miller, Vice Chair; Robert Keith Collins, Secretary; Praveen Soni, Member-at-Large; Darlene Yee-Melichar, Member-at-Large
- UC Senate: J. Daniel Hare, Chair; Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair; Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair (phone); Barbara Knowlton, UCEP Vice Chair; Caroline Streeter, UCOPE Chair; Hilary Baxter, Executive Director
- Staff: Michael LaBriola, Policy Analyst, UC Academic Senate
- Guests: Vincent Stewart, CCC Vice Chancellor for External Relations; Nichole Munoz-Murillo, CSU Interim Director of Advocacy and State Relations; Steve Juarez, UC Associate Vice President and Director of State Governmental Relations; Kiernan Flaherty UC Deputy to the Chief Financial Officer, State Budget Relations

I. Consent Calendar

- February 17, 2016 ICAS Agenda
- December 17, 2015 ICAS Minutes

ACTION: ICAS approved the consent calendar.

II. Executive Session

III. Consultation with State Government Relations

- Steve Juarez, UC Associate Vice President & Director of State Governmental Relations
- Nichole Munoz-Murillo, CSU Interim Director of Advocacy and State Relations
- Vincent Stewart, CCC Vice Chancellor for External Relations
- Kiernan Flaherty, UC Deputy to the Chief Financial Officer, State Budget Relations

General Overview: The general climate of support for public higher education is improving. The Governor's 2016-17 budget includes modest general fund increases for UC and CSU that help restore past cuts. However, the increases fall short of total need, and the segments are

pushing the Governor to invest more of the large state budget surplus in higher education. The final outcome of the budget will not be known until June, but the segments are also optimistic about opportunities for additional funding through the Legislature. The segments have attempted to be as transparent as possible about their needs and how they use state funds. Policymakers are also increasing their involvement in admissions, curriculum, and instruction issues at the three segments, and introducing more bills that would change or limit certain activities. A new law on term limits provides a better opportunity for legislators to develop expertise in a subject area over time, although high staff turnover on legislative committees and in member offices is a challenge. The Legislature is increasingly diverse, and the ethnic caucuses' perspectives about higher education relate closely to the needs and interests of the communities they represent.

UC and CSU are preparing for a series of Legislative hearings on the Governor's proposed budget in early March. Later in March, all three segments will participate in a joint hearing of the Assembly Higher Education Committee and the Assembly Budget Subcommittee #2 focused on workforce development and degree production.

UC Budget: The Governor has proposed 4% annual increases to UC's base budget for 2016-17, and also supports UC's request for modest tuition increases tied to inflation after this year. UC hopes to secure additional funding to support the enrollment of 600 new graduate students next year, which will be important for UC's ability to support a 5,000 increase in undergraduate enrollment. UC also wants to ensure that the state funds any sustained expansion of enrollment according to the marginal cost of instruction formula. UC is undergoing an audit initiated by the Legislature last spring after the release of UC's five-year budget stability plan. Its scope includes 1) nonresident enrollment; 2) Expenditures, including compensation and the use of state revenues and nonresident tuition; 3) budget oversight processes at UCOP and the campuses; and 4) the "rebenching" process underway to rebalance per-student state funding across UC campuses. The results of the audit are expected in late March 2016.

CSU Budget: The Governor's proposed budget includes a \$148.3 million general fund increase for CSU, \$35 million in one-time funds each to UC and CSU for deferred maintenance, and \$25M and \$35M, respectively, in Cap and Trade funds for energy efficiency projects. The Governor's budget funds CSU enrollment growth at 1%, and provides \$25 million to CSU for the Innovation in Higher Education program, which awards grants that support CSU campus innovations related to student success. CSU has asked the state to continue its support of timely completion. In 2009, CSU launched its Graduation Initiative 2025, which aimed to raise systemwide six-year graduation rates by 8% by 2015 and four-year rates to 24% by 2025. The first goal was exceeded; the six-year rate has risen 11% since 2009.

CCC Budget: The Governor's proposed budget provides strong support for the California Community Colleges, which have the added advantage of Proposition 98 funding guarantees. The Governor is interested in shifting the funding model to one that supports more local CCC district decision-making. His budget also recognizes that 3 of 4 students come to the CCC in need of math or English remediation, and it allocates additional resources to programs that expand access to career technical education courses and programs, improve student success and remediation, and support basic skills instruction and students' transition to college-level work.

CCC is concerned that the budget includes minimal discretionary funding and funding for cost of living adjustments.

Current Legislative Issues: A number of recently-introduced bills have implications for the higher education segments. The deadline to introduce bills is this Friday, February 19, but it is typical for 75% of bills to be released the week before the deadline. Legislators are particularly concerned about factors affecting the overall affordability of a college education—including the growing costs of tuition, housing, and textbooks. They are also concerned about food insecurity and the prevention of sexual violence on campus.

- [AB 1837 \(Low\)](#) is the latest legislative effort to identify a statewide higher education planning and coordinating body to replace the defunded California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). All previous efforts have been vetoed by the Governor.
- [AB 1887 \(Low\)](#) would ban public employees (including faculty) from using state funds to travel to any state with a law that allows discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.
- [AB 1914 \(Bonilla\)](#) reflects legislators' interest in promoting open educational resources. It would forbid faculty from requiring students to purchase an access code for online educational resources or functions that are otherwise available for free.
- [AB 13 \(Chavez\)](#) would authorize UC, CSU, and the CCC to waive nonresident tuition for veteran students. Other bills seek to extend the tuition waiver to additional beneficiaries, including those affected by the mass shooting in San Bernardino ([SB 893](#)).

It was noted that the most well-intentioned policies can cumulatively, and over time, have unintended fiscal effects. It was noted that there are growing political calls for tuition-free college, but less discussion about how such a scheme would be funded.

Other Bills of Interest to CCC: The CCC is working with specific legislators to sponsor bills addressing tuition, fees, and financial aid. These include [AB 1721 \(Medina\)](#), which increases awards for the Cal Grant B program used by CCC students and CCC students transferring to a four-year institution, and [AB 1892 \(Medina\)](#), which expands the Cal Grant C program, used by students to help offset the costs of a technical or career education, by aligning the maximum award with Cal Grant B. Finally, [SB 66 \(Leyva\)](#) reauthorizes the Career Technical Education Pathways Program and allows the CCC to access employment and income data from other state agencies to help measure outcomes of students who participate in CTE programs.

In addition, the College Board worked with Assembly Member Williams to sponsor [AB 1985](#) which would require the CCC to grant GE credit for students who receive at least a score of 3 on an Advanced Placement exam. CCC has noted that the majority of colleges already award credit for AP exams, and such a mandate will remove local control and in some cases lower standards. It was noted that the legislation will also impact UC and CSU in terms of transfer student preparation.

Other Bills of Interest to UC: UC is working to extend or eliminate sunset dates for three programs enacted through legislation: 1) the Best Value Construction Contractor Selection Pilot Program; 2) the California Subject Matter Project; and 3) the California Breast Cancer Research Fund income tax form check-off. UC is sponsoring two bills related to innovation and entrepreneurship: a challenge grant program that addresses big California issues such as water and health; and a program to fund campus incubators that aim to spur local economic development. UC is concerned about [AB 1711 \(McCarty\)](#), which would require UC, as a condition of receiving state funds, to cap nonresident enrollment at the systemwide and campus level, and [SB 959 \(Lara\)](#), which would require UC to offer contracted employees salary and benefits equivalent to those offered to campus employees in a similar position.

April Legislative Day: UC State Governmental Relations has secured a room at the Capitol for ICAS' Legislative Day scheduled for Thursday, April 14. However, CSU faculty have noted a potential conflict on that date, and it has also been noted that Tuesdays and Wednesdays are better for legislative visits. ICAS agreed to move the Legislative Day meeting to April 5. UC SGR agreed to provide a list of potential invitees, who should include chairs and vice chairs of the Assembly and Senate committees and subcommittees on budget, higher education, and appropriations; committee policy staff; and staff from the LAO, DOF, and Governor's office, as well as specific legislators who have introduced bills that affect the segments.

IV. Reports from Senate Leadership

UC Senate Chair Dan Hare: Chair Hare's comments at the January Board of Regents meeting focused on how UC campuses will meet the challenge of fulfilling an agreement with the state to enroll 10,000 more resident undergraduates over the next three years, and concerns that UC quality could suffer without a proportional number of additional faculty, staff, and physical infrastructure to support a larger student population. Chair Hare is a member of the UC Regents Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance, which recently forwarded to the Chair of the Regents a revised Statement on Intolerance, which condemns acts of intolerance, distinguishes protected speech from the consequences of unprotected acts of intolerance, and addresses the need to protect free speech and academic freedom. The Senate provided [comments](#) on the [report of the Retirement Options Task Force](#) and its recommendations for a new pension plan that will apply to UC employees hired after July 1, 2016. The Senate noted that all options will reduce retirement benefits for new employees relative to existing employees and will threaten UC's continued excellence by constraining UC's ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty.

ASCCC President David Morse: The Consultation Council is finalizing a report to Chancellor Harris about a new accreditation model for the CCC, which will recommend that the CCC no longer have a separate accrediting agency from California's public four-year institutions. The ASCCC's April plenary session "Aligning Partnerships for Student Success," will bring together the Chief Instructional Officers, Chief Student Services Officers, and representatives from the Chancellor's Office and other organizations. A set of parameters for the new CCC baccalaureate degrees will be reviewed by the Board of Governors in March, and the search committee to replace retiring CCC Chancellor Harris hopes to have an individual in place by the summer. The ASCCC is discussing the feasibility of a new grant program in the Governor's budget that seeks to incentivize the development of zero-textbook-cost-degrees ("Z-Degrees") at the colleges. It is

also discussing how funding included in the budget for new full-time faculty could be leveraged to increase faculty diversity, and considering how loan forgiveness programs and other incentives could be used to encourage graduate students, particularly those studying at UC and CSU and former CCC students, to consider community college teaching as a career pathway.

ASCSU Chair Steven Filling: Chair Filling attended a recent meeting of the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee, which included presentations on the redesigned SAT and on the implications of the Common Core and the Smarter Balanced Assessment for higher education. CSU's Task Force on GE Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Credit will meet next week to discuss issues surrounding college readiness in math, and a CSU Task Force will recommend making Ethnic Studies a systemwide general education requirement. The ASCSU continues to discuss decreases in tenure density at CSU; the lack of openness and transparency in presidential searches; strategies for increasing graduation rates; a new policy requiring background checks for all CSU employees; the need to ramp-up teacher education programs to address a projected teacher shortage in California; and structural deficits at several CSU campuses. The ASCSU is also planning to update a prior study of the efficacy of online instruction, and to conduct a demographic study of CSU students to help policymakers understand current demographics.

V. Review of ICAS Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen

The Academic Senates of the three segments have approved ICAS's revised "Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen."

ACTION: A motion to approve the statement was made and seconded. ICAS approved the statement.

VI. Appointments to IGETC Standards Subcommittee

The nine-member ICAS IGETC Standards Subcommittee maintains the "[IGETC Standards, Policies, and Procedures](#)" document, which outlines guidelines for the content and use of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum. The Subcommittee includes a faculty representative, administrator, and articulation officer from each higher education segment. Professor John Stankas (CCC) will chair the subcommittee this year. UC and CSU are asked to appoint representatives to the group so that it can convene to discuss potential modifications.

ACTION: UC will identify a faculty representative.

VII. Update on the California Open Education Resources Council (CA-OERC)

ICAS sent the Legislature its final report on the CA-OERC's work at the end of December.

ICAS members noted that the CA-OERC continues to refine the lengthier version of the document it submitted to ICAS, and is developing a plan for the administration of [AB 798](#), the College Textbook Affordability Act, which creates an incentive fund to reward efforts that

accelerate faculty adoption of open educational resources (OER) at CCC and CSU. The bill also notes that CSU will administer the grant program outlined in the bill through the California Digital Open Source Library (CDOSL), and will report annually to the Legislature in consultation with ICAS. The CDOSL is now known as the “COOL4ED” website, the repository of OER resources identified by the CA-OERC. COOL4ED uses some of the infrastructure of CSU MERLOT, an existing repository of online learning resources housed at CSU. It was noted that CA-OERC’s plan for CSU’s administration of AB 798 is said to involve the director of CSU-MERLOT, Gerry Hanley, who is also the PI on the Hewlett and Gates grants that provided the matching funding for COOL4ED and CA-OERC stipulated by SB1052 and SB1053.

AB 798 references “the California Open Education Resources Council established in Section 66409” of Education Code. Section 66409 (a) states that the council “shall be administered by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges.” ASCCC members stated that Assembly member Bonilla’s office assured them that this language would maintain ICAS’ oversight of the council. Given this authority, ASCCC leaders noted that they want to ensure that CCC faculty have a role in the implementation of AB 798, particularly in reviewing local grant proposal content. It was also noted that ICAS appoints the CA-OERC chair and should establish a formal policy defining the length of the chair’s appointment, performance expectations, review parameters, and an evaluation process.

ACTION: It was agreed that an ICAS subcommittee comprised of the Senate chairs and vice chairs will draft a policy for ICAS to review in April.

VIII. UC Updates on Transfer Issues and CLEP

UC Transfer Pathways: The UC Senate office is gathering final campus department sign-offs on UC Transfer Pathway agreements for 11 majors, including three engineering majors, reached by faculty delegates in October. Most UC Pathways require fewer courses than the Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD-T), because they focus on pre-major preparation and are not complete degrees, although they are closely related to the AD-Ts.

Course Identification Numbering System: BOARS has endorsed a plan to pilot the use of C-IDs in the course-to-course articulation of a select number of UC Transfer Pathways. The Mathematics, Chemistry, and Physics Pathways were selected based on their having a high level of overlapping course expectations. UC faculty from the relevant discipline will review each course expectation against the relevant C-ID descriptor to determine a match. The pilot will help establish UC systemwide articulation for these Pathway courses, after which UC will need to address campus variation around general education requirements.

UC Review of CLEP exams: The UC Academic Council endorsed a plan for the evaluation of seven College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams for possible UC credit by systemwide UC faculty committees. Each committee will determine the extent to which a given exam measures UC-level knowledge, covers in sufficient breadth and depth the content of a lower division UC course or courses and prepares students for the next level of coursework in a given

department. If any exam is determined to be acceptable, there will be a follow up discussion about how individual campus departments might use it.

IX. Mathematics and Computer Science course acceptance

The ASCSU is considering a resolution calling on CSU to require a fourth year of high school mathematics/quantitative reasoning for admission. CSU currently requires three years of math. The resolution also calls for a mathematics/quantitative course to be completed in the senior year of high school. In addition, CSU has been asked to consider allowing rigorous computer science courses to fulfill the mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirement.

UC Senate Chair Hare noted that the Lieutenant Governor and a coalition of business leaders recently asked UC BOARS to consider allowing high school computer science courses to count toward the core mathematics (area “c”) requirement for freshman admission. BOARS [responded](#) that it is already possible for computer science courses to qualify for area “c” provided they include sufficient math content, and that approved computer sciences courses may also count toward the college-preparatory elective (“g”) requirement.

X. Public Support for Higher Education Funding

In light of the segments’ continued struggles with state funding, it was suggested that ICAS discuss strategies for furthering public understanding, especially among policy makers, about the need to support funding for public higher education.

It was noted that the three segments’ work around improving the transfer path is a positive example of their shared commitment to access. Uniting around a common message about transfer would also enable the segments to communicate the benefits of different approaches to improving transfer and to challenge some of the more unhelpful legislative mandates. For example, faculty feel the 60 + 60 unit constraint associated with the Associate Degrees for Transfer may harm the quality of some high unit majors, while the UC Pathways may in some cases better prepare students for success. CSU campuses have found that a 60-unit Transfer Model Curricula does not always align with the preparation and competencies required for a major, and therefore they accept the TMC as valid only for certain concentrations within that major. The segments need to emphasize that some majors require more than 120 units. It was noted that UC’s approach to transfer streamlining took a different approach from the legislative mandate imposed on CSU and CCC. It started by looking at the preparation transfer students need to take to be competitive for admission to UC, rather than at a specific unit target.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst