



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

**ICAS Meeting Minutes**  
**September 28, 2017**  
**USC State Capitol Center, Sacramento, CA**  
<http://icas-ca.org/>

**In Attendance:**

CSU Senate: Christine Miller – Chair; Catherine Nelson – Vice Chair; Simone Aloisio - Secretary (virtually via Zoom); Robert K. Collins – Member-at-Large; Tom Krabacher – Member-at-Large;

CCC Senate: Julie Bruno – President; John Stankas – Vice President; Virginia May – Area A Representative; Dolores Davison – Secretary; John Freitas – Treasurer

UC Senate: Shane White – Chair; Robert May – Vice Chair; Henry Sanchez – BOARS Chair; Carrie Wastal – UCOPE Chair; Edward Caswell-Chen – UCEP Chair

Staff: Tracy Butler, ASCSU, Julie Adams, ASCCC, Hillary Baxter, ASCCC

**Agenda approved as amended** after the addition of the IGETC standards subcommittee Chair to agenda (as Item 3)

**Minutes approved from June**

**I. IGETC Standards Subcommittee Chair**

ICAS members nominated, seconded and elected Virginia May by acclamation Subcommittee Chair May asked to have faculty named for the committee noting that those serving currently are willing to serve again.

**II. 2017-2018 Meeting Calendar**

Calendar was decided for all ICAS meetings. For now meetings will be at the USC Capital Center (though locations might change at a later date). Dates decided:

- December 6, 2017
- February 9, 2018
- April 18, 2018
- May 21, 2018

Possible guests at upcoming ICAS meetings and those to meet with in April at Legislative Day:

- Lark Park from the Governor’s office (now also a UC Regent),

- Jeanice Warden (Chief Consultant on the Committee on Higher Education),
- Olgalilia Ramirez (Consultant, Senate Education Committee),
- Christian Osmana (Department of Finance),
- Staff from McCarty's office,
- Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)
  - Judy Heiman
  - Paul Steenhausen

### III. Legislative day strategic agenda

- Establish goals and ICAS' priorities
- Subgroup to look at background papers and what papers there are that can be shared to share with Legislators about common goals and priorities (i.e. C-ID, Education Standards and Accountability)
- An updated brochure (messaging). The current one was updated 3 or 4 years ago.
- An educational forum at the capitol (a kind of mini-advocacy day)
- Does ICAS want to do a transfer campaign and, if so, what would that look like?
- It's best to give legislators and idea of who you are, what you're looking for (not just that looking for money)
  - Get to know them.
  - Let them get to know you.
  - If funding is what you're looking for:
    - Give them a complete picture what that would be used for.
- It's best to show transparency to Legislators about what we're doing collectively so they don't feel as if there is something that needs to be "fixed".
  - In part, to show that legislation of higher education (transfer among other things) is not needed.
  - To prevent Legislative encroachment in the classroom.
- Is there a way to counter outside pressure from groups that could also be driving false impressions legislative presence in this capacity is somehow needed?
- Another strategy could be to approach legislators that ICAS knows will be writing a bill and offer expertise.
  - "We know you're writing a bill. This would be helpful"
  - Cultivate relationships so they know they can come to ICAS for education related questions or legislative decisions, bills, policies, etc.
  - We are equally valid voices with these issues.
- ICAS' absence is a concern. Cultivate relationships so they know ICAS is the group to come to.
  - ICAS' expertise in the field is an asset they can use.
- Invitations should be to both Legislative leadership and their Higher Ed Staffers.
- Talking to staffers can be productive.
  - They have a unique perspective.
  - There is continuity since they are often there for many years (spanning several legislators).
- Faculty Diversity and hiring in higher education (that spans segments and faculty hiring would be included) would be an important topic to bring to them.

- It would be helpful to come up with a one to two page document that could be shopped around or act as a “leave behind” explaining the crucial points from the perspective of all three segments. Something that had statistics that showed why this was important.
- Funding for faculty hiring as regular priority with the legislature?
  - It had been “on the radar” and might come back.
- Tenure density is another.
  - CCC member talked to a Chancellor from another institution and discussed faculty hiring, teacher preparation, and tenure density. Legislative networking opportunities were discussed and are a possibility.
- Academic Quality and Access from a student perspective?
  - CSU had very positive results bringing students to meetings with legislators and/or staffers.
- Want to be certain to be inclusive of all three segments’ Senates/Senates’ leadership.
- There might be ways to work toward carrying legislation (a long-term strategy with a January 2019 timeline).
  - Would want to bring in the segments’ Chancellor’s offices.
  - And put it past the segment Senates (no surprises).
- Would need to be mindful– no matter which approach – it does not have unintended consequences for any of the three segments.
- Talk to others in the Higher Ed arena who already have the ears of legislators (i.e. PPIC) for collaboration and/or assistance of some kind?
- Recently, there seems to be more awareness in the legislature of the existence of Academic Senates and that communication with the faculty is facilitated through them.
- Meet and Greet: have the three Chairs go for a “meet and greet” with legislators to visit at the Capitol and leave the brochure behind at each of those visits.
- Faculty Diversity and Hiring: Create a one to two page document of statistics on Faculty diversity and hiring.
  - A couple of members from each segment will supply the statistics from their segment for a collaborative document.
- Transfer (emphasize before Leg day):
  - Consult the ICAS website for documents and papers ICAS currently has on this subject (look at and update documents).
  - A forum in February to be arranged that will include updated statistics and information about the current state of transfer between segments and how it’s working.
    - Would be a good idea to include transfer students to speak about their experiences.

#### **IV. CSU Executive Orders 1100 & 1110**

- Two Executive orders the Chancellor's office issued in August. Executive Orders 1100 and 1110
- Faculty consultation was definitely inadequate but the best was done under the circumstances.
- EO 1100 was a revision of an existing Executive order on General Education
- EO 1110 mandates CSU campuses have different approaches to academic preparation.
  - ELM and EPT exams are eliminated.
- There are issues with both content and process.
- Deadlines for substantial changes and implementation are very constraining (a year from now).
- ASCSU/faculty asked for more time for such sweeping changes and delay of deadlines to at least Fall of 2019.
- ASCSU is waiting for response.
- General EAC also recommended the pause button be pressed.
- 10 or 11 Campus Senates have weighed in and drafted their own resolutions asking for that slow down as well (or even rescind).
- Graduation Initiative 2025 is driving most of this. It has a very aggressive timeline.
- ICAS members communicated concerns that hasty implementation could cause public and legislative response should things go awry.
  - There are possible implications of that for the other two segments should that happen
- In very general terms, specifically with change in academic preparation and direction for education reform, there isn't necessarily disagreement. But, as far as implementation and timeline, the devil is in the details.

#### **V. Working Lunch and Chairs Reports:**

##### **Christine Miller, Chair, CSU Academic Senate**

- One of the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report was for building a center for the advancement of Quantitative Reasoning to – among other things - help high school teachers develop curricula for a 4<sup>th</sup> year of Math instruction for high school students.
- Some funding sources have come through.
- For a period of months, Chair Miller has heard there is a center that will be started with the goal (as of August) to have the center up and running before the beginning of the semester.
- A call was put out for faculty Co-Directors.
  - Chair Miller was asked to identify some faculty names to work on this.
- Three CSU Faculty did come forward.
  - Two of them backed out before contracts were finalized.
  - Third person just backed out earlier this week.

- There were concerns regarding consultation and whether or not the recommendations of the task force were being implemented.
- The most recent developments were VERY recent so nothing further is known about the direction this is going now.
- To Chair Miller's knowledge, there is no faculty involvement in the effort at this point.
- Discipline faculty and intermediate algebra and the conversations with the California acceleration project last spring:
  - The Chancellor's office is coordinating and informed people about how they are going to pursue that discipline faculty consultation.
  - That should be happening very soon and going forward this semester.
  - Chair Miller has not heard of any difficulty with the way that's developing.
- Changes with IGETC with respect to online oral communication:
  - At an earlier meeting, ICAS asked that discipline CSU faculty in communication studies be consulted about "oralcom" with that particular online class.
  - Chair Miller is reconciling contact information and getting an accurate list of who those Chairs are and will be following through on that.
  - Is working with GEAC Chair Kevin Baaske and waiting for him input on the draft of a letter to send to the discipline Chairs.
  - Looking at getting a Zoom meeting in October or November with a follow-up in February
  - Member Stanskas mentioned that at a C-ID meeting, the CSU Chancellor's office reported that they were working on a survey.
  - Chair Miller believes the direction is to have the survey first and then consult with the Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRG) so that FDRG folks would be looking at the survey.
    - The intent looks to be that the survey is to incorporate more voices and FDRG would then discuss.
  - ICAS Feedback suggested that the CSU be encouraged to share the survey results with discipline faculty and have a follow-up conversation on the results of that survey data (among the discipline faculty) and ensure appropriate content review.
- Legislation for a second voting student trustee:
  - A piece of legislation came up over the summer to change the one voting and one non-voting student Trustees to both voting Trustees.
  - At some point in the process, language was added to include a second \*Faculty\* trustee.
  - The legislation passed both houses and was headed to the Governor's desk. But, right before that, the author pulled it.
  - There has been no reason given for the path it took.

- ASCSU September 2017 resolutions
  - AS-3304-17/FGA/AA/APEP On the Development and Implementation of Executive Orders 1100 (Revised) and 1110
  - AS-3306-17/APEP/FGA Support for AB 19 (2017) Community Colleges: California College Promises
  - (in first reading) AS-3308-17/APEP Standards for Quantitative Reasoning
    - It picks up on the QRTF thread and argues there be adoption of foundational quantitative reasoning as defined in the QRTF Report of September 2016.
- Faculty Diversity in Hiring
  - CSU Tenure Density Task Force was due to complete their work last March but its work is still ongoing.
  - Chair Miller has been told it will imminently be completed soon.
  - When that point is reached, that Task Force's report will be coming out (hopefully, in the next few weeks).
    - The President who is Chair of that Task Force is still reviewing the report.
- General Education Task Force
  - GETF is continuing to meet and should have something by the end of the year.

### **Shane White, Chair, UC Academic Senate**

- Some legislative efforts geared toward the UC and legislative environments for the UC can look very different than it does for the CSU and CCC.
- Legislative efforts can sometimes be linked to budget bills and the current budget discussions could represent a disadvantage for the UC.
- The UC is currently wrapping up recommendations, discussions, and reports of the items required of them from the budget bill two years ago.
- AB 97, the current budget bill, additionally requires a number of things from the UC which could potentially hold up funding unless certain conditions are met.
- UC Senate recommendations are that funding and budget choices which must be made concerning academics, be reviewed by the Senate and Provosts in addition to Finance personnel.
- There had been proposed cuts to retiree health and it came up as a Regents' agenda item (July).
  - It was effectively another cut – not just to faculty – but to all employees.
  - Just yesterday there was a Presidential announcement of a task force to address how this is looked at as well as developing a framework and a process going forward.
  - This was a good example of Shared Governance that worked.
- UC Transfer Pathways:
  - This is important to the UC and they are committed to it for a variety of reasons.
    - It's a good thing to do

- It's a response to other considered legislation. For instance, 1440 capped the number of transfer degrees/units to CSU but not to the UC.
  - It's an opportunity to fix unintended consequences from the actions of legislators.
  - It's an opportunity for the segments to work together and show that there is a collective voice
  - It speaks to the credibility of all three faculty Senates.
- Academic Freedom, Freedom of Speech and Campus Climate:
  - These items are tied together and can sometimes get conflated but are really three separate interlocking issues.
  - The current challenges and opportunities for UC were discussed (i.e. the expense of insuring safety for public gathering, civil discourse/free speech, finding support for those opportunities, outside retaliation, etc.)
- BOARS
  - The Letters of Recommendation Study has been completed
    - The study ran an analysis to determine the impact of letters of recommendation on admission and the effect on enrollment.
  - Compare Favorably Report for 2016 has been posted to the BOARS website and was forwarded to the President.

**Julie Bruno, President, CCC Academic Senate**

- At their last meeting, the Board of Governors just approved the strategic goals for our system which came out of the "Vision for Success" (a project, their foundation undertook for their Chancellor's office).
  - It set several important and ambitious goals
    - Elimination of the achievement gap
    - Elimination of the equity gap
    - Increase the number of transfer students to the CSU or UC by 35%
    - Implementing guided pathways
- At the same meeting, the Board approved a budget proposal that included a request for money for hiring full-time faculty as well as part-time faculty.
  - Also included was funding for professional development, and a base increase of \$200 million
- The Governor sent a letter to their Chancellor asking for what would be the 115th community college to be completely online.
  - In response, their Chancellor's office has created a task force called "Flexible Learning Outcomes for Workers" (FLOW)
  - They have also hired a consultant
  - Once their work is completed, they will forward their recommendations to the Board of Governors
- AB 705 (Irwin) is a piece of legislation that the CCC Faculty Senate still opposes.
  - It would go into effect in January
  - Mandates getting students through transfer level English and math in one year.

- DACA
  - They have a response committee in their system.
  - Their Chancellor is joining arms with President Napolitano and Chancellor White to put together a higher education response to developments on the federal level.
  - One of their committees is putting together a website where their faculty can go to get information.

## **VI. Campus Climate**

- (also addressed in Chairs' reports)
- Member Collins mentioned that he has received feedback from faculty stating that they have been experiencing attacks from outside groups and asked UC and CCC if they've received similar reports.
- Faculty feedback from all three segments was discussed and the general feeling is that there is cause for concern and action (in the UC for instance, some faculty have received threats).

## **VII. UC Transfer Pathways**

- (addressed in Chairs' reports)

## **VIII. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)**

- Enclosure 8 is the ASCSU Resolution just passed on DACA at ASCSU's last plenary.
- Chair Miller asked CCC members how many Dreamer resource centers or a similar projects/centers there are at the community college campuses.
  - There are a few centers and several have websites and/or dedicated counselors/staff.
  - The CCC members had heard from faculty that after the announcements at the federal level, many Dreamer students were not coming to classes, attending rallies, etc. because they didn't want to be identified.
    - So, even if there were a physical site on campus, chances are those same Dreamer students would be just as reluctant to take advantage of the resource for the same reasons.
    - There are suggestions they may even fear to go online expecting they might be remotely identified and/or tracked.
- As all three system heads are publicly committed and united in support of DACA students, a suggestion was made to have each segment create a listing of what Dreamer resources exist across their system (campus centers, websites etc.) by area.
- Then craft a letter to the segment heads from ICAS suggesting that a pooling of resources to scaffold support for Dreamers in higher education as a whole, would be a way to advocate and support Dreamers in all three systems.
- Motion was made to have all three Chairs send a letter to the three segment leaders.
- Motion was seconded and approved.
- ICAS Member/UC Senate Chair Shane White agreed to draft a letter to bring back to the next meeting.

**IX. AA to MA-Approval of Task Force**

- There is an interest from the CCC to partner and expand the project of getting students back to their respective segments to teach for those segments (as the CCC is attempting to do for their segment).
- Member/CCC Chair Julie Bruno wished to see when the CSU & UC would want to participate in an effort like this before an intersegmental task force is formed.
- ASCCC currently have a group working on a two page document on Faculty diversity.
- ICAS Member/UC Chair Shane White wished to know how help for an effort like this would be needed or requested from the UC and the CSU.
- Member Bruno mentioned that there are efforts within the CCC already in place for this project and suggested coming back with a plan to outline how this effort can move forward with ICAS.
  - In the meantime, perhaps the two other segments could go back to their Senates and bring this idea forward.
- Chair Miller suggested that this be a referral to the ASCSU Faculty Affairs committee (on the CSU side) and perhaps have someone from the CCC segment (Julie Bruno?) participate in a virtual meeting with that committee to get feedback from them about how to get to a point where there might be intersegmental coordination. There needs to be some “meat on the bones” before getting to that point and a meeting like that would serve to show where the “meat” needs to be.
- UC feedback was similar.

**X. Adjournment**

-----  
**Respectfully Submitted by Director Tracy Butler**