DRAFT ICAS Minutes of Meeting
Friday, June 5, 2015
10:00 am – 3:00 pm

CSU Sacramento
6000 J Street, University Union, Capitol Room
http://icas-ca.org

In Attendance:

CSU Senate: Steven Filling, Chair; Christine Miller, Vice Chair; Robert K. Collins, 2015-2016 Secretary; Praveen Soni, Member-at-Large; Darlene Yee-Melichar, 2015-2016 Member-at-Large; and Tracy Butler, Director

CCC Senate: David Morse, President; Julie Bruno, Vice President; John Stanskas, Secretary; Craig Rutan, South Representative; Michelle Grimes-Hillman, South Representative; Dolores Davison and Julie Adams, Executive Director

UC Senate: Mary Gilly, 2014-2015 Chair; J. Daniel Hair, 2015-2016 Chair; James Chalfant, Vice Chair; Bruce Cooperstein, 2014-2015 UCOPE Chair; Caroline Streeter, 2015-2016 UCOPE Chair; and Hilary Baxter, Executive Director

Ca-OERC: Katherine Harris, Chair; Diego Bonilla; Charles "Kale" Braden; Cheryl Stewart; Leslie Kennedy (CSU Chancellor's Office)

Consent Calendar

Approval of the June 5, 2015 Agenda – Enclosure 1a
Agenda was approved with additions (ICAS position on AB 798)

Approval of the February 5, 2015 & April 13, 2015 Meeting Notes – Enclosure 1b
February was approved and April minutes were approved as amended

ICAS September Meeting
The next ICAS meeting will be held on September 25th at the CSU East Bay Oakland Center. Dates for future meetings will be decided then.

Katherine Harris, Chair (and additional members of) the California Open Education Resources Council – Enclosure 2
Dr. Harris provided members with a progress report.

The project has received positive feedback from faculty and legislators about the cooperation between segments and the passion the faculty have shown for the project.

The last two months, they have been focusing on infrastructure for the Fall pilot project. Emphasis has been on outreach to more faculty and faculty professional development.

The council has employed a public relations professional to help get the word out. The PR campaign has been approved by the Council and will be implemented over the summer. It also calls for more use of Twitter, Instragram, blogging and other social media. The [marketing plan](#) is now online.

The council has been brainstorming about how to leverage partnerships to provide greater availability of these texts to students (OpenStax, bookstores, Library Deans, CSU's Affordable Learning Solutions, etc.)

The summer and the fall will focus on research of best practices for OER in higher education, faculty surveys and faculty outreach.

From survey research so far, the council has identified four things that deter faculty from using OER.

1. No comprehensive catalog.
2. It's difficult to find needed information.
3. There aren't enough resources for some subjects.
4. Not knowing if permission is given to use or change.

So, the council proposed a pilot project for fall of 2015 and has already selected the participants. They've chosen courses that have a C-ID correlation.

Q: In the Council's May Progress report, it says faculty agreed to use at least one chapter. What does that mean? What else are they using?

A: Most of them are using their regular textbook and integrating one chapter from an OER textbook. There were a few who have used and will continue to use a complete OER textbook for their classes.

The Council has done some preliminary student focus groups during which a number of students provided valuable feedback. Computer Science students requested learning modules be included and that they be distributed as pdf for more access (i.e. highlighting, annotating, searching, etc.). ADA access will be a focus of the Council's infrastructure discussions.

The Council's objectives with the next focus groups will include a variety of faculty who are OER experienced. The objectives will be:

1. Why are you using OER (or not)?
2. What are the barriers?
3. What incentives can be added to the pilot project?
4. Identify who might be OER ambassadors on various campuses.

For those faculty who are not OER experienced, the objectives are different:

- Understand California faculty and what would motivate them to use OER.
- Discover barriers to adoption
- Further educate faculty about OER

A new and very different version of AB 798 was introduced on June 2nd. Council Chair Harris spoke with ICAS Chair Filling about the Council's ideas and perspective on the bill and who would be the point person. Further discussions will be needed.

Possible projects to address in year three:

- RFPs for more OER texts
- Public relations program
    a. Bring more faculty on board
- If AB 798 does go through, there are enough funds for beta test and infrastructure on select campuses

Q: My understanding is that there is a final report due in December for 1052. What do you expect that final report would look like?

A: We finish our projects at the end of December so we're anticipating the white paper and final report would happen in January.

Q: Can we have a framework of that final report at the September ICAS meeting (outline what has been finished and what is scheduled to be finished)?

A: Yes…and for larger projects we're doing in the fall, they'll be listed as "in progress". By mid-October, we should have RFPs to submit to ICAS for year three review and approval.

Q: We have looked at some budget figures. Do we have the various aspects of this project for next year and moving forward – in terms of budget?

A: Gerard Hanley is handling that part of this project.

Chair Morse commented that he wasn't finding where compensation is mentioned for faculty participating in the project. So, before something like that moves forward, it should come back to ICAS for some discussion. When the budget information is available, it should be clarified. Chair Harris commented that compensation for CSU & CCC faculty is very different than compensation for UC faculty. The Council is discussing that challenge.

Member Diego shared that recent research shows students tend to read only 1-3 chapters of an OER for the entire course. The Council is working to address that challenge. Tablets aren't much better. Some of the things they're doing now – at least in the case of the focus groups – is to understand how students lay things out visually when they study. But, when you have a tablet, it's more difficult to navigate through the pages easily. That's one of the concerns of the Council. So, they are working to find solutions.

Q: Regarding your PR plan and faculty ambassadors, how do you intend to select faculty members on each campus? Do you think you'll be providing incentives to these individuals? What are the ambassadors' objectives?

A: The PR campaign is something we'll be working on over the summer. As far as selecting faculty for ambassadors is concerned, it would be the people who come forward or are already champions. Yes, they will be compensated.

Member Soni suggested that the Council work with campus Academic Senates. They can help identify and recommend faculty for these purposes. David Morse agreed it would be a good path forward since these faculty positions should be appointed by faculty.

Each segment outlined alternate resources they use to contact their faculty system-wide. Since ICAS members are familiar with these resources, it was recommended that the Council send ICAS what needs to be disseminated to each segment's faculty.

Personnel review processes were also discussed.

Members would like to meet again with the Council at the September 25th ICAS meeting.

Update on C-ID, Transfer Model Curriculum and Areas of Emphasis *(Julie Bruno, CCC)* **– Enclosure 3**
A status report was provided to members.

The grant for C-ID was awarded to Mt. San Antonio. There will be a transition period. But, after that, there will be approximately $800,000 per year for funding C-ID. It will help to expand C-ID and support Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC).

They are moving toward Model Curriculum work as well and it will help support some of the primary recommendations of the Strong Workforce Task Force the Board of Governors convened. The increase in funding will help support the work of the Common Assessment Initiative, the Educational Planning initiative, and the Online Education initiative as C-ID is integral to these.

Some of the Model Curriculum being explored:

1. Agriculture
2. Bio-Technology
3. Emergency Medical Services
4. Commercial Music
5. Culinary Arts
6. Addiction studies
7. Automotive Technology

Some of the Model Curriculum are going to be just for the CCC system. But some have intersegmental components. In those cases, they've reached out to CSU faculty to go through the necessary processes to help create C-ID descriptors for the courses. CCC will schedule a meeting with UC and CSU to discuss further.

Q: Do the reviewers have to be from certain campuses with articulation agreements pending or can they be from any campus?
A: We work through your Academic Senate and they appoint reviewers. They need to be within the discipline and I believe they have to be tenured. There is compensation.

Q: Could the compensation amount be increased as an incentive?
A: Possibly, but it does take a sizable amount of the budget (approximately $150,000 last year). We can certainly discuss it.

Q: How complete is this project? How many students earn those degrees?
A: We're passed our completion phase and now it's taking on a larger life (Model Curriculum in additional disciplines). The number of students is high…around 16,000.

This project must be sustained (part of the reason for current funding levels). They are looking at instituting it structurally into our system.

SB 1440 called for "Areas of Emphasis degrees". They are working on that as well as the five year review of TMC's and the descriptors.

General Announcements - Chair/President Reports

David Morse, President, CCC Academic Senate
CCC appointments for ICAS next year (15/16) are not changing.

Items coming up
We have our Faculty Leadership Institute for training new Academic Senate Presidents. That's in June at San José. In July, we have our State-wide Curriculum Institute working on various curriculum issues. We would welcome connection with the other two segments, if you're interested in our events.

Our Task force on Career Technical Education (CTE) is coming up. It's a state-wide Task Force like our Student Success Task Force a couple of years ago. This one focuses on CTE issues.

One of the items we wish to pursue this year is diversification of our faculty in the recruitment process. We'd like to follow up with the UC and CSU to ensure their graduate students are made aware of the recruitment opportunities at the CCC.

Accreditation
We do have a task force formed under our Consultation Council looking at our accreditation. No report has been released yet. We're working on it.

Legislation
At the last plenary session, we took position on a number of different bills:

1. SB 42 – Replacement for CPEC. Oppose
2. AB 626 – Student Success and Support Program Funds to increase the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty. Support
3. AB 770 – Financial grant and professional development funding program. Support if amended
4. AB 288 – Seamless pathways from high school to community college. Support
5. AB 798 – College Textbook Affordability. Support

Mary Gilly, Chair, UC Academic Senate
Regents Meeting
There was concern about training graduate students on sexual harassment and sexual assault in terms of their rights, responsibilities and what role they are in (are they employees? Are they students? What kind of training do they need?)

There was opposition to the development of the Gill Tract Farm at UC Berkeley and a request to establish a center for urban agriculture and food justice at the Farm.

People came and spoke – both for and against – the State Department's definition of anti-Semitism.

5

Members of American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) urged the UC to end outsourcing jobs to private contractors. Those employees work alongside UC employees. But, they receive no benefits and are paid less than their UC counterparts.

The father of one of the students killed by a gunman at UC Santa Barbara last year, urged the Regents to divest themselves from the gun industry.

A UC Santa Cruz Student (and fellow of the Global Food Initiative) commented about food security for UC students. Many skip meals to save money and some use CalFresh foodstamps. She urged Regents to support measures recommended by the Global Food Initiative Food Security and Access Subcommittee and to consider setting up more food banks on campuses.

Most of the rest of our report will be covered by two later items on the ICAS agenda (budget and transfer).

Steven Filling, Chair of ICAS and CSU Academic Senate
Senate elections took place in May. Steven, Christine Miller and Praveen Soni were re-elected as Chair, Vice Chair and Member-at-Large, respectively. Robert Collins (SFSU) was elected Secretary and Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU) was elected as the second Member-at-Large.

The Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) has been working with the Western Interstate Commisson for Higher Education (WICHE) to clarify the ASCSU's role and degree of participation in their current project (Interstate Passport Project…which involves certification of lower division course work across state lines).

ASCSU has been discussing tenure density in the CSU with Chancellor White and the CSU Trustees. Tenure density has decreased from 68% to less than 55%. The aspirational goal of ACR 73 (several years ago) was 75%. ASCSU is encouraging administration to move toward that goal again and to reduce the student to faculty ratio to no more than 18:1.

The dynamics and risks of public/private partnerships (as demonstrated in the space lease agreement between CSU Sacramento and California North State University), were discussed.

The Senate also issued a statement on the expectations for upper division GE, suggesting that the Chancellor more exclusively define it in his Executive Order. They asked that the characteristics of upper division GE include:

1. GE be an integrative experience that relies on knowledge, abilities and skills obtained in lower division GE.
2. There be affirmation that the upper division portion of CSU GE requirements be acknowledged as a campus specific contribution of GE (meaning each campus is able to determine transferability or appropriateness of transfer for upper division GE courses).
3. Specific upper division GE requirements and modifications (or changes to those requirements) be determined by faculty at the campus level

The Senate also spoke on the consultation regarding the CCC pilot Baccalaureate degree programs. After which, Chair Filling attended the CCC Board of Governors' meeting where he shared ASCSU concerns with the Board and the Governor.

The CSU has a new Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs. Loren Blanchard spent 20 plus years at Xavier University in New Orleans and will begin his new role with the CSU on July 1, 2015.

AB 798 (Bonilla)
ICAS members were sent the latest text of the bill via email. Progression of the bill may be found here: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/postquery?bill_number=ab_798&sess=CUR&house=B&author=bonilla_%3Cbonilla%3E. This morning it was approved and forwarded on to the Senate. There were a number of substantive changes in the most recent version of the bill. ICAS discussed the impact of these changes and recommendations for further changes.

After an earlier discussion with Council Chair Harris, it was agreed that further communication with the legislature and recommendations to legislators regarding changes to AB 798 (reporting structure, oversight, metrics for success, funding, etc.), would be directed and referred to ICAS.

The three segment Chairs will work together to craft a letter as well as a list of talking points to the Senate Education Committee legislators suggesting changes to the bill and the reasons for them.

Transfer (UC)
The President's first year, she appointed a transfer action team which consisted of administrators, the Senate, and the Chair of BOARS co-Chaired with the Vice President for Student Affairs. The task force came out with a number of recommendations.

One issue identified - different undergraduate campuses might have different sets of major preparation expectations.

The focus was on the 10 most popular majors for transfer students (11 additional majors/agreements are on track for completion next year).

1. Biology
2. Biochemistry
3. Cell Biology
4. Molecular Biology
5. Chemistry
6. Physics
7. Mathematics
8. Anthropology
9. Economics
10. Sociology

Chair Gilly and Vice Chair Hare studied campus websites to find out what native freshman were expected to have by the time they get to their Junior year.

They began with Natural Sciences and Social Sciences as their first set and presented their findings at a meeting in Oakland, to selected groups of faculty and staff (assistant deans, student advisors, etc).

Because of the short time frame there weren't representatives from every campus at every meeting. But nine undergraduate campuses and ten majors overall were represented. So far, there has been buy-in by 89 of 90 faculty groups (10 disciplines for each of 9 undergraduate campuses).

Although the major preparation outlined by the project does not guarantee admission to UC, it does provide a pathway for students to prepare for their major, transfer and timely graduation.

For the next phase in October, the 11 additional disciplines will be:

1. Business Administration
2. Electrical Engineering
3. History
4. Political Science
5. Communications
6. English/Literature
7. Mechanical Engineering
8. Psychology
9. Computer Science
10. Film
11. Philosophy

Invitations to the campus delegates have already gone out.

Members discussed implementation and suggested further collaboration between segments on the more challenging disciplines.

On June 8th, President Napolitano, Chancellor White and Chancellor Harris will be meeting to discuss transfer pathways. Chair Gilly and Vice Chair Hare encouraged ICAS members to contact them with any questions they may have prior to that meeting.

President Napolitano plans to make an announcement and launch a central, dedicated "Major Preparation" website by July 1st.

CCC Bachelor's Degrees Pilot Programs *(Morse)* **– Enclosure 4**
The Pilot allows for 15 different degrees in 15 districts. 12 were approved in January and the other 3 were approved at the Board of Governors' meeting in May. The 15 colleges have been selected. The Chancellor's Office has been clear that the ASCCC take the lead in discussions about the instructional aspects of these degrees and to help develop the curricular parameters.

ASCCC has put together a Task Force of CTE discipline representatives, GE, counseling and articulation officers. They were asked to create proposals for the pilot colleges to reference, outline and discuss what the curricular parameters should be (defining upper division coursework, upper division GE requirements, qualifications for instructors and needed support services).

Progress has been made in defining what these degrees will look like and feedback is being received from representatives at the pilot colleges.

Member Stankas has spoken to UC's Ed Policy committee and the CSU General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) to collect feedback from other universities in the state.

They intend to spend the next couple of months collecting faculty feedback from the field at large. Ultimately, approval will be needed from their delegates state-wide as an academic and professional matter, for defining the parameters and finally, for making recommendations to the Board of Governors about Title V changes regarding minimum standards.

Budget - May Revise *(UC, Mary Gilly)* **– Enclosure 5**
UC did receive new revenue. A 4% base budget increase in the next 4 fiscal years and nearly $500 million in one-time funding to help pay down UCRP liability, deferred maintenance and sustainability projects. There is no resident tuition increase for the next two years. The Regents approved an up to 8% increase in non-resident tuition. Professional degrees supplemental tuition can be increased for everything but law.

One of the bigger aspects of the May revise (from the faculty perspective) is pension reform.

There is no money in the May revise for enrollment growth for UC. But the Governor did say, if the legislature put money into it, he wouldn't veto it.

Natural Sciences Competency Statement – Enclosure 6
There is feedback from the UC on the competency statement and member Rutan indicated they would welcome feedback from the CSU. The language changes that are mentioned by UCEP can be easily addressed.

ICAS didn't appoint engineering faculty for the engineering piece since it was not their intention to create a separate engineering section in the document. When you look at it in NGSS it's not a comprehensive piece. If there is a desire to add it, engineering faculty would need to be called in.

The original goal is to have the three segments approve the document in the fall. Some of the language and the appendices will be cleaned up before that approval.

Chair Filling requested that CSU get the document to review in late August.

IGETC Standards documents – Enclosures 7a, 7b and 7c
Every year, the standards document is reviewed. There have been minimal corrections this year. Member Stanskas indicated, if there were no further changes, ICAS adopt the IGETC standards document.

It was moved, seconded and approved.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50.

Respectfully Submitted by,
Tracy Butler, Director – Academic Senate CSU