**KATherinE W. CLARK**

1389 Terrace Way

Laguna Beach, CA 92651

 September 19, 2012

Michelle Pilati, President

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

555 Capital Mall, Suite 525

Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Michelle:

Julie Adams had asked me to examine ICAS’ *Academic Literacy* document (2002) in light of the recent publication of “California’s Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts, Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects” (March 2012). She had forwarded a request that I examine the two documents and advise you and ICAS on whether the ICAS competency statement needs to be updated.

The simple answer is no.

Our ten-year old document is more thorough, more comprehensive, and more overtly theoretically based than the Department of Education Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Even the technology portion of *Academic Literacy*—the section most likely to be dated in some way—remains as true today as when the ICAS document was first published. Only the recent phenomenon of social media was not anticipated, though the remarks about on-line sources and publication would still apply, and comments about sensitivity to audience and presentation of self are equally applicable.

The ICAS document continues to be used. For example, Contra Costa Dept. of Education sites the ICAS publication in its clear explanation of what is needed to prepare high school students for entry into universities or the workplace. Sadly, many of the key recommendations they noted—and that ICAS recommended—are still not addressed in the newly published standards. UCI also uses the document in outreach between its Writing Program and regional high school English teachers.

I’m attaching two documents: (1) a brief summary of significant differences between their document and ours (if I can still claim some membership); and (2) a longer crosswalk table to demonstrate that ideas discussed in the CCSS are covered in the ICAS document written ten years ago. A word about the table: I did not include every mention of every concept to be found in the ICAS document; these are only representative passages and any errors in the table are mine alone. Should ICAS decide to undertake a revision of its publication or supplement it in some way, the table might prove to be a time-saving mechanism. It might also serve intersegmental faculty serving on the DoE’s Implementation Phase Committee. I hope representatives of the three segments are familiar with the ICAS document.

What recommendations for ICAS action do I have?

1. The Survey we administered when we wrote the document could productively be readministered to UC, CSU, and CCC faculty during the active portion of the academic year (i.e., not during vacations or breaks) to determine any shifts in attitudes. The survey was maintained by the University of California, Irvine, and was an on-line, radio-button survey that could be sent broadly; I believe UCI is still in possession of it and the original data. I’ve been told that the UC Office of the President may have funds for such an activity designed to further the clear articulation of standards and expectations between K-12 and post-secondary institutions. Other funds should be sought to conduct a new survey, if such funds are not forthcoming from our fiscally-challenged systems’ offices.
2. At some time soon, pending any revision or addition to the original document, republish the document in its entirety. While groups continue to download and duplicate this document, it still deserves wider dissemination in a professional format.

I’m happy to answer any questions that ICAS may have, or to clarify any of my observations that follow. Thank you for this opportunity to comment, Michelle; frankly, ICAS was years ahead of its time by supporting this document, lo those many years ago!

Cordially,



Professor Emerita

Department of English

Irvine Valley College

Past President, Academic Senate

 for California Community Colleges