



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

ICAS MEETING & LEGISLATIVE DAY

Monday, April 26, 2010

9:30 am – 5:10 pm

State Capitol, Committee Room 115

Action	Item	Enclosures
Information 9:30-9:35	I. Chair’s Welcome & Announcements ▪ Chair Henry Powell, UC Senate and ICAS Chair	
Action 9:35-9:40	II. Consent Calendar A. Approve the Agenda B. Approve February 4, 2010 Meeting Notes C. Approve letter transmitting Math Competencies Statement	Encl. 1 (p. 5-10) Encl. 2 (p. 11)
Information Discussion 9:40-10:05	III. Common General Education Curriculum ▪ Richard Mahon, CCC Curriculum Chair Chair Powell asked the IGETC Standards Review Committee to discuss the implications of whether the segments should establish a common transfer General Education Curriculum, and how to resolve the lack of alignment between IGETC and CSU’s General Education Breadth. ➤ See also, as a resource, report of the 2007 UC Commission on General Education	Encl. 3 (p. 12) Encl. 4 (p. 13-15)
Information Discussion 10:05-10:15	IV. Early Assessment Program ▪ John Tarjan, CSU Senate Chair Endorse the draft ICAS Position on the Early Assessment Program, which expresses concern about using the EAP as an indicator of college level readiness for all segments of higher education in California.	Encl. 5 (p. 16-17)

Information Discussion
10:15-10:30

- V. **Preparation for Legislative Visitors**
- **Henry Powell, UC Senate and ICAS Chair**

Members will discuss the most important messages to convey to the visiting legislators, and to the staff of the Legislative Analysts' Office.

Information Discussion
10:30-noon

- VI. **Legislative Analyst's Office**
- **Steve Boilard, Director, Higher Education**— Mr. Boilard focuses on UC, Master Plan, accountability.
 - **Judy Heiman, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst.** Areas: CSU, faculty compensation, K-14 outreach, marginal cost funding and student financial aid.
 - **Paul Steenhausen, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst.** Areas: CCC, CPEC, transfer issues, nursing programs and workforce development.
 - **Mark Whitaker, Fiscal and Policy Analyst.** Areas: capital outlays, enrollment projections and long-term planning.

For recent LAO publications click [here](#).

Information Discussion
12:00-12:25

- VII. **Rosalind Escobar, Staff to Senator Gloria Romero (D-Los Angeles)**
- Key Committee Memberships:* Education (Chair); Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee on Education (Chair)
- Education:* AA, Barstow Community College; BA, CSU-Long Beach; MA/Ph.D., UC Riverside
- Other:* Former member of LA community College Board of Trustees; taught at CSU-Los Angeles

Lunch
12:30-1:25

- VIII. **Working Lunch—**
- A) **Reports from Senate Chairs**
- **Jane Patton, President, CCC Academic Senate**
 - **John Tarjan, Chair, CSU Academic Senate**
 - **Harry Powell, Chair, UC Academic Senate**
- B) **Update on the Master Plan for Health Sciences Subcommittee**
- **Dan Simmons, UC Senate Vice Chair**

- Information Discussion 1:30-1:55**
- IX. Deputy Secretary of Education Anne McKinney**
Experience: Former Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Federal Governmental Relations at the Chancellor’s Office for California Community Colleges; Assistant Secretary for Higher Education; Deputy Director of the Federal Department of Education Region IX Office; 15 years of service as education advisor in the California Senate and Assembly; Governor George Deukmejian as Assistant Education Advisor.
Education: BA, Mary Hardin-Baylor University; MA, CSU-Sacramento
- Information Discussion 2:00-2:25**
- X. Ivan Carrillo, Staff to Assemblymember Manuel Perez (D – El Centro/Palm Springs)**
Key Committee Memberships: Jobs, Economic Development and the Economy (Chair); Aging and Long-term Care; Administration and Administrative Review; Health; Select Committee on Career Technical Education and Workforce Development
Education: BA, UC Riverside; M.Ed, Harvard
Other: Former teacher and member, Coachella Valley Unified School District Board, and community health director
- Information Discussion 2:25-2:55**
- XI. Assemblymember Ira Ruskin (D – Silicon Valley)**
Key Committee Memberships: Budget Subcommittee on Resources (Chair); Budget; Higher Education; Business and Professions; Joint Committee on the Master Plan
Education: BA, UC Berkeley; MA, Stanford
- Information Discussion 3:00-3:25**
- XII. Assemblymember Marty Block (D – San Diego) and Staff Member Kevin Powers**
Key Committee Membership: Higher Education (Chair); Jobs, Economic Development and the Economy; Accountability and Administrative Review; Select Committee on K-16 Articulation, Access and Affordability; Joint Committee on the Master Plan; Select Committee on Community Colleges; Select Committee on Career Technical Education and Workforce Development
Education: BA, Indiana University; JD, DePaul University
Other: Block is a former dean and retired professor from San Diego State University, former member of the San Diego Community College District Board of Trustees, and former member of the San Diego County Board of Education.

ICAS Meeting Notes

February 4, 2010
CCC Offices
555 Capitol Mall, Sacramento

Members present. CSU: John Tarjan, Bernadette Cheyne, Diana Guerin, Barbara Swerkes, Catherine Nelson. CCC: Jane Patton, Richard Mahon, Michelle Pilati, Beth Smith.
UC: Henry Powell, Dan Simmons, Keith Williams, Bill Jacobs (alternate for Sylvia Hurtado).

Staff present. CCC: Julie Adams. UC: Martha Winnacker, Clare Sheridan.

Absent. UC: Jonathan Alexander, Sylvia Hurtado

Guests. Steve Juarez, UC Associate Vice President and Director of State Governmental Relations; Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, CSU Assistant Vice Chancellor for Governmental Affairs; Marlene Garcia, CCC Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations; Jesse Cheng, UC Regent-designate; Reid Milburn, President, Student Senate for California Community Colleges

I. Chair's Welcome and Announcements

Chair Powell welcomed ICAS members and reviewed the agenda. He reported that he made a presentation at a hearing on February 2 of the state legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan. Student leaders also spoke at the hearing and it was important that everyone echoed the same message—that the state is losing its educational primacy and must pay attention to the needs of students. The single biggest concern is that due to CSU's enrollment restrictions students who would have been admitted to the CSUs are now going to the CCCs, resulting in further pressure on under-served populations. Chair Powell reported that Academic Senate and student leaders from the three segments met yesterday with legislators and their staffs. Finally, he noted that UC has concerns about recent reports from the LAO critiquing a lack of coordination among the segments. On the contrary, ICAS represents three decades of coordination and through ICAS, faculty have solved intersegmental problems and has produced IGETC, ASSIST and the competency statements. President Patton stated that Assemblyman Ruskin understands the challenges facing higher education and that he listens. She expressed concern that a legislator suggested that the CCCs should confer baccalaureate degree and that ICAS may want to take a position stating that we should not change the mission of the CCCs or the tri-partite mission of public higher education as outlined in the Master Plan. She noted that the meetings with legislators presented an opportunity for real dialogue and the ability to answer questions, rather than just recite talking points. She suggested that it might be a good idea to have a forum with legislative staff to counter the claims made in research studies by Nancy Shulock and Mary Gill. Chair Tarjan noted that upper division courses offered are more expensive than lower division courses, so it would be unlikely that the CCC could offer such courses at a lower cost.

II. Consent Calendar.

1. Approval of the agenda. The agenda was approved.
2. Approval of the December 4, 2009 Meeting Notes. The Notes were approved.

III. Advocacy Discussion with State Governmental Relations Staff

- Steve Juarez, UC Associate Vice President and Director of State Governmental Relations
- Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, CSU Assistant Vice Chancellor for Governmental Affairs
- Marlene Garcia, CCC Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations

Marlene Garcia, CCC Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations, noted that it has not been common for faculty to join together, so intersegmental advocacy is particularly effective. She stated that a crisis also is an opportunity. She believes that the universities have sent a message that higher education matters and pointed to the governor's budget proposal, which provides more funding to education than to other sectors. At the national level, President Obama has made college graduation a priority and has linked it to economic recovery. Turning to advocacy, she emphasized that it is vital to know your audience and to tailor your message. She cautioned faculty not to oppose an idea because it may set a precedent. While we must adhere to core principles, we also must be perceived as being responsive and reasonable. Lately, she has been fielding questions from legislators on easing transfer. Finally she encouraged local advocacy efforts, since legislators are responsive to their communities.

Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, CSU Assistant Vice Chancellor for Governmental Affairs, began by noting that joint advocacy has been very effective. She said we must find a way to hold legislators accountable to their local communities. However, she emphasized that lobbying legislators in Sacramento is only one segment of an advocacy effort; we must also reach out to communities and voters to convince them of the value that higher education provides to the state. The public generally views higher education as a personal benefit, not as a public good or as a right, like K-12 education. She urged faculty to participate in advocacy efforts at the district level along with students, parents and staff. Second, have a clear objective and common message emphasizing two or three core issues and do not deviate from it; do not get distracted by new issues introduced by legislators. Even legislators who are supportive of education may vote to cut education because the alternative is to cut CalWorks, Healthy Families, and other social safety net programs. She observed that legislators understand issues relating to access and affordability, but the budget solutions that they favor impinge upon quality. The Academic Senates can help them understand the critical role of quality at our universities. She advised following up with information if asked a question at a meeting, and also holding them accountable for their decisions. If they say they will vote in favor of something and do not do so, call them and ask why. They will know you are paying attention.

Steve Juarez, UC Associate Vice President and Director of State Governmental Relations, noted that a budget deficit of \$60-70 million remains in this fiscal year, so the solutions to this year's budget gap will be an indication of prospects for next year. He stated that on April 27 there will be an Intersegmental Advocacy Day on which all stakeholders will be invited to come to Sacramento to support higher education. We will emphasize higher education's contributions to the economy and urge legislators to keep faith with the governor's State of the State address. He also observed that legislators "live by anecdote" and perceive textbook affordability as a real problem. He asked if ICAS can take leadership on this issue. He also noted the need to educate legislators about what we are doing to encourage transfer and what it will take to make a more effective transfer system.

IV. Advocacy Coordination & Planning with Student Representatives

- **Jesse Cheng, UC Regent-Designate**
- **Reid Milburn, President, Student Senate for CA Community Colleges**

Reid Milburn, President of the Student Senate for California Community Colleges (SSCCC), reported that her organization represents nearly 3 million students at 110 different colleges through 30 senators. The organization is all-volunteer, with no paid staff, but it receives funding from the Chancellor's office. While they have few resources, they do have people power. It has organized a "March in March" on March 22 in partnership, for the first time, with the CSU student association and is organizing several "Follow-up Fridays" on which students will lobby their local legislators. They plan to make an effort to keep students engaged during the summer when the budget decisions are made. SSCCC also has organized a cadre of students to issue "rapid response" emails to flood the Capitol. The SSCCC's Capitol Response Team wears blue ribbons on their lapels to signify their support for the CCCs. It is an inexpensive, easy way to identify themselves as community college students. They also plan to participate in the intersegmental lobbying effort on April 27. She reported that for the first time in six years, a student appointed by the governor will sit on the CCC's Board of Governors.

Jesse Cheng, the UC Regent-designate, who in the past has been part of the UC Student Association (UCSA), pointed to several efforts to better engage students and the public in the campaign for funding higher education. For example, CalPIRG will launch a campaign, "What's Your Plan?" which will ask gubernatorial candidates to answer the question: What's your plan for higher education? The student Democrats are asking candidates to pledge funding for higher education. UCSA plans to conduct a voter registration drive on campuses; in 2008 they registered 42,000 students. Students also plan to visit every legislator on March 1.

V. Master Plan for the Health Sciences

- **Dan Simmons, UC Academic Senate Vice Chair**

UC Vice Chair Dan Simmons stated that ICAS could play a key role in exploring the notion of a Master Plan for Health Sciences. He suggested that a faculty-led effort to look at state workforce needs in the health sciences and to catalogue programs that already are offered could be a valuable starting point. UC did a study of workforce needs in the health sciences and enrollment planning within UC a few years ago. This also would be a way to resolve questions intersegmentally about applied degrees in the health sciences area, including applied doctorates. He suggested forming a subcommittee of two faculty members from each segment with interest and expertise in health education. When appropriate, the committee could be expanded to include senior administrators in health education. Members spoke in support of the idea, stating that it would be a good role for ICAS, and suggested that if the approach works, it could be used as a model for Master Plans in other professional programs such as education. A member expressed concern that it would be a large project and inquired whether ICAS could join other initiatives in place to insert the faculty voice. A member noted that the effort could also facilitate course coordination across the segments.

ACTION: ICAS unanimously endorsed establishing a task force to explore the possibility of forming a faculty-led effort to write a Master Plan for the Health Sciences, with Dan Simons serving as chair.

VI. Reports from Senate Chairs

- **Jane Patton, President, Academic Senate, CCC**
- **John Tarjan, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU**
- **Henry Powell, Chair, Academic Senate UC**

Jane Patton, President of the CCC Academic Senate

President Patton reported that enrollment continues to be a challenge for the CCC. While the system does not restrict access, it has curtailed enrollment by slashing sections and cancelling summer sessions. She stated that educating transfer students is not its only mission; it also provides career technical education, Associate degrees and certificates, and adult education. Following up on her report at the last ICAS meeting, Patton reported that the CCC is making progress on establishing a system to ensure that students are prepared for courses with the appropriate pre-requisites. The Chancellor's office secured a grant for exploring common placement assessments instruments; currently each college chooses its own assessment and if students move to another college, they have to take another assessment. Finally, she reported that the CCC Senate's plenary session will be held on April 15 and 16.

John Tarjan, Chair of the CSU Academic Senate,

Chair Tarjan reported that CSU changed its residency requirements to be in alignment with UC's. CSU also is challenged by capacity and enrollment management. He summarized the Early Start program, whose goal is to ensure that students are proficient before entering. Students who are not will be required to take coursework the summer prior to enrollment. CSU also is spearheading an effort to improve graduation rates. Presidents have been given the authority to initiate graduation if a student has completed all of the requirements. Every campus must improve its graduation rate by 6 basis percentage points, even if they already are in the top quartile. One aim is to close the achievement gap. On the budget, he reported that layoff notices went out, even to tenured faculty, and that he expects another 10% fee increase. Tarjan announced that the CSU Senate passed a resolution approving the C-ID project. He noted that the position of faculty trustee remains vacant; the governor has not made an appointment. Finally, he stated that the Compass Project, which supports learning communities, internships, peer mentoring, and faculty-student collaboration on research, is seeking additional support to broaden to more campuses and cooperate with the CCCs.

Henry Powell, Chair of the UC Academic Senate,

Chair Powell reported that UC is continuing to get pressure from advocacy groups regarding its new eligibility policy. He reported on the meetings and process of the UC Commission on the Future. The first round of recommendations of its Working Groups will be released in March. He also noted that several recent reports from the Legislative Analyst's Office have been critical of intersegmental cooperation and encouraged ICAS to develop a response to the LAO. He suggested that ICAS invite the LAO staff to attend a future ICAS meeting. Chair Patton suggested developing a one-pager to highlight ICAS products.

VIII. Briefing Papers on Issues in California Public Higher Education

- **Richard Mahon, CCC Academic Senate and CCC Curriculum Chair**

Richard Mahon stated that the aim of the briefing papers is to highlight ICAS' accomplishments and that the papers need a common structure and format. Members suggested developing a briefing aimed at more knowledgeable audiences; developing ones on intersegmental transfer and major preparation; adding a section on what remains to be done; noting if resources are needed (e.g., to upgrade ASSIST); listing the accountability efforts we already do (e.g., Voluntary Student Accountability system, program review, accreditation); listing university responses to legislation; and writing an FAQ explaining why seemingly simple solutions would not work, e.g., why can't you all teach the same curriculum? The group agreed that each briefing should begin by contextualizing the topic, stating why we are writing about it. Through a series of bullet points (using links for further information, when appropriate), it should focus on things that already work, and then outline what remains to be done and what help we will need to accomplish the goals. Bernadette Cheyne (CSU) volunteered to write a briefing on Standardization. Briefings should be developed on access, capacity, and learning assessment.

IX. Transfer Issues

A. Common General Education Curriculum

- **Jane Patton, CCC Academic Senate President**
- **Keith Williams, UC Academic Senate and UCEP Chair**

Keith Williams reported that Sue Wilbur, Director of Admissions at UC, and Ken O'Donnell, Associate Dean of Academic Program Planning at CSU, are interested in revisiting the topic of having one general education curriculum rather than two (IGETC for UC and GE Breadth for CSU). He stated that given the pressures for standardization and for simplifying transfer, ICAS should address this topic. The two administrators identified six areas where there are discrepancies. A member noted that a Task Force recently examined this idea, and while the faculty were amenable to the idea, the systemwide administrations were not in favor of it. Members agreed to address this issue in more depth at the next ICAS meeting.

B. C-ID & LDTP Updates

- **Michelle Pilati, CCC Academic Senate Vice President**
- **Barbara Swerkes, CSU Member-at-Large**

Michelle Pilati reported that the C-ID committee has finalized descriptors for agriculture. They are currently reviewing courses in Accounting, Communications Studies, History and Sociology. They also are improving the technology used to facilitate the process of reviewing course outlines. Only CCC and CSU faculty are providing input; they hope to get UC faculty approval but do not want to delay the project. The C-ID committee is seeking endorsement by all three segments and by ICAS. Pilati stated that the legislature is requesting intersegmental coordination to facilitate transfer. C-ID offers a way to accomplish this with faculty control over the process.

Barbara Swerkes stated that the CSU Senate passed a resolution urging faculty to participate actively in C-ID descriptor development and review. Any faculty member may comment on the descriptors on the website. LDTP is maintaining ten high-demand disciplines where there is comparability in program requirements and may add five additional disciplines. LDTP sends a message to students about what courses count for graduation. It aims to reduce the number of

super-seniors. She stated that faculty should continue to accept LDTP agreements through summer 2012. By fall 2012, all LDTP courses should all have C-ID numbers.

C. ASSIST Update

- **Jeff Spano, Chair, ASSIST Executive Management Oversight Committee (via email)**

The ASSIST team has been working to fill the program manager position vacated in July 2008, and is moving forward on ASSIST Project Next Generation, which is a major update of the ASSIST software application and database. The program manager positions should be filled by March. The Executive Management Oversight Committee is developing an RFP to hire a vendor to do the software update, and it recruited a contractor to lead the RFP development process. The draft RFP is planned for early fall, followed by publication and vendor response evaluation by the end of the year. The project design phase will be in 2011.

X. Advocacy Brochures

- **Beth Smith, CCC Treasurer**

Beth Smith noted that while ICAS requested two brochures aimed at different audiences, the subcommittee opted to produce one that is usable by all constituencies. ICAS members made suggestions regarding the brochure. Julie Adams volunteered to investigate pricing for printing.

XI. New Business—Science Competency Statement

- **Bill Jacobs, UC Vice Chair of BOARS**

Bill Jacobs stated that the Science competencies have not been revised since 1986 and are in dire need of updating; they include nothing on earth, environmental and space sciences or computer science. Furthermore, the Department of Education asked us to revise the natural sciences standards. Jacobs volunteered to develop a recommendation for the composition of the group, including representatives from high schools and the California Department of Education. He will follow the model of the math competency standards, but the committee necessarily will be larger. Julie Adams volunteered to investigate grant funding from the Chancellors' offices for this effort. Richard Mahon asked whether it is time to develop an ICAS competency statement on writing and communications skills.



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

April 26, 2010

Dear Colleagues:

We are pleased to transmit to you the *2009 Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students*. This document is the result of a remarkable collaboration among secondary mathematics teachers and college and university faculty. It has benefited from many comments and suggestions from people throughout California who responded to the review. It updates and replaces the previous competency statement produced in 1997. The document provides a clear statement of expectations that faculty have for the mathematical ability of students entering college in order to be successful.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), representing the academic senates of the three segments of California's higher education system, sponsored the efforts that produced this document. The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California all have endorsed this document and offer it as their official recommendation on math preparation to the K-12 sector, to students and their parents, to teachers and administrators, and to public policy makers.

Please share this statement with your colleagues, distribute it widely, or refer interested parties to the ICAS website to download the document: <http://icas-ca.org/>.

Sincerely,

Jane Patton, President
CCC Academic Senate

John Tarjan, Chair
CSU Academic Senate

Henry Powell, Chair
UC Academic Senate



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

March 3, 2010

Richard Mahon
CCC Curriculum Chair
Professor of Humanities
Riverside City College
4800 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside, CA 92506

Dear Richard:

As you know, the question about whether or not the segments could (or should) have one common transfer GE has been raised again.

The ICAS segment chairs spoke and determined that before we bring the item to ICAS (potentially in April), it would help if the IGETC Standards Review Committee had a preliminary conversation, and a summary of your discussions were provided to ICAS. Some members have not had much experience with IGETC or CSU GE.

Some things you might discuss include (but are not limited to) are listed below:

1. What are the issues that would need to be considered?
2. What is the status of GE---both IGETC and CSU GE?
3. What is working or not working well for students?
4. Should ICAS support a consideration of further alignment?
5. If so, what next steps does your committee recommend to ICAS?

We request that your committee prepare an informal briefing and an outline document to help us be better prepared for a conversation at ICAS. Would your committee be willing to accept this charge and would you be willing to provide us with a briefing? Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Henry C. Powell', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Henry C. Powell
Chair, ICAS and UC Academic Senate



**Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS):
Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)
Standards Committee**

Monday, March 15, 2009 11-1 • **Un**approved Minutes

Members present: Thea Labrenz, Richard Mahon (chair), Ken O'Donnell, Estela Narrie, Harry Powell, Bob Quinn, Dawn Sheibani, John Tarjan

Member unavailable: Janet Rizzoli

The meeting began at 11:05

- I. The agenda was approved by consensus
- II. The minutes of Nov. 24, 2009 were approved by consensus
- III. **Ongoing issues:**

The committee reviewed and approved language regarding the following topics for inclusion in the next edition of the *IGETC Standards*:

- Add a section around a new area 1.5 that *defines IGETC* and describes all the areas in a single list
- Clarify credit-by-exam section to *exclude* ACT and SAT II tests
- Fix the erroneous reference to CSU Executive Order #595 (*now #1033*)
- Add language regarding Defense Language Institute courses to clear *Language other than English*

Thea wondered about the use of Defense Language Institute courses for CSU GE; Ken indicated he would check with CSU AOs and report back to Thea.

The following two items were discussed by ICAS at its Dec. 4, 2009 meeting and the IGETC Standards committee was encouraged to draft and return language for ICAS review and approval:

- Combining 3-unit quarter sequential courses in written communication. Estela & Ken agreed to draft language on this topic; members discussed and agreed it would be desirable for language permitting the combining of *mathematics* classes *as well*, which ICAS might additionally choose to approve.

- Liberalize pass-along to match GE Breadth. CSU Executive Order 1033 already includes language granting more authority to CCCs than *IGETC* permits; Ken will edit the CSU language for inclusion in *IGETC Standards* and forward to Estela for inclusion in the next version of the *Standards* to be reviewed by the committee.

IV. New issues:

1. **Common GE:** Members discussed the feasibility of working toward “one common transfer GE” pattern, as requested by ICAS chair (and committee member), Harry Powell. One member noted that the three segments *already* have a common GE pattern (IGETC) and that more confusion would be created by seeking to more closely align IGETC and CSU GE. Particular challenges would likely arise in (1) minimum GPA requirements, (2) addressing Language-other-than-English and Oral Communication requirements, and (3) increased CCC workload should the UC version of critical thinking/composition become the intersegmental standard/requirement.

Members agreed that achieving more consistency in the assignment of courses to the IGETC categories would be useful, with humanities and arts being an area where different reviewers sometimes assign courses differently.

Ken pointed out that there is a statewide articulation conference in San Diego, April 22-23, where it would be possible to informally poll articulation officers regarding their view of the issue. The committee agreed to hold a very short meeting on Saturday, April 24 at 9:00am to discuss the reaction of articulation officers to inform discussion at ICAS on Monday, April 26. (Harry pointed out that the April 26 agenda will be tricky given its proximity to (1) ICAS leg day, (2) groundbreaking for a new community college center on the UC Davis campus, and both (3) UC lobby day *and* (4) the 50th anniversary of the Master Plan on April 27. Should ICAS think the issue should go forward, committee members agreed ICAS should appoint an intersegmental faculty group to further explore the issue.

2. **Common Major Messaging:** Members discussed the possibility of recommending to ICAS a project based on researching and messaging common major requirements. Based on aspects of both *UC Streamlining* and *LDTP*, the project would research the *existing* degree of overlap in the major requirements of the most common majors in both CSU and UC. Estela indicated that the results of UC Streamlining have been very helpful on her campus (Santa Monica) though Thea noted the project has not been as relevant at her more rural campus (Cuesta, San Luis Obispo). *UC Streamlining* cost UC about \$2 million and took two years to implement; building on UC’s work in process and workflow might mean an additional year to extend the project to CSU. Because of the cost attached, any progress on this project would take place after

exploration of common transfer GE pattern. Members agreed that the *UC Streamlining* project seems not to be well known outside the group that developed it and counselors and that it should be highlighted to policymakers who see modest evidence of intersegmental cooperation or effort to make transfer easier for students.

3. Ken noted that the **College board Calculus** test includes a *subscore* that needs to be acknowledged in the IGETC Standards and he volunteered to draft language and forward to Estela.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

ICAS Position on The Early Assessment Program

The Inter-segmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) represents the faculty in higher education across California. Positions of support or concern on issues of mutual interest in areas of faculty purview, primarily curriculum, educational programs and student success, are issued to the Legislature, administrators and other educational partners when appropriate. The CSU Early Assessment Program (EAP) has received widespread attention as an “early indicator” program for high school students about their preparedness for college level work in English and Mathematics. ICAS expresses both its support for and concerns with the EAP as a state-wide indicator of skills and knowledge necessary for enrolling in non-remedial credit-bearing baccalaureate-level courses in California’s postsecondary institutions. First, ICAS recognizes and applauds the efforts of CSU in developing the concept of EAP as an early messaging tool for 11th grade students’ preparation in mathematics and English, the subsequent development of curriculum for 12th grade students, and especially the resulting collaboration between K-12 and higher education. Secondly, however, ICAS has serious concerns about the EAP and its current evolution, specifically proposals to use the EAP as an indicator of college level readiness for all segments of higher education in California. ICAS’ particular concerns include:

- The California Diploma Project is currently suggesting use of EAP beyond the originally intended use of the test and its messages to students. It was not developed as an accountability measure but has now been proposed to be used as one. It is also being recommended for use to replace the CBEST which is inappropriate for students preparing to become teachers.
- Over reliance on a single indicator for messages about college readiness is problematic for student success at any postsecondary institution of higher education.
- “College readiness” in English and mathematics has been defined by higher education faculty through the ICAS Competency Statements, but these statements were not used to determine a student’s required body of knowledge prior to entering college. High school exit standards in these subjects were used instead. A broader definition of college readiness has not been agreed to by all segments of higher education through the standard processes used by Academic Senates where all significant factors that contribute to a student’s understanding of college readiness are addressed.
- The assessment of EAP success is not yet published or available in order to make a recommendation for expanded use of the test and program.
- Evaluation by Achieve and others indicate potential problems with the exams that need to be addressed.
- Remediation efforts in 12th grade are too late for many English students and much too late for mathematics students resulting in fewer student choices when continuing an education in college.

There are growing bodies of evidence that pinpoint problems related to college readiness, demonstrate the failings of California's current standards-based approaches, as well as the disparate impact that California's educational strategies have on low-income and underrepresented minority students. ICAS supports policy leaders who want to increase student success in high school as well as postsecondary education and who rely on the expertise and authority of the state's Academic Senates in higher education to set standards for college admission and success. Recommendations for solutions and responses to the concerns listed above can be developed by ICAS in concert with CSU, as the parent of EAP, and other partners in the state. ICAS stands ready to support a renewed effort to support college and career readiness for all of California's students and help mitigate problems with the current trajectory for EAP.

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2937-10/AA/FGA (Rev)
March 11, 2010

**Opposition to AB 440, as amended (July 4, 2009), Beall - California
Community Colleges: student transfer**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) find that the modification of AB440 to require 18 units (27 quarter units) of “coursework in the major or an area of emphasis” could induce many community college students to take extra lower division units that will not count towards their chosen major after transfer to a CSU campus; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU cannot support AB440 in its current form as a result of this modification; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Office of the Honorable Jim Beall, Jr. (California State Assembly); to the Board of Trustees, to Assistant Vice-Chancellor Zamarripa, to the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates, and to Executive Vice Chancellor Echeverria (CSU).

RATIONALE: AB 440 seeks to ensure that Community College Districts have the ability to offer degrees designed to facilitate expedient transfer. AB 440 does not require districts to offer these “for transfer” degrees nor does it require local CSU campuses to accept all such graduates – although it is noted that such programs could very effectively be used with transfer admission guarantees as negotiated with local campuses. The original impetus for the bill was to facilitate transfer; the addition of the stipulation that there be 18 units in the major or an area of emphasis requirement voids the gains inherent in the original bill.

Approved Unanimously – March 10-11, 2010

AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 2, 2009
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 27, 2009
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 16, 2009
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2009—10 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 440

Introduced by Assembly Member Beall
(Principal coauthor: Senator Padilla)
**(Coauthors: Assembly Members Block, Chesbro, Coto, De Leon,
and Fong Eng, Fong, Swanson, and Torrico)**

February 24, 2009

An act to add Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to community colleges.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 440, as amended, Beall. California Community Colleges: student transfer.

Existing law establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. These segments include the California State University, the campuses of which are administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, which is administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, which are administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Existing law establishes community college districts throughout the state, and authorizes them to provide instruction to students at community college campuses.

Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, authorizes the community colleges to grant associate in arts and associate in science degrees. The act also requires the regents, the trustees, and the board of governors to have as a fundamental policy the maintenance of a healthy and expanded program to increase the number of transfer students from community colleges.

This bill would enact the ~~College Student Success~~ *Associate Degree and Recognition of Student Transfer Preparation Act*, which would authorize a community college ~~district~~ to grant an associate ~~in arts~~ degree in ~~transfer studies or an equivalent program~~ *the student's field of study, that is designated as being "for transfer,"* to a student ~~meeting specified requirements~~ *who completes 60 transferable semester units or 27 quarter units, as specified, and meets the minimum requirements for transfer to a public university or alternative path to transfer program. The bill would prohibit a community college district from imposing any requirements, in addition to these requirements, for the granting of an associate degree with the "for transfer" designation.*

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.
 State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the
- 2 following:
- 3 (a) Since the enactment of the Master Plan for Higher Education
- 4 in 1960, preparing students to transfer to a four-year university
- 5 has been a core function of the California Community Colleges.
- 6 (b) Successful progression from lower division coursework to
- 7 degree completion is a basic principle of California higher
- 8 education and is critical to the future of the state's economy.
- 9 (c) Currently, the coursework necessary to transfer to a campus
- 10 of the California State University or the University of California
- 11 differs from the coursework needed to earn an associate degree.
- 12 As a result, many transfer students leave the community college
- 13 system having completed transfer requirements, but are unable to
- 14 participate in community college graduation ceremonies, do not
- 15 have a degree to show for their work, and are ineligible for some
- 16 awards and scholarships because they did not fulfill current
- 17 requirements for an associate degree.

1 (d) Today, one in every four jobs requires an associate degree
2 or higher. In the near future, one in every three jobs will require
3 an associate degree or higher.

4 (e) The community college system allows the state to address
5 the serious shortage of educated workers.

6 (f) To meet workforce demands in a cost-effective way, ~~a~~
7 ~~transfer studies associate degree program provides increased~~
8 ~~educational opportunities for Californians throughout the state~~
9 ~~who might not otherwise earn a baccalaureate degree because of~~
10 ~~interruptions in their education. incentivizing students to earn an~~
11 ~~associate degree while preparing for transfer to a four-year college~~
12 ~~or university, and recognizing that they have completed a transfer~~
13 ~~preparation course pattern, provides students encouragement and~~
14 ~~support to complete their overall educational pursuits.~~

15 ~~(g) In the current difficult fiscal times, increasing student success~~
16 ~~will have long-term benefits for California's economy.~~

17 ~~(h) A transfer studies associate degree program is a manageable~~
18 ~~reform in an otherwise bleak economic climate.~~

19 SEC. 2. Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) is added
20 to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education
21 Code, to read:

22
23 Article 3. ~~Transfer Studies Program~~ *Associate Degree and*
24 *Recognition of Student Transfer Preparation*
25

26 66745. ~~This act~~ *(a) This article shall be known, and may be*
27 *cited, as the* ~~College Student Success Act.~~ *Community College*
28 *Associate Degree and Recognition of Student Transfer Preparation*
29 *Act.*

30 *(b) It is the intent of the Legislature that, whenever possible, a*
31 *community college shall consider the requirements for transfer as*
32 *it develops associate degree requirements and encourages students*
33 *to take courses that simultaneously meet both of the requirements*
34 *of Section 66746.*

35 66746. A community college ~~district~~ may grant an associate
36 ~~in arts degree in transfer studies or an associate in arts degree in~~
37 ~~an equivalent program to a student meeting both of the following~~
38 ~~requirements:~~

39 ~~(a) Completes a minimum of 60 semester units.~~

1 ~~(b) Meets the minimum requirements for transfer to a campus~~
 2 ~~of the California State University or the University of California.~~
 3 *degree, in the student’s field of study, on which is designated that*
 4 *it is “for transfer,” to a student who meets both of the following*
 5 *requirements:*

6 *(a) Completes a minimum of 60 transferable semester units or*
 7 *90 quarter units, 18 semester units or 27 quarter units of which*
 8 *shall comprise coursework in a major or an area of emphasis, as*
 9 *determined by the college.*

10 *(b) Meets the minimum requirements for transfer in an approved*
 11 *transfer core curriculum program, approved transfer agreement*
 12 *program, or dual admission program, implemented pursuant to*
 13 *Chapter 9.2 (commencing with Section 66720) of Part 40 of Title*
 14 *3 or meets the requirements of an alternative path to transfer*
 15 *program, including, but not limited to, the Intersegmental General*
 16 *Education Transfer Curriculum or the California State University*
 17 *General Education Breadth Requirements.*

18 *66747. If a community college provides a degree with the “for*
 19 *transfer” designation as provided for in Section 66746, the college*
 20 *shall not impose any requirements in addition to the requirements*
 21 *of Section 66746, including any local college or district*
 22 *requirements.*

23 ~~66747.~~

24 *66748. (a) A degree granted pursuant to this article shall*
 25 *recognize reflect the completion of lower division general*
 26 *education requirements.*

27 ~~(b) A degree granted~~ *The granting of a degree pursuant to this*
 28 *article does not guarantee admission to any institution.*

O

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Henry C. Powell
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: henry.powell@ucop.edu

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

March 18, 2010

**ED STEWART
ISSUES MANAGEMENT POLICY ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: AB 2400

Dear Ed:

The Academic Senate urges the University to strongly oppose AB 2400, which would, if enacted, authorize the Grossmont-Cuyamaca, San Diego, and San Mateo County Community College Districts to establish baccalaureate degree pilot programs. Although the Senate can appreciate the perceived economic need to allow certain community colleges to grant baccalaureate degrees at seemingly lower costs to students, it objects to this proposal primarily on the basis that it would violate the fundamental principles of California's Master Plan for Higher Education, as well as from a cost/resource, quality of instruction, and segmental coordination perspective.

History has shown that the rationale behind the Master Plan, that California's three higher education segments be divided by purpose, function, and resource allocation, to be solid and sound. Indeed, it has provided the state a number of benefits—both in terms of the quality of education provided to California's students, as well as cost savings. The Master Plan designates the following missions for the different segments: The University of California is California's primary academic research institution, and provides undergraduate, graduate and professional education for the state; the California State University (CSU) specializes in undergraduate education and graduate education through the master's degree, including teacher education; and the CCCs primarily provide the academic and vocational instruction for older and younger students through the first two years of undergraduate education (lower division), with a specific emphasis on transfer to UC or the CSU. Such a division has allowed each higher education segment to concentrate on what it does best, and has allowed the state to appropriately fund each segment per its respective missions.

In our view, this bill is predicated on the perception that CCCs can provide a low-cost baccalaureate education to underserved populations in these hard economic times. While it may be true that community colleges have traditionally been well-positioned to provide the first two years of the undergraduate curriculum to individual transfer students, they are wholly lacking the resources to offer the full baccalaureate curriculum en masse, especially in these difficult budgetary times. The

University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) aptly points out that the CCCs will not be able deliver an upper division undergraduate experience without a significant amount of new facilities and expertise. It is highly misleading to apply their current cost-per-student credit hour to the cost of upper division courses that would be needed. Indeed, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) recently reported that by 2019, the demand for slots at the CCCs is expected to rise by 313,253 students. In addition CPEC noted that the 2009–10 budget does not provide proper enrollment growth funding for California’s community colleges—if the community college system finds it necessary to reduce enrollments by 4%, consistent with the 4% decline in overall funding, the number of prospective students not served could top 365,000 by fall 2010.¹ Adding four-year degree-seeking students to this mix would overburden community colleges to the breaking point. Students would not be able to get the classes that they need, which would inevitably lead to extended time-to-degree beyond four years. In our view, it is inappropriate and irresponsible for community colleges to significantly expand their mission for the foreseeable future, especially when they are not even meeting their primary responsibilities, as spelled out by the Master Plan. A far better solution would be to bolster the funding of already-existing UC and CSU campuses in these areas.

The Senate also objects to this bill from a quality of instruction point of view. It should not escape notice that not all instructors at the CCCs hold earned doctorates, which is the standard at both UC and CSU. Indeed, a significant number of instructors at community colleges only hold masters’ degrees, and are unable to deliver the full breadth of curriculum necessary for a quality undergraduate education. Therefore, transitioning to four-year degrees would require that participating community colleges hire new faculty with PhDs. Second, community colleges simply do not have the capital infrastructure necessary for these degrees, especially with regard to the type of buildings and equipment needed to offer science degrees, as well as sufficient library resources needed for all kinds of undergraduate degrees. A build-out of this kind of infrastructure would take years to complete, and cost the state a significant amount of money that it frankly does not have at this time. It would also duplicate what is already available on UC and CSU campuses.

Finally, at a time when the Legislative Analyst’s Office is issuing calls for better coordination among the segments, we find it odd that this bill undermines such intersegmental coordination. It is interesting that the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS), which has a 30-year track record of solid intersegmental coordination, has not been consulted in any meaningful way on this proposal. UCPB also notes that this proposal has not even been run by CPEC, which is well-positioned to conduct a preliminary analysis of such a proposal. In sum, this kind of legislative interference has the potential to pit campuses, segments, and even legislative districts, against one another.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this proposed legislation. If you have any questions regarding the Senate’s comments, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Henry C. Powell, Chair

¹ See [“Ready or Not, Here They Come: Community College Enrollment Demand Projections, 2009–2019”](#) by Stacy Wilson, Mallory Newell, and Ryan Fuller, CPEC, December 2009; and [“16% Rise in Undergrads on California’s State Campuses Predicted,”](#) Carla Rivera, LA Times, March 11, 2010.

Academic Council

Encl: 2

Copy: Academic Council

Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Steve Juarez, Associate Vice President & Director, State Governmental Relations

Jenny Kao, Executive Director, IMPAC

Academic Senate Positions on “*Transfer*” Degrees

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has held numerous discussions over the last several years about the meaning of our degrees and determined the following:

Earning a degree that is composed only of transfer requirements is really not what was intended by Title 5, which states that degrees must *not* be granted based on an accumulation of units such as those in the IGETC pattern or the CSU GE breadth requirements; but that instead there must be a concentrated focus in the form of a major or in an area of emphasis, which was the recent change in Title 5. (See resolution 13.02 Fall 2006)

The titles of degrees at some of our colleges have been misleading, suggesting to students that completion of a degree automatically qualifies a student for transfer – as is the case in some states. A degree entitled “Transfer” or “University Studies” does not come with any such guarantee. In actuality, transfer requirements are out of our control and frequently changed by the receiving institutions, so a degree which includes the word “transfer” is really a false promise to students, suggesting that by taking our programs, they will automatically be accepted at given institutions. Therefore we recommended that titles of degrees not include the word “transfer”. (Resolution 9.02 Fall 2006, reprinted below).

“Transfer” is something students do once they leave the colleges rather than something that happens when they are within our doors.

In fact, students may continue to do what they have always done: complete an associate’s degree **and/ or** prepare for transfer and they can accomplish both if they plan appropriately - to take the courses required by their college to earn a degree with either a major or an area of emphasis as well as complete the lower division requirements for the university to which they plan to transfer. The concept of an “area of emphasis” was recently added to permit colleges to develop an alternative to majors that is broader than traditional majors, allowing colleges to better meet the needs of their communities.

In general, ASCCC is committed to facilitating student transfer in a manner that is compliant with existing Title 5 language with respect to the degree (GE + major/area of emphasis), and also allowing for more local decisions regarding degrees.

The ASCCC Supports:

1. Helping students to transfer by providing clear information about transfer and degree requirements and not misleading them with our degree titles.
2. Providing degrees that are meaningful - that indicate an appropriate level of competency in English and math, as well as a more in depth knowledge in an area of study (what is commonly referred to as a "major", but which may be somewhat broader than what this concept generally implies with the new option of an "area of emphasis").
3. Providing opportunities to recognize and transcript CSU GE or IGETC completion that does not lessen the meaning of a community college degree. (i.e., certificates could be provided for those students who do not opt to complete a "major"). This option was added as part of the recent Title 5 changes.
4. Broadening the concept of what is permissible as a "major" such that degrees that are not explicitly designed to prepare a student for transfer may be offered (i.e., permitting degrees where the major component does not necessarily substantively meet the requirements of the lower division for a CSU or UC major, with the caveat that this is made explicit to students).

The ASCCC Opposes:

1. Compromising the meaning of an associate's degree by permitting the awarding of degrees that are merely a collection of general education courses without an additional organized pattern of study on a single discipline or related disciplines (i.e., major or area of emphasis). (See Resolution 13.02 Fall 2006)
2. Calling a degree a "transfer" degree ---because it cannot guarantee it. (See Resolution 9.02, Fall 2006)

Resolution 9.02 Fall 2006

Eliminate the word "*Transfer*" in Degree Titles

Whereas, The use of the word "transfer" in degree titles may lead students to believe the completion of the degree ensures transfer to a four-year institution; and

Whereas, Students may believe that all courses they successfully complete for a "transfer" degree are transferable;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with local senates, local curriculum committees, and chief instructional officers (CIOs) to eliminate the use of the term "transfer" in program titles for the associate degree.

1/09