**ICAS Minutes of Meeting**

**September 23, 2016**

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Sacramento, CA

<http://icas-ca.org/>

****

**In Attendance:**

CCC Senate: Julie Bruno, President; John Stanskas, Vice President; Dolores Davison, Secretary; John Freitas, Treasurer; Virginia May, Representative North; Julie Adams, Executive Director

CSU Senate: Christine Miller, Chair; Catherine Nelson, Vice Chair; Robert Keith Collins, Secretary; Kevin Baaske, Member-at-Large; Thomas Krabacher, Member-at-Large, and Steven Filling, Immediate Past Chair.

UC Senate: Jim Chalfant, Chair; Henry Sanchez, Chair, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools; Barbara Knowlton, Chair, University Committee on Educational Policy; Hilary Baxter, Executive Director

Staff: Annie Wilcox-Barlettani Academic Senate

1. **Announcements**

ICAS Chair, Julie Bruno, President of the ASCCC Executive Committee, welcomed members. Introductions were made around the room.

1. **Consent Calendar**

* September 23, 2016 ICAS Agenda
* June 2, 2016 ICAS Minutes

The consent calendar was approved by consensus.

1. **Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF)**

Steven Filling, QRTF Chair, provided members with the history of the task force report. The CSU Chancellor’s Office General Education Advisory Committee granted several community colleges with the authority to engage in pilot projects to develop math pathways. One such project, Statway, claimed to have very good results regarding student success. In discussions with representatives of Statway and in exploring the content of the Statway courses, CSU discovered that one reason Statway might be having good results is because it removes about 85% of intermediate algebra from the course. This discovery coupled with the public and legislative pressure to put an end to students delaying graduation because of the math requirements encouraged CSU to establish a task force in 2015-16 to review the CSU’s expectations for student proficiency in quantitative reasoning, both before college and at graduation, and to recommend changes to existing policies and practices

In forming this task force, the CSU considered the broad implications for general education and invited many stakeholders to join the task force including representatives from the University of California, California community colleges, K-12, legislative staff, Board of Education, and others. The taskforce took great care to invite individuals who were not mathematicians to the meetings to discuss what mathematical skills students need to succeed both in their coursework and their careers.

The task force met frequently during the spring term and at the conclusion developed a report which includes the following four recommendations:

* Recommendation I: Formulate an updated quantitative reasoning definition based on CSU best practices and reflecting national standards.
* Recommendation II: Revise CSU quantitative requirements and adopt equitable, feasible requirements that articulate with the other segments.
* Recommendation III: Ensure equitable access and opportunity to all CSU students.
* Recommendation IV: Create a CSU *Center for Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning*.

The task force agreed to forward recommendations III and IV to the CSU Chancellor’s Office for final approval. The two recommendations provide support for requiring students to complete a 4th year of quantitative reasoning coursework for admission to the CSU and establishing a *Center for the Advancement of Instruction in Mathematics*. The CSU Academic Senate formally received the task force report this past week.

The CSU segment asks ICAS members to receive the QRTF report and share with each segment for discussions and recommendations to CSU regarding the report and its findings and recommendations. It was clarified that “receiving” the report is not considered acceptance but instead is intended as an informal receipt of report to allow for the segments to discuss the report. CSU requested that after discussion with their respective bodies, ICAS members would discuss feedback and further recommendations to CSU at the December ICAS meeting. CSU further requested that each segment consider approving the report and that each segment work together to adopt a plan of action to implement the recommendations as modified as appropriate.

By consensus, each segment received the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force report and agreed to share with their respective segments for input and feedback at the December ICAS meeting.

1. **Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 158, Holden, Postsecondary education: transfers**

CSU Academic Senate Chair Christine Miller informed members about a recent hearing on ACR 158 (2016, Holden) Postsecondary education: transfers. During the hearing, presenters raised concerns about the difficulty of one student to transfer between two CSUs (San Jose to Dominguez Hills) because of barriers such as the different requirements for articulation and general education between the campuses. While the hearing was about CSU, the other two segments were mentioned in the discussion. The California community colleges were mentioned because the student at the hearing was told to attend a community college so that he could then transfer to the CSU of his choice. The Chairperson, Senator Liu noted during the hearing that academic senates often contribute to the barriers for students because of their purview over curricular matters. It was noted that concurrent resolutions frequently signal the legislature’s interest to address concerns via legislation and ACR 158 passed the assembly without any dissent. In a follow up conversation Holden’s staff confirmed that there will be a bill introduced on this topic.

The CSU Academic Senate discussed how best to respond to this ACR at their recent plenary session including approving the first reading of a senate resolution in opposition to ACR 158. The resolution addresses the inaccuracies in the testimony as well as the concurrent resolution. Additionally, the problem expressed in the hearing is not actually a problem because only 2.4% transfer between CSU to CSU. CSU presented a draft letter regarding ACR 158 and suggested that ICAS might consider crafting a similar letter about the work currently in progress to address many of the issues raised in the hearing including the intersegmental work of ICAS to improve transfer such as Transfer Model Curriculum, C-ID, and SB1440 and SB440.

ICAS discussed the concurrent resolution, hearing comments, and the CSU draft letter and considered how best to inform the Assemblymember Holden of current work regarding transfer and general education. Concern was raised regarding including general education in the response and suggested that any response concentrate only on transfer. CSU, however, commented that during the hearing legislators asked the Assemblymember to introduce a bill on this issue. If a bill is introduced, more than likely the legislative intent will be to address both general education and transfer as they both are seen by the legislature as barriers to intrasegmental transfer because of the differences at each individual university. Part of the reason CSU included general education in the letter is because the student at the hearing stated he was trying to transfer from a CSU to a CSU and have his general education course transferred. Upon further exploration by CSU, the course was actually a transfer course but based on comments by the Assemblymember’s staff, Holden would like to address both general education and transfer to ensure a seamless transfer process. Holden concluded the hearing by claiming that underrepresented minority students will be disadvantaged across California because of the three segments are not working well enough to ensure that the transfer process is seamless and it needs to be so that certain students are not disenfranchised.

Several ICAS members acknowledged that some challenges within the segments exist; however, the letter as written would not necessarily dissuade Holden from introducing new legislation. ICAS might consider a response that shares the complexity of how the current student pathways intersect with each other, what the segments are doing to improve transfer, how each segment is communicating more effectively between and within segments both intersegmentally and intrasegmentally, and acknowledge that there is still work to be done. By consensus, members agreed that the three segment chairs or their designee draft a letter to reflect the current issues raised in ACR 158, the hearing, and the ICAS conversations and bring back to the December meeting for further discussion and refinement. In December, ICAS will also discuss other actions regarding this item including visiting the Assemblymember or inviting him to a future ICAS meeting, as well as holding a legislative information session to inform legislative membership about the work of ICAS in the area of transfer.

1. **Honorary Degrees**

ICAS members briefly discussed whether or not each segment offers honorary degrees and if so, what are the policies and practices for each segment.

1. **Reports from Senate Leadership**

**ASCCC President, Julie Bruno**

President Bruno highlighted the following California community college system recent activities:

* Eloy Ortiz Oakley, current president of Long Beach City College, will assume his new role as the new California Community College Chancellor in December.
* The CCC recent Board of Governors meeting, the board approved the budget proposals for 2017 fiscal year. Key areas include:
  + $100 million dollars towards full- time faculty hiring and $25 million dollars towards part-time faculty support;
  + $25 million to support a veteran’s resource center on all 113 community colleges;
  + $25 millions for mental health services;
  + $10 million to adopt one online course management system (Canvas) for all 113 colleges;
  + $650 for Pathways to Community College Teaching, which would create a pipeline for California Community College students to become faculty within the California Community Colleges system;
  + $2.5 million plus $6 million one-time for an integrated library system; and
  + Other general funding requests.
* The ASCCC is tracking several pieces of legislation, two bills of note are: [AB 2017 (McCarty) College Mental Health Services Program](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB2017) and [AB 1985 (Williams) Advanced Placement credit.](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB1985) This bill originally required the California community colleges to set a common AP score of 3 for the majors and general education. The ASCCC worked with the author to remove the requirement of the majors out of the bill. The bill now requires that the California community colleges set a policy for AP scores for general education to be implemented by all 113 California community college. If colleges are unable to develop and implement a policy, then the colleges will have to default to the CSUs policy on AP score. While this is better than the requirement noted in the original legislation, it still sets a precedent for our colleges that is not ideal.
* Some of our colleges have College Promise programs in place. Now there will a grant process to fund more of these programs. The programs that currently exist concentrate on fees. Since students can apply for the Board of Governors Fee Waiver to cover these costs, the ASCCC is urging colleges to use the funds for wrap around services.
* The ASCCC Fall Plenary Session will be taking place November 3-5, 2016 at the Westin South Coast Plaza in Costa Mesa. All of ICAS is invited to attend.
* The ASCCC will be hosting regional meetings this fall to support faculty professional development including faculty minimum qualifications, formerly incarcerated students, curriculum, and several others.
* The California Community Colleges System is still having significant challenges with our accreditor, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Last year, a workgroup made two recommendations about next steps for accreditation including working with the existing accreditation and exploring moving to a single regional accrediting commission. Two workgroups to address each of these recommendations have been working this semester. The first workgroup is assessing the policies and processes. The second workgroup is looking into options for a long term regional accreditor for the CCC system.

**ASCSU Chair, Christine Miller**

ASCSU Chair Christine Miller highlighted the recent events taking place within the California State University system:

* In 2009, CSU launched its first concerted graduation initiative to improve six-year completion rates and halve achievement gaps for first-time freshman by 2015. However, the results of the first initiative exceeded the original completion goals by achieving the highest graduation rates in recent history. As a consequence, CSU created a Graduation Initiative 2025 advisory committee comprised of faculty, students, and campus leaders to establish new campus and system targets for 2025, to make recommendations to the CSU Chancellor’s Office. The task force work resulted in a set of completion goals that are audacious. Miller shared the new targeted graduation rates. CSU recently held a symposium to share effective practices and showcase campuses that are achieving their graduation goals. The CSUAS has acknowledged that targets will not be reached without additional funding resources, which is anticipated to exceed $400 million dollars. However, the current budget proposal only requests $75 million to implement the new graduation initiative.
* A recently released Ethnic Studies Taskforce report made two recommendations to the CSU Chancellor. The first recommendation suggested that the Chancellor’s Office fund faculty hires devoted to ethnic studies, which was rejected because of campus autonomy and the authority of campuses to determine their hiring priorities. The second recommendation was a moratorium on changes to ethnic studies programs, which was accepted so that the shared governance processes could be pursued.
* CSUAS is participating in ongoing discussion about how to influence a proposed policy on required background checks created by the CSU administration. There continues to be resistance to the policy because some believe it would violate academic freedom.
* Miller shared updates on other CSU relevant issues including discussions on the following topics:
  + Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property policies;
  + Proposition 55: Tax Extension to Fund Education and Healthcare;
  + The Golden Four course grading issues; and
  + The Establishment of an ASCSU Faculty Workgroup to Study General Education.

**UC Chair, Jim Chalfant**

University of California, Chair, Jim Chalfant shared with members the recent events taking place within the University of California System:

* In a recent meeting, the Board of Regents expressed concerns with UC debt capacity. Given the current climate of state funding, the regents have managed employer contributions by borrowing from short-term funds that UC controls. One topic included in the governor’s budget agreement was the need for the Regents to adopt a policy limiting non-resident enrollment. The UC Senate chair took the opportunity to remind the regents that they are making budget policy and not admissions policy. At the same time, the UC chair informed the Regents that some of the UC campuses have very few non-residents so the process used to equate state funding per student of a given type does not really equate to the amount available to spend on a quality education for each UC.
* UC Berkeley recently reinstated a course on Palestine. There has been growing concern about the course and whether or not the course violates the regents’ principles on intolerance. Although UC campuses are autonomous, the UC Senate is considering the development of a system wide policy to address effective practices in this area. The course on Palestine is a one-credit, student-led offering and is causing some in the UC system to question giving credit for courses that are not associated with an academic discipline or scholarly work.
* The UC budget will include $2 million for faculty diversity. Campuses have submitted proposals to increase faculty diversity. An advisory group was formed to examine and award the money based on the proposals. Currently, three out of nine proposals are still being vetted for final consideration by the administration.
* The President of the Board of Regents has developed a housing initiative to deal with UC’s space considerations and capital problems. UC Santa Cruz presented their housing constraints to the regents, which included a proposal to build additional modular housing. The regents did not approve the proposal because of the low quality modular housing and requested that UC Santa Cruz bring back a proposal with a higher quality residence option.
* Transfer Pathways: The UC Regents raised questions about the slow progress being made on transfer pathways. The UC Senate informed the regents that they have benefited from meeting with the CCC regarding their Course Identification System (C-ID) and that UC has no opposition to the consideration of adopting C-ID. UC is currently evaluating the the UC pathways in comparison to the C-ID System prior to taking further action with C-ID and anticipated that a report will soon be released indicating how many pathways are completed.
* Incoming Chancellor, Eloy Ortiz Oakley was present at the regents meetings and expressed interest in when UC will complete transfer pathways at all 113 California community colleges. Emphasis will be the continued cooperation between the three systems including sharing information and ongoing work.

1. **ICAS Meeting Calendar for 2016 – 2017**

By consensus, members approved the 2016 – 17 ICAS regular meeting dates of December 13, 2016, February 7, 2017, and June 7, 2017. The meetings will be held in Sacramento. The ICAS Legislative Day will be held April 3, 2017 in a meeting room in the State Capitol. Legislators and staff will be invited to meet with ICAS throughout the day. Planning for the event will occur in February during the ICAS meeting.

**Action**

* ASCCC Staff will finalize meeting location for 2016 – 2017.
* The February ICAS agenda will include an item to plan for the ICAS Legislative Day including legislators and staff to invite and key issues to cover.

1. **IGETC Subcommittee Chair**

Bruno advised members that historically the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) subcommittee chair has been a faculty member from the California Community College System. In keeping with this past practice, a California community colleges segment representative will serve as the new IGETC Chair. By consensus members approved California Community College System faculty member May will chair the IGETC Subcommittee.

**Action**

* May to work with past IGETC chair and the other two segments on appointing the remaining members for the committee.

1. **New Business**

Members discussed the following upcoming agenda items for the December meeting.

* Consistent ICAS messaging
* Follow up to the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force report
* Follow up to ACR 158, Postsecondary education: transfers. Discuss holding an informational forum.

1. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

---------------------------------------

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Annie Wilcox-Barlettani, Executive Assistant, CCC

Julie Adams, Executive Director, CCC