

**Meeting Minutes**

***Monday, September 26, 2011*10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Sacramento, Ca.

ICAS Website • <http://icas-ca.org/>

**In Attendance:**

CCC Senate: Michelle Pilati, President; Beth Smith, Vice President; David Morse, Secretary; Phil Smith, Member at Large

CSU Senate: James Postma, Chair; Darlene Yee-Melichar, Vice Chair; Kevin Baaske, Secretary; Christine Miller, Member-at-Large; Paul O’Brien, Member-at-Large

UC Senate: Robert Anderson, Chair; Robert Powell, Vice Chair; Jonathan Alexander, UCOPE Chair; Jose Wudka, Chair BOARS

**Guests:**

Ralph Wolff, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC Senior)

**Senate Executive Directors**

CCC: Julie Adams

CSU: Tracy Butler

UC: Martha Winnacker

**Welcome and Chair’s Announcements**

Chair Postma welcomed ICAS members to the meeting and member introductions were made.

**Consent Calendar**

Approval of the Agenda – Amended to add

* Restrictions on Foreign travel
* ICAS Mission statement

Approval of the June 9, 2011 Meeting Notes - Approved

**Transfer**

Michelle Pilati and Chair Postma updated members. To date, 180 courses have been approved by the CCC Chancellors office. Campuses are now offering degrees in Sociology, Psychology, Communication Studies, Math, and Administration of Justice. Efforts are currently underway to streamline the process and offer more degrees very soon.

The systemwide approach to implementation has worked well. The next phase, on the CSU side, is to have campuses review the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) and provide feedback for the next step in implementation. The results have been positive in most cases. Efforts are being made to address instances where there may be additional challenges to implementation. TMC development continues.

On the CCC side, 3 or 4 more TMCs are being vetted right now with a finish date around mid October, when they should be available for review. Also in October, Discipline Interest Groups (DIG) representing 9-10 disciplines will be meeting.

Some funding has been provided for marketing and a new logo for the project was just approved.

At UC, there are currently 7 discipline groups meeting. Efforts are underway to increase that number.

One of the challenges in implementing SB1440 is with some of the STEM disciplines. There are 60 units to work with and most of those disciplines have a large number of units required to meet the lower division preparatory courses. Designing healthy transfer curricula for those disciplines is being looked at with SCIGETC as a possible model.

David Morse was re-appointed as IGETC Standards Committee Chair. Jim Postma will be the CSU representative, Jon Alexander is the UC Representative

IGETC Standards 3a is referred to the committee for review and possible revision.

**Legislation and Advocacy**

Members agreed that last year’s meetings with Legislative staffers were extremely valuable. It was noted that advocacy efforts face challenges with Legislators of both parties in the current economic climate. Though there is certainly support for higher education within the legislature, budget constraints play a large role in decision making.

Enclosures 3a (Advocacy letter sample) and 3b (Guide to Intersegmental Legislative Advocacy) outline a unified approach to many issues facing higher education in California as well as the fiscal challenges facing higher education. Members were encouraged to use the guide to prepare for the upcoming Legislative visits in April. CSU Member Yee-Melichar commended ICAS on the effectiveness of its advocacy brochure used in previous years.

One possible goal for advocacy meetings is to update and inform legislators about tangible, ongoing efforts on the part of CCC, CSU and UC with regard to current projects such as C-ID, transfer, etc.

Members discussed the possibility of legislative district offices visits in addition to the Spring advocacy effort at the capitol. There are a number of things to consider including logistics, costs and a system of coordination between the three segments and their GR offices.

Chairs Postma, Pilati and Anderson will consult with their respective Governmental Relations. ICAS will re-visit this agenda item at its December 12th meeting.

**Guest: Ralph Wolff, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC Senior) - Time certain 11:00 a.m.**

WASC is interested in more interaction with community colleges as a result of the increasing number of transfers and encouraged sharing of ideas to that end.

WASC Senior is undergoing a re-design of its process which will be “rolled out” more officially by November 10th, 2011. There will be a series of regional meetings for the senior college commission.

Mr. Wolff asked members if there were specific issues they would like addressed or if there were questions.

Q: How is the measurement of Education Quality envisioned by WASC? What was the motivation behind the change in process?

A: In answering the question, it’s important to be clear the answer is with regard to WASC senior college commission. Core standards between the senior college commission and the community college commission are different in terms of length and focus.

For a number of years WASC senior has had a three stage process which tried to focus institutions on student learning outcomes, assessment and program review. External review and surveys of presidents, provosts and liaison officers revealed processes that were working but also processes that were not. In the review process, WASC looked at cost, value and time.

The new process focuses on more fully embedding student learning outcomes and assessment in institutions.

At the federal level, economy is the dominant issue in conversation. Higher education is being asked what it’s doing to ensure consistent quality given the level of investment (especially in financial aid). After years of focusing on assessment, the emphasis is shifting from process to results…how to define results and how to evaluate them.

Over the years there have been a wide variety of institutions –including for-profit institutions and on-line institutions - that have presented a wide variety of degree offerings and asked for accreditation. WASC Senior has looked at more thoroughly defining what a degree means. WASC is involved with Lumina in the development of this profile and would like to pilot the framework defined in their document “Degree Qualifications Profile”. Mr. Wolff encouraged feedback from all three segments to help with this endeavor.

Taskforces have identified three core competencies of writing, written communication, critical thinking and quantitative skills that would be expected of all Baccalaureate degree holders. Part of the process redesign is to have institutions identify how they would evaluate or assure how those outcomes are being met by their students using a variety of measures or metrics.

There have also been taskforce reports that have recommended a greater degree of public access to the accreditation processes. Work is currently underway to expand that access via the web.

C: When you see the costs per student, the UC, the CSU and the CCC are far more cost effective and efficient with the use of public funds than private for-profit institutions. It would be helpful if the accreditation evaluation could include a cost-benefit analysis that shows how much value the state is receiving for its investment in public higher education, what that investment \*could\* be and what it actually is.

A: WASC’s view is that the appropriate graduation rate should be set by the institution not by WASC. Our job is to validate whether that rate makes sense based on the case the institution has made. Publicly we want to be able to say that variable rates are appropriate rather than a single standard.

Q: I think the real issue is the question of quality with these for-profit institutions. Graduation rates are one thing you can point to but I think we all have an intersegmental interest as institutions to address the comparisons the public makes between us and the for-profits. Does WASC’s “change in ecology” include addressing this concern and the concern that students might choose for-profits without a clearer picture of the potential consequences of that choice other than the institution’s marketing? Looking at the handout, I see the issue of private institutions is only briefly touched on but it’s the one that concerns me the most.

A: Not all for-profits are alike and there are sometimes similarities between private and public institutions. Quality is not just a for-profit issue. I don’t want to start with the assumption that one institution has it and another does not. I want to start with the finding out how we define it and what the measures of review and evidence would be. And we do need your input and help for that.

Q: What are your expectations for institutions to develop ongoing assessments? Once those assessments are developed will there be room for customized assessments? Some math majors are gifted algebraically; others can see the geometry of a problem very well. I can see a math major that is strong in two of five assessment benchmarks but maybe not all of them.

A: There is a lot of data that supports the notion that students are not graduating with a strong enough set of skills for the workplace. People who are graduating are either not getting employment or they’re found wanting. Our goal as an agent of quality assurance is “how do we have this conservation in the higher education community? At the end of the day, there are ways people engage, talk about and evaluate critical thinking. And critical thinking is one of the most commonly expected outcomes of a Bachelor’s degree. We want to be in a position of validating that the institution has really taken responsibility for that.

We’re not promoting a single measure. We’re not saying “this is the one we want to use”. We want all of us to learn together. We would be delighted to have an all faculty meeting to talk about these issues. We welcome your recommendations.

**Working Lunch and Reports from Senate Chairs**

**James Postma, Chair, Academic Senate CSU** - The biggest topic has really been the Board’s decision to change the way they search for our Presidents which would make campus visits more optional. The Board responded by moderating their position after resolutions from both faculty and students expressed concern.

Administration has proposed an expansion of online offerings. The initiative is still in its formative stages and the faculty role and quality assurance hasn’t been clearly outlined in this process yet.

Implementation of SB1440 has been ongoing. We’re passed the general policy stages of it. The curriculum evaluation process, which requires a lot of faculty interaction, is moving forward but with limited resources.

**Michelle Pilati, President, Academic Senate CCC** - SB 1440 and 1143 are the big items for the CCC right now. We are also getting ready for our Fall Plenary which is the first week of November in San Diego. 1143 Student Success Task Force work is the main focus.

CCC is also focusing on the issue of repeatability and limiting the number of times a student can repeat a course.

Legislation was recently passed that delayed the CCC fee increase until summer.

**Robert Anderson, Chair, Academic Senate UC** - There are a number of proposals to create self-sustaining Master’s degrees at UC and it’s being viewed as a revenue stream.

There’s been some concern by the Board of Regents about adverse outcomes for students at student health centers. Some solutions are being proposed.

SB 185 passed the legislature and is now with the Governor. It mandates that CSU and requests that UC take into account raising ethnicity in admissions by the full extent permitted by Proposition 209.

**White Papers**

* *Educational Standards and Accountability –* Will be amended and brought back to ICAS for approval.
* *C-ID: Common Course numbering* - Will be amended and brought back to ICAS for approval.
* *Why Full-time Faculty are Critical in Higher Education* – Will be amended and brought back to ICAS for approval.
* *Intersegmental Transfer* – Will be amended and brought back to ICAS for approval.

**College Readiness**

There are discussions at the K-12 level regarding College Readiness. It’s important to have higher education at the table for those discussions. K-12 has adopted standards and are talking about ways to implement and assess them through the “Smarter Balanced assessment consortium” (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr11/yr11rel43.asp>) which includes standards on college readiness. The competency statements that ICAS has developed don’t seem to be a part of that dialog.

The membership will invite someone with the California Department of Education who works in Common Core standards and invite them to speak to ICAS on these issues.

**Update on 1143 Student Success Task Force**

SB 1143 directed the CCC Chancellor’s office to create a task force to look at ways to enhance student success, specifically looking at their funding model and has been meeting monthly since January 2010. It consists of interested constituencies within the system including 4 appointees from the Senate. The Task Force is has put together a draft set of recommendations addressing a number of areas. These recommendations are currently being vetted. The task force will meet again in November and December to finalize them. They will be presented to the Board of Governors in January. They, in turn, will send a report to the Legislature in March. Some of these recommendations may be of interest to ICAS because they may have implications for transfer students.

**Improving Teacher Quality – action (CPEC)**

CPEC will be dissolved by the middle of November. Two aspects of CPEC’s operation are very desirable and have been preserved. The first is their database of information on educational institutions. That is being temporarily housed on the CENIC network and will be looking for a lower cost solution in the long-term.

The other is their “Improving Teacher Quality” grants. This is a federal program and is funded through “No Child Left Behind”. The main focus of the grants is K-12 instruction. CPEC had a sub-granting process through which regional consortia (universities, community colleges and school districts) could apply for grants to fund professional development activities. There may be a role for ICAS in the sub-granting process. Members are willing to pursue the possibility but more information is needed.

**Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity Questions on the College/University Application**

The CCC Senate has been directed as a body to adding sexual orientation and transgender status on applications for admission. Nationwide there appears to be only one college is planning on doing this in the future (Elmhurst) and it will not take effect until next year. One possible benefit would be to track the rates of success among LGBT groups. There is some speculation that LGBT students drop out more frequently. But there is currently no data to support that. There’s also speculation that they may be model students. But it’s unknown. This may be an opportunity for that kind of data tracking.

The UC and CSU have LGBT student centers but the CCC does not. There’s no way of knowing whether such a center would serve that community since the size of that community in the CCC system is unknown.

The information is currently gathered, if at all, after students arrive. The admission application approach would be more a more strategic gathering of data. To answer the question on admissions forms would be still be optional but it would afford an opportunity to systematically gather the data that the CCC doesn’t currently have.

The UC surveys their students every 2 years. They know that LGBT students are much more likely to experience harassment. Although UC’s Senate hasn’t discussed this admissions application approach UC’s Senate leadership will take it back to their senate.

CCC acknowledges and recognizes the importance of treating such information with sensitivity and security.

**Adding Student Representation to ICAS**

ICAS is a body of the CSU, CCC and UC faculty senate leadership. Although sharing information, student input and/or student visits may be applicable to some agenda items, since ICAS is a faculty body, a student representative isn’t warranted. Member suggested a possible, periodic, joint meeting with a student counterpart to ICAS. Segment chairs will take the idea back to their respective student leadership.

**New Business**

ICAS Mission statement –

* ICAS members discussed and agreed that there is need for a mission statement. CSU member Darlene Yee-Melichar volunteered to research ICAS, segmental websites and background information. Then, draft a recommendation for consideration. She will confer with Julie Adams and submit recommendations for review and approval and the next meeting.

Future ICAS Meeting dates –

* December 12th (CCC Office of the Chancellor)
* February 27th (CCC Office of the Chancellor)
* April 24th (ICAS Legislative Advocacy Day at the Capitol)
* June 25th (TBA)

**Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted by:

Tracy Butler, Director, CSU Academic Senate