INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

NOTICE OF MEETING
Tuesday, February 5, 2008
10:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.
(Continental breakfast and lunch will be provided)

Westin LAX
5400 West Century Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90045
(310) 216-5858

Action	Item		Enclosure
Information 10:00 – 10:05 a.m.	**I.**	**Chair's Announcements** *Mark Wade Lieu, ICAS Chair*	Encl. 1
Action 10:05 – 10:10 a.m.	**II.**	**Consent Calendar** • *Approval of the Agenda* • *Approval of the December 5, 2007, Meeting Notes* • *Approval of the September 12, 2007, Meeting Notes* • *Approval of the June 7, 2007, Meeting Notes*	Encl. 2, 3, & 4
Information 10:10 – 10:55 a.m.	**III.**	**Reports from Senate Chairs** *Michael Brown, Chair, Academic Senate UC* *Barry Pasternack, Chair, Academic Senate CSU* *Mark Wade Lieu, President, Academic Senate CCC*	
Discussion/Action 10:55 – 11:15 a.m.	**IV.**	**IGETC Standards** *Members will discuss a process for making changes to the IGETC Standards.*	
Discussion 11:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	**V.**	**2008-09 Budget** *Members will discuss how ICAS can respond in a unified way to the Governor's budget and funding for higher education.*	
Break 12:00 – 12:15 p.m.	**VI.**	***Working Lunch*** *Members will take a short break to get lunch, freshen up, and return to work.*	
Discussion 12: 15 – 1:00 p.m.	**VII.**	**Textbook Legislation** *Members will discuss textbook legislation developed by Barry Pasternack and Dan Crump.*	

Action	Item	Enclosure

Discussion/Action
1:00 – 2:20 p.m.

VIII.   ICAS Legislative Day
Members will begin planning for the April 2, 2008, ICAS Legislative Day. Members will develop materials (including Textbook Legislation and the 2008-09 Budget) and "talking points" to bring on legislative visits.

Discussion/Action
2:20 - 2:45 p.m.

IX.   Transfer Issues
Members will discuss various on-going transfer issues.
- LDTP
- C-ID

Discussion/Action
2:45– 3:00 p.m.

X.   New Business

Discussion/Action
3:00 p.m.

XI.   Adjournment

Meeting Dates:
- April 2, 2008 – ICAS Legislative Day in Sacramento
- April 30, 2008 – Westin SFO
- June 3, 2008 – Westin LAX

Enclosures:
1. Updated ICAS Membership Roster 2007-08
2. December 5, 2007 Meeting Notes
3. September 12, 2007 Meeting Notes
4. June 7, 2007 Meeting Notes

Directions to the Westin LAX:

From Los Angeles International Airport
- Take Century Boulevard East
- The hotel is less than 1 mile ahead on the right, just past Aviation Boulevard

From Long Beach Airport
- Take Interstate 405 North
- Exit at Century Boulevard and turn left
- The hotel is less than 2 miles down on the left, just past La Cienega Boulevard
- Turn left onto the concourse to enter

From East
- Take I-105 West and exit at La Cienega Boulevard
- Take La Cienega North, and turn left onto Century Boulevard
- The hotel is located just ahead, on the left

From Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport
- Take Interstate 5 South to the 110 Freeway South and follow to Interstate 105 West

- Exit at La Cienega/Aviation and turn left
- Turn right onto Aviation Boulevard, and then right onto Century Boulevard
- The hotel is located on the right.

Parking is available at the Westin LAX.

INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF
ACADEMIC SENATES (ICAS)
2007-2008 ROSTER

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES	
MARK WADE LIEU Chair, ICAS President, Academic Senate, CCC English as a Second Language 428 J Street, Suite 430 Sacramento, CA 95814 916-445-4753 916-323-9867 (Fax) mwlieu@asccc.org	**JANE PATTON** Vice President Academic Senate, CCC Communication Studies Mission College 3000 Mission College Blvd., M/S 18 Santa Clara, CA 95054-1897 408-855-5296 jane_patton@wvm.edu
DAN CRUMP Secretary Academic Senate, CCC Library Science American River College 4700 College Oak Drive Sacramento, CA 95841 916-484-8167 916-484-8018 (Fax) crumpd@arc.losrios.edu	**MICHELLE PILATI** Treasurer Academic Senate, CCC Psychology Rio Hondo College 3600 Workman Mill Road Whittier, CA 90601 562-652-1932 mpilati@riohondo.edu
JANET FULKS North Representative Academic Senate, CCC Biology Bakersfield College 1801 Panorama Drive Bakersfield, CA 93306 661-395-4381 661-395-4434 (Fax) jfulks@bakersfieldcollege.edu	*STAFF*: **JULIE ADAMS** Executive Director Academic Senate, CCC 428 J Street, Suite 430 Sacramento, CA 95814 916-445-4753 916-323-9867 (Fax) julie@asccc.org

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY	
BARRY PASTERNACK Chair Academic Senate, CSU CSU Office of the Chancellor 401 Golden Shore, Suite 139 Long Beach, CA 90802 562-619-0213 562-951-4911 (Fax) bpasternack@calstate.edu	**JOHN TARJAN** Vice Chair Academic Senate, CSU Management/MIS CSU Bakersfield 9001 Stockdale Highway Bakersfield, CA 93311 661-654-2321 661-703-2679 (cell) jtarjan@csub.edu
MARK VAN SELST Secretary Academic Senate, CSU Psychology CSU San Jose One Washington Square San Jose, CA 95192 408-924-5674 408-924-5605 (Fax) mark.vanselst@sjsu.edu	**ROCHELLE KELLNER** Member-at-Large Academic Senate, CSU Accounting CSU Cal Poly Pomona 3801 W. Temple Avenue Pomona, CA 91768 909-869-4531 909-869-3631 (Fax) rakellner@csupomona.edu
DARLENE YEE-MELICHAR Member-at-Large Academic Senate, CSU Gerontology San Francisco State University 1600 Holloway Avenue San Francisco, CA 94132 415-338-3588 415-338-3556 (Fax) dyee@sfsu.edu	*STAFF:* **ANN PEACOCK** Executive Director Academic Senate, CSU CSU Office of the Chancellor 401 Golden Shore, Suite 139 Long Beach, CA 90802 562-951-4015 562-951-4911 (Fax) apeacock@calstate.edu

INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES (ICAS)
2007-2008 ROSTER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	
MICHAEL T. BROWN Chair Academic Senate, UC UC Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Fl. Oakland, CA 94607-5200 510-987-0711 510-763-0309 (Fax) michael.brown@ucop.edu	**MARY CROUGHAN** Vice Chair Academic Senate, UC UC Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Fl. Oakland, CA 94607-5200 510-987-9303 510-763-0309 (Fax) mary.croughan@ucop.edu
MARK RASHID BOARS Chair Academic Senate, UC Civil & Environmental Engineering UC Davis 2001 Engineering III Davis, CA 95616 530-752-7013 mmrashid@ucdavis.edu	**KEITH R. WILLIAMS** UCEP Chair Academic Senate, UC Biology UC Davis Exercise Biology Program 279 Hickey Gym Davis, CA 95616 530-752-3337 530-752-6681 (Fax) krwilliams@ucdavis.edu
JAN FRODESEN UCOPE Chair Academic Senate, UC ESL Sub-committee Chair ESL Program, Department of Linguistics UC Santa Barbara 3607 South Hall Santa Barbara, CA 93106 805-893-3303 805-893-7769 (Fax) frodesen@linguistics.ucsb.edu	*STAFF:* **MARIA BERTERO-BARCELO** Executive Director Academic Senate, UC UC Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Fl. Oakland, CA 94607-5200 510-987-9458 510-763-0309 (Fax) maria.bertero-barcelo@ucop.edu

INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

DRAFT MINUTES
Wednesday, December 5, 2007
10:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.
SFO Westin

Members Present:
CCC: Dan Crump, Janet Fulks, Mark Wade Lieu, Jane Patton, Michelle Pilati.
CSU: Rochelle Kellner, Darlene Yee-Melichar, Barry Pasternack, John Tarjan.
UC: Michael Brown, Mary Croughan, Mark Rashid, Keith Williams.

Guests Present: Julie Adams (CCC Executive Director); Elizabeth Atondo (Transfer Director and Articulation Officer at LA Pierce); Maria Bertero-Barcelo (UC Executive Director); Kate Clark (Faculty Project Coordinator, C-ID); Dan Nannini (Transfer Center Coordinator, Santa Monica College); Estela Narrie (Articulation Officer and Counseling Faculty, Santa Monica College); Marshelle Thobaben (Past Chair, Academic Senate, CSU).

I.   Chair's Announcements
Chair Mark Wade Lieu called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed members and guests.

II.   Consent Calendar
A. Approval of the Agenda
ACTION: Members removed item X, "Doctoral Degrees" from the agenda and postponed this item for a future meeting. Members also removed the Approval of the June 7, 2007 Meeting Notes and Approval of the September 12, 2007 Meeting Notes from the agenda.

ACTION: MSU Croughan to move calendar with the discussed adjustments.

B. Approval of the June 7, 2007 Meeting Notes
ACTION: Removed from the agenda.

C. Approval of the September 12, 2007 Meeting Notes
ACTION: Removed from the agenda.

III.   **Reports from Senate Chairs**
<u>Michael Brown</u>, *Chair, Academic Senate, UC*
Professor Brown informed members about the recommendations from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) about taking a different approach to the top 12 ½ percent policy, which limits eligibility to those graduates of California public high schools in the top one-eighth (12 ½ percent) of their class. Recommendations from BOARS regarding how the 12 ½ percent determination is made has been distributed to UC campuses for review and comments from the UC campuses will be coming back to the UC Academic Senate at the end of the week.

Professor Brown mentioned that UC is currently searching for a President. There have been complications in the process of searching for a new President and UC faculty members hope that these issues will be resolved in the near future. One issue in particular that has been an obstacle in the process is that UC Senior Managers do not utilize a "best practices approach". The UC faculty disagree with the lack of a "best practices approach" by UC Senior Managers, due to the fact that faculty believe that performance reviews are a practice of excellence. Through a joint effort between UC faculty and administrators, a new protocol will be put in place regarding performance reviews, which should come into fruition in the near future. The UC faculty are optimistic regarding this issue of performance reviews.

Professor Brown informed members about the Academic Senate's intent to review the plan for raising Chancellor's salaries, who are under compensated, as are many other UC groups, including faculty members. The Academic Senate will bring the plan to raise the Chancellor's salaries to the UC Regents in January.

Professor Brown then discussed the continuing restructuring of the Office of the President, but shared that no firm decisions have been made regarding restructuring plans yet. UC faculty members are currently engaged in monitoring the restructuring of the Office of the President. Professor Brown informed members that the UC Regents voted to take a position of opposition on Proposition 92, an initiative known as the Community College Governance, Funding Stabilization, and Student Fee Reduction Act, which will be on the February 5, 2008 ballot in California.

<u>Barry Pasternack</u>, *Chair, Academic Senate CSU*
Professor Pasternack updated members about the CSU Plenary Session, which was held in early December, and discussed resolutions that were passed. Professor Pasternack highlighted resolutions passed regarding budget priorities and textbook affordability.

Professor Pasternack noted that CSU is also opposed to Proposition 92, but would like to work with the UC and CCC regarding this issue. He discussed that some CSU campuses have passed a vote of "no confidence" for their campus

presidents. The CSU may conduct a climate survey with CSU faculty members regarding confidence in their respective campus presidents, and the CSU Academic Senate received a phone call from Human Resources regarding the development of this survey.
Professor Pasternack discussed the Drop, Withdrawal, Incomplete and Repeats Taskforce. When students drop, withdraw, or repeat a class, it is often not a good use of state resources. This problem could be potentially eliminated by restructuring the CSU fee structure and tightening the rules for repeating a course.

Professor Pasternack mentioned the increased supplemental fees for professional business graduate programs, which will increase the cost of obtaining a MBA at CSU. The Deans of Business imposed the fee increase, which will triple the cost of the MBA program. Concerns have been expressed by the CSU Academic Senate regarding the impact of the fee increase, such as a potential decline in enrollment. It was expressed that the fee increase would be a departure from the CSU's commitment to providing access to all students in California.

Professor Pasternack informed members that CSU is anticipating receiving 30 million dollars over the next three years for academic technology to improve and reduce the cost of learning. There has been some concern that CSU will not receive the money due to issues with the State budget. Prioritization will be happening in the CSU in the near future, and CSU administration is working with faculty determine which programs may need to be cut.

Additionally, it was noted that an audit report regarding CSU executive compensation had been conducted. The audit report, which was prepared by a consultant for the CSU Chancellor's office, found that CSU faculty members are not under-compensated with respect to administrators, but Professor Pasternak noted that the report failed to take into consideration non-salary compensation such as housing and transportation. Currently, there is legislation regarding how the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) calculates the salary gap, along with a mandate that would require CSU faulty members to declare any outside employment.

Professor Pasternack concluded his report by informing members about the Troops for College initiative, which will be a priority for the CSU and commentated about the national shift to part-time college instructors, which was documented by *Academe* this month.

Mark Wade Lieu, *President, Academic Senate CCC*
Chair Lieu noted that many items he would normally discuss in his report are already included in the agenda. The CCC Fall Plenary Session was held in November and was very successful. Chair Lieu highlighted some resolutions that were passed at the CCC Fall Plenary Session, including resolutions regarding IGETC and CAHSEE.

The Academic Senate has a Textbook Ad Hoc committee and Chair Lieu discussed the Textbook Summit which was recently held. The Futures Ad Hoc committee will try to act now regarding Governor Schwarzenegger's declaration of 2008 being the "Year of Education Reform." The CCC is currently searching for a new Chancellor, and has hired a consultant group to work on recruitment brochures.

The Board of Governors (BOG) reviewed the report from the System's Assessment Task Force regarding the system-wide process of assessment for placing students in courses. The BOG is concerned with the issue of assessment and would like to have common measurements across the colleges regarding what courses students are entering. The System's Assessment Task Force has made recommendations regarding this issue.

The CCC system is currently involved with a messaging project funded by the Hewlett Foundation to find out what types of messages have the most potential for increasing public support of the CCC system. The public does not want to hear negative messages about what is wrong with the CCC system in order to get more funding. Instead, the public wants to hear positive messages regarding student success. The CCC is trying to recast the messages that are communicated to the legislature and to the public. The CCC will focus on communicating positive messages and hopes that these messages will result in more support and funds for the CCC system.

The "We Make California Work" campaign was a reasonably successful CCC marketing campaign, and as a result of this campaign, more funds have been made available for Career Technical Education (CTE). Phase two of the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) will end in December and has been successful and received positive feedback. The results of the BSI will be a positive message to send to the legislature. One hundred and seven community colleges have been engaging in the BSI, and the Academic Senate will be examining how the colleges have used the literature review in their self-assessments to decide how best to address local BSI needs. Additionally, a 1.6 million dollar BSI grant for professional development will be awarded at the end of the week.

The Academic Senate has been working on supporting the local colleges in Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and working on accreditation. Currently, the CCC has fostered the largest statewide SLO support effort in the nation and Professor Fulks has been very involved in the SLO effort. Chair Lieu noted that Proposition 92 is moving along and fundraising efforts are currently taking place. Chair Lieu expressed that he understands why the UC and CSU are opposed to Proposition 92 and that all three segments are fighting over the same limited money.

IV.   2008-09 Budget Issues

ICAS members discussed where each segment is with respect to next year's budget and what challenges the segments, and specifically the Academic Senate of each segment, might be facing.

The CCC recently received a report regarding the increase in structural deficit. Most state agencies have to conduct a cut drill and have to offer a proposal, but the CCC has been informed that they do not have to participate in the cut drill. Over the past year, the Governor's teams went out and held meetings to raise ideas about educational reform. The message communicated at these educational reform meetings was if there is no money in the State budget for education reform, then there is little point in making an effort towards educational reform. Due to the lack of funding, the 2008 educational reform effort will be modest and focused on K-12.

The CSU's funding issues are centered on the fact that money is allocated differently. Individual CSU campuses are currently operating at 1990 budget levels, and prioritization is necessary. The CSU Trustees recently approved a 10% student fee increase. It was noted that California's 13 billion dollar deficit will have serious implications for higher education.

Members discussed the idea of a uniform budget plan for all higher education segments, and getting UC, CSU and CCC together in order to have more negotiating power when discussing higher education funding. All three segments are financially suffering and more intersegmental cooperation is needed. ICAS could potentially be a catalyst for creating a uniform budget plan, but concerns were expressed regarding this idea. Each segment is funded differently, for example, the CCC receives funding from Proposition 98, and the UC frequently receives grant money.

An initiative for a ½¢ sales tax was suggested. It was noted that each segment's administration is more competitive than each segment's faculty members regarding funding. Members discussed the fact that student fees are much less expensive in California, and that California has the least expensive higher education system in the nation. By consensus ICAS will discuss how to encourage intersegmental cooperation in order to increase funding at its next meeting.

ACTION: Professor Pasternack, Professor Brown, and Chair Lieu will confer and bring issues to the next ICAS meeting. Chair Lieu will contact Professor Pasternack and Brown.

V.   **ICAS Legislative Day**
Members began planning for the ICAS Legislative Day, which will be held on April 2, 2008. ICAS members requested that the legislative day conversations should include: what ICAS hopes to accomplish by holding a legislative day, what was successful at last year's legislative day, what should be changed for this year, and whether or not the Governor should be invited.

It was noted that many of the ICAS members enjoyed having legislators attend the previous year's legislative day. The organization of the 2007 legislative day was well done, and the amount of time spent with the legislators was approximately 15 minutes. The 2007 legislative day was held in a Senate Meeting room in the Capitol, and was planned and executed by the UC.

The February 5, 2008, ICAS meeting will solidify the details of the 2008 legislative day and a discussion will be held regarding what legislators to invite. The legislative issues that are of importance to ICAS will help determine who to invite to the legislative day. Currently, California legislators are looking to fix transfer issues, and ICAS should have a discussion with legislators to develop solutions. ICAS will need to develop a list of what the higher education segments are seeking in terms of budget needs, transfer issues, and articulation. It was suggested that the cost of textbooks should be an agenda item for the 2008 legislative day, and that ICAS will need to work with legislators regarding their textbook policies.

At the 2008 ICAS legislative day it will be important to involve the legislators' staff, particularly those staffers who deal with and advise the legislators about educational issues. It will be important for ICAS to develop a relationship with the legislators' staff members because staff members truly know the issues and do a majority of the background work for the legislators. It was suggested to meet locally with staffers, due to the fact that it is a better place to bring in students and faculty.

It was suggested to bring a "success story" to the 2008 legislative day, particularly a person who can articulately speak about their success through California's higher education systems. It was noted that ICAS has many members who have gone through the California higher education systems, and that many of the California legislators and their staff members have also received their education at California higher education institutions.

A discussion was held about possibly involving the Department of Finance (DOF) in the 2008 legislative day and informing the DOF of things that are working well. The Governor often listens to the DOF and it is important to learn about the DOF's perspective regarding higher education. It was suggested that ICAS should develop a proactive relationship with the DOF.

It will be essential to invite important people as soon as possible to the legislative day, such as Senator Padilla, Assembly Member Portantino, staff members for Higher Education Committees, the head of PERS, Jack O'Connell, DOF representatives, and staff members for the Governor.

ACTION: A sub-group, consisting of Professor Brown, Professor Croughan, Professor Pasternack, Professor Tarjan, Professor Patton, and Chair Lieu, will

work on identifying important issues. In February, a roster and talking points will be drafted.

VI.   **Textbook Affordability**
Members discussed the possibility of forming a workgroup to develop a textbook affordability legislative policy. It was suggested that textbook affordability be discussed with legislators at the 2008 legislative day. It was noted that legislators have the potential to write legislation that would exempt textbooks from sales tax. A discussion was held regarding the CCC Textbook Summit, which textbook publishers were invited to. The group recognized that there will not be a single solution to the textbook affordability issue, but rather, several solutions will have to work together for success. Student organizations have been coming up with solutions and are interested in the possibilities of open-source materials and working with bookstores. It was suggested that it would be useful to gather information from student organizations and take this information back to the UC, CSU, and CCC for review.

Used books are often why the cost of textbooks goes up so drastically and why new versions are introduced so often. It was suggested that ICAS will need to be proactive and study the different types of textbook affordability proposals that are available. Chair Lieu summarized the necessary steps to take regarding textbook affordability, noting that it will be useful to discuss the currently established positions from each segment and see if there are any commonalities for an ICAS position.

VIII.   **Transfer Issues**
A. C-ID Report
Presenter: Professor Kate Clark, Faculty Project Coordinator, C-ID.
Professor Clark provided ICAS with an update about the C-ID project. The C-ID project attempts to identify courses by the common features that they have. Professor Clark reviewed five important issues regarding C-ID, including the advisory committee, selection of areas, a course numbering prototype, special requests for the identification of faculty, and future planning.

The advisory committee has met twice and will meet again in January and has included representatives from four segments: UC, CSU, CCC, and independent universities. Professor Clark noted that the advisory committee has done a good job with advising on how C-ID should move forward.

The four areas that have been selected for the first round are Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Psychology. These disciplines were well discussed in IMPAC and faculty have strong relationships with one another.

A numbering prototype is being developed, and Agriculture is functioning as a good example because the Agriculture faculty have worked together to identify courses. The numbering prototype will include a discipline designator, a sub-

discipline designator if the discipline chooses, a three digit number and a suffix which will identify whether or not a course has a lab or prerequisite, or is part of a sequence.

Professor Clark discussed the process of identifying faculty participants. Specifically, she is searching for three faculty members in each of the areas, for a total of 12 faculty members. These faculty members will hopefully gather for a training session in the near future, which will be a demonstration of inter-segmental faculty working well together. Backwards articulation is driving the project and C-ID will avoid duplicating any earlier work by looking at previous articulation and examining commonalities; the project is intended to be complimentary to LDTP and other projects. A C-ID training manual is being finalized and will be sent to committee members and a training session will be held on February 1, 2008. Professor Clark requested help from ICAS members to recruit faculty members.

B. Advanced Placement (AP) and IGETC Standards
Presenters: Elizabeth Atondo, Transfer Director and Articulation Officer at LA Pierce, Dan Nannini, Transfer Center Coordinator, Santa Monica College, and Estela Narrie, Articulation Officer and Counseling Faculty, Santa Monica College.

ICAS members and presenters discussed the CCC's approval of *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC* without the AP Chart. It was noted that the UC and CSU are the segments that will actually use the chart.

A discussion was then held regarding why the UC system grants fewer credits for students with AP credit and the differences between course and unit credit. It was noted that AP credit applies to IGETC in subject only, and it is up to the individual campuses and their faculty members to ultimately determine how AP credit is applied. The IGETC Notes that were submitted to ICAS were an attempt to guide people on how to deal with particular issues. Historically, an implementation committee was set up and put together by ICAS and existed for many years.

A discussion was held regarding the introduction of a new version of the *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC* after the CCC had approved a final version at their Fall 2007 Session. ICAS wanted to go through all the Senate bodies before final approval of the *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC*. The CSU and UC are comfortable with the newest version of the *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC*, but the CCC wished they had seen the final document earlier. An option would be for the CCC to introduce the revised *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC* at their 2008 Spring Session. The final version of the *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC* reflects all the changes the UC and CSU requested, but the CCC delegates have not seen the changes. Issues surrounding the process of approving the *Standards,*

Policies, and Procedures for IGETC were discussed. The UC BOARS committee was supportive of the changes made to the final document; the CSU had a similar response.

A discussion was held about potentially creating an oversight committee. It was suggested that this type of procedural problem could be resolved with a procedural fix due to the fact that the CCC resolution regarding the IGETC Standards does not include an absolute date regarding the finalization of the *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC*. It was noted that this situation is difficult because changes are being made without a process for approving future changes. It was also noted that when ICAS approves a document, it must be approved by each segment. Chair Lieu discussed logistical questions regarding the provisional document.

ACTION: MSU Rashid to give provisional acceptance to the final version of *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC* document before ICAS, set to expire on May 31, 2008. Motion passed by ICAS. The CCC will need a list of changes to the IGETC document by the middle of March to bring to the 2008 Spring Session.

The process for establishing an IGETC Standards Review Committee was discussed. Representatives, which drafted the Standards Review Committee document, is looking to ICAS for guidance and ideas regarding the establishment of this committee. The ownership of the committee was discussed. It was suggested that the committee makes more sense with the California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC). If ICAS does not take ownership of the IGETC Standards Review Committee, it was suggested that a liaison from ICAS to the committee would be needed along with an annual update to ICAS of any changes. Concern was expressed regarding ICAS not directing this committee and the impact it would have on the relationship between IGETC and ICAS. It was suggested that if this committee was not a subcommittee of ICAS, there would still be a need for ICAS to have control over IGETC policy.

The CCC Chancellor's office has agreed to house the IGETC website, which has already been designed. It was suggested to put the website address on the IGETC handout that students use.

ACTION: Chair Lieu proposed that some ICAS members work with Dan Nannini and Estela Narrie to draft policy and process for changes to bring back to February meeting. Professor Tarjan, Professor Pilati, and Professor Rashid will work with Dan Nannini and Estela Narrie. The existing version of the *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for IGETC* will be used for the next couple of months.

C. Statewide Career Pathways
Professor Patton updated ICAS members about Statewide Career Pathways, which began with Senator Scott's SB 70 legislation that called for alignment of

Career Technical Education (CTE) courses in secondary schools and community colleges.

The next step for Statewide Career Pathways will be to involve CSU and UC faculty members, though there could be potential issues with the CCC articulating secondary classes, and problems that may happen if a student attempts to transfer these courses to a CSU or UC.

The Riverside Transfer Project was discussed, which examined the transferability of courses in CTE fields that begin in high school, go into the CCC, and end up in the CSU/UC. A presentation regarding ConnectEd was discussed. There was a question about whether Statewide Career Pathways will address a-g courses. The 1.6 million dollar Basic Skills grant was discussed, which could address the Math and English courses.

IX.   ICAS High School Competency Statements
Julie Adams, CCC Executive Director, provided background information on the ICAS high school competency statements, which ICAS is responsible for updating. An English competency statement was recently updated and the mathematics competency statement was updated in 1997. The 1.6 million dollar Basic Skills grant would address updating the math competency statement.

ACTION: MSU Patton for ICAS to revise the math competency statements, contingent on funding from the grant.

XI.   Public Health Grant
Professor Fulks updated ICAS members about the Public Health Grant discussed at the last ICAS meeting. A discussion was held regarding the work of the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC). The potential development of a public health school at UC Davis was discussed, along with a partnership regarding a community college in Davis.

XII.   California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)
Members continued the discussion from the September 12, 2007, ICAS meeting regarding a possible joint ICAS resolution on the proper use of the CAHSEE.

A discussion was held regarding the CCC Resolutions from the Fall 2007 Session regarding CAHSEE. The CCC delegates were not as concerned with the CAHSEE resolution as they once were. The tutoring and individual instruction for high school students who cannot pass the CAHSEE during their senior year was discussed.

It was noted that CSU Admissions and Records greatly supports CAHSEE, due to the fact that CAHSEE addresses issues of remediation. It was suggested that the impact of CAHSEE needs to be studied academically because CAHSEE is the door to all Calfornia's public higher education institutions. The CSU will most

likely not want to come out with anything that is anti-CAHSEE. The University Committee on Educational Policy's (UCEP) discussion of the issue last spring included a broader review of CAHSEE and was in favor of the ICAS resolution.

ACTION: ICAS will wait on a definitive answer from the CSU regarding CAHSEE before placing this issue on an agenda at a future ICAS meeting.

XIII. Perkins Gold, Silver and Bronze Status

Members discussed the federal Perkins Act and the pressures for standardization. Two bills have been drafted regarding higher education, which will allow the government to determine student outcomes. The draft version of these bills would mandate that if a school wants funding from the government for Career Technical Education (CTE) courses, then the school would have to comply with the government's student outcomes.

The "Gold" standard would require student outcome testing by an external third party. The "Silver" standard would test student outcomes via a statewide test. The "Bronze" standard would determine if student outcomes met the government standards by examining student grades and program completion.

In five years, the "Bronze" standard will no longer be an acceptable way to determine if the government's student outcomes have been met. It was noted that every discipline will be affected by these standards. The CCC responded to these standards by arguing against the use of tests to determine student outcomes. It will be difficult for the Perkins standards to keep up with the changing programs; there are over 200 new programs in the CCC each year.

People who employ college graduates are not interested in a single test result, but rather they are interested in the student's overall grades and performance. Professor Fulks summarized information from the government status report. The American university system produces the most responsive and creative graduates due to the fact that it does not homogenize education with standardized tests.

It was noted that CTE programs depend on the government Perkins funding. These standards are a way to get outcomes from higher education in a way that is very frightening. The CCC resolution lays out how these standards encroach on higher education and decision making.

XIV. New Business

Future ICAS agenda items and issues were discussed.
• Draft of *Process for Changes to IGETC Standards* for Feb. 5th Meeting.
• Approval of June 7, 2007 Meeting Notes.
• Approval of the September 12, 2007 Meeting Notes.
• Develop a roster and "talking points" at the February 5, 2008 ICAS meeting for the 2008 ICAS Legislative Day.

XV.   Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Katey Lewis, Senior Administrative Assistant
Mark Wade Lieu, President, CCC Academic Senate

INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

DRAFT MINUTES
Wednesday, September 12, 2007
10:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.
LAX Sheraton Gateway Hotel

Members Present:
CCC: Dan Crump, Janet Fulks, Mark Wade Lieu, Jane Patton, Michelle Pilati.
CSU: Rochelle Kellner, Darlene Yee-Melichar, Barry Pasternack, Mark Van Selst, John Tarjan.
UC: Michael Brown, Mary Croughan, Jan Frodesen, Mark Rashid.

Guests Present: Julie Adams (CCC Executive Director); Elizabeth Atondo (Transfer Director and Articulation Officer at LA Pierce); Maria Bertero-Barcelo (UC Executive Director); Dan Nannini (Transfer Center Coordinator, Santa Monica College); Ann Peacock (CSU Executive Director).

I.   **Chair's Announcements**
        Chair Mark Wade Lieu called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed members and guests.

II.   **Consent Calendar**
        A. *Approval of the Agenda*
        ACTION: Members discussed the agenda and added Item VIII: Textbooks.

        B. *Approval of the June 7th Meeting Notes*
        ACTION: The meeting notes for June will be considered at the next meeting on December 5th, 2007.

III.   **Reports from Senate Chairs**
        Michael T. Brown, *Chair, Academic Senate, UC*
        Professor Brown informed members about issues surrounding compensation, including management and salary increases. Many anticipate that there will be compensation reform this year including reorganization of the administrative salary structure. Professor Brown briefly updated members about discussions on research projects funded by tobacco monies, noting that the idea of local units banning tobacco company funding is troublesome from an academic freedom

standpoint. UC has considered forming a subgroup to review the tobacco funding appropriately.

Professor Brown highlighted a university diversity report due to be released at the end of September and presented at the next UC Regents meeting. The Regents created a workgroup to look at diversity in the post 209 climate. The report studied the state of diversity in undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty and is likely to make recommendations for further work in diversity at UC.

Professor Brown informed members that the UC President has charged the UC system with reviewing security in light of the Virginia Tech tragedy. He noted that Homeland Security is currently offering grants to upgrade security on college campuses but UC has been unable to receive these grants because the federal government does not differentiate between the CSU and the UC. In spite of the lack of federal money, the UC faculty will be re-evaluating campus security and making necessary improvements. Professor Croughan commented about the work done in response to the Virginia Tech University tragedy and suggested that ICAS members discuss possible combined response to emergency situations.

Barry Pasternack, *Chair, Academic Senate, CSU*
Professor Pasternack commented that CSU's major concern over the past summer was having the State budget signed in time for faculty members to receive their paychecks. He briefly highlighted discussions in the CSU Academic Senate including a presentation on the CCC Initiative and the graduate fee increase by $210 for Masters Programs.

Professor Pasternack informed members that the first draft of "Access to Excellence" (strategic planning) was created and will be made public this month. Over the next three years, CSU plans to spend 180 million dollars to improve current course transformation and academic technology, assuming there is no decrease in funding. CSU has taken a half billion budget cut over the previous years.

Professor Pasternack discussed Assembly Concurrent Resolution 73, which called for CSU to increase the number of tenured faculty. The issue of increasing the number of CSU tenured faculty has been a priority over the past six years. He noted that the senate newsletter has had a number of articles regarding the California Faculty Association (CFA) contract and its fight to raise wages for its constituents.

Mark Wade Lieu, *President, Academic Senate CCC*
Chair Lieu discussed the issue of accountability. A Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Institute was held this past July, which was the only training nationwide targeting college faculty members regarding student learning outcomes at the time.

Chair Lieu discussed the upcoming CCC Fall Plenary, which will be held on November 1-3 and will have a presentation on changing student demographics. Chair Lieu summarized the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), which received initial funding of $33.1 million and has made great progress. BSI brochures were created that summarized the project and sent to California's legislators, who in turn contacted the CCC Systems Office and expressed their enthusiasm about the BSI project and assured them funding, which should be received in the near future. A BSI report came out this past February, and since the release of this report, all 109 community colleges have be engaging in Basic Skills training. These trainings will continue through October of 2007, and if funding is approved, the BSI Training Projects will start.

Professor Patton summarized Career Technical Education and the Statewide Career Pathways project for the ICAS members. Professor Patton discussed the use of IMPAC as a model for the Statewide Career Pathways project, and highlighted the importance of intra-faculty dialogue to build the project. She also recommended adding a conversation about CTE and its affects on all three segments as a future agenda item.

Members discussed Governor Schwarzenegger's declaration of 2008 being the "Year of Education Reform." It was shared that the Governor is looking for creative and bold solutions to ongoing education problems and wants action taken in the next 60 days. The CCC Systems Office wants a plan within the next two to three months for the January budget. Governor Schwarzenegger is going on a ten city tour of California regarding education reform and is contacting external state holders. Someone suggested presenting the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) to Governor Schwarzenegger and legislators. Meeting attendees then discussed issues of reform and accountability.

IV. **IGETC Notes**
Presenters: Elizabeth Atondo, Transfer Director and Articulation Officer at LA Pierce and Dan Nannini, Transfer Center Coordinator, Santa Monica College

ICAS members reviewed the draft IGETC notes with the authors and provided feedback and next steps. The IGETC notes were created over a period of nine months and can be used much like a dictionary. In general, the IGETC notes have been well received. The IGETC cover memo summarizes the biggest changes to the document, excluding the AP Chart. The main focus in the creation of the IGETC notes was to have standards that helped the students and helped maintain IGETC.

It was suggested that it may be helpful if the authors critique the changes they made to the document and provide principal arguments for these changes. Atondo and Nannini summarized the changes made to the document and distributed two documents ("Santa Monica College: IGETC: 2007-2008

Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum" and "Santa Monica College: CSU General Education Certification Pattern"). Members agreed that ICAS members needed only to discuss changes to the IGETC policy. Members discussed the changes and the potential impacts. Chair Lieu summarized the IGETC discussion and the ICAS requested changes. By consensus, each segment will be expected to vet the document through the appropriate advisory groups prior to an adoption vote by ICAS. The item will be reconsidered at another meeting.

V.   Transfer Issues
A. *ASSIST – Proposed Next Steps in Governance*
A document titled "ASSIST Governance Proposal" was distributed and ICAS members discussed the restructuring of ASSIST. Professor Brown expressed interest in making the ASSIST board functional again and spoke about the goals of the board. Professor Brown would also like to see increased intersegmental ownership of the ASSIST board.

Members discussed the proposed change to the governance of ASSIST and the goal of making the governing board a decision-making board. The new governing board of ASSIST is intended to be a three-person board that reports to the UC Provost of Academic Affairs and is required to meet together on a regular basis. The ASSIST governing board will create an advisory board that will provide overall feedback to the ASSIST governing board. The advisory board, which will meet twice a year, will have an ICAS representative, who will represent the key concerns of ICAS.

Members also discussed the role of sponsors and chief officers. It was noted that the chief officers are individuals that control the money and it is hoped that as the management of ASSIST matures, it will facilitate intersegmental funding. Members discussed how the advisory board will be accountable to the public in issues regarding public money, interest, and accountability.

Members discussed the scope of ASSIST and concerns were expressed regarding the imminent crisis due to hardware and software failures. It was generally agreed that it is important that ASSIST continues to be funded, as the site is heavily used. It was also noted that there have been issues with the company which manages the ongoing functionality of the database.

Professor Brown expressed a personal interest in making sure that ASSIST works and discussed the fundamental purpose of ASSIST, which acts as starting place for unification. The ICAS members agreed with Professor Brown and would like to see ASSIST continue in the future.

Chair Lieu summarized the suggested changes to the ASSIST Governance Proposal, which will be forwarded to UC Representative overseeing ASSIST.

ACTION: MSU (Patton) to approve the ASSIST Governance Proposal with changes.

B**.** *LDTP Update*
Professor Pasternack began the LDTP update by informing ICAS members that the project was moving forward and though an Economics course had caused issues for the program, solutions were being formulated to solve the problem. A recent decision made at San Diego State University in the subject of accounting. San Diego's decision would require all articulation to go through LDTP, a decision which created concern for some CCC faculty members.

The group discussed maximizing articulation and thinking about preparation for a major, two of LDTP's primary goals.

C. *C-ID Update*
Julie Adams, CCC Executive Director, provided an update on the C-ID project. A grant was awarded to the ASCCC to create a course identification numbering system. The first meeting for the project was held on August 9th, 2007, where it was decided that agriculture will serve as a pilot discipline for creating a numbering system. The project will study other states that have common course numbering systems. C-ID will be requesting referrals of college faculty members to create work groups no later than October 1st, 2007. The C-ID project will build on the IMPAC project and Statewide Career Pathways.

VI. **California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)**
Members discussed a possible joint ICAS resolution on the proper use of the CAHSEE. Professor Brown shared feedback from UC colleagues and a new draft resolution for consideration, which was sent out for system-wide review.

Gratitude was expressed for the work that Professor Brown has done and his willingness to address the important issues surrounding the CAHSEE. A discussion was held about students who have failed the CAHSEE, as well as how to get students up to standards. A UC admissions advisory council discussed the issue of the high school exit exam, which will remain a requirement.

Chair Lieu concluded the CAHSEE discussion. The CCC and CSU will bring the revised resolution back to their respective Academic Senates. Time will be allowed for the segments to show the revised resolution to their Academic Senates.

ACTION: This item will be re-agenized for a future meeting.

VII. **Intersegmental Coordination on Creation of Laboratory Training**
Professor Fulks shared a request for intersegmental representation on a Laboratory Training Project. ICAS members discussed the problem of a lack of science laboratories at the Bachelor's level. The San Francisco State University

Center for Micromedical Science Lab was nearly closed almost a year ago because the Center could not find faculty to teach there. The lack of instructors at the center was due to issues regarding compensation and poor facilities. Members discussed ways to partner up with the science industry, which might provide labs with more off-site space.

VIII.   CSU Textbook Affordability Taskforce.

A document titled *Report of the CSU Textbook Affordability Taskforce* was distributed to ICAS members. Professor Pasternack noted that the report discussed several ideas such as a textbook rental model that models the video tape industry. Video rental stores do not pay the retail price for their videos, but instead shares part of the rental profit with the video makers. It was suggested to have the college campus bookstores be the rental agents and have more rental textbooks readily available. It was also suggested that the intellectual property be divorced from the physical property of the book.

ICAS members also discussed that the revisions that are made to textbooks are not always necessary and it was suggested that colleges could charge students for electronic version of textbooks. In exchange, the textbook publisher would agree to sell the textbooks at cost to the students. Students who are on a textbook committee are not opposed to the idea of electronic textbooks.

Members discussed bringing the report forward so that many institutions can be informed and sign on, which will create progress in reducing the cost of textbooks. The *Report of the CSU Textbook Affordability Taskforce* will be shown to each segment's academic senates. The report also includes the fact that a number of states do not charge sales tax on text books. Some ICAS members thought that if legislators think that textbooks cost too much, then they should not tax them.

The CCC had their own set of recommendations for textbooks and the report will be shared at the plenary session. The CCC has looked at textbook affordability from an ethical standpoint. It was noted that the Student Senate has looked at these models of reducing the cost of textbooks.

Textbook affordability was a shared concern and will be presented to the segmental academic senates. Questions were raised regarding selling back text books. Concern is expressed about the textbook publishing business. A plan should be developed that is fair to all parties and ultimately, textbook publishers will make more money with this plan. It was noted that any textbook affordability plan will not be successful unless everyone wins. Concern was expressed regarding custom printing and online textbooks. The initiative to use the "digital marketplace" to have electronic materials made available to students – presents many challenges. California legislators want college faculty to agree on an amount of time that faculty would use a particular textbook, but it is difficult to get college faculty to agree on using one textbook. It was noted that creating a

textbook rental plan would be easier with smaller colleges. A discussion was held about three hole-punched books versus hardbound books.   It was suggested that ICAS meet with legislators to discuss a textbook affordability bill and the issue of textbook affordability will be introduced to the legislators at the ICAS legislative day.

IX.   Next Meeting Dates
Members approved future dates for ICAS 2007-08 meetings.
• December 5th, 2007 in San Francisco.
• February 5th, 2008 in Los Angeles.
• April 30th, 2008 in San Francisco.
• June 3rd in Los Angeles.
• April 2008 ICAS Legislative Day TBD.

X.   New Business
Future ICAS agenda items and issues were discussed.
• Advanced Placement discussion.
• Create a textbook affordability legislative agreement/agenda/policy.
• Address IGETC Standards at the beginning of the year.
• Judicial Process (IGETC).
• Future report for C-ID.
• Reconsideration of CAHSEE.
• Discuss the role of Career Technical Education in high schools.
• Invite the Governor to an upcoming ICAS meeting.
• Developing doctorate degrees at UC and CSU. Create a model for discussion.
• Update ICAS high school competency statements.

XI.   Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 3p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Katey Lewis, Senior Administrative Assistant
Mark Wade Lieu, President, CCC Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE

INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES – JUNE 7, 2007

Present: Michael Brown, Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Mary Croughan, Marshall Cates, Janet Fulks (new member), Jane Patton, Michelle Pilati, Susan Wilbur, Richard Weiss, Keith Williams, John Eggers, Ian Walton, Greg Gilbert, Hank Reichman, Darlene Yee-Melichar, Ann Peacock, Marshelle Thobaben, Barry Pasternak, Julie Adams, Mark Wade Lieu, Dan Crump, John Tarjan, and Todd Giedt

I.   Chair's Announcements – *Michael T. Brown*
ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Brown summarized some issues that he believes will be worthy of ICAS discussion next year. These include doctoral education, the flattening curve of the number of high school graduates, and learning outcome assessment. He also noted that the CAHSEE resolution is currently out for review at UC; responses should be available at the first ICAS first meeting in the fall.

II.   Consent Calendar
A. Approval of the Agenda
ACTION: Members approved the agenda with the addition of the C&D Task Force (math and science requirements) under new business.
B. Draft Minutes from the April 10, 2007 Meeting
ACTION: Members approved the minutes from the April 10, 2007 meeting with minor amendments.

III.   Reports from the Senate Chairs
ISSUE/REPORT:
Marshelle Thobaben, CSU Chair
Professor Thobaben announced that the CSU Senate recently held elections; for the 2007-08 year, Barry Pasternak is Chair and John Tarjan is the Vice-Chair. She briefed members on the 'Access to Excellence' strategic plan, which the Board is updating. The Senate Executive Committee has been involved in the planning process; a summit on the planning process was recently held. She also reported that the Executive Director for the Western Association for Schools and Colleges (WASC), Ralph Wolff came to the state-wide CSU Senate Plenary in May; he emphasized faculty participation in the accreditation process. Towards that end, he views his recent meeting with ICAS as a first step. He also reported that there are ongoing negotiations with the federal government over the amount of centralized and regional control of the accreditation process, as well as accountability measures. WASC is also currently going though its own internal review.

Professor Thobaben said that the CSU Senate also passed two resolutions that address doctoral education. These are AS-2792-07/TEKR 'Enhancing the Doctoral Culture,' and AS-2793/TEKR 'Establish a CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee.'   Six CSU campuses have received WASC approval for stand-alone Ed.D programs. Professor Marshall Coates also gave a briefing on the Lower-Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP). He noted that CSU has passed new

rules that ensure that any new future course development committees will have CCC faculty representation appointed by the CCC Senate. He also reported that for the purpose of facilitating CSU-campus transfers, they have asked that each of the campuses assign TCSU numbers to their courses.   Other difficulties in the LDTP include the fact that many of the course reviews have never been taken back to the CCC faculty; as a result 50 percent were rejected the first time around. Many of the CCC courses submitted had not really been reviewed for seven to ten years, and they were submitted as 'off the shelf' courses.   Professor Hank Reichman mentioned the new CSU faculty contract; he believes that the solidarity of the faculty (94 percent faculty strike vote), as well as the political forces in support of a new contract helped to settle this dispute. Professor Barry Pasternak also listed a number of active CSU Senate task forces. These include international education, as well as a task force on additional fees for post-baccalaureate business and other masters programs. A draft report from the text book task force is expected in the coming months. Finally, there is a task force on dropped courses, withdrawals, incompletes, and repeats. He explained that the CSU fee structure encourages students to over-enroll in their courses because if they take under six units they pay one fee; if they take over six units they pay another fee. One issue is how prescriptive the system wants to be with the individual campuses. A per-unit fee would create better consumer behavior.

Ian Walton, CCC Chair
Professor Walton reported that CCC Chancellor Drummond is going back to his prior job as the Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District (he recently resigned from the system-wide chancellorship). He reported that the CCC ballot initiative passed and it will be placed on the February '08 ballot. This initiative contains language that tries to end Department of Finance (DOF) interference in CCC educational policy (such as the information competency requirements issue); it also concerns the status of the system office as a state agency and its ability to make executive-level appointments and set salaries; and it rolls student fees back to $15/unit and ties fee increases to the growth in personal income. Also included is a change in the CCC funding formula that is specified in Proposition 98. Currently, the formula is based solely on K-12 enrollment; the money is split between K-12 and the CCCs. In this proposal, K-12 funding would grow according to K-12 enrollment and the CCC funding would grow according to CCC enrollment. The con-argument is that it will take money away from UC and CSU. It may mean that the total going to Prop. 98 may not decline in future years as K-12 enrollment declines because CCC enrollment is still expected to increase. Most CCC faculty support this initiative; he urged the support of the faculty from the other segments. He asked the respective Chairs to contact him for additional information.

CAHSEE contines to concern the CCC Senate. In particular, CCC faculty are worried that this test might be applied to those CCCs that grant high school diplomas. While this is not mandatory at this time, there is a proposed revision to Title V that would make it mandatory. The CCC is concerned that CAHSEE is a single measure when the CCCs are in the business of providing alternatives to students who do not obtain high school diplomas. Therefore, it makes no sense to provide alternate pathways if in the end a single measure will still be applied. He also noted that the math and English competencies will be in effect by fall 2009. Regional meetings are taking place now on the 'skills initiative'. The next issue is assessment. He also described a visit that he recently made to Ironwood Prison, which runs an associate degree program with a local community college.

Michael T. Brown, UC Senate Vice Chair/John Oakley, UC Senate Chair
Chair Brown announced that the UC Assembly of the Academic Senate has voted overwhelmingly against prohibitions on tobacco research on the basis of academic freedom. Such a prohibition would constrain faculty research activities. International education is an upcoming issue for UC. While the Senate is participating in the review of the Education Abroad Program, the Senate is also looking at how to make it more structurally central to the UC intellectual enterprise. UC faculty are currently engaged around the issue of graduate education; yet, they do not want to lose their focus on undergraduate education. He remarked that the State Legislature may not really understand graduate education as it does undergraduate education, except that it means 'more education.' UC needs to do a better job explaining its role in knowledge production, knowledge dissemination, economic prosperity, and educational opportunity. Finally, the Senate is passing a resolution that UCOP estimate what mandates to the campuses would cost. UC Senate Chair John Oakley praised Chair Brown for his service to ICAS. He also remarked that UC Provost Rory Hume is engaged in intersegmental cooperation and he will convene a workshop on July 20th to move this cooperation forward; Chair Brown and BOARS Chair Mark Rashid will be representing the Senate at that workshop. .

DISCUSSION: Members expressed their interest in placing the CCC ballot initiative on a future ICAS agenda. The also acknowledged that the K-12 and CCC enrollment patterns are likely to shift, and they briefly discussed some possible funding outcomes if this initiative passes.

One member remarked that externally, graduate education already seems to be the predominant focus of UC; it is somewhat perplexing to hear that the Senate believes that a renewed emphasis is necessary. Chair Brown explained that when compared to other research 'R1' institutions, UC's investment is at the low end. Only about 17% of UC's enrollment are graduate students; other R1s typically maintain a 30% graduate student enrollment. Members also raised the issue of the dearth of counselors at some high schools. Chair Brown acknowledged that this is a growing problem, and he suggested that ICAS may want to take this up in the fall.

ACTION: Chair Brown/John Tarjan will draft a resolution on the dearth of high school counselors; the CCC ballot initiative will be placed on the September ICAS meeting agenda.

III. UC BOARS Update
ISSUE/REPORT: BOARS Chair Mark Rashid reported that BOARS has drafted a proposal to reform UC's freshman eligibility construct. Currently, there are two filters to UC admissions— eligibility and selection; Eligibility confers a guaranteed admission somewhere in the UC system. Campuses essentially select from amongst UC eligible applicants. Eligibility includes the a-g courses (15 courses including four approved English courses beginning in the ninth grade), the GPA received in those courses, the taking of standardized tests, and scores received on those tests. In reality however, it is the actual taking of both the a-g courses and the standardized tests that determine eligibility. He remarked that a particular type of student is well-served by the current system, one for which the bureaucratic complexities of eligibility have been obviated by his or her environment: parents, school, etc. For other types of students, there are a number of barriers to eligibility--bureaucratic and otherwise. The rules of eligibility are

strictly enforced even in cases where it does not make any educational sense. It is not access friendly and therefore it is not optimal in admitting the best and brightest students.

The BOARS' proposal would institute comprehensive review (called 'Entitled to Review') to select students. Under the new system, students would still need to complete the a-g requirements (11 out of the 15 a-g courses by the 11th grade and complete 15 a-g courses by graduation); achieve at least a 3.2 GPA in those courses; and take the SAT core exam. BOARS has estimated that this group will be somewhat larger than the current eligibility pool, but richer in terms of underrepresented minority (URM) students. He stressed that the new system would not change the size of the UC system however. He remarked that there would be an annual adjustment to enrollment targets to ensure that UC does not stray from the Master Plan mandate. The proposal has passed through BOARS unanimously; it is now before the Academic Council with a request to distribute it for system-wide review, which will allow campuses to opine. The final step will be Academic Assembly. He noted that eligibility reform must take place in two places—Senate regulations and Regental policy. The Regents will need to ultimately consider it and approve it. He also reminded members that the proposal is not yet a public document.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if students would no longer need to take the SAT test. Professor Rashid clarified that the core SAT test would still be required, but the subject tests would not be. He remarked that scores on those elective subject tests tell UC admission officers almost nothing about how well students will do in UC. The results on these subject tests also vary widely among ethnic groups. He also noted that the policy proposal would retain eligibility in a local context (ELC) in its current form. Another member asked about the interplay between the a-g courses and career tech courses. Professor Rashid said that the proposal is not specifically tied to career tech courses, but this is certainly an issue that demands BOARS's attention. In particular, BOARS is also looking at the 'g' in the a-g courses to be more inclusive with regard to career tech courses. Members were also interested in any weighting of the criteria in the proposal. He responded that there are really two and one-half requirements (as compared to the current four): the SAT core test, a-g courses, and the GPA receive in those courses. While there really is not any weighting per se, there is a GPA floor.

IV.   ASSIST Update
ISSUE: Chair Brown briefly summarized the correspondence regarding ASSIST. ICAS's initial letter to UC Provost Rory Hume suggested ways to improve the functionality of the ASSIST Board, as well as an offer to convene the Board itself. Provost Hume responded that he did not think this was an appropriate role for this body because ASSIST is an implementation body and not a policy-making entity, but asked for input from the committee. ICAS responded that at the very least, effective Board meetings are desired. Other suggestions included a distinction between official Board members and consultants; clear voting policies and procedures/operating protocols and process; and a mechanism for compliance with these processes. He added that within UC there have been many personnel changes, which have contributed to the deterioration of ASSIST.

UC Admissions Director Susan Wilbur briefed members on the recent history of ASSIST. In the 2005-06 year, the situation with the Board deteriorated, and it has not met this year. In January however, the Executive Committee of the Board began meeting; they discovered serious issues

related to technology -- both with the hardware and the software. A Technology Advisory Committee was formed and it has come forward with a mitigation plan. Hardware issues are currently being addressed, but a number of software issues remain. She noted that the software was last updated in 1996; the current software is no longer supported. A functioning Board is necessary to thoughtfully and thoroughly address the complex software issues. She proposed that an ad-hoc group be formed consisting of six members: three faculty members from each segment and three segment administrators. This group would be tasked with reviewing, discussing, and updating the ASSIST bylaws. She also suggested that Professor Brown be selected to chair this group.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if the ASSIST Executive Director would be participating in the ad-hoc committee. Director Wilbur responded that this is an open question, but she feels that the ad-hoc group should be limited to segment representatives and administrators. As the choice of software platform will have policy implications, it is essential to have faculty representation. Ideally, some faculty representatives should have experience in technology-related projects. Segments would be allowed to make their own administrative appointments; Provost Hume would make the decision on the UC administrator for this group. She added that the charge or bylaws of this group would also specify its composition of the group.

Members discussed the ASSIST reporting line, its funding, and leadership. Certainly, ASSIST's future reporting line may be part of the discussion. UC is the fiscal agent of ASSIST, but chronic funding problems have plagued ASSIST for some time; the last budget augmentation came in the mid-1990s. As a result, the Director has had to adopt a practice of taking on additional projects to support basic core funding, which has produced considerable tensions between priorities. The current funding model is also strained by the information technology problems. Members asked about ASSIST's stability given its outdated technology platform. Susan responded that the hardware issues have been alleviated with the approval of funding for the purchase of two additional servers. Software issues are more daunting though. Indeed, the most recent Microsoft update threatened to break the system, but it did not. UC has prioritized the most serious software issues, and it is worthwhile taking the time to create something that will be sustainable going forward. Members remarked that there are probably one million ASSIST users per month. Director Wilbur added that there are no longer paper back-ups for much of this stuff; many transfer projects would simply grind to a halt if this system stopped working.

One member made a motion to pass the proposal as stated. The clarification was made that the ad-hoc committee will make review ASSIST bylaws and make recommendations to the system-wide offices; it will not make decisions on the software. The segment administrators would be chosen by each of the segmental administrations, probably at the executive level. The point was also made that the group is small enough so that the chairship duties will be quite minimal (it might even be possible to not have a chair); it also may be that important if the chair has voting privileges. All members agreed that an independent and external review of the ASSIST bylaws are necessary; the task of ICAS will be to select faculty members for this group. A motion was made to allow the task group to pick their own Chair from within their group, which was seconded. Members voted in favor of the motion with one vote against and one abstention. Members also approved the ad-hoc proposal, as worded below:

"This six-person ad hoc committee would review the ASSIST bylaws with a particular focus on board composition, reporting lines, and other governing issues. Recommendations would be provided to each of the three segment system offices. Each of the Senates would appoint their faculty to represent their segments and ICAS; each system office would provide one administrator."

ACTION: Members approved the following proposal for the ASSIST task force: "The six-person ad hoc committee would review the ASSIST bylaws with a particular focus on board composition, reporting lines, and other governing issues. Recommendations would be provided to each of the three segment system offices. Each of the Senates would appoint their faculty to represent their segments and ICAS; each system office would provide one administrator." The committee unanimously agreed that the task force should select their own Chair from within the group after the ad hoc committee is convened.

V.   C-ID Project
ISSUE: Julie Adams noted that this project has been funded by the CCC Board of Governors. She is waiting on the naming of UC's articulation officers however. The Advisory Board will be formed over the summer.

ACTION: Chair Brown will forward to Julie Adams the name of an articulation officer to who will represent UC on the C-ID Advisory Board.

VI.   Transfer Update
ISSUE: Chair Brown reported on the implementation of UC senate regulations (SRs) 477 and 478 that address with streamlining of UC's transfer preparation patterns. Specifically, SR 478 concerns itself with the Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC). He reminded members that SB 652 required the Academic Senate to adopt lower division major preparation for transfer students. The Senate's divisional Chairs (each division corresponds to one campus) have been instructed to designate a local committee to participate in the implementation of the UC transfer path with a January 1, 2008 deadline for designation. The **CCC segment** reported that the ICC Transfer Committee began making regional visits to community colleges about one year ago. The committee has collected a fair amount of qualitative data. The committee invited transfer professionals and transfer students to discuss their experiences with the current transfer system. A report will be forthcoming.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if SB 652 mandated that UC institute the LDTP (or something very similar). Chair Brown replied that SB 652 did not require UC to set-up an identical program to the LDTP because of the hyper-differentiation of majors found on UC campuses. Regarding the ICC Transfer Committee, one member recalled that he had seen a report at the last ICC meeting that looked like a list of actions coming out of this group. However, other members were not certain that such a list had been generated.

ACTION: Ian Walton will send out the 'list of actions' that was distributed at the ICC meeting.

VII.   GE Task Force Update

ISSUE: Professor John Tarjan reported that the GE Task Force has met twice. A straw man proposal was distributed in regard to area breadth and IGETC.   Each segment agreed to bring this straw man proposal back to its respective Senate body. He reported that within the **CSU Senate**, there really is no interest to move away from area breadth because most students use it as the course list is more extensive.

The **CCC segment** reported that its Senate has devoted considerable discussion around barriers to transfer and advising issues. The current consensus is that CSU GE breadth works quite well for CCC students. The CCC Senate is also interested in making the intersegmental general education transfer curriculum (IGETC) better. One suggestion included the allowance for IGETC completion after transfer (and not only in times of hardship); another idea was to consider the double-counting of courses (for both IGETC and GE breadth), thereby allowing for more flexibility.

The UC Committee for Educational Policy Chair Richard Weiss reported that for **UC**, it is clear that the CSU/CCC breadth system seems to be working well. Therefore, trying to institute a uniform system is not feasible. UC is also concerned with making IGETC work better. A continuing problem with IGETC is the way in which it is handled on the campuses in terms of uniformity in both implementation and requirements.   Making the transfer process clear and transparent is very important. SCIGETC, which offers flexibility to science transfer students, is not yet in an implementable form. It is currently in the 'Pathways' program, and is still under development.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that if transfer students (to UC) have not completed all of their GE courses before transfer, they are in trouble. At UC Berkeley, an exception is required if a student transfers without completing IGETC first. In other words, students cannot complete IGETC on campus; they must do this off-campus during the summer.

Members also discussed the IGETC Notes. They said that when IGETC was implemented about 15 years ago, there were three 'notes' that provided procedures on IGETC. Since that time much of the knowledge around IGETC has not been written down, and some of this knowledge is leaving with impending retirements. As a result, there have been some efforts made to update these 'notes.' Chair Brown commented that while he was not certain about the status of the IGETC Notes, the AP Chart, which will provide coherence on how AP credit will be factored into acceptance of a courses fulfilling particular transfer requirements on CCC campuses, will be on the September ICAS agenda. Members suggested that both the AP Chart and the IGETC Notes be added to the September agenda. IGETC Notes should go to ICAS first, and then to the segments for review (segment faculty do not need to review for content; the discipline faculty can do that). While some members agreed that allowing ICAS to review the IGETC Notes first was the most logical approach, others did not think that this is necessary. The next ICAS meeting is not until September. CSU members noted that the next CSU Senate plenary occurs one week before the September meeting. With that in mind, members agreed that it would best if ICAS members received the IGETC Notes by email during the summer. It would then be forwarded to the segmental Senates for review before the September meeting. Members

acknowledged that most likely ICAS would not receive any formal comments back before their September meeting.

ACTION: Chair Brown will ask (1) Susan Wilbur to send a draft of the IGETC Notes to ICAS members; (2) a finalized version of the IGETC Notes will go out to the segment heads for distribution over the summer; and (3) IGETC Notes will be placed on the September ICAS meeting agenda.

VIII. WASC/ACCJC Follow-Up

ISSUE: Chair Brown reminded members that Ralph Wolff recently attended the CSU plenary. He acknowledged that some ICAS members were able to attend the WASC annual meeting in San Jose. Certainly, increasing faculty participation in the WASC accreditation process(es) is important. He reported that nationally, negotiations between the Department of Education and universities/colleges has broken down. The Department of Education is now planning on going ahead with its own plans for such things as accountability measures. The Department of Education can establish the new standards, which will go into effect in July 2008.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that segmental Senates have to find ways to support WASC. At the same time, ICAS has some of the concerns vis-à-vis faculty participation and the complex review processes that drag out on the campuses. CCC representatives added that the ICC has been more collegial as of late; they co-sponsored the annual meeting with WASC. Members emphasized that while ICAS wants to support WASC, on the other hand, there still is a need to work on the ICAS/WASC relationship. They mentioned that both WASC and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) are going through their own evaluations at the same time that the Department of Education is trying to change the accreditation rules. The ACCJC has urged faculty to write letters to legislators, the press, and their faculty colleagues. Professor Greg Gilbert, CCC representative, handed out a draft letter from the CCC Senate. He invited members to use it as a template for similar letters from their own Senates. He remarked that the letter adheres to the principles that ICAS embraces and emphasizes the 'Nation at Risk' approach. He further commented that most professors are oblivious about what is going on in Washington D.C. regarding accreditation.

Chair Brown summarized the two related issues for ICAS-- addressing both the 'national scene' of accreditation and the segments' relationship with the local accrediting bodies (WASC/ACCJC). One of the main issues locally is the problem of two different bodies with different standards. Members discussed a number of ways to tackle this issue. Nationally, members felt strongly that an ICAS letter should be sent to Washington D.C. to try to restart discussions between the accrediting agencies and the Department of Education. The letter would emphasize peer-review and best practices; it would argue against homogenization. One member said that the literature clearly shows that the further one goes away from the classroom, the less effective standards become and the more impotent they become in actually promoting change. Another member made a motion to send an ICAS letter to Department of Education Director Spellings first, and obtain the support of the respective segments after it was sent; this motion was seconded. However, other members felt that getting the backing of the segments is also important. Given the short time frame, the suggestion was made to draft something concise that could come directly from ICAS. Chairs from both the CSU and UC segments stated that they

want to get 'buy-in' from their respective Senates' executive committees before sending such a letter. Chair Brown noted that the letter needs to be drafted in the next week. They also agreed that a selection of a short-term writing team would be the best way to move forward.

ACTION: CCC Representative Janet Fulks will chair a subcommittee to draft a letter to national legislators arguing against a standardization of higher education through revisions in the Department of Education's regulatory language regarding certified accreditation. The letter is due by Monday, June 11, 2007, in order for the CSU Senate to review it at their June plenary meeting. Other members of the subcommittee include UC BOARS Chair Mark Rashid and UC Academic Senate Chair John Oakley, as well as CSU Professor Darlene Yee-Melichar.

IX.   ICAS Scheduling/Planning for the 2007-08 Academic Year
ISSUE: Wednesday, September 12, 2007 is the first ICAS meeting of the year in the Los Angeles area (most likely LAX); other dates will be set at the first meeting. Members agreed on the following agenda items for next year: doctoral education, CAHSEE, flagging enrollments, outcomes assessments; CCC ballot initiative/Proposition 98, high schools counselors, review of ASSIST, AP Chart, IGETC Notes, accrediting groups follow-up, and the two-day Legislative meeting in spring 2008.

ACTION: Members agreed upon September 12, 2007 as the next ICAS meeting. The meeting will be held at LAX. ICAS will schedule the remaining meetings for the 2007-08 year at that meeting. 2007-08 ICAS agenda topics include doctoral education, CAHSEE, flagging enrollments, outcomes assessments; CCC ballot initiative/Proposition 98, high schools counselors, review of ASSIST, AP Chart, IGETC Notes, accrediting groups follow-up, and the two-day Legislative meeting in spring 2008.

X.   New Business
ISSUE: Chair Brown mentioned that the membership of the C&D task force needs to be amended (it is a joint task force between the UC Administration and the faculty). He said that this task force was created to add specification to the C and D requirements (the science and math requirements within a-g). He stated that UC implements the approval of courses that meet the requirements for the a-g courses. UC BOARS Chair Rashid added that this task force's mandate is not to reinvent the math and science requirements, but to address the fact that California state standards specify certain things, and if UC/CSU needs something different, then these differences between UC and CSU should be reflected in the policy. The proposal currently calls for 17 members to be on the task force; there are two CSU representatives and no CCC representatives on the task force now. A suggestion has been made to add two CSU representatives. Chair Brown stated that any changes need to be approved by the UC Senate Chair and the UC Provost.

DISCUSSION: CSU members suggested that CSU's representatives on the task force be increased to four to five faculty. Ideally, these members should represent the physical sciences, life sciences, engineering, and mathematics (CSU already has one member from mathematics). CCC members remarked that a-g is also important for their segment; they would like to have at least one representative.

BOARS Chair Rashid commented on some of the broad issues surrounding the a-g courses, which was originally created by UC for UC's own purposes. CSU now makes use of a-g, but UC continues to run the process. The C&D task force is only one issue; there are other times when tinkering with a-g will need to take place. There is also a lot of pressure on a-g, which will make it a good discussion topic for next year's ICAS agenda. Intersegmental cooperation and collegiality will be key. With this in mind, the suggestion was made to suggest the addition of two CCC members to the task force to ensure that the CCC retains their voice (in case one representative is absent).

ACTION: Chair Brown will send a proposal to the UC Academic Council and Provost Rory Hume to suggest the membership of four or, preferably, five CSU representatives and two CCC representatives to the C&D Task Force. The CSU additions to the task force should represent the academic disciplines of the physical sciences, life sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Attest: Michael T. Brown, ICAS Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst