



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

ICAS Meeting Minutes December 6, 2017 USC State Capitol Center, Sacramento, CA <http://icas-ca.org/>

In Attendance:

CSU Senate: Christine Miller – Chair; Catherine Nelson – Vice Chair; Simone Aloisio - Secretary; Robert K. Collins – Member-at-Large (virtually via Zoom); Tom Krabacher – Member-at-Large

CCC Senate: Julie Bruno – President; John Stankas – Vice President; Virginia May – Area A Representative; Dolores Davison – Secretary; John Freitas – Treasurer

UC Senate: Shane White – Chair; Robert May – Vice Chair; Henry Sanchez – BOARS Chair; Carrie Wastal – UCOPE Chair; Edward Caswell-Chen – UCEP Chair

Staff: Tracy Butler, ASCSU, Julie Adams, ASCCC, Hillary Baxter, ASCCC

I. Agenda approved as amended after the re-order of Area D Proposal to Item 2 (to accommodate travel needs) and moving approval of the minutes off of the consent calendar (both sets of minutes will be approved at the next meeting)

II. Area D Proposal (UC Henry Sanchez)

- Chair Miller shared
 - She had been asked for ASCSU feedback and forwarded it.
 - She attended a CSU Academic Council meeting (Provosts) where the Area D proposal was mentioned. An administrator from the CSU indicated they were aware of it and would be trying to provide feedback from administration.
- ICAS Member Sanchez discussed:
 - The classic three – Biology, Chemistry and Physics were subject to the next generation science standards as outlined in the Common Core.
 - UC adopted the Next Generation Science Standards.
 - One of the benefits to new standards put forward, intersegmentally, is that CCC and CSU also benefit by having students who are better prepared.
 - With Area D Proposal, 2023/24 would be the first year freshman would be entering that had been exposed to the 4 year science requirement.
 - UC Academic Council felt they could look at the data to see if there are area high schools that did not offer access to at least 3 or 4 years of

science, and come back a year from now to consider and bring the data back in January and put it forward to the Academic Assembly which meets in the middle of February where they could vote on it in terms of going through this implementation.

- This could be an issue of access.
- Chair Miller asked a clarifying question about academic preparation given the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning task force and the CSU experience (and challenge) of remediation for students who come to the CSU without a 4th year of mathematics.
 - There is the added challenge of the differences in academic preparation between segments (i.e. admission standards are different).
- Member Sanchez offered that this conversation with the State Board of Education (Michael Kirst) and the four segments (K-12, CCC, CSU, UC) needs to take place sooner rather than later.
 - To discuss the whole pipeline and aligning curriculum itself – not just assessment of the curriculum – and academic preparation overall.
- Members discussed the necessity of avoiding unintended consequences (i.e. lower graduation rates among set groups of students such as underrepresented populations).
 - Caution in sweeping academic preparation changes must be used to avoid widening achievement gaps.
- Member Sanchez stated that next steps are to identify if there are any high schools in the system that cannot offer three years of science (to determine that there is not a question of access).
 - If there is a question of access for any of the districts, outside assistance could be used to provide support to them and help them make access available over time.
 - It will be brought back to the Academic Council in January and if they are satisfied, a vote would then send it to the Academic Assembly for a vote to adopt, campus-wide.
 - Changes would be made to Area D.
 - Then the process of implementation would begin.
- Member Sanchez will keep ICAS apprised with how this is moving forward.

III. ICAS Legislative Plan

- In about a week, ICAS Chairs will be going to the Capitol for a legislative meet and greet.
 - Julie Bruno may have Jury duty and, if so, John Stankas may be in attendance in her place.
- Director Adams indicated there were a number of appointments that had already been nailed down (Enclosure 3) and will keep everyone updated.
- Member/CCC Chair Bruno is currently working with staff from UC and CSU to finalize the document on faculty diversity for the Chairs' meetings with legislators.

- Director Adams will have information on each legislator/staffer (what committees they're on, etc.) and have it to Chairs sometime this week.
- Chairs will want to touch on promoting the Transfer forum during visits.
- Chairs might also want to touch on "the new CPEC" and make the connection with legislators to allow ICAS to be a guide and resource for creating that in the future.
- Emphasis should be put on *what* requested funding would be used for (i.e. budgets for hiring of both full and part-time faculty to support progress and further the mission of higher education).
- Director Adams stated that there was still time to add additional people to the list Chairs would be speaking to so if anyone thinks of another legislator to be added, please contact her immediately.

IV. Transfer Forum

- Chair Miller shared (during discussion of ICAS Legislative Plan) in the beginning of the week, there had been a Senate Select Committee hearing on Student Success which focused on the CSU (also discussed in Chairs' reports). At the end of her testimony Chair Miller mentioned that the Transfer Forum was scheduled for February. The three Senators there (Glazer, Wilk and Allen), were *very* interested and asked for further information.
- Member/CCC Chair Julie Bruno identified Richard Pan (D) as a legislative ally.
- Director Adams shared two flyer options with Members which can be emailed or printed and included with other "leave behinds" (i.e. the packet used for next week with the Chairs/Legislators meet and greet).
 - Members were asked to make a choice between two, for the meet-and-greets next week.
- Arrangements are being made with staff for a room at the capitol. Once that has been secured, Chair Miller will send email invitations to the three Senate members she met with at the Senate Select Committee Hearing and tell them where.
- The Transfer Forum is set to take place from 1:00 to 4:00 (3 hours). Discussion was had on the structure of the forum (an event that takes place over the entire 3 hours or one that happens for 1.5 hours and then repeated with a new set of legislators). Structure of the Forum (and, to some degree, the documentation there for folks to take away with them) should probably include
 - Introduction
 - Q&A sessions
 - Opportunities to introduce ICAS
 - Transfer efforts at each of the segments.
 - The governance structure of each segment and how the respective Senates work into that.
 - How ICAS brings those three segments together and how they work collectively.
 - What efforts the segments are doing in concert.
 - The challenges.

- The solutions that are being worked toward (segmentally and intersegmentally).
- Mention was made that a diverse set of students from each of the segments should be invited to share:
 - Their transfer stories,
 - Their challenges (what they faced then and what they face now)
 - Success stories.
- Member Stankas suggested they might include successful transfer stories that highlighted examples of hiring former students as teachers when funding was available to make that happen.
- Member Nelson suggested that if the forum were to be split into sections, those sections should be highlighted in the flyer so legislators would know when to come for which parts of the forum.
- Chair Miller added that the times ICAS would be covering each topic should be called out on the flyer.
 - It might be more manageable if they could be repeated (something like a poster session) rather than one long 3 hour marathon session.
- Member/CCC Chair Bruno mentioned that the group should be aware of and be ready to address the data that's out there about transfer.
 - There could be a "one pager" with data on transfer trends from the respective segments so there is a common reference point.
 - (Director Baxter) Perhaps each Chair could think about "If I had one message on transfer, to communicate about my segment and one to communicate collectively with my fellow Chairs, what would those two messages be?"
- Chair Miller suggested that rather than highlight how each segment handles their students (although that could be there to some degree), there should be a strong focus on movement between segments.
- Chair Miller asked that members turn their attention to the ICAS Brochure and return to the Transfer Forum discussion after lunch.
- Chair Miller suggested brainstorming to get a final structure for the Forum. There is no additional ICAS meeting before it's happening
 - Chair Miller asked what the general consensus was on breaking the forum into two parts – 1:00 to 2:30 and again from 2:30 to 4:00 (repeating the first part).
 - Breaks could be built inbetween.
 - Segments could be broken into 15 minutes with 5 minutes afterward for follow-up discussion.
 - Member/CCC Chair Bruno added that doing so might break it up into two forums almost. Her sense is they might get into good conversations that will take longer than allotted time. She likes the idea of "chunking" it – but possibly with discreet topics.
 - Visitors to the forum can "float" in and out depending on their schedules.
 - Specific topics should certainly be called out on the agenda so people know when to show up for what discussion.

- Chair Miller had pinpointed several topics for discussion that had already been identified by ICAS and believed the structure of the forum might allow guidance on when to take on what discreet topic.
- Member Nelson suggested taking topics in groups (three?) but for longer chunks of time, to allow for longer follow on discussion and Q&A.
- Member/UC Chair and member Krabacher offered that the relationship building aspect of the forum was a very important factor. Perhaps having shorter presentations (not too short) with longer time for discussion would be valuable.
- Director Baxter suggested identifying primary messages and starting off with segments of whatever length is decided on (three or five) then
 - Start with context and challenges,
 - “Faculty prerogatives” where the main message is around faculty input,
 - Perhaps highlighting the good things that have come from 1440, Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT), UC transfer pathways, the challenges to getting further convergence, etc.
- Chair Miller suggested an approach and an answer to the questions that may come up about why there are segmental differences to academic preparation and in academic pathways.
 - Further comment was made about taking time to explain why some of those differences are actually beneficial and keep options open for students.
 - Additional comments were made about fleshing out other arguments as well, in case the “celebrate the differences” concept doesn’t speak to legislators.
 - It might be valuable to have a narrative and facts on hand in the event it’s necessary to refute some challenging narratives out there. But, not lead with that, call it out or go in defensively.
- Comments were made about focusing on the student experience and the clarity of transfer pathways for them. As a message to legislators, that would resonate as these students are their constituents.
 - Pinpoint that though there are differences between the segments, the paths from one to the other are clear for students regardless of the choice they make for their paths in higher education.
- Now that brainstorming has happened, what do we talk about in this forum?
 - Pathways (UC pathways, 1440).
 - Data (transfer trends, etc. This should be data driven).
 - Messaging (how we communicate with students about transfer).
 - Student Panel (member/CCC Chair Bruno mentioned they might not have to be there the entire day since the forum is being split up).
 - Each of the segments will reach out to their Student associations.
- The decision was made not to invite press to this particular event though the possibility of a post-forum press release was floated.

V. ICAS Brochure

- All three Chairs looked at the brochure and approved it prior to the meeting (agenda listed as “discussion/action” but Chairs wished to share it).
- Chair Miller wished to discuss when it’s used, how everyone gets access to it, etc.
 - It would be helpful if all three segments had the brochure in electronic form so that they could use it for their own needs (i.e. ASCSU Legislative Day).
- The brochure is normally on the ICAS website and can be downloaded).
- 100 printed copies will be made available.
- When updated data becomes available, it can be added to the electronic/downloadable version on the ICAS website.

VI. Working Lunch and Chairs’ Reports (other agenda items demanded greater than allotted time and Chairs’ reports were given in the last part of the meeting as a result):

CSU – Christine Miller

- CSU is seeing a lot of interest from the Department of Finance, the Governor’s office, and from the LAO on online education.
 - Paul Steenhausen from the LAO asked for a meeting with the CSU on the topic.
- There is indication that folks at the capital are looking for legislative solutions that push that agenda.
- To give a sense of the Special Committee Hearing on Student Success, it had the CSU Assistant Vice Chancellor James Minor, Bruce Vandel from Complete College America and Laura Jimenez from the Center for American Progress.
 - Two CSU faculty were included on a panel to discuss remediation
 - Chair Miller was also there to testify.
- As an informational item that will come to ICAS in February:
 - AB 798 (Open education resources) will be bringing funding to campuses in 2018 (and a June 30 2018 due date for proposals for faculty development and textbook affordability programs).
 - There is \$1.3 Million to be distributed to the CCC and CSU.
 - ICAS will need to appoint the OER Council members to review the proposals.
 - Chair Miller will be sending information about this to ICAS members in January.
- At ASCSU’s last plenary they had several resolutions.
 - One that passed in second reading was on Quantitative Reasoning
 - AS-3308-17/APEP (Rev) **Standards for Quantitative Reasoning**
 - ASCSU is still waiting on a response
 - There was a first reading item which might be of interest to ICAS

- It was not distributed to ICAS since the sponsoring committee will be meeting again and there may be changes to the resolution that might expand it.
- It is on “Project Rebound” the project to assist educational goals of the formerly incarcerated
- It will be acted on at the ASCSU’s January Plenary.
 - Another first reading item is on C-ID but may not pass in January.
- Another item CSU is starting to focus on is student basic needs (housing and food security).
 - An announcement of a Basic Needs conference in February was recently made.
- The ASCSU Executive committee is having an ongoing series of meetings with administration, to discuss shared governance.

UC – Shane White

- Chair White gave an update on his segment’s
 - Governance challenges,
 - State audits,
 - Whistle blower complaints,
 - UC President
- and the lucubration they represent for the UC Senate.
- UC Transfer Pathways – will have its first full meeting tomorrow
 - There will be three subcommittees
 - One will be on ADTs for science
 - One is on articulation
 - One is on advising

CCC – Julie Bruno

- The ASCCC had their plenary in November and there was a resolution on collegial consultation and decision making (the issues of shared governance).
- They passed a number of other resolutions. Some were about support for DACA students.
- Others included
 - implementing AB 705,
 - Accreditation,
 - ESL impact from the termination of the common assessment,
 - Articulation
 - Student accountability
 - Implementing “vision for success”
 - College autonomy
- The Governor sent a letter to the CCC Chancellor asking for a 115th CCC that is completely online.
- The Chancellor’s response was to form FLOW – a task force – who have asked the ASCCC for representatives.

- The workgroup (and consultant) have identified that this 115th CCC would serve students with some college and no certification and working adults with vocational needs.
- They have had two in-person and one virtual meeting.
- A report from the group has just come out today that no one has really had a chance to see.
- It will go directly to the Governor.
- It has 4 options.
 - Option 1 - They create a FLOW unit with a state-wide mission that's within an existing CCC campus.
 - Option 2 - There be a FLOW consortium of colleges hosted by an existing district
 - Option 3 – the new FLOW district, operating under the Chancellor's Office (and fully competency based).
 - Option 4 – Expand their existing online education initiative
- A new Chancellor came in a year ago, of course.
- Almost all of the Vice Chancellor's – save one – have been replaced in their system
- Their deputy chancellor will be leaving in January
- The Board of Governors' President came to their last plenary session and reminded them they had hired the new Chancellor to shake things up and the ASCCC must take on their responsibility of speaking truth to power.

VII. Dream Centers/DACA Joint Letter

- At the last meeting, a joint letter was proposed from the 3 ICAS segment Chairs to the 3 segment leaders (President and Chancellors) suggesting all three segments share resources to support higher education DACA students overall.
- Chair Miller reported that since the last meeting, she has been informed that the number of dream centers in the CSU now number 16.
 - The CSU Chancellor is very supportive of ICAS' idea
- CCC reports that since the last meeting, the feedback they've received indicates there are fewer than 10 campuses with an actual physical center. Most of their resources are in the form of counselors and staff that can speak to students.
 - At a few CCC campuses report there has been a large drop in Dreamer students this quarter.
- UC reports that the feedback they've received indicates the system has lost 4 or 5 students since federal announcements indicated DACA students could now be targeted (not necessarily because of deportation).
 - Mention was made about the possibility of sharing resources and there is concern about making certain UC students will still receive the support they need from their system and demand will not overwhelm the system's ability to do so.
 - This is a very important issue for President Napolitano.
- Talk of Federal Budget decisions to keep the government open, might have an effect DACA and DACA resources.

- ICAS will continue to discuss and what the actions in Washington to see what the overall effect will be on this population of students.
- A letter of some sort could still be a positive thing to alert segment leadership that this is something that concerns ICAS and offers data (resources each segment has on the ground and the number of students we're talking about).
- A draft of the letter will come back to the February meeting.

VIII. Higher Ed Provision in the Proposed Federal Tax Bill

- Chair Miller received an update email from the CSU federal government relations staff to the government relations staff at the campuses on this topic.
 - It includes a table outlining the house plan and the Senate plan and the differences between them. Chair Miller forwarded to members.
- The Bill disadvantages higher education in a number of ways (tax benefits, charitable giving, tax exempt loan financing, unrelated business income taxation, among others).
- It hits universities in a number of different dimensions from taxation of students and student families to tax exempt bonds and charitable giving.
- Higher education lobbyists are apparently working nonstop.
- This is moving so quickly, however, there is probably little that can be done at this point. It looks like this is inevitable.

IX. Articulation (agreements and requesting syllabi)

- Member/CCC Chair Bruno stated that this was a topic that came from an articulation officer at her college.
 - There had been anecdotal data that classes that had been articulated through ASSIST, faculty members and others were still demanding syllabi rather than accepting those courses.
 - She had asked the officer if there were specific areas this was happening in.
 - Some were UC, some were CSU and the disciplines ranged.
 - Their understanding is that courses outline of record are supposed to be used for articulation purposes.
 - ICAS had put out a memo to that effect in 2010.
 - Comment was made that folks can be directed to the website and it might be time to revisit the memo since it has been 7 years.
 - Mention was made that the course outline of record is where to direct folks to see if there's an issue there and that – perhaps - the course outline of record needs to be addressed.
 - Syllabi can vary widely so rather than get “into the weeds”, it would be handy to direct folks to the document that outlines the basis of understanding for this topic.
 - Chair Miller asked to be copied on any such communication as a way to bring it back to the CSU segment and request feedback.

- A request was made to do the same for the UC segment and copy ASUC Chair Shane White.
- Given the time elapsed, Chair Miller would like to get a better idea of what the problem is, why the problem exists before stating that ICAS should send out another announcement regarding the document put out in 2010.
 - Is it necessarily the solution to the issue?
 - Is this a failing of a particular course that has deviated from the course outline of record? Is it student specific (did not meeting their obligations in class)? Is it a difference between faculty-to-faculty conversations vs. articulation officers communicating?
 - There are many variables that need to be identified and discussions that need to be expanded.

X. Adjournment

Respectfully Submitted by Director Tracy Butler.