

**Meeting Minutes (Draft)**

***Thursday, June 9, 2011*10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Holiday Inn Capitol Plaza - Sacramento   
300 J Street Sacramento, California 95814

**In Attendance:**

CCC: Richard Mahon, David Morse, Jane Patton, Michelle Pilati, Beth Smith

CSU: Kevin Baaske, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Thomas Krabacher, James Postma,

UC: Jonathan Alexander, Robert Anderson, William Jacob, David Kay, Daniel Simmons

**Guests:**

CCC: Julie Bruno, Phil Smith

CSU: Christine Miller, Darlene Yee-Melcher

**Staff**

CCC: Julie Adams, Katey Lewis

CSU: Tracy Butler

UC: Martha Winnacker

**I. Welcome and Chair’s Announcements**

Chair Patton welcomed ICAS members to the meeting at 10:02 am.

**II. Consent Calendar**

*Approval of the Agenda*

*Approval of the April 25, 2011 Meeting Notes*

MSU (Jacob) to approve the consent calendar as presented.

**III. Legislation and Advocacy**

Members debriefed on the April 25th legislative advocacy day and discussed potential plans for the next year. Traditionally, ICAS hosts a legislative day every year in the State Capitol and invited staffers and legislators visit with all of the ICAS members for 15 – 20 minute appointments. This year, the committee room was only available until 3 p.m., so at that time ICAS members split into three teams and made office visits. Members agreed that it is more effective to have guests come and visit with all ICAS members at once. Conversations with long-time staffers like Sandra Fried, Consultant to the Assembly Higher Education Committee, are very productive because these staffers have background knowledge about ICAS and higher education. Future meetings with high-level staffers would be beneficial because these staffers are influential and can effectively communicate issues to their members.

ICAS members also discussed the presentation provided at the pre-legislative day dinner the night before ICAS. It was suggested that next year, instead of a presenter, ICAS members should spend this time in the future solidifying the group’s talking points. Members provided additional feedback and thoughts on the legislative day. Overall, the efforts of ICAS to advocate for the entire public, higher education system as a whole has been successful. The physical presence of ICAS members conducting advocacy activities in the State Capitol have been noticed and these efforts are recognized by the segments’ governmental relations offices.

Members then discussed the development of an advocacy toolkit. Smith distributed an updated cover letter to accompany the toolkit for review. She also shared lobbying guidelines developed by the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) for faculty and members agreed these materials should be modified into an intersegmental resource.

Action Items

* The three chairs will check with their respective governmental relations offices to determine the best time to distribute the cover letter and advocacy materials to local faculty.
* ICAS members agreed that the cover letter is acceptable.
* CCC Senate Office will initially draft the advocacy materials. These items will be on the September 2011 ICAS agenda for approval and then will be distributed to the three segment’s governmental relations offices for feedback.

**IV. CPEC Student Success Advisory Committee Recommendations**

Beth Smith reported on recent discussions of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) advisory committee on student success. Smith, who has been serving as a liaison to CPEC, explained that the advisory committee will release a report on student success. Members agreed that a more productive conversation should take place regarding whether ICAS should support CPEC, specifically if there are areas within CPEC that should be maintained. The future of CPEC is unknown as the agency is zeroed out in the proposed State budget (*addendum*: the State budget signed on July 1, 2011 eliminated all funding for CPEC). Members agreed that CPEC does collect and package useful data, particularly when post-secondary and secondary data are organized by region or county. The data that CPEC provides the UC regarding eligibility are also important. CPEC’s report titled [*Ready or Not, Here They Come*](http://www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2010reports/10-05.pdf) was useful to some ICAS members. A discussion was held about the potential benefits of pursuing a relationship with CPEC. Members wondered if another agency or organization would handle the data collection if CPEC were eliminated, and one ICAS member noted that it would be important for an independent body to collect the data. Patton proposed that three different approaches could be taken in regards to CPEC: 1) wait and see the outcome of CPEC’s funding, 2) Draft an email in support of CPEC, and 3) write a formal letter in support of CPEC.

Action Items

* Smith to compile points regarding the value of CPEC’s data.
* The three segment chairs will continue the conversation regarding CPEC.

**V. White Papers**

Richard Mahon updated members on the history and progress of ICAS draft white papers. He thought that ICAS approved the three papers (Common Course Numbering & Transfer, Accountability, and Intersegmental Transfer) at some level in 2009-10. Adams noted that the ICAS minutes do not mention any approval of the papers. The papers on distance education and full-time faculty were worked on this year. Mahon asked if these papers would have been helpful to the chairs during their advocacy visits last year and he wondered if the audience for the papers is legislators and their staff. The distance education paper, which addresses an issue that changes frequently, does not take an official position. Patton spoke about a recent hearing she attended at the Little Hoover Commission, during which questions arose regarding “what happened” to common course numbering. Jack Scott, the CCC Chancellor, also recently asked for more information about C-ID so there is need for ICAS to have simple materials ready to distribute as needed. Patton suggested that the paper on common course numbering and transfer be shorter and simpler. Postma suggested developing a “hybrid” version of the papers – both a shorter and longer version. Members agreed that there is a need for both types of papers – a background document on the issue and a corresponding “talking points” paper.

Members then discussed the proposed template for the ICAS papers. One member explained that they liked the outlining style of the template, which could be a predictable format for legislative staffers. The papers could then be “bundled” together and distributed, or distributed individually. It was noted that the “What can legislators do to help?” section on the intersegmental transfer paper was beneficial and should be included on the other papers. Members also mentioned that the papers should have the ICAS’ mission statement inserted. Adams noted that ICAS does not have a mission statement. Some members requested that a mission statement be discussed at the September 2011 meeting.

Action Items

* Patton offered to write executive summaries of the papers and will send them to the other two chairs, for approval by ICAS at the September 2011 meeting.
* Pilati offered to assist with updating the C-ID paper using the bullet point format.
* Revise the Template by removing the term “voluntary” from the footer of all the papers and website.
* CSU staff to include an item on the next agenda to discuss a mission statement for ICAS.

Members then discussed each paper’s next steps for the record and to identity the needed actions.

The Master Plan at 50: Distance Education

Members spoke about some of their concerns and agreed that the paper is in need of additional work. Members agreed to bring the paper back in the fall with less narrative and a list of principles. Winnacker wondered why the paper was tied so closely to the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) report on distance education and Patton suggested that the LAO report should not receive as much prominence in the ICAS paper. Members were asked to send their comments on the distance education paper to the subgroup. It was suggested to add a section to this paper titled “Recent Actions” which would include the Western Governors University and the LAO report. Beth Smith suggested having the paper linked to the ICAS website where topics could be developed in more depth. Members agreed that distance education is becoming a significant topic.

The Master Plan: Common Course Numbering and Transfer

Members agreed that the common course numbering paper should be put in the new format and C-ID leadership should update the content of the paper. It was suggested that the paper should explain why “common” should not be too “common” by having identical programs at all colleges. It was also noted that most of the paper discusses past failures and should be modified to discuss successes or mention the past projects as “evolutions” into C-ID.

The Master Plan and Accountability

ICAS members spoke about the first sentence of the paper, specifically the definition of “accountability”. Members then agreed that “The Master Plan” should be removed from the title of all the papers and should be replaced with “California Public Higher Education”. Postma suggested that ICAS draft a paper on the Master Plan itself, discussing its evolution and consensus of the faculty regarding the Master Plan.

The Master Plan at 50 – Providing Quality Higher Education in California: Why Full-time Faculty are Critical

Mahon explained that this is the most difficult paper and is a larger project.

The Master Plan and Intersegmental Transfer

This paper is missing new information on SB 1440 and would be an appropriate place to discuss transfer AA/AS degrees. It was suggested to include data on how many community college students transfer to the CSU. Postma suggested including a statement against standardization.

Members expressed gratitude to Mahon for taking the lead on the ICAS papers.

Action Item: All papers will be edited and on the September 2011 ICAS agenda as an action item for approval.

**VI. Working Lunch and Reports from Senate Chairs**

Daniel Simmons, Chair, Academic Senate UC

Simmons reported that the budget is the central focus for the UC. He reported on budget conversations that took place at the recent UC Regents meeting regarding the UC budget and raising fees. Simmons then spoke about efforts taking place to redirect how funding is allocated to UC campuses. He discussed research programs that are legislative earmarks and the debate on whether some of the legislatively-favored programs could be reallocated in the way that UCOP is proposing, which results in some UC campuses have more funding per student. A special task force through the UC Academic Council has been formed to develop innovative ways to reallocate funds. Their ideas will then be presented to the re-benching task force. Simmons then spoke about the UC’s recent loan of $7 million to fund distance education projects and the UC Academic Senate’s response to this loan, particularly that the program should be focused on educating UC students but the proposal is focused on marketing UC courses to non-UC students. A significant element of the proposal is the evaluation of the developed online courses. Members briefly discussed UC transfer certificates, which include online courses. Simmons concluded his report by noting that under Jacob’s leadership, BOARS is developing a comprehensive review process for transfer students.

James Postma, Chair, Academic Senate CSU

Postma began his report by explaining that CSU is particularly vulnerable to explicit budget cuts and the strategy under discussion to combat those cuts is to increase student fees. He explained that increasing student fees leads to enrollment management and planning issues. The budget cuts have caused the CSU campuses to examine their individual funding. Postma noted that the smaller and newer campuses have communicated with the CSU Chancellor’s Office and minor budget adjustments were made accordingly – the smaller campuses received slight funding increases and the older campuses received slight decreases in funding. Postma informed ICAS members that the CSU Chancellor’s Office received a $10 million funding reduction, which includes the CSU Senate office. The implications of this budget cut for the CSU Academic Senate will include more meetings held via conference call, less travel and a possible cut to Plenary Sessions.

Members agreed that it was an appropriate time to discuss the budget situations for the CCC and UC Academic Senates. Simmons reported that the UC Academic Senate’s budget will be reduced by 8%. These cuts will be absorbed through less committee travel. Patton reported on the budget cuts for the CCC Academic Senate. A reduction in committee activities and events will take place and she is concerned about the long-range implications of the budget cuts. The CCC Academic Senate receives revenue from different sources and some grants will be concluding and operational costs will need to be reduced by 20%. Patton explained that the CCC Academic Senate is pursuing additional grants and outside funding through their foundation.

Postma concluded his report and explained that the passage and implementation of SB 1440 has resulted in internal issues such as waivers for the removal of the American Institutions requirement, as well as additional costs burdens.

Jane Patton, President, Academic Senate CCC

Patton began her report by discussing the budget situation for both the state CCC Academic Senate and the local senates. During difficult budget times, shared governance can be threatened. The greatest work load for the CCC Academic Senate is C-ID and the implementation of SB 1440. Patton spoke about SB 1143, which was signed in the fall and mandates the development of a community college student success task force . The task force is looking at what the metrics of success should be along with examining performance-based funding. Historically, faculty have been opposed to performance based funding. Patton then spoke about her recent attendance at an ICC meeting and noted that SB 1440 and the transfer degrees were not discussed. She suggested that next year, ICAS meet with the new Executive Director to the State Board of Education to discuss the new “common core” agenda . Patton explained that the State Board of Education is attempting to tie the K-12 standards into a common core and predict college readiness; ICAS will need to intervene with the college readiness standards. Jacob informed members that UC BOARS is aware of this. Patton then spoke about the assessment consortium called “Smarter Balanced Assessment” which includes plans from the California Department of Education to create linkages with post-secondary education. (<http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/pj/582>) Smarter Balanced is connected to EdSource and Patton suggested inviting Sue Burr, the EdSource Executive Director, to a future ICAS meeting to discuss the implications of their activities on the post-secondary sector. Patton spoke about the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and expressed concern about the federal intrusion into California’s education system. She encouraged members to think about what faculty can do to help the Governor oppose the federalization of education in California. She also suggested that ICAS have a conversation regarding the Western Governors University in the fall. Patton concluded her report by suggesting that a discussion regarding acceleration and pressures to move students quickly through degree programs be discussed on the September 2011 ICAS agenda.

**VII. Transfer Update**

C-ID and SB 1440 Implementation

Pilati began the update on C-ID and SB 1440 by informing members that ten TMCs have been approved. The next vetting period for the draft TMCs will end on October 16, 2011. SB 1440 implementation efforts between the CSU and CCC have been well coordinated. In the future, a plan will need to be developed to periodically evaluate the curriculum within the TMCs. The CCC Chancellor’s office has approved 59 degrees from 33 colleges so far. Postma explained that there is wisdom to these statewide TMCs because as the degrees come to the CSU campuses, those based on a TMC have a 90% approval rate. The value of developing a centralized structure has been demonstrated.

Members then discussed SciGETC and why it was never completed and implemented. Postma spoke about the history of SciGETC and proposed that it could be useful in the future.

Simmons reported on the transfer efforts of the UC, notably that seven discipline groups have convened in an attempt to identify common, lower discipline preparation programs. Members discussed which disciplines are beneficial for transfer students to complete IGETC for – particularly the disciplines where the lower division preparation is less demanding. Mahon, who previously chaired the IGETC standards committee, explained that ICAS approved IGETC after transfer. Phil Smith explained that the intention of SciGETC was to have it be another option for transfer, but never came to fruition. Members then discussed the interaction of SB 1440 degrees and IGETC.

Action Item:

ICAS members will continue discussions on SB 1440 and IGETC.

Update on BOARs Discussion

Jacob updated members on conversations in BOARs regarding transfer. He explained that major preparation is a topic receiving a great deal of attention and a single message is needed – students should identify a major and properly prepare for it. Jacob discussed UC admissions procedures and issues in further detail. A potential admissions message from the UC could be if a student completes an 1) AA for transfer, 2) UC common core in a major or 3) or completes an existing pathways (TAGs), and if the student has a good GPA, the strongest students will be admitted. Campus admission directors could ignore a minor missing requirement if they feel that the candidate is strong. This strawman proposal is moving slowly. Jacob explained that his objective is that by July or October of 2011 to have a proposal distributed for system-wide review. Jacob would like to work on common messaging and asked ICAS members about how they feel about identifying a major and preparing appropriately. Patton asked if it was conceivable that UC faculty might consider a TMC, and Jacob said yes.

Members summarized the discussion, and a “wait and see” approach will be taken. Patton explained that this was good news and would like to see the UC report from the discipline meetings. Postma suggested taking a new look at the design of SciGETC to see if it would work smoothly with the new SB 1440 transfer degrees. The IGETC subcommittee should be tasked with examining SciGETC and the transfer degrees. It was suggested that a conference call be held prior to the next ICAS meeting.

IGETC Standards Group

Morse reported on the work of the ICAS IGETC Standards subgroup and explained the changes made to the most recent version of the standards document. Jacob provided an update on Statway, which will potentially be discussed on July 9th at UC BOARs. The IGETC Standards subgroup was waiting on input from UC BOARS to make a decision on Statway. Morse spoke about the art classes for general education, specifically what can be counted for general education.

Action: MSU (Mahon) to approve the minor recommendations from the ICAS IGETC subgroup as noted in Enclosures 7a and 7b.

Action Items:

* CCC Academic Senate office to post the updated standards document on the ICAS website.
* Before July 2011, appointments from each segment should be made for the IGETC Standards subgroup.

**VIII. Request for Syllabi**

David Kay and Beth Smith presented final letters to ICAS members regarding articulation based on syllabi rather than course outlines. The versions presented reflect the changes suggested at the last ICAS meeting. Postma noted that he thought the wording of the letters was eloquent. ICAS members had a lengthy discussion regarding mechanisms to deal with course review issues and the C-ID numbers. Members agreed that it would be best to finish the letter and if faculty have local questions, the local department chairs could be consulted.

Action: By consensus, ICAS members approved the memos for distribution in June.

**IX. Transition Discussion/2011-12 Meeting Dates**

ICAS members discussed items to be addressed during 2011-12 and the following topics were suggested:

* Invite Ralph Wolfe from WASC and Sue Burr from EdSource to attend an ICAS meeting.
* Discuss the federal intrusion on education, distance learning and the Western Governors University.
* SciGETC
* Pressures for acceleration and student completion
* Budget and lobbying efforts
  + Advocacy letter should come back for approval.
* Budget reductions and the impact on shared governance.

The CSU Academic Senate will take the lead on scheduling the first ICAS meeting of 2011-12. Members agreed to meet in Sacramento and several office spaces were offered. The CSU Academic Senate will coordinate with the incoming chairs on the selection of a first meeting date.

**X. New Business**

**XI. Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted by:

Katey Lewis, ASCCC Program Specialist