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**In Attendance:**

CCC Senate: David Morse, President; John Stanskas, Secretary; Craig Rutan, South Representative; Michelle Grimes-Hillman, South Representative; and Julie Adams, Executive Director

CSU Senate: Steven Filling, Chair; Christine Miller, Vice Chair; Susan Gubernat, Secretary; Praveen Soni, Member-at-Large; Julie Chisholm, Member-at-Large; and Tracy Butler, Director

UC Senate: J. Daniel Hare, Vice Chair; Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair; Tracy Larrabee, UCEP Chair; Bruce Cooperstein, UCOPE Chair; and Hilary Baxter, Executive Director

Guests: Kathy Harris, COERC Project Coordinator

**Consent Calendar**

*Approval of the September 26, 2014 Agenda*

Introductions were conducted. The agenda was approved by consensus with a clarification about CSU Executive Order 1065.

*Approval of the June 5, 2014 Meeting Notes*

There were no substantive changes to the minutes. They were approved by consensus.

**Date and Location of future ICAS Meetings**

Chair Filling introduced the option of having ICAS meetings at different locations through the year (CSU Office of the Chancellor, for instance). After discussion of locations and dates, locations and schedule were determined as follows:

* + Monday, December 15, 2014 will be held at the CSU Chancellor’s Office in Long Beach.
	+ Thursday, February 5, 2014 will be held at CSU East Bay.
	+ April meeting will be held in Sacramento. Possible dates are April 13th or 20th (it might be a better date for legislators and it’s after the Easter break) The committee will wait on deciding an exact date after speaking with government relations staff.
	+ Friday, June 5, 2014 will be held in Sacramento.

*Action*

* + Tracy Butler will check with the CSU East Bay office to secure a meeting space for the February 5th meeting.
	+ Chair Filling will get feedback from CSU governmental relations staff to see which date in April (13th or 20th) would be better for ICAS advocacy days at the capitol.

**General Announcements**

*Chair/President Reports*

***David Morse, President, CCC Academic Senate***

Member Morse provided updates on three technology initiatives which are a focus of their Senate. They are: 1) an Online Initiative, 2) Developing a Common Assessment, and 3) Educational Planning.

The Online Initiative is being worked on by a large group that is putting together an online portal for students to access classes and support services. The second initiative - involves developing one common assessment tool (rather than many) that each of their 113 campuses can use. The third initiative focuses on using technology to accomplish an educational plan for students. All three initiatives are moving forward, have faculty representation and discussions are continuing.

The Course Identifier (C-ID) System, its expansion, support and adjustments are also part of their discussions with the CCC Chancellor’s office.

Transfer Degrees: over 1,400 system-wide have been developed, approved and are in place. Their goal is to have 1,622 to have 100% compliance. They do expect to achieve that by the end of the year.

Member Gubernat asked if they were aware of longer term plans with regard to transfer degrees, enrollment management and capacity.

He is aware the topic has been introduced and discussed between the two segments (CCC & CSU). At the present time, capacity is not an issue. But, there is awareness; it will have to be revisited as transfer degrees grow. In the longer term, it will impact capacity.

Legislation: AB 2558 (professional development) did several things. First, it renamed their professional development program. Second, it made an explicit statement that professional development needed to be for all employees (administrators and staff as well as faculty) in their system. This will be more inclusive and could provide development for part-time faculty as well. However, the language that set aside funding for the purpose has since been removed from the bill. The CCC is currently in the process of finding money in the system to implement the new program.

They have a new Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (Pam Walker). She is the former interim President of American River College.

They have a new Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness (a new area developed by their Chancellor’s office). Theresa Tena (formerly Vice President for the Community College League of California) and her division will provide technical assistance and resources to colleges for the purposes of accreditation, fiscal administration and student preparedness.

There have been ongoing discussions, statewide, about adult education and the relationships between community colleges, K-12 and private providers of each region of the state. This was started by Assembly Bill 86 last year. The idea is to make certain that each region around the state is covered. There will be money for implementation next year after the planning phase of that. They have been making progress in ensuring faculty voices are brought to the table to make certain there is faculty representation during discussions.

There have been questions and discussion among their Academic Senates as to whether they are bound by the Browne and/or Bagley Keene acts. Chair Filling shared a similar line of discussion that happened at CSU Stanislaus and the ASCSU. CSU’s General Counsel indicated CSU Academic Senates (and the ASCSU) were not subject to either act as they are recommending bodies.

*Action*

* Chair Filling to get consensus from CCC, UC and CSU system Senate Chairs on a memo or letter from ICAS to send to each segments’ General Counsel which asks their considered opinion regarding the degree to which the Senate meetings fall under the Brown and/or Bagley-Keen acts.

***Daniel Hare, Vice Chair, UC Academic Senate***

Their first academic senate meeting was held 2 days ago and Regents meeting held 10 days ago. A number of issues were discussed. Among them, the most prominent were with regard to recommendations of the Sexual Assault Task Force presented to the regents. The goal is for UC to create a national model for dealing with sexual assault. Including creation of a system response team model for all campuses by January 2015 as well as adoption of system-wide investigation and communication standards by July 2015.

This may be rolled into existing 2 hour sexual harassment training for faculty and administrators.

One of the most important aspects is the establishment of a Confidential Advocacy office for sexual assault and sexual violence by Jan. 2015. This would be separate and independent of their Title 9 Offices and Procedures on the campuses. Funding is yet to be determined. Phase I and Phase II focuses on the initial development, and Phase III will be implementation in three month intervals over the next six to eight months.

UC is experimenting with venture investing. They are taking approximately $250 million from the endowment and investing in UC startups. Its application is currently being discussed and developed. There is concern about the relationship between venture investing and graduate students’ ability to publish their research. The belief is that there needs to be strong intellectual property protections in place.

The Regents addressed the divestment issue. UC Faculty support continued assessment and discussion with their Chief Investment officer as the framework for this is assembled. Although the students’ proposal to immediately divest was not accepted by the Regents, there is still quite a lot of policy formation ahead in incorporating these principles and investment decisions.

The Governor’s Innovation Award plans have been announced. Basically creating awards for increasing the number of bachelor degrees awarded; increasing the completion rate with regard the number of completions within 4 years, and transfers through the State’s education system. These are awards not grants – they are prizes for having done something in these areas and not funding to propose to do something in the future.

***Steven Filling, Chair, CSU Academic Senate***

Legislative: CSU Academic Senate has been active with legislatures and legislation.

Among the bills that went through last year was AB 46. During the legislative process, its scope was widened from third party providers disclosing information they gather through Learning Management Systems to include the CSU as well. This greatly increased the scope of data to be disclosed. Chair Filling had heard (though not seen in writing) that the Governor declined to sign the bill. This was useful in understanding how much shifts and amendments can change a bill that might initially have been supported by the ASCSU.

AB 2324 deals with the CSU Faculty Trustee voting Board member. The process of nominating and electing candidates for Faculty Trustee ends with the Governor appointing one of the candidates ASCSU puts forward. Under AB 2324, if the Governor does not appoint (as had happened in the past under Governor Schwarzenegger), the currently serving Faculty Trustee may serve for an additional year.

ASCSU is in the final planning stages of the Academic Conference…an event which works to bring faculty, administrators, Board members and students together to have conversations about what we do and how it might evolve in the future. The event had taken place for a number of years but was canceled for approximately 10 years due to budgetary concerns. There have been a number of challenges during the planning phases but the ASCSU is moving forward. The planned dates for the conference are November 13th and 14th (2014).

The CSU is in the process of searching for a new Chief Academic Officer. The position was formerly known as the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (currently Ephram Smith). Under Chancellor White’s leadership the position will now be known and the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs.

The CSU continues to be in contract negotiations which expired at the end of June. There was an extension to August which has also expired. Compensation and workload are under negotiation.

There is more focus at the CSU on the services we provide for Veterans’ both in terms of services that help them succeed in classes as well as success and re-entry into society. There is also some focus for awarding them academic credit for their life experiences. It’s a challenging, but ongoing conversation.

The CSU is focusing a bit on the 17 metrics the State is mandating be reported. In doing so, the CSU is considering ways to not only report those but create metrics that will make the reporting easier to understand. One of them is graduation rates and helping both the legislature and the public to understand the context of a 4 year graduation rate at the CSU as opposed to a 4 year graduation rate in the UC. The metrics for one, don’t necessarily reflect the same information as the metrics for the other. Because of this, there are discussions about re-envisioning the way the data is used to drive decision making.

The topic of General Education is of great concern in the CSU right now. Specifically since the Board of Trustees made their decision to require degree completion within 120 (semester)/180 (quarter) units. It’s become a challenge particularly for the CSU’s engineering and accounting programs as we try to reconcile the Legislature and the Trustees’ reduction in units to degree with the requirements of accreditation bodies and licensing requirements for graduates of these programs.

**California Open Education Resources *Council* (CA-OERC)**

***Katherine Harris, Project Coordinator***

The California Open Educational Resources Council is re-branding their name to “California OER Council (CA-OERC)”. This project is funded by the state, the Hewlett Foundation, the Gates Foundation and other private donors for development of OER textbooks and materials, specifically. The council has members from all three higher education segments.

The council has been looking at how to utilize OER technologies and how to harness the technology that’s being used. They started with the basic question “what is a textbook?” and “how do we create peer reviewed text books that faculty will then want to adopt.

There have been about 1200 responses from a faculty survey they sent out to numerous faculty at several different levels and across all three segments. It’s taking some time and effort to get the number of responses they’re hoping for. Members have taken a personalized approach by giving presentations at faculty Senate meetings, on campuses and, in October, a visit to a UC student association to get students on board as well.

CA-OERC is selecting reviewers for textbooks and developing a rigorous rubric of how to review OER textbooks. To accomplish this, the started searching for the full contingent of their reviewers. There are three main criteria they have for reviewers. One – there needs to be one from each segment; two – a variety of career levels (lecturers, adjunct, tenured); third – reviewers with a variety of experience with OER.

They started with Beta-testing over the summer with five courses: public speaking, statistics, economics, chemistry, and history (three or four textbooks in each discipline except public speaking which had six). They were given 4 weeks to review followed by five debrief sessions in which they could come together and discuss their findings. The have been asked about a number of criteria for selecting textbooks: subject matter, editorial design, access on multiple platforms, is the navigation intuitive. As they move further into reviews, they are making an effort to bring students into the conversation in order to get their perspective on the same criteria.

One item that could be taken into consideration (and could come out of this meeting with ICAS) is the council may look to get discipline consultants. Particularly with Chemistry, reviewing text books across all three segments can be challenging. Some courses are similar from one segment to another. But other courses –and therefore textbooks - are not. Perhaps a consultant could help guide the process. A suggestion was made that there might be a way to interface with C-ID and utilize the resources there as C-ID already has resources in place that cross over from CCC, CSU and UC (listserves that reach a wide audience, discipline work groups, etc.)

Kathy Harris requested that Julie Adams utilize her access to these listserves to get the survey out to as many faculty as possible. The next phase (to be completed by fall of 2015) is a review of 45 textbooks. So, as many faculty as possible will need to be reached to aid in that process.

Once peer reviews are done, a faculty adoption process will begin in the spring. The council is working on making these reviews public (as well as a faculty showcase where instructors who are already using OER can share their syllabi and use of the resource). It’s a goal to make the faculty adoption process a fairly easy and informative one.

They would like to use social media as a central resource for accessing these OER (i.e. posting its web link/location to Facebook, twitter, etc.). The council is also asking reviewers to recommend OERs, if they find textbooks they prefer. On the review form, several of the reviewers expressed interest in constructing an OER textbook.

CA-OERC has a Facebook page and are COERC1 on Twitter.

*Action*

* Kathy Harris requested that the 16 reviewers be given a letter of thanks for the work they’ve done (highlighting its innovation and importance as an intersegmental undertaking) and would like that letter to come from ICAS (with cc’s to the reviewers’ Deans, Provosts and department Chairs).

**Academic Freedom & Free *Speech*** *(Filling)*

Chair Filling mentioned that ICAS members will have received a draft resolution (via email) that the ASCSU is considering which addresses Academic Freedom and asked how the three segments could come together on a shared definition and understanding of Academic Freedom. Reference was made to AAUP’s statement as a possible place to start.

Filling asked that they create a shared and common definition of what they think the definition of “academic freedom” is. The group discussed that they should refer to AAUP statements and Title 5 to use as a starting point.

The differences in each segment’s statements on academic freedom were discussed. CCC Colleges each have their own; UC’s is a five page document which is a part of its personnel manual and was recently updated; CSU’s is dated, a one paragraph statement and ASCSU members are concerned that it must be updated.

It was suggested that instead of ICAS crafting a shared statement for all segments, to rather endorse or adopt statements for each segment or, focus on the commonalities between the three segments (for instance, most CCC colleges statements refer to the AAUP statement).

Julie Adams volunteered to look at past ICAS minutes to find a similar conversation ICAS had in the past (reference was made to Horowitz).

**C-ID Update**

Covered previously in the meeting.

**Degree Unit Limits**

Member Morse shared that the 60 unit limit in the CCC for some transfer degrees has proven challenging in much the same way as the 120/180 unit limit has in the CSU. A suggestion among some CCC constituencies has been to pursue “clean-up” to the language in the legislation to increase that to 65 units.

There is awareness that doing so would directly impinge on the number of units to degree in the CSU (and UC) leaving fewer units to 120/180. Morse mentioned that there was a member of FACC who has worked on these kinds of things many times and, perhaps, could find a way to address this through legislation. The possibility of reframing the issue to legislators was also suggested.

It was mentioned that the CSU Board was very clear on the 120 unit limit. An earlier point made by Chair Filling about AB 46 was mentioned. The ASCSU has learned in recent months that legislation can go through amendments and change a bill that might initially have been supported.

**Online Education (Cross *Campus* Enrollment)** *(Hare)*

An update on UC online cross campus enrollments: In 2014 they had 11 online courses and over 1,000 students completed them for an average of approximately 100 students per course on their own campuses. At the same time, there were 33 students who completed these courses in a cross campus mode.

They hope to increase the catalog to another 40-50 courses with the goal being 150 courses in the future.

Member Hare asked what the cross campus enrollment picture is for CCC and CSU.

Member Morse responded that, although the tracking numbers for this are not available right now, articulation agreements show that there are many successful online courses at the community college level.

Chair Filling indicated that the numbers on the CSU side are not yet available for fall (and the summer numbers are not complete). But, the numbers that are available seem to indicate a situation similar to UC – good enrollment in online courses at home campuses, less for cross campus.

A UC member pointed out that much of this could be driven by the difference between an online class where the student can take advantage of opportunities to speak face to face with the instructor and utilize tutoring services if they are enrolled at the same campus offering the course. A UC Santa Barbara student’s experience of an online course offered by that campus is going to be different than a UC Berkeley student’s experience in the same course.

Member Gubernat mentioned the CSU’s “Course-Match” project and the difficulties it raises for students looking to take a course at a CSU campus other than their own. It’s a problem the CSU Chancellor’s office is aware of.

**CSU Executive Order (EO) 1065 revision – GE Breadth**

EO 1065 addresses several aspects of general education including minimum grades, residency, and (to some degree) learning outcomes (demonstrated competencies).

Filling shared a copy of the order and its revisions with ICAS members. His understanding is that the changes are to clarify items in the order.

**Adding/Removing members from the listserv**

Reference was made to the ICAS bylaws. Members agreed, generally speaking, substitutes can attend when a member of ICAS can’t make a meeting but individuals from outside the committee are not to be added to the ICAS membership (each segment has 5 members). Those who need to see meeting materials in their capacity as substitutes can be added to the listserv.

**BA/BS Conversation** *(Morse)*

SB 850 has passed through the legislature and the Governor is expected to sign it. The legislation allows for a 15 college pilot program where each is allowed to offer one Bachelor’s in an area where a Bachelor’s degree is not offered by the CSU or UC.

There are a number of things to be decided at the CCC regarding implementation. At the last CSU General Education Advisory Committee, members asked to be kept up to date on developments and offered items for the CCC to consider. For instance, questions were raised about upper division general education.

A suggestion was made for ICAS to express its concern as to how this will be implemented and make formal recommendations that the segments work together to craft implementation processes and policies, highlight the faculty’s role in certain aspects of the legislation and voice faculty concerns as an intersegmental body.

Suggestions were also made that, if the CCC has a task force or committee that meets or will meet to discuss the implementation, they might consider making sure members of the other two segments are a part of or participate in such a committee.

**ICAS Advocacy Day – April 13th or 20th**

Chair Filling shared how the members of ICAS (Chairs of each segment) had been doing a number of follow-up visits last year in the fall to legislators and their staff to discuss specific pieces of legislation and held a brown bag workshop in February for legislators staff which centered around online education. It was well received and helped get the story out about what’s going on with regard to online education and how it works.

He suggested it might be a good idea to do that again and perhaps have Kathy Harris come for one to talk to legislators about OER. It might also be useful to have a brown bag workshop with them that discusses the human realities students face on their paths to degrees.

Identifying newer legislators and legislative staff could be an area of focus for some of these visits. ICAS member Miller added that a letter from ICAS, reaching out to congratulate them and express great interest in meeting with them, will aid in advocacy efforts.

Additionally, it would be very useful to make them aware of ICAS as an invaluable higher education resource when seeking information and/or guidance on legislation as well as providing perspective for the “big picture” (and unintended consequences) when it comes to the CSU, UC, and CCC.

It was noted that meeting with Governmental affairs representatives from all three segments prior to advocacy days and brown bag workshops (at the next ICAS meeting) could prove valuable.

**National Science Foundation (NSF) – Sponsored Engineering Transfer Workshop** *(Morse)*

A letter from NSF to CCC Engineering Deans was included in each members meeting folder. The NSF is sponsoring a discussion of engineering curricula and transfer paths. They would like to put together a group of faculty from all three segments to discuss. Specifically, the letter requests assistance in identifying and nominating two representatives from each institution to participate (a faculty member involved with engineering curriculum and another individual - dean, associate dean, or faculty - involved with enrollment management and transfer. C-ID director Michelle Pilati suggested to member Morse that this is something to bring to ICAS’ attention.

Members agreed that the originator of the letter should be contacted and directed to each segments’ Academic Senate.

**Adjournment – 3:00**

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

Respectfully submitted by Tracy Butler