



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

ICAS MEETING MINUTES

Monday, November 29, 2021 | 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Videoconference

ROLL CALL

(CSU) Robert Keith Collins, Chair; Thomas Norman, Secretary; Nola Butler-Byrd, Member-at-Large; David M. Speak, Member-at-Large; Tracy Butler, Director

(UC) Robert Horwitz, Chair; Susan Cochran, Vice Chair; Mary Lynch, UCEP Chair; Katheryn Russ, UCEP Vice Chair; Madeleine Sorapure, BOARS Chair; Jingsong Zhang, UCOPE Chair; *Monica Lin*, Director, A-G and Transfer Policy Analysis & Coordination, UC Office of the President; Hilary Baxter, Executive Director; Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

(CCC) Dolores Davison, President; Virginia May, Vice President; Cheryl Aschenbach, Secretary; Michelle Bean, Treasurer; Karla Kirk, North Representative; Krystinne Mica, Executive Director

I. Announcements

Robert Horwitz, ICAS Chair and Chair, UC Academic Senate

- The Regents met in person at UCSF last week and agenda topics included:
 - UC has reached a tentative settlement with Unit 18 Lecturers after two years of negotiations;
 - The graduate student researchers are forming a bargaining unit and a central question is who should be in it;
 - The complicated issues related to transferring into UC.

Robert Collins, Chair, CSU Academic Senate

- Effective and transparent communication about the work on Assembly Bill (AB) 928 is a priority and a feedback portal will help guide initial CSU contributions to ICAS conversations.
- The ASCSU plenary on November 4-5th included:
 - The third Moving Beyond Bias Trainings and meetings with CSU student trustees, Chancellor Castro, and other representatives of the Chancellor's Office.
 - The introduction of 16 resolutions: four appearing in Second Reading, two in First Reading with a waiver request, ten in First Reading, and those approved included:
 1. AS-3500-21/FA (Rev) Suspension of Mandatory Peer Observations of Instruction and Student Evaluations for Academic Year 2021-2022, which was approved.
 2. AS-3505-21/APEP (Rev) Supporting CSU System Office Review Standards for General Education (GE) Area F (Ethnic Studies) Submissions, which was approved.
 3. AS-3509-21/FGA/FA WSCUC Continued Authorization for Remote Instruction During COVID-19 Pandemic, which was approved.
 - The following resolutions were introduced for First Reading consideration:
 1. AS-3510-21/EX Apportionment of ASCSU Seats
 2. AS-3511-21/AA Role of Shared Governance for Decisions on Instructional Modality
 3. AS-3513-21/FGA Updated Legislative Advocacy Guidelines for the ASCSU
 4. AS-3514-21/FA Faculty Rights to Due Process in Letters of Reprimand Within the CSU

5. AS-3515-21/APEP Establishing Core Competencies for CSU General Education (GE) Areas A1, A2, A3, and B4 (the “Golden Four”)
 6. AS-3518-21/EX Increasing the Membership of the Ad Hoc Committee to Advance Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Within the ASCSU
 7. AS-3519-21/FA Support of Faculty Supervision of Student Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities in the CSU
 8. S-3520-21/FA Recognition and Support of Faculty Participation in Shared Governance
- ASCSU continues to monitor campus repopulation concerns raised by faculty; the implementation of the new CSU Ethnic Studies Requirement through the Academic Affairs Committee; and calls for faculty participation in the Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs) and CORE C-ID processes continue to be circulated.

Dolores Davison, President, CCC Academic Senate

- President Davison, Chair Horwitz and CSU representatives provided testimony to the Assembly Committee on Higher Education about how the systems were recovering from the pandemic.
- The ASCCC held its plenary session from November 4-6th: 23 resolutions were approved and there was significant interest in the Senate’s involvement with how the return to campus and vaccine mandates are being handled.
- During the Board of Governors meeting this month, there were discussions about remedial education and ensuring that students graduate within two years.
 - Another topic was the CCC’s memorandum of understanding with the for-profit American Public University (APU) system which has been designated as a predatory system by watchdog groups. The Chancellor’s Office has explained that the APU will accept the CCC transfer students because the CSUs and UCs do not have the capacity to admit them.
- Faculty in Communications and other disciplines are concerned that their courses will be cut because of AB 928, and President Davison advises ICAS to be careful as it considers what GE will be.
- The AB 1111 task force has not been established yet but the Chancellor’s Office has contracted with an outside organization to begin looking at the common course numbering system.
 - WestEd has worked with CCCs on the C-ID and is interested in this new effort as well as transitioning to numbering based on Classification of Instructional Programs (C-IP) codes.
 - CCC is the only institution that lists its courses under the taxonomy of programs and the common course numbering legislation is an opportunity to transition to the C-IP codes used by most other systems of higher education.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The October 22, 2021 ICAS videoconference minutes were approved.

Acton: The committee approved the appointment of Jingsong Zhang as Chair of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) Standards Subcommittee.

III. Implementation of Assembly Bill 928 ~ Singular GE Pathway

Chair Horwitz has proposed to President Davison and Chair Collins that the IGETC Standard Subcommittee with two additional members from each segment would comprise the group that figures out the singular GE pathway. Members were asked to give this idea some thought which can be discussed later in the meeting. During the last meeting, the committee considered forming a new GE pathway that builds on IGETC but there were worries that this approach would not lead to a singular

pathway. Executive Director Baxter suggested starting with Areas 1 through 5 of IGETC as the core of GE and adding UC's Language other than English requirement or CSU's Critical Thinking requirement as admissions requirements. This would simplify what applies to both CSU and UC and clearly signal anything additional specifically required by CSU or UC.

Discussion: It is possible that legislators will not view what Executive Director Baxter proposed as a singular pathway. CSU and UC need to reach an agreement otherwise administrators will define the GE pathway, and administrators do not fully understand the distinctions between the CSU and UC systems and the types of students each segment wants to produce. Chair Collins commented that the decrease from 39 to 34 units will be challenging for the CSU. Members agree that the new Ethnic Studies requirement will be in the new pathway, however, where Oral Communication and Lifelong Learning fit needs to be determined. A member noted that the CCC courses that articulate for GE to CSU and UC are not necessarily the same courses even if they fall into the same categories, and more courses articulate to CSU than to UC. Lifelong Learning was removed from the GE pattern at most CCCs. An added complication is that many CCCs have local GE patterns and the changes made to create the singular GE pathway may impact CCC students planning to transfer to schools other than CSU or UC, so the CCCs may advocate to keep the local GE offerings. The CCCs also want to avoid eliminating student choice although this is already a reality since transfer students are limited to taking 60 units.

While there is some flexibility for the CSUs to teach certain courses at the upper division instead of lower division, CSU faculty consider Oral Communication and Lifelong Learning to be lower division major preparation students should have before coming to a CSU. The more remedial work students have completed the better their chances of success. Chair Horwitz encouraged members to think about compromises in terms of where certain courses fit in without sacrificing the skills faculty want students to attain. Chair Collins indicated that ICAS could think about this as a completely new GE pathway and consider restructuring the subject areas such as moving English and Oral Communication into Areas 3 and 4 of IGETC. Several members agreed with the notion of starting from scratch by thinking about the knowledge and skills critical to GE or reducing the number of units required in some areas.

UCR has been looking at its GE requirements and this work is still unfinished after a year, and a similar effort at UCSF is meeting with faculty resistance. UC faculty would be concerned about any changes that would diminish Writing instruction because there is an expectation that transfer students will have strong writing skills. Eliminating Lifelong Learning would open up a number of units and it could be taught at the upper division or woven into other subject areas. ICAS members agree on the commitment to ensuring strong writing, communication, and quantitative skills. Moving certain subject areas from the lower to upper division will be problematic for high unit majors at the CSUs like Engineering, Business, or Computer Science.

A member asked if the CSU IGETC could be the definition of IGETC since it has more units. One thing that would need to be worked out is the difference in how CSU and UC currently distribute course requirements among Areas 1 to 5. If the CSU IGETC is adopted, the additional course in English Communication could be moved to Social and Behavioral Sciences. Members agreed that clarification is needed about whether the number of units is 34 or 37. Chair Collins was told by the CSU Chancellor's Office that the unit cap is 34. Chair Horwitz may wish to check in with UC Legal and State Government Relations about their reading of the legislation and the unit limits.

IV. Transfer Alignment Project (TAP)

- *Ginni May, Vice President, CCC Academic Senate*

The UC and CSU senates were asked to identify a faculty representative and an articulation officer to serve on the Transfer Alignment Project (TAP) Workgroup. The workgroup has met with the Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs) for Biology and English as part of phase two of the project to consider if there is a way to align the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) with the UC Transfer Pathways. A UC faculty representative at the meeting on Biology indicated that the Transfer Pathways were established at the system level. The UC Office of the President asked the faculty across the campuses to indicate which courses transfer students should have taken for this major, and there were no in-depth discussions among all the discipline faculty on what courses should be included or eliminated. This resulted in CCC students following a Pathway taking more courses than necessary, especially in Science, Technology, Math and Engineering. The TAP Workgroup wants to have meetings where UC, CSU, and CCC faculty are able to get into the details about their disciplines and determine what courses students can take after transferring. When faculty decide there is no way to align a Pathway with the TMC, they will consider how to clearly communicate the differences to CCC students and the public. The workgroup's next meeting will be in January.

Discussion: Chair Collins expects to identify the CSU representative by next week. It was noted that the Transfer Pathways for Chemistry and Physics have been worked out. Biology tends to require even more courses than Chemistry and Physics but the Biology faculty have explained why the additional requirements are necessary. The workgroup may wish to pursue the idea of devising distinctive program names in order to identify and distinguish different programs by their different goals. Vice President May indicated that having different names for similar degrees would mean changing the rule that there can only be one TMC per discipline. Chair Horwitz asked how the TAP corresponds to the ADT Intersegmental Implementation Committee called for by AB 928 to serve as the primary entity charged with oversight of the ADTs. Since the TAP began some time ago, Vice President May believes the project's work could possibly be completed before this new committee gets off the ground.

The vice president explained that the ASCCC's request for funding to bring together faculty from the three segments to discuss aligning the Pathways and TMCs was denied, so the existing Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW) is being utilized for this effort. The TAP is studying the 20 UC Transfer Pathways and the TMCs that align with them. The ICW assembles the FDRGs, which are comprised of three faculty members from each segment in a discipline, and the FDRG discusses the major and curriculum and makes a recommendation to the ICW about what the pathway and the preparatory courses should be. The FDRGs do not look at GE unless there are questions about the number of units. The ICW then prepares a survey to send to discipline faculty to weigh in on the recommendation. The CCC and CSU chancellor's offices facilitate the agreements for the ADTs and TMCs. The ICW's regular work involves vetting the TMCs (there are currently 40) which will be used by the CCCs to develop the ADTs.

Reportedly, it took five years to finalize the negotiations for the Physics and Chemistry pathways. To date, the participation of CSU faculty has been good and Vice President May emphasized the need for UC faculty involvement. If the project had funding, faculty could be compensated for this work. The TAP has looked at seven disciplines and found that Sociology, History, and Anthropology easily aligned while Business Administration, Mathematics, Economics and Philosophy did not. The lack of alignment

in these four disciplines led to the idea of establishing two TMCs for a discipline, one leading to CSU and the other leading to UC.

In-depth conversations with participation by CCC, CSU and UC faculty are essential to being able to communicate the reasons why major preparation does not align. If faculty were given the time to do this work, instead of taking two or three years to complete, recommendations could be ready by the end of June. One previous request for funds was in the ASCCC's budget change proposal to their chancellor's office as part of a bill that was eventually rejected. The immediate past chair of the UC Senate felt that a proposed joint funding request of \$900k per segment which was discussed by ICAS last year was too large. There was an expectation that the FDRG meetings would be done in person but how much each faculty member would be compensated had not been calculated. Ideally, the FDRGs would include at least one UC faculty member per discipline from each UC campus with at least nine CCC and nine CSU faculty per discipline. Funds would also be need to cover support and coordination from staff, and President Davison stated that it might be possible to use funding CCCs have received for other transfer efforts for the TAP.

ICAS could make a statement about the nature of major preparation, explaining that there are areas where the segments agree and that certain majors require different preparation. The statement could also argue that it is better for faculty to collaborate on these issues rather than having policymakers use legislation to force curriculum to meet requirements that are not appropriate from the perspective of faculty. Chair Horwitz suggested that ICAS should prepare a progress report for Assemblymember Berman about the work on AB 928 so far and the report could highlight some of the complications.

President Davison agreed with the suggestion of a progress report and commented that it is important for legislators to hear directly from faculty with expertise in their disciplines. Policymakers need to hear directly from students about why they cannot afford to give up their employment or relocate away from their families in order to complete their degrees in 60 units. Chair Collins shared that Engineering faculty assert that capping the number of units limits their ability to prepare students to perform engineering jobs when they enter the workforce. Another important factor is that Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology certification cannot be changed.

V. Assembly Bill 1111

This topic was discussed during the Announcements.

VI. Campus Repopulation Concerns During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Chair Horwitz shared that an issue that has surfaced at many UC campuses is the question of who controls teaching modality, which should be left up to faculty. However, the need to accommodate students due to medical reasons is now conflicting with faculty control over teaching modality. Teaching in more than one modality is labor intensive for faculty and they are not compensated for the extra effort.

Discussion: The need to accommodate students is a long-standing problem that was heightened by the pandemic but has been compounded by the difficulties of getting to campus due to things students cannot control, such as public transit not being available at pre-pandemic levels. Teaching hybrid courses is more challenging in part because technical support has been underfunded for many years and better technical infrastructure could enable faculty to be more creative. Chair Collins made a

motion, which was seconded, for ICAS to make a resolution that teaching modality is under the control of faculty, and Chair Collins also offered to draft the resolution. The joint memo on AB 928 was widely read but Chair Collins learned that legislators and their staffers do not know about ICAS.

The backlash to this proposed resolution might be that people disagree with the position ICAS takes, but Chair Collins believes it would be beneficial for the committee to drive the discussion about online instruction, and to point out that significant professional development and funding are required. Importantly, the resolution will be the voice of faculty and show that faculty from the three segments share common ground. The resolution should be carefully worded to avoid the suggestion that faculty are unwilling to be flexible or are anti-student, but the document needs to help policymakers understand that teaching in multiple modalities is a tremendous amount of work for faculty who receive no support. Data from UC's faculty survey on remote instruction and a CSU student trustee survey might be incorporated into the resolution. The analyst proposed that ICAS could send a letter to legislators at the beginning of every year introducing them to the committee.

VII. New Business

There was no New Business.

Videoconference adjourned at: 3:55 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Robert Horwitz