



The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates - University of California - The California State University - California Community Colleges

## ICAS Meeting Minutes – Monday, April 13, 2026

### Roll Call

(ASCCC) LaTonya Parker-Parnell, President; Robert Stewart, Vice President; Erik Reese, Treasurer; Eric Wada, Secretary, Stephanie Curry, North Representative; Kim Tran, Executive Director; Austin Webster, Interim Executive Director; Holly Deme, Project Manager

(ASCSU) Adam Swenson, Vice Chair; Tracy Dawn Hamilton, Secretary; Dana Nakano, Member-at-Large; Nola Butler-Byrd, Member-at-Large; Tracey McGuire, Program Manager

(UC Academic Senate) Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair; Susannah Scott, Vice Chair; Catherine Sugar, UCEP Chair; Dave Volz, BOARS Chair; Bradley Queen, UCOPE Chair; Monica Lin, Executive Director

Guests:

Cheryl Aschenbach, Common Course Numbering Faculty Director (ASCCC)

### Consent Calendar

**Action:** Approval of March 30, 2026, meeting minutes deferred due to a lack of quorum.

**Action:** Approval of April 13, 2026, agenda, with agreement to not take action on items without appropriate representation. (Curry, Butler-Byrd)

## I. Announcements

### a. LaTonya Parker-Parnell, ICAS Chair, and Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) President

Kim Tran was welcomed as the permanent Executive Director of the ASCCC, having joined in early April 2026. He will serve as chief executive officer, providing strategic leadership, representing the organization on academic and professional matters, and supporting the development of systemwide partnerships.

Recent events included the ASCCC Artificial Intelligence (AI) Academic Academy held March 19-21 in Costa Mesa, as well as the 2026 Spring Plenary session which occurred April 9-11 in Santa Rosa and included elections. Parker-Parnell confirmed continuing leadership with new member Jerome Hunt beginning June 1<sup>st</sup>. Various resolutions were adopted and will be posted soon on the ASCCC website.

Five strategic directions were approved by resolution during the 2026 Spring Plenary session including positioning the ASCCC as a leading voice for California Community College faculty; promoting connection, inclusion, and collaborative engagement; advancing organizational trust, accountability, and long-term financial stability; evaluating and reimagining organizational structures, processes and governance; and promoting professional learning that builds faculty leadership. Other focuses included generative AI training and resources for faculty.

Additionally, “Counseling: Mental Health” and “Uncrewed Aircraft Systems (UAS) Technology” were recommended as new disciplines though they still require approval from the CCC Board of Governors. Also included was support for legislation related to baccalaureate degrees (AB 2301, AB 2694, SB 960).

A Word document copy of this report was provided to meeting attendees.

**b. Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair, UC Academic Senate**

There were no significant updates since the prior meeting other than the recent election of Amani M. Nuru-Jeter (UC Berkeley) as incoming UC Academic Senate Vice Chair beginning September 1, 2026, as Susannah Scott steps up to Chair.

**c. Dana Nakano, CSU Academic Senate Member-at-Large on behalf of Elizabeth Boyd, Chair, CSU Academic Senate**

Members Boyd, Volz, and Reese met to discuss the CCN articulation memo with a particular focus on the associated diagram. Concerns regarding course articulation in CSU degrees were discussed. Both simplified and complex versions of the diagram were forwarded to Marci Sanchez (Assistant Director, Undergraduate Transfer Programs) and Quajuana Chapman (Assistant Director of General Education and Intersegmental Partnerships) of the CSU Office of the Chancellor with a request to develop a parallel CSU version or amend the existing diagrams with the hope to have feedback by the next meeting. It was relayed that the CCN Template memo should be on hold and revisited for discussion in May. It was felt that they were closer to an agreed upon articulation process with a need for there to be a CCC understanding of why a non-COR approach poses challenges. Boyd, Volz, and Reese agreed it would be valuable to have an ICAS-agreed upon process to share with Assembly Member Berman ahead of AB 2236.

**II. Cal-GETC Standards Subcommittee Report**

The Cal-GETC Standards Subcommittee convened faculty workgroups related to Area 1 (including all subareas), 2, and 6, to review the subject areas. Each of the three subject areas had one faculty representative from each segment with a total of five groups formed. The faculty representatives were often joined by intersegmental articulation officers and system office representatives. In addition, an annual survey was conducted to gather articulation officer feedback across all segments. A smaller subcommittee reviewed the articulation officer survey results. While some feedback was not actionable, limited revisions are under consideration.

For Areas 1A and 1B, efforts focused on alignment between the Cal-GETC standards and the UC 7-course pattern. It is very close and there will be some additions to these areas for that alignment. There were a couple of items not explicitly mentioned in the standards such as substantial reading which we will see in forthcoming standards. Area 1C will have minor changes related to transitional language in moving from IGETC to Cal-GETC.

The goal for Area 2 this year was to align as well as possible the UC 7-course criteria for the Mathematics area with the Cal-GETC standards. The group ultimately found there was not going to be an easy way to do that and composed a rationale memo for why they were not recommending any changes at this time that will be shared with the Cal-GETC Standards Subcommittee and ICAS.

The Area 6 workgroup continues to have robust intersegmental conversations. There were some concerns expressed about the compressed timeline for the work given the need for thoughtful conversation. The interest continues to be clarifying in the standards document what a transferable course meeting the subject area will look like. Suggestions were made and there needs to be agreement from all three segments that those suggestions are acceptable.

Further discussion within ICAS centered around the main issues or questions related to alignment of criteria between the CSU and UC. CCC have expressed concerns about strong Ethnic Studies courses being denied

and exact courses receiving disparate transferability review and articulation decisions. There is further intersegmental conversation needed regarding how to address these concerns.

### **III. Proposal for Clarifying Revisions to ICAS Bylaw Article IX, Section 3. General Education Transfer Curriculum Standards Review Committee**

Following prior discussions on the role and responsibilities of the General Education Transfer Curriculum Standards Review Committee in convening subgroups, this proposed revision aims to clarify and strengthen the subcommittee's authority to appoint discipline committees.

ICAS members reviewed the bylaw language together and made edits during the discussion process. Key points discussed included:

- Benefits of having intersegmental continuity between ICAS and the Cal-GETC subcommittee which leads to consistency in messaging
- Structure as one subcommittee with workgroups or separate ICAS workgroups
- Recruitment of subject matter experts and recommendation responsibilities
- Clarity around equal representation for voting members across all three segments
- Historical process of the chair determining the number of advisors and faculty representatives based on the year's workload which provides flexibility

The ICAS Bylaw Article IX, Section 3 updates were approved as edited during the meeting (Stewart, Palazoglu) with the ASCCC having responsibility to reflect the changes on the ICAS website.

### **IV. Common Course Numbering Course Templates**

The discussion opened with the status of the newest version of the Common Course Numbering (CCN) Course Template memo. Proposed edits from the prior meeting were incorporated and a clean copy was provided by separate email to the group. A new urgency was conveyed based on AB 2236 and the desire to show intersegmental progress. The CCC and UC have weighed in and CSU input of language they feel comfortable with is requested.

A draft recommended process for articulation review of CCN templates created by Volz was shared. This flow chart could be used for ICAS, potentially as a public-facing form of communication with legislators and for other forms of outreach. ICAS members discussed differences in segment processes (UC centralized review versus CSU reliance on campus-level determinations), the need to clarify feedback loops for denied templates, and the relationship between Course Outlines of Record (CORs) and templates. As the group stepped through the flow process, some members expressed that CORs remain necessary in some cases, particularly where templates cannot fully address articulation needs. There was a reminder that the focus for right now is more on transferability versus course-to-course or major articulation and that the current template process largely mirrors the current COR process. A potential flow simplification was suggested that would highlight ASSIST as the public-facing articulation repository and help provide clear messaging to support further ASSIST funding.

The group agreed that having a visual process representation would be very useful in clarifying how articulation works and showing the progress being made. There was general agreement on the value of developing both an internal, detailed process flow and a simplified, public-facing version to support communication with external stakeholders.

Volz requested members send written comments before he, Boyd, and Reese meet again in order to bring the updated memo and process flow chart to the May 15 meeting which will be the last opportunity for the group to take action in this academic year.

## V. Common Course Numbering Update

CCN Faculty Director Cheryl Aschenbach provided an overview of the CCN implementation progress. To date, 82 CCN templates have been developed (Phase I – 6, Phase II – 24, Phase III - 52). This was a rapid implementation from initiating Phase I pre-convening surveys in April of 2024 to Phase III faculty reconvenings to finalize templates in November 2025. Phase I is student-facing as of Fall 2025, Phase IIA as of Fall 2026, and Phase IIB is coming in Fall 2027 (though some colleges have already planned to release specific Phase IIB aligned courses with Phase IIA courses in Fall 2026). As of April 6, 2026, nearly 2,200 CCN Phase I and II courses are live across 115 CCCs. The release of Phase III templates is on hold pending further intersegmental discussion with a goal toward a template-first review process.

Intersegmental faculty participation has been critical to the implementation process and the structure has evolved over the three phases from large convenings to smaller CCN Faculty Workgroups (CCNFWs) with extensive surveying of the faculty-at-large for widespread feedback beyond the workgroups.

Fall 2025 student enrollment data indicates more than 550,000 CCC students enrolled in a CCN aligned course across the six Phase I templates. Projected annual student enrollment numbers for Phase I-III courses (based on C-ID alignments) are estimated to approach 4 million which is likely a lower than true total since some templates are not based on C-ID descriptors, and the number does not take into account students taking honors or embedded support-related courses.

Aschenbach pointed out that there is a Chemistry survey vetting until April 28 to gather feedback on updated lab content for the Introduction to General Chemistry, General Chemistry I, and General Chemistry II templates. The Chemistry CCNFW was reconvened last fall to add additional detail to the lab content to support transferability and articulation without creating a common curriculum or demanding specific experiments or lab equipment. ICAS CSU and UC representatives indicated they had passed along the survey request to their related faculty.

The presentation also included information regarding CCN and C-ID similarities and differences. C-ID is meant for alignment of similar courses – many potential types of courses to one descriptor – versus CCN which is a one course for one template structure. Development and review cycles are necessary for both CCN and C-ID and will require coordination. C-ID descriptors may need updating and templates should not be revised without descriptor updates. There are faculty groups associated with each initiative and there have been conversations about whether there should be crossover or interaction between the two. Considerations are ongoing.

Articulation challenges have evolved with CCCs having to resubmit all CORs for transferability review (UC transferability and eligibility, Cal-GETC, and CSU American Institutions). Most transferability denials in Phase I were technical, not content based. However, Phase II related courses are now receiving decisions that seem inconsistent with historical approvals and may reduce student flexibility including History courses being denied Area 3B and CSU US-1.

The next steps for CCN include continuing intersegmental template-first articulation conversations at ICAS and with the system offices, while also taking a deeper look into what is happening with the transferability denials. In addition, the CCC Chancellor's Office CCN Scope & Sequencing Workgroup, containing two articulation officers from the CCC, CSU, and UC, is reviewing 319 course clusters generated via AI (based on data from ASSIST, C-ID, and 22-23 enrollment data) with the goal to provide a recommended list of which courses should be next in the development queue. The workgroup's recommendations will go to the CCN Council for a projected template development list and a determination of what a template review process will look like. There is still a focus on further development given the push by legislation and revisions will need to be made to the initial templates based on what we have learned to date. Finally, there will be a template development effort related to quarter colleges.

The final presentation slide focused on available resources.

A question was posed about outcomes and how many of the CCN aligned courses are tied to new baccalaureate degrees. Aschenbach indicated the CCN templates are not related to the baccalaureate degrees as there is no intention at this time to address upper-division work. There has been some discussion at the CCN Council level regarding outcomes, but it will take some time to get the data. When asked how template articulation sits alongside C-ID and Associate Degrees for Transfer, Aschenbach indicated that the ask, even from the initial Task Force report, was to use the CCN templates for transferability determinations at the system level rather than from 115 CCC CORs. And then, in the future potentially, to have university departments or programs review a template rather than a COR. The C-ID piece is similar. Instead of 115 colleges needing to resubmit their updated CORs for C-ID review, we would like C-ID reviewers to make decisions based on the templates which would then apply to any CCC that adopts that commonly numbered course. It would be more predictable up front and remove decision variability.

Post-presentation discussion highlighted ongoing challenges, including inconsistent articulation outcomes, difficulty in distinguishing between template versus COR-related transferability denials, and concerns about the impact on academic freedom. Faculty feedback indicates both support for alignment and tension between standardization and academic freedom.

## **VI. Proposed Common Course Numbering Legislation, Assembly Bill 2236**

This item was placed on the agenda to continue the conversations initiated during the ICAS Legislative Day regarding AB 2236 authored by Assembly Member Berman (Berman). The UC will be meeting with Ellen Green from Berman's office on Friday. There is a desire to make the point that collaboration is happening across the three segments to make sure students benefit from this effort. Since the meeting has not occurred yet, concerns or comments were elicited from the segments to be incorporated into the legislative conversation. The purpose of requesting the meeting is to underscore the meaningful progress that has been made, preserve faculty curricular authority, and not get mired in articulation complexities. Segment leadership provided background regarding their legislative meetings and expressed support for the use of templates as well as some examples where the use CORs might be necessary. Discussion included that most aligned content will work, particularly since the focus is currently on general education versus course-to-course and major preparation articulation. It was noted that the upcoming meeting should emphasize the general education-specific articulation and the enrollment numbers provided by Aschenbach given the astounding student impact.

## **VII. ICAS Core Values Statement**

Given the April meeting occurred only two weeks after the March meeting, the members working on the values document had not yet reconnected. Three guiding elements are included in the approach - the statement should be succinct like a mission statement, include a preamble, and not be bound to a particular point in time. A revised version will be brought to ICAS for the May 15 meeting.

## **VIII. Future Agenda Items and Adjournment**

The next ICAS meeting will take place on Friday, May 15, 2026, at San Diego City College. More information will be provided. There was an inquiry as to whether a dinner would be held the evening prior to the meeting. No decision was made.

Meeting adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Holly Deme